REVIEWS


The monograph reports on the excavation of the Deh Morasi Ghundai site about 16 to 17 miles south-west of Kandahar — an important station enroute from northern Iran to Quetta. This is one of the many sites that lie on the edge of the great desert region of south-west Afghanistan. All these sites are useful in tracing the influences coming from Iran and passing on to Baluchistan. Here we see the presence of both the influences from the buff-ware cultures of southern Iran and the red-ware cultures of northern Iran. And there is no doubt that the twin influences reached Quetta and also Zhob Valley. It is for this reason that Piggott’s classification of Baluchi cultures into buff-ware zone and red-ware zone is now upset.

At Deh Morasi four main periods have been distinguished. The first period is known only by a few sherds, here roughly said to be comparable with Rana Ghundai I phase (see next review) but no flint tools have been reported here. The second phase is the most important period which has yielded ceramics comparable with Quetta on the one hand and Iran on the other. In this period we also get here the typical Zhob Culture mother-goddess (Pl. 23-O). It is difficult to accept the argument of Dupree (P. 98) when he suggests “that the Zhob figurines represent a primitive Kali”. The goddess Kali is rooted in the primitive Indian cultural concept where grotesque and ferocious demand a particular kind of sacrifice while the Zhob figurine is related to the concept of the mother-goddesses of Western Asia. In this very period we find compartmented seals also rooted in the old civilizations. Another important find is the shouldered hoe (Fig. 12) which has also been found at Mundigak and Tepe Hissar. I picked up a few examples on the surface in the northern part of Peshawar region. Period III revealed three burials which could not be properly examined. The ceramic continued some features of the earlier period. Period IV yielded a mixed deposit which is dated roughly between 2000 to 1500 B.C. But two finds are very important. The rouletted ware (P. 113) fragments (Pl. 23. K and L), if they are really so, are the first of the kind reported from this area. Similarly the terracotta figurine (Pl. 23-P) is the well-known “baroque lady” of Gandhara.

Such monographs suggest the importance of the Kandahar area for intensive exploration.

A. H. Dani.
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The monograph under review is the third in the series describing archaeological research in Baluchistan and Afghanistan by the American team. The survey relates to an area locked up by the Sulaiman Range on the east and the Tobakakar Range on the west and includes mainly two valleys, the Zhob valley that slopes to the north towards the Gomal river and the Loralai that slopes south-west, both being approachable from Quetta. The Zhob has also a direct access to Afghanistan via Qamruddin Karez and there are passages across the Sulaiman into Sind. The Loralai has also other routes along the river valleys to Sind. But the direct route from Afghanistan through Kandahar, Quetta, Bolan Pass to Sibi lies further south of this area. Thus Zhob-Loralai Zone is an intervening pocket between the Sind plain of the Indus and southern Afghanistan away from the direct communication line between Southern Afghanistan and Sind. However, the zone is important in so far as it connects Quetta — the gateway to Bolan Pass — with the Gomal pass which opens another passage across the Indus to Multan in the Panjab. So far the cultural complex noted in this zone has not been found north of the Gomal river. The zone was first surveyed by Sir Aurel Stein who started from the north in Waziristan and came down to Quetta. Stein’s work brought to light number of sites, but real chronological sequence to this complex was given by Ross in his stratigraphic study of the Rana Ghundai site. On the basis of these works Piggott defined the “Zhob Culture”, and characterised it mainly by its pottery types and the peculiar figurine of the mother-goddess. The present study of Fairservis is to arrive at a more definitive evaluation of this culture complex and relate the different phases of its growth with those that were earlier established in Quetta region. For this purpose he started his survey from the south in Quetta and went northward. The limited time of three weeks at his disposal enabled him to revisit the sites of Stein and add a few more. Though his own work was of a general nature, he succeeded in redefining the phases at Sur Jangal, Rana Ghundai and Dabar-Kot in Loralai and at Periano Ghundai, Mughal Ghundai and Kaundani in Zhob. According to his analysis the earliest phase in Rana Ghundai is later than the earliest period at Kille Gul Muhammad, but still more important is the recognition that this Zone had contact with the Quetta group as is illustrated in some pottery types, flint implements and the so-called Zhob figurines. Evidence has also been produced to show direct contact with the Harappan Culture in Rana Ghundai III phase and also with the cultures on the west. But so far Rana Ghundai I phase remains ill defined. Not much is known about

1. My recent visit to the sites in the Gomal valley in Dera Ismail Khan district has convinced me that these sites appertain to the same cultural complex.


4. See his Prehistoric India, Chapter IV.
the character of the flint tools and the nature of the nomadic stage of life. It is, however, being realized that the Zhob culture was not an isolated growth. It is an adaptation of the general bronze-age cultural developments of the ancient world in the environmental background of this region, in which the route from Quetta onward to the Gomal Pass must have played an important part. So far the study of this culture has been made on the basis of the sites lying mainly on this route. The Survey of Fairservis is an overgrowth of his Excavations at Quetta.

A. H. Dani.


Mundigak lies 55 km. to the north-west of Kandahar in a valley separated from that of the Arghandab by a chain of small hill. It was the first prehistoric site to be excavated at some length in South Central Afghanistan, thus providing an important connecting station between the prehistoric sites in Iran and Southern Pakistan. The excavated materials are of the greatest value to us as they provide a time scale for interlinking the bronze age materials from Pakistan with those of Iran found here together in the different periods. Unfortunately the radio-carbon dates published by Casal (P. 258) have little value as the inconsistencies in the dates suggest that there must have been some mixing in the samples. Notwithstanding this defect in the report it is possible to arrive at some chronological fixation on the basis of the wealth of materials produced.

The excavator himself has distinguished seven periods in the history of Mundigak with many sub-periods recognised on the basis of different building phases. According to him there was an interval between periods I and II and again between periods IV and V. But the general description of the author suggests four main phases in the development of Mundigak.

Phase I, which includes his period I, is a nomadic stage in early levels but shows some structures in the later levels and painted pottery tradition which the author compares with Susa I and Uruk. The nomadic stage is, however, to be compared with Rana Ghundai I and Deh Morsai Ghundai I. The structural remains, which begin in sub-period four of his Period I, continue in Period II, with of course a “break” or probably invasion of a new people who used coarse pottery.

Phase II represents the village culture of Mundigak which should include the different building phases of the structural remains in the author's period I (sub-period 4 to 5), II and III. The intervening Period II, which shows retardation in the cultural growth and a complete break in the other site at Deh Morasi Ghundai (see review above), appears to be a local affair. But the main development in this phase is seen in the author’s period III. Here the
comparable materials may be seen in the Quetta, Nal and Zhob cultures of Baluchistan. In all these phases similar village cultures developed. It is also possible to trace some distant connection with the village cultures of Sind, as can be gathered from some painted designs and microliths. Pipal leaf design appearing on a pedestalled cup (Fig. 59 No. 116) in period III becomes more common (see Fig. 64) in the next phase. This leaf is typical of the Indus Civilization. This period must be considered co-eval with the early phase of Rana Ghundai III but the latter site could not grow beyond the stage of village culture most probably because of its environmental condition. The same is true with Deh Morasi Ghundai, in which case its period II should equate with Mundigak III.

However, Mundigak Phase III, which includes Casal’s periods IV and V, represents an urban development where the author has been able to identify rampart wall, palace remains and temple ruins. Period V is distinguished from period IV in so far as the earlier buildings no longer remained in use but instead a massive monument was observed. There is also a deterioration in the art of ceramic painting. This urban development in Mundigak is partly co-eval with Rana Ghundai III, as the author himself believes. Among other parallel materials the most important is the “Zhob mother-goddess” found here — a fact which now proves a wider circulation of this figurine type. Similarly it has been recognized by Piggott that the Harappan contact was established in Rana Ghundai III phase. Thus here we see Rana Ghundai III connecting two urban developments — one in the Indus Zone and the other in the Arghandab valley of South Central Afghanistan. The two developments were not the same but each must be explained in its particular environment.

The last phase in Mundigak, which includes Casal’s periods VI and VII, was again an age of cultural retardation in which the massive constructions came to an end. Old ceramic types survived for some time only to be replaced by unpainted coarse ware. This decay of the old ceramic painting art is also seen in Rana Ghundai IV which should be co-eval with this last phase of Mundigak. Fairervis in his report (see review above) sees some connection between this period of Rana Ghundai IV and Jhukar phase in Sind. This last phase of decay need not be due to an invasion. It must be connected with the drying up of those resources on which the urban development at Mundigak was founded. Unfortunately there is no clear picture of these conditions of living in the report. Mundigak ruins stand alone to tell the story but the story has to be understood in the wider back-ground of contemporary life in the area, for which we have still to work more and more there.

A. H. Dani.
Baluchistan has drawn the attention of the archaeologists for a long time as a transition zone between the Indus Civilisation of the main valley and the ancient cultures that grew up in the Iranian plateau. Several sites have been located along the old caravan routes and the river valleys but all present a picture of the poverty-stricken communities seeking life in the dry zone of Baluchistan more by trade than in the subsistence of the local products. Recent studies of Fairservis and de Cardi have focussed light on these little communities pursuing their hard life in isolated pockets of small valleys with occasional germination of new cultures on the arrival of new caravans, loaded with goods and technical knowledge of higher culture. Such studies are highly rewarding in those places where the caravans from different directions meet. The Surab Region, studied in this report, is one such area which was selected after careful consideration of all these problems. The region on the one hand opens through Mula pass into the main valley of the Indus and on the other three routes diverge -- one northward to Quetta, the second southward along the Mashkai river and the third westward along Rakshan river and lower down along the Kech river. With such a central location it was not difficult to catch here the influences from different quarters. But the excavation was rather short and only one part of the report is published here, with a promise that the whole exploration report will follow in the next issue of the journal.

The report deals with the excavations of only two sites: Anjira and Siah-Damb, Surab. At Anjira the excavation revealed four main periods, to which period V was added by the surface collection of materials and those found "in superficial layers". At Siah two main periods were distinguished, the second subdivided into three phases. Again period III was added by the "Surface sherds". At Siah period II was most important. On the basis of pottery it was equated with period III of Anjira. Period I of Siah was again poorly represented but on the sparse material recovered it was equated with Anjira II. Thus the sequence is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anjira</th>
<th>Siah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period I</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period II</td>
<td>Period I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period III</td>
<td>Period II with 3 phases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period IV</td>
<td>Period III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period V</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to re-assess the whole material we can broadly group them under three categories:

(A) The age of Stone, when metal tools were not known. This includes Anjira periods I and II, the first period of settlement yielded no
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structures but only pottery, chert flakes and animal bones: and the second period revealed boulder walls as footings for mud-brick super-structures with almost the same material contents plus additional types of pottery, particularly "cream-surfaced hand-made and basket-marked wares, ranging from a quarter to a half of the total number of sherds found". (P. 101).

(B) The age of Metal, when "chert implements had disappeared completely, and their absence, combined with the discovery of a whetstone may signify the introduction of metal during this period" (P. 102). This includes Anjira periods III and IV, the third period marked by walls of "roughly squared stone" and the fourth period by "fine squared masonry walls". This last was "a period of rebuilding and great expansion", when pottery types clearly show contacts established with Amri in the main valley of the Indus and with Nal and other sites in the South.

(C) It includes "an ill-defined Period V" of Anjira, which is supposed, on the basis of surface pottery, to include "a small settlement of Rana Ghundai III C or allied folk". This was obviously an age of decay and desolation, probably a disruption of the main sources of life.

The chert implements of Anjira have been described and discussed by the late Col. D.H. Gordon (PP. 122-26). He has placed them in the wider context of the neighbouring areas. A doubtful terminology of "neolithic assemblage" has been applied to them, while Dr. Fairservis in his report on Excavations in the Quetta Valley has gone outright to speak of "neolithic period". The term has to be understood in a limited sense as applicable to the environment of Baluchistan. The chronology of the period has been discussed by de Cardi in the background of Sialk and Hissar (PP. 111-15). The first period of the so-called "nomadic settlement" is equated with Kile Gul Mohammad II, but in general can be understood in the background of the earliest settlements in Deh Morasi Ghundai, Rana Ghundai and Mundigak (see earlier reviews). Quite naturally, in this stage A, de Cardi found pottery types showing links with the north. At Kot Diji (see next review) some chert flakes and "micro-blades" were found in the earliest level along with the well-known ribbon-flakes of the Indus Civilization. How far can we now understand them in the background of the materials from Baluchistan? However, a definite link with Amri and Kot Diji is seen in period III (P. 113).

On the whole the report is very constructive and advances our knowledge of the people of Baluchistan at this little-known period of history.

A. H. Dani.

---

1. This report could not be reviewed in this journal because I could not procure a copy.

The long awaited report on the Excavations at Kot Diji has at last been published. For this achievement Dr. F.A. Khan must be congratulated. But even greater credit goes to him for actual excavation of the site and a clear recognition of a cultural pattern at Kot Diji that is chronologically as well as materially accepted to be a "fore-runner" of the great Indus Civilization. Before him the late-lamented Mr. N.G. Majundar had discovered the pre-Harappan Amri site but his untimely death did not allow him to go beyond the exploration stage. It was left for Mon. J. M. Casal to carry out the detailed excavation at the site (See below for review). Kot Diji, therefore, offered the first important pre-Harappan materials in the main Valley of the Indus. The discovery and the excavation of the site would continue to show the great interest that the Government of Pakistan has been taking in the furtherance of our knowledge about the Bronze Age Cultures in the Indus region.

The report, however, leaves much to be desired. A superficial examination, no doubt, enables us to understand the two clear-cut cultural patterns at Kot Diji — the mature Harappa phase as represented in the upper levels (Layers 1 to 3 in the citadel area and layer 1 in the city area) and the "Kot Diji" culture in the lower levels (layers 4-16 in the citadel area and layers 2-5 in the other area). But for a detailed study we would have liked that the draughtsman's drawings of the plan and sections to be properly utilized in the text, and both presented in a way that the report is intelligible to the readers who have had no opportunity to go to the site. It seems that the text writer never bothered to go to the drawings and he prepared his own report on the basis of his daily note-book. The only exception is the report on pottery, which obviously was written and drawn together in the office. To give a few examples:- the report has been divided into "A Citadel" and "B Outer City", but except for Fig. 5, which refers to Sq. A III/20 all other sections are described as Squares of B. It was difficult to find out the line of the section on XX from the published plan, Fig. 4. Obviously the upper section on Fig. 10, marked as Sq. B IV/5 refers to the Citadel area, as it is there that sixteen layers were found. Similarly the descriptions of the cuttings from area B, given in the text are not those of which sections are apparently published. It is not necessary to add any more. A little more caution would have made the report more readable. On the other hand if one desires to know fully the chronological interlocking of the different layers of the Kot Diji culture with the neighbouring excavations, he is not made wiser by this report. He will have to go to the account published by others, e.g. relations with Amri to Casal and with Kalat sites to Miss de Cardi. In their accounts we get a clear-cut time scale for the different periods, which we lack here.

This criticism does not in any way lower the value of either the report or the excavation. From the report we learn of the two main periods of the Harappan Culture and two or rather three of the Kot Diji Culture. The mature phase
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of Harappan Culture is attested in the upper levels of the area A — Citadel, below which is the stage of invasion and burning in the opinion of the author. In the Harappan period "there is no evidence to show that the Harappans also used the fortification wall". (P. 16). However, "Spacious rooms with stone foundations, mud-brick superstructures and mud-brick paved floors have been uncovered in a considerable area" (P. 18). If we omit the stage of burning, we miss the earlier phase of the Harappan culture in the citadel area. For that the author takes us to the excavations in the City — area B. There layer (1) is a mixed material and immediately from layer (2) downwards Kot Diji objects have been met with. The total number of layers here was five but "in some of the squares in the south-eastern slope Harappan pottery continued down to layer (4)" (P. 37). According to the author the Harappan pottery of these layers is simpler and earlier in date than those found in the upper levels of the citadel area. This simpler Harappan pottery reached Kot Diji by trade earlier than the invasion. Thus the author speaks of the contemporaneity for some time of the early Harappan with the Kot Dijian. It is, however, strange that this simpler pottery of Harappa could not be found in the deep trenches in the citadel area, where we have again to go back for the main evolution of the Kot Diji Culture. Its two phases are clearly understood: (a) early, when the painted decoration consisted of a simple band at the neck and (b) late when more decorated forms in painting is seen. Probably a third stage may be distinguished when we get more elaborate decoration like the "Horned deity" (Pl. XVII, Fig. 16) on pot. This classification is clear from the detailed account of the pottery. Other finds have been sparsely described. We would have liked to know more about the terracotta bull mentioned on P. 83. Does it refer to Pl. XXVIII a? If so, it is highly expressive. The micro-blades and scrapers can be seen in the photograph (Pl. XXXIV b).

One important point to note is the principle of construction — mud-brick super-structure on stone foundation, a system also known from Kalat area (see above review No. 4).

A. H. Dani.


The site of Amri was discovered by N.G. Majumdar as early as 1929, who was the first to recognise its pre-Harappan nature. For a full-scale excavation of the site we had to wait long until Mon. Casal’s work, which is completed most efficiently. In his detailed report under review he has ably presented the materials in a way that we are now in a position to think in concrete terms the evolution of the Bronze Age cultures in the main Valley of the Indus and their relation on the one hand with those that grew in Baluchistan and Afghanistan and on the other with the developments in the Indian site like Lothal in Gujarat. “Amri, in the Dadu district, is a small village about one mile from the Indus, on the right bank, and some hundred miles from Mohenjodaro, farther downstream.”
The problem of the origin of the Harappan civilization has long faced the archaeologists. Both at Harappa and Mohenjodaro the civilization is seen at its mature stage. There was thus the need of discovering an earlier period site. From this angle the excavation of Amri is of prime importance. The object of Mon. Casal’s excavation was “to go deeper into the discovery made by Majumdar at Amri, and elucidate whether the Amri Culture had some parental relationship with the Harappan Civilization, or otherwise to clarify the degree of precedence or contemporaneity linking them”.

There are two mounds at Amri, named in the report A and B. Casal concludes: “the earliest settlement had been confined to Mound A and that the occupation had only later extended to Mound B.” The materials are divided into five main periods, of which the last is a later occupation of the Muslim period. Of the “prehistoric periods” (I to IV) the first is taken to be the true representative of the Amri culture, characterised by the typical thin ware pottery of the site, mud-brick walls, “chert blades” and other objects. The author notes: “in one case, there is an indication that wooden posts had been embodied in the walls”. Later the author notes the occurrence of timber re-inforcing in the burnt brick masonry, discovered in the Great Granary and defence tower in 1950 excavation at Mohenjodaro. Is there any connection in this wood technique of the two cultures? The author does not commit himself. However, he divides the first period into four sub-periods and traces the evolution of the ceramic tradition. Significantly even in the earliest sub-period the decorations are much more evolved than those seen in the lowest levels at Kot Diji. At the same time “Togau C crooks” are seen here in the first and second sub-periods. This recognition of Togau ware gives a solid base to link Amri culture chronologically with those in Baluchistan, particularly in the Surab region. de Cardi says: “Togau-ware was associated almost wholly with the period III occupation at Anjira, with only a single sherd from the preceding and later periods”.

In other words the earliest level of Amri coincides with phase B (see above review No. 4) of Anjira. What about Kot Diji? Casal remarks: “The Kot-Dijian Culture seems accordingly to be contemporaneous with period I at least partially, and Period II of Amri. It looks as though Amri and Kot-Diji had a common background of a local culture. But Amri being much more diversified must have had closer contacts with Baluchistan in which Kot-Diji did not take part, probably for geographical reasons”. This remark of Casal can hardly be accepted now when the Kot-Diji report is published (see review No. 5). The system of house construction at Kot Diji — stone footing with mud-brick super-structure — clearly recalls the similar practice of Surab region. On the other hand Kot Diji pottery has not produced any Togau ware, nor even the animal designs seen in the last sub-period at Amri. It is possible that there was a contact between Surab region and Kot Diji in Phase A of Anjira but later with the introduction of metal there the contact was lost. On the other hand the pottery decorations of late Kot Diji culture (our phase b) compare fairly well with Amri Period I. Thus according to our estimation the early phase of Kot Diji appears to be earlier than the main Amri settlements.

In the last sub-period “a few specimens of Harappan pottery appear”. 235
But “the progressive multiplication of Harappan types” is seen in the main period II, which is regarded as an intermediate stage between the main Amri culture of period I and full-fledged Harappan culture of period III, which includes the Jhukar culture in the last sub-period. Period IV is characterised by Jhangar culture. Period III a “practically marks the disappearance of the Amrian pottery”. What brought about its end? Casal is doubtful: “The upper layers (period II) are blackish and ashy, but they are mostly so near the surface that it is difficult to say whether this occurrence should be interpreted as evidence of some sort of violence or of a fire”. On the other hand he categorically says: “The Harappan Civilization does not derive from the Amrian. Harappan modes are intrusive at Amri”. The same picture we saw at Kot Diji. However, Casal gives precedence to Mohenjodaro over Harappa and significantly remarks: “Lothal must have been founded later than the towns of Sind and Punjab........the foundation of Lothal in Kathiawar must be ascribed to the time of Amri III B, which thus represents the moment when the Harappan Civilization attains a climax”. Sir Mortimer Wheeler’s excavation at Harappa has given us the materials of the earliest levels at that site. But the earlier levels at Mohenjodaro still remain unknown. If the materials of 1950 excavation were published, we could get definite idea of the Intermediate stage, when the granary was built, and also what lay below it? However, now it is clear that the origin of the Mohenjodaro Civilization has to be sought by deep digging at this site. That is a responsibility which the Government of Pakistan owes to the scholars of the world. Meanwhile is it not possible to surmise that small bronze age communities developed at different places in the valley of the Indus probably as a result of western influence? In course of time one such community at Mohenjodaro developed its material culture and gradually expanded its influence in the neighbouring areas. Later Mohenjodarians forged ahead politically and dominated the entire valley of the Indus and even beyond in Kathiawar. This is just a surmise. Leaving aside this, we can build a chronological chart as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anjira</th>
<th>Kot Diji</th>
<th>Amri</th>
<th>Harappan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age of Stone</td>
<td>Periods I &amp; II</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kot Diji (a)</td>
<td>(early)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amri I (A-C) &amp; (c) (late)</td>
<td>Harappan?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Metals</td>
<td>Period III</td>
<td>Kot Diji (Harappan contact)</td>
<td>Amri I D &amp; II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Period IV</td>
<td>Harappan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. H. Dani.
7. Dr. F. A. KHAN — *The Indus Valley and Early Iran.*
Memoir No. 4 of the Department of Archaeology and Museums, Pakistan, Karachi, 1964. PP. 104. plates 49.
Maps 4 and figures 11. Price Rs. 15.00.

Ever since the dawn of human migrations and the advent of international trade and commerce, Iran has been on the crossroads of civilizations. Poverty-stricken communities around the Caspian moved westwards to Anatolia and onwards to Europe. In the days of great urban civilizations of the Indus and Tigris-Euphrates Valley the Iranian plateau served as a bridge between Mesopotamia and the Land of the Indus. The rich and flourishing trade connecting the above-noted civilizations was carried on both through the Persian Gulf and land routes across the Iranian plateau. Very often this commercial intercourse was accomplished through entrepots in the Gulf such as Behrain (Sumerian Dilmun) and several others along the coast and through Northern Iran. It was, therefore, but natural that Sumerian, Iranian and Harappan merchants exchanged not only goods, but also ideas and traditions etc. Thus it was obvious that this commercial pursuit should result in a natural influence of arts and crafts of these regions.

In this book, which is mainly based on Dr. Khan’s thesis (submitted to the University of London, 1953) the author has showed most remarkably through specimens of arts and crafts how Iran and West Pakistan were linked to, and influenced by, each other in ceramics, jewellery, cosmetics, stone vessels and terracottas etc.

First Chapter of the book is devoted to the geographical background, and the routes connecting the two regions. Dr. Khan has illustrated here (Map 2) how caravans moved through Diyala region (Mesopotamia) Kirman Shah, Hamadan, Ray, Hissar-Damghan and Seistan into Baluchistan and the Indus Valley across Northern Iran; Diyala-Hamadan-Sialk-Kirman-Bampur; Susa-Tell Bakun and Bampur into Baluchistan and the Indus Valley across Southern Iran.

The second chapter, illustrating cultural relationship between the two regions, shows how Bampur and Baluchistan served as intermediaries between North East and South West Iran on the one hand and the Indus Valley on the other, as evidenced through arts and crafts of these regions. Third chapter deals with the recently excavated sites of Kot-Diji and Amri in Khairpur and Sind areas. Although, hardly a few specimens from these two sites can be compared with Iranian stuff, a brief note on them was perhaps of some significance for the study of the protohistory in the Indus region.

However, for fair and critical angles, one misses certain factors in this book. While several objects in the plates have not been referred to in the text, and some plates are unnecessarily included, a few others should have been there for the convenience of the readers. Map No. 1 shows wrong names for the rivers in Mesopotamia, but that, however, may be a cartographic mistake, although such details require careful attention, while the book is in preparation. The most wanted element for such an accomplished work, however,
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would be a good concluding chapter, which is not there. Such a chapter would obviously be dealing mainly with important factors, such as the volume of trade links, its significance and above all dating of the Indus Civilization in the light of fresh discoveries and informations. At the moment, it is a general tendency (as pointed out by Wheeler in his preface) to lower the dating of the Indus Civilization on the bases of C14 tests, the stratigraphy at Kot-Diji and the presence of Kot-Diji Culture pottery in the pre-Harappan levels at other sites in the Indus region.

It is not likely that the Harappan metropolis like Mohenjodaro did not exist at the time when Kot-Dijians flourished (as suggested by Wheeler in his preface) but even if that be so, there is evidence of commercial link between Harappans, Iranians and Sumerians in Early Dynastic period of Mesopotamia (as noted on pages 27, 28, 31, 32, 37, 38, 39 and 41). Moreover strong Indus Valley influence on Mesopotamian stone vessels is evidenced at Khafajah and Tell Agrab in Early Dynastic II and III periods of Mesopotamia¹. This suggests that the Indus Civilization had its links already established with Mesopotamia in the 1st half of the third millennium B.C. As a civilization would usually require a couple of centuries to attain status and position in international trade links, the beginning of Harappan civilization may therefore be proposed at least Early Dynastic I (C. 2900 B.C.) if not earlier. The evidence cited above and the one collected through Dr. George F. Dales boring in 1965 (and the recent boring in 1966) would suggest a much longer life for Mohenjodaro and Indus Civilization.

Sir Mortimer Wheeler is therefore quite correct in admitting that his earlier bracket (2500-1500) was “excessively conservative” (Preface XIII) and that the C14 tests so far made for Indus Valley sites are inadequate and the results yielded through them are insecure (Preface XII).

On the whole, however, a book of this kind was needed for a long time, specially in the days when the destiny of Iran and Pakistan are being recognised as Common (R.C.D.), and we are culturally drifting closer to each other, for which Dr. F. A. Khan, deserves full credit.

F. A. Durrani.

---


---

238