

THE ECONOMICS OF POTNIA: STORAGE IN 'TEMPLES' OF PREHISTORIC GREECE*

The studies on the storage of any ritual site, are not that numerous; in fact, there is only one article by Pilali-Papasteriou¹ on the subject for Minoan times. In it, she briefly attempts to demonstrate that there is storage associated with some 'religious' buildings and interprets the data accordingly. This view will be firmly supported here. It has to be noted that for the purposes of this article, the term storage refers only to food storage as indicator of subsistence potential and by extension, for a non-monetary society, of relative wealth. For this I follow the methodological framework developed by K. Christakis.²

The question of storage of ritual places can be looked at only in these sites that have been properly excavated and published. Unfortunately, the only ritual space or associated area that meets both of these requirements in Prehistoric Greece is Building 4 at Arkhanes.³ Nevertheless there are some other sites, which have been properly excavated and have had their detailed preliminary reports. The much-neglected coarse ceramics, especially pithoi and large vessels can give us a reasonable idea on storage. Storage, no doubt, could also be achieved by bags or baskets, which unfortunately leave no trace. Cists or boxes that were specifically made for storage are very rare and are not normally found outside large buildings.

Minoan Period

Independent Sanctuaries

Prepalatial period

Atsipades Korakias⁴ (EM to OP)

The well-excavated but very humble site of Atsipades, in Western Crete, is very important to us as it is one of the earliest ritual sites and is totally devoid of buildings. Some medium sized vessels and few small pithoi are worth noting. Jars could be identified as more versatile storage vessels than pithoi, easier to use and transport. The discovery of small pithoi is more surprising, as there is no building at Atsipades. Although, small pithoi could have been transported there, the need for storage, even in small quantities, is noteworthy.

* I must record my gratitude for the notes and corrections made by J.T. Killen, and K. Christakis, who both saw a previous version of this paper and to my thesis supervisor C. Renfrew for all his support. I am also grateful to L. French, and J. Clarke for their contributions to the final version of this paper. This study would not have been accomplished without the financial support of the N. Goulondris foundation. This article is dedicated to the memory of A. Naoum, who taught me how to think.

1 A. PILALI-PAPASTERIOU, "Ιερά και Αποθήκες στην Ανακτορική Κρήτη" in *ΕΙΛΑΠΙΝΗ, Τόμος τιμητικός για τον Καθηγητή ΝΙΚΟΛΑΟ ΠΛΑΤΩΝΑ* (1987) 179-196.

2 K. CHRISTAKIS, "Pithoi and food storage in Neopalatial Crete: a domestic perspective," *World Archaeology* 31(1) (1999) 1-20.

3 E. DELIGIANNI, *Το κτίριο 4 του Μινωικού Νεκροταφείου στη Θέση Φουννί Αρχανών*, Ph.D. (1995).

4 A. PEATFIELD, "Rural Ritual in Bronze Age Crete: The Peak Sanctuary at Atsipades," *CAJ* 2 (1992) 59-87; A. PEATFIELD, "The Atsipades Korakias Peak Sanctuary Project," *Classics Ireland* 1 (1994) 90-5; C. MORRIS and A. PEATFIELD, "Pottery from the peak sanctuary of Korakias, Ayioy Vasiliou, Rethymnon," *Pepragmena of the Z International Cretological Congress*, vol. A2 (1995) 643-7, pl. 21-26; C. MORRIS and V. BATTEN, "Early Pottery from the Atsipades Peak Sanctuary," *Herakleion Cretological 1996* (forthcoming); I thank C. Morris for letting me see a preliminary version of this paper.

*Old and New Palace Periods*Anemospelia (MMIB-MMIIIA)⁵

Anemospelia has yielded the largest number of pithoi -twenty- from the greater Arkhanes area; of these three were found in the antechamber,⁶ twelve in the central room,⁷ and five in the east room.⁸ Carbonised seeds were found in some of the large vessels. It seems that an organised accumulation of surplus took place there to a large extent.

Its proximity to Youkhtas and the road that connected the two sites, may indicate that Anemospelia was a satellite site, which served and increased the storage of the Peak Sanctuary. Similar is possibly the case of Building B.

Youkhtas

Many storage vessels have been attested at the peak sanctuary of Youkhtas. Unfortunately, the evidence is mainly in secondary deposition. Nevertheless, it is indicative of a large-scale storage in the sanctuary, no matter where.

Several pithos sherds were discovered in the 'Ash altar's' deposit that is dated to the MMIA-II phase.⁹

In the NP period, an LMIA pithos with a decorative band near its base and several small handles was one of the few vessels found *in situ*.¹⁰ Many pithos sherds were found in layers underneath, therefore predating the disturbed floor of the room.¹¹

One has to add, moreover, that there was ample evidence of smaller closed vessels that were used for 'versatile storage' both in the OP and the NP periods.¹²

In other words, it is evident that the presence of pithoi and other storage vessels, was significant at Youkhtas, not only during one, but through several periods. The find of a pithos *in situ* in room 1, one of the very few *in situ* finds, and the ample pithos sherds, point to the probability, that one or more of the rooms in Youkhtas were designated for storage.

Syme¹³

At Syme, the greatest amount of information for Minoan times came from the site's second OP period (U). On the floor of room 2, sherds belonging to three large pithoi and many small ones were recovered. The preponderance of the relevant sherds shows that the entire room was used for storage.¹⁴ Room 17¹⁵ may have also been used for the same purpose and to a greater degree, as a large number of pithoi and cups were found together *in situ*.¹⁶

The fill of room 4A had several sherds that postdated the construction of the building (U) but still associated to the complex. Those of the MMIII-LMI period included a great quantity of pithos fragments. This shows that pithoi were used in the sanctuary during the NP period¹⁷ too.

5 Y. and E. SAKELLARAKIS, *Arkhanes Minoan Crete in a new light* (1997) 269-310.

6 SAKELLARAKIS (*supra* n. 5) 275-279.

7 SAKELLARAKIS (*supra* n. 5) 281-285.

8 SAKELLARAKIS (*supra* n. 5) 288-291.

9 A. KARETSOU, "Το Ιερόν Κορυφός του Γιούχτα," *PraktArchEt* (1978) 247-9; the same layer was discovered under the floor of room 1.

10 A. KARETSOU, "Το Ιερόν Κορυφός του Γιούχτα," *PraktArchEt* (1975) 334; it was found in the NW corner of room 1.

11 Under the floor, in a yellowy coloured soil 35-52cm thick that was attested throughout the room and in the 'Ash altar's' deposit that continued under the floor of this room. See KARETSOU (*supra* n. 9) 235-8.

12 These types of vessels are very frequent in the OP period, when many spouted jars of all sizes are to be found. In the NP period, some bridge-spouted globular jars are more frequent, though the open-spouted and plastic ring-on-neck jars are also attested. Several trickle ware vessels must have been used as cereal containers.

13 I thank A. LEMBESSI for providing me with the relevant information.

14 A. LEMBESSI, "Το ιερό του Ερμή και της Αφροδίτης στη Σύμη της Βιάννου," *PraktArchEt* (1995) 248 f. and *PraktArchEt* (1994) 244.

15 Great parts of rooms 17 and 18, and their scattered remnants, were covered by a destruction layer; thus, all that has been found there was *in situ*.

16 A. LEMBESSI, "Το ιερό του Ερμή και της Αφροδίτης στη Σύμη της Βιάννου," *PraktArchEt* (1993) 215 f.; for the small pithos in the bedrock depression, see plate 131a-b. EAD., "Το ιερό του Ερμή και της Αφροδίτης στη Σύμη της Βιάννου," *PraktArchEt* (1992) 219.

17 A. LEMBESSI, "Το ιερό του Ερμή και της Αφροδίτης στη Σύμη της Βιάννου," *PraktArchEt* (1977) 407.

The third Minoan OP period was that of the open-air enclosure Ub and its rooms. Within the enclosure several amphoroid vessels appear possibly as remains of some open-air activity.¹⁸

More pithos fragments, NP this time, were discovered in a haphazardly created pit¹⁹ (light blue).²⁰ Although out of context, they demonstrate their use in the period.²¹ Many fragments from very large pithoi were also found in later (LMIII) contexts. Syme, therefore, has shown a significant presence of Pithoi during all the Minoan periods.

Building B at Arkhanes²²

From the last of the two phases of the Building B at Arkhanes (MMIIB) a great number of pithoi were reported.

Philioremos, Gonies

In room D of the Philioremos Peak Sanctuary complex,²³ a part of a small pithos was preserved *in situ* in the SE corner of the room.²⁴ Like Youkhtas, very few items were found *in situ*.

Karphi, Vigla²⁵

Although there are some walls built near the summit of the Karphi Peak Sanctuary, it is not certain that they belong to it. In any case, among the sherds of pottery associated with the site, several pithos sherds were found.

St. George at Kythera²⁶ (mainly MMIII/LMI, some remains from MMIB-II and LMII-III)²⁷

The Peak Sanctuary in the island of Kythera, gave us several MMIII-LMIA/IB pithos fragments that would argue for some considerable storage.

Building 4 at Phourni²⁸ (NP)

At Building 4, Phourni, large pieces of twelve pithoi have come from rooms 1 and 2 and from deposits outside the east wall of the building. Room 1 was designated for storage and there was not an easily negotiable passage in the room because of the vessels and pithoi. A great part of the pithos fragments have come from the upper storey as well. The storage of the building is very large and the accumulation of surplus must have been organised.

Building 4 has been considered by the excavators as unique, as it seems to be a mundane building in what is considered a ritual-cemetery space. It has been taken as mundane, however, because important storage and workshop activities took place there. Workshop and storage are associated with everyday activities and not with ritual. Indeed, they do not have any obvious ritual value, and are usually part of the everyday world.

18 The wall of the enclosure covers an earlier pithos together with a MMIIB sherd that date the destruction of this part of building U, within the OP period. See LEMBESSI (*supra* n. 16) 218 and LEMBESSI (*supra* n. 4) 257-9. Both the construction and the destruction seem to have happened in MMIIB, a very analogous situation to the destruction and remodelling of the lower West court 'sanctuary' in the palace at Phaestos.

19 Square H51-2.

20 A. LEMBESSI, "Το ιερό του Ερμή και της Αφροδίτης στη Σύμη της Βιάννου," *PraktArchEt* (1985) 274.

21 See also room 4A that was mentioned above.

22 A. KARETSOU, "Γιούχτας," *Ergon* (1989) 147-52, esp. 150; A. KARETSOU, ID., *Ergon* (1988) 160-5.

23 S. ALEXIOU, "Αρχαιότητες και Μνημεία της Κεντρικής και Ανατολικής Κρήτης," *AD* 22 (1967) 484 f.; ID., "Χρονικά, Αρχαιότητες και Μνημεία της Κεντρικής και Ανατολικής Κρήτης," *CretChron* 20 (1966) 322; P. FAURE, "Sur trois sortes de sanctuaires Crétois," *BCH* 92 (1969) 174-213, esp. 184.

24 It must be said, however, that in this room, according to the very brief report by Alexiou, several human figurines were also found, which may argue for the performance of ritual there.

25 H.W. and J.D.S. PENDLEBURY, M.B. MONEY COUTTS, "Excavations in the Plain of Lasithi III," *BSA* 38 (1937-8) 57-141, esp. 97 f.

26 Y. SAKELLARAKIS, "Minoan Religious Influence in the Aegean," *BSA* 91 (1996) 81-99, esp. 87.

27 No building was preserved on the site, due to the subsequent building in the area of the sanctuary proper.

28 SAKELLARAKIS (*supra* n. 5) 223-9; DELIGIANNI (*supra* n. 3).

Kophinas²⁹ (MMIIIB-LMIA)

The NP sanctuary at Kophinas was demarcated by a MMIIIB-LMIA³⁰ surrounding wall and unlike the above sites did not have any type of edifice. Inside and outside of the wall, several sherds of the same period were found, amongst which many small pithoi and spouted jars. The presence of small pithoi, is noted together with the absence of buildings. One should bear in mind that the situation was similar in Atsipades, though the period was totally different.

The possible existence of small pithoi has been reported at Piskokephalo,³¹ which is a site of a similar type to Kophinas.

Non Independent Sanctuaries*Old Palace Period*

Phaestos (MMIIB)

The Lower West Court Sanctuary Complex

Room LVIII of the Lower West Court Sanctuary complex at Phaestos included several pithoi (six), and would have acted as a storeroom.³² Evidence for the existence of large and small pithoi was yielded in rooms XXVII-XVIII, IL, under stairs LIII-LV, and LXII.

The Upper West Court Sanctuary Complex

The area of the Upper West Court Sanctuary Complex at Phaestos, which includes rooms V-X, does not seem to have any large or medium storage vessels. Only some jars were found in rooms VI-IX and nothing more. No doubt these rooms may have communicated with rooms XI-XIII, which had some evidence for storage. Rooms VII and X, which do not communicate directly with the rooms of the complex, include some storage vessels but not large ones.³³

*New Palace Period*Mallia, Quartier 18³⁴

A small room (4) at the back of Quartier 18 at Mallia contained pithoi and large jars together with large amounts of crockery.³⁵

The storage of the sanctuary, although it cannot be estimated with any precision, is small in comparison with places like Youkhtas; it is greater however than in Atsipades or Kophinas.

At any rate, the relatively low storage capacity of these sanctuaries that are near a large centre can be explained by the assumption that the palatial storage was used instead. It is only natural to suppose that the enormous palatial storage would have been employed by the associated sanctuary complexes. This would not mean, however, that the palatial storerooms were entirely religious.³⁶

Mycenaean Period**Linear B**

It would be helpful to compare the above picture to the ritual institutions³⁷ storage in the ensuing Post-palatial or Mycenaean phase. The texts of Linear B are in this case the

29 N. PLATON and C. DAVARAS, "Ἱερό Κορυφῆς Κόφιννα," *CretChron* 14 (1960) 526; and *ArchDelt* 17 (1962-3) 287f.; A. KARETSOU and G. RETHYMNIO TAKIS, "Ἱερό Κορυφῆς Κόφιννα," *Κρητική Εστία* 4 (1991/3) 289-292, pl. 5-7.

30 The wall had nearer to it only MMIIIB-LMIA sherds and thus was probably of that date.

31 N. PLATON, "Το Ἱερόν Πισκοκέφαλον Σιτειάς," *PraktArchEt* (1952) 631-636 esp. 631.

32 P. CARINCI, pers. com.

33 PILALI-PAPASTERIOU (*supra* n. 1) 185 f.

34 J.-C. POURSAT, *Fouilles exécutées à Mallia, quatrième rapport: Exploration du palais, ÉtCrét XII* (1962) 7-13.

35 MMIIIA period.

36 PILALI-PAPASTERIOU (*supra* n. 1) 186 f.

37 In this early stage of institutional research, the term 'ritual institution' conventionally means the ritual locus, its associated areas/buildings and its personnel.

most revealing. It must be stated however, that the Minoan institutions are ritual, but not clearly religious, whereas the Mycenaean institutions that we will refer to are both ritual and religious.

There are several words in the Linear B vocabulary, which can be interpreted as denoting a sacred place, or sanctuary. These are the words *i-je-ro*, *na-wi-jo*, *wo-ko* and possibly others (*o-pi-e-de-i*, *ti-mi-to(-)a-ke-i*). Certainly, these are not all exact synonyms. The stress of the first one is on the sacredness, while *na-wi-jo* is associated with several non-cultic persons (with the exception perhaps of *ka-ra-wi-po-ro* in the famous PY Jn 829 tablet); *wo-ko* is associated with several workers and craftsmen and possibly with entire workshops of economic significance.³⁸

In Linear B, ritual institutions appear to have property. The fact that Hermes seems to own sheep (KN D 411) and Potnia sheep and pig herds in several places like *si-ja-du-we* (KN DI 930; 933; 946; 950; 7503; 7905; 969), *qa-nwa-so* (KN DI 943), *ka-ru-no* (KN DI 7147) and *ra-ja* (KN DI 777) shows that sacred institutions owned livestock. On the other hand, several slaves of priestesses (*i-je-re-ja do-e-ra*), or slaves of god (*te-o-jo do-e-ra*), together with priestesses (*i-je-re-ja*), are recorded along with other individuals as owners of land (in the E tablets). Twice, however, it is explicitly said that it is the God who owns the land (PY Ep 704.5 and Xn 1357). In the first instance the nature of the plot of *e-ri-ta* is contested. This plot is clearly said to belong to "the God." In the second, Hermes (*e-ma-a₂*) is presented as a flax land-owner who receives a tax exemption.³⁹ From these references one can tentatively support that certain functionaries act on behalf of a divine institution. It is feasible, therefore, that the personal property of those individuals and that of the respective institutions is the same. It is therefore possible that these 'sanctuaries' or 'institutions' were land and property owners and that they were administered by various functionaries.

In fact, judging from the frequency⁴⁰ of religious titles in the Pylian Eb/p texts, the religious institutions could conceivably be very large landowners or land-hirers, and would thus have a considerable income from the exploitation of the land. The land property would create wealth that would have to be stored.

One other aspect of the wealth of ritual institutions is the maintenance of specialised workers, within or outside the confines of each institution (several Potnian bronze smiths, for instance). The payment of specialised workgroups, according to the A-series, and the maintenance of priests or slaves of god (their status is of no importance to this argument) would have been made in the form of wheat, figs or their equivalent.⁴¹ These payment commodities, together with the production of the workshops and that of wool and other products coming from the herds or the land create a need for storage. In other words, one would expect great storage capacities in the buildings of the respective institutions for the accommodation of all these items. Both raw materials (food, or other) and finished products made by these institutions, would on several occasions create surplus, and would thus be accumulated as wealth. This wealth stored, would be spent in festivals, on personnel, on running costs, perhaps on taxes, on purchase of raw materials used in the workshops etc.

It is fair, therefore, to ask whether these institutions were totally independent from the central administrative authorities, considering that the latter made the respective records on their wealth.⁴² The answer to it lies somewhere in between the two extremes; of complete autonomy and total control. Their administrative independence can be seriously questioned as they are repeatedly mentioned in the relevant texts. Hiller, on the other hand, maintains

38 S. HILLER, "Mykenische Heiligtümer: das Zeugnis der Linear B-Texte," in *Sanctuaries and Cults* 95-125.

39 J. KILLEN, "KE-U-PO-DA E-SA-RE-U and the exemptions," *Minos* XXVI-XXVIII (1992-1993) 120, n. 30. The fact that *e-ma-a₂* receives a tax exemption and that the god's plot could have been an *e-to-ni-jo*, possibly meaning tax exempt plot as well, may be indicative of the tendency to exempt from taxation divine plots. This might be an argument against complete dependence of the ritual institution to the palaces.

40 S. HILLER, "Tempelwirtschaft im mykenischen Griechenland," *AfO* 19 (1982) 94-104, esp. 95.

41 That we suppose by analogy to the A-series.

42 Susan Lupack has put forward some hypotheses on the relation between the religious and the political spheres in Mycenaean times. See S. LUPACK, "Palaces, Sanctuaries and Workshops: The Role of the Religious Sector in Mycenaean Economics," in *Mycenaean Palaces* 25-34.

that there is no tablet with any obligation implied on the part of the ‘sanctuaries’ towards the palaces.⁴³ Although this is not entirely so, as one can assume from the land-holding tablets that the land recorded there is going to be taxed,⁴⁴ there is no explicit written obligation binding these ‘institutions’ to the palace. Along the lines of Hiller’s argument, one could maintain that the palace only recorded the land that was under its direct jurisdiction, as large portions remained unrecorded. This unrecorded land would normally include more than one ritual locus or property of a ritual institution. A more likely suggestion would be that the Palace did not directly control or own any land in the unrecorded region and so the ritual institutions that hired or owned land there, were not mentioned.⁴⁵ Furthermore, there seems to exist a kind of obligation of ‘subjects’ of the palace to several ritual institutions. Apart from the ‘donations’, in small quantities, of several commodities or finished products to the Gods (as seen in the Pylos Fp 1+31 and in many other tablets), there are several large-scale ‘gifts’ in the form of taxation (part of the whole production, *do-so-mo*) to Poseidon recorded by the Palace (PY Es tablets).

Conclusions

There are several points that could be raised regarding the above material:

A) It is clear, from the Minoan and the Mycenaean cases, that storage, as others have suggested,⁴⁶ can be associated with ritual institutions. All the more interesting is that some architecturally independent ritual sites show evidence of extensive storage in the same way as some ‘regional centres’ (see Villas). It is possible that some of these ritual sites devoted a large portion of their available space for storage. We do not dispute that storage is a mundane activity. On the contrary, we argue that mundane activities, such as storage, are not exclusive traits of mundane institutions, but of ritual ones as well.

B) The accumulation of staple wealth seems to vary from site to site. As far as the Minoan ritual institutions are concerned, it seems to be connected with certain factors:

The proximity to other storage areas (see Phaestos W court sanctuaries).

The existence of buildings associated with the site and their quality (so that storage can be housed) (compare Kophinas to Youkhtas).

The size of the related habitation site (compare Youkhtas to Atsipades).

The extent of the site’s use (permanent or seasonal) (Long-term storage is difficult in a seasonally inhabited site).

C) Storage potential is an indication of wealth. It has been argued by several scholars that the accumulation of wealth can be a source of political and material power.⁴⁷ For Minoan Crete, we know from the study of K. Christakis that the subsistence potential of LMIB (and possibly all NP period) ordinary households was relatively weak.⁴⁸ Foodstocks were insufficient to meet the nutritional requirements of the household during prolonged food shortage. Only some regional élite households and, I may add, some ritual institutions, yield evidence of a high subsistence potential. The power therefore, of these peripheral élite households⁴⁹ and

43 HILLER (*supra* n. 38) 116.

44 This is exactly the argument around the term *e-to-ni-jo*, conceivably some sort of tax-free land, which the God does not have, according to the *da-mo*.

45 Surely in some of the cases we are simply missing the respective records, as it could possibly be the case with some parts of the Pylian Further Province. No matter how much land is recorded, however, it seems only logical that there will always be some unrecorded land.

46 N. PLATON, “The Minoan Palaces: Centres of Organisation of a Theocratic Social and Political System,” in O. KRZYSZKOWSKA and L. NIXON (eds), *Minoan Society* (1983) 273-276.

47 T.K. EARLE, *How Chiefs Come to Power. The Political Economy in Prehistory* (1997) 67.

48 CHRISTAKIS (*supra* n. 2) 16.

49 PILALI-PAPASTERIOU (*supra* n. 1) 190.

ritual institutions would have thus become more important.⁵⁰ It must be noted here that we have insufficient evidence to estimate storage capacity of the Minoan ritual institutions with any precision. It seems plausible, however, that at least some ritual institutions had enough financial sufficiency to be independent or semi-independent so as to form autonomous or semi-autonomous financial and conceivably political units (although the latter cannot be directly assumed from the former). We are aware that such a model cannot be sufficiently supported and therefore used without further research.

D) The various storage strategies developed by humans (some also by other animals) to cope with risk have been described by several scholars. O. Soffer referred to them under three different rubrics.⁵¹ These are:

- 1) Indirect intra-corporeal storage (accumulation of fat in animal bodies).⁵²
- 2) Social storage: exchange network and obligation mechanisms.⁵³
- 3) Material storage: portable or permanent.

It can be argued here, that there exists a fourth way: that of Religious storage. By religious storage we mean donation of goods to the supernatural. Even if the latter is a fiction, it can still be considered an active agent for those who do believe in it.

Religious storage can be seen from two different angles. Concerning society, religious storage is a social obligation and therefore should be classified under the rubric of social storage. Concerning however, the bilateral relation between the 'investor' and the supernatural, religious storage could be an independent category. One dedicates wealth to the supernatural on the basis of a give and take relationship. The supernatural is supposed to be appeased, or to favour those who are constant to their 'obligations' and those who 'invest' on it. In other words religious storage can be seen as another uncertainty buffering mechanism.⁵⁴

For the non-believers, religious storage, therefore, could be only another version of social storage; for the faithful however, offering dinner to friends and sacrificing to the Gods would have been two different actions. The latter, might still consider some social obligations as regards dedicating to the supernatural; the primary concern however, would be to please one's Gods and not one's neighbours. It has to be noted here, that the borders between social and religious storage, are still fuzzy. One could argue, that the role of gods for many are very similar to that of powerful individuals. This, however, depends on the belief system of each individual and on the unilateral relation of the faithful to their Gods.

We have seen in this short paper therefore, that storage can be associated with ritual institutions. The Minoan ones seem to be influenced by several factors. As storage shows wealth, it has been argued that it may also be indicative of power. In Late Minoan times the inefficiency of households would further enhance this power. Moreover, religious storage was offered as an explanation to the motives behind the wealth of the Mycenaean institutions that we see in Linear B. All these points would need further research. We think it is still useful however, to introduce these suggestions for further discussion.

Evangelos KYRIAKIDIS

50 Papasteriou supports the theocratic model for Minoan administration, all palatially controlled. Despite that, she goes as far as to suggest that: 'The amassing of this wealth was aiming at the creation of an independent sacred wealth that was not a part of the palatial system and aimed at its self-preservation' (p. 190 f). In the same line Earle and D'Altroy suggest that 'The direct control of the surplus and the mechanism of its mobilisation guarantee the independence and viability of political institutions...' T.K. EARLE and T.N. D'ALTROY, "Storage facilities and state finance in the upper Mantaro valley, Peru," in J.E. ERICSON and T.K. EARLE (eds), *Contexts for Prehistoric Exchange* (1982) 265-90.

51 O. SOFFER, "Storage, sedentism and the Eurasian Palaeolithic record," *Antiquity* 63 (1989) 719-32, esp. 722.

52 Both direct (fat in human body) and indirect (fat in animal bodies that are going to be eaten).

53 P. WIESSNER, "Risk, reciprocity and social influences on Kung San economics," in LEACOCK and LEE (eds), *Politics and history in band societies* (1982) 61-84.

54 J. O'SHEA, "Coping with scarcity: exchange and social storage," in SHERIDAN and BAILEY (eds), *Economic Archaeology* (1981) 167-86.