Timargarha and Gandhara Grave Culture

Part 1

INTRODUCTION

By

PROF. AHMAD HASAN DANI

INTRODUCTION

SECTION — I

GANDHARA GRAVE CULTURE— A NEW CHAPTER IN THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF PAKISTAN

Archaeological activities in Pakistan have covered mainly three fields: Prehistoric, Protohistoric and historic. Whatever studies in these fields have so far been made, remain isolated. No continuous history of man is yet available. There are many gaps in between these fields and even within each field there are problems — crucial problems that remain to be solved.

It was Helmut De Terra[1], who by his field work in the thirties of this century, placed Pakistan in the prehistoric map. His geological sequence for this part of Asia soon became classic, and the associated human cultures, studied by Paterson,[2] formed the basis for future theories and gave rise to the hypothetical term "Soan Culture". While De Terra's geological sequence has been modified by Zeuner[3] and viewed with great doubts by others, H.L. Movius[4] has attempted to define the culture and place it in the world context. The terminology proposed by Movius is again a matter of discussion[5] while recent discoveries[6] in northern and central India have produced ample evidence to view Soan materials in different perspective.[7] On the other hand there has been no follow-up in the field for a further search of the materials or for building up the environment. The late Col. D. H. Gordon,[8] in his amateurish attempts, visited a few caves in Gandhara and collected some microlithic tools, which have been referred to in his articles in a general way. The American anthropologist[9] Henry Field had an exploratory trip from Karachi westward along the Makran coast and collected some more microlithic tools. Very recently, Dr. Johnson[10] from Minnosotta University looked into some of the cave in Hazara and Rawalpindi districts, which, if explored properly, may provide proper context to the stray microliths found here and there. In 963 the University of Peshawar laid an exploratory trench at Sanghao Cave[11] in Mardan district and the results were very encouraging. The quartz blade and flake industry took the his-

tory from the Middle to the Late Stone Age. Yet we do not know the succession that finally led to the early agricultural communities in Baluchistan.

It was De Terra[12], who first used the term "Protoneolith" for a type of blade-and-flake industry found in the Indus Zone. Dr. Fairservis[13] went a step further and on the basis of a single small trench at Kille Gul Muhammad near Quetta coined the term "neolithic culture" for a pre-pottery assemblage in the lowest level, which, among others included a kind of blade-and-flake industry. Further excavations in southern Afghanistan[14], Baluchistan[15], and Sind[16] have given a better picture of this pattern of life which is verging on nomadism — a stage which is over-shadowed by the influx of bronze-using communities. This is the picture in the southern part of West Pakistan. The northern zone has different story to tell. The first scene opens in the main valley of Kashmir[17] where in the vicinity of Srinagar pit-dwellings of the so-called neolithic community have been excavated. The materials yet remain ill defined and ill connected. The Kashmir find is not an isolated phenomenon. We have been able to follow its traces in Swat and Dir as will be shown below.

The protohistoric sequence in Pakistan is mainly concerned with the Bronze Age Culture, which culminated in the Indus Civilization, so well attested in the excavations at Mohenjodaro,[18] Harappa[19] and other sites.[20] Since its recognition and proper definition in the twenties of this century by Sir John Marshall, this new field of archaeology has attracted greater and greater attraction. The late professor Gordon Childe[21] placed it in the context of the Ancient Orient Civilizations, while at home several explorations revealed its wide extension from Suktagendor[22] on the extreme western Makran Coast to Rupar[28] in Ambala district just at the Indo-Gangetic divide. Its further penetration towards the upper Ganges Valley[24] is perepheral while its onward trading posts[25] in Gujarat appear to be either a colonial enterprise or a survival in another context. Though the civilization is deeply rooted in the Indus pattern, its origins are still uncertain. Dr. Fairservis[26] has made a claim for possible precursor in one of the cultural complexes of Baluchistan but this thinking is probably influenced more by the intermediate geographic position of Baluchistan between Iran and the Indus Valley than by the actual evidence found so far. It is not necessary to limit one's horizon only to the land-routes through Baluchistan. There are other routes and ways of communication. Again the end of the civilization is still debated.[27] Though Dr. Khan[28] has pushed back its closing years to about 1750 B.C. its succeeding cultures[29] remain poorly described in the main valley of the Indus. On the other hand in Gujarat and Deccan, where

its succession has been duly phased[30] the context, environment and probably also the people differ materially. The neglect of these factors in interpreting the materials has told heavily on our understanding of the civilization. Even though its materials are available in abundance, I wonder how many anthropologists would concede to viewing them from the light of the later Hindu Culture that is essentially rooted in the Gangetic pattern. Yet that is the angle in the monumental work[31] of Sir John Marshall and of most of the writers of the day. Particularly the Indian archaeologists and the old school of ancient historians of India catch hold of this cultural efflorescence and foist it as a sort of padding on to the Hindu Culture of later growth. If Indus Civilization has to be understood properly, it must be interpreted on the basic pattern of the Indus Zone[32] and viewed in the greater context of the Ancient Orient Civilizations—a context in which the Gangetic world had no place.

On this basis the Civilization is a growth of the Indus system—a gift of the Indus founded on the technology of the intensive cultivation of land irrigated by flood water. It is this rich harvest which was exploited by a mercantile class well established in cities on the river highways. The control had already passed on to their hands and it is they who dictated the rigid civic system, the weights and measures, the games and pastimes, the writing vocabulary and religious discipline. The village rituals survived as affording fun to the city dwellers or at best practices of a backward community, that had to be tolerated. The moving spirit of the civilization lay in the set-up of the cities which exploited the villages. Once the main life was destroyed, what was left was only a rural scene in stark backwardness. Unless there was something to back up the old cities, all those trends which were associated with the civilization would fall to ruin. The rural would dominate the scene. The savage would conquer the civil. The rugged highlanders in their exclusive backwardness would pounce upon the villages of the plain and the twin feature of the Indus—the eastern plain and the western hill—would merge in the common struggle for existence. A new force must come to resuscitate the life. That has always come in the geographic scene of the Indus that lies midway between the settled communities of the Indian Gangetic system and the moving masses of Central Asia.[33]

It is one such Achaemenian Iranian movement towards the east in the 6th century B.C. which opened the historic scene in the Indus Zone. The conquests of Cyrus and Darius once again brought to the forefront the contrast between the Indus and Gangetic patterns. The Indus bore the full measure of the Achaemenian legacy. The new writing system of Kharoshthi,

the coin currency, the *Karsha* weight and *Parsang* measures, the stone cutter's art and the new diaper stone masonry, the improved iron smithery and gem-cutting—all tell a story of a new civic life which must be the result of new bureaucracy and new administrative pattern introduced by the Achaemenians.[34] It is no wonder that it is at this time when the fame of the city of Taxila as an important educational centre spread eastward in the Ganges Valley. The scattered remnants of the Achaemenian age have been picked up here and there but the full measure of the time yet remains to be revealed in the excavation of a potential Achaemenian site. The legacy of this age is generally missed as it is overshadowed by the overwhelming account of Alexander's march towards the east, his overthrow of the Achaemenians and opening of a new era when the Greeks had upperhand in the affairs of Asia as far east as West Pakistan.

Before the Greeks could re-assert their power in the Indus region, there was an interlude of about 100 years from 321 B.C. onward, when an Indo-Gangetic empire of the Mauryans gave an administrative unity and helped in the interflow of the art-trends and cultural ideas in the two geographic zones. As a result many Achaemenian art currents and administrative practices are seen in the Mauryan system but the most important gain for West Pakistan was the gradual spread of Buddhism, which adopted this land as its second home and continued to inspire the common mass for centuries to come. Of the Mauryans the rock edicts[35] at Shahbazgarhi and Mansehra are the ever-lasting relics while the material culture of their time is dimly visible in the excavations of the Bhir mound at Taxila[36] and of the Bala Hisar mound at Charsada[37].

The beginning of the second century B.C. opened with the re-appearance of the Greeks,[38] this time from Bactria, in the Indus region. Their chequered history has been reconstructed mainly on the basis of their coins, and to them has been attributed exaggerated cultural contribution probably because of their belonging to the Greek stock. The excavations at Sirkap[39] in Taxila and at Shaikhan Dheri[40] in Charsada have brought forth some materials to evaluate their achievements. Though the Greeks were rounded off in the 1st century B.C. by the Scytho-Parthians, their language and script persisted much longer. The Parthians, who came from the eastern shore of the Caspian Sea, re-opened the trade with Western Asia and imported many kinds of technical knowledge. However, the full benefit of these commercial contacts was reaped in the time of the Great Kushanas, who in the Ist and 2nd centuries A.D., united the three valleys of the Oxus, Indus and Ganges under their sceptre. It is the peace and prosperity of the Kushana

empire, which lay at the root of the development of the Gandhara art. Lot has been written on the origin and development of the Gandhara art but all these views are based on the study of the isolated sculptures, or parts of them, taken away from their context and studied through the spectacle of either Greek[41] or Roman[42] art. The Buddhist stupas and monasteries finding no champion in the land of their origin, are denuded of their treasures and today they stand naked with little to throw light on the evolution of the Gandhara art. The craze for the Gandhara sculptures has not abated yet, and this over-enthusiasm on the part of the scholars has robbed the real basis for the proper study of this art. Apart from the over-emphasis on the Gandhara art, the archaeologists have not cared to relate this art to actual life. We have, therefore, one-sided picture of the Gandhara art of Pakistan. However, enough materials have now been produced in the excavations at Taxila, Charsada and Bagram[43], which yet remain to be correlated. In their perspective new vistas of life are bound to emerge, that will give a right direction to the understanding of the Gandhara art.

The archaeology of Pakistan in the post-Kushana period is ill evidenced. On the suggestion of Sir John Marshall[44] it is generally believed that the Huns destroyed the Buddhist monasteries in the 5th century A.D., and they probably spelt disaster to the rich civilization built by the Kushanas under the inspiration of Buddhism and on the thriving commerce with the East and the West. Unfortunately no heed is paid to the accounts of the Chinese pilgrims[45] who travelled in West Pakistan either during the rule of the Huns or after them. The analysis of their accounts tells entirely a different story. When these details are combined with scattered pieces of archaeological material, we get a completely new picture. The age of Kharoshthi writing came to an end. The Sarada script obtained the field. The language of the mass, expressed in Prakrit, gave way to Sanskrit. The Buddhist monasteries dwindled and Gandhara art met its doom. The Hindu influences, Hindu deities and temples and the great leaning of the Hindu Shahi rulers to India point the direction to which the currents of life in the Indus region had then moved. The temple remains at Kafirkot[46] in Dera Ismail Khan district and the great mound at Hund on the bank of the Indus in Mardan district have ample materials to unfold the real story of the time. The politics of the time lay at the root of this change of vision—a vision which was soon to take a complete turn to the west after the coming of the Muslims.

In this narration of the archaeological history of the Indus Zone the protohistory of Gandhara is completely missing, and whatever we know of the protohistoric civilization of Mohenjodaro and Harappa, there is a long

gap between its end and the beginning of the historic period of archaeology under the Achaemenians in the 6th century B.C. What was going on during this interrugnum, yet remains to be authenticated in the archaeological materials. Mythologies and literary traditions from Sanskrit (see below section 3) have been analysed and a story of the Aryans[47] has been built. Once Sir Mortimer Wheeler[48] and Professor Stuart Piggott[49] took hold of this Aryan theory and linked the Aryans with the destruction of the Indus Civilization, hoping thereby to close the gap between the protohistory and Sanskrit traditional history. This hypothesis remained ill-proven, as no definite Aryan archaeological materials could be found. The archaeological gap has been filled in India,[50] but the story is entirely different. The main home of the Rigvedic Aryans in the Indus Zone has not yet produced the required evidence.

The new discovery of the graves in Gandhara will go a long way to shed light on this dark period of Pakistan's archaeology. The Italians, who made the first discovery, have spoken of them as "pre-Buddhist"[51] graves, probably because these graves were un-related to their main work on the Buddhist stupa and monastery at Butkara in Swat. But the term "Pre-Buddhist" is as indeterminate as the confused phrase "Buddhist period". What is the earliest Buddhist relic in Swat, is not yet ascertained. Should we take its beginning to the time of Asoka (second century B.C.) or to the time of Kanishka (1st century A.D.)? In this uncertainty what can be the meaning of "Pre-Buddhist"? It seems that finding no other comparable material in the locality of the excavation, the Italians vaguely used the term "Pre-Buddhist". But in the main Gandhara valley of Peshawar we have now two city excavations undertaken at Bala Hisar[52] and at Shaikhan Dheri[53] in the Charsada area. Sequence of pottery built here has given us a definite clue to the understanding of the ceramic tradition of Gandhara. This has now been linked up with the Balambat settlement site where two periods of settlement have been firmly established. The last period of Balambat dates from 6th to 4th centuries B.C. (see below section 6). These last period settlers cut across the older walls and made their own dwellings. The earlier period belonged to a people whose skeletal remains have been found in one type of the graves at Timargarha. But their own houses overlie the graves of still older people, among whom burning of the dead was the common ritual. The graves containing burnt bones were destroyed by the later people. A study of the graves, excavated at Timargarha, has revealed three distinct periods with three different rituals—(i) complete inflexed burial, (ii) burial of burnt bones or ashes and (iii) fractional burial.

We have here three periods of graves prior to 6th century B.C. Only in the last period of the graves we get iron objects. In the earlier two periods bronze is usually found, though metal objects are scarce. In these graves of Timargarha we have materials which take us beyond the historic period and for the first time open the chapter of protohistory in Gandhara. At the same time they go a long way in filling the gap between the protohistory of the Indus civilization and the historic period of West Pakistan. A comparative study of the materials found in these graves and those found in the northern part of Iran has opened new avenues of cultural link between two countries and at the same time provided a proper chronological table.

Professor G. Tucci[54] has gone a step further and drawn a hasty conclusion, when he remarks: "Returning to the subject of cemeteries, it seems to me that it can hardly be doubted that they should be attributed to the Assakenoi of Alexander's historians. The Assakenoi are in fact the peoples which Alexander found after crossing the Panjkora and with whom he was compelled to fight hard". This definite attribution of the graves to a people who lived in the time of Alexander, is as wide the mark as referring to them as "Pre-Buddhist". The sequence at Balambat settlement site clearly shows that at least Timargarha graves antedate the Achaemenian period, a period which was brought to a close by Alexander's invasion.

In the settlement site at Balambat we have also found some ground stone tools: mainly of two types—pointed-butt stone axes and ring stones. Some other ground stone tools are scattered in the fields where the graves are buried. From Swat also come similar ground stone tools. But so far the actual neolithic site has not been located. At Balambat we observed some pit circles, but before we could excavate them, they were dug up by the local villagers. Thus the neolithic here remains ill defined.

However, the graves at Timargarha are coming up to throw light on the dark period of Pakistan's archaeological history, which was dimly visible in the mythologies and Sanskrit traditions.

1. De Terra, H. and Paterson, T.T.—*'Studies on the Ice Age in India and Associated Human Cultures'*, Carnaegie Institution of Washington Publication No. 499. 1939.
2. Paterson, T.T. and Drummond, N.J.H.—*Soan the Palaeolithic of Pakistan*, Karachi, 1962.
3. Zeuner, F.E. *Dating the Past*, third ed. 1952, pp. 274-276.
4. Movius, H.L. *The Lower Palaeolithic Cultures of Southern and Eastern Asia*. Trans, Amer. Phil. Soc, (N.S.) Vol. 38, Pt. 4 (1948).

'Early Man and Pleistocene Stratigraphy in Southernand Eastern Asia.' *Papers of Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology,* Vol. XIX, Cambridge, Mass, U.S.A. 1944.

5. Paterson, T.T. & Drummond, N.J.H.—*Op. Cit.,* pp. 44-53.
6. Sankalia, H.D.—*Prehistory and Protohistory of India and Pakistan,* Bombay, 1962, Chapter I.
   Subbarao, B. *Personality of India,* 2nd edition 1958 , Baroda.
   Lal, B.B.—'Palaeoliths from the Beas and Banganga Valleys, Panjab.' *Ancient India,* No. 12. 1956. pp. 59-92.
7. Misra V.N. and Mate, M.S.—*Indian Prehistory,* Deccan College, Poona, 1965.
   Soundara Rajan, K.U.—'Quaternary Pebble, Core and Flake cultures of India—An Appraisal of the Data.' *Ancient India,* No. 17, 1961. pp. 68-79.
8. Gordon, D.H.—*The Prehistoric Background of Indian Culture,* Bombay, 1958.
   Gordon, D.H.—'The Microlithic Industries of India,' in *Man* 1938, No. 19. p. 23.
9. Field, H.—"An Anthropological Reconnaisance in West Pakistan", *Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology,* Harvard University 52 (1959).
10. Dr. Johnson of Minnosotta University, U.S.A.—His work was personally communicated to me by his assistant Mr. Sharif, Field Officer in the Department of Archaeology, Govt. of Pakistan.
11. Dani, A.H.—"Sanghao Cave Excavation" (The first season 1963), *Ancient Pakistan,* Volume I. Peshawar, 1964.
12. De Terra, *Op. Cit.*
13. Fairservis (Jr) W.A.J.—"Excavations in the Quetta Valley, West Pakistan". *An Anthropological paper of the American Museum of Natural History,* New York, 1956. pp. 354-361.
14. Casal, Jean. Marie—*Fouilles De Mundigak* Vol. I. Paris, 1961.
15. Beatrice de Cardi—"Expedition to Kalat 1948 and 1957. *Pakistan Archaeology,* No. 1, 1964. pp. 20-29.
    "Excavations and Reconnaisance in Kalat, West Pakistan" *Pakistan Archaeology,* No. 2. 1965. pp. 86-180.
16. Khan, F.A.—"Excavation at Koṭ Diji" *Pakistan Archaeology* No. 1, 1964. pp. 39-43.
    "Excavations at Kot Diji" *Pakistan Archaeology* No. 2. 1965 pp. 12-85.
17. Burzahome—*Indian Archaeology. A Review.* 1960-61 (1961) p. 11.
18. Marshall John—*Mohenjodaro and the Indus Civilization.* London 1931.
19. Vats. M.S.—*Excavation at Harappa.* New Delhi 1940. Vol. I.
20. Mackay, E.J.H.—*Chanhudaru Excavations* 1935-36 American Or. Soc , New Haven, Connecticut, 1943).
21. Childe, V.G.—*New Light on the Most Ancient East.* London 1953. pp. 172-188.
22. Stein, Aurel—'An Archaeological Tour in Gedrosia', *Mem. Archaeol., Surv.* India, 43, (1931).
23. Sharma, Y.D. 'Exploration of Historical Sites'. *Ancient India* No. 9. p. 124.
24. Sharma, Y.D.—"Alamgirpur" *Indian Archaeology*—A Review 1958-59.
25. Rao, S.R.—('Lothal'). *Indian Archaeology*—A Review, 1958-59.
    'New Light on the Indus Valley Civilization. Seals, Drains, and Dockyard in new excavation at Lothal in India' Part I. *Illustrated London News.* pp. 302-3-4. Part II pp. 387-389, March 11, 1961.
    "Excavation at Rangpur and other explorations in Gujarat" *Ancient India,* Bulletin of the Archaeological Survey of India, Nos. 18 and 19, 1962 and 1963.
26. Fairservis (Jr) W.A.J.—'The Origin, Character, and Decline of an Early Civilization', *Novitates.* No. 2302, 1967.
27. Marshall, J. *Op. Cit.*
    Wheeler, R.E.M.—*Cambridge History of India. The Indus Valley Civilization.* Cambridge. 1960. pp. 96-100.
    Raikes, R.L.—'The End of the Ancient Cities of the Indus,' *American Anthropologist,* Vol. 66. No. 2, pp. 1964. 284-298.
    Raikes, R.L.—'The Mohenjodaro Flood.' *Antiquity* XXXIX, pp. 196-203, 1965. The Mohenjodaro Flood-' Further notes' *Antiquity* Vol: XLI No. 161, pp. 64-66, 1967.
    Dales, G.F.—'The Decline of the Harappans,' *Scientific American* Vol. 214, No. 5 1966. pp. 93-100.
    "The Mythical Massacre at Mohenjodaro'. *Expedition,* VI, 1964, 36.
28. Khan, F.A.—'Fresh Side-light on the Indus Valley and the Bronze Age Orient,' *Annual Report of the Institute of Archaeology,* 1955. pp. 51-58.
29. Mackay, E.J.H.—*Op. Cit.*
    Casal, Jean. Marie—*Fouilles D' Amri.,* Vol. I, Paris 1964, pp. 8-20 (English Summary).
30. Rao, S.R.—*Ancient India* Nos. 18 and 19 'Excavation at Rangpur and other explorations,' pp. 175-183.
31. Partially See the Chapter on Religion by Sir John Marshall in *Mohenjodaro and the Indus Civilization,* Vol. I.
32. Dani, A.H.—*A Short History of Pakistan,* Book 1, Karachi, 1967, pp. 37-44.

33. Dani, A.H.—*Op. Cit.* See Chapter I.
34. Prakash, Buddha—*Political and Social Movements in Ancient Panjab*, Delhi, 1964.
35. Hultzsch, E.—*Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum,* Vol. 1 *Inscriptions of Ashoka,* Oxford, 1925.
36. Marshall, J.—*Taxila,* Vol. I.
37. Wheeler, R.E.M.—*Charsada*, Oxford, 1962.
38. Tarn, W.W.—*The Greeks in Bactria and India.* 2nd ed. Cambridge, 1951.
39. Marshall, J.— *Op. Cit.*
40. Dani, A.H.—*Ancient Pakistan,* Vol. 2, 1965-66, pp. 227-36.
41. Marshall, J.—*The Buddhist Art of Gandhara,* Cambridge, 1960;
Foucher, A.—*L' Art Greco-Bouddhique du Gandhara,* Paris 1905-51.
42. Benjamin R.—*Art and Architecture of India,* Second Ed. 1953.
43. Ghirshman, R.—*Begram. Recherches Archealogiques* et Historiques sur les Kouchans. (Le Caire 1946). pp. 121-123.
45. Beal, S.—*Chinese Accounts of India,* Vols. Four. New edition Calcutta, 1958.
46. Wheeler, R.E.M—*Five Thousand Years of Pakistan,* London, 1950, pp. 57-61;
Stein, Aurel—*Report of Archaeological Survey Work in the North-West Frontier Province and Baluchistan,* (Govt. Press Peshawar, 1905);
Stein, Aurel—*Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India.* Frontier Circle for 1911-12 (Peshawar 1912).
47. Childe, V.G.—*The Aryans.* New York; London, 1926.
Majumdar, R.C. and Pusalkar, A.D.—*The History and Culture of the Indian People. The Vedic Age.*
48. Wheeler, R.E.M.—*Ancient India,* No. 3, 1947.
49. Piggott. S.—*Prehistoric India.* Pelican, London 1950.
50. Lal, B.B.—*Ancient India Nos.* 18, 19. Picture Emerges—an assessment of the carbon-14 datings of the Protohistoric culture of the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent. pp. 208-221.
51. Antonini, C.S.—*East and West,* Vol. 14, Nos. 1-2, 1963. Rome. pp. 13—25.
Stacul, G.—*East and West,* Vol. 16 Nos. 1-2, Rome, 1966. Preliminary report on the Pre-Buddhist Necropolis in Swat (West Pakistan) pp. 37-79.
Stacul, G.—*East and West,* Vol. 16, Nos. 3-4, Rome, 1966. Notes on the Discovery of a Necropolis near Kherai in the Gorband Valley, Swat (West Pakistan) pp. 261-274.
52. Wheeler, R.E.M.—*Op. Cit.*
53. Dani, A.H.—*Op. Cit.*
54. Tucci, G.—*East and West,* Vol. 14, Nos. 1-2, Rome, 1966.
The Tombs of the Asvakayana'—Assakenoi. p. 27.

SECTION — 2

STORY OF THE DISCOVERY

The establishment of the Department of Archaeology in the University of Peshawar brightened up the prospects of archaeological research in Pakistan. The archaeological activities, which were mostly initiated by foreign missions, and the theories, which were built away from the scene of activity, could now find a suitable home within the country, and these could be viewed in the perspective of the local environment and the geographic factors that move man in his surrounding. It is with this idea behind

that archaeology was started at Peshawar, which is located in the heart of the main currents that have affected the archaeological world. Peshawar (ancient *Poshapura*[1], to be Sanskritised as *Parshapura* and not *Purushapura*[2]) has attracted the scholars of the world for the study of Gandhara art, as in its vicinity stand today many Buddhist monasteries and stupas which have been denuded of their sculptural treasures. The Gandhara sculptures have an appeal to the expert, the amateur and the art collector. But that is not so to an ordinary Muslim as sculpture to him is an image —an idol to be discarded and broken. The second field of study is rather historical as it centres round the romantic adventure of Alexander the Great and continues to rope in the storey of the Bactrian Greeks who have left behind large number of silver and copper coins to attest their rule in the 2nd and 1st centuries B.C. Alexander's march through the territory of West Pakistan is recorded in the contemporary accounts,[3] and to trace the route followed by him has led to lot of controversy[4] and also to geographical exploration.[5] However it has not been given to an archaeologist to follow in his footsteps and stumble on traces of old that may have survived today. Alexander definitely marched through the areas of human population and followed a route that must have been most frequented, as he had Ambhi,[6] the ruler of Taxila, as his main guide.

As Alexander's invasion has been the "sheet anchor" for determining chronology in this area, his route is bound to reveal many old sites to the archaeologists. With this idea in mind the University authorities were pursuaded to send a team in order to follow the track of Alexander. The present author in the company of Dr. Munawwar Khan, Head of the Department of History, called on Mr. Wajihuddin, the then political agent of the Malakand Agency, who was himself well versed in the literature about Alexander and was good enough to produce many old records and maps and to discuss with us the possible routes. At the end he made all arrangements for our trip to the tribal area and also gave us a Tahsildar as our guide. Encouraged by Mr. Wajihuddin, we went to Thana, the home town of Dr. Munawwar Khan. Thana is situated on a hill spur not far from the Swat river, overlooking the Chakdara opening and giving a direct passage over the Shahkot pass to the main valley of Peshawar. Alexander must have skirted this town in his Swat campaign but unfortunately it is not mentioned by his historians.

At Thana we made our first discovery. In the night after the meal while we gathered round the fire, Dr. Munawwar Khan was trying to introduce me to his fellow companions in his Pashto—a language which I hard-

GRAVE SITES IN GANDHARA

Scale:- 1" = 7-3/9 Miles

8 4 0 1" 2" 3" 4"

GRAVE SITES.....

KUNAR RIVER

NAWA PASS

INAYAT QILA

R. JANDOOL

BALAMBAT

PANJKORA TO CHITRAL

TIMARGARHA

ZIARAT

CHARPAT

CHAKDARA

SWAT R.

MINGORA

BARIKOT

THANA

GORBAND

USSR

AFGHANISTAN

PAKISTAN

INDUS R.

INDIA

ARABIAN SEA

SWAT RIVER

JAMALGARHI

KABUL RIVER

KHYBER PASS.

PESHAWAR

MARDAN

SWABI

TARBELA

INDUS R.

HAZARA

LOHAR

PANJPIR

HUND

TO ABBOTTABAD

NOWSHERA

TO KOHAT

ATTOCK

TO RAWALPINDI

DRAWN BY
M. DAUD KAMAL
21.10.67

Fig. 1

ly understood then. But when he used the phrase *But-parast* (idol-worshipper) for me, I intervened and asked him to let me know the gist of his talk. He explained that finding no other term for archaeologist in his language, he was using this phrase as the people in the locality knew fully well how the archaeologists were crazy for *Buts* (images). I strongly objected to the use of this phrase as I was not a *but-parast*, and secondly if people knew that I was after the images, it would be difficult for me to work in the area. I requested Khan Sahib to act as an interpreter for me and allow me to speak for myself. As I did not like my head to be broken by the Pathans, I did not dare to speak of the images or even of the Gandhara art. For me the archaeologist is one who is in search of the traces of ancient man, looking for him in old mounds, city ruins, dilapidated homesteads and old graves. As soon as I uttered the word, "graves", a villager stood up and said, "I have seen *Kafir* graves in the fields, the graves which have got pots in them and which are aligned east to west as opposed to the Muslim graves which lie north to south". This unique information was very heartening and early next morning we took him as our guide and went to the field. In an hour's dig our guide brought out the grave, of which he had talked. The grave lay in an extensive cemetery of old at Thana, which we later excavated in 1963. Our guide further pointed out that similar graves could also be seen near Chakdara. Our later exploration in that area revealed graves in the site of the State Dak Banglow at Chakdara and in the village of Charpat about one mile west of Chakdara.

Next day we crossed the Swat river over the British-built iron bridge and after leaving the Chakdara fort behind entered the Talash Valley of Dir State. By the road side we located many stupa mounds,[7] the tallest of which was called *Andan Dheri*, near the ancient village of Uchh. About ten miles from Chakdara we had a view of a large number of derelict standing walls on the hill top on our left near the village of Machowa—obviously the ruins of a large fortified settlement. It is these ruins which are identified with the ancient city of Massaga by Sir Olaf Caroe[7]. These house ruins continued right up to the modern village of Ziarat, so called as there is an old tomb of a saint. The village is now shifted to the modern road side but the tomb, locally called *Gumbad*, is in the older locality. On our way to the *Gumbad* we passed by a Muslim graveyard. In one place a ditch had been dug, and in the section, we found, to our utter surprise, a Muslim grave resting on the top of a huge slab, below which was an ancient burial with some pot-sherds still sticking. This was our third discovery of the ancient cemetery.

Beyond Ziarat we crossed a *Khwar* (torrent) called Gour and our road winded up the hill in a serpentine fashion much to our discomfort. We

wondered why such a nasty road had been built by the British when it was possible to go round the hill alongside the *Khwar*. The Tahsildar came to our rescue and explained that on the hills opposite to us, known as Arang and Barang, lived the sturdy Mohmand tribe, who used to snipe at the army train moving down the old road which originally ran along the Khwar. In order to be safe from sniping, the British built this new military road at a higher altitude. It was for this reason that we could see no ruins on the hi'' road that we followed. But we had the advantage of seeing below the bend of the Panchkora river and how it took its turn through the Mohmand hills and left Ziarat far away on the other side of the hill. When we reached the top we had a beautiful panoramic view (pl. 1.) of the valley of Panchkora, where the village of Timargarha was situated. We were now reaching another world of green valley with poplar trees hedging the gardens of juicy oranges and pines shooting high on the hill slopes, variegated colours of terraced fields shining brightly in the morning sun, the greenery kissing right down the swift-flowing water of the river. From a vantage point at the village we saw the noble bend of the river and in the stillness of the night we heard the sonorous music of the rippling water, dashing against the boulders and rocks that had rolled down the river bed in ages past. But evening presented a still more wonderous picture. The hills that girdle around the village gradually rise up to their heights. In their laps lie sleeping many a concealed village, which you hardly catch in the glare of the day light. With the approaching night one by one fire is lit — smouldering fire, flaming fire, shining glow in the pitch darkness — as if the whole aflame in some festive ceremony. Humanity has returned home and is now kindling fire for food and comfort. How long past this scene has been raging in this valley ? No one was there to narrate the story. But the river Panchkora merrily flowed singing the story of man in her eternal tune. As long as the river nourished the fields and quenched the thirst of man, there could be no lack of human population.

The road that we followed went ahead to Chitral but from the northern extremity of the village another road bifurcated that led across the Panchkora and around the fort of Balambat over to the bank of the Jandul (Chandawal of Babar's *Memoirs*)[8] river, where there is a ford, traditionally known to have been a crossing for the caravans. A few miles down Jandul joined with the Panchkora and just before the confluence there used to be a ropebridge over the latter river. Since British time this bridge has been given up and the traffic now crosses over the bridge far to the north. But here about came Babar with his galloping horses, which drank the water of the river Panchkora. After receiving the submission of the

Yusufzais Babar went back and followed up the Kharappa route to Peshawar valley. It was at this very point that Alexander must have crossed the river either before or after his engagement with the *Gourais*[10] *in* his *onward* march to carry on Swat campaigns.

Just close to the crossing stands a village called Khazana on an ancient mound, the word Khazana recalling Kozana or Kushana[11]. Away from this place it was difficult to locate any site. The modern village of Timargarha has nothing of old except a mosque which includes some sculptured stones in its parapet and some carved wooden pillars and beams. But even this mosque, where lies buried the locally famous saint Timar Baba, cannot be older than two centuries. Such a barren prospect for archaeology was unbelievable to me! After a restless sleep in a local Dak banglow, early next morning I went out to loiter about a small *Khwar* that flowed down through the village and showed some sections cutting the neighbouring fields. Luck was not in favour because the object was not clear. Suddenly the village urchins crowded around to have a view of such a mad man who turned up and down the stones and pricked his knife in the tasteless earth. Why should there be such a large slab of stone ? A piece of bone—whose can that be? One boy came boldly forward and said "you are a fool. If you need more of such bones, I show you a better place ". I followed him blindly to the north of the village and he led me on to a ditch. What an amazing scene! The villagers had done my job. They had exposed good sections by removing the earth for manuring their fields. In the sections hang masonry walls, sometimes covered by a row of stones, and within were sticking bones — lot of them—with sherds scattered here and there. A little digging brought out a full skull and a complete pot: I thanked the boy and said, "I have got the full share of bones". Here was spread before me the whole graveyard that had been cut by the Chitral road, and many a ploughshare had ribbed open the bones of old. Nay, the graves had penetrated right down into the village home which were standing over them. The village folks had no knowledge that they were sitting over the graves of by-gone people.

Our object fulfilled, we proceeded ahead along the Jandul river and reached the important state headquarter of Munda. Here again the road branched into two—one led to the north towards Shahi, beyond which lay Bin Shahi and further ahead ran the ranges of Hinduraj that separated Pakistan from Afghanistan. These are the offshoots of the well-known Hindukush hill, whose snow-capped tops showed in the distance. The preservation of such names like Shahi, Bin Shahi, Hinduraj and Hindukush, is

not without any significance. In this area occasionally we obtain the coins of the Hindu Shahi rulers. It is, therefore, not unreasonable to associate these names with those Hindu rulers who survived late in this area. When we proceeded further and reached the deserted village of Khar (correctly *Shahr*, meaning city), we were shown in a military camp a few terracotta objects collected from Tordheri, where a new fort was under construction. These terracotta figurines were typical of the Hindu Shahi period. Khar, which is so well described by Babar, [12] has today only a small plastered brick mosque of the time of Aurangzeb and a *chashma* (pond) which belonged to an old Mughal garden, now completely gone. The old city is prostrate on the ground. Further ahead the road led beyond Nawagai (Arigaeum of Alexander's historians) to Nawa pass—the pass through which Alexander must have entered Pakistan. We diverted our journey northward to Shinkot, wherefrom an inscribed casket[13] of the time of Menander had been earlier found. The old mound stands in an open plain just by the side of a *Khwar*. At a short distance stands the modern fort of Enayet Qila, where it was not possible for us to go. Later Mr. F.A. Durani paid a visit to the place and noticed the scatter of a large number of grave stone slabs in the field. This was the furthest extent we traced the graves on the west.

On our return from Bajaur and Dir we proceeded to Swat where the Italians had been excavating Buddhist remains for a number of years. This area had been explored earlier by Sir Aurel Stein[14] and later Professor G. Tucci[15] had gone deeper into the problems of the Buddhist monuments here. But when we reached Swat, we found that the Italians had already excavated three cemeteries in the vicinity of Mingora and their store room was full of pots from these graves. The story of the discovery of these graves in Swat was nowhere told. We learn from C.S. Antonini that "In the years 1956-60, Professor Tucci had thoroughly explored the zones around the city of Saidu Sharif (Swat State), finding there, among other things, many ceramic fragments which he himself recognized as protohistorical. They formed part of the material whch came to light after the infiltration of tombs. Later, the members of the Italian Archaeological Mission were able to localize the burial zone thanks to the discovery of human bones and slabs of stone".[16] G. Stacul again writes: "during widespread exploration and research extending over several years throughout the Swat region (W. Pakistan), Professor Giuseppe Tucci, as early as 1958, detected the presence of various necropolises".[17] But in the "preliminary report on an archaeological survey in Swat", published by Professor Tucci himself, no reference to any "necropolis" is made. Obviously the discovery is of a later date when the Italians had already started work on the Buddhist remains. It is likely

that the information about the graves may have been supplied by the local village diggers. G. Stacul[18] himself records one such information about some tombs in Karora area. He writes: "In 1961, during the construction of a road that links the valley of the Swat with the valley of the Indus (West Pakistan), some tombs were found six miles outside of Karora, near the village of Kherai. Thanks to the courteous information of Major Riaz, of the Corps of Engineers of the Pakistan Army, the Italian Archaeological Mission carried out a first survey of the site, during which two vases from damaged tombs were recovered".

When we reported the discovery of these graves to Mr. M.A. Shakoor, the then Curator of the Peshawar Museum, he showed to us some pots sent to him by the political agent, Malakand Agency, which contained some bones and ashes. Later we recognized a type of terracotta figurine in the museum that must have originally come from one such grave. Still later Mr. Waliullah Khan, the then Superintendent of Archaeology, West Pakistan Circle, informed us of the existence of such graves at the foot of the hill where much later the Buddhists erected their own monastery at Jamalgarhi —a place which must have been passed by Alexander. In the early fifties the Irrigation Department was cutting an irrigation channel from the newly-built Dargai headworks. In the course of digging the earth near Panchpir (not far from Hund) near the Indus (See fig. No. 1) the workers had encountered a few graves. Mr. (later Dr.) Nazimuddin Ahmad, the then Assistant Superintendent of Archaeology, West Pakistan Circle, paid a visit to the site and collected some materials, but nothing was done to probe into the subject further.

The credit must go to the Italians for digging for the first time these graves in Swat and they were the first to speak of them as "pre-Buddhist."[19] Professor Tucci extended the date further by attributing them to the "Asvakayana-Assakenoi" of the time of Alexander.[20] In the first Italian publication C.V. Antonini Vaguely surmised, "it seems to us particularly close to the ceramic production of the locality of Tepe Hissar II B".[21] Even after recognizing this analogy, the Italians were too much obsessed with their Buddhist studies. Antonini further reiterates the fact that "they are pre-Buddhist, that they have fairly persuasive analogies to Iranian culture and partially too with that of Asia Minor".[22] Unfortunately in the publication, except for this surmise no comparison is given. In the second *publication* again G. Stacul[23] preferred to use the title "Pre-Buddhist necropolises in Swat". He has been intelligent enough to classify the graves on the basis of stratigraphy into three chronological periods. But even finding good com-

parisons of pottery types with those from Tepe Hissar and other sites in Iran, he says: "We think it is right to stress the analogies with pottery in moved from the deepest levels at Charsada (6th—4th century B.C.)"[24] This bias for late dating is apparently due to Professor Tucci's attribution of these graves to the "Asvakayana—Assakenoi".

Right from the beginning we have had no such bias. In these graves we have materials that are bound to throw light on the bronze and iron ages of Gandhara—a protohistoric period that must take back the history of Gandhara before the time of the Achaemenians.

1. Sten Know, *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum,* Vol. II, *Kharoshthi Inscriptions, Calcutta,* 1929, p. 165.
2. *Journal of the Research Society of Pakistan, Vol. II.* 1966.
3. W.W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great,* Cambridge, 1948, and the references therein to the contemporary historians.
4. Sir Olaf Caroe, *The Pathans,* London, 1962, Chapter III.
5. Sir Aurel Stein, *On Alexander's Track to the Indus,* 1929.
6. A.H. Dani, *A Short History of Pakistan,* Book One, Karachi, 1967, p. 92.
7. Caroe, *Op. Cit.,* p. 52.
8. *Babar's Memoirs,* Eng. Tr. by Mrs. Beveridge, p. 367.
9. *Ibid.* p. 376.
10. R.C. Majumdar, *The Classical Accounts of India,* Calcutta, 1960, p 11.
11. *Ancient Pakistan,* Vol. I, 1964, p. 126.
12. *Babar's Memoirs,* Eng. Tr. by Mrs. Beveridge, pp. 367-68.
13. *Epigraphia Indica,* Vol. XXIV, pp. 1-8.
14. A. Stein, *An Archaeological Tour in Upper Swat and Adjacent Hill Tracts, Memoirs of the Archaeological* Survey of India.
15. G. Tucci, *'Preliminary Report on an archaeological survey in Swat',* in *East and West,* Vol. 9, Rome, 1958, pp. 279-328.
16. *East and West,* Vol. 14, Rome, 1963, p. 13.
17. *Ibid,* Vol. 16, 1966, p. 37.
18. *Ibid,* Vol. 16, 1966, p. 261.
19. *Ibid,* Vol. 14, 1963, p. 25.
20. *Ibid,* Vol 14, 1963, pp. 27-28.
21. *Ibid,* Vol. 14, 1963, p. 25.
22. *Ibid,*
23. *Ibid,* Vol. 16, 1966, pp. 37-79.
24. *Ibid,* p. 78.

SECTION — 3

GEOGRAPHICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The story of the discovery, narrated in the last section, took us from the frontier of Pakistan in Bajaur to the neighbourhood of Hund, which

was the ancient crossing of the river. We followed in the foot-steps of Alexander the Great and climbed over many a hill and passed through several valleys until we were down in the plains of Peshawar. It was not possible for us to go into the hill-girt valley, where dominates the Khan of Nawagai —the village which leads to Nawa Pass (6000 feet high) on the western frontier and opens out through a Khandao ('break in the hill') into the plain of Bajaur. Southward there are several routes from Nawagai leading to Gandhav and onward to Shabqadar and Charsada. Two of them have been frequently used in the past—the Kharappa valley route and the Ambar pass route. Alexander chose to march into Bajaur along a perennial river and a fertile plain, where survives today the important centre of Khar. Our story of the graves begins in this plain. Onward an important hill torrent (Khwar) coming from Barwa joins the river Jandul at a point where stands the *tehsil* headquarter of Munda. Further on the river moves forward to meet with Panchkora, not far from T imargarha. Panchkora is generally identified with Guraeus probably seeking Gurae in the modern word (Panch) Kora. According to Alexander's historians the river gave its name to the land and also to the people, who are referred to as "Guraeans". In other words the names of the people, the land and the river are derived from the same basic root. That name should now be restored from the present survival of Panch Kora i.e. five Kora or *Kura* or *Kurav* or *Kurae*. If we interchange the name we get Kura-panch, which strongly recalls *Kuru-Panchala* of the upper Ganges-Jamuna Doab. Should we seek in these people the forgotten *Uttara-kurus*, the Northern Kurus? The answer is difficult to give.

Beyond the land of the Guraeans to-day we cross over the Kamrani pass and reach the open Talash valley where there are two dominating points, Ziarat of Mujawar Baba and the old ruined city of Uchh. The valley converges on Chakdara pass, standing right over Swat river. Here in this valley Alexander met the forces of Assacenians and stormed their fort of Massaga, not far from Ziarat. At present a *Khwar* flows below the old fort and meets with Swat river near Cha dara. No other people's name is mentioned by Alexander's historians, though his forces stormed Ora and Bazira, which are identified respectively with Udegram and Barikot on the right bank of the river Swat. But the upper Swat valley is separate from that of Talash, and we also learn that the king of "Abhisares" in Hazara district was sending help to Ora. This must be across the river Indus over a northern point. Fortunately the Italians have excavated a grave site near Kherai not far from the Indus. Much later in history when the Yusufzai Pathans

crossed over to Swat, the older Swatis moved onward to Hazara where they are still seen.

The Assacenoi is generally restored to Sanskrit *Asvakayana* and it is to these people that Professor Tucci attributed the graves probably because we have little knowledge of any other people in the "pre-Buddhist" period of the history of this region. But while the Assacenians are said to be in Talash valley and probably also in Swat, the graves have a wider distribution.

From Swat several routes lead to Peshawar plain. Today we motor over the Malakand pass and come to Dargai (meaning "the village at the Pass"). At the eastern end from Barikot we climb up the Karakar pass and reach Buner valley and going out again through Ambela pass we come to Sudama plain of the Chinese pilgrims, wherein stands Shahbazgarhi. In between Malakand and Karakar we have the Shahkot pass that connects Chakdara, Thana and Jamalgarhi via Sanghao and Katlang. Jamalgarhi and Takhtbahi both stand on an offshoot of the Paja hill, which is broken in several places. The route via Takhtbahi rounds the abrupt end of the hill and that at Jamalgarhi passes through a gap made by a *Khwar*. The northern area is stony and dry and the area south of this hill is the fertile plain of Peshawar. There are two more outcrops in the southern plain — the noble heights of the Karamar hill that finish off at Shahbazgarhi and provide the stone block for the Asokan rock edicts, and the second provides a support for the northern bank of the river Kabul. In the northern area the graves have been located at Jamalgarhi and in the southern area at Panchpir and Pehur.

In Peshawar plain the main opponent of Alexander was Astes, the chief of Pushkalavati, who was the head of the people called Astakenoi, sometimes Sanskritised as *Hastinayana*, but more correctly *Astakayana* — a name which is preserved in Hashtnagar.

It is not possible to stretch back the historical geography of the time of Alexander in great detail. In the 6th century B.C. Gandhara formed a part of the Achaemenian empire. Darius sent a naval expedition under Skylax of Caryanda down the Indus but from him very little information has come down to us. Kaspatyrus, the place wherefrom Skylax started his journey, has not yet been correctly identified. Herodotus informs: "There are Indians of another tribe; who border on the city of Caspatyrus, and the country of Pactyica; these people dwell northward of all the rest of the

Indians, and follow nearly the same mode of life as the Bactrians. They are more warlike than any of the other tribes and from them the men are sent forth who go to procure the gold." Herodotus has carefully recorded that the other Indians (Probably of the plain east of the river Indus) formed the twentieth Satrapy of the Persian empire while the northern tribes, which included "the Sattagydians, the Gandarians, the Dadicae, and the Aparytae, who were all reckoned together", formed the seventh satrapy. We need not discuss the identification of the tribes. For our purpose it is enough to remember that they all paid taxes to the Persian emperor and that each one of them was a distinct tribe living in a defined region. For this very period of the Achaemenians we have another source in the great Sanskrit grammarian, Panini, who was born at Salature, identified with the ruins at Lahur, about four miles west of Hund (restored as mediaeval Waihind and ancient Udbhandapura). His grammatical work gives the name of the country as Gandhari or Gandhara and refers to the rivers Sindhu and Suvastu. Dr. V. S. Agrawala, in his *India as known to Panini,* has gleaned the materials from the Sanskrit sources and tried to Sanskritize some modern names in this region. He restores Dir as Dviravati — i.e. the land lying in between two rivers. Massaga he takes to be Masakavati, which was actually a river that flowed by the city. The Mohmand tribe, now living in the hill agency between Shabqadar and Bajaur, is recognised as Madhumant tribe, the Shinwari tribe as Asani, the Karshabun as Karshapana, the Powindas as Pavindas, the Wana plain in South Waziristan as Vanavya country, Tira as Triravati (the Land between three rivers), and finally the Afridi tribe as Apritas. He has further suggested Hridgola for Hidda or Hadda, Andhakavarta for Andkhui, Rohitagiri as the old name of Hindukush, and Tri-kakud as the old name of Takht-Sulaiman. The identifications of Dr. Agrawala are apparently appealing but they are based on the assumption that the present geography and the tribal distribution have remained constant. Fluctuations in the historical geography, tribal migrations in history and later historical records have all been set aside to satisfy the ardent zeal of the scholar. However, if all the Sanskrit names catalogued here, do refer to this region the knowledge of our historical geography is really enriched. In this doubt one thing is certain that the people of the hill are referred to by the general designation of *Ayudhajiviganas,* i.e. "people who lived by the profession of arms", — a description which agrees with what Herodotus has written about them.

Before the Achaemenians Gandhara was a well-knit kingdom. Prof. H.C. Raychaudhuri, in his *Political History of Ancient India,* sums up the evidence, "In the middle of the sixth century B. C. the throne of Gandhara

was occupied by Pukkusati (Pushkarasarin) who is said to have sent an embassy and a letter to King Bimbisara of Magadha, and waged war on Pradyota of Avanti who was defeated." He is also said to have been threatened in his own kingdom by the Pandavas who occupied a part of the Panjab as late as the time of Ptolemy".

The reference to the Pandavas recalls the whole story of the Indian epic, the *Mahabharata*, in which the Pandavas played a dominant role. But though the Pandavas are regarded in the Indian tradition to belong to the Kuru tribe, Prof. Hopkins, in his *The Religions of India*, thinks that they were an unknown folk connected with the wild tribes located north of the Ganges. This opinion is based on the strange custom of the Pandavas, particularly their polyandrous marriage system. In order to reconcile with Indian tradition should we take them as belonging to the branch of the *Uttara-kurus?* Whatever may be the truth, the appearance of the Pandavas in ancient history of this region, set the ball rolling that culminated in the great *Mahabharata* war. In the post-Vedic period the Kurus were the dominant tribe in the upper Ganges valley, while one of their kings, Janmejaya by name, is said to have advanced right upto Takshasila. According to the Indian traditional history, the *Puranas,* the Gandhara princes were the descendants of the Druhyu tribe. While Druhyus will be discussed below, it is worthwhile noting that the emergence of the Pandavas and the *Mahabharata* war inaugurated a new era in the ancient history of Pakistan and northern India. It is after this period that we have a continuous history as told in the Puranas.

As far as the history of this region is concerned, we are in the realm of traditions. We may note others as well. Arrian, in *The Anabasis*, records about Nysa: 'In this country, lying between the rivers Cophen and Indus, which was traversed by Alexander, the city of Nysa is said to be situated. The report is that its foundation was the work of Dionysus, who built it after he had subjugated the Indians. But it is impossible to determine who this Dionysus was, and at what time, or from what quarter he led an army against the Indians. For I am unable to decide whether the Theban Dionysus, starting from Thebes or from the Lydian Tmolus, came into India at the head of an army, and after traversing the territories of so many warlike nations, unknown to the Greeks of that time forcibly subjugated none of them except that of the Indians." In another place Arrian writes: "the Indians between the river Sindu and Kabul were in ancient times subject to the Assyrians, the Medes, and finally, to the Persians under Cyrus". We

have seen earlier the Persian conquest of Gandhara after Pukkusati, but of the earlier conquests we know nothing.

With the name of the Druhyus we come to still earlier period, when dim light is thrown on the tribes of this region from the Rigveda. The Druhyus appear as one of the ten tribes who fought in the *Battle of the Ten Kings* on the bank of the river Ravi. It is strange that the Kurus do not participate in this famous battle. In fact their name is not mentioned at all in the Rigveda. It is therefore legitimate to assume that the period of the Rigveda is pre-Kuru age. The Druhyus in the Rigvedic time are supposed to have lived between the rivers Chenab and Ravi, but later their princes are known to have occupied Gandhara. Along with them five western tribes are mentioned. "The Pakthas, Bhalanases, Vishanins, Alinas, and Sivas were the five frontier tribes. The Pakthas lived in the hills from which the Krumu originates. Zimmer locates them in eastern Afghanistan, identifying them with the modern Pakthun. South of the Pakthas stretched the Bhalanases for whom Zimmer suggests east Kabulistan as original home. The Vishanins, so-called probably because their helmets were horn-shaped or ornamented with horns, were, like their allies, a tribe of the north-west located farther down between the Krumu and the Gomati. Northeast of Kafiristan has been suggested as the location of the Alinas, who were closely allied with the Pakthas. The Sivas lay between the Sindhu and Vitasta in the Vedic period." But west of the river Indus in Swabi Tehsil we have still an ancient village bearing the name of Siva.

In the Rigveda we get the names of the rivers Sindhu, Kubha (Kabul), Suvastu (Swat), Krumu (Kurram), Gomati (Gomal) and a few other smaller ones, and also of the region called Gandhari. Beyond this literary evidence our sources fade out. To go beyond this time is to probe into the linguistic prehistory—a period when the philologists have talked about the arrival of the Aryans in this part of the world. Who were these people? Wherefrom did they come? What was their cultural equipment? The answers have been given on the basis of philological reconstruction. But their history yet remains to be substantiated in archaeology. Before we turn to the archaeological evidence, we sum up the historical outline below:

1.— The emergence of the Aryans.

2.— The age of the Druhyus and the five western tribes, the Pakthas, Bhalanases, Alinas, Sivas and Vishanins.

3.— The age of the Kurus, the Pandavas, the Mahabharata war, and the later Druhyus.

4.— The time of Pukkusati.

5.— The Achaemenian age.

6.— Alexander's invasion.

The true historical period begins from no. 5 onward. From 1 to 4 is the protohistoric period when dim light is thrown from literature. Prior to No. 1 is the prehistoric period, of which we know nothing from literature.

SECTION — 4

GANDHARA GRAVE CULTURE — A DEFINITION

In an earlier article I had titled the subject as "Gandhara Grave complex in West Pakistan[1]" and further clarified, "The proposition does not imply that the graves are special to Gandhara. It simply means that in the present state of our exploration they are spread throughout this region. With the widening of our exploration we are likely to find them in the area east of the Indus river." That hope still remains to be fulfilled as it has not so far been possible for us to move out into that region[2]. Meanwhile we have completed our study of the materials so far brought to light, and this study has enabled us to define the terms in a positive manner. We have passed the stage of the preliminary study and are now in a position to present the different facets of Gandhara Grave Culture.

The term Gandhara has so far been applied in archaeology to a particular school of art and the associated Buddhist culture that developed in this region in the early centuries of the Christian era. Prior to the beginning of this art archaeology has traced back the material culture to at least the dawn of the historic period when the Achaemenian Iranians, in the sixth century B.C., incorporated this region within their empire. Earlier than this time our historical notion has been vague and mythological. The graves have broken these myths and today we can talk in terms of real human achievement. The Gandhara Grave Culture has opened up two periods of archaeological studies in this region— those of the Bronze Age and the Iron Age. The Aryan myths of the Vedic literature will now be understood on the solid material foundation of these two ages. As the culture belongs to a people or peoples, whose names have not been revealed to us in our ex-

cavations, we have preferred to derive the archaeological terminology from two main factors: firstly the culture is known to us mainly from the grave goods and secondly it was first discovered in this region. We have again chosen the term "culture" so as to fit the material equipments to the hill pattern of the region where it is now being studied. Gandhara Grave Culture thus presents a pattern of living in the hill zone of Gandhara, as evidenced in the graves, and shows how the peoples, who were equipped with poor bronze and iron tools and weapons, adapted themselves to the natural resources.

As will be discussed in the following sections, this culture is fundamentally different from the Indus Civilization and has also little relation with the Baluchi village cultures. While the Indus Civilization was rooted in the intense cultivation of the fertile soil of the main Indus valley, the Baluchi village cultures grew athwart the land routes that connected the Indus Zone with the main theatres of civilisation in Western Asia. The Baluchi cultures represented a back wash of the cvilisations that developed in the river plains on the east and the west. The Gandhara Grave Culture, though originating in the Bronze Age and continuing in that of the Iron, represents a different phenomenon of history and is apparently connected with another move, or moves, of the people, that shows strong links with northern Iran and Central Asia. They introduced the Bronze Age in Ganhara west of the river Indus and ushered in an era of plain pottery tradition, as opposed to the painted pottery of the Indus Civilization. The plain pottery is seen in two wares, grey and red. The plain grey ware is a harbinger of this culture and marks the introduction of a completely new tradition in West Pakistan. The further development of this grey ware when it came in contact with the painted tradition of the main Indus plain, yet remains to be seen. But it is not improper to seek the origin of the painted grey ware[3], known from East Panjab and the Upper Ganges Valley in India, to the developments of this grey ware in the intervening plains between the Indus and East Panjab.

The next section will give the detail of three main burial ritual practices known from the graves: (i) inflexed burial, (ii) urn burial after cremation and (iii) fractional and multiple burials. These three practices, no doubt, speak of three different rituals and they reveal to us the knowledge of two different metal technologies, yet in the general pattern of life there seems little change. It is for this reason that we have used the term culture in the singular. It is easy to understand that the pattern was conditioned more by the hill environment than by the possible developments in the

plains. When in future new developments are seen in the plains, new terms would be evolved to suit the change. For the time we are dealing with the Gandhara Grave Culture of the hill zone, where the introduction of bronze as well as iron made life little different from the neolithic stage, as is surmised from a few survival of the ground stone tools in this late context.

The settlement pattern is very significant. All the sites show the people settling on the hill slopes more towards the stretch of the land beginning from the foot hill to the brink of the near-by flowing river. The terraced cultivation was no doubt the chief feature, as is also seen today, but the very fact that the graves are concentrated in a limited area, while the occupation goes right upto the brink of the then river bed suggests that the river water must have been used for limited irrigation, as is the practice in the present day. In fact away from the river we have not been able to trace the settlement to any great depth. How far the pasture land of the hill slopes added to the economy of the people is difficult to say? But it is fair to presume that while the grave people extended the earlier cultivation towards the river, the higher slopes were used for grazing the cattle.

Unfortunately we have not been able to find specimens of corns in our excavations nor have we been able to get a full report on the animal bones. It is, however, well to underline the fact that horse played a significant role in the life of the people.

The architecture was based on stone masonry. In the graves as well as in the last period settlement at Balambat we find rubble stone masonry used without any mortar, though mud plaster is seen in the houses. At Thana long slabs of schist stones were cut out from the living rock to serve as floor for the dead bodies. At Timargarha large slabs of stones were used to make the box-like graves. These stone blocks were properly chiselled, and the inner face, which lined the graves, were duly pecked with sharp tools in order to give a flat surface. As the walls are preserved just above the four dations, it is difficult to suggest whether the people made use of timber for holding the rubble stones, as is known today in this locality. We have no information about the village planning, nor have we been able to trace a complete house with all its requirements. No drain has so far been found. But the presence of circular and rectangular storage rooms with a connecting platform, suggests extra store of corns. On the whole the architecture was simple. No decorative element has so far been found.

We have little information about the religion of the people except their burial rites. In the settlement area, excavated by us, no temple complex

has been found, nor have we been able to discover any statuary or sculpture. We have, however, discovered a few terracotta human figurines, both male and female. It is not possible to take them as deities for worship at this stage. In the section on small finds it will be shown how they are technically related to the so-called 'baroque ladies' discovered from the historic sites in this region. Our specimen (Pl. Ll) also shows cross-band (channavira) on the body but there are other fundamental differences. We do not find on them elaborate head-dress. They show only brief ornaments — a necklace consisting of circlets scratched around the neck. The back of the head is pressed with a finger. What could be the purpose of these figurines? They are obviously not toys, as the whole manner of depiction is highly ritualistic. If we could generalise from one specimen found in our grave, it is possible to surmise that these figurines have some totemic significance. The rarity of such figurines in the settlement site points to their not very common use by the people.

This totemic idea is not limited to the figurines alone. It is possible to see a similar meaning in the use of the visage urn in connection with the second type of burial. These urns prominently show the mouth, the nose, the eyes and the eye-brow as if by representing them, the urn typifies a stylised human face. These urns are definitely not meant for worship. Then what could be the sense behind this human facial representation? As the urns contain only human bones, it is not necessary to specify them by such representation as human burial. And when we realise that this type of burial is a development from the earlier inflexed burial and is again distinguishable from the later fractional and multiple burials, it is possible to imagine a special part played by the visage urns in relation to the rite of cremation. Even the later people, who did not practise cremation, when burying their dead in the older graves, did not destroy the urns found by them but removed them to a side. It seems that there was some sanctity attached to the burial rite though we do find some disturbance caused by the later people.

We have found no definite evidence of any human sacrifice practised by these people. Multiple burials are seen in the second and third types of the graves but in both these cases the bones could be preserved elsewhere and buried together later, or in a few cases we have the actual evidence of the re-opening of the earlier graves. A number of graves, particularly in the last period, have shown double burial, representing male and female skeletons. It is possible that they are husband and wife, but as they are not cremated, we cannot take them as a case of the burning of the widow on the

husband's funeral pyre. But the way in which the skeletons lie face to face, leg-on-leg, clasping each other, is highly suggestive of a particular rite that must have prevailed in the last period of the graves. Does this represent a willing sacrifice of the wife on her husband's death? In any case the burial customs, seen here, are fundamentally different from that known to the Hindus in India. As will be shown in the next section, only at Harappa in the post-Indus Valley period a few graves have been found, which contain inflexed burial of the type seen here in the first period. In these graves again the pot forms are simple and plain, though we have a few survivals from the earlier period. How do we account for these limited number of inflexed burials at Harappa?

The small finds and the pot forms discovered in the graves give us some more detail about the people. Besides the cooking pot, which was obviously a food vessel, we generally get a bowl-on-stand and a tall drinking vase. For drinking purposes we sometimes get a medium-sized drinking goblet and a small drinking cup. Sometimes we also have a handled drinking glass and a cup or bowl on footed stand. While the bowl-on-stand is, with a few exceptions, in red ware, the drinking vessels are usually in grey ware. The bowl-on-stand is a type different from the fruit-dish-on-stand seen in the Indus Civilization. The Gandhara Grave type is persistent throughout and must be associated with a particular kind of ritual. In the settlement site its number is limited. The grey drinking vessels are so dominant in the graves that it is possible to think of some special drink popular among these people. Spouted vessels are rather rare. Their number increased in the last period. For pouring liquid we also find jars with pinched mouth or a cup having a hole at the bottom. Food habits can be guessed from the flat dish *(thali)*, which is very convenient for eating rice. Curry bowls and dishes have also been found. In the settlement site we obtained flat-bottomed troughs with lugs on either side. Some of these troughs were made of very poor clay and also not very well fired. They could be used for three different purposes—for kneading dough, for washing clothes and for baking bread. Several varieties of jar lids have been found. The knobs of these lids are different from those found in the historic period. One of the lid knob, found in Swat, significantly adopts the form of a horse. For storing liquid we get narrow-mouthed bottles and in the last period water was kept in the long-necked *Surahis* (bottle pitchers). We have not found any brazier in the graves, though in the settlement site we recovered a vase with holes from the Achaemenian level. Storage jars take the form of the enlarged version of the cooking pot. Same form is used for burial urns but for storing water we

have several shapes. One form, which still persists in India, is a globular vase with a narrow long-necked mouth. This is the *Kalasa* type, which the ladies generally use to carry water from a pond. The *Kalasa* is placed at the waist on a side and one arm goes around the neck to hold it to its place. The long neck is very convenient to take the arm around.

The metal objects and their techniques are very important in defining the culture. Apart from gold and silver, copper was the chief metal used in the first two periods. Iron came in use only in the third period. Copper was used with tin as an alloy and both the techniques of hammering and casting were known. Iron smithery was also quite well advanced but the weapons, like the spear-heads, do not show well-formed mid-ribs. However, the metal technology was the dominant factor in the life of the people. Though the number of the metal objects is limited, probably due to poverty rather than lack of knowledge, we find the influence of technology in other aspects of life. Some of the pots definitely show metal forms. The construction of stone-built graves and the quarrying of huge slabs of stones reflect the use of metal tools. They were also used for weapons, house-hold objects, toilet materials, ornaments and other miscellaneous purposes. It is therefore reasonable to infer that the Gandhara Grave people were already in the metal age. This metallurgy does not appear to have been derived from the Indus Civilization, but the comparative study makes it clear that the knowledge of metal was brought by these people from the west. They introduced a full blooded metal age in the hill zone west of the Indus — the area where so far we have found the persistence of the neolithic pattern of life.

Among the small finds in the graves the largest number is that of the long pins having varieties of head tops. They are all cast in bronze. Mr. Rahman has discussed below (see part IV) the purpose of these pins and has rightly stressed on their wide popularity. In the Balambat settlement site they survived in the Achaemenian level. We have also got pins of ivory but in this material the type is limited to one. The most noteworthy among these are the loop-headed examples, which have a single coil and have been rightly compared with the Hissar specimens. The presence of eye needles in the graves is remarkable as they indubitably attest the stitching of garments. Besides the antimony rods of ivory, we have a remarkable long handled small blade type of toilet object. Its purpose is not certain, though it is possible that it was used for mixing paste. Among the iron objects the long ladle-like spoon, the spear-head and three ringed cheek-piece of a horse's snaffle are worth noting. Among the ornaments we should spe-

cify the pendants, ear rings and finger rings. The finger rings are made of spiral copper wire while the ear-ring is remarkable with its spikes around the ring. Beads of precious stones were also in use.

The most prolific among these beads is the terracotta biconical type. These could hardly be used as beads. Some have taken them for spindle whorls while others take them for net-sinkers. They could be used for either purpose. It must, however, be pointed out that the present day net-sinkers are rather barrel-shaped and have bigger holes while the spindle whorls are generally truncated conical shape. In any case there is no bar to using them as net-sinkers. When it is known that the Panchkora river is good for fishing even today, it is reasonable to infer that fish was also then caught by some means.

On the whole the grave materials introduce to us a rapidly developing culture of a people or peoples who were fast growing. The development in the three different periods is remarkable and their rapid move throughout the region is none the less striking. In contrast with the Indus Valley Civization, which was rather static through the centuries, the Gandhara grave culture was fast growing by not only borrowing materials from outside but also by developing new forms in course of evolution. This development is best seen in the changing forms of the pots. Whether we take the cooking pots, or the bowl-on-stand or even the tall drinking glass, we can easily trace the course of evolving shapes. This rapid change speaks of wider contact and buoyant youth. It is true that because of the poverty of the region we are unable to see its fully developed form. However, it is hoped that future discoveries in the plains may bring out more clearly the different facets of this culture.

NOTES

1. The article was sent for publication in *Asian Perspective* in June 1966 but because of some difficulties the journal could not come out in time. A summary was published in five instalments in *Pakistan Times*, Lahore, on 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22 September, 1966.
2. Now our programme is set to start exploration in February, 1968.
3. B.B. Lal, 'The Painted Grey Ware of the upper Gangetic Basin: an approach to the problems of the Dark Age', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, (Letters)*, XVI (1950), pp. 89 ff.

SECTION — 5

RITUAL PRACTICES AND MATERIAL EQUIPMENT

The grave furniture and the material objects discovered at Balambat Settlement site abundantly make it clear that here we are dealing with people or peoples who in the first two periods knew the working of copper and in the last grave period got the knowledge of iron. Besides, gold and silver were also familiar though their ornaments were rather scarce. On the whole the use of metal was not very profuse. In the last period iron was exclusively used for weapons and implements. Copper objects were either cast or hammered out, and they mostly served as toilet materials but in Swat Copper harpoon, arrow-heads and knife-blades have also been found (see Stacul).

Among the copper objects the long slender pins with top heads predominate in quantity as well as in variety. They have been observed near the head or sticking to the skull, suggesting that they were used as hairpins, or probably to keep the scarf tied round the head. The presence of eye-needles in the graves is an important evidence for the stitching of the garments. The toilet equipment consists of antimony rods and an unidentified copper object having a flat blade on one end and long handle on the other, probably used for mixing red pigment. The ornaments include ear rings, finger-rings, pendants, beads and bangle.

The iron objects include spear-head, arrow-head, nails, spoon, "flat rectangular axe" (in Swat) and a cheek-bar of a horse's harness. The spear and arrow-heads show thickened mid-rib, described by Stacul as "swollen at the centre."

The animal terracotta figurines are conspicuously absent in the graves, though they have been found in the settlement site at Balambat. There we have found humped bull, ram's head and cat. Only in Swat a jar lid showed a handle in the shape of a horse. On the other hand from the graves have been found bones of goat, horse, stag, sheep, hare and snake. In Swat two complete skeletons of horses were also discovered.

At Timargarha we obtained only one terracotta human figurine from grave No. 183, which belongs to period III. Here the figurine was found near the pelvis of one of the two individuals buried in the grave. In the same grave the snake bones were found in the bowl-on-stand. This terracotta specimen is a male figurine with a cross band at the chest while the back of the head is pressed with thumb. Similar figurines have also been found in the Balambat settlement site. From Swat come many other varieties of human figurines, both male and female. One female specimen has a broad hip, slender waist and conjoined legs almost pillar-like—the prototype of the later mother-goddess. Stacul points out: "anthropomorphic figurines occupied a special position being placed under the arm-pits or head, or at any rate near the body." It is difficult to specify the purpose of these figurines. They do not appear to have been objects of worship. As they are limited only to the last period graves and further restricted to a few of them, they may have some totemic significance.

We are in a better position to speak of the burial rites of these people. Three distinct types of the disposal of the dead have been noted:

1) In the first type single individuals are buried in the graves along with funerary pots. Complete skeletons of these individuals have been found. These skeletons are generally aligned north-west to south-east, with rare exceptions, lying on one side, with their legs inflexed and hands drawn up towards the face, one palm of the hand generally resting on an open-mouthed flaring cup. It is possible that originally he was holding the cup. In general there are at least three types of vessels in such graves — a hand-made cooking pot of coarse red ware, a bowl-on-stand of red ware in medium fabric (see description on pottery), and either a tall drinking vase in grey ware or an open-mouthed small drinking cup in grey ware.

2) In the second type the individuals were burnt away from the graves. Their bones (a few of them), ashes and charcoal were collected and placed in urns. Sometimes the urns contained only bones, while the others had only ashes and some had nothing. It is in these urns that we get bones of more than one individual. This need not mean that other individuals were deliberately killed or burned along with the principal dead. We should not cite this as an example of human sacrifice, as is suggested by C.S. Antonini (*East and West*, Vol. 14, 1963, P. 15). The usual custom noted in India, is to collect the bones and ashes in urns for a later disposal. Here at Timargarha the urns were placed inside the graves. The bones or ashes were generally found in visage urns—large globular vases with an imitation

of human face on one side, showing a holed mouth, holed eyes, protruding nose and eye-lashes. The significance of this anthropomorphic representation is difficult to guess. Obviously it is not meant for worship but it has some relation to the concept of the dead.

3) In the third type several graves were found in which unburnt fractional bones of one or more than one individual were buried. Whatever bones were available were disposed of in the regular fashion of inflexed burial. The quantity of the bones varied from grave to grave. In some we obtained almost complete skeleton while in others only a few fragmentary bones were dumped in the middle of the grave. In many graves one skeleton was preserved to a greater extent while the bones of another were heaped in the middle. It is not possible that in all the cases the graves were disturbed. There is a strong possibility that here we have examples of burial after exposure — a practice which is so well attested in the ancient world. It is along with these graves of the fractional burial that we find the multiple burial of the unburned bones — a completely new ritual different from type No. 1. In some graves we found male and female buried, face to face, clasping each other. Do they represent husband and wife? Should we suppose that the wife is sacrificed at the death of the husband and is buried with him? Such questions cannot be definitely answered. But the manner in which one skeleton is lying in the proper inflexed position and the bones of another are dumped in the same grave suggests that the graves were re-opened at a later stage. Dr. Bernhard, the anthropologist who has examined the bones, is firmly of this opinion. If there was no custom of human sacrifice, and if the bones could not be preserved elsewhere, we must suppose that the graves were re-opened at some later stage when other persons died. It is in these multiple burial graves that the number of vessels is much large.

This practice of re-opening the graves brings us to the question of mixed graves — a terminology adopted by us for those graves in which we find a mixture of Nos. 1 and 3 or 2 and 3. We have never found a mixture of Nos. 1 and 2, suggesting that those who practised No. 2 type of burial did not have the custom of re-opening the earlier graves. It is difficult to conceive that two different burial rites should occur in the same grave. If such was the general practice, that should have been the normal rule. But when such cases are limited, and even here there is a marked difference of the depth of burial, or in the case of cremation intentional removal of the urns to a corner, it is reasonable to suppose that the mixed burials are really mixtures of two different rites, practised by two different peoples.

probably at two different times. This suggestion does not mean that one ritual was completely given up at the end of one period and then another type of ritual started in the next period. What is implied is that in the succeeding periods new types of rituals were introduced possibly by new immigrants or at least by new infiltrating cultural trends. The new introduction did not mean the total annihilation of the earlier people or their practice. The survival of the earlier practices have been amply noted in the excavations at Thana and in Swat. But what we really mean is that a particular grave must belong to a people practising one and the same ritual. Multiple burials showing same rituals are possible but burials showing different rituals in the same grave are hardly likely in this early stage, unless, of course, it is postulated that co-existence of the peoples might have led to mutual cultural influences and the adoption of the other's practices. This is possible, particularly in religious matters, after a prolonged period.

Children's graves formed a different grouping by themselves in so far as the grave pit is smaller and is dug close to the ground surface. As the pit was small, it was possible to get one long slab to line one side of the pit, and thus we generally get box-like grave for children (see below for the description). In some graves meant for children we sometimes get the skeleton of adults. This is, of course, an exception. The same rituals are observed in the case of the children as seen for adults. In the anthropological report Dr. Bernhard has by an error written "that the inflexed burial of a single individual was the prevailing burial type in the case of children". Actually he examined only those bones which could give some definite anthropological information. The other small graves he has omitted as will be seen from his report. However, the excavators have noted the details of all the graves excavated by them. Their report clearly shows that we have children's graves showing cremation, inflexed burial as well as fractional burial. Dr. Bernhard again points out that in many graves, where cremation was noted, children's bones were also found in the urns. Similarly in the multiple burial graves children's bones have also been observed. Their exact implication is difficult to give. But some guess is possible.

In India where cremation is today practised, the dead are generally burned by the side of a river or a tank on a funeral pyre, and after the burning the burnt bones and the ashes are thrown in the water. Some persons, who live far away from the Ganges river, collect some small bones in a pot and take it with them for immersion whenever they go on a pilgrimage to the Ganges. Today the Hindus do not erect tombs but they have

only *Samadhis* — memorials to commemorate the dead. That has been the usual practice among the Hindus in history. But here at Timargarha the remains of the dead were ultimately buried whatever might have been the rituals observed by them. In the case of the complete and fractional burials the disposal was in the inflexed position as far as the preservation of the bones could allow. In the case of cremation the remains were first placed in the urns and then such urns were placed inside the grave pit. It is rare that the bones were found out-side the urns. The urns do not contain complete skeletons. Possibly they could not do so. Only limited number of bones were preserved inside the urns. What was done with the remainder, is difficult to say. Were they thrown in the river? Whatever they did, this type of burial rite is entirely different from that which the Hindus have been practising since historical time. Again the burial rites at Timargarha are entirely different from what is known in the cemetery at Harappa (see M.S. Vats — *Excavations at Harappa*, chapter VI). There Vats has noted two main types of burial — "earth-burials", in which the dead lay in an extended position on their backs. Only three graves (see his plate LIII, Nos. (a), (c) and (d) show inflexed burial. The second is "Pot-burial," in which the bones were placed after exposure. These two practices are not seen in the graves excavated by us.

Now, coming back to the multiple burial graves at Timargarha, the anthropological report shows the burial of individuals including male, female and children. Does this justify that one grave contained the remains of one family? Taking into consideration the trouble and time that were required to build the graves, we may fairly well conclude that the process was not an easy one. To save the trouble it was easier to use the same grave for more than one burial. This practice was, of course, not followed in type No. 1 graves. But in the other two types of graves this practice is usual. Again in multiple burial it is difficult to accept that the burial of strangers should be in one grave. The question of ownership necessarily implies that the persons buried together should belong to one kinship, probably to one family. Therefore it will not be wrong if we take them as family graves.

The detail of the burial rite cannot be fully made up. Besides the presence of ornaments, weapons and implements, several funerary vessels have been noted in the graves. One typical vessel is the cooking pot, which must be taken as a food container. The second is a bowl-on-stand or an offering bowl. In one such bowl bones of a snake were found. Should we take the snake for an offering? Or should we think that the snake somehow got into the grave later and ultimately stuck up dead in the bowl?

Though a few other animal bones have also been found in the graves, their number is rather limited. It seems highly unlikely that the animals were sacrificed for the burial. However, it is quite understable that something must have been offered in this bowl-on-stand. Other vessels are connected with drinking — a tall drinking vase, a medium-sized goblet or a small drinking cup with flaring mouth. The very fact that in the inflexed burial graves the hand is near the drinking vessel, suggests some special significance to the drink. In the cremation graves, besides the burial urn, we have water pitcher of different sizes. But in the fractional and multiple burial graves the variety of the pots greatly increases. The typical addition is the food dish *(thali)*, which became very common in the historical period, curry bowl of various shapes and sizes, long-necked *surahis*, and hour-glass type of drinking vase. The water pitchers of new shapes are found here. We also get a small cup with a hole at the bottom. It is obviously meant for pouring liquid. There is another handled vase with a pinched mouth for the same purpose. Among the lids we have different shapes of the handle. Some handles are inside the concave shaped saucer and some are outside. The horse-handled lid, found in Swat, is very significant. In one grave at Timargarha the looped handle of the lid was in the inner side of the urn (see photo in the frontis piece, where it has been deliberately kept up). Why the loop handle should be inside is difficult to say. Were the bones tied and hung up at the handle? Or, the handle has been wrongly placed at the outside of the lid. Usually the concave parts of the lids are facing upward.

At the end it may be pointed out that from Chitral we obtained a burial urn which shows a holed mouth in the same fashion as seen in the pots from our graves. As the Chitral pot is a chance find, it is diffcult to say whether it belonged to similar graves or not.

SECTION 6

COMPARISON AND CHRONOLOGY

The discovery of cemeteries in such a widely-distributed zone of the northern part of West Pakistan is a significant advance in our knowledge of the ancient people who inhabited this land. They have taken the archaeological history from the mute objects to the dead bones of human beings. Even though we may not know their names, it is possible to visualize cer-

tain racial types (see next section for detail) and relate the cultural products with these typical individuals. But as cultures could be borrowed, races could also get mixed up. Their products are the common achievements of man. Our analysis of the cultural traits and the racial types are just attempts to trace the various channels through which the progress of man is conditioned. It is only in this analysis that we see the give and take of man, the conflict of interests, the clash of ideas and final juxtaposition of various forces that result in the achievements of man.

Earlier several cemeteries had been excavated in the northern part of Iran around the Caspian Sea and also in Central Asia. In West Pakistan the cemetery[1] at Harappa has been well-known. Some graves in Baluchistan[2] have also been dug up. It is in the light of these neighbournig cemeteries that we shall try to understand our graves and place them in their proper sequence.

First of all the evidence from radio-carbon dates. The examination is unfortunately very limited. It was done on the bone materials of two individuals from grave No. 101 at the University of Heidelberg, West Germany. The lower burial gave an absolute age of 3380 ± 60 years and the upper one 2805 years. According to our classification the lower burial belongs to period I, for which we get a date about 15th-14th century B.C. The upper burial belongs to period III, for which the date is 8th-9th century B.C. It is hoped that the Italians will publish the results of their tests and thus we will have some confirmatory evidence. Meanwhile confirmation will be sought in our comparative study.

We will start our comparison with our latest period at Balambat settlement site, where we were fortunate to discover the buildings and materials belonging to the Achaemenian period. So far in Pakistan the Achaemenian period materials have been found in the excavations of Bhir mound at Taxila by Sir John Marshall[3] and at Bala Hisar in Charsada by Sir Mortimer Wheeler[4]. The Italian excavation of the settlement site at Udegram in Swat remains unpublished. It is therefore difficult to say what periods they have found there. But a storage jar (pl. XLVII, c), with a pointed bottom and rows of applied bands on the body, from our site has its counterpart in their excavation. Their specimen is now exhibited in the Swat Museum. This type of storage jar has not been illustrated either by Marshall or by Wheeler. It must, however, be noted that both at Bhir and Bala Hisar the Achaemenian period materials were not very significant. No particular type of building is associated with them. Wheeler alone has been clear in ana-

lysing the pot forms and giving a complete description, which is of great help for comparison. In our excavations the Achaemenian period introduces the painted pottery tradition. In the graves painting is not seen at all, except a thick black paint on the neck of the *Surahi* type vessel (our variety xix. see part III for detail). The painted pots bring in a new type of red ware having black paint on red slip. This red ware is entirely different from the one seen in the graves. The painted jar is a typical specimen (pl. XLVII, a), (see part VI for detail). From Taxila only gardrooned rim of a pot can be compared (See fig. 58, nos. 1 and 3, and *Taxila,* pl. 123, No. 75, but the shapes of the pots are different).

The pot-forms from Charsada are easy to compare. We have reproduced the comparable forms in fig. 61. Unfortunately Wheeler got only broken sherds. No complete sections could therefore be made. The first is what Wheeler calls "rippled rim ware" *(Charsada,* fig. 10/1 and fig. 11/1). There are many other examples illustrated by Wheeler. He has recognised the pot to be "a fairly large globular jar or cooking-pot, possibly round-bottomed". He further adds, "The buff-brown ware usually had a rough gritty surface, and was generally (perhaps not invariably) wheel-turned." This is our variety (i). Our complete specimens clearly show that they are cooking pots. We have several sub-varieties. The majority of our pots are hand-made and disc-based. Wheeler's description agrees with our fabric (b) ware, but we still prefer to use the term "red-ware", and not Wheeler's "buff-brown ware." We get the wheel-made examples only from period II onward, but hand-made ware remains the first choice and survives in our Achaemenian level at Balambat. In Charsada it is apparently a survival and Wheeler dates it between 550-325 B.C. in the context of his excavation. His work has clearly shown the upper date for this pottery, but its earlier occurrence is not precluded. In our grave excavation we have seen how the hand-made ware comes first and afterwards we get the wheel-turned pots.

The second is what Wheeler calls 'soapy red ware' *(Charsada'* fig. 10/4 and 11/5). He describes it as "richly red or reddish ware, sometimes hand-made and usually polished, with a pleasant soapy feel." This is our red ware of fabric 'c', which we get only in period III graves. Our pot forms are in very fine ware. Stacul describes it as 'red thin-sided ware', But Wheeler's specimens seem to be rather thick sectioned. Our examples are all wheel-turned. We have several forms in this ware. Wheeler speaks only of semi-circular bowls or cups, pedestals from vessels of uncertain shape and wavy-lined bowls. His forms are entirely different from ours. But his fig. 10/4 comes closer to our medium-sized drinking goblet (our variety V). However, our ware is different.

Stacul[6] has also compared *Charsada* fig. 10/3 with his fig. 70, g and i, and calls it "bell-shaped vase". We have described it under our variety (iii) — tall drinking vase. There are several sub-varieties. Stacul's examples fall in our sub-variety (a). Wheeler's specimen is in 'soapy red ware'. In our graves the drinking vases are all in grey ware. The red ware examples are few and far between, and even these are definitely not in 'soapy red ware'. In form the pots from Charsada and our graves show an apparent resemblance but actually there is a marked difference. The Charsada specimen gradually flares right from the base to the tip of the rim. Stacul's specimens as well as those found by us show first a vertical side upto the middle and thereafter flaring starts right up to the rim. That is the main principle in all our tall drinking vases, which keeps the waist narrow so that it is easier to grip it while drinking. This principle is not seen in the Charsada vase. However, it is possible to surmise that the Charsada example is a later survival.

We may compare also *Charsada* fig. 13/B with our pedestal-based deep bowl (variety XXVI, sub-variety b). Even *Charsada* fig. 13/A (not reproduced by us) has a distant similarity with Stacul's examples (see his fig. 71). Our examples are found only in period III graves. These have not been found in the Balambat settlement site. Wheeler's examples actually come from the unstratified site of Sari Dheri, about five miles away from Charsada.

Stacul has further compared *Charsada* fig. 11/10 with his fig. 74, c. This is our flat-based dish (variety XVIII, sub-variety a). We have found this only in period III graves. Actually this type of dish is seen on a stand, our variety (ii), sub-variety (g) (see Stacul's fig 74 no. e). Both these types are rare in our graves. We have found only two such dishes in our excavations. But more common in period III graves as well as in the Achaemenian level are the *thalis* (compare our variety XIV with Wheeler's fig. 10 nos. 7 and 8, not reproduced here). *Charsada* fig. 19/97, described by Wheeler as dish with incurved sides, has a distant resemblance with the troughs found by us in the Balambat site (see fig. 56 nos. 2 and 3). But our examples have all straight sides with additional lugs.

Finally Stacul has compared his fig. 68 no.e with *Charsada* fig. 14/36 (not reproduced here). Wheeler's example is a rippled rim while Stacul's is not. The Swat specimen is the same as our variety (ix) — globular urn with flaring rim. It is most unfortunate that Stacul has bracketted this form with his fig. 68 no. f, which is our variety (XVI) — water pitcher

having a collared rim. This last type is found only in period III graves and also in the Achaemenian level. This is the only example of thick rim formation in the graves, otherwise all the grave pots have the general tendency of simple rim forms, which are either everted, flaring or incurved. Only the *thalis* and a few bowls show flat-topped rims.

The Charsada specimens do not bear as close a resemblance as the Balambat settlement pottery (Achaemenian period) with those of the graves. This is quite understandable as the proximity of the graves necessarily left their legacy behind. However, one fundamental difference which Stacul (p. 77) has underlined: "At Charsada, however, all the biconical and hour-glass types are missing. These constitute the main group of vases in the Swat tombs of period III". These are also missing from the Balambat settlement site, both from the Achaemenian level as well as from the grave period III level. If this absence from our excavation is representative, we may say that those fine forms were manufactured only for the graves. Again it should be noted that the grey ware pots continued in all the periods of the graves. They have also been found in all the levels at the Balambat settlement, though in the Achaemenian period they are rather scarce. The grey ware pottery is the hall mark of the graves. Their total absence from Charsada places the graves apart from the latter both in culture as well as in time. But when some grave pot forms survive in Charsada, they are of no more significance than their occurrence in the Achaemenian level at Balambat site.

It is unfortunate that the comparable materials for the Achaemenian level, other than a few sherds are not available in Pakistan. With us we have only the publication[7] on "Excavations at Dahan-i-Ghulaman." We can compare our deep bowls fig. 59, no. 2 with the typical bowls from this site, (see his fig. 58 and 59). We have also got spout attached to this pot. This type is not found in the graves at all. But as Mr. Scerrato rightly points out this is typical in all the Achaemenian sites. At Dahan-i-Ghulaman has also been found *thali* (his fig. 61), as we have got several varieties at Balambat. Dahan-i-Ghulaman's simple deep bowl with tapering side (his Fig. 61 No. 3) can be compared with our ash-tray type of dish (Pl. XLIIIa). Another comparable example is our Fig. 58, No. 12 — a deep bowl with a central knob, serving the purpose of a lid. A variant of this type is seen at *Charsada* (Fig. 34/302 and 303) as well as in other historical sites. As Wheeler has pointed out this "has a wide distribution in time and space, from fourth millennium Mesopotamia to mediaeval and later India".

The determining factor in dating the later Balambat levels to the Achaemenian period is the presence of fire altars in almost all the rooms and evidence of rich iron industry. We can not take the fire altars as ovens because the type of the latter was entirely different in our excavation. These fire altars are always placed on high platforms or benches. They are not associated with any images. But on one of them there was a terracotta lamp *in situ* and others showed signs of burning. Again they can not be taken as fire places to be used during the winter. We do not know of any fire place raised high on a bench. We therefore compare these fire altars with those found at Dahan-i-Ghulaman. Our fire altars are in the private houses while in the latter place a public building for religious use has been found. On the other hand large amount of iron, including arrow-heads found in these levels recall the worlds of Herodotus, according to whom the local soldiers were armed with iron-tipped arrows. This statement does not mean that iron was introduced here by the Achaemenians. When Herodotus pointedly refers to this, it implies that iron smithery was a fairly established technique in this region. And we have seen how in the last period of the graves iron for the first time reached this part of the world.

The Achaemenian level structures cut across the walls of the last period grave settlers. The excavation has not revealed any break in the occupation. Hence the grave period settlement is taken immediately preceding the Achaemenian period. So far we have not found any grave in our excavations showing the typical cultural traits of the Achaemenian period. Even the stone masonry makes for the difference. Both in the graves as well as in their settlement structures dry rubble stone masonry is seen but in the Achaemenian period we see for the first time rough kind of stone diaper walls. All these evidences convince us to date the graves in the pre-Achaemenian period.

How far back can we go? In order to give the answer we will have to compare the excavated materials from the grave sites in Pakistan as well as outside. But before we do that, it is well to remember the definition of the grave culture given by us in an earlier section. Most important is to remember the change from the bronze age to iron age and the consequent transformations in the rituals as well as in the pot forms. We should also recall how the people of the iron age destroyed the earlier graves, reopened some of them and re-used them. Obviously there was some new zeal among the grave people of period, III, who had scant regard for the earlier people. Their equipment so materially differs from those of the earlier grave diggers that they appear to be new-comers, possibly invaders,

who broke into this region to establish their supremacy. It is their graves that are wide-spread throughout this region. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that they quickly spread out here and continued to maintain their hegemony for a long time. On the other hand period II people appear to have gradually advanced and improved from period I. There is no destruction, no complete departure and no separation. The pot forms show gradual evolution, better manufacture, technique as well as the introduction of some new forms. The fundamental change is seen in the rituals. It is possible that the inflexed burial people of period I now began to adopt cremation in period II. The change is not abrupt and the old practice is not given up completely. The first type of ritual continued even later. It is therefore reasonable to conceive of a gradual evolution of the culture in the bronze age.

Now coming back to the graves near at hand, we go to Harappa where two distinct periods of graves have been excavated. The R 37 cemetery is contemporary with the Indus Civilization. There the skeletons are laid in the extended fashion from north to south with the grave goods typical of that civilization. This practice of burial is different from those seen in our graves. In cemetery H at Harappa urn burials have been found but in those urns bones after exposure are preserved. On the other hand we have found burnt bones in the urns at Timargarha. The ritual is completely different. The pot forms are also completely different and they show a tradition of highly stylized painting. Below these pot burials in Cemetery H there was an earlier burial in stratum II, where about two dozen extended burials were uncovered. Some of the dead are lying in the inflexed position as those in our graves. It is also thought that some graves have fractional burials. The ritual is comparable with our last period graves but the pot forms and other material equipments are completely different. The painting on the dish lids makes these Harappan graves culturally apart. It is difficult to see any borrowing, one way or the other, between our grave people and those at Harappa. The inflexed burials at Harappa must be traced from other source wherefrom these people must have brought the painted pottery traditon. The same is true with regard to the cemetery at Shahi-Tump, excavated by Sir Aurel Stein. There again inflexed burials were found but the cultural material is fundamentally different. Again we have not seen cremation either at Harappa or at Shahi Tump. And we do not have grey ware pottery in these two sites.

The inflexed burials are attested in a number of cemeteries excavated in the northern part of Iran, e.g. at Tepe Hissar[8] Shah Tepe[9] and Tureng

Tepe[10]. It is in these Iranian sites that we have both the painted pottery tradition as well as that of unpainted plain pots. The first great site is Tepe Hissar, from which comparable pot forms are illustrated in fig. 61. As our pottery is plain red and grey ware, it is no use seeking correspondence with Tepe Hissar I, which is the main period of painted pottery there. In Hissar IIA the painted pottery continues but at the same time this period marks the introduction of plain grey ware from the north. Period II B is the main grey ware phase, when the painted pottery tradition came to an end. In Hissar III the grey ware continues with some new forms, and the end of Hissar is marked by the re-introduction of plain red ware, of which the evidence was scant.

The comparable forms from our excavation relate to the pot forms of Hissar II B onward to Hissar III C, with the main difference that at Hissar these forms are in plain grey ware while our forms are mostly in red ware of medium fabric (b). The first is a bowl-on-stand, Hissar 5070, which is similar to our variety (ii), sub-variety (b). The second is again a bowl-on-stand with its bowl carinated, Hissar 5056, which corresponds to our sub-variety (a), but while the Hissar specimen has a short hollow stem, our example has a tall solid stem. The third is again a bowl-on-stand, Hissar 4782, which corresponds with our sub-variety (d). It may be noted that we have also found a few examples of grey bowl-on-stand. All the corresponding Hissar specimens, cited here, come from II B level. We have taken this type of the pots first because they are the hallmark of our graves. They have not been found at Charsada at all, though in our Balambat settlement site this type persists. This is a group apart from the "offering stands of censers" found at Mohenjodaro[11] and Harappa[12]. The examples illustrated by Sankalia[13] from Navdatoli fall in two main varieties: first is the Harappan type and the second goblet-on-stand has a short solid stem. They are generally painted. In Iran we find this type in other sites as well. From Shah Tepe, P. 184 figs. 348 and 3506. (reproduced in our fig. 61) come from stratum II b.

Next we come to pedestal-based deep bowl, our variety XXVI, sub-variety (b), which has a parallel in Charsada fig. 13 B and also from Swat (see Stacul, No. 1, Fig. 71, g). This is comparable with Hissar 4177 from II B level. There are other examples from the same level. In our graves it is found only in period III graves. This is not a common type in the earlier graves. Not far removed from this type is the pedestalled cup, our variety (VII), which corresponds with Hissar 3300 from III c level. Stacul has illustrated several specimens of this variety. *Charsada* fig. 13 A is slightly different, as it has a straight-sided cup on a stand.

Next comparable form is a cooking pot-on-stand, our variety II, sub-variety (e), which corresponds with Hissar 4136 and 5215 from level III A. Like the Hissar examples our pots have also short solid stem. In our opinion this is an evolution from the earlier simple cooking pot form, though we do find a correspondence here at Hissar.

Stacul has compared the hour-glass type of drinking vessel, our variety (XIII) with some Hissar specimens in Hissar pl. XXXVII and XXXVIII. We have reproduced here two examples, Hissar 3971 and 5011. The correspondence is not striking. Our variety has an extremely narrow waist and shows a different manufacturing technique. In our examples the upper and lower parts are made separately and then finally joined in the middle. The Hissar specimen shows only concave side like our tall drinking vases, variety (iii). Stacul has further compared this hour-glass type with Navdatoli[14] specimen, possibly NVT. T. 63 a (reproduced in fig. 61). The Navdatoli specimen is not biconical. It is round-bottomed and has concave sides with flaring rim. It is further painted with a row of stylized humans. Comparison has also been sought with Hassanlu[15] specimens. Two of them have been reproduced in our fig. 61. These are handled tall drinking vases similar to our variety (iii), sub-variety (g). But Hassanlu examples have foot ring-base while ours have disc-base. Such handled drinking vases are also known in Tepe Giyan[16] and Tepe Sialk.[17]

Now we come to narrow necked bottles, our variety (vi). In our graves we have specimens both in plain grey and red, and these are special to period II graves, though poor imitation survived later also. They come closer to Hissar 2190 from level II B and Hissar 3490 from level III c. Similar bottles come from Shah Tepe II b, Fig. 344 a.

The next dominant type in our period III graves is our variety XIX, *Surahi* type of long necked water pitcher, or what is usually known as bottle-pitchers. Our examples are in extremely fine red ware. We have illustrated three specimens from Hissar, No. 2164 from level III A, no. 3987 from level III B and no. 3525 from level III c. We also get examples from Shah Tepe (see his fig. 413) and other Iranian sites. A development is seen by attaching a straight spout to this vase, sometimes with a handle, our variety No. (XX), Shah Tepe fig. 394 and fig. 392, Hissar 4296, and also in Tepe Sialk, necropole B.[18] A variant of this is a handled jug with a pinched mouth, our variety (XXIII). Such pinched mouth jugs are known from Hissar 5040, level III B, (not reproduced here) and Shah Tepe figs. 351 and 352 (not reproduced). Similar handled jug comes from Talyche[19] in Persia.

Next we take up deep bowls, our variety (XXVI),) sub-variety (a). Different varieties of such bowls have been found by Stacul[20] in his Kherai site (his fig. 5). We illustrate here two bowls from Hissar, No. 4115 and No. 4338 from level III C and two from Shah Tepe, fig. 308b and fig. 309. For the lids, our variety (XI) we have exact counterparts from Shah Tepe: Our sub-variety (c) is similar to Shah Tepe fig. 466 a, and our sub-variety (d) compares well with Shah Tepe fig. 466 b.

Another comparison for a triplicate pot on a stand[21] found in Swat comes from Marlik excavation[22] No. 26 (reproduced in fig. 61). Finally we may compare a trough from Navdatoli T. 25 ag. (reproduced in fig. 61), so common in our Balambat settlement site. But our examples have generally lugs at the sides.

Among the small finds we leave aside the spindle-whorls or net-sinkers (Pl. La, Nos. 1—4) and also beads (For detailed comparison see part IV). We take up particularly the pins illustrated in our plate XLVIII a and b. Similar pins are seen in Hissar pl. LIII, Nos. H. 3141, H. 2244 and H 4878. From Shah Tepe we have several in fig. 648, a, b, and c, and fig. 646 a, b, and c. The eye needle is also seen, Hissar 5265 and Shah Tepe 644a. The spiral finger rings (pl. XLIX b, No. 6) can be compared with Hissar 4262 and 4263, and Shah Tepe 636 with Stacul (No. 2) fig. 6.

The comparisons of our grave goods, particularly pottery and burial rites with those from the sites in northern Iran, opens up a new vista of cultural influences. The earliest comparable material comes from Hissar II B and latest from Marlik. As our grave people had no painted pottery tradition, it is no use seeking comparison with those cultures where painted tradition was the general feature. For this very reason we have omitted Hissar I and II A and even Shah Tepe I. As has been noted by the earlier writers, the introduction of plain grey ware possibly from the north into Shah Tepe and Hissar marked a definite departure from the earlier cultural trends. This grey ware tradition was also brought into Pakistan, but as the forms here are akin to both the periods II and III in Hissar, it is reasonable to infer that our grave people borrowed from both the levels of Hissar occupation. On the other hand when we note that along with the grey ware, our grave people developed the same forms in red ware, it is reasonable to suppose that their time was later. It is likely that they imbibed the red ware trend seen towards the end of Hissar III C occupation. On the other hand the plain red pottery has recently been dug at Marlik and Godin. Whatever little is known about the pot forms from these sites, they correspond more with those from our period III graves.

Our cremation burial graves are a group by themselves. They continued the pottery tradition of the earlier period and at the same time introduced some new forms both in grey and red wares. Such cremations are not noted in the sites of northern Iran. Sir Mortimer Wheeler[23] adds a footnote in his book "Whilst this chapter was in the press, Mr. A. Ghosh, of the Indian Archaeological Department reported cremations in the latest Harappan level of a site, Tarkhanawala Dera, discovered by him a few miles north of Anupgarh in north west Bikaner. It remains to be seen whether these burials are Harappan or intrusive." As the details are not published, it is difficult to make comparison with the Indian site. Again the cremation burial points to a time later than the last phase of Hissar.

How much later can we place our graves in time? We have seen earlier why we can not bring down the date of our graves to the Achaemenian level inspite of the remarks of Stacul: "Among the various cross-references remarked upon, however, we think it is right to stress the analogies with pottery removed from the deepest levels at Charsada (6th-4th century B.C."[24] In order to be precise about the date of our graves we should clearly distinguish the bronze age graves from the iron age graves. It is the first group of the graves which need to be compared with the early Iranian sites. Even here we have two definite burial rites: the inflexed burial rite was later practically replaced by cremation burials. As in Iran we are getting only inflexed burials, it is with that burial rite that the corresponding pottery tradition should find relationship. However, as the grey ware tradition is an intrusive element in Iran from the north, the same source might have pushed the people across the hills to Pakistan. But correspondence with both Hissar II and III forms suggests that the developments in Iran were fully taken advantage of by our grave people. On the other hand when the same forms are produced in red ware here, it is clear that our grave people advanced a step beyond that reached in Hissar. In other words our grave people knew the Hissar plain pottery tradition of grey ware but at the same time developed plain red ware pottery. It is therefore reasonable to suppose that there should not be a long duration between the end of Hissar and the beginning of the graves in Pakistan. If the end of Hissar III C is taken to be about 1800 B.C.,[25] the beginning of our graves should be placed in about the middle of the second millennium B.C. — a date which closely corresponds to that obtained from radio-carbon analysis.

Now, if we examine the graves of period I and even later ones, we get there a hand-made red ware cooking pot having a disc base. It is so

dominant a feature in the graves that we can not miss. It persists throughout the periods and survives even in the Achaemenian level. The disc base of this pot is so characteristic that it affects other forms derived from Iran. Except the pedestalled pots and bowls-on-stand, all other vessels have disc base with only a few exceptions, where we get flat base. It seems that the disc base was a special liking in these graves of Pakistan. It is possible that the disc-base was connected with a particular technique of manufacturing pots in this region, which was difficult to give up. This cooking pot type is in coarse red ware. Its parallel has not been found in Iran. It is likely that this was the pot form already known in this region before the introduction of the grey ware and medium red ware (fabric b) pottery, in which alone Iranian forms are seen. This suggestion is made in view of the survival of a few pointed butt stone axes and ring stones in the Balambat settlement site. These ground tools were not the main character of the site as the people already knew iron, but when a limited number is found, it is reasonable to take them as survivals. We located some pit circles in the neighbourhood hoping to excavate them the following year and to throw some light on this vexed problem of the ground stone tools. But before we could resume our excavation, the circles were already dug up by the villagers and the materials thrown away. In our share fell only one broken cooking pot. Under the circumstance we doubtfully put a hypothesis for an earlier neolithic settlement before the grave people appeared on the scene.

It must again be admitted that the graves of period I are so far very limited. Even in Swat their number is few. The graves of periods II and III are widely distributed. It is probably for this reason that Stacul has bracketted the earlier single burial graves with the cremation burials and placed them together in his period I. But our excavation at Timargarha is quite clear, providing srtatigraphic evidence to separate them into two chronological groups. As we have remarked earlier, cremation is a later growth from the earlier practice, well documented in the evolution of the pot forms. These people, who practised cremation, do not appear to have been invaders from outside. We do not see any destruction or disturbance of the earlier graves as we do find in period III. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that period II graves followed immediately period I graves. It is from the pottery forms of this period that some survivals are seen in the historical time. In duration we should give a longer span to this period.

Period III makes a definite departure from the earlier periods in so far as it inaugurates the iron age in Pakistan. Along with the new ritual of the disposal of the dead after exposure, they brought new pottery tradition.

They built houses of stone, in which store rooms for corn were the dominant feature. Their weapons were better made — all of iron. They showed no regard for the earlier people. In the Balambat settlement site we found them robbing the stones of the earlier graves, disturbing the burnt bones and building their own houses on their top. Similar disturbance is seen in the cemeteries as well. The evidence suggests that these people were invaders who came in the wake of fresh conquests and quickly spread out in the area. They no doubt destroyed the earlier populace but also borrowed much from them. We have compared a typical triple pot-on-stand with similar specimen from Marlik. Ther again the burial rite is comparable. Dr. Negahban also found a child's grave of about the same fashion as we have seen in our excavations. It is therefore reasonable to suggest a date very close to Marlik for the beginning of period III and a duration which must have covered the first half of the Ist millennium B.C. As this period was brought to an end by the invasion of the Achaemenians, the end of this period III should be placed in the middle of the 6th century B.C. Our dating is confirmed by the radio carbon date given earlier.

We may sum up the chronology period-wise:

Neolithic (?)	Ist half of the 2nd millennium B.C. and possibly earlier.
Period I	16th to 13th century B.C.
Period II	12th to 10th century B.C.
Period III	9th to the middle of 6th century B.C.
Period IV	From the middle of the 6th to the 3rd quarter of the 4th century B.C. — the historical age of the Achaemenians.

1. — M.S. Vats, *Excavations at Harappa,* Delhi, 1940, Chapter VI; *Ancient India*, No. 3 (1947), pp. 83 ff.
2. — Sir Aurel Stein, *Archaeological Tour in Gedrosia,* 1931, pp. 88-105, for Shahi Tump cemetery.
3. — Sir John Marshall, *Taxila,* Cambridge, 1951, pp. 87 ff. (abbreviated as *Taxila*).
4. — Sir Mortimer Wheeler, *Charsada,* Oxford, 1962. (abbreviated as *Charsada*).
5. — Stacul, G. 'Preliminary Report on the Pre-Buddhist Necropolis in Swat (West Pakistan), *East and West,* Nos. 1-2, Rome, 1966, p. 53 (Henceforward abbreviated as Stacul No. 1).
6. — *Ibid,* p. 67.
7. — Umberto Scerrato, 'Excavations at Dahan-i-Ghulaman (Seistan—Iran). First Preliminary Report', *East and West,* Nos. 1-2, Rome 1966, pp. 9-30.
8. — E.F. Schmidt, *Excavations at Tepe Hissar Damghan,* Philadelphia, 1937.
9. — T.J. Arne, *Excavations at Shah Tepe, Iran,* Stockholm, 1945.
10. — F.R. Wulsin, *Excavations at Turreng Tepe Near Asterabad,* 1932.
11. — Sir John Marshall, *Mohenjodaro and The Indus Civilizatton,* London, 1931, Pl. LXXIX.
12. — Vats, *Op. Cit.,* Pl. LXX.

13. — H.D. Sankalia, 'New Light on the Indo-Iranian or Western Asiatic Relations between 1700 B.C.—1200 B.C. in *Artibus Asiae*, Vol. XXVI, Fig. 3.
14. — H.D. Sankalia, B. Subba Rao, S.B. Dev, *The Excavations at Maheshwar and Navdatoli* (1952-53), Poona 1958.
15. — T. Cuyer Young, 'A comparative Ceramic Chronology for Western Iran; *Iran*, Vol. III. 1965.
16. — Claude F.A. Schaeffer, *Stratigraphie Comparee et Chronologie de l' Asie Occidentale*, Oxford, 1948. fig. 246, No. 6.
17. — *Ibid*, Fig. 262, Nos. 5 and 7.
18. — *Ibid*, fig. 255, No. 65.
19. — *Ibid*, fig. 218.
20. — G. Stacul, 'Notes on the Discovery of a Necropolis near Kherai in the Gorband valley (Swat-West Pakistan)', *East and West*, Vol. 16 Nos. 3 and 4, 1966, pp. 261-274. (henceforward cited as Stacul No. 2).
21. — C.S. Antonini, *Op. Cit., East and West*, Vol. 14, 1963, fig. 8.
22. — Ezat O. Negahban, *A Preliminary Report on Marlik Excavation*, Tehran, 1964.
23. — Wheeler, *The Indus Civilization*, Cambridge 1953, p. 48, f.n. 1.
24. — Stacul No. 1. p. 78.
25. — Robert W. Ehrich, *Chronologies in Old World Archaeology*, ed. by, Chicago, 1954, p. 242.

SECTION—7

WHO WERE THE GANDHARA GRAVE PEOPLE?

In the last part Dr. Bernhard gives a complete report on the skeletal materials. His conclusion is worth quoting: "Morphologically the population can be characterised as relatively high statured, long and narrow-headed, with narrow nose and a medium high to high face, the breadth of which is, however, more in relation to the cranial breadth. Though a slight Mongoloid admixture could be observed, the series from Timargarha can be considered on the whole as distinctly Europoid". He goes a step further and maintains that they "are closely connected with the southern migration of foreign people into the Pak-Indian subcontinent which began in the second millennium B.C. and continued in the first millennium B.C." This observation will be quite in keepin with the theory of entire population assessment of a given site, as is propounded by D. K. Sen.[1] But having said that, it is necessary to go deeper into the problem of the racial complex of the cemetery at Timargarha. Here Dr. Bernhard has again fallen back on the older concept of categories and though he uses the new descriptive terminology, his methodology is not much different. However, I leave this question of theoretical discussion to the physical anthropologists and come back to the problem of racial identification. Who were the people or peoples that made the Gandhara Grave Culture ?

Dr. Bernhard has recognised two groups of foreign people in the graves: the first is termed *Eurdolichomorph* or *Proto-europoid* and this is the predominant type in period I graves, the second is termed *Leptodolichomorph* or the Mediterranean type and this is predominant in Period III graves. Alongside them the Mongolian strain has been traced only in two skulls. But there is another suppressed element, termed here as Veddid and intelligently distinguished from the *Veddoid, Australoid, Proto-austroloid* or *Dravidoid.* This element has been indubitably found in three skulls — one male in trench CO in 1964 excavation and two females in graves 101 and 197, both appertaining to later fractional burials. Dr. Bernhard has also differenciated this from Harappa type A^2 and sought identities with similar type in Central Asia as well as in the hills of Central India. If Dr. Bernhard is correct, we could visualise the spread of the Veddid people from Central Asia through the Frontier hilly region into the hills of Central India. What culture did they represent? Obviously they were not the main persons who created the Gandhara Grave Culture, though they were present when this culture developed. The only other cultural trait noticeable here is the presence of the neolithic ground stone tools. So far the neolithic culture was not attested in West Pakistan but recently we have received support for our find from the discovery at Taxila.[3] Should we attribute the neolithic culture to the Veddid people? Only future discoveries can amplify this hypothesis. It is, however, worth repeating that this element is not traced in the Harappan cemeteries. Has this absence any significance?

If we rely on the new analysis of the skeletal materials from Mohenjodaro and Harappa, as given by D.K. Sen, we have to follow his conclusion: "Two generalizations seem to be legitimate in this context. The first is that the populations at Harappa, Mohenjodaro and Lothal possessed rather broad noses. And the second is that the population at Lothal had, relative to those at the two other sites, broader heads ..... this population was broad-nosed or chamaerrhine, tall and long-headed in Punjab and Sind and with somewhat rounded heads in Gujrat". [4] In connection with one group of the Lothal (Gujrat) specimens S.S. Sarkar has used the term "Aryan" and Sen remarks, "that Sarkar's conclusion in identifying Aryan skeletal remains at Lothal in the late Harappan period fits in admirably with the hypothesis that the Harappa culture was destroyed by Aryan invasion towards the middle of the second millennium B.C."[5] This is rather going too much into a hypothetical field. The anthropologist is biased on the side of one school of the archaeologists who believe in the theory of the Aryan destruction of the Indus Civilisation. Without committing our-

selves to any such theory, we can, distinguish the main population, who created the Indus Civilization, from those who developed the Gandhara Grave Culture. The description of *Eurdolichomorph* and *Leptodolichomorph*, as given by Dr. Bernhard, places these people in a different category.

If the analysis of our cultural material is correct, we find these new groups of people first bringing the knowledge of bronze and later the knowledge of iron along with other traits. They settled in an area where earlier lived probably the Veddid people. Unfortunately we know nothing about those people who practised cremation at Timargarha. Is it feasible to assume that they belonged to the same group as known from period I graves? If archaeological evidence is to be relied upon, this assumption will not be far wrong. In any case we can talk of two groups of people—the first migrating in about the middle of the second millennium B.C. and the second towards the beginning of the Ist millennium B.C. In this conclusion both archaeology and anthropology have led us to agree from two different angles.

It is most unfortunate that we have no written records from our excavations to supply names to the dead bones and the material culture unearthed by us. Can we take the help from the literary materials and attribute those names to these dead bones? Even if we do so, our conclusions will be purely hypothetical, subject to confirmation by future discoveries. However, it is well worth noting that in the same geographic region the earliest portions of the Rigveda speak of a people who appropriated for themselves the title of "Arya" as opposed to the conquered people. As our historical analysis in Section 3 (above) has shown, in the next stage we come to the period of the later Vedic literature, the traditions as recorded in the *Mahabharata*. The two historical periods coincide chronologically with the two archaeological periods and they agree with the two migrations of people from the west. The comparison can be further specified. In the Rigveda we know of, besides gold, only one metal called *Ayas*,[6] generally taken to be copper, while in the later Vedic literature two metals are distinguished as *Tamra Ayas* (copper) and *Krishna Ayas* (iron).[7] As regards the disposal of the dead it is noted: "The dead were either cremated or buried, and, if cremated, the ashes were regularly buried. This suggests that burial was the older method which was altered under the pressure of migration and perhaps the Indian climate".[8] This Rigvedic reference accords very well with the graves of periods I and II. We can summarise the main features below:

(i) The geographic scene of archaeology and history opens in the same region.

(ii) The chronological period of both refers to the same time.

(iii) The knowledge of copper or bronze technology is seen at this time.

(iv) The disposal of the dead, first by burial and later by the addition of cremation, is also similar.

(v) Literary evidence brings the Aryans from the West. The ar chaeological evidence also connects the grave culture with the plain grey ware tradition of the West.

There is thus a priori basis for equating the literary materials of the Rigveda with those now brought forth from the archaeological excavations. If this is accepted, we will have to seek the identification of the second group of migration which introduced iron into our region along with a new wave of invasion. Their practice of fractional and multiple burial after exposure is not known to have received great sanctity in the Sanskrit literature. In fact the Hindus later chose only cremation as the main form of the disposal of the dead. But we do not know when this change took place. In our region the archaeology has produced evidence for the persistence of the third type of burial. Even when the Indian archaeology has not produced material to support this type of burial, the literary evidence as well as the archaeological materials speak of a tremendous change that came in the second stage as a result of violent outbreak. Can we not understand in that perspective the germ of events that later became glorified in the *Mahabharata*? It is only in the later Vedic literature that we find for the first time the name of the *Kurus*, whose descendants played so dominant role in the *Mahabharata* war. It is these *Kurus* who spread out into the Ganges valley and established the Kuru-Panchala kingdom. It is after them that we have the name Kurukshetra. Surely the Kurus must have played some special historical role in the past. Could we recognise them in the new migrating hordes who are found in period III graves?

The answer to this question can be given only after careful exploration and excavation in Panjab. Meanwhile we turn to the Indian archaeological evidence. As early as 1949 Mr. B.B. Lal paid a visit to the ruins at Hastinapur, located about 60 miles north-east of Delhi and referred to in

the *Mahabharata*. He writes: "In the lower levels of the mound was found a fine grey ware with designs executed in black pigment (hereafter called the Painted Grey Ware). This was superimposed by another class of pottery known to archaeologists as the Northern Black Polished Ware ..... Painted grey Ware also occurred at Ahichchhatra, another site mentioned in the *Mahabharata* ..... the author undertook a trial-excavation at Tilpat, 11 miles south of Delhi, ... associated with the *Mahabharata* story, and it was indeed gratifying to find there the same ceramic sequence as was observed at Hastinapura. This encouraged the author further, and he planned a systematic exploration of over thirty sites mentioned either in the *Mahabharata* itself or alleged to have been associated with the story according to local tradition. The investigations more than fulfilled his expectations, since almost all the sites yielded the Painted Grey Ware from their lower levels".[9] The chronological position of this Ware has been established by Lal in his excavation of the Hastinapura site. His main conclusions are quoted below in his own words:[10]

(i) That the Painted Grey Ware was later than the Harappa Ware.

(ii) That the Painted Grey Ware well-preceded the Northern Black Polished Ware, though there may have been subsequent overlap between the two.

(iii) That the Painted Grey Ware occurs at large number of sites in the upper Ganga basin.

(iv) That on the basis of (i) and (ii) above, the Painted Grey Ware may be placed somewhere within the limits of 600 B.C. on the one hand and 1500 B.C. on the other.

With this chronology fixed for the archaeological material Lal brings in the relevant information from ancient Indian literature and says "that Hastinapura, Ahichchhatra and Kampil were respectively the capitals of the Pauravas, and north and south Panchalas, who formed a part of the early Aryan stock in India". He finally concludes, "that a large number of sites associated with the *Mahabharata* story contain the same ceramic industry, viz. the Painted Grey Ware, in their lower levels."

Even when we accept the sequence of the Painted Grey Ware and agree with the apparent correlation of this cultural sequence with that narrated in the main stories of the *Mahabharata*, the date cannot be

stretched back to 1500 B.C. This position was fully realised by Lal and therefore he dated this particular sequence at Hastinapur between 1100 and 800 B.C. It is clear that the Painted Grey Ware sites are apparently associated with the *Mahabharata* stories, and if this association is based on any reality, the date of these sites should not be earlier than the main events narrated in this great epic. Lal himself is inclined to accept the date of F.E. Pargiter for these events, i.e. middle of the 10th century B.C.[11] Why do we begin to get the Painted Grey Ware sites at this time? Before we give the answer, we analyse the factors underlying the earlier date of 1500 B.C.

This earlier date is supposed on the basis of Lal's exploration of some sites in the Ghaggar and Sarasvati valleys. But the later excavation of Dr. Y.D. Sharma at Rupar[12] has clearly shown a break between the end of the Harappa phase and the beginning of the Painted Grey Ware.[13] The duration of this break is not definitely known. Therefore even if we accept the literary evidence, "that the combined stream of the Ghaggar and Sarsuti is identifiable with the Sarasvati and the Sutlej with the Sutudru, on the banks of which the early Aryans used to live", we have no means of fixing the date of "the early Aryans" in this region. Finding no clue in the excavations in India, Lal looked for comparative material in Iran and the West. He got hold of the same material in Iran, which we have cited above in section 6. But as we have seen earlier, these materials are all in plain grey ware. Lal also referred to a few painted grey ware sherds from Thessaly in Greece, and some from Seistan,[14] and at the end he concluded, "The above-mentioned painted and plain grey wares with their sub-varieties, from Greece to Seistan via Iran, are assignable very broadly to the second millennium B.C. Within this period also falls the well-known inscription at Boghaz Keui (1360 B.C.) which records the names of Aryan deities like Indra, Varuna, Mitra etc. This coincidence, though not having much weight in itself, cannot be altogether set aside, and it may be well worth the trouble to study the distribution of painted and plain grey ware while trying to work out the movement of Aryan-speaking people in Western Asia and southern Europe".[15] And now we have the plain grey ware in our region falling in the same period. It is this background which must be kept in mind while considering the earlier date 1500 B.C. assigned by Lal to the lower limit of the Painted Grey Ware.

But we have seen in our region how there had been two main periods of invasion of these Grey Ware people. While the earlier date of Lal tallies with the first invasion in our region, we have so far no evidence for extending this invasion into East Panjab and the upper Ganges Valley. But the second invasion came about the same time when the Painted Grey Ware cul-

ture is seen in upper India. Could we, therefore, not see the spread of this latter culture as a result of the second invasion from the West? A definite answer to this question will be provided only when our investigations are extended into Panjab east of the river Indus.

Meanwhile it is well to summarise the position as we get today from archaeology, anthropology and history. The archaeology has produced the materials for two waves of invasion of the plain grey ware culture, the first associated with bronze and the second with iron. This culture is different from the Indus Valley Civilisation. The anthropology has brought forth two groups of western people in the graves at Timargarha, who are different from those buried in the Harappan cemeteries. At about the same time the literary history has produced materials about a people who call themselves Aryans, who in the first instance lived in the land of the *Sapta Sindhu* and in the second stage, possibly after the *Mahabharata* War, spread out into the upper Ganges valley. All these coincidences occurred between the end of the Indus Civilization and the beginning of the historic period in the 6th century B.C. There is thus a strong basis for correlating the materials from different sources and viewing in that perspective the appearance of the hypothetical Aryans in history.

NOTES

1. D.K. Sen, "Ancient Races of India and Pakistan", *Ancient India*, Nos. 20 and 21, 1965, pp. 178-205.
2. P. Gupta, P.C. Dutta and A Basu, *Human Skeletal Remains from Harappa, Memoirs of the Anthropological Survey of India* No. 9 (Calcutta, 1952).
3. Dr. F.A. Khan, "A prehistoric settlement discovered near Taxila", *Pakistan Times*, Lahore 14th January, 1968.
4. D.K. Sen, *Op. Cit.*, p. 204.
5. *Ibid*, p. 186.
6. *Cambridge History of India*, Vol. I, p. 89.
7. *Ibid*, p. 122.
8. *Ibid*, p. 96.
9. B.B. Lal, "Excavation at Hastinapura and other Explorations in the Upper Ganga and Sutlej Basins 1950-52" *Ancient India*, Nos. 10 and 11, 1954 and 1955, pp. 5-151.
10. *Ibid*, p. 150.
11. *Ibid*, p. 149.
12. Dr. Y.D. Sharma, "Exploration of Historical Sites", *Ancient India*, No. 9.
13. S. R. Rao, "Excavation at Rangpur and other explorations in Gujarat", *Ancient India*, Nos. 18 and 19, 1962 pp. 193-94, 1953, p. 124.
14. Sir Aural Stein, *Archaeological Reconnaissances in North-Western India and South-Eastern Iran*, London 1937, pp. 118 ff. Pl. XV.
15. Lal, *op. cit.*, p. 147.