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The Harappan ‘Veneer’ and the Forging of Urban Identity

Mary A. Davis

The widespread similarity and standardization heralded by early scholars of Indus Studies has been aptly termed the 'Harappan Veneer' by J. M. Kenoyer and R. H. Meadow (1997). This uniformity of material culture spread across a relatively large region and overlaid a diverse population, which both produced and consumed it. This paper examines the possible mechanisms that could have resulted in the notable similarities in material culture across the Indus and examines models of Indus identity and urban immigration. I propose that as urbanism developed in South Asia a shared use of material culture and symbolic representations were forged through the integration of different regions linked by trade and craft traditions. This new material culture was instrumental in creating a common identity for residents of urban centers who, like in all preindustrial cities were constantly immigrating to the emerging urban centers. The emerging ‘Harappan style’ was an ethnically neutral style that was a signal of being cosmopolitan and well connected, and was broadly adapted in a way that has historic and modern parallels in urban studies rather than being a material manifestation of ethnic identity. Individuals that used these ‘Harappan’ items did not seem themselves as ‘Harappans’ but as ambitious persons with identities that would have been more locally rooted.

Keywords: Indus Civilization, Ethnicity, Identity, Material Culture, Urbanism, Branding, Ethnogenesis.

This paper seeks to address the processes that lie behind similarities in material culture during the Urbanized, or Integration, Era of the Indus Civilization. In the past, there were few questions as to why such extensive common suites of material culture existed. As regional and temporal variations in material culture begin to be more thoughtfully explored, questions remain regarding the similarity that exists across the urbanized landscape of the Greater Indus region. Mechanisms for the maintenance of these similarities through networks of craftspeople and extensive trade have been extensively discussed by Kenoyer (Kenoyer 1984, 1989, 1995, 1997, 2000; Meadow and Kenoyer 1997). Kenoyer and others argue that Indus or ‘Harappan’ materials and symbols functioned to unite people of different classes and occupations (Kenoyer 2000; Vidale and Miller 2001). What remains to be better understood is why there was a need for maintaining these similarities over such a vast area, what the effects were, and what this similarity in material culture actually represented. This chapter sets out to address if the archaeological culture designated as Harappan represent an ethnicity or identity, or as it may alternatively be phrased, as ‘Did the Harappans recognize themselves as Harappan?’

Emic understandings of identity are problematic within archaeology, particularly when dealing with long-lasting traditions that extend over an incredibly vast and diverse geographic area such as the greater Indus region. Individual and group identities, including ethnicity, would have shifted over time, space, and situationally, with some facets of identity being variously activated or latent in different contexts and conceived of differently for each individual and group (Brubaker 2004; Casella and Folwer 2005; Hu 2013; Jones 1997; Meskell 2001: 201; Shennan 1989; Tilly 2005: 144). Although an emic understanding of ‘Harappan’ identity is beyond our reach, here I explore the possibility of testing if the homogenization of styles is a reflection of ethnogenesis, that is, the formation of a new ‘Harappan’ people, or other processes that were used to unite diverse peoples. Four models of the intersection of urbanization, material culture, and identity are presented and evaluated based on published data.

Background

The Indus Tradition, particularly during the urban phases, integrated many regions, ecological zones, subsistence practices, material cultures, and persons over a geographic range much larger than any other contemporary civilization (Petrie et al. 2017; Weber et al. 2010; Madella and Fuller 2006; Weber and Kashyap 2016; Weber et al. 2011; Possehl 1992).

A suite of material culture that includes utilitarian products, prestige goods, and items showing imitation or affiliations with prestige goods is shared by the Indus Tradition (Kenoyer 2000). Hallmark artifacts include classic black on red pottery with distinctive motifs and a series of forms (Dales and Kenoyer 1986), baked and raw bricks with a ratio of 1:2:4 (Kenoyer 1998a; Khan and Lemmen 2014), a shared script, stylistically similar seals, highly standardized system(s) of weights (Kenoyer 2010; Miller 2013), Rohri–like chert blade technology (Allchin 1979; Cleland 1977; Davis 2016;

---

1 There is no general model for why material culture suites with stylistic similarities were used to unite different and even competing political polities. Those developed in the Maya region, for example, focus on ‘high culture’ being utilized by the elites to achieve and maintain access to exotic goods used to legitimize their political power claims locally. Such models do not fit the Indus region as these political power strategies do not seem to be extensively employed by Indus elites comparatively and they do not account for the stylistic similarity in utilitarian or non-elite goods.
The Harappan period of the Indus Tradition is perhaps better understood as the ‘Integration Era’ (Kenoyer 1991b; Shaffer 1992). This urbanized period of the Indus tradition is meaningfully named, and mechanisms of how this integration was accomplished and maintained have been explained through investigation of trade networks (Kenoyer 1997; Law 2011) and interregional networks of craftspeople (Kenoyer 1989).

The Regionalization Era directly preceded this urban and integrated period. During the Regionalization Era, trade networks, symbols, and technology associated with the Integration Era were developed (Kenoyer 1991c). As in the Integration Era, trade and networks are craftspeople are believed to have been instrumental in developing these regional styles. These pre-urban phases of the Regionalization Era are also variously labeled as pre-Harappan (Hasan 1985; Mughal 1970: 5) or Early Harappan (Possehl 1999). The major phases include Amri that is sometimes grouped with Nal Tradition, Kot Diji, Dab Sadaat, Sothi-Siswal, Tochi-Gomal. See Figure 1 for a map of the approximate location of the major sites of greater Indus region with a particular emphasis of sites relating to this Regionalization Era, or Early Harappan sites, and other relevant sites to this paper. This map also approximates the groupings of material culture phases of this Era. The boundaries are not hard and fast, but are often permeable, fluid, subjective, and are likely undergo future revisions and revaluations.

The Harappan ‘veneer’ and the monotonous uniformity of sameness

Regional and chronological variation has increasingly become an important focus for better understanding the Indus Tradition or Civilization (Ameri 2013; Gadekar et al. 2013; Jamison 2016; Jenkins 1994; Kenoyer 2005b; Kumar et al. 2011; Possehl 1992, 2002c; Quivron 2000; Shinde et al. 2008; Uesugi 2013; Weber 1999), and is a direction of study that needs much more detailed work. The relatively recent focus on regional variation during
The material culture of the Indus Civilization was traditionally described as being extremely homogeneous, even monotonous and lacking imagination (Mackay 1948: 120; Marshall 1931: 91; Piggott 1950: 136; Wheeler 1953). Early 20th century scholars emphasized the ‘monotonous regularity’ and high levels of community organization partly to fulfill expectations and preconceptions of an expansive empire and ‘Civilization’ (Piggott 1950: 136).

Kenoyer and Meadow (Kenoyer and Meadow 1997) aptly described the prominent continuity throughout the region as the ‘Harappan Veneer’ of similar material culture that overlays the diverse people that consumed and produced it. This veneer, thin as it may be, is relatively homogeneous and includes not only prestige items embedded with active symbolism, ideologies, and identities, but also utilitarian items and those associated with domestic practice, such as terracotta cakes in various forms.

**Harappans as an ethnic group**

The concept of ‘the Harappans’ as an ethnic or linguistic group persists in interpretations of the Indus archaeological record, particularly in discussions of migrations in the border regions. The linkage of material culture with ethnic and linguistic groups was fundamental to culture historical and diffusionist approaches to the archaeology of the early 20th century with its roots in nationalism. However, the boundaries and expressions of material culture may or may not align well with those of social groups such as ethnicities (Barth 1969; Croucher and Wynne-Jones 2006; Hill 1996; Hodder 1978; Moore 1994; Ortman 2012; Renfrew 1993; Terrell 2001).

The more explicit concept of ‘paleoethnicities,’ which was largely equated with material culture traditions, were applied to regional stylistic traditions of the Regionalization phase (Shaffer and Lichtenstein 1994). Shaffer and Lichtenstein saw the (Mature) Harappan Culture as a result of the fusion of Bagor, Hakra, and Kot Diji ethnic groups (Shaffer and Lichtenstein 1989: 123), in a process akin to ethnosgenesis within a few generations using binary concepts of ethnic group segmentation or fusion (Keessing 1958). Ethnic groups were also fundamental to portrayals of the greater Indus region as a Cultural Mosaic, where different ecological zones had distinct ceramics and subsistence systems (Mughal 1992; Possehl 1992, 1997, 1999, 2002b; Possehl and Herman 1990). In these cases, ethnicity is employed as an organizational construct, assumed to exist, rather than being a process that can inform us about the dynamic nature of how groups of people negotiated their identities in a pluralistic and diverse urban society.

**The effect of urbanization on the material culture**

I believe that the phenomena of urbanization in the Indus region and the increased homogenization and development of the suite of Harappan material culture are inherently linked. Urbanization, like other significant shifts in socio-political organization, would have had an impact on the dynamic processes of identities and ethnicities (Barth 1956; Diaz-Andreu 2005; Jones 1997; Insoll 2006; Lucy 2005). Likewise significant changes in material culture, architecture, and culinary practices reflect of shifts in perceptions of selves and nature (Deetz 1977).

During urbanization and integration regional identities may have become more important as the landscape became more interconnected and networks expanded (Bourdieu 1991; Canuto and Bell 2017). In other cases, communities and identities are constructed through manipulation and creation of a common system of symbols, values, and practices (Schortman *et al.* 2001; Yaeger and Canuto 2000).

Urbanism, particularly the relatively dense urbanism presumed in the Indus, places diverse populations within close quarters and necessitates the frequent interactions of unknown persons with potentially competing interests. The formation of social groups and group identities is a coping strategy that positions individuals and households into larger collectives with common interests and relatively more power. Individuals would have been a part of more than one social community and group. These group identities could include ethnicity, but also include class, occupation, and possibly religion, linguistic groups, political factions, and other social groups. Material culture is a tool that could be used to signal membership or aspiration of membership of these various communities. Kenoyer and others have established the expression of group identity and personal identity in the Indus using visual cues such ornamentation (Kenoyer 1991a, 1994, 2000, 2007, 2005b, 2013; Clark 2003, 2009).

The process of urbanization does not only include the initial founding of cities on the landscape but also includes the constant in-migration and integration of outside populations into urban centers. This is a general process that is common for all urban centers. In-migration may have been necessary to sustain populations in pre-modern cities, though this principle is not without controversy (Krøger 2010; Paine 2000; Paine and Storey 2006; Storey 1992, 1997, 2006; Storey *et al.* 2012). In the Indus, we now have direct evidence for such migration from isotopic evidence where nearly all the individuals subjected to isotopic analysis were
immigrants at Farmana and Harappa (Valentine 2013; Valentine et al. 2015). These individuals comprised only a small segment of the population that was buried, and it may be possible that the individual’s first-generation immigration status itself is biasing the burial sampling (Valentine 2016).

Models for ethnic processes during urbanization

The urbanization processes would enact changes and pressures upon existing ethnicities as individuals, society, and culture negotiated and innovated arrangements and patterns to adjust to new settlement scales and densities, landscape use, and social networks. Here I outline four basic models that describe the ways in that ethnicity can be affected through urbanization processes, or other processes of high-level multi-cultural co-habitation and/or interaction. These models are modified and refitted from the hypotheses that Attarian developed for coastal Peru (Attarian 2003). Attarian’s predictions regarding urban interaction of groups created four patterns in which: 1) new communities and networks would emerge in the urban environment with new stylistic material cultures that maintain spatial segregation within urban centers. 2) new communities emerged divided by wealth, indicated by new styles but differences in wealth emphasized through exotic and high labor materials and wealth clustering. 3) old communities and ethnic divides of pre-urban and rural communities were maintained within urban centers, exhibiting clusters of pre-urban styles and continued use of those styles in rural areas. 4) new social identities seen through homogeneity and decrease in stylistic variation without spatial clustering. Building on this and other’s work I have modeled the correlates of four separate ethnic processes in the face of urbanization Ethnogenesis, Emphasis, Dominance, and Dormancy. A highly simplified model of the effects of material culture resulting from urbanization and these potential ethnic processes can be found in the schematic Figure 2.

Ethnogenesis

Ethnogenesis is a result of the formation of a new ethnic identity. This has been widely discussed in archaeological literature (Canuto and Bell 2017; Cordell and Yannie 1991; Kurien 1994; Hill 1996; Hu 2013; Voss 2008). Both the term and conceptions of ethnogenesis are laden with colonial baggage (Card 2013), as models of ethnogenesis are almost invariably based on migration events or colonial encounters (see Maceachern, 1998: 112). Here I partially divest myself from this scholarship and consider the material correlates of a new community identity with new, shared values and culture. The networks of individuals sharing this community identity, i.e. ethnicity, would demonstrate membership and inclusion of those groups dynamically and locally, drawing on extant expressions and inventing new ones. It may be that ethnicity as it is analogous to historic examples only comes into being during the urbanization of landscapes (for summary of other positions, see Emberling 1997).

Most discussions of ethnogenesis processes relate to power structures and unequal distribution of resources. However, in remote periods when inequity was emergent and urbanization was nascent, these historic colonial models may not cover the entire range of possibilities. Therefore, models of processes linked to cultural, economic, or political dominance have been segregated from ethnogenesis and specifically dealt with in the Dominance process and correlates outlined below. The remaining ethnogenesis process is simply the emergence of new styles, symbols and practices among regional interaction network foraging a new common identity.

It is challenging to confidently identify new expressions of identity, shifts in old expressions, and hybridizations and positively correlate them with any ethnic processes, including ethnogenesis, in remote history. One needs a multi-scalar approach over an extended timescale utilizing multiple lines of evidence including symbolic, technological, and isochrestic styles with similar distributions in ritual, domestic, dietary, or other forms of practice (Stovel 2013). At a most basic level, an ethnic group should share a distribution of multiple material indicators reflecting similar symbolism and practices that is continuously spread over a regional landscape. These practices, chaîne opératoires, material cultures should not demonstrate spatial segregation within urban centers (except for special foreign enclaves, or sarais), and bridge economic or other social divides. In practice, such distributions of symbolism, styles, and practices would roughly align with culture, including archaeological cultures or traditions.
How does one then differentiate culture from ethnicity? The ethnomorphemic processes (Kohl 1998), or history of the local processes, can elucidate how ethnicity and identity function dynamically within a tradition and additionally if the shared material culture represents something akin to ethnic identity. We should not assume archaeological cultures are linked to ethnicity. A local temporally deep and detailed understanding of social, political, and economic networks, communities, and expressions of identity are required before such linkages can be made. Ethnicity, and, in particular, this process of ethnogenesis, should be hypothesized when no other explanations of the data are compatible with other models of ethnic processes.

In this model of these particular ethnogenesis processes, as the landscape is urbanized new communities of practice, isochrestic, emblematic, and technological styles should emerge possibly as hybridization of two or more pre-existing separate local traditions. What should be apparent is that in addition to the identification of the communities that are compatible with our understandings of ethnic processes that they are signaling membership of this new ethnicity through material culture in emblematic style (Wiessner 1983: 257) as a way to make it socially, politically, or economically salient. This should be evident not only in the way these styles are used at a local level but also that they are operating at scales larger than distribution (Emberling 1997).

**Emphasis**

In this scenario of social arrangement there should be pronounced emphasis on ethnicity as an important social construct and identity, and this emphasis of ethnic identity correlates of active displays of identity through material culture and styles, publicly and privately signaling your affiliations to others (Garraty 2013; Hayden 1998; Mills 2004; Peeples 2011). Both ethnoarchaeology and art history have provided examples of this effect i.e. (Hodder 1979; O’Donoghue 2011), where increased interaction leads to increased conflict and emphasis of these identities. In such cases ethnic grouping can be both primordial, based on deep shared history or descent, and concurrently instrumentalist in that it is strategically invoked to meet political or economic goals (Barth 1994; Cipolla 2010; Hu 2013; Jones 1997; Roosens 1994; Vermeulen and Govers 1994; Voss 2008).

The material culture styles should be spatially concentrated in the urbanized landscape, including within urban centers, and would re-occur in multiple, variously valued object classes and materials. Here I do not differentiate between the employments of emergent or existing material cultural styles, however, such patterns would be useful in understanding local historical trajectories. Such patterns in material culture would require further support through the identification of distinct, and co-occurring, communities of practice demonstrated through technological styles, chaîne opératoires, ritual activities, or domestic practices and architectures.

**Dominance**

Dominance would include legitimization of social and economic power inequities, at a local scale and regionally through migration, imperialism, conquest, and the subversion of all other ethnicities under one ethnicity. Dominance does not imply that former identities are effectively erased. In cases of historic colonialism, local identities persist in a myriad of ways (for a summary, see Voss 2015). Even in cases of supposed complete domination and incorporation, such as the assimilation of the Ainu into a mythological homogenous Japanese ethnicity, local identities persist (Cheung 2005; Howell 2004; Siddle 2003). While emulation and diffusion at the boundaries of social groups have been traditionally employed in archaeology to account for hybrid forms, it traditionally ignored the possibility of new groups emerging from that interaction (Lightfoot and Martinez 1995). This type of ethnomorphism should be particularly visible on the land-bridges were processes of acculturation, accommodation, bricolage, or other related processes should be evidenced through local interpretations of the dominant ethnicities material culture. However, it would be expected that similar looking processes would occur on the borderlands between two different subsistence, economic, and social systems and networks even if those entities were not conceived of as ethnicities, the power relations and interactions between the cultures were not unequal, and borders were not analogous to colonial frontiers. The nature and selective use of hybrids and exotic and local symbols, objects, and technologies should be reflective of the differential power structures and relationships between two or more social groups (Card 2013; Fennell 2007; Weik 2014). Important aspects to consider when examining local processes would be the pace of hybridization and if the all genders, occupations, and classes within the culture acted the elements adopted. Along with the types of elements utilized, including domestic and culinary practices, technological styles, and emblematic styles.

A different kind of possible ethnogenesis tied to inequality and dominance would be fission of earlier ethnicities (Hu 2013a: 382). In an urban environment, a fission event could occur when two social groups with close interactions develop social inequalities (Hu 2013; Voss 2005). Evidence of this would result in the social and spatial coincidence of economic or political inequality and the development of multiple new forms of personal, private, public expressions of identity.
sometime after the initial urbanization or founding of centers.

**Dormancy**

The final possible effect of urbanization on ethnicity is Dormancy. During Dormancy, ethnic identities remain intact, however, other identities such as class and occupation become more active and salient. Ethnicity becomes less salient (Tilly 2015), de-emphasized, or latent. In the ‘Dormancy’ scenario, ethnicity would not necessarily work to cohere a ‘group’ (Brubaker 2004). This effect corresponds to Barth’s prediction that ethnic groups would become less distinct as they interacted more and became more economically interdependent (Barth 1969) Ethnic groups may lie dormant for extended periods of time until activated under certain circumstances such as threat, stress, or through the efforts of a charismatic leader drawing on location, social memory or activities (Janusek 2004: 18).

In the case of initial urbanization, I predict that stylistic elements would build off previous pre-urban motifs drawing particularly from transcultural symbolism and elements to create a new neutral style, rather than seeing a true hybridization of forms. The homogenization of material culture can be a conscious or unconscious strategy to strengthened intercommunity relations (Voss 2008). New ideology, values, or polity affiliation and an individual’s adherence to them can be demonstrated through this new material culture and practices. Shared material culture also can act as a way to promote collective action and has been a marker of commercialization where neutrality was more beneficial than signaling ethnic identities (Blanton 2015).

**Macro-scale patterns of practice and material culture in the Indus**

A true evaluation of the ethnomorphic processes and dynamics of identity within the greater Indus Tradition, and in specific regions, will required more directed and detailed archaeological inquiries. Well-recorded and published attributes of artifacts from secure context are not available from all corners of the Indus Tradition or for all periods. The urbanization process during the Regionalization Phase is amongst the most impoverished datasets and the most important for understanding how the Harappan Style emerged. Future work aimed at outlining changes temporally and regionally is imperative for further testing of these models of ethnomorphic processes.

I argue below there is not evidence, at this time, for one regional style spreading and replacing others as would be expected following the dominance model of migration, colonialism, or conquest. Neither is there evidence that geographically based regional styles remaining distinct though dynamic urban processes as the emphasis model predicts. The relationships between Regional and Integration phase material culture could fit with either the ethnogenesis or dormancy models as it is a new style that draws upon pre-existing elements and forms. I believe those elements that continued on were those that were the broadest and conveyed the most fundamental concepts and stories that become increasingly abstract through time as they become firmly established within the cultural landscape. The continued use of generic, common, and basic elements rather than selective use and manipulation of elements, the development of extensive use of hybridized or new elements and forms bolsters the ethnic dormancy model over ethnogenesis. The greatest support of the dormancy model is the re-emergence of regional style elements during the deurbanizing Localization Era, demonstrating a cultural memory and persistence of local style and possibly identity that lie dormant during the urban Harappan phase.

Below I will briefly outline the extant evidence for the most relevant indicators proposed for my different models of the ethnomorphic processes of urbanization and how they favor the dormancy model. I will first outline the relationship of regional pre-urban styles to Harappan style. I will then argue for cultural plurality, and the lack of spatial segregation between groups within the Indus urban centers, and briefly examine some examples of hybridity and inequity in Indus urbanism. Finally, I will introduce the phenomena of cultural memory of regional elements.

**Origins of Harappan style and its relationship to earlier regional traditions**

The transition from the Regionalization era to the Integration Era, or from the Early Harappan to the Mature Harappan across the region is not well understood. A refined analysis and reporting of artifact attributes and re-assessments of chronological and spatial relationships, and regional variations is still required. Kot Dijian style has been largely framed as a core repertoire from which the Harappan style emerged. In addition to our greater understandings of the nature of other pre-urban regional traditions (Garge 2010) (Ajitprasad 2002; Rajesh 2011; Rajesh et al. 2013), the regional variations in the Kot Dijian style are beginning to be clarified (Uesugi 2017a). It may be that the emphasis placed on ‘Kot Dijian style’ as an antecedent to the Harappan style is accident of archaeological typological conventions rather a cultural reality. Instead elements of technology, form, and décor may exist on a more fluid spatial gradient during the Regionalization Era. The roughly central location of the Indus Valley associated with classic Kot Diji would allow for the greatest amount of overlapping regional
traditions, and the greatest distance from the various traditions that can be viewed as ‘non-Harappan’.

This gradient notwithstanding, many aspects of the Harappan style appears are not exclusively found in at sites labeled Kot Diji but draw upon larger and deep transcultural symbolism and knowledge. Antecedents of Harappan styles and forms appear in other regional traditions and even outside the geographic core of the Indus Tradition. There are examples of early versions of iconic motifs such as pipal leaves, intersecting circles, and fish scales (also triangles and sun/disk motifs) and distinctive forms such as dish on stands that span in all corners of the greater Indus sphere from Northern and Southern Baluchistan, Sindh, Punjab, Rajasthan, Haryana, and to a more limited extent Northern Gujarat (Ajithprasad 2002; Besenval 1997; Bisht 2015; Casal 1964; Durrani 1984; Franke-Vogt and Ibrahim 2001; Jenkins 1994; Khan 1965; Khan et al. 1991; Kenoyer 2011; Kenoyer and Meadow 2000; Lal et al. 2003; Majumdar 1999; Mughal 1990; Possehl 1999; Pracchia 1985; Quivron 2000; Uesugi 2013, 2017b) and beyond at sites such as Mundigak in Afghanistan (Casal 1961) and Shahr-i Sokhta in Iran (Cortesi et al. 2008; Jarrige et al. 2017; Sajjadi et al. 2003). I believe the early forms and motifs drawn upon to create the corpus of Harappan Style were transcultural and transregional, and as argued elsewhere the regional traditions were ‘distilled’ to form the urbanized Harappan style (Kenoyer 2011). Quivron has argued that the Harappan style may have emerged somewhere near Chanhu-daro based upon the quality of craftsmanship (Quivron 2000). However, the earliest examples of motifs thus far are from Harappa (Kenoyer and Meadow 2000) and Quivron’s first stage of ‘Mature Harappan style’ pottery can contemporaneously be outside the Indus Valley proper in the Ghaggar Hakra plains (Dangi and Uesugi 2013). These patterns of the emergence of the Harappan style are the most consistent with the dormancy or ethogenesis model where a new style draws upon extant, transcultural and possible neutral forms and motifs. It is not consistent with the dominance model where one core area replaces local styles, or with the emphasis model where the distinctive aspects of local styles become more apparent.

Evidence of ethnic diversity and the relationships between Harappan and Non-Harappan material culture

The existence of pluralism within the Indus during the Integration Era is one way of distinguishing between the dormancy and ethogenesis models of urbanization ethnoprocesses. In the case of ethogenesis we would not see any substantial levels of plurality. However, subtle ethnic plurality would be expected in the dormancy model. Ethnic plurality would be remarkable and spatially distinct in urban centers in the emphasis model and would be viewed through extensive hybridization in ‘borderland’ regions such as Gujarat, Haryana and Baluchistan signaling processes such as acculturation, accommodation, bricolage.

There are several lines of evidence that suggest ethnic pluralism in the Harappan world and that this ethnic pluralism is not spatially segregated as the emphasis model predicts. The first is the existence of difference of several types of cooking pots co-occurring at sites, such as at Mohenjo-daro where five different cooking pot types could be found in one relatively small area (Dales and Kenoyer 1986: 132). Such cooking pots, and associated foods maybe linked to both tacit and performative expressions of identity e.g. (Ferguson 2012). Analysis of human figurines has also been used to address issues of Indus identity and forms of self-representation with multiple ethnicities suggested, but without spatial segregation at sites such as Harappa (Clark 2003; Clark 2017; Clark 2009). Other emblematic and explicit displays of ethnicity or social distinctiveness maybe viewed through the highly diversified styles of beads and bangles after the urbanization of Indus cities (Kenoyer 1991a). Different communities of practice can be seen through technological studies of drilling techniques (Kenoyer 1997) and in material evidence of distinct domestic practices (Chase et al. 2014).

These distinct domestic practices are may be the best indicators we have for distinct ethnic groups, perhaps even more than material symbols (McGuire 1983) than even more than material symbols (McGuire 1983) than the technological and production communities, which may better align with social networks (Gosselain 1998) see also (Kenoyer 1989).

There is co-occurrence of Harappan and local non-Harappan ceramic traditions sites at many sites throughout Haryana, Rajasthan, and Gujarat. Even in the cases where distinct patterns of spatial clustering could be expected, such as within the enclosed areas associated with Harappan style craft production at Bagasara, no clearly demarcated patterns have emerged (Lindstrom 2013). At small regional extraction centers, villages and cities various local Gujarati Chalcolithic ceramics traditions are found alongside classic or Sindhi Harappan tradition ceramics (Bhan and Ajithprasad 2013; Bisht 2015; Chase 2010; Hegde et al. 1988; Lindstrom 2013; Mukherjee 2013; Shinde et al. 2008; Sonawane 2004), these relative proportions are not always quantified but the local signature is never insignificant. This pattern of co-occurring ceramic traditions at sites in Gujarat is found with the first examples of Early Harappan Ceramics (Ajithprasad 2002; Dhaivalkar and Possehl 1992; Majumdar 1999). In the Ghaggar Plain the ceramics indicate that the regional Sothi-Siswal tradition, or the relate ‘fabrics’ of Kalibangan (Garge 2010), continued on alongside Harappan tradition ceramics from the Regionalization Phase onward with no discernable patterns of variation.
based upon the size of the community or spatial segregation (Dangi 2011; Kumar et al. 2011; Shinde et al. 2008; Uesugi 2011a, 2011b, 2017).

These different ceramic traditions may or may not encode emblematic style or meaningful symbolism (Wiessner 1983). If they did, we must investigate if these symbols functioned to express identity or other aspects of culture, and how it varied in time and space. We do know that these different traditions co-occur in burials of single individuals, in fact at the Farmana cemetery burials are roughly three times as likely to contain both traditions rather than ceramics belonging exclusively to either Harappan or Sothi-Siswal traditions (Uesugi 2011a, 2011b, 2017).

Our current evidence neither supports a scenario where these regional ethnic identities were emphasized and spatially segregated, nor does it align well with pure ethnogenesis of a entirely new ethnic group as the traditions continue alongside each other during urbanization. One way to differentiate between the dominance and dormancy models is to examine the role and nature of hybridity and synergy between the traditions, an area of study where significantly more research is required. The grey wares of the Ghaggar plains draw on both Sothi-Siswal and Harappan elements, and Sothi-Siswal pottery of the Farmana cemetery imitates Harappan forms, and during the late 3rd millennium BC a greater amount of fusion is displayed on the Ghaggar plain as Harappan forms adopted Sothi-Siswal motifs and the Sothi-Siswal cooking pots adopted Harappan ledges (Uesugi 2017a). If Bara pottery style of the Localization Phase is an example of widespread fusion of these traditions (Jalal et al. 2011; Uesugi 2017), this maybe an example of ethnogenesis. In Gujarat, examples of hybrid wares can be found between Harappan, the so-called Sorath Harappan, and other Chalcolithic traditions such as Ahar Black and Red Ware stud-handled bowls, Micaceous Red Ware forms in the Harappan tradition, Anarta wares made in Harappan forms and technique, and Harappan perforated jars in Gritty Red ware (Ajithprasad and Sonawane 1993; Harris 2011; Rao 1985; Sonawane et al. 2003). A systematic study of these various types of ceramic hybrids, other fusions of material culture, and their relationships is needed to understand the complexities of identity in these borderland regions. However, based upon gross patterns, there is not just a single direction of adoption in form, technique, or motif, which may be expected in the unequal power relationships of the dominance model.

Cultural Memory

The final support for the dormancy model of ethnomorphic processes during urbanization in the Indus is the relative absence or suppression of some Regionalization styles during the Integration Era only to have them re-emerge during the Localization Era (Jarrige 1997). This pattern persistence of cultural memory in regions despite adoption of Harappan forms during the urban period provides little support that the Harappan material culture was a marker of ethnicity. If processes of ethnogenesis had taken place as a result of urbanization, the processes of creation of the new and active ethnic identity and the dynamic processes of ethnicity maintenance would have effectually ‘erased’ earlier regional identity. Instead over many generations, the roughly seven hundred years between the Regionalization and Integration Eras, in a complex and pluralistic urban environment conceptions of those identities remained preserved though not in highly visible manner. Cultural memory can used to forge ethnic identities but cultures can also choose to forget (Cipolla 2008; Connerton 2006; Forty and Küchler 1999; Mills 2008), which they evidently did not.

Alternatively, if the dormancy model is applied, such re-emergence suggests that those regional identities were maintained but not activated during the Integration Era. At the end of the urban Integration Era, when localized traditions re-appear, some of the symbols of the Integration Era seem to have been actively rejected and replaced with regional variations that recalled those of the Regionalization Era in a way consistent with the re-activation of ethnic identities. The regional styles certainly would have been used in different ways and embedded with various meanings in each Era, and indeed in each region and community, however, this does suggest that some sort of continuity existed in the memories of those communities throughout the Integration Era.

An alternative approach to interpreting Harappan material culture

If the dormancy model is the best-supported ethnomorphic process and Harappan styled material culture did not represent a people or ethnicity as per culture history models or the Paleo-ethnicity model, what in fact did the material culture symbolize? I suggest that rather than an ethnic group, the urban integration era material culture often referred to as Harappan is more akin to a brand (Hamilton and Lai 1989; Wengrow 2008, 2010). This description of the Harappan Veneer has recently been independently suggested by Sharri Clark (2017: 310), however, with little elaboration.

Here I suggest that the Harappan Veneer as the Harappan Brand symbolized the trade networks and interconnections of the Integration Era. A super-ethnic, super-regional, urbanized symbol system that conveyed something akin to cosmopolitanism. While the individual motifs would have been embedded
with much deeper ideological meaning that was culturally understood, the consumption objects of the Integration Era material culture suite would have had a panache, whether it be Rohri chert blades, steatite beads, or Harappan black and red painted pottery. Cosmopolitanism would have been an abstract concept that people of all social classes and ethnicities could have drawn upon to emphasize their real or imagined connections to the greater system as citizens of the Harappan world. These goods had been transformed to commodities during the Indus period, material cultural elements that were enmeshed in social symbolism and codes and the consumption of which is telling (Kopytoff 1986).

Questions about the applicability and strength of the idea of branding to the remote past need to be addressed explicitly. Branding in the modern capitalist sense has limited value in the Pre-Industrial Era. However, branding as a wider concept is associated with urbanized societies, high standardization, and highly developed systems of regional exchange, where producers and consumers are separated, operating without personal knowledge of each other (Bevan 2010: 39–41). It is also associated with an emphasis on provenience of materials and goods, the appearance of highly standardized weight systems (Bevan 2010: 39–41), and use of seals and sealings (Bevan 2010: 47; Wengrow 2008: 16–23, 2010). All of these features fit well in with what we know of the Indus Civilization (Kenoyer 1998b; Law 2011).

If the Harappan Veneer functioned as a brand, what may that imply about the consumed goods and social-economic behaviors? Based upon brands in late 20th century studies of Kalakkadu and elsewhere (Fanselow 1990; Geertz 1978, 1963) brand economies are contrasted with bazaar economies. In a ‘brand economy’ the quality of goods is relatively known, the price is set, the competition is focused between sellers, traders minimize risk and increase efficiency by using techniques such as sealing (Fanselow 1990). In contrast, a ‘bazaar economy’ has more uncertainty for the consumer (Geertz 1963), competition plays out between buyers and sellers, and is deeply tied to kinship and networks (Fanselow 1990). If a brand economy were indeed the basis behind some of the standardization and other good distribution and use systems in the Indus, e.g. rare and standardized vessels like Black Slipped Jars, which are theorized to contain particular goods, were widely traded, retained, and reused (particularly in non-Indus regions) (Blackman and Mery 1999; Méry and Blackman 1996), then it would be a reflection of changes in social relations particular to urbanization. Small-scale village situations have no need for branding, the producers and consumers would have been on intimate terms and had relationships structured by known social networks (Yaeger 2010: 168). Instead the heterogeneous populations of the Indus used branding as a way of negotiating risk and reducing conflict in economic exchanges between those with non-local weak ties or local individuals with limited trust or knowledge of each other.

Conclusion

The thin overlay of the Harappan Veneer does not reflect ethnicity and Harappan pottery does not equate with Harappan People. This re-evaluation of the Harappan Veneer explains why Harappan material culture appears in large and small sites, amongst the elites and non-elites, and in many different environmental and subsistence regions, partially obscuring regional variations. Rather than envisioning Harappans as single cultural or linguistic swath, we can use this framework to map different communities of practices, and the various ways in which identity was expressed actively and passively on the Indus landscape.

I suggest instead that ethnicity as an identity became of secondary or tertiary importance during the urban Indus period. The best current evidence supports a model where regional and other ethnic identities were partially dormant during the 1000-700 years of the integration and urbanism and other identities and communities became more salient. As would be predicted by the dormancy model, occupation and class are emphasized during the Harappan period, like many other urbanized societies where social roles and competencies are displayed rather than ethnicity (Fair 2001: 83). This pattern also aligning with Barth’s (1969) prediction of ethnic distinctions subsiding in situations of increased economic interdependence.

Whether or not we want to explicitly extend the concept of brand to the Indus, a shared material culture would have been an important in a pluralistic and urbanized landscape with extensive trade networks in reducing identity conflicts. The consumption and display of these goods could signal a sameness; that they were all urbanite and part of a greater social and economic network. Lines of social division could be drawn between those living in both small and large settlements in contrast to the pastoralists, traders, hunter and gatherers and other non-urbanites living in the urbanized landscape of Northwest South Asia (Kenoyer 1998a; Possehl 2002a). Similar concepts of social units and ‘othering’ was applied to non-urbanite pastoral peoples in Mesopotamia, where ethnicity and language were not significant aspects of identity (Bahrani 2006).

There is a range of questions remaining and much work to be done concerning the arc of identity in the processes of urbanization and de-urbanization, and how it regionally varied in the Greater Indus and Ghaggar-
Hakra Region. Greater attention to the attributes of artifacts of different material classes between and within sites, refined chronologies using AMS dates from sealed contexts, and systematic study of hybrid or fusion forms can be used to gain a more nuanced understanding and evaluation of these ethnomorphic processes.
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