

MOHENJO-DARO AND THE INDUS CIVILIZATION

Being an official account of Archæological Excavations at
Mohenjo-daro carried out by the Government of India
between the years 1922 and 1927

Edited by

SIR JOHN MARSHALL, C I E, Litt D, Ph D, F S A, Hon A R I B A,
Hon Fellow of King's College, Cambridge

Late Director-General of Archæology in India

In three volumes, with plan and map in colours, and 164 plates
in collotype

Volume I Text Chapters I—XIX and Plates I—XIV



INDOLOGICAL BOOK HOUSE

DELHI

VARANASI

1973

CHAPTER VII

EXTENT OF THE INDUS CIVILIZATION

ONE of the most striking facts revealed by the excavations at Mohenjo-daro and Harappā is the complete uniformity of their culture. Though these two spots are some four hundred miles apart, their monuments and antiquities are to all intents and purposes identical. Houses, drains, bricks, pottery, weapons, household utensils, ornaments, seals—all are cast in the same mould and so alike that it is impossible to distinguish between them. Some structures and antiquities there are, of course, at both sites to which no counterparts have yet been found at the other—the Great Bath, for example, at Mohenjo-daro, or the Corridor Hall at Harappā—but there is nothing in the structural character of these buildings or in the fabric and design of any of the smaller antiquities which enables us to say of them “this belongs to Mohenjo-daro” or “that belongs to Harappā”. Such consistent uniformity in all the appurtenances of daily life could never have been achieved and could certainly never have endured through so many centuries of occupation had not the Indus civilization been deeply rooted throughout Sind and the Panjāb and already consolidated for long ages before it first breaks upon our vision. To this civilization I have tentatively given the name of “Indus”, because of its close association with the country watered by that river and its tributaries. For all we know, however, it may have extended well beyond the eastern limits of the Panjāb. On that point we have no specific evidence one way or the other. If it proves eventually to have done so, the term “Indian” rather than “Indus” may be more appropriate, but for the moment it seemed advisable to avoid designating it by a name which might be taken to imply a wider diffusion than is actually warranted by our discoveries. Let me emphasize the fact, however, that we have no sufficient grounds as yet for affirming positively that this civilization was limited to the Indus Valley and the plains of the Panjāb. Ten years ago we knew nothing of its existence at all, and since then we have been too pre-occupied with the exploration of Mohenjo-daro and Harappā and with following up its tracks towards the west to find time for tracing it eastward across Rājputāna or down the valleys of the Jumna and the Ganges, and, until that has been done, it would be premature to assume that it stopped short of those areas. This is a point to which I shall have occasion to revert later, meanwhile, I draw attention to it here merely in order to forestall any misconception on the part of the reader.

Uniformity of the Indus culture

Besides Mohenjo-daro and Harappā there are a number of other sites in Sind and the Panjāb which belong to the same Chalcolithic Age. These are shown underlined in red

Other Chalcolithic sites in Sind and the Panjāb

in the map inserted at the end of this volume Starting from the south there is Gujo,¹ about 14 miles east of Bhambor and 12 miles from Tattā, and on the left bank of the Indus, opposite Jarak, is Budh-ke-Takar² Then, north of Kotri, there is Karri, and further-north still, in the Lārkāna district, is Lohumjo-daro Near Mohenjo-daro itself is Bādah, and outside the town of Lārkāna, the important site of Jhukar A little south of Rohri, again, there is a big group of mounds at Aror, or Alor, as it should perhaps more correctly be written, while in the Upper Sind Frontier district is Līmōjunejo, and on the old bed of the Hakrā, near the eastern boundary of the Sukkur district, Vijnot At all except one of these sites finds have been made such as painted pottery, chert flakes, and cores, copper implements, shell bangles, and the like, which indicate that they were occupied during the same period and shared in the same culture as Mohenjo-daro and Harappā The exception referred to is Budh-ke-Takar, where Mr G E L Carter, late of the Indian Civil Service, records that he found various neolithic implements but no painted pottery or other objects specially typical of the Chalcolithic Age It may be, therefore, that this site was occupied during the Neolithic but not during the Chalcolithic Period³

Neolithic artefacts are abundant in Sind They have been found in great numbers on the hills round Rohri in the Mol Valley, and throughout the Kirthar Range generally Cairns, barrows, and other rough stone structures, which have been ascribed to the Stone Age, are numerous in the Mol and other Valleys of the Kirthar Range, and Mr R D Banerji tells of the existence of "prehistoric settlements" on the banks of the Manchhār Lake and near the hot springs at Tirth-Lāki in the extreme north of the Karāchi district The information, however, that we possess about these rude stone monuments is altogether too vague and shadowy to permit of reliable conclusions being drawn from it Such monuments are common in Balūchistān, where some certainly go back to the Chalcolithic Age, but others belong to early historic times, and others, again, are quite modern Before, then, any of these stone structures can be assigned to Chalcolithic times, they need to be carefully examined and surveyed Nevertheless, the character of many of the artefacts found in Sind leaves little room for doubt that they are true neoliths and of an age anterior to those recovered at Mohenjo-daro and Jhukar Long before Mohenjo-daro was excavated or we knew anything of the Chalcolithic culture of Sind, Mr W T Blandford pointed out that there was a marked difference between the nummulitic flint flakes and cores found in the bed of the Indus at Sukkur and those from the hill-tops round about Rohri, and he surmised that the former belonged to a later age, when the art of flint chipping had been brought to greater perfection⁴ This surmise was undoubtedly correct We know now that the flakes and cores from the Indus bed are identical with those found at

¹ More correctly this site should be designated "Tharro", a hill about 2 miles from Gujo Recently, Mr N G Majumdar, of the Archaeological Department, has visited Tharro and collected there numerous chert flakes and cores and potsherds of the Indus class, and he has also found some pictographic signs engraved on the neighbouring rocks

² Or Budh-jo-Takar

³ Since the above was written, Mr N G Majumdar has discovered two more Chalcolithic sites of importance in Southern Sind One is Chānhu-daro in the Nawāb Shāh district, 4.4 miles NE of Sakrand and 7.4 miles W of Nawāz Dahri Railway Station, the other is Amri in the Kotri Division of the Karāchi district, about 2 miles E of Amri Station At the latter site Mr Majumdar unearthed much pottery of the typical Indus class and, in a lower stratum, a new kind of pottery which he describes as "a thin ware of pale red colour bearing designs in black, chocolate, or light red on a cream or pink background, what is almost an invariable feature of the vases is that their necks are painted both inside and out with a black slip"

⁴ See W T Blandford, *JASB* 1875, pp 135-6, Sir John Evans, *Geol Mag* 1866, pp 433-4, J Coggin-Brown, *Cat of Prehist Antiq in Indian Museum*, p 120

Mohenjo-daro and Harappā, and were produced in the Chalcolithic Period, and we are justified, therefore, in concluding that the cruder stone implements from the Rohri hills and elsewhere belong to an earlier age when neolithic man was occupying most of the Indian sub-continent

Of the sites enumerated above, only one besides Mohenjo-daro has actually been excavated. This is Jhukar, near Lārkāna, where three clear and distinct periods of occupation have been revealed, the earliest contemporary with Mohenjo-daro, the latest of Kushān date, and the middle one intermediate between the two, but distinguished by a class of painted pottery which suggests that, though prehistoric, it was, nevertheless, substantially later than the uppermost settlements at Mohenjo-daro or Harappā

So far, therefore, as Sind is concerned, there is ample and convincing proof that the whole country from north to south was permeated in the Chalcolithic Age by the long protracted civilization which we have unveiled at Mohenjo-daro and Harappā. In the Panjāb the evidence is more meagre. To the north-east we have found traces of this culture as far as Rupar on the Sutlej, below the Simla hills, where experimental trenches on a small site have yielded bricks and earthenware vessels identical with those found at Harappā. West of the Indus, also, we have followed it through Loralai, the Derajāt, Zhob, and northwards as far as Bannu. Then, in the heart of the Panjāb, there is Harappā on the banks of the ancient Rāvi, a city which appears to have been occupied during a still longer period than Mohenjo-daro, and which, if we may judge by the size of its crumbling mounds, was considerably bigger than that settlement.

**Diffusion of
Indus culture in
Sind and
Panjāb**

With the existence of the Indus culture thus attested in the Central Panjāb as well as on its extreme west and east, there can be no reasonable doubt that it extended over the intervening country also, and that, whenever the time may come for surveying the ancient beds of the Indus and its affluents, many more remains of the Chalcolithic Age will come to light.

That this Indus civilization was part and parcel of that greater civilization which during the Chalcolithic Age extended across the broad Afrasian belt, and that it was intimately related to other branches of that civilization in Western Persia and Mesopotamia, became clear almost from the first moment of its discovery. And this, indeed, was only to be expected. For the Afrasian civilization was literally the offspring of the great rivers of Northern Africa and South-Western Asia and dependent on them for its evolution. Without their help man could never have achieved what he did. So long as he was in the hunting or nomad stage, he might wander at will wherever he could find game or pasturage and sufficient water for his wants, and, even when he had turned to agriculture as a means of life, he might subsist in small communities wherever cultivatable land was available and the rainfall adequate. But it was only on the banks of the great rivers that he could develop agriculture on a scale sufficient for the needs of a dense population, there only that he could organize society in great cities, and there only that he could maintain that commercial intercourse with distant communities which was indispensable for providing him with the necessities or luxuries of life and for quickening his inventive and intellectual faculties. And let it be remembered that the importance of the river was all the greater in the early days when there were no ploughs, no wheeled vehicles, few beasts of burden, and little or no means of fertilizing the land artificially, since it was the river that enriched the soil, and by its seasonal inundation lessened the labour of hoeing and provided regular irrigation for the growing crops, as well as a highway by which the produce of the land could be brought into the cities.

**All-important
part played by
the great rivers
in the evolution
of Chalcolithic
civilization**

With the contributions to the common stock of this civilization made by the other

great rivers of Afrasia—by the Nile in Egypt, by the Euphrates and Tigris in Mesopotamia, by the Kārūn and Karkheh in Western Persia—we have long since been tolerably familiar, and we knew a little, too, of the part played by the Helmand. It can hardly surprise us, therefore, to find the river valleys of Sind and the Panjāb—the broadest and richest of all the valleys of Southern Asia—taking their share in the evolution of this civilization, nor will it surprise us if, as the field of exploration widens, we find that the valleys of the Jumna and the Ganges in India, of the Oxus and other rivers of Transcaspiā, prove to have been vital centres of human activity and progress in the Chalcolithic Age, though, in regard to Transcaspiā, it is unlikely that its more rigorous climate could have been as favourable to the advancement of civilization in its earlier stages as were the warmer river valleys of the South.

**Unity in
diversity of
Chalcolithic
civilization**

In the nature of things a civilization as widely diffused as the chalcolithic, with ramifications extending as far west as Thessaly and Southern Italy, and as far east, perhaps, as the Chinese Provinces of Honan and Chih-li, could not have been homogeneous throughout. The peoples who participated in it were of different races, spoke different languages, wrote different characters, worshipped different deities, and in other ways displayed different orders of mentality. It is too much, therefore, to expect that there should have been a close correspondence in their material cultures. Nevertheless, we must be careful not to exaggerate the differences between them or to regard them as entirely self-centred and self-sufficient communities. Each no doubt had its own particular type of civilization, which was adapted to suit local conditions. But between them all was a fundamental unity of ideas which could hardly have been the result of mere commercial intercourse. Let me illustrate what I mean by taking one or two concrete examples. The signs which each country devised to record its speech differed materially from those of its neighbours—the hieroglyphs of Egypt from those of Crete, the Cretan from the Sumerian, the Sumerian from the Elamite, and so on. But, however much these scripts differed from one another, however much they demonstrated the independence of their authors, they were all based on one and the same idea—the idea of using pictured signs to represent not only objects or concepts, but actual sounds. When, therefore, we attempt to estimate the degree of unity or diversity in the chalcolithic civilization, we must admit that this wonderful invention, which is fundamental to each and every mode of writing, counts for far more than the diversity which distinguishes the various systems of pictured signs. Another typical illustration may be taken from spinning and weaving. On the Indus, cotton was used for the thinner textiles, on the Nile, flax. Each in its own way was an important discovery and a valuable contribution to the common stock of human knowledge. But more valuable than either was the discovery of how to spin, and how to weave, and this discovery was the universal possession of the then civilized world—one of the many factors that justify us in regarding this culture as a more or less coherent whole. It is the same with the painted pottery. Each of the river valleys in which this civilization was centred had its own ceramic wares, with shapes and designs adapted to local needs or ideas, but all alike shared the secret of the potter's wheel and of how to fix the colouring on the vessels by firing—secrets which are not likely to have been discovered independently.

**The Indus
civilization no
less individual
and national
than other great
River
civilizations**

These examples—and many more might be cited—will suffice to make clear what I mean by the fundamental unity of this civilization. The point is one that needs to be stressed, because it has been the fashion to emphasize the diversity of this civilization, while ignoring its essential homogeneity, and in the case of the particular branch with which we are now concerned, we should certainly misunderstand its evolution if we conceived of it as a wholly isolated and independent growth. It is just as individual, just as national in character as

other branches are—the Sumerian, for example, or the Egyptian, and it is no less typical of the region where it took shape than the former is of Southern Mesopotamia, or the latter of the Valley of the Nile. Thus, to mention but a few of its leading features, there are, first and foremost, the domestic houses, the unique character of which has already been emphasized, and with the private houses must be coupled also the great public baths, for which there is no parallel elsewhere until we come down to Roman times. A feature of another kind, but no less distinctive, is the remarkably naturalistic quality of the Indus art, which is wholly unlike the contemporary art of Elam, Sumer, or Egypt, another is the decoration of its painted pottery, easily distinguishable from any other red-and-black wares known to us, still more easily from the paler wares of Persia and Mesopotamia, another, the use of cotton instead of flax for light textiles, another, the highly evolved type of the characters devised for writing. But behind these and manifold other traits that are peculiar to the Indus civilization and give it its national character, is a tissue of ideas, inventions, and discoveries which were the common property of the then civilized world and cannot be traced to their respective sources. Some may have originated among the Indus people, but many must have been derived from elsewhere, borrowed, may be, from other regions, or in some cases inherited from earlier ages, when the races of Afrasia were perhaps less heterogeneous. Such are the domestication of animals, the cultivation of wheat, barley, and other grains, the growing of fruits, the irrigation of land with the aid of artificial canals and embankments, the building of houses, the organization of society in cities, spinning and the weaving of textiles and the dyeing of them in various colours, the use of the potter's wheel and the decoration of earthenware with encaustic designs, navigation by river and the use of wheeled vehicles on land, the working of gold and silver, of copper, and of tin, the recording of speech by means of picture signs, and the fashioning of ornaments from faience, ivory, bone, shell, and semi-precious stones. Seeing that these and many other elements were basic to civilization throughout the entire Afrasian belt and just as distinctive of it in other regions as they are in the Indus Valley, we should clearly be in danger of straying from the truth if we failed to recognize that the Indus civilization is an integral part of the whole. Or the other hand, we should be equally far from the truth if we ignored those other and hardly less important features which are the special attributes of the Indus civilization and which give it its local and national complexion.

We have now to consider how far this Indus civilization, as distinct from other regional civilizations of the same age, extended to the east and west. To take the east first, there is some slight evidence in the shape of stone flakes and cores, shell, earthenware, and other objects which have been picked up on the surface of various mounds¹ in Kāthiāwār, to suggest that this civilization extended in a south-easterly direction at least as far as the Gulf of Cambay. But though the objects in question might equally well have been found at Mohenjo-daro or Harappā, it must be confessed that none of them are of a sufficiently distinctive type for it to be affirmed with certainty that they belong to the Indus sphere of culture. On the other hand, it would be rash to assume that the Indus culture did not extend even beyond the Gulf of Cambay or further north across Rājputānā, since, as already stated, no effort has yet been possible to follow it up eastward. That it did not extend much beyond the land watered by the Indus and the Great Mīhrān and their tributaries is probable enough. Other civilizations of this age are mainly confined to the riverine valleys in which they arose, and there is no reason to suppose that the Indus civilization was an exception to this rule. Nevertheless, it is difficult to believe that, while the Panjāb and Sindh were in possession of this highly

But indissolubly connected with other civilizations by community of ideas and inventions

Extension of Indus civilization eastward

¹ R. Bruce Foote, *Indian Prehistoric and Protohistoric Antiquities*, pp. 146-53

advanced culture, the valleys of the Jumna and the Ganges, of the Narbadā and the Tāpti could have been far behind them. Our knowledge of prehistoric culture in these valleys is very scanty. At present it is drawn almost exclusively from artefacts of the Stone and Copper Ages found on the surface of the ground, and from these objects we glean little more than that this part of India must have passed through much the same Stone and Metal Ages as the rest of South-West Asia and that, so far as the weapons and implements of the people are concerned, it was generally on a par with those of the Indus region. Whether its peoples possessed cities and houses and all the other amenities of life such as we find in Sind and the Panjāb, has yet to be established. Meanwhile, it may be remarked that there is nothing in Vedic or later literature or in the diffusion of the pre-Āryan races or languages, so far as they are known to us, to suggest that the pre-Āryan people of the Panjāb and Sind were markedly different in culture from those of the Jumna and Gangetic basins further east, and it may also be added that a people accustomed to carry on trade and commerce as far afield as the Indus people were, were *prima facie* likely to have made their influence felt far beyond the limits of the Indus Valley.

**Extension of
Indus civiliza-
tion westward**

Westward of Sind and the Panjāb the materials at our disposal are more abundant. In 1925-6 Mr H Hargreaves, then Superintendent of the Frontier Circle, excavated certain mounds at Nāl in the Jhalāwīn Division of the Kalāt State, which had yielded the remarkable series of painted funerary vases published by me twenty-five years ago,¹ and in the two following winters Sir Aurel Stein was deputed to make a general archaeological reconnaissance of Southern Wazīrīstān and Balūchīstān. The results achieved by these two officers have already been described in three Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India,² and there is no need to discuss them in detail, but there are certain broad facts emerging from their discoveries that claim attention, as they have an intimate bearing on the Indus problems.

**Balūchīstān not
an important
cultural centre**

And first let it be said that Balūchīstān, with its barren mountain ranges, stony wastes, and small extent of arable land, could never have been an important cultural centre. Sir Aurel Stein's explorations have, it is true, shown conclusively that much of what is now and was even in the days of Alexander the Great nothing but barren wilderness, at a more remote date still had been well cultivated land capable of sustaining a settled and relatively dense population. Evidence of this greater productiveness and prosperity during the Chalcolithic Age was observed time and again by the explorer in the course of his journeys through the central and southern districts, and was explained by him on the assumption—as to which there can be no shadow of doubt—that the country had then enjoyed a more copious rainfall. Nevertheless, making all allowance for more favourable climatic conditions as well as for the intensive cultivation of every available acre of land (to which the innumerable *gabar bands* and other irrigation works bear witness), it yet remains true that Balūchīstān could never have been other than a comparatively poor country or other than largely dependent for its culture on the richer and more populous regions that adjoined it—on Sind and the Panjāb to the one side, on Persia and Sīstān to the other, with Mesopotamia in the background further west.

**Cultural
dependence on
neighbours
illustrated by
pottery**

This cultural dependence of Balūchīstān on her neighbours is illustrated with singular clarity in its ceramic wares, an extensive collection of which, gathered from over a hundred sites, was brought back by Sir Aurel Stein. Any discussion of these wares, unfortunately, is hampered by the fact that they are still unclassified and unpublished,³ and the difficulty

¹ *ASR* 1904-5, p 105, and pls xxxiii and xxxiv

² H Hargreaves, *Excavations in Baluchistan* (Mem No 35), Sir Aurel Stein, *An Archaeological Tour in Waziristan and Northern Baluchistan* (Mem No 37), and *An Archaeological Tour in Gedrosia* (Mem No 43)

³ Since this was written, Sir Aurel Stein's two Memoirs referred to in the preceding note have appeared, containing many illustrations but no classification, of these wares

is all the greater because space does not permit of any of them being illustrated here. I hope, however, that the following brief account of them, rough and ready as it admittedly is, will serve provisionally to give an idea of their extent and variety, of the relation in which they stand to one another, and of their bearing on our Indus problems.

Broadly speaking, the Balūchī pottery falls into three main divisions, viz red-and-black wares, hybrid wares, and buff wares, and these three divisions may be subdivided again into the following classes —

**Classification
of Balūchī
pottery**

RED-AND-BLACK WARES

- 1 Red-and-black ware of the true "Indus" variety
- 2 Red-and-black Balūchī ware
- 3 Sūr-jāngal ware

HYBRID WARES

- 4 Polychrome banded ware
- 5 Mehī ware

BUFF WARES

- 6 Buff Balūchī ware
- 7 Grey ware
- 8 Shāhī-tump ware
- 9 Nāl ware

Of the above main divisions, the first or red-and-black class, which comprises all wares with designs in black, brown, or purplish-brown on a red ground, predominates over Eastern Balūchīstān, Loralāi, Zhob, and the Derajāt west of the Indus, and links up with the red-and-black ware which is characteristic of the whole of the Indus region. The third or buff ware division, which comprises all wares with designs in black, grey, brown, or red on a buff, cream, grey, or greenish ground, predominates over Western Balūchīstān and Sīstān, and links up with the light coloured wares of Persia and Mesopotamia. In the middle districts, like Quetta-Pishin, the two groups are about evenly divided, but the line of demarcation between them seems to have been a fluctuating one, the red-and-black ware predominating at one time in certain areas, the buff ware at another, and, as might only be expected, the two groups combined on occasion to produce hybrid fabrics, the ground colouring of which was partly red and partly buff, with the two colours disposed in broad horizontal bands. Let it be added, too, that the mutual influence which these two groups of pottery exerted upon each other is clearly shown by the way in which the shapes and designs of the one are not infrequently borrowed by the other.

Of the nine classes the first, viz the true Indus ware, has been found in all the strata so far explored at Mohenjo-daro as well as in the corresponding strata at Harappā, but not in the latest deposits on the latter site. West of the Indus it occurs at Dabar-kot in Loralāi, besides several other places in the Derajāt and Southern Wazirīstān, to which it was presumably imported from the Panjāb and Sind, since the prevalent ware in those regions is the local red-and-black ware (Class 2) and the polychrome banded ware (Class 4).

Indus ware

The second class of ware, which may conveniently be termed red-and-black Balūchī ware, resembles the Indus pottery in so far as it is a red ware with or without a slip, relieved with designs in black or dark brown, but its fabric is generally coarser and its patterns less free. It is found throughout Eastern Balūchīstān and occasionally in the western districts also,

**Red-and-black
Balūchī ware**

as well as in Sīstān, but its chief locale seems to be the Derjāt, Southern Wazīrīstān, and North-East Balūchīstān from Bannu to the south of Lorālai, some of the sites which have yielded it most plentifully being Dābra, Kot-Kāt, and Shāh Zamānī-dherai near Tank, Shāhidān near Bannu, Surkh-dherai and Chaudhwān south-west of Dera Ismā'īl Khān, Perīāno-Ghundai, Kaudanī, Mughal-Ghundai and Karezgāi in Zhob, and Rāna-Ghundai and Dābar-kot in Lorālai. It is found also in common with "buff" ware at Spīna-ghundai, Krīnāi, and other sites in the Quetta-Pishin area. As some of the finest of this red-and-black pottery comes from Zhob, it might, in order to distinguish it from the other red-and-black wares of Balūchīstān, conveniently be called Zhob ware, but I have hesitated to adopt this term, lest it might lead to misunderstanding as to the range of country over which this pottery is found.

That this "Balūchī red-and-black" pottery was contemporary with the "Indus" pottery was proved by its presence in the same strata as the latter at Dābar-kot, but that it extends down to a later date than the last settlements at Mohenjo-daro is rendered probable, if not certain, by the obviously late and decadent character of many specimens, particularly from the mounds of Chīcha-dherai, Abī-Khel, Kaudanī, Chaudhwān, Dābra, and Adamzai.

While the above type of red-and-black pottery is widely diffused over the Trans-Indus country and most of Eastern Balūchīstān, there is a local variety of it of a distinctive character which is found in the Lorālai district. This is the ware to which I have ventured to give the name of "Sūr-jangal", for the reason that most of the specimens in our possession were brought by Sir Aurel Stein from that site, though the ware is found in smaller quantities at other sites also, notably at Mughal-Qīla and Rīna-ghundai. It is generally thinner in texture and better burnt than the other red-and-black pottery of Balūchīstān, and its ground colour is frequently purplish-red rather than terra-cotta, it is distinguished, moreover, from other red-and-black wares by its ornamentation, which is remarkable for its exceptionally fine line work and the præter-naturally long thin legs of the humped bulls which constitute one of its most important motifs.

Of the two classes of hybrid wares (4 and 5) the former, which I have called "polychrome banded ware", is found at most of the sites in North-Eastern Balūchīstān, Southern Wazīrīstān, and the Derjāt which have yielded the local red-and-black Balūchī pottery.¹ It seems, in fact, to have been evolved out of that pottery under the influence of the paler buff wares intruding from the west. Its distinguishing characteristic is the use of both red and buff or greenish-buff for the slip of a vessel, the two colours being disposed side by side in horizontal bands, and further decorations applied in black, brown, red, or sometimes white. For the rest, the designs on this ware take the same simple forms as they do in the Balūchī red-and-black or buff wares (Classes 2 and 6). It is a misfortune that little stratigraphical evidence is yet available as to the history of this polychrome banded ware, but it seems fairly certain that, like the Mehī ware, it endured for a long period of time and that it was to some extent contemporary with the Balūchī red-and-black pottery.

The ware classed as Mehī is the most stylish of all the red-and-black or hybrid wares. It was found by Sir Aurel Stein most abundantly at Mehī and Kullī in Kolwa, but occurs at many other sites in the Mashkai and Kej Valleys and as far west as Shāhī-tump and Suktagēn-dor. Most of it is red-and-black, but with the red-and-black is invariably mixed

¹ Among the many sites where the polychrome banded ware has been found may be mentioned Rāna ghundai, Sūr-jangal, Mughal ghundai, Adamzai, Chaudhwān, Dābar kot, Dukī-dherai, Spīna ghundai, Mughal qīla, Nūmkai, Surkh-dherai. In the Quetta Pishin area it appears to be relatively scarce.

Sūr-jangal
ware

Polychrome
banded ware

Mehī ware

a certain proportion of polychrome banded ware resembling in technique the polychrome banded ware described above but differing from it in the matter of design, just as the red-and-black Mehī ware differs in design from the red-and-black Balūchī ware. Were it not, indeed, for its decorative motifs, the Mehī ware would have no claim to be placed in a separate category, since in technique and colouring it corresponds closely with the two classes described above, viz with the red-and-black Balūchī pottery on the one hand, and with the polychrome banded ware on the other, and it may be inferred that it was evolved simultaneously and in the same manner as those wares. Its decorative motifs, however, are of a kind to distinguish this ware sharply from all other classes in Balūchistān. They consist for the most part of bands of schematic fishes, humped bulls of a particularly elongated form (the intthesis of the bulls on the Sūr-jungal ware), conventionalized foliage of the *pīpal* and other trees, and long lines of horned ibexes. These last resemble the lines of ibexes on the Musyān and Susa II pottery, and the connection with that pottery is further indicated by certain other motifs—trees, snakes, double triangles, and chequers—as well as by the panels into which the horizontal bands are sometimes divided. Thus, although the red-and-black technique connects the Mehī ware with the Indus pottery, the polychromy of other examples, coupled with the decoration generally, points to influence from the Persian side.

The next class of Balūchī buff ware comprises a large and varied body of pale fabrics, with a ground colouring ranging from pale to dark buff, cream, grey, or greenish-yellow, and with designs generally in brown, black, or occasionally in red. It is found predominating throughout the western districts and Sīstān, but occurs spasmodically as far east even as Loralai, Zhob, and the Derajāt. The decoration consists of the simplest patterns, generally of a geometric kind and without any of the stylishness which characterizes the Mehī or Nāl wares. The fabrics included in this class may be reckoned as the western counterpart of the Balūchī red-and-black fabrics, linking up with the Persian and Mesopotamian pale wares in the same way as the latter linked up with the Indus red wares, and invading on occasion the latter's field, just as their own field was invaded by the red-and-black wares.

To the same category of light-coloured western wares belongs the fine grey ware (Class 7) which is common in Sīstān, and still more so in South-West Balūchistān (from which district it probably emanated), but occurs also, though less frequently, in districts as far afield as Zhob and Loralai.

Another pale grey ware of a rougher but singularly interesting type is the Shāhi-tump funerary ware of Class 8. Although the graves in which it was found are proved by their location to be relatively late, nevertheless the ware itself is strangely archaic-looking, both as to fabric and decoration, and is in fact probably archaic, reproducing, that is to say, a much older type of pottery which, as Sir Aurel Stein suggests, had once been made for ordinary household purposes and afterwards religiously perpetuated for the use of the dead, in order that in their future lives they might live after the fashion of their ancestors.

Though emanating from the Jhalāwān and Nūndara areas, the Nāl ware belongs essentially to the western group of pale pottery and has scarcely anything in common with the red-and-black pottery of Eastern Balūchistān. Some specimens of it, it is true, are executed in red and black, but these are exceptional and doubtless due to contamination. The bulk of it is pale or dark buff, straw-coloured or of greenish hue, with designs applied in brown or sepia or black and filled in *after firing* with blue, green, red, yellow, or white, certain of its linear decoration showing a marked resemblance to that of the Susa I pottery.

¹ In many of the Musyān vessels the ground is partly buff, partly red, decorated with black, brown, or red designs. But the Musyān pottery is far less stylish than the Mehī.

When first discovered this Nāl ware was thought to be exclusively a funerary ware, partly because of its archaic patterns, but more especially because its evanescent colours and unusually delicate fabric were ill-suited to ordinary domestic usage. Subsequent exploration, however, has revealed the fact that the Nāl ware is prevalent on various ancient town sites, particularly in the Nūndarā district, and must have been made for household as well as funerary purposes. Observations, too, made on these sites have led Sir Aurel Stein to the conclusion that this ware belonged to a relatively late period—late, that is, as compared with the Mehri ware or the typical red-and-black ware of Zhob and Iorān. This is an important point, because, if Mr Mackay is right in assigning the Nāl ware to about 3000 B.C., it means that most of the Balūchī wares described above would have to be relegated to the fourth or even fifth millennium B.C., and with them we should also have to push back the date of the Indus red-and-black pottery, which is almost certainly contemporary with the finer kinds of Balūchī red-and-black ware of Zhob and Iorān. These are problems, however, which will have to await further stratigraphical evidence from representative sites in both Sind and Balūchistān, since the data at present available are altogether too meagre for their solution.¹ Whatever be the date of the Nāl ware,² one thing seems certain, viz. that it has no logical place among the other wares of that region and could neither have led up to nor resulted from them. I do not mean by this to imply that it was an imported ware, it is found in such quantities that it must certainly have been manufactured on the spot, but it looks as if the potters who first produced it could hardly have been native to Eastern Balūchistān, but had migrated there from the Persian side, where it may be hoped that the missing links between this and the Susa I ware will some day be found.

Nāl ware
intrusive in
Eastern
Balūchistān

Evidence of
other
antiquities
of Nāl

The conclusion drawn above from the pottery, that the Nāl culture is intrusive from the west and distinct from the Indus culture, is borne out generally by the other antiquities from Nāl. Thus, both the peculiar type of "Indus" chisel and the short blade-axe which is found in the Indus and Ganges basins, are absent from Nāl. Secondly, the long blade-axe of Nāl differs from the long blade-axe of the Indus in that it tapers more towards the butt. Thirdly, the straight-edged Nāl saw is quite different from the curvilinear Indus saw, which closely resembles the early Egyptian types. Fourthly, none of the Indus leaf-shaped spear-heads and daggers have been found at Nāl, nor does bronze occur there, though bronze is common in the Indus Valley and also on sites in Balūchistān which evidence a connection with the Indus sphere of culture. On the other side of the scale, it is true, we have to set the presence at Nāl of long and short biconical beads and of a large weight, similar in shape to those found at Mohenjo-daro and Harappā. The former, however, have no special significance, for the reason that they are found on the Persian no less than on the Indian side, and, so far as the weight is concerned, it is likely enough that for commercial reasons

¹ Since the above was written Mr N. G. Majumdar has discovered at Amri and other sites in Lower Sind clear evidence of two distinct periods of occupation, the upper and later represented by the characteristic red and black Indus pottery, the lower and earlier by pale and polychrome wares closely akin to those from Mehri and from Nāl. Possibly we may find that the paler wares antedated the black and red pottery throughout the Indus country, and that the latter was introduced into Sind either from the Panjāb or from still further east. Mr Majumdar's discovery, however, does not necessarily imply that this was so, for there is no question that the two classes of wares—the red and black on the one hand, the buff on the other—were contemporary with one another over a long protracted period, and it is obvious that, if there was a temporary intrusion of western buff wares into the red and black sphere, the former might be found either above or below the latter. The stratification at Amri and elsewhere undoubtedly suggests that the Indus culture succeeded an earlier and different culture in Lower Sind, but it would be wise not to draw from it any hasty conclusions.

² For my own part, I still incline to adhere to the opinion which I expressed some years ago, that the remains at Nāl are earlier than any yet exposed at Mohenjo-daro or Harappā.

the two countries may have found it convenient to adopt a similar system of weights and measures, whatever the racial or cultural differences between them may have been

I hope there is no need for me to apologize for devoting so much space to these Balūchī wares. I have done so because they are our chief guide in estimating the extent of the influence exerted by the Indus culture in Balūchistān. It is evident from them that that culture must have predominated at one time over the eastern districts of Balūchistān,¹ Southern Wazīristān and the Derajat west of the Indus, and that it was an active force, moreover, in Kolwa and the Kej Valley. But it is also evident that in Western Balūchistān and Sīstān there was a rival culture distinguished by an essentially different class of wares which found its way into Balūchistān from the Persian side and encroached at one time or another as far east as Southern Sind. To this rival culture from the west belongs the remarkable Nāl pottery from the Nūndara district and Nāl in Jhalāwān, which may have either preceded or followed the red-and-black wares in that part of Balūchistān.

This evidence from the pottery is also borne out by certain other antiquities of Balūchistān, notably by the terra-cotta figurines of humped bulls and of the Mother Goddess, both of which seem to have been intimately connected with the pre-Āryan religion of India and more likely to have derived from the East than from the West, though, as I have shown in Chapter V, the cult of the Mother Goddess was also found in Western Asia. Now, the sites which have yielded these terra-cottas are those which have also yielded the red-and-black, polychrome-banded, and Mehī varieties of pottery, viz. Periāno-Ghundai, Mughal-Ghundai, Kudani, Dabar-kot, Sūr-jangal, Mehī, and Kulli in the case of the Mother Goddess figurines, and Periāno-Ghundai, Mehī, Men-dāmb, Kulli, and Shāhī-tump in the case of the humped bulls.² In other words, these two particular classes of objects are found on sites which their ceramic wares connect more or less closely with the Indus zone of culture, whereas, according to Sir Aurel Stein, neither of them is found in association with Nāl ware, which there are good reasons for associating with the Persian zone.³

**Evidence of
pottery
summed up**

**Corroborated
by other
antiquities
Figurines of the
Mother
Goddess and
humped bulls**

¹ Las Bela has not yet been explored and is not therefore included in this statement.

² It should be added that the humped bull is also freely delineated on the Mehī pottery and on the red and black ware of Sūr-jangal, but occurs also occasionally on the Nāl pottery which shared some of its motifs with the Mehī ware.

³ Sir Aurel Stein is specific on this point. As to the bull figurines found by Mr. Hargreaves in Areas A, D, E, and F at Nāl, it is to be noted that the remains with which the bulls were associated in two of these areas (D and F) appeared to be of a different age from the graves which yielded the Nāl ware, as to the other two areas, it is not clear from Mr. Hargreaves' report in which particular stratum they were found, but there is no mention of any bull figurine having been found in any of the graves.