



The Ethno-Political Situation In Central Asia On The Eve Of The Emergence Of The Hephthalite State

Kamolov Jakhongir Mamasidikovich

Basic Doctoral Student Of The Tashkent State Pedagogical University, Specialty 07.00.01 - History Of Uzbekistan

Copyright: Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the creative commons attributes 4.0 licence.

ABSTRACT

This article describes the ethno-political processes that took place in Central Asia in the IV-V centuries and the socio-political events that took place on the eve of the formation of the Hephthalite state and their analysis.

KEYWORDS

Ethnos, nomadic tribe, Ikshids, Afshins, Khorezmshahs, Dabusshahs, Tuduns, peasants, melon culture, military power, Huns.

INTRODUCTION

In the first hundred years of BC, the Eurasian region experienced an increase in the activity of migration processes, rapid assimilation of nomadic tribes. By the first Middle Ages, the process of penetration of Turkic tribes into the territory of Turunzamin increased. During

the Kushan Empire, the inhabitants of the land of

Central Asia were Sogdian-speaking, and the settlers who entered it continued to speak the language of the local population. But at the same time, the territory of the Proto-Turkic

language gradually expanded, especially on the basis of the Qang state. Turkish political forces, which established military power in the society in the early Middle Ages, are accelerating the influx of new Turkic ethnic groups from the north-east of Central Asia. The transition of the on-site management system to the influence of Turkish Originals also has its impact on the development of ethnogenetic processes in the region. As a result of this, increasing the prestige of the Turkic ethnic layer in the region, this country begins to be called Turkistan in written sources. These historical and ethnogenetic processes are evident not only in written sources, but also in archaeological materials of the early medieval period.

RESEARCH METHODS

The research was carried out using objectivity, analysis, synthesis, comparative analysis, generalization, historical analysis, chronological methods.

RESULTS

In the process of analyzing the scientific works of many researchers who have studied this period, new ideas have emerged, which require a separate scientific work to draw certain conclusions and bring them to the science of history.

In this regard, Academician A. Askarov quotes academician VV Bartold, one of the scholars who studied the early Middle Ages: “In connection with the language of the inhabitants of the Volga river basins, It is associated with the Yayik hydronym, which was used in the Middle Ages for the Ural River.[1] It is worth noting that the Turkic-speaking population lived in the Black Sea region, from the Caspian basin. There are

many more examples of the same situation. Utigur (thirty thieves), kutrigur (nine thieves), hun ,barsil, savir, bulgar, hazar who lived between the Caspian and Black Seas in the IV-VI centuries AD. Many scholars agree that Turkic tribes such as the Khazars lived in ancient Turkic languages.[2] So, it can be said that in the middle or lower basins of the Syrdarya, and not only in the western part of the country, but also in the Middle Ages, Turkic peoples lived in large numbers.

The fact that part of the population of Khorasan and northern Afghanistan is Turkic is due to the existence of the Kushan Empire, the Xionites and the Hephthalites from the first centuries AD, and the ethnic groups that founded these states are more or less related to the Turks. explained.[3]

From the end of antiquity, the Turkic ethnos continued to thicken south of the Syrdarya. Prior to the Hephthalite invasion, the region was dominated by Sogdians, as well as Bactrians, Khorezmians, Chachs, and Parcanans in the valley. Local government was in the hands of the local people, who were called Ikhshids in Sughd and Fergana, Afshins in Usturishon, Khorezmshahs in Khorezm, Dabushahs in Dabusia, Tuduns in Chach, and peasants in Ilaq. The form of land tenure took three forms in the early Middle Ages, with most of the land in the hands of large landowners, as well as community property and vagnze property, which belonged to Zoroastrian temples. According to archeological and anthropological materials and their comparative analysis with ancient written sources, the middle basins of the Syrdarya, especially the Tashkent oasis, became an area of regular contact, socio-economic and ethnocultural intermingling of Sogdian and Turkic-speaking tribes, especially

in ancient times. As a result of these economic and ethnocultural ties, the Kavunchi culture is formed.[4]

Mil. avv. Between 73 and 48, when the Huns were openly competing with each other, the Central Government weakened and the rulers of the Han dynasty launched a military campaign against the Huns. In the battles between the two countries, the Chinese gained the upper hand and the Huns were forced to retreat to the territory of the Kang Dynasty.

Usually, in pastoral disputes over pastures, in wars with other tribes, the defeated army is forced to retreat with its tribes. For the nomads to take their tribes captive by the enemy was tantamount to destroying the seed. Therefore, the Huns mil. avv. In the second quarter of the first century, it was natural for the Qang to enter the country en masse. As a result, the Proto-Turkic ethnic layer thickened in the middle reaches of the Syrdarya. The Turkification of the local population of the Chach and Otrar valleys has accelerated. This is reflected not only in language but also in material culture. These radical social, economic and ethnocultural changes play an important role in the formation of the Melon culture.[5]

It is known that there are fundamentally contradictory views in science on the historical roots of the formation of the Melon culture, especially on its ethnic composition. For example, on the question of the origin of the Melon culture, T.G. Oboldueva sees it as a local variant of Sughd culture, native to the Syrdarya basin and one of the oldest farming communities. Looking at the monuments found in the territory of the Jun Canal as objects of independent Jun culture, which

formed the ethnic basis of the population of the Tashkent oasis, it is concluded that they are genetically related to the population of the Melon culture.[6] Its periodic date is III-IV centuries AD. A.I.Terenojkin and T.G. Based on the genetic features of the Jun culture identified with the Lower Volga Sarmatian tribes identified by Oboldueva, the Jun complex dates back to the II-IV centuries AD. This connection is primarily seen in the burials and anthropological materials observed in the tombs of the Jun culture, i.e. the dolichocephalic melon saks Yettisuv usuns, the ancient inhabitants of East Turkestan-Uighurs and the brachycephalic typical of the Lower Volga Sarmatians similar to europeoids, he says.[7]

For the first time, the study of Shoshtepa revealed a clear stratigraphy of cultural strata. This is the basis for determining the exact period of the Kavunchi culture (Melon 2-1 centuries BC; Melon 2 is divided into two stages, the 1st stage is the 1st-4th centuries AD, the 2nd stage is the 5th-6th centuries AD). Idi. Kavunchi culture developed on the basis of the ancient farming culture of the Tashkent oasis (see Burganli culture) under the influence of the ethnic culture of the Sarmatians, Huns, Usuns and other peoples who entered the Tashkent oasis during the "Great Migration".[8]

Migration processes, that is, the influx of the Xionians in the 4th century AD, the Kidarites in the 5th century, and the Hephthalites in the early 6th century, led to the thickening of the Turkic ethnic group in the region, but some of them settled there. These historical events did not lead to the end of the ethnogenesis of the Uzbek people.

Here it is worth quoting the following thoughts of E. Aradi about the Hephthalites: "...hephthalites and their ancestors, the Huns, were the peoples of Turan, first in Inner Asia, then in Central Asia and Bactria, then to the west of the Caucasus.[9]

In these phrases, Tabari points out that the northern basins of Khorezm, that is, the lower reaches of the Syrdarya, are the land of the Turks. In fact, not only the northern borders of the middle reaches of the Syrdarya, that is, Otrar and its environs, but most of the population west of it were Turkic.[10] Ethnotoponyms also testify to this. In particular, Turkic toponyms include the following place names: Mingbulak, Otrar, Yangikent, Sutkand, Sayram, Karachuk, Atlakh, Khurlug, Jumishlagu, Signak, Talas and others.

According to Academician A. Askarov, even the most ardent pro-Iranian V.V Bartold could not turn a blind eye to the historical truth. He writes that the Daix (Daiks) River, mentioned in Greek sources in the 2nd century AD, is associated with the hydronym "Yayik" used in the Turkic language in the Middle Ages.[11]

Indeed, in the IV-VI centuries AD, in the steppes between the Caspian and Black Seas, utigur (thirty oxen), kutrigur (nine oxen), diet, barsil, savir, bulg Turkic tribes such as the Khazars and their languages formed the corresponding dialects of the ancient Turkic languages.[12]

The nomadic nature required them to constantly move around the region in search of new pastures, but by the early Middle Ages, many nomadic Turkic tribes had migrated to a semi-settled area, settling in one area. began to live steadily. Over time, the area became fully Turkicized and even the language

environment changed. Although Sogdian was the dominant language in government, the local language was Turkish. Therefore, in the opinion of many Western researchers, there are cases when the origin of the people is determined by the numismatic material struck in the official language or the state language.

"Ethnogenesis and ethnic history of the Uzbek people" by Ahmadali Askarov

"The indigenous population of the region is only Iranian that there were linguistic peoples, with them a single territorial notwithstanding the fact that Turkic peoples also lived in the latitudes, to the point of denying the Turkic ethnos in ancient Turan was criticized.[13]

There are similar ideas about the origin of the ephthals we are studying above. We do not agree with BG Gafurov, because there are many examples of the fact that the language introduced in life and public affairs does not determine the ethnic origin of peoples.

The Soviet state for more than 70 years before independence In the republics of which Indigenous intellectuals spoke and wrote in this language they wrote. But that did not change their ethnicity. Is it correct to say that their authors, or the non-Russian peoples who used the language, were Russians, based on state documents and scientific and literary works in Russian that have survived for centuries? There have been many ethnic groups in history whose language and script have changed.[14]

CONCLUSION

An analysis of many studies suggests that by antiquity, the northern part of Central Asia, the Syrdarya Basin, had become a permanent habitat for the Turkic ethnic group, and that

with the influx of the Hephthalites, the border shifted to the south. By the time of the Turkish Khanate, the area of permanent residence of Turkic ethnic groups extended to the Amu Darya, and the region began to be called Turkestan.

REFERENCES

1. Askarov A. Ethnogenesis and ethnic history of the Uzbek people. T. : 2007, p.297.
2. Golden P. B. Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples. Chev. O. Karatay. Ankara: M, 2002. 81-87 p. ; Pletneva S. Drevnie bolgary v vostochnoevropeyskix stepyax // Tatarskaya Arxeologiya. 1997, №1. S. 31; Komar A. Nasledie tyurkskix kaganatov v Vostochnoy Evrope // Madeni mura - Kulturnoe nasledie. Astana ,2009. № I. str 100-101.
3. Bongrad-Levin G. M., Ilin G. F. India in antiquity. Moscow. Nauka, 1985. p. 420-421.
4. O.Inomov. Kavunchi culture and its role in the formation of the Uzbek people. Dissertation of Doctor of Philosophy in History. Tashkent - 2019. 58 pages
5. O.Inomov. Kavunchi culture and its role in the formation of the Uzbek people. Dissertation of Doctor of Philosophy in History. Tashkent - 2019. 86 pages
6. Oboldueva T.G. Kurgan kaunchinskoy and djunskoy kultury. KSIIMK, vyp. 23. Moscow-Leningrad. 1948, p. 101-102.
7. Terenojkin A.I. Rets. at work G.V.Grigoreva at Kaunchitepe. Uz FAN SSSR, vyp.VIII, 1940. p. 88-89.
8. Shosh.uz. Melon culture. Tashkent encyclopedia. 2009 y
9. Aradi Eva. A fehér hunok története / История бelyх gunnov // Magyarságtudományi tanulmányok / Nauchnye izyskaniya po voprosu vengrov. - Budapest: Izd-vo «Khan aydia pabliishing haus», 2008.
10. Boboyorov G'. Sheets from the history of hair 77 p.
11. Barthold V.V. Central Asian Turkish History. Ankara. 2004, 29 pages.
12. Golden. P.B. Introduction to the history of the Turkic peoples. Chev. O. Karatray, Karam. Ankara, 2002, p. 8187; Komar A. Nasledie tyurskix kaganatov v Vostochnoy Evrope. «Kulturnoe nasledie» № I Astana, 2009, p. 100-101.
13. Askarov A. Ethnogenesis and ethnic history of the Uzbek people. T. : 2007. 9-p
14. A.Khojaev "Information on the history of Fergana (translations and commentaries on ancient and early medieval Chinese sources)". Fergana Publishing House. 2009 y. 266-b