

Researches into the Origins, Antiquity, Nature and Functions of the Pre-Historic Megalithic Cultures of the Hill People of North East India

G. P. Singh

The primary object of this paper is to throw new light on various aspects of the megalithic cultures of North East India in the Pre-historic Age. It is, indeed, an undeniable truth that the subject under review has attracted the attention of various ethnographers, archaeologists, antiquarians and other noted scholars like Mortimer Wheeler, Haimendorf, J. H. Hutton, J. P. Mills, R. T. Bloch, J. D. Hooker, H. Yule, C. B. Clarke, Godwin Austin, H. D. Sankalia, H. C. Dasgupta and P. R. T. Gurdon¹, but the picture which emerges out of their researches, is neither graphic nor complete. Their accounts are more of descriptive nature than analytical. Moreover, several broken chains have been noticed in their accounts which need not only restoration but also fresh evaluation and interpretation. Further more, no systematic survey of the pre-historic relics and monuments of unknown antiquity of the aboriginals of North-East has been conducted so far, nor has any archaeological exploration been undertaken. However, in order to obtain a clearer picture of the subject reliance has been placed on the available archaeological Reports, Census Report, imperial records, indigenous sources, personal tour diary, contemporary accounts and other standard historical texts.

The duty of a historian is not only to investigate higher civilization but also the primitive civilization ; for, the latter constitutes the bedrock of the former. In historical reconstruction of the early history of mankind the sober method of research should follow.²

The master key to the investigation of primitive culture of primaeval antiquity is the monumental evidence of the Stone Age. The pre-historic remains and relics not only testify to the living condition of the people in different ecological settings, but also provide some clues for determining the stages

and extent of progress in the realm of civilisation. Voltaire had reasonably insisted on making enquiry into the various steps by which men passed from barbarism to civilization. These monuments also cast reflections to a considerable degree on the knowledge, beliefs, arts, technology, customs etc. of the primitive people of hoary past. The Megalithic structures of Asia, Europe, Africa and Australia are the legacy of the races of mysterious past.

These Megalithic monuments have served as a Museum of early history and culture.³ Prof. Nilsson in 1843 had affirmed that the antiquities of the human race of by-gone age are the "fragments of a progressive series of civilization"⁴. While adopting more or less the same line of enquiry Will Durant⁵ had observed that the surviving records of the Stone Age are highly impressive. The people of the Neolithic Age laid another foundation of civilization.

The term Megalithic⁶ are applied to structures or monuments of rudimentary character consisting of huge rough undressed stones as well as elaborately dressed stones of sophisticated kind popularly known as Menhirs, Dolmens, Cromlechs, Stone Circles, Stonehinge, etc.

The beliefs of the tribal people concerned in the doctrine of transmigration of soul or life after death and their socio-religious practices, ceremonies and customs constituted the basis and further promoted the growth of Megalithic cultures. The Megalithic monuments used to fulfil the three - fold functions, funerary, commemorative and religious.

The statement made by B. C. Allen, E. Gait, G. H. Allen and H. F. Howard⁷ that "Assam is somewhat destitute of archaeological remains" is not tenable. An archaeological characteristic of Assam of world-wide fame is its wealth of Megaliths comprising sepulchral monuments like cairns, dolmens, menhirs, cromiechs, upright stones, flat and horizontal stones, male stones, female stones and some stones depicting carving and designs on them.⁸

One of the most prominent and striking aspects of the history and culture of the Khasis, the Jaintias, the Nagas and the Cacharis is the age-old practice of erecting various kinds of monumental stones which are scattered generally on every ways in side. These are mysterious, solitary and clustered monuments of remote antiquity. These remarkable monuments abounding in this region are similar to that found

in Europe and western Asia. Some of them are puzzling and delightful for antiquarians. The megalithic stones were erected at different periods of history. But historically this practice can be traced back to pre-historic age.

We find traces of wide spread megalithic culture in the Khasi and Jaintia Hills. The tall upright stones, known as menhirs representing Mao Shinrang or male stones are always uneven numbers varying from three to nine. The highest one is placed in the centre and the lower one on each side. The highest pillar which is the centre-monolith is occasionally crowned with a circular disk or covered with a round flat stone and to right and left they gradually diminish. In front of each set of three stones is placed one flat horizontal stone called by the English antiquarian "Cromlech" which rests on three or four small upright stones. This represents Mao kynthai or female stones, sometimes five menhirs and two dolmens have been found. The dolmens associated with human remains erected by a clan to commemorate member of the clan represent Mothers. This is for commemorative purposes. Memorial stones of considerable significance were classified into two categories : (a) Stones erected by the family or Kur in accordance with the Khasi custom of ancestor worship, and (b) Stones which are erected by children in honour of the deceased parents. Both classes of stones are merely Cenotaphs or Masoleums of ancestors.

According to indigenous sources¹⁰ after cremation the charred bones were collected in an earthen pot and eventually placed in the common sepulchre of the clan. Bones were placed under the cover of flat stones. Large upright stone groups were erected in honour of the dead. The philosophy behind the practice of erecting commemorative stones was that their spirits will be gratified by these memorials and their souls will be in eternal peace without being affected by supernatural forces. The installation of memorial stones preceded the performance of dance and music. This practice was based on certain social and religious norms. The erection of monoliths was associated with sacrifices of oxes, pigs, etc. Edward Gait while corroborating the account in his Census Report¹¹ pointed out that similar monuments are found amongst the Hos, the Mundas, the Kiratas and the Naga tribes. Gurdon¹² found a striking similarity between these monuments and those of England, Brittany, Denmark and Scandinavia.

C. Von Furer Haimendorf¹³ has rightly observed that the Khasis and the Nagas alike erect single standing stone (menhirs) or alignments of stone in honour of the dead who are thereby encouraged to help their living kinsmen. The setting up of menhirs dolmens and stone circles links the Khasis and the Nagas with the Gonds of Bastar, the Mundas of Chotanagpur and Orissa tribes. The Khasis indeed approach more nearly to the dominant Megalithic custom of Peninsular India in that they collect periodically the bones of clan members and deposit them in a free standing cist as big as small house, built of enormous single slabs.

The Imperial records¹⁴ bear witness to the truth that some inscribed memorial stones were found at Mawphlang in 1918-19. The memorial stones at Laitlucote has been considered by the British antiquarians as the great work of archaeological interest. Several Megalithic monuments have been found near Cherra, Jowai, Nartiang and Laitlyngkote in pair menhirs or dolmen circles and other forms.

The eye-witness account of Lt. H. Yule¹⁵ who visited the Khasi and Jaintia hills between 1838 and 1844 reveals the truth that the tallest pillar was in the market place of Nartiang in the Jaintia hills. The biggest menhir which still stands there measured 26 feet in height. A flat table stone or cromlech near the village of Sailankot elevated five feet from the earth measured thirtytwo feet by 15 and two feet in thickness. In other instance the monuments is a square sarcophagus composed of four large slabs-resting on their edges and well fitted together and roofed in by a fifth placed horizontally. The sarcophagus is often found in the form of a large slab accurately circular resting on the heads of many little rough pillars closely planted together through whose chinks one may destroy certain earthen pots containing the ashes of a family. In Mausmai deep in the forest he saw great collection of such circular Cineraries so close that one may step from slab to slab for many yards. A simple Cairn or a pyramid some twenty feet in height as seen by him sometimes remind us of the common notion of the Tower of Babel or pyramid of Saocara in Egypt. He further observes that in Bell's Circassia a drawing of ancient monument existing in that country which is an exact representation of the thousand such in the Khasi Hills and nearly as exact a description of referring to the relics on the eastern bank of Jordan may be read in Irby and

Mangles's Syrian travellers.

J. H. Hutton¹⁶ while visiting the Jaintia Hills in 1925 saw some dolmens as reminiscence of Manipur. At Nartiang Bazar he saw single highest monolith twenty six and half feet long raised from the ground level to the top six feet to six inch in breadth and 2 ft. to 8 inch in thickness and enormous flat stones in the form of dolmens at its bases. The Nartiang Bazar is wonderful collection of manhirs or dolmens. Near Laitlyng he noticed dolmens in which bones of the dead were buried. This memorial stones represented the males in the right side and female to the left. He also witnessed quite a good number of menhirs and dolmens at Malynglang near Jawdaija and a stone circle like an Angami Tehuba Cromlech. Further near Mosniang he saw burial cist flanked by a menhir and broken dolmens.

Suniti Kumar Chatterjee¹⁷ also refers to this popular custom of the Austric Khasis.

The Mon-khmer speaking people of North-East no doubt made a distinctive cultural contribution to the evolution of the Megalithic culture.

Equally significant is the Megalithic culture of the Nagas. A good deal of varieties are to be observed among the Naga tribes in their use of Monoliths. Some are of considerable size and others massive set up from time immemorial for commemorating the death, raids, hunting, conceptional valour or prowess and other utilitarian and ceremonial purposes. The Angamis, the Aos, the Semas, the Lothas, the Rengmas and the Konyak Naga tribes erect the memorial stones of great architectural merit. The Angami Monoliths are without carving or ornamentation, whereas on the other hand the Lothas ornament their monoliths with rough designs. The Sema Nagas perpetuate the memory by shallow circles of flat stones met in the ground. The Kacha Nagas build similar circle for the same purpose. The Ao Nagas also used to erect upright stones (Menhirs) like the Dusums of Borneo and Tinguian of Philippines. The purpose of setting up stones by Rengma Nagas is purely commemorative like that of Madagascar. Dr. T. Bloch¹⁸ during his archaeological tour in the Naga Hills found striking similarity between 'V' shaped pillars and memorials used by the Naga tribes.

L. W. Shakespear¹⁹ presents a very authentic account of the Megalithic cultures of the Nagas. The Angamis and Mara-

mis have been in the habit of setting up huge stones right from the early days. The Nagas of Maram in Manipur territory set up in the past the largest and the most remarkable "Stonehenge". The gigantic Monoliths at Togwema has been referred to by him and by Hutton in 1923. The Konyak Naga erect small Monoliths for ceremonial purposes.

J. H. Hutton²⁰ suggests that the Angamis' Tehuba Cromlech bears resemblance to the stone circles of the Jaintias. The Angami Nagas always put the big end of the stone in the earth. The Kacha Nagas followed the Khasi plan and installed prominent large stones at Lakema. He also refers to carved stones at Kigwema in the Naga Hills associated with fertility symbols like that of Khonoma. J. P. Mills²¹ refers to stones of Kacha Naga village of peisa with a carved female figure associated with a cult of fertility. The popular tradition and the actual practice of erecting the monoliths point to a highly developed stone cultures of the Naga tribes.

Both commemorative and funeral stones roughly fall into three groups i.e. ossuary pillar, Dolmen stone circles and ritual stones. Memorial stones can be broadly classified into two categories - Quadrilateral and Vertical.²²

The stone monuments of the Naga tribes of Manipur consisting of Monoliths not as large as that of the Khasis and Jaintia were found either singly or arranged symmetrically in rows, avenues circle or ovals, cairns or heaps of stones, single smaller stones or flat stones. The huge stone Monoliths or "Y" shaped structures found in Mao and Maram areas really appear as architectural monuments. The sepulchral monument erected by some of the minor Kuki tribes in honour of rich women after her death are also interesting architectural objects.²³

Significantly enough, the Megalithic monuments at Salangthel near Moirang in Manipur engraved with the symbol of genital organs of female and some flat horizontal stones bearing the engravings of foot prints are of great architectural interest.²⁴

The hallowed monoliths of North Cachar Hills were used for depositing ashes of the dead as a proto-type of the Khasis. J. H. Hutton and J. P. Mills both noticed solid and hollow monoliths in North Cachar hills in 1929.

While comparing the pre-historic dolmens, cromlechs and other monuments of the Khasis and Nagas with Gadabas,

Bondus of Orissa and Gonds of Bastar and tribes of the Decan, Haimendorf²⁵ was not struck by any resemblance. More important are the differences in function and meaning of the monuments. The Megaliths of the tribal folks of today are with comparatively few exception, memorials connected with graves or burning ground. But those of pre-historic times are closely associated with graves.

One of the noteworthy features of the megalithic culture of North East India is that it represents a living tradition of entirely unknown antiquity, whereas the South Indian Megaliths came to an end in the first century A. D.

It is worthwhile to note that all these monuments of N. E. India were brought under the Ancient Monuments Preservation Act, VII of 1904 passed by Lord Curzon.²⁶

One of the curious features to be noted here is that these Neolithic stone Monuments are associated with the cult of fertility, ancestor worship, theory of sacrifice, and worship of Phallus-Linga and Yoni, later personified as the mother Goddess and Siva principles of Saktism. G. Bertrand has emphatically asserted that "the Khasi Monoliths comprising memorial stones, menhirs and dolmens like those of Western Europe, Northern Africa and Western Asia are doubtless the emblems of that phallic cult of standing stones which were so spread in ancient times. These monoliths in the shape of Linga found in India are associated with the worship of Siva".²⁷

One remarkable fact which has not yet been acknowledged by many competent authorities is that the tribal notion of life after death and idea of the plurality of souls gave a new line of speculation to the Vedic Aryans and Brahmanical thinkers who had no acquaintance with the doctrine before. Sir Mortimer Wheeler, a celebrated archaeologist has correctly stated that "The Buddhists, Jains and Hindus imitated free-standing structures in cutting their cave temples and monastries . . .".²⁸

It remains to be examined whether the megalithic culture of North East India represent Northern Black Polished (N.B.P) ware associated with Iron objects or painted Grey ware associated with copper or Bronze implements. Since the black and red ware associated with iron objects or other metals like copper and bronze like that of Central and Southern India have not been discovered in the megalithic burials of the North-East, it can be fairly admitted that this region had not reached the level of distinctive ware culture.

In North Eastern India the Khasis were the only tribes who acquired the knowledge of Iron ore. This is very puzzling question whether their megalithic monuments of the neolithic age was associated with iron object or copper. It can be fairly stated that they acquired the knowledge of iron in post Neolithic age. S K Chatterjee²⁹ attempted to prove that the Khasi or Mon-Khmer group of Austro-Asiatic were in the neolithic stage of culture and learned the use of copper and Iron. Lt. H. Yule³⁰ observed that the Khasi Iron ore is two thousand years old. But this is a plausible hypothesis not correct discovery. Pliny³¹ in his National History ascribes its antiquity to the first century A. D. The tradition also confirms the remote antiquity of the Iron technology of the Khasis. It can be positively affirmed that their megalithic culture began in the Neolithic Age but comparatively at later stage it became associated with the Copper, Iron phase of culture.

The questions relating to the origins and antiquities of the megalithic cultures still remain unsolved. The divergent views and many hypothetical theories have made the confusion worth confounded. The closer links and affinities of the tribal megaliths of N. E. India with those of the megalithic monuments of South-western coastal strip of India, South-East Asia, Philippines, Formosa, Megagascar, Africa, Iran, Mediterranean world and pacific world, Asia minor, Western Asia, France, Britain, Scandinavia and Denmark in respect of method and purpose, of course, stir our imagination. But they can never represent a single cultural phase as supposed by Mr. Peet. Prof. Panchanan Mitra suggested that there arose Indo-Erythraean culture complex and in the north-east srong culture stream came by sea-board which later passed over to another zone. This is a fanciful notion.³²

Dr. J. H. Hutton³³ while delivering a lecture in the Indian Museum at Calcutta in 1923 observed that its origin was from Indonesia and the Mon-Khmer speaking Khasi tribe or Australoid or Austro Asiatic or Pre-Mediterranean Khasis introduced this culture

S. C. Roy³⁴ and Haimendorf³⁵ are inclined to recognise that Megalithic builders were proto-Dravidians. A. H. Dani³⁶ dates back this culture to simply pre-historic age. He has made a futile attempt to associate this culture with the stone tools of Neolithic Age. It reached its highwater marks comparatively at later stage.

As a matter of fact, the Megalithic culture of the North-East is an essence of both indigenous and foreign elements. It would be absolutely wrong on our part to trace its origin and growth only under the external influence. The identity of custom and striking similarities between the various practices do not always necessarily hint at their common origin. The contemporary geographical factors and natural environments in the different countries conditions the evolution of the Megalithic culture in different ways. The antiquity of this culture may tentatively be ascribed to the Neolithic Age (7000-4000 B.C.). Thus pre-historic times of pre-Aryan period proved to be a cultural watershed in the early tribal history of N. E. India.

Haimendorf³⁷ as a protagonist of the theory of its foreign origin observed that "they belong essentially to South-Eastern Asia-Indonesia, Oceania, the Philippines, & Formosa". Whatever be the truth underlying this statement, it is almost certain that this culture was introduced in N. E. India by Austro-Asiatic immigrants (the Khasis) as clearly stated by M. Wheeler.³⁸

Notes & References

1. Wheeler, (1947, 147-310 ; 1968, 150-53) ; Haimendorf (1945, 73-86) ; Hutton (1926, 133, 333-46) ; Mills (1930, 34-35) ; Bloch, (Report on the Archaeological Tour in Assam, 1905) ; Hooker (1854, 66ff) ; Yule (1844, 617-18) ; Clarks (1874) ; Austen (1874 1-6) ; Sankalia (1962, 100-2) ; Dasgupta (1931, 1-96) ; Gurdon (1914, 145f ; 1904, 64-65) - all have dealt with the Megalithic cultures of North East India without solving the problems relating to their origins and antiquity.
2. Henry Maine strongly advocated the cause of sover research for proper understanding of the Primitive culture (Lowie, 1949, 423).
3. Tylor (1903, 38f, 61f) suggests that the megalithic structures of Asia minor, Egypt, Palestine, China, England, France, Algeria and indigenous tribes of India are of great antiquarian interest.
4. Prof. Nilsson emphasised the need of understanding the significance of the antiquities of the past (Ref. to Tylor, 1903, 61-62).

5. Durant (1954, 97f) has rightly pointed out that the Neolithic Age marked the second foundation of civilization.
6. The term Megalith is derived from the Greek words Megas i.e. great and lithos, i.e. stones. This term was "originally introduced by antiquarians to describe easily definable class of monuments in Western and Northern Europe.." (Ancient India, 1947-48 No. IV, p. 5)
7. (1879, 40) In both the valleys and hills of Assam large number of remains of archaeological interests have been discovered.
8. Journal of the Assam Research Society (J. R. A. S), April 1933, Vol. I pp 4-5 ; J. E. A. S. April 1939, Vol. VII, pp. 10-18.
9. Allen, 1905-8, 53-54, 124 ; Gurdon, 1904, 64-65 ; Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1879, Vol. VIII, 133-137 ; Yule, 1868, Calcutta Review, Vol. 274 ; K. L. Barua, 1939, 4-12, 35-40. All these sources throw considerable light on the Megaliths of the Khasis.
10. G. Costa (1937, Ch. XX, 63-72) deals with the customs of thirty Khasi Kings.
11. Gait (1891, 261)
12. Gurdon (1914, 145f) - some of his observations are subject to further verification.
13. Haimendorf (1945, 73-86). See his comparative analysis.
14. Pol. Dept. B. Progs Jan. 1919 N. 479-87 File o. III, M-15 of 1918. The Report is based on the Tour Diary of D. C. K & J Hills ; Letters Issued to Govt. Vol 35. 1867-68. Both these records are very important from archaeological point of view.
15. Yule (1844, 617-18) presents an exhaustive account of the subject. See also his *Calcutta Review*, 1868, Vol. XXXVIII, 274f.
16. Hutton (1926, 333-461) presents a trust worthy account of the Meghaliths of the Jaintias. I had the opportunity to see quite a good number of Megalithic monuments in Khasi and Jaintia Hills.
17. S. K. Chatterjee (1969, 37-38) makes an incidental reference to the megaliths of the Khasis.
18. Bloch (1905, Report on the Archaeological Tour in Assam) presents a very valuable and reliable account. See also *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, 1908, 586.
19. L. W. Shakespear (1929, 260-62) extensively traversed thr-

- ough the Hills of the North East and obtained the first hand information of the subject. See also *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* (J. R. A. I) 1965, Vol. 95, 28.
20. Hutton (1926, 333-46) ; See also his account in J. R. A. I. LVI, 71f. and *Man in India*, 1926, 74.
 21. Mills (1930, *Man in India*, 34-35).
 22. Barih (1970 67-68) has made a very scientific analysis of the subject.
 23. Hodson (1974 86ff) gives a clear description of the Megaliths of the Naga tribes of Manipur. See also *Geographical Society* 1904, 31-32 and *Journal of the Society of Arts*, Vol. LXXX, 559.
 24. I visited this site in June, 1985.
 25. Haimendorf (1945, 73-86) has drawn his conclusion on the basis of a comparative study of the subject.
 26. Proceedings of the Hon'ble Lt. Governor of Eastern Bengal and Assam, June 1910, Arch. Deptt.
 27. G. P. Singh (1981, 25-26) ; Bertrand (1958, 134-35). The historical authenticity of the statement has been carefully examined.
 28. Wheeler (1968, 158-59) ; G. P. Singh (1921, 25), The Contribution of the tribal people to the evolution of the philosophical thoughts of the Hindus, Buddhists and Jains has not yet received the serious attention of the scholars.
 29. S. K. Chatterjee (1969, 37).
 30. Yule (*Calcutta Review* 1868, Vol XXXVIII, 278). See also *Imperial Gazetteer of India* Vol. VI, 73 ; Vol. XV, 262-63 ; U Nongpynim, *Naiwang* Nov. 1937, 3-5 ; U Khasi Mynta, *Risaw* Oct. 1902 ; J. A. S. B. 1832, Vol. I, 150ff ; Hooker (1854, Vol. II 66ff) Yule, J. A. S. B., 1842, Vol. XI, 853. All these sources are important for the detailed study of the knowledge of the Khasis about Iron Technology.
 31. Taylor (J. A. S. B. 1847, Vol. I 68-69, 73). On the authority of Pliny he tried to prove that the Khasi iron is not earlier than the 1st century A. D.
 32. For detailed study see K. L. Barua, 1939, J. A. R. S. Vol.-VIII, April, 1939, No. I, 1-18 ; *Ibid*, July 1939, 35-40.
 33. Cf. Bagchi (1929, *Introd.* XVII, XVIII). He has focused on this matter on the basis of the extracts of J. H Hutton's speech.
 34. Barua (J. A. R. S. July 1939, 35) has discussed the views of various scholars without striking any balance bet-

- ween them. Nor has he drawn any plausible conclusion.
35. Haimendorf (1953, New aspects of the Dravidian problem, Tamil culture -II)
 36. Dani (1960, 41) has mainly discussed the problems associated with Neolithic Stone tools, not the Megaliths.
 37. Haimendorf (1945, 73-86).
 38. Wheeler (1968, 150). Both Haimendorf and Wheeler, no doubt made sincere attempt to understand the problems associated with the subject, but some of the ideas as presented by them need further investigation.

Bibliography

- | | |
|---|---|
| Allen, B. C. 1905-8 | : <i>Assam District Gazetteer</i> , Vol X. |
| Allen, B. C., Gait, E. A.,
Allen, H. H. & Howard,
H.F. 1879 | : <i>Gazetteer of Bengal and North-East India.</i> |
| Austen, G. 1874 | : <i>Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal</i> , Vol. Xlii, Pt. 1. |
| Barua, K. L. 1939 | : <i>Journal of the Assam Research Society</i> , April, Vol. Vii, July, Vol. Vii. N. 2. |
| Bagchi, P. C. 1929 | : <i>Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidians in India</i> , Calcutta. |
| Bareh, H. 1970 | : <i>Nagaland District Gazetteer.</i> |
| Bertrand, G. 1958 | : <i>Secret Land Where Women Reign</i> , London. |
| Bloch, T. 1905 | : <i>Report on Archaeological Tour in Assam.</i> |
| Chatterjee, S. K. 1969 | : <i>Indo-Aryan and Hindi</i> , Calcutta. |
| Costa, G. 1937 | : <i>Ka Riti Jong Ka Riti Laiphew Syiem</i> , Shillong. |
| Dani, A. H. 1960 | : <i>Pre-History and Proto History of Eastern India</i> , Calcutta. |
| Dasgupta, H. C. 1931 | : <i>Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal</i> , Vol. XXVII. |
| Durant, Will, 1954 | : <i>The Story of Civilization, Pt. I, Our Oriental Heritage</i> , Newyork. |
| Gait, E. A. 1891 | : <i>Census of India, Assam Census Report</i> , Vol. 1. |
| Gurdon, P. R. T. 1914 | : <i>The Khasis</i> , London. |
| 1904 | : "Notes on the Khasis, Syntengs |

- and allied tribes inhabiting the Khasi and Jaintia Hills Dist. in Assam," Cf. *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. Lxxiii, Pt. iii, (Calcutta, 1905).
- Haimendorf, C. V. F. 1945 : "The Problem of Megalithic Cultures in the Middle India," Cf *Man in India*, Vol. xv.
- Hooker, J. D. 1854 : *Himalayan Journals*. vol 11 London.
- Hutton, J. H. 1922 : "The meaning and method of the Erection of Monoliths by the Naga tribes". Cf. *The Journal of the Roy. Anthropological Inst.* LII.
- 1926 : "Some Megalithic work in the Jaintia Hills" *Journal & Proceed. of the Asiatic Society of the Bengal*, vol.-xxII (Calcutta. 1928).
- 1926 : "The use of stones in the Naga Hills", *The Journal of the Roy. Anthropol. Institute*, Lvl.
- 1926 : *Man in India*, Ranchi
- Hudson, T. C. 1974 : *The Naga Tribes of Manipur*.
- Lowie, R. H. 1949 : *Primitive Society*, London.
- Mills, J. P. 1980 : *Man in India*, Ranchi.
- Shakespeare, L. W. 1929 : *History of the Assam Rifles*, London.
- Singh, G. P. 1981 : "The Genesis and Growth of of Tribal Culture and Civilization in North East India (from pre-historic times to the 12th fcentury A. D.", *Journal of the Institute of Social Research*, vol. I No. 1 Shillong.
- 1980-81 : *The Quarterly Review of Historical Studies*, vol. xx, no. 4, Calcutta.
- Sankalia, H. D. 1962 . *Indian Archaeology Today*, Bombay;
- Tylor, E.B. 1903 . *Primitive Culture*, vol. 1, London.
- Yule, H. 1844 . "Notes on the Khasi Hills and people, *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, vol xiii, pt. 2 Nos. 151-6.
- 1868 : *Calcutta Review* Vol. xxxviii.
- Wheeler, M. 1968 : *Early India and Pakistan*, London.
- 1947 : *Ancient India (Bulletin of the Archaeological Survey of India, No.4.)*