Origin of the Harappan Ernestites: Geochemical Insights into Provenance and Fabrication

M. K. Mahala[1], Jyotiranjan S. Ray[1, *], A. K. Kanungo[2], G. N. S. Sree Bhuvan[3], A. Chatterjee[1,4], B. G. George[5], N. Sorcar[6,7], Y. S. Rawat[8], J. S. Kharakwal[9], and S. V. Rajesh[10]

[1]Physical Research Laboratory, Navrangpura, Ahmedabad 380009, India
[2]Indian Institute of Technology Gandhinagar, Palaj, Gandhinagar 382055, India
[3]Department of Earth Sciences, Pondicherry University, Puducherry 605014, India
[4]Department of Geology, Presidency University, College Street, Kolkata 700073, India
[5]Department of Earth Sciences, Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, Mumbai 400076, India
[6]National Centre for Earth Science Studies, Akkulam, Thiruvananthapuram 695011, India
[7]Korea Polar Research Institute, Incheon 21990, Republic of Korea
[8]Archaeological Survey of India, Dharohar Bhawan, 24 Tilak Marg, New Delhi 110011, India
[9]JRN Rajasthan Vidyapeeth, Sahitya Sansthan, Udaipur 313001, India
[10]Department of Archaeology, University of Kerala, Thiruvananthapuram 695581, India

*Correspondence: jsray@prl.res.in

Abstract

Advancements in stone bead technology, particularly in drilling techniques, emerged during the Indus Valley (Harappan) civilization. Long-constricted cylindrical drill bits, made from a unique stone called Ernestite, were a distinctive feature of this culture. The origin of Ernestite is a mystery due to the lack of a natural analogue and an unknown manufacturing process. This study presents a mineralogical and geochemical investigation of Ernestite stones and drill bits from several Harappan and contemporaneous sites in Gujarat, India, to uncover their origin. The isotopic ratios of Sr and Nd link the drills to the Ernestites. The texture and presence of pseudo-mullite ($SiO_2 > 40$ wt%) with high Al-Ti-bearing hematite suggest that Ernestites are synthetic, created through a sintering process at ~1100°C. An abundance of sand to silt-sized detrital quartz, along with Fe-Ti-Zr-rich minerals, indicates the use of crudely powdered sandstones and laterites as raw materials, with geochemical ties to regional sources.

Introduction

The prehistoric Indus Valley Civilization (IVC), also known as the Harappan civilization, was one of South Asia's most advanced civilizations of its time, renowned for its sophisticated urban architecture and material culture[1–5]. This civilization is famous for its fortified structures, efficient drainage systems, standardized seals and weights, and advanced technology employed in the manufacture of a diverse range of artifacts crafted from stone, metal, and shell[2,6–11]. Findings from nearly 2,500 sites across diverse geographic zones reveal that this civilization had broader spatial coverage compared to the contemporary Mesopotamian and Egyptian civilizations[1,5,12,13]. Most of the Harappan sites have been discovered along the river valleys of the Indus and Ghaggar-Hakra systems, distributed across Afghanistan, Pakistan, and northwestern India. It is generally believed that the Harappan culture began as small agro-pastoral communities in its Early phase (> 5000-2600 BCE), which matured into an urban civilization, recognized as the Harappan phase (2600-1900 BCE), demonstrating remarkable advancements in town planning, food production, and the technology of pottery and bead manufacturing. Subsequently, the society declined through de-urbanization in the Late Harappan phase (1900-1300 BCE)[4,14–18].

Stone beads are one of the critical indicators of cultural and trade practices within prehistoric South Asian civilizations[7,19]. The manufacture of stone beads began with the perforation of soft stones (e.g., limestone, steatite, and lapis lazuli) and later with hard stones (e.g., chert, agate, and jasper). The earliest evidence of stone beads dates back to the Mesolithic period (e.g., Jwalapuram)[20]; significant developments in bead production technologies, such as drilling, shaping, coloring, and mounting onto ornaments, occurred in the Neolithic and Chalcolithic periods[2] and became a key component of regional and external trades during the Harappan civilization[7,9,14]. Ancient Gujarat was well known for its rich agate resources, which attracted the Harappans to this region, and bead manufacturing industries/workshops were established in several urban centres in Kutch and Saurashtra[14,21]. Although various beads of different materials were in use, the long cylindrical beads of harder stones, typically jasper and carnelian, were manufactured through perforation using constricted cylindrical drill bits cut out from unique chips/stones called Ernestites[19,22–24], since their hardness is higher than agate (~7.5 on Mohs' scale; ref. [7,13,21]). The beads are characterized by a drill hole section with a stepped profile[7], as the drill bits are typically wide at the tip and narrow at the mid-section (Fig. 2b).

The name "Ernestite" was given temporarily by Kenoyer and Vidale[19] after Ernst J.H. Mackay, but it remains in use. Ernestites are a signature finding of the urban phase of the Harappan civilization; however, they have been reported in large numbers from the late phase, single-cultured Harappan and Sorath Harappan sites as well[25–27]. Many Ernestite stones and drill bits have been found in close association with bead workshops in several Harappan sites in Pakistan (e.g., Harappa, Mahenjo-daro, Chahnudaro)[14,19,28,29] as well as in India (e.g., Dholavira, Khirsara, Kanmer)[24,26,27,30–32], and in a few Sorath Harappan sites such as Bhagatrav, Bagasra, Shikarpur, Nagwada[6,25,33]. Some important Harappan and Sorath Harappan sites, including those where Ernesites have been reported, are shown on the map (Fig. 1). Primarily manufactured by the artisans of the Harappan civilization[7,34], these unique materials almost became extinct in subsequent cultural periods[35,36].

Kenoyer and Vidale[19] described Ernestite at Mohenjo-daro as a rock composed of a mottled greyish-green to yellow-brown matrix with dark brown to black irregular patches or dendritic formations. Based on the XRD analysis of samples from Mohenjo-daro, Chanhudaro, and Harappa, they opined that these are metamorphic rocks composed of quartz, sillimanite, mullite, hematite, and titanium oxide phases. Law[14] observed significant quartz, mullite-sillimanite, and hematite phases in two samples from Harappa, as well as mullite and cristobalite in the other two. He found from XRD and EMPA analyses that the light and dark matrices consisted of clay-sized (<2 μm) Al-Si bearing phases, compositionally similar to mullite and sillimanite, apart from quartz. The dark matrix contained additional phases such as hematite, titanohematite, rutile, and zircon. He suggested that the Ernestite is likely a highly indurated tonstein flint clay, sufficiently heat-treated (up to 1100°C) to yield its characteristic hardness, based on the limited mineralogical and chemical data from his study and earlier experimental studies on clays. Tonstein is a kaolinitic (flint) claystone formed by diagenesis of volcanic ash in a swampy or non-marine environment[37]. However, Law[14] did not provide the locations of the probable sources of tonstein or any experimental proof for transforming any natural rock or mineral to Ernestites by heating. His study tried to justify the presence of the constituent minerals but did not establish if all of these were produced during the heating process or if some could have been detrital. Besides, he did not explain why the so-called mullites in the Ernestites contained much less Al_2O_3 and higher SiO_2 than stoichiometry mandated[38].

Because of the sheer number of Ernestite drill bits reported from the Harappan city of Dholavira in Gujarat (1212), Prabhakar et al.[24] hypothesized that the sources of Ernestite raw materials were located within the Kutch province of Gujarat. The XRD analyses of two samples of Ernestites from Dholavira and one sample from Bhgatrav, done by Prabhakar et al.[24] and Prasad and Prabhakar[25], respectively, showed the presence of quartz, hematite, and sillimanite/mullite. No cristobalite has been reported in Ernestites from any of the Indian sites. An ambiguity persists about the provenance (source regions) of the Ernestite raw materials as earlier workers[14,24] speculated both local (Kutch/Ratanpur) and regional (Gujarat) sources, and there exists no isotopic data to establish the source(s) conclusively.

Despite their ubiquitous presence in the Harappan settlements (Fig. 1), the origin of the Ernestite stones and drill bits remains uncertain. Hence, deciphering the Ernestite source materials and their geologic origin is vital to understanding the stone drilling technology and the inter-regional communication network during the Harappan period. In this study, we have addressed the following poorly understood aspects of the Ernestites with detailed petrography, mineralogy, mineral chemistry, geochemical and isotopic investigations from three Harappan sites (Dholavira, Khirsara, Kanmer) and one Sorath Harappan site (Bhagatrav) in Gujarat, India: (1) What is the nature of Ernestites, (2) If artificial, what raw materials were used for their manufacturing, and (3) What were the geologic sources for these raw materials? In addition, we have attempted to shed some light on the manufacturing process of these stones.

Methods

Owing to our limited access to the Harappan artifacts, only six samples could be included in this study, consisting of three Ernestite stone/rock samples (Fig. 2a) and three drill bits (Fig. 2b) from four sites (Khirsara, Kanmer, Dholavira, and Bhagatrav; Fig. 1) in Gujarat. The sample from Kanmer is associated with the mature Harappan phase and comes from the collection of Kharakawal et al.[31]. The Bhagatrav sample is related to the Sorath Harappan phase[39] and comes from the collection of Kanungo[40]. A sample from Dholavira represents the Mature/Late Harappan phase[30]. The stratigraphic contexts of the samples can be found in the references given for each location. The Ernestite from Bhagatrav was subsampled into three; there were two drill bits from Kanmer (the first and third from the left in Fig. 2b) and one from Khirsara. Two laterite samples and two sandstone samples from the island of Khadir, on which Dholavira is located, were also studied. Because of their size and rarity, the drill bits were analyzed only for Sr-Nd isotopic compositions, whereas the stones/rocks were powdered for mineralogical, geochemical, and isotopic analyses.

Petrographic studies were conducted on thin sections of all three Ernestite samples using transmitted and reflected light. Grain size analysis was done using the inbuilt software (Stream Basic) associated with the petrographic microscope (Olympus® BX-53). The mineralogical compositions of the Dholavira and Bhagatrav Ernestites whole rock powders were determined by X-ray diffraction (XRD) using a Bruker D2 Phaser diffractometer at the Physical Research Laboratory (PRL).

The major element contents of Ernestites were determined by X-ray Fluorescence (XRF) spectroscopy using a Rigaku® Supermini200 instrument at PRL and the pressed pellet method[41]. Multiple international rock standards were used for calibration, and the reference material OU-6 from the International Association of Geoanalysts (IAG) was used for accuracy and precision checks. The major element contents of laterites and sandstones were measured at the National Centre for Earth Science Studies (NCESS), Thiruvananthapuram, using an S4 Pioneer sequential wavelength dispersive-XRF[42], with reference materials VL-1 and MAG-1 used for accuracy and precision checks (Table S1).

Bulk sample geochemical and isotopic measurements were carried out at PRL. About 50 mg of sample powder each was digested using conventional HF-HNO_3 and HF-HNO_3-HCl dissolution protocols for trace element and isotopic analyses, respectively. The details of the analytical procedures are given in George and Ray[43]. Trace element concentrations were measured on a Thermo® HR-ICPMS using BHVO-2 (USGS) as a calibration standard. Machine drift correction was performed using ^{115}In as an internal standard. The accuracy and precision of our measurements, determined by repeated analyses of BHVO-2 (as unknown), were better than 2% for REE and 5% for other trace elements. Sr and REE were separated from digested solutions by conventional cation exchange column chromatography using AG 50W-X8 resin (BioRad®), and Nd was eluted from REE using Ln-specific resin (Eichrom®), using protocols given in George and Ray[43]. Sr and Nd isotopic ratio measurements were performed on a TIMS (Thermo® Triton Plus) in static multicollection mode. Sr isotopes of some samples were measured on an MC-ICPMS at PRL[44]. Instrumental mass fractionation for Sr and Nd isotopic ratios was corrected using exponential fractionation (internal) correction equations of Thirlwall[45] and assuming ^{88}Sr/^{86}Sr = 8.375209 and ^{146}Nd/^{144}Nd = 0.7219. Multiple measurements of SRM-987 and JNdi-1 over three years yielded an average of ^{87}Sr/^{86}Sr = 0.710249±0.000009 (2σ; n = 14) and ^{143}Nd/^{144}Nd = 0.512102±0.000010 (2σ; n = 14).

Results

Petrography and Mineralogy

All Ernestite stone chips from Dholavira, Kanmer, and Bhagatrav exhibit heterogeneous physical appearances, unlike other Harappan artifacts, which demonstrate remarkable homogeneity[42] (Fig. 2a). They are hard (harder than quartz), highly compact, do not produce streaks, and are difficult to break. Two clear domains, a yellowish-brown or khaki color phase and a black color phase, can be distinguished by the naked eye (Fig. 2b). Transmitted and reflected light microscopy reveals that Ernestite stones contain detrital subangular to subrounded quartz grains (sand to silt-sized) and angular to sub-angular opaque phases like hematite and ilmenite set in a compact, fine-grained, light-colored (yellowish/khaki) groundmass of unidentifiable mineral(s) (Fig. 3). Quartz in Dholavira Ernestite occurs as fractured angular to subangular grains (Fig. 3a,b) compared to the sub-angular to sub-rounded grains in Bhagatrav (Fig. 3c,d) and Kanmer (Fig. 3e,f). The opaque phases (hematite, titanohematite, and ilmenite) appear as narrow bands or irregular patches. They occur in lower proportions in the Dholavira Ernestite than in the Kanmer and Bhagatrav stones. Hematite appears gray and displays the characteristic reddish internal reflection under plane and cross-polar view, respectively, in reflected light (Fig. 3g,h), and is often associated with ilmenite (shows bi-reflectance). All these detrital phases are essentially larger than clay-sized (~4 μm) mineral grains that constitute a claystone. Sand-sized (210-736 μm diameter; Supplementary Figure 1) detrital grains of ilmenite and its partial replacement by hematite are also observed in the Kanmer Ernestite under a cross-polar view in reflected light (Fig. 3e,f). Zircon and rutile in Kanmer Ernestite have subrounded to irregular grain boundaries, confirming their detrital nature (Supplementary Figure 3). The size (longest diameter) distributions of detrital quartz grains (measured in the thin sections) in Dholavira, Kanmer, and Bhagatrav Ernestites are presented in a box plot (Fig. 4). Their ϕ (= $-\log_2 d$; d = diameter) sizes (1.84-6.64) vary between medium sand to fine silt, with half of the distributions falling between very-fine sand to coarse silt fractions. The quartz grains in Kanmer and Dholavira stones are moderately sorted (1σ = 0.81 and 0.71, respectively), whereas those in the Bhagatrav stone are moderately well-sorted (1σ = 0.68). Powder XRD patterns of the Dholavira and Bhagatrav samples (Supplementary Figure 2) reveal that quartz is the most abundant phase in all the samples, followed by a mullite-like phase (mullite/sillimanite). Hematite was detected only in the

Bhagatrav dark matrix (Supplementary Figure 2), though it is observed in the petrography of all Ernestites.

Major and Trace elements

The major oxide and trace element contents of two Ernestite samples from Bhagatrav and Dholavira, as well as two laterite and two sandstone samples from Khadir Island, are presented in Supplementary Data 1. SiO_2 content (47-61 wt%) is the highest among all oxides, with Al_2O_3, FeO^T, and TiO_2 being other major components. MnO, Na_2O, and P_2O_5 are either very low (< 0.1wt%) or absent, whereas K_2O and MgO concentrations are minor. Bhagatrav Ernestite has lower SiO_2 and Al_2O_3, FeO_T, and TiO_2 than Dholavira Ernestite. The major oxide data of the laterite and sandstone samples from the Khadir Island are also presented in Supplementary Data 1. Laterites have high Fe_2O_3 (36.7-37.6 wt%), moderate SiO_2 (32.31-32.61 wt%) and low Al_2O_3 (8.77-8.89 wt%), TiO_2 (1.32-1.34 wt%) contents, whereas sandstones are characterized by high SiO_2 (67.57-68.42 wt%), moderate Al_2O_3 (13.26-13.19), K_2O (1.83-1.84 wt%) and low Fe_2O_3 (2.06-2.09 wt%). Various oxides vs. SiO_2 diagrams plotted for Ernestites, sandstones, and laterites, along with the published data for Mesozoic sandstones[46,47] and laterites-bauxites of Kutch[48–50], are presented in Fig. 5. Figure 6 presents the primitive mantle (PM) normalized multi-element patterns for the Ernestite samples and those for Mesozoic rocks[51], and laterites of Kutch region[50].

Mineral Chemistry

Representative backscattered electron (BSE) images of various phases in a polished thin section of the Kanmer Ernestite are given in Supplementary Fig. 3. Mineral compositions of different phases are provided in Supplementary Data 2. X-ray elemental maps for all three Ernestite stones (i.e., Kanmer, Bhagatrav, and Dholavira), as well as chemical spot analysis data (both by EPMA), are provided in Supplementary Figs. 3-6 and Supplementary Data 2. Quartz (SiO_2: 98-100 wt%) of varying sizes is dispersed within the light-colored (yellow) fine matrix, which is mainly composed of aluminosilicate phases (SiO_2: 40-53 wt%; Al_2O_3: 40-50 wt%). Although identified as mullites by XRD, the aluminosilicate matrix phases contain much higher SiO_2 than that mandated by stoichiometry (i.e., < 30 wt%; Lentz et al., 2019), therefore, we identify these phases as pseudomullites. Fe-Ti bearing phases, such as hematite (FeO: 71-74 wt%) and ilmenite (TiO_2: 51-56 wt%), often occur as narrow patches or are finely dispersed within the light (yellow) matrix. Many hematite grains have a high TiO2 content (29-40 wt%) and can thus be classified as titanohematite. The titanohematites also contain an appreciable amount of Al_2O_3 (5-21 wt%).

Sr-Nd isotopic ratios

Results of Sr and Nd isotopic compositions of Ernestite whole rocks and drill bits, laterites, and sandstones are provided in Table 1. The $^{87}Sr/^{86}Sr$ and $\varepsilon_{Nd}(0)$ of Ernestite stones and drill bits from

Kutch (Dholavira, Kanmer, and Khirsara) vary between 0.71000 and 0.72282, and -14.7 and -13.9, respectively. In contrast, the Sr-Nd isotopic compositions of Bhagatrav Ernestites are more radiogenic in Sr and less radiogenic in Nd ($^{87}Sr/^{86}Sr$ = 0.73022 to 0.730876; $\varepsilon_{Nd}(0)$ = -18.3 to -18.1). The drill bits from Kanmer have an identical $\varepsilon_{Nd}(0)$ of -13.9, and one of the drill bits has almost identical $^{87}Sr/^{86}Sr$ as that of the Ernestite stone (0.72282 vs. 0.72207; Table 4). The laterite samples collected from the Khadir (Dholavira) have $^{87}Sr/^{86}Sr$ varying from 0.7089 to 0.7096, and their $\varepsilon_{Nd}(0)$ ranges from -7.7 to -7.5, whereas the sandstones have more radiogenic Sr and Nd ($^{87}Sr/^{86}Sr$ = 0.71494 and 0.74344; $\varepsilon_{Nd}(0)$ = -23.5 and -17.7).

Discussion

In the first-ever detailed characterization, Kenoyer and Vidale[19] suggested a metamorphic origin for Ernestites based on their identification of the matrix phases as sillimanite and mullite. Mullite is a rare mineral and has only been reported from specific contact-metamorphic rocks (in metamorphosed clays) and pseudotachylites[52,53]. It is also commonly observed in high-temperature ceramics and has been synthesized by heating various aluminosilicate minerals (e.g., kaolinite, kyanite, andalusite, sillimanite) at high temperatures (> 1100 °C)[54–57]. However, we identify these phases, which exhibit identical XRD spectra to mullite, as pseudomullites based on their higher SiO2 contents (>40 wt%). Since mullite and pseudomullite are isostructural, all earlier studies, which relied primarily on XRD data, had incorrectly identified pseudomullite as mulite. "Pseudomullite" refers to a structure or phase that resembles mullite (Fig. 7) but is not the true, stoichiometric mullite. It can be formed by the decomposition of kaolinite or other aluminosilicate materials[57–59]. Mullite refers to an experimentally observed solid solution series $Al_{4+2x}Si_{2-2x}O_{10-x}$ with $0.2 < x < 0.9$ (Fig. 7)[60,61]. According to Shears and Archibald[38], the stoichiometric composition of synthetic mullite commonly varies between $3Al_2O_3.2SiO_2$ (~72 wt% Al_2O_3) and $2Al_2O_3.SiO_2$ (~78wt% Al_2O_3). In natural mullites, Fe_2O_3 substitutes Al_2O_3, producing a wide range of compositions at ~30 wt% SiO_2 (Fig. 7)[53,60]. In contrast, stoichiometric sillimanite has ~61 wt% Al_2O_3 (Fig. 7). The aluminosilicate phase in the Ernestite matrix is pseudomullites and has higher SiO_2 and lower Al_2O_3 than those of natural mullite or silimanite (Fig.7). Pseudomullites are not found in nature and have been shown in synthetic heating experiments to be developed as an intermediate phase during kaolinite to mullite transformation at high temperature[57,62] (~1100°C). Therefore, the presence of pseudomullites unambiguously rules out that Ernestites are natural rocks, indicating their origin by high-temperature processing.

The Harappans artificially produced the Ernestites as the source stones for drill bits through a high-temperature heating process that could generate the pseudomullites. Further evidence for a high-temperature process is provided by the chemical composition of Fe-Ti-bearing phases, as determined by EPMA analyses. The presence of titanohematites with significant TiO_2 (29-40 wt%) and Al_2O_3 (5-21 wt%) suggests an extensive substitution between Fe_2O_3 and TiO_2 and between Fe_2O_3 and Al_2O_3. It is known that at temperatures below 800°C, only a limited solid solution between TiO_2 and Fe_2O_3 is possible[63]. Similarly, in the Fe_2O_3-Al_2O_3

system, higher Al_2O_3 (up to 10 wt%) can be substituted into the hematite (Fe_2O_3) structure at high temperatures only (~1000°C)[63]. Therefore, higher TiO_2 and Al_2O_3 in the titanohematite confirm a heating process (>1000°C) in Ernestite manufacturing. It is thus apparent that the pseudomullite matrix was produced during high-temperature sintering. This provides the first geochemical evidence of sintering being used in the manufacture of Ernestites. This also successfully explains the presence of high-temperature craft objects, such as stoneware bangles[64,65], steatite beads[66], and furnaces[31,32], at the Harappan sites. The presence of detrital quartz grains, ilmenite, hematite, zircon, and rutile suggests that the raw materials used to make the Ernestites are natural, even though the manufacturing process was artificial.

Law[14] suggested tonstein as the only raw material for Harappan Ernestites. He attributed the coarser (up to 100 μm) subhedral quartz or cristobalite grains (detected in his BSE images) to the recrystallized free silica (released during heating) and zircon to a magmatic origin. He further proposed that the raw materials for the Ernsitites (i.e, tonsteins) were sourced from local/regional sources (i.e., Kutch). Tonsteins are hard and compact kaolinite-altered volcanic ash layers, generally found in coals and associated sediments[37]. These often contain magmatic quartz and zircon[37,67]. However, microtextural characteristics of these constituent minerals suggest that zircon, quartz, ilmenite, and rutile in Ernestites are essentially detrital. Therefore, tonstein is ruled out as Ernestite's raw material. Additional evidence against using tonsteins for Ernestites comes from the presence of non-radiogenic Nd in the Ernestites ($\varepsilon_{Nd}(0) < -14$), because all ash beds in Kutch are linked to the Deccan Traps[50], which contain more radiogenic Nd ($\varepsilon_{Nd}(0) > -11$, Fig. 8). Besides, our Ernestite samples contain sand-sized detrital quartz and ilmenite grains in contrast to a claystone/tonstein that usually contains clay-sized grains ($\leq 2\mu m$).

The detrital quartz grains' size and moderately sorted nature suggest using coarser raw materials, such as sandstones, which were likely pounded into sand/silt-sized particles before being processed for sintering. It is possible that the Fe-Ti phases (hematite, titanohematite, ilmenite, and rutile) observed in the Ernestites also originated from the sandstones, as sandstones generally contain such heavy minerals. However, our Ernestites appear to exhibit mixing trends between Mesozoic sandstones and laterites-bauxites of the Kutch region in various oxide vs. SiO_2 plots (Fig. 5). Trace element patterns (Fig. 6) also suggest that such a mixture is necessary to explain the chemistry of the Ernestites. Besides, high contents of Al_2O_3 (> 20 wt%) and high field strength elements (e.g., Sc, V, Cr, and Co) in Ernestites cannot be achieved by the sandstones of the Kutch alone. Therefore, a second end-member, containing Fe-Ti minerals but low in alkali elements, is needed to explain the Ernestite chemistry, and the laterites of Kutch, derived from the mafic volcanic rocks of the Deccan Traps, fit the bill. The Paleocene to Eocene lateritic deposits in western Kutch (Matanomadh Formation) and Saurashtra (Jamnagar) contain both Al-rich (gibbsite, kaolinite) and Fe-rich (goethite, hematite, ilmenite-rich) phases and are depleted in alkalis[48–50], and have the required characteristics of this raw material. Although we discard claystone as the sole raw material, we do not deny its possible use in combination with sandstone and laterite for Ernestite manufacturing.

Since kaolinite is a common mineral in laterites, it could have decomposed and undergone subsequent chemical and structural changes to form the pseudomullite matrix during the sintering process. The free (amorphous) silica released during the heating of pure kaolinite recrystallizes as cristobalite upon further heating (to ~1350°C)[57] and when kaolinite is heated with alumina-bearing material (e.g., bauxite, aluminum fluoride, aluminum hydroxide), free silica formation is prohibited[68–70]. We suspect that during the sintering process carried out by the Harappans, the free silica (SiO_2) formation was suppressed by the presence of gibbsite ($Al(OH)_3$) in the laterite. Moreover, gibbsite undergoes thermal decomposition to boehmite (AlO.OH) at 200°C, which transforms into a transitional alumina (α- Al_2O_3) phase at 500°C[71,72]. We suspect that the Al_2O_3 in the titanohematite structure was sourced from gibbsite (lateritic) in the mixture during the α-Al_2O_3 stage. Since the results of our study point to a maximum temperature of 1100°C for the sintering process, the cristobalites observed by Law[14] likely represent a higher temperature or longer heating process.

Similar $^{87}Sr/^{86}Sr$ and $\varepsilon_{Nd}(0)$ of Ernestite stone and drill bits from Kanmer genetically link the drill bits to the stone. Although it has been well established that Ernestite stones are the raw materials for long and constricted cylindrical drill bits[14], their isotopic similarity is the first-ever chemical evidence for the same. Because of the sheer number of Ernestite stones and drill bits from Dholavira, Law[14] speculated that the raw materials for the stones came from either the island itself (i.e., Khadir) or the Kutch region of Gujarat. However, our geochemical data (Figs. 5 and 6) support a regional sourcing of the raw materials. The sandstones and laterites of Kutch appear to have been the primary sources of the raw materials for the Ernestites. In search of more robust evidence for this geological provenance hypothesis, we make use of the Sr-Nd isotopic compositions of Ernestites and their potential source rocks (Table 1; Fig. 8). Although, the ε_{Nd} and $^{87}Sr/^{86}Sr$ compositions of the Ernestites plot well within the compositional field of the Mesozoic sandstones of Kutch, they can be explained by a two-component mixing between the sandstones and laterites of Khadir (Fig. 8). The isotopic compositions of laterites of Khadir, which are developed over volcanic ash of Deccan Traps fall well within the field of the Deccan Basalts, which suggests that other lateritic horizons in the Kutch and Saurashtra region, developed over Deccan Trap rocks could also have served as sources for the raw material for Ernestites. The mixing model suggests 55-60% contribution from these end-members to the isotopic compositions of most of our samples; however, those from Bhagatrav (in south Gujarat) require ~80% contribution from the sandstones. Therefore, we infer that the Harappans used laterite from different weathered (Deccan) horizons and sand from Mesozoic sandstones from Kutch to manufacture Ernestites.

We make the following conclusions based on our investigation of Ernestites, the parent material for the unique constricted drill bits of the Harappan Civilization, using petrographic, mineralogical, geochemical, and Sr-Nd isotopic techniques.

1. Stone drill bits have been isotopically fingerprinted to the Ernestites, confirming their genetic link.

2. The Ernestites consist of medium sand to fine silt detrital quartz, hematite, ilmenite, zircon, and rutile welded together in a fine-grained aluminosilicate matrix/groundmass.
3. Ernestites' texture (larger mineral grains and their detrital nature), and its whole-rock Nd isotopic composition ($\varepsilon_{Nd}(0) > -11$) rule out the use of tonstein flint as a raw material.
4. The aluminosilicate matrix/groundmass phase has been chemically identified as pseudomullite, though its XRD spectrum is similar to mullite.
5. The presence of pseudomullites, with high SiO_2 contents (> 40 wt%), unambiguously makes Ernestites artificial, with supporting evidence from the significant substitution of Al_2O_3 and TiO_2 in hematites. These data also suggest a high temperature (reaching 1100 °C) synthesis of Ernestites.
6. Mineralogy, texture, and mineral chemistry suggest Ernestites were manufactured through a high-temperature sintering process involving sand and clay-bearing raw materials.
7. Major and trace elements and Sr-Nd isotopic data point to the likelihood of the raw materials' regional provenance (sandstones and laterites of Kutch).
8. All our findings suggest that Ernestites were likely made in the Harappan centres of Gujarat, India, and the Ernestite-based drilling technology was exclusive to this civilization.

Author contributions

JSR and AC conceived the study. AKK, YSR, JSK, and SVR supplied samples. AC, MKM, BGG, NS, and GNSSB conducted the analytical work. MKM, GNSSB, AC, and JSR interpreted the data. JSR secured the project's funding, and all authors contributed to the writing.

Data Availability Statement

All data generated for this study are in the tables in the manuscript and the supplementary files.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests related to this work.

Acknowledgments

JSR thanks the Physical Research Laboratory, Ahmedabad, India, for funding. The authors acknowledge the laboratory support of Sneha Mukherjee of NCESS and Jitender Kumar of PRL.

Appendix A. Supplementary Information

Supplementary materials for this article have been attached as separate files.

1) Supplementary Data 1 (Excel file containing Major and Trace element data for Ernestites)
2) Supplementary Data 2 (Mineral chemistry - EMPA data for various phases in Ernestites)
3) Supplementary Figures (Supplementary Figures 1-6)

References

1. Ramesh, S. The Indus Valley Civilisation: 3000 BC to 1600 BC. in *The Political Economy of India's Economic Development: 5000BC to 2022AD, Volume I: Before the Indus Civilisation to Alexander the Great* (ed. Ramesh, S.) 37–75 (Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2023). doi:10.1007/978-3-031-42072-6_2.
2. Possehl, G. L. Revolution in the Urban Revolution: The Emergence of Indus Urbanization. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* **19**, 261–282 (1990).
3. Agrawal, D. P. *The Indus Civilization: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*. (Aryan Books International, New Delhi, 2007).
4. Wright, R. P. *The Ancient Indus: Urbanism, Economy, and Society*. (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2010).
5. Shinde, V. Current Perspectives on the Harappan Civilization. in *A Companion to South Asia in the Past* (eds. Schug, G. R. & Walimbe, S. R.) 125–144 (Wiley, 2016). doi:10.1002/9781119055280.ch9.
6. Bhan, K. K. Some Important Aspects of Technology and Craft Production in the Indus Civilization with Specific Reference to Gujarat. in *Walking with the Unicorn: Jonathan Mark Kenoyer Felicitation Volume* (eds. Frenez, D., Jamison, G. M., Law, R. W., Vidale, M. & Meadow, R. H.) 48–67 (Archaeopress Archaeology, 2018).
7. Kenoyer, J. M. History of stone beads and drilling: South Asia. in *Stone Beads of South & South-East Asia: Archaeology, Ethnography and Global Connections* (ed. Kanungo, A. K.) 125–148 (Indian Institute of Technology- Gandhinagar & Aryan Press: Ahmedabad and Delhi, 2017).
8. Kenoyer, J. M. Trade and technology of the Indus Valley: New insights from Harappa, Pakistan. *World Archaeol.* **29**, 262–280 (1997).
9. Kenoyer, J. M. Stone beads in Ancient South Asia-7000-600 BC: A comparative approach to technology, style, and ideology. in *The Global Perspective of Beads and Beadwork: History, Manufacture, Trade, and Adornment* (eds. Allen, J. & Hector, V.) 1–12 (Kadir Has University, Istanbul, 2007).
10. Kenoyer, J. M. Bead technologies at Harappa, 3300-1900 BC: a comparative summary. *South Asian Archaeol.* 157–170 (2001).
11. Vahia, M. N. & Yadav, N. Reconstructing the history of Harappan civilization. *Soc. Evol. Hist.* **10**, 87–120 (2011).
12. Danino, M. *The Lost River: On the Trail of the Sarasvatī*. (Penguin Books India, 2010).
13. Prabhakar, V. N. An overview of the stone bead drilling technology in South Asia from earliest times to Harappans. *Herit. J. Multidiscip. Stud. Archaeol.* **4**, 47–74 (2016).
14. Law, R. W. *Inter-Regional Interaction and Urbanism in the Ancient Indus Valley. A Geological Provenience Study of Harappa's Rock and Mineral Assemblage*. (Indus Project, Research Institute for Humanity and Nature, Kyoto, 2011).
15. Jahan, T. & Quamar, M. F. The '4.2 ka drought event' and the fall of the Harappan Civilization: A critical review. *Rev. Palaeobot. Palynol.* **331**, 105187 (2024).

16. Dutt, S. *et al.* Climate variability and evolution of the Indus civilization. *Quat. Int.* **507**, 15–23 (2019).
17. Possehl, G. L. *The Indus Civilization: A Contemporary Perspective*. (Rowman Altamira, 2002).
18. Chatterjee, A., Ray, J. S., Shukla, A. D. & Pande, K. On the existence of a perennial river in the Harappan heartland. *Sci. Rep.* **9**, 17221 (2019).
19. Kenoyer, J. M. & Vidale, M. A new look at stone drills of the Indus Valley Tradition. in *Materials Issues in Art and Archaeology III* (eds. Vandiver, P. B., Druzik, J. R., Wheeler, G. S. & Freestone, I. C.) vol. 267 495–518 (MATERIALS RESEARCH SOCIETY, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 1992).
20. Clarkson, C. *et al.* The oldest and longest enduring microlithic sequence in India: 35 000 years of modern human occupation and change at the Jwalapuram Locality 9 rockshelter. *Antiquity* **83**, 326–348 (2009).
21. Law, R. W. The Important Stone and Metal Resources of Gujarat during the Harappan Period. *Herit. J. Multidiscip. Stud. Archaeol.* **1**, 319–343 (2013).
22. Kenoyer, J. M. Stone Beads and Pendant Making Techniques. in *A Bead Timeline. Volume I: Prehistory to 1200 CE* (ed. Lankton, J. W.) 14–19 (Washington DC: The Bead Museum, 2003).
23. Kenoyer, J. M. Bead technologies at Harappa, 3300-1900 BC: A comparison of tools, techniques and Finished Beads from the Ravi to the Late Harappan Period. in *South Asian Archaeology 2001* (eds. Jarrige, C. & Lefèvre, V.) 157–170 (CRNS, Paris, 2005).
24. Prabhakar, V. N., Bisht, R. S., Law, R. W. & Kenoyer, J. M. Stone Drill Bits from Dholavira – A Multi-faceted Analysis. *Man Environ.* **XXXVII**, 8–25 (2012).
25. Prasad, R. K. & Prabhakar, V. N. Mineralogical characterization of raw materials from Dholavira, Gujarat, India and its geological and archaeological significance. *Curr. Sci.* **123**, 1341 (2022).
26. Nath, J. & Kumaran, R. N. Khirsara - A Harappan Metropolis in Western Kachchh, Gujarat, India. *Herit. J. Multidiscip. Stud. Archaeol.* **5**, 541–555 (2017).
27. Pokharia, A. K. *et al.* Altered cropping pattern and cultural continuation with declined prosperity following abrupt and extreme arid event at ~4,200 yrs BP: Evidence from an Indus archaeological site Khirsara, Gujarat, western India. *PLOS ONE* **12**, e0185684 (2017).
28. Mackay, E. Bead Making in Ancient Sind. *J. Am. Orient. Soc.* **57**, 1–15 (1937).
29. Mackay, E. J. H. *Further Excavations at Mohenjo-Daro*. (Manager of Publications, Delhi, 1938).
30. Bisht, R. S. *Excavations at Dholavifra 1989-2005: A Report Submitted to Archaeological Survey of India*. (2015).
31. *Excavation at Kanmer: 2005-06 – 2008-09*. (Indus Project, Research Institute for Humanity and Nature, Kyoto, 2012).
32. Kharakwal, J. S., Rawat, Y. S., Osada, T. & Uesugi, A. Preliminary observations on the excavation at Kanmer, Kachchh, India 2006–2007. *Linguist. Archaeol. Hum. Past* 5–23 (2008).

33. Chase, B., Ajithprasad, P., Rajesh, S. V., Patel, A. & Sharma, B. Materializing Harappan identities: Unity and diversity in the borderlands of the Indus Civilization. *J. Anthropol. Archaeol.* **35**, 63–78 (2014).
34. Kenoyer, J. M. *et al.* Carnelian beads in Mongolia: new perspectives on technology and trade. *Archaeol. Anthropol. Sci.* **14**, 6 (2022).
35. Kenoyer, J. M. The Indus civilization (2600-1900 BC): Early urbanism in South Asia and Its Legacy. *Bull. Shanghai Archaeol. Forum 1* 304–322 (2015).
36. Ludvik, G. E., Kenoyer, J. M., Klonymus, H. C., Barkay, G. & Dvira, Z. Stone Beads from the Temple Mount, Jerusalem: A relative chronology through high-resolution studies of bead technology. *Archaeol. Anthropol. Sci.* **14**, 115 (2022).
37. Spears, D. A. The origin of tonsteins, an overview, and links with seatearths, fireclays and fragmental clay rocks. *Int. J. Coal Geol.* **94**, 22–31 (2012).
38. Shears, E. C. & Archibald, W. A. Aluminosilicate refractories. *Iron Steel* **27**, 26–30 (1954).
39. Kanungo, A. K. *et al.* Luminescence and radiocarbon chronology of Bhagatrav: A Sorath Harappan camp site in South Gujarat. *Radiocarbon* **67**, 53–73 (2025).
40. Kanungo, A. K. Harappan Horn Deity Tradition: A Recent Finds at Bhagatrav. *Bull. Deccan Coll. Post-Grad. Res. Inst.* **81**, 1–16 (2021).
41. Tripati, S. *et al.* Geochemical provenance of an Indo-Arabian stone anchor from Manikapatna highlights the medieval maritime trade of India. *Sci. Rep.* **12**, 13559 (2022).
42. Ravindra Kumar, G. R. & Sreejith, C. Petrology and geochemistry of charnockites (felsic ortho-granulites) from the Kerala Khondalite Belt, Southern India: Evidence for intra-crustal melting, magmatic differentiation and episodic crustal growth. *Lithos* **262**, 334–354 (2016).
43. George, B. G. & Ray, J. S. Provenance of sediments in the Marwar Supergroup, Rajasthan, India: Implications for basin evolution and Neoproterozoic global events. *J. Asian Earth Sci.* **147**, 254–270 (2017).
44. Chatterjee, A. & Ray, J. S. Sources and depositional pathways of mid-Holocene sediments in the Great Rann of Kachchh, India: Implications for fluvial scenario during the Harappan Culture. *Quat. Int.* **443**, 177–187 (2017).
45. Thirlwall, M. F. Long-term reproducibility of multicollector Sr and Nd isotope ratio analysis. *Chem. Geol. Isot. Geosci. Sect.* **94**, 85–104 (1991).
46. Mandal, A. *et al.* Physico-chemical tuning of palaeogeographic shifts: Bhuj formation, Kutch, India. *Mar. Pet. Geol.* **78**, 474–492 (2016).
47. Periasamy, V. & Venkateshwarlu, M. Petrography and geochemistry of Jurassic sandstones from the Jhuran Formation of Jara dome, Kachchh basin, India: Implications for provenance and tectonic setting. *J. Earth Syst. Sci.* **126**, 44 (2017).
48. Meshram, R. R. & Randive, K. R. Geochemical study of laterites of the Jamnagar district, Gujarat, India: Implications on parent rock, mineralogy and tectonics. *J. Asian Earth Sci.* **42**, 1271–1287 (2011).
49. Jadhav, G. N., Sharma, N. & Sen, P. Characterization of Bauxite Deposits from Kachchh Area, Gujarat. *J. Geol. Soc. India* **80**, 351–362 (2012).

50. Singh, B. P. & Srivastava, V. K. Petrographical, mineralogical, and geochemical characteristics of the Palaeocene lateritic bauxite deposits of Kachchh Basin, Western India. *Geol. J.* **54**, 2588–2607 (2019).
51. Chaudhuri, A., Chatterjee, A., Banerjee, S. & Ray, J. S. Tracing multiple sources of sediments using trace element and Nd isotope geochemistry: provenance of the Mesozoic succession in the Kutch Basin, western India. *Geol. Mag.* **158**, 359–374 (2021).
52. Deer, W. A., Howie, R. A. & Zussman, J. *An Introduction to the Rock-Forming Minerals*. (Mineralogical Society of Great Britain and Ireland, 2013). doi:10.1180/DHZ.
53. Moecher, D. P. & Brearley, A. J. Mineralogy and petrology of a mullite-bearing pseudotachylyte: Constraints on the temperature of coseismic frictional fusion. *Am. Mineral.* **89**, 1486–1495 (2004).
54. Chin, C. L., Ahmad, Z. A. & Sow, S. S. Relationship between the thermal behaviour of the clays and their mineralogical and chemical composition: Example of Ipoh, Kuala Rompin and Mersing (Malaysia). *Appl. Clay Sci.* **143**, 327–335 (2017).
55. Komarneni, S., Schneider, H. & Okada, K. Mullite Synthesis and Processing. in *Mullite* (eds. Schneider, H. & Komarneni, S.) 251–348 (Wiley, 2005). doi:10.1002/3527607358.ch4.
56. Septawendar, R. Sifat fisik lempung Tanjung Morawa dalam transformasi fasa mineral berdasarkan investigasi difraksi Sinar X. *Ris. Geol. Dan Pertamb.* **17**, 11–19 (2007).
57. Worrall, W. E. *Clays : Their Nature, Origin and General Properties*. (Maclaren, 1968).
58. Querol, X., Fernandez Turiel, J. L. & Lopez Soler, A. The behaviour of mineral matter during combustion of Spanish subbituminous and brown coals. *Mineral. Mag.* **58**, 119–133 (1994).
59. Noghani, S. & Emami, M. Mineralogical Phase Transition on Sandwich-like Structure of Clinky Pottery from Parthian Period, Iran. *Period. Mineral.* **83**, 171–185 (2014).
60. Lenz, S. *et al.* Natural mullites: chemical composition, crystal structure, and optical properties. *Eur. J. Mineral.* **31**, 353–367 (2019).
61. Schneider, H., Schreuer, J. & Hildmann, B. Structure and properties of mullite—A review. *J. Eur. Ceram. Soc.* **28**, 329–344 (2008).
62. Yanti, E. D. & Pratiwi, I. Correlation between thermal behavior of clays and their chemical and mineralogical composition: A review. in *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* vol. 118 012078 (IOP Publishing, 2018).
63. Deer, W. A., Howie, R. A. & Zussman, J. *An Introduction to the Rock-Forming Minerals*. (Longman Scientific and Technology, Essex, England, 1992).
64. Pracchia, S., Vidale, M. & Volpicelli, O. The Archaeological Context of Stoneware Firing at Mohenjo-Daro. *East West* **43**, 23–68 (1993).
65. Vidale, M. *The Archaeology of Indus Crafts: Indus Craftspeople and Why We Study Them*. (Istituto Italiano per l''Africa el'Oriente, Rome, 2000).
66. Barthélemy De Saizieu, B. & Bouquillon, A. Steatite working at Mehrgarh during the Neolithic and Chalcolithic periods: quantitative distribution, characterization of material and manufacturing processes. in *Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae. Series B* vol. 271 47–59 (1993).

67. Lyons, P. C., Spears, D. A., Outerbridge, W. F., Congdon, R. D. & Evans Jr, H. T. Euramerican tonsteins: overview, magmatic origin, and depositional-tectonic implications. *Palaeogeogr. Palaeoclimatol. Palaeoecol.* **106**, 113–134 (1994).
68. Chatterjee, N. B. & Panti, B. N. Mullite Refractories from Clay-Bauxite or Quartz-Bauxite Mixes. *Trans. Indian Ceram. Soc.* **24**, 116–121 (1965).
69. Locsei, B. Possible technical developments in the manufacture of fireclay refractory materials: III, Mechanisms of the synthesis of mullite in the system kaolinite-aluminum fluoride. *Keram Z* **20**, 362–367 (1968).
70. Rossini, A. R., Arazi, S. C. & Krenkel, T. G. Mullitization of mixtures of kaolinitic clay and aluminium hydroxides. *Bol Soc Espan Ceram* **9**, 579–591 (1970).
71. Baranyai, V. Z., Kristály, F. & Szücs, I. Influence of the short time grinding on the thermal decomposition processes of gibbsite produced by the Bayer process. *Mater. Sci. Eng.* **38**, 15–27 (2013).
72. Kloprogge, J. T., Ruan, H. D. & Frost, R. L. Thermal decomposition of bauxite minerals: infrared emission spectroscopy of gibbsite, boehmite and diaspore. *J. Mater. Sci.* **37**, 1121–1129 (2002).
73. Sun, S.-S. & McDonough, W. F. Chemical and isotopic systematics of oceanic basalts: implications for mantle composition and processes. *Geol. Soc. Lond. Spec. Publ.* **42**, 313–345 (1989).
74. McDonough, W. F. & Sun, S. -s. The composition of the Earth. *Chem. Geol.* **120**, 223–253 (1995).
75. Simonetti, A., Goldstein, S. L., Schmidberger, S. S. & Viladkar, S. G. Geochemical and Nd, Pb, and Sr isotope data from Deccan alkaline complexes—inferences for mantle sources and plume–lithosphere interaction. *J. Petrol.* **39**, 1847–1864 (1998).
76. Paul, D. K., Ray, A., Das, B., Patil, S. K. & Biswas, S. K. Petrology, geochemistry and paleomagnetism of the earliest magmatic rocks of Deccan Volcanic Province, Kutch, Northwest India. *Lithos* **102**, 237–259 (2008).
77. Sheth, H. C. *et al.* Geology and geochemistry of Pachmarhi dykes and sills, Satpura Gondwana Basin, central India: problems of dyke-sill-flow correlations in the Deccan Traps. *Contrib. Mineral. Petrol.* **158**, 357–380 (2009).
78. Cucciniello, C., Demonterova, E. I., Sheth, H., Pande, K. & Vijayan, A. 40Ar/39Ar geochronology and geochemistry of the Central Saurashtra mafic dyke swarm: insights into magmatic evolution, magma transport, and dyke-flow relationships in the northwestern Deccan Traps. *Bull. Volcanol.* **77**, 45 (2015).
79. Cucciniello, C. *et al.* The Southeastern Saurashtra dyke swarm, Deccan Traps: Magmatic evolution of a tholeiitic basalt–basaltic andesite–andesite–rhyolite suite. *Lithos* **376–377**, 105759 (2020).
80. Banerjee, A. & Chakrabarti, R. A geochemical and Nd, Sr and stable Ca isotopic study of carbonatites and associated silicate rocks from the ~65 Ma old Ambadongar carbonatite complex and the Phenai Mata igneous complex, Gujarat, India: Implications for crustal

contamination, carbonate recycling, hydrothermal alteration and source-mantle mineralogy. *Lithos* **326–327**, 572–585 (2019).

81. Chandra, J., Paul, D., Stracke, A., Chabaux, F. & Granet, M. The Origin of Carbonatites from Amba Dongar within the Deccan Large Igneous Province. *J. Petrol.* **60**, 1119–1134 (2019).
82. Chatterjee, A. Provenance of late quarternary continental sediments in western India insight from trace element and isotope geochemistry. (Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda, 2017).

Table 1. Sr-Nd isotopic data for the Ernestite stones/drills and Laterites

Sample	Type	Location	$^{87}Sr/^{86}Sr$	$^{143}Nd/^{144}Nd$	$\varepsilon_{Nd}(0)$
E-2	Ernestite	Bhagatrav	0.73022*	0.511708	-18.1
E-3	Ernestite	Bhagatrav	0.73027 *	0.511703	-18.2
E-4	Ernestite	Bhagatrav	0.73087*	0.511700	-18.3
3304	Drill bit	Kanmer	0.72282*	0.511927	-13.9
3285	Drill bit	Kanmer	0.71778 *	0.511926	-13.9
ERN-KM	Ernestite	Kanmer	0.72207*	0.511884	-14.7
ERN-DV	Ernestite	Dholavira	0.712901	0.511900	-14.4
ERN-KU	Drill bit	Khirsara	0.709991	0.511915	-14.1
KH-3	Laterite	Khadir	0.708990	0.512256	-7.5
KH-4	Laterite	Khadir	0.709551	0.512245	-7.7
KH-15-6	Sandstone	Khadir	0.714940*	0.511731*	-17.7
KH-15-27	Sandstone	Khadir	0.743439*	0.511433*	-23.5

Note: All ratios are TIMS data except those marked with *, which are MC-ICPMS data. The average isotopic ratios and external reproducibilities determined for the international SRM-987 and JNdi-1 in TIMS, after repeated analyses over three years, are $^{87}Sr/^{86}Sr = 0.710249 \pm 0.000009$ (2σ; n=14) and $^{143}Nd/^{144}Nd = 0.512102 \pm 0.000010$ (2σ; n = 14), respectively. $\square_{Nd}(0) = [(^{143}Nd/^{144}Nd)_{sample}/^{143}Nd/^{144}Nd)_{CHUR} - 1] \times 10^4$, where CHUR = Chondrite Uniform Reservoir and (0) stands for present-day value.

Figure Captions

Figure 1. A schematic geographical map of western India and Pakistan shows important Harappan urban centers and cities yielding Ernestite stones and drill bits. The four Harappan sites whose Ernestite samples have been studied in this work are marked.

Figure 2. (a) Ernestite stones from Dholavira, Bhagatrav, and Kanmer studied in this work. Note the compositional variations between different samples, as reflected in their colors. (b) Ernestite drill bits from Kanmer. Note the compositional variations. The first and third samples have been used for isotopic analyses.

Figure 3. Photomicrographs of Ernestite thin sections: (a) sample from Dholavira in plane-polarized transmitted light showing the presence of quartz (Qz) and opaques (Opq); (b) same as in (a) with hematite (Hem) displaying characteristic red internal reflection under reflected lights;

(c-d) sample from Bhagatrav in plane-polarized and cross-polarized transmitted lights; (e-f) sample from Kanmer showing detrital ilmenite (Ilm) and quartz (Qz) in plane-polarized transmitted light; (g-h) sand-sized ilmenite (Ilm) grains and hematite (Hem) patches in the same sample as in (e) in plane and crossed polarized reflected lights, respectively.

Figure 4. Boxplot showing grain size distribution (in ϕ scale) in the Ernestites. Relevant statistical information is given in boxes inside the figure. The mean (square) and median (red dashed line) are marked in each box. Bhagatrav-1 and Bhagatrav-2 represent the yellow (khaki) and black colored groundmasses, respectively. Symbols: n= number of observations; μ = mean; σ = standard deviation; SK = skewness; K = Kurtosis.

Figure 5. Plots of various oxides vs SiO_2 for Ernestites of Gujarat, laterites, and sandstones from Khadir Island (data in Table 1). Compositions of Mesozoic sandstones, laterites, and bauxites of Kutch are plotted as fields for comparison. Data from ref. [46–50].

Figure 6. Primitive Mantle normalized spider diagram for Ernestites of Gujarat. Also plotted are the data for Mesozoic shales and laterites of Kutch (Data from ref. [48,51]. Normalizing values are from [73,74].

Figure 7. The plot of Al_2O_3 vs. SiO_2 for the aluminosilicate phases in our Ernestite samples compared with compositions of natural mullite, stoichiometric (synthetic) mullite, mullite solid solution, and stoichiometric sillimanite. Data for Natural mullite from ref. [53,60].

Figure 8. The plot of $\varepsilon_{Nd}(0)$ vs. $^{87}Sr/^{86}Sr$ of the Ernestite stones and drill bits, along with laterites and sandstones from Khadir Island. The compositional fields for Deccan Basalts and Mesozoic sedimentary rocks (sandstones) of Kutch are also shown for comparison. The curves represent binary mixing curves between a sandstone ($^{87}Sr/^{86}Sr = 0.743415$; $\varepsilon_{Nd} = -23.5$) and a laterite ($^{87}Sr/^{86}Sr = 0.70927$; $\varepsilon_{Nd} = -7.6$). The sandstone end-member (A) composition is similar to a Mesozoic sandstone of Kutch, and the laterite (B) is from Khadir (Table 4); *f* represents the fraction of sand end-member in the mixture. Data for Deccan Basalts: ref. [75–81] and Mesozoic sandstones: ref. [82].