

K. Paddayya

THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL TURN IN INDIAN ARCHAEOLOGY

Introduction

Casting a retrospective glance at the growth of antiquarian studies in India, one notes that the half-century following upon the establishment of the Asiatic Society in 1784 by Sir William Jones witnessed many important developments in literary, epigraphical, numismatic, and art historical and architectural studies. Studies relating to discovery and investigation of particular archaeological sites were limited in number and isolated in character, if not altogether lacking. It is here that the prolonged field investigations of Alexander Cunningham in Upper India and those of Robert Bruce Foote in peninsular India were a big departure, laying the foundations for early historical and prehistoric archaeology, respectively. Barring some infrequent observations about the general cultural aspects of the people, the writings of both Cunningham and Foote basically concentrated on reporting their field findings.

Then in the 1920s of the following century the Indus Civilization sites of Mohenjodaro and Harappa were noticed, revealing a new Bronze Age civilization in the ancient world. These site studies, together with Meadows Taylor's discovery and excavation of Iron Age stone circles in the Shorapur Doab of Deccan in the middle of the previous century and Foote's own discoveries of settlements and ashmounds of the South Indian Neolithic, carved a place for protohistory in Indian archaeology. Taking cue from Lord Curzon's speech before the Asiatic Society in Kolkata on 6 February 1900 and also based upon his own experience of participation in large-scale excavations in the Mediterranean zone, Marshall attempted to shift attention from objects and sites to the reconstruction of "the total culture of India in past ages" (Roy 1961: 91). These were the first signs of an anthropological turn in the antiquarian pursuits in the country. We shall examine below the subsequent developments in this direction; we shall use for this purpose the major works of synthesis that appeared in the 1950s and 1960s.

Arising from the site excavations and regional surveys undertaken in the second quarter of the century, general syntheses of South Asian archaeology

soon began to appear. In the 1950s Stuart Piggott (1950), D.H. Gordon (1958), B. Subbarao (1958) and Sir Mortimer Wheeler (1960) published their books. In the next decade four other books appeared in quick succession – by H.D. Sankalia (1962, revised 1974), D.D. Kosambi (1965), Bridget and Raymond Allchin (1968), and Walter A. Fairservis Jr. (1971). Many more works of synthesis appeared in subsequent years.

In general these publications were content with giving site- or region-wise accounts (stratigraphy and culture sequence) and description of various categories of finds. But the books by Subbarao and Fairservis Jr. differed inasmuch as they examined cultures in relation to geographical features. Subbarao's cultural division of the country into nuclear areas, areas of isolation and areas of semi-isolation is well known. Likewise Fairservis emphasized the "relation of economics and geography as of maximum importance in establishing a paleoethnography." N. K. Bose (2009) adopted a similar approach in his anthropological study of the Indian peasant lifeways. In their book the Allchins went one step ahead and devoted sections to settlements, economic organization, religion, etc. These are the beginnings of a realization that our final concern as archaeologists is with ancient human groups and that their material culture remains only serve as a means for realizing this purpose. Kosambi introduced further dynamism into the study by adopting a techno-economic approach for explaining the functioning and development of human societies. His goals were broadly anthropological and he viewed cultures as essential ways of life of the people. He also introduced ethnographic analogies and causal links or relationships to explain cultural developments. But an explicitly anthropological approach was yet to emerge. The situation began to alter from the 1970s. The impetus for this change was provided by the percolation of ideas forming part of the New Archaeology.

Impact of the New Archaeology

Although unfortunately left unnoticed by most workers, S.C. Malik was the first person in India to come under the influence of the New Archaeology. His association with the Department of Anthropology at the University of Chicago as a Fulbright-Smith-Mundt research scholar between 1963 and 1965 coincided with Lewis Binford's rebellious efforts that were underway there to break from traditional approaches and develop new perspectives. On his return he started seriously examining their relevance with reference to Indian archaeology. Soon he published a book entitled *Indian Civilization – The Formative Period* (1968) in which he explicitly mentioned that he had been "greatly influenced by the ideas and orientation of Binford and others". In this book Malik argued for an anthropological orientation in Indian prehistory and protohistory and advocated the use of functional approaches for reconstructing past socio-cultural processes.

Unfortunately these views fell by and large on deaf ears and one had to wait till 1974 when H. D. Sankalia took up the case and adopted the New Archaeology, which had by then fully emerged, as the theme of D. N. Mazumdar memorial lectures in Lucknow University. Three years later these lectures appeared in print as a book entitled *New Archaeology: Its Scope and Application to India* (Sankalia 1977). This was the true baptism of archaeological studies in India into the New Archaeology. Sankalia's detailed discussion of the topics dealt with in D. L. Clarke's book *Analytical Archaeology* (1968) and *New Perspectives in Archaeology* edited by Sally and Lew Binford and of the usefulness of these ideas for a fresh understanding of the pre- and protohistoric record in India, coupled with his own high standing in the country, attracted the attention of workers. At the Deccan College in Pune the impact was stronger and louder because of Sankalia's personal exhortations to research students and faculty to give a serious thought to the use of these new ideas in their respective research projects.

Soon some of these ideas were also introduced as part of postgraduate teaching. By the mid-1980s the impact was strong enough at the Deccan College that the New Archaeology was kept as the main theme of an All-India Refresher Course for teachers organized under the supervision of Prof. M. K. Dhavalikar. This continued for four weeks in May-June 1986. Binford himself was invited as one of the principal resource persons; he delivered half a dozen inspiring lectures on the rise and precepts of the New Archaeology and on his ethnoarchaeological research on the Eskimos of Alaska (Paddayya 2012a). These and the informal discussions he held with the course participants took the new concepts and methods to other places in India.

The influence of the new ideas spread further in the country during the next two decades; theoretical debates are now quite common both at teaching and research levels. Taking off from the statement of Maitland, as quoted by Willey and Phillips (1958: 2), that "American archaeology is anthropology or else it is nothing," the New Archaeology of North America sought to elevate the discipline from a descriptive/classificatory concern with artefacts to the level of a science interested in unravelling past cultural processes. Thus New Archaeology has become synonymous with processual archaeology. New conceptual and methodological strategies were put forward to translate this anthropological turn into reality. The major strategies advocated by the New Archaeology towards this end are as follows (Paddayya 1990: 1-19):

1. Going beyond construction of site- and regional culture sequences redefining the goal of the discipline as one of recognizing and explaining cultural similarities and differences across time and space.
2. Replacement of the big-site approach to the archaeological record by a regional approach.
3. In replacement of classificatory studies, treating artefacts as products of past human behaviour.

4. Redefining discipline's own concepts of site, artefact, type, culture, assemblages, etc., in terms of human behaviour.
5. Cultures as systemic wholes comprising various components as well as their interrelationships, which constitute culture process.
6. Cultures as adaptational mechanisms of people for coping with their respective environmental settings (natural and social).
7. Use of the method of hypothesis for tackling questions of how and why.
8. Study of formation processes of the archaeological record, using ethnoarchaeological, ethological and experimental analogies.
9. Final reconstruction of past cultures as settlement systems.
10. Identification of general cultural patterns of the past arising from synchronic and long-term studies of archaeological record.

Influenced directly or otherwise by some or all of these fresh ideas, some of the workers in India have reoriented their studies during the last three decades. Elsewhere I have published reviews of these studies (Paddayya 2004, 2012b), so a brief note should suffice here. Without meaning to deny the existence of other examples pertaining to various periods ranging from the Stone Age to the medieval period, I will restrict myself to a few studies in prehistory and protohistory about which I have first-hand knowledge.

Some Case Studies

Indian prehistory has a long history of 150 years. But till the mid-1970s the concern was one of finding secondary context lithic assemblages in river gravels and silts and then building up stratigraphical-cum-cultural sequences based upon type-fossil kind of typological schemes. Wheeler (1960: 34, 63) was therefore fully justified when he dubbed the whole study as one of "Stones" and "More Stones". It was against this background that calls began to be given which emphasized the importance of investigating primary sites (Paddayya 1978a). Simultaneously, attention was also called to the relevance of basic tenets of the New Archaeology, viz. culture as a system and as a means of adaptation, and the importance of ecological and ethnoarchaeological approaches (Paddayya 1979). In short a paradigm shift was called for in Indian prehistory.

V. N. Misra's prolonged explorations in Central India and Rajasthan, including detailed excavations at Bhimbetka and Samnapur in Madhya Pradesh, and Bagor, Tilwara and 16 R dune site at Didwana in Rajasthan, are an outstanding example of this fresh work in prehistory (Misra 1973, 1978, 1989, 1995). Another important example is provided by M. L. K. Murty's equally prolonged field studies in the Eastern Ghats zone of southwestern Andhra Pradesh, including excavations in the Billasurgam caves and Muchchla Chintamanugavi in the Kurnool limestone hills (Murty 1968, 1974, 1981, 1985). In both these studies the regional perspective was kept in mind and it involved

systematic explorations meant for identifying primary sites. Also in both these areas excavations exposed living or habitation levels which were carefully mapped and photographed in all details. Further, these planned archaeological studies were supplemented by detailed ethnoarchaeological studies of locally resident hunter-gatherer groups, such as the Van Vagrish and Pardhis in central and western India (Misra 1990), and the Chenchus and Yanadis in south India. These fresh archaeological and ethnographic studies enabled Misra and Murty to reconstruct in detail the settlement and subsistence patterns of distant hunter-gatherer communities ranging from Lower Palaeolithic to Mesolithic.

In protohistory a fine example is provided by the work on the Chalcolithic phase of northern Deccan. For about two decades Sankalia and his colleagues concentrated on establishing internal sequence within the phase and identifying major traits of the successive cultural stages (Sankalia 1974). Then in the 1970s the prolonged and horizontal excavations at Inamgaon by Sankalia and his team made it possible to reconstruct the lifeways of the Chalcolithic communities, including the physical traits and pathological conditions of people themselves (Dhavalikar, Sankalia and Ansari 1988). Arising from this foundation work Dhavalikar (1988) used some of the propositions of the New Archaeology and prepared a synthesis of this entire phase from ecological and subsistence-settlement points of view.

Striking a personal note, I recall with gratitude that it was Professor Sankalia who drew my attention to the emergence of the New Archaeology in the Anglo-American world and initiated me into it by asking me to prepare a review of his book arising from the D.N. Majumdar memorial lectures mentioned above (Paddayya 1978b). I soon realized that these theoretical developments could not be fully understood without some knowledge of philosophy of science. So I completed half a dozen courses in philosophy of both natural and social sciences taught by the late Professor R. Sundararajan in the Department of Philosophy of Pune University. These courses were very beneficial and truly broadened my mental horizons. I was in fact inspired by these new knowledge experiences to prepare small research papers on various aspects of the New Archaeology in the 1980s; these culminated in a small book entitled *The New Archaeology and Aftermath: A View from Outside the Anglo-American World* (1990). In addition to these learning experiences and sharing these with students as part of postgraduate teaching at the Deccan College, I made attempts to adopt some of these ideas and approaches in my field studies of the Palaeolithic (Acheulian) and Neolithic sites of the Shorapur Doab forming part of southern Deccan.

Handaxes and other Acheulian artefacts were found by Bruce Foote at Yedihalli in the Baichbal valley of the Shorapur Doab as early as 1871. But, when I started my field studies in the 1960s, I did not attach much importance to this finding because I thought that limestone used for fashioning these artefacts was an unlikely raw material employed by the Stone Age groups.

Realization of the importance of Foote's discovery dawned on me only when I myself picked up a well-shaped pointed handaxe of this soft rock in 1969 from a colluvial gravel in the foothill zone of limestone plateau at Gulbal in the neighbouring Hunsgi valley. Then in March 1974 many more limestone implements were found in a similar colluvial gravel dug up as part of the construction of a low dam or bund across the local stream at Hunsgi. The fresh condition of artefacts and the location of these sites away from the Krishna river by 25 to 30 km raised the possibility of identifying primary context sites and obtaining evidence for making inferences about the Stone Age behavioural patterns. This led to the formulation of the Hunsgi and Baichbal valleys research project, which spanned a full quarter-century and involved the application of one of the major stipulations of the New Archaeology, viz. regional approach to the archaeological record. This in turn entailed intensive foot-surveys and adoption of formation processes perspective, excavation of primary sites with occupation levels at three sites (Hunsgi, Yediyapur and Isampur), use of ethnographic analogies in respect of wild plant and animal foods, and recognition of the role of seasonal climate in the organization of annual settlement and subsistence practices. In one of my publications I have dealt with at length the progress of this project and its results (Paddayya 2001). The major findings are briefly stated below.

The settlement system approach developed by Binford was adopted as an explicit research perspective in this entire study (Paddayya 1982). The Hunsgi and Baichbal valleys, enclosed by shale-limestone tablelands or Archaean formations, are an erosional basin and cover an area of 500 km². Over 200 Acheulian sites were found in this basin. These mostly belong to the primary type and occur on the valley floor and in the foothill zone. Limestone was the principal raw material; and fossil fauna (wild cattle, horse, deer species, etc.) was also found in small quantities at some of the sites. Two major concentrations, each made up of 15 to 20 sites and located in a stretch of 3 to 4 km., were found in the area – one along the Hunsgi stream in the Hunsgi valley and the second along the Fatehpur stream in the Baichbal valley. The remaining sites were found scattered all across the valley floor. My ethnographic studies in the area spread over different seasons of the year showed that economically backward people still depended on large-scale exploitation of wild foods. These included 55 types of plant foods (fruits, seeds, gums, leafy greens, etc.) and 30 types of wild animal foods.

Pooling together these archaeological and ethnographic data, I proposed a model of the Acheulian settlement system of the Hunsgi and Baichbal valleys (Paddayya 1982: 61-95). This settlement system hinged on two principal seasonal resource management strategies: (a) dry season aggregation of the Acheulian groups (as indicated by the two major clusters of archaeological sites) near perennial water-pools in the form of spring flows in the Hunsgi stream of the Hunsgi valley and the Fatehpur stream of the

Baichbal valley and reliance on large game hunting including scavenging; and (b) wet season dispersal of the groups all over the valley floor and emphasis on the exploitation of small fauna and plant foods.

My subsequent work in the two valleys was aimed at a more comprehensive understanding of the sites from the point of view of formation processes. This led to the recognition of functional variability among the sites in terms of hominin behavior—manufacturing sites, occupation sites, food-processing sites, etc. (Paddayya and Petraglia 1995). This work also led to the discovery and excavation of the Isampur site, which is one of the best preserved and largest Acheulian manufacturing-cum-occupation sites in the Old World. The site covers an area of three-quarters of a hectare and the cultural horizon, associated with a weathered silicified limestone bed, underlay 1 to 2 m. thick silt deposit that had been quarried away by the Irrigation Department in 1985. Our excavations, covering an area of 159 m², exposed actual chipping areas and yielded over 20,000 artefacts in various stages of manufacture. Isampur gave fresh insights into the reduction processes employed for making various artefact types. The occurrence of animal fossils along with stone artefacts shows that the site was also an occupation site. It was a localized hub for manufacturing and occupation activities, from which the hominins radiated on to the uplands and the valley floor itself as part of their daily foraging activities (Paddayya, Jhaldiyal and Petraglia 2000, 2006). Samples of enamel extracted from bovid teeth found in excavation were dated by ESR (electron spin resonance) method to 1.2 million years (Paddayya *et al.* 2002). My prolonged studies also made it possible to identify a three-phase evolution within the Acheulian culture of the Hunsgi and Baichbal valleys (Paddayya 2008).

In a more recent study I have tried to improve upon the dry vs wet season settlement-subsistence model mentioned above and infer the day-to-day or short-term aspects of the spatial behavior of the Acheulian groups of the Hunsgi and Baichbal valleys (Paddayya *In Press*). For this purpose I have made use of analogies drawn from studies of the non-human primate groups such as the chimpanzee, the gorilla and the baboon – their core areas or sites, home range and group behaviour, all governed by ecological factors. Using these analogies in the context of 200 and odd Acheulian sites of the two valleys and their sizes and distribution in relation to surface water bodies, raw material and food resources, I concluded that for its day-to-day functioning the Acheulian population aggregate organized itself into five core groups (each with its own home range) in the Hunsgi valley and four groups in the Baichbal valley. Each home range had a core site or spot to which the hominins of the group returned after completing their daily foraging rounds. In the archaeological record the core location is represented by large sites like Isampur and Hunsgi, while the small sites and non-sites found in the surrounding areas form part of the archaeological record representing the hominin daily foraging rounds.

The three major case studies of the Stone Age cited above, one each from trans-Vindhyan area, southern Deccan and south-east coast of India, should suffice to drive home the point that Palaeolithic research in India has moved well beyond the level of mere concern with “Stones” and “More Stones.” Misra (2002) has given an excellent review of the progress made along these lines in Mesolithic studies.

Ashmounds of southern Deccan are another topic where I benefited from the propositions of the New Archaeology. These sites are known for the last 200 years and more. Going beyond Foote’s recognition of their Neolithic age and burnt cow-dung character, Raymond Allchin undertook a systematic regional survey in the 1950s and arrived at the proposition that these were Neolithic cattle-pens. He tested this hypothesis positively with reference to a large excavation at Utnur (Allchin 1967). Complementing these archaeological studies with ethnographic analogies relating to place-names with *budi* (ash) prefix and pastoral practices as well as rituals and festivals involving cattle, Allchin (1963) concluded that the periodic burnings of cattle-pens and cow-dung accumulated in these pens by the Neolithic groups of South India were part of a regular cattle fertility cult and involved driving of cattle through moderate fire. He further showed that the cattle-dominated character of the Southern Neolithic culture was an adaptation to the hilly landscape with semi-arid climate. Allchin’s monograph *Neolithic Cattle-Keepers of South India: A Study of the Deccan Ashmounds* (1963) is a landmark publication of the post-Independence era. It not only exemplified sound traditional archaeology but also simultaneously foreshadowed several elements of both processual and ideational perspectives.

My own survey of all major ashmound sites in southern Deccan in the 1990s enabled me to rise one step above Allchin’s foundational study. I raised doubts about Allchin’s dichotomy of Neolithic sites into settlements and cattle-pens and instead proposed that the ashmounds were regular pastoral sites and witnessed both cattle penning and human occupation (Paddayya 1993). I corroborated this proposition by undertaking a multi-season, horizontal excavation at Budihal. The main locality here (Locality 1 spread over nearly two hectares) produced evidence of various activity areas: cattle-penning area; cow-dung dumping and burning area; human settlement area with burials and an animal butchering platform; a lithic blade industry workshop; and grinding grooves. The Budihal site setting was governed by the availability of water sources in the form of springs occurring in the ravines on the northern and eastern sides, existence of pasture lands, and occurrence of dolerites and cherts suitable for making edged and non-edge tools (Paddayya 2002).

Based upon the analogies provided by present-day *jatras* or fairs held in the area, I further interpreted that some of the major ashmounds such as Budihal were places of periodic congregations of people from smaller sites in the area within a radius of 15 to 20 km. These congregations witnessed socio-

economic and ritual transactions of various kinds and promoted feelings of regional cultural identity. The ‘monumental’ size of the larger ashmounds further strengthened these feelings of cultural identity (Paddayya 2005).

A New Twist in the Anthropological Turn?

More recently, I felt truly refreshed to go through the writings of the famous American anthropologist late Professor Robert Redfield on simple societies. Redfield was appointed on the faculty of University of Chicago in 1928 and was Robert Maynard Hutchins Distinguished Service Professor of Anthropology from 1953 till his untimely death in 1958. In the second quarter of the last century he undertook very detailed studies of the villages of Tepoztlan and Chan Kom for understanding, respectively, the Mayan peasant way of life in Mexico and the Hispanic peasant life in Guatemala. These field studies, coupled with his comparative study of simple societies across the world, enabled him to track down their chief attributes. In his own words: “Such a society is small, isolated, non-literate, and homogeneous with a strong sense of group solidarity. The ways of living are conventionalized into that coherent system which we call a culture. Behaviour is traditional, spontaneous, uncritical, and personal; there is no legislation or habit of experiment and reflection for intellectual ends. Kinship, its relationships and institutions, are the type categories of experience and familiar group the unit of action. The sacred prevails over the secular; the economy is one of status rather than of the market. These and related characterizations may be stated in terms of “folk mentality”...” (Redfield 1947: 293). Sanders (1953) listed a similar set of characteristics of peasant societies.

Redfield developed these ideas further in his books *The Primitive World and its Transformation* (1953) and *Peasant Society and Culture* (1956). The former is an excellent anthropological complement to Gordon Childe’s well-known book *Man Makes Himself* which appeared nearly two decades earlier (Childe 1941). Further, arising from his own field experiences and also based upon a comparative study of literature about what good life is according to peasant societies themselves, Redfield (1962) identified the following principal virtues of the peasant way of life in general:

- (a) Pride in the ability to work hard and for long hours, disregarding physical discomfort; viewing toil both as a burden and a virtue.
- (b) Work is valued because it provides security to oneself and his family.
- (c) Avoiding showiness of one’s status or wealth.
- (d) Reverential attitude towards the landscape and all its components.
- (e) Close family bonds and respect for others.
- (f) Avoiding excesses of denial and careless abandon in the use of resources.
- (g) Perception of sex not as a sport or bravado but as an aspect of the generative powers of nature and divine dispensation of fertility.

- (h) Peasant life is not merely toil but has its own dimensions of creative activity – story telling, dances, decorative art, rituals, festivities and ceremonies.

It is interesting to recall that a quarter-century earlier Mahatma Gandhi, based upon his extensive first-hand knowledge of the rural landscape in India, identified in an informal way an almost identical set of values underlying village life. These include (a) viewing of peasant's work as life-creating as against the life-destructive nature of industrial life; (b) reverential attitude towards land and life; (c) dignity of labour; (d) personalized nature of human relationships; and (e) self-effacing attitude (Gandhi 2002). Sanders *et al.* (1953: 19-118) give a fine account of the attributes of peasant life in China, which is another important ancient region of the world.

These attributes of folk societies identified by Redfield and Gandhi have two-fold importance. First, remembering them in day-to-day transactions will bring a level of sobriety to modern life which is pervaded by materialism and over-consumerism. Secondly, these attributes have clear implications for archaeology because these are also reflected in the various components of the archeological record of South Asia's early farming communities – hamlets or villages bespeaking organized group living; beginnings of regionalization of the food-producing way of life; close relationships among people themselves and between them and the natural world; emergence of artistic representations and body ornamentation; and the rise of folk beliefs. Redfield's writings are in fact both an inspiration and an invitation to archaeologists to charter a newer and deeper anthropological orientation to the archeological record of preliterate groups of South Asia covering both food-producing and hunting-gathering stages of life. Archaeologists clearly stand to benefit from a closer and fuller understanding of these writings.

From my own limited exposure I feel sure that Redfield's works have the potential to elevate the current theoretical debates in archaeology above the polemics generated between the hard, adaptational approaches prescribed by the New Archaeology and the soft, ideational approaches advocated by post-processual archaeology. Much before the rise of these polarizing 'isms', Redfield was unintentionally attempting to develop an approach which integrates both mind- and body-related aspects of human societies. While the influences received from positivistic philosophy as well as functional anthropology of A. R. Radcliffe-Brown impressed upon him the need to first consider human groups as adaptational entities to their respective ecological settings, the influences from sociology and his own grounding in the humanistic traditions of social and cultural anthropology made him simultaneously realize the necessity of taking into account the non-material components too in the functioning of human societies. Unlike the protagonists of the New Archaeology and post-processual archaeology, Redfield, far from visualizing any dichotomy, viewed these two components of human societies as complementary to and influencing each other.

The project on comparative studies of ancient civilizations of the world which he developed jointly with his colleagues at the University of Chicago in the 1950s was aimed at investigating the organizational processes involved in the operationalization of various attributes of simple societies mentioned earlier in actual life and identifying the patterns that may be embedded in these processes (see Redfield 1962b). It is here that Redfield rises above the British versions of post-processual archaeology developed in Britain since the 1980s. While the British approaches tend to be anecdotal and historical, Redfield's sociological and social anthropological perspectives towards the study of ideational domains, or what he calls the "expressive life" of human societies (Redfield 1962b: 434-9), have a clear ring of processual orientation. Redfield's student Milton Singer (1972) employed this approach in his admirable contextual studies of the organizational aspects of India's higher culture and its structural components.

In effect, Redfield's approach represents an American and anthropological counterpart to the post-processual perspectives that came up in Britain as a reaction to the rise of the New Archaeology. Because these are aimed to grasp the basic attributes of human societies arising from the interplay of adaptational and ideational dimensions of life, Redfield's writings give a new and interesting twist to the anthropological turn in archaeology. These have the potential to suggest new ways of looking at and interpreting the archaeological record of simple societies, and call for the use of multiple sources – archaeological, ethnographic, literary and oral. In my view, so far as South Asia is concerned the tone for this new extension in the anthropological turn was in a way already set by Raymond Allchin's study of the ashmounds of southern Deccan, as exemplified in his famous monograph *Neolithic Cattle-Keeper of South India: A Study of the Deccan Ashmounds* (1963).

Also useful are Redfield's concepts of Great and Little Traditions, and folk-urban continuum. The Great Traditions are represented by urban, civilized societies and the Little Traditions by simple, non-literate societies. Redfield viewed civilizations as "kinds of ways of life in relationship, both persisting and yet changing, with one another" and recognized that civilization in India involved towns and cities, as well as peasant and tribal communities (1957: 14). Elaborating this idea, Redfield (1962c: 345-6) stated that "Rural-urban integration in this phase of urbanization rests primarily on the mutuality of interests and on the "symbiotic" relations that have been described. The city is a "service station" and amusement center for the country, and the country is a "food basket" for the society..." His concept of folk-urban continuum viewed urban communities not as sudden appearances from a cultural vacuum but as organic growths from peasant societies. In fact, Redfield goes beyond Gordon Childe's ten well-known and matter-of-fact criteria for a civilization and enlists new ones. In his own words: "Civilization is an interaction of many live local cultures and a "high culture", a "great tradition", that is considered, developed,

and eventually written down by thinkers and teachers provided with the time to create works of the kind and connected with religious or philosophical institutions” (Redfield 1962d: 40). In sum, Redfield’s various ideas and constructs deserve a closer examination and have the potential to help us develop a comprehensive and well-integrated approach towards recovery of meaning from archaeological record in terms of mind-body interactions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This paper is based on a special lecture delivered by me in April 2013 in the Department of Anthropology, University of Chicago. I am truly grateful to Prof. Kathleen Morrison and her colleagues and graduate students for the wonderful hospitality as well as the lively discussion that followed the lecture.

REFERENCES

- Allchin, F. R.
 1957 *Utnur Excavations*. Hyderabad: Government of Andhra Pradesh.
 1963 *Neolithic Cattle-Keepers of South India: A Study of the Deccan Ashmounds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Allchin, B. and F. R. Allchin
 1968 *The Birth of Indian Civilization: India and Pakistan before 500 B.C.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Binford, S. R. and L. R. Binford (Eds.)
 1968 *New Perspectives in Archaeology*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Bose, N. K. (Ed.)
 2009 *Peasant Life in India: A Study in Unity and Diversity*. Kolkata: Desktop Printers. Originally Published in 1961.
- Childe, V. G.
 1941 *Man Makes Himself*. London: Watts and Co. First published in 1936.
- Clarke, David L.
 1968 *Analytical Archaeology*. London: Methuen.
- Dhavalikar, M. K.
 1988 *The First Farmers of the Deccan*. Pune: Ravish Publishers.
- Dhavalikar, M. K., H.D. Sankalia and Z. D. Ansari
 1988 *Excavations at Inamgaon, Vol. I, Parts 1 and 2*. Pune: Deccan College.
- Fairservis, Jr. Walter A.
 1971 *The Roots of Ancient India: The Archaeology of Early Indian Civilization*. New York: Macmillan Company.
- Gandhi, M. K.
 2002 *Village Swaraj* (Collected Writings edited by H.M. Vyas). Ahmedabad: Navjivan Publishing House. Originally published in 1962.

Gordon, D. H.

- 1958 *The Prehistoric Background of Indian Culture*. Mumbai: Madhuri Dhirajlal Desai.

Kosambi, D. D.

- 1965 *Culture and Civilization of India in Historical Outline*. London: Routledge.

Malik, S. C.

- 1968 *Indian Civilization: The Formative Period — A Study of Archaeology as Anthropology*. Simla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study.

Misra, V. N.

- 1973 "Bagor: A Late Mesolithic settlement in northwest India," *World Archaeology* 5(1): 92-110.
- 1978 "The Acheulian industry of rock-shelter III F-23 at Bhimbetka, central India: A preliminary study," *Australian Archaeology* 8: 63-106.
- 1989 "Stone Age India: An ecological perspective," *Man and Environment* 14: 17-64.
- 1990 "The Van Vagris: 'Lost' hunters of the Thar desert, Rajasthan," *Man and Environment* 15(2): 89-108.
- 1995 "Evolution of environment and culture in the Rajasthan desert during the late Quaternary." In E. Johnson (Ed.) *Ancient Peoples and Landscapes*, pp. 77-103. Lubbock, Texas: Texas Technical University Press.
- 2002 "Mesolithic culture in India: Keynote." In V.D. Misra and J.N. Pal (Eds.) *Mesolithic India*, pp. 1-66. Allahabad: University of Allahabad.

Murty, M. L. K.

- 1968 "Blade and burin industries near Renigunta on the southeast of India," *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 34: 83-101.
- 1974 "A Late Paleolithic cave site in southern India," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 118: 196-230.
- 1981 "Hunter-gatherer ecosystems and archaeological patterns of subsistence behaviour on the southeast coast of India: An ethnographic model," *World Archaeology* 12: 47-58.
- 1985 "Ethnoarchaeology of the Kurnool cave areas," *World Archaeology* 17: 192-205.

Paddayya, K.

- 1978a "Now research designs and field techniques in the Palaeolithic archaeology of India," *World Archaeology* 10: 94-110.
- 1978b Review of H.D. Sankalia's book *New Archaeology: Its Scope and Application to India*, *Indica* 15: 158-163.
- 1979 "Palaeoethnography *vis-à-vis* the Stone Age cultures of India: Some methodological considerations," *Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute* 38: 63-90.

- 1982 *The Acheulian Culture of the Hunsgi Valley (Peninsular India): A Settlement System Perspective.* Pune: Deccan College.
- 1990 *The New Archaeology and Aftermath: A View from Outside the Anglo-American World.* Pune: Ravish Publishers.
- 1993 "The ashmounds of South India: Fresh evidence and possible implications," *Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute* 51-52: 573-626.
- 2001 "The Acheulian culture project of the Hunsgi and Baichbal valleys, peninsular India." In L. Barham and K. Robson-Brown (Eds.) *Human Roots: Africa and Asia in the Middle Pleistocene*, pp. 235-258. Bristol: Western Academic Press.
- 2002 "The problem of ashmounds of southern Deccan in the light of recent research." In K. Paddayya (Ed.) *Recent Studies in Indian Archaeology*, pp. 81-111. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- 2004 "The expanding horizons of Indian archaeology," *Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute* 62-63 (2002-2003): 291-309.
- 2005 "Symbolic approaches to the study of early agropastoral communities of lower Deccan," *Puratattva* 35: 1-6.
- 2008 "Evolution within the Acheulian in India: A case study from the Hunsgi and Baichbal valleys, Karnataka," *Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute* 66-67 (2006-2007): 95-111.
- 2012a "Lewis Binford and the Deccan College connection," *Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute* 70-71 (2010-2011): 157-164.
- 2012b "Some major issues in Indian archaeology." In Bijoy Kumar Chaudhary (Ed.) *Changing Perspectives and Methodologies in South Asian Archaeology*, pp. 1-19. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute.
- In Press* The Acheulian culture studies in India: A long story but many unfinished tasks, *Man and Environment*.
- Paddayya, K., B.A.B. Blackwell, R. Jhaldiyal, M.D. Petraglia, S. Fevrier, D.A. Chanderton II, I.I.B. Blickstein and R. Skinner
- 2002 "Recent findings on the Acheulian of the Hunsgi and Baichbal valleys, Karnataka, with special reference to the Isampur excavation and its dating," *Current Science* 83(5): 641-657.
- Paddayya, K., R. Jhaldiyal and M.D. Petraglia
- 2000 "The significance of the Acheulian site of Isampur, Karnataka, in the Lower Palaeolithic of India," *Puratattva* 30: 1-24.
- Paddayya, K., R. Jhaldiyal and M.D. Petraglia
- 2006 "The Acheulian quarry at Isampur, lower Deccan." In Nama Goren-Inbar and Goren Sharon (Eds.) *Axe-Age: Acheulian Tool-Making from Quarry to Discard*, pp. 45-73. London: Equinox.
- Paddayya, K., R. Jhaldiyal and S.G. Deo (Eds.)
- 2007 *Formation Processes and Indian Archaeology.* Pune: Deccan College.

Paddayya, K. and M. D. Petraglia

- 1995 "Natural and cultural formation processes of the Acheulian sites of the Hunsgi and Baichbal valleys, Karnataka." In S. Wadia, R. Korisettar and V.S. Kale (Eds.) *Quaternary Environments and Geoarchaeology of India*, pp. 333-351. Bengaluru: Geological Society of India.

Piggott, Stuart

- 1950 *Prehistoric India*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Redfield, Robert

- 1947 "The folk society," *The American Journal of Sociology* 52(4): 293-308.
- 1953 *The Primitive World and its Transformation*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- 1956 *Peasant Society and Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 1957 "Thinking about a civilization." In Milton Singer (Ed.) *Introducing India in Liberal Education*, pp. 2-15. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 1962a "The peasant's view of the good life." In Margaret Park Redfield (Ed.) *Human Nature and the Study of Society: The Papers of Robert Redfield*, Volume 1, pp. 310-326. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 1962b "How human society operates." In Margaret Park Redfield (Ed.) *Human Nature and the Study of Society: The Papers of Robert Redfield*, Volume 1, pp. 417-439. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- 1962c "The Cultural role of cities". In Margaret Park Redfield (Ed.) *Human Nature and the Study of Society: The Papers of Robert Redfield*, Volume 1, pp. 326-350. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 1962d "Civilization." In Margaret Park Redfield (Ed.) *Human Nature and the Study of Society: The Papers of Robert Redfield*, Volume 1, pp. 402-414. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Roy, Sourindranath

- 1961 *The Story of Indian Archaeology* New Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India.

Sanders, Irwin T.

- 1953 "Characteristics of peasant societies." In I.T. Sanders, R.B. Woodbury, F.J. Essene, T. P. Field, J. R. Schwende man and C. E. Snow (Eds.) *Societies Around the World: The Chinese Peasant, the Cotton South and the English Midlands*, pp. 19-24. New York: Dryden Press. Originally published in E. de S. Brunner, I.T. Sanders and Douglas Ensminger (Eds.) *Farmers of the World: The Development of Agricultural Extension*, pp. 37-45. New York: Columbia University Press.

Sankalia, H. D.

- 1962 *Prehistory and Protohistory in India and Pakistan*. Mumbai: University of Bombay.
- 1974 *Prehistory and Protohistory of India and Pakistan*. Pune: Deccan College.

- 1977 *New Archaeology: Its Scope and Application to India*. Lucknow: Ethnographic and Folk Culture Society.
- Singer, Milton
- 1972 *When a Great Tradition Modernizes: An Anthropological Approach to Indian Civilization*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Subbarao, B.
- 1958 *The Personality of India*. 2nd edition. Vadodara: M.S. University.
- Wheeler, R. E. M.
- 1960 *Early India and Pakistan to Ashoka*. Mumbai: D.B. Taraporewala Sons. Originally published in 1959 by Thames and Hudson, London.
- Willey, G. R. and P. Phillips
- 1958 *Method and Theory in American Archaeology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.