



# FROM THE PAGE COVERING THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC RELATIONS OF THE POPULATION OF SOUTH ARAL IN ANCIENT TIMES

**Kadirov Jahongir Kahromon<sup>1</sup>, Khujamatov Intizom Jumabayevich<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>A Graduate Student of the Urganch State University "History" Department

<sup>2</sup>Master's Department of "History" Urganch State University, Urgench, Uzbekistan

## ANNOTATION

*Culture and history of sociale conomical relation softhe peopleof ancient Southern Aralbuyi (Southern coastof the Aral Sea) areloo kedth roughinthe article.*

**KEYWORDS:** *Tozabogyob, Amirabad, Southern Aralbuyi, Central Asia, reservoir Okchadarya, M.A.Itina, S.P.Tolstov.*

The borders of livestock breeders' location widened because of domesticating horses, new pastures and water sources were mastered, there appeared possibilities to migrate to winter and summer pasturelands[1].

Southern Aralbuyi was included to the circle of pastureland cultures in which horse breeding was developed. This idea can be proved by horse bones identified in the locations and clay monument of horse found in the memorial Kava.

Needs for the metals like tin and copper increased at the result of the prosperity of bronze metallurgy. Mines of tin and copper were situated in central Kizilkum near Aralbuyi territories[2]. Tin and copper mines were actively mastered by pasture tribes during Bronze Age and raw materials taken from them and cast metal pieces produced at the result of melting metals in the workshops near mines played a big role in the process of internal and external bartering. Transportation tools were used in order to transport luggage in mining affairs. We can suppose that donkeys and camels were considered as heavy luggage lifters among them. According to the writings, donkey was the main luggage carrying transport in Mesopotamia (the middle of the rivers Dajla and Frot) during Bronze Age. Donkey had the ability of carrying the luggage of 60 kg and walking 35 km distance in a day.

Archeological materials which were found from houses and locations play an important role in learning the proccses of social relations in the system of family and society. Groups of hunters, fishers and pickers spread in Okchadarya reservoir by the beginning of 2 thousands B.C. they continued their traditions of house building and custom. These traditions are reflected in scoopers, hole pokers, tips of arrows and spears which were made of quartzite and flint belonging to Suvyorgan culture and in the forms of shelters with wood columns.

Even though there is not enough scientific proves, S.P. Tolstov connected the appearance of Suvyorgan culture tribes in Khorezm at the edge of 3 – 2 thousands B.C. with "the new ethnic element which came from flat mountain regions of Iran and neighboring countries". This approach was criticized in scientific literatures. In the memorial Jonbos 6 belonging to Suvyorgan culture there were found the sprints of large mud-built stove and little mud-built stoves belonging to separate families surrounding the larger one in the shelter formed house. This behavior repeats the location



stoves in a shelter belonging to Kaltaminor culture. It is known that during the Bronze Age houses were built with mud wall and unripe bricks in the south of Central Asia, in neighbour regions Afghanistan and Iran. The Southern Aralbuyi societies didn't use those construction materials for a long time.

Regional hunters and fishers who often changed their living places during the Ages of New Stone and early Bronze did not have the necessity for steady houses built of mud walls and unripe bricks. This situation can be commented with natural atmosphere, mastering economy, societies' life condition and their unfamiliarity of leading practice in house building. But during the developed and late Bronze Age, half cellars like a hovel and light huts served as a main form of housing approximately for 700 years in Khorezm oasis, i.e. the behavior of using houses suitable for wasteland livestock breeder tribes was kept.

Uneven social and economical development between tribes and people is particular with world historical processes and leading technological and cultural achievements were applied in different territories at the result of increasing of cultural economical relations and migration of people. The researchers stress about that like this, "it is necessary to pay attention to a special lawfulness in the formation of the first and next birth places of civilisation connected with step-by-step increasing of the territories in which economical, technological and cultural achievements were spread out".

In the 70s of the XX century V.M. Masson analyzed the task – theoretical and methodical role of using archeological information in learning social and economical problems. Social, economical and ecological factors effected the peculiarities of house building in the Bronze Age in Khorezm oasis either. The functions of houses are connected with economical forms, people's life style (settled, half settled, migratory) and natural atmosphere and the size of houses were marked with the number of family members. So, shepherds who were breeding cattle in pasturelands used seasonal light houses of farmers like huts during farming, harvesting and preparing feed and hay reserves.

In Tozabogyop period locations containing separate groups appeared in comparison with the last stages (the existence of single situated shelters belonging to kin societies in vast territories). Researchers wrote that more than 35-40 family members lived together in half cellars the plot of which was more than 100 square/meters. Medium 100 people lived in the Tozabogyop period locations and it is supposed that the number of the people of Yakkaparon 2 location including 19 houses in itself comprised 500-550 persons.

I.M. Dyakov writes that separate families consisted of 4-5 members in the Ancient East being based on the analysis of the family lists in the households of Lagash city[3]. According to the idea of V.M. Masson, G.N. Lisishyna and A.A Askarov, it is possible to comment the family composition of the New Stone, Eneolithic and Bronze Ages with 4-5-6 members.

V.M. Masson stressed that 150-180 persons lived in Joytun memorial of the New Stone Age containing 30 single room houses in Southern Turkmenistan(S.P. Tolstov wrote that 100-125 kin members lived in the shelter Jonbos 4 of the New Stone Age). According to G.N. Lisishyna's writings the number of Joytun's people contains 120 persons.

According A.A. Askarov's idea, medium 154-314-242 people lived in the 8 shopping districts of Sapallitepa during the three stages of the Bronze Age.

Thus we can see that there are different ideas about the number of ancient people in the scientific literatures. The ideas about the composition of a large family in Southern Aralbuyi during the Bronze Age consisted of 35-40 persons are a little discussable. A large family might contain 3-4 little families considering the sociable and economical situation and life condition of the ancient period. There was made a conclusion that a large family containing 4 little families of 20-24 persons



in the house fortification Kizilcha belonging to the early Iron Age which was learned in Southern Uzbekistan in Mirshodi oasis. There were identified 15 house-fortresses in Mirshodi oasis and the number of people of them was marked with approximately 300 hundred people[4].

Large families containing little family members comprised kin societies. According to “Avesta” traditions of kin – “vis” composition included 15 families in itself. In Mirshodi oasis house-fortresses comprise separate groups containing 3-4 houses. It means that they belonged to relative large families and it is not out of the realm of possibility. Separate descendent society members containing large families lived in houses learned in Yakkaparon 2 memorial of Amirabad culture too. Considering the total number of people containing 500-550 people which was supposed by M.A. Itina, Yakkaparon is like the centre of the tribe. The above shown indicators about the number of people are relative at a special degree. It is considered that medium 1700-2400 people lived in Geoksur location (Southern Turkmenistan) in the Eneolithic Age the size of which is larger than Yakkaparon location.

Archeological information belonging to Tozabogyop culture shows the proprietary and social equality of the society members. Hand made clay dishes of the same quality, stone and bronze instruments were found in houses. Researchers paid attention to the materials of half cellars which are differentiated by their size in Kukcha 15 memorial. Bones of two cows, six minor cattle, pig, camel and horse were found in that house. There was a question put forward about the appearance of large patriarchal families separated with their position at the last stage of primitive society’s history, because such amount of livestock bones were not found in other houses. So, there was made a conclusion that women were buried separately according to their position on the basis of the 5 bronze bracelets found among the burial utensils in the grave of a woman of Kukcha 3 memorial of the Bronze Age. But there was not observed any sign of social differentiation or proprietary inequality in the quantity of household utensils and kinds of jewelry in the same houses with half cellars belonging to separate large families.

Large patriarchal families containing several little families owned their half cellar houses, private property, private plot, livestock, food reserve and productive utensils during the stages of development of Tozabogyop and Amirabad cultures. Such families continued descendent traditions of primitive society comparing with ethnographical information. They were united by common labor, the law equal working for everybody for the prosperity of family, common property, labor instruments and food reserve, common houses and life condition. Besides, it is necessary to mention the appearance of large family societies of the Bronze Age which could economically provide themselves in Khorezm oasis.

Learning ancient sociable system and problems of social relations on the basis of archeological information is a very difficult task. But we have to use this approach because of the inexistence of written sources. Existing information is the basis to note the following ideas:

- the Bronze Age locations of Khorezm oasis were not surrounded by defending walls. This situation shows that there was not the necessity for defending from outer attacks;
- there were not found sociable buildings and places of worship connected with belief and fulfilling customs;
- learned ancient graves consist of plain cavities, the burial utensils taken from them were the basis for the conclusion about sociable equality;
- there was not found any building for keeping agricultural goods and food reserves;
- the prosperity of household handicrafts was mainly directed to provide the internal needs of kin societies.



We know that the appearance of production economy, copper and bronze metallurgy caused the appearance of excessive goods in different continents [5]. In our opinion, there was not a comfortable condition to excess agricultural goods and handicraft utensils for regional large families and kin societies because of not enough development of production power during the Bronze age in Southern Aralbuyi. In this point it is necessary to mention one more time the condition of uneven social and economical development of the tribes belonging to the history of the Bronze Age.

In the last years learning the tasks of economical relations in Central Asia and process of appearance and development of sociable governing was observed by U.I. Abdullaev. The researcher widely analyzed the results of learning primitive society's sociable and economical relations which was based on mastering and productive economy on the basis of historical literatures, ethnographical and archeological information. Considering existing approaches and scientific view points, it is possible to suppose that sociable governing based on the demands of primitive society was developed in Khorezm oasis because of the superiority of the traditions and customs of kin system in the history of the Bronze Age. As we mentioned above, the rulers of large families and elder grandfathers played an important role in the regularity of sociable governing. The functions of planning, organizing, regulating, controlling and conforming relations between societies, solving discussable tasks were vital actual necessities.

The signs of the Bronze Age society in Southern Aralbuyi are as following on the basis of analyzed information:

As a conclusion it's necessary to stress that any person or special common government who had carried out ruling affairs gaining a special position in the kin society of people in Khorezm oasis was not known by the 7<sup>th</sup> century B.C. sociable governing connected with processes of fulfilling vital necessary needs of society members was on the upper position. The most important tasks were solved in common meetings of kin representatives. Kin rulers and tribe leaders were selected in the meetings of the representatives of large families and kin societies.

The selection of leaders in the system of kinsmen – tribe was connected with their personal ethical peculiarities and practical knowledge.

The researchers' conclusion (S.P. Tolstov, M.A. Itina) in which the history of Khorezm oasis during the 9<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> centuries B.C. is the stage of passing to new sociable formation – slavery system has not been proved.

## REFERENCES

1. Akishev K.A. *Equestrian nomads of ancient Kazakhstan // Interaction of nomadic cultures and ancient civilizations.* - Alma-Ata: Science, 1987.
2. Buryakov Yu. *The state of metallurgical production during the emergence of the Avesta // O'zbekiston tarixi.* - Tashkent, 2001. 3-son.
3. Dyakonov I.M. *The social and state system of the ancient Mesopotamia.* –M.: IVL, 1959.
4. Sagdullaev A.S. *Estates of ancient Bactria.* - Tashkent: Fan, 1987.
5. Masson V.M. *On the issue of the social structure of ancient Central Asia // History, archeology and ethnography of Central Asia.* –M.: Nauka, 1968.
6. *Primitive society. The main problems of development.* –M.: Nauka, 1975.
7. Abidova Z.K. *Sanctification of Water among the Population of the Khorezm Oasis. Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities. Volume 12, Number 4, 2020. Pp. 32.*