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Studying Buddhist Sculptures in Context (II)
The Case of the Buddhist Site of But Kara III-Swat, Gandhāra
Study Dedicated to Prof. Dr. Abdur Rahman

M. Nasim Khan

Abstract

The idea to write this paper came after reading the publication of a catalogue of sculptures (GR Khan 2015) found during two season’s excavations at the Buddhist site of But Kara III (hereafter BK III), located in the Swat Valley of ancient Uḍḍiyāna. The corpus includes almost all the recorded/excavated sculptures and other objects from the site. A review of this publication has already been written by the author (Nasim Khan 2015) where some of the few shortcomings were pointed out including a reference to certain unintentional discrepancies related to the contextual details of the sculptures. Apart from the present author’s personal knowledge about the site, preliminary reports of the excavations at BK III and other related research articles published by Prof. A. Rahman on BK III (e.g. Rahman 1990, 1991, 1995) and others (e.g. Swati 1997, 1997a) also remained the source of information for the present paper which is actually an attempt to study the Buddhist sculptures from BK III in their proper archaeological context rather than to merely describe their iconographic and other details. The information provided here are mainly based on the available published data, archival photographic records and on the author’s personal observations as member of the excavation team in 1985/86.

Keywords: But Kara III, Swat, Gandhāra, Buddhism, Buddhist art, Buddhist architecture

The Buddhist site of BK III is situated in the Upper Swat area and inside a small valley located on the right side of the road leading to Jambil Valley and is about less than a kilometre towards the east from the Buddhist site of But Kara I (fig. 1). The Buddhist remains at BK III were first explored by Prof. Dr. Abdur Rahman with whom efforts the Department of Archaeology, University of Peshawar decided to investigate the site under his supervision. Subsequently, thanks to the efforts of Prof. Dr. Abdur Rahman, the Federal Department of Archaeology and Museums Government of Pakistan was persuaded to add BK III to the list of protected archaeological sites in the Swat area. During excavations conducted by A. Rahman, the site was found one of the very well preserved Buddhist sacred sites in the whole of ancient Gandhāra though, it is presently in a dilapidated condition. The area is being gradually encroached by modern buildings in the surroundings and there is a fear that, as a result of this, the whole site will soon disappear from sight (see infra, note 5).

BK III is divided into two parts, Zone A and B1, by a seasonal torrent called Narey or Nari Khwar running in south-north direction (figs.4, 5)2. The torrent collects water from Kato Khpa hill (Swati 1997: 8), located to the south and join the Jambil Khwar to the north. The remains of But Kara II, reported as Gandhāra Grave Culture site, are located to

---

1 Structures in Zone B consisted of only few cells or rooms.

2 The seasonal torrent to the east of BK III is sometime named “Tangai”.

the east and on the backside of BK III; they were excavated by the Italian Archaeological Mission to Swat.

The site, which is comparatively a small Buddhist establishment, is said originally representing a stūpa and a monastery and is also argued unique in the whole of the Indus region because of its clayey-cut shrines (Swati 1997: 8). The six shrines, two of them are said vihāras (Rahman 1991:154), are dug into about four meters thick colluvium soils deposited here due to continuous erosion at the base of the Kato Khpa hill slopes. They were found very well preserved at the time of their first excavations, in 1982 and 1985, except the cells to the south-west which were observed partially damaged due to hillside erosion. The two structures (rooms) between shrines E and F to the east of the stūpas court are considered kitchen and workshop areas. During excavation in 1985/1986, few structures were exposed on the left side of Narey Khwar (fig. 5) and opposite to the stūpas court which were supposed to be part of a monastery. As far as the existence of the main stūpa at the site is concerned, if other than our stūpa No. 1, illegal excavation was recently conducted to the west of the stūpas court in search of the main stūpa. Illegal diggers could not find any such structure except traces of some ancient graves. On contrary, those structures exposed earlier to the west of the stūpas court (fig.5) are now being washed away with these recent illegal activities in the area (fig.6).

Different kinds of antiquities were recovered from the site during the first two seasons’ archaeological investigations which include potsherds, iron nails, earthen lamps, terracotta beads, etc. But the most important among these were the sculptures and two copper coins of the Kushan period, the latter are used, among other objects, as evidence to establish chronology of the site.

Field reports and other research articles on these excavations have been published by Professor Dr. A. Rahman (Rahman 1990, 1991, 1995). Some important works have also been done by Professor Dr. Farooq Swati (Swati 1997, 1997a) where in he published majority of the sculptures from BK III. To compile and publish all sculptures in one volume, the credit of this goes to Prof. Dr. Gul Rahim Khan who prepared a catalogue of the owner of the area has bulldozed the whole land up to 30 feet deep in the hope of finding sculptures and the supposed main stupa of the site is now washed away. In Pl.02-05 one can see how everything is lost. … the cavities in the section are the Gandhara graves, a continuation of a series found above the shrine stupas by Italian Mission and termed it BK II… above the graves the projected stone slabs are the pavement of a path used before bulldozing. Pl. 5 shows the robber holes dug for sculptures.”

1 For funerary practices and absolute chronology, see Vidale and Micheli 2017: 398-399.
4 The excavation in 1986 is not confirmed in the published reports. The information were retrieved from the personal diary of Mr. Daud Kamal, the then draftsman of the Department of Archaeology, University of Peshawar, and the archival photographic record maintained by the Department of Archaeology, University of Peshawar.
5 I am very thankful to Dr. Zarawar Khan for providing the following useful information in this regard, “…to the west of the excavated site where the
sculptures, including the two copper coins, and published it in 2015 (Khan, G.R. 2015, here after GRK). These publications are important endeavours towards the study of the Buddhist heritage sites in Swat. The GRK catalogue is also is an important effort albeit the few shortcomings, particularly the lack of the contextual study of the sculptures that persuaded the present author to contextualize them and try to understand the different factors that may have contributed to the establishment of this sacred premises. Therefore, the present effort is more to study the circumstantial and other evidence rather than to yield only iconographic details that the mentioned scholars have already nicely done; even so, wherever necessary, iconographic details will also be provided here. However, this study mainly focuses on the contextual details and to show how the iconographic study of sculptures would misguide or may be erroneous when they are taken out or not studied in their context. Therefore, the objectives here are to provide maximum possible information about finding spots of the sculptures to better understand the site of BK III, may be one of the and the place of iconography in the architectural landscape. To comprehend the contextual position of the artefacts, therefore, the archival photographic record of the sculptures - photographs taken at the time of their first discovery are used here for reference. Moreover, the author’s memory to recall glimpses from the progress during excavations is also a source for this study.

Excavations in 1982: Before excavation of the area, the landscape of the slope of the hills was showing several terraces (fig.7) which have been used for agricultural purposes by the owner of the land named Bashi Kaka. The two seasons’ excavations were mainly focused on the area to the right side or to the east of Narey Khawar and to the south and south-west of the house of the land owner. The lower terrace, hill towards Narey Khwar was excavated in 1982. This was about two months excavation project and the major areas exposed and investigated during that campaign were the shrines to the south (fig. 10) and the square stūpas in the open court (figs. 3, 7). One of the shrines or cells to the south exposed in 1982 was probably added with a stūpa, whereof only skimpy signs were available, while no clue of other structures were observed in the two cells/vihāras located at the south-west of the site.

Excavations in 1985: The excavation in 1985 was for a bit longer period and which was started in May 1985 and continued till October 1985. This was the period when other excavations were simultaneously going on such as at Pataka, Gilbanr Serai and Gumbatkai Buddhist sites.

The excavation at BK III was focused on the cells/shrines to the south, east and north-east of the stūpas court. The very thick deposit at the top was removed by conducting vertical diggings for about two meters (figs.11, 12). The rest of the deposit was carefully examined and the excavation was conducted with horizontal method, but wherever and whenever it was found necessary, vertical excavation was also carried out. During these two seasons’ excavations, the site was found almost intact and without any illegal diggings at the site (Rahman 1991: 152)


An article has recently been published by the author (Nasim Khan 2019) where he has tried to show how the study of sculptures without context could be misleading.

According to his personal dairy, late Daud Kamal, draftsman of the Department of Archaeology, University of Peshawar, the excavation was started wherever it was found necessary, iconographic details will also be provided here. However, this study mainly focuses on the contextual details and to show how the iconographic study of sculptures would misguide or may be erroneous when they are taken out or not studied in their context. Therefore, the objectives here are to provide maximum possible information about finding spots of the sculptures to better understand the site of BK III, may be one of the and the place of iconography in the architectural landscape. To comprehend the contextual position of the artefacts, therefore, the archival photographic record of the sculptures - photographs taken at the time of their first discovery are used here for reference. Moreover, the author’s memory to recall glimpses from the progress during excavations is also a source for this study.

According to late Daud Kamal diary a one week excavation was conducted in Zone B of the site which may be confirmed by the photographic records of the excavation in 1986.
out in August 1986 to investigate the area opposite and to the west of the stūpa. The idea was to clear the few structures, which were already noticed by the team. These structures were supposed to be part of a monastery (see fig. 5), but the recent illegal excavations in the area has shown that the structures in question were not part of a monastery (see above, note 5), but most probably they were used for the purpose of meditation by the monks.

**Future excavation:** The area to the south of cells 1 and 2 seems intact and undisturbed and there is hope to find more cells/vihāras or other structures in the same alignment of the cells. Moreover, excavations in the area to the north, and may be behind the shrines, could also result the unearthing of some more structures, belonging to the same complex.

**Summary of previous research**

According to the previous studies, BK III is claimed used to be a stūpa and monastery site and because of the presence of clayey-rock cut shrines, it is also regarded the first of its kind or unique in the whole of the Indus region (Rahman 1997: 153; Swati 1997: 8). Based on numismatic evidence and because of the types of masonry used in the construction at the time as well as taking into account the iconographic study, four phases in the cultural chronology for the site have been established. Considering the numismatic evidence, Phase II and III are regarded as ‘terminus ante quem’ and ‘terminus post quem’ for Phases I and IV respectively (Swati 1997:8). According to A. Rahman, Phase I is associated with pre-Soter Mega (Wima Takt) period. The structures associated to this phase are shrine B, C, D and the inner chamber of shrine A. These, according to him, show early diaper masonry (Rahman 1991: 154). Stūpas in the open court such as No. 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, the porch of shrine A, vihāra 1 and 2; kitchen and workshop area to the north-east; sculptures from shrine B which, according to A. Rahman, were probably reused in stūpa 1; semi-diaper masonry are associated with a coin of Soter Mega and placed in Phase II. Phase III, according to A. Rahman, is represented by stūpa 2, 5 and 6 in the open court; shrine E together with its clay sculptures and clay sculptures in the hall adjacent to the ‘workshop’.

The masonry of this phase is partly late diaper and partly ashlar and is associated with a coin of Vasudeva (see Rahman 1991: 154). Phase IV is attributed to post Vasudeva era and is represented by shrine F and its four stūpas (Swati 1997: 8).

Using iconographic evidence, F. Swati is of the view that BK III probably gave birth to the image of the Buddha. He even suggests that the monks of BK III may have supervised the construction of the stūpa of But Kara I (Swati 1997:8); this would suggest that the site of BK III is earlier in date to But Kara I. He further adds that the form of the pillars in the relief panels shows a Vedic-Persian architectural tradition and may represent the earliest relief panels and may be placed in Phase I of the site. These panels are presumed to have been carved during the Indo-Greeks period (Swati 1997: 9). He adds that the incentive to create the Buddha’s first image in human form might have been emerged due to close contact with the Greek culture (Swati 1997: 8). As already demonstrated, taking into consideration the shape of the core stūpa found in Gandhāra and Central Asia (Nasim Khan 2019: 354; Kato 2007: 66, fig.6), it is suggested that the stūpas inside the shrines at BK III may represent the early form of stūpas in Gandhāra and could be dated to the pre-Kushan period (Nasim Khan 2019: 355). Believing in it, the early phase of

---

11 No photograph, except fig. 81, or material evidence for clay sculptures is available in the Department of Archaeology, University of Peshawar.

12 I think three such stūpas were built in the porch area (see also Rahman 1997: 153).
the site may be associated with shrine B-E while those in the open court, except stūpa 1, may belong to a later period.

**Internal landscape and architecture**

The Bashi *pate* (field) is originally an outcrop or clayey deposits which are resulted from a colluvium originated from Kato Khpa hills located to the south. The space has been in use for agricultural purposes but most part of the area is now converted to a habitation zone. In the past, this area certainly remained a secluded place for a perfect peace and tranquility. The selection of this area by the Buddhists might have certain relation to the environmental changes, religion needs and behavioral requirements. This particular location has, therefore, not only been chosen because of its scenic view but its calm seclusion made it suitable for the Buddhists to have stūpas and other associated objects of veneration and offerings according to the Buddha’s teaching concerning the construction of a stūpa (see Nasim Khan 2016: 112). Bearing in mind the environmental condition at the time as well as the social and religious behavior of the followers of the Buddha, the area was chosen as a perfect location for their architectural landscape. The physiography of the encased valley which is the combination of springs to the east and below (now defunct) for easy water supply, the scenic view of the valley to the north, the very thick deposit of clay rendered the location ideal for the Buddhists to make a space for religious establishment to venerate or where to worship. Moreover, this area remained perfect for the Buddhist clayey-cut architecture to fulfill requirement as far the climatic condition at the time was concerned. The establishment of BK III may, therefore, be the outcome of the picturesque view of the area, environmental condition at the time as well as socio-behavioral and religious requirements of the Buddhists.

The exposed structures show two main areas of architectural space: the clayey-cut/stone built domical shrines and the open court. Both are harmonizing the architectural space in relation to the original landscape, setting of the buildings, their direction, and accessibility to the site but at the same time showing seclusion and is entirely planned with in accord to the Buddhist concept. In both these areas, the main structures found here, leaving aside the workshop and kitchen areas, etc., are the cells, the shrines and stūpas (figs. 4, 5).

**Cell/Vihāra 1:** This structure opens to the west towards the seasonal torrent Narey Khwar and is made of rubble or semi diaper masonry (Rahman 1991: 154). In front of the cell there is an open area with access from the cell to the north (fig. 10).

**Cell/Vihāra 2:** It is made of the same type of masonry as Cell 1 and is also constructed in the same alignment but is bigger in size as compared to Cell 1. Most part of the structure is lost and mainly the back wall is preserved to the height of the ceiling. Its access was probably from the south (fig. 10). A princely figure (GRK 142) and a part of a panel with garland bearer (GRK 113) was recovered from this cell.

**Cell/Vihāra 3:** It is located to the south of stūpa 1 and opens to the stūpas court. Like the other cells, it is constructed on an elevated ground and is made of the same type of masonry like the other cells. A seated Buddha in *abhayamudrā* was recovered from the cell (GRK 1). In front of the Cell, a headless seated Buddha figure (GRK, no. 3) was also recovered.

The roof of the cells and shrines to the south of the open court were found damaged or collapsed probably due to the thick deposit which was partially removed during excavation (figs. 11, 12). This process was of Narey Khwar and was used for regulating the flow of the water (Rahman 1991: 152).
made not only to clear the thick deposit but also to avoid further damage of the structures; the idea was probably also to know if there were any other structures above (fig. 12) or behind.

Besides these three cells/vihāras, to the south of the open court, other structures have been dug into the clayey-rock to enshrine stūpas; some of them were probably used for other purposes as well. Two of them are stone built with the same type of masonry as cells 1-3 while the rest of the underground shrines or chambers (Rahman 1991: 153) were told dug into the thick deposits of the ground. The shrines are numbered from A-F staring from the south-west towards the north and north east (fig.5).

Shrine A: A circular base stūpa was found inside shrine A (fig. 14). Only few signs of the base of the stūpa (?) were traced out inside the chamber. A good number of relief panels were recovered from this shrine, particularly panels representing arches (e.g. GRK 99-101, 103, 104, 109). A Buddha’s head in stone (GRK 2) and a beautiful relief panel (GRK 5) were also amongst the findings from shrine A. Another panel but representing the birth scene of Siddhārtha (GRK 7) was also claimed recovered from this shrine or could be from cell 3.

Shrine B: A stūpa, made of diaper masonry, was found inside the cell. The circular base and the drum, probably the lower tier, were found intact (fig. 14). Cultural objects were recovered from this shrine. According to Rahman (1997: 154), sculptures from shrine B were probably re-used in stūpa 1. A fragmentary sculpture was also recovered from shrine B (GRK 152)

Shrine C: Shrine C, located to the north-east of shrine B and opens to the stūpas court. Its porch is approached by a pair of steps which give access to the stūpa located behind the entrance to the stūpa (figs. 15-18). A good number of sculptures, in total 42, and a complete harmikā were recovered from this shrine. The stūpa is made of diaper masonry while the entrance is of rubble or semi diaper stonework. The stūpa was found complete up to the flattened summit for the harmikā except the umbrellas which were missing from their original positions. According to A. Rahman, “…in shrine C where most of the panels showing garland-bearers were found at one level and those depicting human figures under arches at another. Similarly panels showing jataka stories or scenes from the life of the Buddha were found at a different level” (Rahman 1997: 155). He further adds, “Numismatic evidence shows that the shrine is datable to the time of Kanishka I, the Kushan, famous in the Buddhist tradition as a great patron of the faith.” (Rahman 1995: 7).

Shrine D: Similar to shrine C, the porch of the shrine is approached by steps from the west while access to the stūpa is through a small entrance made of irregular slabs. Two lotus flowers were fixed to the two posts, one to each jamb at the doorsill level (fig.19). The stūpa, made of diaper masonry, was found complete to the level of harmikā (figs. 18-19). A good number of sculptures and a complete harmikā made of a single block of stone was recovered from the shrine. The most important finding was the reliquary in form of a stūpa model (fig. 50); it was recovered from a relic chamber constructed in the core of the dome of the stūpa (see note 29).

About 11 panels, represented Buddha seated in abhayamudrā, were recovered from this shrine. The photographic record shows that they were fixed to the drum of the stūpa. One of these panels is inscribed with Kharoṣṭhī letters “ra” “pa ?”.

---

14 There seems a confusion in the identification of shrine A and Cell 3.

15 On this issue see Nasim Khan 2019: 35, note 14
Among other sculptures, 4 princely figures (e.g. fig. 157) were also recovered from this shrine. A. Rahman says, “Out of these 19 are free-standing human figures in high relief, wearing in some cases princely costumes, and the rest are rectangular panels of phyllite or green schist. The distribution of princely figures is as follows: 4 belong to shrine D, 2 were found in debris belonging to shrine A, 2 in shrine E and the rest in debris belong to shrine F. In shrine D they were found at level with the dome indicating that they were fixed on top of it on four different sides” (Rahman 1997: 154-155).

Shrine E: Shrine E is equally approached through a porch with steps that lead to the entrance behind which a stūpa is built (figs. 20-22). This was also found one of the very well preserved stūpas at the time of its first discovery. It is made of diaper masonry while the entrance is of irregular slabs. In front of the entrance, there are two square structures, one on each side of the entrance, which are either votive stūpas or may be built as podium for installing images of the Buddha or other sculptures such as lions. Similar structures were found in front of the gate to the stūpa in shrine F (see fig. 26).

Few sculptures were recovered from this shrine along with a well preserved relic casket from inside the dome of the stūpa. Besides, a hallow harmikā made of 16 different pieces (GRK 177) was also recovered from shrine E. On two of its sides are the figures of Buddha seated in abhayamudrā while the other two sides show lotus flowers. Interestingly, the shape of the harmikā and its formation is very much similar to the one depicted in a panel representing stūpa worship by devotees (fig. 136).

Between shrine E and F two rooms (figs. 23, 24) were exposed without any sign of stūpas or other structures.

Shrine F: This is the last shrine of the site which accommodates a less preserved stūpa of the site (figs. 25, 26). Only its circular base is preserved from where a roughly made relic casket of stone was recovered (figs. 32, 32a). It was placed inside a well-made stone relic chamber. The stūpa is made probably of ashlar or diaper masonry and is lime plastered. A room was exposed adjacent and to the north of shrine F (fig. 27). In the porch, or probably inside a covered room, in front of the shrine three stūpas in row were recorded. Outside and in front of the entrance to the porch, two similar structures were equally observed (see also shrine E).

Apart from a relic-casket and other sculptures, majority of the princely figures from BK III were recovered from this shrine (e.g. fig. 162). Large size catras were also found close to the stūpa built in this shrine.

Cells to the west and opposite to the open court: Few structures were exposed on the left side of Narey Khwar and opposite to the stūpas court (fig. 5). According to A. Rahman, “Excavation work to the west of the Nari Khwar, our area B has brought to light the front face in a much damaged condition, of a row of six rooms dug out of the natural clay deposit and provided with a masonry front wall facing area A to the east – the scene of our major operation” (Rahman 1991: 152). Recent illegal diggings has resulted the destruction of these rooms and has also disregarded the assumption of a monastery in that particular area (see supra, note 5). Apparently, these were cells used for meditation.

Form of stūpas at BK III

Mainly two types of stūpas were unearthed at BK III. These are small stūpas either circular or they are circular stūpas with a square base. The circular stūpas are built inside the

---

16 According to GRK only No. 139 was found in shrine D.
chambers dug into the clayey-rock while, those with square base are located in the open court. Such kinds of stūpas are found not only in Udāiyāna but they can also be observed in the whole of Gandhāra region.

Apart from their material evidence or physical presence, references to the form and size of the stūpas are also found in ancient literatures, in the rock art of the Upper Indus Valley, and in the Buddhist iconography of Gandhāra. The earliest literary reference to the form of Gandhāran stūpa may be found in the ancient Buddhist text, the Saddharma Puṇḍarīka (see e.g. Karashima 2018) and in the different Chinese travelers’ accounts (e.g. Faxian and Xuanzang). While the earliest representations are probably those illustrated in the petroglyphs or rock paintings in the Upper Indus Valley, Pakistan. In this region, the earliest datable evidence may be the Peshawri Buddhist paintings at Kala Tassa, Mansehra (figs. 37a, 37b) (Nasim Khan 2000), and those rock carvings recorded at Akre Kai, Chilas in the Upper Indus Valley (figs. 38, 39). In the latter examples, the drawings of the stūpas are accompanied by Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions and, on a palaeographic ground, they could be dated to the 1st BC-2nd century AD.

There are other ample iconographic evidence in the Buddhist art of Gandhāra (figs. 40-53) from which one can develop an idea about the size and shape of the early form of stūpas in the region. In this regard, one can refer to different examples depicted in relief panels17 or the multiple stūpa models used as reliquaries recovered from Gandhāra such as the stūpa depicted in a relief panel (fig. 45) and the reliquary in form of a stūpa recovered from shrine D (figs. 35a, b) at BK III. Both these examples show certain similarities with the stūpas of shrines C, D and E. The other iconographic evidence found in Gandhāra are the sculptures preserved in the different museums in Pakistan, e.g. figs. 40-44, and the reliquaries in form of stūpa excavated in the region of ancient Gandhāra (e.g. figs. 46, 48-53).18

The form of stūpas in shrine B-E at BK III can also be compared with the core stūpas excavated in certain sites in Gandhāra and in the surrounding regions e.g., Dharmarajika, Bhamala, Kalawan and But Kara I. As long as they belong to the early phases of construction of the relevant stūpas, one would suggest that the early form of stūpa in Gandhāra were circular in form and could be compared to the stūpas in Shrine B-E at BK III. Even though their shape and size are not exactly analogous still, they can be compared with the circular stūpas at BK III and to other similar stūpas found in the Swat Valley where some are built inside shrines e.g. Charg Pate, stūpa No. 3 at Marjani Buddhist site which is built inside a domical structure with a gate (fig. 55) like stūpas at BK III. At Marjani, the shrines are built with stone masonry similar to cells 1-3 at BK III.

It is possible that the early form of Gandhāran stūpa was a small conical, but with round top, like structure generally composed of a circular base with one or several tiers of drum, dome, harmikā, yashti, chatras and may be added Gandhāra before the publication of the Catalogue. Though it is an important piece of work, may be some doubtful reliquaries are also included in this collection, particularly some of the inscribed reliquaries which are being used, among others, for establishing chronology of the Buddhist art of Gandhāra. This subject will be discussed in my coming book to be published under the title “Calamity of Gandhāran Archaeology, which will hopefully appear before the end of 2021.

---

17 A list of such representations is given by D. Faccenna in his article published in 1995. For the sake of comparison few of them are included in the present article. But, since the publication of Faccenna’s article new materials are available (e.g. fig. 41) which would be useful for any further study in this regard.

18 An important work on Gandhāran Buddhist Reliquaries has already been published by Yongeward et al. (Yongeward, et al. 2012) which includes almost all reliquaries discovered in
with bells and banners for which we have, so far, hardly any certain material evidence. The stūpa depicted in the relief panel from Charg Pate shows two umbrellas, each one is added with banners (fig. 42) and, interestingly, in the same site the "chatra" found inside a shrine and near to the stūpa are showing four holes apart from the central one which was probably used for a "yashti" to hold the umbrella. The other holes were either used for attaching banners to the umbrella or for hanging bells from it.

The existence of stūpas under this form continued even in a very late period such as is the case of stūpa No. 6 at Aziz Dheri (fig. 54), except the square base. The stūpa at Aziz Dheri may belong to the late Kušān/Kušāno-Sasanian period.19

It is observed that the number of stūpas with a circular base are found in limited number in Gandhāra compared to those with a square base. It is also noticed that the stūpas with round base are mainly constructed inside cells/chambers, except may be few examples such as the small circular stūpa at Gumbatkai, Swat (fig.51) and Matkanai, Dir (fig.62), while similar stūpas but with square base are found in open area. The apparent reason may be due to the available landscape for architecture. The round base stūpas are generally built inside shrines and their shape may be the result of roundness in the form of the shrines.

Masonry types: Four main types of structures were noticed at BK III: Clayey-cut cells/shrines (stone built or mud structure), stūpas (with square or round base), meditation cells and platforms and niches for installing images or were used for other purposes. The number of stūpas in the open court are nine20 and are built with three different types of masonry. Stūpa 1, whereas only the square base or plinth is partially preserved, shows rubble/semi-diaper masonry while stūpas 2-3 and 7-9 are made of diaper masonry. Stūpas 4, 5 and 6 in the open court are made of dressed blocks and could be compared with stūpas in other sites in the Swat valley such as those found at the Buddhist sites of Gumbatkai (fig. 60), Baghrajai (fig. 64) and Matkanai (figs. 61-63)21, at the latter site stucco sculptures have also been recorded, and. Other examples of stūpas built with the same type of masonry have also been observed in other sites in the Swat Valley such as But Kara I.

The cells/vihāras and the stone built shrines as well as the meditation cells in Zone B or opposite to the open court are made with the same type of masonry as stūpa 1 while stūpas in shrine B-E are made of diaper masonry. The stūpa in shrine F and other structures to the north are made of ashlar masonry. On the basis of their masonry types, the structures at BK III may be classified under three groups: I, II, III. The cells, Shrine A, stūpa 1 comes under Group I while stūpas 2, 3 and 7-8 in the

19 In the rock art of the Upper Indus Valley, the construction of a tower form of stūpa continued till very late date, may be to the 8th-11th centuries AD.
20 According to A. Rahman and F. Swati there are 10 stūpas in the open court (Rahman 1991: 152; Swati 1997a: 8). The layout plan provided by F. Swati shows stūpa 10 at the extreme north end of the complex. F. Swati has probably taken the stucco figure inside a cell (figs. 28, 29, 80-82) for a stūpa. On the other hand the original drawing of the site shows that there was probably another circular stūpa inside a shrine, may be shrine G, located at the north of the stūpas court (fig.5).
21 According to late Mr. Daud Kamal personal diary, draftsman of the Department of Archaeology, University of Peshawar, the site was excavated by Prof. Farid Khan and Prof. Dr. Abdur Rahman. The excavation was started in 1.10.1980 and continued till 31.12.1980.
22 The good example is a series of seated Buddha figures in stucco attached to the plinth of the stūpa. As it was told by late Asad Ali, photographer of the Department of Archaeology, University of Peshawar, after completion of the excavation at the site and during leveling the area by the landlord, a bronze bowl/casket was told recovered by the owner from one of the stūpas but, no further details are available about the said object.
open court and stūpas in shrines B-E belong to Group II. The structures built of ashlar masonry such as stūpas inside shrine F and the base of the pillars (?) in front of shrine F could be placed under Group III. The exact chronological order for these structures would be difficult to establish. Because, we do not know which group belongs to which period or even which building is contemporary to which one. They certainly belong to different periods but, due to lack of sufficient evidence it is still risky to draw any certain conclusion. Based on traditional criterion of dating the Buddhist architecture in Gandhāra, the first group of buildings predate the other two groups while the buildings of group III may belong to the late Kushan period. Apart from analyzing the masonry types and the few numismatic evidence found at the site, one may also need to examine the circumstantial evidence as well and to combine them with the study of the architectural landscape and analysis of the place of iconography in their architectural context.

Antiquities: Sculptures

The most important antiquities recorded during excavations at BK III are the good number of sculptures presently preserved in the SSAQ Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Department of Archaeology, University of Peshawar. These are important materials in terms of studying the chronology of the Buddhist art in Gandhāra since most of them were found in situ and in a proper archaeological and cultural context.

Sculpture being part of a culture, its purpose, background, the situation and the circumstances with in which it was used are, therefore, important to understand. And this would only be possible when its study is contextualized provided that the source is known such as is the case for the sculptures recorded at BK III23.

Gandhāran Buddhist sculptures, mainly carved from schist or molded out of stucco, have been the focus of research and scholarly discussions for more than over 150 years. Majority of these researches generally concentrate on the iconography, style, chronology and on the origin of the Buddhist art in Gandhāra. Whether they were found during official excavations or recovered through other sources, they are mainly studied and arranged according to their theme such as the Buddha’s life story. Similar is the case for the sculptures from BK III where, during two seasons of fieldwork, more than 180 sculptures were recovered from the site. The sculptures got, generally, the same type of treatment and as such more attention is probably paid to the physical descriptions or iconographic study of the sculptures rather than to contextualize them or to analyze the concepts surrounding them. In some cases different scenes which belong to the same object are treated separately and under different theme (e.g. GRK 9, 21, 29, 55).

Though several of the BK III sculptures were found fallen from the stūpas or were found dumped nearby or inside rooms, a good number of them were also observed in situ and could be used as an important evidence for understanding the space of iconography in the architectural landscape. The original positions of those sculptures which have fallen not far from the stūpas could also be find out thanks to some of the photographs of the sculptures taken at the time of their first discovery. Using archival records and recalling author’s memory as well as based on his personal observation during the excavation process in 1985, the sculptures from BK III are,

23 For a similar study but only devoted to the stair riser relief panels from Aziz Dheri, see Nasim Khan 2020.
therefore, revisited and studied here with a different perspective.

The sculptures from BK III are to be classified under four different groups based on their finding spots and the situation in which they were discovered.

Group I: sculptures found in situ
Group II: sculptures fallen from the structures
Group III: dumped sculptures
Group IV: stray finds

According to A. Rahman, out of 188 antiquities found at BK III, 180 are represented by sculptures (Rahman 1991: 154). GRK also refers to the same figure of 180 sculptures. But the number may be more as to be guessed from the photographs taken in 1982 and 1985. It is possible that the fragments, probably found in large number, are not included in the list of the antiquities because of their fragile nature and may be due to lack of insufficient details.

**Group I. Sculptures found in situ**

**I.i. Sculptures attached to Stūpa 1**

The number of sculptures found fixed to stūpas or other structures are sufficient to get an idea about their arrangements such as their symmetrical disposition, thematic order/meaning and chronological sequence. It is also possible that neither of the above has been applied but certain other approach has been adopted in the display of the panels.

Majority of the sculptures under this group were observed fixed to stūpa 1 (figs. 65-74) where only its square base/plinth was found somehow preserved. The stūpa is comparatively bigger in size than the rest of the stūpas unearthed at BK III and is believed to be the main stūpa of the site. It was exposed during excavation in 1982 alongside other stūpas located in the open court (figs. 2, 3, 5). The sculptures were fixed to the walls of the stūpa except may be its western wall since no sculpture, neither in situ nor near to the wall, was apparently noticed. Before removing the sculptures from the other three walls - for a reason of security, photographs of some of them were taken in situ and which are important evidence that can help one in studying these sculptures in their architectural landscape. Apart from the published reports, the photographic documentation of the activities at the site may also help in dealing with this difficult subject and to reach in some way to a logical conclusion.

About 20 sculptures were found fixed to the three walls of Śtūpa 1: six panels were added to the south wall of the stūpa, probably seven to the east wall and possibly the same number to its north wall (fig. 74).

**North wall**: The first panel, starting from the northwest corner of the wall to the north, illustrates a stūpa carving venerated by worshipers (fig. 71). Next to it and to the east the panel represents Buddha seated in abhayamudrā. The one which follows is comparatively a large size sculpture of Buddha seated in dhyānamudrā (fig. 71). The costume and the gesture and some of its other characteristics are the same as the second panel added to the east wall of the stūpa. Apparently they came from the same workshop or made by the same person. This one is followed by three panels, each one is shown with Buddha in abhayamudrā. The other two panels, each one with Buddha seated in abhayamudrā, are possibly followed by another panel, because of the available space, which the author could not traced out. The last panel of the series on the north wall of the stūpa shows three Nāgarājas (fig. 74).

---

24 *In situ* here refers to those sculptures which were found in their original positions.
East wall: In total, seven panels were noticed which were found fixed to this side of the stūpa. The display of the panels starts from the northern end of the wall. The first panel on this side of the stūpa shows three Nāgarājās (fig. 74). Then comes a panel with a seated figure of Buddha in abhayamudrā which is followed by another one with an ascetic sitting inside his hut (fig. 68) which itself is followed by another panel with five ascetics (fig.68). The next panel shows the birth of Siddhārtha followed by a relief panel which exhibits the festivity arranged on the occasion of his birth (fig. 69). The last panel on this side of the stūpa is shown with the scene of worship of a winged column or triratna by the devotees (fig. 69).

South wall: Six sculpture were fixed to this wall of the stūpa. The first three panels show Buddha, each one seated with his right hand raised in abhayamudrā (figs. 65, 65a, 66). They are followed by a panel representing Siddhārtha going to school (fig. 66). The next panel shows the archery contest (fig. 66) while the last panel represents Buddha seated in abhayamudrā (fig. 66).

West wall: As already explained above, no sculpture was found attached or near to the west wall of the stūpa and it is difficult to guess whether sculptures were originally added to this side of the stūpa or not.

I.ii. Panel attached to shrine A

The only sculpture in situ from shrine A is a relief panel which represents garland bearers. It was fixed to the left side wall of the entrance to the shrine A and below the cornice marked by a projecting stone slab (figs. 75, 75a). To keep balance in symmetry, one could expect another such panel to be attached to the right side of the entrance. A projecting slab is equally not added to the right side of the entrance which explain the reason for not having a similar representation to the other side of the entrance to the shrine. Another possibility would be that the present panel is either a later addition, for which there is a less probability, or this was just because symmetry was not an important issue for the builder of the shrine.

Liii. Sculptures attached to the entrance of shrine D

Shrine D is approached from the west through an elevated porch with steps and an entrance gate to the stūpa. The two posts of the passage were found preserved with sculptures, in situ, showing lotus designs. They were added to the walls, one each to the doorposts, and fixed to the exterior surface, the left one was added with a beaded frame (figs. 77, 78). Both panels shows almost similar size and designs and are made of the same type of stone; most probably, they are the work of the same hand.

L.iv. Seated Buddha inside a niche

Immediately after entering to the open court from the north and to the left there is a high platform, originally a niche or cell, with a damaged figure of a large size Buddha in stucco. The image did not survive much longer, after its discovery, due to its fragile nature. The Buddha was facing to the open court and was probably seated in meditation pose. A coin of Wima Takto II was probably recovered from underneath the image (Nasim Khan 2010: 15).

25 According to GRK, it was attached to the north side wall of stūpa 1 (GRK 45) while the last one is mentioned fallen from Stūpa 4 (GRK 52)

26 But it is not specified to which wall it was fixed. (GRK 19)

27 The original place of these three objects and their association with each other could not be confirmed by GRK (GRK 167, 168, 206)
Group II. Sculptures fallen from the structures

Majority of the sculptures, included in this group, were found fallen from stūpas, particularly in shrine C and D. Unfortunately, photographic records for most of these sculptures could not be traced out. However, record of the sculptures from stūpas in shrine C and D is available but it is partially complete. For the rest one can refer to the reports published by A. Rahman (Rahman 1990, 1991, 1995) and others (e.g. Swati 1997, 1997a and GRK).

II.i: Sculptures from shrine C

In total 42 sculptures are said recovered from shrine C (Raman 1991: 154) but a complete photographs record of the objects in situ could not be confirmed by the present author.

The sculptures in shrine C were not found in their original positions but, they were recovered from different levels of the deposits inside the shrine and were found close or adjacent to the stūpa. Their finding spots suggest that they originally belong to the different parts of the stūpa the desertion/decay of which could have lasted for centuries. These sculptures, including the relic casket and the harmikā, are catalogued under the Table provided here. The relic-casket (fig. 34a) was found in situ inside the dome while the rest were recovered, as explained above, at different levels and near to the different parts of the stūpa starting from the cornice of the dome to the floor level of the shrine. With the help of photographs of the objects taken at the time of their first discovery, the original positions for about 20 of them could be somehow traced out and may be repositioned to the different parts of the stūpa (see figs. 88-112).

The stūpa of shrine C is having a circular base with mouldings and a cornice between the base and the drum. The space above the cornice and the narrow projected band of moulding around the lower half of the first tier of the drum gives enough space for sculptural decoration (figs.9, 34). The area above the narrow band of moulding and below the second cornice that separates the two tiers of the drum was also used for display of the sculptures, most probably for the panels with garland bearers. The second tier is symmetrically built in accordance with the plan of the first tier and is having two areas for display of the sculptures: the narrow lower ring and the wide upper band. Due to its width, the lower one was probably used for sculptures with reduced width like the panels with arches while the upper part of the tier was most probably opened for the panels with garland bearers.

A cornice separates the area of the drum from that of the dome. The dome was found intact with a flat top for a harmikā which was tumbled down from its original position and was found near to the cornice separating the two tiers of the drum. This shows that the collapse of sculptures from the stūpa was already started before the drop of the harmikā from the top of the stūpa (fig.102) because the relief panels were recovered below the area from where the harmikā was recovered.

The stūpa in shrine C is the tallest amongst the rest and, according to A. Rahman, its height is 3.20m from the floor to the level of the harmikā. While the diameter of the base being 2.70 m (Rahman 1991: 154).

To deduce from the above, the stūpa was originally decorated with narrative relief panels, panels with figures under arches and garland bearer reliefs and may be some other sculptures such as princely figures. About 28 Their exact location is not mentioned by A. Rahman, but he might be certainly referring to Shrine C while saying that ‘In one case, however, which alone yielded 42 sculptures, the drum of the stūpa is composed of two tiers.’ (Rahman 1991: 154)
their exact position in the stūpa, A. Rahman says, “The reliefs, as originally designed, had obviously been fixed in a connected row running around the drum or dome of the stūpa but, unfortunately, they were found scattered, making it difficult to pinpoint their exact position in the sacred architecture.” (Rahman 1995: 7). But, to judge from the number of the sculptures recovered from shrine C, the size of the stūpa and the finding spots of the fallen sculptures, it is possible that, apart from the harmikā, only the two tiers of the stūpa were decorated with sculptures. Considering the width of the panels of the garland bearer relief panels (total running length c.465.4) and the wide space of the two tiers, the garland bearer reliefs are enough to cover the space of both tiers of the drum; this can also be guessed from their finding spots, the levels from where these panels were recovered.

The 16 panels with arches, total running length c. 372.5 cm, are probably sufficient to cover the space around and below the cornice of the dome. While the 9 sculptures (total running length c. 261.5) amongst the 42 are narrative relief panels and were probably added to the lower tier of the drum and to the space just above the first cornice of the stūpa. They would have been arranged in chronological order following the Buddha’s life story starting from the Maya dream, the interpretation of the dream, the birth and bath of Siddhārtha, Siddhārtha going to school, the scenes of different competitions, departure from the palace, cremation of the body and finally worship of triratna.

The relic casket (fig.34a) which was recovered from inside the dome was found intact along with a foundation stone or a platform for the harmikā of the stūpa. The four sides of the harmikā are decorated with seated figures of Buddha, three in abhayamudrā and one in dhyānamudrā.

According to GRK, two princely figures (135, 136) were also recovered from shrine C.

IIi: Sculptures from shrine D

Apart from the harmikā (fig. 111) and a reliquary (fig.112), about thirteen panels were recovered from near to the stūpa inside shrine D. Almost all of them represent Buddha’s figure seated in abhayamudrā. According to A. Rahman, four princely figures were recovered from this shrine and which were fixed on top of the stūpa on four different sides (Rahman 1991: 155). But according to GRK catalogue the only princely figure came from shrine D is GRK 139 (fig. 157).

As far as the themes depicted on the sides of the harmikā are concerned, contrary to the harmikā from shrine C, the harmikā here shows different scenes from Buddha’s life such as his birth, great departure, Buddha seated in abhayamudrā and finally a structure, generally known as vihāra29 or a shrine venerated by devotees (figs. 111, 150). The other, but most important, object recovered from the stūpa of shrine D is the reliquary in form of a stūpa model (figs.33a, 35a 50).30 According to GRK, catalogue object no. 216, photographs of the progress of our work. Moreover, to avoid unnecessary damages to the dome, we have to tactfully excavate inside a limited area and to remove the slab one by one, which were fixed with the help of mud layers that turned our job more time consuming. At the same time, owing to security constraint, we must had to finish our job as quickly as possible. Therefore, we could not manage to properly record each and every thing during excavation. The relic’s chamber was found built very deep and taking good photographs of the casket in situ was impossible for us. Though recovery of the
lid of a relic casket was also recovered from Shrine D.\(^{31}\)

A. Rahman thinks that the little holes around the springing point of the dome and the number of brackets recovered from shrine D show tenon which help to put them back in their original positions (Rahman 1991: 155).\(^{32}\) He further adds that the top of the panels was covered by a separate wreath-like frieze showing traces of gold wash (Rahman 1991: 155). If it was the case the unrecorded frieze with gold wash (fig.104) might come from shrine D.

II.iii: Sculptures recovered from shrine E

Apparently no photographic record of the sculptures in situ or taken during the time of their first discovery is available. According to GRK catalogue, about 23 objects were recovered from this shrine including the 16 parts of the harmikā (GRK 177) and a relic casket (fig.36a).\(^{33}\) It is difficult to say to which part of the stūpa these panels originally belong, but the interesting features noticed here are the presence of lotus flowers, carved slabs in schist stone - probably from cornice, and the Buddha’s figures which are only shown in abhayamudrā.

II.iv: Sculptures recovered from shrine F

In total, 11 sculptures were recovered from shrine F. this list also includes a very rough relic casket which was found inside a relic chamber of the stūpa in shrine F. The most important sculpture here may be the arched panel representing the worship of the Buddha’s crown and his begging bowl (fig.147). Buddha in abhayamudrā can be seen in the lower part of the same panel. The other most important sculptures are the princely figures shown in añjalimudrā or in the gesture of adoration (see e.g. fig. 162; GRK 141, 146, 148). A. Rahman refers to these princely figures which, according to him, were also among the findings from shrine F (Rahman 1991: 155). The stūpa, with a circular base, seems originally a low structure from the upper part of which very little seems missing. This can also be suggested by the height of the shrine or the available space for the stūpa and the depth of the relic chamber, which was found below the ground level. Probably, no sculpture was fixed to the drum of the stūpa. As far as the original position of the princely figures in the stūpa is concerned, it is difficult to decide. However, the tenon at the top or both ends (fig. 157) of most of these images would suggest that they were probably fixed to certain structure in this shrine or were brought from somewhere else to enshrine here.

Group III. Dumped sculptures

Under this group, more than 60 sculptures were recorded during excavation at BK III. As to be confirmed by the photographic record, they were placed together, at least, at three different areas of the site.

---

31 There is a serious problem with the identification or numbering of the stūpas at BK III. GRK, sometimes, identifies the stūpa in shrine D as stūpa 16 (GRK 216) and sometimes stūpa 10 in shrine D (GRK 139) while according to F. Swati (1997a), stūpa 16 belong to shrine C.

32 In the GRK catalogue, only five such brackets are included (GRK 201-205). These are shown without context as well as having no Registration numbers. Conversely, a number of brackets were found together alongside other sculptures (see figs. 113-113b; see also note 33); they are not included in the catalogue.

33 The shape of the relic casket could be compared with the one found at Sirkap (Marshal 1951: vol. III, plate 36, h).
Area A: Here, about 46 sculptures were found which were lying messily in the open court (figs. 113-113b). Most of these seem brackets, at least 12, and other architectural elements. Two among these are panels with figures under arches while two are spacers (?) which were used between the umbrellas.

Area B: This area is located in the corner between stūpa 4 and 9 located in the open court (figs. 114-114c). To judge from the photographs, at least 12 sculptures are dumped here. They are lying haphazardly and consist of some important panels, such as fig. 114a which is lying in upside down position. It is an arched panel mentioned by GRK (GRK 61) as fallen from stūpa 4. The other one seems a free standing image of Buddha or Bodhisattva which is about 20cm in height (it may be our figs. 114b, 114c). He is probably accompanied by another human figure seated to his left and is shown in aṅjalimudrā. The Buddha image is probably included in GRK under serial No. 1 (?). If it was the case, then it is wrongly associated with Cell 3, north of shrine A. Even Cell 3 is not located to the north of shrine A but to its west.

Area C: This area, which is consisted of mainly two zones, is situated in the vicinity of shrine F. According to the photographic record, only catras and spacers were dumped in this area (figs. 115-118a). Some of the catras seem unfinished (fig. 115a) like GRK 178 which was told found in the supposed workshop area-the area between shrine E and shrine F.

Group IV. Stray finds

Apart from the above sculptures, fragments of sculptures or other objects were found in debris, above stūpa 1 and in other locations in the open court or in front of the shrines, particularly shrine C (see figs. 83-84 note 33) which seem brackets.

Discussion and conclusion

During the process of excavations at BK III, the site was noticed as one of the very well preserved Buddhist establishments in Gandhāra region and it is due to this reason that the more than 180 sculptures recovered from the site were generally observed in a very good condition except few of them which were not found in situ. Some of the sculptures were found fixed to the walls of the structures (figs. 65-71, 75a, 77-79) or installed inside a niche (figs. 81, 82) while some of them were recovered from inside vihāras 1-3 and shrines A-F (figs. 88-112). A good number of the sculptures were discovered as dumped materials and were recovered from different areas of the site (figs. 113-118a) while few were found lying here and there (figs. 83, 84).

Apart from the well preserved nature and uniqueness of the site (Rahman 1991: 153) and good condition of majority of the sculptures, the other important aspect of the site is the presence of narrative relief panels which depict all major events from the Buddha’s life or sections from his previous life such as the display of Dīpamkara Jātaka (fig. 123), Maya’s dream and its interpretation (fig. 124), multiple examples showing Siddhartha’s birth (figs. 125-127), his bath (figs. 128, 129) and the festivity after of his birth (fig. 130). Moreover, his early life is manifested with his school days such as Siddhārtha going to school where he is shown with the moment of learning (figs 131, 132). To test Siddhartha’s physical strength and intellectual aptitude, tournaments and competitions were arranged which were successfully accomplished, for instance the taming and throwing of elephant (figs. 133-

---

34 A good number of sculptures from other areas was also added to this lot during excavation in 1985 (see figs. 113 and 113b).

35 Some of these brackets were recovered from the eastern section of the site and from the front of shrine C (see figs. 83, 84).
135), winning of the horse race (fig. 135), win at tug of war (fig. 136) and the archery competition (fig. 137). His marriage with Yaśodharā is another important theme in the sculptures from BK III where Siddhārtha is shown playing a game with Yaśodharā in the palace (fig. 138). And finally, the Buddhist art of BK III shows different events from Siddhārtha’s life after the great renunciation in search of enlightenment and truth. His departure from the palace and farewell to Kanthataka and Cantaka are important subjects in the sculptures from BK III (figs. 139, 140). Afterwards he left the great luxury life, Siddhārtha proceeds to the forest, adopts monasticism and stays in meditation for several years under the Bodhi tree (fig. 141), fully concentrated and calm afore Maras (fig. 142), conquering the evils witnessed by the earth and finally he achieves enlightenment before the historical Buddha passed away and embrace Mahāparinirvāṇa.

As soon as his quest has accomplished and he has conveyed his message to the followers, Buddha experienced his parinirvāṇa. The sculptures from BK III show that the Buddha’s life came to an end, his body was cremated (fig. 145) and the ashes were distributed and stūpas were built over the remains of the Buddha (e.g. fig. 146) for the followers to remember and venerate him. Not only the funeral monuments are worshipped but his followers started to adore his personal belongings (fig. 147) and other sacred buildings (fig. 148) where he might have spent the final days of his life. Example of worship of his crown and the begging bowl are also presented at the sculptures from BK III. And finally all his life and struggles for the humanity is summarised by the three jewels and veneration of the three major Buddhist elements, the Buddha, the Dharma and the Samgha, which is one of the other important themes depicted in the Buddhist art of BK III (fig. 149).

Though there were enough sacred elements at BK III that could quench the thirst of devotion of the Buddha’s followers and to nourish the believers by satisfying their feelings, the reasons for the meagre number of Bodhisattvas’ figures at BK III, only two examples, compared to the number of Buddha’s representations found at the site still need to be figured out. It is also important to know about the wisdom behind which could explain why amongst the 35 seated figures of Buddha recorded at BK III, only three of them are shown in dhyānamudrā (e.g. fig. 141), one in bhūmisparśamudrā (fig. 142) while the rest are in the gesture of reassurance or abhayamudrā (e.g. 143). Furthermore, arrangement of the sculptures fixed to Stūpa I are, I assume, are with an asymmetrical distribution and are not in a chronological sequence.

BK III complex is divided into two main zones or areas: A and B (fig. 5). Few structures were exposed in Zone B, the area opposite to Zone A, which are presently washed away due to illegal diggings in the area. Zone A covers the area of the open court which consists of 9 stūpas (stūpas 1-9), all with a square base, and the shrines built or dug into the clayey-rock. The shrines (shrines A-F) or the cells are located on the three sides of the open court: the north, the east and to the south side (fig. 2). The cells and shrines to the south have been built on high platforms, each one with a front porch (figs. 10, 14), while those to the east and north are with or without porch and have been built with comparatively low platform (e.g. figs. 18, 19). Neither they have been built in the same alignment nor do these cells/shrines represent the same height (fig. 2). It is possible that the structures situated to the south and most probably shrine C, located to the east,

---

36 According to A. Rahman (1991: 152) and F. Swati (1997: 8), there are 10 stūpas in the open court (see note 19)
were covered from the top with domical stone structures. While the stūpas in shrine D and the rest were presumably built in an area which was possibly levelled for the purpose. The thick colluvium is probably the result of a continuous downslope creep as to be guessed from the formation of the deposits with a regular stratigraphy that goes through the section, particularly in the case of shrine F (figs. 25, 122). Besides, figs 119-122 show signs of horizontal, vertical and diagonal stratigraphy and pockets of eroded materials from the south which would suggest that though some of the shrines were dug into the clay-rock they were most probably not covered from the top. This explain the reason for the presence of a thick deposit inside the shrines without any sign of collapse of its ceiling, provided that there was any. In believing that these shrines were covered from the top with their intact ceilings, then we could have find them hallow during excavation, like those located to the south of the open court, but, in fact, the texture in some cases was found the same through the layers of sediments (see figs. 25, 122).

Most of the sculptures were recovered from stūpa 1, shrine C and D (see table). A good number of them were also found dumped in different areas of the site (figs. 113-118a). The sculptures associated with stūpa 1 were found in situ which were fixed to the three sides of the stūpa: north, east and south. No sculpture is reported, fixed or fallen, from the west side wall of the stūpa. It is also possible that these sculptures, if there were any, must had been washed away by the flow of the seasonal torrent due to its proximity to the stūpa or were removed by the illegal diggers. Supposing that the western side of the stūpa has equally been adorned with sculptures, still we would not be able to know about their number, themes and their sequential order since the order of arrangement of the rest of the sculptures from stūpa 1 is equally difficult to understand. The absence of sculptures from the western wall of stūpa I also creates a problem in determining the starting point of circumambulation around the stūpa.

Circumambulation around a stūpa for the Buddhist is a form of individual ritual but it is also considered an integral part of the Buddhist faith. Therefore, in the arrangement of sculptures, importance is generally given to depict the life of the Buddha or sections from his life around a stūpa in chronological sequence as, for example, seen in the reliquary, a model of stūpa, from Chatpat where the drum is decorated with scenes from the life of Buddha in chronological sequence (fig. 52)\(^37\).

As far as circumambulation around stūpa 1 is concerned, due to a disorder in the display of the sculptures, it would be difficult to decide from which side and how could it have happened. We know that clockwise circumambulation around a stūpa is considered a sign of respect by the Buddhists. In this regard various Buddhist sūtras instruct the disciples to follow this order. At BK III, the only main access to the site was probably from the north and the most important stūpa at the time in the open court, in terms of devotional objects, was possibly stūpa 1. It is constructed not in the same alignment but slightly apart from the rest of the group of stūpas. It is also bigger in size and should have had received more importance/attention from the worshipers than the rest of the stūpas in the

---

\(^{37}\) One of the good examples in Gandhāra may also be the stūpa 6 recently discovered at the site of Aziz Dheri where the sequence of narrative relief panels attached to the first tier of the drum are in chronological order. While entering from the west, with a clockwise circumambulation, the chronological sequence of the relief panels is: Dīpakāra Jātaka → Birth of Siddhārtha → Buddha → Missing → Figure → Preparation of seat → Missing → Mahāparinirvāṇa. A detailed study on Aziz Dheri stūpa is going to be published in Gandhāran Studies 13 under the title: Studying Buddhist sculptures in Context (IV) – Study of the Sculptures from Aziz Dheri.
court. Since access to the site was from the north, the worshipers had to follow clockwise direction for circumambulation around this stūpa (fig.74). If it was the case, the circumambulation could have logically taken place along its northern side wall keeping the stūpa on one’s right, and toward the east and then turns to the south following the path in front of the cells and the stūpa. From this point, the worshipers had to follow the path between the stūpas in the open court, the cells/shrines to the south, east and to the north.

As far as the order of the sculptures is concerned, they had not been displayed in chronological or other comprehensible sequence or this may be beyond my knowledge to decipher their wisdom of thought and the secret behind the kind of an exhibition at stūpa 1. Despite this intricate problem, I hope it would still not do any harm to suggest the following.

Whether to circumambulate clockwise or supposing anticlockwise around stūpa 1, the arrangement of the objects is still difficult to understand. One could expect their exhibition either in a chronological sequence following the different stages of life of the Buddha or thematic order such as the case in shrine C (see below). But here, this apparent jumble could lead to many more questions which may have several aspects and reasons. It is possible that neither the builder/s of the stūpa nor the worshipers have really mattered much about the sequence, provided that both the structure and the sculptural decorations are contemporary. It is also possible that the most important for the followers of the Buddha was the stūpa itself, with or without the relics or any other object of devotion. But the most plausible theory to suggest would be that the stūpa was probably in existence for a quite long period of time and might have viewed several phases of necessary additions and alteration after considering the condition of the stūpa. This cannot only be suggested due to the thematic disorder in the arrangement of sculptures but also because of the incongruity in their size and alignment. All these sculptures were probably not fixed to the stūpa at the same time but they were probably added in different periods.

The above analysis may not suit to practicality or the practical aspects of the situations and events that were probably involved at the time of first construction of the stūpa 1 but even then they are suggested here before looking for more logical conclusion.

As far as the stūpa of shrine C is concerned, about 40 sculptures were recovered from inside the shrine wherein about 21 were captured by camera. The photographic record shows that they were recovered from various levels of the deposit inside the shrine but within close proximity to the different parts of the stūpa (figs. 88-103). Their finding spots would, therefore, suggest that they did not collapsed overnight but, this process must have taken several years after the abandonment of the site. Keeping in mind findings spots of the sculptures, they were probably fixed to both tiers of the drum. The sequence of their arrangements is not clear but to get help from the data sheet prepared for the purpose (see table) 14 panels with garland bearers were recovered from shrine C. The length of each panel ranges from 29-43cm except of a broken piece which measures 15.4cm long. Their total running length, therefore, arrives to 465.4cm. The dia. of each arranged in the same row and with a regular interval around the drum of the stūpa (see note 37).

38 The same situation is observed in the site of Aziz Dheri where stūpa 6 is decorated with figures made both in stucco and stones and might have seen several phases of repairs. At least in one case, the missing or possibly a damaged stucco figure, most probably of a seated Buddha, is replaced with a seated Buddha figure in stone, could be a reused sculpture. The size of the figure is more than the rest of the stucco figures

39 A. Rahman (1991:154) mentioned 42 sculptures associated to certain stūpa which may be our stūpa of shrine C. According to him the tallest of these structures (may be shrine C) measures 3.20 m from the floor to the level of harmikā. The average dia. of the base is calculated to 2.70 m (= 270cm).
tier of the drum is less than 270cm but, between the cornices and the narrow band of mouldings or projecting lines, it must be more than that of the drum. The average width of the panels with garlands bearers is 23cm suggesting that they could perfectly fit into the space of each tier of the stūpa. To calculate the running length of both tiers, it would come to c. 540cm almost the same length which is computed for the running length of the panels with garland bearers. We also know that they could be fixed to the base of the stūpa because most of them were found above the cornice of its circular base. More likely both tiers of the drum were wreathed with the garland bearers’ panels. While the narrow spaces or band of the drums were decorated with the rest of the sculptures found inside shrine C.

The narrative relief panels and those depicted with figures under arches were probably fixed to two different areas of the drum. In total 16 panels with figure under arches were found inside shrine C. The length of each panel ranges from 20-47cm while their total running length is calculated to 372.5cm. The average height of the panel is 15cm which could easily fit into the space between the cornice and the lines of the drum. Apparently, these panels were fixed to the area above the cornice that divided the two tiers of the drum and below the line of the panels with garland bears.

As far as the relief panels from shrine C are concerned, they are 9 in number where the length of each one oscillates between 19-35cm. The total running length is, therefore, calculated to 261.5cm while the average height of the individual panel is about 16.5cm. I suppose that these sculptures were enough to cover the space above the lower cornice. Their order of arrangement may be guessed as: dream (missing) + interpretation of the dream + birth of Siddhārtha → Bath of Siddhārtha → Siddhārtha at school → killing and hurling of the dead elephant → hurling of the dead elephant and the winning of the horse race → Farewell to Chandaka and Kaṇṭhaka → Buddha visiting ascetics → Cremation of the body → worship of triratna.

Regarding the arrangement of sculptures around stūpa of shrine D, the number is 11 wherein 6 are confirmed through photographic record (figs. 105-110). The average length of each panel is from 16.5-28.5cm while their total running length is 239cm. They were found close to the drum of the stūpa and were apparently fixed to it but their sequence is not clear neither it is very important to know because all of them represent Buddha seated in the gesture of abhaya and is revered by monks or princely figures analogous to the free standing images recovered inside the shrines.

How old these sacred buildings and their associated sculptures are? It would be difficult to determine as neither stratigraphic analysis of the site is yet available nor enough numismatic or epigraphic evidence were recovered from the site that could help us in establishing a chronological framework for the site. The available sources at the moment are, therefore, the published reports, photographic record, architectural evidence with their masonry types, and review of iconography and the two Kushan period coins.

The stratigraphic study for BK III has not yet been published but we should not expect too much from it since stratigraphy at a historic period site is a complex matter or scholarship where sometimes lot of work gives no definite result about the exact chronology of a site. Strata at a historic period site generally changes from area to area and from structure to structure as well as owing to change in the landscape which sometimes result a reverse stratigraphy except may be in those cases where a good deposit from overlapping of the site with sufficient cultural or other datable materials are available such as it is the case e.g. with Balahisr (Wheeler 1962), Shaikhan Dheri (Dani 1966) and Aziz Dheri (Nasim Khan 2010) sites in Gandhāra. As BK III site
is located at the slope of the hill and the accumulation of deposits is mainly due to sediments erosion from the south. Therefore, after the abandonment of the site, whatever the reason might be, the accumulation of deposits consisted of natural sediments, generally, without the inclusion of cultural materials.

The other possibility of dating the site would be to determine the date of the structures through analysing their method of construction, particularly to study their masonry types. Considering this criteria of dating, three phases of constructions could be observed at BK III. One group of the buildings are those which are made of rubble/semi-diaper masonry such as stūpa 1 and the cells and shrines to the south of the stūpas court. The second group of structures are made of diaper masonry such as stūpa 3, 4 and 7-9 in the open court and stūpas in shrine B-E in the south and east of the open court. The third group of buildings are made of ashlar masonry stūpas, particularly stūpa 4-6 in the open court, 3 votive stūpas in shrine F and the base of two pillars in front of shrine F. But once again, this typology could not be taken a sure criteria for dating. In this regard, one can refer to the structures of shrine B-F where either rubble/semi diaper and diaper or rubble and ashlar masonry is used at the same time.

The next possibility of dating BK III is to study its architecture, particularly the form of the stūpas and to look for their datable analogous in the Buddhist art and architecture in Gandhāra. The stūpas inside shrine B-E probably represent the early form of stūpa as they are similar to the core stūpas buried in some of the supposed earliest Buddhist establishments in the region such as But Kara I in Swat. Moreover, similar types of stūpas are depicted in the Buddhist sculptures from Gandhāra where they show almost the same form which is comparable to the shape of those excavated at BK III. They are with square or circular base having one or two tiers of a drum which is surmounted with a hemispherical dome that is added, generally, with 2-7\textsuperscript{40} umbrellas. Here, one of the most important iconographic evidence comes from But Kara I (Faccena 1962: vol. 1: 39, pl. CXXXIX) (fig. 47) where the stūpa is built inside a building, termed vihāra, with double dome. This stūpa is composed of a circular base, decorated drum\textsuperscript{41}, dome adorned with garlands and is topped with harmikā.

Apart from the above, there are both iconographic and epigraphic evidence that refer to the early form of Buddhist sacred architecture in Gandhāra. The first of these is the Kharoṣṭhī inscription from Kala Tassa - Peshawri, Mansehra, written near to a stūpa mentioning “maharajasa kaniskasa vihāro” which means “Vihara of Maharaja Kaniska” (Nasim Khan 2000: 33).

Besides iconographic evidence, the Lotus Sutra also describes the form of stūpa which is told similar to those found in Gandhāra (Karashima 2018).

We have also few individual Kharoṣṭhī letters which are inscribed into some of the sculptures from BK III. These are: ra (GRK 188), [pra] cha (GRK 190)\textsuperscript{42}, a pa ba/ra (GRK 194), ca (GRK 196)\textsuperscript{43}, tra ra tra ma (GRK 193)\textsuperscript{44}, etc. The palaeography of these Kharoṣṭhī letters suggests that the inscribed sculptures may belong to the Kushan period.

---

\textsuperscript{40} A relief panel showing a stūpa, probably with two umbrellas, was found at the Buddhist site of Charg Pate, lower Dir (fig. 42).

\textsuperscript{41} According to Faccena (1962: 39) the design around the drum represents a balustrade. It may also be the sculptural decorations with geometrical designs (see figs. 42, 45). A stūpa with a high base and a balustrade is generally added with a staircase or steps (e.g., fig. 39) which is missing here. There are other examples where the drum is decorated with garlands shown in undulated form (e.g. fig. 42).

\textsuperscript{42} GRK reads “va da”

\textsuperscript{43} Read by GRK 2015 as “dha”.

\textsuperscript{44} This one is not identified by GRK.
Two Kushan coins were also recovered from the site, one of these belongs to Wima Tako II (Nasim Khan 2010a) and the other one to Vasu Deva I. Provided that they are contemporary to the stūpas, the site could be more or less dated to the early Kushan period. But, still, the presence of these two coins may not determine the establishment of the site in this period because, there is also the possibility of offerings of these coins in a later period. Such a complexity was already noticed by the author at the Buddhist site of Patika in Swat where a coin of Apollodotus II was placed in a relic casket which was deposited inside a stūpa that may belong to a later period (see Nasim Khan 2010a).

To conclude from the above discussion, the early phase of the site may belong to the pre-Kushan or at least to the early Kushan period and which was most probably functional till the late Kushan or Kushano-Sasanian period. The abandonment of the site was probably abrupt, without knowing the reason, but its desertion might have happened gradually for the reasons explained above (see p.13).

The arrangement of the sculptures around the stūpas in shrine C and D shows that they were fixed to them at the time of their first construction while those fixed to stūpa 1, which might have seen different phases of repairs, were probably added by different hands and in different periods. This is one of the reasons that the sculptures here do not show any logical sequence in their arrangement.

As regards to iconography, certain elements suggest that the art style of BK III sculptures is probably indigenous and is executed in a workshop/s most probably located in the Upper Swat, more precisely in the area of Jambil valley or even located at BK III as suggested by A. Rahman (Rahman 1991: 154).

In addition, the structures at BK III may not belong to the same period, but it is possible that the site was initially a small Buddhist establishment mainly consisted of the cells to the south and the Stūpa 1 in the open court. The extension work at BK III is probably executed in a later period by the addition of shrines C-E. While the structures to the north of shrine F and some of the stūpas built in the open court were further additions to the site that might have taken place during the late Kushan period.
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Table: Distribution of the objects from BK III according to GRK 2015 based on Accession Register of SSAQ Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, University of Peshawar

1. **Stūpa 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRK 10 East wall</th>
<th>GRK 12 East wall</th>
<th>GRK 13 South wall</th>
<th>GRK 19 South wall</th>
<th>GRK 26 North wall</th>
<th>GRK 27 East wall</th>
<th>GRK 38 South wall</th>
<th>GRK 40 North wall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seven steps of Siddhārtha</td>
<td>Birth festival</td>
<td>Siddhārtha going to school</td>
<td>archery contest</td>
<td>worship of stūpa</td>
<td>worship of the winged column</td>
<td>Buddha in abhayamudrā</td>
<td>Buddha in abhayamudrā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRK 44 East wall</th>
<th>GRK 45 North wall</th>
<th>GRK 46 North wall</th>
<th>GRK 57 North wall</th>
<th>GRK 58 East wall (?)</th>
<th>GRK 65 East wall</th>
<th>GRK 71 East wall</th>
<th>GRK 72 East wall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Buddha in abhayamudrā | Buddha in abhayamudrā | Buddha in dhyānamudrā | Buddha in dhyānamudrā | Buddha in abhayamudrā | Ascetic inside hut | -5 Ascetics | }

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRK 73 North wall</th>
<th>GRK 132 From debris above stūpa 1</th>
<th>GRK 137 From debris above stūpa 1</th>
<th>GRK 153 From debris above stūpa 1</th>
<th>GRK 166 Debris</th>
<th>GRK 176 From debris in the middle of stūpa 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Nagarajas</td>
<td>-G. bearers</td>
<td>-Panel with floral designs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle of stūpa 1</td>
<td>-Harmika</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| GRK 134 | Along the east side of stūpa 3 | -W. cupid |

2. **Stūpa 3**

3. **Stūpa 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRK 8 East side</th>
<th>GRK 52 Fallen from the stūpa</th>
<th>GRK 61 Fallen from the stūpa</th>
<th>GRK 182 Debris along east side of stūpa 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Birth of Siddhārtha</td>
<td>-Buddha in abhayamudrā</td>
<td>-Buddha in abhayamudrā</td>
<td>-Corinthian column</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Between stūpa 3 and 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRK 110</th>
<th>GRK 156</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-G. bearers</td>
<td>-Floral design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Between stūpa 4 and 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRK 179</th>
<th>Coralithian column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. **Floor level, stūpa 5, 6 & 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRK 219</th>
<th>Near the path of stūpa 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### 7. Stūpa 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRK 4</th>
<th>East wall</th>
<th>GRK 84</th>
<th>Along the south wall of the stūpa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dipamkara Jātaka</td>
<td></td>
<td>Panel with 2 arches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8. Stūpa 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRK 63</th>
<th>Debris, east side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maitreya, Buddha visiting ascetic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9. Cell 1


### 10. Cell 2/Vihāra 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRK 3</th>
<th>-Buddha in dhāranīmudrā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRK 62</td>
<td>Debris in front of cell 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 67</td>
<td>-Buddha with Vajrapāṇi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 68</td>
<td>Debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 75</td>
<td>-Triton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 114</td>
<td>-G. bearers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 142</td>
<td>Debris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 11. Shrine A/Cell 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRK 1</th>
<th>-Buddha in abhayamudrā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRK 2</td>
<td>-head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 5</td>
<td>-Dream and interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 7</td>
<td>-Birth of Siddhārtha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 24</td>
<td>See also cell 3, cremation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 74</td>
<td>Debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 99</td>
<td>-Nagaraja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 100</td>
<td>-Panel with 3 arches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12. Shrine B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRK 49</th>
<th>-Buddha in abhayamudrā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRK 152</td>
<td>Debris -Lower body</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 13. Shrine C

#### A. Narrative Relief panels - Total accumulative length : c. 261.5 cm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRK 6</th>
<th>-Maya's Dream, interpretation and birth scene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRK 11</td>
<td>-Bath of Siddhārtha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 14</td>
<td>-Siddhārtha at school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 15</td>
<td>-Killing and hurling of the dead elephant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 17</td>
<td>-Hurling of the dead elephant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 22</td>
<td>-Siddhārtha, Kaṇṭhaka and Cantaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 23</td>
<td>-Cremation of the body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 28</td>
<td>-Worship of triratna</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRK 64</th>
<th>GRK 76</th>
<th>GRK 77</th>
<th>GRK 78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37x16.5cm</td>
<td>29.5x16.5cm</td>
<td>19.5x17cm</td>
<td>35x16.5cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.5x16cm</td>
<td>32x16cm</td>
<td>23x16.5cm</td>
<td>28x17.5cm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B. Harmikā with narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRK 35</th>
<th>GRK 36</th>
<th>GRK 37</th>
<th>GRK 38</th>
<th>GRK 39</th>
<th>GRK 40</th>
<th>GRK 41</th>
<th>GRK 42</th>
<th>GRK 43</th>
<th>GRK 44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harmikā</td>
<td>Harmikā</td>
<td>Harmikā</td>
<td>Harmikā</td>
<td>Harmikā</td>
<td>Harmikā</td>
<td>Harmikā</td>
<td>Harmikā</td>
<td>Harmikā</td>
<td>Harmikā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Buddha in abhayamudrā</td>
<td>-Buddha in abhayamudrā</td>
<td>-Buddha in abhayamudrā</td>
<td>-Buddha in abhayamudrā</td>
<td>-Buddha in abhayamudrā</td>
<td>-Buddha in abhayamudrā</td>
<td>-Buddha in abhayamudrā</td>
<td>-Buddha in abhayamudrā</td>
<td>-Buddha in abhayamudrā</td>
<td>-Buddha in abhayamudrā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Panels with arches – Total accumulative length : c. 372.5 cm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRK 80</th>
<th>GRK 81</th>
<th>GRK 82</th>
<th>GRK 83</th>
<th>GRK 84</th>
<th>GRK 85</th>
<th>GRK 86</th>
<th>GRK 87</th>
<th>GRK 88</th>
<th>GRK 89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Panel with 2 arches</td>
<td>-Panel with 3 arches</td>
<td>-Panel with 3 arches</td>
<td>-Panel with 3 arches</td>
<td>-Panel with 3 arches</td>
<td>-Panel with 3 arches</td>
<td>-Panel with 3 arches</td>
<td>-Panel with 3 arches</td>
<td>-Panel with 2 arches</td>
<td>-Panel with 2 arches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22x16cm</td>
<td>32.5x16cm</td>
<td>28x16.5cm</td>
<td>27.5x16.5cm</td>
<td>28.5x15.5cm</td>
<td>40x16cm</td>
<td>32x16cm</td>
<td>21x16cm</td>
<td>21.5x16cm</td>
<td>22x16cm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. Garland bearer reliefs panels : Total accumulated length : c. 465.4 cm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRK 113</th>
<th>GRK 116</th>
<th>GRK 117</th>
<th>GRK 120</th>
<th>GRK 121</th>
<th>GRK 122</th>
<th>GRK 123</th>
<th>GRK 124</th>
<th>GRK 125</th>
<th>GRK 126</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23x15.4cm</td>
<td>38x24cm</td>
<td>34.5x24cm</td>
<td>36x21cm</td>
<td>31x22.5cm</td>
<td>33x22.5cm</td>
<td>32.5x23cm</td>
<td>33.5x23.5cm</td>
<td>36x23cm</td>
<td>33x23cm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRK 127</th>
<th>GRK 128</th>
<th>GRK 129</th>
<th>GRK 130</th>
<th>GRK 131</th>
<th>GRK 132</th>
<th>GRK 133</th>
<th>GRK 134</th>
<th>GRK 135</th>
<th>GRK 136</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31.5x23cm</td>
<td>31x23cm</td>
<td>35x24cm</td>
<td>41x24</td>
<td>43.24.5cm</td>
<td>29x24cm</td>
<td>32.5x23cm</td>
<td>33.5x23.5cm</td>
<td>36x23cm</td>
<td>31x23cm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. Miscellaneous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRK 135</th>
<th>GRK 136</th>
<th>GRK 137</th>
<th>GRK 138</th>
<th>GRK 139</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stūpa 17, shrine C</td>
<td>Debris, stūpa 17 shrine C</td>
<td>-Princely fig.</td>
<td>-Harmikā</td>
<td>Relic casket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Princely fig.</td>
<td>-Princely fig.</td>
<td>-Relic casket</td>
<td>Inside GRK 213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 14. Shrine D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRK 9</th>
<th>GRK 21</th>
<th>GRK 29</th>
<th>GRK 30</th>
<th>GRK 31</th>
<th>GRK 32</th>
<th>GRK 33</th>
<th>GRK 34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harmikā, East of stūpa 16</td>
<td>Harmikā East of stūpa 16</td>
<td>Harmikā East of stūpa 16</td>
<td>Buddha in abhayamudrā</td>
<td>Buddha in abhayamudrā</td>
<td>Buddha in abhayamudrā</td>
<td>Buddha in abhayamudrā</td>
<td>Buddha in abhayamudrā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Birth of Siddhartha</td>
<td>-Great departure</td>
<td>-Vihāra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| GRK 41 | GRK 42 | GRK 47 | GRK 48 | GRK 49 | GRK 50 | GRK 51 | GRK 52 | GRK 53 | GRK 54 | GRK 55 | GRK 56 | GRK 57 | GRK 58 | GRK 59 | GRK 60 | GRK 61 | GRK 62 |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|

| GRK 170 | GRK 171 | GRK 172 | GRK 173 | GRK 174 | GRK 175 | GRK 176 | GRK 177 | GRK 178 | GRK 179 | GRK 180 | GRK 181 | GRK 182 | GRK 183 | GRK 184 | GRK 185 | GRK 186 | GRK 187 |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
15. Stūpa 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRK 92</td>
<td>Found with a coin, Panel with 3 arches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 138</td>
<td>Debris, front of stūpa 1, Bust of a human fig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 144</td>
<td>Debris, front of stūpa 10, Princely fig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 150</td>
<td>Debris of stūpa 10, Princely fig. carrying garland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 218</td>
<td>Wima Takto II, Inside niche</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Shrine adjacent to stūpa 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRK 107</td>
<td>Panel with 2 arches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 149</td>
<td>Princely fig. with lamp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Room 1, east of stūpa 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRK 119</td>
<td>G. bearer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. West of stūpa 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRK 151</td>
<td>West of stūpa 10, Layer 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Shrine E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRK 53</td>
<td>East corner, Buddha in abhayamudrā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 54</td>
<td>East corner, Buddha in abhayamudrā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 59</td>
<td>Front portion, Buddha in abhayamudrā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 70</td>
<td>Broken panel, Panel with 3 arches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 98</td>
<td>Front of entrance of the shrine, G. bearer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 118</td>
<td>In front of entrance of the shrine, G. bearer, Princely fig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 143</td>
<td>East side corner, Princely fig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 145</td>
<td>East side corner, Princely fig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 169</td>
<td>East corner, Lotus flower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 170</td>
<td>East corner, Lotus flower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 171</td>
<td>Left side of the entrance, Lotus flower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 172</td>
<td>Front of the entrance, Lotus flower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 177</td>
<td>Harmikā with lotus flowers and seated Buddha in abhayamudrā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 185</td>
<td>Southeast flor., shrine E, Columns, part of Harmikā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 186</td>
<td>Northeast flor., columns, part of Harmikā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 187</td>
<td>Northeast flor., Corinthian columns, part of Harmikā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 188</td>
<td>Southwest flor., Column, part of Harmikā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 189</td>
<td>South east flor., Cornice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 190</td>
<td>Southeast flor., Cornice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 191</td>
<td>Southeast flor., Cornice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 192</td>
<td>Base, Southeast flor, Cornice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 193</td>
<td>Base, Southeast flor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 194</td>
<td>Base, Southeast flor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 195</td>
<td>Base, Southeast flor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 196</td>
<td>Base, Southeast flor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 209</td>
<td>Relic casket inside GRK 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 191</td>
<td>Relic casket</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Shrine F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRK 60</td>
<td>Crown, bowl, worship and Buddha in abhayamudrā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 102</td>
<td>Debris, Panel with 1 arch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 111</td>
<td>Debris, front of stūpa 10, G. bearers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 112</td>
<td>Debris, front of stūpa 10, G. bearers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 113</td>
<td>Debris, front of stūpa 10, G. bearers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 141</td>
<td>Front of stūpa 10, Princely fig. in abhayamudrā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 146</td>
<td>Debris front of stūpa 10, Princely fig. in abhayamudrā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 147</td>
<td>Debris front of stūpa 10, Princely fig. in abhayamudrā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 148</td>
<td>Debris front of stūpa 10, Princely fig. in abhayamudrā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 150</td>
<td>Debris front of stūpa 10, Princely fig. in abhayamudrā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 151</td>
<td>Debris front of stūpa 10, Princely fig. in abhayamudrā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 215</td>
<td>Relic casket, Floor of round stūpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 217</td>
<td>Relic casket, Floor level, shrine F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 218</td>
<td>Relic casket, Floor level, shrine F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 219</td>
<td>Relic casket, Floor level, shrine F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 220</td>
<td>Relic casket, Floor level, shrine F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 221</td>
<td>Relic casket, Floor level, shrine F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 222</td>
<td>Relic casket, Floor level, shrine F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. Corner of stūpa 8 and 9

22. Front of stūpa 11-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRK 155</th>
<th>GRK 157</th>
<th>GRK 158</th>
<th>GRK 159</th>
<th>GRK 160</th>
<th>GRK 161</th>
<th>GRK 162</th>
<th>GRK 163</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front of stūpa 11-13</td>
<td>Front with lotus flower</td>
<td>Front with lotus flowers</td>
<td>Debris</td>
<td>Debris</td>
<td>Debris</td>
<td>Debris</td>
<td>Debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Floral designs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Panel with lotus flowers</td>
<td>-Panel with lotus flowers</td>
<td>-Panel with lotus flowers</td>
<td>-Panel with lotus flowers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Debris

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRK 16</th>
<th>GRK 18</th>
<th>GRK 20</th>
<th>GRK 29</th>
<th>GRK 69</th>
<th>GRK 79</th>
<th>GRK 85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In debris between stūpa 4 and 8</td>
<td>In debris between stūpa 4 and 8</td>
<td>Front of stūpa 10</td>
<td>Front of stūpa</td>
<td>Debris, north side of stūpa 8</td>
<td>Debris along the wall of stūpa 7</td>
<td>Debris front of cell 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddha and Vajrapāṇi</td>
<td>Buddha in abhaya-mudrā</td>
<td>Buddha in standing position</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buddha and Vajrapāṇi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Uncertain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRK 25</th>
<th>GRK 43</th>
<th>GRK 66</th>
<th>GRK 93</th>
<th>GRK 97</th>
<th>GRK 107</th>
<th>GRK 167</th>
<th>GRK 168</th>
<th>GRK 180</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation of the relics</td>
<td>Buddha in abhaya-mudrā?</td>
<td>Buddha in standing position</td>
<td>Panel with a single arch</td>
<td>Panel with 1 arch</td>
<td>Fixed in front of entrance</td>
<td>Fixed in front of entrance</td>
<td>Fixed in front of entrance</td>
<td>Corinthian column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corinthian columns</td>
<td>Corinthian columns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 181</td>
<td>GRK 184</td>
<td>GRK 197</td>
<td>GRK 198</td>
<td>GRK 199</td>
<td>GRK 200</td>
<td>GRK 201</td>
<td>GRK 202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bracket-volute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRK 202</th>
<th>GRK 203</th>
<th>GRK 204</th>
<th>GRK 205</th>
<th>GRK 206</th>
<th>GRK 207</th>
<th>GRK 208</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bracket-volute</td>
<td>Bracket-volute</td>
<td>Bracket-volute</td>
<td>Bracket-volute</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Spacer</td>
<td>Stūpa model?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Ashy pit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRK 105</th>
<th>GRK 106</th>
<th>GRK 108</th>
<th>GRK 140</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panel with 4 arches</td>
<td>Panel with 3 arches</td>
<td>Panel with 2 arches</td>
<td>Princely fig. in añjalimudrā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. Workshop area

| GRK 178 | |
|--------||
| Unfinished panel. The panel is marked with a different date |
Fig. 1: Location of BK III archaeological site. Google map

Fig. 2: Ariel view of BK III archaeological remains (Courtesy Dr. Zarawar Khan)
Fig. 3: Areal view of BK III (Courtesy Dr. Zarawar Khan)

Fig.4: View of BK III remains (photo taken in 1985)
Fig. 5: Layout drawing of the structural remains at BK III, Zone A and Zone B (prepared by late Daud Kamal, draftsman of the Department of Archaeology, University of Peshawar)

Fig. 6: Illegal diggings in search of the main stūpa at BK III. Area opposite to the stūpa court (courtesy Dr. awar Khan)
Fig. 7: Excavation in 1982, the partially exposed stūpa court

Fig. 8: Stūpa 6, with square base, made of ashlar masonry

Fig. 9: Shrine D, stūpa with circular base
Fig. 10: Cells 1 and 2 located to the south of the stūpa court (photo 1982)

Fig. 11: Excavation of the cells and shrines to the south of the stūpa court (Excavation 1985)

Fig. 12: Debris removed from the top of cells and Shrines A and B (Excavation 1985)
Fig. 13: Shrine A and B before and after excavation
Fig. 14: Shrine B before and after excavation

Fig. 15: Shrine C before excavation
Fig. 16: Shrine C before excavation

Fig. 17: Porch in front of Shrine C before excavation
Fig. 18: Shrine C and D after excavation

Fig. 19: Shrine D before and after excavation
Fig. 20: Location of Shrine E and northern part of the complex

Fig. 21: Shrine E partially covered with debris

Fig. 22: Shrine E after excavation

Fig. 23: Shrine (?) to the north and adjacent of Shrine E
Fig. 24: Sculptures inside room (?) to the south of Shrine F (?)

Fig. 25: Shrine F before excavation

Fig. 26: Shrine F after excavation

Fig. 27: Probably shrine to the east of the niche with Buddha figure

Fig. 28: Buddha in stucco seated inside a niche (?); to the north of the stūpa court.

Fig. 29: View of the site from the south
Fig. 30: Stūpa 2 made of diaper masonry

Fig. 31: Stūpa 6 made of ashlar masonry

Fig. 32: Stūpa of shrine F

Fig. 33: Stūpa of shrine D

Fig. 34: Stūpa of shrine C

Fig. 32a: Relicquary from stūpa of shrine F

Fig. 33a: Reliquary from stūpa of shrine D

Fig. 34a: Reliquary from stūpa of shrine C
Fig. 35: Stūpa of shrine D

Fig. 35a: Reliquary (stūpa model) from stūpa shrine D

Fig. 35b: Parts and contents of fig. 35a

Fig. 36: Stūpa of shrine E

Fig. 36a: Relic casket from stūpa of shrine E
Fig. 37a: Peshawri – Painting of a stūpa with a the figure of seated Buddha

Fig. 37b: Peshawri: Maharaja Kaniska stūpa at Kala Tassa (Peshawri), Mansehra; stūpa with probably seven umbrellas

Fig. 38: The earliest representation of stūpas with inscriptions, Akre Kai Rock-carving site in Chilas, Upper Indus Valley, Pakistan. Stūpa with 3 umbrellas

Fig. 39: Stūpa with Kharoṣṭhī inscription. Akre Kai Rock-carving site in Chilas, Upper Indus Valley, Pakistan. Stūpa probably without umbrella
Fig. 40: Relief panel showing stūpa; maybe from Baghrajai. According to the Chakdara Museum records, the reliquary came from Chatpat Buddhist site (DMC_1987). The stūpa is with probably 5 umbrellas.

Fig. 40a: Close up of fig. 40

Fig. 41: Relief panel showing a stūpa (SRO 913)

Fig. 41a: Detail of fig. 41; stūpa with 3 umbrellas
Fig. 42: Stūpa with 3 umbrellas (From Charg Pate) (SSAQ Museum, Peshawar)

Fig. 43: Stūpa with 3 umbrellas (SSAQ Museum, Peshawar)

Fig. 44: Panel showing stūpa with 3 umbrellas (PM_02840)

Fig. 45: Relief panel from BK III showing stūpa with 3 umbrellas (SSAQ Museum Peshawar)

Fig. 46: Stūpa model from Shaikhan Dheri (SSAQ Museum)

Fig. 47: Relief panel from But Kara I showing stūpa inside a vihāra (taken from Faccena 1962)
Fig. 48: Model of a stūpa (SSAQ Museum, Peshawar). From Pataka site

Fig. 49: Stūpa model. Private collection

Fig. 50: From stūpa of shrine D.

Fig. 51: Circular stūpa at Gumbatkai, Swat

Fig. 51a: Reliquary (stūpa model) from Gumbatkai, Swat

Fig. 51b: Reliquary from Gumbatkai site, Swat (SSAQ Museum, Peshawar)
Fig. 52: Stūpa model from Chatpat Buddhist site, Lower Dir, now in Chakdra Museum

Fig. 53: Probably model of a stūpa. From Kalam, Swat (private collection, may be a fake). Inscribed with an unclear inscription

Fig. 54: Stūpa (no.7), from Aziz Dheri, with a square base, plinth, two tiers of drum and a dome

Fig. 55: Marjani Buddhist site; stūpa built inside a shrine
Fig. 56: Stūpa 5 and 6 made of ashlar masonry

Fig. 57: Small structures in front of shrine F and near to stūpa 5

Fig. 58: Structures made of ashlar masonry, part of shrine F

Fig. 59: View of the structures inside shrine F
Fig. 60: Stūpas, with square base, made of ashlar masonry. Gumbatkai Buddhist site, Swat.

Fig. 61: Stūpas with square base and made of ashlar masonry. Matkanai Buddhist site in Lower Swat valley.

Fig. 62: Stūpa with round base made of ashlar masonry. Matkanai Buddhist site, Lower Swat valley.

Fig. 63: Stucco seated Buddha figures attached to a structure at Matkanai Buddhist site in Lower Swat valley.

Fig. 64: Stūpa made of ashlar masonry (Baghrajai Buddhist site, Swat).
Fig. 65: South wall of Stūpa 1. Six sculptures were probably fixed to this side of the Stūpa.

Fig. 66: Identification and repositioning of the sculptures from the south wall of Stūpa 1.
Fig. 67: East wall of Stūpa 1

Fig. 68: East wall of Stūpa 1 before removal of the sculptures

Fig. 69: East wall of Stūpa 1 before removal of the sculptures
Fig. 70: May be North wall of Stūpa 1

Fig. 71: North wall of Stūpa 1

Fig. 72: Westside wall of Stūpa 1 (1982)

Fig. 73: Westside wall of Stūpa 1 (1985).
Fig. 74: Sculptures fixed to the walls of Stūpa 1

Fig. 75: Shrine A

Fig. 75a, b: Frieze with garland bearers
Fig. 76: Shrines C and D

Fig. 77: Steps leading to Shrine D

Fig. 78: Lotus flowers and a beaded frame found in front of the entrance to Shrine D (GR 167, 168, 206)

Fig. 79: Lotus flower fixed doorpost of shrine D
Fig. 80: Location of the Buddha figure in stucco (excavation is in progress)

Fig. 81: Close up view of fig. 80

Fig. 82: Damaged figure of Buddha in stucco
Fig. 83: Shrin C before excavation

Fig. 84: Shrin C before excavation. Two sculptures can be seen in the section and at the floor level

Fig. 85: View of shrine Cell 3 and shrines A and B

Fig. 86: Stūpa of shrine C
Fig. 87: View of shrine C and D

Fig. 88: Shrine C. Sculpture close to the mouldings of the second tier of the stūpa

GRK 94 (Reg. No. nil) Context uncertain
(Museum Acc. No. BKIII 1985-1-65)
Fig. 89: Shrine C. Sculptures found on the cornice of the first tier and against the second tier of the drum of the stūpa (see fig. 92)

GRK 80 (Reg No. 93)
(Museum Acc. No. BKIII 1985-1-66)

Fig. 90: Shrine C. Sculpture found below the second cornice and near to the first tier of the drum of the stūpa

GRK 90 (Reg. No. 89)
(Museum Acc. No. BKIII 1985-1-179)
Fig. 91: Shrine C. Sculpture found near to the second tier of the drum of the stūpa

GRK 88 (Reg. No. 119)
(Museum Acc. No. BKIII 1985-1-78)

Fig. 92: Shrine C. Sculptures found on the cornice of the first tier and against the second tier of the drum of the stūpa (see fig. 89)

GRK 127 (garland bearers) (Reg No. 109)
(Museum Acc. No. BKIII 1985-1-154)
Fig. 93: Shrine C. Sculpture found against the second tier of the drum of the stūpa.

Fig. 94: Shrine C. Sculpture found close to the first tier of the drum of the stūpa.
Fig. 95: Shrine C. Sculpture found against the first tier of the drum of the stūpa

GR 126 (Reg. No. 101)
(Museum Acc. No. BKIII 1985-1-150)

Fig. 96: Shrine C. Sculpture found probably below the first cornice of the stūpa

GR 125 (Reg. No. 100)
(Museum Acc. No. BKIII 1985-1-153)
Fig. 97: Shrine C. Sculptures found close to the mouldings of the first tier of the drum of the stūpa (see figs. 98, 99)

GR 129 (Reg. No. 124)
(Museum Acc. No. BKIII 1985-1-157)

Fig. 98: Shrine C. Sculptures found close to the mouldings of the first tier of the drum of the stūpa C (see figs. 97, 99)

GR 23 (Reg. No. 116)
(Museum Acc. No. BKIII 1985-1-76)
Fig. 99: Shrine C. Sculptures found close to the mouldings of the first tier of the drum of stūpa (see figs.97, 98)

GR 91 (Reg. No. 118)
(Museum Acc. No. BKIII 1985-1-77)

Fig. 100: Shrine C. Panel found against the space between the first tier and the line of mouldings above the first cornice of the stūpa

GRK 17 (Reg. No. 94)
(Museum Acc. No. BKIII 1985-1-172)
Fig. 101: Shrine C. Panel found below the first cornice of the dome of the stūpa

GRK 64 (Reg. No. 98)
(Museum Acc. No. BKIII 1985-1-67)

Fig. 101: Shrine C. Two panels found against the first tier of the drum of the stūpa

GRK 22 (Reg. No. 95)
(Museum Acc. No. BKIII 1985-1-173)
Fig. 102: Shrine C. *Harmikā*, found near to the second cornice of the stūpa

(Museum Acc. No. BKIII 1985-1-178)

Fig. 103: Shrine C. Possible original position of the sculptures fallen from the stūpa
104: Fragment of a mould in stone with gold wash recorded near to the stūpa of shrine C (Not included in GRK catalogue)

Fig. 105: Shrine D. Panel found close to the drum of the stūpa

GRK 32 (Reg. No. 75)
(Museum Acc. No. BKIII 1985-1-52)
Fig. 106: Shrine D. Panel found close to the drum of the stūpa

Fig. 107: Found close to the drum of the stūpa in shrine D
Fig. 108: Shrine D. Sculptures found close to the drum of the stūpa (see fig. 109)

GRK 41 (Reg. No. 688 [68])
(Museum Acc. No. BKIII 1985-1-44)

Fig. 109: Shrine D. Sculptures found close to the drum of the stūpa (see fig. 108)

GRK 31 (Shrine D) Reg. No. 69
(Museum Acc. No. BKIII 1985-1-45)
Fig. 110: Shrine D. Sculpture found close to the cornice of the base of the stūpa

GRK 47 (Shrine D) (Reg. No. 74)
(Museum Acc. No. BKIII 1985-1-51)

Fig. 111. Shrine D. Each of the four sides of the Harmikā represents a scene from Buddha’s life
Fig. 112: Shrine D. The panels from this stūpa were probably fixed to the drum of the stūpa.
Fig. 113: Dumped sculptures

Fig. 113a: Further addition to the dumped sculptures of Fig. 113

Fig. 113b: Close up view of fig. 113a. About 46 sculptures were found here. Few of them are included in GRK 2015
Fig. 114: Sculptures dumped at the corner between stupa 8 and 9

Fig. 114a: GR 61 (Reg. No. 35) Fallen from stūpa 4

Fig. 114b: Detail of fig. 114

Fig. 114c: GRK 1 (Reg. No. 60). Cell 3, north of shrine A
Fig. 115: *Catras* placed against the wall of shrine F

Fig. 115a: Close-up view of fig. 115

Fig. 116: *Catras* probably fallen from a stūpa

Fig. 117: *Catras* and other sculptures lying in front of shrine F
Fig. 118: Small structures in front of shrine F

Fig. 118a: Another view of fig. 118

Fig. 119: Section of shrine C and D before their excavation
Fig. 120: Section of shrine D before its excavation

Fig. 121: Section of shrine D and E before their excavation
Fig. 121a: Section of shrine C and D before their excavation

Fig. 122: Section of shrine F before and after excavation
123. Dipamkara Jātaka (Museum Acc. No. 1982-1-164)

124. Panel shows Maya’s dream and its interpretation (Museum Acc. No. 1985-1-166)
Fig. 125: Interpretation of the dream and birth of Siddhārtha.

Fig. 126: Interpretation of the dream (?) and birth of Siddhārtha.

Fig. 127: Birth of Siddhārtha.
Fig. 128: Siddhārtha taking his seven steps after his birth.

Fig. 129: Bath of Siddhartha by Indra (?) and Brahma.
Fig. 130: Festivity after the birth of Siddhārtha

Fig. 131: Panel represents Siddhārtha’s first ride or his visit to school.
Fig. 132; Siddhārtha at school (see also fig. 121).

Fig. 133: The killing and hurling of the dead elephant.
Fig. 134: The hurling of the dead elephant

Fig 135: The hurling of the dead (?) elephant and the winning of the horse race.
Fig. 136: Tug of war scene (?)

Fig. 137: Archery competition (?).
Fig. 138: Siddhārtha and Yaśodharā playing the ring. Probably Prajpati standing on the other side of the table

Fig. 139: Great departure (Museum Acc. No. 1985-1-178). Harmikā from shrine D
Fig. 140: Farewell to Kaṇṭhaka and Chandaka ((Museum Acc. No. 1985-1-173). Panel from shrine C

Fig. 141: Buddha or Bodhisattva in meditation (Museum Acc. No. 1982-1-174). From stūpa 1
Fig. 142: Bodhisattva under Maras’s attack. Bodhisattva witnessing the earth that he reached the truth and received enlightenment (Museum Acc. No. 1982-1-19).

Fig. 143: Brahma and Indra entreat Buddha to preach. (Museum Acc. No. 1985-1-79).
Fig. 14: Buddha’s visit to Kāśyapa and miracle of the fire (Museum Acc. No. 1985-1-67). From shrine C

Fig. 145: Buddha’s life end and his body is cremated (Museum Acc. No. 1985-1-76). From shrine C
Fig. 146: Worship of the stūpa (Museum Acc. No. 1982-1-183). From stūpa 1

Fig. 147: Worship of the crown and the begging bowl (upper two compartments) (Museum Acc. No. 1985-1-104). From shrine F
Fig. 148: Worship of a shrine (Museum Acc. No. 1985-1-178). Harmikā from shrine D

Fig. 149: Worship of *triratna* (Buddha, Dharma, Samgha) (Museum Acc. No. 1982-1-177). Panel from stūpa 1
Fig. 150: Harmikā from shrine D (Museum Acc. No. 1985-1-178).

Fig. 151: Nagarājas from stūpa 1 (Museum Acc. No. 1982-1-2).
Fig. 152: Ascetics, panel from stūpa 1 (Museum Acc. No. 1982-1-12).

Fig. 153: Ascetics, etc. under arches. Panel from shrine C (Museum Acc. No. 1985-1-77).

Fig. 154: Buddha dhoni under an arch, panel from shrine C (Museum Acc. No. 1985-1-71).
Fig. 155: Garland bearers relief from shrine C (Museum Acc. No. 1985-1-157).

Fig. 156: Garland bearer relief from shrine C (Museum Acc. No. 1985-1-68).
Fig. 157: Princely figure carrying offerings: bunch of flowers and food. From shrine D

Fig. 158: Princely figure carrying a relic casket. From shrine E.

Fig. 159: Princely figure holding offerings in both his hands. From shrine E

Fig. 160: Princely figure carrying offering (a wreath). From debris of stūpa 10 (?)

Fig. 161: Princely figure carrying a lamp. From shrine adjacent to stūpa 10 (?), GRK 149

Fig. 162: Princely figure in anjalimudrā. From shrine F
Excavation at the Buddhist Site of Jinnan Wali Dheri – Taxila
A Preliminary Report

Muhammad Waqar, Moahid Gul, Maseeh Ullah, Ghayyur Shahab

Abstract

The historic city of Taxila is famous for Buddhist and other heritage sites and it was due to the efforts of Sir John Marshall who excavated them from 1913-34 and published the reports in three monumental volumes (Marshall 1951) bringing their importance into the notice of the scholarly world. After the independence of Pakistan in 1947, archaeological investigations in Taxila continued by the Department of Archaeology and Museums Government of Pakistan and made some important discoveries in this regard. One of these was the excavation of the Buddhist monastic establishment of Jinnan Wali Dheri. This site is located in the Taxila valley of district Haripur. The site was explored and excavated by the Federal Department of Archaeology from 2002-08. After the 18th constitutional amendment of Government of Pakistan, the provincial Directorate of Archaeology & Museums Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar, resumed excavation at Jinnan Wali Dheri in 2014 preliminary report of which is presented here.

Keywords: Taxila, Jinnan Wali Dheri, Khanpur, Archaeology, Excavation, Buddhism.

Introduction: The site of Jinnan Wali Dheri (mound of the Jinns “ghosts”) is situated about 10 km north-east of Taxila Museum and about 2 km north-west of Julian village, on the left bank of Haro river near Bhera village in District Haripur. It can be reached through a zigzag road from Julian village. The site is roughly rectangular in plan and covers almost 14 kanal of area. It measures 100 meters east to west and 75 meters north to south with a maximum height of 4.5 meters from the surrounding cultivated fields with an altitude of 524 meters above sea level. In the past, the site has been plundered badly by the illegal diggers and the antiquity seekers (Kakar et al. 2008: 13). The first excavation was conducted by the Federal Department of Archaeology and Museums Government of Pakistan, in 2002 up to 2008 the preliminary report of which was published in the same year (Kakar and Khan 2008). The excavation was a fruitful one because they not only explored the main stūpa, votive stūpas, meditation cells and chapels around the main stūpa but the team also exposed a monastery with a water tank in the centre of the monastery (Fig. 1) and mural paintings¹ of Buddha and Bodhisattva², dated to the 5th century AD (Kakar and Khan 2008: 21). Apart from this, several other minor antiquities were also reported e.g., sculptures, coins, pottery, terracotta objects and a hoard of silver jewellery.

¹ Buddhist paintings in Gandhāra are rarely attested as compared to other areas in the region, therefore, this subject has received little attention of the scholars before the significant discoveries recently made by Prof. Dr. M. Nasim Khan in this area (see e.g., Nasim Khan 2000; 2015; 2016).

² These paintings were removed from their original positions and were brought to the Taxila museum for safeguarding. But, unfortunately, during their transportation from the site, they were not properly handled and the present condition of these painting is told not very encouraging.
Current Investigations

After eighteen amendment to the constitution of Pakistan (April 8, 2010), the Ministry of Archaeology and Culture (Federal Department of Archaeology) has been devolved into provinces. Similarly, museums and sites which are located in the territory of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa were handed over to the provincial Directorate of Archaeology and Museums Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Peshawar. Among them the site of Jinnan Wali Dheri along with other important archaeological sites of Taxila region, came under the control of provincial Directorate of Archaeology.

Excavation of the site at Jinnan Wali Dheri was started in March 2014 under the leadership of Moahid Gul, one of the authors, Assistant Director Archaeology and Museums, Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. It was a limited excavation project aimed at to train officers of the Directorate of Archaeology and students from various institutes in the field of Archaeology, to search out the missing portions of the said site, to continue the chain of seasonal excavations of the directorate and to promote awareness among the public regarding archaeological sites.

Site Gridding

The site was already divided into 180 grids of 5 x 5 meters, during previous excavations which were marked from north-western side of the mound and the same grids were followed in the current excavation. The western axis was marked by alphabetical numbers from A to K and the northern axis by numerical numbers 1 to 19 (Fig. 2). The present trench was laid on the north-eastern corner of the main stūpa and to the north-western corner of the monastery. It measures 10 x 8 meters in east-west orientation covering the grids of B, 6.7.8a, C, 6.7.8a and D, 6.7.8a while some 3.34 meters below the datum point (Figs. 3 & 4).

Stratigraphy

During previous excavations 9 layers have been unearthed with a depth of 4.5m. These 9 layers had comprised of 3 periods, starting from the 4th century A.D to 8th or 9th century A.D. (Kakar and Khan 2008: 19-20). During current excavation we were able to dugout into the deposit up to the depth of 2.70m. Initial investigations were started after removing of the humus layer which was followed by layer-I with thickness of ca. 60 cm. It was mostly comprised of dumped material from previous excavations. The colour was dark brown while soil composition was consisted of lose earth, dressed and undressed stone blocks. Layer-II contained loose soil filled with dumped material. This layer had almost 45 cm thick deposit. Its colour was brownish, having lose texture. Here we found potsherds, large and small, dressed and undressed stone blocks as well as traces of ashes at the end of the layer. Layer-III was light brown in colour, having 70 cm thick deposit. Soil composition of this layer was varied in nature both compact and lose texture were observed. Compared to layer-II, potsherds increased in quantity and a complete rim of a pitcher-pot was reported, along with other sherds such as bases, partially broken bowls and spouts etc. A bust of an animal figurine and two terracotta beads were important finds from this layer. Traces of ashes and charcoal were also observed. Layer-IV was almost of a 50 cm thick deposit. This layer contained compact soil as compared to other layers, which was brownish. Here too, traces of ashes and charcoal were also observed. Layer-V was the continuation of layer-IV although having slight differences; the quantity of ashes and charcoal increased here. At this layer, a unique and an
unidentified round stone object, having two prominent cavities, one on each surface was found. A rusted copper was near the northern wall in the trench (Pls. 5-8).

**Architectural Remains**

During previous excavations almost the entire network of structures at this site has been explored including the main stūpa court, votive stūpas, monastery and water tank made of semi ashlar and diaper masonry, which are dated to 4th to 5th century A.D (Kakar and Khan 2008: 14). But the most important discovery during our excavation was the finding of wall structures at the depth of 2.15m (Figs. 5-9). These structures were exposed to the south of the main stūpa court and to the east of monastery area. Thickness of these structures varied from 1.05 to 1.10m with a maximum height of the walls 55cm. These structures, from southern section, showing the continuation of two wall structures runs from the main stūpa court and the votive stūpas but, due to limited excavation, the purpose of these structures could be identified (Pls. 9, 10).

**Minor Findings**

Apart from architectural remains, few artefacts were also recorded during excavation. They include beads, a sling-ball, coin, iron-nails, iron-pieces, a weight-stone, bangles, oil-lamp, animal-figurine and stone objects (see Table. 1).

**Conclusion**

The total depth of excavation was 2.70m wherein 1.20m residue from the previous excavation. The rest of the deposit was observed undisturbed. The antiquities recovered from the debris mostly consisted of potsherds. Charcoal, lime fragments, dressed and undressed lime and kanjur stone blocks (might have been used in the stūpa and other constructions) were also observed in the upper layers. But the objects recorded at the lowest and intact deposits consisted of potsherd terracotta oil lamp, animal figurine, sling ball, beads of varies shapes & size, iron pieces, fragment of an ivory bangle and one corroded coin.

Unlike other major Buddhist sites in the Taxila valley, the site of Jinnan Wali Dheri still lacking certain essential elements as part of a Buddhist monastic landscape such as an assembly hall, kitchen area, etc. The purpose of present excavation was also to find out such components of the monastery, if there any, on this side of the monastery. But the orientation of the structures exposed during 2014 season’s excavation shows that the two parallel walls coming from the main stūpa side and at the end of which remains of a rectangular room was observed (Figs. 5-9) are most probably part of the stūpa court rather than to be associated with the monastery. But this can be confirmed during further excavation in this area as well as on the back side of the monastery which is still unexcavated.
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Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No:</th>
<th>JWD/2014/01</th>
<th>Object: Bead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Layer:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement:</td>
<td>(Dia;2.3cm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight:</td>
<td>10g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Terracotta bicone shape bead containing an incised line around his neck. It is heavily weathered and greyish in colour.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No:</th>
<th>JWD/2014/02</th>
<th>Object: Sling ball</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Layer:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement:</td>
<td>(Dia;1.9cm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight:</td>
<td>5g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Terracotta sphere shape sling ball and slightly rough in shape having reddish in colour.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No:</th>
<th>JWD/2014/03</th>
<th>Object: Animal Figurine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Layer:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement L/W:</td>
<td>(9x7cm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight:</td>
<td>137g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Terracotta animal figurine probably a humped bull, having prominent horns, circular embossed eyes and sign of elongated portion of nose with nasal perforations with traces of mouth indicate a horizontal line, reddish in colour with well fired. Only head and some portion of its neck’s intact, the remaining body is missing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No:</th>
<th>JWD/2014/04</th>
<th>Object: Semi Precious Bead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Layer:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement:</td>
<td>(L;1.9x W;1.2cm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight:</td>
<td>4g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>Semi precious tear shape bead with polished surface made of topaz. It has dark-blue colour.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No:</th>
<th>JWD/2014/05</th>
<th>Object: Oil-Lamp?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Layer:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement:</td>
<td>(Dia;7cm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight:</td>
<td>82g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No:</th>
<th>JWD/2014/06</th>
<th>Object: T/C Bead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Layer:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement:</td>
<td>(Dia; 3.2cm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight:</td>
<td>21g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description: Perhaps an oil-lamp made terracotta. Its upper most round edge is partially broken. It is reddish in colour well fired with disc shape base. Externally it is entirely encrusted and crude in form.

S. No: JWD/2014/07
Object: Broken Iron Pieces
3D: (Depth; 248cm)
Layer: 5
Weight: 115g (collectively)
Description: Unidentified iron object broken into pieces.

Description: Terracotta conical bead, blackish-grey in colour. An incised line runs around its neck/ridge, prominent axial hole.

S. No: JWD/2014/08
Object: Stone object?
3D: (D.260x E.190x S.395cm)
Layer: 5
Measurement: (Dia. 9.5cm)
Weight: 1.104kg
Description: A round stone object, perhaps used for bead drilling. It is plain having crude surface with two prominent deep cavities. It is greenish in colour and made from pebble stone.

S. No: JWD/2014/09
Object: Coin
3D: (D.265x N.95x E.130cm)
Layer: 5
Measurement: (Dia. 1.9cm)
Weight: 4g
Description: Rusted copper coin, probably belonged to Kushan-period.

S. No: JWD/2014/10
Object: Ivory Bangle
3D: (D.270x W.110x S.410cm)
Layer: 5
Measurement: (L/W: 4.6x 0.6cm)
Weight: 3g
Description: Ivory broken bangle piece.

S. No: JWD/2014/11
Object: Iron-Nails or Hooks
3D: (D.268x W.210x N.280cm)
Layer: 5
Measurement: A (L/W: 6.4x 1.2cm) B (L/W: 8.3x 1.5cm)
Weight: A. 12g B. 30g
Description: Two rusted iron-nails or hooks.

S. No: JWD/2014/12
Object: Gambling Stone
3D: (D.270x W.190x N.250cm)
Layer: 5
Measurement: (Dia. 3.5cm)
Weight: 16g
Description: A stone object, probably a used as gambling stone.
Plates & Figures:

Figure 1: Plan of exposed structures, Courtesy: after Jinnan Wali Dheri Excavation report 2002-08.

Figure 2: Grid Plan of the site, the marked-area shows the present excavation.
Figure 3: Grid plan of the present excavation-2014.

Figure 4: Prof. Dr. Muhammad Nasim Khan with pick to inaugurate the excavation-2014.

Figure 5: Southern section-wall.
Figure 6: Eastern section-wall.

Figure 7: Western section showing loose deposits including sands from recent activities.

Figure 8: View of the excavated area after completing the project.
Figure 9: Exposed wall-structures, eastern view.

Figure 10: Exposed wall-structures, north-eastern view.

Figure 11: Excavation team members and labours.
The Eight-Armed Devi from Guligram, Swat (c. 8th century CE) 
A study in three parts dedicated to the memory of Harald Hauptmann

By
Doris M. Srinivasan, and Luca M. Olivieri, with a note by Giuseppe Salemi

PART I
Old and new data, and why we dedicate the study to Harald

Luca M. Olivieri

Introduction

In summer 2007 during one of the many visits to Harald Hauptmann’s headquarters in Chilas, I saw him directing a German team busy with one of the first attempts to document the rock-art stations of Upper Indus through what was then a totally new technology. 3D scan had been successfully utilized in Turkey for the documentation of the astonishing Pre-Pottery Neolithic complex of Göbekli Tepe (10th Millennium BC), a site excavated by Klaus Schmidt, a former student of Hauptmann. The site, one of the major discoveries of the 20th century, differed from the coeval site of Nevali Çori, excavated by Hauptmann, which was unfortunately submerged after the damming of the Euphrates. Göbekli Tepe was declared in 2018 World Heritage Site and saved. With the successful saving of the Southern Anatolian site, and with the prospect of a possible similar tragedy occurring to Chilas (included in the Basha-Diamir mega-dam project), Hauptmann decided to apply for the first time 3D technologies to the Pakistani heritage in order to document all the endangered rock-art patrimony, starting from Shathial and its surroundings. It was in fact exactly at Shathial that I saw for the first time the heavy 3D scanning instruments at work. Five years later, when the Italian Mission started using 3D in Swat for the restoration of the Jahanabad Buddha (8th century AD) defaced by explosives in 2007, the instruments utilized by my colleague Giuseppe Salemi were far more advanced, manageable and lighter. In the following years Salemi carried out the documentation of all the late Buddhist stelae at the Swat Museum. I included in the project the newly documented stele S39 from Jambil valley (near Shanglo) (Figs. 1-2), and

1 Data entry of the stele from the Jambil (S39) can be found on p. 195 of Filigenzi (2015). It was found near the locality of Shanglo in the sub-sector of Jambil Valley. It is a big stele in white marble representing a beautifully carved nimbate Buddha. The figure is sitting in padmāsana on a legged throne supported by two standing lions viewed frontally, which raise and turn their head looking symmetrically at the Buddha. The Buddha is flanked by two nimbate standing Bodhisattvas (on the left: Avalokiteśvara, to the right Vajrapani [?]). S39 is
the boulder C93 from Jahanabad, blasted as an act of iconoclasm in 2009 (Figs. 4-6). In 2015 we recovered all the fragments of boulder C93 (representing Avalokiteśvara), which were 3D scanned, and restored in May 2018. Both carvings are now in the garden of the Swat Museum.

The following paragraphs will report on a specific moment of this documentation activity, i.e. the new documentation of a stele representing a multi-armed devī (stele S070). It is a dramatic piece of iconography, certainly the most enigmatic amongst the stelae housed in the Swat Museum, to which Giuseppe Tucci dedicated what is possibly his most detailed, esoteric, iconography study on Swat (Tucci 1963).

The common interest on the documentation and preservation of the rock-art patrimony of Northern Pakistan created something durable, transforming a scientific partnership into a true friendship between us and Harald Hauptmann. A friendship which started with our seniores, Domenico Faccenna and Maurizio Taddei. For this reason, we and Doris have selected for a multi-authored contribution in his memory, this topic, a particularly thorny rock-art monument, where the world of the mountains - dear to Harald - intertwines with the heritage of ancient India.

The stele

Provenance

The stele S070 was found in its fragmentary form in 1962 a field nearby Guligram during a survey by Giuseppe Tucci (Fig. 7) (Tucci 1963; Taddei 1987). In Tucci’s report the location was erroneously positioned on the left bank of the Jambil River. The site is located instead on the left bank of the Saidu River, some few km south-southwest of Saidu Sharif, not distant from the site of Shandala (Filigenzi 204). The fieldwork notes drafted the following year by Mr. Abdul Ghafoor, Field Officer of the Swat Museum, for the Superintendent of Archaeological Dept. of West Pakistan, Lahore Circle, mention the site of Guligram-serai (Chinar-tangai), near the village of Guligram, located beyond the Saidu Sharif - Marghuzar road on the left bank of the Saidu river. There – in the area locally known as Somgali - there were ruins associated to a Buddhist sacred area. This site is denoted as site 047 of the Archaeological Map of the Swat valley (AMSV). Site 047 was likely the spot...
where the stele was found by the workers of the Italian Archaeological Mission. Unfortunately, no direct archaeological evidence is associated with the recovery of the stele in the archival data. It was first brought to the nearby Mission House, then to the Museum, where it is currently housed. The stele is registered as S070 in the catalogue of late Buddhist rock-carvings written by Anna Filigenzi with my collaboration.  

Archaeological features

Stele S070 is made in white marble, and it shows an extremely worn and chipped surface, which makes its interpretation a particularly challenging task. The stele was found in fragmentary conditions, with two surviving pieces (parts A and B), and smaller fragments which were restored in the 60s. Part A is the bigger piece which include 3/4 of the lower part of the stele (Figs. 15-18). Part B is the smaller, and belongs to the upper part of the same (Figs. 12-14). The two fragments although clearly parts of the same boulder, do not match perfectly, as we will see.

The boulder is carved in half-round, in a way that allows a partial view also from the sides. The back sides are plain, almost flat, and does not present traces of working. There are no traces of re-working.

The inner fractures of parts A and B do not match each other, as they have different surfaces and surfaces’ conditions. The latter are certainly due to a different weathering. It is possible – for example - that part B remained upside down on the ground, so its inner fracture side became smoother and rounded.

Therefore, it is certain that there were four other fragments, now lost. One missing fragment, a big wedge-shaped flake or slab, should be placed between A and B, one, a long fragment was on the [proper] left side of A, another big flake (wedge-shaped) was at the back of B, and one - smaller - on the [proper] top right side (or corner) of part B. Therefore, the re-composition illustrating Tucci’s article of 1963 (Figs. 8-9) does not represent the original shape of the stele, which was a little bit taller (Figs. 10-12).

Before it got broken, the stele was possibly meant to be vertically placed on a flat hard surface, propped against a vertical, certainly open-air, surface within a cultic space.

There are no doubts concerning the chronology of the piece (ca 8th century AD). Although, as we will see, its iconography differs from most of the late-Buddhist stele and rock-carvings of Swat and surroundings, its stylistic features do not differ too much from those of the other stelae. Moreover, as proved by many coeval examples (see below the contribution by Doris Meth Srinivasan), the presence of such imagery in a late-Buddhist environment (e.g. at Tapa Sardar) is not unusual. For late Buddhist Swat, one should consider e.g. the following examples:

1) Stele S 124, from Udegram, now in the Museum of Oriental Art in Rome, representing an eight-armed nimbate Avalokiteśvara (Filigenzi 2015: fig. 109);

---

6 The “Catalogue” is on pp. 173-237 of Filigenzi 2015.
2) Stele S 126, unknown provenance (Swat), now in the Swat Museum, representing a four-armed Maitreya (Filigenzi 2015: 228, fig. 129);
3) Carving C 91, Banjot (near Manglawar), representing a four-armed Maitreya (Filigenzi 2015: figs. 91a-b);
4) Carving C 67, Supal Bandai (to the south of Guligaram), a group of three Bodhisattvas, including a four-armed Maitreya (Filigenzi 2015: 201, figs. 64a-b).

The figure

The figure represents a multi-armed female deity, frontal, standing in ālīḍha posture. The breast is not evident neither in the old photographs, nor in the new documentation. It is possible that the breast was represented in an intermediate missing part (see above). It wears a dhoti, and torso and arms are naked. The headwear resembles a jatāmukūṭa.

The figure places the right foot (represented by three-fourth) on the hind limb of the animal, while the left foot rests on the ground (in profile). The animal, a big mammal with its legs bent under the body, possibly shows its head slightly bent downwards. One round short horn is apparently preserved to the proper left (Figs. 12-13). The particular of the horned head is barely visible, since that part of the stela is extremely badly preserved. Therefore, it is here presented with great caution (see fn. 7). Even when not taking into account the detail of the head, the animal looks like a humped big bovine, with a long tail ending with a short switch clearly visible below the hind leg.

Curiously, a severed long-horned head is represented a bit lower, at the bottom of the stela, like it was in the foreground (Tucci 1963: 146, 152). The head is represented in profile facing right. The carving is flat, a bit crude and marked by a deep silhouette grooved all around the head. The latter - Tucci is right – is the head of a goat (wild).7

Because of the missing parts, the visible arms of the deity are six, but on the proper right there are four objects/weapons; clockwise: quiver – triśūla – cakra -sword. The gesture of the deity picking an arrow from the quiver with the first two fingers of one of her right hands is extremely elegant. Strikingly elegant, when it is seen in the context of an apparently crude iconography (Fig. 14). The cakra and the sword are visible only on part B. On the proper left one can see only three objects: unidentified 1 -unidentified 2 -[missing] - bow. Unidentified 1 is on part A, the other two on part B. The missing object was possibly represented in the non-preserved side of part A. Unidentified 1 looks like a rope firmly held in the hand. Unidentified 2

---

7 In October 2018, when this article was ready for submission, I noticed these details upon re-inspecting the stela. The head of the wild goat or ibex, to me, at least at first sight, looked like a kind of supernumerary symbol in addition to the main scene represented in the stela. Moreover, it seemed to me also possible that the goat/ibex head was added in a later moment, after the sculpture was completed. However, at this stage of the study, I think we should stop, meditate a bit the possible implications of these new details, and consider them as a working hypothesis. The options presented by Doris Meth Srinivasan (see Part III) are the only ones for which corroborative iconographic and textual evidence have been found.
seems to be a bell: Tucci saw a shield, whereas it is more plausible that the rounded shape corresponds to the elbow of an arm holding a small pyramidal object. On the right side, between the leg and the quiver one can see something looking like a twisted cord (well visible also in fig. 3 of Tucci’s article of 1963), a detail that can be found (the “knotted” or “looped belt”) in many Late Buddhist rock-carvings and stelae (e.g. S134, S. 137, etc.; see again on that the data from Anna Filigenzi’s book).

Part II

Notes on the technology involved in the study

Giuseppe Salemi

The 3d-scan of Stele S070 was performed in spring 2018. For the two pieces (part A and part B) we have chosen to perform a very high-resolution scan in order to be able to highlight the individual morphological and stylistic details, as well as the eventual cracking picture.

The instrumentation used was a structured light scanner (Open Technologies’ Cronos Dual model) with a point spacing up to 73 micron. It allows to maintain the exact same performances when environmental conditions change; this aspect proved to be very useful during the acquisition operations carried out in the Garden of the Museum of Swat in changing weather.

With a volume of measurement varying between 150 and 450 mm, the two digital cameras of the so-called far field have been chosen; to perform the full front-back scan of Part A were performed almost 200 scans and about 120 for Part B.

 Altogether more than 170 million points were acquired for part A and more than 89 million points for part B; this huge amount of data generated two mesh composed of more than 3.3 and 1.7 million triangles, respectively.

It is not surprising, therefore, whether they were acquired about 10 Gb of data, processed in the Optical Revenge 2.4 SR8 Professional Software Environment on a Dell gaming computer, that is, with specific hardware equipment both in terms of processing and graphical restitution.

The greatest difficulty in acquiring the all-round model of the two parts was to “connect” the front with the back through the smoothed and rounded edges, where it is difficult to locate homologous points between two successive scans for a correct mosaicking. Finally, two files were produced in .STL format (160 MB for part A and 84 MB for B) that are easily manageable on standard hardware, but retain all the morphological richness deriving from the very high acquisition resolution.

The intercompatibility of the models thus obtained has also occurred: they are also viewable in 3D PDF format through Acrobat Reader, have been imported
into the open-source MeshLab for further control of topological errors, have also been managed with Cloudcompare which is a 3D point cloud and mesh processing software Open Source Project. It was preferred not to describe the process of acquisition and elaboration of the 3D datum because already known in literature and subject of numerous presentations in congresses; rather, it was wanted to provide some numerical indications that give an idea of the very high resolution of acquisition.

It was not, therefore, an exercise in technology rather putting technology at the service of archeology. During the acquisition process the comparison between real (the scanned surface) and virtual (the model of the surface) allowed to “read” better even the smallest features from the morphological and metric point of view (Figs. 1-7).

Part III

Inching incrementally...towards insight

Doris Meth Srinivasan

Ever since the rock carving of a ‘Devi’ was found in Guligram village, Pakistan, she has perplexed and mystified. The subject of numerous discussions, those of Giuseppe Tucci, Maurizio Taddei and Anna Filigenzi, are major and advance the study but without a breakthrough regarding the identification of the Devi. Why study this badly damaged carving again? Has something new come to light? Actually, yes. High - resolution photographs made on site of the object show the remaining features as clear as they will ever be. In addition, new appropriate images have surfaced, helpful iconographic studies have been made, textual references thus far overlooked shed light, and new folkloric material from the northern regions have been published. In this part of the co-authored paper, I shall discuss in detail all the above topics except those dealing with the high-resolution photos and archaeological data.

Major Contributions thus far

A. Summary of Tucci’s Findings

In 1963 Tucci published the 1962 discovery and description of the eight-armed ‘Devi’ image which he dated to the 8th - 9th century A.D (Tucci 1963). His description has not been challenged and needs to be repeated so that the new elements given below can be usefully compared. Tucci noted: 1) traces of a \( jātāmukūṭa \) tied around the head with an undulating ribbon, 2) the Devi positioned her right leg on an animal below, 3) the weapons held in her hands, from lower right: trident, quiver, cakra or wheel, sword; on the left, a bow, a shield [last two are unclear]. The head of the decapitated animal beneath the female is that of a caprid.

Tucci opined that there is a female, a mountain deity associated with the
Gandhāra and adjoining regions. She is a huntress, “Her abode lies on a mountain called Kurukulla or in a mountain cave”. He further cites a sect called the Kurukulas which A. Bareau thinks should be interpreted as those belonging to the Kuru family (as mentioned in the Mahābhārata) (Tucci 1963). The Devi’s eight arms plus killing an animal remind of the eight-armed Hindu goddess Mahiṣāsuramardinī, but Tucci dismissed that identification because the animal is a caprid and not a buffalo; “the goddess must represent some peculiar local variety of some homologous religious entities accepted by Hinduism and Buddhism.” He looks to Swat, Kafiristan, and Hinduism (including survival of Śaiva traditions), to provide fuller meaning of the carving.

B. Summary of Taddei’s Findings

Although Taddei’s remarks are brief, he provides two important ideas (Taddei 1987). First, he believes that it may be too hasty to dismiss a connection between the Guligram Devi and Mahiṣāsuramardinī, even though he agrees with Tucci that a caprid, (that is a wild animal of the mountains such as a goat or ram), rather than a bull or buffalo typical of the lowlands, is portrayed. Second, he introduces Gandhāran images of females associated with the head of a ram: one is a hitherto unpublished piece from Kyoto of a seated female deity holding a ram’s severed head on her left knee. In another example, a ram’s head is held in the left hand of a seated goddess (in Taddei: the Lahore Museum, but probably moved to the Chandigarh Museum) (Srinivasan 1997: pl. 20.10). Taddei, as Tucci, believes that the Guligram and the ram - bearing females indicate that non-canonical (i.e. neither Buddhist nor Hindu) divine entities had a presence in the Northwest and (as they continued) they progressively adapted Gupta and post-Gupta iconographies developed in India.

C. Summary of Filigenzi’s Discussions

Filigenzi’s monograph offers both specific and general details applicable to the Guligram carving (Filigenzi 2015). She implies that local beliefs can be incorporated into Buddhist Northwestern contexts by citing the latest representation of Mahiṣāsuramardinī found at Mes Aynak in Afghanistan (Filigenzi 2015: 141, fn. 220); two others also from Afghanistan are at Tepe Sadar where an eight-armed Mahiṣāsuramardinī of the c. 8th century was found, and the 8th/9th century so-called “Scorretti Marble” of the same deity which is very damaged. Her monograph’s focus on rock art is predominantly on carvings of Buddhist deities, and of those Maitreya has multiple arms, namely four. Importantly, Filigenzi’s brief discussion of the ‘Culture of the valleys and the culture of the mountains’ in Chapter 2 brings topography into discussion for further consideration which may be applicable to the Devi (Filigenzi 2015: 140).

These writings provide a springboard. I shall discuss the two main influences upon the Guligram ‘Devi’: Hinduism and local cults. Though a Hindu deity resembling the ‘Devi’ is found in Buddhist contexts, her depiction does not appear to be influenced by Buddhist iconography. Perhaps Mahiṣāsuramardinī was accepted in Afghan Buddhist monuments because she had something in her background that appealed to the monks and/or laity; it must also be remembered that converts to Buddhism in the Northern areas could come from local cults and/or Hinduism.
**Hindu Influences**

**A. The Eight Arms**

Multiple arms unquestionably started out as a Hindu iconographic convention. When this feature first appeared in the Mathura school of art of the Kuṣāṇa period, the feature was not employed with Mathura’s Buddhist icons. It pertained only to early Hindu (or Brahmanic) deities (Srinivasan 1997). Maitreya, as legends have it, was born to Brahman parents in a previous birth. This birth seems not to be forgotten in Swat, since Maitreya can be shown on a rock carving wearing the Brahmanic sacred thread (Filigenzi 2015: fig. 107). Thus, a four-armed Maitreya on rock representations, does not seriously break the rule. Filigenzi mentions another four-armed representation, that of Gaṇeśa (Filigenzi 2015: 146), a Hindu god. Most interesting is that a four-armed Gaṇeśa sits at the bottom of a rock carving of Padmapāṇi (Filigenzi 2015: 102, 215). Here is another example of a Hindu deity (exhibiting typical Hindu multiplicity) incorporated smoothly into a Buddhist context, assuring that the notion of ‘intrusion’ – when a Hindu deity appears in a Northern Buddhist context – seems less applicable than ‘incorporation’. There is one eight-armed Buddhist rock carving, as Luca M. Olivieri has noted, namely that of Avalokiteśvara.

To highlight the limited depiction of eight-armed deities in the Northwest at this time, a heretofore unpublished relief is introduced (Fig. 1). The standing multi-armed male easily exhibits the same ‘anomalous’ character as does the Guligram ‘Devi’. While some elements remind of known religious imagery, they occur together with numerous elements falling outside of the known model. Standing frontally, the male’s armor reminds of the warrior’s outfit that identifies the dress of Skanda/Kārttikeya to the west of the Indus Skanda/Kārttikeya to the west of the Indus River during the first four hundred years of the Common Era (Srinivasan 1997-1998). But where are his identifying attributes, his cock and spear? Instead, the gestures and attributes on this relief are unrelated to the Northwestern model of Skanda/Kārttikeya in any period known to me. The male’s two ‘normal’ hands hold what looks like a flute or pipe to his mouth; the next two arms are outstretched and the hands rest on top of the heads of kneeling devotees; a cakra is next on the right and an unclear object is on held on the left. The two uppermost arms are bent and the hands hold the ends of a tie or ribbon (cf. Tucci’s paṭṭa for the Devi?). This gesture, if one agrees that the god holds the bands of a headgear, could relate to (or be a vestige of) the self – coronation gesture executed by the Goddess who killed Mahiṣa in Kuṣāṇa art of Mathura (Srinivasan 1997: pl. 20.18) and in Gupta art such as in the rock relief from the cave 6 at Udayagiri (Fig. 3). Indeed, the Guligram ‘Devi’s’ undulating ribbon tied around her hair according to Tucci, may be the remnant of a form inspired by the earlier Hindu victory wreath gracing the head of Mahiṣa’s killer, the Goddess who performs the gesture of self-coronation (Fig. 2) (Srinivasan 1997: pl. 20.18).

**B. The Posture**

The pose of the Guligram ‘Devi’ somewhat reflects a Gupta pose that might have developed from the Kuṣāṇa stance of the Warrior Goddess who kills Mahiṣa (see Mitterwallner 1976). In Kuṣāṇa (possibly even pre-Kuṣāṇa) iconography, the Goddess also is multi-armed; she may have four, six

---

8 This is the subject of my forthcoming paper entitled “Self-Coronation: India’s Earliest Victors Inherit the Olympian Gesture”.
or eight arms. Though she holds numerous weapons in these hands, contrary to Gupta depictions, none touch the buffalo, Mahiṣa. The Goddess overcomes her adversary with her bare hands: she strangles him. She squeezes Mahiṣa’s neck with her left natural arm while the right natural arm presses down on his spine. The demon is balanced on her bent left leg so that he cannot escape from her tight grip. In the fifth century Cave 6 at Udayagiri, on the proper left of the entrance to the cave, the Goddess presses her right foot on the demon’s head and raises his haunches and hind legs with her natural inner left hand (Fig. 3). Mahiṣa’s tilted body, conveys defeat. But it is not the tilt that is new; it can already be seen in Mathura Kuṣāṇa reliefs (e.g. MM 2317 in the Mathura Government Museum (Srinivasan 1997: pl. 20). It is the Goddess’ aggressive posture. If we now compare the posture of the Guligram ‘Devi’’s right leg which presses down on the horizontally defeated animal, it is apparent that her pose has more in common with the Gupta than the Kuṣāṇa position of the Goddess and the animal (although the correspondence is not exact). Both the use and type of weaponry to kill the enemy at Udayagiri (Cave 17, the other fifth century rock relief featuring Mahiṣāsuramardinī on the outside wall of the cave, pl. 4), and the Guligram ‘Devi’ have some commonalities. First of all, a long-shafted trident pointed downward and piercing the hide of the animal is common to both depictions. This is significant because Herbert Härtel has shown the progressive introduction of the long-shafted trident in the iconography of Mahiṣāsuramardinī, concluding that this weapon, thrust downward, does not occur prior to the Gupta period (Härtel 1992). These iconographic features (i.e. long trident, posture, eight arms), taken together with the fact that an eight-armed Warrior Goddess appears in the Late Kuṣāṇa art of Mathura (Srinivasan 1997: 89-90; Härtel 1992: 86) begin to suggest that certain Hindu elements of the Guligram ‘Devi’ are quite in keeping with Indian iconographic developments of the fourth / fifth century (and beyond). Further, some of the weaponry held by the Guligram ‘Devi’ - in addition to the trident – are similar to those of the Udayagiri Cave 17 Goddess namely, arrows, shield, bow. In Udayagiri Cave 6, a wheel or cakra, a bow, a sword are similar weapons. Gritli von Mitterwallner’s analysis of Mahiṣāsuramardinī not only agrees with the chronological introduction of the trident as the slaying weapon, but also traces, via later Indian medieval and contemporary depictions, that the trident continues to serve this purpose (Mitterwallner 1976). Of interest is that the downward thrust of the trident by Mahiṣāsuramardinī can also be noticed in one Afghani Mahiṣāsuramardinī image. The marble statue of the Goddess slaying the buffalo from Gardez (dating to the 7th – 8th century) has the lower section still intact. That part shows a long-handled trident, thrust downward into the rump of the buffalo (Kuwayama 2002: fig. 33). The Tepe Sardar Mahiṣāsuramardinī fragment (dated to the second half of the eight century) has a human foot on the head of the buffalo, reminding, of course, of the Cave 6 Gupta example at Udayagiri, cited above. In addition, the Tepe Sardar excavation report also notes finding fragments which probably belonged to the Goddess: a right hand holding a vajra and a fragment possibly of her trident (Taddei and Verardi 1978). Filigenzi is able to report in a 2017 paper of the reconstruction of the Tepe Sardar image to a possible/plausible approximation of the original (Filigenzi 2014: fig. 61). This reconstruction includes the (eight-armed) Devi’s right foot on the rump of Mahiṣa and the downward thrust of a trident in one of her right hands. An eight-armed marble of
the same deity comes from Tepe Skandar. Again, incomplete due to fragmentation, only the upper part and not the animal can be seen. However enough remains to determine that the Goddess holds a long handle downward; this ought to have ended in the three prongs of the trident, now missing. Two more examples are extremely damaged: the Scoretti marble of Mahiṣasuramardini, and the latest find of this Devi in an Afghani context, namely from Mes Aynak. However, the latter has received careful investigation by Filigenzi and Nicolas Engel with the result that the former scholar is able to propose that this Buddhist site also contained a huge image of Mahiṣasuramardini (Filigenzi 2014: 81-82). The reason for numerous large icons of Mahiṣasuramardini in Afghani Buddhist contexts still awaits explanation, but it can already be said that - as a group - they clearly reflect the iconographic developments that had been worked out earlier in India, and the Guligram ‘Devi’ is allied to this group.

C. The Presence of Hinduism

Giovanni Verardi in his paper “Buddhism in North-western India and Eastern Afghanistan, Sixth to Ninth Century AD”, provides, in a survey, a general sense of the way Buddhism weakened and Hinduism advanced in these areas. Verardi does not mention it, but probably Hinduism (or better early Hinduism which can be designated ‘Brahmanism’) was never completely wiped out in the Gandhāran and northern regions. Verardi believes that Brahman settlers, during the centuries considered in his paper aimed for control of Bactria/Tokharistan. He describes the considerable changes from the time Faxian visited these upper regions to the time Xuanzang did; the latter mentions five ‘deva’ temples in the vicinity of Haḍḍa. Political and economic changes account for the marble Hindu statues of Gardez, and other Afghanistan sites, the Hindu temples of the Salt Range, and, closer to the area of our concern, the Hindu temple built at Barikot, Swat, during the 7th/8th century A.D.: at Zalamkot, and the remains at Manyar (Verardi 2012-2013). This is the setting against which the physical presence of Mahiṣasuramardini statues with their post-Gupta iconography are found in Buddhist stupas. Moreover, this is the background for the iconographic similarities evoking the Gupta features in the Guligram ‘Devi’ and those in the Hindu Goddess, Mahiṣasuramardini.

The operative word here is “evoking” because the 8th/9th century Guligram ‘Devi’ only “evokes”. Gandhāra produced its own version of the killing of Mahiṣa which predates both the Guligram ‘Devi’ and Gupta examples!

Local Features and Influences

A. Skanda Kills Mahiṣa – the visual evidence

The schist image from Mohammed Zai, near Peshawar has curiously never been discussed in this context because the initial description of its finding, in 1999, considered the figure not as Skanda but as Mahiṣasuramardini (Fig. 5). The authors of the article, Muhammad Ashraf Khan and Abdul Azeem, saw the characteristics of the relief clearly, but did not identify the image by what they saw. They wrote, “The Mahiṣasuramardini sculpture from Mohammed Zai (Peshawar) has some distinctive features. Here Durgā is clad in warrior dress like a Kārttikeya figure. Except for her garments, our

9 On Barikot, see Callieri et al. 2000 and 2000-2001; on Zalamkot, see Olivieri, Vidale et al. 2006; on Manyar, see Filigenzi 2006.
Mahiṣāsuramardinī is almost identical with other Mahiṣa figures of the Gupta period as found in Afghanistan, Rokhri (Pakistan) and India.” (Khan and Azeem 1999).

The figure can be shown to be Skanda/Kārttikeya, and not the Goddess. However, as late as 2012 in Verardi’s paper cited above, the sculpture has been identified as Mahiṣāsuramardinī, thereby obfuscating the initial elements defining the myth in art. The image from Mohammed Zai is a male, and that male is Skanda/Kārttikeya. A comparison between the figure and other Skanda images from Gandhāra provides incontrovertible evidence. Even more important, the Mahābhārata ascribes to Skanda the feat of killing Mahiṣa in an account which precedes accounts in the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa (chapters 81-93) attributing the action to Mahiṣāsuramardinī.

The sculpture (19 x11 x 2.5 cm) from Mohammed Zai shows a male standing astride a fallen animal, presumably a buffalo (but I am not so sure; Fig. 5). He has placed his left foot on the head of the animal and the right leg pins down Mahiṣa’s body so he cannot escape. The male has two arms, the left is bent and poised on his left thigh; the right, bent and stretched outward holds the end of a long - handled spear (not a trident as the authors’ conjecture) which aims directly at the throat of the demon. [Mahiṣa’s short sword is useless at this moment of the hero’s victory]. The haloed god is dressed in armor. The top part is composed of diamond-shaped platelettes forming the breastplate that goes a bit below the waist. A wide skirt of rectangular sections goes to the knees. The god may be wearing a dhoti under the coat of mail. Beneath the armor the deity wears loose-fitting leggings. Although the face is broken off, the silhouette indicates that he wears a turban. In addition, he is ornamented with bangles, necklace and earrings, as Khan and Azeem have noted. But these adornments need not bespeak of a female deity. Other Gandhāran representations of Skanda/Kārttikeya show the god with adornments. My survey of Skanda/Kārttikeya’s Gandhāran imagery in the Northwest – and he is frequently depicted – shows that the way he is represented on the Mohammed Zai sculpture is typical for the model of the warrior god in the Northwest (Srinivasan 1997/98: figs. 6, 7, 11, 13). The ornaments, the shapes of individual pieces of armor, both on the breastplate and skirt, the dhoti fringe, the turban are all there. When the typical figures cited above are compared with the Warrior God in the Mohammed Zai sculpture the approximate date of the latter may be surmised as late 3rd – early 4th century AD. This is based on style, especially the execution of the more spirited movement. Whereas I have no doubt that the sculpture depicts Skanda/Kārttikeya, especially in light of the epic passage to be discussed below, where is his signature emblem, the cock? Nowhere on the Mohammed Zai sculpture.

This late Kuṣāṇa - early Gupta Gandhāran carving of Skanda omits an expected emblem, yet includes much of his Northwestern conventional iconography. This unexplained iconographic collision also occurs in the Guligram ‘Devi’ where a caprid head is felled by a ‘Devi’ whose pose has many earmarks of Mahiṣāsuramardinī of the Gupta and post-Gupta periods. A more extreme collision is apparent in the fluting male dressed as warrior seen in Fig. 1. It begins to appear as if there is an undeniable ‘local’ element in some images from the North. Their iconography reveals that artisans are cognizant of iconographic developments further south but that these
artisans may be borrowing visual elements to express something local (a belief?, a phenomenon?, a myth?). Something akin to the local reconfiguration of an outside (or non-local) myth can be seen in a Gandhāran weight stone; Heracles prepares to fight the Nemean Lion but already holds his skin on his arm (Behrendt 2007: fig.8). In short, the totality of the iconographic analyses confirms what Tucci and Taddei had proposed, namely that a local deity may express non-Hindu or non-Buddhist beliefs even though the iconography reflects some canonical features or reconfigures canonical myths. A different world view opens.

B. Skanda kills Mahiṣa – the literary evidence

The Mahābhārata hints that Mahiṣa’s destruction may have special meaning for the Northern regions. The Āraṇyaka Parvan (3.221.1 – 80) relates the slaying of the demon which Śiva lets his son achieve. The section does not specifically state that Mahiṣa is a buffalo. The result of Skanda/Kārttikeya’s victory over Mahiṣa continues in several manuscripts in both the Northern and Southern recensions, but were not incorporated into the critical edition of the epic. After the god split the head of Mahiṣa with his spear (3.221. 66), these manuscripts add that the fallen head barred the entrance to the country of the Northern Kurus (Uttara Kurus). It became inaccessible after that although at present the people of that country pass easily through the gate. This addition may have significant bearing on local beliefs. It may corroborate, in some way to be explained, Tucci’s finding that there is a cult of a Devi in Gandhāra who may be connected to a mountain called Kurukulla (pp. 149 - 150 in Tucci), which Bareau interprets as “belonging to the Kuru family (kula)”.

Because of the potential importance of this passage, I asked James Fitzgerald about it and he kindly sent (Aug. 13, 2018), his translation. It is given below:

A gate/gateway/pass of 16 'leagues' was closed up by the falling of his head, which seemed like a mountain--that [= gate/pass] became impassable because of this (ll. 1-2). Today the Northern Kurus go by it [i.e., use it] as they like [i.e., if they wish].

This translation, together with Tucci’s notions, allows speculation that a particular mountain pass, previously open, became blocked with Mahiṣa’s head, likened to a mountain, insinuating that the head is of gigantic size. This passage Fitzgerald notes “is found in most Northern mss., but NOT in the Śāradā ms.” Perhaps the above epic ms. passage indicates that some believed that Skanda/Kārttikeya, in killing Mahiṣa, caused blockage of a mountain pass in the north. The ability of the Kurus in getting through could ascribe the opening to another force. A candidate may (or may not) be the Guligram ‘Devi’ (whose iconography has semblance to the pose struck by Skanda). Some evidence needs consideration in this new light.

12 The transliteration given by James Fitzgerald is as follows:
3.221.66
After 66, K2 B D (except D1-3) G3 ins.:
03*1088_01 patatA zirasA tena dvAraM SoDazayojanam
03*1088_02 parvatAbhena pihitaM tad agamyaM tato ’bhavat
03*1088_03 uttarAH kuravas tena gacchanty adya yathAsukham

10 See also my forthcoming paper, “Self-Coronation: India’s Earliest Victors Inherit the Olympian Gesture”.

11 Already noticed, but not definitively, in Srinivasan 1997: see fn. on p. 303
C. Other Mountain Divinities with a Caprid Head

It now becomes clear that Taddei’s incorporation of females holding a ram’s head may have relevance for the theme of the killing of Mahiṣa. The Northern manuscripts of the Mahābhārata lead us into the mountains. A caprid (i.e. ram or goat) is of course a mountain animal. Can smaller images (stelae) holding a (decapitated?) caprid’s head give further insight into the myth? More examples have been found since Taddei in 1987 discussed two female images. Two examples are found in excavation at Barikot. Luca M. Olivieri describes a seated male (BKG 2304) found in Period VIII, balancing a goat’s head on his right knee (Olivieri 2013: fig. 15). He suggests that the figure is likely to be a haloed local divinity. Further, he proposes, based on stylistic and iconographic grounds, that this male may form a couple with the c. 4th century seated Kyoto female mentioned by Taddei; there is merit to this suggestion. The implication would be that there is a divine local couple associated with a mountain animal that was (according to the find place of BKG 2304) included in a local, Swati domestic cult. Found in a different area of Period VIII at Barikot is a schist stele of a seated female whose head is broken off; she holds a flower in her raised right hand and the remainder of an object ending in a goat’s or ram’s head (his fig. 15 b). Olivieri does not consider the head part of a cornucopia but I am not so sure. A number of seated female goddesses on late Kuśāna coins and on Kashmir stele from the 5th – 8th century show the female garbed in similarly folded drapery as the fig. 15b female (Srinivasan 2010: figs. 18,20; Srinivasan 2016: figs. 18.2,3.8); sometimes she holds a cornucopia that terminates in the head of a caprid. A very small, less complex schist fragment, unpublished so far, in the Collection of Aman ur Rahman may be applicable although it is unprovenanced (Plate 6). The collector has given the measurements (1 7/8”x1“); the figure holds a ram’s head with both hands in front. Two Gandhāran sculptures not heretofore mentioned show a seated female, haloed quite like the one mentioned by Taddei; there is merit to this suggestion. Further investigations into local myths involving a female and a caprid’s head from Swat and Kafiristan are warranted.

Options from Mountains and Valleys

Tucci looked to Swat and Kafiristan, in addition to Hinduism (including Śaivism), to throw further light on the Guligram ‘Devi’. This is an essential methodological approach, not only for the ‘Devi’ but also the other examples cited in this paper that combine elements from disparate cultures.

Option 1

To pick up on the implications of the Mahābhārata’s Northern passage (above), Option 1 is that a myth about mountain
passes of importance to Swat — nay vital importance - is at the core of the Guligram carving. The Swat Valley’s reliance on passable routes can be observed by the Valley’s geophysical aspects.

Anna Filigenzi states that some economic interaction between mountains and valleys existed, but the dynamics of the interactions is not yet well understood. She also states that the mountain people were not integrated into the social systems of the valleys. If even today there is a social and class distinction between those living in the fertile valley and those living on the slopes of the mountains, the cultural distinctions in ancient days between peoples of the mountains and those of the valleys should have been as sharp, or perhaps sharper. It seems fair to assume that at the time the Guligram rock was carved — and before there were two cultures living side by side [Hindu and Buddhist vis-à-vis local] with but occasional interaction between them. That interaction depended upon open, connective passes.

Swat Valley is surrounded by mountains stemming as offshoots from the Hindu Kush mountains. The mountain ranges enclose the towns, villages, hamlets of Swat, sometimes from each other within the Valley and certainly from surrounding regions. Dir to the West of Swat, Chitral and Gilgit to the North, Indus Kohistan, Shangla and Buner to the East and Buner, Peshawar Valley and Bajaur to the South — they all link only through mountain passes to the Swat Valley. According to Dar the connection between Gandhāra and Swat in antiquity cut through mountains in Buner District. The most prominent opening was at Barikot where one or more passes existed. This pathway may explain why Barikot witnessed the building of a Hindu temple in the 7th/8th century (just a bit before the carving at Guligram); the pathway could have given access from the Indian subcontinent through to Gandhāra and entry at the first Swati urban entry point at Barikot. All this is to highlight the importance of negotiable passes. If one were blocked, it could create hardship. No wonder such a fragile geo-and-ecosystem may have had the potential to stimulate a myth as the epic passage may suggest. [The last sentence is in the subjunctive as it is subjective, no doubt, but reasonable, I suspect].

The epic passage, quoted above and situated in its epic overall context, could recount a mountain pathway closed by the head of a giant cut off by Skanda. The word ‘mahīṣa’ is of course from the Sanskrit, and means ‘great’ etc. in the sense of size not, I suspect, ‘eminence’. A head resembling a mountain reminds of Filigenzi’s observation that occasionally rocks may have resembled gigantic anthropomorphic or zoomorphic images. The above passage also mentions that presumably when the pass re-opened the Northern Kurus (the Uttara Kurus) benefitted; they could move through that pathway at their will. The reader will not fail to note that already Tucci singled out the Northern Kurus in his discussion of the Guligram ‘Devi’. He proposed that a Devi had her abode on a mountain called Kurukulla or in a mountain cave. He further referred to a sect, ostensibly from that locality called the

\[\text{The epic passage, quoted above and situated in its epic overall context, could recount a mountain pathway closed by the head of a giant cut off by Skanda. The word ‘mahīṣa’ is of course from the Sanskrit, and means ‘great’ etc. in the sense of size not, I suspect, ‘eminence’. A head resembling a mountain reminds of Filigenzi’s observation that occasionally rocks may have resembled gigantic anthropomorphic or zoomorphic images. The above passage also mentions that presumably when the pass re-opened the Northern Kurus (the Uttara Kurus) benefitted; they could move through that pathway at their will. The reader will not fail to note that already Tucci singled out the Northern Kurus in his discussion of the Guligram ‘Devi’. He proposed that a Devi had her abode on a mountain called Kurukulla or in a mountain cave. He further referred to a sect, ostensibly from that locality called the}\]

13 Filigenzi 2015: 34. See also Olivieri 2016, and Rahim and Viaro 2002 (see chapter 4 on Pukhtun Society).
14 Ibid.: 1-2.
15 Dar 2006: 79.
Kurukulas, which Bareau linked to the Kuru family.

Who were the Kurus? Can they be historically identified? Where are they to be located? Greek Ptolemy considered the Ottorocorras, the Uttara Kuru of the Vedas and the Mahābhārata, as the eastern part of the colossal Himalayan range; the text of Ammianus (23.6.63), cites Opuro-Carra as Mount Kuru. The people living in these mountains were still an historical people in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, but became a mythic people later on. They should be the ones who used the pass when it was cleared. Who cleared it? If we extrapolate from Tucci’s remarks (above) then a possible answer is that a local Goddess opened the mountain pass and the Guligram carving may represent her. As such the Guligram ‘Devi’ would be the remover of a giant obstructor’s head.

Demonic giants interact in the world of gods and humans. They could be killed by these two agents as well as by other demons. However, some seem to have formidable powers. They can change their form; they can sprout another head if one is cut off; from drops of a slain giant’s blood another giant can grow; living in a cave in Swat, a giant’s hunger can only be appeased by the offer of a human. If such an offering is refused he lets a river by the village overflow and flood the locality. A yush can sometimes appear as an animal. Most intriguing in the present context is “an example of a yush who in the form of a ram impregnates the goddess Disni” (Jettmar 1986: 42, citing the 1951 work of Morgenstierne [Morgenstierne 1951]). This story allows for the possibility that the Guligram image reflects a local myth wherein a local ‘Devi’ (and not Skanda), interacted with a giant in the form of a caprid. His decapitated head on the rock carving would then represent the so-called local “Mahiṣa”. Perhaps, this same Devi is represented in the other images (in addition the Guligram image) of a female holding a caprid’s head. The grounds for considering Disni /Disani as the Guligram Devi as well as the Devi who holds the head of a caprid is explained in greater detail in Option 2.

Option 2

Disni can appear as a wild goat, but when in human form, she is armed with a bow and quiver (Jettmar 1986: 47). Max Klimburg notes that Disani a mountain divinity,
“...was greatly feared. It is certain that Disani was invoked as mistress of the animal world almost everywhere to protect the herds in the high pasture. She could change herself into a goat, for which reason she was often called Atali-Disani “Disani of the crossed horns”. (in Jettmar 1986: 124).

The recently published compendium of Kafiri myths contains several tales still remembered by the Kafirs in 1956 and 1970 and told to Georg Buddrus.25 Disni is a main actor in a few. I have summarized and translated these from the German into English below:

From Text 2 ‘Disni Gang zum Eisgeist’, we learn that Munjem Malik considers Disni the strongest deity and send her to melt a spirit within an iceberg. She ascends but at first finds that there is no path; finally, she succeeds but could do nothing and descends again. Then Munjem Malik gives her a rain cloud and instructs her to ascend again and with this she can melt the iceberg. She does so and finds the god Züzum sitting in the middle of a sea on a chair and she asks him to descend with her to come into the presence of Munjem Malik. At first Züzum strongly refuses; he changes form; Disni escapes but finally she succeeds. There are mutual cordial and respectful greetings and Züzum is offered to sit on a golden chair. He does so, and everyone in the area affirms the decision of Munjeb. All return to their localities.

Text 61 ‘Disni’ describes her residence upon a holy stone in a field near Dewa. There she enjoys offerings comprising a mixture of wheat flour and nuts, white goats and millet. Then she tied on a pair of bells, built two fields (?), enjoyed a millet offering. She lives in the Melig Sea.

Text 82 ‘Wie Disni ihren Sohn Totete’ is about the son of Disni. He and the son of another god built themselves their own small world with plants, water etc. The gods didn’t like the changes; it would lessen their terrain. The gods chased both. The other son hid himself in a boulder. Disni’s son provided water to the other in the boulder so he could survive. This further enraged the gods and they went after Disni’s son. When Disni appeared from a different direction, the gods shouted to direct her attention to the son. She swung her long knife, and decapitated her son. Realizing her mistake, she growled with anger. Then the gods placated her. “You are our Mother” they explained and this had to be done because he wished to change things. To compensate the gods organized festivities to commemorate her son.

Text 84 a hymn to Disni does not seem to have information relevant to our subject.

The précis on Disni/Disani given by Jettmar (culled from his own and other works), synopsizes her salient characteristics. (Jettmar 1986: 68-72). Her multifaceted nature leads him to suggest that the goddess may have absorbed the features of numerous Kafir deities, suggesting thereby that Disni was a force to be reckoned with by many mountainous Kafir groups. Her origins have several explanations. One is that she is the daughter of a god (Sudrem) who can sometimes be seen as a markhor buck. This would explain why she can appear, and indeed be the embodiment of a wild goat. She too can change form. And in a song to her noted by Jettmar, she is a keeper and protector of gates. One cannot but remember Tucci’s similar intuitive remark, when reading

Jettmar’s description that Disni ‘s role is that of a huntress! In addition, the bell noticed by Luca M. Olivieri (his Unidentified 2) fits her description in the Prasun Text 61, above. The weapons she wields in human form (i.e. quiver, arrow, sword) are also seen on the Guligram Devi. There seems to be a strong possibility that the Guligram ‘Devi’ is Disni, chief female divinity for the Nuristanis.

More needs to be known about the appearance of Disni’s son to determine whether the decapitated caprid’s head might be his. Did he inherit the goat-like appearance of his mother? Was he a giant? If he is the product of Disni and the yush, who in the form of a ram, impregnated her, the son could well be a giant with the head of a goat or ram. Then the son’s head could be like a boulder, and be the ‘Northern’ Mahiṣa. Or, perhaps the yush who impregnated Disni is represented by the ram’s head. But to date I have not found a text indicating that he was decapitated.

One area has not been sufficiently explored in this essay. Both Tucci and Jettmar have remarked on a śaivite factor prevalent in the mountain regions. Epic passages reflecting early Hinduism plus the Peshawar relief highlight the presence of a śaivite factor. Skanda portrayed in the Mohammed Zai image is of course Śiva’s son. Tucci calls attention to Śiva’s connection to Gandhāra many years prior to the excavation at Kashmir Smast where evidence of worship to Śiva in the Swat region can be documented in the first half of the first millennium A.D (Nasim Khan 2006). There ought to be a link between Skanda and the later Guligram Devi because of their commonality in significant areas of their iconography. Moreover, all three –Skanda, the Devi and Gupta Mahiṣāsuramardinī images at, for example, Udayagiri - share visual features. This does not seem to be accidental. There is also fact that the Kafirs have a major goddess of the mountains, Disni. According to Tucci’s research, a Devi has her abode on a mountain called Kurukulla or in a mountain cave, and the passage of Northern manuscripts of the Mahābhārata mentions the Uttara Kurus who benefitted when the passage way was cleared. All these mythic threads may be interconnected. Perhaps when a śaivite factor is more deeply researched, more information, not necessarily only on the identification of the Guligram Devi would be forthcoming. Possibly there may be found the influencing factor coming from the Northern regions in the beginning of the first millennium that could clarify the context behind the 1st-3rd century Mathura Warrior Goddess who ultimately morphed into the Hindu Mahiṣāsuramardinī. I for one would be prepared for that. Already in 1997, not finding an indigenous influence from India upon the Hindu Warrior Goddess portrayed at Mathura, I concluded that the “controlling input upon the Warrior Goddess and the buffalo comes from the Northwest and Western Asia”. (Srinivasan 1997: Chapter 20).

Conclusion

The c. 8th century Guligram Devi has some visual features seen on 5th century Gupta Hindu Goddess Mahiṣāsuramardinī at Udayagiri. The similarities between her and the earlier 3rd – 4th century Mohammed Zai image of Skanda have also been noted. So too have been described the pathways along which Hindu visual conventions could travel to the Gandhāra region prior to the 8th century. Implicit is reliance on open mountain passes allowing entry into Swat valleys with their resultant impact on the cited epic’s unincorporated material. Tales from Swat and myths from Kafiristan
strongly suggest that Disni may be represented in the Guligram stele. Perhaps Disni is also the one depicted sitting with the ram’s head by her side. That head would not be her symbol because the head appears in images where the female already has a caprid’s head.

The two proposed options indicate that the Devi is not directly related to the Hindu myth of Mahiṣāsura-mardini. Instead of a Hindu Goddess who fights the buffalo Mahiṣa with weapons culled from an array of Hindu gods, the Guligram Devi may be a local goddess who either removed a blockage (symbolized by Mahiṣa’s head), or caused it by decapitating a caprid giant. The local goddess and Mahiṣāsura-mardini are different deities and operate within different contexts. However, when a śaivite factor is analyzed more closely it may possibly find an earlier link that connects the two.

Incrementally we may be getting closer to an understanding. But there is still much to learn.
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Abstract

Gankoreneotek – Singoor is home to one of the largest protohistoric cemeteries in District Chitral. Since its discovery in 2004, a total of 86 graves have been excavated in four excavation seasons in 2007–2008 and 2016. In 2008, the site has been dated from 8th century BCE to 8th century CE.

During the 2007–08’s excavation season, a unique medieval burial, datable to the last quarter of the 8th century CE, was unearthed in grave GTG_064. The grave contained the inhumation remains of an adult female. The grave goods included two bronze 2-cash coins of the Emperor Su Zong (758 – 762 CE), corresponding to one of the most interesting historic epochs of Chitral and its relationships with the Tang Empire.

In order to break the emerging alliance between the Tibetan and Arab armies in Central Asia, Emperor Xuanzong, the father of Emperor Su Zong, ordered General Gao Xianzhi to invade Little P’o-lü or Yasin and Gilgit regions in 747 CE. He succeeded in the mission and installed a new king and established a Chinese garrison at Gilgit. In 750 CE, Gao Xianzhi removed the king of Chitral at the request of the ruler of Badakhshan. The Badakhshan ruler, along with forces from nine neighbouring states, possibly including a contingent from Chitral, helped the embattled Emperor Su Zong against the rebels in 758-59 CE.

The finding of Tang coins connects well with what is perhaps the most recorded part of Chitral’s medieval history in Tang Annals. In mid-8th century CE, Chitral, which has largely remained on the fringes of major historical epochs, emerged as the central arena of the great game of the Tang, Arab, Turk and Tibetan empires. The exotic nature of the grave goods, and the burial, leads us to cautiously regard the deceased female as an important foreigner, possibly a Chinese lady.

Key Words: Chitral Archaeology; Protohistoric Cemeteries; Tang Dynasty Coins; Silk Routes; Chinese influence; Gao Xianzhi; Kao Hsien-chih; Emperor Su Zong; Emperor Xuanzong.

1. Introduction

District Chitral is advantageously positioned at the confluence of South Asia, Trans-Pamir regions, Central Asia and China. It is the largest district of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province, Pakistan, covering approximately 14850 square kilometres area (Zahir 2017a,b). The present Chitral District shares its borders with the Afghan provinces of Badakhshan, Nuristan and Kunar to the north and west respectively, Gilgit-Baltistan province (formerly the Northern Areas of Pakistan) to the east and Districts Upper Dir and Swat to the south and southeast respectively (Ali et al. 2013; Zahir 2017a,b). The Wakhan corridor, to the north of Chitral, separates it from Tajikistan. Several mountains’ passes break the all encompassing Hindukush and Pamir ranges and connect it with Central Asia, Afghanistan and adjoining regions of Pakistan (Ali et al. 2013; Israr-ud-Din 2008: 175).

The archaeology of Chitral is largely known through the study of the protohistoric cemeteries during the last two decades (e.g.
Ali et al. 1999, 2005a,b, 2010; Ali and Zahir 2005; Hemphill et al. 2018; Zahir 2016a,b, 2017a,b). A total of 47 protohistoric cemeteries have so far been documented in the region (Zahir 2016b). Out of the five excavated protohistoric cemeteries, Gankoreneotek represents the largest excavated cemetery in District Chitral (Zahir 2017a,b). Based upon the limited radiocarbon dates from these excavations, the protohistoric cemeteries have been broadly dated from 8th century BCE to 10th century CE in Chitral (Ali et al. 2008; Zahir 2016a). However, recent radiocarbon dates from Grave 51 at Shah Mirandehe Graves – Singoor (310 ± 30 BP) indicate that the presence of protohistoric, and/or rather medieval, burial traditions possibly continued till end of 15th – 17th century CE (Narasimhan et al. 2019). Previous understandings of the protohistoric burial traditions in northern and north-western South Asia envisaged their range of existence from the end of 3rd millennium BCE to the end of 10th century CE (Zahir 2016a). The new radiocarbon dates extends the range of similar burial traditions to the last quarter of the 2nd millennium CE in Chitral.

The excavations of grave GTG_064 at Gankoreneotek cemetery produced some of the most exciting finds, particularly the Tang bronze coins, from protohistoric cemeteries in Chitral. The two bronze coins provide us with a reasonable dating terminus post quem for the burial, as the coins belong to the Tang Emperor Su Zong (756 – 762 CE). The Chinese Tang Annals have left us with a large body of historical information on Chitral and the surrounding regions during the middle of 8th century CE and the finding of the Tang coins can be linked with the same historical epoch. The investigation of the archaeological and historical contexts of the bronze coins from grave GTG_064 points to the relationships of the fringe mountainous petty states, such as Chitral, and the large empires, such as the Tang Empire, during the 8th century CE. The 8th century CE was, perhaps, the most politically, religiously and militarily volatile century in Central Asia, northern and north-western South Asia and Tibet (see Beckwith 1987).

2. Excavations at Gankoreneotek – Singoor Cemetery

The small settlement of Gankoreneotek is part of the larger village of Singoor in District Chitral, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province. Gankoreneotek cemetery is located on the right bank of the Chitral River, at latitude 35°54′7.06″N and longitude 71°48′23.88″E, at an altitude of about 1562 metres above mean sea level, on Chitral ~ Garam Chasma Road (Fig. 1 and 2). The Gankoreneotek cemetery is located in the vicinity, across the road, of the Chitral Power Station, on a small earthen hill slope (Ali et al. 2010: 210; Zahir 2017a).

Gankoreneotek graves were first documented during the archaeological survey of District Chitral in 2004 (Ali et al. 2005: 133; Zahir 2016b). In 2007, archaeologists from Hazara University, Mansehra – Pakistan and University of Leicester, UK excavated two graves to understand the nature of the site and to collect bone samples for radiocarbon dating (Ali et al. 2008). The cremated remains from Grave 1 were dated by a radiocarbon laboratory at Waikato University, New Zealand (WK-22036) and the remains were dated to 2494±30 BP, ranging between 790 – 420 cal. BCE (at 95% confidence) (Ali et al. 2008; Zahir 2016a: 288).

A team of archaeologists from Hazara University, Mansehra – Pakistan systematically excavated the site from November 2007 to January 2008 under the guidance of Prof. Ihsan Ali. However, the detailed excavations report is yet to be published, hampered by challenges in accessing the excavation datasets and availability of the main researchers. The team excavated a total of 41 graves at the site (Ali
et al. 2010: 210; Zahir 2017a; Fig. 3). The present short note is based upon the discovery of Tang Dynasty coins from grave GTG_064 during the excavations conducted at the site from November 2007 to January 2008. The finding of two bronze Chinese coins was perhaps the most important discovery from the excavations at Gankoreneotek – Singoor, representing a milestone in the archaeology of Chitral.

A new team from Hazara University, Mansehra – Pakistan, again excavated the site under the supervision of Prof. Ihsan Ali for three months, June - August 2008, and a brief excavation report was published in 2010 (Ali et al. 2010: 210). The team excavated 39 graves that contained the remains of 54 individuals: ranging from infants, children and adults (Ali et al. 2010: 211–3). Unfortunately the skeletal materials from both the field seasons were lost, including the skeletal materials from grave GTG_064, due to unknown reasons. The grave constructions ranged from simple pits to elaborate constructions and box-like graves (Ali et al. 2010: 213). Inhumations (flexed and disarticulated) and cremation burial practices were noted, including single, double and multiple burials in the same grave (e.g. grave 143 contained the remains of 7 individuals) (Ali et al. 2010: 211). The grave goods were dominated by pottery vessels, of different types but primarily consisting of bowls, jars, pitchers, glasses and miniature pots. The metal artefacts included copper/bronze mirrors and hairpins, pendants, ear pendants, bangles, hairpins, arrowheads, dress buttons and knives (Ali et al. 2010: 215, 221).

In 2016, rescue excavations were undertaken to salvage archaeological remains at the Gankoreneotek graves that were threatened by aggressive house building activities. The landowners have bulldozed most of the site in order to clear the land for the construction of their houses. The rescue excavations were limited to the digging of four grave structures (graves 1, 2, 4, and 30) and the reopening of previously excavated grave, GTG_003 (Zahir 2017a).

3. The Context of Tang Dynasty Coins

The Chinese Tang Dynasty (618 – 907 CE) was established by Emperor Gaozu in 618 CE and it is considered as the Golden Age of Chinese Civilization (Nasim Khan 2018: 307). At its zenith, the Tang Empire stretched from Korea across all of Central Asia to the borders of Persia (Rhie 1988: 1). The Tang emperors accepted Buddhism and Chinese influence grew in Central Asia, Korea and Japan (Nasim Khan 2018: 307). Under the Tang Dynasty, China became more receptive to cultural, religious and artistic phenomena originating from Central, Western and South Asia (Rhie 1988: 1). The relationship of China and South Asia grew rapidly from 640 CE and reached its pinnacle around 700 – 730 CE (Rhie 1988: 1). Coupled with the expansion of the Chinese empire under the Tang Dynasty, Chinese contact increased with northern and north-western regions of Pakistan, primarily with Gandhara. In fact, during the Tang Dynasty, the Gandhara influence on Chinese arts and religions continued during this period (Nasim Khan 2018: 308; Rhie 1988). Gandhari, the language of Gandhara, served as a ‘major trans-regional language’ for Buddhist scriptures and for ‘international administration’ in much wider areas of northern and western India, Bactria, Sogdia, Khotan and beyond (Salomon 2007:109).

The Tang Dynasty’s coins were found during the excavation of grave GTG_064, in Trench E III/4, located to the east of the owner of the newly built house (Fig. 4). The structure of the grave, GTG_064, started appearing in layer 3 of the trench, at an average of 1.36 meters depth from the then surface level. The grave measured 1.4 meters in length and 0.8 meters in width. It appears that a formal grave structure, similar to other graves from the site and in the region, was not built for the burial
of the deceased. It seemed that the individual was buried in the available space on top of other burials in the trench or was buried in a perishable wooden structure or coffin, of which no evidence was encountered during the excavation of the grave. However, the grave seemed to have been provided with a non-continuous floor, constructed of small irregular stones and the body or the structure containing the body was placed on it. A schist slab, possibly acting as a headstone, was also provided for the grave. The buried individual was probably an adult female based upon the initial understanding of the skeletal remains (pers.comm. Dr. Brian Hemphill 2019). However, no physical anthropological investigations could be carried out due to the mysterious loss of skeletal materials from this grave from Hazara University Museum in 2009-2010.

In terms of grave goods, grave GTG_064, is one of the most interesting burial within the Gankoreneotek graves in particular and protohistoric graves in District Chitral in general. Grave GTG_064 is the most embellished burial from the Gankoreneotek graves, as a total of 125 objects, including 103 beads, were recovered from the grave. Besides the finding of two bronze Tang Dynasty coins, the findings included iron arrowhead, iron and bronze possible sewing needles, bronze finger rings, bronze and silver bangles, terracotta disc or a possible burial money, a metal figurine and a bronze rosette-designed button (Fig. 5).

The bronze coins were found on either side of the deceased and they were recovered from the two respective pouches/pocket areas of the deceased (Figs. 6, 7). The coin on the right side was found between the arm and ribcage of the deceased (henceforth the first coin), while the coin on the left side (henceforth the second coin) was found under the arm of the deceased. Both the coins were part of the collection of objects, including carnelian beads, lapis lazuli beads, cowry beads or cowry money and bronze spacer beads or crowns of the prayer beads and rosette-shaped button or spacer.

The first coin is round in shape and has a diameter of 28.65 millimetres and a maximum thickness at the edges is 2.03 millimetres. The second coin is also round in shape and has a diameter of 29.53 millimetres and a maximum thickness at the edges is 1.80 millimetres. The second and first coins weigh 6.1 grams (7.07 grams before cleaning) or 1.22 qian (a unit of the traditional Chinese weight system) and 6.7 grams (7.40 grams before cleaning) or 1.34 qian respectively. Both the coins were

---

**Fig. 5:** Distribution chart of grave goods, with the exception of beads, from grave GTG_064.
provided with a square hole in the middle, measuring 7.13 x 6.73 square millimetres and 6.77 x 6.87 square millimetres respectively. Such holes were provided in cash coins to be tied together in strings for general use (Fig. 8).

The first coin is relatively smaller and reddish in colour as compared to the second coin. The red colour is probably due to the extra quantity of lead in the alloy (pers.comm. Dr. David Hartill 2019). Both the coins are provided with a broad rim or border, measuring 40 millimetres and 33 millimetres on the second and first coins respectively. The quality of the embossed design on the first coin is much finer as compared to the second coin. The first coin seems to have been buried in mint condition or immediately after being cast. The reverse of both the coins is devoid of any script or decoration, except for a small sign, or a mint sign, of a crescent moon, on the second coin. The presence of the crescent on Chinese coins has been linked with auspiciousness and also with the nail impression of the Empress. The meaning of the crescent on Tang coins is not clear; however, it is fabled that a Tang Empress (or some other Lady) inadvertently stuck one of her fingernails in a wax model of the first kai yuan coin and it was respectfully retained on the later coins (pers.comm. Dr. David Hartill 2019; Fig. 9). The kai yuan coins were first introduced by the Tang Emperor Gauzo/Kao-tsu (r. 618 – 626 CE) (Stein 1907: 206).

Both the coins are of the 11th Tang Emperor Su Zong (756 – 762 CE) and were probably cast in 758 – 762 CE, appearing generally to be 10-cash coins (pers.comm. Late Dr. Mark Blackburn 2008). The 10-cash coins of Su Zong were later on devalued to 2-cash coins and the discovered coins from grave GTG_064 appear to be 2-cash coins rather than the first issue10-cash coins (pers.comm. Dr. David Hartill 2019). The personal name of Emperor Su Zong, the son of Emperor Xuanzong, was Li Heng. This is perhaps the first time in Pakistan archaeology that coins of the Emperor Su Zong have been discovered. Both the coins are inscribed with four identical Chinese characters 乾元重寶, possibly written in a fusion of two scripts, Befan and Li, the official scripts of the time. The legend on the obverse reads Qian Yuan zhong bao, possibly meaning ‘the second era of Su Zong heavy currency’. The qian yuan coins were issued by Emperor Su Zong to pay the army to fight against the rebels that had plagued his rule and the later Tang Dynasty (Hartill 2017: 109 (13.113)). The first issue coins in 758 CE were 10 ordinary cash coins, weighing 1.6 qian or 8 grams (Hartill 2017: 109 (13.113)).

Previously, a Chinese coin of Wang Mang the usurper (7 – 23 CE) of Xin Dynasty, the huoqan coin, probably issued from 14 CE onward, and Tang Dynasty coin, kāi yuán tōng bāo coin, possibly issued after 621 CE and of Emperor Gaozu, the founder of the Tang Dynasty, have also been discovered in Pakistan. Both of these coins were found during the excavations of Kashmir Smast Cave in District Mardan in the Vale of Peshawar or Gandhara region, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province, Pakistan (Nasim Khan 2018: 307-308, 2006; Khan et al. 2008). However, both these coins are much smaller, judging from their diameters, as compared to the coins from Gankorenet. Coins of a larger diameter were discarded quickly as compared to the coins of smaller sizes and they continued for much longer periods within China. For example, the ban liang coins from 200 BCE have been found in coins’ strings till the 19th century CE (pers.comm. Dr. David Hartill 2019).

Kashmir Smast, the largest excavated historic cave in Pakistan, was not only one of the most important religious centres of Hinduism, but it was also a major centre of Buddhism in Gandhara and it might have been a key destination for pilgrimage and pilgrims. The findings of these coins possibly indicate the
visit of Chinese traders, merchants, missionaries, monks or religious students to Kashmir Smast monasteries and Gandhara. Furthermore, Kashmir Smast might have been an important station on the Silk Routes that connected South Asia with China, Chinese Central Asia, Central Asia and Europe, particularly in the mid-1st century CE. In fact, the finding of these coins from Kashmir Smast were linked with the cultural and economic relationship between Gandhara and China (Nasim Khan 2018: 307).

Chitral remained effectively on the periphery of the rise of civilizations, such as the Indus Civilization, and empires, such as the Achaemenids, the Mauriyans, the Indo-Greeks, the Kushans, and the Mughals, and was never integrated into the discourses of these protohistoric and historic epochs (Zahir 2017b). The chronology of Chitral is still largely unknown. The region seems to have been under the sway of the Da Yuezi during the 4th century CE (Kuwayama 2002: 271). The Hepthalites had controlled Chitral in the 6th century CE and their control was possibly ended as a result of the defeat by Turks in Central Asia in 558 CE (Kuwayama 2002: 153). In the mid-7th century CE, Chitral was an integral part of the two routes, as part of the Silk Routes, from India to China and as an integral part of the trade between Central Asia, China and India (Chandra 1977: 3; Kuwayama 2002: 8, 153; Monshee 1869: 133). In 749 CE, the embassy of King jabsu of the Badakhshan region to the Tang Emperor Xuanzong clearly stated that all caravans from Kashmir to Central Asia, primarily trading in rice and salt, had to pass through the region of Chitral (Stein 1907: 11; 1921: 29). The control of long-distance trade routes through the high mountain borderlands was a key aspect of the struggle between the Chinese and Tibetans in the region (Neelis 2011: 176).

In the 8th century CE, Chitral assumed a central role during the Tang Empire and became a key theatre of the political and military manoeuvres between the Chinese and Tibetan empires, and between the Tibetan and the invading Arab armies in the Central Asia. It is believed that the Chinese were initially only interested in preventing the Turkic advancements into their country and later on to stop the collusion between the Arabs and the Tibetans (Dani 1991: 144). The rulers of Gilgit and Kashmir were willing allies of Chinese against the Arabs and Tibetans (Dani 1991: 144).

In the first quarter of the 8th century CE, the Arab armies in Central Asia repeatedly tried to win over the petty kingdoms of the Hindukush against the Chinese. However, the small states remained loyal to the Chinese over lordship and the Arabs did not succeed. In recognition of their loyalty, the Tang Emperor Xuanzong sent envoys to these states to confer the title of kings on their chiefs or rulers, for example the ruler of Mastuj was declared a king, in 720 CE (Stein 1921: 43).

The Chinese Tang Imperial Annals records the five regions that now form parts of District Chitral that could have been separate political entities at the same or different chronological epochs. These regions or states probably included the Wakhan – Baroghil region (as Ta-mo-hsi-‘tieh-ti and Bohuo), Mastuj (as Shang-mi and Chi-wei); Yasin region (as Little P‘o-lü), Chitral proper (as Chieh-shih or Chieh-shuai or Chieh) and Kafiristan/Upper regions of Kunar River (as Shemi) (Kuwayama 2002: 147; Stein 1921: 28-33, 42-45). The Shemi region has sometime been identified with the Chitral proper (Kuwayama 2002: 275 cf. Chavannes 1903: 406, fn. 3).

In 721 CE, the Tibetans had gained controlled over the Little Balur (i.e. Little P‘o-lü), requiring a military response from the Tang Dynasty, who defeated the Tibetans therein some years later (Mock 2016: 122 cf. Beckwith 1987: 95). Furthermore, in 737 CE, the Tibetans had again captured Little P‘o-lü and it stopped paying tribute to the Tang
Tibetans, in 741 CE, claimed to have subjugated more than twenty kingdoms in the present north-western Pakistan, possibly including Chitral, Mastuj, Yasin and Gilgit (Stein 1922: 116). The allegiances and alliances of the relatively small and insignificant states, such as those constituting the modern Chitral District now, with the Tibetans became a subject of Tang imperial deliberations. These alliances warranted military interventions by the Tang Emperors as the Tibetan presence and their collusion with the Arab armies, was considered a major threat to the Chinese protectorate at An-hsi, the headquarters of the Chinese administration, at Tarim Basin (Stein 1922: 116).

Three successive expeditions by the Protector of the Protectorate, or Four Garrisons, at An-hsi, Tarim Basin, failed to dislodge the Tibetans from the region. Gao Xianzhi or Kao Hsien-chih, the celebrated Tang general of Korean descent was the Deputy Protector of the Four Garrisons at Tarim Basin in mid-8th century CE. The four garrisons were stationed at Khotan, Kucha, Kasghar and Kara Shahr (Dani 1991: 147).

In 747 CE, Gao Xianzhi, on the orders of the Tang Emperor Xuanzong, the father of Emperor Su Zong, marched with ten thousand cavalry and infantry on Little P'o-tê-mo, identified with the Yasin region and District Gilgit and parts of the Ghizer District of the Gilgit-Baltistan province. Gao Xianzhi defeated the Tibetan garrison therein and installed a loyal king (Bushell 1880: 461, 530; Neelis 2011: 176; Stein 1907: 8-17, 1922: 112-129; 1921: 28-29). Gao Xianzhi, after the installation of the new king and taking prisoner the previous king, garrisoned one or three thousand strong army at Yasin and Gilgit with an aim to thwart any future ingress by the Tibetans and marched back to Tarim Basim (Stein 1921: 29, 59; 1922: 130). Thus, as a result of the Gao Xianzhi military expedition, the Yasin-Gilgit region was turned into a Chinese military district and was named as Kuei-jên and a garrison of thousand men were established there (Stein 1921: 59). The region was then ruled by the Palola Shahi Dynasty, which disappeared as a result of this intense rivalry between the Chinese and the Tibetans (Neelis 2011: 176). The last ruler of the Palola Shahi Dynasty was Sri Deva Chandra Vikramaditya and is recorded in Chinese records as Su-shih-li-Chih (Dani 1991: 149,150).

In 750 CE, at the request of the prince of Badakhshan region, Jabgo or Yabgu, Gao Xianzhi intervened again in the region, as per the aspirations of the Emperor Xuanzong. Gao Xianzhi removed P’o-tê-mo, the ruler of Chieh-shuai or Chitral proper and replaced him with his elder brother Su-chia. Emperor Xuanzong bestowed the title of the king upon the new ruler (Dani 1991: 148; Stein 1921:29, 32). The Chinese were greatly helped by the ruler of Kashmir, Mu-to-pi, identified with Lalitaditya Muktapida (Dani 1991: 149). The Chinese influence over the regions of Chitral and Gilgit waned after the defeat of Gao Xianzhi by the Arabs and their allies in 751 CE at the battle of Talas, Farghana (Dani 1991: 149; Stein 1907: 68; 1921: 32; 1922: 130). The Tibetans, in 791 CE, eventually overran the Chinese garrison in Tarim Basin (Stein 1922: 131).

However, the prince of Badakhshan, Jabgo or Yabgu, along with the rulers of nine other states, possibly including Chitral and Yasin – Gilgit regions, came to the help, with five thousand horses, of Emperor Su Zang against the great rebellion of An-lu-shan in 758-9 CE and helped him in successfully regaining his capital (Stein 1921:32). The younger brother of king Jabgu or Yabgu, prince Yao was appointed as the second-in-command of the Four Garrisons at Tarim in 760 CE (Stein 1907: 177). From there onward, it seems that Chitral remained outside the influence of the Chinese for a thousand years, possibly due to
internal rifts and dwindling Chinese imperial power in Central Asia. However, in the middle of the 18th century CE under the Qing Emperor Qianlong/Ch’ien-lung (r. 1735 – 1796), after regaining control of the Tarim Basin, the Chinese again extended their authority to Chitral and the rulers of Chitral accordingly accepted Chinese sovereignty and suzerainty as late as 1789 CE (Biddulph 1971[1880]: 151; Stein 1921: 33, 1922: 131).

Thus, it may be clear from the above discussion that by the middle of the 8th century CE, Chitral was at the centre of the power play of three major Asian powers, that is the Chinese, the Arabs and the Tibetans. The discovery of the Tang coins in a female grave, datable from the middle of the 8th century CE to the last quarter of the 8th century CE, with largely foreign grave goods (to be discussed in a separate detailed paper on the subject), assume tremendous importance and relevance to the history of Chitral and its socio-political relations with China.

Biddulph (1971[1880]: 150) records an interesting local Chitrali oral tradition of the rape or murder of the slave of the Chinese leader by the Chitralis during the Chinese occupation of an unknown period, which resulted in the massacre of the inhabitants by the Chinese. Relations between the ruling houses, involving women, were a regular phenomenon during the 8th century CE. For example, the Tibetans were only successful in subduing, and making an alliance with, the ruler of the Little P’o-lü, when they offered a hand of their princess to the king (Mock 2016: 126; Stein 1922: 116). In 740 CE, the King of Little P’o-lü married the Tibetan princess Khri ma lod, establishing a matrimonial alliance and becoming a nephew of the Tibetan King (Mock 2016: 124 cf. Richardson 1988: 16 and Dotson 2009: 31–37). Thus, there are glimpses within the oral records of Chitral, which document the presence of females of Chinese origin or foreign women who were a part of the Chinese missions.

Therefore, it may be argued, in the absence of any scientific datasets, that the deceased in grave GTG_064 was probably a foreigner to Chitral and that she was probably of considerable social and political status, possibly a Chinese lady. It is plausible to assume that she might have come or had been brought to Chitral in the tumultuous period of the Tang Dynasty during the reign of Emperor Su Zong. Her grave was also venerated and visited by mourners even after the decay of the tissues and flesh, without disturbing the grave goods. During one of those visits, the displaced mandible was put on top of the lower abdominal region and left hand (Fig. 6). Scientific investigations at the site in the future may reveal new information on the nature of the relationship and its material manifestation between Chitral and China in the mid-8th century CE.

The interactions between the northern and north-western South Asia and China, are generally understood in terms of the flow of ideas, cultures, religions and trade through Silk Routes. Silk routes, throughout their prime time existence, from 2nd century BCE till 15th century CE (Chandra 1977; Hauptmann 2008: 352; Jansen 2008a: 30, 2008b: 293; Gupta et al. 2017), connected the regions of Gandhara and Taxila with the bordering regions of China, such as Khotan, Yarkand, Kashgar and Kucha. Within the archaeology of Pakistan, and South Asia, the relationship of South Asia, for example of the regions of Gandhara, and China, has been studied through the influences on the art, religion and architecture (see Ali and Qazi 2008; Barnes 1995; Falser 2015; Hauptmann 2008: 352; Hung 1986; Neelis 2011; Rhie 1988) and major empires, such as the Kushan empire (Nasim Khan 2018: 307).

South Asia and China were directly or indirectly linked through routes from as early as 3rd century BCE and Buddhism travelled to China at the time, as attested by the oldest Pali
literature, especially the *Dipavamsa*, from Sri Lanka (Nasim Khan 2018: 307). Within the extensive rock carvings province of northern Pakistan, or the upper Indus region, at least four (Yong 1986: 204) or eight (Nasim Khan 2018: 307) or thirteen (Hauptmann 2008: 357) Chinese inscriptions, sometimes accompanied by the drawing of a pagoda or stupa, have been recorded so far. One of these inscriptions, at the site of Haldeikish at the Hunza Valley of Gilgit, on a trade route leading to Kashghar – Xinjiang, known as the “Jibin route” which was part of the southern “Silk Road”, mentioned the diplomatic mission of Gu-Weilong, the envoy of the ‘Great Wei’ dynasty (386 – 564 CE) (Hauptmann 2008: 357; Dani 1991: 144; Nasim Khan 2018: 307). Dani, citing Professor Ma Yong, suggested that the Chinese envoy was sent probably between 444 and 453 CE (Dani 1991: 143; Yong 1986: 210). The Chinese envoy was probably sent by the Wei Emperor Tai Wu (Yong 1986: 210). The extensive rock carvings in northern Pakistan are also known as the ‘guestbook of the Silk Route’ (Hauptmann 2008: 352). Under the Tang Dynasty, the Silk Routes witnessed the highest levels of trade and connectivity (Andrea 2014: 122).

The examination and analyses of the archaeology and archaeological evidence of this relationship has a potential to yield new information and avenues of understanding, such as the role of fringe regions, for example Chitral, in the formation of this broader relationship between South Asia and China. This relationship was sustained and flourished through the Silk Routes. The evidence of the Tang Dynasty coins from Chitral opens up the question of the nature, material and human manifestations of the military and socio-political relationship between the bordering areas and the Tang Empire, the golden period of the Chinese Civilization. With the exception of the Tang Empire, the border regions, such as Chitral, did not figure in the discussions of the relationships between South Asian, Chinese, Central Asian and Persian civilizations and empires that developed around it (Zahir 2017a). Future investigations, with robust research questions and methodologies, have the potential to change and challenge this perception.

### 4. Summary

There exists extremely restricted archaeological knowledge of District Chitral as compared to its surrounding regions, for example Swat, Dir, and even Gilgit-Baltistan (Samad et al. 2012: 25). This limited information has resulted in District Chitral being left out of the discussions of the major archaeological and historical phenomena in South and Central Asia. Consequently, there are very few archaeological or historical narratives of the region (Zahir 2017a). The finding of the Tang Emperor Su Zong’s coins from a medieval burial in a protohistoric cemetery is very important. This possibly represents the vivid archaeological material manifestation of the elaborate and exciting relationship of the petty states of the Hindukush, that now make up District Chitral, with the Chinese Tang Empire. This relationship is clearly recorded in the Tang Annals, thanks to one of the most impressive and successful military expeditions of all times by General Gao Xianzhi against the Tibetans in 747 CE. The Chinese under Tang were deeply concerned politically and militarily with the internal political, dynastic, militaristic and inter-state affairs of these hard-to-access small states on the fringes of the Empire. The Chinese actively protected and advanced their interests through all available means, such as diplomatic and military, exemplified by the forceful removal and replacement of the ruler of Chitral and conferment of kingship on the new ruler in 750 CE.

The interests of these inconsequential states were also entwined with the internal affairs of the Chinese, especially Tang Empire, and they extended all possible support and help to them,
for example the military and material help to Emperor Su Zong in his fight against rebels in 758-59 CE by the King of Badakhshan region. The finding of Chinese Tang coins, minted and meant for soldiers fighting the rebels, in a female grave with very distinctive grave goods, point to the possible existence of Chinese goods, and Chinese people, in Chitral. The Chinese were in Chitral probably as a result of political, military, trade or matrimonial alliances during the 8th century CE. The projection of Chinese power and sovereignty in northern and north-western South Asia continued until the beginning of the 19th century CE. Presently, there is bonhomie in the political, military and economic spheres and interactions as a result of the China Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC), under the broader and imaginative Belt and Roads Initiative (BRI) of the Peoples Republic of China, in the region. This makes it imperative to investigate archaeologically and historically the genealogy and nature of the relationships between fringe petty states, now part of Pakistan, and the Imperial Tang Dynasty and other dynasties of China. Future studies on the nature and extent of the past relationships between these may lead to the construction of informed narratives of the past and future.

**Note:**

The finding of Chinese Tang Dynasty coins in the protohistoric graves’ contexts in Chitral is hugely important and these coins have an unambiguous impact on the overall understandings of the protohistoric burial traditions in northern and northwestern South Asia. This coupled with the late dating of the graves (such as those at Shah Mirande - Singoor) through radiocarbon dating technique make it necessary to study the protohistoric graves at Chitral in detail and understand and interpret their early/late historical and possible medieval contexts. As an author of the present paper, and as member of multiple archaeological sites’ excavations in Chitral, I have now embarked on the investigation and interpretations of these, and other, aspects of the graves and burial traditions in Chitral and their possible relationships with similar burial traditions in northern and northwestern South Asia. Furthermore, these Chinese coins are part of the repertoire of unique grave goods from the concerned grave and I intend to submit a detailed paper(s) on these findings from this particular grave in the next volumes of the Gandharan Studies. A detailed report on the cemetery excavations is also being compiled.

**Acknowledgments**

I am greatly indebted to Prof. Dr. Ihsan Ali, the then Vice Chancellor of Hazara University for supporting and guiding the research at Gankoreneotek – Singoor. I am profoundly thankful to late Dr. Mark Blackburn of Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, UK, for his initial readings of the coins. Dr. David Hartill, the foremost expert on Chinese cast coins, also deserves my special thanks for his help and support. I am also thankful to Dr. Andrian Popescu, the Keeper of the Coins at the Fitzwilliam Museum for his help. Dr. Brian Hemphil also deserves special mention for his help. I am also thankful to Dr. Ruth Young, Dr. Satoshi Naiki, Mr. Muhammad Naeem Chitrali and Family, Mr. Muhammad Hassan Shamir and Family, Mr. Muhammad Qasim Chitrali and family, Mr. Junaid Ahmed, Ms. Saeed Gul and family, Mr. Sher Azam Khan and family, Mr. Sultan Madad, Mr. Nazeemullah Baig, Ms. Nails Akhtar, Ms. Rukhsana Younas, Ms. Sakina Bibi Majao and family, Mr. Sardar Ali, Mr. Adil Fayaz, Mr. Adil Nawaz, Mr. Muhammad Shabir, Mr. Mehrab Wali Khan, Mr. Muhammad Zubair, Mr. Zakir Khan, Mr. Muhammad Ashfaq, Mr. Mir Hayat Khan, Mr. Abdul Ghani Khan, Mr. Sher Arab and family, and Capt. (R.) Prince
Siraj ul Mulk and family for their help and support. I am also thankful to my friends Ms. Feryal Ali Gauhar, Dr. Astha Dipyopama and Dr. Ijaz Khan for going through the drafts of the paper and for their valuable suggestions.

The support and advice of Prof. Dr. Muhammad Nasim Khan was instrumental to the development of this paper and I am highly obliged to him.
References


Neelis, J. (2011). Historical Contexts for the Emergence and Transmission of Buddhism Within South Asia: *Early Buddhist Transmission and Trade Networks: Mobility and Exchange Within and Beyond the Northwestern Borderlands of South Asia*. Brill. Xxx: pages


Figure 1: Satellite View of the Gankorentek Cemetery on October 5, 2005

Figure 2: Satellite View of the Gankorentek Cemetery on October 8, 2017

Figure 3: General View of the Excavations at Gankorentek Site (2007-8), Chitral
Figure 4: General View of the Excavations at Trench C III/4, Gankoreneotek

Figure 6: General View of the grave GTG_064, Gankoreneotek – Chitral

Figure 7: The context of the second Tang Coin, grave GTG_064, Gankoreneotek – Chitral

Figure 8: Detailed photograph of the Obverse of second and first Tang coins, grave GTG_064, Gankoreneotek – Chitral

Figure 9: Detailed photograph of the Reverse of second and first Tang coins, grave GTG_064, Gankoreneotek – Chitral
The Sasanian Coinage of Sakastan under Khusro I (531–579) in the Context of the Administrative Reforms of the 6th Century

Nikolaus Schindel

The Sasanian coinage of the Eastern Iranian region Sakastan (comprising parts of the modern states Iran, Afghanistan, and Pakistan) has attracted quite some interest recently. The international cooperation project “Sylloge Nummorum Sasanidarum (SNS)”, which aims at publishing the Sasanian coins in the collections of Paris, Berlin, and Vienna,\(^1\) contains several specimens from this area. Volume 1, which covers the coins of Ardashir I (224–240) and Shapur I (240–272), presents a typical group of silver drachms, as well as large copper coins, which Michael Alram tentatively attributed to Sakastan because of their peculiar metal composition — they are made of pure copper without tin.\(^2\) He could later confirm this attribution.\(^3\) Recently, I was able to demonstrate that the obverse legends — which had remained an enigma since the first appearance of this type in 1852 — do in fact cite a local ruler on the obverse, viz. Ardashir Sakanshah.\(^4\) In this respect, they are the only Sasanian issues proper to do so — the Kushano-Sasanian coins, which are a sort of provincial money, never refer to the Sasanian King of Kings, and thus belong into a separate category. After Ardashir I, specific style groups can be attributed to Sakastan, either because the unusual employment of the full Pehlevi name of the region (SKSTN), or because of a typical star, until the early 5th century.\(^5\) Then, in the middle of the 5th century, Sakastan suddenly disappears from the numismatic record. Sasanian coins that can be (possibly) attributed to this region re-appear only late in the 2nd reign of Kawad I (488–496, 499–531) (no 1, 4).\(^6\) Back in 2004, I read one of the mint signatures in question as “BŠT”, the other one as “BYŠT”.\(^7\) After having studied in detail the

\(^1\) Published so far in the main series: Alram/Gyselen 2003; Alram/Gyselen 2012; Schindel 2004; the following additional volumes have appeared to date: Schindel 2009; Baratova/Schindel/Rtveladze 2012; Schindel 2014; Akbarzadeh/Schindel 2017; on Sakastan in the 6th century see Jullien/Gyselen 2015.
\(^3\) Alram 2007.

\(^4\) Schindel 2016a. The recent contribution by Shavarebi 2017 is bizarrely inadequate in terms of methodology: the author is completely unaware of the need to collect sufficient numismatic data, and of the way a proper numismatic (and, more generally, scientific) discussion works. His omission of a sound discussion of the obverse legends of these coins makes the article basically valueless. “Die einzige sinnvolle Alternative zur Identifizierung der bartlosen Büste…” is just wishful thinking, and no scientific argument at all. His idea that on a small copper coin (Shavarebi 2017, p. 176, no. 6) the bust of “Abarsam” has been scratched out in an act of “damnatio memoriae” is remarkable not only because the observation as such is incorrect, but also because he failed to understand that in Sakastan only large copper coins were issued. Such a small unit cannot possibly originate from this region because of its denomination, as far the material known so far suggests. Shavarebi’s suggestion that the silver drachms featuring this peculiar obverse type were not struck in the same mint as the coppers violates Ockham’s law (indeed, they share the style and lettering of the copper issues). Shavarebi also fails to make a suggestion for an alternative mint place. His idea that Abarsam’s name is related to Sakastan is highly hypothetical; but even if it held true, it does not explain why a functionary attested in Ctesiphon should be depicted on coins only in Sakastan.


\(^6\) For an attempt to derive historical information from Sasanian coinage of eastern Iran Schindel 2006.

\(^7\) Schindel 2004, vol. 1, p. 133 f., 156, vol. 2, pl. 123, no. A9 (the signature on this photo is somewhat obscure, especially since the line of the “B” seems quite indistinguishable from that of “S” and “T”), 121.
coinage of Khusro I (531–578), I now see that the former variant has to be read as BST, and the latter as BWST (the single specimen of Kawad did not permit this reading). I will deal with these readings in more detail soon.

First, the (potential) mints in Sakastan under Khusro I are discussed (tab. 1), then the monetary production in Sakastan in the broader context of the administrative reforms of the 6th century is reviewed. Let us start with the reading and interpretation of the mint signatures (in alphabetical order).

**BST**

The first variant that needs to be discussed here is BST. The first letter clearly is a Pehlevi “B”; because of the length of the horizontal line, and because it is not connected to the next sign, it cannot be anything else. The second letter clearly is a “S”, as several drachms of Khusro I prove beyond doubt (e.g. no. 2). The last Pehlevi sign is also easy to identify: it has to be a “T”. The vertical line to its left clearly separates it from “M” or “P”. Therefore, nowadays the reading of the signature in its entirety as BST can be regarded as certain.

Among the first scholars to comment on this signature was Mordtmann, who in 1879 stated that this “ist der ganz ausgeschriebene Name der Stadt Bost …”.

Still, it exists, as especially no. 5 and 6 prove: we see all the letters of BST, but there is an additional one, not connected to the left, in front of the “S”. One clear example (no. 5) shows that this is no “Y”, as no. 4 had made me believe, but rather a “W”. I cannot find a Middle Persian word that begins with *bwst-* in MacKenzie. The city Bost is spelled *bst* in Pehlevi, as it seems.

**BWST**

This rare signature is little known. Still, it exists, as especially no. 5 and 6 prove: we see all the letters of BST, but there is an additional one, not connected to the left, in front of the “S”. One clear example (no. 5) shows that this is no “Y”, as no. 4 had made me believe, but rather a “W”. I cannot find a Middle Persian word that begins with *bwst-* in MacKenzie. The city Bost is spelled *bst* in Pehlevi, as it seems.

As stated above, I myself have originally misread the signature as “BŠT”; my alternative attribution to the Sakastani town, viz. Bušt in Khurasan, can now be ruled out since the middle letter is a Pehlevi “Š”, not a “Š”. BST is a rare signature; among 297 coins of Kawad’s 2nd reign on www.zeno.ru, there is no BST specimen.

Apart from considering the reading as BST as certain, I now also believe that especially when taking into account the larger numismatic picture that emerges for the reign of Khusro I, the equation of this signature with Bost in Sakastan is reliable enough to be of use for the further discussion. I see no serious alternative at the moment.
stands for correct WYH\textsuperscript{22} (Weh-Andiyok-Shapur).\textsuperscript{23} The region Gurgan can be written GWLGAN as well as GWLKAN on seals.\textsuperscript{24} Finally, I think it likely that WLC represents Georgia, correctly spelled \textit{wlwc`n} in Pehlevi. If the equation of BWST with Bost in Sakastan were not completely impossible on linguistic grounds, there are at least no alternative candidates I could think of. Still, this signature in theory also might have referred to a short-lived administrative unit otherwise unattested; but for the time being, I regard an equation with Bost as more likely.

SK

The first letter clearly is a “S”, the second mostly shows the regular form of a “K”. Sometimes, however, the lower horizontal element typical of this letter is missing (no. II), and this has resulted in the misreading as “SD”. Since a final “D” should have a long, horizontal stroke to the left, such an alternative reading is definitely wrong from a palaeographic point of view.

While this common signature has been known since Mordtmann’s times,\textsuperscript{25} its correct interpretation took quite some time. That author has proposed Yazd, impossible from a palaeographic point of view.\textsuperscript{26} In 1954, Göbl proposed (on the basis of the incorrect reading as SD) “Sudd? Khurasan”.\textsuperscript{27} In 1971, he has changed his mind, and read it as SK.\textsuperscript{28} Pivotal for the correct identification was Walker’s catalogue from 1941; he rightly proposed Sakastan.\textsuperscript{29} Among the further authors advocating this are Gaube,\textsuperscript{30} Malek,\textsuperscript{31} Album/Goodwin\textsuperscript{32} (no change of numbers ‘layout intended!’) and Akbarzadeh and myself.\textsuperscript{33} A strong argument for the equation of SK with Sakastan is the stylistic evidence of Late Sasanian drachms e.g. of Buran,\textsuperscript{34} or Yazdgerd III: they exhibit an unusual style, which is well in accord with a mint in Eastern Iran. Also the later Arab-Sasanian issues with SK and Arab governors’ names offer conclusive arguments for localizing SK in Sakastan.\textsuperscript{35} The actual mint in all probability was located in Zaranj, the capital. I am confident that the equation of SK with Sakastan can be regarded as certain.

ZL

This is a rather rare signature. Its first letter shows the typical form of the Pehlevi “Z”; the “L” is one of the clearest signs, so the reading can be regarded as certain. Also its identification is straightforward: already in 1854, Mordtmann has suggested Zaranj, the capital city of Sakastan.\textsuperscript{36} He is followed, among others, by Valentine,\textsuperscript{37} Göbl,\textsuperscript{38} Gurnet,\textsuperscript{39} and Akbarzadeh/Schindel.\textsuperscript{40} To conclude, while we lack definite proof for the equation of ZL with

\textsuperscript{24} Gyselen 1989, p. 116; Gyselen 2002, p. 75.
\textsuperscript{25} Mordtmann 1854, pl. 4, no. 16 (read as “AD”).
\textsuperscript{26} Mordtmann 1858, p. 2, no. 2 (equated with Yazd); without suggestion Paruck 1924, p. 179, no. 195.
\textsuperscript{27} Göbl 1954, p. 92, no. 68.
\textsuperscript{28} Göbl 1971, tab. 16, no. 68.
\textsuperscript{29} Walker 1941, p. CIV f., CXXIX.
\textsuperscript{30} Gaube 1973, p. 103, no. 4.2.33.1.
\textsuperscript{31} Malek 1993, p. 242 “Sakastān, Sistān (most probably ...)”.
\textsuperscript{32} Album/Goodwin 2002, p. 56.
\textsuperscript{33} Akbarzadeh/Schindel 2017, p. 61 f.; Schindel 2013, p. 823; Schindel 2016c.
Zaranj, I believe that it is still probable enough to adhere to it here.\footnote{On Zaranj e.g. Gyselen 1989, p. 62; Daryae 2002, p. 19. The latter reference implies that the statement of Paruck 1924, p. 190 f. (Zaranj was an Arabic name, and therefore cannot represent a Sasanian mint) is not convincing.}

The following tab. 1 gives an overview on the occurrence of the four mint signatures just discussed during the 48-year reign of Khusro I. The numbers given are of the specimens known to me at the time of writing.

**Tab. 1. Sakastan mint signatures under Khusro I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regal Year</th>
<th>BST</th>
<th>BWST</th>
<th>SK</th>
<th>ZL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the present state of research, it seems that no coins were struck in Sakastan during the first ten years of Khusro I’s reign. The possibility exists that in the future some issues will turn up; but this does not necessarily have to happen, and anyway we can reach our conclusion only on the basis of the coins available today. Then, in RY 12, Khusro’s new creation ZL (Zaranj) started to strike drachms, followed in RY 14 by BST, \footnote{The reason for the difference of the total of 63 coins in tab. 1 and 65 pieces in tab. 2 is that the latter contains drachms the dates of which cannot be read with certainty, and which I therefore have not included in tab. 1.}
which had already been active under Kawad I.\textsuperscript{44} The former was more active both in terms of coins known (9 : 6), as well as in regal years attested (5 : 2). It may be that in RY 18 and 20, Bost struck drachms under the signature variant BWST; both attestations so far are unique. In the middle of Khusro’s reign, there is once again a gap in monetary production in Sakastan: no coins under any mint signature (be it BST; BWST, ZL or SK) are known from RY 21 to 26. Then, in RY 27, another new variant turns up: SK. Other than BST, BWST, and ZL, it was striking coins on a regular, yearly basis: Only three out of the subsequent 22 regal years until Khusro’s death are not attested so far, and it seems plausible that these gaps will be filled one day.\textsuperscript{45} SK is also much more productive. For these 22 years, 65 drachms are known (i.e. on average three drachms per year), while the 26 years before account for only 18 examples altogether, i.e. 0,6 coins per year on average, five times less than the value for SK. Even if this type of statistical analysis is very basic, to say the least, it is our only possibility to approach such topics. With the material basis being as meagre as it is, a die analysis makes no sense; and even if I hope that in the future, much more coins will be published and studied, the differences in the patterns of minting that can be observed in tab. 1 still allow us at least the preliminary conclusions presented here. Under the last Sasanian rulers, SK became the most important mint of the empire – under Queen Buran, for example, out of 163 drachms known to Malek and Curtis in 1998, no less than 105 (64 \%) bore the signature SK.\textsuperscript{46}

Still, the focus here is on Khusro I. Let us now consider how the evidence of the mints in Sakastan derived from tab. 1 fits into the wider image of the patterns of monetary production under this king. Tab. 2 gives an overview on all signatures known to me. They are arranged by their rank (1\textsuperscript{st} column) in terms of the number of coins known to me (4\textsuperscript{th} column). A main concern of the further discussion is under which king the signatures are first attested; this piece of information is provided in the last column. Khusro I is printed in bold script so that his new mints can be easier spotted. Obviously, this is not the place for a detailed discussion of the rationale of every single equation.\textsuperscript{47}

\textsuperscript{44} Even if no. 1 was to be disregarded because the signature is too obscure for a reliable reading as BST, no. 4 attests this mint, as long as both BWST and BST are taken to represent Bost in Sakastan. Alternatively, this region started coin production not during the last years of Kawad I, but only under Khusro I, which would not greatly change the overall picture. I believe this variant to be unlikely, though.

\textsuperscript{45} Even the major mints are not attested for every single of Khusro’s 48 regal years so far, Schindel 2015b, p. 133–136.

\textsuperscript{46} Malek/Curtis 1998, p. 120.

\textsuperscript{47} Some thoughts and references can be found in Schindel 2004, vol. 1, p. 128–175.
Tab. 2. Overview on the mint signatures of Khusro I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Localisation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>First attested under</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>WYHC</td>
<td>Weh-az-Antiyok-Khusro/Asuristan</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>Khusro I(^{48})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>AY</td>
<td>Eran-khwarrah-Shapur/Khuzistan</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>Wahram IV(^{49})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>BYŠ</td>
<td>Bishapur/Fars</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>Shapur II(^{50})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>YZ</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>Khusro I(^{51})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>GD</td>
<td>Gay/Media</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Peroz(^{52})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>Ray/Media</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Wahram IV(^{53})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>AYLAN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>Kawad I/2(^{54}) reign(^{55})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>WH</td>
<td>Weh-Antiyok-Shapur/Khuzistan</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>Wahram IV(^{55})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>AW</td>
<td>Ohrmazd-Ardashir/Khuzistan</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>Ardashir II(^{56})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>KL</td>
<td>Kirman</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>Wahram IV(^{57})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>MY</td>
<td>Meshan</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>Wahram IV(^{58})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Asuristan</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Wahram IV(^{59})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>Gurgan</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Yazdgerd I(^{60})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>Merw/Khurasan</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Kawad I/2(^{61}) reign(^{62})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Stakhr/Fars</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Wahram IV(^{62})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Furat-Meshan/Meshan</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Kawad I/2(^{61}) reign(^{63})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{48}\) Akbarzadeh/Schindel 2017, pl. 7 f., no. 75–89. There are extremely rare coins of Kawad I bearing the same signature, Schindel 2004, vol. 2, pl. 136, no. A25; there is neither a doubt about the authenticity of this specimen, nor about the reading of the signature. Since WYHC normally means Weh-az-Antiyok-Khusro, a foundation of Khusro I after his conquest of Antiochia in 540, Kawad’s signature has to refer to another place, in all probability Weh-az-Amid-Kawad in Fars, cp. Schindel 2004, vol. 1, p. 170 f.

\(^{49}\) Schindel 2004, vol. 2, pl. 45, no. N1; most of this king’s drachms bear the variant AYL (Schindel 2004, vol. 2, pl. 37, no. A23 f.), which because of typological and stylistic reasons also stands for Eran-khwarrah-Shapur, Schindel 2004, vol. 1, p. 152 f.

\(^{50}\) Schindel 2014, p. 29 f., pl. 29, no. 323; this is the only coin of this ruler to bear a mint indication, at least at the time of writing.

\(^{51}\) Schindel 2015b, p. 140, no. 14; Akbarzadeh/Schindel 2017, pl. 8, no. 90–95.


\(^{55}\) Schindel 2004, vol. 2, pl. 41, no. 61–63; on the reason why the usual equation with Weh-Ardashir has to be abandoned Schindel 2004, vol. 1, p. 169 f.

\(^{56}\) Schindel 2004, vol. 2, pl. 23, no. A10–A12; mint-signed coins of this king are very rare.

\(^{57}\) Schindel 2004, vol. 2, pl. 39, no. 43–47.


\(^{61}\) Schindel 2004, vol. 2, pl. 132, no. 226–232; Merw was the first Sasanian mint to put its name on a coin (Alram/Gyselen 2003, pl. 35, no. A51), albeit in the full form MLWY which had dropped out of use by the time of Kawad I.

\(^{62}\) Schindel 2004, vol. 2, pl. 38, no. A34; this coin bears the short form ST on the obverse, and the full mint name STHL on the reverse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Mint</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Reign Dates</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>WYH</td>
<td>Weh-Kawad/Asuristan</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Kawad I/2nd reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>Ardashir-khwarrah/Fars</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Wahram IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>HWC</td>
<td>Khuzistan</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Khusro I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>LAM</td>
<td>Ram-Ohrmazd/Khuzistan</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Khusro I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Darabgerd/Fars</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Wahram IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Peroz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Sakastan</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Khusro I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Amul/Tabaristan</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Kawad I/1st reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>LYW</td>
<td>Rew-Ardashir/Khuzistan</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Wahram IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>APL</td>
<td>Ahvadan/Media</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Yazdgerd I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>APL</td>
<td>Abarsahr/Khurasan</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Kawad I/2nd reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>BN</td>
<td>?/Kirman</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Peroz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>ŠY</td>
<td>Shiraz/Fars</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Wahram IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>ALM</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Kawad I/2nd reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Wahram V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>WLC</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Khusro I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>AH</td>
<td>Ahmadan/Media</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Wahram IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Khusro I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>KA</td>
<td>Karzi/Fars</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yazdgerd I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

65 Schindel 2004, vol. 2, pl. 38, no. 39; the same basic phenomenon as with ST appears also here.
66 Schindel 2015b, p. 137, no. 1; Akbarzadeh/Schindel 2017, pl. 4, no. 43–45.
67 Akbarzadeh/Schindel 2017, pl. 5, no. 55–58.
70 Akbarzadeh/Schindel 2017, pl. 6, no. 64. This rendering of the mint name is not attested before 531; cp. for the coinage from this region under Shapur II (as well as for a quick glance at the 3rd century) Schindel 2011, for the late 4th and 5th century Schindel 2015a.
72 Schindel 2004, vol. 2, pl. 38, no. A32 f. As with ST and ART, different variants of the signature occur on obverse and reverse under Wahram IV. While Rew-Ardashir is normally considered a part of Khuzistan, this peculiarity is otherwise attested only in Fars, Schindel 2004, vol. 1, p. 165.
73 Schindel 2004, vol. 2, pl. 46, no. A2; at this time, this is a very rare variant of AH, which is much more common in the 5th century. Only under Khusro I was it replaced by AHM.
74 Schindel 2004, vol. 2, pl. 114, no. 8 f.
76 Schindel 2004, vol. 2, pl. 38, no. A35. Here, too, obverse and reverse bear different variants of the signature under this ruler.
78 Schindel 2004, vol. 2, pl. 64, no. A26
81 Akbarzadeh/Schindel 2017, pl. 1, no. 2; Schindel 2019, p.111
As is well known, Khusro I finalized the administrative reforms begun by his father. Let us focus here on the question whether they left a readily identifiable imprint on Sasanian coinage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Mint</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>NAL/WAL</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>HL</td>
<td>Herat/Khurasan</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>AYL</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Adurbadagan</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>ZL</td>
<td>Zaranj/Sakastan</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>BST</td>
<td>Bost/Sakastan</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>MLWL</td>
<td>Mar-Rud/Khurasan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>YD</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Abarshahr/Khurasan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>BWST</td>
<td>Bost/Sakastan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>YD</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>WL</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>ZZ</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>KYŠ</td>
<td>Kish/Asuristan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>LDY</td>
<td>Ray/Media</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>SML</td>
<td>Samarkand/Khurasan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>YZD</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{83}\) Akbarzadeh/Schindel 2017, pl. 6, no. 61.
\(^{85}\) Schindel 2004, vol. 2, pl. 121, no. 99. While the earlier occurrences under Wahram IV and Yazdgerd I stood for the same mint as AY, this is very unlikely for Kawad, Schindel 2004, vol. 1, p. 152 f.
\(^{87}\) Schindel 2004, vol. 2, pl. 123, no. A9 (there, I used the incorrect transliteration “BŠT”, and might also have been a little bit too skeptical about the equation with Bost).
\(^{88}\) Schindel 2016b.
\(^{91}\) Schindel 2004, vol. 2, pl. 123, no. 121, there catalogued under “BYST (?)”.
\(^{92}\) The reading is quite uncertain.
\(^{93}\) Mochiri 1977, p. 417, no. 1548.
\(^{94}\) Schindel (in preparation).
\(^{95}\) Mochiri 1977, p. 259, no. 720 f.
\(^{96}\) Tsotselia 2003, pl. 8, no. 12.
\(^{97}\) Schindel 2017b.
\(^{99}\) Mochiri 2009, p. 244, no. 1.
\(^{100}\) Moushegian et al. 2000, pl. 26, no. 20 (Gumri hoard).
\(^{101}\) Mochiri 1998, p. 11, no. 2.
In *tab. 2*, 14 signatures attested by three coins or less (from no. 42 onwards) make up one quarter of all the mints listed. But if one adds all the coins known for them so far, the result is a mere 26 specimens, i.e. only 0.6 percent of the total of 4049 coins. Thus, despite their general interest they are in reality of little importance. At the same time, in some cases we might not even be dealing with a new mint signature, but merely with the faulty execution of the lettering of an already known place. We are therefore well advised not to put much relevance on them. Ten out of these 14 marginal signatures are first attested under Khusro I. If we detract these ten from the total of 19 mint names first encountered under this king, the total number of his innovations shrinks to nine, which make up only 645 coins, i.e. 15.9 % of the total. From this, we also should remove WYHC, because it is only formally new, but continues without interruption the traditional activity of AS (Asuristan), established already under Wahram IV. Thus, the number of relevant mints newly attested under Khusro I is just eight, which account all together for merely 357 out of the 4049 drachms which I have collected for this ruler so far. That means that only 8.8 % of Khusro’s silver coins are products of substantial new foundations of this king. For the sake of comparison, it might be noted that Peroz, a king not especially famous for his outstanding impact on Sasanian administrative history, is responsible for four new mint signatures, from which 331 coins of Khusro I are attested, or 8.2 % – almost the same fraction as Khusro’s. Mints newly established under Kawad I, and still active under his son, make up 716 drachms, i.e. 17.7 % of the total of coins I recorded for Khusro I, or double the amount of this king’s innovations. From a purely statistical point of view, the most important king under him. When it comes to coin production and the numismatic sources, this little-known ruler therefore is the most important of all Sasanian kings (maybe with the exception of the founder of the dynasty, Ardasdr I), and he easily outshines Khusro I, despite the latter’s propagandistic efforts. Whatever the truth of this may be in other fields of Sasanian administration, monetary production was already so well-established by the early 6th century that not much needed to be done by Khusro I. If we had to rely on the numismatic sources, I am highly skeptical if we could trace any administrative reform of Khusro I at all.

If we finally turn our attention again to Sakastan, we now can judge better this king’s impact on local coinage. On the one hand, the establishment of the mint using the signature SK was to be of great importance – but only in the 2nd quarter of the 7th century. Under Kusro I, and during the reigns of his immediate successors, SK was of secondary importance. Even if the limited duration of its coin production (only 22 out of 48 regal years) makes a direct comparison with other mints difficult, Sakastan as a whole does not figure prominently among the coin-producing regions of the Sasanian Empire: it ranks far behind Khuzistan (26.2 % of total), Fars (15.4 %), Media (15.1 %), Asuristan (14.1 %), Meshan (7.5 %), Kirman (6.7 %), Khurasan (6.4 %), and Gurgan (4.1 %), amounting to only 2.3 % of the total.{}^{102} Still, there are some regions which are even more weakly attested – Tabaristan (1.6 %), Armenia (1.0 %), Georgia (0.4 %), and Adurbadagan (0.3 %), and there are several areas where no coins were struck at all. Considering the relative importance of coin issues from Sakastan from Ardashir I to the middle of the 5th century, the re-establishment of minting activity in this region is no innovation of Khusro I, but rather a restauration.

---

{}^{102} Schindel 2015b, p. 121.
We should finally look at Khurasan, neighboring Sakastan to the north. There, coin output was even more important during the earlier Sasanian period. Already under Wahram V and Yazdgerd II, there are some discontinuities in local coinage which could be explained with military and political problems the Sasanians encountered. Their power in this Eastern region totally collapsed, as is evidenced by the coins, after the defeat and death of Peroz in 484. Only from the 20ies of Kawad I onwards did the Sasanians regain their local power, as is indicated by the re-emergence of the mints in Khurasan such as APL, HL, and ML. Sakastan is different: coinage already comes to an end under Wahram V, and fully recovers only with the establishment of SK in RY 27 of Khusro I, since BST, BWST and ZL are neither very productive, nor did they strike coins on a truly continuous basis. We do not know if Sakastan, too, was lost in 484, as a consequence of Peroz’ defeat at the hands of the Hephthtalites. Kirman certainly remained under Sasanian control, but this does not necessarily imply that the same holds true of its Eastern neighbor. The patterns of minting in Khurasan and Sakastan are different, and because of the decreased coin output during the 5th century, the lack of numismatic evidence from the latter region makes any historical conclusions mere guesswork (the basic problem of argumentum ex silentio apart). Under Ohrmazd IV and Khusro II, SK is not prominent; only after 628 did it rise in importance (actually overshadowing Khurasan), and retained its prominent position even in the Early Islamic period.

Key to plates

BST
3. Khusro I. Drachm. Type SN II/2. RY 16. NZK.

BWST

ZL

SK

---
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Recent Discoveries

Manuscripts from Gilgit: An important discovery of an ancient manuscript written on a birch bark in Proto-Sharada script has recently been made in Ghizer district of the Gilgit-Baltistan region of Pakistan. The manuscript, consists of 12 roles, may be contemporary to the already known Gilgit manuscript because of its style of writing. Detailed study of the manuscript is in progress.

Excavations

Excavation at Balahisar, Charsadda: Excavation at Balahisar is resumed by the SSAQ Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, University of Peshawar. The last excavation at the site was conducted in 2004 by the Department of Archaeology, University of Peshawar and the Institute of Cambridge University in the framework of a joint collaboration programme under the leadership of Dr. Cameron Petrie and Prof. Dr. M. Nasim Khan. But the 2004 field activities were stopped due to security issues in the country.

Publication

The long-awaited publication which covers about 16 years of archaeological investigations at Kashmir Smast is available. The publication is in two volumes and almost covers research on various aspects of the archaeological landscape and environments at Kashmir Smast (https://independent.academia.edu/NasimKhanM) (http://www.cgbs-gandhara.net/).