

nisms. The Kültepe link thus becomes a principal synchronism.

One may not be satisfied, however. To accommodate the archaeology to the dendrocalibration of the radiocarbon dates we now have means stretching out the growth of Crete in EM I and EM II—although I do not stretch so far as Warren.¹⁸⁹ Problems come at the end of the third millennium since, as Warren points out, the calibrated chronology is rather higher than the historical one, and the two have to be made to fit. I have suggested 125–150 years for Knossian EM III, and 175–200 years for the Gournia, North Trench group, but I wonder if that is not too long—for one or for both? In which case, if we reduce Knossian EM III to, say, 100 years, should we be stretch-

ing out MM IA there too much, even though it is a long phase with two sub-phases? I have reduced MM II to about 150 years (which is still 50 years longer than Warren's MM II),¹⁹⁰ so as to bring up MM III and yet keep the correlation with Khyan, in order to allow more time for LM IA.

There is much work still to do in establishing the sequence and its correlations. Some of the synchronisms we value now will be discarded, and some of those discarded now may be restored. I am sure there will be many more discussions on Early Minoan and Middle Minoan chronology.

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI
CINCINNATI, OHIO 45221

Excavations at Shortughaï in Northeast Afghanistan

HENRI-PAUL FRANCFORT

Shortughaï is a protohistoric settlement ca. 2 ha. in area located in a small plain at the meeting point of the Kokcha and Amu Darya rivers in NE Afghanistan. It has been excavated for four seasons (1976–1979). The history of Shortughaï can conveniently be divided into two successive phases: A and B. During phase A (ca. 2200–2000 B.C.), the site was a Harappan outpost in Central Asia. During phase B (ca. 2000–1800 B.C.), it was part of the Eastern Bactrian culture province.

All the material of phase A can be related directly to the Harappan assemblage; it is completely dissimilar from that of the local Neolithic and Chalcolithic cultures. The artifacts of phase A were not imported from the Indus basin, but were locally made. Yet the brick architecture, the ceramics (including remarkable black-on-red pottery decorated with fish and peacocks), the copper metallurgy and one stamp seal depicting a rhinoceros with two pictograms are purely Harappan in type. Imported items, e.g., shell bangles and etched carnelian beads, connect Shortughaï with

the Harappan world as far as the Indian Ocean. There is also some evidence that Shortughaï may have been involved in trade with the West, in the form of lapis lazuli. One of the major sources of lapis lazuli is in NE Afghanistan, and the stone was worked at Shortughaï. The most likely areas which would have traded with Shortughaï or similar Harappan outposts are South Turkmenia and NE Iran. During the Namazga V and Hissar III periods, both these areas were in contact with the Harappan world, as well as with NE Iran and western Bactria (the Dashly culture). This complex network of interrelated cultures seems to decline and collapse at the beginning of the second millennium B.C.

Despite some continuity in the types of crafts made, a great change occurs at Shortughaï in phase B. Typologically, the assemblage becomes more local, Bactrian. There is no further evidence for stone work and long distance trade. All the manufacturing techniques become simpler (except copper metallurgy). The inhabitants of Shortughaï were relying more on

¹⁸⁹ Warren 498–99.

¹⁹⁰ Warren 499.

the resources locally available in the plain, and possibly improved its agricultural potential by introducing plants (like millet or new varieties of wheat) more suitable for dry farming. At the end of phase B, there is a clear connection with the cultures of Western Bactria (Bishkent, Mollali) and the steppes (sherds of Andronovo type).

In sum, the history of Shortughaï can be characterized by three changes:

- 1) in cultural polarity (from the Indus to Central Asia);
- 2) in economy (decline in trade and crafts, and agricultural progress);
- 3) in ethnicity (the most difficult to interpret).

CENTRE DE RECHERCHES ARCHÉOLOGIQUES
23, RUE DUMAROC
75019 PARIS, FRANCE