

Historical Reconstruction Of Social Relations Of The Bronze And Early Iron Age

Jasur Togaev

Abstract: To reconstruct an objective ancient history is an actual issue. In ancient periods Central Asian people had cultural, socio-economic relations with each other and they lived in general region. It is the fact that each civilization is a result of relations of the different peoples and nations. Bactria is a large historic-cultural region located in southwest of Central Asia and has a great place in Uzbekistan statehood. Bactria included both banks of Amu Darya River that is modern territories of Northern Afghanistan, Southern Uzbekistan and Tajikistan. In Southern Uzbekistan was researched the Bronze and the early Iron Age cultures as Sapalli, Kuchuktepa, Ancient Bactria. In the territory of these monuments large-scale archaeological excavations were carried out. Local scientists and international archaeological expeditions such as Uzbek-German, Uzbek-French, Uzbek-Czech and others have worked in the southern part of Uzbekistan (Surkhandarya region). On basis of scientific analyzing results of these archaeological excavations, consolidating this information and historical reconstruct social relations of the Bronze and Early Iron Age is the main goal of this research.

Keywords: Bronze Age, Early Iron Age, historical reconstruction, social relations, Southern Uzbekistan, family, society, community, archaeological researches.

1 INTRODUCTION

Archaeology studies ancient human society history, historical and cultural heritage based on an analysis of archaeological artifacts and written sources. The issue of "reconstruction" of the historical and cultural heritage, cultural life has become one of the most questionable topics in the world of scientific communication in XX century. Historical reconstruction in archaeology is one of the actual issues. It is be noted that historical reconstruction is the process of reconstructing the material or spiritual culture of a particular historical era and region or reproducing a historical event. The rise of archaeological research has required paying particular attention to the special training of specialists of a special historical profile, who have mastered the features of conducting field and analytical work with artifacts and the ability to reconstruct archaeological sources in historical side [8]. In the Bronze Age, there were absolute changes occurred in social and economic life of primitive communities. These changes altered the previous social nature of ownership, and first of all, it led to the private ownership to land and live-stock. In Bronze Age, in the ancient agricultural regions, private ownership to land, and in the desert regions, private ownership to live-stock emerged.

2 MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Historiography of Social Relations

Bronze and Early Iron Age history of ancient Bactria (as such Southern Uzbekistan) were learnt by G.A. Pugachenkova V.M.Masson, L.I.Albaum, B.A.Litvinsky, E.V.Rtveladze, A.A.Askarov, A.S.Sagdullaev, V.I.Sarianidi, T.Sh.Shirinov, Sh.B. Shaydullaev, N.A. Avanesova, K.Abdullaev, M.Kh.Esonov, A.Sh.Shaydullaev, D.O.Karimova and others.

was also researched by foreign historians and archeologists. For example, D.Huff, N.Baroffka, M.Teufer, K.Kaniuth, M.Tosi, C.Lamberg-Karlovsky, F. Kohl, P.Amiet and F.Hiebert, S. Salvatori, E.Luneau, J.Bendezu-Sarmiento, L.Stanco, P.Tuslova. International archaeological expeditions such as Uzbek-German, Uzbek-French, Uzbek-Czech and others have worked in the Southern Uzbekistan (Surkhandarya region) and they have played a great role to discovery new archaeological sites [9]. Some researches which are connected with reconstruction of social life of ancient tribes are also vital in methodological aspect [11]. On the basis of the scientific researches of above mentioned scientists and information of written sources ("Avesta") may reconstruct social relations of Bronze and Early Iron Age society of the Southern Uzbekistan (one of the main part of Ancient Bactria)

2.2 Family and society of the Bronze Age

Development of society has been studied mainly based on the formational and civilizational viewpoints. Many historians, mainly, archeologists prefer a civilizational viewpoint as they studied the history of material culture and civilizations [13]. According to the analyses of archeological and ethnographical date, people lived in groups from the Upper Paleolithic Period and this period is considered as a "period of primitive communal system". In terms of history, kinship community is studied by classifying them into matriarchy, patriarchy and military democracy stages. In matriarchy, property had a social nature, that is, it was owned by kinship community. Because the economic base of community was acquiring economy. After the emergence of agriculture, live-stock breeding and handicraft, economic base of community changed to production economy. It created ample possibilities for the emergence of private property. It led to the first social labor distribution (specialization of agricultural and live-stock breeding economies), the second social labor distribution (separation of handicraft from agriculture), emergence of patriarchy. In patriarchy, private ownership got developed, but property kept several social norms. Comparative analyses of date in the archeological and written sources play a significant role in illustrating the development of family and society of the Bronze Age. Researcher I.M. D'yakonov compared the terms about the communities described in "Avesta" with the community of Media. After that, many scholars compared the social composition of the population of the cultures they are

• Jasur Erkinovich Togaev, senior lecturer, National University of Uzbekistan, Uzbekistan. E-mail: jasur.togaev@nuu.uz

learning with the "Avesta" community. A.A. Askarov compared it with the Sapallitepe population, T.Sh. Shirinov compared it with the Jarkutan population, V.I. Sarianidi and V.M. Masson compared it with the Bronze Age population of Margiana, Yu.A. Zadneprovsky compared it with the Chust culture, A.S. Sagdullaev compared it with the social composition of Early Iron age population of Bactria. According to the analyses of the study results and precise layout, Sapallitepe was a village of 8 patriarchal communities of Bronze Age [2]. To tell it in the Avesta language, we can imagine Sapallitepe as a "vis" (village, community) uniting 8 "nmana" (family) with each other. Each kinship community, that is, a big patriarchal family had its Patriarch – nmanapati, and each vis (a village kinship community) uniting these families had a vispati. Each patriarchal dwelling complex had a house with many rooms (a fireplace with a chimney, a hallway, and bedroom with a sandal, a family altar, and a grain storage room, a wide and long room for a weaving loom) and this kind of big patriarchal family made up the Sapallitepe nmanas. V.A. Livshits comments that according to an Avesta tradition, a clan was consisted of 15 and more small families (15 small family is about 75-90 people). A small family in Sapallitepe was consisted of 5-6 people, in different periods, 30-61-47 families lived in Sapallitepe (A.A. Askarov). Maximally, a small family had 6 people, and it is possible that in different period, population of Sapallitepe was 180-366-282 people or it consisted of several neighboring clan communities (they are called "varzana" in Avesta) [1]. People of Sapallitepe initially buried their dead fellow clan members under the floor of their homes, women were often buried in front of a fireplace while men were buried in front of a room door, and under the defense and room walls [3]. In graves they put various meals, a dead man and woman's own belongings, labor and household tools. From the items put in graves one can conclude about profession and status of the deceased. In some graves, a spirit of the community member who was lost unknown buried, these graves are called cenotaph. In Sapallitepe stage, practices of praying to totems such as totemism, animism is not observed. But on images engraved on stone, terracotta and metal, on patterns of amulets, stone beads, on seals of big patriarchal family (nmana) and village (vis), we can them symbolically. For example, in Sapallitepe, many animals such as snake, eagle, camel, riparian cat, mouflon, ibex, tiger, pig, various herbs were described on amulets and community seals. Sphragistic and glyptic artifacts of the Sapalli culture and its role in determine social relations and religion of the Bronze Age analyzed by A. Shaydullaev [23]. Over two thousands of graves have been studied so far in Sapallitepe and Jarkutan settlements. Social origination of population of these settlements was also studied based on the collected date. A.A. Askarov divides population of the settlement into three (social) groups based on the items found in the Sapallitepe graves:

1. Lower layer of the community. The graves of this population layer are very primary, very few, and sometimes, we can see only a single earthenware item in a grave, that is all.
2. Full-fledged members of the community. In graves of this rank, there are a few earthenware items and bronze vessels and jewelry.
3. Rich people of the community. In graves of this rank, there are about 50 earthenware items, various jewelry items and tools [4].

Graves of the rich discovered in Sapallitepe, were mainly belong to women. It could be a ground to suggest that women had a high status in the Sapallitepe community. Of course, this is a biased opinion, this is undervaluation of achievements of the Sapallitepe population in agriculture, handicraftsmanship, construction, metal works, that is, it disregards the fact these jobs are men's work [24]. Professor M. Tosi believes that, precious items found in graves of women in Sapallitepe are a custom characteristic to nomadic nations [26]. The main reason of the fact that graves of the rich in Sapallitepe were mainly belong to women and seals were found in these graves can be explained by the fact that women played a leading role in household. It is also worth mentioning about a grave of community leader discovered in hill no. 5 of the Jarkutan settlement. The 5th hill was actually a residential area, and the grave of community leader found there has, apart from other graves, various items. A bronze ring, a bronze part of rod - emblem of ruler, lapis-lazuli, a bronze anlace, and bronze bowl, over 30 earthenware items, a surma phial, and two pins were discovered in this grave. Taking into account the fact that a seal made of marl stone found in the cultural layer almost near the floor during the digging process of the room where the grave was found, we can conclude that this dwelling complex was belong to the community leader [6]. The studies by V.I. Ionesov indicate that significant economic and social changes occurred in the life of communities in the Jarkutan period. The Jarkutan settlement had several patriarchal communities (the Jarkutan I -VIII hills), and each community has its separate cemetery. During the digging process, graves of community leaders, worshippers were found in the cemeteries (graves of the rich), and they were heads of their communities. The researcher explains the fact that aristocracy emerged in Jarkutan by the building of Jarkutan palace and temple. The studies in Jarkutan by V.I. Ionesov also indicate that in the Kuzali and Molali periods, aristocrat groups centralized the economic production. Common production formed among the communities In the Jarkutan temple, he took the metal production in the part of production as an example. Increase of metal by 41.18 percent found in the Kuzali period graves is considered by the researcher as the centralization of production. Moreover, increase of the number of cenotaph graves in Kuzali period and more and more arms and weapons found there can be explained by intensification of military threat. In the Buston period, the Jarkutan population experienced difficult social and economic crises, and as a result of this, the Sopolli culture fell into decay. There was not a regular army in Jarkutan, because army is a sign of antagonistic society. A.A. Askarov and T.Sh. Shirinov substantiated that initial class relations established in Jarkutan based on their studies conducted in the Jarkutan settlement, palace and fire temple. The Jarkutan population was divided at least six social groups:

1. City rulers, leaders (palace people, graves of the rich);
2. Religious ideology servants (temple people, graves where seals found);
3. Community members with no rights (graves of the poor);
4. Military people (graves where weapons found);
5. Handicraftsmen (graves where handicraftsmanship items found);
6. City population (peasants, stock-breeding people, merchants) [5].

The Bronze Age settlements in the northern Afghanistan were studied by V.I. Sarianidi. In their studies, scholars analyzed family and society in the ancient Bactria, that is, they analyzed the processes of social and economic relations [22]. In the Dashtli-3 settlement, the remains of a temple complex and palace were discovered and studied. According to V.I. Sarianidi, in the 2nd millennium B.C., agriculture was the main activity of economy of local tribes; in the temple complex, about 150-200 people lived. They were engaged mainly in agriculture and handicraftsmanship. In the Bronze age, forms of private land farming and land farming belonging to temples developed, a leader priest and his administrative staff controlled and coordinated the daily life and mutual relations of the Dashtli people. V.I. Sarianidi in his studies expressed his views about the emergence of specialist potters and blacksmiths as a result of development of handicraftsmanship. According to the statement of the scholar, "that time in Bactria the formation of classes began, performing religious and ideological functions became an occupation of certain people: community aristocrats and military people emerged". According to the conclusions of B.A. Kolchin, E.V. Sayko, emergence of professional administration was connected with the necessity of organization of production and complication of economic relations. In the Bronze Age big central settlements were in the form of a city, and they were built with a precise architectural plan (streets, squares, big public buildings). Architecture required applied knowledge and specialization. Management played a key role in planning architectural tasks, organization of construction activity and realization of these tasks. People who engaged in management did not directly participate themselves in the activity of agriculture, irrigation, architecture and handicraftsmanship, and they organized the management only. People who performed functions of regulation and realization of management were paid for their labor with the community products [18]. Likewise, initially, the handicraftsmen who produced labor tools, jewelry items, earthenware items for the population were also paid with the agricultural products of the community taking a certain share according to their status and rank (till the development of barter and trade). Because the handicraftsmen whole engaged in special craft work had limited opportunities to employ in agricultural work. According to general opinions of researchers, in initial time, initial states were administered as how the communities were managed, that is, they were managed by council of leaders. The development of production in agricultural communities required to create a new water facility - canals. Clan communities could not manage to excavate and maintain water facilities that require mass labor and manpower [12]. This kind of works could be done forcibly by exploitation of labor of certain layer of population. Religious leaders - priests had the right to organize this kind of work. Initially, they were elected among the members of community, and later this religious leadership title transferred from generation to generation. As a result of the fact that priests transferred temple households into their private ownership, new rules - kings emerged. Increasingly having more and more power, the priest kings occupied other surrounding lands and extended their power. In this way, in one or more small river beds, initial states were founded..

2.3 Social Relations of Early Iron Age

Social relations of Early Iron Age can be studied by archaeological finds and information from written sources. The

study of Avestan texts is complicated by their unclear dating and localization. In relation to certain regions and monuments of Central Asia, they should be used very carefully. However, the limited written information has always necessitated various comparisons and interpretations of the Avesta based on archaeological materials. Avesta in this aspect was specifically considered by I.M.Dyakonov, V.A.Livshits, S.N.Sokolov, V.M.Masson, V.I.Sarianidi, A.A.Askarov, A.S.Sagdullaev, T.Sh.Shirinov, M.Iskhokov and some other researchers. The Early Iron Age Society was also built on small families that were consisted of 5-6 people. They were parts of big patriarch family. Big family (20-25 people) lived in a common habitation [20]. In spite of some small families could have their special living spaces in these common habitations, their social-economic life passed under "one common roof" big family (habitation owner "nmanapati") governance. Family in "Avesta" society characterized as downward, group of people who are equally linked from side lines with the wide relative alliances, moreover, it is unique with its mutual property, consumption and production, and finally they derived from one predecessor. "Avesta" recognizes family as a main section of the society, existence and prosperity, strengthening of social relations, struggle against the evil, continuation of the humanity, tenacity of Avesta society, stability and spread of religion was directly depended on the family [17]. That is why marriage and the responsibility in front of family had a crucial ethic importance in Zoroastrianism. It was condemned if people lived without marrying. It was responsibility of each Zoroasterian [15]. Zoroastrianism supported the marriage only between trustful people – Ahura Mazda followers, and prohibited the marriage with the other religion believers. Clear as a day prohibitions are included in "Vendidad", correspondingly to the directions included, "the man who mixes the seeds of rightness and irregularity, origins of people who values giants and mazda believers" highly distresses Ahura Mazda. ("Vendidad", XVIII, 125-126). Some interpreters pay attention to the phrases as "marriage between relatives", "kinsmen marriage", and they believe that, "Avesta" permits the inclusion of blood. But, these attitudes formed because of these false interpretations, and in reality Zoroastrianism does not permit the marriage with blood inclusion [17]. In the third chapter of Yasht, there are notions like the head of the family (house owner), head of the clan, tribe leader and country governor [27]. In order to describe the head of the family, tribe and clan there used term "pati" ("nmanapati", "vispati", "zantupati"). Country governor called "kavi", commander in chief of the tribe – "sastar". The table below, can describe the society members and governance order of "Avesta" society [1].

"Avesta" notions	Governance order
"dmana", "nmana"-	house owner, head of the family
"vis"- clan, village	head of the clan
"varzana"- neighbor	Council of heads of the clans
"zantu"- tribe, district	District mayor
"dahyu" – region	Region mayor
"dahyusasti" – country	Governor of the country

Fig. 1. "Avesta" society.

Military commanders, soldiers, military battles, king (shakh) – "kavi" ("kayanian") dynasties gave different information about the development of social- economic and political governance.

In "Avesta" there are information about "kavi"s – kings dynasty (in "Shahnameh" – "kayanian"). First homeland of "kavi"s covered Khamun lake, Khilmend river coasts, Kukhi Khvadja Mountain foots, Ancient Bactria territories and they ruled during IX-VIII centuries B.C. [25]. The word kaviy was used to describe priest-kings, governors in Avesta. As mentions M. Iskhakov, "kavi" term was used towards social layer which united the duty of priest and governor before Zoroastr [7]. Kavi-priests were against teachings of Zoroastr. First "kavi" who adopted Zoroastrianism was bactrian Vishtasp. That is why, in "Avesta" positive terms such as "Powerful Vishtasp", "Athlete Vishtaspa" were used towards him. It should be mentioned that, Sh. B. Shaydullaev [25] offered to use phrase "Bactrian Kavi" instead of "Bactria Kingdom" in his article. According to E.V. Rtveladze, "kavi" title originated locally, it is also can be found in coins of Bukhara kings – "bukharkhudat"s from VI-VII century. This title saved its value starting from "Avesta" times, till the early mid-century's [16]. Besides kavi title, there is also term "sastar" can be met in "Avesta". This title owner was the governor of the country (oasis) and its center. E.V. Rtveladze mentions Bandikhan country as a sastar and describes Bandikhan I memorial as a center of the country [10]. According to the last researches "sastar" describes as kavi's military commander. Usually sastar was mayor of the dahyu capital in case of martial law he took the responsibility of military commander. As it is written in 'Avesta" sastar also could be governor of the dahyu regions. His duties were commanded the military sources of country, governed capital city or the regions. Sastar and kavi terms also can be met in country governance system which economic lifestyle was based on agriculture. In a group of cattle – risers, kavi and sastar duties were taken by yabgu of the tribe. According to the information from written sources, "Ancient Bactria kingdom" existed until the Achaemenids. Even, there is a assumption that, Margiana and Sogdiana were part of it. In this union of countries, Bactria was a leader. But, kingdom, under rule of dahyu sasti, did not have absolute power, it's rights were limited by dahyupatins. This political union had religious supervisor – zarathustraema. He was an equally high religious supervisor as a prophet Zarathustra. Without his permission, dahyupaties and dahyu sasties could not be adopted as governors. Group of "Avesto" epoch divides into three parts – "ratayshtar", "atrivan" and "vastriya-fshuyant". According to I.V. Pyankov, archeologically "ratayshtar" lived in strongholds, built on platforms, "atrivan" lived in castle like fortresses, around of the strongholds, and "vastriya-fshuyant" lived in villages where not any strongholds. Around the strongholds were places to live for dependent citizens, and the villages for independent husbandmans [24]. According to the Zoroastrianism traditions, "nasassa"s also can be assumed as low estate members. They did all ceremonies concerning dead – bodies. "Nasassa"s lived separately from society. They were obligated to wear rings in public places. Heard the sound of ring zoroastrians tried to run away, avoid the touch with them. So, "nasassa"s were separated from the society and considered as low estate members. According to the oldest Gathas part of "Avesta", most of the citizens mainly occupied with cattle-raising and agriculture, but cattle-raising were more popular than agriculture. There is the information that confirms the existence of watered agriculture system that means canals also existed. The oldest canal of Northern Bactria was built in period of Kuchuk I rule. It is called Bandikhan canal, studied by E.V. Rtveladze and emphasized that, it was dug in period of

Bandikhan I. Digging the canals, bringing up wheat was considered as a victory over evil in Zoroastrianism. Another aspect that to be mentioned is, among the memorials of Bactria's early the Iron Age, there are many handmade ceramic objects. The reason of handmade ceramics spread can be interpreted in a different ways. Sh. B. Shaydullaev assumes that, abandoning high technology (ceramics making workbenches) was effect of taking shape of new religious attitudes, minds. In our opinion, the spread of handmade items can be interpreted with the increase in demand to ceramic items. It is known that, during the early Iron Age, locations territory enlarged, citizens number increased. As a result, potters could not meet the demand appropriately, and thus, they pay attention to the "number", not to the "quality" during production. According to this aspect, t can be assumed that potters were highly valued in social life. Social responsibilities of Ancient Bactria in early Iron Age can be compared with appropriate archeological signs [24].

Social signs	Archaeological signs
Signs that describe increase in citizens number and social stratification	Increase of living locations number, enlargement of locations' territories
Existence of city – first country center.	Appearance of cities, process of joining village-locations around the cities
Development of handicraft	Process of handicraft fields centralization, increase in sorts of handicraft products, changes of qualities
Development of agriculture	Progress in operating tools, artificial watering branches and appearance of canals, increase in agriculture products number
Development of cattle-raising	Increase in number of domestic animals bones
Progress of military operations	Existence of strongholds, progress of weapons, defensive buildings, responsibilities
Centralized religion that mentally unites people	Existence of temples
Trade and cultural relations	Material culture examples that characteristic to other cultures, development of ancient communication ways

Fig. 1. Signs of Ancient States.

We can observe that in all shown archaeological evidences the existence of signs of early iron period in Bactrian monuments. In Central Asia, especially, in Bactria there could be divided two approaches concerning the gaining of social status. First, gaining social status is connected with the attempt of some personalities' growing positions in society and their status, as well as with drawing the share from society's product. Higher social position gained in the society served as a footing to wealth of a person [14]. In the result of social division of labor the activity of organizational management divided from the production. For the people who are not always engaged in production but mostly busy with managing social and economic life during the allocation of social goods it served as a foundation in mastering its big portion. The second, personal moral characteristics, knowledge and impact became the decisive factor in the election of managing personalities. So, primarily, the most experienced person (hunter, smith, and warrior) in the society could easily gain social status [20]. According to this one can say that in the first approach the attention to the management's initial social efficiency activity, turning into a professional management and

to its laws were not enough. The basis of social positions' and management's origins were the results of production, division of social labor, protection from the outer military invasion and the need for solving social issues. All these triggered the need for the functions of organization, ordering, surveillance as well as for the control of societies' external and internal relations [19]. In the result of functions' widening in the management system primary useful management became a professional activity. The organization of farming, production, division of land and water resources, construction, irrigation, agriculture, production of handicraft goods, exchange of goods, trade relations in the system of economic functions had very important role. The existence of organizational as well as production elements and principles alongside with management's economic functions could be noted in the following:

- Management and control of economic relations in various spheres of production;
- Creation and implementation of technologic innovations;
- Providing the production process with important materials and tools;
- Implementation of innovations into the organizational spheres of economics [21].

In addition, if management's social functions are related to such tasks as regulation and coordination of mutual relations in societies, solving disputable issues, military and political functions developed based on the protection from external military invasions, production of weapons, organizing armies, setting up defense within the territory of regions, establishing mutual relations between districts and regions, solving disputable issues. Along with the formation of professional management began the history of territorial administration, that's appeared district and region mayors, heads of state. Instead of primitive-communal management emerged political governance.

3 CONCLUSION

A family was a foundation of the Bronze Age society in the Southern Uzbekistan (part of Ancient Bactria). Small families consisted of 5-6 people. Uniting together, patriarchal families made up a clan community. Based on the archeological and written sources, we can say that the Bronze Age population divided into different social groups, that is, they divided into layers. Existence of palaces and temples in the Bronze Age settlements show that necessity to manage the population deliberately emerged. Monks, warriors, farmers and handicraftsmen made up "social-professional" group in the Southern Uzbekistan (part of Ancient Bactria). At the beginning, the rulers in the regions of land farming were monks. They were the owners of land and cattle. Cattle farmers used to be herdsman who looked after the cattle, ships and horses of monks and warriors. Handicraftsmen used to produce labor tools and weapons. They were producing jeweler and weaving goods as well as conducting land farming, i.e. they were land farming households. Handicraftsmen played important role in social life so they provided people with tools permanently. In the result of the growth of the population in the early iron period the demand for the products of the handicraftsmen rose simultaneously. If to take in to account the facts about permanent lootings in sources, we can note that, in such situation the role of warriors became important in social life.

4 ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author wish to thank academician A.S.Sagdullaev and PhD F.B.Ochildiev. This work was supported in part by a grant from OT-F1-91 - "Formation of historic-cultural areas in the Central Asia and a problem of ethnic geography".

5 REFERENCES

- [1] Abdullaev U.I. (2008). Historiography of Central Asian administrative system and early statehood (XX – beginning of XXI centuries). Dissertation of the Candidate of science on history. Urganch. P. 41.
- [2] Askarov A. (1977). Drevnezemledelcheskaya kultura epokhi bronzi yuga Uzbekistana. Tashkent. C.13-32.
- [3] Askarov A. (1973). Sapallitepa. Tashkent. C. 42-70.
- [4] Askarov A.A, Buryakov Yu.F, Kvirkveliya O.R, Radililovskiy V.V. (1988). Teoreticheskie i metodologicheskie problemi issledovaniya v arkheologii. – Fan, Tashkent. C. 30-31.
- [5] Askarov A.A, Shirinov T.Sh. (1993). Rannaya gorodskaya kultura epokhi bronzi juga Sredney Azii. Samarkand. C. 120.
- [6] Askarova.A. (2015). History of the origin of Uzbek Nation. "Uzbekistan". Tashkent. P.53.
- [7] Avesta. Yasht Book / Translated by M.Is'hokov. (2001). Tashkent. P.122.
- [8] Buryakov Yu.F. (2010). K 70-letiyu kafedri arkheologii Sredney Azii NUUz im. Mirzo Ulugbeka // Traditsii drevney i srednevekovoy gorodskoy kulturi Sredney Azii. – Tashkent. C. 4.
- [9] Sagdullaev A.S., Shaydullaev A.Sh., Togaev J.E. (2018). Exploration of the Bronze and Early Iron Age sites of Surkhan oasis (in independence period) // History science in Uzbekistan: issues and prospects of development. Historiography Studies – 2017. Tashkent. P. 36-40.
- [10] Istoriya gosudarstvennosti Uzbekistana. (2009). Tom 1. – Tashkent. 2009. C.334.
- [11] Kristiansen K., Larsson T.B. (2005). The Rise of Bronze Age Society: Travels, Transmissions and Transformations. Cambridge University Press.; Spencer Ch., Bevan A. (2018). Settlement location models, archaeological survey data and social change in Bronze Age Crete // Journal of Anthropological Archaeology. Volume 52, P. 71-86.; Palmisano A. (2017). Confronting scales of settlement hierarchy in state-level societies: Upper Mesopotamia and Central Anatolia in the Middle Bronze Age // Journal of Archaeological Science: Reports Volume 14, P. 220-240.
- [12] Kudratov S. (1999). Administration system and social relations in early Central Asian states // History of Uzbekistan. Tashkent, № 4, P. 3.
- [13] Masson V.M. (1984). Pervie sivilizatsii. Leningrad.
- [14] Masson V.M. (1967). Stanovlenie ranneklassovogo obshchestva na Drevnem Vostoke // Voprosi istorii.– № 5. C. 85.
- [15] Rasulova Z. (2013). Family-marriage relations of modern Uzbeks. Tashkent P. 61.
- [16] Rtveldzhe E. (2005) Sivilizatsii, gosudarstva, kulturi Sentralnoy Azii. – Tashkent. C. 58-61.
- [17] Rtveldzhe E.V., Saidov A.Kh., Abdullaev E.V. (2001). Civilization of ancient Uzbekistan: scenes of the history of statehood and law. Tashkent. P. 229.
- [18] Sagdullaev A., Mavlonov U. (2006). The history of state administration in Uzbekistan. – Tashkent, Academia, P. 25.

- [19] Sagdullaev A.S. (2004). Formation of administration basics and stages of development // Society and administration. – Tashkent, – № 1. P. 9-10.
- [20] Sagdullaev A.S. (2004). History of ancient Central Asia. Tashkent. P. 51.
- [21] Sagdullaev A.S. (2005). History of management formation of innovation management basics // Innovation management. Textbook. – Academia, Tashkent. P. 5-22.
- [22] Sarianidi V.I. (1977). Drevnie zemledelsi Afganistana. – Nauka, Moskva. C. 132-139.
- [23] Shaydullaev A.Sh. (2018). Glyptics and sphragistics of Sapalli culture. Dissertation abstract of the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) on historical sciences. Tashkent.
- [24] Shaydullaev Sh.B. (2009). The steps of formation and developments of state system in the territory of Uzbekistan (on the example of Bactria). Dissertation of the Doctor of science on history. – Samarkand. P. 174.
- [25] Shaydullaev Sh.B. (2012). Some considerations ancient Bactrian Kavi // Innovations of the discipline of Uzbekistan History. Collection of scientific articles. Tashkent. P. 38-47.
- [26] Tosi M. (1989). The Origins of Early Bactrian Civilization. Bactria. An Ancient Oasis Civilizations. Roma-Venezia. P. 69-71.
- [27] Yashti. Gl. X. / Per. S.P. Vinogradovoy / Khrestomatiya po istorii Drevnego Vostoka. (1980). Visshaya shkola, Moskva. 1980. Ch. 2. C. 66.