Chapter- VI

Conclusion

Various palaeontological and archaeological studies have revealed human existence only in a few pockets of the world during the Palaeolithic period, though humans comparatively inhabited vast regions in Africa, Europe, Americas and Asia even before the end of the Neolithic period. Whatever be the period of human existence in different regions of the world, it remains a universal truth that the experience and training in arts, crafts, beliefs and social institutions started slowly and developed gradually. From the stage of crude flake and hand-axe culture it took man hundreds of thousand of years to reach to a stage of efficient and sharp edged ground tool-culture which eventually gave way to new modes of human life all over the world. This general pattern of evolution of cultures is witnessed in Kashmir too, from the beginning of the Palaeolithic period down upto the Neolithic period. The Neolithic culture of Kashmir was broadly a product of the co-existence of many-sided inter and intra-relations among the humans, who occupied such sites as were generally located on the Karewa tops adjacent to the river Jehlum and its many
tributaries. Both in appearance and formation these river sites, located throughout the length and the breadth of the Valley, give the look of a sort of fairly populated villages. These villages were dotted with various types of houses, to begin with semi-subterranean square shaped pit-chambers followed by over-ground mud and timber houses. The people occupying such village houses were not nomads as they had discontinued the habit of roaming around in search of food. They permanently settled down in these villages, and lived continuously there generation after generation for about two thousand years, depending mostly on farming though simultaneously taking some support from the age-old practice of chase. Their contribution to the development of far-reaching social or communal relations was there, at the same time they equally contributed to the evolution of faith which was translated into practice while worshipping several objects or things, be they natural or man made. Their rich heritage visible in the archaeological remains is indeed indicative of a developed culture, which is what is known as the Neolithic culture in the history of Kashmir.

Having said so, one pertinent question remains as to who were these people? Did they seek birth in Kashmir just with the beginning of the Neolithic period? Or where they descendants of those people who lived before them in the Palaeolithic Kashmir? Prof. H. D. Sankalia believed that they were not natives who developed the Neolithic culture in Kashmir but were definitely 'colonists' who came from outside for 'no gradual local development is hitherto known nor are their antecedents known'.

distinguishes these people from those who inhabited Kashmir during the Palaeolithic period. While supporting Prof. Sankalia, Khazanchi held that they could have come from Central Asia, particularly the North and Central China\(^2\) though he does not furnish any scientific reasoning in this regard. He simply based his argument on mere affinities that some of the material culture of Kashmir had with the Neolithic cultures that obtained in the North and Central China, ShiIka valley and some Neolithic sites in eastern Siberia, in Russia.\(^3\) Before drawing any final conclusion, one needs to examine separately the views of Prof. Sankalia and Khazanchi.

At the time Prof. Sankalia formulated his viewpoint, there was very little Palaeolithic evidence available in Kashmir. However, the latest researches have revealed several results, which put to question the opinion of Prof. Sankalia regarding the relations that obtained between the Palaeolithic and the Neolithic people of Kashmir. One might recall that during the Palaeolithic period the Valley was occupied by a vast lake without any drainage for water. Man lived on high altitude mountain valleys, as Kashmir valley floor was not accessible to him. It was the time when climate was fluctuating broadly between cold and warm stages and even the vegetation cover of the Valley was changing in accordance with the available climate. But man lived in all these situations and survived on hunting a variety of large animals that lived in his company in Kashmir. As many of his tools have been found from the glacial deposits, these men


\(^3\) T. N. Khazanchi, 'North-Western Neolithic Cultures of India', Newsletter, Nos. 7 and 8, Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Shimla 1977, p. 24.
seem to have lived in Kashmir without getting disturbed by the effects of sever cold climate following the glacial periods. The tools recovered from several Palaeolithic sites, particularly from the foot of a river valley at Mansbal, located on the banks of the vast prehistoric valley lake, are considerably important in the sense that they at least point to the behavior of the prehistoric man after changing his habitat from high altitude mountain valleys to the lower reaches. Habitational caves found at Mansbal and various Palaeolithic tools located there around suggest that people lived in communities at one place which eventually helped them develop fellow-feelings as a prerequisite to build up cultural foundations for the posterity. For them things further eased out when the Valley lake got finally drained so as to allow new physiography of the Karewas to emerge. After they were stabilized, the Palaeolithic people thereupon chose these foot-hills as their living grounds as is evidenced by the findings of the Upper Palaeolithic assemblage from these Karewas, laying thereby foundations of a culture which was acknowledged by the succeeding generations including the one that survived during the Neolithic culture. Infact the succeeding Neolithic culture shows distinct signs of evolution, spatial differentiation and clear technological affinities with the preceding Palaeolithic culture⁴ which is proved by chopper like discoidal cores, borers, flake tools and scrapers recovered from the preceramic horizons at Kuladur, Tapribal, Balapur etc. Indeed all these tools are of an antecedent stage that existed just before the fully developed Neolithic period in Kashmir. Even though it is difficult to

guess about the mode of production adopted by these people yet hunting might have contributed largely to their food economy as is certified by the tools found. Together with these tools, they also had backed knives, grinders and pounders which suggests some kind of grain collection or incipient agricultural activity at this pre-Neolithic stage as the definite proof regarding grain based food economy is yet to be traced out. Agriculture as a permanent mode of production, supplemented by animal husbandry, was adopted only during the Neolithic period though hunting as a reminiscence of the Palaeolithic period was not abandoned by the Neolithic people. The Neolithic people lived in groups inside their villages and thereby honored the rich heritage of fellow-feeling that was transmitted to them by their predecessors. Thus there was a definite evolutionary continuity, and no break in the relations existing between the Palaeolithic and the Neolithic people of Kashmir. All this evidence thereby establishes a scope for disagreeing with the opinion of Prof Sankalia that the Neolithic people of Kashmir were aliens and thus far removed from those who preceded them in the Palaeolithic period.

Khazanchi's view point that the Neolithic people of Kashmir had affinities with Shilka valley and other sites in eastern Siberia for they, like them, pursued fishing and hunting as a dominant mode of production, particularly because of the large equipment of hunting tools like harpoons, daggers, arrow-heads and points available in Kashmir bone industry, also does not hold good in the face of modern researches. These studies contrarily reveal, as discussed earlier, that farming of plants and rearing

---

5 T.N. Khazanchi, *Newsletter.*
animals was the principal and hunting of wild animals only as the secondary source of sustenance for the Burzahomites. True equipment used in hunting, fishing, agriculture, etc and designs adopted for raising houses, exhibit certain typological resemblance as has been detailed out by Fairservis and the Allchins. Nonetheless, vast differences remain between Burzahomities and Central Asians with particular reference to the

W.A. Fairservis Jr., remarks that textured (combed) pottery, rectangular knives (harvesters), pit-houses, polished stone celts of ovoid or quadriangular type and stone-rings (mace heads), all have direct analogies in such places as southern Siberia (Minusink, Transbaikalia), Mongolia, Manchuria and Northern China. Dog eating, flexed burials, pole-houses are also found in eastern (Lung shan) and northern (Yang shao) China, The Roots of Ancient India, London, 1971, pp 312-13.

The Allchins hold that Burzahomites had affinities with the Neolithic and surrounding hunting people of the peripheral regions, north and north west of China and of Central Asia, particularly because of the practice of animal burial common in these areas. They further report that burial of dog with their masters was found in Ang-Ang Hsi culture of Manchuria and dog was almost cult animal in the Shiika cave culture of the upper Amur; and this animal was until recently sacrificed and buried with their masters among such people as the Gilyaks, Ulchis and Goldis of this region, Bridget and Raymond Allchin, The Rise of Civilization in India and Pakistan, New Delhi, 1983, p 116. We have, however, noted earlier that only in one human grave at Burzahom there was found a skull of a dog while the rest of these animals were buried separately, supra Appendix II. Gupta holds that Siberian sites are far removed from Kashmir and also harpoons, etc. differ considerably in techno-typology. He, however, argues that Ordous Central China (Yang shao), Yunan (Lung shan) and Burzahom have their ultimate origin in the Neolithic Ordous culture of Northern China (Yang shao nuclear area), S.P. Gupta, 'Neolithic Problems in India', Indian Prehistory, eds. V.N. Mishra and M.S. Mate, Poona, 1964, pp 99-101.
Chinese, as Central China was the nuclear area wherefrom knowledge pertaining to the development of Neolithic culture diffused in the surrounding areas in the Far East. It is a fact that both in China and Kashmir the Neolithic people lived in semi-subterranean houses, called pit-chambers, at one or the other stage. But the structural pattern reflects variations of profound nature. Whereas the pit-chamber type houses in the Neolithic Kashmir were largely square or rectangular in shape, in China such houses were mostly circular, and only occasionally oblong or square in the Yang shao culture (4800-3300 B.C.). The possibility that the

In China there were two principal Neolithic cultures, the earlier North Central China Yang shao which, as per the corrected chronometric dating, spread from 4800 to 3300 B.C., and later Eastern China Lung shan culture which began around 2700 B.C.; in between these two cultures there were one or two regional cultures in the north east Manchuria and adjacent areas, called Lung-shanoids which resembles more with the Lung shan cultures. Both these cultures had their characteristic features, even though the Lung shan was basically similar to the Yang shao in economy and material culture. The Yang shao culture had its nuclear area on the Wei river, mostly on its numerous tributaries, on the loess land south of Ordous desert and north of Cho'in Ling mountains, whileas Lung shan culture developed in the Far East Coast on the flood plains of the lower Hungho, covering the modern provinces of Hanan, Hopei, Shantang, and northern parts of Anhui and Kangsu, K.C. Chang, *The Archaeology of Ancient China*, New Heaven, 1968.

The Yang shao villages were divided into dwelling area outlined by ditches 5-6 mts deep and wide, a kiln area for pottery making and village cemetry for the burial of dead while the Lung shan had no such sub-division of their villages. The Yang shao houses, built in a cluster at the centre of a village, were 3-5 meters in diameter, mostly round and occasionally oblong or square having plastered floors. They were semi-subterranean or at ground level with wattle and daub foundation. Sometimes they had also long houses with partitioned compartments. Each of the houses and compartment had a fire place inside. The Lung shan houses were circular, with a concave
Kashmiris borrowed the square type pattern from the Chinese is to be ruled out in the face of the vast variety of difference that existed invariably in the settlement pattern of the villages of the Yang shao and Kashmir. Unlike the Yang shao people, for instance, the Neolithic people in Kashmir did not follow the pattern of dividing the village land into settlement area for the purpose of habitation, kiln area for pottery and cemetery for burial of the dead. Nor were these settlement areas separated by digging ditches there around for defense purposes. Contrarily, however, the extent of the Kashmir settlements were dotted all around with pits for storage purpose. Because of such diversity Kashmiris were not indebted to the Yang shao Chinese in terms of designing the semi-subterranean houses. Particularly because, Chinese were not the only people who knew the art of raising the pit-chamber type houses. Largely, square and occasionally round pit-chamber type houses were also discovered in all the five cultural phases of Jamon Neolithic culture in Japan. Likewise in former USSR such dwelling

The Lung shan people are to be ruled out for any kind of influence at the beginning of the Neolithic culture in Kashmir as they started their culture some three hundred years after Kashmir.

houses were found in the European forest zone as well as in Ukraine to Kiev\(^\text{12}\) at many places belonging to the Neolithic period. Similarly in West Asia such houses have been found at the Neolithic sites at Beidha, Ramand (Levant),\(^\text{13}\) Abu-Zureiq (near Hazorea),\(^\text{14}\) M'lefaat (Iraq),\(^\text{15}\) Tepe Asiab and Tepe Sarab (Iran),\(^\text{16}\) and Swat\(^\text{17}\) (Pakistan). All this, therefore, suffices to prove that such a structural pattern of houses was the offshoot of a universal rather than a regional phenomenon. Even if it is presumed that such types of structures were raised under the Chinese influence especially under the Yang shao influence in Kashmir, yet we cannot trace out any sort of migration of people from China to Kashmir. There remain certain marked variations, besides in culture, in terms of racial and genetic comparisons of the two peoples, while the Chinese, both the Yang shao and the Lung shan, were of Mongoloid stock,\(^\text{18}\) the Kashmiris on the other hand were having physical features of the Caucasoids. In view of this, the opinion of Dikshit that the Neolithic Kashmir was a part or an extension of


\(^{13}\) Prushotam Sing, *The Neolithic Cultures of West Asia*, London, 1974, p 22, 49.

\(^{14}\) Ibid, p 48.


the East-Asian culture\(^{19}\) can be accepted with reservations only. Thus besides genetic differences, broad cultural differences existed between the two peoples. For example unlike the Yang shao culture, wherefrom diffusion of the Neolithic culture in Kashmir could have taken place as they were ahead of the Kashmiris in time, but there were no separate burial grounds in the Neolithic Kashmir. Instead the dead humans in Kashmir were buried within the settlement area and inside the living houses under their floors. Again, such a practice seems to be of a universal pattern as is certified by the archaeological findings, because at the Lung shan Chinese sites, Catal-Huyuk (Anatolia)\(^{20}\) and Sialk in Iran\(^{21}\) the dead were buried under the house floors. Presumed again that such a ritual was followed after the Chinese where the burial practice started from the very beginning of the Yang-shao culture, yet unlike them the burial practice started in Kashmir after about 600 years of the appearance of the Neolithic culture. Again the skeletons of the dead were painted with red-ochre in Kashmir but unlike them, out of hundreds of the Chinese finds one single skeleton was found painted with red ochre and that too was kept in a coffin urn.\(^{22}\) At the same time, the said ritual was followed very commonly in the Neolithic burials of the former USSR,\(^{23}\) Japan\(^{24}\) as well as in West Asia at Ramand


\(^{20}\) Prushotam Sing, The Neolithic Cultures of West Asia, p. 100.

\(^{21}\) James Mellart, The Neolithic Cultures of Near-East, p. 191.


\(^{23}\) Alexander Mongait, Archaeology in USSR, pp 103-122.

\(^{24}\) G.J. Groote, The Prehistory of Japan, p 66.
(Levant)\textsuperscript{26} Catal-Huyuk (Anatolia)\textsuperscript{26} Tepe Asiab, Haji Firuz culture,\textsuperscript{27} Sialk, Zagha, Tepe Sagzabad\textsuperscript{28} and Hissar\textsuperscript{29} in Iran.

In addition to this, various types of the Neolithic pottery of Kashmir rules out the scope of influence following the diffusion of knowledge from China. Since even postulation of stimulus of diffusion requires material evidence and it is difficult to establish any real cultural affinity between the pottery groups of the Chinese cultures and that of Kashmir, the ceramic industry of Kashmir seem almost certain to have occurred independently.\textsuperscript{30} The only affinity, which the two pottery groups had, is reflected in the established reality that both had cord-impressed pottery, called combed ware in Kashmir; whereas this pottery developed in China around 5000 B.C.,\textsuperscript{31} on the other hand it surfaced in Kashmir as late as around 2000 B.C, i.e. almost around 1000 years after the onset of the Neolithic period.\textsuperscript{32} In other respects too the ceramic complexes of the two regions are fairly distinguishable as in China pottery preceded field agriculture, on the contrary in Kashmir, as in West Asia, pottery followed the grain-centered

\begin{itemize}
  \item Prushotam Sing, \textit{The Neolithic Cultures of West Asia}, p 150.
  \item \textit{Ibid}, p. 100.
  \item \textit{Ibid}, 167-190.
  \item James Melart, \textit{The Neolithic Cultures of Near East}, p 190-91.
  \item Moreso because in China pottery was available to the Neolithic people from the very beginning, even earlier, on the other hand in Kashmir after the birth of the Neolithic culture in 3000 B.C. no pottery was known for first 500-600 years.
  \item Ping-Ti Ho, \textit{The Cradle of the East}, pp 124-27.
  \item The cord-marked pottery developed in Kashmir after the first, thick-coarse grey ware, developed around 2500 B.C.
\end{itemize}
agriculture. Equally important is the fact that along with the pottery of the
cord-marked type, the painted pottery in China was of a large number and
variety. In Kashmir on the other hand, such an element is totally absent,
except one pot bearing bucranian head, which having the Iranian origin,
seems to have reached Kashmir via the Indus Civilization (see the sequel).

Even in the shapes of vessels, the Kashmir pottery is different and do not
bear any Chinese influence except in the shapes of certain simple
vessels of daily use, such as basin having curvilinear sides, which too
appear, more or less, practically in all ceramic traditions. That is why we
find some square bowls having round base, straightened four walls with
rising curved tops and four corners slightly depressed or else the bowls
with tapering straight sides and straight base or for that matter the great
variety of jars with flaring rims, long necks, globular body having flat
bottom, they are typical of Kashmir only without having parallel in China.

33 K.C. Chang, The Archaeology of Ancient China; Ping-Ti Ho, The Cradle of
the East, pp. 131-175.

34 There are many typical shapes in China, like Yang shao tseng- steamer, a
bowl shaped vessel with holes in the bottom, ting-tripod, a bowl shaped
vessel with a tripod, the Lungshanoid and Lung shan ll-tripod, a jar with a
tripod either having a handle or without a handle, Ping-Ti Ho, Ibid, pp 131-
132.

35 Seton Lloyd and Fuad Safar, "Tell Hassuna: The excavations by Iraq
Government in 1943-44, Journal of Near Eastern Studies, Vol IV, No. 4,
1945; at Hassuna dishes and saucers are fairly common among pottery
wares, similarly such dishes are found near home at Sarai Khola, M. R.
Mughal, 'The Sarai khola pottery types of the Early periods I and II, Pakistan
Archaeology, Vol. 8, 1972, Fig. 23; as well as in the pre-Harappan and
Harappan sites but in painted ware as at Amri, Kalibangan, Mundigak,
Harappa, etc. B. and F. Allchin, The Rise of Civilization in India and
Pakistan.
The other important vessels, like the globular pots or jars which have near spherical bodies with either low neck or without any neck, but invariably have round bottom or flat bottom on hollow stand, are not found in China. Pots with almost similar shapes, particularly those with round bottom, are found at many places in West Asia like at Hassuna. Significantly like that of West Asia, Kashmir pottery is invariably hand-made while Chinese pottery is found to have been made on turntable. Similarly, pots, like common type of jars or bowls with a little modification here or there had analogy in Sarai Khola. Moreover like Sarai Khola, Kashmir pottery had also burnished types, which however were of black shades while at Sarai Khola these were generally in red shades. There were similarities in terms of mat-impression on the base of a few pots, as was the case with early pottery in China, and north west Pakistan at Gumlā, Levan, Mehargarh, etc.

In other respects too vast differences existed between the cultures of Kashmir and China. In the Neolithic China, the food economy depended on the cultivation of millet and pig farming from the very beginning, while as rice entered the Chinese life around 4000 B.C. followed by wheat and barley around 1300 B.C. As against this, Kashmir economy featured primarily wheat, barley and masur cultivation from the very beginning of the

---

33 Ibid, p 347. Ping – Ti. Ho however records that earliest rice culture has been found outside the Yang shao nuclear area and did not enter into the proper Yang shao sites but spread to peripheral areas of the Yang shao before entering the Lung shan sites around 2700 B.C.
34 Ibid, p. 352.
Neolithic culture around 3000 B.C., followed by rice around 2000 B.C., while among the animals sheep, goat and cattle were the first to have been domesticated in Kashmir exactly on the West Asian and Mehargarh pattern. At Mehargarh, however, masur was not grown while cattle (Bos and water buffalo) contributed largely and sheep and goat only insignificantly to the respective economy; on the other hand in Kashmir sheep, goat and cattle contributed almost equally to the Neolithic economy.

All this evidence thereby leaves very little scope to believe in, what is called, 'cultural invasion or diffusion' from China at least at the time of the birth of the Neolithic culture in Kashmir. In the light of the above discussion one may argue that for the first one thousand years the Neolithic culture of Kashmir was devoid of Chinese imprints. Their cultural impact, nevertheless, began to be certainly felt around 2000 B.C. when Kashmir for the first time seems to have come into contact with the Lung shan people, the only Chinese living in the Neolithic age at this period of time. As a proof, it may be said that it was the time when agricultural economy of Kashmir was supplemented by rice and millet cultivation, and pig farming got introduced. Simultaneously, the harvester, both in semi-lunar and rectangular shapes, which were characteristic shapes of the Lung shan Chinese,\(^\text{41}\) formed part

\(^{41}\) While Yang shao people in China had semi-lunar shaped stone knife, the Lung shan had both the shapes and obviously because of the typological similarities it was from the Lung shan cultures that the harvester got introduced in Kashmir during the middle stages of the Neolithic period. It must have reached Kashmir around 2000 B.C. as is evident from its findings at Gofkral in period IC, 2000-1700 B.C. even though Burzahom had it during period II, 2500-1700 B.C. but then out of 56 stone harvesters reported from there only two were of period II giving thus an indication of its late introduction.
of the Neolithic assemblage at Gofkral and Burzahom. A relevant question is as to who were the agencies or the people involved in transmitting, whatever little or large, Chinese influences to Kashmir? Not necessarily were they the Chinese, far neither any Mongoloid genetic group was traced in Kashmir nor any veritable relics of the Neolithic China were found along the possible routes leading into Kashmir. On the other hand, we have the definite reason to believe that the Neolithic people of Kashmir might have been largely instrumental in this endeavor because of their extra-territorial contacts. It is indeed because of their in a way globalised state of affairs that Kashmir became the entrepot of ideas and cultural traits not only from China but from other countries as well, and whatever cultural 'imports' we have, they are only sporadic and therefore, do not present the traits of a foreign culture in totality. Sometimes they are not even synchronised in time, while at times they appear to be mere copies of the people living outside Kashmir, as is the case of Gofkral hair pin. Despite this, we should not hold back our opinion that the Neolithic culture of Kashmir was a cultural mosaic which took shape as a result of congregation of ideas and coalescence of influences of various cultures. It is because of such reasons that the Neolithic equipment of Kashmir show but rudimentary similarities with outside equipment. This is vindicated by Krishnaswami who on the

There are no intermediary sources or ethenic groups present on and around the possible routes through which a possible migration or trait infiltration could have taken place neither through Sinkiang – Tibet – Ladakh nor through Sinkiang – Gilgat route, the routes that could have been used because the geographical proximity of Kashmir with China through this area. In this area the establishment of the Neolithic communities from the North China are far from clear.
basis of typological resemblances, round butt and cylindrical shapes, observed that ground stone tools of Kashmir had a definite western influence of Iran and Baluchistan.\textsuperscript{43} Take for example Kashmir stone tools of which celts, adzes, chisels and mace heads had their analogies in Pakistan at Kachibegi, Loralai, Kile Gul Mohammed, Harappa, Mohanjodaro, Nal, Lewan\textsuperscript{44} and Sarai Khola.\textsuperscript{45} While only a few types of Kashmir bone-tools were found in Baluchistan and north-west Pakistan and Sarai Khola but a good number with a variety of form was found in Manchuria (China), Siberia and in the Jamon culture. Rudimentary similarities are also found in bone harpoons of Kashmir with those of Manchuria while eyed needles and awls were found at both these places in great number, projecting typological similarities. Similarities are even established by the fact that people in the Neolithic Kashmir painted their house-floors with red ochre (Gofkral period IA, Burzahom period I and II). It was a practice which was simultaneously in vogue not only in Mehargarh\textsuperscript{46} but also in Djeitun culture\textsuperscript{47} (Turkemenia) Hacilar\textsuperscript{48} and Can-Hasan\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{43} V.D. Krishnaswami, 'The Neolithic pattern of India', \textit{Ancient India}, No. 16, 1962, p 34.
\textsuperscript{44} Shashi Asthana, \textit{History and Archaeology of India's contacts with other countries}, Delhi, 1976, p 80.
\textsuperscript{48} Prushotam Sing, \textit{The Neolithic Cultures of West Asia}, p 68.
\textsuperscript{49} \textit{Ibid}, p 105.
(Turkey), Beidh\textsuperscript{50} (Levant) and Deh-Luran\textsuperscript{51} (Iran). The natives seem to have accepted such foreign influences, at the same time they appear to have equally reciprocated by providing necessary ideas to their neighbours for the development of their cultures as was the case at Ghaligai, Aligmara and Loebanr in Swat valley (Pakistan). Swat Neolithic culture was of a later date than Kashmir and had coarse grey and black burnished pottery, pit-houses, ground stone tools, bone-tools and even \textit{masur} along with wheat, barley and rice, all showing cultural traits of the Neolithic Kashmir.\textsuperscript{52}

Since human cultures progress due to integrated activities of distinct social groups and communities, it is not as such surprising to see Kashmir and its neighbours borrowing each others influences in the respective social behaviour, settlement pattern, tool technology, designing of craft objects or development of economy. However, such a give and take relationship seems to have had developed only upto limited proportions so that what was used or produced at a certain place was not always made or found in Kashmir or vice-versa. For example we had no fish-hoorks or shouldered celts in Kashmir as were found in China like-wise they had no stone points as found in Kashmir. Doubtlessly Kashmir Neolithic culture had its own indigenous features but then the exotic influences rendered it

\textsuperscript{50} Ibid, p 25.
\textsuperscript{51} Ibid, p 186.
to appear as an amalgam of East–West cultures. Since these widely varying foreign ‘imports’ did not often synchronize in terms of time, speed and chronology, some Neolithic site, around Kashmir, might have had played host by welding them together, depending certainly how close it was to Kashmir and how attractive or useful those distinct foreign elements were for adoption in the conditions of Kashmir. Such a site would have been the one which on the one hand was recipient of the West-Asian influences in agricultural pattern and on the other hand was influenced by the Chinese type pit–houses. Kashmir herself could have claimed to be such a place where such intermingling of East-West influences took birth but then non synchronization of dates does not allow it to be so. To say precisely, we are unable to locate such a place. Nevertheless, this does not mean that the Neolithic culture did not entail foreign reinforcements directly from a primary source. Had it not been there, the bucranian motif painted on a Kot–Dijian type pot found at Burzahom (period I) would have been a remote possibility. Sankalia rightly argues that this Burzahom painted pot had its origin either in Iran or Sind and Punjab. Since similar type of a pot with the motif has been found simultaneously from the pre-Harappan layers at Kot-Diji, Banawali, Sarai Khola, etc. It is very possible that Sarai Khola being comparatively nearer to Kashmir might have as such remained the intermediary channel or the primary source of transmission of this pre-Harappan element to Kashmir. This being so, particularly because

---

53 Even though Khazanchi and Dikshit reports that it was found from period II at Burzahom, *Puratattva*, No. 9, 1980, yet S.S Saar report its find spot from the layers of period I at Burzahom, *Archaeology*, pp 13-14.

the pre Harappans were contemporary to the Burzahomities at the early Neolithic stage, and such elements get easily imported in a culture which at this period of time had neither an inclination to produce any pottery nor had means to make such wheel–made pottery. On the other hand metal objects found at Burzahom and Gofkral were made by the natives themselves but they employed the technology of the Harappans for that purpose, certifying thereby certain contacts established somewhere around 2000 B.C through trade or other type of links between the advanced Harapans and the Kashmiris of the Neolithic period. Nevertheless, such a contact was restricted too as no major elements of their culture were established in Kashmir.

To sum up, we can safely argue that the Neolithic people of Kashmir were the natives who were themselves instrumental in evolving and giving birth to the Neolithic culture in Kashmir. While withstanding the odds of nature they ventured to carve out for themselves a permanent space in the scenic environs of the Valley on the Karewa tops overlooking vast plains and eventfully took to agriculture and husbandry as more reliable sources of sustenance. The settlements they made were characterized by a wide range of hectic socio-economic and culture activities among their social

---

55 Even though Neolithic Kashmir shares some other cultural elements with Sarai Khola like in burnished pottery, ground stone tools, storage pits etc. yet when all these things were there at Sarai Khola, Neolithic Kashmir was yet to take birth, and after it happened we had no pottery for first 600 years in Kashmir and when black burnished pottery was made in Kashmir around 2000 B.C the Neolithic culture was no more existing in Sarai Khola instead they had by then passed though culture stages of the pre Harrappan and mature Harappan.
beings. Though these activities were conducted as per their nature of
culture and local conditions yet the role of their neighbours in the
development of their culture cannot be ruled out keeping in view the
relations that the Neolithic people of Kashmir had established with them at
one or the other period of time. The nature of such relations cannot be
explained exactly. However such relations left definite imprints on their
culture. Significantly most of the exotic influences might have not reached
Kashmir directly but via some kind of intermediary source which in itself
would have represented the features of being a hybrid culture centre. True
for the establishment of West Asian farming pattern the Bulaclistant site at
Mehargaoh exemplify a spectacular centre where from the cultural traits
reached to not necessarily all north west Indian sites but atleast up to Kile
Gul Mohammad and Gumla. Nevertheless, this nuclear area fostered such
processes which according to Gupta "inspired chain reaction giving birth to
the Neolithic complexes in Punjab at Sarai Khola in Potwar and Jalilpur
in Multan, not withstanding their localized and distinct cultural identity.
Nonetheless, what was common in all these places was indeed imminent in
the gradual and simultaneous development of the Chalcolithic phenomenon
which itself stemmed from the Neolithic culture in the whole region.

One can think that trade may have been one such aspect to develop
relations but then there is no evidence which could suggest what might have
been traded by the respective parties even though hundreds of beads from
Harappans were found at Burzahom in lieu of what is unknown. Similarly
one may follow the line that "ideas have wings" but then these "wings" that
carried early ideas had to be men who had to travel and cross the natural
barriers for a definite reason.

S.P Gupta, Disposal of the Dead and Physical types in Ancient India, New
Delhi 1972, p. 263.
However Kashmir seems to have been receptive of this region's wide technological development yet it could not give rise to the establishment of Chalcothic culture in Kashmir. True that only little metallurgical activities were conducted here and that too after around 2000 B.C., thereby implying that the idea regarding adoption of Chalcolithic culture had started floating into Kashmir but not disturbing the existing Neolithic formation. What is therefore essentially significant is that the Neolithic people of Kashmir on account of contacts, however tenuous, showed no scruples in appreciating the foreign influences and ideas for the sake of promoting and guaranteeing the survival of its own culture over a long period of time. As a result of this kind of approach their mental horizons widened though they continued to live their life in their own way and practice dogmas and rituals. All the same, they retained and they developed several unique characteristics which were unparalleled when compared with the cultures that obtained there around.