ISSN: 0974-5823 Vol. 6 (Special Issue, Nov.-Dec. 2021)

International Journal of Mechanical Engineering

ANCIENT STONE TOOL MAKING TECHNIQUES: AN OBSERVATION

Abhinab Nath[1]

Dr. Manik Chandra Nath[2]

[1]Assistant Professor, (Contractual), Tihu College, Nalbari
[1]Assistant Professor, Dept. of History, Barbhag College, Nalbari

Abstract: The evolution of man and his culture have proved without doubt that our prehistoric Stone Age ancestors had used stone tools made by them. Stone tools are the only preserved archaeological remains of prehistoric man while many of their handiworks are lost in course of time. The ancient stone tools are the implements made by those early men to meet their needs. They acquired through experience certain skills to make the different groups of stone implements called artifacts Archaeologists coined some terms to study the tool making skills of the prehistoric people. These different techniques are anvil/block-on-block technique, stone hammer, cylinder hammer, bipolar, step flaking, Clactonian flaking, Levalloisian flaking, discoid core Mousterian flaking, pressure flaking, fluting, backing or blunting, peeking, sawing, grinding and polishing, and shattering techniques. This paper is intended to find out the history of ancient stone tools and its making techniques. Secondly, to find out the semi primitive people making tools impact on socio-economic life of the people in ancient India. To formulate the necessary data primary and secondary sources are used. The study is historical, analytical and observation.

Keywords: stone, tools, techniques, flaking, society

Introduction

Stone tools are among the most distinctive features of the lives and evolution of hominines and, through them, material culture came to play an increasingly important role in the behaviour of our ancestors. As a result, material culture and stone tools in particular have given archaeologists a window onto behaviours and life ways that have long since disappeared. Although, stone tools were initially studied primarily as indicators of cultural achievements and then of technology; subsistence strategies, our understanding of the kinds of information that can be inferred from stone tools has expanded significantly in recent years. This broadening of analysis is linked to the development of cognitive archaeology. In this paper, we focus on the multiple ways in which stone tools can inform archaeologists about the evolution of hominine cognitive abilities.

On the evolution of man and his culture have proved without doubt that our prehistoric Stone Age ancestors had used stone tools made by themselves. H.D Sankalia found in his experiments two basic principles of fracture that 'firstly that the force from a blow does not travel in the direction in which the Upper Palaeolithic life Direct percussion Chopper 2 blow was struck, but radiates in the form of a cone, and secondly that the direction of the force along the cone will vary according to the amount of resistance it meets relative to the force of blow.' Francois Bordes, professor of prehistory also had a number of experiments and he is able to make, within a few minutes, all the known varieties of Palaeolithic implements. In the book – Early Man, published by Life Nature Library (1970) there are photographs showing the making of stone tools like chopping tool, Acheulian handaxes and laurel leaf point by Francois Bordes. Stone tool making techniques: We can broadly group the stone tool making techniques of prehistoric periods into four. They are: 1) Percussion, 2) Blade, B) Grinding and Polishing, and 4) Shattering. Out of these four groups, the percussion group has two sub-groups viz., A) the direct percussion and B) the indirect percussion. The direct percussion sub-group consists of eight techniques. They are discussed under the following heads. Let us now study some of the techniques and their identifying characters. A) Direct percussion flaking technique: Flaking by striking directly with a hammer is known as direct percussion flaking technique. This flaking technique includes many flaking techniques, such as: Handaxe Laurel leaf point 3 i) Anvil technique or Block-on-Block technique, ii) Stone hammer technique or Direct percussion technique, iii) Cylinder hammer or Hollow hammer or bone/antler/hard wood hammer technique, iv) Bipolar technique, v) Step or Resolved or Controlled flaking technique, vi) Clactonian technique, vii) Levalloisian technique, and viii) Discoid core or Mousterian technique. Anvil/Block-on-Block technique – In this technique a lump of stone to be flaked is held in one or both hands and strikes directly against a projected edge of a fixed huge block of stone or anvil. This results to the detachment of a large massive flake from the stone lump in hand with a prominent bulb of percussion. Such large primary flakes could be used in making of tools like some of the handaxes and cleavers. Thus the block-on-block or anvil technique produces thick flakes as in the case of the course direct stone hammer technique. Stone hammer technique – A suitable shaped stone is used as hammer and strikes at an inclined angle on the surface of a lump of stone and that result to the removal of a flake with a

[1]Assistant Professor, (Contractual), Tihu College, Nalbari
[2]Assistant Professor, Dept. of History, Barbhag College, Nalbari

Fluted core Anvil/Block-on-Block flaking technique 4 positive bulb of percussion. On the core there is a hollow or concave surface corresponding to the shape and size of the detached flake. This concave surface is called negative bulb of percussion.

Methods:

In this paper the method used by studying the stone tool, trying to imitate techniques today and observing primitive or semi primitive people making similar tools and using them in India. On the prehistoric stone tool techniques required for making a particular tool type has been fully mastered, the actual making of the implement is very quick process indeed, while the discovery of new technique is often wholly accidental and unexpected, as indeed it must also have been in the past. The method consist mainly secondary data. Secondary source which collect; analyses and interpret the data from books, journals, government websites and government published reports and newspapers. The method of preparation data for study is historical and analytical.

Objectives:

The objective of this paper is as follows:

- To find out the history of ancient stone tools and its making techniques.
- Secondly, to find out the semi primitive people making tools impact on socio-economic life of the people in ancient India.
- On focus the multiple ways in which stone tools can inform archaeologists about the evolution of hominine cognitive age.

Description:

Stone tool making techniques:

We can broadly group the stone tool making techniques of prehistoric periods into four. They are: 1) Percussion, 2) Blade, 3) Grinding and Polishing, and 4) Shattering. Out of these four groups, the percussion group has two sub-groups *viz.*, A) the direct percussion and B) the indirect percussion. The direct percussion sub-group consists of eight techniques. They are discussed under the following heads.

some of the techniques and their identifying characters are follows:

A) <u>Direct percussion flaking technique</u>: Direct percussion flaking is a method of flaking that involves striking directly with a hammer. Many flaking techniques are included in this process, including:

i) Anvil technique or Block-on-Block technique,

ii) Stone hammer technique or Direct percussion technique,

iii) Cylinder hammer or Hollow hammer or bone/antler/hard wood hammer technique,

iv) Bipolar technique,

v) Step or Resolved or Controlled flaking technique,

vi) Clactonian technique,

vii) Levalloisian technique, and

viii) Discoid core or Mousterian technique.

Anvil/Block-on-Block technique – A lump of flaked stone is gripped in one or both hands and struck directly against a projecting edge of a fixed big block of stone or anvil in this technique. With a noticeable bulb of percussion, a giant enormous flake detaches itself from the stone lump in hand. Large primary flakes like this might be utilised to make tools like handaxes and cleavers. As a result, the block-on-block or anvil technique, like the course direct stone hammer technique, creates thick flakes.

Stone hammer technique – A properly shaped stone is used as a hammer, striking the surface of a lump of stone at an inclined angle, resulting in a positive bulb of percussion. A hollow or concave surface on the core corresponds to the form and size of the detached flake. Negative bulb of percussion refers to this concave surface.

Cylinder hammer technique –

The advanced tool making technology developed in the early palaeolithic times is the soft hammer or cylinder hammer technique. In this case, the hammer is of a cylindrical bone or antler or hard wood; soft stone might be used. Tools of the Acheulian stage of the Lower Palaeolithic Culture show a very flat bulb of applied force. Experiments made by M. Coutier and Leakey (1960:42) have suggested that a cylinder hammer of soft stone, bone, or wood was used in detaching such flat flakes. Leakey (ibid) states '…… very flat flaking is achieved, partly because the blow is struck with a soft curved edge and not with a point, and partly because when using such a hammer it is impossible to strike a blow except at the very edge of the block which is to be trimmed.' It is most likely that initial shaping was done with the stone hammer technique and the cylinder hammer technique was used for the finishing process.

Bipolar technique – This flaking technique is less prevalent, but it is considered cost-effective since two flakes may be separated simultaneously with a single blow. The core is put on another hard rock and hammered on the top free end of the core to accomplish this. Two flakes, one from each opposite end, have been removed on the same face of the core due to the rebound of the force from the underlying rock and the force of the hammer blow on the higher end (Fig. p.168). The bipolar method is defined by the existence of radiating fissures on the same face at opposing ends of the core.

Stepped or Resolved/controlled flaking technique – A more sophisticated secondary flaking method evolved during the early palaeolithic cultural era is the stepped, resolved, or regulated flaking technique. In this situation, the hammer strikes the core with a controlled blow or force, not at an inclined angle to the surface, so that the penetrating force does not pass through but instead terminates within the core, snapping off a flake and leaving a step on the core. Step flaking produces short flakes in general and is mostly used in secondary flaking. The snap off flakes might curl over at the end furthest from the bulb on occasion. This is referred to as a hinge fracture. Such a fracture is impossible to induce at will, according to Leakey (1960:40). A hinge fracture is distinguishable from step fracture by its smooth surface.

Clactonian technique – The clactonian technique, named after the type site at Clacton-on-Sea, England, was a method of producing a flake employed by Lower Palaeolithic humans. In a nutshell, it's a method of removing a huge flake in order to make flake tools. The anvil or stone hammer technique might also be used to obtain Clactonian flakes. In this example, a naturally flattened surface is employed as the hitting platform, and the force does not flow through the core, but instead finishes within the core, snapping off a flake and leaving a step on the core. Step flaking produces short flakes in general and is mostly used in secondary flaking. The snap off flakes might curl over at the end furthest from the bulb on occasion. This is known as hinge fracture. According to Leakey (1960:40), such fracture is difficult to produce at will. A hinge fracture is distinguishable from step fracture by its smooth surface.

Levalloisian technique – This is also a further advanced technique of obtaining a flake to make tools. The main characteristic of this technique is the extensive preparation of the core and the striking platform (faceted striking platform) by using stone hammer. Only one flake could be obtained from such a prepared core and the flake resembles the form of the tortoise shell. It is so known as tortoise core technique. The flake has very sharp margin, due to the truncation of the previously prepared flake scars on the dorsal with the main flake surface, and could be used as tool without further working. The angle between the main flake surface and the striking platform is almost near to 90 degree. Thus Levalloisian technique is an artistic and skillful method of preparing flakes and cores that was first noticed from Levallois Perret, Paris.

Discoid core /Mousterian technique – This is also a prepared core technique for obtaining a flake. In this case the prepared core resembles a circular or disc shape. Any one of the flake scars on the core serves as striking platform and a flake with 2 to 4 truncated flake scars on the dorsal surface could be detached by striking with a stone hammer. The flake scar left on the core after detaching the first flake could also be served as striking platform for detaching another flake, thus several flakes could be obtained from a single discoid core. Hence, Discoid core or Mousterian technique is considered to be more economical than the Levalloisian technique

B) **<u>Indirect percussion technique</u>** – It is one of the methods of obtaining a blade by the prehistoric man. In this case, the prepared cylindrical core is not struck directly by the hammer but through a punch. The pointed end of the punch is fixed on the striking platform of the core and then hammered on the other end of the punch. This resulted to the removal of a thin blade that exhibits numerous closely placed prominent ripples on the main flake surface.

Blade technique – This is the technique known to man for the first time during the Middle Palaeolithic. By this method long, narrow, thin and parallel sided flakes have been produced in different parts of the world (during the Palaeolithic period). But this technique has been regularly and extensively used during the Upper Palaeolithic, Mesolithic and later periods. A blade is a narrow flake with nearly parallel sides and mostly thin and flat ventral surface. The dorsal surface is represented by at least two parallel flake scars. The length of the blade exceeds twice its breadth. The cross-section is somewhat triangular. By this definition all flakes cannot become blades though all blades are flakes. Some of the advanced techniques which were frequently used by prehistoric men to procure blades are briefly described below :

I. Pressure flaking technique/Blade by pressure

II. Fluting technique and /Blade by percussion

III. Baking or blunting

I. Pressure technique – Pressure flaking technique is another advanced flaking technique developed during the Upper Palaeolithic culture to prepare beautiful tools like the laurel-leaf and willow leaf points. On the other hand it is a technique used by the prehistoric man in secondary flaking or obtaining a blade. In this case also an intermediary implement served as punch is used to exert force on the core by applying pressure, but not by hammering. Very thin and small waste flakes or chips, known also as fish scale, could be removed for finishing the tools like leaf-shaped points during the Upper Palaeolithic Culture. Long blades could also be obtained by this technique. It is often difficult to distinguished indirect percussion from pressure flaking; both the methods are in fact a form of indirect pressure.

II. Fluting technique: It was used for making blade tools. In this technique, starting with suitably prepared cylindrical nodules, a series of uniformly thin parallel sided blades were detached in rapid succession by applying vertical pressures on edges. The blades could be flat as well as crested the blades produced by fluting were, however, crested with multiple flake scars transversely across the crest. It was pointed out by Sir John Evans that these scars were taken out from the surface of a natural module in order to form a corner along the length of the otherwise spherical surface of the material. Thus a blow delivered on the top of this ridge or corner would detach a blade with the marks of transverse flaking retain on it. It has been argued that besides forming a hold for the application of vertical pressure these transverse flaking were also used to guide the length of these blades, so that on application of the vertical pressure a blade of only that length would be produced up to which the crest had been prepared. Therefore, such blades have been called crest-guiding blades. On the other hand some scholars prefer to call this technique as punching technique. In short, in this technique a rough surface is made on the core, thereafter a small platform is prepared at one end. Against this is placed a short wood punch and a tap is given with the help of a mallet.

III. Backing or blunting:

Blades manufactured by fluting technique were further retouched to form specific tools. Since every blade had two readymade sharp edges, retouching in these blades were mainly done to blunt any specific area out of the two already present borders. The area chosen and the manner of blunting depended on the requirement of the marker. These blunting were mainly to afford a firm hafting of the blades on handles. A blunted edge is placed inside the groove of the handle when a force was applied to cut anything with the other sharp edge of the blade. Thus it is significant to note that while secondary working on core and flake tools was mainly aimed to impart sharpness. In blade tools they were done to blunt an already sharp edge.

Grinding and Polishing – This technique is the characteristic feature of making the Neolithic tools. Though the Neolithic stone tools are shaped by applying various methods of percussion flaking and pecking, the rough flaking or pecking surfaces are further worked by grinding and polishing technique to produce smooth and polished surfaces.

Neolithic culture is characterized by the making of smoothed surface stone tools generally known as celts. These smooth surface tools are produced by grinding and polishing method/technique. This technique has four stages like chipping, pecking, grinding and finally polishing. Thus after the selection of a suitable piece of stone, it has been shaped by flaking with a hammer, then ground on a coarse stone slab by adding sand and water often to smoothen the surfaces. To prepare the cutting edge it is further ground bifacially or unifacially to get the medial or lateral edge. Pecking is also another stage of this technique adopted by the Neolithic man in making the celt out of very hard and tough rock that is difficult in flaking. In this method, the maker used a very narrow ended hammer (like the prism edge of the quartz) to peck all over the surfaces of the stone, probably shaped pebble. Then ground all over the surfaces. The ground tools (shaped either by flaking or chipping or pecking) are then polished to make the smooth surfaces glaze.

There are various types of celts. Of them rectilinear shouldered celt possesses a tenon. Such tenon of the celt is supposed to be made by sawing technique. The sawing was believed to have been done with a sharp-edged sliver, might be of bamboo or shell, by adding sand and water to serve as abrasive action. During the Neolithic cultural period, there was also another tool type known as ring stone. It was meant to use as weight of the digging stick or head of mace. Drilling technique was used in making the hole of the ring stones or mace heads. For this drilling technique, a suitably sized pebble was selected and a depression was made on both the surfaces at the centre by pecking with another stone hammer. Thereafter, drilling on the depression was done first from the upper surface with bamboo tube rotating between the palms, and often-adding sand and water for abrasive action; when it drills about halfway it upturns and repeat the same process of drilling, and in this way the hole was made.

Shattering technique: This type of tool making technique is very simple. In this technique, the manufacturer holds the suitable stone with his hands (both) and rises to a certain height and then releases the same so as the rock breaks into pieces when it hits the ground. The flakes/rock pieces thus produced do not possess either negative or positive bulb of percussion. From such flakes any required size can be selected and trimmed further by using either grinding or stone hammering. This tool making technique is confined to Southeast Asia.

Above all, there are two more flaking techniques. They are the primary flaking techniques and secondary flaking technique based on the nature of the flake scars as well as its workmanship. Such flaking can be done by using any one of the percussion or blade technique. Now let us see how these techniques work.

Primary flaking technique – After selecting a suitable piece of rock, the prehistoric man will start flaking to get the conceptualized form of the tool. All such flakes detached for getting the desire shape and size of tools are primary flakes. However, the characters of the flakes detached exhibit differently according to the particular technique and hammer used. For example, the flakes removed by the anvil technique and direct stone percussion technique with heavy hammer will produce massif flakes with prominent bulb of percussion, while smaller and flatter flakes can be obtained by using cylinder hammer technique. The main purpose of the primary flaking is to get the desired shape and size of the tool.

Secondary flaking technique – Secondary flaking are those further flaking, after obtaining the desired shape and size, for producing sharp working edge and the suitable handholding place of the tools. The massif primary flakes could also be used for making many tools of the Stone Age by detaching further smaller flakes from the surfaces. The secondary flaking could be done by the direct percussion technique with smaller stone hammer or cylinder hammer technique and pressure flaking. Step flaking is also evident in

the secondary flaking; the flakes removed in step flaking are generally small and has a blunt end due to the sudden break of the force in the core material. The size of the secondary flake is generally small and known as waste flake or chip.

Conclusion

Many of prehistoric man's handiworks have been lost through time, therefore stone tools are the sole archaeological remnants of prehistoric man that have survived. The implements produced by that early mankind to suit their requirements are these stone tools. They learned to manufacture the various groupings of stone implements known as artefacts via experience. To examine the prehistoric people's tool-making abilities, archaeologists invented various names. Anvil/block-on-block technique, stone hammer, cylinder hammer, bipolar, step flaking, Clactonian flaking, Levalloisian flaking, discoid core Mousterian flaking, pressure flaking, fluting, backing or blunting, peeking, sawing, grinding and polishing techniques, and shattering techniques are some of the different techniques.

REFERENCES

- Bogucki, P. The Origins of Human Society. Massachusets and Oxford: Blackwell Publishers,1999
- Chang, K.C. The Archeology of Ancient China. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977
- Childe, G. “The Urban Revolution.” The Town Planning Review, Vol. 21, No. 1 (April 1950), pp. 3-17
- Fagan, B.M. and N. Durrani. The People of the Earth: An Introduction to World Pre-history. 16th reprint, New York: Routledge, 2016.
- Farooqui, A. Early Social Formations. Delhi: Manak Publications, 2001.
- Flannery, K.V. “Origins of Food Production.” Annual Review of Anthropology, 2 (1973): 271310.
- Feng, Li. Early China. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- James, T.G.H. The British Museum’s Concise Introduction to Ancient Egypt (British Museum Publications, 1979). Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 2005
- Keightly, D.N. “The Shang. China’s First Historical Dynasty.” In The Cambridge History of Ancient China. From the origins of Civilization to 221 B.C., edited by Michael Loewe and Edward L. Shaughnessey. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Lerner, G. The Creation of Patriarchy. Oxford, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1986
- Lewin, R. Evolution: An Illustrated Introduction. 5th Blackwell, 2003. edition. Massachusets, Oxford and Victoria:
- Nissen, H.J. The Early History of the Ancient Near East, 9000-2000 B.C.. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1988.
- Price, T.D., ed. Europe’s First Farmers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2000.
- Redman, C.L. The Rise of Civilisations. From Early Farmers to Urban Society in the Ancient Near East. San Fransisco: W.H. Freeeman 1978.
- Allchin, F.R. et al.The Archaeology of Early Historic South Asia: The Emergence of Cities and States. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Chattopadhyaya, B.D. Studying Early India: Archaeology, Texts, and Historical Issues. Delhi: Permanent Black, 2003.
- Agrawala R C 1989 Noh; in*An encyclopedia of Indian archaeology* (ed.) A Ghosh (New Delhi: Munshiram Monoharlal) vol. 2, pp 318–319
- Ahmed N 1966*Stone Age Cultures of the Upper Son Valley*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Poona University, Pune
- Allchin B 1981 The Palaeolithic of the Potwar plateau, Punjab, Pakistan: a fresh approach;*Palaeorient* **7** 123–134
- Allchin B and Allchin R 1982*The Rise of Civilization in India and Pakistan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Allchin B, Goudie A and Hegde K T M 1978*Prehistory and Palaeogeography of the Great Indian Desert* (London: Academic Press)
- Allchin F R 1960*Piklihal Excavations*, Andhra Pradesh Government Archaeological Series 1 (Hyderabad: Government of Andhra Pradesh)
- Allchin F R 1961*Utnur Excavations*, Andhra Pradesh Government Archaeological Series 5 (Hyderabad: Government of Andhra Pradesh)
- Allchin F R 1963*Neolithic Cattle Keepers of South India* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Ansari Z D and Dhavalikar M K 1973*Excavations at Kayatha* (Poona: Deccan College)
- Ansari Z D and Nagarajarao M S 1969*Excavations at Sangankallu* - 1964–1965 (Poona: Deccan College)
- Badam G L 1979*Pleistocene Fauna of India with Special Reference to the Siwaliks* (Poona: Deccan College)
- Banerjee N R 1956 The megalithic problem of Chingleput in the light of recent exploration;*Ancient India* **12** 21–34
- Banerjee N R 1986*Nagda* (New Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India)
- Banerjee N R and Soundara Rajan K V 1959 Sanur 1950–1952 a megalithic site in district Chingleput;*Ancient India* **15** 4–42

- Baskaran M, Marathe A R, Rajaguru S N and Somayajulu B L K 1986 Geochronology of Palaeolithic cultures in Hiran Valley, Saurashtra, India;*J. Archaeol. Sci.* **13** 505–514
- Bisht R S 1978 Banawali: a new Harappan site in Haryana;*Man Environ.* **2** 86–88
- Bisht R S 1991 Dholavira: a new horizon of the Indus Civilization;*Puratattva* **20** 71–82
- Casal J M 1964*Fouilles d'Amri* 2 vols (Paris: Publications de la Commission des Fouilles Archaeologiques, Fouilles du Pakistan)
- Chakrabarti D K 1990*The External Trade of the Indus Civilization* (Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal)
- Chaturvedi S N 1985 Advance of Vindhyan Neolithic and Chalcolithic cultures to the Himalaya terai: excavations and explorations in the Sarayupara region of Uttar Pradesh;*Man Environ.* **9** 101–108
- Childe V G 1936*Man Makes Himself* (London: Watts)
- Corvinus G 1983*A Survey of the Pravara River System in Western Maharashtra, India*, Vol 1.*The Excavations at the Acheulian Site of Chirki-on-Pravara, India* (Tubingen: Institute fur Urgeschichte)
- Dales G F 1979 The Balakot project: summary of four years of excavations in Pakistan,*Man Environ.* **3** 45–53
- Dani A H 1960*Prehistory and Protohistory of Eastern India* (Calcutta: Firma K L Mukhopadhyay)
- Das Gupta P C 1964*The Excavations at Pandu Rajar Dhibi* (Calcutta: Directorate of Archaeology and Museums)
- de Terra H and Paterson T T 1939*Studies on the Ice Age in India and Associated Human Cultures* (Washington DC: Carnegie Institution)
- Deavaraj D V, Shaffer J G, Patil C S and Balasubramanya 1995 The Watgal excavation: an interim report;*Man Environ.* **22** 57–74
- Dennell R W, Rendell H and Hailwood E 1988 Early toolmaking in Asia: two million year old artefacts in Pakistan;*Antiquity* **62** 98–106
- De Lumley, Henry and Sonakia A 1985 Contexte stratigraphique et archeologique de l'homme de la Narmada, a Hathnora, Madhya Pradesh, Inde;*L'Anthropologie* **89** 3–12
- De Lumley M-A and Sonakia A 1985 Premiere decouverte d'un*Homo erectus* sur le continent indien a Hathnora, dans la moyenne valee de la Narmada;*L'Anthropologie* **89** 13–61
- Deo S B 1970*Excavations at Takkalghat and Khapa (1968-1969)* (Nagpur: Nagpur University)
- Deo SB 1973*Mahurjhuri Excavation* (1970–1972) (Nagpur: Nagpur University)
- Deo S B and Jamkhedkar A P 1982*Excavations at Naikund (1978–1980)* (Bombay: Department of Archaeology and Museums)
- Deo S B and Mujumdar G G 1969*Songaon Excavation* (Poona: Deccan College)
- Deo S B and Ansari Z D 1965*Chalcolithic Chandoli* (Poona: Deccan College)
- Deo S B, Dhavalikar M K and Ansari Z D 1969*Excavations at Apegaon* (Poona: Deccan College)
- Dhavalikar M K 1988*The First Farmers of the Deccan* (Pune: Ravish Publishers)
- Dhavalikar M K 1997*Indian Protohistory* (New Delhi: Books and Books)
- Dhavalikar M K, Sankalia H D and Ansari Z D 1988*Excavations at Inamgaon*, Vol I, Parts I and II (Pune: Deccan College)
- Dhavalikar M K, Shinde V S and Atre Subhangana 1990a*Excavations at Kaothe* (Pune: Deccan College)
- Dhavalikar M K, Shinde V S and Atre Subhangana 1990b Small site archaeology — excavations at Walki;*Bull. Deccan College Res. Inst.* **50** 197–228
- Dhavalikar M K, Raval M R and Chitalwala Y M 1996*Kuntasi: a Harappan emporium on West Coast* (Pune: Deccan College)
- Dikshit K N 1981 The excavation at Hulas and further explorations of the upper Ganga-Yamuna Doab;*Man Environ.* **5** 70–76
- Dikshit K N 1989 Ambkheri; in*An Encyclopaedia of Indian Archaeology* (ed.) A Ghosh (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal) vol. 2 pp 17–18
- Ehrhardt S and Kennedy KAR 1965*Excavations at Langhnaj*: 1944–1963, Part 3,*The Human Remains* (Poona: Deccan College)
- Fairservis W A Jr 1982 Allhadino: an excavation of a small Harappan site, in*Harappan Civilization: A Contemporary Prespective* (ed.) G L Possehl (New Delhi: Oxford IBH) pp 133–141

- Fuerer-Haimendorf C von 1943*The Chenhus: Jungle Folk of the Deccan* (London: Macmillan)
- Fuerer-Haimendorf C von 1945 The problem of megalithic cultures in middle India;*Man India* **25** 73–86
- Fontugne M R and Duplessy J C 1986 Variations in the monsoon regime during the Upper Quaternary: evidence from carbon isotopic record of organic matter in north Indian sediment cores;*Palaeogeogr. Palaeoclimatol. Palaeoecol.* **56** 69–88
- Foote R B 1916*The Foote Collection of Indian Prehistoric and Protohistoric Antiquities, Notes on their Ages and Distribution* (Madras: Madras Government Museum)
- Francfort H P 1989*Fouilles de Shortughai: Recherches sur l' Asie Centrale Protohistorique* (Paris: Diffusion de Boccard)
- Gaillard C, Raju D R, Misra V N and Rajaguru S N 1986 Handaxe assemblages from Didwana region, Thar desert: a preliminary report on 1982 excavation;*Man Environ.* **7** 112–130
- Gaur R C 1983*Excavations at Atranjikhera: Early Civilization of the Upper Ganga Valley* (Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal)
- Gaur R C 1989 Lal Qila; in*An Encyclopaedia of Indian Archaeology* (ed.) A Ghosh (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal) vol 2, pp 251–253
- Ghosh A 1973*The City in Early Historical India* (Simla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study)
- Ghosh A 1989a Jodhpura; in*An Encyclopaedia of Indian Archaeology* (ed.) A Ghosh (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal) vol 2, pp 186–187
- Ghosh A 1989b Koldihwa, in*An Encyclopaedia of Indian Archaeology* (ed.) A Ghosh (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal) vol 2, pp 232–233
- Ghosh A 1989c Noh; in*An Encyclopaedia of Indian Archaeology* (ed.) A Ghosh (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal) vol 2, pp 318–319
- Ghosh A and Panigrahi K C 1946 Pottery of Ahichhatra;*Ancient India* **1** 37–59
- Ghosh A K 1970 The Palaeolithic cultures of Singhbhum;*Trans. Am. Philos. Soc.* **60** 1–68
- Gordon D H 1958*The Prehistoric Background of Indian Culture* (Bombay: N M Tripathi Pvt Ltd)
- Gupta S P (ed.) 1972 Proceedings of the Seminar on OCP and NBP: 1971;*Puratattva* **5** 5–28
- Gupta S P 1996*The Indus-Saraswati Civilization: Origins, Problems and Issues* (Delhi: Pratibha Prakashan)
- Gururaja Rao B K 1972*Megalithic Cultures in South India* (Mysore: University of Mysore)
- Hanumantha Rao M and Nagaraju S 1974*Excavations at Hemmige* 1964 (Mysore: Directorate of Archaeology and Museums)
- Hegde K T M 1975 The Painted Grey Ware of India;*Antiquity* **XLIX** (195) 187–190
- Hegde K T M, Bhan K K, Sonawane V H, Krishnan K and Shah D R 1990*Excavations at Nageshwar, Gujarat: a Harappan Shell Working Site on the Gulf of Kutch*, Archaeology Series 18 (Baroda: M.S. University)
- Iyer L A K 1925*Lectures on Ethnography* (Calcutta: University of Calcutta)
- Jacobson J 1985 Acheulian surface sites in central India; in*Recent Advances in Indo-Pacific Prehistory* (eds) V N Misra and Peter Bellwood (Delhi: Oxford-IBH) pp 49–57
- Jarrige J F 1986 Excavations at Mehrgarh-Nausharo;*Pakistan Archaeol.* **10–22** 63–161
- Jarrige J F 1990 Excavations at Nausharo 1988–1989,*Pakistan Archaeol.* **25** 193–240
- Jayswal V 1989 Belan Valley; in*An Encyclopeadia of Indian Archaeology* (ed.) A Ghosh (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal) vol. 2, pp 59–60
- Joshi J P 1990*Excavation at Surkotada 1971–1972 and Exploration in Kutch* (New Delhi: Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India)
- Joshi R V 1978*Stone Age Cultures of Central India: Report on the Excavations of Rock Shelters at Adamgarh, Madhya Pradesh* (Poona: Deccan College)
- Kale V S and Rajaguru S N 1987 Late Quaternary alluvial history of the northwestern Deccan upland region,*Nature* **325** 612–614
- Karir B S 1985*Geomorphology and Stone Age Cultures of Northwestern India* (Delhi: Sundeep Prakashan)

- Kaw R N 1989 Burzahom; in*An Encyclopaedia of Indian Archaeology* (ed.) A Ghosh (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal) vol. 2, pp 86–89

- Kennedy KAR 1984 Trauma and disease in the ancient Harappans; in*Frontiers of the Indus Civilization* (eds) B B Lal and S P Gupta (New Delhi: Books and Booka) pp 425–436
- Kennedy KAR 1992 Biological anthropology of human skeletons from Harappa: 1928 to 1988;*Eastern Anthropol.* **45** 55–85
- Kennedy KAR and Chiment J 1991 The fossil hominid from the Narmada valley, India:*Homo erectus* or*Homo sapiens*?; in*Indo-Pacific Prehistory* 1990 (ed.) P Bellwood (Canberra: Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association) vol. 1, pp 42–58
- Kennedy K A R, Lovell N C and Burrow C B 1986*Mesolithic Human Remains from the Gangetic Plain: Sarai Nahar Rai* (Occasional Papers and Theses of the South Asia Program, Cornell University, No. 10)
- Kennedy K A R, Lukacs J R, Pastor R F, Johnston T L, Lovell N C, Pal J N and Burrow C B 1992*Human Skeletal Remains from Mahadaha: A Gangetic Mesolithic Site* (Occasional Papers and Theses of the South Asia Program, Cornell University, No. 11)
- Kenoyer J M 1998*Ancient Cities of the Indus Valley Civilization* (Karachi: Oxford University Press)
- Kenoyer J M, Clark J D, Pal J N and Sharma G R 1983 An Upper Palaeolithic shrine in India;*Antiquity* **57** 88–94
- Khan F A 1964*Kot Diji* (Karachi: Government of Pakistan, Department of Archaeology)
- Khatri A P 1962 Origin and development of Series II culture in India;*Proc. Prehist. Soc.* **28** 191–208
- Krishna Sastry V V 1983*The Proto and Early Historic Cultures of Andhra Pradesh* (Hyderabad: Government of Andhra Pradesh)
- Krishnaswami V D 1949 Megalithic types of south India;*Ancient India* **5** 35–45
- Kumar G, Narvare G and Pancholi R K 1988 Engraved ostritch egg shell objects: new evidence in Upper Palaeolithic art in India,*Rock Art Res.* **5** 43–52
- Lal B B 1951 Further copper hoards from the Gangetic basin and a review of the problem;*Ancient India* **7** 20–39