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Abstract

The concluding part of this paper extends the concepts presented in Part One and provides a century by century view of how the transformation of Harappan India to Post-Harappan India took place with maps so that readers can evaluate for themselves how different aspects of Indian culture got formed. Everything in this paper is presented using a figure-it-out-for-yourself approach, and naturally, anyone who refutes one part of this hypothesis, would contradict himself elsewhere. That would eliminate all pseudo-scientific approaches quickly and easily. We also revisit age-old controversies about the relationship between Sanskrit and the Prakrits after taking into account the views of some other scholars and examine how this can be explained from our model. Our assessment: current theories explaining the origin of IA languages are gross over-simplifications and need a rethink. We therefore, propose a completely new model as a replacement for the classical theory explaining the origin of IA languages. We propose that IA languages were derivatives of the languages spoken in the Indus and were only heavily transformed by Sanskrit. Thus, this issue is studied as an evolving interplay between two language groups: Sanskrit spread in a part of India, died out as a spoken language, and became a liturgical language, and popular as a lingua franca of the elite. The speakers of IE languages then took on the languages of the descendants of the Indus for everyday speech because of the transfer of populations to the Ganga-Yamuna doab. Sanskrit then re-influenced the languages of the region, in a process that continues to this day even after disappeared as a spoken language. Much more importantly, this paper argues that progress in Indology can come not from the decipherment of the Indus script, though small groups of scholars may still study this script if required, but from India-specific research strategies. This would be the cornerstone of all meaningful progress. This model shows how easy it is to derive and even partly reconstruct the languages spoken in the Indus from this model, thus opening a window to the long-forgotten world of the Harappans, and readers must use their own judgement as usual. Much more importantly, we try to create a new, via media third school of Indological thought for the Twenty-first century.
Overview of Part One

In the first part of this Paper, “Syncretism and Acculturation in Ancient India: A New Nine Phase Acculturation Model explaining the process of transfer of power from the Harappans to the Indo-Aryans”, which was published in the January 2009 issue of the ICFAI Journal of History and Culture, we proposed a new Nine phase model explaining the process of transfer of power from the Harappans to the Indo-Aryans, as a replacement for the AMT and other acculturation models, the phases of which can be described as follows (This can be purchased from ICFAI at nominal cost):

Phase One: The Harappan Evolution to Maturity phase (Evolved starting 7000 BC, Early phase 3300 BC to 2600 BC, mature phase 2600 BC to 1900 BC): This phase traces the spread of the Harappan culture from a period prior to the Kot Diji phase to the Mature Harappan phase when the IVC covered most of North-Western India and Pakistan.

Phase Two: The Indo-Aryan Evolution phase (before 2500 BC): The Indo-Aryans or the Aryans, who would not have identified themselves as such, lived in the northernmost tip of India in the Vedic homeland for some time before spreading out to the plains, having migrated from a homeland believed to be somewhere in Central Asia even earlier.

Phase Three: The Indo-Aryan Maturity phase (>2300 BC) where the Indo-Aryans spread out to the plains along River valleys including the Ganga-Yamuna valley and slowly drying up Saraswathi river, founding small settlements. Early settlements also included Pratishtaan and Kosala (2200BC) from a textual reconstruction, which we attempted with “Anchor points”.

Phase Four: Harappan and Indo-Aryan Synthesis phase (>2300 BC) where the acculturation between the Harappan and the Indo-Aryan cultures took place leading to a culture change in the eastern part of the IVC towards the end of this civilization. Evidence to support this was also discussed.

(Understanding the difference between Phase Three and Phase Four is the key to understanding how the Indo-Aryan culture became dominant, and the maps can be improved and made more detailed, if required, in a manner that clearly brings out the difference between the two. Thus, acculturation with the Harappans and setting up of early small independent kingdoms several hundred kilometers to the east along the banks of the River Ganges, the names and locations of which are available in the paper, perhaps happened in parallel around 2200 BC)

Phase Five: Harappan and Indo-Aryan Fusion Phase (>1900 BC) (Encompassing the Canonization of Vedic Beliefs in 1500 BC). This would explain the transfer of populations to the Gangetic plains resulting in the formation of a new culture with the epicenter in the Ganges. It would also explain the Caste system and religious traditions satisfactorily.

Phase Six: Harappan and Indo-Aryan De-Synthesis Phase (1900 BC to 1300 BC). The de-synthesis occurred because the transfer of populations to the Gangetic plains took place in 1900 BC, some five centuries before the IVC vanished. This primarily took place because the Rajasthan region slowly became desertified after 1900 BC. (This phase clearly explains how a new composite culture got formed independently in the Gangetic plains after 1900 BC. This independent culture of course must be studied separately with interesting aspects such as the south westerly expansion of the Indo-Aryans in 1600 and 1500 BC, when kingdoms again moved closer to Harappan territory although the IVC was almost dead by this time, if ancient India is to become clear, and its material cultural and religious history is to be constructed adequately).

Phase Seven: Post-Harappan Indo-Iranian Synthesis phase (1800 BC to 1300 BC) This would explain trade and cultural contacts with West Asia that took place soon after 1900 BC.
This led to the import of crucial technologies such as iron and know how for chariots.

Phase Eight: Post-Harappan Indo-Iranian De-Synthesis phase (>1300 BC)
This would explain the cessation of trade and cultural contacts with West Asia after 1300 BC.

Phase Nine: Cultural contacts between North and South India

In this part we will try to understand the transformation of Harappan India to Post-Harappan India better, and propose methodologies to identify the languages spoken by the Harappans.

Studying the Transformation of Harappan to Post-Harappan India

Let us now examine available data to find out how materially advanced and economically prosperous Post-Harappan India was so that we may begin studying the transformation of Harappan India to Post-Harappan India in detail.

How materially advanced was Post-Harappan India?

While this paper along with its earlier part, provides enough evidence for rejecting Mortimer Wheeler’s Dark Age hypothesis 1 which, in any case, conflicts headlong with Indian tradition, (views of other mainstream Western scholars are also presented), it is unlikely that the Cultures of the Post-Harappan India could have produced a level of prosperity comparable to the Indus for the following reasons. While it is very difficult yet to make a balanced assessment yet, we can try to draw some preliminary conclusions based on the following factors:

1. The cultures of Post-Harappan India would not have had extensive sea-based trade networks with Egypt and the rest of the old world. However, inland contacts with West Asia are documented. However, Kushasthali and Bet Dwaraka 2 were ports much later and around 1500 BC, and a detailed study of the transformation of the IVC into the cultures of Post-Harappan India needs to be carried out by other scholars.

2. The cultures of Post-Harappan India took shape under exceptional circumstances with the migration of people to the Gangetic plains in 1900 BC. 3 Settlements of the Gangetic plains would not have benefited from the careful planning which went into the cities of the Indus and the long periods of stability the preceded the Mature Harappan phase. The Gangetic plains were perhaps more densely populated and a greater portion of the population depended on agriculture.

3. Post-Harappan India was a hierarchical society with evils such as the Caste system 4 unlike the IVC which was more or less egalitarian.

4. Post-Harappan India was full of dynasties, warring kings, kinglings and ephemeral kingdoms. From what we know at this point, only a few kingdoms like Kasi 5 and Kosala appear to have

---


4 P. 39 Origin and Growth of Caste in India By Nripendra Kumar Dutt

5 Susruta The Imperial Gazetteer of India, 1909, v. 2, p. 570.
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been stable and a few cities like Indraprastha and Hastinapura appear to have been big. Mainstream Western scholars like Eltsov have also recently published scholarly articles on the issue (From Harappa to Hastinapura)\textsuperscript{6} From a sample of a textual reconstruction produced below, it would appear that Post-Harappan India was similar to the Warring states period in China, which also incidentally marked the transformation of a Bronze age culture to an Iron age culture and was represented by wars between the states of Han, Wu, Zhao, Chu, Qi and Yan. In India’s case, the kingdoms were apparently more numerous and ephemeral, with ever-changing borders, yet with an underlying cultural similarity across present-day North India and Pakistan.

Therefore, the prosperity of the cities of the Indus was primarily determined by trade and commerce. The success and longevity of a kingdom on the Gangetic plains was mainly dependant on political factors, or much more commonly, the lack of it.

Given below is an extract from a textual reconstruction which would give us a feel of the cultures of Post-Harappan India. (This particular paragraph is chosen because of a recent archeological find in the same location i.e. Malwa of an urn which dates to 1300 BC (from the Iron-age Mahajanpadas- a photograph is reproduced). The towns mentioned below are all located in the archeologically challenged and challenging Gangetic plains and some in Western India. The location of many of these these kingdoms is known, and many of these correspond to modern settlements). This clearly shows how unstable much of Post-Harappan India was, with some notable and outstanding exceptions such as Hastinapura and Indraprastha. The stability and the kind of standard of living that would have been necessary to produce cities like Mohenjodaro and Harappa would not have existed, and some towns may have survived only a few decades

\textit{Mandhatr had three sons, Purukutsa, Ambarisa and Mukukunda. He built and fortified a town on the banks of the Narmada river, at the foot of both the Vindhya and the Satpuda ranges at the place where the two ranges approach the river. It was Mahismati or the modern Mandhata. He also built a spacious town called Punka on the South Bank near the Rkasa range. These were his capitals. The kingdom did not however survive long. The Haihayas prospered in the region of southern Malwa (an urn dated 1300 BC has been very recently found here, and a photograph is available in this paper) and one of their kings Sahanja is said to have founded a city called Sahanjani and his son Mahismant, the town Mahismati mentioned above. Their successor Bhadrasrenya carried his arms eastward, conquered the kingdom of Kasi, took possession of Benares and reigned there, which means that he traversed the prostrate Paurava kingdom. The Kasi king Divodasa I recovered his territory and capital from Bhadrasrenya's sons, sparing one young son Durdama, who abandoned it afterwards and built a new capital on the River Gomati on the eastern border of his land.}\textsuperscript{7}

\textbf{Mortimer Wheeler’s Dark Age hypothesis is unjustified}

The Rural post-Harappan India hypothesis and Wheeler’s dark age hypothesis are prima facie non-starters because of several reasons presented below. To begin with no Indian has ever believed in them, a handful of Marxist historians notwithstanding, and this itself should serve as an acid test of its absurdity, for the simple reason that they are diametrically opposed to ideas of Indo-Aryan culture as known through traditional sources which describe warfare and battles, among others. This is despite the Aryans culture’s possible penchant for exaggeration and the fact that the Gangetic plains are archeologically challenged and challenging. Unfortunately, this is still a source of conflict between moderate Indians and older Indologists despite gradually changing trends, such as Witzel’s recent attempts to write history from the Rig Veda. Furthermore, the epistemology is wrong. Just because X has not been found, it does not mean that it does not exist. Even if it cannot be found, it can be inferred. We can also say why it is difficult to find it and suggest alternative approaches.

\textsuperscript{6} From Harappa to Hastinapura Eltsov, Piotr Andreevich
\textsuperscript{7} Ancient Indian Historical tradition F E Pargiter 1922
(a) Conflicts with Indian tradition: Indian tradition “remembers” kingdoms, kings and warfare before 600 BC, from multiple sources, and every Indian knows this, unlettered people included. Right or wrong, reconciliation must nonetheless be done. The idea of a king could not have come from the IVC or from Central Asia; it must have come from the Aryan rulers’ ability or instinct to rule.

(b) Conflicts with currently available archeological evidence at Bet Dwaraka, Takshashila and elsewhere.

(c) Conflicts with newer trends in Indology and work already done by Piotr Andreevich Eltsov 8 (From Harappa to Hastinapura), and others.

(d) Not based on a concurrent reading of texts. The limitation of the approaches of early linguists was perhaps that they attempted to date the texts themselves but not the content therein. Their emphasis was to make available Indian literature, philosophy and ideas to Western audiences and not to embark on the more challenging task for writing history textbooks from the RV. The concurrent dating paradigm is explained in very great detail in this paper.

(e) Such people confuse Aryavarta 9 with the Vedic homeland and a detailed discussion was provided in Part One of this paper, in a manner that provided a clear distinction between the two.

(f) Chariots 10 are not the Vehicle of rural folk and rural folk would not have had a valid reason to import this technology from West Asia.

(g) Iron may not have been used by nomads especially when it had to be imported from West Asia.

(h) The Rig Veda was itself compiled at Southern Panchala and neighbouring kingdoms under Royal Authority. (Work produced by an English scholar in the 1920’s). There may be no unanimous definition of the word Emperor, King or Kingling but clearly such works could not have been produced by rural folk. Even if they had been able to they would not have had any reason to. Most likely, the RV was meant to be the signature of the new composite culture which developed on the Gangetic plains after 1900 BC, with historical information if any, stored in the form of poetry. It doesn’t make any sense to believe in such hypotheses especially when so much work has already been done on the kings and ministers involved in its compilation, so much so that a separate section is devoted to it in this paper.

(i) There is textual evidence for cities and towns in the Gangetic plains 11 with exact locations from Buddhist and Jain sources 12 as they existed in 600 BC. The term “As they existed in 600 BC” is different from “founded in 600 BC”. Kikata or Magadha is corroborated by the RV as well. From our model, it was founded around 1600 or 1500 BC.

(j) Pataliputra (Patna) of present day Bihar was already the largest city in the world by 300 BC according to Chandler’s and Modelski’s list. A rare honour. How then, did such a sudden transformation take place? Cities could have easily developed after the migrations to the Gangetic plains in 1900 BC because large populations were packed into a small area. Hastinapur and Indraprastha were described as being reasonably large cities from traditional sources. We have dated these to 1500 BC.

(k) Continuous Cultural contacts with West Asia cannot be justified from Mortimer Wheeler’s hypothesis. What is more likely is that there was a period of confusion followed by a slow recovery as towns and cities began to emerge.

(l) Literacy: We proposed that the script at Bet Dwaraka was related to the Proto-Canaanite script and was a derivative of the Protosinatic script.

---

8 From Harappa to Hastinapura : a study of the earliest South Asian city and civilization from the point of view of archaeology and ancient Indian literature / Piotr Andreevich Eltsov.
10 Brewer, E. Cobham. Dictionary of Phrase & Fable. Chariot
11 Political History of Ancient India, 1996, p 88; History & Culture of Indian People: Age of Imperial Unity, p 15-16
12 Anguttara Nikaya I. p 213; IV. pp 252, 256, 261.
(m) Advances in Mathematics and Science: Baudhayana was a famous mathematician by 800 BC, according to mainstream sources (and not Hindutva sources).

(n) The Takshashila evidence: This was a centre of higher learning by 600 BC.  

(o) Conflicts with Indian culture and the process of Indo-Aryan evolution: the four steps in this process are Aranyakya (jungle-based culture), Jana (tribe), Janapada (small settlement or kingdom), Mahajanapada (or mighty kingdom).

Let us now take the views of a few other scholars too:

In the book ‘A History of India’, Hermann Kulke and Dietmer Rothermund 14 state

“The extension of the Vedic culture into the Central and Eastern Gangetic plains was as important for the further course of Indian history as the period of their early settlement in the Punjab and the Ganga Yamuna doab. The penetration of the east soon led to the emergence of the first historical kingdoms and to a second phase of urbanization, the first being that of the Indus civilization.”

Frank Raymond Allchin and Erdosy state in their book “The Archeology of Early South Asia” 15

“Lal's data show that regardless of the absence of a Central place or incipient kingdoms in the region surveyed, the number of new settlements increased and began to colonize or rather exploit areas previously ignored. During the BRW phase, a total of 17.25 hectares were occupied by settlements. During the PGW phase, this had increased to 53.58 hectares and to 140.05 in the NBPW and to 291.12 hectares in the early historic. We may convert this data into possible population densities of 200 people per hectare (Dhavalikar et al 1988). During the BRW period, settlements were occupied by some 3450 people, the PGW settlements by 10716, the NBPW period by 28010 and the early historic period by 58,430 people. It is possible to compare these results with those from Erdosy’s survey. The foregoing discussion has expressly attempted to illustrate that the stretch of c 1000 years between the two great civilizations was not the Dark ages as suggested by Wheeler (Wheeler 1959,114). We must abandon Wheeler's vision of the period as consisting of semi-nomadic food gathering communities, capable of clearing patches of jungle and living mainly on hunting and fishing for one of large permanent settlements, some of which may be surely classified as urban.”

In the book ‘The quest for the origins of Vedic culture’, Edwin Bryant states

“Shaffer (1993) refers to one set of data that undermines this simplistic portrayal of an apparent devolution and re-evolution of urbanization which has nearly become a South Asian archeological axiom. Although there appears to have been a definite shift in settlements from the Indus valley proper in late and post-Harappan periods, there is a significant increase in the number of sites in Gujarat, and an explosion (i.e a 300 percent increase) of new settlements in East Punjab to accommodate the transferral of the population. Shaffer is insistent that this shift by Harappan and perhaps by other Indus valley cultural mosaic groups is the only archeologically documented west to east migrations in ancient India before the first half of the first millennium BC. Moreover, although there is a general decrease in the size of the settlements, not all of these were small and insignificant in comparison with the large complex structures of the Mature Harappan period. Data from Bahawalpur, the region of Pakistan most thoroughly surveyed, suggests an increase in the size of the settlements of the late Harappan period in comparison to the Harappan period. (Shaffer 1993, 57). This is very significant. More surveys have revealed large post-Harappan settlements in the Indus region after the major Indus centres were

13 Majumdar, Raychauduri and Datta. An Advanced History of India. London: Macmillan. pp. 64.
14 ‘A History of India’, Hermann Kulke and Dietmar Rothermund
15 Frank Raymond Allchin and Erdosy “The Archeology of Early South Asia”
abandoned. Research .......... is beginning to demonstrate that there was really no dark age isolating the proto-historic period from the historic period (Kenoyer 1987,26).

As with the BMAC culture, these data also problematize the notion that the Vedas are, in fact silent regarding large settlements, it is not because of a lack of such settlements at the approximate time and place where the Vedas are assumed to have been composed, because as Shaffer has observed, settlements did not disappear, they simply moved east. This would have been caused by the hydrological, ecological, and other factors mentioned previously that had struck the sites further west. Thus there was a re-organization and expansion (Kenoyer 1995, 234) but not dissolution. “

Understanding the transformation of Harappan India to Post-Harappan India

With these in background, let us study the transformation of Harappan to Post-Harappan India and begin explaining this process in detail. Since all the concepts have been explained in Part One, we now present a historical narrative - Readers must question every concept and idea and come up with additional details.

From our model, the first early kingdoms in the present-day Eastern UP region date to 2200 or 2300 BC and are characteristic of the eastward riverline migrations of the Early Aryans after they left the Mid-Himalayan region. This is what makes the Aryan issue complex: In the early years the relatively small numbers of Aryans were more mobile and peripatetic moving around in different directions especially along the Ganges river to the east, and founding kingdoms such as Pratishthaan, Kasi and Kosala but in later years, less so.

After the migration of populations from the Indus to the Ganga-Yamuna doab in 1900 BC, they naturally had to take on the role of rulers and became much less mobile. They then started arguing competing among each other for land. This was a natural process by which bigger kingdoms emerged, and became even more powerful after the import of critical new technologies from West Asia starting in 1800 BC, and of course, the birth of King Bharata in 1700 BC, which marked a turning point in the spread of Indo-Aryan power.

Also note that that caste system not was fully conceptualized by 2200 or 2300 BC. In the Himalayan region, naturally the Caste system did not exist at all. After 1900 BC, the caste system began to take final shape (when the migration from the Indus to the Ganga Yamuna doab took place and people got mixed up in unimaginable number of ways: this may itself become a topic of intensive research) and by 1650 BC when the Rig Veda was compiled it had been fully formed.

The drying up of the River Saraswathi after 1900 BC, and the resultant desynthesis was also critical because it allowed a new composite culture to take shape independently, away from the Indus, with Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Sudras living together. In one or two centuries, the culture of the Gangetic plains would have become completely different from that of the Indus. From our model, Brahmin is NOT equal to Aryan because people got mixed up in many different ways. Therefore, the Caste System had an exploitative element and a Non-exploitative element.

Through intercaste marriages, it is possible that the idea of kingship spread to the descendants of the Harappans themselves. Therefore we had Kshatriya kings, for example, though this may have been a classification based on occupation. Trade and commerce would have continued, though it mat not have been as important as the Indus. Thus, we can imagine, century by century, how Harappan culture got transformed in "Aryan" culture in the eastern half. By 1500 BC, when Hastinapur was founded, the transformation was complete, although a majority of the descendants of the Gangetic plains would themselves Harappans and kings themselves may have been descendants of Harappans. Contacts with West Asia were another trigger for the change, and knowledge about West Asia may have come from the descendants of the Harappans too. Of course Aryan culture spread back into Pakistan by 1600 BC, and had
covered the whole of North India, Pakistan and Afghanistan just as the IVC had also been spread over India and Pakistan.

From this model and from a very basic reconciliation of populations between Central Asia, Pakistan, and North India, we will be able to show very easily and convincingly that a majority, indeed an overwhelming majority of the population of the UP-Bihar region are descendants of the Harappans, and are of the same ethnic stock as those living in Pakistan. The proposition that the Harappans are racially related to South Indians is untenable for several reasons discussed in Part One. Furthermore, the term Dravidian only is a language label.

Let us now propose a very basic and fundamental equation

**Post-Harappan cultures would consist of**

**Elements of the IVC + New additions – Elements of Harappan culture that did not get carried forward into later cultures.**

For all additions and deletions, scholars must produce justifications as we have attempted to do, and of course invite criticism from other scholars, and this will make the study of the process of transformation of Harappan to Post-Harappan cultures and therefore, of Ancient India extremely logical. This is the key to understanding all aspects of Indian culture. The key here is to try to find out WHY the transformation happened.

Indeed, anything known about India in any field or discipline, ancient or modern, must be fitted into this theory or any other substitute theory to see if it makes sense from all angles. This would be the acid test of any acculturation model.

**Let us list some basic Examples of IVC elements carried forward into later cultures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chess, Yoga etc</td>
<td>Recent Archeological evidence has unearthed a Chess board(^{17}), figurines depicting the Indian Namaste and Swastika signs as was discussed in detail in Part One. Similarly, figurines apparently practicing Yoga(^{18}) were found. These elements could have been easily carried forward into later cultures apparently because of their universal appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritual Bathing</td>
<td>This aspect of Harappan culture similarly apparently got carried forward into the Ganges, with modifications. We can argue that the Harappan version would have been prohibitively expensive for the Ganges and economically unviable. Where else could this tradition have come from? From Central Asia? Unlikely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indus Script</td>
<td>Recently examples of the Indus script were found in post-Harappan contexts, reinforcing the theory that this pre-alphabetic script could have been used to write many languages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gods and Goddesses of the Indus</td>
<td>Gods and Goddesses of the IVC such as Proto-Siva, Mother Goddess were clearly carried forward and absorbed into later cultures into the Hindu pantheon of Gods and Goddesses as a new religion designed to accommodate diverse beliefs and interests emerged. Traditions such as ‘Siva married the Aryan Goddess Parvati’ (There are also interesting myths</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{17}\) *Excavation Sites in Rajasthan - Archaeological Survey of India 1977*

around Siva and Parvati) - these can also perhaps be understood and interpreted from the background of how they may have created to promote harmony, and all aspects of Indian religion and tradition must one day be fitted into this model.

Examples of IVC elements not carried forward into later cultures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Sophistication</td>
<td>Such urban sophistication would not have been present in the Gangetic plains because the Gangetic plains would not naturally have been able to produce this kind of a standard of living.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade with Egypt and Sumeria</td>
<td>Did not continue either because of changes in West Asia itself or because the Gangetic plains were further inland. The Aryan culture also naturally had a different approach towards life and manufacturing and international trade and commerce may not have been a top priority despite the existence of smaller ports in Western India by 1500 BC. (Different cultures emphasize different ideals. Designing advanced drainage system for example was not the hallmark or Aryan culture. However Chariots were necessary for the perpetration of the Aryan culture and Iron was used for chariots). Therefore, contacts with Asia were necessary for the preservation of the Aryan cultures' way of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of Beef</td>
<td>The Harappans ate beef. Most modern Hindus do not. Although this is a controversial topic, the possible reason for a slow transition has been dealt with elsewhere in this paper with justifications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of New elements added

It is important to identify the source of the new element. In part one, we proposed several possible sources. (a) Harappan (b) Central Asian (c) West Asian (d) other sources (e) a combination of more than one of the above. Readers should extend this to all aspects of Indian culture and draw their own conclusions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warfare</td>
<td>The IVC was a trade based civilization and did not specialize in warfare. The naturally mobile Indo-Aryans (this word refers to a culture) broke up into groups and frequently warred with each other according to traditional sources. They had always known the horse, and the Chariot was introduced from West Asia as a tool of convenience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Caste System</td>
<td>The caste system was born because different types of people got fused in the Gangetic plains and the origin of the Caste system has been dealt with in Part one in very great detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rig Veda</td>
<td>The Rig Veda was compiled under royal authority according to Pargiter (details provided elsewhere in this paper) and served as the signature of the new culture. It was a religious institution and used as a tool of self-gl glorification. Pastoral folk would have had no reason to produce such complex works.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, reconciliation between various elements in Harappan and Post-Harappan cultures can be carried out with justifications and explanations to explain the process of transformation of Harappan cultures to Post-Harappan cultures in detail. A closer study from this model would reveal that this was an extremely logical and self-explanatory process. Other scholars must be invited to contribute their ideas and this could one day become an important area of study. This could also impart a much-needed logic to the study of ancient India and weed out what is not plausible or possible.
Taking Provisional century by century snapshots

We can now take provisional century by century snapshots and evaluate them from all perspectives. This process could greatly help in the eventual reconstruction of the history of Post-Harappan India. Since these dates are still provisional, it would help take as much contradictory evidence as possible, and use this to test the accuracy of the reconstruction because some of Pargiter’s very early kinglists are clearly not correctly arranged. Many other scholars have also recently researched this period of Indian history. As we discussed, archeological research on the Gangetic plains has already become mainstream in the last few years or so. We can also draw many conclusions this way. We must remember to always invite as many objections as possible, and this process would enable us to hone models to perfection.

Fig 13. Dholavira Gujarat 2500 BC. It is highly unlikely that the cultures of Post-Harappan India ever reached level of prosperity seen in Harappan India due to reasons discussed in the paper.

Fig 14. Hastinapura on the banks of the river Ganges as it is supposed to have existed in 1500 BC. Readers are encouraged to take each and every item shown in this picture on their own and understand how it came into existence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>How the transformation took place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2300-2200 BC</td>
<td>Small primitive Kingdoms were founded in a region covered by the IVC along the Saraswathi River.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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At the same time, in 2300 or 2200 BC, the small kingdoms of Prathistaan (Now Prayaag or Allahabad) and Kasi were set up in the east and this was a parallel expansion along the banks of the Ganges. This riverline expansion is another interesting feature of the early Indo-Aryans and these kingdoms were set up several hundreds of kilometers east of Harappan territory. Caste system not fully formed yet. Caste system did not exist in the Himalayas at all.

At this time some Indo-Aryans knew the use of Copper from the Harappans but not Iron which was introduced only later from West Asia (Evidence: Early Chalcolithic Treasure trove with Anthropomorphic figurine located several hundred kilometers east of the IVC).  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000 BC</td>
<td>The transfer of populations to the Ganges would play a major role in the expansion of Indo-Aryan power. The date of 1900 BC is accurate as will be discussed in this paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-1800 BC</td>
<td>Perhaps a period of chaos and confusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800 BC</td>
<td>Iron was introduced because we have evidence for this. This means that early contacts with West Asia started at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700 BC</td>
<td>King Bharata was born. He naturally took advantage of the Indo-Aryan position of power and united the whole of North India. He also regularly sacrificed on the banks of the River Saraswathi which had almost dried up by then. This means it must have still retained symbolic value. He does seem to have been associated with the Chariot, so chariots were perhaps introduced after him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600 BC</td>
<td>The first permanent trading outpost of Gandhara was set up in the North West. This served as a vital link between the Ganges and West Asia. Finishing touches were being given to the Rig Veda at Kasi and Southern Panchala from 1650 BC onwards. The complete list of rulers, ministers involved in its compilation from Pargiter’s list is produced elsewhere along with dates from our model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 BC</td>
<td>Founding of Hastinapura, Indraprastha and Dwaraka. The large kingdoms possessed chariots. So, chariots were perhaps introduced from West Asia between 1700 BC and 1500 BC. This period shows some kind of a reverse movement. These kingdoms apparently came close to the Rakhigarhi of the Indus, but Rakhigarhi of the Indus was probably abandoned by then. That means, according to our model, the Inhabitants of Hastinapura were remote descendants of the people of the IVC because of the eastward migration of 1900 BC, but arguably did not know anything about Rakhigarhi which had been buried. This process of transformation must be captured century by century and location by location through further archeological</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This also proves one thing. Most of the Rig Veda was compiled on the Banks of the Ganges soon after 1700 BC. (List of kings and ministers responsible attached). Note: this is a concurrent dating paradigm and we have explained this concept in very great detail elsewhere. This means that Hastinapur and Indraprastha were set up soon after this. Many events were taking place at the same time.

Topics for future study would also arguably include topics such as these:

(a) How materially advanced was Post-Harappan India? A study of the towns, cities and kingdoms of the Gangetic plains and in the North West from 2300 or 2200 BC such as Prathistaan and Kasi on the banks of the River Ganges.

(b) Understanding different and unusual aspects of the composite Aryan culture, some of which are baffling and such as its ability to produce complex philosophical works such as the Upanishads by 1300 BC, the presence of brilliant Mathematicians such as Baudhayana 22 23 by 800 BC (Of course, as known through mainstream, and not Hindutva sources), its ability to set up institutes of learning such as Taxila by 700-600 BC (The ruins of which are world famous, still beautifully preserved in Pakistan and can be referred from any mainstream source) which reportedly attracted some international scholars as well, but was bedeviled by untouchability and the Caste system at the other extreme.

(c) A study of Regional variations from Takshashila and Gandhara in the North-West, to Bet Dwaraka in the South West to Kalinga in the east.

(d) A study of evolving trends century by century in Post-Harappan India, and ultimately from ruler to ruler, although it must still be ascertained whether this level of precision is possible or not, because there are certainly several periods of obscurity.

(e) From this model Aryan culture and power seems to have started expanding from around 2300 BC or 2200 BC and reached its peak from 1700 BC to 1500 BC although this view still needs to be challenged.

---


Fig 16. Chalcolithic treasure trove with anthropomorphic figurine in the Gangetic plains typically associated with the Indo-Aryans. The Aryan culture would have evolved and changed century by century. (<2000 BC)

The names of Kings and Ministers involved in the compilation of the Rig Veda

We present our earlier findings again in a table i.e what we called a Concurrent Dating Paradigm, adding some more information to what was already presented in Part one. This will show the kind of detailed research that has already been done by European scholars with no political motives, and other scholars should not be under the mistaken notion that data for the reconstruction of the history of Post-Harappan India is not available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Compiled</th>
<th>Events described</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rig Veda</td>
<td>1650 BC -1380 BC (during the time of a King Bramhadatta of Southern Panchala according to Pargiter, some work was done by his predecessors and some additions were made later). This date range is also consistent with linguistic evidence.</td>
<td>Pertaining to various periods. However, this is quite clearly a compilation, the mandalas having been arranged in the descending order of the number of deities. Historical information in the Rig Veda was stored in the form of Poetry and Aryans were poor historians. This is because the Rig Veda was NOT a history textbook but was used as a signature of the new Composite culture of the Ganges. (They key to reconstructing Ancient Indian history is to de-poetize historical information in RV). The names of the poets, ministers, Kings and Chiefs responsible for various hymns are available in later literature. Thus each text usually describes events preceding it. This reinforces the concurrent dating paradigm and makes the Nine phase acculturation model self-explanatory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mahabharata        | 200 BC to 200 AD (This is a highly mythified text). This date range is also consistent with linguistic evidence. | (1) The Mahabharata describes the River Saraswathi frequently which dried up in 1900 BC  
(2) The submergence of Dwaraka (Bet Dwaraka?) in around 1500 BC (This event is central to the Mahabharata)  
(3) Gandhara (founded in 1600 BC is also quite central to the Mahabharata)  
(4) The Mahabharata talks about people such as the Purus who lived in 1500 BC and not when the |
epic was compiled. The same people are also mentioned in the Rig Veda.

Although, the Mahabharata was compiled and mythified between 200 BC and 200 AD, based on linguistic evidence, it is logically quite impossible that the events described in this text, even if we assume that it has a historical core, pertain to the period of between 200 BC and 200 AD when this text was compiled.

The Ramayana and Mahabharatha may have been Brahminical reactions to Ashoka's conversion to Buddhism which took place around this period, given the fact that the dates tally perfectly. They perhaps chose non-Brahmin kings with easy-to-pronounce names such as Rama and Krishna, who perhaps lived around 2000 BC and 1500 BC respectively, and wove legends around them to build a rapport with large sections of the population. This hypothesis may be challenged by other scholars.

By 1650 BC, various kings and ministers appear to have been giving finishing touches to the Rig Veda in various kingdoms on the banks of the River Ganges and nearby. However, preliminary work seems to have begun earlier. From this it is also apparent that the composite culture of the Ganges was slowly taking shape.

Therefore, before 1700 BC, Brahminism had not got formed, but by 1500 BC Brahminical culture had taken full shape. From here, this culture began to spread throughout India.

Pargiter states:

Further, the most ancient kings and Rishis above-mentioned, to whom hymns were attributed, were not Ailas. The kings were all Manvas and the Rishis were connected with the Manvas or with Daityas and Danvas. Only one hymn is ascribed to an early Aila viz x 95 to Pururavas, yet it was not obviously not composed by him but by some later author just as were x,10 and 86. Not a single other hymn is attributed to any early Aila king until Sivi Ausinara (x,179) and Gathi or Gadhi (iii,19 to 22).

The next great stage in the composition of the hymns began with the above-mentioned development of Brahminism in connection with sacrifice after Bharata's time (1700 BC), culminating with the Rishis, no 49 & c, in the chronological list. The bulk of the Rig Vedic hymns date from after that period. His territory included the tract between the Rivers Saraswathi and Drishtadvathi, and he sacrificed on the latter, which was a large river then. The region has some sanctity before, for on the Saraswathi was Usanas-Sukra's tirtha Kapalamocana, and the river constituted the boundary between the Punjab and the Ganges-Yumna basin, whether it flowed into the Rajputana desert, or especially if the sea extended northwards into that desert then.

Another Kaksivant was the author of the Rigveda i.116 and i.117 where he calls himself Pajiya Kaksivant. These hymns and also 118 to 126 are attributed to Kaksivant Daigharamasa Aujisa, but the rishi cannot be the former Kaksivant because (1) Dirghatamas and his son Kaksivant lived in the time of Dushyanta and Bharata (1700 BC)
The next stage to be noticed is that the division of rc, yajus and saman had apparently come into existence before the time of Hiranyanabha i.e. king of Kosala, because he and his disciple, king Kṛta, constructed samhitas or samans, which were called the eastern Samans and the chanters of them were called Kartas. Here also appears the influence of Ksatriyas.

By the time of King Bramhadatta of Southern Panchala, the collection of Vedic hymns appear to have been largely constituted, for they were definitely combined into a whole by his two ministers, Kandarika or Pundarika and Subalaka or Galava. Kandarika is described as the promulgator or pravartaka of the Veda Sastra. Babharavya Pancala was bahvrama and acarya and knew all the satras; he composed the siksa and instituted it; he also devised the krama, mastered it thoroughly and instituted it; Tradition thus declares that the first substantial compilation and the study of the hymns of the Veda in its triple departments of rc, yajus and saman were made in Southern Pancala by these two Brahmin ministers of Brahmadatta whose position may be estimated as a century and a half before the Bharata battle (1500 BC- 150 BC=1650 BC?). (This reinforces the concurrent dating paradigm and is also consistent with linguistic evidence for the date of compilation of the Rig Veda. But Kandarika's compilation was not the Veda as we have it now, first because certain hymns, such as Devapi's, for instance could not have been included since they were later; and since secondly because tradition is unanimous that Vyasa arranged the Veda, which means a real arrangement of the Veda as it was finally settled). The final compilation was made after Devapi's time and not until that of Vyasa, who followed him by around half a century, because hymns are attributed to Asita or Devala, and Devala was a contemporary of the Pandavas (1500 BC?) and of Vyasa. Vyasa must have added all the hymns that were incorporated latest, and completed the canon. It says generally that he arranged the Veda, he divided the Veda into four, he divided the four pada Veda into four; and there are explicit statements he compiled into the Rig Veda. He would have probably have completed the work about a quarter of a century before the Bharata battle (1525 BC). This supports our concurrent dating paradigm very well.

Dates for the Rig Veda

Therefore, from the above, we can obtain the following dates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Compiled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The process of compilation</td>
<td>Between 1700 BC and 1650 BC in the Kingdoms of Southern Panchala and Kasi. (However Brahminical culture got formed just after 1700 BC). Therefore, early Hymns were not written by Brahmins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later additions</td>
<td>Later additions to the Rig Veda were made around 1500 BC, some even later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memories of the Rig Veda</td>
<td>Memories of the Rig Veda pertain to 2500 BC or earlier going by the River Saraswathi evidence. (This is like a book describing earlier periods)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This tallies with linguistic evidence and current theories perfectly and also reinforces the Concurrent dating paradigm because King Bharata lived a few generations before the Mahabharata war, and we have dated the latter to 1500 BC.

The Nine phase acculturation model would make even more sense if we de-poetize the historical content of the Rig Veda. Even, the word Dasa is perhaps a later name and refers to people in the neighbourhood, an appellation borrowed from West Asia after cultural contacts with the region began in 1800 BC or later. In earlier periods the Harappans may have been known by other names such as Mleccha derived from Meluhha, although this aspect needs to be
researched. Perhaps the word Dasa itself is a Brahminical construct. The word Indo-Aryan itself refers to a culture given the fact that the Genetic input from Central Asia was so small.

Many Vedic hymns as observed by Pargiter and other scholars were written by non-Brahmins. This is in spite of the fact that the caste system is itself mentioned in the Rig Veda. Therefore, the word Aryan only represents a new composite culture that emerged towards the end of and after the IVC. The word Aryan is NOT synonymous with the word Brahmin. Kings themselves were sometimes Brahmin and very often, not. Therefore, the caste system was perhaps partly exploitative and partly a classification of convenience. The Ramanyana and Mahabharata of a later period are however viewed as Brahminical Productions, and this would suggest the gradual entrenchment of the caste system in the post-Vedic era. This would still however leave many questions unanswered. How and why was the caste system initially conceptualized? Our model attempts to provide many answers, but still leaves many questions unanswered such as the mobility of individuals across the caste system. There are many possibilities. As can be understood from traditional sources, mobility was perhaps easier for people belonging to upper castes, but less easy for untouchables. Many such aspects of Indian history would merit further research, and a spirit of constant inquiry would apparently always yield rich dividends.

Fig 17. Priest king Mohenjodaro 2600 BC. Scholars must study the transformation of each element in the IVC to post-Harappan India and study the process of transformation in detail. Some elements have survived in the local cultures of the region as well such as the Sindhi shawl Arjuk, which suggests that the Priest king was native to the region. This could be another novel technique to identify elements of the IVC which were imports and those which were not. The IVC also was perhaps culturally diverse.
Fig 18. On the other hand, a Brahmin priest is believed to have looked like this. Scholars must try to explain the transformation in great detail focusing on the ‘How’ and ‘Why’ of the transformation.

Violent incidents should not be taught in History textbooks

In the Author’s perspective, Violent incidents, even if they had indeed occurred, could have been only internal, as was discussed in Part one. They can be omitted or mentioned in passing, because

(a) They have no historical value.
(b) They can be misused.
(c) Historical incidents in the Rig Veda were stored in the form of poetry and constructing narratives from poetry is still difficult.
(d) People who live next to each other sometimes choose not to get along with each other as is common even today, and these represent an over-simplification and there could have been many different types of relationships between people living in Ancient India, many mutually beneficial and positive.
(e) The priests were perhaps not guided by what was historically important but by exaggeration and self-glorification.
(f) Some incidents could have been modified and exaggerated, some could have been omitted. This automatically creates a mismatch between what happened and what was recorded and makes the narrative incongruent. Everything else can be understood through pure and unadulterated logic, but perhaps, not so much so, these.
(g) These may refer to Devapi’s hymns and may pertain to a period after King Bramhadatta of Southern Panchala, though we cannot be sure yet. However, since chariots were used, they could have only taken place after 1600 BC.
(h) These hymns are referred to as being late.

Such incidents would nonetheless be able to explain by the Western half of the IVC was abandoned in 1500-1400 BC. Why did people move back to villages? The IVC, though diminished in glory, would have still continued to exist because the Indus itself never dried up. An interesting topic for future research, and must be studied with textual and archeological evidence. From our model, the Harappans and the Indo-Aryans were largely of the same ethnic stock, the de-synthesis having taken place in 1900 BC, and the word Aryan only refers to a culture. It is likely that the word Arya meaning noble was itself borrowed from West Asia and the few pastoralists who may have migrated from Central Asia much earlier wouldn't have arguably identified themselves as such.

Again, the term Dasa was mentioned in the Rig-Veda, even if for self-glorification. It was however removed from later literature because it was perhaps factually inconvenient, in spite of the fact that the word Dasa acquired other connotations. This is another problem with post-Harappan India: Additions and deletions to the past to suit the needs of the present.

The Mittani inscriptions have been dated to 1400 BC, and like Bet Dwaraka and Gandhara are outside the archeologically challenged and challenging Gangetic plains and are more recent by 100 and 200 years respectively. If Indra was an invocation in the RV, it must have been used as an invocation here too- the names of the historical persons associated with this must be probed further and would be possible once the history of post-Harappan India is reconstructed. This would mean this kind of an invocation was typical not just of a composer of a hymn in the RV it was symbolic of a culture.

Why texts need to be read concurrently

The concurrent dating Paradigm makes sense in every conceivable way. Perhaps historical information was stored in the form of oral tradition and compiled at periodic intervals.
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This is the way historical information is collected even today excepting that we make tend to make use of written material. Imagine two books written in 1870 and 1890, talking about events that took place between 1810-1814 and 1812-1840 respectively. The Rig Veda was not changed after it had become a rigid tradition and further information was compiled in later literature. All this suggests that historical information had a role to play in the collective consciousness of the Aryan culture and was even used by successive rulers and the clergy for creating cultural awareness. There is, therefore, a chance of manipulation and distortion of historical information, more so when vested interests were involved, and naturally the custodians of historical information in post-Vedic times were Brahmins, and those whose duty and livelihood it was to propagate religion, though this may not have been necessarily so in earlier periods. They therefore did not tamper with accounts of Kshatriya kings, the most interesting exceptions being the Ramayana and Mahabharata of later times.

**How Historical information was handled**

Historical information was generally handled or mishandled in the following fashion.

(a) Information in the Rig Veda was stored in the form of poetry.
(b) Mythification of History as can be found in later texts.
(c) Deleting inconvenient information such as information pertaining to the Dasas and contacts with West Asia from later texts.
(d) Wrong storing of king lists: in one text the lists were stored in a particular fashion but modified later.
(e) Some king lists missing.
(f) Some king lists maybe manufactured - however this is unlikely in the case of Kshatriya kings. The early lists are suspect.
(g) Exaggeration and self-glorification especially when history was in the control of those whose bread and butter it was to propagate religion.
(h) Continuously re-projecting the past to suit the needs to the present. Later Astronomers such as Aryabhatta calculated the reigns of the kings wrongly.
(i) Dates were never maintained.
(j) Mixing up names, and this was frequently done.

The key to achieving greater accuracy would be to

(a) Search for as many “Anchor points” as possible and arrange these in the order of reliability
(b) Look for possible motives for manipulation. Accounts of Brahmin kings were generally manipulated. Accounts of Kshatriya kings were not.
(c) Look for king lists with obvious historical information.
(d) Look for information corroborated by multiple texts.
(e) Arrange the texts in the order of reliability. Buddhist and Jain text, though late, would naturally be the most reliable, followed by the RV. The epics are even less reliable, though again late, and of these the Ramayana is the least reliable according to Pargiter.
(f) Make sure that a Textual reconstruction satisfies multiple Anchor Points. This would be the ultimate test of reliability. However Pargiter did make some mistakes (i) The date of the Mahabharata war is wrong because he had no independent corroborative evidence to date them in 1922 when even the IVC was not known. (ii) The early king lists were not correctly arranged, exaggerated or had short reigns.
(g) Use the work already done, including this model as a base and then study the entire corpus of Sanskrit, Prakrit and Pali literature together.
(h) Most importantly the common sense test is very important. Underlying human motives are the same whether in India or elsewhere in the world.
Inferences of our model for the study of Ancient India: The Aryan cultures’ dietary habits and the consumption of beef

Let us now take one particular aspect of Indian culture and develop some golden rules: The Aryan cultures’ dietary habits. This is only a sample and other scholars must adopt a similar approach for a balanced study of all other aspects of India’s history.

While devout Hindus have claimed the cow has always been held sacred, D N Jha’s views appear to be diametrically the opposite and his book, “The myth of the Holy Cow” was even banned in some parts of the country and is either an angry reaction to the excesses of the Hindutva movement or maybe what we can call Marxist bias or even Marxist communalism. We may want to strike middle ground here in view of the fact that the Rig Veda mentions the Dasas as being beef eating. On the other hand, the Rig Veda 10.86.14 talks of the consumption of beef.

Consumption of beef may not have also made economic sense in the Gangetic plains which were more thickly populated and simply could not have produced the level of economic prosperity of the Indus for the simple reason that vital trade links with West Asia would have been absent. A larger proportion of income would have been based on agriculture and dairy produce. Therefore, this would have certainly made beef consumption less economical. To study any aspect of Indian history, it is always necessary to take contradictory evidence into account. It is also necessary to take into account changes in trends and differences by region.

Perhaps while beef eating was discouraged, habits changed slowly. Future historians may chronicle the transition of Ancient India to a non Beef eating society by going through the vast corpus of Sanskrit literature.

Again, dietary habits would have varied community by community and communities that were generally non-meat eating may have eaten meat on certain occasions. How prevalent was animal sacrifice? How and why did Brahmins become vegetarians? These are all issues that need to be understood.

Thus, as always, while studying Indian history, we can suggest

(a) Introduce one or more Hypotheses
(b) Always look for multiple causes
(c) Always look for contradictory evidence and exceptions: this can refine concepts further
(d) Look for trends and changes to changes to trends
(e) Look for local variations
(f) Put whatever evidence is available to optimal use
(g) Understand India as a series of inter-dependant events

---
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Inferences of our model for the study of Ancient India: The Cemetery H culture and the date of the drying up of the Saraswathi

Let us examine the Cemetery H culture from the point of view of our theory. Gordon Childe in 1926 and G D Kumar in 1973 had made a case that the Cemetery H Culture represented Aryan influences and even Sir Mortimer Wheeler hesitatingly refers to this in his paper “Harappa 1946: The defences and Cemetery R37.” This is dated to 1900 BC. This date corresponds to the drying up of the River Saraswathi. The cremations of this period may have been because of famine and many people perhaps died during the drying up of this river. This also corresponds perfectly to the decline in the IVC and the eastward migrations of this period. This suggests that the River Saraswathi dried up more or less completely in 1900 BC, not earlier, not later. However, the Harappans had earlier only buried their dead. Where did this change come from? The Rig Veda talks about both burial and cremation. This means that the acculturation process had already begun by this time because of kingdoms to the east, and culture change had become significant, not withstanding the fact that cremation is a speedy method of disposing the dead, and would have been a more suitable method of disposing the dead in unnatural circumstances such as famine which would have naturally been associated with the drying up of the Saraswathi and the movement east. Therefore, all early Second millennium BC migration hypotheses would need to be revisited. They are clearly untenable as explained in Part One.

We can now argue that the River Saraswathi dried up in 1900 BC, not earlier or later and research done by ASI in this field is correct. This is because the date of 1900 BC tallies with (a) the date of the Cemetery H culture perfectly. (b) It also tallies with the date of the commencement of decline of the IVC perfectly.

Assuming a date of 2300 BC for the movement of Indo-Aryans into the plains, we must push back the date of migrations to at least 2800 BC immediately, assuming that they lived in the Himalayan region for 500 years. (This must naturally be done after ensuring that the IVC is projected as India’s oldest civilization because the Kot Diji phase dates to 3300 BC and because the roots of this civilization date back to 7000 BC or earlier).

Aspects of Indian culture not accounted for by our Nine Phases

In addition to these phases, evidence for direct contacts between the IVC and the South of India is also available, as also continued contacts between the Aryavarta and the Vedic homeland. All these phase put together should be able to account for all aspects of Indian history, and other scholars are encouraged to take any aspect of ancient or modern India and study it from this perspective.

Therefore,

(a) Cultural contacts between the IVC and South India would explain traditions such as Jallikattu or bull fighting not found in the Gangetic plains. Harappan seals have also been found in the south of India suggesting that there were contacts between the IVC and this region.

---
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(b) Cultural contacts between Aryavarta and the Vedic homeland which retained a cultural significance in Post-Harappan culture and would have explained the retention of names of plants found in cooler climates for example even though the Vedas were compiled in the Gangetic plains.  

Part D
The Remote Ancestor of the Prakrit family of languages Hypothesis

Let us now enter into a much more interesting discussion. As a matter of fact, this would be the last major inference from our model, and would in turn lead to other conclusions such as the origin of IA languages, methods to reconstruct the languages spoken in the IVC and the hunt for the Indological Rosetta stone.

We now introduce a new Hypothesis which consists of the following five elements:

(a) The IVC could have been truly polyglot as suggested by some scholars and there may have been several language families there.  
(b) The Harappans spoke languages that included remote ancestors of what much later came to be known as the Prakrit group of languages.  
(c) These languages may have been collectively referred to as Meluhha or Mleccha.  
(d) These were perhaps related in remote antiquity (before 7000 BC) to the Semitic languages of West Asia. However they would have naturally absorbed many local influences as well.

Let us now proceed as follows:

(a) We will first introduce a Crude hypothesis.  
(b) We will present the ideas of some scholars.  
(c) We will propose methodologies to prove this hypothesis and trace the languages spoken in the IVC.  
(d) We will also use this model to propose a new method which may, in addition to identifying the distance of Genetic markers, help us to calculate the hypothetical arrival date of the Indo-Aryans.  
(e) We will also identify triggers for cultural change at every stage, identify the kind of words that may have been introduced at every stage and try to identify how and why these words may have got transmitted into later cultures.

Our crude hypothesis is as below:

Prakrit which means original, natural or common, refers not just to a single language but to a group of languages and these were the common man’s lingo in contrast to the literary use of Sanskrit in Ancient India. There were several different types of Prakrit such as Sauraseni, Magadhi, Mahasrashtri and Paisaci. These became literary languages only perhaps much later after Sanskrit fell out of favour as a literary language due to various reasons which include the decline of the Vedic orthodoxy owing to the emergence of Buddhism in 600 BC.

From our model, the early Indo-Aryan kings who settled in Kasi and Pratishtaan were speaking an Ancestor of Vedic Sanskrit by 2200 BC. This would have already split up from the PIE long before this. When the migration from the Indus to the Ganga-Yamuna doab took place in 1900 BC leading to a de-synthesis between both sides of what is now known as the Thar desert,

---
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people may have got synthesized in many ways. This could have been through marriages, and several other types of interrelationships, and this kind of a fusion would have led to the development of the Caste system. The need for the rulers to take on the languages of the masses for all ordinary dealings would have been present, and this would have happened slowly and over a period of time. In order to understand this, we may need to do a basic reconciliation of populations. The ruling class would have been a small portion of the population. While some ancestor of Vedic Sanskrit was the language of the early ruling classes, would the ruling class take on the languages of the masses or the other way round?

Let us take the example of Persian and English. While Persian was a court language, did it ever replace the languages of the common man? Can and will English ever replace Indian languages, as a spoken language? This is highly unlikely and may never happen even after many years.

It is impossible from our model that Sanskrit replaced the languages of the masses completely after the eastward migration happened, and Sanskrit was expressly discouraged by the clergy. Furthermore, Kshatriya kings spoke Prakrit even though it was illegitimate by the Vedic orthodoxy. Therefore, the languages of the masses in 1900 BC were the ancestors of the languages of the masses in 600 BC i.e. Prakrit.

If the small ruling class or the elite had to replace the language or the masses, they would have had to carry out a holocaust unparalleled in human history. Even then, they would not have been successful because they were dealing with humans.

Furthermore, the early kings were just kinglings and were frequently quarrelling with each other. They would not have been able to do anything on the lines mentioned above. Furthermore, Brahmanism restricted the use of Sanskrit only for liturgical use as discussed. Even if they theoretically had been able to why would they have had to do that?

Through intercaste marriages between Brahmin and Kshatriya kings, for example, it is likely that Sanskrit got transformed from the language of the Ruling class to a liturgical language reserved only for religious purposes. After a series of inter-caste marriages, the rulers themselves would have given up Sanskrit as a native language. Furthermore, the language of a small minority would not have been practical for daily usage and would have slowly fallen out of use. Naturally, the Vedic orthodoxy would have clung on to it for some more time until using it as a spoken language became impractical. Then, they would have abandoned it, too. This could explain how the language was already extinct by 600 BC.

However, there is enough evidence to suggest that Sanskrit influenced the languages of the region significantly. Thus even numerals became Indo-Europeanized in Pali and Prakrit. Therefore while Sanskrit would have influenced the languages of the region significantly much as Persian and English did, it would not have been able to replace the languages of the region entirely, because a PIE would have lacked agricultural terms and terms pertaining to trade and business for example, and these kind of words would have been taken from the languages of the region.

Therefore we can conclude, that

(a) In 2200 BC, an ancestor of Rig Vedic Sanskrit was the language spoken by the early rulers.

---
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By 1650 BC, when the Rig Veda was compiled on the Ganges, Sanskrit would have been reduced to a liturgical language. Before 1650 BC, it is likely that many members of the ruling class abandoned Sanskrit as a native language.

The heterogeneous ruling class would have itself been influenced by the clergy which would not have liked the use of Sanskrit for Non-liturgical purposes.

Let us take another example. King Gandhara founded Gandhara in the Pakistan region in 1600 BC. By this time, the rulers themselves would have abandoned Sanskrit. However, his ancestor King Yayati founded a small kingdom to the east of the IVC. By this time, an ancestor of Rig Vedic Sanskrit could still have been spoken by him.

This explains how Sanskrit died out excepting for liturgical purposes. By 1500 BC, it was dead. Did Sanskrit manage to replace the languages of the region or was it the other way around? Readers can guess this for themselves.

We can also draw the following conclusions:

(a) Aryans spread their culture throughout India and Pakistan
(b) However, they slowly killed their own language, which became

   (a) A liturgical language
   (b) A lingua franca – because no other language would have been able to play this role (The reasons being (a) The IVC was polyglot and one language would not have been able to play this role (b) The Indo-Aryan kingdoms were spread over a large region)

   If they killed their language, they must have taken on some other language, since they could not have been mute. What other language could they have possibly taken on? There were only some tribes in the Gangetic plains before 2200 BC. Therefore, they took on the languages of the descendants of the inhabitants of the IVC. These were the ancestors of the Prakrits and Pali.

   If this theory is wrong, then our model itself is wrong. But our model has been written taking several different arguments into account. So, readers can figure out for themselves which theory is correct. People who do not accept this theory must give a convincing explanation of how Sanskrit became extinct despite the spread of Aryan culture. Furthermore, there were no other changes in the Gangetic plains between 1900 BC and 600 BC. We also know that the population of Central Asia was very small compared to that of India. We also know that the Gangetic plains were unpopulated before 2200 BC.

   Therefore, we can tentatively conclude that the languages of the IVC were remote ancestors of the Prakrit group of languages, among others. We can also infer this because Prakrits were the most widely used languages in North India in 600 BC. It is also improbable that the Aryans, who were such a small group, wiped out all the languages of the region, and then killed their own language.

**Relationship between Pali, Sanskrit and Prakrit**

There are two possibilities here:

(a) Prakrit and Pali are derivatives of Sanskrit
(b) Prakrit and Pali not Derivatives of Sanskrit: However the three cross influenced each other

Supporters of Hypothesis ‘b’ can always argue that Sanskrit was the language of the elite and was chiefly liturgical as we have already suggested. This is because the Vedas were compiled in the Gangetic plains and the cultures of the Gangetic plains were highly cosmopolitan.
in any case and only a tiny minority of the population could be traced to Central Asia. Only a long-forgotten language of Vedic Sanskrit was perhaps the native language of the early Aryans who lived in the Himalayan region. The composers of the Vedas themselves were not always Brahmins according to many scholars and this is discussed elsewhere in this paper. Therefore, it is unlikely that Sanskrit would have ever been able to replace the languages of the subcontinent entirely under such circumstances.

Experts may try to use tools and techniques to ascertain which of the Hypotheses is true i.e. (a) or (b)

Let us now examine the views of some mainstream scholars:

Franklin C Southworth has discussed existing theories and decipherment in detail in his book “Linguistic Archaeology of South Asia”.  

He says ‘However, it is clear that varieties of speech with Prakritic phonology or morphology existed from the Rig Vedic period onwards. Hock and Pandharipande cite for example, the Prakritism “Kim” or what for older “Kad” both of which appear in the Rig Veda. Furthermore, a number of cases have been shown where the Prakrits retain forms which are more archaic than the equivalents in the earliest Vedic, showing that these dialects are continuous from the Vedic period. Thus, the Prakrit languages or dialects known from early inscriptions (such as those of King Ashoka in the mid-third century BC), from the early writings of Buddhists and the Jains, and from the early Sanskrit dramas, were contemporary with the Sanskrit of the period. For the earlier Vedic period, although there is no direct evidence for any form of speech other than Vedic, the existence of contemporaneous “Prakritic” varieties must be inferred.

M B Emeneau also notes

“Tedesco …prefers to call this dialect parallel to Rig Vedic “Archaic Middle Indic”; probable “Proto-middle Indo-Aryan (or Indic) is as good. No absolute chronology is possible for it, but we can guess that the latter “Proto-middle Indo-Aryan” type of dialect was in existence from the beginning of this time span. Thus, the presence of a parallel body of language can be inferred.


Alfred C Woolner makes this rather ambiguous interpretation:

"Even in the Rig Veda, we find, "prakritis", that is phonetic variations along just those lines that were followed by Prakrits. For e.g. Sitihra meaning loose instead of Srthira as might be expected from the root Srath. From this, and other instances, it is not necessary to deduce a wide difference between the language of the hymns and contemporary speech. Rather, the inclusion of such Prakritis in the sacred texts indicates that the priests regarded them as possible forms of the same language, and were not yet aware of any gulf between the two forms of speech.

In Vedic Aryans, Non-Vedic Aryans, and Non Aryans: Judging the linguistic evidence of the Vedas, Madhav M. Deshpande says,

---
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"Burrow further points out that even within the North-Western region, the Niya Prakrit (also known as Gandhari Prakrit) in the further West preserved r+ dental clusters better than the north-Western Asokan inscriptions. He concludes that phonologically, the language of the former presents a pronouncedly more archaic aspect than of Asoka's edicts. Burrow's conclusion is extremely significant: Obviously, we cannot derive the Niya Prakrit from the language of Asoka, and the most natural conclusion to draw from the fact that phonetically it is better preserved is that its home is to be sought further to the West. Because it seems clearer, (then as now) that the more remote a language was in the direction of the North-West, the less liable it was to phonetic decay."

In addition, these languages wouldn’t have changed by much after 1900 BC or so, apart from Indo-Europeanization which may have included Central and West Asian influences because post-Harappan India was perhaps more sterile. It was more sterile because there were no major cultural changes after 1900 BC, except for contacts with West Asia. These were perhaps restricted to word borrowings for the compilation of the RV. Languages such as Tamil have not changed significantly over two millennia and it is likely the languages spoken by the Harappans were direct ancestors of the Prakrit group of languages, the common man’s languages in Post-Harappan India.

However, these languages would not have survived in their initial form for several reasons:

(a) When the fusion took places in the Ganges, some languages would have survived, some, would not.
(b) They would have been influenced by Sanskrit.
(c) The names of people would definitely have been Sanskritized because of a culture change.

These two hypotheses need to be investigated more meticulously; the reconstruction of the history of the Gangetic plains would play a key role and must be reconstructed before an attempt is made to reconstruct the languages of the IVC. This would naturally necessitate many fundamental changes to be made to theories explaining the relationship between Indo-Aryan languages and other IE languages, too.

From our model, the Modern Indo-Aryan languages would consist of:

The languages of the IVC + influences from Sanskrit + Other local influences + later foreign influences

Understanding this well would enable us to understand the similarities and dissimilarities between modern IA languages and other Indo-European languages which is a different concept from understanding the similarities between Sanskrit and other IE languages, because the two would represent two different streams.

There is contradictory evidence, also, which cannot be assumed to be mutually exclusive:

(a) Some scholars have presented evidence to show that Dravidian languages were spoken there even if by a very small number of people. A common example is Brahui, which may be of relatively recent origin, as some scholars suggest that speakers of these languages migrated from India in more recent times.
(b) There are languages like Proto-Burushaski spoken there.

Several factors who have expedited the Sanskritization of Indian languages, some others would have slowed it down. It would also be prudent to study these factors and arrive at a balanced assessment. For example, the Sanskritization of Hindi and other languages has been

---
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promoted in several quarters well into modern times because Sanskrit has been viewed as a cultural symbol of Ancient India. Thus Sanskritization of Indian languages could have continued long after the language became extinct. Loan words from North India have been referred to as vadačol in the Ancient treatise on Tamil Grammar, the Tholkappiyam, and in this case it is likely that Sanskrit and Prakrits influenced Dravidian languages. Sanskritization was aided by the cultural transformation that took place after 1900 BC too, and the spread of Aryan culture over a large region and was impeded perhaps by the small numbers of immigrants and the priests' likely distaste for the widespread use of Sanskrit.

We have additional evidence to support this Hypothesis, too and this should make this idea all the more convincing.

(a) The modern languages of India and Pakistan belong to the same group in spite of the de-synthesis which took place after 1900 BC. The immediate predecessor of Sindhi was an Apabhramsha Prakrit named Vrachada.

(b) The languages of Pakistan and North-Western India are different from the languages of West Asia and are labeled Indic. Given that the split up from West Asia may have happened 4500 years before the IVC, the languages of the IVC were already Indic and different from West Asia. Dardic languages (Kalasha-mun, Palula, Dameli, Gawar-Bati, Nuristani, Yidgha, Gujar, Wakh, Kyrgyz, Pashto, Dogri (Himachal Pradesh)) are labeled Indo-Aryan, despite their differences with other Indo-Aryan languages.

(c) The languages of the West Coast of India (a classic example being Marathi) are descendants of Maharashtri Prakrits. This form of Prakrit was also used during the Shatavahana dynasty as a court language, while the masses perhaps spoke Telugu. Some IVC sites were located in Maharashtra. Could Sanskrit have replaced the languages of the Maharashtra region fully? This is not possible because there were only a few Indo-Aryan kingdoms there.

(d) Therefore, the location of the IE languages in India and Pakistan is the region where the IVC was located AND the Gangetic plains, taken together. This appears to negate the hypothesis that the Harappans primarily spoke a Dravidian language.

(e) Similarly, it is unlikely that Sanskrit (in spite of the fact that some Indo-Aryan kingdoms such as Gandhara were located in the Pakistan region) would have been able to replace the languages of the region completely according to our model.

(f) Such wholesale displacement of languages seems to be unlikely especially when there is evidence to suggest that the elites restricted the use of Sanskrit for liturgical purposes. In addition to this, however, Sanskrit appears to have been the lingua franca of the elite in Ancient India, the reasons being that the Indo-Aryans were spread over a very large area by 1600 BC (the term Indo-Aryan mostly refers to a culture). On the other hand, if the IVC

---
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was truly polyglot, no language of the IVC would have been able to fulfill the role of a lingua franca, hence this role was perhaps reserved for Sanskrit.

(g) Therefore, if the hypothesis that the Harappans spoke a Dravidian language was true, it would have implied the whole scale displacement of languages in the Indus valley given the fact that Dravidian languages are only spoken by a small minority there today. After the transfer of power from the Harappans to the Indo-Aryans (The term Indo-Aryan refers to a culture here), there were no major cultural shifts in the Pakistan region apart from the spread of Buddhism and later, Islam. Furthermore, there were only West to East and no North to South migrations.

(h) All things considered, the hypothesis that the Harappans mainly spoke a Dravidian language appears to be untenable given the spaces of distance and time and as unlikely as the Aryan Harappa hypothesis.

(i) Although there would have been direct cultural contacts between the Indus and South India even in the Pre-Aryan age as suggested by the presence of Indus seals, the Jallikattu tradition and perhaps Siva worship in the south (this would account for aspects of Indian culture not accounted for by the Nine phase acculturation model), There was never a North-West to South movement.

(j) Early Indologists may have come to the conclusion that the inhabitants of the IVC spoke a Dravidian language with pre-conceived notions; words like phalam (fruit) present in the substratum of Sanskrit are present not just in Tamil, they are present in IA too, for example. Therefore, all conclusions of early Indologists can be wrong. Here is our smoking gun: If the substratum of Sanskrit contains Dravidian words and these words are present in IA, the Dravidian Harappa hypothesis is inconclusive.

(k) Proponents of the hypothesis that the Harappans spoke a Dravidian language must consider contradictory evidence too, which includes evidence that the Tamil script is descended from Brahmi and that by 200BC Tamil was already influenced by Prakrit. Instead all evidence claimed for the hypothesis that the Harappans spoke a Dravidian language can be re-explained in terms of our model to investigate which explanation is more plausible. Our model also accounts for direct links between the North West of India and South India before the spread of Aryan culture.

Proponents of the hypothesis that the Harappans spoke a Dravidian language must also be encouraged to collect as much evidence in support of their ideas, and the process of bringing together contradictory evidence can greatly contribute to our understanding of a complex civilization such as the Indian one. Even if such hypotheses themselves are untenable, their points of view may greatly contribute to our understanding of Ancient India and refine models further.

The key to identifying the nature of the language(s) spoken by the Harappans would also perhaps be to identify as many approaches as possible, so that these can be cross-verified with each other.

Even Witzel agrees when he says "Scholars still know nothing definite of the language of the Indus (Harappan) civilization, and have not taken a close look at the early substrate language(s) preceding the Rgveda (EJVS 5-1) as well as at the Indus words found in the Sumerian Near East (both are not Dravidian). Any Indian language family, now present or completely lost, can have been spoken there (Proto-Burushaski, Proto-Munda, Masica's Gangetic "language X", etc.).

Asko Parpola and Iravatham Mahadevan have been long-time proponents of the hypothesis that the Harappans mainly spoke a Dravidian language - while these scholars have not explicitly emphasized the need to separate race, spoken language written language and culture as we have in the first part of the paper, Iravatham Mahadevan has apparently been particularly very flexible in his views and has been open to all viewpoints. The onus is on such

---
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scholars to come up with as much evidence as they possibly can in support of their hypotheses. Whatever they have presented so far can apparently be easily negated, in the sense that there might have at best only been a few Dravidian language speakers there. While Siva-worship is deep-rooted in South India, it is a part of the Hindu trinity too. Furthermore, the term Dravidian is only a linguistic label, Tamils and other South Indians themselves being an ethnically mixed lot. The term Aryan neither refers to a race or linguistic label. It apparently does not even refer to a group of people. It only refers to a new culture that emerged towards the end of the IVC and immediately after it. Whatever cultural similarities exist between north India and South India can be explained in terms of cultural contacts between the North-West of India and South India when India was significantly Aryanized, especially given the fact that Harappan seals have been found in South India.

Thomas Burrow, in Trans. Philol. Soc., 1946:13-18 set forth criteria for identifying Dravidian words borrowed into Sanskrit. Thomas Burrow’s criteria for identifying Dravidian words in Sanskrit was as follows:

1. The Sanskrit word should have no obvious Indo-European etymology
2. There should be a wide currency of the etymon in the Dravidian languages and it should be a basic element of the vocabulary
3. A word is shown to be Dravidian in origin if it is clearly derived from some Dravidian root
4. The word should be of some antiquity in Dravidian, occurring in the earliest Tamil texts.
5. Comparative lateness of appearance of the word in Sanskrit
6. In each case, possible phonetic criteria should be looked for.
7. Likewise semantic development can be taken as criteria. All criteria except (3) can be explained from our model. Criteria (5) and (7) are irrelevant.

All the so-called Dravidian words are present in IA languages, too. This is the chief weakness of Burrow’s approach and all sub-stratum based approaches. Abandon this approach immediately!

Here is a small test:

If the Substratum of Sanskrit comprises Dravidian words and Dravidian words are also found in IA languages, then the Dravidian Harappa Hypothesis is inconclusive. They can be explained from Phase Nine of our Acculturation model - North-South Contacts.

Clearly, the whole issue needs to be re-examined because early Indologists may have made very simplistic assumptions regarding their terms Aryan and Dravidian.

Furthermore, given the overwhelming lack of evidence for mass intrusions or d-day landings as would also be suggested by the relatively small population of Central Asia which in any case would have been much smaller than that of the IVC, it is logical to assume that the inhabitants of the IVC were biologically similar to the present-day inhabitants of the region.

This being the case, is it logical to suppose that a majority of the inhabitants of the region spoke a Dravidian language? How did these get obliterated overnight? Proponents of the hypothesis that the inhabitants of the IVC spoke a Dravidian language must now make an impassioned plea for mercy. Furthermore, Baluchistan could not have been the originating point for Dravidian languages. Since the people of the IVC were racially similar to the people of the region, how did a Dravidian language get imposed on them? Since the present day inhabitants of the region speak IE languages, how did IE languages get re-imposed on them, given the fact that we have suggested that Sanskrit could have at best influenced the languages of the region? At best there could have been some Dravidian language speakers in the region.

---

Were Prakrits really derivatives of Sanskrit? A new model explaining the origin of Indo-Aryan languages

We now propose that Indo-Aryan languages were not derivatives of Sanskrit but evolved as a result of a continuing interplay between two different streams of languages over millennia, and were in fact descendants of the languages spoken in the region covered by the IVC. These were also influenced in more recent times by many other languages such as Persian. This model, therefore suggests that the roots of Indo-Aryan languages such as Hindi, Marathi, Bengali and Sindhi may be much older than current theories suggest. While we have reproduced statements made by other (all mainstream and Western) scholars that would imply that our theory is correct, and even make it necessary, perhaps no other scholar has suggested that the languages of the IVC were remote ancestors of IA languages before they were significantly transformed by Sanskrit (The author has had to muster all his strength and courage to make this proposal) for want of empirical evidence, and because it would lead to a chicken and egg situation: the languages of the IVC haven’t been reconstructed yet. We have however approached this issue from a completely different angle so as to solve this paradox.

We may map the transition of the PIE as follows:

\[\text{PIE} \rightarrow \text{Some Ancestor of Vedic Sanskrit in the Vedic homeland} \quad \text{(which could have influenced} \quad \text{and been influenced by the languages of the region)} \rightarrow \text{Again influenced by the early languages of the Gangetic plains before 1900 BC when the Indo-Aryans spread beyond the Vedic homeland} \rightarrow \text{Was influenced by the languages of the IVC after the eastward movement of the Harappans in 1900 BC and also influenced them} \rightarrow \text{killed itself} \rightarrow \text{Became a liturgical language} \rightarrow \text{Also became a lingua franca of the upper echelons of society} \rightarrow \text{This language took on influences from West Asia} \rightarrow \text{(The substratum in Sanskrit would consist of all the above influences)} \rightarrow \text{This liturgical language re-influenced the other languages of the region in several periods, right up to the modern period after it became a symbol of Indian culture. For example, in the first instance, the competition between Buddhism and the threatened Vedic faith appears to have seen the re-emergence of Classical Sanskrit. In the second instance, Hinduism appears to have become popular in the 10th Century. There have been movements promoting the Sanskritization of Indian languages even in recent times.}

On the other hand, the now extinct languages of the IVC perhaps got transformed as follows:

\[\text{Ancestors of Semitic (some Ancient period around 7000 BC, perhaps)} \rightarrow \text{Some early form of Indic after 3300 BC and 2600 BC due to (however, there would have been a vast difference between the first two because of the vast time gap and it is natural to expect that there would have been several types of people living in the North-west of India and Pakistan already). The IVC itself was perhaps polyglot} \rightarrow \text{Heavily influenced by Sanskrit after 1900 BC after the migrations to the UP-Bihar region and could have been transformed significantly by around 1700 BC} \rightarrow \text{were not written languages because the Brahminical orthodoxy prevented them from emerging as languages of power} \rightarrow \text{they were re-popularized after the emergence of Buddhism. They were influenced by Greek, Persian and other languages subsequently and by Sanskrit, many times.}

Also,

\[\text{The Prakrits of the Gangetic plains would have been de-synthesized from the Prakrits of the Indus after 1900 BC} \rightarrow \text{There would have been a re-synthesis after Aryan culture spread back into Pakistan after 1600 BC.}

Similarly,

\[\text{Sanskrit particularly Classical Sanskrit, which itself was born as a liturgical language influenced Dravidian languages} \]
And

Several Prakrits influenced Dravidian languages

Tamil is the oldest among Dravidian languages and either Tamil, or an ancestor of Tamil commonly referred to as Proto-Dravidian split up to form other Dravidian languages. These languages were influenced in various times from influences in the North, Telugu to a great extent and Tamil to a smaller extent. On the other hand, languages such as Hindi are of more recent origin the elementary reason being that the North was subject to intensive linguistic change throughout its entire history being subject to alien migrations and invasions. South Indian languages like Tamil remained stable over long periods, North Indian languages did not. This does not however, mean that this model is wrong.

(If this model is accepted, it would transform the way we look at Indian languages, and would imply, among others, that IA languages i.e. North Indian languages are indirect descendants of the languages of the Indus, after having been heavily influenced and transformed by Sanskrit. Sanskrit itself would represent a separate stream and would have been a descendant of the PIE.) This model would in a way turn the old Aryan-Dravidian equation on its head.

Sumerian, Akkadian and PIE

It is believed that the Sumerian language, an isolate, was used around 3000 BC in Mesopotamia and this was followed by the Akkadian / Assyrian-Babylonian language.

Samuel A.B Mercer lists some elementary words in Assyrian as follows: (Work on Akkadian writing and Grammar has been done by I. J Gelb and other scholars as well.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sumu</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilu</td>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alu</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarru</td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ummu</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelu</td>
<td>Man</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This language is classified as a Semitic language and includes Akkadian, Amharic, Arabic, Aramaic, Ge’ez, Hebrew, Maltese, Phoenician, Tigre, Tigrinya, Eblaite, Amorite, Ugaritic, Ammonite, Moabite, Edomite, Nabataean, Mlahso and others

The Akkadian dictionary hosted by the Association Assyrophile de France lists out the following numerals:

- Sina = two
- Salas = three
- Erbet = four
- Hamis = five
- Seššet = six

---

Sebet = seven

On the other hand, it is likely that the languages of the IVC, had split in some ancient period probably 4500 years before the IVC itself, and would have been influenced by scores of languages in the region making the two unrecognizable. This hypothesis can be independently tested by the methods proposed in this paper.

The PIE has been reconstructed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Reconstruction (Sihler)</th>
<th>Reconstruction (Beekes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>*Hoi-no/*Hoi-wo/*Hoi-k(“)o-; *sem-</td>
<td>*Hoi(H)nos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>*d(u)wo-</td>
<td>*duoh₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>*trei-</td>
<td>*treies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>*kʷetwor-</td>
<td>*kʷetuōr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>*penkʷe</td>
<td>*penkʷe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>*(s)wekš;</td>
<td>*(s)uέks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>*septm;</td>
<td>*séptm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight</td>
<td>*oktō, *oktou or *h₁ektō, *h₁ektou</td>
<td>*h₁ektēh₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine</td>
<td>*(h₁)newn;</td>
<td>*(h₁)néun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten</td>
<td>*dekm(t)</td>
<td>*dékm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other reconstructions tend to differ only slightly from Beekes and Sihler (for example Fortson). Texts in Proto Indo-European have been composed by scholars such as

---
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Winfred P. Lehmann, August Schleicher, Douglas Q Adams, Frederik Kortlandt, Ladislav Zgusta and others.

Names of people and places in the IVC

The names of places and people of the IVC as known through from Sanskrit literature are even more interesting, and are clearly non-Dravidian. This should have some bearing on the Indus question, and the last name is clearly much older from this model.

Hariyupiha (Harappa): RV 6.27.5 (1500 BC)
Pipru: RV 1.51.5 (1500 BC)
Ilibisa: RV 1.33.12 (1500 BC)
Susna: RV 1.33.13 (1500 BC)
Ibra: Naram-Sin (2254-2218 BC) referring to rebels to his rule, listing the rebellious kings, including "(...)Ibra, man of Melukha"

Language change: Drawing parallels from other periods in Indian History

Interestingly, English in India is less than two centuries old, and in a very short period, has managed to alter the linguistic landscape significantly. Here are some excerpts from an article by Annika Hohenthal 53

"The Anglicist group's views were expressed in the Minute of Macaulay, which is said to mark "the real beginnings of bilingualism in India" (McCrum et al. 1988: 325). According to the document, which had been prepared for the governor general William Bentinck, after listening to the argument of the two sides, a class should be formed in India, a group of people who would act as interpreters between the British and Indians, "a class of persons, Indians in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinion, in morals and in intellect" (Bailey 1991: 138). Macaulay's proposal was a success; and the following year Lord Bentinck expressed his full support for the minute, declaring that the funds "administered on Public Instruction should be henceforth employed in imparting to the native population a knowledge of English literature and science through the medium of the English language" "(ibid).

In less than two centuries, English has spread and English words are popular in everyday usage in all strata of society. The widespread usage of English words even where vernacular equivalents are found is a case in point. Why and how did this happen? Is this due to the perceived prestige of English? Can English however replace Indian languages completely after a century, a few centuries or more? How many would subscribe to this? Can we draw parallels here to the transformation of Harappan to Post-Harappan cultures? What is interesting is that English entrenched itself in less then two centuries. By this reckoning, the languages of the IVC could have been Sanskritized in a similar span of time after 1900 BC. Since, the change would have been cultural, the descendants of the IVC would have naturally adopted Sanskrit names soon after, and this would have been a natural process through which a culture change occurred.


53 English in India Loyalty and Attitudes Annika Hohenthal
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“Once Sanskrit emerged from the sacred environment to which it was originally confined, it spread with breathtaking rapidity across Southern Asia. Within three centuries, Sanskrit became the sole medium by which ruling elites expressed their power from as far West as Purushapura in Gandhara to Panduranga in Champa in Central Vietnam. Sanskrit probably never functioned as an everyday means of communication, not in South Asia itself, nor was it ever used excepting among the elites as a bridge – or link – or trade language. There is little evidence to show that it was ever used as the language of rule. Tasks such as communication or revenue accounting appear to have been accomplished by informal use of the local language. The work Sanskrit did was beyond the quotidian and the instrumental. It was directed above all towards articulating a form of political consciousness and culture.

Sanskritization of Indian languages therefore happened in several periods in time, a very interesting example being the emergence of Classical Sanskrit after 600 BC, probably due to a rivalry between Buddhism and the threatened Vedic orthodoxy.

As Romila Thapar (1973:51) points out, “The earliest Sanskritization of any importance is that of the Saka ruler Rudraraman and dates to 200 AD, the previous inscriptions having been composed in the Prakrits and other languages.”

Madvav M Deshpande observes, (Sanskrit and Prakrit Madhav M Deshpande)

“The rise in the prestige of Sanskrit must have begun slowly after the fall of the Mauryas and it gradually continued to rise in such a way that the royal inscriptions of India gradually changed from Prakrit to Sanskrit. The Saka rulers began using Sanskrit which was also used extensively by the Gupta kings. While the early inscriptions are in Prakrit, region by region, they gradually change to Sanskrit. Also while the early Pallava inscriptions are in Prakrit, the later ones are in Sanskrit. Nowhere does one see a shift from Sanskrit to Prakrit in India.”

Fig 20 Note that the region corresponding to IA languages is equal to the region covered by the IVC plus the Aravarta. The only exception is Southern Sri Lanka but Sinhala speakers were migrants from North India. We can show that language and race need not spread in tandem. Veddahs of Sri Lanka now speak either Tamil or Sinhala.

54 Romila Thapar (1973:51)
55 Sanskrit and Prakrit Madhav M Deshpande
How to construct the spoken languages of the Harappans from the Nine Phase Acculturation Model

Therefore the languages spoken by the Harappans can be constructed by

Method A

Vedic Sanskrit – PIE influences – West Asian influences (Recommended!)

The balance would represent old Indic. This is because the North-west of India was the only significantly populated region at the time. This would be the simplest and most reliable method and would be far superior to the only existing approach. The arrived at can be easily broken up into language groups). The residual IE words may again be removed.

Method B

Taking the base in NW Prakrit languages including Dardic languages after removing Sanskrit words in whatever form PLUS (Vedic Sanskrit - PIE – language influences from West Asia during the compilation of the RV)

This method can be used once the smoking guns presented as a part of this paper are employed

Method C

Taking the Prakrits of North-Western India and removing PIE influences from them

This method can be used once the smoking guns presented as a part of this paper are employed

Method D

Taking modern IA languages of the region including Dardic languages and working backwards from the present

If modern languages of the region are to be taken as the base, we must systematically remove all later influences starting from the present. The advantage of the second and third methods is probably that they would permit us to reconstruct the different languages spoken in the IVC separately.

Method E

Substratum of Sanskrit

This is an already-existing controversial method and can throw wrong results.

Method F

A combination of all the above.

A knowledge of local history or histories, precision in calculation of dates and a thorough understanding of the process of transformation of Harappan India to Post-Harappan India as known through (a) literary and (b) archeological sources would be the key here.

We can make some assumptions here:
For e.g.

(a) Words pertaining to commerce can be IVC
(b) Words pertaining to agriculture can be IVC
(c) Names of plants found in cold places are Non-IVC

These languages can perhaps be partly reconstructed in the next couple of years or so using Computer Software after classifying words into language groups, if experts find a way or ironing out all the operational issues that may arise. The only limitation here is that the earliest written records in Prakrit and Pali date only to 600 BC.

The spoken languages of which there may have been indeed many, thus constructed, can then be used to research the Indus script and may help in its eventual decipherment. This may me much less important though, and the key to better research on India’s past can only come through India specific approaches.

The five smoking guns!

Our theory comes with its own checks and balances. Our five smoking guns are

Smoking gun A

Vedic Sanskrit – PIE influences – West Asian influences = North West Prakrits + Dardic languages + Proto-Burushaski (after removing later influences including Sanskrit influences, i.e working backwards)

If the Above is approximately true, the remote ancestor of Prakrits hypothesis is true

Otherwise, it is false

Smoking gun B

The languages constructed from our methods need to be compared with later Prakrits to investigate whether Prakrits are independent languages or derivatives of Sanskrit.

If the result is positive the Remote Ancestor or Prakrits hypothesis is correct and the Dravidian Harappa hypothesis is wrong

Smoking gun C

Here is our third smoking gun: If the substratum of Sanskrit contains Dravidian words and these words are present in IA too, the Dravidian Harappa hypothesis is inconclusive.

If the Dravidian Harappa hypothesis is wrong, we can explain borrowings through the Ninth phase of our Nine Phase acculturation model or cultural contacts between North and South India.

Smoking gun D

Vedic Sanskrit – PIE influences – West Asian influences = Prakrits + Dardic languages + Proto-Burushaski (after removing later influences including Sanskrit influences, i.e working backwards)

If the above equation does not tally, the Dravidian Harappa hypothesis has a chance

Otherwise, it may be incorrect
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If the Dravidian Harappa hypothesis is wrong, we can explain borrowings through the Ninth phase of our Nine Phase acculturation model or cultural contacts between North and South India.

Smoking gun E

Vedic Sanskrit – PIE influences – West Asian influences contains Dravidian words which do not exist in Indo-Aryan languages

The Dravidian Harappa hypothesis has a chance

Otherwise it may not have a chance

Once these above approaches are applied, we will finally have a window into the lost world of the Harappans.

**How long were the Aryans here?**

Similarly,

Rig Vedic Sanskrit – Influences from West Asia - Loan words from the IVC as constructed from the previous equation

would represent ancestors of Sanskrit as they existed in say 2200 BC. This can further be compared for non-PIE influences. This may help give us an idea of how long the Indo-Aryans were in the subcontinent and may be a vast improvement over existing Glottochronological methods. Their date of arrival may be estimated by taking the above language, say language X and comparing it with the hypothetical PIE.

Witzel has suggested that the RV contained names of plants which would be found in colder places. These plants could have grown in the Himalayan region too, and cultural contacts between the Himalayan region and the Gangetic plains perhaps continued even till the Vedas were compiled.

Again, look for multiple causes:

(a) The names of plants pertaining to cold climatic conditions could have indeed have indeed come from Central Asia (highly unlikely they were retained after such a long time when the Vedas were compiled in the Gangetic plains)
(b) The could have come from the Himalayan region as the Indo-Aryans moved into the Aryavarta
(c) Cultural contacts could have continued between the Mid-himalayan region and the Gangetic plains

This kind of reasoning, always looking for multiple causes, could help solve many of our problems, and, in this context should help demolish the notion of late migrations completely.

We can conclude that the inhabitants of the IVC were not markedly different from the people inhabiting the region in modern times, because there were only East-West migrations. Similarly the languages they spoke were perhaps ancestors of the languages spoken in present day Pakistan and Northern India. The pre-alphabetic Indus script was perhaps used to write many different languages and this was already discussed in the previous part.

The hypothesis that the Harappans spoke a remote ancestor of Prakrit which may have been Called Mleccha is also evidenced by:
Mleccha was also a language spoken in Ancient India i.e The epic Mahabharata describes a conversation between Vidura and Yudhisthira in Mleccha. Mlecchas are described as being vratyas; they lived in dvipas or islands. We can connect this with the Bet Dwaraka site of the late Harappan period on the sea in Gujarat where the epic was supposed to have taken place. Mleccha was also the language of Artisans and Coppersmiths according to Sanskrit literature: we can again connect this with the Harappans. According to the great epic, Mlecchas lived on islands: "sa sarva_n mleccha nr.patin sa_gara dvi_pa va_sinah, aram a ha ryâm âsa ratna_ni vividha_ni ca, andana aguru vastra_n.i man.i muktam anuttamam, kaîcanam rajatam vajram vidrumam ca maha_dhanam: (Bhima) arranged for all the mleccha kings, who dwell on the ocean islands, to bring varieties of gems, sandalwood, aloe, garments, and incomparable jewels and pearls, gold, silver, diamonds, and extremely valuable coral... great wealth." (MBh. 2.27.25-26).

It may also be interesting to note that a seal of the Akkadian period refers to its owner as 'Silusu, Meluhha interpreter', suggesting that the term Meluhha was also used in the Middle East to refer to a language.

The IVC was known as Meluhha. In Sanskrit they were called Mlecchas meaning alien after the desynthesis. Both these names would be the same because ‘h’ was always replaced by ‘s’, ‘ch’ in Sanskrit.

In his book, Sanskrit and Prakrit, Madhav M. Deshpande says, explaining the linguistic view of Patanjali: “Beyond these varieties of Sanskrit were the world of Prakrit languages, which were spoken by most people if not all as their mother tongue. The outermost layer was that of the so-called mleccha languages or barbarian languages. These languages were obviously viewed as apasabdas, and while their use on non-ritual occasions was acceptable, they were not allowed in the sphere of ritual.” This is explained as below:

Loka: The linguistic world of Patanjali

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mleccha languages (Apasabda)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prakrit languages (Apabhramsa, Apasabda)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Paninian + Sista Sanskrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Paninian - Sista Sanskrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inherited Vedic texts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: While Patanjali lived in 150 BC, the above may represent the view point of an earlier period. Languages such as Gandhari Prakrit may also have been referred to as Mleccha languages as the people there were despised in the Atharva Veda.
The Indus script remained unchanged from Dholavira to Harappa. Like Hieroglyphs and Cuneiform, it was perhaps pre-Alphabetic. However, it was perhaps used to write several languages without modification. Note: The world's first alphabetic script was proto-Sinaitic. If the Harappans had wanted to import Cuneiform, they would have been able to easily. However, the IVC was perhaps interesting among old world civilizations in its ability to provide basic literacy to large sections of society. This can be inferred from the ubiquity of the script.

Fig 2. Ceramic goblet from Navadloli, Malwa 1300 BC

Periods of linguistic change and non-change

We will now list of periods of linguistic change and non-change and these will perhaps help scholars in reconstructing the languages of the Indus one day:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sno</th>
<th>Language group</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Change / non-change</th>
<th>Reason or Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ancestors of Vedic Sanskrit (close to the PIE which is the ancestor of European languages)</td>
<td>2800-2700 BC</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>The Rig Vedic Tribes entered the Himalayas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ancestors of Vedic Sanskrit</td>
<td>2700 BC -2200 BC</td>
<td>Non-Change</td>
<td>The Rig Vedic tribes lived in the Himalayas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ancestor of Vedic</td>
<td>2200 BC</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Influenced by the...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Time Period</td>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ancestor of Vedic Sanskrit</td>
<td>1900 - 1800 BC</td>
<td>Very rapid change</td>
<td>Absorbed language influences from Ancestors of Prakrits due to the movement of the Harappans into the Gangetic plains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Vedic Sanskrit</td>
<td>1650 BC onwards</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Influences from West Asia. These may have been limited to the RV and not to the common man’s speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vedic Sanskrit</td>
<td>1500 BC</td>
<td>Dead. Disappeared and became the language of the priests.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Languages of the IVC (It was polyglot)</td>
<td>3300 BC Kot Diji Phase</td>
<td>Rapid change</td>
<td>Technological advances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Languages of the IVC (It was polyglot)</td>
<td>3200 BC to 2700 BC</td>
<td>Relative non-change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Languages of the IVC (It was polyglot)</td>
<td>2600 BC to 2500 BC</td>
<td>Rapid change</td>
<td>Technological advances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Languages of the IVC (It was polyglot)</td>
<td>2500 BC to 1900 BC</td>
<td>Relative non-change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Languages of the IVC (It was polyglot)</td>
<td>1900 BC to 1800 BC</td>
<td>Transformational change in the eastern half – split up into what later came to be known as Prakrits and Mlechha Prakrits</td>
<td>Migration to Gangetic plains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Languages of the IVC (It was polyglot)</td>
<td>1600 BC</td>
<td>The languages of the Western half were influenced by Sanskrit and the Prakrits of the eastern half</td>
<td>Aryan power spread into Pakistan from the Gangetic plains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Prakrits</td>
<td>After 1500 BC</td>
<td>Stagnated on both sides</td>
<td>Brahminical power and hegemony prevented them from developing as literary languages. These languages however, were influenced by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Prakrits</td>
<td>After 600 BC</td>
<td>Flourished</td>
<td>Sanskrit after it ceased to be a spoken language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Classical Sanskrit</td>
<td>After 600 BC</td>
<td>Emerged but not as a spoken language</td>
<td>Competition between Buddhism and Vedic orthodoxy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It would be possible to take the entire vocabulary in Vedic Sanskrit, the Prakrits and Classical Sanskrit and in addition to identifying them with source language groups, try to relate them with each of these periods. It would thus be possible to make a minimal set of assumptions using Occam’s razor.

There is enough expertise in India and abroad to carry out further research. Some key institutes probably are:

1. Department of Sanskrit and Prakrit Languages, University of Pune, Ganeshkhind Road, Pune - 411007, Maharashtra, India.

2. National Institute of Prakrit Studies and Research, Shravanabelagola

**The quest for the Holy Grail: can our model provide us with Indology’s Rosetta stone? : New methods to study the Indus script**

The Indus script consisted of short strings of symbols and remained unchanged from Dholavira to Harappa. Like Hieroglyphs and Cuneiform, it was perhaps pre-Alphabetic, and had evolved gradually: we know this because a pre-Harappan script has recently been found. However, it was perhaps used to write several languages without modification. We may note that the world’s first known alphabetic script was proto-Sinaitic which, according to current theories, did not exist at that time. If the Harappans had wanted to import Cuneiform, they would have been able to easily, given the widespread cultural contacts between the IVC and the rest of the contemporary civilized world. However, cuneiform would have been naturally very difficult to master, quite apart from the fact that it would have had to be modified extensively to handle different languages and the IVC was perhaps interesting among old world civilizations in its ability to provide basic literacy to large sections of society. This can be inferred from the ubiquity of the script, and the discovery of a signboard at Dholavira, which would suggest that it was meant to be read by relatively large sections of the population. There were notable differences between the IVC and the rest of the contemporary old world: the IVC was trade based with no known evidence of a Royal or a central authority. This would have naturally implied that the usage of the Indus script was widespread.

Even Steve Farmer concludes:

“Judging from modern examples and research in the linguistic history of South Asia, the Indus Valley was probably intensely multi-linguistic throughout its history. This may have provided the Indus emblem system with an advantage over ordinary writing as a means of providing the civilization with social cohesion. The fact that the majority of inscriptions rely on a surprisingly small core of symbols suggests that the meaning of Indus signs could have
potentially been known by almost or all of the population, resulting in a pervasive quasi-literacy far beyond that achieved in Mesopotamia or Egypt.”

The Harappans’ achievements in engineering and mathematics are also well-known, and we must understand the script in the context of these. Even Steve Farmer agrees:

“On the contrary, new evidence confirms traditional views that the symbols were central to Indus society. It also suggests that the Harappans may have created the most complex non-linguistic sign system in the ancient world, which if anything, enhances the inscriptions’ historical importance.”

If the Indus script is to be understood, methods to reconstruct the languages spoken in the region covered by the IVC as proposed in this paper would probably be useful. However, if the Indus script was not closely tied to speech, it will probably be never deciphered entirely.

This conclusion is of utmost importance: the decipherment of the Indus script would not be central to the further course of Indological studies. India can and must be understood only through the adoption of India-specific strategies. More critically, developing a crucial feel for local customs and traditions whether good or bad would be a necessary prerequisite and a concomitant for success. We have briefly touched upon possible India-specific strategies: understanding India as a series of cultural transformations and mutually beneficial interactions, searching for the roots of Indian traditions and many others, already discussed elsewhere.

To sum up our observations on the Indus script:

1. There were 400 - 600 signs (midway between typical logographic and syllabic scripts).
2. There was a standardization of symbols across the civilization, with only a few sites being non-literate.
3. The length of signs was however extremely short.
4. The script was written from right to left as demonstrated by B B Lal, and sometimes followed a boustrophedonic style.
5. Number signs were apparently present.
6. The Harappans achieved advanced engineering and standardization in length, weight and mass, something which would have been implausible had they not been literate.
7. The number of seals was large which means its usage would have been more widespread. (cuneiform was difficult and would therefore have been less suitable for widespread usage)
8. The Indus script was perhaps used to write many languages (cuneiform would not have worked if the Indus valley was truly polyglot.)
9. The discovery of a Pre-harappan script suggests that the Indus script evolved gradually
10. The Indus script has recently been found in iron age sites (outside the context of the Indus valley) as late as 1100 BC. Iravatham Mahadevan has recently claimed it was being used at an even later date. That means it was suitable for use outside the IVC as well.

This suggests that the Indus script may have been unique and much unlike many other contemporaneous scripts in Egypt and Mesopotamia. Recently a group of researchers belonging to the Tata Institute of Fundamental research, Mumbai, University of Washington, Centre for excellence in Basic Sciences in Mumbai and the Chennai-based Institute of Mathematical studies, rejected Steve Farmer’s claim and suggested that the script may have been closely tied to speech. Terms such as literate and non-literate are highly misleading, clearly demonstrate a bias, and should not be used: the IVC was perhaps unique and from a

---

56 Five cases of dubious writing in Indus inscriptions: Parallels with Vinca symbols and Cretan hieroglyphs
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specific standpoint, the most literate civilization in the ancient world due to reasons discussed in this paper, and far ahead of any other civilization in the ancient world: the hieroglyphs of ancient Egypt and the cuneiform of Mesopotamia could perhaps be read only by a microscopic proportion of the population and were used only by scribes. This script may have even been used to produce books, in any language, in spite of the fact that the inscriptions are short and the lost manuscript hypothesis is unproven. We have every reason to believe that it was truly a common man’s civilization, given the ubiquity of the script and the lack of a central authority. We can instead use terms such as (a) was it used to write one or many languages? (b) Was it closely tied to speech? (c) Did it contain grammar? These questions may be addressed individually through better research.

Our suggestions are as follows:

1. Partly reconstruct the languages spoken (individually) in the IVC using the methods discussed in this paper.
2. Look for common elements in these languages.
3. Compare this with what is known about the script and its chief characteristics. We have prepared a list of 10 chief characteristics here.
4. Introduce separate strategies to study the Indus script: much work has already been done this by scholars in India and the West: a study of the repetition of signs etc. Again, compare this with the spoken languages constructed. .
5. This would, in essence, represent an approach where the spoken languages are reconstructed separately and then compared with the script to draw inferences, and would represent Indology’s Rosetta stone. Although the substratum of Sanskrit has been researched for close to eighty years, it has not been compared with the script and the methods to reconstruct the languages of the IVC as proposed in this paper are all-new.

We do not wish to get involved in controversies: Steve Farmer may be wrong, and this is irrelevant to us. However, we may argue that the decipherment of the Indus script would be by and large irrelevant for the further course of Indological studies, although a small specialized team may still want to pursue the study of the Indus script, and the reasons are as follows:

1. India may be best understood through India-specific strategies and we have discussed some already. With India specific strategies, we already have and can work further wonders.
2. The brevity of the inscriptions means that there is very little historical information one can hope to obtain from a study of this script.
3. The fact that the languages spoken in the IVC can be reconstructed much more reliably through methods proposed in this paper makes the study of the Indus script by and large irrelevant. We already have a fair idea of the languages that the Harappans spoke from our model.
4. The fact that the IVC was spread over a vast area and may have been polyglot implies that the script may have been used to write many languages and given that it was pre-alphabetic, may not have represented any one language.

Key research institutes such as the TIFR would be well-advised to try out this approach and collaborate with institutes of Prakrit studies and language change.

“Aryan”, “Dravidian” and “Harappan”: Some important terminology re-understood from our model

The following are the key interpretations from our model, and would probably need no further elucidation at all, and would be almost self-explanatory and only reinforce Max Muller’s statement “When I say Arya, I mean neither blood nor bones, nor hair nor skull”. Our
observations would also bring Hindutva and traditional viewpoints together into a logical and harmonious whole:

1. The word Dravidian refers to a language group and not a race, and South Indians and indeed Tamils themselves are racially very diverse, and has been reinforced by most recent studies.
2. The word Aryan does not even refer to a language group but to a new culture that emerged towards the end of and soon after the IVC, and this was spread by a small group of people who had not yet identified themselves as Aryan. By the time, the word Aryan, meaning noble had been imported from West Asia, the immigrants had lost their identity and had got mixed up with local populations. A leading researcher has suggested the word Aryan was used only in Ancient Iran and India, and not throughout the Indo-European world. Its (perverted) usage in the west was more recent. The usage of this word Aryan and Aryavarta appear to have gradually disappeared by 600 BC and appears to have been replaced by the term Bharatvarsha, suggesting that an amalgam of different cultures had taken place by then.

"Uttaram yat samudrasya Himdreschaiva daksinam
Varsham tat Bharatam nama Bharati yatra santati"

(The region spanning in between the Himalayas in the north to the Indian ocean in the south is called Bharatavarsham and the natives of this region are called Bharatiyas (Indians))]

3. This naturally means that the word Aryan would not correspond to the word Brahmin and the word Aryan would not correspond to the immigrants from Central Asia. All three terms are naturally and fundamentally different, despite a possible overlap.
4. The term “Vedic people” is naturally a misnomer: the Rig Veda only refers to a text and the knowledge to the Rig Veda would have been limited to a coveted few.
5. The cultures of the Gangetic plains were not just Vedic. These were complex, cosmopolitan and consisted of several faiths and beliefs. Post-Harappan cultures encompassed the whole of North India and Pakistan.
6. The IVC was as “Hindu” or “Non-Hindu” as Post-Harappan India and many important traditions can be traced back to the IVC as was discussed here and in Part One. The word Hindu was not in use until much later and did not even exist in 600 BC.
7. The transformation of Harappan to Post-Harappan India happened due to a wide variety of reasons as was discussed in Part One and Part Two. The small groups of pastoralists from Central Asia were only one of the several important triggers for change.

**Importance of studying post-Harappan India**

A study of Post-Harappan India (Controversial sites may be blocked for research, if required, because they would offend the feelings of minorities) would naturally play an important role in twenty-first century Indology. Our case may be stated as follows:

1. The cultures of the Gangetic plains were not just Vedic. These were complex, cosmopolitan and consisted of several faiths and beliefs.
2. Study of Indian religious traditions is impossible without understanding post-Harappan India.
3. A Study of the Caste system is not possible unless this period is researched.
4. Post Harappan cultures represented a crucial cultural link between the IVC and the Buddhist period. We have made good progress in part One and Two of this paper in understanding the IVC by reconstructing post-Harappan India. Thus those who block
research into this crucial period of Indian history would in a way be blocking research into Harappan India.

5. There were many cultural contacts between North and South India and an understanding of this period of Indian history is crucial to the understanding of Dravidian cultures.

6. Modern Indians cannot culturally relate to the IVC which was abandoned 3400 years ago, despite the fact that many elements of this culture have survived in later cultures. This is not the case with Post-Harappan India. If Indians do not get what they want through mainstream sources, they take recourse to alternative sources of History, which quite interestingly and understandably has become a multi-million dollar or rupee cottage industry in India. This encourages superstition and blind faith more.

7. Some mainstream ideas such as mid-second millennium BC migrations taught to us in Colonial-Marxist officialdom are so ludicrous and absurd that anyone with a feel of local history would easily be able to write a short note on why such ideas are absurd and propose a counter-theory written with other ulterior motives. This encourages religious fanaticism more. In the 21st century, we can argue that transparency is the only way forward. Anything else would keep producing counter-reactions ad infinitum and only destroy its creators. As stated, Post-Harappan cultures, though naturally closer to modern Indian cultures than the IVC, were only as "Hindu" or "Non-Hindu" as the IVC. Many cultures played a role in the development of what is today known as Hinduism, and this includes lesser known cultures as well. Therefore, Marxists should have no reason to fear here. Anything and everything in Indian history is interconnected. This is a golden rule, unless provable otherwise.

8. Although Christians and Muslims follow a different religion from the majority; in all other respects they are typically Indian. This includes dietary habits, dress and several other customs. Research of this period would therefore benefit all Indians irrespective of religion. If required, disputed sites such as Ayodhya may be excluded from further research as it would naturally offend the feelings of the Muslims.

9. Different groups of people got mixed up in thousands of different ways. Since the transfer to the Ganga Yamuna doab happened before the Vedas were compiled by the priests in the Gangetic plains, it is even possible given the small genetic input from Central Asia that some of their ancestors could be traced to the IVC. Members of the Brahmin community, for instance, worship Gods which can be traced to a wide variety of sources. Likewise, it is widely believed that some portions of the RV were compiled by authors who were not exactly at the top of the Caste hierarchy. While it is indeed true that the caste system was a Post-IVC construct, both Brahmins and Dalits must understand all dimensions of this issue and not get carried away by simplistic notions of Harappan and Aryan. For every concept in Ancient India, there are thousands of exceptions.

Fig 23. Harappan, Dravidian, Aryan and other cultures may have contributed in great measure to what is now called Hinduism. The IVC was therefore as Hindu or as Non-Hindu as the cultures of Post-Harappan India. One can call it Hindu...
if he wants to or Non-Hindu if he wants to, but the word Hindu was not in use at the time. Contributions of the IVC include Swastika, probably Ritual bathing, Yoga, Proto-Siva and Female Goddesses.

Fig 24. Yama, god of death. Many cultures, besides the Harappan and the Aryan must have contributed to Hinduism. A search can now be made for the missing elements in Hinduism. One approach would to identify anything we know about modern India and search for its origin.

Fig 25 Shrine to a village God, Tamilnadu. Some elements of the IVC such as Proto-Siva could have been shared with the south of India when the Gangetic plains were unpopulated. Therefore, the religion of the Tamils includes a mixture of native elements, few Harappan elements and few Aryan elements. Many Tamil Gods were also borrowed by North Indian cultures. Eg Karthikeya

Acculturation models must account for the Genetic diversity of India

According to the Anthropological Survey of India there are 4,635 identifiable communities, diverse in biological traits, dress, language, forms of worship, occupation, food habits and kinship patterns. Most of these communities have a mixed ancestry and it is now almost impossible to identify their roots. They could be traced to Proto-Austroloid, Palio-Mediterranean, Caucasian, Negroid and Mongoloid. The racial component is also quite varied, drawing from almost every stock in the world. This plurality is also reflected in the number of languages in use. Apart from thousands of dialects there are as many as 325 languages and 25 scripts derived from various linguistic families - Indo-Aryan, Tibeto-Burman, Dravidian, Austro-Asiatic, Andamese, Semitic, Indo-Iranian, Sino-Tibetan, Indo-European and so on. The Indian society, as a consequence, is a social and cultural amalgam with many of its constitutive elements loosing their specific identity, at any rate none existing in its initial pure form. 57 58


58 K.S.Singh, People of India: An Introduction, New Delhi, 1995
The notion of invasions or mass intrusions is widely rejected by modern scholars, as is also the notion of any Aryan or Dravidian race. The next logical step would perhaps, therefore, be to understand the historical basis for India's human genetic diversity by taking into account later documented migrations such as those of the Persians, Huns and the Greeks, and recent trends such as rural to urban migrations among many others:

Kenneth A.R. Kennedy, a U.S. expert who has extensively studied skeletal remains in the region, observes, "Biological anthropologists remain unable to lend support to any of the theories concerning an Aryan biological or demographic entity." Chaubey et al. (2007) find that most of the India-specific mtDNA haplogroups show coalescent times of 40 to 60 millennia ago. 59 60

Kennedy also concludes that the ancient Harappans “are not markedly different in their skeletal biology from the present-day inhabitants of Northwestern India and Pakistan”. The cranio metric variables of prehistoric and living South Asians also showed an "obvious separation" from the prehistoric people of the Iranian plateau and western Asia. Furthermore, the results of cranio metric variation from Indus Valley sites indicate "significant separation" of Moenjodaro from Harappa and the others.

Kennedy also concluded, "There is no evidence of demographic disruptions in the north-western sector of the subcontinent during and immediately after the decline of the Harappan culture. If Vedic Aryans were a biological entity represented by the skeletons from Timargarha, then their biological features of cranial and dental anatomy were not distinct to a marked degree from what we encountered in the ancient Harappans." Comparing the Harappan and Gandhara cultures, Kennedy (in Erdosy 1995:49) also remarks: “Our multivariate approach does not define the biological identity of an ancient Aryan population, but it does indicate that the Indus Valley and Gandhara peoples shared a number of cranio metric, odontometric and discrete traits that point to a high degree of biological affinity. Cephalic measures though might not be a good indicator as they do not necessarily indicate ethnicity and there might be a tendency of plasticity due to environment.”

A 2002-03 study by T. Kivisild et al. concluded that the "Indian tribal and caste populations derive largely from the same genetic heritage of Pleistocene southern and western Asians and have received limited gene flow from external India regions since the Holocene." A 2006 genetic study by the National Institute of Biologicals in, testing a sample of men from 32 tribal and 45 caste groups, concluded that the Indians have acquired very few genes from Indo-European speaking migrants. 61 Bamshad et al. (2001) state:

“For maternally inherited mtDNA, each caste is most similar to Asians. However, 20%-30% of Indian mtDNA haplotypes belong to West Eurasian haplogroups, and the frequency of these haplotypes is proportional to caste rank, the highest frequency of West Eurasian haplotypes being found in the upper castes. In contrast, for paternally inherited Y-chromosome variation each caste is more similar to Europeans than to Asians. Moreover, the affinity to Europeans is proportionate to caste rank, the upper castes being most similar to Europeans, particularly East Europeans. [...] Analysis of these data demonstrated that the upper castes have a higher affinity to Europeans than to Asians, and the upper castes are significantly more similar to Europeans than are the lower castes. Collectively, all five datasets show a trend toward upper castes being more similar to Europeans, whereas lower castes are more similar to Asians.”

60 Kennedy, "Have Aryans been identified in the prehistoric skeletal record from South Asia? Biological anthropology and concepts of ancient races", in Erdosy (1995), at p. 49.

“It is not necessary, based on the current evidence, to look beyond South Asia for the origins of the paternal heritage of the majority of Indians at the time of the onset of settled agriculture. The perennial concept of people, language, and agriculture arriving to India together through the northwest corridor does not hold up to close scrutiny. Recent claims for a linkage of haplogroups J2, L, R1a, and R2 with a contemporaneous origin for the majority of the Indian castes’ paternal lineages from outside the subcontinent are rejected, although our findings do support a local origin of haplogroups F* and H. Of the others, only J2 indicates an unambiguous recent external contribution, from West Asia rather than Central Asia. The current distributions of haplogroup frequencies are, with the exception of the O lineages, predominantly driven by geographical, rather than cultural determinants. Ironically, it is in the northeast of India, among the TB groups that there is clear-cut evidence for large-scale demic diffusion traceable by genes, culture, and language, but apparently not by agriculture. “

(This finding supports our conclusion that the Genetic input from Central Asia could at best have been small and that a majority of Upper caste Indians are closely related to West Asians)

Past imperfect, future tense: Problems with the Vedic Indus theory and the necessary projection of extreme forms of Hindutva as “anti-Hindu”

The chief problem of the Vedic Indus theory from the Non-colonial perspective, apart from the fact that ignores linguistic evidence is that there is a complete location mismatch between the Aryavarta, the Vedic homeland and the location of the IVC, which was centered on North-west India and Pakistan. One may attempt a textual reconstruction with zest and with zeal. However, the locations of early kingdoms would not match with the locations of the cities of the Indus, despite the fact that many important kingdoms were located in Pakistan. Also, all aspects of what is today known as Hinduism need to be taken into account and not just Vedic beliefs. It is highly unlikely that Sanskrit was ever the language of the masses. Sanskrit could not have become a liturgical language in a linguistic vacuum without spawning derivatives, strongly lending credibility to the theory that many complex forces shaped Indian culture. Furthermore, the Classical Sanskrit of later times, contemporaneous with the Prakrits, was unlikely to have been a spoken language, either. By the same analogy, anyone who proposes that Prakrits were descendants of Sanskrit always finds himself in a chicken and egg situation. How does a theory which states that the Prakrits of later times were derivatives of Sanskrit account for the differences between Classical Sanskrit and the Prakrits? We have provided a detailed account of language transformation in Ancient India. Can the Vedic Indus theory do that? Can the over-simplified derivative of Sanskrit theory do that? In addition to this, there are significant cultural differences between the two cultures in addition to similarities. Also, the IVC had cultural contacts with the Old World, while the Aryan culture did not: the only contacts were with West Asia. If the whole of India was Vedic, where did the Non-Vedic components of what is today known as Hinduism come from? If the Aryans were the authors of this civilization, how did the mix-up of various streams of Hinduism occur, given the fact that this was India’s first civilization? While anyone is free to believe in an ideology of his choice, we can argue, that the Hindutva version of history is bedeviled with inherent contradictions and fundamental internal inconsistencies given the fact that the word Hindu is itself of a recent origin, and extreme versions of Hindutva are even anti-Hindu, seeking to promote a sectarian view of Hinduism, given the fact that the religion that is today known as Hinduism was shaped by many complex forces. Many people contributed to what is today known as Hinduism, the Aryans, Harappans, other lesser known groups, and South Indians (going by the Skanda Purana evidence). The concept of Hindutva may be fundamentally flawed because the word Hindu is itself perhaps an import, and apart from being against other
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religions, Hindutva proponents are in many ways against the richness, vastness and diversity of their own religion. The Vedic Indus theory cannot explain the caste system at all, apart from brushing it aside a classification of convenience. Since the IVC was egalitarian, how did the caste system originate? On the other hand, elements of Hinduism are perhaps older than the IVC, and those who claim that Hinduism is the oldest religion on earth have plenty going in their favour. It is a matter of how one wishes to argue out his case. Bal Ganghadar Tilak has suggested that the Aryans came from the North pole. After the discovery of the IVC, the Aryan migration theory was factually inconvenient and had to be negated. A more recent variant has it that the Vedic culture was Pre-IVC, and introduces some kind of a crude “Is “mine” older” or “is “theirs” older?” kind of a competition. While a vast majority of Indians are truth-seeking and prepared for all kinds of solutions, proponents of extreme versions of Hindutva leaving aside those who have believed in the VIT innocently or were misled have never shown an interest in Indian history but only in crude politics, and this can perhaps be proven empirically too.

On the contrary, there has been a continuous and continuing demand for revision of history textbooks not because Indians are endowed with a fanatical streak but because theories were never presented in a manner that made sense to locals. If demands for revision are to be discouraged, theories must be presented in a manner that would permit locals to make sense of their culture and tradition because they have a natural feel for Indian tradition and history but cannot naturally hope to offer evidence. This has not been done, and therefore, theories such as the VIT have been proposed by scholars in very good faith. It would be unfair and cruel to label all such scholars as fanatics, given the quantum of chaos and confusion that exists in our understanding of the ancient past, and such widely differing viewpoints can be expected to die natural deaths as acculturation models improve.

From the Left to the Right: Evolving New Paradigms for Indian Historiography

We may recommend a formula where (a) Pre-Harappan India and the history of lesser known people (b) The IVC (c) The history of the culturally crucial and critical Post-Harappan India (d) The history of India between 600 BC and 1000 AD (e) The Mughal period (f) The British raj (g) The history of Post-Independent India (i) The history of Dravidian and other cultures (j) Common cultural threads, basic concepts, special topics etc are given equal coverage. This may be called a “One by Ten formula”, though other scholars are invited to comment. If 40% of space is reserved for Indian and 60% for world history, 4% space must be allocated or each period. Alternatively, different periods of Indian history may be evaluated for their economic and cultural value and this formula may be modified accordingly. Other scholars must also come with strategies for explaining basic concepts to students. This would naturally involve explaining how different aspects of Indian culture got formed while always encouraging students to think for themselves. The origins of different aspects of Indian culture must naturally be evaluated and re-evaluated in a global context and the origin of different technologies such as chariots, bronze and copper must be explained to students. This will ensure that the man in the street does not get carried away by proponents of theories such as the 3100 BC Mahabharata theory.

One cannot wish away religion easily; if religious fanaticism is to be brought to an end, it must be done so through transparency: Explain the history of religion and mythology transparently and religious fanatics will no longer hold sway. If current theories are all a part of pre-enlightenment enterprise, and it is argued that the centrality of religion will wane in Indian society, the transition to post-enlightenment must itself be brought about through logic and reasoning. The approach that is alleged to have been followed by Marxist historians in the past i.e. that of suppressing the history of post-Harappan India because of an incorrect notion that it is “Hindu” may be a form of inadvertent or conscious communalism (this is a widely held belief among many segments of the Indian population) and may be dangerous and counter-productive because it may be inconsistent with the spirit of human inquiry. On the other hand Marxists themselves generally do not believe in religion: their approach of negating the notion that anything existed between the IVC and the time of the Buddha because if may encourage
Hindutva, is perhaps counter-productive. In addition, Marxist scholars have insisted that all schools of Indological thought have been encouraged throughout the history of post-independent India, including Hindutva thought and what Marxists call the Liberal school. If any form of historiography is to be branded as undesirable, it may have to be done so through empirical evidence, and this can be collected as we proceed to detect biases and evolve new paradigms. Marxists nearly argue that nothing existed between the period of the IVC, the magical transformation to civilization having been brought about without any apparent rhyme or reason in 600 BC and still argue for the mid or early second millennium migrations both of which are certainly impossible to sell to history-literate Indian populations and lead to situations where nobody believes history textbooks, thereby producing an alternative industry, and encouraging fanatics even more. Argue against the Vedic-Harappan equation, but argue using the right reasons to avoid counter-reactions. If the “Aryans” lived in the Punjab, how was Buddha born in the Gangetic plains? In the popular view, Marxists always argue using the wrong reasons and by doing so are not peddling the truth – they are imposing their own ideology and adding to the confusion.

In the pre-consensus scenario, having many schools of thought may be necessary and Marxist historians cannot be blamed for everything because

(a) There is no agreement on many issues pertaining to the ancient past
(b) In such a scenario, Marxist historiography can counterbalance the excesses of the Hindutva movement
(c) Ideas vary from person to person and some Marxist historians have even supported the VIT
(d) Marxist historians themselves i.e Romila Thapar have called for the abandonment of the AIT in the 1960’s
(e) Marxist historians may only be riding piggyback on older colonial theories and did not invent the AIT themselves
(f) India has been a democratic country and every school of thought has been encouraged

In the long run, however, biases are extremely dangerous because

(a) One kind of bias automatically legitimizes every other kind of bias
(b) It leads to a loss of credibility eventually
(c) It automatically produces reactionary schools of thought
(d) It encourages religious fanatics even more by giving them something to shout about
(e) People cease to read mainstream theories and this encourages superstition and blind faith even more
(f) Teleological approaches may discriminate on the basis of religion and are not in the interests of communal harmony
(g) Blocking research on post-Harappan India blocks research on the history of the caste system
(h) It affects Harappan studies because everything in India is interrelated
(i) It affects Dravidian studies because everything in India is interrelated
(j) Suppression doesn’t work in today’s world and is unsustainable
(k) From a national perspective, it affects national progress and research
(l) This ensures that textbooks are not updated. This encourages superstition and blind faith even more.
(m) This kind of an approach is a perfect recipe for stagnation and non-progress

The underlying philosophical message from this model can be explained in Thirteen words “ One kind of bias automatically provides justification for every other kind of bias”.
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Therefore, in the post-consensus era, such approaches maybe the most substantial fodder for the Hindutva brigade.

On the other hand Hindu fanatics also ensure from a nationalistic perspective, that India (as a nation) becomes a laughing stock in the eyes of the world as it already happened half a decade ago, as they only seek to boost sectarian pride, paying scant respect to science or knowledge in the process. While woolly-headed and self-destructing Marxists peddle their theories to God knows what beneficial end, fascism is more infinitely more venomous and dangerous by any account, and even Marxist need to bear this in mind.

Nonetheless, and mercifully, there is an increasing awareness of the pitfalls of “saffronisation” and “crimsonisation” even in political circles and a news report from Shantiniketan dating from January 2006 has the following comment of a union minister:

“Historians must guard against "saffronisation" or "crimsonisation" of history and avoid trying to find answers to bitter controversies through an objective approach, Defence Minister Pranab Mukherjee said today. "Saffronisation and crimsonisation are of no consequence. There should be a continuous judgement and dispassionate pursuit of the truth," Mukherjee said while inaugurating the 66th Indian History Congress (IHC) here.”

Acknowledging the fact that history textbooks have not been updated for decades, Marxist historian Romila Thapar states:62

“Barring a few exceptions, early Indian history is still generally taught in many schools as it was half-a-century ago. Out-of-date textbooks, sometimes factually incorrect, written in a dull and plodding fashion, are used to smother students with boring information, chunks of which they are made to learn by heart and reproduce in examinations. There is little attempt to convey the idea that history is a process of gaining an understanding of the past and not a body of information to be memorised. No attempt is made to integrate the different activities that went into the making of the past, or to explain why there are differences in various parts of the country and how they came about. Even the differences in the nature of the societies of early times and of now are not discussed. The continuity between periods of time and the transmutation of ideas and institutions are absent. Distortions are sometimes not even noticed, leave alone being corrected. The results of modern research are not reflected because those authors of history textbooks who are not historians seldom consult historians or their work. The writing and prescribing of textbooks used to be a cottage industry; it has now become a factory system. One has therefore to ask where the profits go before the mess can be cleaned up. “

Another problem has been the neglect of regional cultures. However, the history of the Gangetic plains itself has been neglected. Romila Thapar states:

“At the time of independence there was a feeling that the history of India was dominated by the history of the Ganges valley and that south Indian history, for example, tended to be neglected. This was largely true. The colonial vision had been the perspective from the Ganges valley and northern India. Added to this, the identity of each state was strengthened by the creation of linguistic states. The impetus for writing regional histories was encouraged by the growing middle class in the States searching for its identity in the past of the region.

The positive result of this was an intensive search for local sources on the past. Archaeological excavation was undertaken with enthusiasm, surveys of local monuments revealed structures ignored prior to this change, inscriptions were discovered through a more careful screening of local landscapes and settlements, and texts pertaining to regional circuits of pilgrimage and administration, all added up to increasing the knowledge about the region.

62 A paradigm shift. Frontline August 9-22, 1997
But the weakness lay in either adhering too closely to the all-India periodisation of Ancient, Medieval and Modern, which in some cases, such as the States of the North-East, made little historical sense, or else in moving too far away and losing the broader perspective for the narrower regional history. We met with this problem as early as the 1960s when some of us wrote model textbooks for the NCERT (National Council for Educational Research and Training) in which attempts were made to keep in mind both the national and the regional perspectives. But we frequently heard that our textbooks did not suit the local schools since there was not enough of the history of the particular State. This was also born out of a regional chauvinism where the local elite was concerned that the regional history should focus on its origins and rise to power. Yet regional history, when placed in perspective, can usefully modulate the generalisation about historical change on a national level.

A further corrective which regional history can encourage, if it is not hijacked for purposes of regional chauvinism, is to demonstrate that there is a multiplicity of histories, even of early India, which have to be co-related. There are variant perspectives on the same events and the historian has to be aware of this variance, both in looking for evidence and in interpreting it.

A search must be made for new topics of study, and a short, preliminary list might include the following topics, among others: (a) Understanding India and South Asia in terms of a series of cultural transformations and mutually beneficial interactions over millennia. (b) A scientific study of the Racial origins of Indians (c) A scientific study of language transformations and the origin of Indian languages (d) The history of History (e) The history of religion (f) The history of mythology (The history of religion and mythology can be used to fight superstition and blind faith) and many more. All aspects of Indian culture would also need to be fitted into any model, and such endeavours would keep historians occupied for decades.

SR Rao controversially proposed that the Harappans spoke Sanskrit. BB Lal believed in the Vedic Indus theory as also did late Dr SP Gupta. It is highly unlikely that these very competent scholars were politically motivated, but instead presented their theories in good faith. The VIT naturally gained currency because of the failings of older theories, and the fact that textbooks were antiquated and woefully inadequate. While the VIT can be presented as a hypothesis, and all proponents of the VIT or even the indigenous Aryan theory, or the still more controversial OIT are not necessarily fanatics, the dangers of the Hindutva ideology are too dangerous to be overlooked.

While, it must be admitted that religious fanatics managed to get the upper hand either because key issues in ancient Indian history remain unresolved, or because textbooks were not updated regularly or often enough, and that people are entitled to believe in the Vedic Indus theory if they want to, have their points of view heard thoroughly and patiently, or even publish such theories in peer-reviewed journals, it must be emphasized that many religious fanatics were never interested in history of India, the history of Hinduism or the history of the Gangetic plains. In the Author’s perspective, proponents of the VIT, the IAT/AAT, or the OIT may be classified into (a) those who believe in this theory innocently or because they are confused and confounded because of myriad and inadequate interpretations (b) those who even formulate these theories in good faith because they may have made better sense than obsolete notions of Aryan and Dravidian. (such people cannot naturally be faulted and they retain the right to present the own hypotheses in a democratic and a free-thinking society) (c) those who use the chaos and confusion that surrounds the earliest, crucial and the formative periods of Indian history to influence category (a) and promote some kind of a talibanization, known locally as saffronization. There are many types of forces at play and one should be wary.

The following should serve as a salutary lesson for those who do not want to walk into the Hindutva trap and make them more careful. While perceptions vary from person to person, and there are many shades between the left, centre and the right, in the Author’s perspective, the following five attributes may help identify those who owe allegiance to the farthest right (a) Such
people are not interested in the history of India or even the history of Hinduism (b) Such people only seem to be eager to establish the fact that the Aryans are indigenous to India, a fact irrelevant to history. However, many innocent people were dragged into the Hindutva camp in the 1990’s as some kind of hysteria was built up then and religious fanatics sought control of key institutions such as the NCERT, ICHR and the UGC. (c) They are not interested in the history of post-Harappan India but want to prove that the Harappans and Aryans were the same. (d) Propose an alternative model such as the one presented in Part one and two of this paper and observe how he or she reacts. This would serve as an acid test of their sincerity and the author has already used this with a remarkable degree of success. While via media solutions have even been published in Vedic conferences, the far right will not be willing to listen to reason. (e) Those owing allegiance to the far right mislead people by attacking obsolete theories such as the AIT which even Marxist historians have already abandoned. (This is despite the fact that none of the Acculturation models available till date are very convincing. Therefore, this theory was developed with a moderate Indian audience in mind).

However, there is a failure on all sides as many obsolete concepts were not replaced fast enough, and we tried to demolish many myths in Part one. Those who opposed the Vedic Indus theory themselves had no alternative concrete proposal. There is still no consensus on many issues, and perhaps, one must be prepared to live with this kind of a chaos and confusion for some more time. This leads to people taking refuge in comic books, for example, many of which mix myth and history and lay the foundations for pseudoscience, sectarian interpretations and false nationalistic pride. The Amar Chitra Katha, the Adarsh Chitra Katha and the Chaturang Katha are prime examples and though apparently innocuous, result in a kind of indoctrination all the same as they present sectarian viewpoints and are based on literature that was compiled in 200 BC. Not as dangerous and open as the kind of indoctrination taking place in the NWFP, but fraught with dangerous implications all the same, because they promote a kind of mythistory. The likes of PN Oak manage to capture people’s imagination. Much has been written about the Hindutva movement. Sadly, much less has been written about why they have been able to capture people’s imagination, and the factors that led to their popularity. It is very difficult to find a balanced assessment of this issue, and it may be prudent to reserve this assessment for posterity.

There are varying perceptions between the left, right and centre on other critical issues too. Those who claim that there isn’t a nugget or iota of historical information in the RV and other Sanskrit literature and that there is no information to reconstruct the history of India before 600 BC are politically motivated, given that fact that the converse is probably much more likely to be true and even Witzel has, time and again acknowledged that fact that there is plenty of historical information in the RV, and strategies to cull this information non-controversially and reliably only need to be put in place. There is however, a world of difference between properly constructed historical narratives from the RV and the popular Ramayana and Mahabharata TV shows which are based on later literature commonly dated to 200 BC to 200 AD, or what Pargiter calls “Brahminical Productions”. The latter clearly contributes to superstition and blind faith and a certain kind of an unscientific thinking which is not in the best interests of a scientific spirit of enquiry.

If a foundation is to be laid for a safe and a secure tomorrow, efforts to research India’s ancient past must indeed be intensified and the process of updating badly outdated books must be begun in right earnest. There would be nothing more to India than the IVC, the cultures of the Gangetic plains, the cultures of South India and other regional and lesser known cultures. It would help if the transition from the present school of Indology, which in the overwhelming consensus of history-literate population is long past its prime to the twenty first century school of Indology were completed as quickly as possible. Answers to all the questions students ask must be made available from mainstream sources, and students must be encouraged to think for themselves, ponder and investigate.
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A visual depiction of the Transformation of Harappan India to Post-Harappan India and other forces which shaped Indian culture

Note the eastward movement of the Indo-Aryans. They left the Himalayan region between 2200 BC and 2300 BC and moved along the Ganga and the Yamuna, through Jungles. They founded many kingdoms there e.g (a) Pratishana (Lunar Dynasty or Moon dynasty) (Later known as Prayag and then Allahabad (b) Kosala (Ayodhya) (c) Kasi (Benares or Varanasi).

Given that the number of migrants from Central Asia even in multiwave models would be limited to the populations there (it is unlikely that two people rode in per horse), and the fact that there were a small number of people in the Ganges plains before 2200 BC would suggest that the inhabitants of the IVC were ancestors of the people living in the UP-Bihar region. Even If we assume that the immigrants were small and were male (they would then have naturally lost their identity in the Himalayan region itself), we can convincingly explain the spread of IE culture century by century.
Note the parallel movements of the Indo-Aryans. Acculturation within the IVC would explain the Saraswat Brahmins (Note: it is necessary to understand the southward migrations of 1900 BC well and the acculturation must have already begun before that), the presence of alien objects, the petty kingdoms along the Saraswat river according to the RV and changes in Burial practices by 1900 BC; the Cemetery H culture may be as a result of a famine in 1900 BC when the eastward movement started. It is fascinating to understand, always using logic and reasoning, taking century by century snapshots, how composite Indian culture got formed starting from the Kot Diji phase of 3300 BC. This would be a fascinating voyage of understanding.
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The Samaewal river must have dried up around 1900 BC as suggested by the ASI because this date tallies with the Cemetery H culture and the beginning of the decline of the IVC well. The Cemetery H culture may have been the manifestation of a famine as a result of the drying up of this river.
There is a wealth of information about the reign of King Bharata as known through traditional sources. It is believed that his reign marked a major turning point in the expansion of Indo-Aryan power.
Trade and cultural contacts with West Asia began around 1800 BC, or perhaps a little later than this. Iron was perhaps imported starting 1800 BC and knowhow for chariots around 1600 BC. The concurrent dating paradigm means that several events were taking place in parallel. Readers must take anything they know about the Ganges plains and fit it into this model.
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Note how the Indo-Aryan kingdoms moved back close to the decaying IVC. However, the region between the two became a desert after the eastward migrations of 1900 BC, when the populations of the IVC were split up between the Gangetic plains and the Indus.

However, this model differs fundamentally from earlier models in many respects. While IE culture spread, they killed their own language and made it (i) a liturgical language and (ii) a lingua franca of the elite. Secondly, Prakrits did not derive from Sanskrit but closely interacted with them over millenia. This theory if accepted, would change the way we look at IA languages and understand the probable distant relationships between modern IA languages like Punjabi, Gujarati and the languages of the Indus. Note our century by century depiction of the transformation.
Note the changes to Indian culture as a result of the competition between Buddhism and the threatened Vedic orthodoxy. Classical Sanskrit began to emerge after 500 BC. Another trigger was perhaps Asoka's conversion to Buddhism around 200 BC which resulted in composition of new works and significant changes to religion.
Around 800 AD, the religion that is now called Hinduism appears to have been threatened by Buddhism again. Adi Sankaracarya was an Indian philosopher who popularized the Vedas. The period appears to have been marked by many changes to religion such as temple building.
Direct contacts between the IVC and the South of India will explain many aspects of Indian culture not accounted for by our Nine phases as discussed in this paper. The problem with the Dravidian Harappa hypothesis is that all aspects of Dravidian culture are not represented in the IVC.
Contacts between the Gangetic plains and the Vedic homeland will explain the retention of names of plants found in cool climates when the Vedas were compiled.
**Conclusion**

Here is an interesting quote from “When Scholarship Matters: The Indo-Aryan Origins Debate by Edwin Bryant Rutgers University”.

“Having said that, it seems fair to state from the other side, that while pointing out colonial biases is of fundamental importance—cleansing Indology from the ghosts of the past is a process that is by no means passé—there is still solid empirical data that need to be confronted and addressed if one chooses to tackle a problem like that of the Indo-Aryans; suspicion of colonial motives does not make such evidence disappear. Besides, this is no longer the colonial period; it is still a post-modern one where alternative, suppressed and subaltern views are, if anything, glamorized. Established paradigms have been subverted left, right and center throughout humanities departments all over western academia. Why on earth would present-day western Indologists still be invested in an Aryan Invasion Theory anyway? Whatever may have been the agendas underpinning 19th Century scholarship, the fact is that most present-day western scholars have been unconvinced by the polemical and all-too-often embarrassingly ill-informed arguments they encounter, not because they somehow have some mysterious investment in insisting on an external origin for this language group. There were, and still are, some very good reasons to retain the theory of Aryan migrations, and this evidence needs to be addressed. Simply aggressively promoting only those selective aspects of the data that are amenable to a specific alternative view with troubling ideological underpinnings is to duplicate the errors and excesses of the much-maligned 19th century European Indological enterprise. Two wrongs do not make a right: European racism and elitism cannot be replaced by Hindu chauvinism. History cannot be written by decibel.

Casting off the legacies of colonialism opens up exciting new possibilities for the understanding of Indian proto-history provided the constraints of the colonial period are not replaced by an equally constraining insistence on a different ideologically driven reading of the historical evidence, whether 'western elitist,' 'secular Marxist' or 'Hindu nationalist.' Unless attitudes to this issue change from all sides, I foresee the perpetuation of two widening divisions as the 'Indigenist' position becomes more vociferous: one between western Indologists, and the more persistent voices from the Hindu diaspora, and the other much more serious confrontation between 'leftist' and 'rightist' academics in the subcontinent itself. Most unfortunate, if this trend continues, will be that the entire field will suffer due to loss of communication between differing opinions and points of view—the lifeblood of a progressive field of study. “

An incomplete list of such ghosts of the past, whether Indian or Western in origin, is given below

(a) The so-called Indo-Iranian language split
(b) The yet-to-be-reconciled-with-the-Kurgan Hypothesis BMAC hypothesis
(c) The Rural post-Harappan India hypothesis which has been inconsistent with archeological data available for forty years, even the recent views of mainstream Western scholars and flies in the face of tradition. Interestingly early mainstream and western Indologists bestowed upon the Gangetic plains encomiums far in excess of what was warranted, calling it in certain extreme cases, the birthplace of every known science in the world, and some Western indology departments were named “Benares’ on the Rhine.” This was abruptly dumped in favour of Sir Mortimer Wheeler’s dark age hypothesis which was presented without any underlying evidence.

(d) The notion of early second millennium migrations (migrations just before the RV was compiled) which borders on the fringes of common sense and is even inconsistent with data available from the region covered by the IVC. (Instead, we have proposed

---
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Middle of the first half of the third millennium BC migrations, around 2750 BC or earlier).

(e) The idea that the “Aryans” lived in the Punjab. This is clearly pre-common sense because Buddha was born in the Gangetic plains.

(f) The illiterate post-Harappan India hypothesis. This hypothesis is virulently unscientific because it is impossible to disprove the existence of something unless it conflicts with a known principle or law, and textual evidence suggests that there was limited literacy available and that it came somewhere in between.

(g) Imbalanced coverage: we have instead proposed a one by ten formula here.

(h) Arguing against the Vedic Harappan equation using all the wrong reasons either due to ideological constraints or because of obsolete ideas.

(i) Much more importantly, India specific approaches have never been formulated, and there has never been an attempt to understand India as ONE entity, across regions and periods. This is probably why all existing approaches will one day be probably consigned to the rubbish heap of history.

There is the problem with such theories or approaches is that they make people highly suspicious and encourage religious fanatics even more, by permitting them to take control of people’s consciousness with great ease. Given this background, it is hardly possible to label the forever confused and confounded man in the street as a fanatic. As a matter of fact, this would be sacrilegious. On the other hand, proponents of the VIT have very little to argue their case, though this theory may be initially very appealing for those to whom outdated colonial constructs may appear to be the only alternative. These findings are not based on any predilections: everybody’s point of view was taken, wherever backed up by data. Theories such as this make the history of Hinduism and even the history of Brahminical traditions clearer than the VIT. As emphasized, Aryan is not equal to Brahmin and neither equates to the immigrants from Central Asia. The theory that IA languages like Sindhi, Gujarati, Marathi (and even Hindi and Bengali), derived from Prakrits which were not descendants of Sanskrit but of the languages of the Indus and were only transformed by Sanskrit may not gain widespread acceptance immediately, though the Author is confident it ultimately will.

Here is a famous Sanskrit quote and this should make sense to the locals seeking moderation:

गुणदोषौ बुधो गृहन् इन्दुक्षेप्याविवेधरः

शिरसा श्लाघते पूर्व परं कण्ठे नियच्छति

English Translation:

"A wise-man accepts (both) the good and the bad. He appreciates the former by a nod of his head and restricts the latter in his throat, just as Lord Shiva adorned his head with the crescent moon and restricted the poison in his throat."

While it is unlikely that the people of the region ever built fancy ziggurats or pyramids in the manner Egyptians or the cultures of the middle east did, It is the diversity, the mutually beneficial relationships and the plurality of the nation is what makes it fascinating. It is about how different cultures have interacted for thousands of years producing new paradigms without losing their individuality. This is why many elements of Indian culture can be traced back to the Indus although the Harappan culture itself has ceased to exist as an entity. This gives Indian culture a certain kind of continuity across millennia, which further provides substance to our case that the region must always be studied as one entity for meaningful progress to be made. Approaches
developed for the study of Ancient India may then be used for study of complex cultures anywhere else in the world, throwing up new areas for multi-cultural studies.

A change of name is necessary: A New Nine Phase Acculturation model explaining the process of transformation of Harappan India to Post-Harappan India

Taking all earlier mentioned factors into account, and keeping in mind current terminology, it may be prudent, with hindsight, to rename Parts One and Two of this paper "A New Nine Phase Acculturation model explaining the process of transformation of Harappan India to Post-Harappan India." This is because the small group of pastoralists who may not have even called themselves Aryans would have only been one of several triggers for cultural change. The IVC is and will always be considered India's oldest civilization due to several reasons already explained in both parts of the paper. Hackneyed terms such as secular and secular Marxist may be replaced by newer terms such as multi-cultural, multi-religious, multi-ethnic, diverse, composite etc.

The Aryan issue is undoubtedly a complex issue and there has been no agreement on this issue till date. The AMT was never presented as a perfect solution to the Aryan problem, but only represents the bare minimum that has been agreed upon through consensus. To reiterate, if demands for revision are to be discouraged, theories must be presented in a manner that would permit locals to make sense of their culture and tradition because they have a natural feel for Indian tradition and history but cannot hope to offer evidence. This has probably been the drawback of all early theories. Answers to the questions students ask must also be available from mainstream sources. If these two principles are satisfied, we will automatically lay the foundations for a safe and secure tomorrow and foster innovate and creative thought. The 19th and even the 20th centuries are in many ways different from today's world. Imposing any form of ideology in today's world will keep on producing counter-reactions ad infinitum. New initiatives like the SSA are certain to increase inquisitiveness, enlightenment and quasi-enlightenment and therefore, we may need to reiterate that every kind of bias in today's world will induce unequal and opposite reactions. The history of Indian history may one day be even viewed as a series of reactions against biases, inaccuracies and prejudices. The common criticism has so far been that Indian scholars have never been able to understand historical problems in a global context, and have always approached the issue from the point of view of a Brahmin, Dalit, Aryan, North Indian, South Indian, Marxist, Hindu, Non-Hindu etc—another major (if not the biggest) stumbling block to research – and what glorifies their own community and what not is necessarily correct, (if this trend continues the best option might be to write off Indian and indeed South Asian scholarship completely) and in such a case, the baton may be passed on to the younger, post-globalized generation - and that older Western scholars have not invested time to develop a critical feel for the local culture and have not developed strategies that could take into account the realities of the region. They can be hardly faulted however, as Ancient India has confounded and baffled locals as well. In Witzel's view, a hunt for the soul of India was attempted in all sincerity and given up. Furthermore, in today's globalized world, all such fault lines can easily get dissipated, as has been amply demonstrated in the recent past with even Japanese scholars beginning to research India and Indian scholars taking interest in research on other parts of the world. Every nation would be expected to take and active interest in its own history, but it must be done accurately, otherwise angry reactions from the rest of the world will result as it happened a decade ago. Without India-specific approaches, Indology would be doomed to fail and would be an enormous waste of time and effort. It would be abundantly clear that approaches driven by decipherment of the Indus script, for example, would hardly be successful, and would not take researchers anywhere, though a specialized team may still focus on it, to gain a better understanding of it. India-specific research strategies MUST be the starting point, and without this any individual or institution, Indian or foreign, is only wasting his, her or its time and resources.

To summarize this section, here are some old terms and their modern equivalents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Old terms</th>
<th>New terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vedic India, Vedic people, Aryan</td>
<td>Post-Harappan India, Cultures of the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>India, Vedic period</th>
<th>Ganges (still misleading)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The rise of Aryan power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Nine Phase Acculturation model comes in two versions. The basic high-level version as explained in the previous part, and a more detailed, century by century version. Therefore, in the more detailed version of the theory, the nine phases of transformation of Harappan India to post-Harappan India may be represented as

(a) The arrival of small groups of IE speakers around 2750 BC
(b) Their spread along the banks of the Ganges between 2300 and 2200 BC
(c) The acculturation within the area of the IVC from between 2300 and 2200 BC
(d) The migration to the Ganga-Yamuna doab in 1900 BC
(e) The resultant de-synthesis which led to a new culture being formed
(f) The unification of North India under King Bharata 1700 BC
(g) Contacts with West Asia from 1700 BC
(h) Violent incidents if any, which could have been internal
(i) The spread of Indo-Aryan culture into Pakistan 1600 BC

Anyone can present this hypothesis, yet …

The methodology adopted is rather different

1. Anyone who refutes one part of the hypothesis will contradict himself elsewhere as evidence is provided for every major conclusion reached. This will make the process of getting consensus much faster.
2. Always present views of mainstream scholars always support of this hypotheses.
3. Take the assumptions of the colonial school of Indology as a basis and work backwards, always providing evidence everywhere, so that any scholar familiar with the colonial school of Indology can understand it easily.
4. No personal attacks against anyone. The only exceptions being a criticism of the Hindutva and Marxist schools of thought or ideologies to the extent they are anti-Indology and against long-term national interest (from a nationalistic perspective).
5. Always use a Figure-it-out-for-yourself approach.
6. Present the model as a series of inter-dependant steps so that any post-2200 BC migration hypotheses into the plains and post-2700 BC migration hypotheses into the Vedic homeland will cease to pass elementary common-sense tests.
7. No nationalism, direct or subtle. Wherever the term ‘national’ is used, it is always followed by a rider.

In all 21st Century schools of Indology, driven of course by multi-disciplinary and India-specific approaches, both Western and Indian scholars must be called upon to participate and contribute, as this kind of an approach would help guard against nationalism and parochialism. The fight against all kinds of nonsense must be fought through better research, greater transparency and textbooks that are not outdated (This will lead to better education, naturally) and not from any kind of ideology because this approach will encourage fundamentalism, superstition and blind faith even more and produce the archetypal argumentative Indian. While this battle may be tough, it will ensure that the well-intentioned aren’t misled.

As would probably be clear by this time, Parts One and Two of this paper are written with the intention of introducing a Third School of Indological thought, one driven by commonsense and India-specific approaches, and contain intended replacements for obsolete concepts and Hindutva approaches and cover almost everything, and even propose a complete and a comprehensive solution for the so-called Aryan problem at two levels the basic Nine Phase acculturation model, and the more detailed century by century mode, stopping, of course, just
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short of the decipherment of the Indus script, though methods to reconstruct the languages spoken in the Indus are provided with smoking guns, and these would naturally have a bearing on its eventual though relatively less important decipherment. As the underlying methodology and evidence has always been provided, readers may exercise their own judgment.

We began our journey from the 1500 BC AMT or early second millennium migrations and have arrived at a certain destination. The Twenty-first century is already a decade old. It is time to bring Indology up-to-date.

CONCLUDED