Feminist archaeology for the present. Maintenance activities and social caring

Laia Colomer, Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3353-8969

Paloma González-Marcén, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9410-8826

Marina Picazo, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5187-9674

Abstract: This chapter introduces the notion of maintenance activities as an epistemological category that frames our approach to applied research as a feminist practice when exploring the past from and for the present. Drawing on the feminist political movement, we understand archaeology as a practice that develops forms of engendering research, practice and behaviours in academic milieus. It also formulates new knowledges of the past that contributes to change patriarchal visions of the present through its implementation in education and heritage milieus by the Pastwomen network. Furthermore, this chapter incorporates the ethics of care, inspired by Joan Tronto, as an ontological and epistemological notion that helps to better frame and complement the notion of maintenance activities. To illustrate this, some examples are provided from our research work in the fields of archaeology, heritage studies, and, specifically, the dissemination project carried out by the Pastwomen network.

> "The world will look different if we place care, and its related values and concerns, closer to the center of human life" (Tronto 1993: 14)

Introduction

In this paper, we propose to take a complete understanding of feminist care ethics to frame archaeological and heritage research and to reflect upon how a feminist ethics of care can be already seen in works that maintain, continue, repair and transform human lives in the past and the present. The following section will describe this theoretical framework that sustains the notion of maintenance, along with those of the ethics of care and standpoint theory. Equipped with these conceptual tools, we will turn to three examples (*momenta* of research practice) in which these epistemological tools are implemented. The first describes the archaeology of maintenance activities and introduces examples to illustrate its formulation. After, we will provide one example of how to incorporate the ethics of care as a category of analysis in cultural heritage, more precisely on today's memorialisation of cultural trauma, to frame these practices as social care. Our third example describes extensively how the Pastwomen network has used the notion of maintenance activities to illustrate historical narratives and create visual materials to represent caring practices.

Feminist archaeology, care ethics and the maintenance activities

More than thirty years ago, Donna Haraway (1988) coined the concept of situated knowledge to describe her idea of feminist objectivity, which she proposed as the foundation of network connections to promote public and political action and epistemological reflection. Along with

the critical epistemological perspectives linked to situated knowledge proposed by Donna Haraway, we want to add the concept of activism here. Although activism covers a broad semantic field, in this text, we assume what Alison Wylie (2007: 212) defined as "ethical and pragmatic norms for feminist research," which she specifies as "the ideals that animate various forms of action research." participatory and collaborative community-based and (...) the epistemic arguments for "democratising" science," along with what she calls "the central virtue of reflexivity." Following Wylie (2007), a feminist disciplinary practice in archaeology should both enrich historical research and public narratives and, in doing so, confer new meanings and values on historical and archaeological heritage (Rueda et al. 2021). We think an approach that reunites the past with the present in its different forms of representation can be best articulated within the concept of ethics of care and caring practices.

As an academic field in moral politics, the ethics of care seeks to address, understand, and uncover the diverse and contextually specific epistemological resources that arise from the central role of care in human morality. It is rooted in a fundamentally relational view of human beings that conceives of people as mutually interconnected, vulnerable, and interdependent beings (Held 2006). It conceives care as a central value and a paradigmatic set of practices and values for the care of people, normatively informed by three virtues: attention, responsiveness and respect (Tronto 1993; Engster 2007). Fisher and Tronto (1990) defined caregiving as "an activity of the species that includes everything we do to maintain, continue, and repair our ' *world* ' so that we can live in it as well as possible. This world includes our bodies, ourselves/ ourselves and our environment, all elements that we seek to weave into a complex network, to sustain life" (1990: 40). According to Tronto (2015), to make caring *well* a central moral concern presupposes a different kind of moral and political theory. Caring does not begin from abstract principles and reason down to pronouncements about what is right and wrong; it starts in the middle of things. Care practices do not suddenly begin; they are already ongoing, practised daily when humans relate to others, independently of any economic and political model. Historically and anthropologically, it might be interesting to determine the caring practices in particular times and situations, and the politics that determine the relationships between the caregivers and the care-receivers. As a political project, the best way of caring would depend on establishing democratic processes for assessing and meeting care needs.

Care conceptually offers a different ontology from one that begins with rational actors. It starts from the premise that everything exists in relation to other things, in relation to other people; it is thus relational and assumes that people, other beings and the environment are interdependent. Care presumes that people become autonomous and capable of acting independently because there exists a complex and interrelated process of *caring about* and *caring for.* Accepting the existence of inevitable networks of care means understanding that all humans are vulnerable and fragile; therefore, we need support and care to fulfil our everyday lives. But that we are also providers of care. Accordingly, feminist ethics of care is grounded in a relational social ontology that recognises our collective inter-dependence and responsibility to care for and sustain life. It calls our attention to our general situation of dependence, and develops an analysis of social relations organised around caring in the context of independence and vulnerability.

The way that care ethics assists us in visualising people in need of care on an everyday basis for the continuity and success of life perfectly describes what the maintenance activities

developed for archaeological research. Furthermore, the notion of maintenance activities is also part of the feminist standpoint theories as it develops significant revaluations on archaeological research from the vital experience of women (agents of knowledge) as a marginalised group reflecting on their engendered social condition. The concept of maintenance activities was developed in the late 1990s by a group of Catalan archaeologists, in conjunction with historical materialism, Haraway's situated knowledge, and the Italian feminism of sexual difference (Picazo 1997; Colomer et al. 1998; González-Marcén and Picazo 2005; see also Lozano-Rubio 2011). Today it represents one of the main agendas in Spanish gender archaeology, mainly gathered around the so-called Pastwomen group (Sánchez-Romero 2023), has been applied to illustrate the past (see below), and has even begun to be recognised in other academic traditions, colonial history and women's political resistance (Gifford-Gonzalez 2008; Montón-Subías and Hernando 2018; Dezhamkhooy 2023). Maintenance activities are described as "a set of practices that involve the sustenance, welfare and effective reproduction of all the members of a social group. These practices comprise the basic tasks of daily life that regulate and stabilise social life. They mainly involve caregiving, feeding and food processing, weaving and cloth manufacture, hygiene, public health and healing, socialisation of children and the fitting out and organisation of related spaces" (González-Marcén et al. 2008: 3). They are forms of interaction that generate basic forms of communication and connection of social life and are created, superimposed or interconnected with other forms of social relationship. Daily life decisions made in the past (and, consequently, those who made them) were interrelated with the other spheres of social action and formed an inseparable part of the complexity of humans. Political, economic and symbolic relationships are expressed daily in interpersonal relationships. Therefore, the continuity or change of these personal relationships is defined by the creation, recreation or disappearance of interrelationship networks. The activities and how they are organised are culturally specific, but they usually have historically been developed mainly by women and have been designated as being part of the domestic domains (vs. the public). However, this division is an androcentric construction.

[here Figure 1]

The main objective of maintenance activities is to guarantee the group's survival, ensuring the stability of the whole group through daily routines. Framed in care ethics, these activities mean the "caregiving" of the group in terms of knowledge, practical work and competence (Fisher and Tronto 1990). Maintenance activities require specific technological knowledge to be performed, taught, learned, and improved (as in the notion of *chaîne opératoire*). Furthermore, as in other work development, maintenance activities require and simultaneously create a time dynamic and a spatial organisation. The time of the maintenance activities is the quotidian time. Its predominant feature is that it is recurrent and involves a particular and differentiated form of temporality. Maintenance activities take place at their own pace, cyclical and routine. They constitute the temporal and relational network of the daily life cycle and comprise the forms of care that create and preserve social structures. These rhythms contrast with the linear times that are the object of historical study and, by extension, the chronological schemes used in archaeology. The time of normative history leaves out of line all those vital experiences that pass circularly and do not change so frequently. Relative timelines, for example, rarely consider artefacts from maintenance activities. Thus, a biased vision of the evolution of human groups is created, which does not consider the rate of change experienced in daily life (Picazo 1997;

González-Marcén & Picazo 2005; Hernando 2005; Montón and González-Marcén 2009). Finally, maintenance activities do not equal domestic spaces. As a category, the maintenance activities constituted an attempt to disassociate the characterisation of these activity patterns from the often used "domestic activities" category because of the limiting nature of this concept in that it is associated with a particular space. The space of maintenance activities must be a more open space than that which is traditionally associated with the domestic domain. We have chosen to use the term maintenance activities to emphasise the fact that the common factor is that this basic pattern of activities does not stem from one space – the domestic space – which is culturally and historically dependent, but from its structural function, both material and symbolic - which has existed and is to be found in all human groups. This structural function has taken on different forms for different ranges of activities. It may lead to different organisational combinations of the specific tasks associated with it and the spaces in which they are carried out, although a continuum of similarities has existed between maintenance tasks and spaces, historically and ethnographically speaking. It is not the space as such that delimits the actions but the practices and the relationships of the maintenance activities that determine the location of the space.

Archaeology of maintenance activities

Approaching the study of maintenance activities from archaeology involves focusing on what indicates both specific care practices and their impact on the configuration and dynamics of communities, even beyond the domestic group. The identification and interpretation of care practices in archaeology have developed from two perspectives. The first one, the bioarchaeology of care (Tilley 2017), includes the study of the care of the sick, disabled, elderly, children and other vulnerable individuals in ancient societies. To do this, archaeologists examine material evidence, focusing mainly on skeletal remains found in burials and tombs, in order to detect different types of pathologies, causes of death, healing traces or weaning patterns, etc. and their intersection with social and cultural practices of healing and support, making frequent use of exact biochemical analysis (Powell et al. 2016). The second one can be linked to the maintenance activities approach by which research is aimed to study those actions, knowledge, relationships, technologies and policies that are developed in the field of daily life (e.g., González-Marcén & Picazo 2005; Masvidal 2007) and whose stability or collapse marks the microhistorical dynamics that foster changes or continuity in all spheres of society (Lightfoot et al. 2018; Robin 2020). From this perspective, care is understood as an ethical praxis and a social, cultural and political relationship. Everyday maintenance practices require complex organisational and technical knowledge and are historically embedded in gender structures. The study of these quotidian living spaces, material culture and related activities can also be currently documented by the analysis and study of objects and inhabited areas, applying, together with conventional archaeological methods, an increasing battery of analytical techniques on materials and sediments that provide exact information about their patterns of production, circulation, use and abandonment (Parker & Foster 2012).

Ruth Tringham (1991) already stressed the relevance of the small-scale analysis of settlements to explore the interpersonal relationships that shape the changes and continuities found in the archaeological record, taking as an example the neolithic houses of the Balkans. Determining the micro spatial and material properties of the archaeological record that constitute an ancient

space of relationship, either a shelter, a house, or a village, involves considering them to the activities carried inside and outside them. Precisely starting from the certainty that maintenance activities seek the effective and daily creation and recreation of all human groups, they can be evaluated as generators of material conditions that must necessarily be shown in the spatial distribution and the properties of archaeological objects (e.g., Picazo et al. 2000). Clearly, the category of maintenance activities cannot be restricted to the study of domestic units, although the contributions of household archaeology are fundamental (Wilk & Rathje 1982; Hendon 1996; Allison 1999; Robin & Brumfiel 2010; Carpenter & Prentiss 2021). The maintenance activities category of analysis proposes that their specific organisation (spatial, technological, symbolic, productive) and their changes have central explanatory value in characterising the ways of life and the political, economic and social context of past and present communities. The specific characteristics of maintenance activities in each historical situation are not a consequence or byproduct of macrostructural or extra-household variables, but changes (or continuities) in maintenance activities are crucial in the success or failure of societal dynamics.

[here Figure 2]

A clear example of this central ontological role of maintenance activities, understood as care practices, are those domestic technologies which operate as facilitators of the conservation, processing and distribution of food (e.g., Colomer et al. 1998). Subsistence production cannot be understood independently of the manipulation and transformation processes that allow its consumption or, eventually, its short or long-term storage and the associated techno-cultural choices (e.g., Alarcón & García 2019). Other technology of care includes maternal practices, the learning and socialisation of infant individuals, textile, ceramic, lithic and metallurgical productions (e.g., Colomer 2005; Rísquez et al. 2020; Sánchez-Romero 2005, 2018; Sánchez-Romero & Cid 2018). They are part of the same chain, and their mutual adaptation makes their socio-economic viability possible (Håland 2007; 2012; Graff 2018).

Beyond linking maintenance activities to care practices in terms of the physiological support of the people who make up a community through food procurement, other care practices that are also part of maintenance activities are frequently hidden under the conceptual umbrella of cultural practices. A classic variable in archaeological studies to analyse changes and continuities in historical dynamics is the study of funerary rituals. The abundant literature around funerary archaeology points out its heuristic potential to propose hypotheses about the characteristics and socio-political dynamics of human groups of the past stemming from this kind of cultural trait (Tarlow & Stutz 2013). However, every funerary ritual is, in the first instance, a care practice that is carried out within the framework of a specific model of maintenance activities: the preparation of the bodies of the deceased, the elaboration and preparation of material items for ceremonies or the farewell performances (e.g., Aranda et al. 2009; Delgado & Rivera 2018; Montón & González-Marcén 2009, Rueda-Galán et al. 2021). All these elements imply, on the one hand, a specific vision of what caring for the dead means and, on the other, new techniques, procedures and organisation of maintenance activities. In short, cultural changes like these, of enormous importance in the ideological reproduction of communities, are unviable without their acceptance and management by the agents of maintenance activities.

Heritage and social care

Heritage is not a neutral element but a faithful reflection of society and, as such, a tool at the service of patriarchy (Jiménez-Esquinas 2017; Smith 2016). This is mainly manifested when we understand that heritage is an *action* of conserving and explaining what we value as relevant from the past so that current and future generations know their cultural and ideological references. For this reason, we speak of memorialisation, or even heritagization, processes rather than the existence of heritage inherited from the past (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2004). From a cultural identity politics point of view, heritage is understood as a symbol, as a representation, and even as a practice of cultural production focused on the present and that takes the past as a narrative and justifying resource. Such a narrative expresses (negotiates and validates) our cultural, national, and class identities (Smith 2016). Beyond analysing identity and power between genders in heritage and museum spaces, heritage studies can have a transforming vocation when understood as something *for* society. In a reflection on public archaeology and gender, González-Marcen and Sánchez-Romero (2018) considered that an activist feminist public archaeology should include a "transformative vocation" (p. 27) through an inclusive representation of the past, an assessment of historical experiences, and the incorporation of gender as a defining variable of collective memory and heritage. In order to achieve this collective transforming vocation, we must modify the starting points and points of view (after Haraway 1988), which means understanding heritage no longer as a tangible or intangible object preserved for posterity but as an action mediated by interpersonal relationships in order to care for today's society (e.g., Colomer 2020, 2021).

From a caring ethics standing position, caring for society means positioning the heritage practices, not as synonymous with curating the past (Veldpaus and Szemző 2021; Jones and Yarrow 2022) or with the daily maintenance of heritage spaces (Jiménez-Esquinas 2017) but understood as curating people throughout heritage. It is about transforming collective memories into (new) heritage elements that have significance for the sustenance and well-being of today's society. This shift in understanding the values and uses of heritage for society becomes more relevant when heritage and memorialisation processes are designed to overcome crisis or trauma, a collective event that has structurally affected society and marks its collective future. This includes genocides, femicides, terrorist attacks, wars, or pandemics. Trauma leaves metaphorical, psychological and material marks on individuals and society, marks that are difficult to bear, face, express, mourn, and overcome. Active acknowledgment of trauma, acceptance of the structural roots of trauma, and engagement in trauma-coping processes play an integral role in social trauma recovery and resilience (Ford 2009). How each community experiences traumatic events and expresses the emotions behind this personal and collective trauma varies greatly (Hirschberger 2018). Togetherness, a sense of community, empathy, and interpersonal care are integral to these processes. Collectively, these emotions are performed in different ways, from spontaneous memorials to more official acts of public mourning. In memory studies, these rituals are understood as processes that arise to satisfy the desire to honour the victims in a way that crystallises a sense of victimisation by the circumstances of their death or grief. They include commemorative plaques, monuments, museums, interpretation centres, and cyber-exhibitions. These curatorial practices seek to promote a collective narrative of what happened (Margry and Sánchez-Carretero 2011; Mason 2019). Primarily, creating commemorative events and memorial spaces should not be understood as social duties towards the people affected by a traumatic event, as markers to remember the

difficult moment *per se* or to honour heroic actions. From a care ethics perspective, they can instead be contextualised and defined as practices of care developed for those around us. For the caring of the victims, their families and other affected people. It means covering people's basic psychological and symbolic needs after the traumatic experience. Rather than being created (only) under criteria of professional expertise (and authority) responding to "what future generations will know about what happened to us" and therefore be guarded as historical memorabilia, curatorial works designed for the collection and storage of the tangible and intangible experiences of loss must be understood as forms of caring for the affected society, implying the direct victims but also the shell shocked society (Colomer n.d.; see also Arvanitis forthcoming; Bounia 2020; Colomer and Schmitt forthcoming).

Illustrating care and maintenance activities

Since the late 1980s, archaeology became more critical of its scientific work and underlined the need to reflect on the nature of archaeological textual representation, pointing out that how we write about the past has a significant role in determining its meaning. Nevertheless, this ontological debate has mainly focused on academic discourses. Less attention has been given to the visual dimensions of archaeological interpretations, although these representations play an essential role in interpreting concepts about past ways of life (Perry 2018). Archaeological visual products demand attention because they influence the public perceptions of archaeology, the past, and the discipline's knowledge construction (Moser 2014). In the nineteenth century, Romantic and Orientalist artists and evolutionists reconstructing primitive humans tended to establish representational stereotypes associated with, at that time, cultural and moral values of male Western upper and middle-class scientists and scholars. At present, most of these connotative archaeological visual representations are still present in many visual and popular products addressed to the general public (James 1997; Moser 1998; Smiles and Moser 2008; Hendershott 2020; Coltofean-Arizancu and Matić 2021). Among these connotations, the most common bias is the persistence of binary gender stereotypes representing men as dominant, strong, active and creative humans, while women seem to be either symbolic beauties or passive caretakers with little initiative and creativity (Gifford–Gonzalez 1993; Wiber 1997; Sánchez-Romero 2008; Solometo and Moss 2013; van den Dries and Kerkhof 2018; Vujakovic 2018). These images not only represent a stereotyped past full of androcentric understandings of gender roles but also become powerful iconographies with lasting impacts on today's consciousness, transmitting these views as eternal realities. Paraphrasing Laurajane Smith (2006), these images operate as an Authorised Pictorial Representation Discourse, combining pictorial conventions and dominant historical and cultural preconceptions.

Archaeological illustrations are not only interested in "inventions" or "reconstructions" of the past. They are actual interpretation mechanisms. Stephanie Moser (2001) defined them as the "production of meaning through a visual language of communicating the past". As an interpretation tool, they require an epistemological link between what they are picturing and the historical data, either from the archaeological record or archival documentation and, in its absence, from ethnographic referents. Archaeological illustrations' rigour thus comes from the fact that their visual interpretation is constrained and cannot contradict the available archaeological data (Wylie 2011). Accordingly, the representational value of illustrations

representing the past should be measured in terms of their accuracy in matching the specificities of the archaeological record (James 1997; Westin 2014). In this sense, archaeological illustrations can become interesting working tools to communicate to the public an accurate past and a research tool when asking whether the past they represent is 'correct' and, if not, what it actually looked like.

Pastwomen is a research network gathering several women researchers today working in different Spanish universities and archaeological museums and in two European research institutions. Although some of us have been working on gender archaeology since the late 1980s, the origin of the network dates 15 years ago, when an early small composition of the group was granted with a project whose main objective was to visualise the general public through a digital platform, the results of our archaeological research focused on the study of women's work and daily activities during Iberian prehistory and protohistory times. Since then, Pastwomen has expanded the working network by incorporating researchers from several academic institutions working on a large number of topics, including osteoarchaeology of motherhood and prehistoric art (besides above references, see also Cacheda-Pérez 2022; De Miquel 2010; Delgado & Ferrer 2012; Delgado-Hervás and Picazo 2016), and professionals from the educational and heritage sectors (Cacheda-Pérez 2021; Garcia-Luque 2015; Herranz et al. 2017; Jardón-Giner 2021) and popular divulgation (Soler 2006; Picazo 2008, 2017; Sánchez-Romero 2022). The network has also expanded its thematic interests to include Iberian protohistory colonial times, and classic Roman and Greek periods. Undoubtedly, among all the resources and activities developed by the Pastwomen network, it stands out the creation of free accessible image repertoires accessible at www.pastwomen.net. Fifteen years ago, we did not have (and even today, they are scarce) visual representations of the material culture typical of the maintenance activities or any of the works and actions historically carried out by women and other social groups underrepresented in archaeological interpretations. This absence contrasted with our archaeological research and its results. Therefore, we argued that the creation of 'other' visual representations of the past, based on robust archaeological data, produced in close collaboration with professional illustrators and accessible to all through an open-source web platform, would portray other pasts and therefore open the possibility of thinking of other possible presents (González-Marcén et al. forthcoming).

Pastwomen project has sought imaginative ways to overcome the shortcomings of current visual representation by producing interpretative archaeological images of the past. For that, we have used the notion of maintenance activities both as a way to structure the information contained in the images and as the typology of scenes recreated, more a king of the day-to-day core of social coexistence and person-centred scale. There is a three-fold purpose for doing this. Firstly, to bring to the forefront activities traditionally carried out by women, which, because they are quotidian and related to the so-called domestic sphere, have been understated in historicist tradition; secondly, not to present white, adult, normative men as the only active, intelligent and capable historical agents, associated with technology and knowledge, and therefore the only ones fully participating in the social dynamics of their communities, and thirdly, to propose an alternative visual narrative on the distant past.

[here Figure 3]

The open-source webpage pastwomen.net has designed three ways of searching for information and illustrations. One search is under "Women in…" (chrono-historical periods). Another search is under "Life cycles" (from pregnancy until death). The third search category is under "Activities", organised according to the maintenance activities: Caring for people, Procuring food, Building the community, Living spaces, and Everyday technologies. Each of these categories organises the data following chrono-historical periods. For each of these activities and periods, images have been created that, based on archaeological research, represent different kinds of people immersed in the activities at different stages of their lives. There is a three-fold purpose for doing this. Firstly, to bring to the forefront activities traditionally carried out by women, which, because they are quotidian and related to the so-called domestic sphere, have been understated in historicist tradition; secondly, not to present white, adult, normative men as the only active, intelligent and capable historical agents, associated with technology and knowledge, and therefore the only ones fully participating in the social dynamics of their communities, and thirdly, to propose an alternative visual narrative on the distant past. These two sections ("Women in..." and "Activities") are supported by other series of resources, such as the "Objects" section, which shows the material culture directly linked to these activities, and the "Archaeological traces" section dedicated to the archaeological methods and techniques used to infer these activities. Through the "Archaeological traces" section, we wanted to emphasise both the empirical grounds supporting the illustrations and the limitations of our data. This involves an attempt to define the limit between the data obtained and the pictorial interpretations we offer, the possibilities offered by material culture, and the most advanced techniques for analysing the archaeological record. Of course, we are aware, and even more so from a critical feminist perspective, that there is no such thing as "objective data", but we also want to honor the existence of material links in the archaeological record that can be used to create alternative depictions of prehistoric life. We call these "situated data" since they are not "found" but instead sought, generating, at times, conflicts with established interpretations and, at others, suggesting new paths of inquiry.

The aim of imaging the past has never been to construct a unified, idyllic catalogue of representations of the distant past from a single perspective but to express our interpretations as researchers of a specific past society through images. Hence, each image on the Pastwomen website is a unique product born out of the collaboration between the researchers and the illustrators, who gradually shaped the ideas we want to convey based on conversations about our experience and the questions that each of us asks of the archaeological record. In doing so, and as Alice Watterson (2015: 121) says, "creative practice destabilises established method, negotiates different types of engagements with the archaeological record and challenges many of the problematic tropes associated with this type of work".

Conclusions

It is in our trust that there should be a connection between feminist theory and activism, archaeological theory and practice engaged with feminist standpoint theories, and ways to construct other presents away from androcentric and patriarchal perspectives. Pastwomen network aims to deconstruct sex/gendered-biased interpretations and challenge heteronormative and patriarchal views perceived as normative when they are 'naturally' present

in the Modernist history of humanity. Moreover, we aim to provide new epistemological paradigms to create other narratives of history and heritage positioned differently, from women's marginality, and to focus on people's relationality, inter-dependence, and the action done for caring for each other. Furthermore, feminist care ethics is founded on a relational social ontology, an understanding that to be in the world is to be dependent on others at some point in the course of our lifetime (Tronto 2013). Recognising this collective inter-dependence and positioning care at the core as those who are, at the same time, *knowers* and agents facilitates to position maintenance activities at the core of archaeological and heritage epistemologies.

By using the term maintenance activities, we seek to stress that the common factor of this basic pattern of female activities lies in the structural function –both material and symbolic– that they have exercised and continue to exercise in all human groups. This structural function has taken on and taken on different forms. It encompasses a wide range of activities and may take on the form of distinct organisational combinations regarding the specific tasks associated with it and the spaces where these tasks are performed. Nevertheless, maintenance activities and their spaces show, both historically and ethnographically, a constant set of similarities and are expressed in common forms of relationships and knowledge management.

Acknowledgements

References

Alarcón, Eva & Alejandra García 2019. Las producciones cerámicas argáricas. *Treballs d'Arqueologia*, 23: 1-27.

Allison, Penelope M. (ed.) 1999. *The Archaeology of Household Activities*: London: Routledge.

Aranda, Gonzalo, Sandra Montón-Subías, Margarita Sánchez-Romero & Eva Alarcón 2009. Death and everyday life: the Argaric societies from Southeast Iberia. *Journal of Social Archaeology*, 9:139-162

Arvanitis, Kostas forthcoming. Ethics of care in collecting spontaneous memorials. *In:* A. Bounia & A. Witcomb (eds.) *The Ethics of Collecting Trauma.The Role of Museums in Collecting and Displaying Contemporary Crises.* pp.London: Routledge.

Bounia, Alexandra 2020. Museums, activism, and the ethics of care: Two museum exhibitions on the refugee 'crisis' in Greece in 2016 *In:* Laia Colomer & Ana Catalani (eds.) *Heritage Discourses in Europe. Responding to Migration, Mobility and Cultural Identities in the Twenty-first Century.* pp.ARC-Amsterdam University Press.

Bradley J. & Catherine P. Foster, (eds.) 2012. *New Perspectives on Household Archaeology*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns

Cacheda-Pérez, María 2021. Coeducación patrimonial en arqueología prehistórica: una herramienta para aplicar la perspectiva de género a la divulgación de la Prehistoria. *Clio. History and History Teaching***:**204-251.

Cacheda-Pérez, María 2022. La representación de las mujeres levantinas en el conjunto rupestre de la Roca de los Moros del Cogul (El Cogul, Lleida) desde una perspectiva feminista. *Complutum,* 33**:**329-346.

Carpenter, Lacey B. & Anna Marie Prentiss (eds.) 2021. *Archaeology of Households, Kinship, and Social Change*: London: Routledge.

Colomer, Laia 2005 Cerámica prehistórica y trabajo femenino en el Argar: una aproximación desde el estudio de la tecnología cerámica. In: M. Sánchez-Romero (ed.) *Arqueología y género*, pp. 177-218, Granada: Universidad de Granada.

Colomer, Laia 2020 Doing things/Things doing. Mobility, things, humans, home, and the affectivity of migration. In: Laia Colomer and Ana Catalani (eds.) *Heritage Approaches in Europe Today: Responding to Migration, Mobility, and Cultural Identities in the 21st Century*, pp. 83-97. Leeds, ARC Humanities Impact.

Colomer, Laia 2021. Memorialising forced migration and beyond. Commemorating Salvador Allende in Barcelona as memory-work in the context of civic memory and the politics of belonging. *International Journal of Heritage Studies,* 28**:**92-108.

Colomer, Laia n.d. Trauma, values and memory work of terrorist attacks. Mapping social caring after July 22, 2011 in Norway. *Manuscript submitted for publication (2023)*.

Colomer, Laia, Paloma González-Marcén & Sandra Montón 1998. Maintenance activities, technological knowledge and consumption patterns: a view of northeast Iberia (2000-500 Cal BC). *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology,* 11**:**53-80.

Colomer, Laia & Edwin Schmitt forthcoming. Mapping memorialisation of pandemic experiences: Care, stewardship, and guardianship *In:* A. Bounia & A. Witcomb (eds.) *The Ethics of Collecting Trauma.The Role of Museums in Collecting and Displaying Contemporary Crises.* London: Routledge.

Coltofean-Arizancu, Laura & Uroš Matić 2021. *Gender Stereotypes in Archaeology: A Short Reflection in Image and Text.* Sidestone Press.

Delgado-Hervás, Ana and Meritxell Ferré-Baldrich (2012). La muerte visita la casa: mujeres, cuidados y memorias familiares en los rituales funerarios fenicio-púnicos. *In:* Lourdes Prados-Torreira, Clara López-Ruiz and Javier Parra-Camacho (eds.) *La Arqueología funeraria desde una perspectiva de género*, pp. 123-156. Madrid: Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.

Delgado-Hervás, Ana & Marina Picazo 2016. *Los trabajos de las mujeres en el mundo antiguo: cuidado y mantenimiento de la vida.* Tarragona: Institut Català d'Arqueologia Clàssica.

Delgado-Hervás, Ana & Aurora Rivera 2018. Death in birth: Pregnancy, maternal death and funerary practices in the Phoenician and Punic World. *In*: Margarita Sánchez-Romero & Rosa Cid-López (eds.) *Motherhood and Infancies in the Mediterranean in Antiquity*, pp.54-70. Oxford: Oxbow.

Dezhamkhooy, Maryam 2023. *Women and the Politics of Resistance in the Iranian Constitutional Revolution.* Cham: Springer.

De Miquel, Patxuca 2010. Una visión de la infancia desde la osteoarqueologia, *Complutum*, 21(2):135-154.

Engster, Daniel 2007. *The Heart of Justice: Care Ethics and Political Theory.* Oxford University Press.

Fisher, Berenice & Joan Tronto 1990. Towards a feminist theory of care. *In:* E. K. Abel & M. K. Nelson (eds.) *Circles of care: Work and Identity in Women's Lives.* pp.SUNY Press.

Ford, Julian D 2009. *Posttraumatic Stress Disorder. Scientific and Professional Dimensions.* Elsevier.

García-Luque, Antonia 2015. Didactics of childhood: The case study of prehistory. In: Margarita Sánchez-Romero, Eva Alarcón & Gonzalo Aranda (eds.) *Children, Sapces, and Identity*, pp. 179-192. Oxford: Oxbow.

Gifford-Gonzalez, Diane 2008. Thoughts on a method for zooarchaeological study of quotidian life. *In:* Sandra Montón Subías & Marga Sánchez-Romero (eds.) *Engendering social dynamics: The Archaeology of Maintenance Activities.* pp.Oxford: Archaeopress.

Gifford–Gonzalez, Diane 1993. You can hide, but you can't run: representations of women's work in illustrations of Palaeolithic life. *Visual Anthropology Review,* 9**:**22-41.

González-Marcén, Paloma 2021. De genealogías y referentes en las arqueólogas españolas del siglo XXI: reflexiones desde el grupo Pastwomen. Paper presented at *Voces in crescendo: del mutismo a la afonía en la historia de las mujeres en la arqueología española, Barcelona, 12 & 13 March 2021.* Universitat de Barcelona.

González-Marcén, Paloma, Clara Masriera-Esquerra, Laia Colomer, Marta Díaz-Zorita, Marina Picazo, Carmen Rísquez-Cuenca, Margarita Sánchez-Romero & Begonya Soler-Mayor forthcoming. Critical approaches to archaeological visual representations: the Pastwomen project. *In:* D. Gutsmiedl-Schümann, J. Z. Matias & N. Scheyhing (eds.) *Diversity in Visual Representations of the Past.* pp.Cham: Springer.

González-Marcén, Paloma, Sandra Montón & Marina Picazo 2008. Towards an archaeology of maintenance activities. *In:* S. Montón & M. Sánchez-Romero (eds.) *Engendering Social Dynamics: The Archaeology of Maintenance Activities.* pp.Archeopress.

González-Marcén, Paloma & Marina Picazo 2005. Arqueología de la vida cotidiana. *In:* M. Sánchez-Romero (ed.) *Arqueología y género.* pp.Granada: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Granada.

González-Marcen, Paloma & Margarita Sánchez-Romero 2018. Arqueología pública y género. Estrategias para nuevas formas de relación con la sociedad. *Storia delle Donne,* 14**:**19-42.

Graff, Sarah R. 2018. Archaeological studies of cooking and food preparation. *Journal of Archaeological Research*, 26: 305-351.

Haraway, Donna 1988. Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies***:**575-599.

Held, Virginia 2006. *The Ethics of Care: Personal, Political, and Global.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hendershott, Rebecca 2020. Didactic and artistic representations of prehistoric hominins: Who were we? Who are we now? *Journal of Science & Popular Culture,* 3**:**153-171.

Hendon, Julia A. 1996. Archaeological approaches to the organisation of domestic labor: household practice and domestic relations. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 25: 45-61.

Hernando, Almudena 2005. *¿Por qué la historia no ha valorado las actividades de mantenimiento?* Bellaterra: CEPAP-Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

Herranz-Sánchez, Ana, Carmen Rísquez-Cuenca, Carmen Rueda-Galán, Francisca Hornos-Mata and Antonia García-Luque 2017. Rompiendo silencios: Las edades de las mujeres iberas. La ritualidad femenina en las colecciones del Museo de Jaén. *In:* Lourdes Prados-Torreira and Clara López-Ruiz (eds.) *Museos arqueológicos y género. Educando en igualdad*, pp. 401-431. Madrid: UAM ediciones.

Hirschberger, Gilad 2018. Collective trauma and the social construction of meaning. *Frontiers in psychology,* 9**:**1441.

Håland, Randi 2012. Changing food ways as indicators of emerging complexity in Sudanese Nubia: from Neolithic agropastoralists to the Meroitic civilisation. *Azania: Archaeological Research in Africa* 47: 327-342.

James, Simon 1997. Drawing inferences. Visual representations in theory and practice. *In:* B. L. Molyneaux (ed.) *The Cultural Life of Images. Visual Representation in Archaeology.* pp.London: Routledge.

Jardón-Giner, Paula 2021. Una educación inclusiva de género con perspectiva crítica:¿ cómo incorporar la historia de las mujeres si yo no la estudié? *Íber: didáctica de las ciencias sociales, geografía e historia*.

Jiménez-Esquinas, Guadalupe 2017. El patrimonio (también) es nuestro. Hacia una crítica patrimonial feminista. *In:* I. Arrieta-Urtizberea (ed.) *El género en el patrimonio cultural.* pp.Bilbao: Universidad del País Vasco/Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea.

Jones, Siân & Thomas Yarrow 2022. *The Object of Conservation. An Ethnography of Heritage Practice.* Routledge.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara 2004. Intangible heritage as metacultural production1. *Museum International,* 56**:**52-65.

Lightfoot, Kent G., Antoinette Martinez and Ann M. Schiff 1998. Daily practice and material culture in pluralistic social settings: an archaeological study of culture change and persistence from Fort Ross, California. *American Antiquity*, 63: 199-222.

Lozano Rubio, Sandra 2011. Gender thinking in the making: feminist epistemology and gender archaeology. *Norwegian archaeological review,* 44**:**21-39.

Margry, Peter Jan & Cristina Sánchez-Carretero 2011. *Grassroots Memorials. The Politics of Memorializing Traumatic Death.* London: Berghahn Books.

Mason, Randall 2019. Valuing traumatic heritage places as archives and agents. *In:* E. Avrami, S. MacDonald, R. Mason & D. Myers (eds.) *Values in Heritage Management. Emerging Approaches and Research Directions.* pp.Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute.

Masvidal-Fernández, Cristina 2007. Bases para una nueva interpretación sobre las mujeres en la Prehistoria. *Complutum,* 18**:**209-215.

Montón-Subías, Sandra & Almudena Hernando 2018. Modern colonialism, eurocentrism and historical archaeology: some engendered thoughts. *European Journal of Archaeology,* 21**:**455-471.

Montón, Sandra & Paloma González-Marcén 2009. Time, women, identity and maintenance activities. Death and life in the Argaric communities of southeast Iberia. *In:* K. Kopoka (ed.) *Fylo: Engendering Prehistoric 'Stratigraphies' in the Aegean and the Mediterranean. Proceedings of an International Conference, University of Crete, Rethymno, 2-5 June 2005.* pp.Liège: Université de Liège.

Moser, Stephanie 1998. *Ancestral Images. The Iconography of Human Origins.* Cornell University Press.

Moser, Stephanie 2001. Archaeological representation: the visual conventions for constructing knowledge about the past. *In:* I. Hodder (ed.) *Archaeological Theory Today.* pp.London: Polity Press.

Moser, Stephanie 2014. Legacies of engagement: the multiple manifestations of Ancient Egypt in public discourse. *In:* W. Carruthers (ed.) *Histories of Egyptology.* pp.London: Routledge.

Perry, Sara 2018. Why are heritage interpreters voiceless at the trowel's edge? A plea for rewriting the archaeological workflow. *Advances in Archaeological Practice,* 6**:**212-227.

Picazo, Marina 1997. Hearth and home: the timing of maintenance activities. *In:* J. Moore & E. Scott (eds.) *Invisible People and Processes: Writing Women and Children into European Archaeology.* pp.Leicester University Press.

Picazo, Marina 2008. *Alguien se acordará de nosotras. Mujeres en la ciudad griega antigua.* Barcelona: Edicions Bellaterra.

Picazo, Marina 2017. Más allá de los estereotipos: nuevas tendencias en el estudio del género en arqueología clásica. *Arenal. Revista de historia de las mujeres,* 24**:**5-31.

Picazo, Marina, Cristina Masvidal-Fernández & Elisenda Curià 2000. Desigualdad politica y prácticas de creación y mantenimiento de la vida en Iberia septentrional. *Arqueología Espacial,* 22**:**107-122.

Rísquez-Cuenca, Carmen, Carmen Rueda-Galán, Ana B Herranz-Sánchez & Míriam Vílchez-Suárez 2020. Among threads and looms. Maintenance activities in the Iberian societies: the case of El Cerro de la Plaza de Armas de Puente Tablas (Jaén). *Saguntum Extra,* 20**:**97-111.

Robin, Cynthia and Elisabeth M. Brumfiel, E. M. (eds.) 2010. *Gender, Households, and Society: Unraveling the Threads of the Past and the Present.* Archaeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association, 18.

Rueda-Galán, Carmen, Paloma González-Marcén, Margarita Sánchez-Romero, Carmen Rísquez Rísquez-Cuenca, María Cacheda-Pérez, Patxuca De Miguel-Ibáñez, Ana Delgado-Hervás, Marta Díaz-Zorita, Ana Belén Herranz-Sánchez, Mireia López-Bertran, Marina Picazo & Begonya Soler-Mayor 2021. Cuerpos estereotipados, cuerpos enterrados, cuerpos representados, cuerpos cambiantes: Una aproximación panorámica desde la arqueología feminista. *Anales de Arqueología y Etnología,* 76**:**215-251.

Sánchez-Romero, Margarita 2005. Cultura material y actitudes de género: el utillaje lítico. In: Sánchez-Romero, M (ed.) Arqueología y género, pp.219-244. Granada: Universidad de Granada.

Sánchez-Romero, Margarita 2008. Imágenes de mujeres de la Prehistoria. *Arenal: Revista de historia de mujeres,* 15**:**5-109.

Sánchez-Romero, Margarita 2018. Care and socialisation of children in the European Bronze Age. *In:* S. Crawford, D. M. Hadley and G. B. Shepherd (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of Childhood*, pp.338-351. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sánchez-Romero, Margarita 2022. *Prehistorias de Mujeres.* Barcelona: Destino.

Sánchez Romero, Margarita 2023. Prehistoric archaeology in Spain from a feminist perspective: Thirty years of reflection and debate. *In:* S. López-Varela (ed.) *Women in Archaeology: Intersectionalities in Practice Worldwide*, pp. 201-220. Springer.

Sánchez-Romero, Margarita & Rosa Cid-López (eds.) 2018. *Motherhood and Infancies in the Mediterranean in Antiquity*: Oxford: Oxbow.

Smiles, Sam & Stephanie Moser (eds.) 2008. *Envisioning the Past: Archaeology an the Image*: London: John Wiley & Sons.

Smith, Laurajane 2016. Heritage, gender and identity. *In:* P. Howard & B. Graham (eds.) *The Routledge Research Companion to Heritage and Identity.* pp. Routledge.

Soler, Begonya (ed.) 2006. *Les dones en la prehistòria*: València: Museu de Prehistòria de València.

Solometo, Julie & Joshua Moss 2013. Picturing the past: gender in National Geographic reconstructions of prehistoric life. *American Antiquity,* 78**:**123-146.

Tarlow, Sarah & Liv Nilsson Stutz (eds.) 2013. *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of Death and Burial.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tringham, Ruth 1991. Households with faces: the challenge of gender in prehistoric architectural remains. *In:* Joan Gero & Margaret Conkey (eds) *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory,* pp.93-131. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Tronto, Joan C 1993. *Moral Boundaries: A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care.* Routledge.

Tronto, Joan C 2015. *Who Cares? How to Reshape a Democratic Politics.* Cornell University Press.

van den Dries, Monique H & Miyuki Kerkhof 2018. The past is male: gender representation in Dutch archaeological practice. *Advances in Archaeological Practice,* 6**:**228-237.

Veldpaus, Loes & Hanna Szemző 2021. Heritage as a matter of care, and conservation as caring for the matter. *In:* A. Gabauer, S. Knierbein, N. Cohen, H. Lebuhn, K. Trogal, T. Viderman & T. Haas (eds.) *Care and the City: Encounters with Urban Studies.* pp.Routledge.

Vujakovic, Peter 2018. Prehistoric 'taskscapes': representing gender, age and the geography of work. *Visual Culture in Britain,* 19**:** 255-278.

Watterson, Alice 2015. Beyond digital dwelling: Re-thinking interpretive visualisation in archaeology. *Open Archaeology,* 1.

Westin, Jonathan 2014. Inking a past; visualisation as a shedding of uncertainty. *Visual Anthropology Review,* 30**:**139-150.

Wiber, Melanie G 1997. *Erect men/Undulating women. The Visual Imagery of Gender, "Race" and Progress in Reconstructive Illustrations of Human Evolution.* Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier Univ. Press.

Wilk, Richard R. & William L. Rathje 1982. Archaeology of the household: building a prehistory of domestic life. *American Behavioral Scientist,* 25: 617-724.

Wylie, Alison 2011. Critical distance: stabilising evidential claims in archaeology. *In:* P. Dawind, W. Twining & M. Vasilaki (eds.) *Evidence, Inference and Enquiry. .* pp.London: British Academy.