Women have long held a place of prominence as professionals in the field of anthropology. To the general public the names Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict are practically synonymous with science. Ironically, however, women as subjects of inquiry have not held such status throughout most of anthropology's history as an academic discipline. This neglect, both in theory and in the fieldwork which is the hallmark of anthropology, has been addressed in recent years. A new generation of women anthropologists has been building on the legacy of those who preceded them by including women's experience in the configuration of culture as a legitimate subject worthy of inquiry and analysis. An historical survey of the treatment of women as a research problem, along with a sampling of the work of female anthropologists, particularly as it pertains to this topic, offers an overview of the contribution of women, both as professional and as subject, to the science of anthropology.

During the formative years of anthropology, this new science in "accepting the psychic unity of mankind", "was kinder to women", making them "more welcome than in other professions" (Mead & Bunzel 1960:5). In an era when few women worked outside the home in a professional capacity the discipline was, of course, dominated by men. The women drawn to anthropology with its emphasis turning to fieldwork and the rigors inherent in it, were certainly uncommon women.

Matilda Cox Stephenson first began her work among the Zuni with her husband, but later returned after his death to do extensive research under the auspices of the Bureau of American Ethnology. She "paid especial attention to the activities of women and children, and was, indeed, the first American ethnologist to consider children worthy of notice" (Mead & Bunzel 1960:205). Stephenson, along with Alice Cunningham Fletcher, helped to organize the Women's Anthropological Society of America in 1885. The precursor to the American Anthropological Association, founded in 1879, was at that time restricted to men. In 1889 the two societies merged and in 1902 became the present American Anthropological Society (MacCormack 1981:101; de Laguna 1960:93-101).
Alice Fletcher was another early ethnologist who worked among the Indians. Her original interest was in Indian music and she spent many years among the Omaha, before the time of tape or record players, recording their songs by notation. For over twenty-five years she collaborated with Francis La Flesche, the son of an Omaha chief, and published the prodigious volume, The Omaha Tribe, in 1911. She may be considered America's first applied anthropologist. Commissioned by the government because of her extensive background with the Omaha, she supervised the distribution of reservation lands for that tribe and later for the Winnebago and the Nez Perce. She later formulated rules to be used with other tribes and wrote a treatise on Indian education in response to a congressional resolution (Mead and Bunzel 1960:227; Eggan 1968:126). In 1882, Fletcher became the first ethnologist to join the staff of the Peabody Museum at Harvard and "helped to set the course of anthropology as a discipline by emphasizing indigenous interpretations and meanings in her work" (MacCormack 1981:100; Eggan 1968:126).

Elsie Clews Parsons was born into wealthy and socially prominent family, but chose her own path. Earning her Ph.D. in sociology in 1889, "she pioneered in new investigations on the effect of culture on women". Several years later she met Boas and turned to anthropology where she was able to abandon the pseudonym of John Main which she used as a sociologist to write about ceremonial chastity (Mead and Bunzel 1960:5). Her persistent interest in social control, "especially as it affected the role of woman", took her ethnographic research to the Pueblo Indian culture, a culture more demanding of conformity than her own. Her book, Mitla, Town of Souls, which presented her study of the informal techniques of social control, was written from the woman's perspective (Mead and Bunzel 1960:546-7).

Though the women drawn to the field of anthropology may have been uncommon, the subject of women, especially relations between the sexes, was commonplace in Victorian British anthropology. The contemporary social concerns of the period influenced anthropological inquiry. "A highly visible and vocal feminist movement flourished at the time, making an issue of the status of women, 'challenging complacent assumptions about the timeless quality of women's roles, (and rejecting the notions that) marriage, the family, and sexual roles'. belong to the natural conditions of men or are dictated by law of nature" (Rogers 1978:125; Fee 1973:23=4). A study of the past was undertaken, a study of the role of women in 'history', in order to ascertain the 'proper' role of contemporary women (Fee 1973:25).
Anthropologists at the time worked from an evolutionary framework and believed that by studying the present day "primitive" societies, which were assumed to be in earlier stages of evolution they could reconstruct the process of social evolution (Rogers 1978:125). These were not, however, ethnographic studies, but consisted instead of reports from missionaries and explorers to which logic, deductive reasoning, and "considerable imagination" were applied to arrange in sequence the development of civilization to its high point which was, of course, believed to be that of middle-class Victorian society (Rogers 1978:125). "The Victorians saw women in non-Western societies as oppressed and servile creatures, beasts of burden, chattels who could be bought and sold, eventually to be liberated by 'civilizations' or 'progress,' thus attaining the enviable position of women in Western society" (Etienne and Leacock 1980:1).

Bachofen, in Das Mutterrecht, provided a theory of "a continuing struggle between male and female as the central theme in social evolution" and envisioned a prior stage of promiscuity which was replaced by a social matriarchy and eventually the patriarchy of the present day (Fee 1973:27). His theory that women at one time overthrew men in an Amazonian revolt to form a matriarchy did not fit in with the contemporary Victorian view of the "eternal [passive) nature of women" and the authority of the patriarchal family (Fee 1973:27-8). Yet his argument that the modern Victorian family was the culmination of along evolutionary "struggle against the crude desires of nature" gave his theory some plausibility among such contemporary theorists as McLennan, Lubbock, Spencer, and Morgan who reconstructed his model to suit their views as well as those of their "middle-class audience" (Fee 1973:28).

Lewis Henry Morgan, an American anthropologist, believed that society was first organized on the basis of sex and that women had no productive function in society. He did not reject Bachofen's theory of an earlier matriarchy and though he believed the monogamy of the present stage"to be far superior to the original stage of "promiscuity", he saw the transition to patriarchy as having a very "unfavorable influence on the position of women" (Fee 1973:32). He predicted an eventual equality of the sexes as the next stage in the evolution of the family. Believing as he did in the emancipation of women, Morgan, in fact, donated a large amount of money to the University of Rochester for the furthering of female education (Fee 1973:33-4). Perhaps because he was an American (or perhaps because of his sympathies with the status of women), Morgan's views held little esteem among British anthropologists (Fee 1973:32).
Herbert Spencer, on the other hand, preferred the status quo. He believed that "since evolution had placed women in the home, there they should stay" (Fee 1973:34). He used anthropological theory of that time to support his opinion and pointed out to his audience that women in primitive societies had received harsh and cruel treatment and that present civilization brought about an "improvement of women's status implied by limitation of their labors to the lighter kind" (Fee 1973:37; Spencer 1966:724). The pedestal upon which wealthy middle-class Victorian women were placed was viewed as the pinnacle of civilization for women and though men were firmly in control, women were protected and spared the savagery of the primitive state (Fee 1973:37). As civilization evolved, bringing the 'natural' male lust under control, women's status was improved and they should be grateful (Rogers 1978:126). Thus the status of women was measured in moral terms with "current social arrangement" being the culmination of "moral evolution from savagery to civilization" (Fee 1973:24; emphasis added). In this manner, evolutionary anthropology provided a justification for the status quo of the position of women in Victorian society (Rogers 1978:125).

As twentieth century anthropology took a different turn, with "armchair theories" of social evolution being replaced by ahistorical studies of particular societies with cultural relativism and fieldwork becoming its hallmarks, interest in female status largely disappeared along with a decline in the feminist challenge in the societies which were involved in anthropological inquiry. Issues of female role and status were generally supplanted by a focus on women's suffrage (Rogers 1978:126).

With few exceptions, anthropology, from the turn of the century until late 1960s, has "treated women as at best peripheral members of society" (Rogers 1978:126), in the same way as the Nuer's cows (Ardener 1972:140; 1975:4). This view is well illustrated by Evans-Pritchard in his essay "The position of women in primitive society and our own": "men are always in the ascendancy, and this is perhaps the more evident the higher the civilization;". "the adult primitive woman is above all a wife, whose life is centered in her home and family" (Evans-Pritchard 1965:54,46). He "questions whether the subject of female status may even be considered a serious research problem, at least in the social sciences" (Rogers 1978:123), that is an "imponderable" and "fundamentally a moral question" (Evans-pritchard 1965:42,56; emphasis added). This assumption has been made in "innumerable anthropological texts, monographs, and theoretical works", and ahs
generally "been accepted as a given, hardly requiring sustantiation, justification, or even explicit statement" (Rogers 1978:123). Indeed, the literature of twentieth century anthropology reflected this belief with data on women being relegated to descriptions of kinship, marriage, and domestic life (Tsing and Yanagisako 1983:516; Strathern 1987:278; Mukhopadhyay and Higgens 1988:465; Rogers 1978:145), inferring "that women everywhere do little but marry men and run" ."households" (Rogers 1978:145). The male representation of a society was presented as the entire reality for the group (Rogers 1978:126; Reiter 1975:12) with the "assumption of a fundamental unity of male and female values in any given society. .unquestioned" (Rogers 1978:131).

There were exceptions to this rule, however. Women such as Phyllis Kayberry, Margaret Mead, Ruth Benedict, and Audrey Richards and men such as Robert Lowie and Oscar Lewis documented "for various cultures the participation of women in all spheres of social life" (Etienne and Leacock 1980:1). In 1939 Kayberry wrote Aboriginal Women: Sacred and Profane, a study which gave special attention to the status of women. Her 1952 Women of the Grassfields was a study done at government request over concern for the underpopulation and economic underdevelopment of the Bamenda area of West Africa. Suspecting a correlation among social factors such as high infant mortality and women's status, Kayberry's assistance was requested due to her prior work with the status of women Australia. Kayberry pointed up the discrepancy between the 'ideal' of social organization and its actual functioning. In Bamenda, though land is owned by male chiefs, women actually exert 'real' control of the land by their right to crop production (MacCormack 1981:102; Forde in Kayberry, 1952:v-vi).

Mead's pioneering research on the female gender (1) stressing the wide cross-cultural variability of sex-role definition showed that cultural constraints played a larger part in female temperament than did biology, work which also argued against neo-Freudian views of the essential passivity of women (Sanday 1980:340; Rogers 1978:128; Kessler 1976:9; Leacock 1981:1). Ruth Benedict, in her work on the relationship of culture and the individual "presented materials that contradicted sex-role stereotypes" (MacCormack 1981:100; Leacock 1981:9-10). Audrey Richards in her book, Chisunqu (1956) not only showed how young girls, through ritual, could be molded to meet a society's expectations of a woman, but at the same time pioneered the study of symbolism (Kessler 1976:vii; La Fontaine 1972:xv). Lowie included the activities of women in his ethnography of The Crow
Indians (1943) and wrote a chapter on women in *Primitive Society* (1935) (MacCormack 1981:100). As a male anthropologist Oscar Lewis was most exceptional in that realizing his inability "to penetrate the world of women and included that dimension", he used tape recorders to permit women to tell their own stories (Kessler 1976:9,vii).

The revival of the feminist movement in the 1960's brought a resurgence of interest in the spheres of women cross-culturally. Feminist interest in discovering the origins and development of sexual asymmetry (defined as male dominance/superiority and female subordination/inferiority) required the dimension that only anthropology could supply: cross-cultural data through space and time and theories of social evolution (Kessler 1976:7; Reiter 1975:11). The monumental task of determining whether male dominance was universal across time and cultures, as well as the "key determinants" to women's status, was eagerly taken up by many women anthropologists. Answers to these "key universals" were expected to give direction for social change in the perceived universally inferior status of women. A search of the ethnographic record provided a dearth of information on women such that it constituted "a genuine deficiency" which "has led to distorted theories and impoverished ethnographic accounts" (Rosaldo and Lamphere 1974:v-vi).

The initial response in the literature was an outpouring of attacks charging male bias in the discipline (Reiter 1975; Slocum 1975; Etienne and Leacock 1980; Ardener 1972, 1975; Rosaldo and Lamphere 1974; Rosaldo 1980; Leacock 1981; Rohrlich-Leavitt, et al 1975). Such bias has been attributed to male ethnographers or women trained by men who, working with male models of society, deemed the activities of women unimportant. In addition, there has been a long-standing assumption in anthropological fieldwork that women generally make poor informants. Therefore, the data that had been obtained on women was provided almost exclusively by male informants (Quinn 1977:183; Rogers 1978:126; Ardener 1975:1-3; Slocum 1975:37; Scheper-Hughes 1983:110; Milton 1979:40,44; Reiter 1975:13-14; Rohrlich-Leavitt, et al 1975:110-11; Friedl 1975:279), with total analyses failing to include one half the people (Ardener 1975:3), the social realities of groups under study were being seriously distorted (Rogers 1978:144). The common assumption that both genders perceive their own culture and their own gender's place in it in essentially the same way, and that "men and women share a common culture on similar terms" (Chinas 1973:2; Ardener 1972:140-41) has "profound empirical and
theoretical implications" (Rogers 1978:131).

Just as the first anthropologists challenged the assumptions of superiority of Western civilization, a new generation of anthropologists, mainly women, were challenging some cherished assumptions about sex and gender long held in society and in the discipline of anthropology (Atkinson 1982:237-8). "Feminists were asking the kinds of questions about ideologies and models that anthropologists recognized. In short, they gave excellent anthropological advice" (Strathern 1987:279).

Rather than the lone, individual voices of the early anthropologists who included the spheres of women in their studies, the work of the many women anthropologists of recent years may be heard as one voice in the quest to restore women to view by placing them at the center of inquiry. The task itself, however, "speaks in many voices" as the researchers involved come from different motivations, as well as the diverse perspectives which constitute both feminist and anthropological scholarship (Rogers 1978:137-8; Strathern 1987:284-5).

A subdiscipline known as the anthropology of women or feminist anthropology has been created in which researchers have been gathering new data from the field and reviewing the old, as well as reexamining the models that have been used to generate hypotheses and analyze data on social systems (MacCormack 1981:102). Some have worked under the assumption of a universal male dominance while others have worked to refute the idea of women as passive and powerless, and see women not as "pawns", but as actors with their own agendas (Stack, et al. 1975:1472; Atkinson 1982:250; Rosaldo and Lamphere 1974:9).

As is characteristic of new fields of inquiry, a deluge of literature has appeared since the early 1970's. The numerous and largely disparate studies represent nearly all the subdisciplines in anthropology and as many theoretical positions. Diverse aspects of women's lives in virtually every culture have appeared in the ethnographic literature (2) (Quinn 1977:181; Strathern 1987:285; Mukhopadhyay and Higgens 1988:461). "This literature has profoundly affected anthropology, challenging basic tenets and theories as well as the reliability and objectivity of traditional ethnographic data and methods" (Mukhopadhyay and Higgens 1988:461).

One of the first challenges posed perhaps best exemplifies how valuing rather than diminishing 'women's work' may change or offer a more complete picture. Though
the research of the 1960's overwhelmingly showed that it was the gathering and collecting of small game by women that supplied the majority of the population's subsistence, scholars insisted that it was the hunting of large game by males that was most instrumental in the transition from hominid to human (Rosaldo 1980:410). Sally (Linton) Slocum challenged the emphasis given to hunting in this widely accepted theory as presented by Washburn and Lancaster in "The Evolution of Hunting" (1968), in which they posit that "in a very real sense our intellect, interests, emotions and basic social life--all are evolutionary products of the success of the hunting adaptation" (1968:293). She offered an alternative theory of human evolution, "Woman the Gatherer" (1975), which places the female in "an active and possibly dominant role in the development of human intelligence and culture" (Stacey & Thorne 1985:305). By combining data from the fossil record, primate ancestors, and contemporary hunting and gathering groups, Slocum suggests that it was the innovations required for gathering while simultaneously caring for and socializing off-spring that were the dominant factors in the transition. She insists that the activities of gathering and the socialization of children "required cooperative and communicative skills as complex as those required for hunting" and that the hunting of big-game likely came much later in cultural evolution, after the increase in brain size (Reiter 1975:16-17; Rosaldo and Lamphere 1974:7; Slocum 1975:43-46).

Tanner and Zihlman further developed the theory and brought forth evidence to support the view that "the critical hominid innovation was the gathering and sharing of plant food". They suggest that the mother-offspring bond was primary and that an important selective agent may have been the preference by females for non-aggressive mates as they would be least disruptive in the mother-centered unit (Tanner and Zihlman 1976:608; Stack, et al 1975:149). This view contrasts with the traditional 'man the hunter' theory which emphasizes male technology, aggression, and dominance in the provision of subsistence and protection to the weak, passive and dependent females with whom they are assumed to be attached in a sexual pair-bond (Tanner and Zihlman 1976:608).

In addition, Patricia Draper refutes the common representation of hunting being more highly regarded than the 'women's work' of gathering which is viewed as boring and repetitious [and perhaps initially requiring less brain development] (Service 1966:12). In her work among present day hunter-gatherers, the !Kung Bushmen, Draper finds the return of a gathering expedition greeted with
much celebration as men returning from the hunt. She also states that the task of gathering "demands as much ability to discriminate among hundreds of different paint species at different stages of their life cycle" while also collecting "information as to the 'state of the bush', crucial to band movements and hunting decisions" (Quinn 1977:184; Draper 1975).

These studies have been seen as exemplifying the critical need to reanalyze the concepts of cultural and biological evolution, as well as serving "as a corrective to the bias of mainstream anthropology" (Reiter 1975:19). Such bias was also challenged in the ethnographic method as restudies by women anthropologists who listened to women in their work discovered omissions leading to distortions in past studies.

In comparing the earlier work by male ethnographers to the studies of aboriginal societies in Australia done by Jane Goodale (1971) and Phyllis Kayberry (1939), Rohrlich-Leavitt, Sykes and Weatherford find the depiction of aboriginal women as "profane, ritually unclean, and economically unimportant", to be quite different from what Kayberry and Goodale noted. Their data show that women "play a central role in subsistence, perform their own important rituals, and are treated by men with respect and dignity" (Quinn 1977:184). Kayberry questions "whether male anthropologists are correct in reporting that Australian men and their rites represent the sacred element in the community, in view of her observation that Australian women do not seem to 'be cognizant of the fact and accept it'" (Rogers 1978:144; Kayberry 1939:230). Annette Weiner's restudy of the Trobriand Islanders offers a new theory of social organization by demonstrating the significance of women's wealth and exchange which was overlooked in Malinowski's classic ethnography because he deemed "'women's business' unworthy of careful study" (Weiner 1976:11,29; Atkinson 1982:255; Rapp 1979:501-2). Jean Briggs, in her study of the Eskimo, differs with earlier ethnographers by denying that Eskimo men devalue the women. She maintains that men and women respect each other's expertise in the different and complementary roles each fulfills (Quinn 1977:184; Briggs 1974:276).

New ethnographic work and analyses by women anthropologists also suggested androcentrism (male bias) in the interpretation of the ethnographic record. Elizabeth Faithorn disagrees with the traditional treatment by anthropologists of female pollution in Highland New Guinea. Among the Kafe, it is not women, themselves, who are regarded as polluting, but rather, certain reproductive fluids like menstrual blood or
semen. Men may pollute as well. Faithorn believes ethnographers have disregarded taboos regarding male sexuality because they have conceptualized women, rather than the excretions, as polluting agents (Faithorn 1975:138-9; Quinn 1977:184). Leacock believes that ethnographers may be seeing sexual asymmetry where none exists, noting the common interpretation of women's isolation in menstrual huts as exclusion from society "while men's parallel isolation in men's houses is interpreted as the exclusion of women from the men's world" (Leacock 1972:40).

The lack of sufficient data and the misinterpretations of data collections resulting in distortions of the ethnographic record have been blamed on the failure to ask the right questions. This failure, it has been charged, is due to the traditional androcentric models which have failed to accurately account for the variety and importance of women's roles in many cultures. Yet as some feminist anthropologists set out to rectify the record, others charged that female bias in the fieldwork led to equally distorted ethnographic accounts (Milton 1970:47; Strathern 1981:669; Scheper-Hughes 1983:110). There was a tendency among some ethnographers to record what women in other societies were not, according to feminists standards, rather than what they were (Atkinson 1982:254).

Feminist anthropologists also took each other to task over other inconsistencies and contradictions. The major analytical construct of a universal male dominance was shown to be invalid if the ethnographic accounts upon which the concept was based were male-biased as well (Scheper-Hughes 1983:111; Milton 1979:45). The assumption of a universal 'womanness', a common experience as women, was seen as naive at best and ethnocentric at the worst (Mukhopadhyay and Higgens 1988:462; Strathern 1981:670-73; Milton 1979:47). Such universal assumptions resulted in a projection of feminist's own cultural conflicts and priorities onto other cultures in other times and places (Rogers 1978:136-37; Rapp 1979:571). Conceptual errors of this sort were uncovered in part by the extensive fieldwork undertaken which soon brought to light that the notion of male superiority was not universally held, and was often contradicted; nor was there a universal conceptualization of a hierarchy between the sexes (Milton 1979:53). Studies also revealed the concept of motherhood as being a universally constraining factor further subjugating women to be more of a reflection of the feminist perspective of women in their own society (Rogers 1978:136-37).

If, then, the aim of feminist anthropologists was to
"correct the male bias in the field and revise the nature of anthropological inquiry" (Scheper-Hughes 1983:110), because prior work reflected the anthropologists' own culture (as in diminishing the importance of women), it would seem that they fell short of their mark by becoming ensnared in their own culture-bond assumptions. Such views were repeatedly exchanged in the literature over the past twenty years and has led to a maturing in thought and goals.

Universalistic theories as bases for cross-cultural comparisons have been replaced by "theories more restricted in scope" designed for particular types of societies or "applicable to a narrower range of lower-level phenomena" (Mukhopadhyay and Higgens 1988:486). The search for origins and 'key' determinants to women's status along with the entire concept of 'status' have been abandoned as ethnographic evidence has demonstrated women's status to be "multi-dimensional, measurable according to a variety of possibly unrelated scales" (Mukhopadhyay and Higgens 1988:486,466).

The female-centered thought of earlier work has shifted to a development of a "more fully 'gendered' understanding of all aspects of human culture and relationships" (Stacey and Thorne 1985:305). There has been a trend toward the examination of "gender as the basis of all social and cultural life, [and a] tracing [of] the significance of gender organization and relations in all institutions and in shaping men's as well as women's lives" (Stacey and Thorne 1985:306). Efforts are being made to develop a comparative framework to examine the concept of gender and sexuality which are seen as cultural constructs explaining a biological phenomenon (Atkinson 1982:246). The variability of such concepts and the extent to which they emphasize biology as an explanation for differences was a "problem thrust into the foreground of anthropological attention by Mead in 1935, but subsequently buried. " (Ortner and Whitehead 1981:1,25; Atkinson 1982:245).

The renewed interest in gender studies by feminist anthropologists is based, in part, on the tradition among social scientists to view roles, in general, as social constructs, but binding the female role to biological characteristics (Atkinson 1982:245). Collier and Yanagisako assert that "social wholes" must be analyzed in order to question the "assumption that 'male' and 'female' are two natural categories of human beings whose relations are everywhere structured by their biological differences" (Collier and Yanagisako 1987:8). "Even if rooted in biology, gender (like reproduction, kinship, sexuality, and age) is always culturally elaborated. The
major task of gender theorists, then, is to discover the principles and processes through which 'nature' is transformed into 'culture' and to chart the ways these processes manifest themselves" (Mukhopadhyay and Higgens 1988:485).

The analysis of gender in feminist anthropology has found relevance in a number of areas under anthropological investigation with kinship being the most obvious (Tsing and Yanagisako 1983:511). In a reexamination of kinship theory, Collier, Rosaldo, and Yanagisako challenge the traditional anthropological view of the family as a 'natural' "institution designed to fulfill universal human needs" and assert that rather than being a cross-cultural universal it represents a modern ideal (1982:25). With kinship holding a central place in traditional anthropology, the feminist reanalysis of gender brings feminist scholarship to "heart of the discipline" (Tsing and Yanagisako 1983:511).

The area of symbolic analysis is also drawing on the work of gender theorists as the symbolic nature of gender and sexuality come under examination. Rather than assuming what "male", "female", "sex" and "reproduction" mean in various cultural contexts the concepts are being treated as symbols invested with "culturally variable 'meanings'" (Ortner and Whitehead 1981:1,ix). Inquiries are being made into "the sources, processes, and consequences of (the symbolic] construction and organization" of these concepts (Ortner and Whitehead 1981:1). Such work "seeks to go beyond a simple description of gender symbolism to an examination of how symbols are manipulated--ultimately to construct a theory of the relationship between behavior and symbols" (Mukhopadhyay and Higgens 1988:486).

Kinship and symbolism are but two of numerous areas that have drawn feminist-inspired studies of gender. Economic roles of women continue to be a focus with research extending into industrialized and developing societies as well as gatherer-hunter groups. Anthropologists are contributing to inter-disciplinary studies on women and development, largely through ethnohistoric research. All the various dimensions of women's lives have drawn the attention of anthropologists from sexuality, reproduction and mothering, to political activities, religious beliefs and practices, to women's art, music literature, and even games (Mukhopadhyay and Higgens 1988:462-5). Such studies are illuminating the complexity and richness of women's lives formerly stereotyped as mundane and confining. The recognition that women, cross-culturally, "play many roles,
simultaneously and over the course of a lifetime" (Mukhopadhyay and Higgens 1988:465) emphasizes the neglect throughout most of anthropology's history, yet at the same time serves as a stimulus for reevaluating some of the most widely and firmly held beliefs about the importance of (or lack of) women's contribution to the 'Science of Man'.

The characteristic dedication and innovative thinking of early women anthropologists drawn to the present and multiplied by the many women the field now boasts, have served the science well by doing what anthropologists do best: challenging ethnocentrism in society, in the discipline, and in themselves. As a science "built up in the face of prejudice" (Strathern 1981:667), anthropology may continue to simply find a place for women in the subdiscipline of "women's anthropology" or follow its "long tradition of breaking with the past" (Strathern 1987:287-7) and look to a realignment of its disciplinary approaches. Such a step can only further the goal of a holistic study of humanity.

Footnotes

(1) • Though Mead was an early exception the rule of ignoring the contribution of women of female subjects, it is interesting to note that "the current controversy surrounding Derek Freeman's (1983) attempt to discredit Mead's work on Samoa includes many references to the fact that Mead's primary informants were, after all, only young adolescent girls" (Scheper-Hughes 1983:111).

(2) • A regionally focused review of the literature by the "Gender and the Anthropology Curriculum Project," under a FIPSE grant to the American Anthropological Association, will provide curriculum guides for major culture areas, as well as archaeology, biocultural anthropology, language, applied anthropology, and several other topics. Contact Sandra Morgen, 208 Bartlett Hall, University of Massachusetts, Amherst. (Mukhopadhyay and Higgens 1988:462).
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