History

104	rnal or p	
5	29	
ğ	ja j	
	ARIPE	

ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER

Understanding the Evolution of Southern Neolithic Society

KEY WORDS: Society-Archaeology- Neolithic- South India

Avantika Sharma University of Delhi

Contemporaneous to Indus Civilization, the southern Neolithic Culture dominated south India from 3000 BCE to 1400 BCE. This vast timeline was further divided into three phases by Allchins. In their opinion, the three phases saw a transition from a predominantly pastoral society to a settled agricultural one. In this paper, we revisit the three phases and attempt to understand the development of society in each phase. For this purpose, we rely on anthropological concepts of band, tribes, chiefdom and state.

1.1 Introduction:

BSTRACT

┛

The period between 3000 BCE to 1400 BCE, the southern landscape was dominated by Neolithic culture. The significance of the Neolithic phase was first diagnosed by Gordon Childe, ¹ who saw it as nothing less than a revolution. The most important changes of this phase were animal and plant domestication. It has been argued that they created the economic base for surplus production from which further complex societies could emerge. The aim of this paper is to understand the kind of society that existed in this period. To do this we make use of anthropological concepts of band, tribes, chiefdom and state. Before that, we shall take a brief survey of the Neolithic sites across the region.

Many sites in the region have been excavated and explored. The bulk of the data is mainly located in the states of Telangana, Andhra and Karnataka with few sites in Tamil Nadu. In this article, we restrict ourselves to the three states. Some of the major excavated sites in each state are as follows: in Telangana, Paidigutta and Utnur in Mahabubnagar district,² Palavoy³ in Anantapur district;⁴ in Andhra, Nagarjunakonda and Kesarpalle in Krishna district⁴, and Veerapuram in Kurnool district;⁵ in Karnataka, Budihal⁶ in Gulbarga district, Hallur in Dharwar district,⁷ Hemmige and T.Narsipura in Mysore district, ⁸ Sanganakallu⁹ and Tekkalakota¹⁰ in Bellary district, Watgal, Maski, and Piklihal in Raichur district.¹¹

The data accumulated is vast and has certain shared charac teristics. There is similarity in pottery types like occurrence of grey ware, red ware with occasional painted pottery; the ground and pecked stone industry and the blade industry and burial rituals. The Allchins' were the first to organise this data into different phases in 1968.¹² They depended on radiocarbon dates and stratigraphy at the various sites. In their understanding, the Neolithic folk transitioned from nomadic pastoralists to settled agriculturists. This transition occurred in three phases:¹³

Phase I: The defining characteristic of this phase is the absence of metal and nomadic-pastoral economy. Many of the ashmounds like Utnur, Kupgal, Kodekal, Palavoy, Brahmagiri, and Sanganakallu belong to this phase. The Allchins have dated this phase between 3000 and 2000 BCE.

Phase II: This phase sees the coming in of permanent dwelling, some usage of metal, and refinement of blade industry at Piklihal (upper Neolithic), Brahmagiri (parts of IA and IB), Sanganakallu I and Hallur IIA (layers 10-11). This phase is dated between c. 2100 and c. 1700 BCE.

Phase III: The most important characteristic of this phase is exploitation of metal on a much larger scale and wheel made pottery. It is represented by Tekkalakota II, Sanganakallu II, Hallur (layers 8-9), Paiyampalli I and other sites. This phase is dated between 1700 BCE to 1400 BCE.

1.2 Phase I

From stratigraphy and radiocarbon dates available, we can infer that the earliest settlements involved founding of ashmound sites like Utnur, Piklihal, Kupgal, Kodekal, Kudatini, and Watgal. In the recent years, Fuller and his team have sub-divided the phase into a non-ashmound phase (IA) and ashmound phase (IB).¹⁴ Sub-phase (IA) dated between 3000- 2500 BCE was discovered at Utnur, Kodekal, Watgal, Budihal and Sannarachamma. But not much inference on economy or society can be drawn as we only get data for ceramics.

Returning to ashmounds, we must note that not all ashmounds represent the earliest settlements. Some belong to the second and third phase of the Neolithic¹⁵ and also the Iron Age.¹⁶ However, with each phase the practice declined.¹⁷ These mounds occur in various sizes. Some are small accumulations while others are quite large; geographically they are located on both the plains and the hills.¹⁸

The mounds were cattle penning areas as is seen from sites like Budihal,¹⁹ Hullikallu²⁰ and other ashmounds. Allchins²¹ argued large mounds like Utnur, and Kudatini to be temporary campsites in the forests as these had no habitational deposits associated with them. These were formed during the winters when more pasture was available in the forest. The small ones have habitational deposits which mean they were permanent settlements. They were formed in the monsoon season when enough pasture was available near the settlements. Recent excavations by K. Paddayya (2002) at Budihal has questioned temporary settlement paradigm. The site was a proper settlement with separate area for burials, an animal butchering floor, a chert workshops and polishing grooves.²² However, this site is an exception and more discoveries may be needed to change the perception of the first phase. Ravi Korisettar considers it to be an extended camp.²³

The economy of this period was dependent on pastoralism and hunting gathering. Several sites have data for cattle, goat and sheep. The Indian humped cattle or *Bos indicus* was discovered at Kodekal,²⁴ Utnur²⁵ and Piklihal.²⁶ Kodekal also had Indian domestic buffalo or *Bos bubalis*.²⁷ The existence of bones of Indian gazelle (*Gazella gazelle*), deer species like Barasingha (*Cervus duvaucelii*) and spotted deer (*Axis axis*) found at Kodekal meant that hunting supplemented the subsistence.²⁸ On agriculture, from presence of saddle querns, rubbers, hammer stones and mullers, we know that plant food was important part of the diet. But data for cultivation is flimsy. It is likely the food was gathered.

On crafts, we know of tool production and pottery making. The tool industry was divided into pecked and ground stone tool and blade industry.²⁹ Pecked and ground tools consist of edge tools like axes, adzes, chisels, chopper chopping tools; and non-edge tools like hammer stones, rubbing stones, and saddle querns. The phase was mostly non-metallic. The pottery of the phase is handmade. But data for beads is absent. One can only note

PARIPEX - INDIAN JOURNAL OF RESEARCH

VOLUME-6 | ISSUE-7 | JULY-2017 | ISSN - 2250-1991 | IF : 5.761 | IC Value : 79.96

dolerite and shell beads at Watgal.³⁰ So may be in the early stages it was not an important craft.

1.3 Phase II

The second phase sees the coming in of more complexity. For the first time, at sites like Tekkalakota, ³¹ Sanganakallu, ³² Budihal, ³³ Chinnamarur, ³⁴ Ramapuram IA, ³⁵ Budidapadu³⁶ have data for huts. Pit dwellings are known from Veerapuram, ³⁷ Nagarjunakonda, ³⁸ Garapadu³⁹ and Gandlur.⁴⁰ Most of the settlements are now made on the top of granite hills, on levelled terraces on the hillside and on the saddles or plateaux between such hills.⁴¹ In the economy, we know of both animal husbandry and hunting. Bones of humped cattle, domestic buffalo, goat, sheep and hog were discovered along with bones of antelopes from various sites. The inhabitants of Budihal⁴² and Piklihal⁴³ also exploited aquatic sources.

In the crafts, we see two new developments. One, coming in of metals like copper, antimony and gold in small quantities; and second, beginning of bead manufacture on a large scale. Thus, copper axe was found at Tekkalakota,⁴⁴ and copper wire at Ramapuram.⁴⁵ Piklihal had a copper chisel and two copper bowls.⁴⁶ Gold objects were discovered at Tekkalakota⁴⁷ and T.Narsipura.⁴⁸ Beads were found from sites like Budigapally,⁴⁹ Ramapuram,⁵⁰ Tekkalakota,⁵¹ Veerapuram,⁵² Hallur,⁵³ and Brahmagiri.⁵⁴ The most popular material was steatite, followed by shell, magnesite, carnelian, green stone, argillite and terracotta. Other than this, the earlier pecked and ground stone tool and blade industry continued. The data of pottery in this phase was mainly handmade.

1.4 Phase III

While many of the earlier settlements like Chinnamarur, Paidigutta in Telangana; Ramapuram, Veerapuram in Andhra; Tekkalakota, Sanganakallu and Brahmagiri in Karnataka continued; this phase too saw the expansion of sites into newer areas like Cuddapah district. Venkatasubbaiah explored many sites in the district along with excavations at Hanumantaraopet, Kundele Cherlopalle and Peddamudiyam.⁵⁵

The phase is known as Neolithic-Chalcolithic by scholars as there was greater usage of copper. The metal is visible at most of the above sites and occurs either in the form of tools or in the form of ornaments. The table 1 gives the distribution at the various sites. Whether copper was smelted or not is a matter of dispute? Dorian Q. Fuller and his team believe that it was imported; but recently some proof of smelting was discovered at Kudachi ashmound.⁵⁷ On a minor scale, we have presence of antimony at Chagatur,⁵⁸ Paidigutta,⁶⁰ and Ramapuram; and bronze rod was discovered at Brahmagiri.⁶¹

Table	1:	Phase		Copper	Objects	at	several	sites	of	Telengana,
Andhr	a ar	nd Karı	nat	aka						

Site	Tools	Ornaments	Miscellaneous
Veerapuram	tiny double		
	edged axe		
Gandluru	copper axe		copper wire
Chinnamarur	copper fish	copper	
	hook	bangles	
Paidigutta	copper axe,		button
	fish hook		
Ramapuram			copper tongue of a
			bell, hopscotches,
			copper parers
Nagarjunakonda			remnants of copper
Tekkalakota		copper	bent copper wire; a
		spiral	copper nail head, an
		earrings, ; a	unidentified piece
		copper ring	

Brahmagiri	a flat axe, a double	a spiral coil	copper rod
	edged axe	with drum like	
		ends	
Hemmige			a twisted flat
			piece of copper
			(2 x 1/2 cm)
T.Narsipura		copper bead	
Watgal		copper	twisted wire
		pendant	fragment
Maski			copper rod
Hallur	double edged axe, a		
	flat miniature axe, a		
	fish hook		

In pottery, while most of it is still handmade; at some sites like Tekkalakota, ⁶² Veerapuram, ⁶³ Hallur, ⁶⁴ Sanganakallu, ⁶⁵Watgal, ⁶⁶ Maski, ⁶⁷ and Paidigutta⁶⁸ some wheel-made specimens were discovered. This phase saw flourishing of the bead-manufacture industry. Steatite beads were discovered at Nagarjunakonda, ⁶⁹ Chagatur⁷⁰ Chinnamarur, ⁷¹ Sanganakallu, ⁷² Hallur, ⁷³ Watgal⁷⁴ and many other sites. Other materials used were — paste, shell, carnelian, chalcedony, faience, and terracotta. The sites of Ramapuram and Pusalpadu, in Kurnool district were, perhaps, bead manufacturing centers. ⁷⁵ Apart from this, the earlier pecked and ground stone industry and blade tool industry continues intact. No typological changes were noted in any of them.

In subsistence, there is greater data for practice of cultivation. An important crop was millet which occurs in various varieties of crops like Italian millet, Browntop millet, setaria/ brachiaria millet, Sawa millet, and Finger millet (ragi). These were found at sites like Hanumantaraopet,⁷⁶ Peddamudiyam,⁷⁷ and Hallur.⁷⁸ Hanuman taraopet also had data of wheat and barley.⁷⁹ Besides, we also have pulses like black gram, green gram, horse gram, hyacinth bean, pigeon pea at the above sites. The food was also supplemented by Jujube (Ziyziphus spp), Jamun (Syzigium cumini), Ablemoschus (a Lady finger type plant), and Parenchyma fragments (root like tubers).⁸⁰ Cultivation tools like picks, ringstones, and shoe-last celt, used for digging, were recovered from some sites. Picks have been identified at Andepalle (2), Hulikal (1) and Velpumadugu (1). ⁸¹Ring stones were discovered at Akkammakonda (1), Yatakal (1), Hulikal (2), and Kunduripi (2).⁸² Shoe-last celt and a long weeding hoe were discovered at Nagarjunakonda.⁸³ Animal domestication also continued to be an important occupation. Animal bones of cattle, sheep, goat etc. have been found at nearly all the sites. Of interest is the discovery from Hallur, where K R Alur reported the occurrence of horse, along with other animal bones.⁸⁴

1.5 Understanding Evolution of Society

Thus, above is a brief survey of development of southern Neolithic through various phases. Looking at the various developments in each phase, we try to infer the society in each phase. For understanding this, certain anthropological concepts may be useful. According to the anthropologists, the evolution of a society may be divided into certain stages like bands, tribes, chiefdoms and finally state.⁸⁵ Bands are the earliest level in social organisation. These are very small communities formed around one family who usually depend on foraging for survival. The population may range in between 25 to 150. These are small enough and hence lack division of labour. All the members have the same access to the resources. The leadership is temporary and is based on situation and need. The band does not permit any single member to coerce other members or place restrictions on the use of resources. A band's search for food and resources is seasonal, and migration allows the band to look for the best resources available.⁸⁶

The next stage is that of tribe. These are a village or collection of family groups. In these societies, power is decentralised and egalitarian. There is existence of leadership lineage, but a strong network of kinship keeps the power in check. Overall, the

PARIPEX - INDIAN JOURNAL OF RESEARCH

economy of a tribe is at a subsistence level. It depends on animals, and some form of agriculture. Tribes usually develop a notion of communal ownership. There is no concept of specialization of labour. People complete specific tasks as required.⁸

From the archaeological data, it will be difficult to guess whether we have bands or tribes in phase I, or there was a gradual change from band into tribe. For phase I, this is characteristic of life: migration, pastoralism, hunting, gathering, fishing, pottery and stone tool making. We do not have any estimates of population. But presence of a large number of infant burials makes one think of smaller populations. In smaller population, it is possible that there is less specialisation of labour. But given the number of tasks the society was performing, it is possible that certain temporary groups were formed to complete a specific task such as hunting, stone tool making, etc. The formation of the groups may have had something to do with individual's skill. Some were good at hunting, some at cattle-rearing and others at stone crafting. The same individuals might have been given the same task and perhaps the specialised groups over a time crystallised.

In phase two, the most important change is the coming in of beads and slight decline of ashmound tradition. The bead-makers were probably derived from the stone-tool makers, who had intimate knowledge of raw materials and their availability. It is possible it might have something to do with adornment or might been markers of elites within the society. There is also change in the former pastoralists and gatherers. Perhaps, few of them were taking to agriculture. We now also have the presence of copper tools.

In phase three, there is intensification of the economic activities. We now have wheel-made pottery, more instances of copper, agriculture and external exchange. The exchange is reflected in the presence of horse at Hallur and lapis lazuli beads at Watgal. The presence of many groups, coming in of a new technology, and intensification of the economy, makes one think of specialised groups. This viewpoint is also shared by Dorian Q Fuller, but he says this in context of the transition at Hiregudda.⁸⁸

1.6 Conclusion:

Thus, we attempted to understand the society in the Neolithic phase through archaeology and applying anthropological concepts. Overall, one thinks that the organisation right at the start is at the level of tribe. With each phase, the complexity of society increased, but it is within the parameter of a tribe. What we see is coming in of new occupations, and intensification of activities in each phase. For instance, greater data for agriculture and copper tools comes from phase three than phase two. The effect of these twin phenomena increases the specialisation of groups. We see steady foundations of chiefdom being laid, that comes through in the Iron Age phase. The limitation of this analysis is lack of literacy sources. The earliest sources are dated to 300 BCE. As a result, we do not how the production is organised. Were there kinship groups? Was the ruling class involved in its regulation? Also, we cannot ascertain any rise of hierarchy. Were the new class of bead-makers or traders more important than the traditional crafts? One way to check this is to understand the house structures. Is there is any difference in their sizes, material used? But limited excavations come in the way. Thus, we may tenuously conclude the society to be at the level of tribe.

Abbreviations:

AI	Ancient India
APGA	SAndhra Pradesh Government Archaeological Series
BACRI	Birla Archaeological and Cultural Research Institute
DCPRI	Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute
IAR	Indian Archaeological Review
MASI	Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India

References:

- Childe, VG., 1936, Man Makes Himself, London: Watts, pp.74-118
- Sastry, D.L.N., 2000, Paidigutta excavations: a Proto Historic site in lower www.worldwidejournals.com

Thungabhadra Valley, Jaipur: Publication Scheme; Allchin, F.R, 1961, Utnur Excavations, APGAS No 5, Hyderabad. 3

- Rami Reddy, V., 1976, The Prehistoric and Protohistoric Cultures of Palavoy, South India: With Special Reference to the Ashmound Problem, APGAS, no. 43, Hyderabad,
- Subrahmanyam, R. (ed.), 1975, Nagarjunakonda 1954-60. Vol. I., MASI no. 75, 4. New Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India; Sarkar, H., 1966, "Kesarpalle 1962," in Al. no. 22. Sastri, T.V.G, et al., 1984, Veerapuram, a type site for cultural study in the Krishna
- 5. valley, Hyderabad, BACRI
- Paddayya, K., 1973, Investigations into the Neolithic Culture of the Shorapur Doab, 6. Leiden: EJ. Brills; Paddayya, K., 2002, "The Problems of Ashmounds of Southern Deccan in the Light of Recent Research," in idem., ed., Recent Studies in India Archaeology, New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, pp. 81-111
- Nagaraja Rao, M.S., 1971, Protohistoric Cultures of the Tungabhadra Valley, 7. Dharwar: Author
- 8. Hanumantha Rao, M., and Nagaraju, S., 1974, Excavations at Hemmige 1964, Mysore: Directorate of Archaeology and Museums, Karnataka; Seshadri, M., 1971, "T. Narasipura Excavation" in B.R. Gopal and D.V. Devaraj (eds.), 1995, Seshachandrika, Mysore: Directorate of Archaeology and Museums
- Ansari, Z.D., and M. S. Nagaraja Rao, 1969, Excavation at Sanganakallu, 1964-65 (Early Neolithic House at Bellary). Pune: DCPRI; Subbarao, B., 1948, Stone Age Cultures of Bellary, Poona: DCPRI.
- Nagaraja Rao, M.S., and K. C. Malhotra, 1965, The Stone Age hill Dwellers of 10. Tekkalakota, Pune: DCPRI.
- Devaraj, D.V., et al., 1995, "The Watgal Excavations: an Interim Report" in Man and Environment XX(2), pp. 57-74; Thapar B.K., 1957, "Maski 1954: A Chalcolithic Site of the Southern Deccan." in Al no. 13, pp. 4-142; Allchin, F.R., 1960, Piklihal Excavations, APGAS, No. 1, Hyderabad Allchin, F.R., and B. Allchin, 1968, The Birth of Indian Civilization, Harmondsworth:
- 12. Penguin Books, pp. 161-165
- Allchin, F.R., and B. Allchin, 1982, The Rise of Civilization in India and Pakistan, 13. London: Cambridge University Press, pp. 286-288 Fuller, Dorian Q., Nicole Boivin and Ravi Korisettar, 2007, "Dating the Neolithic of
- 14. South India: New radiometric evidence for key economic, Social and Ritual transformations," pp. 1-47 in [Online: Web] Accessed 10th March, 2012, URL: http://goo.gl/NnM5a5 pp. 46- 47
- Korisettar, Ravi, et al., 2001, "Brahmagiri and Beyond: The Archaeology of the Southern Neolithic" in S. Settar and Ravi Korisettar (eds.), Indian Archaeology 15. Retrospect, Vol1:Prehistory: Archaeology of South Asia, New Delhi: Indian Council for Historical Research and Manohar, pp. 208-209
- Rami Reddy, V., 1976, op. cit., pp. 127-130 ; Sundara, A., 1975, The Early Chamber Tombs of South India, Delhi: University Publishers, p. 178
- 17. Korisettar, Ravi, et al., 2001, op. cit., p. 209, see the evidence for Hattibelagallu and others
- 18. Allchin, F.R., 1963, Neolithic Cattle Keepers of South India, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 164 Paddayya, K., 2002, op. cit., pp. 81-111 IAR 1978-79, pp. 62-63
- 19 20.
- 21. Allchin, F.R., and B. Allchin, 1963, op. cit., pp. 164-166
- 22 Paddayya, K., 2002, op. cit., p. 83 Korisettar, Ravi, et al., 2001, op. cit., p. 212
- 23.
- Shah, D.R., in Paddayya, K., 1973, op. cit., p. 93 Allchin, F.R., 1961, op. cit., p. 55 Allchin, F.R., 1960, op. cit., p. 115 24. 25
- 26.
- 27. Shah, D.R., 1973, "Animal Remains from the Kodekal Excavation" in K. Paddayya, 1973, op. cit., p. 93 Shah, D.R., 1973, ibid., p. 93
- 28
- Allchin, F.R., 1960, op. cit., pp. 85-106 29
- 30.
- 31. 32.
- 33
- Aliclini, F.N., 1900, G., G., DJ. 50-100 Devaraj, D.V., et al., 1995, op. cit., p. 61 Nagaraja Rao, M.S., and K. C. Malhotra, 1965, op. cit., p. 21 Ansari, Z.D., and M. S. Nagaraja Rao, 1969, op. cit., p. 10 Paddaya, K., 2002, op. cit., pp. 97–98 Subrahmanyam, B., 1997, Pre, Proto and Early Historic Cultures of Krishna-Tungabhadra Valley, New Delhi: Bharatiya Kala Prakashan p. 56 IVP. 1969, PL of 21/AP 1082-28, p. 31/AP 1082-48, p. 3 34.
- 35 IAR 1980-81, p. 7; IAR 1982-83, p. 3; IAR 1983-84, p. 3.
- Subrahmanyam, B., 1997, op. cit., p. 51 Sastri, T.V.G., et al., 1984, op. cit., p. 32 36
- 37.
- 38 Subrahmanyam, R., 1975, op. cit., pp. 100-101
- IAR 1993-94, p. 2 IAR 1982-83, p. 1; IAR 1983-84, p. 1 39 40
- 41.
- Allchin, F.R., and B. Allchin, 1982, op. cit., p. 287 42
- 43.
- Paddayya, K., 2002, op. cit., p. 102 Allchin, F.R., 1960, op. cit., pp. 114-115 Nagaraja Rao, M.S., and K. C. Malhotra, 1965, op. cit., p. 76 44
- 45 IAR 1982-83, p. 3
- 46
- Allchin, F.R., 1960, op. cit., p. 107 Nagaraja Rao, M.S., and K. C. Malhotra, 1965, op. cit., pp. 75-76 47
- 48
- Seshadri, M., 1971, op. cit., p. 151 Krishnasastry, V.V., 1983, The Proto and Early Historical Cultures of Andhra 49. Pradesh, Hyderabad: Government of Andhra Pradesh p. 27
- 50
- IAR 1982-83, p. 3 Nagaraja Rao, M.S., and K. C. Malhotra, 1965, op. cit., p. 79 51.
- 52. 53
- Sastri, T.V.G., et al., 1984, op. cit., p. 104 Nagaraja Rao, M.S., 1971, op. cit., p. 94 Wheeler, R.E.M., 1948, "Brahmagiri and Chandravelli, 1947: .Megalithic and 54. Vincett, N.L.W., 1940, January and Chandraster, 1947, Antigurate and Other Cultures in Mysore State," in Al no.4, p. 264 Venkatasubbaiah, P. C., 2007, South Indian Neolithic Culture Pennar Basin,
- 55. Andhra Pradesh, Delhi: Bharatiya Kala Prakashan.
- Korisettar, R., et al., 2001, op. cit., p. 186 Padiger S.V., and A. Sundara, 2005, "Excavation of Kudachi: An Ashmound in Dist. Belgaum," Puratattva 35, p. 173 56 57.
- Subrahmanyam, B., 1997, op. cit., p. 57 Sastry, D.L.N., 2000, op. cit., p. 182 58
- 59
- 60.
- 61.
- Mar 1982-83, p. 4; Wheeler R.E.M., 1948, op. cit., p. 267 Nagaraja Rao, M.S., and K. C. Malhora, 1965, op. cit., p. 36 62
- Sastri, T.V.G., et al., 1984, op. cit. p. 45 63.

PARIPEX - INDIAN JOURNAL OF RESEARCH

- PARIPEX INDIAN JOURNAL OF RESEARCH
 VOLU

 64.
 Nagaraja Rao, M.S., 1971, op. cit., p. 31
 55.
 Ansari, Z.D., and M. S. Nagaraja Rao, 1969, op. cit., p. 22
 66.
 Devaraj, D.V., etal., 1995, op. cit., p. 68
 67.
 Thapar, B.K., 1957, op. cit., p. 46
 58.
 58.
 58.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 59.
 <t
- 87. Reeves, E.M., 2010, ibid., pp. 182-183 88. Fuller, D.Q., et al., 2007, op. cit., pp. 15-16