

History of the Ancient Ethnic Processes of the Khorezm Oasis

Matyakubov Khamdam Khamidjanovich,

PhD, teacher of the Department of History,

Urgench State University

Abstract: This article examines some issues of economic, social and political relations, cultural ties of the ancient Khorezm people. The impact of migration on the development of this region is also analyzed.

Keywords: Tozaboghob, Khorezm, migrations, bronze age, Suvyorgan, Kaltaminor, Central Asia.

INTRODUCTION

The Khorezm oasis is one of the ancient centers of Central Asian civilization. The study of archeological monuments of the oasis began in the 30s of the XX century, and research is still ongoing. It is important to expand the scientific knowledge of the history of ancient Khorezm, to reveal the content of the results of many years of research, to use archeological data on current topics as a historical source and to analyze them from a historical point of view. The term "Khorezm" is dedicated to the history of the Southern Aral Sea Bronze Age and the first Iron Age, which was first mentioned in written sources as a historical region of Khorezm. In the Bronze Age, productive farms - agriculture and animal husbandry - developed in the Lower Amudarya region, the last stage in the history of primitive society began. During the Early Iron Age, complex ethnic processes took place in the Khorezm oasis, where defensive structures and individual fortresses were created, urban culture and ancient statehood developed.

The analysis of the scientific literature shows that the history of the Bronze Age and the Early Iron Age of the Khorezm oasis is chronologically interconnected and has not been studied separately as a generalized topic. It is important to study the peculiarities and laws of development of historical processes related to these ancient stages.

DISCUSSION

Historical processes show that native cultures were enriched with new traditions under the influence of migrations, so the fields of economics and craftsmanship and material culture changed gradually [1. p.32-33].

From ancient times, the territory of Central Asia, including Khorezm oasis, was located at

the crossroads of migrations. The territory of the oasis was mastered by the migrations harvesters and hunters of the last Paleolithic, Mesolithic and Neolithic Ages. The Neolithic period locations peculiar to Kaltaminor culture extended in the territories of Upper Uzboy, South Akchadarya, Kyzylkum desert and Lower Zarafshan. The memorials discovered in the south-western part Kyzylkum desert are very old and belong to 6th-5th millennium BC [2. p.32-34].

Groups of cultures of the Kaltaminor culture, which were distributed in relatively wide circles, had common lifestyles and farms. Their lifestyle is characterized by seasonal migration. Such tradition was based on hunting, fishing and harvesting. There were non-mastered territories between the areas where the Neolithic Age kin societies resided. However, different groups of fishermen and hunters faced with each other with the expansion of their use of natural resources and for the sake of migrating from one place to another because of the need for farming. On this basis of that fact, there were developed mutual economic relations. People of Kaltaminor culture had relations with the inhabitants of Sazaghon culture in the areas of Eastern Caspian, the Lower Zarafshan and the northern slopes of the Zarafshan Mountains peculiar to the Neolithic Age. During the Neolithic Age, the relations between the various tribes were carried out by roads of communication [3. p.22-24].

Here, it can be seen that the southern territories of the Aral Sea was mastered due to population's migrations. Over time, as a result of migratory lifestyle and economic relations, the boundaries of early mastered regions expanded gradually. Forms of migration, which are reflected in historical and ethnographic data, were different they are explained with the following content:

1. In certain cultural and economic spheres, newcomer tribes squeezed indigenous groups of population and retained their traditions of material culture.
2. A new culture was formed because of the mixture of newcomer tribes with representatives of native population within the general cultural-economic sphere.
3. The mixture of newcomers and native people and the spread of progressive cultural traditions as a result of the migration from highly developed historic-cultural region to a weaker cultural-economically developed country.
4. The immigrant tribes mastered the traditions of local culture; spiritual culture, burial ceremonies and beliefs changed as a result of migrations from undeveloped cultural-economic sphere to culturally rapidly developed regions.

During the Bronze Age, the development of the Southern Aral Sea region occurred in a calm atmosphere. According to anthropological findings, people peculiar to European race of the Andronovo culture and the race of the East Mediterranean Sea resided on the basin of the Akchadarya River of the Bronze Age [4. p.97-146].

Groups of Andronovo anthropologically looking populations were originally spread in the cultural sphere of Srubnaya (wooden) i.e. Andonovo in the areas the Volga and in the southern Ural and steppe territories of Central Kazakhstan. In the middle of the 2nd millennium BC representatives of people belonging to that race spread over the territories of the Southern Aral Sea as a result of migrations of tribes of the Andronovo culture.

The tribes of the Eastern Mediterranean sea race were spread in the southern regions of Central Asia. Hence, M.A. Itina assumed that they would move to the Lower Amu-Darya River basin and wrote that this process took place during the Neolithic and early Bronze Age [5. p.40].

We know the conclusions of S.P. Tolstov about the migrations of representatives of the Suvyorgan culture to the Khorezm oasis from the southern part of Central Asia and Iran. The Scholar developed his ideas and noted that the communication paths, leading to the Southern Aral Sea regions through eastern ares of the Caspian Sea, the Balkhan Mountain, the banks of the Uzbay river-bed, were formed very early [6. p.169-205].

M.A. Itina compared the forms and decorations of earthenware crockery peculiar to the early Suvyorgan culture in the stage of Kamishli with the earthenware crockery of the southern provinces of Central Asia and found some similarities in them. However, it does seem strange that the investigator did not pay attention to important facts during this comparison. As it's known, dishes of the Ssouthern memorials in the kind of Nomozgoh belonging to the Bronze Age in comparison with Suvyorgan dishes made in hands in the striped style. Also, according to the amount of determined locations, in the first half of the 2nd millennium BC, the number of the population in the areas of the Akchadarya basin was relatively small. On the contrary, the amount of local population changed rapidly as a result of migrations of tribes from the south. It's possible to comment the spread of the Eastern Mediterranean racial groups in Khorezm by the migration of fishermen and hunters from the Eastern Caspian in the Kaltaminor era. Newcomers retained their own cultural traditions based on their mastering economy. It seems that the representatives of Suvyorgan culture were not aware of farming and it's quite probable that they were aware of livestock breeding practices. However, the people of Suvyorgan culture continued the traditions of Kaltaminor's material culture, economy and lifestyle according to their basic cultural traditions (hovels, handmade and fired earthenware crockery, flint lances and arrowheads). Therefore, it is difficult to speak of the appearance of Suvyorgan culture on the basis of external migrations in Khorezm oasis, because the appearance of cultural innovations, which could arise out of their results, were not reflected in archaeological materials.

The above-stated views of the author are related to the problem of local traditions and the influence of external migrations on the transformation of the ethno-cultural processes. Such

changes are explained by the following facts in the culture of Tozabaghyob:

- development of livestock breeding and husbandry;
- appearance of camel breeding and horse breeding together with breeding small cattle;
- using transport and transport facilities (carts, carriages);
- manufacture of copper and bronze products, development of craft;
- peculiarity of earthenware crockery to the pottery of steppe livestock culture in terms of form and decorations.

As a result of the spread of the Andronovo culture tribes to the southern Aral Sea and mixture of them with indigenous populations, a new culture was formed. Even if livestock breeding was superior in the lives of Andronovians and they were engaged in farming in dry-lands and moist territories near river basins [7. p.40-41]. Especially, they developed producing bronze tools, household items, jewelry and armaments.

People of Tozaboghyob culture could have mastered skills of caring for cultivated plants from the southern farmers. It is also possible to conclude that they were more likely to grow cattle fodder plants as there weren't found grain remains in the houses of Tozabaghob. In the second half of the 2nd millennium BC, the southern farmers and northern steppe livestock tribes took an active part in the widespread migration processes in Central Asia. The reasons for the spread of the southern populations (the culture of Dashtli-Sopolli) in different regions were caused by the need to acquire virgin lands, new sources of water and pits of raw materials.

The migrations of Andronovo-Tozaboghyob tribes were characterized by the factors like livestock breeding in pastures became a distinctive form of private property, the growth of livestock herds, the need to master new pastures, the development of horse-breeding and transportation, the emergence of surplus products and the desire to exchange. There appeared migration routes to new territories along the Central Asian Rivers in the Bronze Age. From Khorezm, the road passed to the southwest of Turkmenistan through the Uzboy river-bed shores and the eastern part of the Caspian Sea. The second important communication route began in South Khorezm and passed from the present Khazorasp, Sadvar and Darghonota along the left bank of the Amu Darya River, to the Lower Murghab Oasis (Marghiana) and to the western and southern Bactrian lands. This route (from Marv to the Lower Zarafshan and Khorezm) was archaeologically studied by M.E. Muson [8. p.9]. According to the archaeological findings, the path Khorezm-Murghab Oasis was widely used in the Bronze Age.

It seems that in the process of mastering of new lands by the South peasant and steppe cattle-breeding tribes there was no competition between them and the local population. During the study of memorials located in different regions, there was not identified any traces of capturing

locations, destruction and fire i.e. no military strikes, traces of aggression. Representatives of the Dashtli-Sopolli culture comparatively reached till far eastern Fergana valley. A cemetery of Shaghim was studied in 14.5 km south-west of the present-day Uzgan city of the Bronze Age. Ceramic pottery, bronze weapons, household items and jewelry were discovered in the early stages of the Dashtli-Sopolli culture.

Formation of Vakhsh culture in the Bronze Age in southern Tajikistan was due to the fact that some of the population of Bactrian farming had been transferred to livestock [9. p.99-100]. In addition, there were discovered memorials peculiar to of livestock breeding tribes in southern Tajikistan. Their dwelling houses consisted of shelter of branches and there were found hearths made with stones and ceramic handmade bottles peculiar to steppe culture. There were discovered peculiarities belonging to the Andronova-Tozaboghyop culture and the cultures of southern settled husbandry in the findings Zamonbobo in Lower Zarafshan. These cultural traditions were also linked not only to the economic and cultural ties in the Lower Zarafshan, but also to the expansion of the southern settled tribes and northern-eastern livestock breeding tribes of Central Asia.

V.I. Sarianidi compared the archaeological materials Zamonbobo and Bactria of the Bronze Age and noted that there was much connectiveness between them. Signs of such involvement were observed at funeral ceremonies, inner structures of the graves, funeral items (brass glasses, beads, bronze buttons) and other things. Based on archaeological findings, V.I. Sarianidi supposed that the groups of populations from Bactria spread across the Lower Zarafshan lands [10. p.23-28].

A.A. Askarov compared the material findings of the cultures of Sopolli in Southern Uzbekistan and Zamonbobo culture in Bukhara and wrote about the migration of the Sopolli population to the Lower Zarafshan territories. During this period, the expanding of borders in mastered areas were determined by the sharp development of bronze metallurgy, the need for copper, tin and lead deposits by ancient tribes as well as the need for metal products. By the last centuries of the 2nd millennium BC, the livestock farmers gradually entered and settled in the oasis of peasants. As a result of this process, there occurred changes in some aspects of the local culture – funeral ceremonies and beliefs. The decoration of surface of earthenware crockery made by pottery wheel with ornaments peculiar to steppe Bronze Age pottery in Jarkutan of southern Uzbekistan, the spread of the burning habits at Buston VI cemetery and the emergence of new cultural traditions and burial ceremonies, which were not traditionally prevalent by local cultivators, are the evidence of this fact.

At the end of the 2nd and the beginning of the 1st millennium, the process of mixing of

local and foreign cultural traditions continued in the Parphy, Marghiana and Bactria regions and there was observed continual shift of the peasant and livestock tribes. It was supposed by researchers that during that period, the Tozaboghyob tribal groups had came and settled down in the southern agro-oasis of Central Asia [11. p.109-120].

In general, scientific hypotheses about the continuity of migrations of the representatives of the Srubnaya-Andronovo cultures from the middle of the 2nd millennium BC. Khorezm oasis during this period became one of the intermediate territorial centers of migration. Some of the seasonal temples of Andronovo culture, discovered in the Akchadarya basin and southern Khorezm, can be a striking example to our idea. From the 8th and 7th centuries BC, in the steppes and foothills of Central Asia and Kazakhstan, memorials of nomadic people – the early Saks were spread [12. p.9-12]. The migration of the Saks to the basin Dovidon in Khorezm oasis is characterized with the 7th century. The Saks, who had moved from The Lower Syr Darya regions, met geographical condition and natural atmosphere familiar to them in the lands of Sarikamish areas. The representatives of the local population (the kuyisoy population) were engaged in cattle breeding as the early Saks. As water resources and steppe pastures were profitable, there was no competition between local and newcomer tribes. Economic benefits dominated in such circumstances. The early Saks kept their material culture and beliefs within the context of the common cultural economy.

In the 7th century BC, the tribes called dah (day) and massagets were separated from the livestock tribes residing in the Southern Ural region [13. p.75-76]. In the second half of the 6th century BC, the massagets were located in a vast area between the Caspian and the Aral Sea. Their lifestyle was connected with seasonal migrations and the villages of massagets were located in Ustyurt and Manghishlak and in the summer season, they migrated to the steppes around the rivers Yayik, Tobol and Irgyz [14. p.67-68].

Due to the entrance of the southern population to the Khorezm oasis at the end of the 7th century and as a result of the migrations from a highly developed historical and cultural circle to the country peculiar to cattle breeders from cultural-economic view point, there occurred a mixture of the local and indigenous peoples and advanced cultural traditions.

The commentary [15. p.29-30] of Y.A. Rapoport that the Saks' – Khorezmians' natural aspiration for directly getting acquainted with the southern high cultural traditions (architecture and city construction were among them) and using civilization goals were basis for the appearance of Kuzalikir culture, is discussable and does not suit the reality. The emergence of Kouzalikir culture was connected with the implementation architecture, handicrafts and cultural traditions of of Marghiana-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.

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 “Khoesmians”. 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” [16. p.40-42].

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 foots and Tajan and Bactria covered Murghab Oasis” [17. p.560-591].

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 [18.p.125-126]. 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 [19. p.64-65] of various scholars and even calling it as Herat-Marv union was suggested [20. p.150-159].

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. 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 Kopetdagh Mountain foote, Kuchan-Mashhad oasis, Nishapur 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.

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.

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 Khoresmians and the kingdom of Khorezm, the Greek historians only mentioned about Khoresmians.

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. Khodjanizov).

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. 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" [21. p.22-23].

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). In Avesto, there were mentioned about two-sided sharp arrows, stone mallets, military pole-axe, bayonets, daggers, shields, helmets, military carts with horses and "warriors with horses". That time is described in connection with constant attacks and wars, tragic events, robbery, demolition of homes and evil deeds. 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 [22. p.114,121-123].

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 [23. p.30-33]. According to the writings of A.S. Sagdullayev, in the 9th and 8th centuries and especially in the 7th and 6th centuries BC, nomadic lifestyle was widespread in the steppes of Central Asia and Kazakhstan and nomadic tribes gained great success in the field of weapons development and became a large military force. Their raid was a threat to the inhabitants of southern provinces. The need for protection from outside influences required a comprehensive and reliable defense system. Therefore, defense structures and military fortifications surrounded by strongly fortified defense walls were constructed in areas of strategic importance (along the coastline and mountain pass, the Amu Darya transitions and ravine paths) [24. p.79]. Creation of such defense structures of the 7th century BC was confirmed in the examples of Oltindiyor, Talashkan, Bandikhan 2 and Kiziltepa in Bactria, Odoytepa on the banks of the Middle Amu Darya and Uzunkyr, Yerkughon and Kuktepe in Sogdiana [25. p.68-80].

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 [26. p.99].

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 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 [27.p.108]. 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. According to U.I. Abdullayev, nomadic cattle breeder tribes united in military form to expand pasture zones [29. p.131] 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 [30.p.135]. 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.

The connection between Khorezm and the Lower Amu-Darya regions, which was mentioned in Persian texts, is a historical fact.

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 [30. p.89]. 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 [31. p.75-78]. 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 [32. p.40-41].

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. 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 [33. p.38]. 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 [34. p.46-48; p.42].

CONCLUSION

The following points can be expressed as a conclusion:

- from the Neolithic age, lifestyle and material culture having common signs were developed in the cultural and economic field of the Southern Aral Sea. There are opinions that representatives of Kaltaminor and the first Suvyorgan cultures were aware of livestock, but the studied archaeological materials were the evidence of mainly the forms of mastering economy;
- the formation of the culture of Tozaboghob was due to the introduction of new economic and cultural traditions as a result of the distribution of newcomer populations to the Khorezm oasis.

On the basis of the migrations of steppe tribes, the territories of Southern Aral Sea became one of the intermediate regional centers of the external migration of livestock breeders, identifying the southern borders of the Eurasian steppes of the Bronze Age, based on livestock and crop farming.

- people of Tozaboghyop participate in external migration processes, like Andronovo culture groups. Their seasonal venues appeared on the coasts of the Lower Zarafshan, Kalif Uzboy and on the borders of Lower Murghab oasis. These migrations were caused by the need for new pastures and the necessity of sharing products with the southern farmers;

- because of socio-economic reasons, migrations of the southern population to the north-

eastern parts of Central Asia was carried out during the Bronze Age. These migrations lasted until the end of the Bronze Age and early Iron Age. As a result, the members of the southern communities settled in the Khorezm region. The process of forming and developing the culture of Kuzalikir was the result of the migration of population groups from the high cultural-economic circle (Marghiana-Bactria), the mixture of newcomer and local populations and the spread of progressive cultural traditions.

- 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.

REFERENCES

1. Rtveldze E.V. Tsivilizatsii, gosudarstva, kulture Tsentralnoy Azii. - T., 2005.
2. Vinogradov A.V. O rasprostraneni ranneneoliticheskix kompleksov daryasayskogo tipa (po materialam rabot 1970 g.) // Uspexi sredneaziatskoy archeologii. - L. : Nauka, 1972. Vyp. 1.
3. Mavlonov O. The ancient ways of Central Asia. - Tashkent: Academy, 2008.
4. Trofimova T.A. Cherepa iz mogilnika Tazabagyabskoy kulture Kokcha 3 // MXE. - M., 1961. Vyp. 5.
5. Itina M.A. History of stepnyx tribe Yujnogo Priaralya // Trudy XAEE. - M., 1977. T. X.
6. Tolstov S.P. Ancient Khorezm // Po sledam drevnix kultur. - M., 1951.
7. Gryaznov M.P. Pastusheskie plemena Sredney Azii in epoch razvitoy i pozdney bronzy // KSIA. 1970. - № 122.
8. Masson M.E. Srednevekove trgovye puti iz Merva v Xorezm i Maverannaxr // Tr. YUTAKE. - Ashgabat, 1966. T. XIII. - S. 9, ris. 2.
9. Pyankova L.T. Ancient cattle of South Tajikistan. - Dushanbe: Donish, 1989.
10. Sarianidi V.I. K voprosu o kulture Zamanbaba // Etnografiya i archeologiya Sredney Azii. - M. : Nauka, 1979.
11. Itina M.A. Stepnye plemena sredneaziatskogo mejdurechya vo vtoroy polovine II - nachalae I tysyacheletiya do n.e. // SE. - M., 1962. - № 3.
12. Gryaznov M.P. K chronologii drevneyshix pamyatnikov epoxi rannyx kochevnikov //

- Uspexi sredneaziatskoy archeologii. - L. : Nauka, 1975. Vyp. 3.
13. Smirnov K.F. Kochevniki Severnogo Prikaspiya i Yuzhnogo Priuralya skifskogo vremeni // Etnografiya i archeologiya Sredney Azii. - M. : Nauka, 1979.
 14. Pyankov I.V. Massagety Herodota // VDI. - M., 1975. - № 2.
 15. Rapoport Yu.A. Kratkiy ocherk istorii Xorezma v drevnosti // Priarale v drevnosti i srednevekove. - M. : IVL RAN, 1998.
 16. Henning W.B. Zoroaster: Politician or Witch-Doctor. - Oxford, 1951.
 17. Struve V.V. Ancient Iran and Central Asia // Vsemirnaya istoriya. - M., 1955. T. 1.
 18. Masson V.M. Drevnezemledelcheskaya kultura Margiany // MIA. - M. - L., 1959. - № 73.
 19. Fray R. Nasledie Irana / Per. s angl. V.A.Livshitsa and E.V.Zeymal. - M. : IVL, 1972.
 20. Livshits V.A. Drevneyshie gosudarstvennye ob'edineniya // History of the Tajik people. - M. : IVL, 1963. T. 1.
 21. Avesto. Yasht kitobi / M. Ishakov's translation. - Tashkent: Sharq, 2001.
 22. Avesta. Selected anthem / Per. with avestiyskogo I.M.Stebelin-Kamenskogo. - Dushanbe: Adib, 1990.
 23. Rapoport Yu.A. Kratkiy ocherk istorii Xorezma v drevnosti // Priarale v drevnosti i srednevekove. - M. : IVL RAN, 1998.
 24. Sagdullaev A.S. Establishment of early Bactrian and early Sogdian state // History of state of Uzbekistan. - Tashkent: Uzbekistan, 2009. T. 1.
 25. Isamiddinov M., Rapen K. K stratigrafii gorodishcha Koktepa // IMKU. - Samarkand, 1999. Vyp. 30.
 26. Vishnevskaya O.A. Kultura saksix plemen nizovev Syrdari v VII – V vv. do n.e. // Tr. XAEE. - M., 1973. T. VIII.
 27. Dandamaev M.A., Lukonin V.G. Culture and economics of ancient Iran. - M. : Nauka, 1980.
 28. Abdullaev O'I. Historiography of ancient governance and early statehood in Central Asia. - Tashkent: Academy, 2009.
 29. Dyakonov I.M. Vostochnyy Iran do Kira (k vozmojnoy novoy postonovke voprosa) // Истoрия иранского государства и культуры. - M. : Nauka, 1971.
 30. Tolstov S.P. On the ancient deltas of Oksa and Yaksarta. - M. : IVL, 1962.
 31. Andrianov B.V. Roll irrigatsii v stanovlenii drevnix gosudarstv (na primere Sredney Azii) // Ot doklassovykh obshchestv k ranneklassovym. - M. : - Nauka, 1987.
 32. Andrianov B.V., Muxamedjanov A.R. Rol irrigatsii v sotsialnoy istorii Sredney Azii // Drevnie tsivilizatsii Vostoka. - Tashkent: Fan, 1986.

33. Sagdullaev A., Mavlonov O. History of public administration in Uzbekistan. - Tashkent: Academy, 2006.
34. Mambetullaev M. Hum s gorodishcha Aybuyir-Kala // Vestnik Karakalpakskogo filiala AN UzSSR. - Nukus, 1979. - № 1; Livshits V.A., Mambetullaev M.M. Ostrak from Xumbuztepe // Pamyatniki istorii i kultury Vostoka. - M., 1986.