

-
6. J. M. CASAL — *Fouilles D' Amri, Publications de la Commission des Fouilles Archeologiques, Fouilles du Pakistan*, Paris, 1964, 2 Vols. Volume I text and Volume II illustrations, with an English summary.

The site of Amri was discovered by N.G. Majumdar as early as 1929, who was the first to recognise its pre-Harappan nature. For a full-scale excavation of the site we had to wait long until Mon. Casal's work, which is completed most efficiently. In his detailed report under review he has ably presented the materials in a way that we are now in a position to think in concrete terms the evolution of the Bronze Age cultures in the main Valley of the Indus and their relation on the one hand with those that grew in Baluchistan and Afghanistan and on the other with the developments in the Indian site like Lothal in Gujarat. "Amri, in the Dadu district, is a small village about one mile from the Indus, on the right bank, and some hundred miles from Mohenjodaro, farther downstream."

The problem of the origin of the Harappan civilization has long faced the archaeologists. Both at Harappa and Mohenjodaro the civilization is seen at its mature stage. There was thus the need of discovering an earlier period site. From this angle the excavation of Amri is of prime importance. The object of Mon. Casal's excavation was "to go deeper into the discovery made by Majumdar at Amri, and elucidate whether the Amri Culture had some parental relationship with the Harappan Civilization, or otherwise to clarify the degree of precedence or contemporaneity linking them".

There are two mounds at Amri, named in the report A and B. Casal concludes: "the earliest settlement had been confined to Mound A and that the occupation had only later extended to Mound B." The materials are divided into five main periods, of which the last is a later occupation of the Muslim period. Of the "prehistoric periods" (I to IV) the first is taken to be the true representative of the Amri culture, characterised by the typical thin ware pottery of the site, mud-brick walls, "chert blades" and other objects. The author notes: "in one case, there is an indication that wooden posts had been embodied in the walls". Later the author notes the occurrence of timber re-inforcing in the burnt brick masonry, discovered in the Great Granary and defence tower in 1950 excavation at Mohenjodaro. Is there any connection in this wood technique of the two cultures? The author does not commit himself. However, he divides the first period into four sub-periods and traces the evolution of the ceramic tradition. Significantly even in the earliest sub-period the decorations are much more evolved than those seen in the lowest levels at Kot Diji. At the same time "Togau C crooks" are seen here in the first and second sub-periods. This recognition of Togau ware gives a solid base to link Amri culture chronologically with those in Baluchistan, particularly in the Surab region. de Cardi says: "Togau-ware was associated almost wholly with the period III occupation at Anjira, with only a single sherd from the preceding and later periods". In other words the earliest level of Amri coincides with phase B (see above review No. 4) of Anjira. What about Kot Diji? Casal remarks: "The Kot-Dijian Culture seems accordingly to be contemporaneous with period I at least partially, and Period II of Amri. It looks as though Amri and Kot-Diji had a common background of a local culture. But Amri being much more diversified must have had closer contacts with Baluchistan in which Kot-Diji did not take part, probably for geographical reasons". This remark of Casal can hardly be accepted now when the Kot-Diji report is published (see review No. 5). The system of house construction at Kot Diji — stone footing with mud-brick super-structure — clearly recalls the similar practice of Surab region. On the other hand Kot Diji pottery has not produced any Togau ware, nor even the animal designs seen in the last sub-period at Amri. It is possible that there was a contact between Surab region and Kot Diji in Phase A of Anjira but later with the introduction of metal there the contact was lost. On the other hand the pottery decorations of late Kot Diji culture (our phase b) compare fairly well with Amri Period I. Thus according to our estimation the early phase of Kot Diji appears to be earlier than the main Amri settlements.

In the last sub-period "a few specimens of Harappan pottery appear".

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

	<i>Anjira</i>	<i>Kot Diji</i>	<i>Amri</i>	<i>Harappan</i>
Age of Stone	Periods I & II	
Age of Metals	{ Period III Period IV	Kot Diji (a) (early)		
		Kot Diji (b) & (c) (late)	Amri I (A-C)	Harappan?
		Kot Diji (Ha- rappan contact)	Amri I D & II	Harappan

A. H. Dani.