

The ebb and flow of the Ghūrid empire

Adapa Monographs

Series Editors: Alison Betts and Barbara Helwing

Executive Editor: Stephen Bourke

The Adapa Monographs series focuses on the archaeology of the ancient Near East and adjacent regions from North Africa to Central Asia. Archaeology in these regions is a vibrant and active field of research, further stimulated by issues relating to the loss of cultural heritage to war and other factors. The series is peer-reviewed and published in association with the Near Eastern Archaeology Foundation at the University of Sydney.

The ebb and flow of the Ghūrid empire
David C. Thomas

The ebb and flow of the Ghūrid empire

David C. Thomas



SYDNEY UNIVERSITY PRESS

First published by Sydney University Press
© David C. Thomas 2018
© Sydney University Press 2018

Reproduction and Communication for other purposes

Except as permitted under the Act, no part of this edition may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or communicated in any form or by any means without prior written permission. All requests for reproduction or communication should be made to Sydney University Press at the address below:

Sydney University Press
Fisher Library F03
University of Sydney NSW 2006
AUSTRALIA
sup.info@sydney.edu.au
sydney.edu.au/sup



A catalogue record for this
book is available from the
National Library of Australia

ISBN 9781743325414 paperback
ISBN 9781743325421 epub
ISBN 9781743325407 mobi
ISBN 9781743325438 pdf

Cover image: The minaret of Jām. Photo by David C. Thomas.
Cover design by Miguel Yamin.

Contents

<i>List of figures</i>	vii
<i>List of plates</i>	xv
<i>List of tables</i>	xvii
<i>Abstract in Dari</i>	xix
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xxi
<i>Preface</i>	xxv
<i>Note on transliteration and dates</i>	xxix
<i>Abbreviations</i>	xxxii
Introduction	1
1 The nomadic empire of the Ghūrids	19
2 The Ghūrīd landscapes	37
3 The rise, expansion and demise of the Ghūrīds under the Shansabānīd dynasty	71
4 The archaeological remains of the Ghūrīds	105
5 Exploring Jām	145
6 Re-defining Jām: an archaeological eye in the sky	249
7 The Ghūrīds: an unsustainable Early Islamic polity	309
<i>Plates</i>	329
<i>Appendix 1: Google Earth study areas</i>	339
<i>Appendix 2: Less well-known ethnies and dynasties</i>	343

The ebb and flow of the Ghūrid empire

Works cited 347

Index 379

Appendices 3–14 can be found online at:

<http://purl.library.usyd.edu.au/sup/9781743325414>

List of figures

Figure I:1 The minaret of Jām.	2
Figure I:2 Map of the Ghūrid ‘empire’ at its height towards the end of the 12th century.	3
Figure I:3 Election poster at Jām; the central drawing is reputedly Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad.	7
Figure 2:1 Map of Early Islamic Ghūr, Gūzganān and Ṭukhāristān.	40
Figure 2:2 Dupree’s 11 geographical zones, overlain with the major river systems and Google Earth study areas.	48
Figure 2:3 Study Area 6.	50
Figure 2:4 Study Area 8.	50
Figure 2:5 Study Area 7.	51
Figure 2:6 Black goat hair tents, brushwood corrals and dung-stained ground beside a wadi and tracks in Study Area 7.	51
Figure 2:7 Nomads grazing in an irrigated valley in Ghūr province on the route to Jām in 2005.	53
Figure 2:8 Toyota 4WD fording Harī Rūd at low water in August.	54
Figure 2:9 Surveying scree slopes along the Jām Rūd.	55
Figure 2:10 Kevin White sampling marls opposite the kiln site, Khar Khūj.	56
Figure 2:11 West bank of the Jām Rūd (WBJR).	56
Figure 2:12 Robber Hole RH001, prior to cleaning, WBJR.	57
Figure 2:13 Herat-Ghuriyan highway.	61
Figure 2:14 Google Earth Study Areas 9 and 10 in the Turkeṣtān Plains north of Harāt.	64

The ebb and flow of the Ghūrid empire

Figure 2:15 Google Earth Study Areas 1–5, 40 km east of Lashkar-i Bāzār.	66
Figure 3:1 Chronological chart illustrating major territorial gains and military victories during the ‘Ghūrid interlude’.	97
Figure 3:2 Lengths of reigns for the major dynasties in central Asia.	100
Figure 4:1 Distribution of ‘Ghūrid’ sites in Afghanistan by analytical region.	106
Figure 4:2 The principal types of ‘Ghūrid’ sites.	107
Figure 4:3 The grouped ‘Ghūrid’ site types in the Ghūrid heartland.	108
Figure 4:4 The grouped ‘Ghūrid’ site types in the Upland periphery.	109
Figure 4:5 Bar graph displaying the grouped ‘Ghūrid’ site types in the Lowland periphery.	110
Figure 4:6 Line graph displaying the principal types of ‘Ghūrid’ sites with evidence of continuity of occupation.	110
Figure 4:7 ‘Ghūrid’ sites in central Afghanistan.	111
Figure 4:8 ‘Ghūrid’ sites in Ghūrid heartland.	112
Figure 4:9 Evidence of continuity of occupation by region.	117
Figure 4:10 Remains of the Ghūrid madrasa at Chisht-i Sharīf.	123
Figure 4:11 Ghūrid brick vault inside the west <i>īwān</i> on the north side of the Friday Mosque, Harāt.	129
Figure 4:12 Tīmūrid decoration sealing Ghūrid brick work, Friday Mosque, Harāt.	130
Figure 4:13 Satellite image of Lashkar-i Bāzār.	133
Figure 5:1 Satellite image of Jām.	147
Figure 5:2 Plan of Jām, including UNESCO’s definition of the extent of the site.	148
Figure 5:3 Graves eroding out of the Jām Rūd bank at the Jewish cemetery of Kūh-i Kushkak.	153
Figure 5:4 Foundation panel identifying the architect and date of the minaret of Jām.	153
Figure 5:5 Double spiral staircase inside the minaret of Jām.	159
Figure 5:6 Flat land east of the minaret, viewed from Watchtower 3.	161
Figure 5:7 Plan showing the location of MJAP soundings and thumbnails of baked brick paving.	162
Figure 5:8 Detail of MJAP soundings 42–95 m east of the minaret.	163

List of figures

Figure 5:9 Baked brick wall in the south bank of the Harī Rūd, east of the minaret.	164
Figure 5:10 West section of SBHR2 showing baked brick wall and paving.	164
Figure 5:11 Plan of baked brick wall and paving in SBHR2.	165
Figure 5:12 Plan of baked brick paving in SBHR2, south of a baked brick and pakhsa wall.	166
Figure 5:13 Baked brick paving in SBHR2, south of a baked brick and pakhsa wall.	167
Figure 5:14 Baked brick paving in SBHR1.	168
Figure 5:15 Plan of baked brick paving and columns in SBHR1.	169
Figure 5:16 South section of SBHR1, showing a column lying in fluvial deposits on baked brick paving cut by a robber hole.	170
Figure 5:17 Toppled columns lying on baked brick courtyard paving, SBHR1, 85 m east of the minaret.	170
Figure 5:18 Plan of baked brick paving in SBHR4.	171
Figure 5:19 Baked brick paving in robber hole SBHR TP, east of the minaret.	171
Figure 5:20 East section of SBHR TP1 showing the cut of the robber hole into fluvial deposits overlying baked brick paving.	172
Figure 5:21 Plan of Qaṣr Zarafshān.	172
Figure 5:22 Mud-brick tower on stone footings at the north-eastern end of Qaṣr Zarafshān.	175
Figure 5:23 Stone footings of the north-eastern wing of Qaṣr Zarafshān.	178
Figure 5:24 The baked brick, plaster-lined cistern at Kūh-i Khāra, looking north.	178
Figure 5:25 Schematic sketch plan of the cistern at Kūh-i Khāra.	179
Figure 5:26 View from Kūh-i Khāra, south-west, overlooking the minaret and Qaṣr Zarafshān.	180
Figure 5:27 View from Kūh-i Khāra, south, overlooking the minaret and the Jām Rūd.	181
Figure 5:28 Tower guarding access to Herberg’s eastern watchtower, looking north-west.	182
Figure 5:29 Sketch plan of the ‘guardhouse’ controlling access to Jām from the east.	183
Figure 5:30 South wall of the ‘guardhouse’.	183
Figure 5:31 Sketch plan of the central watchtower.	185

Figure 5:32 Herberg's central watchtower, overlooking the Harī Rūd to the north.	186
Figure 5:33 Sketch plan of Herberg's western watchtower overlooking the minaret.	186
Figure 5:34 View north-west from the central watchtower, overlooking the minaret and area of the courtyard building.	187
Figure 5:35 Line of towers on the east bank of the Jar-e Baydān, looking south-east towards Qaṣr Zarafshān.	188
Figure 5:36 'Arcade' wall behind a disused modern shop, NBHR, looking north-east.	189
Figure 5:37 Elevations of exposed mud-brick architecture of 'Arcade' wall in robber hole RH027, NBHR.	190
Figure 5:38 Baked brick bridge stub, opposite the minaret, NBHR.	191
Figure 5:39 Baked brick bridge stub, looking east along reinforced riverbank.	192
Figure 5:40 Rebuilding modern gabions along the Jām Rūd at the base of the minaret.	193
Figure 5:41 Surface scraping on the west bank of the Jām Rūd, WBJR.	193
Figure 5:42 Excavated robber holes on the WBJR, viewed from the minaret.	195
Figure 5:43 Large stone wall (SU 1000) and perpendicular wall (SU 1001), robber hole RH001, WBJR.	196
Figure 5:44 Plan of walls exposed in robber hole RH001, WBJR.	196
Figure 5:45 West and north sections, robber hole RH001, WBJR.	197
Figure 5:46 Plan of walls and surfaces exposed in robber hole RH004, WBJR.	197
Figure 5:47 Wall SU 1061, between robber holes RH008 and RH010, WBJR.	198
Figure 5:48 Composite image of the north bank of the Harī Rūd, NBHR.	199
Figure 5:49 Robber holes surveyed in 2005, in a 50m wide strip from Qaṣr Zarafshān to the Harī Rūd.	200
Figure 5:50 Estimated area of robber holes in the 50 m wide strip, NBHR.	201
Figure 5:51 Maximum dimensions of robber holes recorded by MJAP in 2003 and 2005.	202
Figure 5:52 Presence / absence of architecture in robber holes in the 50 m wide strip, NBHR.	203
Figure 5:53 Number of sherds counted per m ² for robber holes in the 50 m wide strip, NBHR.	204

List of figures

Figure 5:54 Plan of room exposed by robber hole RH201, NBHR.	205
Figure 5:55 Robber hole RH201 with mud-brick vaulted ceiling and domed lamp alcove, NBHR.	206
Figure 5:56 Detail of the plastered lamp alcove in robber hole RH201 with in situ lamp, NBHR.	207
Figure 5:57 In situ lamp in the plastered lamp alcove in robber hole RH201, NBHR.	208
Figure 5:58 Burnt horizon in the section of robber hole RH032, NBHR.	208
Figure 5:59 Artist’s reconstruction of Jām in its heyday.	209
Figure 5:60 Sketch plan of pottery kiln, Khar Khūj.	212
Figure 5:61 Sketch profile of north-eastern end of pottery kiln, Khar Khūj.	212
Figure 5:62 Western end of pottery kiln, Khar Khūj; note the ‘stalactites’ of vitrified mud-brick.	213
Figure 5:63 Judaeo-Persian gravestone belonging to ‘Jacob son of Abraham son of Isaac known as “the strong”’, found at Kushkak.	213
Figure 5:64 Side 2 of Judaeo-Persian gravestone belonging to Jacob son of Abraham, dating to 1148 CE, found at Kushkak.	214
Figure 5:65 Judaeo-Persian gravestone belonging to a ‘goldsmith’.	214
Figure 5:66 Judaeo-Persian gravestone MJAP SF05043, belonging to ‘{...} son of David’, found amongst stones being used to repair the gabions.	215
Figure 5:67 Double grave containing carved wooden panel, repaired after looting; note the unorthodox veneration of the grave.	216
Figure 5:68 Carved wooden panel rescued from robbers looting a double grave.	217
Figure 5:69 Grave of Wazīr Taymān, close to the Hebrew cemetery, Jām Rūd.	218
Figure 5:70 Upright carved panel incorporated into the grave of Wazīr Taymān, Jām Rūd.	218
Figure 5:71 Carved panel incorporated into the grave of Wazīr Taymān, Jām Rūd.	219
Figure 5:72 Stone-lined grave eroding out of Pay-i Ziyārat area of the north bank of the Harī Rūd.	220
Figure 5:73 Paired group Euclidean cluster analysis of XRF data for Jām sherd fabrics.	227

Figure 5:74 Scattergraph plotting the results of principal components analysis of XRF data for Jām sherd fabrics.	228
Figure 5:75 Paired group Euclidean cluster analysis of XRF data for Jām glazes.	228
Figure 5:76 Scattergraph plotting the results of principal components analysis of XRF data for Jām glazes.	229
Figure 5:77 Fine, decorated ceramic spout (SF03001) from robber hole RH003.	231
Figure 5:78 Clay equid figurine head (SF03023) from robber hole RH100.	231
Figure 5:79 Smiling face motif on a moulded sherd from robber hole RH120.	232
Figure 5:80 Saljūqid bronze / gold alloy coin from robber hole RH003, dating to [4]97 or [4]99 AH / 1103–6 CE, SF03015.	232
Figure 5:81 Small, flower-shaped bead (SF05077), recovered from a flotation sample from robber hole RH003.	233
Figure 5:82 Metal (iron?) pin with roundel terminal, SF05066.	233
Figure 5:83 Green glass dish rim fragment (SF05012), Kūh-i Khāra.	234
Figure 5:84 Ribbed green glass bottle neck (SF05027), Kūh-i Khāra.	234
Figure 5:85 Wedge-shaped baked brick with scroll design (SF05083), courtyard building (SBHR1).	235
Figure 5:86 Shaped baked bricks (top: SF05081, SBHR1; bottom two: SF05082), courtyard building.	236
Figure 5:87 Plastered cone (SF05074), miscellaneous surface find.	237
Figure 5:88 Carved floral stucco decoration (SF03036), robber hole RH001.	238
Figure 5:89 Window frame plaster with thin grooves for glass, SF05038, from robber hole RH039.	239
Figure 5:90 Curved plaster setting for window panes (?) with an in situ thin piece of glass, SF05044.	239
Figure 5:91 Pieces of wooden furniture, SF05069, from robber hole RH201.	240
Figure 5:92 Steatite bowls (top: SF05068; middle: SF05030; bottom: SF05061).	241
Figure 5:93 Decorated steatite bowl fragments from Kūh-i Khāra (top: SF05031; middle left: SF05032; middle right: SF05033; bottom: SF05034).	241
Figure 5:94 Heel-shaped steatite artefact (SF05065)	242

List of figures

Figure 5:95 Tāll Baydān.	247
Figure 6:1 Comparison of satellite images of the palaces at Lashkar-i Bāzār, illustrating urban and agricultural expansion.	251
Figure 6:2 Satellite image of Shahr-i Kuhna, Zamīn-Dāwar.	253
Figure 6:3 Satellite image of Chehel Burj, Sīstān.	254
Figure 6:4 Above: water installations SA5_191 and 196 on sebkha; below: 1965 Corona satellite image overlain on the satellite image, showing the same sites.	257
Figure 6:5 Above: lines of <i>kārīz</i> spoil heaps and tepe SA2_513 to the north of the Arghandāb; below: 1965 Corona satellite image showing the same sites.	259
Figure 6:6 Digital terrain model (DTM) of central Afghanistan, looking east along the Harī Rūd, created in Global Mapper using ASTER GDEM data.	260
Figure 6:7 Above: DTM looking north along the Jām Rūd valley to the archaeological site. Below: larger scale satellite image looking north along the Jām Rūd valley.	261
Figure 6:8 Satellite images of Marw, available through Google Earth.	264
Figure 6:9 Overlay of GPS points on geo-rectified portion of Quickbird image of Jām, unrectified Quickbird image in the background.	268
Figure 6:10 Comparison of satellite images of the minaret of Jām.	270
Figure 6:11 GPS points of high status ceramics finds, WBJR, and areas of robber holes in Sang-i Manār, visible in the geo-rectified Quickbird satellite image.	271
Figure 6:12 Robber holes on the north-facing slope of Sang-i Manār, behind the rest house.	271
Figure 6:13 Redefined extent of the site of Jām, overlain on Quickbird satellite image.	272
Figure 6:14 Rank-size graph of Ghūrid sites.	278
Figure 6:15 Satellite images of Afghanistan formerly available through Google Earth.	279
Figure 6:16 Montage of stitched satellite images of Lashkar-i Bāzār / Bust.	281
Figure 6:17 Plan derived from stitched satellite images of Lashkar-i Bāzār / Bust.	282
Figure 6:18 Siyāh Char icehouse, top of satellite image to the north of Schlumberger's Résidence XIII	284
Figure 6:19 Shāh-zāda Sarbaz mausoleum.	285

The ebb and flow of the Ghūrid empire

Figure 6:20 Archaeological sites identified in high resolution Google Earth Study Areas SA1–5 in the Rīgistān desert.	292
Figure 6:21 Sketch plan of the hitherto unplanned Ghaznawid site of Qal'a-i Hauz, derived from the satellite image.	293
Figure 6:22 SA1_058 – enigmatic features, possibly reservoirs and desert kites / hunting hides near Qal'a-i Hauz; SA1_072 – dam.	293
Figure 6:23 Farmstead SA2_570, with possible corrals to the west and south.	296
Figure 6:24 Tepe SA2_512, surrounded by modern fields and ditch leading from a <i>kārīz</i> in the north-east.	296
Figure 6:25 Tepe SA2_536, surrounded by modern fields and ditch.	297
Figure 6:26 SA2_101: tepe with towers guarding the entrance in the west note the overlapping <i>kārīz</i> spoil heaps running to the north and south of the tepe.	297
Figure 6:27 An enigmatic 'saucer-shaped' site (SA2_569) – possibly a burial in an banked enclosure.	298
Figure 6:28 Circular embankment (SA2_533) truncated by the Qandahār to Harāt highway Tepe SA2_536.	299
Figure 6:29 Distribution of <i>kārīz</i> in Study Area SA2, north of the Arghandāb.	300
Figure 6:30 Distribution of pre-modern hamlets along the Arghandāb; modern settlements are only found to the north of the river.	301
Figure 6:31 SA3_499: double-room dwellings, circular corrals and camp sites clustered around an elongated structure (inset), probably a mosque.	302
Figure 6:32 Archaeological sites identified in high resolution Google Earth Study Areas SA6–8 in Ghūr province.	303
Figure 6:33 Archaeological sites identified in high resolution Google Earth Study Areas SA9-10 in Harāt province.	304
Figure 6:34 SA10_360 campsite.	305
Figure 6:35 Caravanserai SA10_321, with modern trenches and tank emplacements on the hill to the south.	306
Figure 6:36 Ruins of a Early Islamic caravanserai at Daya-Khatyn in Turkmenistan.	307

List of plates

Plate 1	Viewshed analysis of the minaret of Jām and Qaṣr Zarafshān superimposed on a Landsat ETM+ image.	330
Plate 2	Fragments of painted plaster from robber holes RH003 (bottom) and RH004 (top), WBJR.	331
Plate 3	Visual identification of robber holes on the North Bank of the Harī Rūd, NBHR.	332
Plate 4	Micromorphological sections of a plaster sample from the lamp alcove, RH201.	333
Plate 5	Micromorphological sections of plaster samples from robber holes RH013 and RH093.	334
Plate 6	Thin section of bronze alloy artefact SF05062, robber hole RH003.	335
Plate 7	High magnification image of bronze alloy artefact bronze alloy artefact SF05062.	335
Plate 8	Viewshed analysis of the three watchtowers, illustrating that their primary fields of vision are inward-looking rather than external.	336
Plate 9	Over 1,100 robber holes visible in the Quickbird satellite image of Jām.	337
Plate 10	Ghūrid sites in Ball's <i>Gazetteer</i> , overlain on satellite image available through Bing.	338

List of tables

Table 2:1 Climatic data (<i>The Kabul Times annual 1967</i>).	48
Table 3:1 Genealogical details of the rulers of the main branch of the Shansabānīd Ghūrīds.	72
Table 3:2 Genealogical details of the rulers of the Bāmiyān branch of the Shansabānīd Ghūrīds.	73
Table 3:3 Summary data for the main dynasties.	98
Table 3:4 Relationship of ruler to predecessor.	98
Table 3:5 Lengths of reigns.	99
Table 3:6 Fate of rulers.	99
Table 4:1 Summary data relating to site type and location for the 91 Ghūrīd period sites.	106
Table 4:2 Summary data relating to site type and continuity of occupation for the 91 Ghūrīd period sites.	107
Table 4:3 Summary data relating to location and continuity of occupation for the 91 Ghūrīd period sites.	108
Table 4:4 Definition of site types.	109
Table 4:5 Summary of the data collected by Herberg (1982).	115
Table 5:1 Presence / absence of architecture in robber holes recorded by MJAP in 2003 and 2005.	202
Table 5:2 Ceramic and petrographic classifications of sherd samples from Jām.	222
Table 5:3 Comparison of geochemical analyses of glazed tile fabrics.	224
Table 5:4a Comparison of geochemical analyses of glazed tile glazes.	225

The ebb and flow of the Ghūrid empire

Table 5:4b Comparison of geochemical analyses of glazed tile glazes: additional elements identified in 2010.	226
Table 6:1 Population estimates based on estimated roofed habitation floor area, for a residential area of 19.5 ha.	275
Table 6:2 Population estimates based on population per hectare data, for a residential area of 19.5 ha.	275
Table 6:3 Ghūrid site settlement hierarchy.	277
Table 6:4 Google Earth study areas.	287
Table 6:5 ASAGE study areas.	288
Table 6:6 ASAGE site types.	289
Table 6:7 ASAGE site location categories.	290
Table 6:8 ASAGE dating categories.	290
Table 6:9 Total number of sites and site types with more than 30 occurrences, by Rīgistān study areas.	290
Table 6:10 Total number of sites and most numerous site types in the Ghūr and Harāt study areas.	302

Abstract in Dari

: خلاصه موضوع

منار مجسمه ای جام در یک دره کوهستانی دوردست مرکز افغانستان قرار دارد، بهترین آثار تاریخی سلسله غوریان میباشد. غوریان چادر نشین فصلی به درجه 1150 / 545 - 1 طریقی کردند، زمانیکه آنها مرکز حکمروایی خاندان غز نویان را در همسایگی شان ویران کردند. غوریان در جریان شصت و پنج سال، قبل از آن که به خوارزم شاه و بعد به مغول ها بپیوندند، حکمروایی شان را تا به خراسان و شبه قاره هند شمالی گسترش دادند. پایتخت تابستانی شان فیروز کوه که جام فعلی میباشد، تصرف شد و هیچگاهی دوباره اشغال نگردید.

کشف دوباره این منار نیم قرن پیش علاقمندی جدیدی را به طرز حکومت غوریان ایجاد نمود و این علاقمندی زمانی تشدید یافت که منار جام منحصی اولین سایت میراث فرهنگی جهانی افغانستان در سال 2002 شناخته شد. مطالعات اندکی که در این زمینه به نشر رسیده است، بیشتر روی موضوعات تاریخی و معماری منار جام تمرکز داشته است. معلومات نسبتاً کمی که در رابطه به باستانشناسی در سایت های غوریان و جام جمع آوری گردیده است در سال های اخیر شدیداً مورد سو استفاده قرار گرفته است. دو دور کارساحوی باستانشناسی در ساحه منار جام، از قبیل تجزیه و تحلیل دقیق تصاویر ماهواره ای و استفاده مبتکرانه جستجوگر زمین (Google Earth) به عنوان یک ابزار مدیریت میراث فرهنگی، سبب شد تا انبوه از معلومات جدید در مورد آدرس های انترنتی شناخته شده غوریان و شناسایی صد ها سایت مستند نشده باستانشناسی افغانستان بدست بیاید. با الهام گرفتن از مکتب انالیس (Annales) و نظریه آدم سمت (Adam T. Smith)، من این اطلاعات را به منظور شناسایی دوباره سلسله غوریان و ایجاد درک دقیقی از این حکومت مهم قرون وسطی استفاده نموده ام.

بر علاوه تکمیل اوینمینتس (événements) که روی منابع تاریخی شهر نشینی تمرکز دارد، اطلاعات جدید باستانشناسی مرا توانایی بخشیده تا مطالعات مجدد خویش را در راستای مشخصات پایتخت تابستانی غوریان دوام بدهم و روی مسایل مانند هویت، ایدولوژی و تداوم طرز حکومت غوریان تحقیق نمایم. استفاده از جستجوگر زمین (Google Earth) بطور خاص نشان دهنده پیشرفت قابل ملاحظه روش باستانشناسی عملی در مناظر نیمه خشکه در سراسر منطقه میباشد.

سپاسگزاری:

اکثراً کار های تحقیقی یک پروسه مشارکتی است که سال های زیادی را دربر میگردد و این پایان نامه نیز از این نظر مثبتی نیست. اساساً این پایان نامه بر مبنای یک کار ساحوی نوشته شده است، که توسط پروژه باستان شناسی منار جام (MJAP)، و تحلیل و تجزیه تصاویر ماهواره ای جستجوگر زمین (Google Earth) توسط پروژه سایت باستان شناسی افغانستان در جستجوگر زمین (ASAGE) تطبیق گردیده است. مهم است تا از مساعدت تمام اعضای تیم این پروژه ها قدردانی نمایم. سپاس ویژه از دوکتور الیسون گاسکوینگن (Dr Alison Gascoigne) هماهنگ کننده پروژه (MJAP) از سال ۲۰۰۶ به این سو، حاجی غلام نقش بند رجبی، داکتر مارتینا روگایدی (Dr Martina Ruigiadi) از پروژه (MJAP) و داکتر فیونا کید (Dr Fiona Kidd) و کلودیا زیپفل (Claudia Zipfel) از پروژه (ASAGE) که بدون زحمات، مهارت ها و علاقمندی ایشان، ما قادر به انجام این همه دست آورد ها نبودیم.

هیچ کدام از پروژه های ساحوی ما در افغانستان بدون مساعدت مقامات افغانی و همکاران ما در انستیتیوت ملی باستانشناسی افغانستان (NAIA) امکان پذیر نبود. در این زمینه، من به طور خاص از آقای عمر سلطان و آقای محمد ضیا افشار از وزارت اطلاعات و فرهنگ، محقق محمد نادر رسولی و معاون سر محقق میر عبدالروف ذاکر از انستیتیوت ملی باستان شناسی افغانستان و آقای مسعودی از

موزیم ملی کابل اظهار امتنان مینمایم. انا رود ریگویز (Ana Rodriguez) و دیگر کارمندان مجتمع حفاظت از میراث های فرهنگی افغانستان (SPACH)، دیوید جوری (David Jurie) و کارمندان تیم باستان شناسان فرانسه در افغانستان (DAFA)، جولیون لیسلی (Jolyon Leslie) از نهاد اعتماد به فرهنگ آغا خان، و روری سٹی وارت (Rory Stewart) و کارمندان بنیاد فیروز کوه (TMF) با مشوره های با ارزش و حمایت های لوجستیکی شان در پروژه ها ما را یاری رساندند. وحید پروانثا، کارمند افتخاری باصلاحیت سفارت افغانستان در لندن، نیز دست باز در تشویق ما در این کار ما داشت. در دانشگاه لتروب، جا دارد تا از مسولین محلی سابق و فعلی آن قدردانی نمایم. من خوشبخت ام که توانستم از حمایت کامل و رهنمایی های حیاتی سوپروایز هایم، هر یک آقای داکتر فیلیپ ادواردز (Dr Phillip Edwards)، پروفیسور دیوید فرنکیل (Prof. David Frankel) و پروفیسور تیم موری (Tim Murray)، مستفید شوم.

هزینه مالی هر دو پروژه، کارساحوی در افغانستان و مطالعه تحقیقی روی تصاویر ماهواره بی توسط موسسات ذیل تهیه گردیده بود: برکت ترست (Barakat Trust) که یک اکادمی بریتانیوی هزینه های کوچک تحقیقی میباشد، سفارت بریتانیا در کابل، کمک مالی تیرتی کالج کمبریج کری رابرتسون (Cary Robertson, Fund of Trinity College Cambridge)، کمیته آسیا مرکزی و داخلی (the Committee for Central and Inner Asia)، دانشگاه لتروب (La Trobe University)، بنیاد لونی پلانیٹ (the Lonely Planet Foundation)، دانشکده مطالعات شرقی دانشگاه کامبریج (the Oriental Studies Faculty of the University of Cambridge)، (the Seven Pillars of Wisdom Trust)، حمایت مالی اکتشافی استین-آرنولد (Stein-Arnold Exploration Fund)، یونسکو (UNESCO) و بنیاد فن بیرجم (Van Berchem Foundation).

Acknowledgements

Archaeological research is often a collaborative process that evolves over many years and the keystones of this book – two seasons of fieldwork at the UNESCO World Heritage site of Jām in central Afghanistan, the subsequent post-excavation analysis and the detailed study of a variety of satellite imagery – are no exception. Although I have been the driving force behind the Minaret of Jam Archaeological Project (MJAP) and the Archaeological Sites of Afghanistan in Google Earth (ASAGE) project, it is important to acknowledge the significant input of the many other team members. The 2003 MJAP team consisted of Giannino Pastori, David Thomas, Ivan Cucco, Haji Ghulam Naqshband Rajabi and Najib Abdul Sidiqi. In 2005, the MJAP team consisted of David Thomas, Dr Alison Gascoigne, Rachel Mairs, Sher Mohammad Nuri, Haji Ghulam Naqshband Rajabi, Danilo Rosati, Martina Rugiadi, Farhad Shamal, Iain Shearer, Dr Kevin White and Mir Abdul Rawof Zakir. Subsequent ASAGE research was conducted by David Thomas, Dr Fiona Kidd, Suzanna Nikolovski, Geoff Smith and Claudia Zipfel. Particular thanks are due to Dr Alison Gascoigne (co-director of MJAP since 2006), Haji Ghulam Naqshband Rajabi and Dr Martina Rugiadi of MJAP, and Dr Fiona Kidd and Claudia Zipfel of ASAGE. We would not have achieved as much as we did without their hard work, skills and enthusiasm. Last, but by no means least, we are indebted to Commander Abdul Bashir, the staff of the guesthouse and the people of Jām for their warm welcome and assistance.

None of our fieldwork in Afghanistan would have been possible without the assistance of the Afghan authorities and our colleagues in the National Afghan Institute of Archaeology (NAIA). In this respect, I am particularly grateful to Mr Omar Sultan, Mr Abdul Wasey Feroozi and Mr Mohammed Zia Afshar (Ministry of Information and Culture – MoIC), Researcher Mh. Nader Rassoli and Assistant Senior Researcher Mir Abdul Rawof Zakir (NAIA), and Mr Masoudi of the Kabul National Museum. Ana Rodriguez and the staff of the Society for the Preservation of Afghanistan’s Cultural Heritage (SPACH), David Jurie and the staff of the Délégation archéologique française en Afghanistan (DAFA), Jolyon Leslie (Aga Khan Trust for Culture – AKTC) and Rory Stewart and the staff of the Turquoise Mountain Foundation (TMF) provided invaluable advice and logistical

support. Wahid Parvanta, Honorary Cultural Attaché in the Afghan Embassy in London, was unstinting in his encouragement of our work.

A plethora of experts on Afghanistan have been generous in their knowledge of this wonderful country and its history and archaeology. These include (in alphabetical order): Warwick Ball, the late Nancy Dupree, Roberta Giunta, the late Dr Bernt Glatzer, Carla Grissmann, Dr Georgina Herrmann, Robert Kluijver, Dr Jonathan Lee, Ulrike-Christiane Lintz, Prof. John Lonsdale, Christian Manhart, Lord David Owen, the late Ralph Pinder-Wilson, Dr St John Simpson, Dr Laura Tedesco, Prof. Giovanni Verardi and Elizabeth Walworth. Prof. Finbarr Flood kindly sent me a copy of his meticulous, insightful study *Objects of translation* (Flood 2009). Assistant Prof. Scott Branting, Wouter Gheyle, Roger Palmer, Assistant Prof. Sarah Parcak, Dr Cameron Petrie, Dr Joshua Trampier, Jodi Turnbull, Prof. Jason Ur, Associate Profs John Webb and Kevin White have provided numerous insights relating to satellite images and geographical information systems (GIS). Dr Catriona Bonfiglioli, Ivan Cucco, Dr Alison Gascoigne, Prof. John Lonsdale, Dr Rachel Mairs, Eugenio Monti, Elio Papparatti, Associate Prof. Alka Patel, Elizabeth Postgate, Danilo Rosati, Jane Sweeney, Associate Prof. Kevin White and Claudia Zipfel drew or inked original drawings, and / or provided photographs; all other unattributed photographs and figures were produced by the author.

At La Trobe University, I was fortunate to receive full support and essential guidance from my doctoral thesis supervisors Dr Phillip Edwards and Emeritus Prof. David Frankel, and Prof. Tim Murray. That research would never have been undertaken, let alone completed, without the award of a Postgraduate Research Scholarship, and other financial and logistic assistance from La Trobe University. I am also grateful to the librarians of the university's Borchardt Library, and to those of the universities of Cambridge and Sydney.

Numerous colleagues and friends have provided moral support and practical assistance throughout the research and writing process. Associate Prof. Alka Patel has contributed many useful comments on my research over the years, as have Prof. Alan Walmsley and Warwick Ball – any remaining errors and inconsistencies are, obviously, my sole responsibility. Prof. Graeme Barker, Dr Stephen Bourke, Prof. David Mattingly, Dr Joan Oates and Prof. Nicholas Postgate have been influential throughout my career, both in the field and at the post-excavation stages of archaeological projects. I could not want for better mentors, and only wish I had heeded much of their advice sooner, rather than later. The board of the Near Eastern Archaeology Foundation at the University of Sydney, and Dr Agata Mrva-Montoya, Publishing Manager at Sydney University Press, provided much support in guiding this book through the publication process. Abdul Youssofzay and Nasratullah Qaderi prepared the Dari abstract.

The funding essential to both the fieldwork in Afghanistan and the study of the satellite images was provided by: the Ancient Persia Fund, the Barakat Trust, a British Academy Small Research Grant, the British Embassy in Kabul, the Cary Robertson Fund of Trinity College Cambridge, the Committee for Central and Inner Asia, the Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente, La Trobe University, the Lonely Planet Foundation, the Oriental Studies Faculty of the University

Acknowledgements

of Cambridge, the Seven Pillars of Wisdom Trust, the Stein-Arnold Exploration Fund, UNESCO, and the Van Berchem Foundation.

As is customary, but somewhat inversely, the most important people to thank are left to the last. My parents, Drs Avril and Colin Thomas, instilled and nurtured a love of learning and travel from an early age, and have never ceased to be hugely supportive of my endeavours. My partner, Gina Mancuso, and our children, Finn and Francesca, have helped to keep the Early Islamic archaeology of Afghanistan in perspective – my life would be much less fulfilling without them.

Preface

The challenges, and rewards, of undertaking archaeological fieldwork in a country like Afghanistan have been numerous and need to be outlined to put the following research in context.

The minaret and archaeological remains of Jām were inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2002 as Afghanistan’s first World Heritage site.¹ The World Heritage nomination concludes by hoping that the inscription of the site would result in the mobilisation of financial and technical support to assist with the conservation, presentation and development of the site, building the capacity of Afghan conservation and management expertise, and the development of a comprehensive management plan.

The first stage of the international response occurred a year later in 2003, with the formation of the Minaret of Jam Archaeological Project (MJAP) under the overall direction of Prof. Giovanni Verardi of the Istituto Italiano per l’Africa e l’Oriente (IsIAO). Although the original remit for the project was to conduct an archaeological impact assessment of the proposed route of a new road on behalf of UNESCO and the National Afghan Institute of Archaeology (NAIA), the fundamental gaps in our knowledge about the site soon became apparent – the World Heritage nomination lacked an accurate site plan, for example.²

As the field director of MJAP, I envisaged undertaking an initial three seasons of fieldwork to explore and document the extent of the site. This target seemed achievable within a relatively short timeframe due to the single-period nature of the site – well-preserved 12th- to 13th-century archaeological remains lie just beneath the surface at Jām. The previously undocumented extent of the looting at the site also warranted detailed study, to salvage what we could from the robber holes, and to generate a baseline against which to monitor

1 See <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/211>. Jam is more accurately transliterated as ‘Jām’ with a long ‘a’ sound, rather than being pronounced like the fruit preserve. The site was initially nominated as a World Heritage site in 1982 (Bruno & Margottini 2011).

2 WHC-10/34.COM/20: 44, available from: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/34COM/documents/>. See 38 COM 7A.14 for the latest communiqué (available from <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/5956>).

any further looting. The short field season in August 2003 also highlighted the need for further research on the Ghūrīd dynasty which built Jām as its summer capital.

Unfortunately, our plans for a second season of fieldwork in 2004 had to be postponed due to a rebellion in Ghūr province. Further security concerns in 2005 prompted the Italian government to place restrictions on its institutions' activities in Afghanistan, so I regretfully had to sever the official link with IsIAO and run MJAP as an independent project. I succeeded in raising US\$72,400 (nearly three times the 2003 budget) in funding, enabling us to undertake a highly productive three weeks of fieldwork at Jām in August 2005, again in conjunction with our colleagues in NAIA, and with UNESCO's approval.

The two successful seasons of fieldwork in 2003 and 2005 prompted me to commence a doctoral thesis on the Ghūrīds at La Trobe University, Australia, in 2006, in an attempt to do justice to the major, interrelated research questions which were arising. These primarily pertained to the archaeological features of Jām, the nature of Ghūrīd society, the heterogeneous identities of the Early Islamic inhabitants of the region, and the implications that our fieldwork and the analysis of satellite imagery had for the cultural heritage management of Jām and other archaeological sites in the region.³ The results of that research form the basis of this book.

Dr Alison Gascoigne, who participated in the 2005 field season as the project's ceramicist, joined me as co-director of MJAP in 2006. Once again, however, despite raising a considerable sum of funding, assembling a highly capable, diverse team and receiving initial approval from UNESCO and the Afghan authorities, we were forced to postpone the fieldwork, 12 hours before departure. Attempts to overcome the last-minute (and to my mind illogical and baseless) objections to our proposed fieldwork and reach a compromise ultimately proved fruitless.

The subsequent moratorium on further archaeological fieldwork at Jām increased the importance of other aspects of our research, particularly the analysis of satellite imagery available through Google Earth. With the approval of our funding bodies and the Ministry of Information and Culture (MoIC), we decided to use the US\$128,500 we had raised to undertake a study of other, less well-known Early Islamic sites in Ghūr province in 2007, integrating detailed analysis of satellite images and archaeological fieldwork. The collaborative fieldwork we planned with NAIA and students from Kābul University was designed to complement a series of seminars and practicals we gave on archaeological survey techniques in Kābul University in August 2007, as part of Afghanistan's National Development Strategy for capacity building. Bilingual booklets based on the seminars have since been published, thanks to a grant from the British Embassy in Kābul and La Trobe University, and donated to NAIA and Kābul University.⁴

3 Following Ball (2008: 88–94), I am defining Early Islamic in Central Asia as dating from the start of the Islamic calendar to the Mongol invasions (622–1220 CE).

4 Thomas 2009; bilingual booklets on the Ghūrīds aimed at Afghan adults and children have also been printed and donated to the Afghan Department of Education, thanks to

Preface

Unfortunately, the kidnappings of 23 South Koreans and two Germans in southern Afghanistan, just prior to us going into the field, and persisting bureaucratic problems, prevented us from leaving Kābul in 2007. The repeated frustration of our attempts to conduct fieldwork in central Afghanistan prompted me to initiate the Archaeological Sites of Afghanistan in Google Earth (ASAGE) project. Alison and I are particularly grateful to the trustees of the Cary Robertson Fund for permitting us to divert funds allocated for the 2007 survey work towards this ground-breaking research, which has been so productive.⁵

Completing my thesis then took priority over attempting to organise further, much-needed fieldwork at Jām and elsewhere in Afghanistan. The rediscovery of the ‘lost’ minaret of Qal’a-i Zārmurgh, Sāghar, however, demonstrates that advances in our archaeological knowledge of this under-researched land can continue to be made through a combination of archival research, collaborative ‘community archaeology’, modern forms of communication and a sprinkling of good fortune.⁶ I hope that this book provides the basis and inspiration for further discoveries of Afghanistan’s unique and remarkable archaeological heritage.

funding from the Lonely Planet Foundation, the British Council and the Faculty of Oriental Studies, University of Cambridge (Thomas 2007b & c, 2009).

5 Thomas & Zipfel 2008; Thomas et al. 2008; Thomas 2015; Thomas & Kidd 2017, *inter alia*.

6 Thomas et al. 2014.

Note on transliteration and dates

The issue of how to transliterate Arabic, Persian, Turk,¹ Russian and Chinese names and titles vexes every scholar researching Central Asia. Despite decades of argument, no single system has been agreed for each of the various languages and scripts; indeed, the number of systems used seems to proliferate, rather than decline, with each publication as authors nominally adopt one of the more commonly used systems, but then apply their own caveats.

Given the range of options, and the fact that I am an archaeologist and not a philologist, I have generally followed a simplified Anglicised version (j rather than dj, for example) of the system used in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam III* (EI3).² The normal spelling of countries, titles and words in common English usage is retained (Afghanistan rather than Afghānistān, for example; sultan rather than sulṭān, etc.).³ Plurals are simply made by adding an 's' rather than using the correct format from the original language which can be confusing to non-linguists.

Where an archaeological site is not listed in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, I have decided to retain the transliteration in Warwick Ball's *Archaeological gazetteer of Afghanistan* to avoid potential confusion, although I also refer to alternative transliterations used by other scholars when these differ markedly from those in the gazetteer.⁴ I have used the Wade-Giles system for Chinese names.

Dates present a similar, if less intractable, problem. Where possible and applicable, I have provided both AH (Anno Hegirae) and CE (Common Era) dates – 617 AH / 1222 CE, for example, with the Anno Hegirae listed first. The Islamic calendar is lunar, and thus on average 11 days shorter than the solar Julian calendar. It starts with the Prophet's Hijra or emigration from Makka (Mecca) to al-Madīna in 622 CE, hence the Anno Hegirae Islamic dates. Where a day and

1 Following Ball (2008: 28 fn. 5), the term 'Turk' will be used as a noun and an adjective, referring to people speaking one of the Turk group of languages, rather than the terms Turkish or Turkic.

2 See <http://www.brill.com/publications/encyclopaedia-islam-three>.

3 I am defining 'common English usage' as words occurring in the *Australian Pocket Oxford Dictionary* (1980).

4 Ball 1982.

The ebb and flow of the Ghūrid empire

month are not specified in the original source, a year in the Islamic calendar will straddle two years in the Julian calendar, and vice versa.

Abbreviations

AKTC	Aga Khan Trust for Culture
ASAGE	Archaeological Sites of Afghanistan in Google Earth
DAFA	Délégation archéologique française en Afghanistan (http://www.ifre.fr/index.php/instituts/asia/dafa-kaboul)
DIA	Deustches Archäologisches Institut (http://www.dainst.org/)
EI	<i>Encyclopaedia of Islam</i>
EIr	<i>Encyclopaedia of Iran</i>
HĀ	Ḥudūd al- ^c Ālam
IsIAO	Istituto Italiano per l’Africa e l’Oriente
JT	Jāmi ^c al-Ta’rīkh
MJAP	Minaret of Jam Archaeological Project (http://www.arch.cam.ac.uk/research/projects/jam/mjap-home)
MoIC	Ministry of Information and Culture, Afghanistan
NAIA	National Afghan Institute of Archaeology
SH	<i>The Secret History of the Mongols</i> (Tobchi’an)
SPACH	Society for the Preservation of Afghanistan’s Cultural Heritage
TIB	<i>The Travels of Ibn Battūta</i>
TJ	Tarīkh-e Janangosha (Ta’rīkh-i Jahān Gusha)
TMF	Turquoise Mountain Foundation
TMP	<i>The Travels of Marco Polo</i>
ṬN	<i>Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣiri</i>
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
WHN	World Heritage Nomination document