https://www.researchgate.net/publication/
275210819_The_status_of_research_on_South_Indian_foragers

Peter M. Gardner

THE STATUS OF RESEARCH ON SOUTH INDIAN HUNTER-GATHERERS

Great strides have been made in anthropological study of South Indian hunter-gatherers in the 74 years since Fürer-Haimendorfbegan his pioneer research. Eight of their cultures have been studied professionally in sufficient detail that it is finally possible to take stock of similarities and differences amongthem.

Before I identify which cultures they are, let me clarify how I have approached the spelling oftheir names. First, I adopted, with one modification, the authoritative spellings of linguist P. S. Nair (1983). He employs double letters to indicate long vowelsor geminate consonants and /c/ to represent the sound written "ch" in English. Second, for clarity as well as ease of printing, I deviate from Nair in using upper case letters (T, D, N, L, and R), in place of subscript dots, to distinguish medial and final retroflex consonants from other consonants. Third, I follow southern Dravidian conventionsin cases where tribal names end with /-n/ and /-r/, with /-n/ being used to mark singular nouns and their adjectives and /-r/ being used to indicate either plurality or respect. There should be no needto emphasize the undesirable social and political implications of our usingnon-respectful forms.

From south to north, the cultures that will be taken up here arethose of the MalapaNDaaram, PaLiyar, KaaDar, Coolakkaar[1] (or Coolanaayakkar), KaaTTunaayakkar (or Naayakkar[2]), Jeen KuRumbaandJeen KuRuba (in Tamil Nadu and Karnataka respectively), YaanaaDi, and Cencu (see sketch map in Gardner 2013d). All are relatively free of even seasonal food production traditionally (unlike IruLa, etc.). The oneculture among these that has not been closely studied or restudiedin the last 60 years is that of KaaDar, yet data on them are adequate to justify their considerationhere.

I prefer using each people's own name for themselves, if possible, rather than either an exonym or their official designation in government records. However, as there are inconsistencies in anthropological literature as to how the peoples *do* label themselves, it is impossible to settle all disagreementsin this brief review. Where choices are shown in the list above, I will use the

PETER M. GARDNER, Emeritus Professor, Dept. of Anthropology, 106 Swallow Hall, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211, USA, *E-mail: gardnerp@missouri.edu*

termsmentioned first. In the case of Coolakkaar, I havefollowed the leadofBhanu who elicited this name from them (1992: 31), while Mathur (1977: 142-3)and Naveh (2007: 30-1) got divergent or ambiguous responses. Anthropologists have long noted cultural similarity of Jeen KuRumbaand KaaTTunaayakkar (e.g., Aiyappan 1948: 101; Bird 1982: 47; Bird-David 1989: 254-5; Demmer 1997: 170; Naveh 2007: 23), but in the two peoples' own minds and officially they appear to have separate identities. As peripheral peoples often label themselvesin terms of what they take to be expectations of outsiders, further study of names is needed.

Subsistence

It is inadequate to sum up Dravidian hunter-gatherer subsistence by saying that theydig wild *Dioscorea* yams, hunt small game, collect honey, and fish. We must also be clear about gender participation. Depending on circumstances, both sexes may gather yams (Fürer-Haimendorf 1943: 61-2; Bhowmick 1992: 96; Ehrenfels 1952: 28; Gardner 1972: 412-4; 1993: 117; Morris 1982: 100-1; Bird-David 1987: 156; Bhanu 1989: 116, 145; Demmer 1996: 131; Rao 2002: 44) and bothmay also be active in hunts (Bhowmick 1992: 4; Raghaviah 1962: 80; Reddy 1972: 13; Morris 1982: 103; Bhanu 1992: 40; Gardner 1993: 123-4) even for large deer (Gardner 1993: 123). It has become clear that close participant observation is the key to learning about some of the subtleties in subsistence practices, as the people seldom discuss them in detail.

We have found that, from culture to culture, people differ in what they consume and how they procure it, in the food taboos they follow, and in their ways of distributing food within their groups. Food resources vary with latitude, altitude, the local seasonality and magnitude of rainfall, botanic zones, presence of tribal and other neighbors, and so on—variables that tend to be interrelated. Notably, even within camps diet varies considerably (Ehrenfels 1952: 119-23; Morris 1982: 71). Tools and techniques tend to be functions of available materials, challenges of local flora and fauna, and the impact of culture contact, especially.It is apparent that we can understand presence or absence of some food taboos in terms of acculturation. Finally, it will be shown that ways of distributing food are culturally specific.

To give a sense of the range of their foods and tools, let me begin by expanding the roster of their similarities and differences that Ipresented at the 10th Conference on Hunting and Gathering Societies (Gardner 2013d). When studied, MalapaNDaaram were unusual in avoidingwild pork, possibly due tocenturies of dealing with Muslim traders along the Punaluur Pass through their range (Morris 1982: 71, 94), and one of their four staple foods was cycad nuts (Morris 1982: 98-9). They hunted with muzzle-loaders, sticks, and dogs (*ibid*. 69-80). PaLiyarin three ranges, although getting the region's ubiquitous 'bill hook' knives (*arivaaL*) from forest produce contractors,

possessed neither guns nor metal-tipped digging sticks in 1962-64. A few had metal spearheads, others hunted with digging sticks, stones, bill hooks, or deadfalls. PaLiyar and KaaDar accessed cliff honey using ladders ofvine loopchains, notthe usual wood or bamboo (AnanthakrishnaIyer 1909: I 16; Gardner 1993: 127; Selvakumar 2007: 385). KaaDar hunted with digging sticks or bill hooks (Ehrenfels 1952: 27, 36) and once consumed bamboo seed, and python (Thurston and Rangachari 1909: III 17). MalapaNDaaram, PaLiyar, and KaaDarexploited pith of sago palm or Wight's sago palm, PaLiyar doing so as an emergency food source when drought made yam digging difficult (Morris 1982: 99; Gardner 1993: 129; Thurston and Rangachari 1909: III 17-8). The Coolakkaar food quest included net hunting of monkeys, raiding bird coloniesfor chicks, and digging pitfalls for gaur bison (Bhanu 1989: 116-20). While KaaTTunaayakkar hunted small game with traps (Naveh 2007: 87-95), Jeen KuRumba and Yaanaa Diused slings (Demmer1996: 132; Raghaviah 1962: 96). YaanaaDi, who dwelt near the coast in open country having meager yams or game, raided molerats' grain stores, used diverse fishing gear, and snared waterfowl (Raghaviah 1962: 84-5, 88-9; Kumar 1995: 45-6; Rao 2002: 48-52). The few remaining YaanaaDiwho lived in dry but forested hillsconsumed palm pith and cycad nuts, and, although they had a taboo against eating even black langur, like Cencu they hunted deer and pigs with bamboo bows, netted small game, and consumed flowers (Fürer-Haimendorf 1943: 63-4; Raghaviah 1962: 91-6; Reddy 1972: 26).

It clearly makes a huge difference whether specific groups liveon west faces of the ranges in dense tropical forest that is wet enough much of the year to be likened to rain forest (Morris 1982: 27; Bhanu 1989: 16), in open, dry, thorny forest on the eastern slopes of the hills, somewhere in between,or in scrub vegetation and sand dunes near the Bay of Bengal (Rao 2002: 28). And fauna, of course, varywith flora.

As for distribution of taboos, just asMalapaNDaaramhave learned to avoid pork, all but Coolakkaar go along with Hindu avoidance of beef. Anomalous bison huntingby Coolakkaarmaybe a function of their relative isolation inforest that is dense and dangerous enough for most outsiders to be unaware of their diet. Finally, people in only two cultures regularly consume brown macaques or the Hanuman Langur, these being Coolakkaar—whose isolation was just described, and Cencu—who stood their own grounduntil the early 20th century in contact situations (Bhanu 1989: 118; Fürer-Haimendorf 1943: 14). All others avoidflesh of brown monkeys, either because they resemble humans (e.g., Ehrenfels 1952: 181) orbecauseforest people mayhave become aware of Hindu reverence for Hanuman.

Principles behind portioning out hunted meat vary in five of the cultures. I described them recently thus (Gardner 2013a: 80):

> [PaLiyan] hunt participants get precisely identical portions and types of meat, with double the amount going to whoever struck a dangerous animal first

> (Gardner 1993:124). [MalapaNDaaram] distribute equal amounts to each family in the camp (Morris 1982:103-4). [KaaTTunaayakkar] do the same, but with adjustment for family size (Bird-David 1990:192). All [Cencu] families get equal shares, but with extra going to the hunter and those who help him carry in the meat (Fürer-Haimendorf 1943: 68-9). And [Coolakkaar] divide meat evenly, but with choice cuts going to the hunter or the equipment owner, with all vegetable food distributed thus too, and—once it has been cooked—with each household dispensing its portion of food evenly to all other families (Bhanu 1992:40-3).

These substantially different ways of handing out a hunter's take reveal thatwe are inconsistent in what we mean by 'sharing' in our 'hunting-as-sharing' theories. After all, the *Oxford English Dictionary*tells us that 'share'can refer to (a) a due, proper, [i.e., entitled] amount, (b) an equal portion, (c) a joint possession, (d) a gift from another person's portion, and so on. Woodburn also contends that we use the word 'share' with culturally inappropriate 'preconceptions' (1998: 61) and Bird-David agrees about this (2008: 535).An effective way we could deal with these difficulties might be to employ the word 'distributing' in its place, for it is semantically simpler and far less laden with Westerners' social notions.

How old is this mode of subsistence in India? Despite persistence in India of a folk theory thatthe region's foragers are runaways who took up forest life in historic times, South Indian foragers have complex, well-rounded diets and theyuse subsistence tools and techniques well suited to their respective environments. It is not far fetched to interpret these as signs ofrelatively mature, long-term ecological adaptations *in situ* (e.g., Gardner 1993: 131-4). In addition, DNA researchers offerevidence they deem statistically 'significant,' that Jeen KuRumba, KaaTTunaayakkar, KaaDar, and 12 other South Indian tribal populations, descend from a paternal lineage long separate from that of the surrounding peoples (Cordaux, Aunger, *et al* 2004: 231-2; Cordaux 2004).

Social Structure

While South Indian hunter-gatherers may differ greatly from their settled neighbors in two aspects of social structure, namely kinship and marriage, comparison reveals that they do share a great deal with one another.

Most of us who study them went into the field knowing basic essentials of Dravidian kinship. It did not take us long to discover that patterns of kin term usage differed between the forest and plains. Adjacent plains peoplesdifferentiate systematically between kin and affine as defined lineally, between generations, and between senior and junior siblings in ego's own and ego's parents' generations. As Bird-David has cautioned us, [KaaTTunaayakkan] usage is 'sometimes in stark contradiction with the logic of the Dravidian . . . system' (1995: 73). What is more, in both reference and address, [KaaTTunaayakkar] refrain from using kin terms in logical accord

with genealogically traceable relationships, employing the terms only for individuals with whom they have ongoing personal relationships (1995: 72-4). This is a major insight most of us have yet to appreciate fully.

Kin vs. affine: In ego's generation, instead of using an affinal term for sibling's spouse or spouse's sibling,MalapaNDaaram men may call BW (brother's wife)'sister' and women may call ZH (sister's husband)'brother' (Morris 1982: 120) and KaaTTunaayakkan husband and wife may adopt each other's term for their partner's sibling (Bird-David 1994: 592). Some PaLiyar call cross-cousins'sibling,' for example, 50% call MBS 'brother' (Gardner 2000b: 113-4, 116, 244 n7). In the first ascending generation, a similar pattern is evident: KaaDar use one and the same term for FZ° and MZ° (Ehrenfels 1952: 124) and Cencuconsider both parents' siblings to be kin (Fürer-Haimendorf 1943: 108; Ivanov 2011: 28 n9). Inthe first descending generation, KaaTTunaayakkarmay call all children in the group 'son' or 'daughter' (Bird 1982: 50; 1994: 592). These are not random deviations from Dravidian kinship. There is a discernable pattern in two senses: first, Dravidian affinal terms tend to be avoided for various relatives; and second, most of these deviations are in the direction of using generational kin terminology. These would both be consistent with theirbilocal residence and bilateral descent (Murdock 1949). Two ethnographers sum the situation up thus: KaaTTunaayakkar 'stretch' terms 'to incorporate as kin anybody within the local community' (Bird-David 1999c: 259) and PaLiyar restrict affinal terms to a 'fuzzy set' of very close relatives, such as one's spouse's sibling and sibling's spouse (Gardner 2000b: 113-7). Clearly, South Indian foragers are rejectingthefundamentalDravidian kin/affine distinction between 'blood' relatives and those related solely through marriage.

Generations: Instead of terms always being restricted to one generation: YaanaaDi MBS who is older than ego may, like MB, be referred to as*maama* (Rao 2002: 224) andPaLiyan WMM may, like WM or FZ, be referred to as*attai* (Gardner 1972:427).

Seniority: Morris tells us that MalapaNDaaram tend to call brothers *aaNgaLa* and sisters*peNgaLa*, using general terms that disregard seniority (1982: 118, 184) and PaLiyaron occasion are heard referring to all siblings as elders (Gardner 2000b: 113). This would be especially baffling to their seniority-conscious neighbors. I know for instance a 65-year-old Tamil man who, in deference, will not smoke a cigarette in front of his 67-year-old brother.

These deviations from all three principles of Dravidian kin terminology suggest that Dravidian terms have at one time been borrowed (Fürer-Haimendorf 1943: 114; Gardner 1969: 156; 1988: 99-100; Misra 1969: 210). In other words, the foragers look as if they had quite another kind ofkin terminology in the past. According to Murdock's comparative study of kinship (1949), generational terms would be consistent with their mainly bilocal

residence (Fürer-Haimendorf 1943: 107; Gardner 1988: 94; 2000b: 103; Bhowmick 1992: 168-9; Morris 1982: 139-42, 164-5; Rao 2002: 95) and with the bilateral descent evident in most of the cultures (Bird-David 1989: 279; Ehrenfels 1952: 133, 149-50, 274; Gardner 1969: 165-7; Morris 1982: 162, 167). YaanaaDi may have both lineal descent groups and 'bilateral kindreds'today, but the latter are said to be of greater importance (Rao 2002: 81-3, 91-3, 226). Despite havingpatrilineages, Cencuare bilocal in their residence, like all the others (Fürer-Haimendorf 1943: 87, 107, 282-3), leaving borrowing as the only plausible explanation for their disharmonious descent groups.

Another aspect of social structure we have reported is fondness and caringbetween brother and sister (Fürer-Haimendorf 1943: 92-3, 203-4; Rao 2002: 137; Gardner 2000b: 114) anda corresponding many-sided relationship between brothers-in-law as well. The latter can be seen in trusting assistance in honey collecting (Fürer-Haimendorf 1943: 65, 115, 282, 291; Ehrenfels 1952: 34; Gardner 2000b: 113-6; Morris 1982: 182-4), in likelihood thattheyreside in the same gathering camps (Morris 1982: 157; Demmer 1997: 173-5), and in play, joking,and general social association (Gardner 1972: 424, 428-9; 2000b: 114, 116; Raghaviah 1962: 188). Louis Dumont was right, half a century ago when he insisted that the link between PaLiyan brothers-in-law warranted structural analysis (1964), but we surely need to reexamine the brother-sister relationship at the same time.

In conclusion, except for what almost have to be borrowedCencu lineages, broad similarities are evident in several aspects ofthe foragers' kinship.

Five characteristics of marriage deserve mention. First, weddings are seldom performed and, because property poses no complications,separations entail little more than one party walking out (Morris 1982: 111-2, 137; Fürer-Haimendorf 1960: 49; Gardner 2009: 49; Ehrenfels 1952: 72, 74, 78, etc.; Bird-David 1987: 157; 1989: 272, 277; Demmer 1996: 191; Raghaviah 1962: 142; Fürer-Haimendorf 1943: 140). Coolakkaar, appropriately,refer to their marital unions as 'cohabitation' (Bhanu 1989: 160) and elopement without ceremony is common amongst Jeen KuRuba (Misra 1969: 212) and others.

Second, big age differences between spouses are common. In 29 well-documented PaLiyan couples, if males are senior, they average being 15.4 years older and, if females are senior, they average being 13.6 years older (Gardner 2000b: 106). This is not what we once called 'gerontogamy' because, amongst PaLiyar, the senior party might be only 25 to 40 and the distinctive feature is actually immaturity of the other. Twelve percent of 153 PaLiyan adults' unions arepedogamous, 13 with immature girls and 5 with boys (Gardner 1972: 419; 2000b: 105-8; 2009: 50); yet others are with mere youths. Such pedogamy is found in five additional cultures(Morris 1982: 143; Fürer-Haimendorf 1960: 49; Ehrenfels 1952: 89, 90, 94, 96, 111; Bhanu 1989: 55-6, 90, 93; Misra 1970: 82; Fürer-Haimendorf 1943: 137, 140-1; Ivanov 2013).

Third, plural marriage is common, polygynyespecially. Polyandry occurs occasionally in five of the cultures, and I documented one durablePaLiyanarrangement structured thus, H=W=H=W,in which discussion by others revealed that the polyandrous woman's children by both men were considered to be born of marriage (Morris 1982: 127; Gardner 2000b: 108-11; Ehrenfels 1952: 92; Bhanu 1989: 93; Raghaviah 1962: 142; Fürer-Haimendorf 1943: 45, 142).

Fourth, extremely close marriages occur. We have documented the following for PaLiyar, MalapaNDaaram, and YaanaaDi, following the death or separation of linking individuals:WD=MH (Gardner 2009: 52; Fürer-Haimendorf 1960: 49); HS=FW (Gardner 2009: 52; Rao 2002: 153); FZ=BS (Gardner 2009: 51-2); FD=FS, BD=FB (Fürer-Haimendorf 1960: 49-50); and BW=HB, DHM=SWF (Rao 2002: 152-3). Plains peoplesview all of these particular unions as incestuous, beside which some of them are in violation of Dravidian kinship as well (Morris 1982: 110, 130-4; Fürer-Haimendorf 1960: 49; Gardner 1969: 156; Bhanu 1989: 13).

Finally, 18% of PaLiyan marriages are with 'parallel kin,' some of these being distant, and others being true parallel cousins (Gardner 1988: 100; see alsoEhrenfels 1952: 135;Fürer-Haimendorf 1960: 49; Morris 1982: 124). Such unions are all proscribed in Dravidian kinship (Dumont 1953).[3]

It should be recognized that marriage with the immature and with close kin (including parallel kin)are likely to be partial outcomes of South Indian foragers having extremely limited marriage opportunities when they live in small, scattered groups. Some MalapaNDaaram offered this very explanation (Fürer-Haimendorf 1960: 50). Yet, PaLiyan adults of both sexes told me thatpedogamous unions are especially durable (Gardner 2009: 50-1). Even though I know of several cases in which youngsters have walked out when a seeming adoptive parent made the move to become a spouse, my data tend to bear out the claimed durability of such unions, once they have begun.

As early as a century ago, forestry officials began attempts to create stable 'settlements' for some of the foragers; then, from the late 1940s onward, tribal welfare and development officers renewed such efforts (see especially Morris 1976). The smaller, relatively mobile 'camps' or 'bands'—seldom made up of more than half a dozen households and with ever changing membership––show us what groups may have looked like previously. The artificially large, recent settlements should not, of course, be averaged in with these camps if we wish to talk about traditional group size. Particularly good accounts of camp size and composition are provided by Morris (1982: 169-73) and Demmer (1996: 144-6; 1997: 173-6), but see also Fürer-Haimendorf (1943: 47-8, 331-65; 1960: 48) and Bhanu (1989). They most often center on brother-sister or brother-in-law relationships, the main alternatives being groups built around sisters, father and adult son, or paternal uncle and adult nephew, etc. Although

actual brothers may co-reside in big, recent settlements, they are rarely found in the same camp—we see that in only 3 out of 23 camps for MalapaNDaaram (Morris 1982) and in 2 out of 25 camps for Jeen KuRumba (Demmer 1997). Piecemeal data on camps in the other South Indian cultures tend to be consistent with this. Morris appears to have been the first among us (at least for South India) to describe structuring of foraging camps around brothers-in-law (1982: 157).[4] While such South Indian camps had customary territories, they did not consider that they 'owned' the land and its resources. And, depending on seasonal weather and resources, wildlife conditions, and intrusions by outsiders, they camped in caves and rock shelters, small huts, or in the open (e.g. Annakaamu 1961: 18; Gardner 1972: 415; 2006: 25, 64-5; Morris 1982: 66; Bhanu 1989).

Social Values and Resolution of Conflict

Despite Bhanu's portrait of Coolakkaar having leaders with privileges and 'supreme authority' (1989: 7, 50, 123, 150) and women who 'contribute the minimum towards the economy' (1989: 147), more balanced, egalitarian social relations are well documented for most of the other cultures(Fürer-Haimendorf 1943; Gardner 1966: 393; Morris 1982: 158; Bird-David 1999: 259; Ivanov 2013). But I did see evidence that gender and age inequality can develop rapidly amongst those having the greatest contact with outsiders. Males were given distinct and wholly new priority amongst settled PaLiyar I revisited 14 years after my initial study. For instance, at a feast to welcome me back, the very same women who I had seen earlier feasting together with their husbands, began eating only after their husbands had finished (Gardner 1988: 98-9, 105; 2000b: 199-201). Nevertheless, claims that the Cencu and YaanaaDi now have 'patriarchy' (Turin 1999: 254; Rao2002: 127) reveal use of eitheroutdated terminology or great overstatement.

Bands are likely to have an individual or two who is sufficiently skilled in humor or quiet diplomacy to be able to step forward and distract or soothe agitated people (Gardner 1999: 263). Some PaLiyar refer to sucha voluntary male or female conciliator as a*talaivan* (literally 'head person').[5] To explain this use of the term, one PaLiyan quipped, they 'have good heads.' A far more plausible explanation is thatthe termderives from the talk of outsiders—who take leadership to be natural and universal. Jeen KuRuba had 'no concept of a chief' (Misra 2003: 32), yet told Misra they had a headman while disagreeing as to who held the position and what that person did. Misra thought they 'might have taken the term from the neighboring people but have not been able to fit it in their own system' (1969: 206). Morris thinks MalapaNDaaram, too,borrowed the term 'headman' from neighbors (1999: 267).In the 19th century, the Maharaja of Cochin appointed a KaaDar administrator---—a post soon discontinued (Ehrenfels 1952: 74). Later officials appointed male MalapaNDaaram, KaaDar, YaanaaDi, and Cencuas leaders in hopes that they

would‘control’ their own communities (Morris 1982: 158; Ehrenfels 1952: 75; Raghaviah 1962: 128; Fürer-Haimendorf 1943: 121). It might have been predicted though, that control of others is such an alien concept for the foragersthat such moves had no possibility of succeeding. What some of us have seen subsequently is astute forestry officers and contractors’ agents asking socially skilled foragers to coax their fellows into joining a work party to extract forest produce (Gardner 2000b: 93; Morris 1982: 158-9). Given the requisite humility, diplomacy, or clowning, the appointed individuals can be quite effective. Because most such foremen disclaim possessing any real power, prerogatives, or right to the role (Fürer-Haimendorf 1990: 27; Gardner 2000: 64, 93), for us to refer to them as‘headmen’is greatly misleading.

How can we understand the anomalous Coolakkaar referred to above? Bhanu, himself,suggested that, after bartering forest goods began to dominate their economy, senior males began to assume authority over their small groups (1989: 9-10, 50, 57-8, 62, 154-5, 162). The work of others may help clarify our understanding of this. Naveh, based on his own research with Coolakkaar,followed up on what Bhanu had written, but he got the impression that a headman was *mainly* prominent in matters having to do with trade. He proposed, too, thatCoolakkaar focus on trade created small, personally owned exploitation areas, like those Leacock had reconstructed for 18th century Algonquins (2007: 231, 244). Morris, 10 years earlier (1977: 225), had noted the possible applicability to South India of an analysis of the impact of barter on South American Mundurucu and North AmericanAlgonquins by Murphy and Steward (1956)—their paper beingbased on earlier studies by Leacock (1954) and Steward (1936). Perhaps male Coolakkaar going out alone from their home territoriesto trade forest products, appeared to have ownership and generalized authority,whereas women, as non-participants, might then have come tolook more and more as if they led dependent lives. Although data are fragmentary, KaaDar women appear to have been idled by similar processes (Ehrenfels 1952: 31), bolstering Bhanu’s interpretation of causes and effects.

To summarize my recent book chapter that compares six of the cultures (Gardner 2013b), self-restraint and withdrawal are the twomain means for both warding off conflict and avoiding its escalation in these egalitarian systems (Fürer-Haimendorf 1943: 172; 1960: 48; Raghaviah 1962: 171-7, 224; Rao 2002: 95; Bird-David 1995: 79; AnanthakrishnaIyer 1909: I 21; Ehrenfels 1952: passim; Gardner 1969: 157; 2000a: 223; 2004: 65; Norström 2003: 130, 193-4, 222, 224; Morris 1982: 113, 129, 175). The same is true of Jeen KuRuba (Misra 1969: 215). But, I must emphasize that PaLiyan withdrawal is, in most cases, temporary (Gardner 1972: 432; 1985: 414), possibly only for ‘minutes, months, or as long as it takes for the threat to subside or for their own anger to dissipate’ (Gardner 2013b: 301). It seldom ever leads to the “fragmentation” then integration into neighboring groups that Norström imagines me to mean (2014).

While there is very little variation among these cultures, violence and murderdid nonetheless erupt when Cencu in Kurnool were herded into closely supervised settlements a century ago, thenprevented from moving away from conflicts—as had once been theirtradition (Fürer-Haimendorf 1943: 312, 318). This extraordinary exception only emphasizes that our South Indian foragers, by comparison with foragers elsewhere, 'stand out . . . for the extreme effectiveness with which they manage conflict' (Gardner 2013b: 311).

Knowledge, Religion, Medicine and Art

PaLiyar deny strongly that anyone has specialized knowledge. There is also an unspoken principle that all but frail elders and the seriously ill should be self-reliant after early childhood (Gardner 1972: 419; 2000b: 89) and learning is thought of the same way. Children are expected tolearn on their own, by watching and experimenting. As Naveh's careful study shows, a child's 'authoritative way of knowing' is 'direct, first-hand knowing . . . from . . . actual engagement' (2007: 86-7; see also 87-93 and note his paper in this volume). This kind of individualized 'social learning' is found in most South Indian foraging cultures (Fürer-Haimendorf 1943: 127-31, 237; Bird-David 1983: 67-8; 2005a: 96; Gardner 1966; 2000b: 178-9; Norström 2003: 218-20; Morris 1982: 146-7). What is more, Ngatatjara, Aka, Gwich'in, and Dehcho Dene foragers elsewhere acquire knowledge this way as well (Gould 1968: 48; 1969: 85-90; Hewlett and Cavalli-Sforza 1986: 929; Hewlett 1991: 37; Nelson 1973: 9-10; Christian and Gardner 1977: 118-21, 290-3, 397), one outcome being unexpectedly variable terminology from person to person (Gardner 1966; 1976). For instance, when we paused for a break during a day I spent foraging with a long-married PaLiyan couple and the cousin of one of them, I asked the name of a healthy bush that I knew provided one of their five best hardwoods for making digging sticks. Examining its leaves and bark carefully, they

> gave me three different names for the bush and argued [amiably] among themselves over the name for several minutes because the alternatives were not synonymous. Finally, one of them laughed, turned to me, and said, 'Well, we all know how to use it!' (Gardner 1966: 397).

Three points have to be made about differences in religion and the first one, concerning the relationship between shamans and deities or spirits, is long overdue. There are two broad types of shamanism, in one of which visiting deities or spirits possess and speak through shamans. This is what we find in most South Indian foraging cultures. In the other type of shamanism,the shaman is an interlocutor whose spirit travels to the realm of the gods and spirits in order to deal with human problems. This is characteristic of only Jeen KuRumba and YaanaaDi, but it is what is found amongst the Onge, some Arctic peoples such as Inuit, and many Native Americans(Demmer 2007: 34; Rao 1983: 228; Pandya 1993: 150-5; Rasmussen 1908).

Secondly, amongstMalapaNDaaram and PaLiyar both sexes are able to serve as shamans, about 28% of each sex doing so in the case of PaLiyar(Morris 1981: 205; Fürer-Haimendorf 1960: 51; Gardner 1991a: 370; 2000b: 123); in the cases of KaaTTunaayakkar, Jeen KuRumba, and Coolakkaar only male shamans have been mentioned in the literature (Bird-David 1989: 273; 1996: 263; Demmer 1999; 2007: 34-45; Misra and Bhanu 1980: 55-6); and Rao has describedYaanaaDi married couples serving jointly in the role (1983: 226-68). Acculturation could possibly account for some differences.

Finally, PaLiyar have three male-female pairs of gamekeeping spirits that assist other deities in sending or injuring game for PaLiyar to hunt, onepair of which deals specifically with bees (Gardner 1991a: 368-70). Cencu, by contrast, have a single gender-ambiguous gamekeeping deity (Fürer-Haimendorf 1943: 180-4). These all function much like thegamekeepers in circumpolar cultures and they too are thanked for any success in acquiring large game (Wallace 1966: 97).

Apart from diagnosis and healing done by means ofshamanism, medical theories and practices remain relatively unstudied, so comparison is out of the question. Anthropologists have accomplished far less thanbotanists in identifying South Indian tribal pharmacopoeias. Much of what we have done is toput together lists of folk remedies and practices of YaanaaDi andCencu (Raghaviah 1962: 307; Kumar 1995: 86-8; Rao 2002: 60-75; Fürer-Haimendorf 1943: 151-3; Morris 1989) andlook at theories about the causesof illness (Fürer-Haimendorf 1943: 198-200; Rao 2002: 59-64). We have just one general overview of a medical system (Gardner 1995).

Limited research has also been done on visual art. Works include engravings, drawings, and paintings, some of which are purely geometric and others realistic. Geometric designs are incised or carved on Cencu, KaaDan, and PaLiyan combs, spoons, measures, or flutes (Fürer-Haimendorf 1943: 36, 39-40; Ehrenfels 1952: 23-5, 59; Gardner unpublished). A tiger chasing a stag is incised on a Cencu flute (Fürer-Haimendorf 1943: 42). YaanaaDi women draw birds and meandering designson the floors and exteriorwalls of houses (Raghaviah 1962: 198, 330-1, and facing 332 and 333; Kumar 1995: 37). And as yet undated paintings in rock shelters have been reported in at least nine Tamil Nadu districts, as well as in Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka. Selvakumar's professional account of art on the walls of seven rock shelters in the central PaLiyan area is especially notable—paintings of deer, bison, elephants, birds, humans, and two cliff-honey collecting scenes with distinctively PaLiyan-KaaDan style vine-loop ladders (2007: 385). This inquiry has only just begun,asa number ofthe region's cave sites were discoveredduring the last decade. Perhaps Bird-David's recent report of a lack of concern for 'elaborate visual art' among South Indian foraging cultures may eventually prove to have been premature (2006: 33-4).

Also warranting mention is the PaLiyan'color' term system, with distinctions based on brightness and illumination rather than on hue (Gardner 1992).It exemplifies Stage 1 of Berlin and Kay's controversial evolutionary color term system (1969). This stage—based on light vs. dark—provides further grounds for rejecting India's popular 'tribes as runaway Indians' theory.

Language

I recently summarized this subject thus (Gardner 2013d),

> While it has been customary to refer in South India to 'Dravidian' foragers, we may need to question this term. First, during Aurangzeb's Deccan campaign in 1694, forest dwelling people were encountered between Kadapa and Nandyal who hunted with bows, dug roots, collected honey, and wore caps of leaves. Although their location and traits suggest that they were Cencus, nearby Telugu villagers claimed not to understand their tongue (Scott 1794: II, 83-4; Fürer-Haimendorf 1943: 6). Second, PaLiyar west of Srivilliputtur speak a form of Tamil that has phonological and grammatical features of a creole language, born from intergroup contact. They exhibit free variation between long and short vowels (i.e., vowel length is not [necessarily] phonemic for them)[6]and they tend to replace the various forms of standard Tamil past tense with a simple means for indicating that an act has already been completed. Thus, they express 'X ate' by saying 'X has/have completed eating,'*saappiTaaccu*. The suffix indicating completion, *-aaccu*, can be affixed to a wide variety of common verb stems. Third, some southern PaLiyar use what two Dravidian linguists have advised me is probably not a Dravidian name, *saipã*, for one of their three main subsistence yams (*Dioscoreatomentosa*). In sum, although the Dravidian languages may well have differentiated *in situ* over the course of several millennia (Gardner 1980), there is no compelling reason to suppose that foragers were speakers of these languages in early times.

Hunter-Gatherers in a Changing World

Two broad questions need to be addressed. First, are pockets of recently studied 'individualistic' people who live largely on wild foods—but adjacent to complex societies—'real' hunter-gatherers? Second, how is it that some such people, in mid-20th century, dwelt in hills within sight of Madurai, a Tamil city that had traded with the Roman Empire? We need to take a broader look at worldwide research on these matters.

Studies suggest that the individualism and egalitarianism characteristic of many hunter-gatherers may be due to: (a) aspects of their subsistence economy (Barry, Child, and Bacon 1959; Cashdan 1980; Leacock and Lee 1982; Woodburn 1982; etc.), (b) their nomadism (Lee and DeVore 1968), (c) the degree of their social integration (Mead 1937; Pelto 1968; etc.), and (d) Holocene ecology (Foley 1988). Yet other studies find that culture contact can produce the very same traits(Steward 1936; Miller and Dollard 1941; Gillin 1942; Kroeber 1945; Bose 1956; Hickerson 1960; James 1961; Lathrap 1968; Fox 1969; etc.).

Parker (1909) once used historical data to question Seligmann's stance (1908) that Vedda culture was pristinely primitive. Veddas had experienced centuries of contact with Sri Lankan society and served it as mercenary warriors. This must have had considerable impact on them. Hunter-gatherersinSouth India too had centuries of contact with more powerful peoples. But that was the case also in much of the Americas, Africa, Southeast Asia, Japan, etc. Indeed, James Deetz, a historical archaeologist, holds that 500 years ago only Brazilian Gê, Australians, and Californians were free of disruptive advanced neighbors (1968: 283-4). It is certainly unclear for now the extent to whichSouth Indian foragers' cultures were shaped in ancient times, orare later adaptations, or result from several complementary factors (Gardner 1991b; 2000c). While the various theories about all this may have merit, it is time now to test them carefully, rather than just debate them. And I urge bearing in mind that, for us to say acculturation has impacted foragers, is not to deny that foragers of the past century or two have been active agents in shaping their own lives. Indeed, like several other peripheral peoples, PaLiyar have crafted a way of moving in and out of contact to their own advantage (Gardner 1985; 2000b: 218; Lukacs 2002: 59).

Many colleagues were astonished when Hitchcock and Biesele cited an as-yet unpublished report by D. Venkatesan that 1.3 million present and recent hunter-gatherers live in mainland India—fully 25 % of the world total (2000: 4-5). This would mean that India is home to five times as many hunter-gatherers as North America and the circumpolar region combined, more than four times as many as Australia, and approximately three times as many as Africa.Whether or not this claim is correct, I have argued recently that three aspects of Hindu culture contact may provide us with an explanation of these unexpected numbers (Gardner 2013c).

To begin with, we need to be aware that both sacred texts and accounts oftraditional practicesemphasize the mutual dependenceof Hindu occupational specialists. The general Indian population is aware that foragers also have a unique and valued occupation within the greater society. Until recently (Reddy 1972: 13; Morris 1976: 139), few have sought to compete with the foragers. So, in the same way that Hindu *jaatis*have been exchanging goods or services with one another for millennia without undergoing any occupational convergence, foragers have maintained low-level yet long-term exchange withplains peoples while remaining aloof (Markham 1862: 403-4; Gardner 1978: 306, 1985; Morris 1977; 1982: 15; Bird-David 1999b: 231). The privacy of forest life (Gardner 1966: 391; 1972: 440-2; Fürer-Haimendorf 1982: 82),together with somewhatroutinized trade in forest produce,have provided the foragers with a refuge, a safe economic 'niche' (Fox 1969: 158; Morris 1982: 14; Bird-David 1999b: 236).

Second, South Indians of the plains, whether they do it helpfully, critically, or in a teasing manner, put pressure on foragers to handle death,

food pollution, and marriage arrangements in ways that Hindus deem 'proper.'I find that PaLiyar, at least, have learned to reduce or eliminate such pressure by saying, 'we bathe after funerals,' 'we avoid such food,' or 'we marry our mother's brother's daughter' (Gardner 2000b: 39, 195, 204). Although some have questioned whether foragers are viewed by neighbors as being part of the larger society (e.g., Demmer 1996: 190), this quite visible pressure hints that foragers areviewed by members of Hindu society as different from other outsiders, because non-Hindus and foreign visitors are not coached in this way.

Third, PaLiyar and Cencuhave traditionally guided pilgrims to temples, they have been documented entering or conductingrituals in Saiva and Vaishnava temples, and they have either been asked by pilgrims to fetch drinking water or permitted to draw water from Brahmin wells. This tells us unambiguously that Hindus—thinking perhaps of humble ascetics in their own society—view austere, itinerant forest life as purifying (Fürer-Haimendorf 1943: 308-15; Gardner 1982).

Taken together, these three aspects of interactionsuggest that people of the Indian plains are likely to avoid disturbing hunter-gatherers unduly, except when asking them to collect forest produce, or instructing them regarding pure or proper practices.[7]Whether or notVenkatesan's population figures actually are accurate, it appears that Hindu concepts might well have served to foster relatively respectful Indiantreatment of foragers inrecent times. It should not surprise us then that foragers had survived *as* forest people in South Asia well into the 20th century.

Yet much can change as the crowded society of the plains encroaches progressively on the forests. Detailed documentation by Misra of the abusive treatment of Jeen KuRuba by Forest Department employees and contractors is a sad commentary on how economic development can undermine the respect and accommodations of the past (1977: 110-5).

Emerging Directions in Our Research

Let me close byrepeating a few words from my closing statement at the 2013 Conference on Hunting and Gathering Societies about some of the new directions in our research, thanks in large partto the efforts of our younger colleagues (2013d).

We now see careful testing of hunches of the pioneers (e.g., Naveh 2007) and exploring of wholly new subjects, such as continuities between archaeological and ethnographic data (Selvakumar 1996; 2002; 2007; 2013), the place of arguments and reason (Demmer 1999; 2001; 2004; 2008; Bird-David 1999a: 76; 2004a: 415), modes of acquiring knowledge (Bird-David 2004a: 415; Naveh 2007), the impact of [land grants,] new social forces, NGOs, and *Ashram* schools ([Morris 1976;] Ivanov 2013; Norström 1999; 2001; 2002; 2003;

2013; [Demmer 2008;]Lavi 2013; Kakkoth 2009; 2013), and displacement from the forest (e.g., Misra 1977 [and 2003: 37];Norström 2001; 2013; Gardner 2004; 2007). The future course of this new work is promising.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper is a much-expanded version of a paper presented on June 27, 2013 in Liverpool, England, at the 10th Conference on Hunting and Gathering Societies. My research was supported by a 1962-4 Ford Foundation Foreign Area Fellowship; a1967-8American Institute for Indian StudiesResearch Fellowship toward understanding acculturation;a 1974 Urgent Ethnology Programme contract with National Museums of Canada and 1974-5 National Science Foundation grant to study hunter-gatherer cognition, plus a 1976 extension of that grant; a 1978 University of Missouri Research CouncilFellowship plus a Travel Award from the American Institute for Indian Studies allowing a revisit to PaLiyar; a 1983 Sabbatical Grant from University of Missouri Graduate School Research Council that furthered my work on acculturation; and a Principal's Lecture Series invitation by American College, Madurai, allowing a revisit to PaLiyarin 2001. I am indebted especially to P. Friedrich, W. H. Goodenough, andA. I. Hallowellfor my training. I am grateful to A. Aiyappan, C. Annakamu,L. Dumont, U. Ehrenfels, C. von Fürer-Haimendorf, K. Gough Aberle, 'Periya Raja' S. N. K.Naiker, Raja Rao, and Sridar, for pointing me in the right direction in the field and afterwards. Ithank Br. S. Arochiasami SJ for assistance inplant identification. I am indebted to M. M.Arpudam, R. G. Fox, L.Furbee, V.Karunakaran, P. K.Misra, V. S. Rajam, T. P. Subramanian, M. M.Suusai, W. Thomas, and T.Veerabaghu, plus members of my family for their generous assistance along the way. But my deepest debt is to Kaamaas, KooTTee, Lacmi,Mutti,Paappa,PeriyaVeelan, Viirappan, and all their fellows for lessons I derivedfrom their companionship.

NOTES

1. Bhanucallsit the people's name for themselves; itaccordswith Thurston and Rangachari'sanglicised 'Shoolaga' (1909, vol. 6: 379-86) and Bhanutreats 'Coolanaayakkar' and 'Naayakkar' asexonyms (1989: 40-1; 1992: 31), the former with an oblique stem, coolai or coola meaning 'grove' or 'retreat'in Tamil or Malayalam (Burrow and Emeneau 1961: entry 2357).
2. Groups across India, especially powerful ones, and rulers use variants of this Sanskrit-based title meaning 'leader.' KaaTTunaayakkar must therefore be an exonym, but with an added oblique stem meaning 'forest' or 'wilderness' in Tamil and Malayalam (Burrow and Emeneau 1961: entry 1206).
3. KaaDar more frequently marry parallel-cousins than thecross-cousins prescribed by Dravidian kinship, but Jeen KuRuba disallow both kinds of marriage (Ehrenfels 1952: 135; Misra 1969: 209).
4. Evolutionary ecologists Hill and Walker claim that hunter-gatherer 'men often co-reside with male in-laws' (2011: 1286), but composition of their sample of cultures does not meet established anthropological criteria for hologeistic theory testing. Their sample of 32 cultures includes 8 Inuit cultures (three of which are immediate neighbors), 3 South Indian cultures (two of which are immediate neighbors), 2 adjacent northern Dene cultures, and 3 North Australian cultures in close proximity to one another.
5. MalapaNDaaram also have both male and female conciliators (Morris 1982: 159).
6. For instance,in PaLiyan Tamil, the first vowel sound in Tamil '*teri*' can simply be lengthened without becoming like the very differently articulated vowel sound in Tamil '*teeri*'. Thus, some PaLiyar draw out all three of the vowel sounds in the name Cellamma—saying it as 'Ceellaammaa.'

7. This is not to deny that there can be actual or threatened violence against the foragers. Some cases in point: Non-tribal witnesses told me a honey contractor had shot and kicked to death three "uncooperative" PaLiyar (2000b: 27); fellow band members told me a Forest Guard killed a PaLiyan whose wife he found attractive; and I once blocked the path of three plantation workers intent on assaulting a 14-year-old PaLiyan who had been accused of petty theft and threatened with murder. Others have reported threats of violence or actual physical assaults (e.g., Misra 1977: 110; Morris 1982: 46, 94; Bhanu 1989: 52), in addition to murder of two men by forest produce contractors (Bhanu 1989: 56).

REFERENCES

Aiyappan, A.

1948 *Report of the Socio-economic Conditions of the Aboriginal Tribes of the Province of Madras*. Madras: The Government Press.

AnanthakrishnaIyer, L. K.

1909 *Cochin Tribes and Castes, 1*. Madras: Higginbotham.

Annakaamu, C.

1961 *MeelmalaiMakka L*. Tanjaavuur: SarvoodayaPirasuraalayam [in Tamil].

Barry, H., I. L. Child, and M. K. Bacon

1959 "Relation of child training to subsistence economy." *American Anthropologist* 61: 51-63.

Berlin, B. and P. Kay

1969 *Basic Color Terms: Their Universality and Evolution*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Bhanu, B. A.

1989 *The Cholanaikan of Kerala, Memoir No, 72*. Calcutta: Anthropological Survey of India.

1992 "Boundaries, obligations and reciprocity: Levels of territoriality among the Cholanaikan of South India." Pp. 29-54 in M. J. Casimir and A. Rao (eds.) *Mobility and Territoriality: Social and Spatial Boundaries among Foragers, Fishers,Pastoralists and Peripatetics*. Oxford: Berg.

Bhowmick, P. K.

1992 *The Chenchus of the Forests and Plateaux: A Hunting-gathering Tribe in Transition*. Calcutta: Institute of Social Research and Applied Anthropology.

Bird, N.

1982 "'Inside' and 'outside' in kinship usage: The hunter-gatherer Naiken of South India." *Cambridge Anthropology* 7, 12: 47-57.

1983 "Wage gathering: Socio-economic changes and the case of the food-gatherer Naikens of South India." In P. Robb (ed.) *Rural South India: Linkages, Change and Development*. London: Curzon Press.

Bird-David, N.

1987 "Single persons and social cohesion in a hunter-gatherer society." In P. Hockings (ed.) *Dimensionsof Social Life: Essays in Honor of David Mandelbaum*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

1989 "An introduction to the Naikens: The people and the ethnographic myth." In P. Hockings (ed.) *Blue Mountains: The Ethnography and Biography of a South Indian Region*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

1990 "The giving environment: Another perspective on the economic system of gatherer-hunters." *Current Anthropology* 31: 189-96.

1994 "Sociality and immediacy: Or, past and present conversations on Bands." *Man* 29: 583-603.

1995 "Hunter-gatherers' kinship organization: Implicit roles and rules." In E. N. Goody (ed.) *Social Intelligence and Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1996 "Puja or sharing with the Gods?: On ritualized possession among Nayaka of South India." *The Eastern Anthropologist* 49: 259-76.

1999a "Animism revisited: Personhood, environment, and relational epistemology." *Current Anthropology*40, Supplement: 67-91.

1999b "Introduction: South Asia." In R. B. Lee and R. Daly (eds.) *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Hunters and Gatherers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1999c "The Nayaka of the Wynaad, South India."In R. B. Lee and R. Daly (eds.) *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Hunters and Gatherers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

2004a "No past, no present: A critical-Nayakaperspective on cultural remembering." *American Ethnologist* 31: 406-21.

2004b "Illness images and joined beings: A critical/Nayaka perspective on intercorporality." *Social Anthropology* 12: 325-39.

2005a "Studying children in 'hunter-gatherer' societies: Reflections from a Nayaka perspective." In B. S. Hewlett and M. E. Lamb (eds.) *Hunter-gatherer Childhoods: Evolutionary, Developmental and Cultural Perspectives*. London: Aldine Transaction.

2005b "The property of sharing: Western analytical notions, Nayaka contexts." In T. Widlock and W. G. Tadesse (eds.) *Property and Equality, Volume 1: Ritualization, Sharing, Egalitarianism*. Oxford: Berghahn.

2006 "Animistic epistemology: Why do some hunter-gatherers not depict animals?" *Ethnos* 71: 33-50.

2008 "Feeding Nayaka children and English readers: A bifocal ethnography of parental feeding in 'the giving environment,'" *Anthropological Quarterly* 81: 523-50.

Bose, N. K.

1956 "Some observations on nomadic castes of India." *Man in India* 36: 1-6.

Burrow, T. and M. B. Emeneau

1961 *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary*. Oxford: TheClarendon Press.

Cashdan, E. A.

"Egalitarianism among hunters and gatherers." *American Anthropologist* 82: 116-20.

Christian, J. M. and P. M. Gardner

1977 *The Individual in Northern Dene Thought and Communication: A Study in Sharing and Diversity*. Ottawa: National Museums of Canada.

Cordaux, R., R. Aunger, *et al.*

2004 "Independent origins of Indian caste and tribal lineages." *Current Biology* 14: 231-5.

Cordaux, R.

2004 Personal communication.

Deetz, J.

1968 "Discussions, Part 6." In R. B. Lee and I. De Vore(eds.) *Man the Hunter*. Chicago: Aldine.

Demmer, U.

1996 *Verwandschaft und Sozialitätbei den Jenu Kurumba: VomArbeiten, vomTeilen und von (Un) gleichheitin Einer SüdindischenSamler- und Jäger-gesellschaft*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

1997 "Voices in the forest: The field of gathering among theJenuKurumba." In P. Hockings (ed.) *Blue Mountains Revisited: Cultural Studies on theNilgiri Hills*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

1999 "How to make the Spirit of the Dead happy: The rhetoric of words and deeds in a JénuKuŸumbaritual." Pp. 68-87 in E. Schömbucher and C. P. Zoller (eds.) *Ways of Dying: Death and its Meaning in South Asia*. Delhi: Manohar.

2001 "Always an argument: Persuasive tools in the death rituals of the JénuKuŸumba." *Anthropos* 96: 475-90.

2004 "Visible knowledge: A test case from South India." *Visual Anthropology* 17: 107-16.

2007 "The power of rhetoric: Dialogue and dynamic persuasion in rituals of a South Indian community." In U. Demmer and M. Gaenszle (eds.) *The Power of Discourse in Ritual Performance, Rhetoric, Poetics, Transformations*. Muenster: LIT.

2008 "Contested modernities in the 'tribal zone': The post-colonial state, Adivasi politics and the makingof local modernity in the northern Nilgiris (South India)." *Zeitschriftfür Ethnology* 113: 257-82.

Dumont, L.

1953 "The Dravidian kinship terminology as an expression of marriage." *Man* 54:34-9.

1964 Personal communication.

Ehrenfels, U.

1952 *The Kadar of Cochin*. Madras: University of Madras.

Foley, R.

1988 "Hominids, humans, and hunter-gatherers: An evolutionary perspective." In T. Ingold, D. Riches and J. Woodburn (eds.) *Hunters and Gatherers, 1: History, Evolution and Social Change*. Oxford: Berg.

Fox, R. G.

1969 "'Professional primitives': Hunters and gatherers of nuclear South Asia." *Man in India* 49: 139-60.

Fürer-Haimendorf, C. von

1943 *The Chenchus: Jungle Folk of the Deccan*. London: Macmillan.

1960 "Notes on the Malapantaram of Travancore." *Bulletin of the International Committee on Urgent Anthropological and Ethnological Research* 3: 45-51.

1982 *Tribes of India: The Struggle for Survival*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gardner, P. M.

1965 *Ecology and Social Structure in Refugee Populations: The Paliyans of South India*. PhD Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania. Ann Arbor: University Microfims.

1966 "Symmetric respect and memorate knowledge: The structure and ecology of individualistic culture." *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 22: 389-415.

1969 "Paliyan social structure." In D. Damas (ed.) *Contributions to Anthropology: Band Societies, Bulletin 228*. Ottawa: National Museums of Canada.

1972 "The Paliyans." In M. G. Bicchieri (ed.) *Hunters and Gatherers Today: A Socio-economic Study of Eleven such Societies in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Holt. Rinehart and Winston.

1976 "Birds, words, and a requiem for the omniscient informant." *American Ethnologist* 3: 446-68.

1978 "India's changing tribes: Identity and interaction in crisis." In G. R. Gupta (ed.) *Main Currents in Indian Sociology, 3: Cohesion and Conflict in Modern India*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.

1980 "Lexicostatistics and Dravidian differentiation *in situ*." *Indian Linguistics* 41: 170-80.

1982 "Ascribed austerity: A tribal path to purity." *Man: Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 17: 472-9.

1985 "Bicultural oscillation as a long-term adaptation to cultural frontiers: Cases and questions." *Human Ecology* 13: 411-32.

1988 "Pressures for Tamil propriety in Paliyan social organization." In T. Ingold, D. Riches, and J. Woodburn (eds.) *Hunters and Gatherers 1: History, Evolution and Social Change*. Oxford: Berg.

1991a "Pragmatic meanings of possession in Paliyan shamanism." *Anthropos* 86: 367-84.

1991b "Foragers' pursuit of individual autonomy." *Current Anthropology* 32: 543-572.

1992 "On brightness and color categories." *Current Anthropology* 33: 397-9.

1993 "Dimensions of subsistence foraging in South India." *Ethnology* 32: 109-44.

1995 "Illness and response among South Indian foragers." *Medical Anthropology* 16: 119-39.

1999 "The Paliyan." In R. B. Lee and R. Daly (eds.) *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Hunters and Gatherers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

2000a "Respect and nonviolence among recently sedentary foragers." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 6: 215-36.

2000b *Bicultural Versatility as a Frontier Adaptation amongPaliyan Foragers of South India*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press.

2000c "Which culture traits are primitive?" In L. D. Katz (ed.) *The Evolutionary Origins of Morality: Cross-disciplinary Perspectives.*Thorverton, Devon: Imprint Academic.

2004 "Respect for all: The Paliyans of South India." In G. Kemp and D. P. Fry (eds.) *Keeping the Peace: Conflict Resolution and Peaceful Societies around the World*. London and New York: Routledge.

2006 *Journeys to the Edge: In the Footsteps of an Anthropologist*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.

2007 "Transmigration: Encountering 'others' in today's pluralistic nations." *www.forumonpublicpolicy.com/archivespring07/gardner.pdf.*

2009 "Quasi-incestuous Paliyan marriage in comparative perspective." *The Open Anthropology Journal* 2: 48-57.

2013a "Meat distribution, game, and spirits: A response to Knight." *Current Anthropology* 54: 80.

2013b "South Indian foragers' conflict management in comparative perspective." In D. P. Fry (ed.) *War, Peace, and Human Nature*. New York: Oxford University Press.

2013c "Understanding anomalous distribution of hunter-gatherers: The Indian case." *Current Anthropology* 54: 510-13.

2013d "Seventy years of South Indian hunter-gatherer research." *Before Farming*. Article 1.

Gillin, J.

1942 "Acquired drives in culture contact." *American Anthropologist* 44: 545-54.

Gould, R.

1968 "Chipping stones in the Outback." *Natural History* 77, 2: 42-9.

1969 *Yiwara: Foragers of the Australian desert*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Hewlett, B. S.

1991 *Intimate Fathers: The Nature and Context of Aka Pygmy Paternal Infant Care*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Hewlett, B. S. and L. L. Cavalli-Sforza

1986 "Cultural transmission among Aka Pygmies." *American Anthropologist* 88: 922-34.

Hickerson, H.

1960 "The Feast of the Dead among the seventeenth-centuryAlgonkians of the Upper Great Lakes." *American Anthropologist* 62: 81-107.

Hill, K. R., R. S. Walker, *et al*

2011 "Co-residence patterns in hunter-gatherer societies show unique human social structure." *Science* 331: 1286-9.

Hitchcock, R. K. and M. Biesele

2000 "Introduction." In P. P. Schweizer, M. Biesele, and R. K. Hitchcock (eds.) *Hunters and Gatherers in the Modern World*. Oxford: Berghahn.

Ivanov, A.

2011 "Food and sanitation patterns and social structure in relation with food customs of the Chenchus of Andhra Pradesh." *Studies of Tribes and Tribals* 9: 11-28.

2013 "Chenchus of Kurnool District: Tradition and reality." Presented at 10th Conference onHunting and Gathering Societies, Liverpool University.

James, B. J.

1961 "Social-psychological dimensions of Ojibwa acculturation." *American Anthropologist* 63: 721-46.

Kakkoth, S.

2009 "Social support for hunter-gatherers: Care or curse?" *Economic and Political Weekly* 44, 36: 70-4.

2013 "Unheard voices: A study on the perceptions of tribal school drop-outs in Kerala." Presented at 10th Conference on Hunting and Gathering Societies, Liverpool University.

Kroeber, A. L.

1945 "The *ancient oikoumenê* as a historic culture aggregate." Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute 75: 9-20.

Kumar, G. S. J.

1995 *Tribals from Tradition to Transition: A Study of the Yanadi Tribe of Andhra Pradesh*. New Delhi: MD Publications.

Lathrap, D. W.

1968 "The 'hunting' economies of the tropical zone of South America: An attempt at historical perspective." In R. B. Lee and I De Vore (eds.) *Man the Hunter*. Chicago: Aldine.

Lavi, N. 2013 "At home in a changing world: Contemporary life of theKattuNayaka in South India." Presented at 10th Conference on Hunting and Gathering Societies, Liverpool University.

Leacock, E.

1954 *The Montagnais 'Hunting Territory' and the Fur Trade.* American Anthropological Association Memoir 78.

Leacock, E. and R. B. Lee

1982 "Introduction." In E. Leacock and R. B. Lee (eds.) *Politics and History in Band Society.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, R. B. and I. De Vore

1968 "Problems in the study of hunters and gatherers." In R. B. Lee and I. De Vore (eds.) *Man the Hunter.* Chicago: Aldine.

Lukacs, J. R.

2002 "Hunting and gathering strategies in prehistoric India: A Abiocultural perspective on trade and subsistence." In K. D. Morrison and L. L. Junker (eds.) *Forager-traders in South and Southeast Asia: Long Term Histories.* Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.

Markham, C. R.

1962 *Travels in Peru and India.* London: J. Murray.

Mathur, R. P. G.

1977 "Cholanaickans of Kerala." In SurajitSinha and B. D. Sharma (eds.) *Primitive Tribes: The First Step.* New Delhi: Government of India.

Mead, M.1937 "Interpretive statement." In M. Mead (ed.) *Cooperation and Competition among Primitive Peoples.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Miller, N. E. and J. Dollard

1941 *Social Learning and Imitation.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Misra, P. K.

1969 "The JenuKuruba." *Bulletin of the Anthropological Survey of India* 18: 183-246.

1970 "Economic development among the JenuKurubas." *Man in India* 50: 78-86.

1977 "The JenuKurubas." In S. Sinha and B. D. Sharma (eds.) Primitive Tribes: *The First Step.* New Delhi: Government of India.

2003 *My Anthropological Journeys.* New Delhi: Mittal.

Misra, P. K. and B. A. Bhanu

1980 "Boundary maintenance among Cholanaickan." *Man in India* 60: 51-9.

Morris, B.

1976 "Settlement and social change among the Hill Pandaram." *Man in India* 56: 134-51.

1977 "Tappers, trappers and the Hill Pandaram (South India)." *Anthropos* 12: 225-41.

1981 "Hill Gods and ecstatic cults: Notes on the religion of a hunting and gathering people." *Man in India* 61: 203-36.

1982 *Forest Traders: A Socio-economic Study of the Hill Pandaram.* London: Athlone.

1989 "Chenchu folk medicine." *Bulletin of the Indian Institute for the History of Medicine* 19: 21-32.

1999 "The Hill Pandaram of Kerala."In R. B. Lee and R. Daly (eds.) *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Hunters and Gatherers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Murdock, G. P.

1949 *Social Structure*. New York: Macmillan.

Murphy, R. F. and J. H. Steward

1956 "Tappers and trappers: Parallel processes in acculturation." *Economic Development and Social Change* 4: 335-53.

Nair, P. S.

1983 "Tribes of Kerala: A proposal for reclassification." *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 12: 496-507.

Naveh, D.

2007 *Continuity and Change in Nayaka Epistemology and Subsistence Economy: A Hunter-gatherer Case from South India*. PhD Dissertation, University of Haifa.

Nelson, R. K.

1973 *Hunters of the Northern Forest: Designs for Survival among the Alaskan Kutchin.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Norström, C.

1999 "Increasing competition, expanding strategies: Wage work and resource utilization among the Paliyans of South India." In T. Granfelt (ed.) *Managing the Globalized Environment*. London: IT Publications.

2001 "Autonomy by default versus popular participation: The Paliyans of South India and the proposed Palni Hills Sanctuary." In I. Keene and T. Yamada (eds.) *Identity and Gender in Hunting and Gathering Societies.* Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.

2002 "From avoidance to alliance: Hunter-gatherers, non-governmental organizations and state relations in Tamil Nadu, South India." In E. Poluha and M. Rosendahl (eds.) *Contesting Good Governance.* London: Routledge Curzon.

2003 *'They Call for Us': Strategies for Securing Autonomy among the Paliyans, Hunter-gatherers of the Palni Hills, South India, Stockholm Studies in Social Anthropology,* 53. Stockholm: Stockholm University.

2013 "The native point of view: A discussion concerning 50 years of change with Pichai, the Paliyan leader of theKollakkarai Valley in the Palni Hills." Presented at 10th Conference on Hunting and Gathering Societies, Liverpool University.

2014 "The story of Andi, the entrepreneurial Paliyan of the Palni Hills and representations of South Asian hunter-gatherers." *The Eastern Anthropologist* this issue.

Pandya, V.

1993 *Above the Forest: A Study of AndamaneseEthnoanemology, Cosmology, and the Power of Ritual*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Parker, H.

1909 *Ancient Ceylon: An Account of the Aborigines and a Part of the Early Civilization.* London: Luzac.

Pelto, P. J.

1968 "The differences between 'tight' and 'loose' societies." *Transaction* 5, 5: 37-40.

Raghaviah, V.

1962 *The Yanadis*. New Delhi: BharatiyaAdimjatiSevakSangh.

Rao, N. S.

1983 "Rangam of the Yanadi of Sriharikota." *The Eastern Anthropologist* 36, 3: 223-35.

2002 *Ethnography of a Nomadic Tribe: A Study of Yanadi.* New Delhi: Concept.

Rasmussen, K.

1908 *The People of the Polar North: A Record.* Philadelphia: Lippincott.

Reddy, G. P.

1972 *The Chenchus: A Scheduled Tribe of Andhra Pradesh, Census of India Monograph Series, Volume 1.* New Delhi: Ministry of Home Affairs.

Scott, J.

1794 *Ferishta's History of Dekkan from the First Mahummedan Conquests,* 2. Shrewsbury: J. and W. Eddowes.

Seligmann, C. G.

1908 "Notes on recent work among the Veddas." *Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 21, 61: 73-84.

Selvakumar, V.

1996 "Archaeological investigations in the upper Gundar Basin." *Man and Environment* 22, 2: 27-42.

2002 "Hunter-gatherer adaptations in Madurai Region, Tamil Nadu, India: From c. 10,000 B. P. to A. D. 500." *Asian Perspectives* 41: 71-102.

2007 "A study of the rock art in the Gundar Basin, Tamil Nadu, India." In P. C. Reddy (ed.) *Exploring the Mind of Ancient Man*. New Delhi: Research India Press.

2013 "Hunting-gathering in Tamil region of South India: A historical review." Presented at 10th Conference on Hunting and Gathering Societies, Liverpool University.

Steward, J. H.

1936 "The economic and social basis of primitive bands." In R. H. Lowie (ed.) *Essays in Anthropology: Presented to A. L. Kroeber*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Thurston, E. and K. Rangachari

1909 *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*. Madras: Government Press, vol. 6.

Turin, M.

1999 "The Chenchu of the Deccan." In R. B. Lee and R. Daly (eds.) *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Hunters and Gatherers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wallace, A. F. C.

1966 *Religion: An Anthropological View*. New York: Random House.

Woodburn, J.

1982 "Egalitarian societies." *Man: Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 17: 431-51.

1998 "'Sharing is not a form of exchange': An analysis of property sharing in immediate-return hunter-gatherer societies." In C. M. Hann (ed.) *Property Relations: Renewing the Anthropological Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

View publication stats