The development of agriculture in the Near East was the result of innovative methods of plant and animal husbandry. The adoption of these new methods led to the domestication of plants and animals, that is to say the development of plants and animals that are dependent on humans for survival and reproduction. While these innovative methods of utilization were adopted deliberately, not all of the consequences of these changes could be foreseen; the domestication of plants and animals affected productivity in surprising ways and entailed a reorganization of subsistence activities. This reorganization had wide-spread ramifications in the social organization of these early farmers; it is this entire suite of changes that is presently understood as the Neolithic Revolution.

Most discussions of agricultural intensification have focused on the intensification of plant cultivation. Although animals may be included in such schemes, they are often seen as a mechanism for intensifying plant cultivation, either by being used as draft animals (Netting 1993), or as a source of manure to be spread on fields, increasing productivity (Stone 1996). Animal use itself is rarely discussed in terms of intensity of production, although it is clear that animal use systems can be more or less productive (cf Rick 1980). This paper will examine the process of intensification as it applies to animal husbandry and hunting at the late Pre-Pottery Neolithic B site of Gritille in southeastern Turkey. In doing so, it will not only demonstrate how the concept of intensification can be applied to animal use, but it will also illustrate new understandings about the intertwined processes of intensification and social change.

The fauna at Gritille demonstrate that animal use underwent a gradual process of intensification relative to land throughout the Neolithic occupation; this intensification also entailed a novel reorganization of agricultural labor. In the earliest levels of
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Neolithic occupation at the site, many different types of animals were being exploited but the range of animals is not as wide in the later levels. Sheep and goats dominate the assemblage throughout, with increasing percentages through the first three levels. In the latest level, however, the importance of sheep and goats decline relative to that of cattle and pigs. By relating these changes in diversity to the environment at the site of Gritille, I will demonstrate that the concept of intensification may provide a viable framework within which to discuss Neolithic subsistence change.

Since the process of agricultural intensification can no longer be viewed as a monolithic process of subsistence change driven by population growth, the changes in animal use which took place at Neolithic Gritille will be contextualized within their social framework. In the Neolithic of the Near East, the main locus of production was the household, which both created demand for production and organized productive labor. No evidence points to the existence of a political entity which created a demand or integrated households beyond the level of the community. The changes in diversity of animal use which occurred at Gritille, therefore, provide an opportunity to examine an example of agricultural innovation and intensification which can be related directly to household demands and the domestic organization of labor.

THE PROCESS OF INTENSIFICATION

Since Boserup's 1965 work *The Conditions of Agricultural Growth* reversed the traditional formulation of the relationship between agriculture and population by viewing agricultural systems as the dependent variable conditioned by population, anthropological inquiries into intensification have examined the conditions under which agricultural intensification takes place. Although Boserup viewed population as the driving variable, others have demonstrated that other variables, such as the availability of a market (Stone, et al. 1990: 8, Netting 1993: 15, Kates, et al. 1993, Guyer and Lambin 1993, Stone 1994, Stone 1996: 33) and risk aversion (Bronson 1972, Brookfield 1972, Nichols 1987, McGuire 1984, Stone 1994), may also stimulate agricultural intensification. Moreover, intensification has come to be viewed as embedded in environmental or social factors, such as the price of labor and produce (Morrison 1994 121-2), or land tenure systems (Netting 1993: 160) that may constrain or encourage the process of intensification. In the process of disaggregating intensification and population, anthropologists have emphasized that intensification cannot be viewed as a unilinear process, but must be seen as a multiplicity of strategies (Morrison 1994). Inquiries into intensification have shifted from explaining why intensification takes place to explaining how the process occurs (Kaiser and Voytek 1983, Morrison 1996, Stone 1996). Some of the ways in which agriculturalists may intensify, such as the construction of large-scale irrigation systems or terraced field systems, may require a large degree of community integration. Many others, however, such as interplanting crops, weeding more frequently, or increasing amounts of fertilizer applied to a field, may be carried out by households, or small work groups. Since the reasons why agriculturalists intensify production often condition the ways