



## The Historical Importance Of Kindiktepa

Ravshon M. Kuyliev

Lecturer, National University Of Uzbekistan, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

**Journal Website:**

<https://theamericanjournals.com/index.php/tajssei>

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

### ABSTRACT

The article describes the emergence and development characteristics of the specific aspects of Kindiktepa settlement, the history of the study, the similarities and differences of urban and rural type settlements. Location dimensions, housing structure studied. Monumental buildings, farmers' residences and household items were also analyzed.

### KEYWORDS

Location, City, Tower, Fortress, Angob, Pit, Stratigraphy, Pottery Wheel, Estrada, Terracotta Sculptures.

### INTRODUCTION

From ancient times the number of rural settlements was much higher than that of cities. Many of them were reflected in archeological maps, many of which were

irreparably ruined because they occupied a smaller area and were much weaker than the cities in terms of relief. As a result, these monuments were destroyed as a result of the

construction of agricultural lands and residential houses. Systematic excavation of archeological monuments and their transmission to future generations is one of the important tasks facing archaeologists.

### THE MAIN RESULTS AND FINDINGS

The process of emergence and development of the settlement into the center of a large micro-oasis is illustrated by a comparative analysis of the similarities and differences between urban and rural-type settlements.

The archeology of the Kashkadarya oasis was studied by archeologists such as G.Y.Drevsyansky, S.B.Lunina, N.I.Krashennekova, B.D.Kochnev, S.K.Kabanov, M.E.Masson, A.S.Sagdullaev, R.H.Suleymanov,

M.Kh.Isomiddinov and new information was introduced into the science of archeology [1]. In the process of studying the Panjikent dwellings, B.Ya. Stavisky compared them with dwellings in other parts of Sughd. V.V.Bartold and D.N.Logofet [2] pointed out the features of the irrigation system and the development of agriculture in the Kashkadarya oasis.

The plan of Kindiktepa settlement is rectangular (140x120) and covers an area of 1.6 hectares. It is located in Tezob village of Yakkabag district. This is one of the unique destinations. Initially appearing as a small settlement, it later developed and became the center of a small micro oasis.

The present view of the settlement consists of a wide hill which, from the top, resembles a navel. That is why the locals called this hill Kindiktepa. The population here began to live in the beginning of our era, that is from

antiquity. Initially, it was only the castle of a local aristocrat and later a rural settlement was formed around this castle.

G.Ya. Drevsyansky was one of the first to study the location of Kindiktepa in Yakkabag district. Excavations have been carried out by S.B. Lunina since the 1980s to study the 35x20 hill section located in the southern part of the settlement. The lands from Tanhozdarya were irrigated with water from the Karasuv canal. Looking at the maps created, we can see traces of the old canal, but this canal is now buried. The canal flowed past Kindiktepa. No remnants of the defensive wall were found during excavations around the site. From this it can be concluded that the settlement is not protected by a wall[3].

As a result of many years of research on the hill in the central part of the settlement, a castle of a local landowner dating back to the VI-VIII centuries was discovered there. Later, a village settlement was formed around this tower. The castle consisted of a reception room and several rooms. The wall of the building is very strong and up to two meters thick. In the net of the room there is a place with a height of 2.75 m and a height of 30 cm. Archaeologists call this place a “estrada” or a place of honor [4]. Apparently, this is where the throne is located and where the chief himself or the most honored guests sit during the banquets[5]. According to tradition, the construction of such orderly halls in the houses of wealthy urban and rural feudal lords was first formed in Zarafshan Sogdiana. For example, during the excavation of the dwellings of the citizens of Panjikent, the ceremonial reception halls, decorated with wood carvings were studied. Such houses belong to VII-VIII centuries[6]. In the VI-VII centuries such a style of house-building appeared, and then quickly spread to neighboring areas. But while the walls of the

hall of the Panjikt townspeople are decorated with colorful themed paintings, the local feudal lord is limited to building a hall of approximately the same size for himself. Its walls and sofas are plastered with a very thick layer of clay. The building was destroyed by fire. During the excavation, burnt tree ashes were found. As a result of research, it can be said that the building was built in the VI century, and later a completely new building was built on its ruins. Therefore, the full plan of the old building cannot be determined.

The location of another building in the northern part of the hill has been excavated. It is also a large hall room where a 3 meter variety is also located. This building is built side by side with the walls of the southern building. Therefore, the thickness of the southern wall does not exceed 90 cm. There are no windows on the walls of the building. It had two doors facing south and north. Both of these buildings were built at almost the same time and belonged to close relatives (father, son, brothers, etc.).

In the 9th century, the castle was completely abandoned and life on the central hill ceased. An example of this is the absence of pottery and other remains from the ninth century. But life continued around the tower. Archaeological excavations have revealed a 6-meter cultural layer from the 6th to 12th centuries.

Kindiktepa was a large rural settlement in the X-XII centuries. It was the center of a small oasis and its sphere of influence included Poxoltepa, Big Javakhitepa, Little Javakhitepa, Bostontepa, which operated in the X-XII centuries.

A complete stratigraphic map was drawn at Kindiktepa. The pit was cut 20 m south-west of the central hill, 3.5x1.5 m and after 3 m it was

cut in half. Damage to the culture layer as a result of plowing and irrigation at depths up to 1 m. Twelfth-century pottery has emerged. From the 3rd tier, black, red, green ornaments on a white background of the X-XII centuries, with ornaments on a red-brown background, pieces of green and blue glazed lamps, carved ornamental cover pieces were found.

Remains of the wall collected from the 4th layer and the floor of the building from the end of the 4th layer are covered with bricks measuring 25-25x25-26x7. Remains of kilns and pottery were found in the corridors. The pottery has a distinctive conical shape, glazed in green, carved, with a dark brown or green bird image on a white background. Remains of a button made of bone were also found here.

Ash and plant debris were identified from layers V-VI. Remains of a meter-thick wall of raw bricks were found in the 6th layer.

As a result of excavations in the 5th-6th layers, the mouth of the jug with a handle and the upper part of the jar, a small pot in the shape of a pot, a glass holder were found. All pottery remnants (except the glass holder) are covered with dark brown angob.

According to N.I.Krashennekova, these pottery pieces are similar to the Karavultepa pottery in Shakhrisabz and can be considered to belong to the VII or early VIII centuries. A window pane was found on the 7th floor, and only a red hum mouth was found on the 8th floor.

From the 9th layer onwards, handmade ceramics begin to appear. The pottery found in layers IX-XI has almost common features. Firstly, the pottery is made on a ceramic wheel and by hand, and secondly, when the pottery is broken, the piece appears to be red. This indicates that the pottery is of good quality and baked well in the jar.

The lips of the hand-made pottery are flattened and decorated with handprints. Similar pottery ornaments were found in the lower layers of Oltintepa. The lip part of the pottery is flat, the neck part is indistinguishable, it expands downwards, it is well baked. The thickness of the ceramics is about 0.5 - 1 cm.

Among the findings, a red glass holder stands out. The glass handle looks like two rings attached to each other.

A whole jar of cream-colored angob was found in the 9th layer. The height of the eye is 8 cm, the diameter of the tag is 3 cm, the diameter of the abdomen is 8 cm. There is a narrow belt in the middle and at the top of the spectacles. The upper and lower parts of the belt are engraved with pointed metal and the middle is decorated with fingerprints.

Studies have shown that ceramics larger than 10-12 cm in diameter are made on a ceramic wheel. The pottery contains a small amount of sand. 3 cups with a thin part of the lab were found.

A total of 6 pieces of handmade pottery and 16 pottery wheels on pottery wheels were found in layers IX-XI. It is difficult to extract a percentage of the hand-made and ceramic wheel ceramics due to the fact that not all areas of the site have been fully excavated. According to S.B. Lunina, "pottery found in the 9th-11th layers in Oltintepa can be attributed to the VI-VII centuries"[7].

Excavations were also carried out in residential buildings in Kindiktepa. An apartment building belonging to a poor man was opened and explored. Since the house was built only of raw brick, excavating the house was a bit of a challenge. The outer walls of the house are 70 cm thick and the inner walls are only 20-40 cm thick. During the research it was found that the

homeowner was constantly forced to carry out repairs to maintain the wall. Because the traces of repairs on the wall are clearly visible. During the repairing, raw bricks were also collected for the wall. In some parts of the wall, repairs have been made several times. When the house was abandoned, the erosion of the wall accelerated greatly, and very little of it has survived to this day.

The house has 4 rooms, the largest of which is 9 sq.m. Furnace remains were also found in one room. So food is prepared in this room. In another apartment, a pit designed to store food has been identified. The third room was occupied by the homeowners. The house dates back to the X-XI centuries. It is difficult to determine what the landlord was doing. Most likely the landlord was a feudal dependent farmer. The reason for this was that the landlord did not benefit much from his labor, but his income was barely enough to make a living. Such a conclusion can be drawn from the discovery in the house of an iron knife, a pot used for cooking, a few glassware, and less glazed and unglazed pottery.

In another part of the settlement, excavations were carried out on the site. This house also had 4 rooms. The house had two construction phases. In the second phase of construction, the house was built in a more curved position. The house building is built in two rows. All rooms have a path to switch from one to the other. One of the rooms served as a utility room. In the corner of the room was a clay oven lined with baked bricks. The peculiarity of this furnace was that it had three compartments, on which up to three pots could be placed at the same time. The diameter of the largest of the pieces is 25 cm. So a pot with a diameter of 30-35 cm was used. A small family lived in the house. Looking at the glazed and unglazed pottery found in the house, it can

be said that the house belongs to the X century.

In another house, 3 rooms are located parallel to each other. The first large room with access to the house is the hotel. Baked bricks were piled on the floor of the hotel. The second room can be called a utility room because this room has an oven. The last third room is the living room. The plan of the house is built taking into account that hot and cold do not leave the room. The house covers an area of 70 square meters. A snake-shaped terracotta plate was found in the house. Depending on the part of the slab to be hung on the wall, it can be called one of the decorations of the house. We can see that the owner of this house is richer than other homeowners.

Depending on the construction method of the houses in Kindiktepa, some general aspects can be mentioned in them. For example, the houses were built with a wide corridor, and a separate door was left from this corridor to enter all the rooms of the house. The walls of the house are repaired with mud plaster or raw brick. The number of rooms in the houses increased or decreased depending on the number of family members. The construction of three-room, multi-functional rural houses lasted until the XVIII-XIX centuries. The tradition of building country houses with 3-4 rooms is typical for the whole oasis.

A completely destroyed pottery wheel was excavated from the 12th century stratum. The potters of the Kashkadarya oasis produced their own unique carvings. But the influence of northern Khorasan potters is also observed. Pottery with high-quality glazed epigraphic ornaments testifies to the influence of potters of the Samarkand oasis. The discovery of a pottery wheel in the Kindiktepa area indicates the development of pottery here as well.

From the Kindiktepa slag, pottery ornaments, the remains of improperly made pottery, we can say that the inhabitants of this area provided themselves with pottery[8].

As in other parts of the Kashkadarya oasis, wells have been dug in Kindiktepa. But the drilling technology is a little different from other areas. If in Pashtantepa, Khaybartepa [9], Oltintepa, which are considered to be large settlements, the inside and top of the wells were lined with baked bricks, in Kindiktepa we do not observe this. Here the wells were simply dug, and the baked bricks on the inside and top were not piled up [10].

Residents of the Kashkadarya oasis have long been engaged in agriculture and horticulture. This is confirmed by archeological finds found during archeological excavations in the area. Peach, watermelon and melon seeds were found in Yalpoqtepa, Oltintepa, Kindiktepa[11]. Arab geographers report that viticulture is well developed around Nasaf [12]. The Kesh oasis and the surrounding lands are more suitable for viticulture, so in the Middle Ages viticulture was also developed in this area[13]. Vineyards are now found in all parts of the entire Kashkadarya oasis[14].

In the X-XII centuries life in Kindiktepa was revived. But after the Mongol invasion after the 13th century, the settlement was in complete crisis. After a while, the present village of Tezob was replaced by barlos seeds. Our well-known and famous ancestor Amir Temur was also born in the village of Khoja Ilgor near this place. To date, two buildings of the XV-XVI centuries have survived: the mausoleum and the khanaqah [15].

## CONCLUSION

During the study of the settlement, it was discovered that it was a rural-type settlement,

not surrounded by a defensive wall, but the center of a micro-oasis in the Middle Ages. Cities can be distinguished from rural settlements only by comparing them. Comparing rural and town houses of the IX-XII centuries, the following peculiarities can be noted;

1. By analyzing the pottery complexes, we can determine how pottery developed. Urban and rural residents used a variety of glazed and unglazed pottery.
2. In the rich houses of the townspeople and in the villages were found ceramics with various epigraphic ornaments of different sizes, large and small. From the 10th to the 12th centuries, pottery with red ornaments depicting birds and animals appeared in towns and villages.
3. The decoration of household appliances used in rural homes is slightly less than in the city. There is a difference as well as metal items. For example, metal items found in Oltintepa are slightly better in quality than in Kindiktepa.

## REFERENCES

1. Dresvyanskaya G.Ya. Works of the Yakkabag route detachment. Archaeological discoveries in 1980. – M. 1981. – P. 448. ; Dresvyanskaya G.Ya. Medieval monuments in the western part of the Yakkabag region. Collection of scientific works of the Tashkent state. University, № 582- Tashkent, 1981. – P. 21-31. ; Dresvyanskaya G.Ya. On the regionalization of archaeological sites of the early Middle Ages. Social sciences in Uzbekistan, 1985, No. 10. – P. 25-29. ; S.B.Lunina. Ancient cities in the Kashkadarya valley. – T.: Uzbekistan, 1988. ; Krashennikova

N.I. Works in the Kashkadarya region. Archaeological discoveries in 1979. – M., 1980. – P. 449-450.; Kochnev B.D. Works in the Karshi oasis. – AO 1978. Moscow, 1979.; S.K. Kabanov Nachsheb at the turn of antiquity and the Middle Ages (III-VII centuries). – Tashkent, 1977.; Masson M.E. Archaeological research in Uzbekistan (1924-1939) // Science in Uzbekistan for 15 years. Tashkent, 1939.; Masson M.E. Archaeological work in Uzbekistan for 1933-1935 // Proceedings of the III International Congress on Iranian Art and Archeology. – L., 1939.; Sagdullaev A.S. Ancient settlements of Kashkadarya. Construction and architecture in Uzbekistan, 1979, No. 7. – P. 34-37.; Sagdullaev A.S. Khanaka and a mosque in the village of Tezob. Construction and architecture in Uzbekistan, 1978, No. 7.; Suleimanov R.Kh. Ancient Nakhshab. Problems of the civilization of Uzbekistan in the 7th century BC NS – VII century AD Samarkand-Tashkent. “Fan”. 2000.; Isamiddinov M.Kh. Stratigraphy of the Yer-Kurgan settlement in southern Uzbekistan. Soviet archeology, 1978, no. 3.

2. Bartold V.V. Works in 9 volumes. – M. : Nauka, 1963-1971.; Logofet D.N. Bukhara Khanate under Russian protectorate. – SPb, 1911, vol. I.
3. Lunina S. B. Ancient cities in the Kashkadarya valley. – T.: Uzbekistan, 1988. – P. 51.
4. Stavisky B.Ya. Excavations of a quarter of dwellings of the nobility of the southeastern part of the Penjikennt settlement (object VI) in

- 1951-1959. MIA USSR, No. 124, M.– L.: Nauka, 1964. – P. 125.
5. Nielsen V.A. Formation of feudal architecture in Central Asia (V-VIII centuries). Tashkent: Fan, 1966, – P. 188-189.
6. Stavisky B.Ya. Excavations of a quarter of dwellings of the nobility in the southeastern part of the Penjikennt settlement (object VI) d 1951-1959. MIA USSR, No. 124, M. – L.: Nauka, 1964. – P. 173.
7. Lunina S.B. The cities of southern Sughd in the VIII-XII centuries Tashkent, 1984. – P. 60-61.
8. Lunina S.B. Ancient cities in the Kashkadarya valley. – T.: Uzbekistan, 1988. – P. 49.
9. Kochnev B.D. Works in the Karshi oasis. AO 1978. – Moscow, 1979, – P. 554.
10. Lunina S.B. The cities of southern Sughd in the VIII-XII centuries Tashkent, 1984. –P. 93.
11. Kochnev B.D. Works in the Karshi oasis. AO 1978. – Moscow, 1979, – P. 554.
12. Bartold V.V. To the history of irrigation ..., – P. 207. Kuyliyev, R., & Abdullaev, I.I. Agriculture and horticulture of kashkadarya oasis: traditional and modernism. EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR), 78.
13. Logofet D.N. Bukhara Khanate under Russian protectorate. – SPb, 1911. vol. I, – P. 117.
14. Sagdullaev A.S. Khanaka and a mosque in the village of Tezob. Construction and architecture in Uzbekistan, 1978, No.7. – P. 36-37.
15. Mavlanov, U., Shakhnoza, M., Shanmugan, K., Adil, M., Sharma, P., Uzakova, Z. F., ... & Sharma, G. Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research (AJMR).
16. Мавлонов, У. М. (1994). Торговые и культурные связи Кашкадарьинского оазиса в XVII-XIX вв.
17. Мавлонов, У. М., Каримов, Я. А., & Артиков, Х. (2017). Место амударьинских переправ в коммуникационной системе центральной Азии. The Newman in Foreign policy, (38 (82)).
18. Muhamedov, Y. K. (2019). The history of commercial economical–cultural relations of Tashkent oasis. ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science, 10(78), 579-582.
19. Yoqubjon Muhamedov. (2021). Chach As The Administrative Center Of The Western Khanate. International Scientific and Current Research Conferences, 1(01), 75–79.
20. Muhamedov, Y. (2021). The study of control system of chach’s oasis by foreign researchers in early middle ages. ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 11(3), 2442-2448.
21. Muhamedov, Y. (2021, November). Chach As The Administrative Center Of The Western Khanate. In International Scientific and Current Research Conferences (pp. 75-79).
22. Muhamedov, Y. K. (2019). The history of commercial economical–cultural relations of Tashkent oasis. ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science, 10(78), 579-582. 13. Ochildiyev, F. (2019). TRADE RELATIONS BETWEEN BUKHARA AND RUSSIA IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE XIX CENTURY THE BEGINNING OF THE XX CENTURY.

23. Ochildiev, F. (2021). THE INFLOW OF RUSSIAN CAPITAL AND INDUSTRY INTO THE BUKHARA EMIRATE IN THE LATE 19TH AND EARLY 20TH CENTURIES. CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF HISTORY (2767-472X), 2(06), 20-26.
24. Очилдиев, Ф. (2021). XIX асрнинг иккинчи ярми-XX аср бошларида Сурхон воҳаси бекликларининг мамурий бўлиниши ва бошқарув тизими. Общество и инновации, 2(4/5), 387-397.