The contributions in this section together build the conviction that inhabiting, discovering, and remembering a landscape are fundamental to the business of being human. Any awareness of the landscape that human beings can develop depends entirely on our incarnation as embodied creatures. The most “distanced” perspective that we can experience is generally considered as being a visual one, but even this is reliant on having eyes to see with. Of course, it is a mistake to separate vision from the other senses, since people generally experience their world through forms of synaesthesia, in which sight, sound, smell, and touch blur into one another, forming complementary aspects or understandings that cannot be reduced to atomized sensory data.

Moreover, the world in general, and the landscape in particular, reveal themselves to us in specific ways according to conditions: light, humidity, and the mood that we happen to find ourselves in. The embodied experience of place is always unique to the circumstances and the particular embodiment that we live through. It is not just any-body that encounters the world: the body is gendered, aged, and enabled in such a way that biological and cultural components are often not easy to separate.

Landscapes may be familiar or unfamiliar, but they are continually disclosed to us, through the body and through material things. Tools provide us with insights into particular places (the hard soil that resists the spade; the machete cutting through the undergrowth), while architecture at once transforms the landscape and renders it memorable. Because this revelation and learning of the land do not take place in a single location, our relationship with the landscape is dispersed. Inhabitation or dwelling is spread through space, and our personal identity (as a combination of past experience, present residence and future projects) is not fixed or bounded in one location. We come to know the world, and ourselves in the world, by moving through it. In these embodied landscapes, time itself sets and unsetst the scene, for we do not merely build on what has come before. Rather, we also silence the past, and with this our previous understanding and experience of our location, continuously performing cultural amnesias through shifting experiences and social performances in very particular places. Thus, landscapes are sensual performances that incorporate not only sight, hearing, smell, taste, and touch but also memory, sentiment, morality, and imagination.

Gender is distinguished from sex on the grounds that it goes beyond the physical distinction between men and women, and is constructed as a set of roles, activities, and behaviors (Nelson 1997: 15). While sharing a “performative” character with sexuality, it extends beyond those aspects of the life journey that pertain to erotic significance. Gender is socially and variably assigned in today’s world, and gender archaeology builds on the premise that this was also the case in the past. Gender is not pregiven. It is defined differentially across cultural groups, with culturally determined “frameworks of intelligibility” often delimiting the possibilities of sex, gender, and sexuality within socially permitted and naturalized categories (e.g., Butler 1990). It has been given considerable attention in the fields of social anthropology, history, cultural studies, and women’s studies, and each of these has certainly influenced the incorporation of gender within landscape archaeology. In line with poststructuralist and critical, postmodern concerns, each discipline has adopted gender analysis and explicit excursions into the gendered world in ongoing commitments to often-marginalized peoples, bodies, and emotions.

This chapter offers a study of gender in lived and living cultural landscapes, set within the context of Indigenous Australian archaeology. Although it is specifically concerned with gender and gendered expressions in landscape archaeology, there are a range of research areas in gender in archaeology. These include not only the study of men, women, and children in the past but also contemporary treatments of the issue, by turning to study the androcentric assumptions and preconceptions in aspects of archaeology and the political aspects of workplace structures and interactions in archaeology (Conkey 1993).

Experiential aspects of the human past have also come to dominate landscape archaeologies and signal the shift away from “high-level systemic explanations” of human groups and the “reinsertion of agency into archaeological social theory” (Hamilakis, Pluciennik, and Tarlow 2002: 3). These dimensions of landscape archaeology have been inspired by the pivotal theoretical works of Bourdieu (1977, 1990), Derrida (1978), Giddens (1979, 1984), and Merleau-Ponty (1962,
Gender in landscape archaeology requests of us to realize the historicity and character of gender in the landscape, to “free up” sacred and gendered locations in light of colonial experiences and the subsequent relocation of Aboriginal people, contemporary non-Indigenous land-use practices, and tourism.

Yanyuwa country appears to have been gendered more explicitly in the past than it is today. Although meanings in the landscape may have shifted, among Yanyuwa elders there persists a memory of the sacred places and ceremonies of men and of women. These sacred places are spoken of with emotion and great care. People recall and understand country to be gendered, especially through means of ceremony and ancestral activity, but at the same time they recognize that land and seascapes are now much more “free,” in that restrictions of access and interaction with key places are no longer enforced in the manner with which they were in the pre- and postcontact past. To enforce Law relating to country (for a discussion of the concept of Yanyuwa Law, see Bradley, this volume), whether in terms of gender restrictions or permissions to land, sea, and resource access, would be impossible for Yanyuwa people today. Their daily world is now frequented by tourists, and non-Indigenous landowners are not sensitive of the ngalki and Law of the land.

Overall there is an understanding among many Yanyuwa that some parts of country must become more open. Thus today such places are granted the status of warrukki—partially sacred, and released from secret and sacred restrictions. An understanding of this fluidity of landscape and its gendered meanings that lie between pre-established categories is framed by a colonized and traumatized landscape, one that is best described as a wounded space (Rose 2004: 34). And it is precisely this fluidity that enables an archaeology of gendered Yanyuwa landscapes to take place, because not only do we find spatially gendered domains in the landscape, but such gendered domains can be expected to have emerged in time and to have unfixed, traceable histories amenable to archaeolog-
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Throughout Yanyuwa country, places and Dreaming ancestors are all granted names and gender. They are often attributed with characteristics that are considered expressions of a particular gender identity. This fact is still evident today; it is part of the Law that forms the basis of Yanyuwa existence, a Law that, according to Yanyuwa elder Dinah Norman Marrngawi (personal communication 2003), “has never changed from the beginning.” Dreaming spirits such as the ancestral Rock Wallaby—*a-buluwardi*—are ascribed female gender and often described in overtly feminine terms. *A-buluwardi* encounters the Tiger Shark Dreaming, which is male, that passes along the coastline of Vanderlin Island. This encounter, translated from the Yanyuwa language, is described as follows:

He [Tiger Shark ancestor] looked onto Vanderlin Island and saw his sister there, the Rock Wallaby (*a-buluwardi*); she was standing on top of the hill *Wubuwarrarrnga*. The Rock Wallaby spoke to the Tiger Shark, saying, “Hey! That bundle of food on your head, what is it?” The Tiger Shark answered saying, “Sister! I have carried this cycad food a long way from the east, from Dumbarra. Can I place this food here as I am tired and my shoulders are cramped as I have carried this bundle a long way?” The Rock Wallaby grew angry and shouted back “No! Never! Go away from here to the south to the mainland. I will stay here by myself, I belong here, I am bitter with feelings, I am dangerous, I am heated. I will stay here and eat shellfish that I break from the rocks. Here I will stay, I belong here by myself, I have few possessions and I have no relations!” Her words were really heated and she threatened the Tiger Shark Dreaming with her fighting stick. She moved all of the west coast of Vanderlin in her anger, striking the ground with her fighting stick, that she created the twisted coastline that is there today. (Yanyuwa Families, Bradley, and Cameron 2003: 67)

The expression given to the Rock Wallaby is of a heated, bitter, and dangerous woman. In visual depictions the Rock Wallaby ancestral spirit is wearing a headdress of string and feathers, the same style of headdress worn by women in ceremony. When people retell this Dreaming narrative and adopt the voice of the Rock Wallaby, it is in a high-pitched tone, not unlike the voice of a little girl. Further, *a-buluwardi* is described by Yanyuwa people as enacting a ritual haranguing technique called *jijijirla*. As John Bradley notes, will have been awed and staggered by the emotional physicality of the movements (Bradley, personal communication 2006). The term *jijijirla* is also used to denote a defensive movement that is a threatening display used by women before dueling with fighting or digging sticks. The Rock Wallaby ancestor expresses herself in many ways that align her with the socially feminine, and therefore with a certain range of gender expressions.

Potentials of gender expression and gender identity are also found in the Dreaming spirits of the Two Young Initiates and the Rainbow Serpent. The initiates are young boys traveling through country on and in the body of the Rainbow Serpent. Their encounters and experiences are used to measure and encode types of behavior that are appropriate and adhering to Law. The initiates are mischievous young boys who cause great trouble for the Rainbow Serpent and are punished accordingly. They dance ceremony and instill danger and potency in parts of the landscape, shaping the spiritual essence, or *ngalki* of several places. Such is the danger associated with the wayward initiates that only very senior men who have been through their second initiation are allowed to travel the places visited by the young initiates (Yanyuwa Families, Bradley, and Cameron 2003: 72). These ancestral spirits marked country and set it apart as the country of initiated and senior men.

This is but a glimpse at the Dreaming spirit-scape of Yanyuwa country. It is a vital snapshot of the ancestral heritage that defines life and Law for Yanyuwa people. These ancestors have expressions and characters that accord with gender identity in Yanyuwa culture. There are many more instances in which spirits and places are feminized and masculinized, but now I turn to a more localized discussion of gender expression in the lives of Yanyuwa people today.

In the last decade, ceremonial activity among the Aboriginal women of Borroloola has effloresced and come to represent a clear point of power and prestige for Yanyuwa women and their neighbors, Garrwa and Mara women. During this time many male elders within the Yanyuwa and Garrwa communities have died, leaving in their wake a small group of younger men who can speak of men’s ceremony but who are regarded as having only passive knowledge of ceremonial activity. In contrast, when asking Dinah Norman Marrngawi (personal communication 2001) how she feels as a woman today, carrying out ceremony, she says unequivocally that “women really strong now, we’ve been here since little girl and now really big woman.” In the same discussion, Annie Karrakayn (personal
made it clear that in doing ceremony, “old people look up at you from a long way, they just listen what you doing up there. Old people—they help you, Old people from a long way.” She (personal communication 2001) followed up by saying: “All the women go high people now, women always strong, old lady used to teach us.” By asserting a gendered form of cultural knowledge through ceremony, women actively ascribe existing and new meanings on the physical places and objects with which they engage in ceremony. In recent times this has brought about the reinscription of places of importance, including a women’s ceremonial ground, practice ground, and other places associated with song origins, song lines, ancestral spirits, and individual performers. 4

The desire on behalf of women to enliven and relive women’s Business and Law has come about as part of a commitment to remembering and managing the landscapes of times past and present. It, at times, moves beyond the maintenance of women’s Business and Law and has seen the gentle incorporation of men’s Business and Law into the arms of women’s knowledge. This expresses a fundamental point that often governs gendered and exclusionary knowledge systems—namely, that knowledge and practice or Being are actions of a very different nature. It is occasionally the case that Yanyuwa women know of men’s Business and Law, song, and ceremony; however, they do not practice this Law, or if they do, they do so in a cautionary manner, recognizing its place in the lives of men. In turn, men have some knowledge of women’s ceremony and exhibit the same healthy respect and distance from an intimacy that is seen to be the domain of women. Men and women also share elements of ceremonial life, with each occupying a different but complementary role. It is necessary to remember that many forms of ceremony were shared, and both men and women occupied essential roles in the performance and maintenance of ceremony. An example of this is in the initiation of young boys—rdaru (initiates) in the a-Marndiwa ceremony. The a-Marndiwa ceremony is a ritual during which boys aged 9–13 are circumcised and brought to age. The ritual lasts up to two weeks and includes the whole community, both men and women. In some ceremonial settings, women are responsible for part of the food getting and preparation, offering this and other support to performers and their families. In other instances men alone are responsible for negotiating across families and kin groups for access to key objects—for example, stones—that objects and other items of spiritual potency (see Kearney and Bradley 2006).

In addition to the ceremonial aspects of Yanyuwa life, women and men share knowledge of gendered language forms, birthing songs, birthing places, objects, and places. Sharing knowledge is one part of the continuum of complementary duality that characterizes the gendered landscapes of Yanyuwa country. The careful inclusion of one gender in the knowledge system of the other is that end of the continuum in which men and women are the same, but different, in which case people know it is possible to mediate the danger of this knowledge by simply holding it and not putting it into practice. To do so would be in breach of Law, something that is taken very seriously by Yanyuwa people.

Finally Seeing Gender

In October, 2003, while resident in Borroloola5 for the purpose of doctoral fieldwork, I had the opportunity to participate in a part of Yanyuwa life that allowed me to see gender expressions and gender identity at work in Yanyuwa country. I was able to participate in a week of women’s ceremonial activity outside the Borroloola township. This would prove to be my introduction to women’s ceremony, and in June 2004 I was invited back to participate in a much larger and more powerful ceremony at a more isolated ceremonial ground.

The place where the 2003 ceremony occurred was located outside the Borroloola township, on Yanyuwa country. This location had recently been given to the women of Borroloola, as a sacred site—courtesy of the Northern Territory Sacred Sites Authority. From initial discussions several women asserted that the area was too open and too close to the road. The turn-off to the ground was marked by a star picket, which was located at the edge of the road, signaling the turning point to access the site.6 Women spoke often of the location’s proximity to the road and the danger this posed for men who traveled within range of the site, and for any men who might prove to be too curious for their own good. For this reason, it was later agreed that the star picket marking the turn-off should be removed, and in due course it was.

As a participant and worker in the ceremony, I had cause to be present at the ceremonial ground for the setting up and for performance. I was also allocated the almost daily task of going into town to collect supplies. On one occasion,
medication, and tobacco for several women. As I arrived at the local shop, I saw my *kangku*, paternal grandfather, old Pyro. I approached him to say hello, at which point he quickly stepped back against the wall and spoke strongly, saying: “Don't you touch me!” As a man with whom I have always had a very relaxed and nurturing relationship, I was astonished by the manner he adopted on this particular day. His engagement with me on this occasion was of a completely different nature to any we had had in the past. He avoided eye contact with me and briefly commented that I was, at that point, considered dangerous, because of my involvement in the women's ceremony. Sensing his great discomfort, I moved away and went about my shopping with haste. I was clearly wearing my gender loudly on that day, and as a result of the encounter I was rather unnerved by the massive shift that had apparently occurred in my status, quite unbeknown to me. Not only had the ceremonial ground gained in potency from women's activities, but also the women and their bodies (including mine) took on potency and a marking that stood them in contrast to and exclusive of men's bodies and men's knowledge. Bodies and place have gender, know gender, and can signal gender.

After several days of setting up at the ceremonial ground, and the singing of “fun songs,” several elder women decided that there was to be an end to people’s coming and going from the ceremonial ground. The place was gradually “closing up”—in light of shifts in ceremonial activity and a shift into more secret and powerful song and dance. From this point, women and children's movements were to be restricted, and visits into the township of Borroloola were avoided. Over the week, women did continue to travel away from the ceremonial ground, but not into the township of Borroloola itself. They would go hunting and fishing across other parts of Yanyuwa country. These visits to country were part of an introduction for visiting women performers and their families to Yanyuwa country and involved efforts to get turtle and other foods to be cooked at the ceremonial ground. The shift to an altogether different level of performance and knowledge enacting not only was signaled by a recreation of place meaning and form, both being to come together knowing opportunity for knowing and being to come together and be expressed through action and form, both of which as concepts, preoccupy the imaginations of archaeologists and often govern the manner in which the archaeologist engages a given landscape. As I witnessed over the days of ceremony, several tangible signatures became evident, including the following:

- People set up camp within the ceremonial ground according to familial and kin relations;
- People visited other parts of the camp according to dancing partnerships—partnerships that reflected kinship;
- Physical barriers and structures were erected within the grounds;
- Ground ovens and surface fires were used for the purpose of cooking;
- Tree bark was collected from many trees in the immediate area and burnt down to ash to accompany chewing tobacco;
- Debris and rubbish was spread across the site in various discard patterns, including cooked items, bones, tin cans, and other food scraps;
- People repeatedly swept the site in an effort to keep the immediate living area clean;
- Certain objects were introduced and placed at certain locations within the site;
- These introductions initiated a shift in people’s settlement and living patterns on the site.

All this formed part of an entire dialogue that was orchestrated among women—both Yanyuwa and visitor—country, ancestral spirits, deceased kin, and objects. This dialogue speaks a women’s dialect of remembering and reliving the landscape, holding it up, strengthening it, testing the limits of ceremony in today's world, maintaining and sharing knowledge and recreating the emotional links between women and place.

The structure that governs the Law of ceremony creates many of the potentials for how women engage with place, objects, food, and people—all of which step gently across the gulf of what is intangible and tangible. Hence, I speak of gender being everywhere and yet nowhere to be seen (even though I have discussed these issues largely in relation to women, similar processes also occur in relation to men). Ceremony creates the opportunity for knowing and being to come together and be expressed through action and form, both of which, as concepts, preoccupy the imaginations of archaeologists and often govern the manner in which the archaeologist engages a given landscape. As I witnessed over the days of ceremony, several tangible signatures became evident, including the following:

- People set up camp within the ceremonial ground according to familial and kin relations;
- People visited other parts of the camp according to dancing partnerships—partnerships that reflected kinship;
- Physical barriers and structures were erected within the grounds;
- Ground ovens and surface fires were used for the purpose of cooking;
- Tree bark was collected from many trees in the immediate area and burnt down to ash to accompany chewing tobacco;
- Debris and rubbish was spread across the site in various discard patterns, including cooked items, bones, tin cans, and other food scraps;
- People repeatedly swept the site in an effort to keep the immediate living area clean;
- Certain objects were introduced and placed at certain locations within the site;
- These introductions initiated a shift in people’s settlement and living patterns on the site.

At the completion of the week, most structures
made to clean up the area. All in all the ceremonial ground looked lived in. There were signatures of the week that was, a week that left gendered debris all around. As such, this place has great potential as an “archaeological site,” in an ethnarchaeological sense. Kent (1984) has explored, through ethnoarchaeology, the basic assumptions that underpin archaeological engagements with spatial and sex-specific behavior such as found at the women’s ceremonial location. In the tradition of this earlier work, the study of gender in landscape archaeology raises a number of questions and challenges to how we view the living spaces of cultural groups. The ceremonial ground was marked in such a manner as to reveal something of gendered site structure and occupational episodes, abandonment, gendered material culture and engagements, with sacred space. There is, however, as highlighted by Kent (1984) also a cautionary note to be made. When concerned with sex or gender specific spatial behavior and the multifunctional nature of places across human landscapes we must recognize the potential for complex cultural determinants (see Kent 1984, 1998).

It is with great subtlety that knowing (knowing gender) and being (being gender) come to express themselves on country, and the degree to which they are encoded by Law and sociality often makes it difficult to disentangle them with broad sweeps of materialist logic. When the physicality—namely, the tangible—can be traced back to the intangible—namely, in expression, memory, engagement, or experience—then gender is everywhere to be seen. Having the eyes to see gender in the landscape requires, first, knowledge of the manner in which gender can express itself (as a precursor to gender identity itself) and, second, recognition of potential gender identities. Even in those instances when the intangibility of gender cannot be accessed through direct engagements with landscape descendants, such as the Yanyuwa, then one must interrogate the fathomable range of gender expressions and gender identities among human groups. It does not suffice to conclude that men do one thing, women do another, for such things are not pregiven. The range of potentials for gender expression and gender identity may be far and wide, and this is what should be the point of interest for the landscape archaeologist.

**Conclusions: Knowing Gender and Being Gender**

Unlike many discussions of gender in archaeology, nor has it presented a prevailing discussion of gender as power and prestige. Rather, it is an expression of gender as complementary forms (usually dualities or more) and of individual and group relationships. Gender archaeology is not simply about looking for men or women in the past, but rather concerns understanding terms of engagement that inform interactions with places, objects, and people. This knowledge can manifest itself archaeologically—for example, as physical traces, such as in women’s and men’s ceremonial locations, material culture items associated with gendered practices and life rituals, or discard patterns of food goods that were consumed on the basis of gender exclusions and inclusions. In reality, these traces are often difficult to discern, and the ability to identify such patterns in the tangible record often comes only from engagements with the intangible record—namely, oral histories that reveal something of the terms of engagement of a particular human group. In other words, gender archaeology requires us to explore the experience of something that relates to the lived cultural domain (see Kearney 2005).

Today, as in the past, Yanyuwa society retains distinctions between genders and their associated bodies of knowledge, ceremony, and economy. This is most commonly expressed in terms of “women’s Business” and “women’s Law” and “men’s Business” and “men’s Law.” In this case, Business and Law are terms that capture a wealth of meaning that is expressed and embodied in moral, jural, social, and ceremonial rules and practices (see Bradley, this volume). The enacting of Yanyuwa Law requires that people engage these meanings and activate and maintain relationships between people, ancestors, and place. All this cannot be done in isolation: men alone cannot do it, and women alone cannot hold up country without the support of their male counterparts. Without kin and recognized gender you are nothing; you cannot engage or be engaged with. Kinship and gender provide vital linkages between people and groups. At no point are people and their engagements and experiences of place objectified and autonomous of these fundamental points of relation. This is best understood as an "interdependence-dependence" relationship, one in which difference is seen as complimentary.

And so it is that gender is all around and yet nowhere to be seen. The best way for us to grasp the meaning of gender and its historicity in dynamic landscapes is to propose a range of potentials for
we can seek to ethnographically document and ethnoarchaeologically interrogate relived and living landscapes as gendered phenomena.
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Notes

1. For an extended discussion of “country,” see Bradley (this volume).
2. *Ngalki* is a Yanyuwa word that refers to the “essence or quality that identifies and gives distinction to its owner or owners. The *ngalki* of a flower is its perfume; of food its taste and a person’s *ngalki* can equally be the individual’s social or landowning (semitmioity) group or the sweat from under their armpits” (Bradley 1997: 150).
3. Only in recent years has the Rock Wallaby been depicted visually. This coincides with the compilation and the publication of the Yanyuwa Visual Atlas (Yanyuwa Families, Bradley, and Cameron 2003). In this document, all Dreaming ancestors are given a physical form and drawn onto maps that track their ancestral journey. The manner in which each ancestor was visually represented was the subject of lengthy negotiation and discussion among Yanyuwa elders. The act of committing an image of the ancestor to page was taken very seriously and people were committed to representing the Rock Wallaby in the correct manner.
5. The township of Borroloola was established in the late 1880s and became the central point of settlement for the region’s Aboriginal people in the early stages of European invasion. Today it is home to many Aboriginal people, including a star picket is a metal fencing post, approximately 5 cm wide and over 1 meter long.
6. “Fun songs” include the *a-Ngadiji*. This name is given to a specific fun dance performed by women. It relates to the Mermaid Dreaming spirits (Bradley, Kirton, and the Yanyuwa Community 1992: 116).
7. By the expression “closing up” I mean that country and this particular place were coming to be governed by stronger Law—Law that restricted people’s coming and going from the actual location, restriction that forbids speaking about the ceremonial activity both to men and outsiders and that demands profound respect for the performers, their knowledge, and their actions during the course of ceremonial activity.
8. I cannot elaborate on this point, because these parts of the ceremony are governed by Law that pertains to secret and sacred ceremony.
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