



REFLECTION OF THE RESEARCHERS WORKS ABOUT THE FIRST URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND STATEHOOD PROBLEMS IN THE LOWER AMUDARYA REGION

Salaev Muminjon Atabaevich¹, Matnazarova Dilorom Rajabboevna²

¹Urganch State University Graduate Student,

²Urganch State University postgraduate student.

Urgench, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

In this article, the first political associations that are formed in the Lower Amudarya region and the processes of their formation are studied.

KEY WORDS: *Tozabog'yoq, Amirabad, Southern Aralbuvi, Central Asia, reservoir Okchadarya, M.A. Itina, S.P. Tolstov.*

In particular, the problem of the emergence of the first statehood in Khorezm is one of the most controversial issues in the history of Central Asia. There were analyzed the preliminary results of this study in the monographs of S.P. Tolstov published in 1948[1].

At the beginning of the 20th century, I. Markvart noted the important role of Khorezm in the history of Central Asia and compared the country Aryonam Vajjo, mentioned in Avesto, to Khorezm. A number of western scientists (A. Hermann, V.Tarn, E. Hertzfeldt, etc.) were included in this idea. In the scientific literatures, there appeared scientific views about Khrezm kingdom which united a large part of Central Asia before the Ahamanids, along with the problem of “Khoresmians”.

According to the writings of S.P. Tolstov, the conclusions of I.Markvart, V.Tarn and other researchers on the Khorezmian kingship, including South Turkmenistan, Khurasan, and Sogdiana are not accidental, this is a confederation of military democracy of the tribes of political association and it became a state unification, completion of this process is peculiar to the 8th and 7th centuries BC and exactly at that time Khorezm's great irrigation system was erected.

The consideration of the Khorezmian kingship based on the study of written sources was developed in the 50s of the last century by V.B. Henning and I. Gershevich and was put into practice as a problem of “Greater Khorezm” [2].

I.Markvart and S.P. Tolstov compared the borders of the Khorezmian kingdom to the territories of Parphia, Khorezm, Areia and Sogdiana, which were united in the 16th satrap state of the Ahamanides, which was written by Greek historian Herodotus. V.B. Henning and I. Gershevich wrote that the center of this state was located in the oasis of Herirud-Tajan river, in Herat and Marv until the occupation of Ahamanids i.e. according to this conclusion, Parphia, Areia (Aria) and Marghiana were included into the composition of “Greater Khorezm” state and its regional center was Marv and Herat. Khorezm oasis was illustrated as a part of this state. This idea originated from the idea that the Khoesmians were located in the south until the occupation of the Ahamanides.



In the 50s of the 20th century, V.V. Strouve wrote the following about the ancient statehood of Central Asia: "... in the lower reaches of the Amu Darya there was Khorezm and in the upper flow there was Bactria. Their cultural and political domains were extensive, covering the Khorezm Kopetdag Mountain fots and Tajan and Bactria covered Murghab Oasis" [3].

According to the ideas of V.M. Masson narrated in the late 1950s of the 20th century, the relatively simple crop-livestock culture was developed in 8th and 7th centuries BC exactly in the territory of Khorezm oasis and ruins of big cities were not investigated. In the Khorezm soil there were not identified houses, fortresses or defensive walls built of raw bricks and wattle and daub walls peculiar to that period. On the basis of such conclusions, V.M. Masson denied early appearance of statehood in Khorezm [4]. The researcher also concluded: "Undoubtedly, at that time, there occurred the destruction of primitive communal relations in Khorezm even if not so intensively compared to the southern provinces, the union of the Saks in the first half of the 6th century BC transmitted its political influence to some southern provinces". But the issue of the territory where the Saks' united politically remained open. V.M. Masson connected the Akes River, belonging to the historic geography of the Khoesmans in the written sources, with Tajan. The views on the political union of Greater Khorezm, whose center was located in Herat and Marv, were reflected in the publications of various scholars and even calling it as Herat-Marw union was suggested.

Some researchers say that during the reign of Kiaksar – the King of Mussel (625-585 BC), the southern provinces of Central Asia and Khorezm were in the composition of Mussel state. I.M. Dyakonov wrote that Girkania, Parphia, Areia and Khorezm were separate administrative regions of Mussel [5]. According to the ideas of B.A. Litvinsky, a part of Sogdiana was also included into the territory of Mussel along these regions i.e. it was supposed that the Greater Khorezm union - Parphia, Khorezm, Areia and Sogdiana were formed in the composition of Mussel.

M.G. Vorobyova analyzed the existing conclusions about the Greater Khorezm kingdom and she offered her ideas that it hadn't been confirmed historically and on the basis of archeological data that this state united the territories of Kopetdogh Mountain fots, Kuchan-Mashhad oasis, Nishopur surroundings, Tajan-Herat oasis, Khoesmans were not moved from the south to the Lower Amu Darya regions during the period Ahamanides, Khorezmian people originally formed as a nation in Khorezm oasis, the southern borders of the ancient Khorezm state stretched to the regions of the Middle Amu Darya [6].

Similarly, I.P. Khlopin wrote that the state, founded by the Khoesmans in southern Central Asia until the time of Ahamanides, was not developed.

E.V. Rtveldze analyzed the data collected in the field of historiography until the recent years and concluded that the state-association Greater Khorezm was a legend created by scientists. To clarify his point of view, the scientist offers the following arguments:

- The story of Herodotus about the use of the Akes River's water does not contain any information about the Khorezm kingdom or Herat (Areia) and Marv (Marghiana);
- Herodotus' reports don't contain information about certain features of the state either: borders, capital, administrative apparatus and political institutions;
- The Greek historian did not write about the political leadership of Khorezm and the military alliance of different nations under Khorezm [7].

It's possible to agree with the conclusions made by the researcher as Herodotus and his earlier Greek historiographer Hekatey did not mention the state of Khoesmans and the kingdom of Khorezm, the Greek historians only mentioned about Khoesmans.

In particular, it is important to identify the period of formation of the first statehood and town-planning culture in Khorezm territory. Various dates were included in the relevant scientific



literatures, besides, beginning of the 6th century BC (M.A. Itina), the first half of the 6th century BC (M.G.Vorobyova), the border of 7th and 6th centuries BC (O.A. Vishnevskaya, Yu.A. Rapoport), by the middle of 7th and 6th centuries BC (M.M. Mambetullaev), 7th and 6th centuries BC (Q. Sobirov, R. Abdirimov), 7th and 6th centuries BC (G. Khodjaniazov).

In our opinion, according to archaeological data, it's expedient to mark the beginning of that process by the end of the 7th and the beginning of the 6th century BC. Compared to this period, connecting the formation of statehood and town-planning culture in Khorezm with the last quarter of the 6th century was the result of the traditional view of the relocation of the "Khoresmians" from the south during the period of Darius the 1st – the king of Persia.

Before the emergence of the Kuzalikir culture, the early Saks settled in the Sarikamish regions and livestock tribes, which were conditionally as "kuyisay people", were representatives of the indigenous people. They were the heirs of the tribes that created the culture of Amirabad. The memorials of the first discovered Saks found in the steppes and foothills of Central Asia are characterized with the 8th and 7th centuries BC [8]. It is well-known that cattle-breeding was important in the economy of immigrants. They propagated lots of cattle, small cattle and horses. Livestock became the main property of immigrants. The book "Yasht" in "Avesto" contains information that leaders of the tribes and leaders of the countries sacrificed "one hundred horses, one thousand cows and a great deal of sheep".

Starting from 8th and 7th centuries BC, livestock breeding farmers in the Aral Sea region achieved great success in the military field and equipment production. Horsing equipments, bronze and iron weapons were found at grave-strongholds Tagizken, Uygarak and Sakarchaga. The horsing equipments, daggers and arrows of the Saks resemble those of the nomadic tribes of Eastern Europe steppes (Savromats, Skifs).

Military attacks and robberies took place in the era of the collapse of the primitive society and the process of appearance of the first statehood. Robberies were the result of intense violence by means of material wealth and the desire to obtain additional goods. The variability of social and economic factors led to the struggle between settled farmers and nomadic tribes and livestock breeders and those struggles competitions led to the struggles for virgin lands and grassy pastures. "Military robberies", "confrontation of armed forces", "bloodthirsty enemy armies" and others were described in "Avesto" and this situation informs about worried events and advantages of political interests.

By the time of the first Iron Age, a new social system was created in the nomadic society. Tribal began to dominate kin and community as a social organization. Even though "people's assembly", the body of elders and the tribal chiefs, peculiar to the history of the primitive society, kept their significance, military leaders and tribal associations played a major role in the system of external relations.

In the Aral Sea areas, it is possible to assume that such military unions, tribal alliances emerged. Y.A. Rapoport wrote that the Saks of the Lower Amudarya attacked to southern civilization centers as the European Scythians and the southern provinces of Central Asia were "invading territories" of the Saks [9]. According to V.N. Yagodin, historical and ethnographic data were evidence of the fact that military raids were important in the social life of nomadic cattle-breeding societies and they emerged at the stage of "military democracy" in the history of nomadic people.

The main part of the Aral Sea Saks consisted of rifle-battalion. According to the writings of Herodotus, the Saks were armed with arrows, daggers and military axes – Sagaris. According to archaeological data, horse equipments and weaponry of the Saks were similar to the weapons of the first Scythian migrants in Southern Ural, Kazakhstan, Siberia and Altai [10].



Herodotus also considered Massaget tribes as “numerous” and “brave” tribes. Massagets are described as fighting warriors able for military affairs. It is possible to assume that women were also involved in battles from the fact that in women’s graves in the Saks’, there were found horse equipments. In the stories of Greek historians Herodotus and Ktesy about queen Tumaris and Zarina there was described the fact that they participated in wars and led tribal associations. In 530 BC, Tumaris’ tribal associations met the armies of the ancient Persian King Cyrus the 2nd. The Massagets defeated the Persian Forces completely and killed Cyrus the 2nd in this war.

At the end of the 7th century BC, the Kuzalikir culture developed at the result of the southern population groups of Central Asia came and settled in the southernmost parts of Khorezm and in the surroundings of the Sarikamish Dowdon river basins. The Saks, who had located on the steppes of Dowdon before the inhabitants of southern population, did not oppose the newcomers. Ceramics workshops of Humbuztepe, Khazorasp and Kuzalikir fortifications were built in peaceful condition.

The structure of Kuzalikir, which was built by South builders, reflect architectural monument in itself, which had a character of military administrative and worship center. The king of Saks was sitting on the throne set in the courtyard of the inner castle palace and aristocrats of tribes were sat on the two sides of the courtyard. In front of the throne, in the center of the courtyard, there was built worshipping otashkade on a high foundation.

The formation of the first statehood in Khorezm is associated with the culture of Kuzalikir. The large centralized state uniting Khorezm oasis did not develop until the time of Ahamanides. It is likely that the first statehood had been established on the basis of a livestock breeding farm in separate districts (Kuzalikir, Khazorasp).

In Marghiana and Bactria, the first states peculiar to the Bronze Age was formed on the basis of regional cultivation of separate crop cultures. There was found an inside fortress, a palace and a temple in Jarkutan, in southern Uzbekistan. Such architectural constructions were discovered in Northern Afghanistan and the Lower Murghab oasis. The studied archaeological sources are evidence of the complexity of socio-economic relationships in agrarian communities. Leaders, who were linked to management functions, such as the organization of production, the custom in the community, the regulation and control of relationships, were separated in society.

It is possible to see the repetition of state archaeological signs (a separate district, oasis, fortress, palace, temple) learned in Bactria and Marghiana in the examples of Kuzalikir. In our opinion, the formation and development of the first statehood in different regions of Central Asia was based on close historical factors.

The emergence of statehood in Khorezm oasis was based on socio-economic and military-political factors. This process started before the invasion of the Ahamanides. Sak-massagets were illustrated in written sources as rivals of Cyrus II and Darius I. Herodotus wrote that “Babylon, the Bactrian people, the Saks and the Egyptians were obstacles” to the plans of Cyrus II's military campaigns. We are well aware of the attack of the Persian Empire against the massagets and its results.

As you can see, Saks joined military-political unions. Some researchers have suggested that massagets were at the stage of collapse of kin system in development during the period of Cyrus II and Darius I and this suggestion is not expedient [11]. The views existing in scientific literatures deny this approach.

According to the writings of A.A. Askarov and T.Sh. Shirinov, the primary state associations of livestock breeders appeared at the beginning of the 1st millennium BC [12]. According to U.I. Abdullayev, nomadic cattle breeder tribes united in military form to expand pasture zones i.e. emergence of political associations of nomadic people derived from socio-economic factors. During



his time, I.M. Dyakonov noted the military and political potential of migrants and wrote that the formation of the ancient Bactrian state was connected with the military campaigns of nomadic tribes to the south [13]. Undoubtedly, the nomadic people actively participated in the political processes that took place in Central Asia, but it can be concluded that it is not expedient to describe their movements as the main factor in the formation of the state in the South.

There should be repeated the conclusion particularly, Khoresmians didn't move to Khorezm as a nation formed in the south, because in the southern provinces of Central Asia (Girkania, Parthia, Areia, Marghiana, Bactria), there inhabited nations such as Girkans, Parthians, Aryans, Marghians, Bactrians, known from written sources. The ancient Khorezmians were formed in the Lower Amu Darya regions as a nation.

According to S.P. Tolstov, in the 7th and 6th centuries BC, there occurred radical changes in the economic, social and cultural system of Khorezm, husbandry, based on artificial irrigation, rapidly developed and that led to the transition to slavery production; there were constructed large canals with the help of the force of many slaves captured as a result of wars between tribes [14]. According to the scientist, "powerful canals" with a width of 20 to 40 meters provided large areas of the old fields with water. "These channels are the magnificent memorials of thousands of unknown slaves and their work was the basis for the Mediterranean Sea and the great civilization of the classic East. So, the huge irrigation of Khorezm was built like the Central Asian irrigation systems".

B.V. Andrianov is a supporter of this idea and wrote that the development of irrigation facilities in Khorezm corresponds to the time when the statehood came into being and many slaves were used for digging and cleaning the canals [15]. As the researcher points out, in the 7th-6th centuries BC, artificial irrigation and construction of a large-scale irrigation system of the "rivers" required a great deal of work because the artificial irrigation economy of that time was powerful and its content changed. Changes in the production required radical change in the social structure of society. The prevailing view of this period that "the slaves had to come to the oasis continuously" was superior and it could take its place firmly in scientific publications.

The views of S.P. Tolstov and B.V. Andrianov are based on the following ideas of statehood appearance such as "the theory of irrigation" and "irrigation-state". "The theory of irrigation" about the emergence of statehood was connected with the idea that in the Ancient East, the appearance of political institutions and state power were associated with the need for organizing and implementing large irrigation systems.

Firstly, the idea that "thousands" of slaves had been used in the process of digging canals in Khorezm during the Early Iron Age does not correspond to the historical reality. Such a number of slaves could only be bought in large, long-term occupation wars. In this regard, the occupation of the southern provinces by the Saks in Khorezm was limited.

Secondly, in Khorezm, there weren't found any traces of large irrigation facilities of the early Saks, cattle-breeder people of Kuyisay and Kuzalikir culture peculiar to the 7th-6th centuries BC. Even in Bactria and Sogdiana, traces of the first canals of the first Iron Age with the width of 2-3 km in the traditional ancient agronomic areas were studied. These irrigation facilities were built by free members of farming communities [16].

At the same time, during the first Iron Age, there began the process of cattle breeding, horse-breeding and cropping began to become an important form of the economy in various regions of Central Asia, including Khorezm. This phenomenon was reflected in the creation of large poultry in the south and in Khorezm – the covered place for the population and livestock.

In the last quarter of the 6th and the 5th century BC, Khorezm became a part of the state of Ahamanides, together with Parthia, Areia and Sogdiana and organized a special military-



administrative country – the sixteenth satrap. Satrapids in the Persian Empire were forced to pay tribute in the form of agricultural, livestock and handicrafts, as well as certain silver taxes. The view of the representatives of 23 satraps – the view of bringing taxes by various nations in the swelling annexes on the wall of long and wide staircase, made from stone blocks leading to the great gate of the palace Darius I in the ancient Persian city of Persepolis, is very famous. Khorezmians organized the seventeenth group and there were described their conditions of carrying weapons, bracelets and horses. The Saks with long peak caps were depicted in the eleventh group, carrying clothes and leading horse.

The Ahamanides' administration tried to promote trade, handicraft and agriculture in the subordinated provinces. During the period of Ahamanides, virgin lands were cultivated in Khorezm oasis and the cultivation of crops, based on artificial irrigation, was widely developed. The tasks of satraps managing in the military-administrative areas were to collect annual taxes in special kinds and quantities. During the military campaigns, troops were sent to the center from the country.

A special communication service was set up in the state of Ahamon, with the purpose of delivering the commandments of Persian rulers and getting the necessary information from the satraps. Khorezm was connected with the centers of Persian Empire through the waterways in the Uzbay River and the Caspian Sea. In the 5th century BC, Uzbay's water level was much higher and navigation was developed along its flow. So, land communication lines and transport vehicles were also widely used.

After the administrative reforms of Darius I, the Aramaic language and writing became the language of communication between the state law-courts. The Aramaic writings also spread in Khorezm oasis. Two ancient Khorezm inscriptions based on the Aramaic alphabet and written on the surface of the pottery found on the Great Oybuyirkala and Khumbuztepa, is peculiar to the borders of 5th-4th centuries BC [17].

In conclusion, it's possible to say that the views on the Greater Khorezm state, which was introduced on the basis of the study of the earliest sources, have not been proved. These views are based on the scientific assumptions of various generations of scholars and do not correspond to the historical reality. The Khorezm government or kingdom was not mentioned in the first written sources.

Some scientific views and approaches belonging to the ancient Khorezm history, adopted in the Central Asian historiography for many years, became antiquated and they need to be observed again. In the 8th-7th centuries BC, the idea of constructing a large irrigation system in the Khorezm oasis, the use of "thousands of slaves" in the production of long and wide canals and the linkage of these processes with the centralized state policy have lost their significance. (In Khorezm, a centralized state was developed in the 4th-3rd centuries BC and there appeared a large irrigation system at the same time). The population peculiar to the period of Kuyisoy and the early Kuzalikir and the culture of the Saks in Khorezm was settled and half-settled livestock breeders. Cultivation during this period (until the last quarter of the 6th century BC) developed as an auxiliary branch of economy.

The transition to the first statehood system in the southern Aral Sea region was due to the emergence of political associations of livestock tribes. By the end of the seventh and early sixth centuries BC, the first statehood structures were developed in the separate districts of Khorezm (Kuzalikir – in the west, Khazorasp – in the south). They represented a small state organization on a territorial basis. The first statehood in all provinces of Central Asia was formed on the basis of separate oasis-regions. This common-continental characteristic feature also belonged to the history of Khorezm.



REFERENGES

1. Толстов С.П. Древний Хорезм. – М.: МГУ, 1948.
2. Henning W.B. Zoroaster: Politician or Witch-Doktor. – Oxford, 1951. – P. 40-42; Gershevitch I. The Avestan hymn to Mithra. – Cambridge, 1959. – P. 14-16.
3. Струве В.В. Древний Иран и Средняя Азия // Всемирная история. – М., 1955. Т. 1. – С. 560-591.
4. Массон В.М. Древнеземледельческая культура Маргианы // МИА. – М. – Л., 1959. – № 73. – С. 125-126.
5. Дьяконов И.М. История Мидии от древнейших времен до конца IV в. до н.э. – М. – Л.: АН СССР, 1956. – С. 349, 358.
6. Воробьева М.Г. Проблема «Большого Хорезма» и археология // Этнография и археология Средней Азии. – М.: Наука, 1979. – С. 38-41.
7. Ртвеладзе Э.В. Государственное объединение «Большой Хорезм» – миф, созданный учеными или историческая реальность? ... – С. 30-35.
8. Грязнов М.П. К хронологии древнейших памятников эпохи ранних кочевников // Успехи среднеазиатской археологии. – Л.: Наука, 1975. Вып. 3. – С.9-12.
9. Рапопорт Ю.А. Краткий очерк истории Хорезма в древности // Приаралье в древности и средневековье. – М.: ИВЛ РАН, 1998. – С. 30-32.
10. Вишневская О.А. Культура сакских племен низовьев Сырдарьи в VII–V вв. до н.э. // Тр. ХАЭЭ. – М., 1973. Т. VIII. – С. 99.
11. Дандамаев М.А., Луконин В.Г. Культура и экономика древнего Ирана. – М.: Наука, 1980. – С. 108.
12. Аскарлов А.А., Ширинов Т.Ш. Ранняя городская культура эпохи бронзы ... – С. 189.
13. Дьяконов И.М. Восточный Иран до Кира (к возможной новой постановке вопроса) // История иранского государства и культуры. – М.: Наука, 1971. – С. 135.
14. Толстов С.П. По древним дельтам Окса и Яксарта. – М.: ИВЛ, 1962. – С. 89.
15. Андрианов Б.В. Роль ирригации в становлении древних государств (на примере Средней Азии) // От доклассовых обществ к раннеклассовым. – М.: – Наука, 1987. – С. 75-78.
16. Сагдуллаев А., Абдуллаев У. История Хорезма в свете исследований С.П.Толстова // O'zbekiston tarixi. 2007. – № 4. – С. 6.
17. Мамбетуллаев М. Хум с городища Айбуйир-Кала // Вестник Каракалпакского филиала АН УзССР. – Нукус, 1979. – № 1. – С. 46-48.
18. Abidova Z.K. The historical studies on shrines and places of worship in Khorezm oasis (30-80 years of the twentieth century). International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences. – India. 2017. (Online). Volume 6, Issue 10. – Pp.160