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In this chapter we will discuss the terracottas found in the megalithic iron-age period. The chronological dating of this phase has been accepted by us to be roughly between c. 1000 B.C. - 200 B.C. The megalithic culture of the Deccan is a regional manifestation of certain eschatological trends which had been imbided by the regional cultures in their transformation from copper-bronze usage to the widespread use of iron metallurgy. The term megalith refers to the two Greek words, megos meaning 'huge and lithos meaning 'stone', thus describing a huge stone\(^1\). It may be explained as a grave or memorial erected in stone either dressed or, in its natural form, contained, enclosed or, over a funerary assemblage. Graves without any lithic appendage containing cultural material of the period have also been called 'megaliths\(^2\).

The areas occupied by the megalithic people in the Deccan are all primarily semi-arid with low rainfall. There is, however, variation in the amount of rainfall especially in the coastal region of the Deccan. The number of megalithic-iron-age sites in the Deccan with terracotta finds are thirty-four (Chart III) (Map, IV). With the decline of the chalcolithic cultures, western Deccan witnessed the emergence of the early historic cultures with the apparent absence of the proto-historic cultures based on iron technology with
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*Names of Sites indicated by Serial no. on this Map are given in Chart III., pp. 123.
megalithic characteristics. Paithan, Prakash, and Ter in mid Godavari are, the only important iron age sites in the western Deccan (Chart I, 47,55,68).
The cultures with megalithic characteristics are, however, found more prolifically in the Vidharbha-Telengana region, and in the southern part of the Mysore Plateau. In this phase ancient habitational sites known are Kaundinyapur, Paunar, Pauni, Takalghat and the sites known from the recent excavation. In the Wainganga basin are Adam and Arni (Chart I, 30,49,66,1,5). From the mid Godavari region the Department of Archaeology and Museums Government of Andhra Pradesh, has excavated altogether twelve sites including four habitational sites along with megalithic burials. While sites like Chagtur, Dongatagu, Kallepalli, Kyatur, Pochampadu, Pratyadevamandalam, Rekulapadu and Serupalle are burials sites (Chart I, II, 18,27,38,54, 56,65), Chinnamarur, Kadambapur, Peddabankur, Peddamarur have yielded habitational evidence of the megalithic period (Chart I, 14,26,50,52). Megalithic-related artefacts like horse remains, iron tools and implements and other horse related materials are prolifically found more in the Vidharbha-Telengana region (Chart III, 6,11,21, 22). Horses and their associated items like stirrups and trappings have been reported from sites like Hallur, Takalghat during phase II. Deo opines that the evidence of horses during the megalithic period indicates that the megalithic society did have persons with some status or rank. An important aspect of the megalithic economy in this region was its ability to produce iron objects on a large scale and the availability of iron.
In contrast to the above regions, in coastal Andhra the settlements emerged out of the already existing neolithic and chalcolithic cultures. Agiripalli\textsuperscript{28}, Huzurnagar\textsuperscript{29}, Keesarpalle\textsuperscript{30}, Nagarjunakonda\textsuperscript{31}, and Yellesvaram\textsuperscript{32} are the major megalithic sites here. (Chart 1,2,22,33,43,75). In coastal Andhra megalithic cultures form an essential background to the early historic period in the fertile belts of Krishna-Godavari basin\textsuperscript{32}. The megalithic cultures in coastal Andhra have been largely evidenced by the occurrence of ceramics like Black and Red ware, Red ware, and sometimes, with the occurrence of iron objects\textsuperscript{34} (Chart III, 9,34). According to SB. Deo the people of coastal Andhra and the Southern Deccan were in contact with the Telengana region for the supply of iron objects and artefacts\textsuperscript{35} since the latter had large resources of naturally available iron ore. In the southern region of the Mysore plateau five megalithic sites have been identified of which Brahmagiri\textsuperscript{36}, Maski\textsuperscript{37}, and Veerapuram\textsuperscript{38} are known to be habitational sites (Chart I, 8,42,76), while Ramapuram\textsuperscript{39} and Sankavaram\textsuperscript{40} are known for megalithic burials only. (Chart I, 58,61) (Map IV).

Unlike in other parts of northern and central India the iron age in the Deccan region was marked essentially in the megalithic context. The megalithic culture, according to Allchin highlighted a significant change in the settlement pattern of the South Indian cultures\textsuperscript{41}. However, the diffusionary element in the spread of the megalithic culture has been suggested by him because, he feels that the introduction of iron technology itself meant the
dawn of civilisation\textsuperscript{42}. The overall uniformity of the megalithic culture as being concomittant with the iron using culture in South India is therefore striking. We find at some sites that these were superimposed at different levels of the preceding phase of the neolithic-chalcolithic settlement. At Hallur there is a chalcolithic-megalithic overlap, presenting the earliest C\textsuperscript{14} date for the use of iron in the Deccan which is c. 1000 BC\textsuperscript{43} (Chart 1,21).

The early megalithic sites suggest a nomadic hoard substantiated by the finding of arrow heads and spear-heads and were constantly on the move Owing to this we have very few reports on terracottas. Paunar pd I dated between 1000 BC and 800 B.C., has revealed pointed pottery with the absence of metal objects\textsuperscript{44}. Iron objects were noticed at Paunar in layers 8,8a and 7 of period MA, whereas Kaundinyapura Pd II, dated to 800-600 BC in western Deccan has revealed BRW, occurrence of iron carnelian beads showing the presence of megalith\textsuperscript{45}. An important feature of the megaliths from this region is that they were associated with the horse, as evident from the bones, horse shoe, etc, which is not reported from the sites of Andhra Pradesh\textsuperscript{46}. The ancient habitation mound at Veerapuram revealed three phases of cultural succession, neolithic, megalithic and early historic. The megalithic phase has been assigned to a time bracket of seven centuries ranging from 1000 BC and ending in overlap phase around 300 B.C. The site has revealed pottery. Iron, beads of semi-precious stones and terracottas\textsuperscript{47}. In the telegana region of Andhra Pradesh sites like
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl No</th>
<th>Name of the Site</th>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Structures</th>
<th>Pottery</th>
<th>Terracottas</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>mf, pb.</td>
<td>BRW, RW.</td>
<td>bd, hs.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>PUR 20:1939-90, p.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agripalli</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>cb.</td>
<td>BRW, RBW, RW.</td>
<td>srp.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ami</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>is.</td>
<td>BRW, RPW.</td>
<td>af, bd, hf, hp.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chagur</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>in.</td>
<td>BRW, RPW, RW.</td>
<td>af, hf, srp.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chinnamarur</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>BRW.</td>
<td>bd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dhulikatta</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>BRW, RW.</td>
<td>bd, hf.</td>
<td>Ivory, PMC.</td>
<td>ARDAM 1975-77, pp.13-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dongatogu</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>BRW.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hallur</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>BRW.</td>
<td>af</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Huzurnagar</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>is.</td>
<td>BRW, RW.</td>
<td>srp</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kadambapur</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>BRW, BW, RBW</td>
<td>bd.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kalepalli</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RW.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Key Pottery: BRW-black and red ware, GW-grey ware, Kw-kaolin ware, JW-jorwe ware, Mlw-malwa ware, Owm-ochre wares, RW-red ware, RPW-red painted ware, NBPW-northern black polished ware.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl No</th>
<th>Name of the Site</th>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Structures</th>
<th>Pottery</th>
<th>Terracottas</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Maski</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>BRW</td>
<td>af,bd,hf, srp</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>AI.13.1957.p.10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Nagarjunakonda</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>BRW</td>
<td>bd.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Paithan</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>BRW,NBPW</td>
<td>af,hf</td>
<td>PMC</td>
<td>IAR.1965-66.p.10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pauni</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>BRW,RW</td>
<td>af, bl</td>
<td>PMC</td>
<td>ASI.1926-27.p.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Paunar</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>BRW,Rw</td>
<td>af,hf,bd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Peddammarur</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td>af,bd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IAR.1977-78.p.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Pochampadu</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>BRW,BPW,RW</td>
<td>af</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IAR.1963.p.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Key Pottery: BRW-black and red ware, GW-grey ware, Kw-kaolin ware, JW-jorwe ware, Mlw-malwa ware, Ow-ochre ware, RW-red ware, RPW-red painted ware, NBPW-northern black polished ware.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl No</th>
<th>Name of the Site</th>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Structures</th>
<th>Pottery</th>
<th>Terracottas</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Rekulapadu</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>russet coated</td>
<td>bd.</td>
<td>IAR, 1981-82,p.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ramapuram</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>BRW</td>
<td>af.</td>
<td>IAR, 1981-82,p.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sankavaram</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>BRW,RW</td>
<td>srp.</td>
<td>DM, 1988,p.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Serupalle</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>BRW,RW</td>
<td>af.srp</td>
<td>PHEHCMR, 1986,p.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Takalghat</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Ter</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>KW,RPW</td>
<td>bd,hf,vot</td>
<td>IAR, 1974-75,p.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Vaddamanu</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Veerapuram</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>imp</td>
<td>bu</td>
<td>BRW</td>
<td>bd.af.</td>
<td>VSTV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Yellesvaram</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>imp</td>
<td>bu</td>
<td>BRW,RW</td>
<td>bd.srp</td>
<td>AMYE, 1983,p.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Key Pottery: BRW-black and red ware, GW-grey ware, Kw-kaolin ware, JW-jorwe ware, Mlw-malwa ware, Ow-ochre ware, RW-red ware, RPW-red painted ware, NBPW-northern black polished ware.
Chinnamarur, Chagtur, Peddamarrur, Serupalle, Kyatur (Chart III, 5,6,15,22,29) known for burials have revealed large and huge sarcophagus, and associated ware like BRW, RW, iron nails and beads. It is only in much later reported sites like Agripalli Adam, Chagtur, we have reports suggesting the presence of terracottas. The terracottas reported were mostly through burials.

The transition from chalcolithic to iron age can be clearly noticed at the site of Chinnamarur. (Chart I, 14), According to Krishna Sastry at Chinnamarur a neolithic cemetery of family burials was noticed in a megalithic habitation while a megalithic cemetery was noticed over the neolithic habitation\textsuperscript{48}. Maloney argues that the spread of iron technology in general implies the diffusion of agricultural economy based on rice cultivation\textsuperscript{49}. Other sites which show the overlap of megalithic culture with the preceding neolithic-chalcolithic, are Brahmagiri and Maski which have evidence of earlier habitation and are in themselves important megalithic sites as well (Chart III, 4,16). At Brahmagiri the iron age culture is represented on the one side by the overlap of the neolithic-chalcolithic and on the other, by early historic Andhra cultures. Around this area this is also important evidence of the presence of the Mauryas (Chart III,4). Brahmagiri is best known for its association with the Asokan rock edict during the megalithic phase\textsuperscript{50}. As can be inferred from the Asokan inscriptions certain tribes seem to have existed even belote the Asokan rule and this has further been substantiated by the archaeological information of the megalithic culture\textsuperscript{51}. The megalithic early
historic overlaps are very important because the cultural level and the technological base for the society becomes inevitably different at this stage.

Iron was used by the megalithic people to meet domestic, warfare and agricultural needs. This equipment appears to represent an uniformity of technical skills in the Deccan (Chart III). Besides the homogeneous equipment, megaliths were also found in association with the evidence of horse related items. Further, they are also found in contact with early historic equipment like Rouletted Ware and Mauryan remains (Chart III,4). The megalithic monuments also had an uniform variety of Black and Red ware ceramic tradition which has been considered significant by scholars for the identification of the iron age (Chart III, 4,6,21,32,34). Scholars like Vimala Begley opine that the iron age and the early historic age should be placed in the same chronological bracket as both were associated with the Rouletted Ware\textsuperscript{52}. The iron age in general brought about significant changes in the pattern of life of the people. Excavation reports have revealed from the overlap phases of neolithic-chalcolithic cultures the terracotta beads from sites like Brahmagiri and so on.

Archaeologists have defined the culture of the megalith period primarily on the basis of its tool technology. The level of tool technology attained by the megalithians can be discussed in the context of the wide
range of tools used which indicate their possible material requirements. The number of objects like agricultural implements such as axes, hoes, ploughshares, offence objects like swords, arrow heads, daggers etc., implies its use for both warfare and agriculture and the availability of this raw maternal in the Deccan on a large scale (Chart III, 6, 15, 21, 29, 34) In the western Deccan megalithic sites like Kaundinyapura and Paunar are scarce (Chart III, 13,20), whereas in the Telengana region the megalithic folk utilised the local raw materials as indicated by the findings of iron-ore and slags at these sites\textsuperscript{53} (Chart III, 6, 15,21,29) As a result of the smelting of iron and making of sophisticated iron tools they could be employed for quarrying the stone blocks in order to detach them from hillocks which, in turn, facilitated the construction of structural edifices, both domestic and sepulchural\textsuperscript{54} (Chart III,25) Peddabankur and Pochampadu have thrown light on numrous iron objects (Chart III,21,23). According to Krishna Sastry the entire Karimnagar region was scattered with iron ore and ancient iron working spots\textsuperscript{55} The evidence of kilns indicate that the iron smelting may have been in the hands of a few smiths who must have been connected with the local levels of production with in the villages or \textit{gramas}, small markets and towns\textsuperscript{56}. The level of craftsmanship reflected in the latter megalithic sites in the manufacture of metal objects and terracottas indicate that the megalithic people had a separate class of artisans who catered to the needs of the community\textsuperscript{57}.
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In the Krishna-Godavari delta basin the iron deposits and objects do not seem to be as rich as the Telengana region (Chart III, 14, 17). However, in the southern part of the Mysore plateau substantial iron tools were found to indicate the megalithic cultures of the region and these are represented along with an assemblage of microliths, copper tools, arrow heads and spearheads (Chart II, 4, 16, 33). Sites like Piklihal have been taken to represent the intrusion of people with iron technology. In the case of Hallur, the iron technology has been thought of in terms of the coming of new people (Chart III, 9). In researches on the Ganges valley the technology of iron was held responsible for the movement of people into forests and clearing the thick vegetation. Scholars have tried to reconstruct the material life of the megalithic people on the basis of their technical equipment but it has been difficult to emphasize on the role of iron technology for the large scale spread of agriculture in Deccan. The advent of the megalith culture and the growth of new technology was nonetheless, concomitant with the rise of ancient agriculture. When the use of iron artefacts became widespread it led to a change of pace in the agrarian growth when compared to the use of other metal technologies for agriculture. However, the megalithic sites also suggest hunting activity as substantiated by the finding of arrow-heads and spear-heads (Chart III, 5, 9, 21, 23). The ploughing of soil was probably done with the help of the bulls and cows were probably used for milking purpose. Rice was supposed to have formed
their staple food. On the basis of various agricultural implements as excavated from the different sites of the Deccan region it is possible to suggest that the economy of the megalithic folk was mixed. Deo pertinently opines that megalithic folk were not settled agriculturists but were mostly pastoralists practising smallscale agriculture in some areas of arable land, or where irrigation tanks existed. Domestication of animals meant that they formed part of the people. This is attested to on the basis of animal bones found at sites like Peddabankur (Chart III, 21). Deo further states that the meagre quantity of grains discovered in the Waidha-Wainganga basin also substantiates that the megalithic groups were not agriculturists in this region but belonged to pastoral community practising small scale agriculture. In other regions according to some scholars the introduction of large scale tanks in the megalithic period not only indicates the advance of agriculture but also the organisational aspect of these communities. Krishna Sastry points out that the burial sites in the Telengana area were noticed in the proximity of large irrigation tanks which may have supplied drinking water to their household and must have, also been used for sustaining the crops.

According to Vishnu-Mittre the plant remains from the southern part of Mysore plateau suggest that the occupation of the megalithic folk in this region was agriculture. Ragi, rice, and sugarcane have been found from the various sites in the Mysore plateau. A. Sundara identifies the charred grains from the overlapping phase in Hallur as ragi.
Thus despite the technological uniformity the advent of the megalithic culture introduced agriculture in some areas whereas in others communities following hunting and pastoralism continued to exist. During the megalithic phase both domestic and sepulchral architecture meant that building activity with non-perishable material began which was not found in the neolithic period. The huge burials related to sarcophagus implies that the megalithic folk had certain religious beliefs in life after death. A change in the religious aspects from the worship of mother goddesses figurines to that of life after death is an indication of the development of a further new mode of thinking. In the Wainganga region the orthostats in Huzurnagar were arranged to form nine chambered cist maintaining equidistance between one chamber and the other for depositing the individual grave goods (Chart III, 10). Provision of two passage chambers and port-holes show the forethought of the people in building these monuments long before completing the burials. After the formation of cists and chambers the folk employed locally available boulders of white granite to protect the exact central spot maintaining an equal distance from the centre. This also indicates that the megalithic folk were precise in mathematical calculations. In the Telengana area, Chinnamarur a megalithic habitation site was situated on the alluvial soil and was close to the burial places (Chart III, 6). The floor of the structures was made of shale stones chips plastered with lime concretations. The enclosed structures at Chagtur and Chinnamarur show that the megalithic people constructed barricades around their dwellings for safety and
protection\textsuperscript{74} (Chart III, 5,6). Krishna Sastry opines that these may have inspired the inhabitants of the later period to plan dry masonry wall around their habitation which in course of time led to the construction of fortification during the early historic period\textsuperscript{75}.

The megalithic monuments as revealed from the sites may have been built by a centralised and co-ordinated society. Renfrew calls such a society as a chiefdom society\textsuperscript{76}. Many of the burial and habitational sites like Chagtur, Chinnamarur, Peddamarur, (Chart III, 5,6,22) have revealed luxury items like BRW, figurines, beads, made of teriraccattas, iron nails etc, which indicate the importance of the chief. According to E.R. Service the chiefdoms were particularly distinguished from tribes by the presence of centres which co-ordinated economic, social, and religious activities\textsuperscript{77}. The ruling chieftains in a chiefdom society commanded the resources of the areas where they maintained predatory control. Anthologies show that the major function of the chieftain was the predatory extraction of resources and their subsequent redistribution\textsuperscript{78}. This also led to the specialisation of crafts and is evident from the various types of pottery and the mould made terracottas. Redistribution was based on the ability of the chieftain to organise plunder raids\textsuperscript{79}. This is evident from the various weapons and tools excavated from the sites of the Deccan region (Chart III, 5,6,10,15,21). Thus the megalithic society was a stratified society but not a full fledged State society.
Of all the material and economic changes, the most significant is its characteristic pottery which during the megalithic phase was largely Black and Red ware. (Chart III, 1,6,7,9,13,14,16,29). Wheeler has suggested that the megalithic builders adopted the BRW from the chalcolithic culture towards its end phase. It was however, adapted to serve their purpose and therefore, some differences emerge during the megalithic phase. The adoption of BRW indicate the impact on the social setup. The new communities imposed themselves on the existing chalcolithic population.

The process of making BRW was different in respect of the technological make up. For example, inverted, single or double firing method was used by the potter in making this ware indicating a development in the technology of making pottery. Hand-made and wheel made pottery continued into the megalithic phase. The BRW according to H.N. Singh was processed by the 'inverted firing technique'. In this method the pots were kept inverted in the kiln and hence, the interior and the portions around the neck were burnt under reducing conditions. As a result of this the interior turned black and the exterior turned from dull red to buff in colour. Saw dust, vegetable matter must have been used to fill in the pots while firing under reducing conditions. The firing of BRW was done on low temperatures as this process would not allow the ware to crumble if kept in wet conditions for a long period of time. But the surface was highly burnished and polished to get a glossy surface with the juice of tuthi or Abutilon Indicum.
has revealed pottery which was made in this way and baked\(^84\) (Chart III, 13). According of M.G. Dikshit the BRW at Kaundinyapura has been labelled as megalithic BRW and it discloses different characteristic features. Further, the scholar elaborates the differences by pointing out that the megalithic BRW with a black slip having bright shining appearances may have been due to burnishing a feature which is not evident in the later BRW\(^85\). Prakash has revealed the BRW with a slight lustre which had probably resulted from cloth or leather burnishing (Chart III, 24)\(^86\).

The pottery in the Deccan region was mostly plain, but occasionally some wares had simple grooves, incised strokes, nail impression etc. Bowls of various shapes like carinated bowl having grooves on the exterior fragments of conical bowl or lid with a concave and inverted rim, fragments of tulip shaped shallow bowl with inverted rim, elliptical and undercut on the exterior, with corresponding depression in the interior were commonly found in the Raichur doab\(^87\). The most common shapes of BRW found in the central Deccan were associated with the megalithic burials which include deep bowls, carinated dishes with round or flat bases and globular pots\(^88\). At Kadambapur the megalithic phase III has revealed pit burials in which a BRW funnel shape vase has been noticed (Chart III, 11)\(^89\).

The associated wares found along with BRW in Deccan are Red Warn, NBPW and Black Ware. The pottery at Kaundinyapura, Paithan,
Prakash is characterised by the presence of NBPW (Chart III, 13.24). The technique of making NBPW is similar in the process of making Black ware. Under the reduction method the pots were burnt for a certain time, the pile was covered with clay paste and all the outlets were sealed, so that the smoke was retained within. The surface of this ware was covered with slip which varied in lustre from steel grey, shining blue or shining brownish black as found in the western Deccan. The shapes in this ware consisted of rimless bowls, handis, pear shaped vases etc.

Megalithic pottery has been classified into two groups: the coarse and unpolished receptacles like the burial urns, the sarcophagi and their lids, and secondly the well fired finely polished smaller vessels as discussed above. The burial urns were mainly of two categories the sarcophagi and pot burials. According to Gururaja Rao megalithic pottery has been classified into two groups in which the technique of making the sarcophagus was to shape the clay into thick sections and then shaped into large vessels of pyriform or fusiform urns with elongated body and a pointed or truncated bottom. Later, they were given animal forms resembling mainly a ram or a buffalo. According to scholars terracotta sarcophagus was introduced by the Chaldeans since this type of burial was not found elsewhere and was absent in phase I of our study. According to B. Subramanyam, terracotta sarcophagi excavated and reported are generally found in all types of burials though not in all burials. Citing an example from the site at Peddamarur
and Serupalle in Central Deccan, nine cist burials revealed the sarcophagi (Chart III, 29). Further, Subramanyam reports that the sarcophagi were meant for elite of the megalithic society or they belong to a religious custom followed by particular tribe. However, merely taking into account the physical features of the burials and assigning them to a particular tribe is not possible unless the contents of the grave goods are studied more closely. For example, a cairn circle may contain sarcophagi urns and other grave goods, but it does not mean that all cairns should contain similar goods. However, it has been observed that though various types of burials existed at one place, each type of burial was contemporaneous with one or other type, and there was also a geograpical continuity as far as their location was concerned.

Since pottery making techniques were also associated with tenacotta making we next turn to take a brief look on the types and techniques involved in making of terracottas. The hand made terracotta figurines of the neolithic-chalcolithic phase continued during the megalithic iron age as well. Apart from the hand made figurines, terracottas also began to be prepared by two types of moulds, the single and the double moulds. Due to specialisation and the techniques involved, hand and mould technique was used simultaneously for making of huge sarcophagi; the concentration of this craft was mainly on the items concerned with burials like beads etc. So the number of terracotta mother goddesses are comparatively less than phase
I and phase III. Craft specialisation and aesthetic sense of the potter can be seen in the various shapes and sizes, types of the urns, pottery and sarcophagi. This technique was an advancement from the neolithic-chalcolithic phase. In the single mould, the figurines were prepared either from models in clay, wax, wood or soap stone or, by carving the desired design in negative. The process of making terracottas from double mould was by pressing the two moulds on a solid lump of clay and removing off the surplus by a sharp instrument. The other method was to press the wet clay into two different moulds of the front and back portion separately so as to form hollow shells (Plate 2). After detaching and luting them together the figurines were retouched to deepen the grooves and incise designs on them could be made. Then the objects were baked in a closed or open kiln but direct heat was not applied. The objects baked were kept in an earthen ware which was covered from outside with charcoal and husk.

Improvement in the technology of making terracottas imply an increasing specialization emerging in the craft of making a variety of ceramic products.

According to S.P. Gupta the distribution of potteries along with terracottas began to vary from one sub-region to other on the Indian sub-continent. Further, he opines that a stage had been reached when the potter-artist who made terracottas did not probably make pottery, or if he did, he rarely did so. The technique of making terracotta now became specialized than those making pots. Terracottas required more skill and artistic flare to
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fashion the figurines. They varied according to their size and features\textsuperscript{104}. Further, the common potter who had earlier been involved making figurines could make only very crude figurines as seen in the earlier chapter on phase I.

Excavation reports have revealed six mother goddess figurines for the megalithic iron age phase in the Deccan (Chart V, 8,34,38,39,44,56). The archaeological reports merely mention the existence of a mother goddesses without dealing the individual features of each in detail. Of the six figurines reported only two have been dealt with the some detail. Mother Goddess figurines are known to us from the reports at Peddabankur. The illustration depicts three figurines. The figurine is hand made, and the goddess head is shown in the first figurine in thin trefoil mass, hand pointed and breast are shown prominently. The body below the breast is broken. The second figurine head is shown as a prominent mass with a round halo at the back pointed breasts, hand and the body below the waist is broken. In the third figurine the mother goddess face is pinched to a prominent mass, hands tapered to points, legs and breasts are broken\textsuperscript{105}. (Plate 3). Terracotta mother goddess figurines of the megalithic iron age bear resemblance to the simple nude figurines with prominent breasts and hanging arm stumps from Ter and Nagarjunakonda (Chart V, 31,56). According to Margret Murray such mother goddess figurines have been classified as the Baubo type\textsuperscript{106}. The Baubo type of figurines are generally reported in squatting form in which the beauty of the form or its individual features are
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disregarded. In fact, the other characteristic features such as breast are also minimized and the importance is laid only on the pudenda\textsuperscript{107}.

In phase I the mother goddess or the so-called shameless goddess were associated with some sort of fertility cult and identified as the earliest examples of mother goddess worship. In phase II the difference is that the mother goddess has been noticed in squatting) position wearing a beaded necklace around the neck, a thick girdle around the waist and heavy anklets\textsuperscript{108}. Such figurines are known to us from the excavation at Ter\textsuperscript{109} (Chart V, 56). For the first time in phase II the girdle emerges on the mother goddess and continues into the early historic phase. It appears to have had a functional value in order to keep the garment in a firm position around the waist (Figure IV). Further, the girdle is also said to symbolize an emphatic significance of being a child bearing fertility features\textsuperscript{110}. Coomaraswamy opines that the nude goddes was known as Aditi who was considered a personification of Nature. Sometimes she was identified with the earth who was incorporated into the later religious practices and is known to us also from the literary texts\textsuperscript{111}. The Atharva veda in fact mentions the sacred girdle (Mekhala) which is seen constantly worn by nude goddesses as being a long-life (ayusyam) charm. Such figurines are also known to us from many sites of northern India\textsuperscript{112}.

Apart from the mother goddess figurines the animal figurines known for this phase are bulls and a solitary example of a deer. Of the animal
figurines the bull which was known profitically in the neolithic-chalcolithic times continued to play an important role in the megalithic phase. The number of bulls reported from excavation are five. (Chart V, 10,14,39,44,). Excavations at Peddamarur reveals bull figurines with a thick long snout and eyes and mouth fashioned in an archaic way\textsuperscript{113} On the other hand from the Central Deccan region Chinnamarur revealed bull figurine found in urns having two long horns and a tail\textsuperscript{114} The legs in this case are shown stout and straight. The eyes are depicted in the form of pinches. The bulls were hand made and stylistic in form. They do not appear to be substantially different in form and style from those found in the neolithic-chalcolithic phase.

The other noteworthy animal figurine identifiable for this phase is a deer figurine (Chart V, 41). The hand made deer figurine is only one of its kind and has an elongated body with long slender horns\textsuperscript{115} Since it is so small in size it has been suggested that these terracotta deer figurines were probably used as toys (Plate 4).

In the early prehistoric cultures the deer figurines have been commonly presented in rock art as part of a larger group as in hunting scenes or in animal processions individually they can be seen as a study naturalism\textsuperscript{116}. For the early man the deer with antlers, beautiful skin and graceful movements must have been of great appeal since it not only provided meat, its hide was used for clothes, while its antlers were used for weapons. The terracotta figurine of the deer indicates that the megalithic folk
were familiar with it and probably hunted the deer for their food and used its horns for weapons.

The megalith phase is of course important for another kind of animal figurines known to us from the cist burials in the form of terracotta sarcophagus (Plate 5). The type of animals attached to the elongated body of the sarcophagi suggest that could either have been meant for the elite of the megalithic society and reflected a religious customs ie., belief in life after death. Some of the animal figurines have been associated and represented with the five elements of nature which served as a means of transport the dead to the other world. Excavation at Peddamarur has revealed three types of sarcophagus from a four chambered cist burial of which one sarcophagi is of red ware with five slip over the body. The sarcophagi was barrel shaped and recantangular in plan and pentagonal in cross section. Subramanyam, opines that the hand made bovine animal, attached to the sarcophagus at Peddamarur, had long and study horn was luted as if to indicate that the animal was carrying the coffin. From Sankavarm a ram shaped sarcophagus with six legs was reported (Chart V, 39,49). The front portion of the coffin was raised in the form of an animal terminating in a socket into which it is fitted. The detachable head of the ram had curved horns.

The buffalo and Ram as found at some or above sites (Chart V, 39,49) has multifarious religious significance. In Hindu art these
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animal figurinese were later represented as vehicles for dieties like Lord Yama, Lord Agni etc\textsuperscript{119}.

Terracotta finds of a non-religious nature were also found in this phase. They were mostly in the form of ornaments. During this phase they mainly consisted of beads and bangles. Beads during this phase were of different shapes and sizes. During this phase fourteen have been identified in excavation reports. Some of the types which were found in this phase were the one which were annular, cylindrical and tabloid in shape. The beads were prepared according to the double mould method. Recent excavations from Adam have brought to light annular beads (Chart VI,1). Beads from Kesarapalli and Prakash that were found were of another type, namely, the pear shaped beads (Chart VI, 22,34). At Prakash this evidence has come from the overlap levels of the use of iron and the early historic phase at this site\textsuperscript{120}. From sites like Chagthur, Kyatur, Peddamarur beads reported from excavations were found, associated with the terracotta sarcophagus\textsuperscript{121}. The most commonly found beads from this places were circular, biconical, spherical, tabloid, long and short barelled beads (Chart VI, 8,24,33). From the hand made beads, the double mould method of bead making was adopted. A change can be seen during the megalithic iron age phase. The shapes and sizes and the broken beads from the various sites, suggest that were baked and moulded. From Peddamarur the tabloid beads were decorated with concentric circles. From the same site
another type ie., the terracotta conical bead was found which is said to represent a phallic symbol. It was found in the a megalitic burial. However, it being a bead is doubted since it had no arrangement for suspension.

Terracotta cylindrical and circular beads have also been found at Keesarapalle II in coastal Andhra, but these were all unpierced\textsuperscript{122}. A pendant which resembled a bead has come to light from Serupalle. A long cylindrical bead having pointed or blunt bead which resembled a phallus was also found. It had a hole at the base just below the broad end to facilitate easy suspension\textsuperscript{123} (Chart VI, 40).

The most interesting ornament during this phase was a bangle from Pauni\textsuperscript{124} (Chart VI, 19). This bangle was noticed in the exploration area. It was made of pure clay; well fired and had negative incised motif of a female figure with lotus on top, which repeated itself if the bangle was rolled. The figure on it had fanned head dress, heavy necklace, prominent bare breast, open navel below which she is shown wearing a sari tucked infront and she also wears a heavy girdle (Figure IV). The artist who made this bangle, may have catered to the needs of the chief or elite; the female figurine with heavy girdle and lotus on top, suggest that she may have been a mother goddess. For the first time we observe that the terracotta figurine shows the depiction of cloth on the body of the figurine infering that the neigalithic iron age society knew the art of wearing clothes. Scholars refers to the girdle as fertility features.
Thus a clear cut marker between the megalthic and the early historic context is quite difficult in the archaeological record because it shows at many sites an overlap between the two phases. The overlapping situation from the neolithic-chalcolithic to the megalithic-iron age are important for postulating internal sub-regional contacts (Chart I). The level of tool technology attained by the megalithians indicate the possible use of tools based on an improved equipment. In this context the introduction of iron technology signified an important breakthrough. Not merely did it introduce a change in the use of a new metal, but with the use of iron artefacts there was a widespread change in the pace of agrarian growth in some areas of the Deccan. Scholars have suggested that the pastoral economy was predominant. The various agricultural implements discussed by us above clearly indicate that megalithic peoples economy was mixed and definitely it was pre-urban. However the megalithic burial monuments suggest that, there may have been a centralised a co-ordinated society to control the surplus and redistribute it.

Iron technology not only played an important role in the economy of the megalithic folk, but also paved the way for an improvement of craft specialisation. With regard to our subject of study we noted that in the level of craftsmanship we find an improvisation as reflected in the manufacture of the moulds for making of terracottas. It has been suggested that this went hand in hand with the use of iron for making the moulds. This had an impact
on the fact that a separate group of artisans emerged in the village who
catered to the needs of the people for making terracottas of a specialist kind.
This is clearly seen in the large sarcophagi that are found in many megalithic
burials. Mother goddess continued and this may suggest that there was an
earlier tradition co-existing with the new megalithic people who had come to
settle in the Deccan. Of all the material eco-changes in the megalithic phase
the most significant was its characteristic potter which was largely BRW. The
firing methods used by the potter in making of this ware indicated a
development in the technology of making pottery. This had also an impact
on the terracotta making and is seen in the preparation of the sarcophagii,
where the wheel was used extensively.

It is interesting to note that during the megalithic phase the mother-
goddess figurines changed in style and make, which is depicted through
ornaments with intricate designs. This further suggest a marked
improvisation from the nude goddess of phase I. Most of the characteristic
features of the nude goddess were retained during this phase. The continuity
of the worship of mother goddess is known to us from a few terracotta
figurines known from sites like Ter and Nagarjunakonda. The super
imposition of the new belief of the burial systems may have been one of the
cause for the less production of mother goddess figurines. This is evident
through excavation reports.
We find from the various types of sarcophagus the notion of life after death was predominantly emphasised through the burial system. The artist improved his technical skills, through the various animal figurines like ram, bovine, elephant which were attached to the body of the sarcophagus by hand and double mould method. The improvisation of the skills is further elaborated in the making sarcophagus with wheels for the leg. The megalithic burials in which sarcophagus were dominantly reported through sites suggests that the religious belief of the folk changed megalithic in a gradual manner and a comparative lack of terracotta figurines.

Terracotta ornaments in the form of beads and bangles were identified by the different types of beads as noted in the chart. We have observed an improvement in the skill of making hand made beads to that of making re., mould. The inherent skills of the artist is seen in the increasing number of beads which were not reported during phase I. There was a continuity of certain beads like arecanut, spherical etc., specialisation is also seen in the ornamentation of bangle. This suggest that during the megalithic-iron age there existed a category of skilled artisan for preparing and making certain specialised objects and figurines, who catered to the local chiefs and the eletes of the society. Greater specialization in terracotta making is, however seen during the early historic phase. We next turn to explain these changes in Chapter IV.
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