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Introduction
According to the Malaysian Constitution, a Malay is a Muslim who speaks Malay and practices Malay custom and traditions. However, the Malays, just like Orang Asli are classified as Bumiputra and the Malay language spoken by the Malays and certain Orang Asli ethnic groups can be sub-divided into 17 to 20 dialects: Kelantan, Terengganu, Ulu Terengganu, Tembeling and other dialects.

There are 18 ethnic groups of Orang Asli in Peninsular Malaysia. Each group practised different socio-cultural traditions. Certain scholars have interpreted these diverse socio-cultural traditions as indicator of different origins. It may not be so but rather due to the adjustment to different types of environment in the Malay Peninsula: the forest, open-land, mangrove and coastal.

Existing Views
Many scholars in the past have given their views on the origin of the Malays and Orang Asli. The most popular version is the successive migrations in the form of "waves" of Proto-Malays and Deutro-Malays, into the Peninsula.

Another and less popular theory is the one associated with the "Austronesian Culture". Heine Geldern in 1932 forwarded a theory to explain the presence of the polished stone axes and adzes which ushered the Neolithic culture into the Malay Peninsula at about 5000 B.P (Heine Geldern 1931: 543-619). In 1945, Heine Geldern wrote that "Quadrangular Adze Culture has been the culture of the
Austronesian people when they invaded Indonesia... It appears that the last common homeland of the Austronesian people before their dispersal must have been the Malay Peninsula. However this Austronesia Quadrangular Adze Culture... could be traced even further back, from China by way of the central regions of further India. The development of the highly specialised pick-adzes of western Indonesia from a simple adze type with quadrangular cross-section and semi-circular edge, found in Laos, through an intermediate type frequent in the Malay Peninsula, in particularly striking form indicates clearly the direction and way of the ancient migration” (R. Heine Geldern, 1945). Other characteristics of the Austronesian Culture were: the cultivation of rice and millet, the perforated stone knife for reaping rice, the brewing of beer from rice or millet, the raising of pigs or buffaloes for sacrificial purposes. The custom of head-huntings, megalithic monuments, the house devoted on piles, bark cloth and the outrigger canoe (Ibid).

However, Roger Duff, one of the followers of Heine Geldern’s theory of migration despite commending Heine Geldern’s reconstruction as bold and fruitful stressed that it was based primarily on inferences drawn from adze distribution and the projection backwards of the cultural traits of surviving primitive groups in the area, left obscure the role of pottery in this postulation of an otherwise rich and sophisticated Neolithic (Roger Duff, 1970: 16).

In order to update Heine Geldern’s conclusions, Duff in 1970 introduced new archaeological discoveries as additional evidence. He focusses on the evidence from three archaeological sites; Gua Cha (Sieveking, 1954) in Peninsular Malaysia, Sai Yok and Ban Kao in Western Thailand. Among the evidence he introduced was the pottery assemblages discovered at those three sites. In general, Duff was in agreement with Heine Geldern that the presence of the quadrangular type of ground stone adzes as diagnostic of Austronesian neolithic but representing a late phase (Ibid: 16).

Accordingly he stresses that “these Neolithic assemblages occur in a stratigraphical context implying a sudden intrusion into a long established pre-Neolithic or mesolithic stone technology, Bacsonian-Hoabinhian status (Ibid: 16). Van Heekeren in 1967 also stresses that cultural standard remained unchanged for thousands and thousands of years and it is not impossible that the mesolithic tribes might have continued their food-gathering economy indefinitely if it was not for the rather sudden, explosive invasion of Mongoloids from the north who introduced agriculture, stock breeding and the new technique of stone polishing, pottery manufacture and the art of weaving” (Van Heekeren, 1964).

The presence of what Duff called the quadrangular adze culture in the wild forested area at Gua Cha: was due to “a sudden and deep canoe penetration by the Neolithic immigrants”. The pottery assemblages at Gua Cha, Sai Yok and Ban Kao to Sorensen (1964) and Heekeren (1967) appear to be related. And to show that some of the potteries in these assemblages were brought by immigrants from China, Heekeren implied that they have close affinities with the Lung Shan Neolithic Culture of Shantung Province, Northeast China.
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Sorensen (1964) stated that "astonishing amount of parallels in shapes and ornamentation, and the same mixture of three different wares with the black ware as the dominant feature". However, most scholars agree that it is very difficult to explain how the Lungshanoid pottery types could have reached the Malay Peninsula. Duff has states that "both Heekeren and Sorensen emphasise the difficulties of postulating the route, means of dispersal and indeed the fact of dispersal in the absence of reports of transit sites in south coastal China and Indocina" (Roger Duff, 1970: 18). But Duff felt that by applying the Chang Kwang-Chih hypothesis (1959) concerning the spread of Lungshanoid Culture, it is possible to overcome the difficulties.

According to Chang Kwang-Chih the Lung Shan Culture extended along the south China coast in time-stayed "Lungshanoid phases" (Roger Duff, 1970: 18) reaching as far south as the Pearl River and the Bay of Canton. The Lung Shan was able to move south along the coastal flood plain to Yangtse delta and merges with local maritime communities (pre-Han) and extended the culture in phase to Pearl River and the Bay of Canton" (Roger Duff, 1970: 18). Duff believed that from Canton the culture was moved by seaborne migrations into the Gulf of Tongking to break the time-stayed mesolithic isolation of cultures of Bacsonian-Hoabinhian Type, whose bearers were Australo-Melanasoid stock . . . also called Oceanic Negroids and Negritos (Ibid 18).

Paul Wheatley mentions that, "as far back as the Pleistocene period men—of a sort—had wandered through the forest of North Malaya and left a cache of their crude stone tools at Kota Tampan in the Upper Perak Valley, but they made little impression on the landscape . . . Nor did their successors who roamed the Peninsula from about the ninth to the third millenia B.C. leave any permanent impress on the face of the country. These were cave-dwelling Melanesoid people whose habitation sites were restricted to the limestone terrains of the centre and north of the Peninsula (Fig. 6). In these areas almost every cave or rock-shelter large enough to be habitable and which, while reasonably accessible, was out of reach of floods, today yields evidence of Mesolithic occupancy . . . they evolved from simple collectors living directly off the bounty of the forest into skilful hunters . . . . The first assault on the forest cover, although to only a limited extent, was undertaken with the arrival of the first cultivators to enter the Peninsula, the forbears of the present Malay and Indonesian people, who filtered in from the northwards probably between 2500 and 1500 B.C. . . . During the later centuries of the pre-Christian period these people, or later immigrants, acquired the use of metal" (1966: xxx-xxxi).

The view of Peter Bellwood is that "... the Negritos and their hunting and gathering traditional lifestyles must be considered as authochthonous to the Indo-Malaysian Archipelago, whereas the agricultural lifestyle of the Austronesian speakers is to a great (but not total) extent the result of an original expansion from more northerly latitudes. The explanations for the present variations in the latter group require not mixing between clearly differentiable and successive races and cultures, but the slow expansion and adaptation of a relatively unified
ethnolinguistic population, combined with intergroup contact and the successive influences of external civilisations" (198: 130).

Geofferey Benjamin has a different view concerning the Austronesian Culture in the Peninsula. Even though he acknowledges the present of the Austronesian speakers in the Peninsula, he attributes only two components of the Malaysian archaeology to the Austronesians, the slab-grave in the Bernam and Sungkai Valley and the Kuala Selinsing sites in Perak (Geofferey Benjamin, 1997: 93).

Archaeological Evidence
The intrusive nature of the Malay Peninsular Neolithic culture as envisaged by Heine-Geldern, Sorensen, Heekeren, Duff and many others were based merely on the basis of some of the apparent mainland derived influences noted on some of the pottery assemblages and quadrangular adzes culture. But even detailed study of the stone adzes of Southeast Asia has not provided convincing proof of the migration theory during the Neolithic period of the Austronesians. Most of the Neolithic sites in the Malay Peninsula besides having some pottery types appear to have their own special characteristics (Leong Sau Heng, 1980: 24). Leong Sau Heng has shown that two types of stone artifacts have not been known to occur in Sai Yok or Ban Kao or in other mainland sites. They are the beaked adzes and stone pounders. Even Duff found it difficult to fit them into his Austronesian Quadrangular Adze Culture. In the Malay Peninsula Neolithic Culture, many of the Neolithic adzes and stone tools, including the Malayan Beaked Adze, according to Duff not yet recorded outside Malaysia.

Because of the presence of so many variants it is difficult to adopt the theory that the quadrangular adze culture of the Malay Peninsula was introduced by the migrating Austronesian people. What we see from the Neolithic artifact assemblages found in the Malay Peninsula are mixed artifactual assemblages. They could not have originated from one source.

As an example beaked adzes have been found at various site in Kedah, Kelantan, Perak, Selangor, Pahang and southern Thailand sometimes together with certain types of the quadrangular adzes and yet they were peculiar to the Malay Peninsula only.

In order for Duff to fit these adzes into his Austronesian Quadrangular Adzes Culture while accepting that they are distinctively Malaysian explained that their presence was indicative of the late Neolithic culture for Gua Cha (Roger Duff, 1970: 17) and they were the prototype of the beaked type of adzes in island Southeast Asia.

The stone bark-cloth beaters, over twenty of them, have been found both in caves and open sites. They were found not only in association with Neolithic cultural assemblages but also in association with iron tools in slab-graves at Changkat Menteri. Sometimes, they were also found together with “Hoabinhian” type of tools at Gua Kelawar and Gua Madu (Leong, 1980: 25). Leong Sau Heng has listed some of the sites that produced bark-cloth beaters such as Gua Cha,
Gua Madu (Kelantan), Gua Kelawar (Kedah), Nyong, Ulu Dong (Pahang) and Tui Gold Mine (Pahang). The stone bark-cloth beaters were also known to have been found in association with three polished T-shaped bracelet rings at Ulu Dong, Pahang (Leong Sau Heng, 1980).

The implication from these finds is that the two types of stone artifacts belonged to some cultural horizon in the Malay Peninsula. They were part and parcel of the Neolithic culture. But these two type of stone artifacts do not fit into what Heine Geldern's or Roger Duff's concept of the Austronesian Quadrangular Adze Culture.

In view of the fact that stone-bracelets, occurring in the Malay Peninsula, also appeared in the Metal Age sites of north western central Thailand and many of bark-cloth beaters were found in the alluvial tin field of the Malay Peninsula, it is possible to say that the later Neolithic phase of the Malay Peninsula had established contacts, probably of commercial nature with the Metal Age societies of the north western central Thailand.

It is apparent that trade was the factor that brought about changes to the Malay Peninsula Neolithic Culture during the later part of the Neolithic phase and not migrating people. The directions of trade were inland-coastal, inland-inland and coastal-inland. There was no effective sea-faring yet till the second half of the first millennium B.C.

By the later half of the first millennium B.C. Peninsular Malaysia saw the rise of new trade networks, the maritime trade networks. The evidence for the maritime trade are several bronze artifacts which are believed to have strong link to the several Bronze Age sites in mainland Southeast Asia.

Among them were the bronze drums and bronze bells of the Dongson type and bronze celts. These artifacts suggest the Peninsular’s contact with the Metal Age Society in Vietnam. The trade route must have been via South China Sea. The earliest discovery of the Dongson type of artifacts was in 1905. Three bronze bells were found in Klang, Selangor. One of them was missing, the other two are described as having spiral and saw-tooth motifs. They are reported to have been found in association with four socketed iron implements (Sieveking, 1956). Another bronze bell was discovered in May 1979 in Kampung Pencu, Kundang Hulu, near Gerisik in the Muar District, Johor (Adi Hj. Taha: 1979).

Understanding of a Bronze Age Culture in Peninsular Malaysia is based on studies by scholars using approaches which concentrated on distributional and stylistic aspects. The corroded tympanum of a bronze drum from Batu Pasir Garam, Sungai Tembeling, Pahang which Linehan described in 1928 as the lid of a ceremonial bronze urn and later corrected to the tympanum of a bronze drum (Linehan, 1951), has been classified as Dongson type (Peacock, 1965a) and was presumed to have been imported (Linehan, 1951; Peacock, 1965a, 1965b; 1967a, Dunn, 1975).

This identification was based on comparison with hundred and sixty five drums classified by Heger in 1902. The common decorative motifs on the Tembeling drum-head and on the Dongson type are the geometric decoration
comprised concentric bands of the ladder pattern, circles and flying birds around a central star. Traditionally the patterns are arranged in counter-clockwise direction. The Tembeling drum-head has two concentric circles flanking the main designs of birds and ladder patterns. The star has ten points.

Another remarkably similar tympanum of a bronze drum was recovered at Bukit Kuda, Klang in 1945. This chance find was made by construction workers on a hill at Bukit Kuda. Better specimens of bronze drums from Peninsular Malaysia were the two brought to light in 1964 by people cleaning a site for a coffee plantation in Klang. The site was excavated by Peacock (1965a) after the drums had been removed to the National Museum, Kuala Lumpur. The smaller of the two, 14 inches in diameter, is almost identical to the two drum-heads discussed earlier in terms of decorative motifs and the number of points on the star. But the bigger drum has a star with two extra points. In addition to the same motifs found on the other three drums, it also has an extra concentric circle of very stylised birds and four frogs arranged in counter-clockwise relief.

The pair of bronze drums recovered at Batu Buruk, Terengganu in 1964 has the same features as other drums recovered so far in Peninsular Malaysia. There is a slight difference in the way the birds are arranged in the rows (Peacock, 1967). Chemical analysis of the Tembeling and Klang drums established the constituent elements as copper, tin and lead (Pirazzoli-t'Serstevens, 1974). It has been pointed out by Linehan (1951) and Lowenstein (1962) that the absence of copper ore, at least in early-worked deposit, may be known for certain from which centre they came. Peacock, however, noted that "in the band containing the birds were two motifs shown in detail in Plate 7. This pattern, not commonly seen on Dong-s'on's drums, is almost duplicated on one of the drums excavated at the classic site of Dongson itself (Peacock, 1965). While Malaysia is today among the world's chief producers of tin, it is a known fact that tin and copper are concentrated in the areas stretching from Yunnan to the Fukien massif (Hsieh, 1973). Although the distributional evidence is not conclusive, scholars are of the opinion that bronze objects were imported.

Dunn for instance, while in agreement with Lowenstein (1962) who had earlier suggested that "only a few objects of bronze have so far turned up at inland localities and these at ancient sites of tin and gold mining", went on to suggest that "they were in the possession of visiting miners rather than indigeneous forest people" (Dunn, 1975).

This, however, contrasts markedly with the distribution of iron implements which has been discovered at many inland localities (Lowenstein, 1962). These discoveries, particularly those along the Tembeling River in Pahang, led Dunn to agree with Sieveking's opinion (1962) that the objects were manufactured locally: "we may have evidence of trade involving forest collector-traders and settled peoples of the western lowlands who are thought to have manufactured these objects locally" (Dunn, 1975).

There have been a number of views regarding the relationship between bronze and iron implements. Linehan, for instance, forcibly argued for a single
Bronze-Iron Age culture (1951). But Lowenstein (1956), after having examined
the bronze artifacts, thinks that the Bronze Age in West Malaysia came before
the Iron Age.

Although this conclusion was made after typological comparison of the
artifacts, C14 dating of samples obtained from the wooden plank on which the
pair of bronze drums from Sungai Lang were placed indicates that it is possible
to say that the Bronze Age is much earlier than the Iron in Peninsular Malaysia.
The C14 gives a dating of 2435 \pm 95 years of about 485 BC (Peacock, 1965a).
Looking at the discoveries at Non Nok Tha, for instance, whose C14 circa 2700
BC for the oldest bronze artifacts, it is not unreasonable to accept the 485 BC
date in Peninsular Malaysia as near the truth. Sieveking (1965) also talked of the
Bronze and Iron Ages in Peninsular Malaysia as two separate cultures.

Besides the similarity of the motifs on the Peninsular Malaysia drums with
other drums in Southeast Asia classified as Dongson type, the technical aspects
of the drums may be another element in the argument that all Peninsular Malay-
sian drums were imported. The Tembeling drum—head is regarded as techni-
cally in very poor shape. But it appears that attempts were made to incise
missing lines and patterns. It is possible to suggest that the crude attempts to
renew the patterns by incising with a pointed tool suggest the work of people
universe in metal working who had no source of supply for replacing a worn out
drum with a new one (Tweedie, 1965).

The excavations by Peacock at Kampung Sungai Lang (1965) and Kuala
Terengganu (1967) brought to light new facts regarding features of the Bronze
and Iron Age Cultures. At Sungai Lang, Peacock (1965a) reported that socketed
iron implements were found in association with bronze drums. In addition, this
controlled excavation confirms that pottery with a coating of organic origin
found in the cist-graves of Southern Perak (Collings, 1937) and in association
with the iron implements of Tulang Mawas of Klang (Peacock, 1965a; Collings,
1949) was also found associated with bronze drums. It has been noted that two
bronze bowls (Peacock, 1965a), with simple liner patterns scratched on their
surfaces which had been commonly associated with cist-graves and with a few
places along Sungai Pahang, were found with Kampung Sungai Lang drums.
Beads commonly found in cist-graves were also found at the sites of bronze
drums.

Associated finds may tentatively establish the relationship pattern between
bronzes and iron in Peninsular Malaysia. Detailed study of the motifs, designs
and technical aspects of the drums and other bronze artifacts may help shed some
light on the problem of their function. Various theories have been suggested
regarding the functional value of the implements. On the evidence of the pres-
ence of small square holes in alternating drums, it has been suggested that the
drums were used as commemorative objects to mark the death of important man
of a tribe (Peacock, 1965a). Since the drums belonged to the coast dwellers who
relies on the sea for their living, Peacock suggests: "It is certainly not outside the
realm of possibility that the drum mounds represent the symbolic or surrogate
funeral of an important member of the tribe lost at sea while on a fishing or trading expedition” (1965a). The burial of the drums in an inverted position may suggest that they were connected with certain festival (Van Heekeren, 1957). The inverted position may help to preserve the strength of their magic. It is hoped that a more detailed study of the drums and the methods of burial through systematic excavation will help to explain their functional value more definitely.

It appears that by the 2nd half of the first millennium B.C. maritime trade links were not only with mainland Southeast Asia but also with Sri Lanka and India and perhaps with the Mediterranean world. This assumption is based on the discoveries of various types of beads, stone and glass at various late prehistoric sites. As mentioned earlier beads were found in association with the bronze drums in Kampung Lang and Batu Buruk, Terengganu and also with bronze bells in Klang and Kampung Pencu, Muar.

Beads were also discovered in association with the first millennium B.C. cist-graves in the Bernam Valley. At the archaeological site in Kuala Selinsing, Pulau Kelumpang (Perak) stone and glass beads appeared even in the lowest level which has a date of c. 200 B.C. All these evidence indicate the pattern of trade networks during the later phase of the prehistoric era in Peninsular Malaysia. However, in the past many scholars who deliberated on the issues of the origin and development of the Metal Age Society in Peninsular Malaysia have ignored one of the most important archaeological evidence, the beads, in their synthesis.

They failed to note the significant of the discoveries of the beads in association with the Metal Age artifacts, especially the Dongson drums and bells. Presumably, these scholars were too pre-occupied with the traditional belief that the Dongson Culture in the Malay Peninsula was brought by migrating Deutro-Malays to the Peninsula on their way to islands Southeast Asia. They failed to consider the fact that the sources for the beads during the prehistoric era were India, Sri Lanka, Mediterranean and probably Africa and not necessarily Vietnam.

Therefore, beads could not have been brought by people practising Dongson Culture. Just like the beads, the Dongson drums and bells could have reached Peninsular Malaysia via trades. It is true that the Dongson drums and bells originated in Vietnam. But beads came from India, Sri Lanka, Burma and probably from the Mediterranean and Africa. Therefore the drums, bells and beads could not have come together. They were from different areas. It has been suggested earlier that they were brought by traders. And therefore, not by migrating people.

The Peninsula has been settled by people about 35,000 years ago. Prehistoric trade was already a well established activity. The Dongson drums and bells and beads reached the Peninsula via maritime trade about 2,500 years ago. The cultural change from Neolithic to Metal was due to trade and could not have been due to the migrating people only. There were two main types of trade during the Metal Age, the inland-inland intra-region trade and also the maritime trade. The Peninsula peoples traded both with the Indians, Sri Lankan and Bur-
mese on the west and Vietnam, Kemboja and probably China and island South-east Asia in the east via maritime trades. However, inland regional trades which began during the Neolithic period between the inhabitants of the Malay Peninsula and northwestern and central Thailand were still very active.

The prehistoric network began to expand from 2500 B.C. onwards and which resulted in the rise of various types of ports, collecting centres (feeder points), landfall ports, primary and secondary ports and entrepots during the early kingdom phase on the Malay Peninsula beginning from about 1st century A.D.

**Conclusion**

Prehistoric trade in Peninsular Malaysia probably evolved about 10,000 years ago. This statement of fact is based on direct and indirect observations of available archaeological materials, collected from various sites, by a number of people, during the last one hundred years. The trade was between the coastal and inland inhabitants of the Peninsula. But trade movements were very slow and the volume was very small. For almost 5,000 years, majority of the inhabitants lived in the interior and therefore exchanges of marine and inland forest products were very insignificant. Nevertheless, exchanges between coastal and inland inhabitants of the Peninsular did take place.

There are ample evidence to indicate the existence of the inland-coastal exchanges. Shells of certain marine and coastal molluscs have been found in inland prehistoric sites such as Gunung Cheroh (Perak), Gua Kerbau (Perak), Bukit Chintamani (Pahang), Gol Bait (Perak), Bukit Chuping (Perlis), Gua Kechil (Pahang), Gua Cha (Kelantan) and Gua Musang (Kelantan). These shells were the raw materials to be converted into ornaments. Among the most valued shells were the cowries (*Cypraea, Pinna, Mytilus, Nautilus* and *Voluta*) (Dunn, 1975).

The coastal or marine shells were traded between inland-coastal people and passing through several hands before they reached their destination in the Peninsular interior and highly unlikely that the coastal or inland people would have travelled back and forth between the coast and such remote inland localities (F.L. Dunn, 1975: 125).

In exchange for the marine and coastal shells were the inland forest products such as rotan, resin and bark of trees and probably stone for making stone tools.

The rhythm of prehistoric exchanges began to increase by 5000 B.P. A number of inland sites have produced trade products which came not only from the coastal areas but also from the areas in the north, practically northwestern and central Thailand. These were the earthenwares and polished stone axes, adzes and bracelets. The trade pattern beginning about 5000 B.P. were inland-coastal and inland (Malaysia) - inland (Thailand).

However, there are no evidence to indicate that maritime trade had taken place during the Neolithic phase in Peninsular Malaysia. The evidence suggest that trade exchanges were between the coastal and inland societies. Archaeologi-
cal studies of the materials from sites dated between 5000 B.P. to 500 B.P. have thrown a new light on the trade networks during this period. But traditionally it was believed that various technological advancement and new material culture found in various Neolithic sites such as Gua Cha, Gua Musang, Gua Kechil, Gunung Cheroih and Gua Kerbau came to the Peninsular via maritime contacts or through migrating peoples from the more advanced cultural centres in the far northeast mainland Asia on their way to the islands of Southeast Asia.

The result of recent archaeological researches and analysis of archaeological evidence found in Peninsular Malaysia, Thailand and Vietnam have shown that the sudden appearance of new products during the Neolithic period was due to the inland intra-regional trades that were taking place between various peoples living in the Malay Peninsula and Thailand.

The Neolithic technology could not provide the necessary tools to produce sea-worthy boat and sails on large scale and number. Presumably the development of effective sea-faring could have started during the Metal Age. The emergence of the Neolithic Culture in the Malay Peninsula had to do with the advanced societies in the central and north western Thailand and not with the migrations of the so called Austronesian. This has been highlighted by the discoveries of material culture in various Neolithic sites in the Malay Peninsula such as Gua Cha, Gua Musang, Bukit Tengku Lembu and Jenderam Hilir. Among the varieties of the archaeological finds recovered are various types of pottery forms and parts such as pedestalally bowls, pot stand, tall bell-mouthed shaped vessels, bucket shaped vessels, hollow pottery cones, stone artifacts, stone axes and adzes, bark cloth beaters, stone mortars and pounders and Tembeling knives.

The prominent examples of these artifacts were recovered from the upper layer of the Neolithic sites of Gua Cha excavated by G. de G Sieveking in 1954 (Sieveking 1954). Studies of the earthenwares from Gua Cha by Per Sorensen and a few others have indicated that some of the Gua Cha Neolithic potteries resembled the earthenware types of the Ban Kao’s late Neolithic sub phase (Per Sorensen, April 1964). Those specimens that resembled the Ban Kao types are the pedestalally bowls, pot stands, bucket shaped vessels and tall bell-mouthed vessels with incised and impressed spiral decorations.
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