The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations
(ISSN – 2689-100x)
Published: September 27, 2021 | **Pages:** 13-18
Doi : https://doi.org/10.37547/tajssei/Volume03Issue09-04

IMPACT FACTOR
2021: 5. 857
OCLC - 1121105668

Journal Website: https://theamericanjournals.com/index.php/tajssei

Research History Of Oxus Civilization In US Archeology

Khayitmurod Khurramov
PhD Student, Termez State University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This article provides an in-depth analysis of the scientific literature on the Oxus civilization that emerged as a result of the research of the famous American archaeologist Lamberg Karlovsky. Extensive analytical information on the stages of the emergence of the Oxus civilization, the factors of its origin, the language of the population, its location.

KEYWORDS

Anau, language and archeology, Soviet Academy of Sciences, BMAC, radiocarbon, US archeology, Trans-Elamite, Indo-Iranians.

INTRODUCTION

The study of the history of the ancient world in terms of civilization is of particular importance to us in the study of the past of the peoples of the ancient world. This approach covers a large geographical area and is characterized by extreme similarity in material findings. There is a great civilization in the study of the history of our country, and we find a lot of information about the ancient times of our country in the monuments of this civilization. The Oxus civilization is part of an ancient era that provides important information about this period. The material culture of the representatives of this civilization has spread to neighboring regions, which has attracted the attention of historians around the world. The history of the study of the Axis civilization is directly linked to the names of representatives of American archeology.

The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations
(ISSN – 2689-100x)
Published: September 27, 2021 | **Pages:** 13-18
Doi : https://doi.org/10.37547/tajssei/Volume03Issue09-04

IMPACT FACTOR
2021: 5. 857
OCLC - 1121105668

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In this study, methods of comparison, analysis, and observation specific to the science of history were used. Well-known American scientists L, Karlovsky, D.Potts, A.H.Dani, G.Possehl, J.P.Mallory, R. Pumpelly , Sandra L.Olsen, F.Hiebert, K.Moore, P.Steinkeller conducted research on the subject of this civilization.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The famous American scientist Lamberg Karlovsky is a researcher who made a great contribution to the study of Oxus civilization. According to the scientist, the birth of the Oxus civilization is directly related to the archeological research conducted in Central Asia in the 1970s by archaeologist V.I Sarianidi, a member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. V.I Sarianidi spent 40 years of his life researching the Gonurtepa monument, which covers more than forty hectares in Turkmenistan. According to Lamberg Karlovsky, V.I Sarianidi used the inappropriate term for this discovery, "Bactria-Margiana Archaeological Complex", later abbreviated BMAC[1]. Bactria and Margiana are historical geographical areas, a term first coined by the Greeks and then by Alexander the Great. An American scientist suggests an alternative to the term "Oxus civilization", which is synonymous with BMAC. Oxus is a historical term used by the Greeks to refer to the Amu Darya, the largest river in Central Asia. According to many archaeologists, the main monument of BMAC is located in the small Murgab River delta, which begins in the Paropamis (Hindukush) Mountains of Afghanistan and flows into the Karakum Desert[2].

A number of scholars have conducted extensive archaeological research in the area over the next twenty years[3]. The chronology of the Oxus civilization is a major problem for archaeologists. Based on radiocarbon analysis of a number of monuments of this civilization, an American scientist agrees with the chronology of the Oxus civilization from 2200 to 1700 BC. Based on the same analysis, there are scientists who date civilization to 2500-1700 BC[4]. Now historians have to answer a lot of questions. When was the Oxus civilization? where is how formed? Civilization can be internal or external. The interior is shaped by these indigenous peoples, while the exterior is shaped by the migration of peoples. V.I Sarianidi considers this process to be external and seeks the factors for the emergence of the Oxus civilization in the latitudes of Anatolia (Asia Minor). According to him, when a group of peoples migrated to Mesopotamia due to large-scale migration and could not find "vacancies" in this area, they crossed the Iranian plateau and finally found the "vacancies" they were looking for in Murgab river delta. Some tribes continue to migrate to what is now northwestern China[5].

At the heart of VI Sarianidi's thought are the Aryans, especially the Indo-Iranians, who followed the Proto-Zoroastrians according to the beliefs and ceremonies of this population. These views of V.I. Sarianidi were also supported by the French scientist P.Amiet[6]. P. Amiet considers BMAC to be a feature of Trans-Elam and argues that a group of nomadic cultures spread to Central Asia through the Iranian plateau. Archaeological excavations have studied the culture of the people who lived on the Iranian plateau since the second half of the third millennium BC[7]. Artifacts similar to those found in BMAK monuments from the last centuries of the 3rd millennium BC have also been found in the Iranian plateau and monuments of Indian culture: Susa, Tepa Yahya, Shahdad, Khinaman, Hissar, Jiroft, Harappa, Mohenjodaro, and Tel Abraq. It is evident that the inhabitants of BMAC have had

The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations
(ISSN – 2689-100x)
Published: September 27, 2021 | **Pages:** 13-18
Doi : https://doi.org/10.37547/tajssei/Volume03Issue09-04

IMPACT FACTOR
2021: 5. 857
OCLC - 1121105668

and have had an impact on both the Iranian plateau and Indian culture, and the most famous monument to which these similarities exist is Gonurtepa[8]. But the similarities are not the same, the BMAK artifact is different from Mesopotamia. For example, there is ample information that the engraved Akkadian seal was recovered in Gonur[9]. According to Karlovsky, there are not enough sources to substantiate the origin of the Oxus civilization by external migration factors.

P. Amiet and Steinkeller, on the other hand, believe that the Oxus civilization was directly related to the Trans-Elamite nomadic culture that existed on the Iranian plateau. Although archaeologist Lamberg Karlovsky agrees a little, he argues that the Oxus civilization is a completely unique culture, and that it would be a mistake to trace its roots only to the Iranian plateau[10]. While trying to justify his opinion with "local origins," he proves his point by saying that many artifacts of the Oxus civilization are not found at all in the existing monuments on the Iranian plateau (Malyan, Godintepe, Shahdad, etc.). Another reason for its local origin is that the rich monuments of the Paleolithic in Central Asia date back to the middle of the 7th millennium BC, the Neolithic period[11]. Located in the foothills of the Kopettag, the Ilginlitepa Monument (Turkmenistan) dates back to the 5th millennium BC and amazes with its rich metallurgy, magnificent sculptures, mosaics and intricate architectural features. This is a clear indication that the Oxus civilization was formed by the local population during the Bronze Age[12].

Subsequent Eneolithic and Bronze monuments, in particular Namazgoh and Oltintepa, continued the formation of new urban settlements in the IV-III millennia BC. Subsequent excavations in Oltintepa under the direction of L. Kircho once again substantiate the idea of BMAC's local origin[13]. In addition, BMAC was not initially located in the Murgab oasis. Subsequent research on the Ajikuli monument, led by G. Rossi Osmida, shows that the first monument in the area appeared in 2700 BC[14]. The monument is stratigraphically fortified as that of the BMAC communities. The concept of the local origin of the Oxus civilization is not a new concept for archaeologists. A few years before these studies, P. Kohl had collected a number of data on the local origin of this civilization as a result of his study of Central Asian archeology[15].

Archaeological excavations and topographic mapping of the Bronze and Early Iron Age monuments, densely populated in the Murgab Delta, have been carried out over the past two decades as a result of joint expeditions by Turkmen and Italian scientists[16]. Lamberg Karlovsky and a number of scholars have thoroughly studied the fortification structure of the Gonur and Togolok monuments in the Murgab oasis[17]. Karlovsky described the origins of the Axis civilization in detail in his monograph "The Indo-Iranians", based on inscriptions and seals found in monuments[18]. In fact, this research is nothing new. Interest in the relationship between archeology, language, and archeogenetics has long been a problem among scholars[19]. Archaeological research on Indo-Europeans is as ancient as the science of archeology. Archaeologist Pumpelly, R.'s research in Anov, Turkmenistan, is devoted to this very issue, and this has had a profound effect on G. Childe's views on the subject[20].

According to British archaeologist Renfrew, the Indo-European language is a continuation of the Indo-Iranian language, and the archaeologist traces the material roots of this scientific hypothesis to the Cucuteni-Tripoli culture in Ukraine[21]. L. Karlovsky and a number of scholars believe that the inhabitants of the Oxus civilization spoke the Indo-Iranian

The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations
(ISSN – 2689-100x)
Published: September 27, 2021 | **Pages:** 13-18
Doi : https://doi.org/10.37547/tajssei/Volume03Issue09-04

IMPACT FACTOR
2021: 5. 857
OCLC - 1121105668

language. There are also researchers who claim that the inhabitants of this civilization were Dravidian or Elamite[22]. It is known that the Dravidian-speaking population is more widespread around the equator. The idea of calling the BMAK population Dravidian is the product of Russian researchers, who have tried to justify this idea with the Shortokay monument on the left bank of the Amu Darya. Due to the well-studied pottery culture and anthropology of Central Asia, the fact that no equatorial material was found in the area completely denies that the inhabitants of the Oxus civilization were Dravidian-speaking[23].

About the Bronze Age population of Central Asia A.A. Askarov's general opinion is as follows: In my opinion, the peoples of the Sopolli and Kuchuktepa cultures understood each other linguistically, on the basis of which the ancient Bactrian language, one of the dialects of the Iranian language, was formed"[24].

CONCLUSION

That the BMAC was characterized by a centralized authority cannot be doubted. The question remains as to whether the BMAC was a centralized singularity or led by a disparity of centralized entities (tribes). Whichever prevailed the function of either would be the same: to organize corvée labor (human capital) for the construction of irrigation works, to maintain central canals, their dams and locks, to collect taxes, and to organize, maintain, provision and control dependent personnel (based on extended families of unfree dependent laborers?) involved in agricultural production. The central authority would also have had judicial responsibilities as well as a monopoly (?) over long distance trade (so abundantly evident in the presence of luxury goods produced of foreign material (gold, silver, lapis lazuli, carnelian, turquoise, tin). The presence of great wealth in the "royal burials" attests to the presence of acquisitive autocrats who secured power by accumulating wealth which in turn under girded their central authority. When thinking of late third millennium Mesopotamia, and the presence of texts, we can, at times, reflect upon the nature of credit institutions, debt, the value of differential products (i.e. onions vs. tin), prebends, sharecropping, judicial punishments, the nature and extent of slavery, even irrigation fees. Within the social world of the BMAC such detail eludes us. However, certain universals within all Bronze Age civilizations, from Egypt to China, may be assumed for the BMAC: slavery, corvée labor, centralized authority within a patrimonial society, the organization of commodity distribution under regional control, the primary role of a central authority in long distance exchange, and a central authorities governance of a distant countryside. Such commonalities, however, are abstractions and offer little understanding as to the specifics of social organization, law, land tenure, or the 'rules' of governance. It is within such specificities that comparisons become meaningful – a trait list of commonalities becomes little more than a laundry list: allegations of similarity without specific meaning or an understanding of difference.

REFERENCES

1. C.C. Lamberg-Karlovsky. Oxus civilization. Cuadernos de Prehistoria y Arqueología Universidad Autónoma de Madrid . 2013. No 39 pp. 21-63
2. SALVATORI, S. (2008a): "Cultural Variability in the Bronze Age Oxus Civilization and its Relations with the Surrounding Regions of Central Asia and Iran" in S. Salvatori and M. Tosi (eds.): The Bronze Age and Early Iron Age in the Margiana Lowlands. BAR International Series 1806. Archaeopress. Oxford: 75-98.

MASIMOV, I. (1975): "New Oasis Settlements of the Bronze Age in the Lower Reaches of the Murghab River". Archaeological Discoveries. Nauka. Moscow: 550-551.

3. SALVATORI, S. and TOSI, M. (eds.) (2008): The Bronze Age and early Iron Age in the Margiana Lowlands. BAR International Series, 1806. Oxford. GUBAEV, A, KOSHELENKO, G. and TOSI, M. (1998): The Archaeological Map of the Murghab Delta. Preliminary Reports. IsIAO. Rome
4. KOZHIN, P.; KOSAREV, M. and DUBOVA, M. (2010): On the Track of Uncovering a Civilization. Alethia. St. Petersburg.
5. SARIANIDI, V. (2009): Turkmenistan Mystery and True of the Great Culture. Türkmen döwlet nesirgy'at gullugy. Ashgabat.
6. AMIET, P. (2004): "De l'Élam á la Margiana", in S. Winkelmann (ed.): Seals of the Oases. Il Punto. Venice.
7. PETRIE, C.A. (ed.) (2013): Ancient Iran and its Neighbors: local developments and long-range interaction in the 4th millennium B.C. (Cambridge, 2008). Oxbow Books. Oxford.
8. SARIANIDI, V. (2009): Turkmenistan Mystery and True of the Great Culture. Türkmen döwlet nesirgy'at gullugy. Ashgabat.
9. SARIANIDI, V. (2002): Margush. Ancient Oriental Kingdom in the Old Delta of the Murghab River. Türkmendölethabarlary. Ashgabat. SARIANIDI, V. (2005): Gonur: City of Kings and Gods. Miras. Ashgabat.
10. C.C. Lamberg-Karlovsky. Oxus civilization. Cuadernos de Prehistoria y Arqueología Universidad Autónoma de Madrid . 2013. No 39 pp. 25
11. DANI, A.H. and MASSON, V.M. (1992): History of Civilizations of Central Asia. UNESCO Publishing. Paris.
12. SOLOVYOVA, N.F. (2005): Chalcolithic Anthropomorphic Figurines from Ilgynly depe. BAR International Series, 1336. Oxford. SALVATORI, S.; VIDALE, M.; GUIDA, G.; MASIOLI, E. (2009): "Ilgylny (Turkmenistan) and the 4th Millennium B.C. Metallurgy of Central Asia". Paléorient, 35 (1): 47-67.
13. KIRCHO, L.; KOROBKOVA, G. and MASSON, V.M. (2008): The Technical and Technological Potential of the Eneolithic Population of Altyn Depe as the Basis of an Early Urban Civilization. European House. St. Petersburg. MASSON, V.M. (2001): Peculiarities of manufacture at the Settlement of Altyn depe in the PaleoMetallic Epoch. Materials of the South Turkmenian Interdisciplinary Archaeological Expedition, 5. St. Petersburg.
14. ROSSI OSMIDA, G. (2008): Adji Kui Oasis, I. La cittadella delle statuette. Il Punto. Venice. ROSSI OSMIDA, G. (2011): Adji Kui Oasis, II. La cittadella delle statuette. Il Punto. Venice.
15. KOHL, P. (1984): Paleolithic Beginnings to the Iron Age. Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations. Paris.
16. SALVATORI, S. and TOSI, M. (eds.) (2008): The Bronze Age and early Iron Age in the Margiana Lowlands. BAR International Series, 1806. Oxford. GUBAEV, A, KOSHELENKO, G. and TOSI, M. (1998): The Archaeological Map of the Murghab Delta. Preliminary Reports. IsIAO. Rome.
17. ANDRIANOV, B.V. (1960): Drevnii Orositel'ny Sistemy Praralya [Ancient Irrigation Systems in the Aral Region]. Nauka. Moscow. LAMBERG-KARLOVSKY, C.C. (1994): "The Bronze Age Khanates of Central Asia". Antiquity, 68 (259): 398-405. SZABO, A. and BARFIELD, T. (1991): An Atlas of Indigenous Domestic

Architecture. University of Texas Press. Austin.

18. Archaeology and Language The Indo-Iranians. C. C. Lamberg-Karlovsky. Current Anthropology Volume 43, Number 1, February 2002 by The Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research.
19. Kohl, Philip, and Clare Fawcett. 1995. Nationalism, politics, and the practice of archaeology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Meskell, Lynn. 1998. Archaeology under fire. London: Routledge. Renfrew, Colin, and Katie Boyle. Editors. 2000. Archaeogenetics: DNA and the population prehistory of Europe. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.
20. Pumpelly, R. 1908. Explorations in Turkestan: Prehistoric civilization of Anau. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Institution.
21. Renfrew, Colin. 1999. Time depth, convergence theory, and innovation in Proto-Indo-European: Old Europe as a PIE linguistic area. Journal of Indo-European Studies 27:258–93.
22. Массон В.М. Печати протоиндийского типа из Алтын-депе (К проблеме этнической атрибуции культур расписной керамики Ближного Востока) // ВДИ. - М.: 1977, №4. – 168-175.
23. Shaydullaev Sh.B. 2009. Emergence and stages of development of statehood in the territory of Uzbekistan. Doctor of Historical Sciences diss. abstracts. Institute of Archeology of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan. - Samarkand, 2009, 170.
24. Аскаров А.А. Южный Узбекистан во II тысячелетии до н.э // Этнические проблемы истории Централной Азии в древности. Труды международного симпозиума по этническим проблемам истории Центральной Азии в древности (II тыс. до н.э.). Душанбе, 17-22 октября 1977 г. - М.: 1981. - С. 167-179.