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1 Based on the analysis of radiocarbon dating of timber in the walls and charcoal in the plaster mortar used in the main dome of the monument, M. Djamali et al. suggested that the Sarvestân monument was built during the transitional period (between the Sasanian and Islamic eras), with major construction work taking place between 658 and
683 C.E. According to them, the new dating indicates that certain socio-political stability existed in Fars during the mid-to late-seventh century C.E. However, in the conclusion (p. 13) they admitted, "Although the present study provides a minimum age of the mid-seventh century C.E., this age may represent a restoration phase or the resumption of the construction work already initiated during the Sasanian period. The foundation and walls of the monument may have been built before the occupation by the Arab armies". As we have already suggested (cf. Abstract in Abstr 42-43, R3.2.3., N° 61), the timbers in the walls and the charcoal used in the plaster mortar in the dome may suggest a date for the repair of the building in the transitional era and incomplete archaeological test excavations (cf. A.R. Askari Chaverdi, "Archaeological Excavations in the so-called 'Palace of Sāsān' at Sarvistān, Fars." Sasanika Archaeology (3) E-Sasanika, 2012, p. 1–5. Available at: https://sites.ucl.edu/sasanika/2012-2/) in the previous decade have not revealed any evidence as to the date of the earliest construction phase of the building. As a direct consequence of this, the newly proposed chronology is problematic unless further systematic archaeological excavation and interdisciplinary investigations are conducted.
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