



## Palaeolithic Cognitive Inheritance in Aesthetic Behavior of the Jarawas of the Andaman Islands

M. Sreenathan, V. R. Rao, and R. G. Bednarik

**Abstract.** – This article considers the limited etic and emic information available on the art-like productions of the Jarawas, Andaman Islands, India, who have only in recent years permitted adequate contact with other societies to facilitate initial studies. Their known history, culture, and art are reviewed, with some reference to nearby other tribes, one of which remains entirely unresearched. It is noted that the known art of the Jarawas consists entirely of nonfigurative or geometric elements, and yet there is evidence that the Jarawas have no difficulty creating highly naturalistic figurative images. The correspondence between the range of their graphic art and the equally limited known repertoire of Final Pleistocene to very Early Holocene South and East Asian art is highlighted. It leads to the consideration of the possibility that the Jarawas' artistic inheritance may be derived directly from a Late Palaeolithic population separated from mainlanders by the rise of the sea level at the end of the Pleistocene. [*India, Andaman Islands, Jarawas, ethnography, material culture, geometric art, Palaeolithic art*]

**M. Sreenathan**, anthropological linguist with the Anthropological Survey of India, has worked among the hunter-gatherers of Andaman and Nicobar Islands and among the Dravidian tribal groups and caste populations of mainland India. His work explores the interrelationship between language, ecology, social structure, and artistic manifestations. He authored books and research articles in English and Malayalam; see References Cited.

**V. R. Rao**, presently head of the Anthropological Survey of India. As a trained biological anthropologist he is instrumental in applying DNA technology in addressing basic issues in ethnoarchaeology and diversity with local cultural and environmental indexing in the interpretation of human evolution. He has worked in various capacities as consultant, chairman, president, and member of many national institutions and organizations and has produced numerous publications.

**Robert G. Bednarik**, convener and editor of the International Federation of Rock Art Organizations (IFRAO), specializes in the origins of human constructs of reality and human cognition,

and their surviving externalizations in the form of palaeoart. Nearly one half of his approximately 1,000 publications appeared in refereed scientific journals; see References Cited.

Scholars have been trying to define art and separate it from nonart through various models and devices. Attempts abound to navigate into how, when, and why the human mind became capable of expressing and recognizing art, and how creative processes actually work (Davis 1986; Hodgson 2000, 2003). The study of palaeoart is actively involved in this quest. The origin of art has been traced mainly through archaeological means, which have generally focused on "Palaeolithic" cultures. Embedded in all enquiries on this front is a predisposition to see Stone Age culture as an entity of the distant past, which can be recapitulated through archaeological evidence. The construct of early palaeoart is thus evidently based on archaeological finds. These consist of a vast number of art-like manifestations, such as nonfigurative engravings, pendants and beads, cupules and linear petroglyphs, protofigurines, etc., that have been identified as being of Lower and Middle Palaeolithic provenience (Bednarik 1992a, 2003a). This massive amount of evidence underlines that the human capacity to create nonutilitarian products dates back hundreds of millennia.

The present study, however, does not focus on this archaeological record, rather it taps into "living evidence" in order to examine the scope of an alternative source for enriching the discussion on the

beginnings of art. In that sense it is hoped that a consideration of the art of the Jarawas of the Andaman Islands can contribute to the discussion of cognitive anthropology.

While the available ethnographic database on art traditions of indigenous groups by and large invokes a great variety of figurative as well as non-figurative (non-iconic, geometric) art, the hunter-gatherer groups of the Andamans exist with a geometric tradition lacking any figurative component. This evidence may have considerable significance to understanding the proposed "cultural revolution" models claiming that modern human behavior arose suddenly throughout the Old World around 40,000 years ago,<sup>1</sup> and that behavioral modernity first appeared in Africa where anatomically modern humans are said to have evolved exclusively.<sup>2</sup> It needs to be clarified from the outset that, contrary to the evolutionary model that perceives figurative palaeoart as conceptually superior to nonfigurative or "geometric" art, the opposite is true. Whereas in figurative or iconic symbolism, the connection between referent and referrer is purely via iconicity – a relatively simple cognitive factor building on visual ambiguity (Bednarik 2003b) – the symbolism of non-iconic art is only navigable by possessing the relevant cultural "software."

There are numerous cultures that either restrict their art completely to non-iconic forms, or use them for specific purposes, such as highly sacred imagery. For instance, one of the most sophisticated megacultures in history, that of Muslim peoples, employs principally non-iconic art forms, yet this does not mean that Muslims cannot perceive or create iconicity. The same seems to be true for all other cultural conventions lacking iconic art, such as specific Amazonian tribes or Tasmanians: they have no difficulty detecting iconic meaning in pictures or producing them when prompted. This also applies to the Jarawas. Moreover, numerous nonhuman animal species can perform the task of recognizing and correctly interpreting iconicity in imagery, therefore, it can be assumed that the cognitive faculties required for this task are less complex than those involved in interpreting non-iconic art. Only humans familiar with the relevant cultural convention can detect meaning in such nonfigurative art, therefore, of the two versions, figurative imagery should be seen as the cognitively more primitive.

However, Bednarik (1993a, 1994a) has pointed out that almost all graphic palaeoart safely attributable to the Pleistocene period is non-iconic. Apart from the Franco-Cantabrian corpus of the Upper Palaeolithic, principally of western Europe, there are almost no two-dimensional iconic depictions from this period. For instance, iconic sculpture is well represented in the Upper Palaeolithic of Russia and Siberia, but graphic art is limited almost entirely to nonfigurative compositions, notably the sometimes incredibly complex engravings found on ivory and bone plaques. These clearly had symbolic meanings; they often resemble maps but might well be mnemonic devices for telling stories. Their meaning is totally inaccessible to us. Or to cite another relevant example: all credibly Pleistocene and Early Holocene rock art of Australia seems entirely non-iconic, but can be shown to refer to very complex, if unexplained cultural practices. On the basis of all available credible evidence, iconic art appears in Australia only during the Holocene, possibly together with the dingo, an introduced species, and the small stone tool traditions. What renders this particularly relevant is that Australia was initially colonized by Middle Palaeolithic seafarers from southern Asia, and their massive corpus of Middle Palaeolithic rock art is many times greater than the body of Upper Palaeolithic rock art of Europe. In other words, there is more surviving Middle Palaeolithic palaeoart in the world than Upper Palaeolithic, and with one single possible exception (Bednarik 2006), all of the known Middle (and Lower) Palaeolithic graphic "art" appears to be non-iconic, and of a quite narrow range of motif elements.

It is therefore reasonable to rationalize that, on current evidence, graphic palaeoart traditions commenced with a limited repertoire of non-iconic elements several hundred thousand years ago, and most of the world's Pleistocene palaeoart continued in much the same form (although the motif repertoire was extended with time). The Upper Palaeolithic graphic traditions of western Europe, still mostly comprised of nonfigurative material, feature also figurative imagery, which in a global perspective is a local aberration that appears to be near-endemic to parts of Europe.

The structure of the discourses on the origins of art is layered with the origins of symbolism, human language, "modern" human culture, and cognition. The discussion on art beginnings has been entirely dominated by discourses on "prehistoric" art, and most specifically on palaeoart of the earliest phases of human culture. However, the kind of art qualifying to be regarded as prehistoric (i.e., prior to

1 Davidson and Noble 1989; Noble and Davidson 1996; Mithen 1996; Klein 2000; White 1992.

2 Deacon 1989; Henshilwood and Sealy 1997; Barham 1998, 2002; Henshilwood and Marean 2003; McBrearty and Brooks 2000.

a period an elitist minority defines as History, on the basis of an irrelevant variable, writing) in this context, and the extent to which ethnographic art traditions need to be considered, remains a matter of debate. The prehistoric periods are traditionally and Eurocentrically divided into Stone, Bronze, and Iron Ages. The Stone Age is represented by the so-called Palaeolithic, Mesolithic, and Neolithic periods. The Palaeolithic and Mesolithic periods (food procuring stage) refer to a hunting-gathering and nomadic way of life while the Neolithic period is manifested in a sedentary, food-producing way of life. However, the ethnography of many world regions reveals systematic fallacies in this simplistic taxonomy, which itself dates from a period of enquiry significantly predating current understanding of the past; it thus needs to be revised (Bednarik 2002). It also involves the assumption that the mode of survival of the represented groups in these periods necessarily reflects their visual arts, which is not borne out by the evidence.

A review of all graphic art forms of humanity based on the variable of iconicity, therefore, reveals two streams. One comprises nonfigurative traditions; the other combines these with figurative ones. In an evolutionary perspective, it has been shown that nonfigurative marks characterize human history until the Holocene, in southwestern Europe until 32,000 years ago. During the last 8,000 years, the latter stream becomes dominant, although purely nonfigurative traditions do occur up to the present. There is a reasonable possibility that some of these latter cultures might be remnant survivals of the broad Pleistocene spectrum of non-iconicity, most especially in remote geographical enclaves or among remnant aboriginal populations. The early evidence from the Pleistocene features groupings of lines, geometric shapes, and patterns, and there is a universal semblance apparent in these archaic traditions (Bednarik 2003a). Parallel lines, sets of convergent lines, lattices, and dot patterns occur very early and can in some cases be traced back at least 250,000 to 350,000 years B.P. (Mania and Mania 1988; Bednarik 1995a). Later they are supplemented by radial motifs, zigzags or meanders, and circles. More recent examples include the Blombos Cave (South Africa) evidence of geometric patterns, perhaps 77,000 years old (Henshilwood et al. 2002). The wide distribution in the Old World of such simple non-iconic forms suggests cognitive universality among the archaic *Homo sapiens* groups involved (Bednarik 1986, 1990b).

Preliminary studies of rock art and portable art from Asia<sup>3</sup> as well as other continents undoubtedly

exposed the Pleistocene base of aesthetic production. The palaeoart of India has been recognized as an important strand of the prehistoric aesthetic tradition of humanity (Chakravarty and Bednarik 1997). Indian palaeoart studies have convincingly established the Lower Palaeolithic human workmanship of nonutilitarian products, first at Bhimbetka (Bednarik 1993b), then at Daraki-Chattan.<sup>4</sup> Thirty cupules and four engraved grooves from these two quartzite sites are either of an Acheulian (Misra 1985) or preceding chopping tool industry, as conclusively shown by stratigraphy. Other early evidence occurs in the form of an ostrich eggshell piece engraved with crosshatched designs from Patne (Sali 1989) and 25,000 years old (Bednarik 1994a). Although rock paintings in central India have been suggested to be Upper Palaeolithic (Wakankar 1983), Misra (1977, 2001) describes them as Mesolithic. Tyagi (1988) also disputes Wakankar's claims for an Upper Palaeolithic antiquity of rock paintings in India. However, nearly all known Asian (as well as eastern European) graphic art of the Pleistocene is nonfigurative (Bednarik 1993a, 1994a). The intricate patterns observed from central Indian rock shelters by Tyagi (1988) are entirely geometric and non-iconic. The Patne eggshell fragment as well as the Mesolithic core from Chandravati (Sonavane 1991) also bear distinctive geometric decoration. Traditionally models of art origins have been guided by deference to the western European paradigm with its overemphasized zoomorphic depictions. This has led to a false expectation that Pleistocene art would be found to consist of naturalistic imageries, particularly of zoomorphs.

However, evidence of the type archaeology can provide because it has survived incredible time spans should not be considered as the initial manifestation of palaeoart, since it has been engraved exclusively on hard surfaces. Taphonomy sees to it that most relevant evidence is unavailable, and none of it if it involves perishable materials (Bednarik 1994b, 1995b). Still today, most art production would not survive as archaeological finds. Because of the temporal nature of most art, very little evidence of early practices can be expected to be available to us. Therefore, the chronological interpretation of the extremely scanty evidence of such

3 Wakankar 1983; Bednarik 1992a, 1993b, 1994a; Bednarik et al. 1991; Bednarik and You 1991; Bednarik and Devlet 1993; Gai Shanlin 1986; Li Fushun 1992; Kumar 1996; Misra 1977; Tyagi 1988; Neumayer 1983, 1993; Hannah et al. 2005.

4 Kumar 1996; Bednarik et al. 2005; cf. also D'Errico et al. 1989.

early practices is entirely contingent upon its severe taphonomy. Ethnographic art, by contrast, offers a vastly more secure sample, and one that is sometimes accompanied by credible emic interpretation. Therefore, we propose that the study of the creativity of the few remaining traditional peoples of the world should be of considerable value in informing palaeoart studies. In this sense, the few remaining hunter-forager-fisher groups of the Andamans are of particular interest. Especially the Jarawas can provide data on verifiable patterns of aesthetic behavior, evidence that is testable and scientifically falsifiable. In this quest we are not simplistically suggesting that the Jarawas are a "Palaeolithic tribe," but rather seek to present observations we consider relevant to the issue.

The Jarawas of the Andaman Islands are regarded as one of the surviving remnants of the Negritoid substratum of southern Asia. In the context of available archaic geometric graphic evidence, the graphic patterns characterizing their art can be considered a remnant of earlier traditions. It would be interesting to establish whether the lack of figurative representation in Jarawa art is attributable to a lack of such creative ability or to other reasons. Along with this question, some basic concepts about the functions of the human cognitive system are already emerging. Further, the world trends in the choice of visual expression lead to another aspect, that is, cultural transmission beyond space and time. The universality of geometric graphic art is not due to proximity, rather it derives from a cognitive context in which creative expressions of humans evolved. To assess the underlying causes that motivated humans to favor geometric markings, we propose that an evaluation of the art of the Jarawas may open the way to a fresh understanding of elementary associative processes.

The Pleistocene archaeological evidence has figured prominently in palaeoart studies, which sometimes attributed false age to the evidence (Bednarik 1996) and is always limited by its inherent weaknesses in assessing the cognitive faculties of populations to which any emic access is impossible. This article contrasts with palaeoart approaches and the difference is found not in aims but in method. The limitation of having to reconstruct past cultures and correlating them with "cognition" and "symbolism" of modern humans renders a great deal of speculation inevitable. Whilst it remains essential to build on the empirical basis of the archaeological evidence, the complexity of the evolution of the concept-mediating role of symbolisms demands an eclectic approach involving both neuroscience and ethnography. Our study represents no


radical paradigm shift; rather it advocates a collaborative approach that reconciles the past with the present. This, in turn, opens up not only a dialogue between the cognitive sphere across cultural time but also presents an aspect of cultural conservation transcending time. In order to accentuate the dialogue on cultural conservation back to "Palaeolithic" time, we propose that the graphic culture of the Jarawas has to be understood, and the technological status of the Andaman Islanders needs to be assessed.

### The Area and the People

The Andaman and Nicobar Archipelagos are situated in the Bay of Bengal between 6° and 14° northern latitude and 92° and 94° eastern longitude (Map). The archipelago consists of 556 small and large islands. The Andaman and Nicobar islands are separated by Ten Degree Channel, which is about 144 km wide and 400 fathoms deep. The Andaman group of islands extends about 350 km north-south, while the Nicobars cover approximately 262 km along that axis.

The indigenous population of the Nicobars consists of Mongoloid tribes, that of the Andamans of Negritos. The latter are divided into the Great Andamanese and Little Andamanese groups. Most of the ten territorial language groups of the originally most numerous Great Andamanese have perished in the 19th and early 20th centuries due to the impact of British colonization. Comprising the Bea, Balawa, Puchikwar (Bojigyab), Juwai, Kol, Bo (Tabo), Cari (Cariar), Kede, Yereva/Jeru, and Kora (Radcliffe-Brown 1948; Man 1932 [1885]), they now number only 53 individuals occupying 3 km<sup>2</sup>. Their decimation was hastened with epidemics of pneumonia in 1868, measles in 1877, and influenza in 1896, and subsequent "assimilation." The Little Andamanese language group consists of the Onges, Sentinelese, and Jarawas. The Onges have been similarly marginalized and now number only 94 members, although occupying 700 km<sup>2</sup>. The Sentinelese occupy and vigorously defend North Sentinel Island, permitting practically no entry by outsiders. They are believed to number about 100. Even in recent years, they repelled any attempt to land on their island. For instance, in the wake of the 2004 tsunami it was endeavored to land with a helicopter to check how the Sentinelese had fared. A hail of arrows and spears greeted the aircraft and the landing had to be abandoned.

The Jarawas, the remaining of the four Negrito remnants of the Andaman Islands, inhabit at pres-



Map: Location of the area.

ent the western region and coastal belt of South and Middle Andaman Islands. Their current population size is thought to be around 300 and they have led a fully traditional hunter-forager-fisher existence until the end of the 20th century.<sup>5</sup> Through their reputation as fierce warriors and uncompromising

defenders of their territory they have been able to maintain their way of life despite encroachment on their forests since the British established a penal colony in the 19th century, and later through Japanese occupation. In July 1996, a Jarawa boy named Enmay, who had fractured his leg after getting caught in an animal trap, was taken to a Port Blair hospital. After his recovery and return, the hitherto hostile Jarawas began making friendly con-

<sup>5</sup> Man 1932; Radcliffe-Brown 1948; Sarkar 1990; Sreenathan 2001.



tact since October 1997 with the mainstream population, Bengali and Tamil immigrants from the Indian mainland. In September 1999, a measles epidemic affecting 48% of the then 350 Jarawas decimated the tribe (Das et al. 2005). In 2001, an outbreak of febrile illness among the Jarawas, who had apparently never experienced malaria, led to a malariological survey that detected *Plasmodium falciparum* in the bloodsmears of 30 of the 179 tribes people examined. It appears that malarial parasites are recent arrivals for these people, a result of the current fading of their long social and geographical isolation.

Both Andamanese linguistic groups seem to have evolved from a single language group, but their respective timescales differ. For instance, among the Great Andamanese, there were two distinct major groups. One was recognized as the Bojingingi group (Bea, Balawa, Bojigiyah [Puchikwar], Kol, and Juwai) and the group was named after their closeness of language; the other was the Yerewa group (Cariar, Kora, Bo, Jeru, and Kede) who shared a common kind of canoe (*yere*). Each of the communities had further been socially recognized either as *eremtagas* (jungle dwellers) or as *aryotas* (coastal dwellers). Despite differences in environmental niche and ecology, *eremtagas* and *aryotas* of each ethnic community maintained the same language identity. That is to say, intracommunity differentiation has not caused linguistic splits while intercommunity differentiation is reflected in language differences. However, apart from their individual linguistic identities, both major Great Andaman groups – Bojingingi and Yerewa – were linguistically closer. But they were not as close with the Onge group. This suggests that the split between the Great and Little Andaman languages occurred much earlier than the split between the Bojingingi and Yerewa groups. The fission between the subgroups followed later again.

The Little Andaman group had also split into the Onges, the Jarawas, and the Sentinelese. Each of these groups maintains separate linguistic identities, but they are cognates. The Little Andamanese languages survived mainly because of the greater isolation, and perhaps the extreme hostility to outsiders of their respective speakers, still maintained by the Sentinelese today. The nonlinguistic cultural database supports the linguistic divisions, for instance, the canoes, bows, spears, cooking pots, and baskets of the South and Middle Andaman types were different from those of the other groups. The typological comparison of all Andamanese languages undoubtedly reiterates their common ancestry.

Although the languages of the Andaman Islands have been studied since the 19th century (Roepstorff 1987 [1875]), they remain inadequately understood. Linguistic enquiries on prehistoric connectivity of the Andamanese languages is scarce, yet there are some observations that, based on the account of mutual unintelligibility and homology, there are no known affiliations either with mainland language families or other linguistic families worldwide. Gray (2005) has suggested that languages through history change 20% of their basic lexicon every 1,000 years. In that sense, the possibility of cognate words between diverged languages may be of 1% or less after 10,000 years and the mutual unintelligibility may be of 100%. This may be the reason why no external cognates have been detected so far for the Andamanese languages,<sup>6</sup> as the existing comparative methods will not allow detecting homologies beyond 8,000 years. However, Pagel (2000) has proposed long-lived cognate words of 20,000 years age. Further, Dunn et al.'s (2005) study suggests that linguistic structural features do indeed contain historical links reaching back at least 4,000 years. But such level of studies has yet to be applied to yield constructive results from Andaman contexts.

Based on Nichols (1992), a preliminary analysis of Jarawa language has been conducted (Sreenathan 2003). It turned out that the language shows no apparent genetic affinity to other existing languages of Southeast Asia or, indeed, the rest of the world, and there is no evidence of outside influence in the form of borrowing or precolonial linguistic colonization. In an effort to determine the global space for the Jarawa language, selected typological comparison was attempted, which shows that only one feature, inclusive/exclusive opposition directly connects the Jarawas to an Old World pattern and exhibits more typological closeness with the recognized patterns of the Pacific and the New World. The absence of other traits in Jarawa language may be of great significance that seems to indicate an evolutionary depth connecting to a Pleistocene substratum in India.

The aboriginal populations of the Andaman Islands along with the Semangs of Malaysia, the Aetas of the Philippines, and a few population groups of Papua New Guinea, are considered as remnants of the Negrito populations of Southeast Asia. However, with the sole exception of the Andamanese, these Negrito groups have lost their original languages. The original Negrito languages of the Semangs and the Aetas are unknown. The Malaysian

6 Radcliffe-Brown 1948; Manoharan 1989; Sreenathan 2001.

Negritos speak languages of the Asian branch of the Austro-Asian family, a family that dominated the area until two thousand years ago, but has since been replaced on the peninsula, except for isolated pockets by Malay and other Austronesian languages. Traces of extinct Negrito languages found so far show no obvious relationship with Andamanese, and proposals of a connection with the Indo-Pacific family or a linguistic isolate like the Kusunda of Nepal remain unsubstantiated. However, the genetic study by Barik et al. (2008) identifies "a rare polymorphism shared between M31 and M32 lineages [which] suggests that they actually belong to a single haplogroup." It seeks to link this with the hypothetical dispersal of anatomically modern humans and proposes that the "enhanced resolution of M31a suggests a back migration from South-East Asia 20–30 kya, into an area that now contains most of the Austro-Asiatic speakers of India." The antiquity of the Andaman Negritoid groups needs to be considered in view of the recent isolation of the mtDNA lineages M31 and M32. Their genetic and linguistic isolation suggests an origin in Late Pleistocene populations of anatomically modern humans that may have reached the archipelago when it was connected to the Asian mainland.

### The Culture of the Jarawas

Although their demise as a viable traditional population may be imminent, the Jarawas remain a nomadic tribe engaged in hunting, gathering, and fishing (Sreenathan 2001). They hunt an endemic wild pig, a monitor lizard, and other quarry with bows and arrows. Unlike the Onges and Andamanese, the Jarawas kept no dogs to help in hunting, although this, too, is now changing. Maritime food sources are of importance, men fishing with bows and arrows in the shallow water while women catch fish with baskets. Mollusks, dugongs, turtles, and so forth constitute a major part of their diet, and they collect fruits, tubers, and honey from the forest. In the latter, they use a plant extract to pacify the bees, and their expertise in the medicinal use of plants is of considerable interest. Digging sticks, wooden buckets (*nuhu*), and baskets (*taaiku*) are used in food gathering, and handmade nets (*pootho*) in fishing (Sreenathan 2005a). Coastal groups were heavily dependant upon shellfish (Cipriani 1966). In general, the diet, modes of foraging, and of food processing (roasting, baking, boiling) and consumption are broadly shared among all Andamanese groups. The temporary camps of the Jarawas

consist of huts made of bamboo and palm fronds and they use crude rafts to cross streams. Other Andamanese have used outrigger canoes, which the Jarawas lack. The *thunya*, which is a leaf stem of the *thunya* plant, was traditionally used as a float for swimming. Pieces of polystyrene wafting ashore are also used these days.

The archaeological evidence (Dutta 1978; Cooper 2002) demonstrates that the Andaman Islanders possessed stone tool technology. Besides lithics, bones and animal teeth were also used as tools, which have been dated back to about 2,000 years. The stone tools found in kitchen midden excavations invite comparisons with stone tool technology elsewhere, and they may suggest that the peopling of the islands may have occurred relatively recently. However, such a hypothesis cannot be tested due to limitations or lack of relevant evidence, or a preference for naturally shaped materials. Moreover, archaeological remains of the Pleistocene are likely to have been submerged beneath the rising sea (Curry 2005). Thus the available and limited evidence may not suffice to gauge the time of the peopling of the islands. Colebrook (1795) observed that "their arrows are headed with fish bones or tusks of wild hogs; sometimes merely with a sharp bit of wood, hardened in the fire, but these are sufficiently destructive." The fibula of the pig was also used for the same purpose (Man 1932). The 1901 census of India states:

Stone Implements – The only stone cutting implement known to the Andamanese is the quartz flake chipped off, never worked and held between the fingers for shaving and tattooing, and shells and fish bones are used for the small blades of the peculiar adze of this people, and for arrow points scraping and cutting. A cyrena valve is the ordinary knife and scraper. Hammers, anvils, bones and oven stones are made of natural stones. They have never made celts ... the ends of glass bottles for some years and iron from wrecks for a long time past have been substituted for the indigenous implements, when and where procurable. The object of the long series of murderous raids made by the inland Jarawas on the outlying parts of the penal settlement proved to have been made in search for iron implements which on the whole are coarsely and roughly made (Temple 1903).

The historical record conveys that Andaman autochthons used improvised iron implements during the days of the British occupation, which began in 1853. Their arrows may nowadays be made of iron derived from shipwrecks and driftwood. Indeed, the metal was known to them well before the advent of the British as shown by its presence in all levels of the Chauldari kitchen midden (Cooper 2002).

This pattern of adapting a stone tool technology to newly available materials can be found widely elsewhere. For instance, the indigenes of Australia first became acquainted with steel through the contact with Macassans shortly before the arrival of the Europeans. After contact with the latter, Aborigines began flaking telegraph insulators, bottle glass, and other introduced materials, and they cold hammered horseshoes into huge "shovel-nosed" spear points.

The rapid acquisition of such new materials challenges the traditional Eurocentric definitions of eras characterized by the materials used. The opportunistic use of metal or glass does not change the underlying ecology of a people, because they continue to lack the technology of manufacturing these materials. Over the last few years, the Jarawas have come into contact with many new materials, such as plastic, textiles, and paper, but so far their ecological and economic basis essentially remains as it has been in the past. Most importantly for our present purpose, their metaphysical world, their ontology or their aesthetic concepts have most probably not changed to any significant degree since the time they relied purely on materials supplied by their immediate natural environment. Their language and their art may both be subjected to major changes now, but so far they have probably retained their traditional format. The emerging issue is not to define the Andamanese groups as Palaeolithic remnant populations, on the basis of their underlying technology, but to recognize that traditional European categorizations are irrelevant to the issue we wish to address here – the status of Jarawa art.

The material culture of the Jarawas shows a gender-based organization of crafts, of which there are broadly two kinds. The primary type is related to their sustenance pattern and the secondary one to the making of ornaments. The absence of specialized craftsmen/craftswomen obviously marks the Jarawas as individually self-sufficient. Ornamentation of material culture related to subsistence was an obligatory practice among the Great Andamanese while for others it was optional. Jarawa ornaments are generally simple and community specific. Except cloth and wool nowadays, all other ornament materials are indigenous and there are no ornaments made of metal. Ornaments are commonly fashioned from selected shells, leaves, flowers, and fruits. Permanent ornaments are made of shells (*telele*), *epochiimi* leaves, pandanus, bark, and cloth or wool.

The temporary or permanent huts of the Jarawas are generally thatched with leaves. Temporary huts have thatched roofs but their sides are open. Dwell-

ing patterns reflect the minimum requirements of individual families or a group of families (communal huts) and the close-knit nature of the society. Small huts are arranged in rows facing the sea or the inland, arranged contiguous or keeping a distance, or the arrangement may be irregular. It may be L-shaped or in a straight line, or with huts face-to-face.

The architecture of the Jarawas reminds us of the nonhierarchical social structure. No animals live in their dwellings. The parents and their dependent infants constitute the family. The adults of both sexes may or may not sleep with parents in the same *chadda* (hut). Unmarried boys and girls are allowed to stay in separate *chaddas*. Within the *chadda* any space other than the oven space is a sleeping space, which anybody within the family can occupy, and there is no rigid direction or pattern of sleeping practiced. If anybody sleeps outside, that space is marked with two sticks. Normally widows and widowers sleep in the open.

The people refer to themselves as *ang* (human; Sreenathan 2001); the word Jarawa is the name given to them by outsiders (Sreenathan 1996). The lowest structural unit in the social organization among them is the elementary family. Jarawa society comprises different hunting units (Sreenathan 2001), each of which is composed of intra- and intergenerational kinfolk. It contains consanguineous, collateral, affinal, and descendant relatives. They possess an Inuit-type kinship system (Sreenathan 2005b) with nuclear families, monogamy, and a deme-community organization. Both patrilineal and matrilineal rulers and exogamy are absent. There are no forms of medical practitioners or shamans, and until recently medical care was entirely by traditional means (Sreenathan 2001).

There is an almost complete absence of musical instruments in the entire Andamans. The only exception is a sounding board shaped like a shield the Great Andamanese formerly used, well ornamented with white clay and used for marking time in song or dance. However, the Jarawas and the Onges use no musical instrument. Their songs are community-specific in nature and all members participate in the singing. No gender differences are observed. Songs are mainly isorhythmic in structure, a single rhythm being repeated. The syllables are grouped into sequences as in words and are often repeated. Phonological deviations of the shape of the words from that of their normal form can be detected. Such changes are yet to be recognized as anaptyxis, metathesis, dissimilation, procope, apocope, syncope, prothesis, vowel harmony, epithesis, and epenthesis. The lack of sufficient data



prevents determination of whether the Jarawa language has developed into a poetic dialect. Songs have words and music and may be functional too. Breathing techniques were unknown to the Jarawas, hence they pause any time during singing and then continue. However, what they mean through these songs semantically and symbolically is yet to be established.

The Jarawas have their own performing tradition. Their intricate and rhythmic dance movements are often monotonous. In a common dance form they stand in a row holding each other closely, jumping one step forward and then backward in a rhythmic manner. The dancers themselves sing the accompanying song. Formal dancing is generally performed as part of important social ceremonies. Men and women do not dance together. Children, married and unmarried folk dance separately. Informal dance, however, is a spontaneous expression of joy. It is performed as part of gift receiving, in connection with the reunion of hunting groups or to mark the success of a good hunt. Remarkably, only women and children participate in this spontaneous expression by clapping their hands on their thighs. Songs are performed with or without clapped rhythm. These occasional but spontaneous outbursts of singing are common. However, representation of supernatural beings through dance has not been observed among the Jarawas (Sreenathan 2000).

The Jarawas possess no system of writing. A set of wavy lines can be observed in some of their designs. It is understood that such lines symbolize the sea, in which case the motif could be defined as a pictograph. Another design recalls the bone of fish or a creeper. Besides these, there are no analogized patterns observed or recognizable. Even in these cases, the Jarawas are not in a position to explain the iconic relevance because they are merely following a conventional style and pattern. The use of such graphics does not indicate that they have a nonphonological system expressed in pictographs, nor do the Jarawas use ideographs.

One of the greatest threats to their continuing viability derives from the Andaman Trunk Road, which passes through today's Jarawa Reserve, an area of 765 km<sup>2</sup> of thick forests. In May 2002, the Supreme Court of India ordered that the road be closed to general traffic, but so far the order has not been executed. There is considerable trespass occurring in the Reserve through poaching, logging, and the illegal removal of forest produce, such as honey. The Jarawas resent this continuing encroachment and altercations still occur, though no fatalities have been reported in recent years. Unless

there is political will to protect these people effectively, it is likely that they will experience the fate of two other Negritoid tribes of the Andamans as reported above.

### Art of the Jarawas

The most important aspect of art in the context of all Andaman hunter-foragers-fishers is that they never promulgated iconographic art. No animal, plant, or human figure features in their graphic tradition. The Jarawas practice art only in the form of geometrical patterns and these are mainly found as body makeup or as painted designs on the bow, chest guard, band of the chest guard, wooden bucket, and on the headband (*mahwa*). Generally, these graphic expressions are arrangements of vertical or horizontal lines, at times crisscrossing lattices, zigzag, or wavy patterns. The characteristic feature of their graphic expression, rhythm and symmetry, establishes and celebrates a balance between the Jarawas and their environment.

All community members recognize these designs and they are community specific in nature. Both elementary patterns and combinations of patterns occur. With a limited scope of creative innovation at the individual level, patterns are chosen on the criteria of attractiveness. The females contribute most of the design work. Whitish-gray clay, red ochre, and the juice of a creeper called *bailatta* (Sreenathan 2001) are commonly in use for the purpose. Whitish-gray clay is mixed with water and used for ornamental painting of the body. The red ochre is applied to the person for ornamentation during ceremonial events.

It needs to be fundamentally appreciated that the Jarawas do possess the creative potential to produce iconic motifs. The Jarawa boy named Enmay could create animated figures from memory (Fig. 1). It is therefore cultural practice rather than ability that determined the strict adherence to geometric art forms. Cognitive capacity and form of artistic convention need not coincide, as we have seen from other cultures. The same could well have been valid for many Pleistocene traditions.

### Body Designs

Unlike the body paintings of the Onges, Jarawas have only elementary patterns (Figs. 2 and 3). Among all Andamanese groups the Onges produce the most elaborate body painting (see Appendix). Several linear designs are found on the bodies of




Fig. 1: Iconographic drawing ability of the Jarawa boy Enmay.

the Jarawas. Wavy designs (*aawaav*) are most common on the face. *Aaweed* is the crisscross lattice pattern drawn on breast, chest, and stomach. The *ikkaath* or *heyayya* parallel lines design is found on the hands and occasionally on stomach and chest. Horizontal and vertical lines are found on any part of the body and are called *oppo*. Body designs are generally made by smearing the body with clay and then scraping out the designs with fingernails or

with a small scraping instrument made of a stick or pith, or by directly drawing with the finger. Mostly one paints oneself but the more elaborate work is accomplished with the help of others, especially wives painting their husbands. Designs are applied irrespective of sex and age. No tattooing is observed (Sreenathan 2000, 2001) and corpses are not decorated.



Fig. 2: Jarawa body painting.



Fig. 3: Jarawa boy with body painting.



Fig. 4: Decorated chest guard worn by Jarawa man.

### Craft Designs

A natural dye of brick red color, extracted from the creeper *bailatta*, is used. The surface is always smeared with beeswax before the dye is applied. Ornamenting crafts with clay paint is not practiced. Not all crafts are embellished with such ornamentation. The bow shaft, wooden bucket, and chest guard are the important items on which designs are

commonly found (Figs. 4 to 6). Also to be noted is that no cultural material object is painted a second time; whatever designs once made on it will be allowed to fade. These designs provide no distinctiveness to one's possessions as they are community designs, which all members may practice. Some individuals produce simple designs while others take




Fig. 5: Jarawa chest guard painted red on white.




Fig. 6: Two Jarawa bow shaft designs.

pains to make the designs more attractive. The occurrence of both decorated and undecorated crafts suggest that the decoration is aesthetic rather than endowed with any spiritual values. Typical motif forms found on craft items are zigzag lines and

small circles (e.g., *onebialile* and *bethubethuoppo* designs on chest guards, see Fig. 7), herringbone, ladder, and loop patterns (Fig. 8).

Pottery is not very developed among any of the Andaman hunters, and the Jarawas have only small