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Abstract
Kooh-e Khajeh (Kajeh Mountain), with 120m height and 2-2.5 km in diameter, is located at Hamoon Lake like an island. Since the archaic era, due to its specific geopolitical location, religious sacredness, and the natural beauty especially at the times of water-richness at Hamoon, this place caused the formation of settlements. Based on an intensive archaeological survey conducted in this region, seventeen sites have been identified of which thirteen possess earthenware. Through typological and chronological studies of potteries found at surface level, two era of settlement have been identified in this Mount: one refers to the pre-Islam era beginning from 3rd century B.C. until the end of Sassanians; the second belongs to the Islamic era particularly on the basis of glazed potteries scattered on the surface as well as some structures built during 6th and 8th century Hegira.

The buildings and structures related to the pre-Islam era include palaces, defensive forts and citadels, and temples, whereas; the buildings of the Islamic era are exclusively related to some religious places such as shrines, mausoleums and cemeteries.
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Introduction
Koohe-e Khajeh is the most important relief in Sistan plain which is located some 20 km southwest of the city of Zabol, in Hamoon Lake (Fig.1). Its height, from surface level, is 120 meters and its diameter is about 2-2.5km (Alaei Taleghani, 2005: 214). Geographically, the proposed Mount is at 30°56′36.5″ Latitudes and 61°15′206″ Longitude.

In the three major religions of Islam, Christianity and Zoroaster, a special sacredness has been attached to Kooh-e Khajeh. In Avesta (Zoroaster’s holy book), this Mount is called as Oshida and referred as the place of descending revelations to Zoroaster (MehrAfarin, 2000:15-16). The three Magi who followed the star of Jesus Christ’s Emersion up to Jerusalem had risen from Kooh-e Khajeh (Herzfeld, 1941:292) and finally one of the followers of Ali (First Imam of Shiism) who martyred by brigands, was buried on the top of this Mount (Sajjadi, 2003: 52). The element of sacredness attached to this Mount has constantly made it the most attractive region of Sistan for pilgrimages and burials.

Since the archaic eras, the geopolitical position of Kooh-e Khajeh caused unruly and rebellious people, blacklisted and anathematized princes and even the ruling elites of Sistan to find it a safe and defendable haven. On the other hand, the beautiful and unique natural attractions of the Mount especially during water-richness of Hamoon Lake together with pleasant summer weather as well as hunting attracted the attention of powerful people and governors (Herzfeld, 1941: 293).

The above factors led to the emergence of substantial monuments and buildings on the flat surface and the sloping domain of the Mount since the time immemorial (Fig.2). The most significant and important monuments identified during the archeological survey include: 1- Kooh-e Khajeh Palace (Citadel); 2- Kok-e Koohzad Castle; 3- Chehel Dokhtaran Castle; 4- The Islamic era’s mausoleums and cemetery (Khwaja Ghaltan’s Mausoleum).

Several archaeologists and architects (Stein, 1928; Herzfeld, 1988; Gullini, 1964; Sajjadi, 2003; Mousavi, 1995; Ghanimati, 2001) have investigated and researched on Kooh-e Khajeh. However, they were unable to identify and recognize all of the sites and monuments there. Besides, no constant chronology has been provided for Kaferoon Castle and other sites, hence; there is a substantial discrepancy and differences of idea among researchers and archaeologists. As such, the current study is an attempt, besides identifying all the existing sites, to find the settlement date, length and the end of habitation period through gathering and collecting typical samples of surface potteries from each of the identified monuments and buildings.
Methodology
This research is based on a field work. For that matter, authors made a complete survey of surface and outskirt of Kooh- Khajeh step by step. After the discovery of a site, geographical coordinates of each site were recorded using GPS. Thereafter, some index potteries were collected from each site in order to classify as well as setup a relative chronology.

Archaeological survey of Kooh-e Khajeh
Kooh-e Khajeh has constantly been in focus due to its sacredness and geopolitical location hence; one can observe some settlements in its domain, each resulted from the existing political, economical, and religious conditions. Of course, its natural status, especially hydrology has been effective too on this procedure, since Sistan was rich in water. The spread (and propagation) of human settlements was in a suitable level considering that the Mount was surrounded by water, however; this level of settlement could reduced at the times of water shortage and drought.

One of the aims of this research is to identify all of the settlements that were constructed on various parts of the Mount in different time intervals. Before this, archaeologists and architects could uncover the palace of Kooh-e Khajeh (Kaferoon Castle) alone and ignored the vital role of other sites, which in fact supplemented each other. Thus, through an intensive survey of Kooh-e Khajeh, seventeen sites have been identified of which thirteen have potteries. Identification of all the monuments and buildings (structures) caused that the archeological atlas of this mount be developed and prepared for the first time (Fig.3).

Establishing the chronology of these seventeen sites was of the secondary aims of the research. It must be notes that despite researches and studies on Kaferoon Castle, its chronology has not been announced explicitly yet and one can see conflicting ideas about it (Gullini, 1964: 65; Kawami, 1987: 154). So far, most studies have focused on the architectural fragments of this castle and they ignored other archaeological aspects, particularly pottery. In fact, potteries as unchangeable materials constitute much of the cultural aspects in an archaeological site and can solely provide a great deal of useful information. Therefore, the present research attempts to study the scattered surface potteries in order to develop a relative chronology of the aforesaid sites. It should be noted that an absolute chronology would be possible only through excavation and stratigraphy as well as by obtaining specific opuses such as inscriptions, coins, carbon-14 test, etc.

According to the selected model in this research which was aimed to achieve relative chronology of the sites of Kooh-e Khajeh
based on the surface potteries, the variables of the pottery were considered more significant. Of course, in relation to the typology and chronology of the collected potteries, the sites which had been excavated previously were prioritized and the results obtained from the field surveys received secondary importance.

All potteries collected from each of the sites at Kooh-e Khajeh were compared with potteries from other sites of historical and Islamic eras, in terms of their shape (edge form), form of containers and dishes, type of decoration, plan, decoration plan, paste, and color. Based on typology of the collected potteries, two settlement stages have been identified in Kooh-e Khajeh, of which the first belongs to pre-Islam (Seleucid, Parthian and Sassanian) and the second belongs to the Islamic era—6th to 8th centuries A.H. (Banijamali, 2008: 62).

Based on dispersion of the surface potteries, sites of Kooh-e Khajeh can be divided into two groups: Sites with potteries; sites without potteries.

1. Sites with potteries:

From among seventeen sites identified in Kooh-e Khajeh, thirteen sites have potteries which are in the form of big and small broken sherds. The rate of dispersion (i.e. scattering) of potteries in these sites are not identical i.e. some sites have very high while some have very low dispersion. The sites 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16 and 17 possess pottery fragments (Fig. 3). Typology and relative chronology of surface potteries in the aforesaid thirteen sites show that two different eras of settlement could be detected (Table1).

1-1. Historical era (Parthian- Sassanian):

Potteries belonging to this era lack inner and outer glaze (enamel) and unlike the pre-historical potteries, these are not decorated (Figs. 9, 10 and 11). In addition to simplicity, ornaments and decorations such as incised decorations (mostly grooved and wave-shaped) and the branded decorations have found on them (Table2).

The sites which have some historical era settlement include: site 2 (Kok Koohzad, Fig. 4); site 14 (Chehel Dokhtaran Castle, Fig. 5); sites 15, 16, and 17. The chronology of these five sites reaches to the age of Parthian and Sassanian. It seems that in this particular era, the Kooh-e Khajeh has had a special importance and has attracted the attention of governors and Satrapies of the archaic Drangiana (Sistan) and subsequently the attention of Sakas. This significance can be summarized in its geopolitical and religious position, on the one hand, from the political struggles and competitions between the Greeks of Bactria, Arsacides (particularly, the family of Soren Pahlav) and subsequently the Sakas who were the newcomers, on the other hand.
These factors lead people consider the Kooh-e Khajeh a sacred place and attempt to build defensive, royal, and religious monuments and buildings there.

The sites of historical eras (Parthian and Sassanians) are mainly in the form of reinforced and fortified structure built by bricks, mud, and black basalt and corpus (cadaver zed) stones. Before the suggested date, no other monument or building could be observed on the surface level of the Mount. Therefore, regarding the presence of scattered potteries, we can reject the date of Achaemenid period as claimed by Gullini (Gullini, 1946: 65,263).

1-2. Historical—Islamic era: Only one site from this era has been found in the southern domain of Kooh-e Khajeh. Site 1 called Kaferoon Castle (Ghahghaheh Shahr or Kakh-e Rostam, Fig. 6), is the largest and the most well-known archaic site of Kooh-e Khajeh. This castle, in fact, is the most outstanding and prevailing archaic site located on this Mount, and is substantially important in the Iranian architecture history. Regarding greatness, strength, and decorations, it seems that this monument has been one of the most elegant palaces of Drangiana’s governor where, besides the palace, the presence of a temple with the fire altar indicates the significance and authority of the common religion (Herzfeld, 1941: 301).

The typology of potteries of this site shows that there has been two different settlement periods. The first period dates back to the Arsacides and subsequently, the Sassanians (Figs. 9, 10, 11); this period has had an uninterrupted and non-stopped continuance. After this, we see such an intermission in this great monument that until the 6th century AH, any pottery which can represent the mentioned period was not found in the surface and periphery of it. The typological comparison shows the second settlement period had restarted with a lengthy interval, through 6th to 8th centuries AH and continued its life, in a small scale, for two centuries (Fig. 12). Therefore, this monument would better be assumed as the most eminent and superior in the aforementioned sites and consider Kok Koohzad and Chehel Dokhtaran as the supplementary for citadel.

1-3. Islamic era: About seven sites have been found with glazed potteries that are related to the Islamic era of the 6th to 8th centuries AH (Fig. 12). The Islamic sites of Kooh-e Khajeh includes sites 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 11 (Fig. 3). These seven sites have ceremonial monuments, particularly burials (mausoleum). In the Islamic era, the Kooh-e Khajeh became the center of attraction for Muslims in the region because of its sacredness resulted from the burial of one of the greatest Muslim saint called Khwajah
Mehdi, such that this Mount was named as Kooh-e Khajeh. Since the grave of Khwajah Mehdi is located in the northeastern front of the Mount (Fig. 7), Muslims preferred this part to construct a mausoleum.

2. Sites without potteries:
Four of the identified sites at Kooh-e Khajeh lack potteries. These are: No.3 (stone graves), 9 (Khwajah Ghaltran Shrine), 12 (stone pond), and 13 (depressions) (Fig. 3). Moreover, there are some evidence which attribute sites 3 and 9 to the Islamic era. Although the most of the stone graves do not contain skeletons, some opened by jackals and foxes show they were made in the same direction that of Muslims i.e. the dead facing toward Mecca (Fig. 8). According to some previous researchers, except rotten sherds of canvas which seem to be grave-cloth (winding sheet), no other cultural materials have been obtained from these graves (Tate, 1910: 256). Thus, it is possible to attribute them to an unknown Islamic period.

The site 9, called Khwajah Mehdi's Mausoleum, is a monument made of brick and mud and is not much old. It appears that this place has been repaired and reconstructed frequently due to its sacredness. This site, according to its plan and shape, belongs to recent Islamic period.

Dating the sites 12 and 13, to some extent, is very difficult because, they not only lack pottery fragments rather there are absence of any specific architecture. Although, it must be noted that the site 12, which is in form of a stone pond, has bricks which enable researcher to engage in dating through excavation and measuring its dimensions. Since the above-mentioned place is located in the vicinity of monuments and mausoleums of the Islamic era, it can be attributed to the Islamic era cautiously.

Throughout the eastern front of Kooh-e Khajeh, we observe some depressions whose shape and dimensions differ from each other. These depressions are called site 13. Considering with the lack of pottery and architecture, it would be very difficult to give any date to this site. At the same time, their performance and affirmative causes are not so clear and explicit. Perhaps it is possible to call them the depressions which have changed into this form in order to deriving basalt stones. Further, there is the possibility that some of these depressions are Stoddan (place to put human skeleton). Anyway, the chronology suggested for these depressions can cover both historical and Islamic eras. It should be noted that some European travelers who visited this mount in the 19th century have cited these depressions and introduced them as ancient sites.
Potteries of Kooh-e Khajeh

As mentioned before, studying scattered potteries on surface level has been the basis for dating the sites of Kooh-e Khajeh. Consequently, pottery samples were gathered from surface, domain, and periphery of each site and after classification and typological studies, the relative chronology was provided for each site. Here, the paper briefly highlights some of the characteristics of potteries of each era.

The potteries of Kooh-e Khajeh, related to the Parthian era, are mostly consisted of simple potteries, lacking decoration or ornamentation. The pottery colors include buff, brick red, brick-colored, red, orange, and dark brown (Mousavi Haji & MehrAfarin, 2008: 87). These are generally coated their containers and dishes with various covers and colors. Attempting to satisfy such an emotion resulted in generating the coatings with buff, red, brown, brick-colored, brick red, and orange colors (Figs. 9, 10 and 11). Of course, some potteries are self-generating. Some of the outstanding examples of the forms of this group include wide-orifice bowls, cup, glass, and chalice (Fig. 9 and Fig. 10(1,2,3)).

The preferred ornamentation and decoration of potteries in this era include incised design (Fig 9(1); Fig. 10(4)), polished (Fig. 10(2,3), stamped and geometrical shapes (Fig. 11(1,2)). One of the designs observed on some of the potteries is an incised figure in the form of grooves which was created, horizontally and parallel to each other, by a kind of tool whose tip has been less than 0.5cm. Usually, size of grooves and the protuberant parts of these designs are equal (Fig. 9(3); Fig. 10(4). Such a decoration has been known as the grooved style of Sistan because of its abundance on the surface of historical ages of Sistan (Haerinck, 1997: 232-5). It is very likely that generating grooves on potteries would have been common since the Achaemenids era or even before. Such decorations could be observed on Achaemenid potteries of Dahane Gholaman.

Another decoration of historical age of Sistan in Kooh-e Khajeh is horizontal burnished lines which were created parallel to each other on the outer surface of containers. Sometimes, this too could be drawn on the inner surface of potteries. Of course, the latter instance is true mostly in wide-orifice containers such as bowls. In containers with narrow orifice, this decoration is seen on outer surface (Fig. 10(2,3).

The potteries of the Sassanian era in this region show the continuance of Parthian era. In this period, too, glazed or enameled potteries are lacking. Much of them are of simple type like the previous era. Likewise, the paste colors are buff, brick red, red, orange, and dark brown (Fig. 11). There, too, a thick layer of mud coating—colored buff, brick red, red, and
orange— is observed whose prevalent color is
of the buff spectrum and the ornamentation
and decoration of the potteries is limited to
burnished and incised designs. Many of the
forms of the containers found in Kooh-e
Khajeh are comparable to the regions which
have the pottery of the historical era, however;
some of these forms are specific to this region
and should be classified in the group of local
potteries of Sistan.

The last settlement era which was identified
in Kooh-e Khajeh is related to the medieval
centuries of Islam (i.e. 6th to 8th centuries AH).
Most of the potteries of this era, like the other
Islamic region, are glazed with simple
decoration (Fig. 12). The pastes are constituted
of soft minerals and color spectrum comprising
of buff and red. The simple glazed potteries
include green blue, lapis lazuli, and dark green,
and the decorated potteries include
ornamentation and decorations such as
painting and incised designs beneath the glaze.
The decoration in such potteries includes
geometrical designs, figures of plants, and
inscriptions.

Another decoration of the Islamic era
potteries at Kooh-e Khajeh is grooved incised
design. Unlike grooved potteries of historical
era of Sistan, these potteries have high strength
and their designs and figures have special
arrangement and order with perfect
geometrical shapes. Further, these have
unstable and fragile paste and their grooved
designs and figures are not so integrated and
accurate hence; lack enough beauty and
delicacy.

Conclusion
As observed, with regard to cultural materials
obtained from Kooh-e Khajeh, particularly
pottery, the oldest era of settlement belongs to
the Parthians whereas the most recent one is 6th
to 8th centuries AH. The noteworthy point is
the time discontinuity at the site1 (Kaferoon
Castle). The first settlement era is related to the
early Parthians but that could not continue
until the end of Sassanians hence; no evidence
of settlement is available for the period
between 1st and 6th centuries AH. It was only
since the 6th century, evidences of settlement
and residence, though in a limited form, are
observed.

Since, many ancient sites dating back to
Achaemenid era could be unearthed in Sistan
(MehrAfarin & Mousavi Haji, 2009), question
arises as why the Kooh-e Khajeh, which is
located in the middle of Hamoon Lake and
suitable strategically for residence of
governors, hadn’t used in this era? The most
important reason may be the central
governance as well as control and supervision
on the country such that during the Satrapy era.
In other words, Sistan benefited from an
extremely high security and safety and had no
foreign enemy along its borders, specifically on the eastern borders. It seems that because of security, they didn't need a place like Kooh-e Khajeh for settlement and residence. Another possibility may be distance of Kooh-e Khajeh from the center as well as deep surrounding water made this mount inaccessible. However, during later eras, the power and authority and also the supervision of central government substantially weakened. In addition, some powerful enemies sprang along the eastern borders, and considering the security and safety, they decided to start building some palaces, castles and citadels there. Furthermore, Kooh-e Khajeh has been mentioned in Avesta as a sacred place and Parthians were very faithful and loyal to their religious traditions, this place gained substantial importance and led to the growth of settlements that continued even after the emergence of Sassanians.

Since, there is lack of potteries related to the late Sassanian era up to the 6th century AH in the archeological sites of Kooh-e Khajeh; as such, we can see a time interval or a settlement discontinuity there. This time interval too could observe during the recent field surveys conducted by Mousavi Haji and MehrAfarin in the Sistan plain (Mousavi Haji & MehrAfarin, 2008).
### Table 1. Source of potteries compared and their antiquity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. No</th>
<th>Coating</th>
<th>Paste</th>
<th>Motif</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Antiquity</th>
<th>Location Comparison</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 1</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>Parthian</td>
<td>Qale Yazdgird</td>
<td>Keall, 1981: Fig.10, no.6/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 2</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parthian</td>
<td>Tape Gowri</td>
<td>Mehrfarin, 86:129, no.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 3</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>Parthian</td>
<td>Charsada</td>
<td>Wheeler, 1962: Fig.33, no.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 4</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parthian</td>
<td>Qale Yazdgird</td>
<td>Keall, ibid: F12, no. 2/49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 5</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sassanian</td>
<td>Merv. Erk Kala</td>
<td>Hermann, 1996: Fig.10, no.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 1</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>Parthian</td>
<td>Qale Sam</td>
<td>Haering, 1376: Fig.6, no.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 2</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>Parthian</td>
<td>Solookieh</td>
<td>Debevoise, 1934: no.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 3</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>Parthian</td>
<td>Tape Nooshijan</td>
<td>Haering, ibid: Fig.15, no.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 4</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>Parthian</td>
<td>Tape Gowri</td>
<td>Mehrfarin, ibid: 127, no.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 5</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>Parthian</td>
<td>Tape Gowri</td>
<td>Mehrfarin, ibid: 126, no.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 1</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>Sassanian</td>
<td>Qale Yazdgird</td>
<td>Keaal, ibid: Fig.24, no.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 2</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>Parthian</td>
<td>Bisotoon</td>
<td>Kleiss, 1970: Ab.22, no.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 3</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>Parthian</td>
<td>Qale Yazdgird</td>
<td>Keall, 1981: Fig.15, no.18/43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 4</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parthian</td>
<td>Charsada</td>
<td>Wheeler, ibid: Fig.30, no.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 5</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>Sassanian</td>
<td>Mah Neshan</td>
<td>Khosrowzadeh, 1383: Fig.14, no.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 1</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>Islamic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Towhidi, 1379: 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 2</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>Islamic</td>
<td>Zahedan Kohne</td>
<td>Mousavi Haji, 1382: Fig.39, no.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 3</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>Islamic</td>
<td>Zahedan Kohne</td>
<td>Mousavi Haji, ibid: Fig.45, no.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Catalogue of potteries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Temper</th>
<th>Paste Color</th>
<th>Outer Coating</th>
<th>Decoration Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mineral</td>
<td>Herbal</td>
<td>Buff</td>
<td>Red/orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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بررسی باستان‌شناسی کوه خواجه سیستان

دکتر رضا مهرآفرین، ۱ دکتر سید رسول موسوی حاجی، ۲ سیده لیلا بنتی جمالی، ۳

تاریخ بدر شورش: ۱۳۸۹/۱۲/۲۱
تاریخ دریافت: ۱۳۸۹/۱۲/۲۱

کوه خواجه با ارتفاع ۱۲۰ متر و قطر دو تا دو و نیم کیلومتر همانند جزیره‌ای در من دریاچه هامون سیستان واقع شده است. این محل به دلایل مختلفی چون: موقعیت مناسب جغرافیایی، تقدیس مذهبی و طبیعت زیبای - به ویژه در ایام ۱۰۰۰ از دریای مورد توجه ساکنان منطقه بوده و مکانی مناسب برای استقرار گروه‌های انسانی بر سطح و دامنه آن بوده است.

با انجام بررسی فشرده باستان‌شناسی بر سطح و دامنه این کوه، تعداد هفده محوطه دار آن شناسایی گردید که از این تعداد، سیزده محوطه دارای سفال و بقیه تا سفالیه بوده‌اند. با مطالعه نمونه‌های سفالین جمع‌آوری شده از سطح محوطه‌های باستانی که به صورت طبقه‌بندی، گونه‌شناسی و مقایسه گونه‌شناسی انجام گرفت، دوره استقراری در این این کوه مشخص گردید، دوره نخست از سده سوم قبل از میلاد تا پایان دوره ساسانی را در بر می‌گیرد و دوره دوم به سده‌های ۶ تا ۸ هجری قمری مربوط می‌شود.

آثار و بنای‌های متعلق به پیش از اسلام که تعداد آنها به شش محوطه می‌رسد بر سطح و دامنه کوه می‌باشد که شامل قصرها، بنای‌های دفاعی، دژها و بنای‌های مذهبی می‌گردند در حالی که آثار دوره اسلامی این کوه را آرامگاه‌ها، زیارتگاه‌ها و گورستان تشکیل می‌دهند.

واژگان کلیدی: سیستان، کوه خواجه، باستان‌شناسی، قلعه کارون، سفال سیستان
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۳. کارشناس ارشد باستان‌شناسی