

**USSR ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
INSTITUTE OF THE PEOPLES OF ASIA**

**Fifty Years of Soviet Oriental Studies
(Brief Reviews)**

**ARCHEOLOGICAL STUDY
OF SOVIET CENTRAL ASIA**

**„NAUKA“ PUBLISHING HOUSE
Central Department of Oriental Literature
Moscow 1967**

USSR ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
INSTITUTE OF THE PEOPLES OF ASIA

Fifty Years of Soviet Oriental Studies
(Brief Reviews)

ARCHEOLOGICAL STUDY
OF SOVIET CENTRAL ASIA

"NAUKA" PUBLISHING HOUSE
Central Department of Oriental Literature
Moscow 1967

Editors: B. G. Gafurov
Y. V. Gankovsky

Archeological Study of Soviet Central Asia

The emergence and remarkable progress of archeology studying Central Asia is a striking instance of the achievements scored by Soviet historical science. True, Soviet archeologists inherited certain traditions in this particular field. Turkestan was often visited by outstanding Russian Orientalists who took a special interest in its archeological sites—by P.I. Lerkh (1864), N.I. Veselovsky (1884-1885), V.A. Zhukovsky (1890 and 1896), V.V. Barthold (1893-1894 and 1904). The local intellectuals and enthusiasts interested in local lore did their best to help discover and study the relics of the past. Especially fruitful was the work of the Turkestan circle of amateur archeologists, which was organized in Tashkent in 1895.¹ However, these archeologists primarily concentrated on the town sites and architectural monuments of the Middle Ages, since these were more conspicuous and accessible. The two exceptions worthy of note were the discovery of Zoroastrian urns and the activities of R.Pumpelly's expedition, which excavated the Aëneolithic and Bronze.

Age mounds of Anau (they were initially investigated by A.V. Komarov as early as the 1880's).² But even the excavations of medieval sites, of which the largest were those carried out by V.L. Vyatkin at Samarkand, fell short of the archeological standards of the time. In contrast to that, the comprehensive study of the history of Central Asia, conducted primarily by V.V. Barthold, was undoubtedly among the finest achievements of Russian Oriental stu-

dies. Consequently, the researchers who took up the archeological study of Central Asia soon after the 1917 October Revolution had to proceed on the basis of desultory information accumulated about certain archeological sites, but they also inherited the highest standards of research in Central Asian history, particularly of the period of advanced medieval relations. The task was not merely to extend the traditional chronological boundaries of research, but also to establish Central Asian archeology as an independent branch, with thoroughly up-to-date methods of investigation and a broad historical perspective.

Soviet archeological studies of Central Asia passed through several phases and periods in their development.³ For convenience's sake, we suggest the following generalised periodisation stressing three stages: 1917-1928, 1929-1945, and from 1946 to the present time.⁴

The first period (1917-1928) may be regarded as transitional and preliminary. In those years, archeologists capable of taking up the finest traditions of pre-revolutionary research - above all, the Barthold tradition--were trained centrally and locally. Researchers were also confronted with a series of problems arising from Soviet reality. The whole process of mankind's historical development was now viewed from the standpoint of Marxist ideology; moreover, the methods of archeological investigation had to be improved.

A characteristic organisational measure of the period was the setting up in Tashkent of a special committee to supervise museums, safeguard relics of the past and works of art (Turkomstaris, later known as Sredazkomstaris). | This committee employed highly-qualified personnel engaged in archeological investigations. The investigations followed two trends: archeological work connected with repairing and restoring architectural monuments, and archeological survey concerned mainly with problems of historical geography and the topography of medieval towns. The latter

trend was represented by a special genre of publications, established by V.V. Barthold: a detailed description of the monuments of a certain area complete with an analysis of written records.⁵ Compared with the publications of Barthold himself, the works of the period under review offered a more detailed and proficient analysis of archeological material.⁶ Along with reconnaissance trips, another tendency was manifested towards the close of the period--that of setting up large-scale expeditions to study one particular region. Thus, in 1928-1929, a special Khaveran Expedition under A.A. Semyonov carried on investigations in Southern Turkmenia;⁷ in 1926-1928, an expedition of the Museum of Oriental Cultures, led by B.P. Denike, was active in Termez.⁸ A new development prompted by the country's daily life, was the introduction of archeological survey at the new construction sites.⁹

More intensive activities and a growing amount of the material obtained were characteristic of many parts of Central Asia.¹⁰ In addition to the two above-mentioned expeditions, there were M.E. Masson's numerous trips to Ferghana, Kirghizia and Southern Kazakhstan, his investigations in the vicinity of Tashkent, and the work of V.D. Gorodetsky and P.P. Ivanov in the same areas; A.Y. Yakubovsky surveyed Shahrisayabz and the middle reaches of the Syr Darya; D.D. Bukinich, the pioneer in the field of Central Asian prehistoric archeology, investigated the Anau sites in Turkmenia.¹¹ True, this work did not result in any spectacular discoveries--mostly due to the limited scope of excavations. The excavations of Afrosiab, supervised by V.L. Vyatkin, did not correspond to the archeological standards of the time. An enthusiastic archeologist and prominent authority on written records, V.L. Vyatkin¹² succeeded in conveying the finest pre-revolutionary traditions to the younger generation; it was Vyatkin who coached M.E. Masson and V.A. Shishkin in practical archeology. Yet a regular and large-scale study of such a complex site as Afrosiab proved beyond Vyatkin's powers, as witnessed by his book,¹³ on which V.V. Barthold wrote a guarded review.¹⁴ In this way, in the period under

examination Soviet archeological studies of Central Asia were gradually taking shape; a dependable basis for the following upsurge was being laid. The ever-widening scope of work, improvement of methods and growth of personnel provided the necessary prerequisites for the further development of research, which had to keep abreast with the country's overall progress.

These prerequisites materialised during the second period, covering from 1929 to 1945. Those who insist on subdividing it into two stages¹⁵ are most probably right, although it is not yet clear where the dividing line should be drawn (1935 or 1936). The first stage is characterised by a marked expansion of the scope of work, the investigation and excavation of ever new sites. Along with the intensified activity of archeologists from Tashkent (M.E. Masson's numerous trips covered nearly all parts of Central Asia), local archeological centres began to develop in Ashkhabad and Dushanbe. The central research institutions, too, carried on investigations on a wider scale: there were the expeditions of A.Y. Yakubovsky (Khorezm and the Zaravshan Valley), B.A. Latynin (Ferghana), M.V. Voyevodsky (Khorezm), etc. Sites of a wider chronological range began to be examined as the archeologists penetrated deeper and deeper into the pre-Islamic past of Central Asia. Excavations of the nomads' tumuli in Kirghizia in 1929 were one of the first steps in this direction.¹⁶ Soon after, excavations of Parthian Nysa began in the vicinity of Ashkhabad.¹⁷ In 1934, G.V. Grigoryev started his investigation of the Kauntchi culture of crop raisers and cattle breeders (near Tashkent).¹⁸ (Preliminary information on this culture had been obtained before the 1917 Revolution.) The 1932-1933 discovery of documents in Mugh Castle, in the mountains of Tajikistan, caused a sensation in the world of learning. These archives included documents in the Sogd language dating from the first decades of the Arabs' military campaigns in Central Asia.¹⁹ Still more striking and stimulating were the Buddhist finds from the Air-Tam town site near Termez, which included fine specimens of sculptu-

re belonging to the so-called Greek-Buddhist art.²⁰ The finds of Kushana coins in this layer made it possible to establish a specific archeological complex differing sharply from the previously discovered materials, which mostly dated from the period of early and well-developed medieval society.

These discoveries were of vital importance because at about the same time Soviet historians began to feel that it was necessary to single out certain qualitatively different periods in the socio-economic history of the East - periods that obviously did not go under the heading of feudalism. Academician V.V. Struve put forward a well-argued theory of the existence of a specific slave-holding formation in the Ancient East.²¹ S.P. Tolstov was the first to apply this thesis to Central Asia, at first on an abstract sociological plane. The great majority of researchers soon accepted Tolstov's view. Moreover, the task of writing a comprehensive history of Central Asia increasingly came to the fore, and this could not be accomplished without drawing extensively on archeological data. It was therefore imperative to fill the "blank spots" in the archeology of Central Asia, which stood out glaringly when compared with the archeology of the European part of the USSR and the Caucasus. The organisational form to remedy the situation were massive expeditions of a broad territorial and chronological range. These expeditions primarily engaged in the routine work connected with registering sites of all epochs; but at the same time, in keeping with the pressing demands of historical science, they paid close attention to questions of fundamental importance--above all, the establishment of archeological complexes and cultures dating from before the Arab conquest. The organisation of such large expeditions and their productive work is the salient feature of the second stage of the period under review.

The first to be launched was the Termez Joint Archeological Expedition, headed by M.E. Masson and active in 1936-1938.²² Beginning with 1936, regular work began in

Kazakhstan and Kirghizia, with A.W. Bernahtam in charge.²³ Finally, the Khorezm Expedition began its regular work in 1938 under S.P. Tolstov,²⁴ who based himself on the results of the preliminary investigations made by A.I. Terenozhkin in 1937 in the lower reaches of the Amu Darya.²⁵ Archeological survey during the irrigation construction in Ferghana²⁶ and Northern Kirghizia²⁷ yielded a mass of material. This survey was made by large-scale expeditions, which included several parties; as a rule, they engaged in the urgent excavation of monuments in a critical condition. Important and valuable material was also obtained by several other expeditions, e.g., the Zeravshan Expedition under A.Y. Yakubovsky,²⁸ which for some time incorporated G.V. Grigoryev's party; the latter's excavations at Tali-Barzu near Samarkand yielded the first systematised materials on the culture of pre-Muslim Sogd.²⁹ In Turkmenia, excavations of Nysa continued--unfortunately, without the proper publications. In the Bukhara oasis, V.A. Shishkin was able to find excellent objects of pre-Islamic art (the Varakhsha town site).³⁰

The efforts of the above-listed expeditions and researchers raised Central Asian archeology to a new, qualitatively different stage. A whole epoch of urban civilisations in Central Asia (from the 6th-5th centuries B.C. to the 5th century A.D.) was actually rediscovered. Many diverse finds were made, pertaining to the life of the cities, the architecture and art of the epoch, which is sometimes described as one of classical antiquity. Soviet researchers, however, were not content with the discovery of hitherto unknown sites and the publication of the finds. Marxist historians immediately raised the question of the socio-economic character of the epoch discovered. In this respect S.P. Tolstov's contribution is particularly substantial; his ideas and formulations, set forth in a series of articles, which were later put together in book form (*Ancient Khorezm*), played a leading part for a long time. Tolstov stressed the qualitative difference between the main aspects of the material culture of that epoch (from the 6th-5th centuries B.C. to the 5th century A.D.) and

the material culture of the well-developed medieval society on the eve of the Arab conquest. He attributed this qualitative difference to the existence in antiquity of a different social formation, which he termed the communal-slave formation. The break-up of many traditions in the 4th-5th centuries A.D. was attributed to the crisis of this formation as it was being replaced by early feudal society. The thesis of the qualitative difference between the two epochs and the existence of a crisis was further developed by M.E. Masson who based himself on material from Termez. The systematisation of the objects of art dating from that epoch, made by K.V. Trever, also pointed to the existence of different aesthetic conceptions in the two epochs. This theory was among the most important contributions of Central Asian archeology in the period examined. Although historians and archeologists still have a lot to accomplish in order to outline the concrete features of the society that existed in Central Asia from the 6th-5th centuries B.C. to the 5th century A.D., the break of continuity between that epoch and the early medieval period is steadily borne out by fresh data.

The progress of Central Asian archeology at that time was not limited to tackling major historical problems. The epochs and periods discerned by the researchers were enveloped in a solid shell of archeological finds. The classification and systematisation of the finds provided a reliable basis for historical conclusions and theories. Of optimal importance at the time was the pattern suggested by S.P. Tolstov for the classification of Khorezmian material and A.N. Bernshtam's pattern for the culture of the nomad tribes and the northern peripheral areas of the settled Central Asian culture. Of definite importance, too, was the stratigraphic column of Tali-Barzu, although its absolute chronology, offered by G.V. Grigoryev, was later revised.

The discovery of the ancient urban civilisations of Khorezm, Bactria, Parthia and Sogd, undoubtedly the most striking and important achievement of Central Asian

archeology in the period examined, was nevertheless not the only one. Massive expeditions covering all the sites of the given area, investigated also the town sites and architectural monuments of the Middle Ages--the traditional subject of Turkestan's archeologists. Moreover, new sites dating back to a still earlier period were discovered, e.g. the Neolithic settlement of Dzhanbas-kala 4 at Khorezm³¹ and the Mousterian cave of Teshik-Tash in the south of Uzbekistan.³² But a comprehensive study of prehistoric archeological sites was still a thing of the future: its heyday came during the third period (according to the classification adopted in this paper).

The archeologists themselves acquired new knowledge and skill during the second period; they came mostly from Leningrad and Tashkent. The Leningrad archeological school, represented by A.Y. Yakubovsky, A.N. Bernshtam, M.M. Dyakonov, A.M. Belenitsky, G.V. Grigoryev and others, was closely connected with the Barthold tradition. It mainly included Orientalists who had taken up archeology, and had a fair knowledge of the collections of the State Hermitage Museum in Leningrad. They had to pick up and improve field-work techniques, learning from the highly-qualified archeologists, of whom Leningrad had many; before the 1917 Revolution, St. Petersburg used to be the centre of archeological research. The striving for a comprehensive analysis of written records, inculcated by V.V. Barthold, was now supplemented by ample knowledge of the chronologically systematised material. Questions of historical geography and topography,³³ special analysis of objects of museum value,³⁴ problems of history--e.g., the origin of the towns,³⁵ the relationship between settled and nomad cultures,³⁶ intricate questions of ethnic origin³⁷ --such was the range of problems tackled by this school.

There was a group of proficient archeologists in Tashkent at that time (M.E. Masson, V.A. Shishkin, Y.G. Gulyamov, V.D. Zhukov and others). Of particular importance for the training of students was the establishment in 1940 of a special chair of Central Asian archeology at the State

University of Central Asia. The chair was headed by M.E. Masson. Although the archeologists trained by this chair began to work in the field only during the third period, it should be stressed that its establishment greatly contributed to the development of the Tashkent school of Central Asian archeology. This school is characterised by close links with the traditions of local studies of Turkestan; it cherishes the heritage of the Turkestan circle of archeologists and of V.L.Vyatkin. These local traditions traceable to the Sredazkomstaris account for the attention paid to historical-architectural problems, to archeological methods of studying architectural monuments.³⁸ On the other hand, V.V.Barthold's influence can be seen in the striving always to make all-round use of the data of written records, in particular data on the historical topography of major urban centres.³⁹ The Tashkent school also has specific methods of field work, particularly the tendency to give a comprehensive interpretation of the cultural influences, of the existence and decline of the cultures discovered. Importance is likewise attached to contiguous branches, primarily numismatics⁴⁰ and the history of mining.⁴¹

The progress of Central Asian archeology was accompanied by intensive publication of material. During the second period, a large number of articles appeared in the central and local scientific periodicals, in special collections, in the transactions of museums and other institutions. Booklets and pamphlets were also published, but, on the whole, articles and preliminary reports predominated. The publication in Tashkent of the proceedings of the Termez Expedition (in two volumes)⁴² at the end of the period was the first step on the way to detailed publication of the material collected.

The Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945, although it hampered and somewhat modified the work of the Central Asian archeologists, failed to put a stop to it. Applied tasks came to the fore, specifically those connected with the history of mining,⁴³ but excavations were nevertheless continued. In Southern Turkmenia, medieval Dandenakan was

investigated,⁴⁴ and in Uzbekistan investigations were made in 1943-1944 in the middle reaches of the Syr Darya in connection with new construction in the area.⁴⁵

We can thus say that the second period was the true rise of Soviet archeology studying Central Asia. Possessing a large number of highly-qualified specialists and an efficient system of training them, Central Asian archeology reached a higher level and came to the foreground of Soviet historical science, inasmuch as it advanced problems of fundamental methodological importance. The heyday of Central Asian archeology was drawing close. It began in the third period (from 1945 to this day).

Large-scale expeditions have fully retained their prominence in the third period, as a means of ensuring the speedy and comprehensive solution of a wide range of tasks and problems. Throughout the third period, S.P. Tolstov's Khorezm Expedition continued its work.⁴⁶ Major excavations were carried on at the sites of the so-called antique period--Toprak-kala (1945-1950) and Koy-Krylgan-kala (1951-1957), with the latter fully uncovered. In the course of broad and systematic excavations a large number of new sites was discovered, including many Aëneolithic and Bronze Age sites giving an insight into the prehistoric culture of Khorezm. The application of new methods--aerial photography and aerial survey--was of considerable help in investigating ancient irrigation systems,⁴⁷ and cooperation with geomorphologists yielded interesting paleogeographic data.⁴⁸ Regular publication of the material obtained by the expedition began at the close of the 1950's.⁴⁹

It was rightly noted in a survey of archeological research in Central Asia that towards the end of the second period research on the territory of Tajikistan and southern Turkmenia began to lag behind⁵⁰ (the northern part of Turkmenia was covered by the Khorezm Expedition). To improve matters, two massive expeditions were launched at the very outset of the third period: the South Turkmenian Joint Archeological Expedition (UTAKE), led by M.E. Masson and staffed mostly by the exponents of the Tashkent archeological school, and the Sogd-Tajik Archeological Expedition

(since 1952 known as the Tajik Expedition), staffed by archeologists of the Leningrad school and headed at first by A.Y. Yakubovsky (1946-1952), and later by M.M. Dyakonov (1953) and A.M. Belenitsky (since 1954).

These large-scale undertakings promptly yielded results. Apart from accomplishing such urgent tasks as registering monuments and advancing classification schemes for the material obtained, these systematic explorations culminated in discoveries of world-wide importance. A.P. Okladnikov, who worked under both expeditions, succeeded in finding numerous Stone Age relics, ranging in time from the Lower Paleolithic to the concluding stages of the Neolithic. Systematic excavations of the South Turkmenian sites of Jeitun, Geoksyur, Kara-depe and Namazga-depe actually re-introduced the spectacular civilisation of early agriculturists which had existed there in the 6th-2nd millenniums B.C. and was previously known only from the sketchy and insipid Anau finds. Equally novel were the results of systematic excavations of Parthian Nysa, conducted by UTAKB, and of early medieval Pendzhikent, regularly carried on by the Tajik Expedition. Both expeditions have systematically published their findings.⁵¹

The new period is also characterised by the growth of local personnel who gradually assumed the main responsibility for the archeological investigation of Central Asia. The Academy of Sciences of the Uzbek Republic, which was established in 1943, has a special Archeology Department, headed by V.A. Shishkin, within one of its institutes.⁵² In 1951 the Tajik and Turkmenian Academies of Sciences were set up;⁵³ both have Archeology Departments. The Tajik Archeology Department, led by B.A. Litvinsky, a graduate of the Tashkent school, has been particularly active. Today Tajikistan has a prominent group of archeologists, which is the foremost in Central Asia from the point of view of its publication activities.⁵⁴

It may well be that around 1951-1953 a new stage in the development of Central Asian archeology began to emerge; this is suggested by the evolution of studies in pre-

history.⁵⁵ This stage is characterised, in particular, by the enhanced role of local, Central Asian research institutions. Indicative in this respect are the all-out efforts to ensure that investigations should cover all parts of Central Asia. Thus, in 1953-1955 a special Kirghiz Archeological-Ethnographical Expedition was active, headed at first by A.P. Okladnikov and later by G.F. Debets.⁵⁶ In 1957 the Kirghiz Academy of Sciences was established, with P.N. Kozhemyako in charge of the Archeology Department⁵⁷ (he is a Tashkent school archeologist, similarly to the head of Tajikistan's Archeology Department). In these years the Archeology Department of the Kazakh Academy of Sciences began to work more intensively under Leningrad-trained K.A. Akishev. A major achievement of this Department is the drawing and publication of the "Archeological Map of the Kazakh Republic"--so far the only work of its kind in the USSR.

Naturally enough, this orderly system of the organisation of work has helped to make good progress. This applies, above all, to prehistoric archeology of Central Asia, which actually took shape during this period. Prehistoric sites were discovered nearly in all parts of Central Asia. Today we know the Paleolithic not only from the surface sites of Western Turkmenia,⁵⁸ Tajikistan,⁵⁹ Ferghana⁶⁰ and the south of Kazakhstan,⁶¹ but also from the excavations of settlements and caves in the vicinity of Samarkand⁶² and Tashkent.⁶³ The map of Neolithic sites, too, has been plotted in greater detail.⁶⁴ In addition to the study of previously known Bronze Age sites from the south of Turkmenia and Khorezm, there were discoveries of Bronze Age cultures in the lower reaches of the Zeravshan,⁶⁵ in Ferghana⁶⁶ and the south of Tajikistan.⁶⁷

One should note the painstaking work in the field of systematisation and classification of prehistoric finds. In this respect the periodisation of material from South Turkmenia based on B.A. Kuftin's stratigraphic excavations at Namazga-depe (1952)⁶⁸ fully retains its cardinal importance for all of Central Asia. Optimum results have been achieved in studying Neolithic and Aëneolithic finds

from South Turkmenia, where regular and purposeful field investigations⁶⁹ made it possible to approach the question of social relations⁷⁰ and to study irrigation systems dating from the beginning of the 3rd millennium B.C. -- probably the oldest in the world.⁷¹ On the basis of this new data the question was raised of Central Asia's historical place in the system of Old World civilisations and cultures.⁷² It was established that the south-western part of Central Asia belonged to the oldest crop farming centres, and was closely connected with the earliest seats of agriculture in Western Asia in the 8th-6th millenniums B.C. The culture of the settled agriculturists of Southern Turkmenia in the 4th-2nd millenniums B.C. also reveals close links with the contemporaneous cultures of Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan and India; it seems to hold an intermediate position between the civilisations of Mesopotamia and Harappa.

The discoveries of recent years lead us to speak of the formation in this area, at the end of the 3rd and the beginning of the 2nd millenniums B.C., of a local proto-urban civilisation with an emerging pictographic writing system. During that period, the greater part of Central Asian territory was inhabited by hunting, fishing and cattle-breeding tribes that made up the southern outpost of a whole system of analogous cultures covering the entire northern part of the continent of Asia. The migrations of these tribes on Central Asian territory, which took place in the second millennium B.C., are of no small importance for studying the geographical distribution of the Indo-Iranian peoples.

Considerable progress has been registered in the period under review in studying the epoch of ancient civilisations, discovered during the archeological investigations of the 1930's. Excavations of new sites made it possible to construct clear-cut classification schemes for Bactria,⁷³ Margiana⁷⁴ and Khorezm.⁷⁵ Attempts have been made to do the same with regard to Sogd,⁷⁶ although the material is rather

limited. In the case of Ferghana, the task is more difficult due to the lack of a precise stratigraphy. New data have been obtained on the origin of these civilisations. It should be noted that in the late 1940's and early 1950's special efforts were made to trace the local roots of different cultures in general. Investigations carried out in Margiana in 1954-1956 showed that as early as in the 9th-7th centuries B.C., Central Asia had large urban centres with citadels, that the roots of local urban civilisations dated back from this particular period.⁷⁷

Investigation of these civilisations was more successful in the aspect of culture studies than in the aspect of their socio-economic essence. As concerns the latter problem, no tangible progress has been made compared with the definitions and formulations of the 1930's, although the finds of Parthian documents at Nysa⁷⁸ and Khorezmian documents at Toprak-kala⁷⁹ offer certain opportunities in this field. As a matter of fact, the researchers, engrossed in the systematisation and publication of the material obtained, often fail to pay proper attention to such general problems as the economic patterns.⁸⁰ Another negative influence is the absence of special large-scale excavations of one of the ancient cities with the purpose of revealing its social and economic structure. On the other hand, there are undoubtedly signal achievements in the field of studying the culture of that fascinating epoch when local traditions were closely interwoven with the Hellenistic spirit. Excavations at Nysa have shed a strong light on the syncretised philhellenic culture of the Parthian Arsacidae.⁸¹ The magnificent sculptures of North Bactrian Khalchayan give us an insight into the development of Kushana art.⁸²

The traditional field of Central Asian archeological studies--monuments of the Middle Ages--is not forgotten either. Mass-scale surveys of several districts resulted in precise localisation of the sites of a number of towns and villages, in tracing ancient trade routes.⁸³ Special progress has been registered in studying medieval pottery;⁸⁴

new data has been obtained on the pattern of urban life, testifying to the intricacy and multiformity of the corresponding processes. Particularly striking is the success achieved in studying Central Asia on the eve of the Arab conquest--in the 6th-8th centuries A.D. The object of art of that period from Pendzhikent,⁸⁵ Varakhsha⁸⁶ and Balalyktepe⁸⁷ revealed a new artistic school, which was of no small importance in the development of the Oriental miniature.

Of outstanding significance for the investigation of that epoch are the excavations at Pendzhikent, where nearly one-fourth of the 19-hectare town site has been uncovered.⁸⁸ The uncovering of whole temples, streets, houses and artisans' shops has made Pendzhikent a kind of laboratory for investigating the early medieval period. A.Y. Yakubovsky's judgement in selecting this as the main site of the Tajik Expedition has been fully justified. Much attention is paid to tracing the cultural links of this region in the early Middle Ages--links leading, on the one hand, into Eastern Turkestan, and, on the other, into Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan and India. Indicative of the nature of these ties is the number of objects showing Buddhist influences--from the stupa of late Parthian and early Sassanian Merv⁸⁹ and the Kushana monastery at Termez⁹⁰ to the medieval temples of Ferghana⁹¹ and Northern Kirghizia.⁹²

A salient feature of the third period is the growing number of highly qualified researchers specialising in Central Asian archeology. The intensive work of the Khorezm Expedition was conducive to the formation of the Moscow school of archeologists of Central Asia. In contrast to Leningrad and Tashkent, this school is concerned with purely archeological work rather than with traditional Oriental Studies. Moscow trained specialists in prehistoric studies earlier than the two other centres;⁹³ Moscow-trained researchers pay close attention to the history of irrigation,⁹⁴ the intricate problems of remote cultural contacts,⁹⁵ the questions of ethnic origin and syncretised ritual elements.⁹⁶ Characteristic of Central Asian archeology as a

whole is the current appearance of researchers specialising in one subject--the cultures of a definite period. This is prompted by the steady progress of Central Asian archeology, which is gradually becoming a complex branch of learning comprising many subjects. Hence the appearance of researchers specialising in prehistory; the credit for training them goes largely to the Leningrad archeological centre with its fine traditions of studying the Stone and Bronze Age cultures on the territory of the USSR.⁹⁷ These specialists in prehistory are no longer the students of A.Y. Yakubovsky's Leningrad school of archeology and Oriental studies, but researchers of a new type conforming to the demands of the time.

All these changes have beneficently affected archeological publications. Apart from the fact that the number of special articles and books devoted to the archeology of Central Asia is larger than in any other branch of the archeology of the USSR, there is this significant development: books have come to predominate over articles. There are many-volume transactions of the major expeditions and collections of articles published by the Academies of Sciences of the Union republics; monographs dealing with a specific range of problems are also published, but their number is so far limited. A certain lag in summarising work, the absence of the necessary number of reviews and surveys is one of the shortcomings of Central Asian archeology, but it also testifies to its thriving. Let us remind that the archeology of Mesopotamia, for example, where in the past years very little field work was done, abounds in summarising publications, contributed by researchers no longer engaged in processing the finds. The first summarising work on Central Asian archeology is probably the book "Central Asia in the Stone and Bronze Ages," published in 1966 by a group of archeologists from Leningrad. There are summarising elements in Volume I of the "History of the Tajik People,"⁹⁸ although the nature of this work is primarily historical. Unfortunately, the annotation and survey of the numerous publications by archeologists studying Central Asia has not

yet reached the necessary level.⁹⁹

We have already noted that during the third period Central Asian archeology has actively tackled major problems of world history. This is reflected not only in the fact that the work of the Central Asian archeologists and their publications are regularly reviewed and commented abroad,¹⁰⁰ but also in the publication of articles by Soviet archeologists in American, British, French and other foreign periodicals.

Thus, while the second period was that of the formation of Soviet archeology of Central Asia, the third period is undoubtedly that of its flourishing. Soviet Central Asian archeology employs some methods and methodological positions which make for new achievements and discoveries. These methods include chronological classification on the basis of stratigraphic columns (Namazga I-VI, Kobadian I-V, Tali-Barzu I-VI); comprehensive investigation of certain areas to cover sites of all epoch (generally effected by massive expeditions); the tendency to uncover whole sites (Jeitun, Koy-Krylgan-kala, Balalyk-tepe, the regular excavations at Pendzhikent). Still more important are the methodological positions stemming from the general positions of Soviet historical science, which rests on the theoretical foundation of historical materialism. Soviet archeologists regard their finds not merely as culture and art monuments or reflections of certain cultural ties and influences but above all as a source of information on the history of society, irrespective of whether this society was prehistoric or knew incipient feudal relations. Accordingly, archeological finds--and this is a matter of method--are employed to elucidate the nature of the economy, the social relations, the origin of cultures and the ethnic origin of the respective tribes and peoples. Thus, only the complete uncovering of Neolithic Jeitun could give us an idea of the social structure of the people who once lived there; only massive excavations of ordinary tumuli that do not promise any spectacular finds, could shed light on the

origin of several nomad tribes and their links with the modern peoples of Central Asia.

These specific features of studies of Central Asian archeology and the success ensured by them stand out clearly when compared with archeological research in the neighbouring countries. The establishment of Soviet archeology of Central Asia is a major achievement of Soviet historical science; it is a tangible result of the national policy of the Soviet state.

Notes

¹ On the activities of this circle, see: Б.В.Лукин, Из истории русского востоковедения и археологии в Туркестане, Ташкент, 1958.

² А.В. Комаров, Закаспийская область в археологическом отношении, - "Туркестанские ведомости", 1888, № 24-25; М.Д. Джуракулов, Археологическая деятельность А.В. Комарова в Закаспии, - "Труды Самаркандского университета", новая серия, вып. 135, Самарканд, 1964, стр. 129-143.

³ М.Е. Массон, Краткий очерк истории изучения Средней Азии в археологическом отношении, - "Труды Среднеазиатского университета", новая серия, вып. LXXXI, ист.науки, кн. 12, Ташкент, 1956.

⁴ The same period division was applied with regard to Tajikistan by В.А. Litvinsky. See: Б.А. литвинский, Археологическое изучение Таджикистана советской наукой, Сталинабад, 1954.

⁵ В.В. Бартольд, Сочинения, т. IV, М., 1966, стр. 9-10.

⁶ М.Е. Массон, Старый Сайрам, - "Известия Средазкомстариса", вып. III, Ташкент, 1928.

⁷ "Древности Абивердского района", - "Труды Среднеазиатского университета", серия II, Orientalia, вып. 3, Ташкент, 1931.

⁸ "Культура Востока", т. I, М., 1927; т. II, М., 1928.

⁹ М.Е. Массон, Несколько археологических данных к исторической топографии Самарканда в связи с проведением узкоколейной городской железной дороги в 1923 году, - "Известия Средазкомстариса", вып. I, Ташкент, 1926.

10 ст. М.Е. Массон, Краткий очерк..., стр. 14-24;
А.Ю. Якубовский, ГАИМК-ИИМК и археологическое изучение
Средней Азии за 20 лет, - КСИИМК, У1, М.-Л., 1940, стр. 14-
17.

11 Д.Д. Букинич, Некоторые новые данные об Анау и На-
мазга-депе, - "Туркменоведение", 1929, № 5; D.D. Bukinich,
Neues über Anau und Namazga-tepe, - ESA, 1930, t.V, Ss. 15-21.

12 В.А. Шишкин, Василий Лаврентьевич Вяткин, - "Ис-
тория материальной культуры Узбекситана", вып. 4, Ташкент,
1963, стр. 152-154.

13 В.Вяткин, Афрасиаб - городище бывшего Самарканда,
Ташкент, 1927.

14 "Иран", т. II, Л., 1928, стр. 181-185.

15 М.Е. Массон, Краткий очерк..., стр. 24.

16 М.В. Воеводский, М.П. Грязнов, У-суньские могиль-
ники на территории Киргизской ССР, - ВДИ, 1938, № 3.

17 see М.Е. Массон, Городища Нисы в селении Багир
и их изучение, - Труды ЮТАКЭ, т. I, Амхабад, 1949, стр. 29-
31.

18 Г.В. Григорьев, Отчет об археологической разведке
в Янгиюльском районе УзССР в 1934 г., Ташкент, 1935.

19 "Согдийский сборник", Л., 1934.

20 М.Е. Массон, Находка скульптурного карниза первых
веков н.э., Ташкент, 1933.

21 В.В. Струве, Проблема зарождения, развития и раз-
ложения рабовладельческого общества Древнего Востока, М.-
Л., 1934.

22 М.Е. Массон, Термезская археологическая комплекс-

ная экспедиция, - КСИИМК, вып. 8, Л., 1940; "Труды Уа. ФАН СССР", сер. I, вып. 2, Ташкент, 1940, (1941); "Труды АНУАССР", сер. I, Ташкент, 1945.

23 А.Н. Бернштам, Кенкольский могильник, Л., 1940; А.Н. Бернштам, Археологический очерк Северной Киргизии, Фрунзе, 1941; А.Н. Бернштам, Памятники старины Таласской долины, Алма-Ата, 1941.

24 С.Р. Tolstov's book is a summarized publication of the expedition's work (С.П. Толстов, Древний Хорезм, М., 1948).

25 А.И. Тереножкин, Археологические разведки в Хорезме, - СА, № 6, М.-Л., 1940.

26 М.Е. Массон, Экспедиция археологического надзора на строительство Большого Ферганского канала, - КСИИМК, вып. IY, М.-Л., 1940; "Труды Института истории и археологии АНУАССР", т. IY, Ташкент, 1951.

27 А.Н. Бернштам, Историко-культурное прошлое северной Киргизии по материалам Большого Чуйского канала, Фрунзе, 1943; А.Н. Бернштам, Чуйская долина, - МИА СССР, № 14, М.-Л., 1950.

28 А.Ю. Якубовский, Заравшанская археологическая экспедиция 1939 г., - КСИИМК, в. IY, М.-Л., 1940.

29 Г.В. Григорьев, Городище Тали-Барзу, - ТОВЭ, т. 2, Л., 1940.

30 В.А. Шипкин, Исследование городища Варахта и его окрестностей, - КСИИМК, вып. X, М.-Л., 1941.

31 С.П. Толстов, Древности верхнего Хорезма, - ВДИ, 1941, № 1.

32 А.П. Окладников, Неандертальский человек и следы его культуры в Средней Азии, - СА, № 6, М.-Л., 1940;

А.П. Окладников, Тешик-Таш. Палеолитический человек, М., 1949.

33 А.Ю. Якубовский, Самарканд при Тимуре и Тимуридах в XIV и XV вв., Л., 1933; А.Ю. Якубовский, Развалины Ургенча, Сообщ. ГАИМК, т. VI, вып. 2, Л., 1930; А.Н. Бернштам, К исторической топографии Чуйской долины, - ВДИ, 1940, № 2; О.Г. Большаков, Заметки по исторической топографии долины Зеравшана в IX-X вв., - КСИИМК, вып. 61, М., 1956; А.М.Мандельштам, Материалы к историко-географическому обзору Памира и памирских областей, Сталинабад, 1957.

34 А.Ю. Якубовский, Среднеазиатские собрания Эрмитажа, - ТОВЭ, т. II, Л., 1940; М.М. Дьяконов, Ширванский бронзовый водолей I206 г., - in: "Памятники эпохи Руставели", Л., 1938; М.М. Дьяконов, Бронзовая гиря с именем Исмаила Самани, - ТОВЭ, т. II, Л., 1940; А.М. Мандельштам, К вопросу о хронологической классификации древних терракот Согда, - "Труды АНТаджССР", т. XXIX, 1960; Б.Я. Ставиский, Оссуарии из Бия-Наймана, - "Труды Государственного Эрмитажа", т. V, Л., 1961.

35 А.Ю. Якубовский, Главные вопросы изучения истории развития городов Средней Азии, - "Труды ТаджФАН СССР", 1951, т. XXIX; А.М. Беленицкий, Из итогов последних лет раскопок древнего Пенджикента, - СА, 1963, № 3.

36 А.Н. Бернштам, Кенкольский могильник, Л., 1940; А.Н. Бернштам, Согдийская колонизация Семиречья, - КСИИМК, в. VI, М.-Л., 1940.

37 А.Ю. Якубовский, К вопросу об этногенезе узбекского народа, Ташкент, 1941; А.Н. Бернштам, Происхождение тюрков, - ПИДО, 1935, № 5-6; А.Н. Бернштам, Древнейшие тюркские элементы в этногенезе Средней Азии, - СЭ, VI-UP, М.-Л., 1947; А.М. Мандельштам, О некоторых вопросах сложения таджикской народности в Среднеазиатском междуречье, - СА, XX, 1954.

38 М.Е. Массон, Краткое сообщение о результатах исследования фундаментов мавзолея Ходжа Ахмеда в группе Шахзинда в Самарканде в 1924 году, - ИТОРГО, 1924, т. ХУП; М.Е. Массон, Г.А. Пугаченкова, Гумбоз Манаса, М., 1950; Б.А. Литвинский, Архитектурный комплекс Ходжа-Нахиран, - "Труды АН ТаджССР", т. ХУП, 1953; Н.В. Немцева, Исследования в "западном коридоре" архитектурного ансамбля Шахзинда, «История материальной культуры Узбекистана», вып. 5, Ташкент, 1964.

39 М.Е. Массон, К периодизации древней истории Самарканды, - ВДИ, 1950, № 4; М.Е. Массон, Прошлое Ташкента, - "Изв. АН УзССР", 1954, № 2.

40 Works by M.E. Masson, Z.A. Alhamova, E.A. Davidovich, V.M. Masson.

41 М.Е. Массон, Из истории горной промышленности Таджикистана, Л., 1934; М.Е. Массон, К истории горного дела на территории Узбекистана, Ташкент, 1953; Б.А. Литвинский, Древнейшие страницы истории горного дела Таджикистана и других республик Средней Азии, Сталинабад, 1954; Д.Ф. Буряков, Древний серебряный рудник Лашкерк, - СА, 1965, № 1.

42 See note 22.

43 М.Е. Массон, Краткий очерк..., стр. 35-36.

44 Б.Н. Заходер, Данденакан, - "Исторический журнал", 1943, № 3, 4; Е.А. Ершов, Данденакан (археологическая разведка у Ташребата в 1942 г.), - КСИИМК, вып. ХУ, 1947.

45 В.Ф. Гайдукевич, Работы фархадской археологической экспедиции в Узбекистане в 1943-1944 гг., - КСИИМК, в. ХІУ, М.-Л., 1947.

46 С.П. Толстов, По следам древнехорезмийской цивилизации, М.-Л., 1948; С.П. Толстов, По древним дельтам Окса и Яксарта, М., 1962.

- 47 С.П. Толстов и Б.В. Андрианов, Новые материалы по истории развития ирригации в Хорезме, - КСИЭ, в. XXVI, М., 1957.
- 48 "Низовья Аму-Дарьи, Сыркамьш, Узбой", - "Материалы Хорезмской экспедиции", вып. 3, М., 1960.
- 49 "Труды Хорезмской археолого-этнографической экспедиции", т. I-IV, М., 1958; "Материалы Хорезмской экспедиции" вып. I-7, М., 1959-1963.
- 50 М.Е. Массон, Краткий очерк..., стр. 37.
- 51 The Tajik Expedition published its materials in: МИА СССР, № 15, М.-Л., 1950; № 37, 1953; № 66, 1958, № 124, 1964; "Труды ЮТАКЭ", т. I-XP, Ашхабад, 1949-1963; "Материалы ЮТАКЭ", вып. I-2, Ашхабад-Ленинград, 1949-1951.
- 52 The proceedings of this sector were at first published in: "Труды Института истории и археологии", т. I, II, IV, V, VI, Ташкент, 1948-1959, and later in: "История материальной культуры Узбекистана", вып. I-7, Ташкент, 1959-1966.
- 53 The work of the Turkmenian sector, which has had several heads, has so far yielded no material results. See: "Труды Института истории, археологии и этнографии АН Туркм. ССР", т. II, Ашхабад, 1956; т. V, Ашхабад, 1959.
- 54 See, for example, "Библиография изданий Академии наук Таджикской ССР", Сталинабад, 1955. Of particular importance are the annual surveys of the excavations.
- 55 "Средняя Азия в эпоху камня и бронзы", М.-Л., 1966, стр. 5.
- 56 "Труды Киргизской археолого-этнографической экспедиции", тт. I-IV, Москва-Фрунзе, 1956-1960.

- 57 This sector published several monographs, but no special series of proceedings has been launched so far.
- 58 А.П. Окладников, Изучение памятников каменного века в Туркмении, - ТЮТАКЭ, т. П, Ашхабад, 1951 (1953).
- 59 В.А. Ранов, Каменный век Таджикистана, Душанбе, 1965.
- 60 Б.А. Литвинский, А.П. Окладников, В.А. Ранов, Древности Кайрак-кумов, Душанбе, 1962.
- 61 Х.А. Алпысбаев, Открытие памятников древнего и позднего палеолита в южном Казахстане, - СА, 1961, № I.
- 62 Д.Н. Лев, Археологические исследования Самаркандского государственного университета в 1955-1956 гг., - "Труды Самаркандского госуд. ун-та", вып. 101, ч. 2, Самарканд, 1960, Д.Н. Лев, Поселение древнекаменного века в Самарканде, вып. 135, Самарканд, 1964.
- 63 А.П. Окладников, Ходжикентская пещера - новый мустьерский памятник Узбекистана, - КСИА, вып. 82, М., 1961; Х.К. Насретдинов, Грот Обирахмат, - in: "История материальной культуры Узбекистана", вып. 5, Ташкент, 1964.
- 64 А.В. Виноградов, К вопросу о южных связях кельтеминарской культуры, - СЭ, 1957, № I; Г.Ф. Коробкова, Орудия труда и хозяйство неолитических племен Средней Азии (Synopsis of thesis), Л., 1966.
- 65 Первобытная культура в низовьях Зеравшана, Ташкент, 1966.
- 66 Д.А. Заднепровский, Древнеземледельческая культура Ферганы, - МИА СССР, № 118, М.-Л., 1962.
- 67 "Средняя Азия в эпоху камня и бронзы", стр. 243-259.

68 Б.А. Куфтин, Полевой отчет о работе XIV отряда ЮТАКЭ, - ЮТАКЭ, т. УП, Ашхабад, 1956; В.М. Массон, Расписная керамика Южной Туркмении по раскопкам Б.А. Куфтина (ibid).

69 See: ЮТАКЭ, т. X, Ашхабад, 1960 (1961), and also the series "Свод археологических источников" (fascicles compiled by V.M. Masson, V. I. Sarianidi, I. N. Khlopov).

70 В.М. Массон, Новые раскопки на Джейтуне и Карадепе, - СА, 1962, № 3.

71 Г.Н. Лисицына, Орошаемое земледелие эпохи энеолита на юге Туркмении, М., 1965.

72 В.М. Массон, Средняя Азия и Древний Восток, М.-Л., 1964.

73 М.М. Дьяконов, Археологические работы в нижнем течении реки Кафирнигана (Кобалдиан), - МИА СССР, № 37, М.-Л., 1953.

74 ЮТАКЭ, т. XI, Ашхабад, 1962.

75 М.Г. Воробьева, Керамика Хорезма античного периода, - "Труды Хорезмской экспедиции", т. III, М., 1958.

76 А.И. Тереножкин, Согд и Чач, - КСИИМК, вып. XXIII, М.-Л., 1950.

77 В.М. Массон, Древнеземледельческая культура Маргианы, - МИА СССР, № 73, М.-Л., 1959.

78 И.М. Дьяконов, В.А. Лившиц, Документы из Нисы I в. до н.э., М., 1960.

79 The deciphering of the archives started by S.P. Tolstov, has been recently carried on by V.A. Livshits. See: С.П. Толстов, По древним дельтам, стр. 215-222.

80 On the opportunities for conducting this research, see: В.М. Массон, Денежное хозяйство древней Средней Азии по нумизматическим данным, - ВДИ, 1955, № 2.

81 ТЮТАКЭ, т. IV, Ашхабад, 1959; М.Е. Массон, Г.А. Пугаченкова, Мраморные статуи парфянского времени из Нисы, - "Ежегодник Института истории искусств. 1956", М., 1957.

82 Г.А. Пугаченкова, Халчаян, Ташкент, 1966.

83 М.Е. Массон, Средневековый путь из Мерва на Амударью (Чарджоу), - "Известия АН Туркм. ССР", 1955, № I; К.А. Адыков, Главные станции на средневековом торговом пути из Серахса в Мерв, - СА, 1959, № 4; П.Н. Кожемяко, Археологические памятники Таласской долины, Фрунзе, 1963.

84 ТЮТАКЭ, т. XI, Ашхабад, 1962; Н.Н. Бактурская, Хронологическая классификация средневековой керамики Хорезма, - "Труды Хорезмской экспедиции", т. IV.

85 "Живопись древнего Панджикента", М., 1954; "Скульптура и живопись древнего Панджикента", М., 1959.

86 В.А. Шишкин, Варахша, М., 1963.

87 А.И. Альбаум, Балалык-тепе, Ташкент, 1960.

88 А.М. Беленицкий, Древний Пенджикент, - СА, 1959, № I; А.М. Беленицкий, Из итогов последних лет раскопок древнего Пенджикента, - СА, 1963, № 3.

89 М.Е. Массон, Из работ ЮТАКЭ АН СССР в 1962 г., - "Известия АН Туркм. ССР", 1963, № 3, стр. 55-58; Г.А. Кошеленко, Культура Парфии, М., 1966, стр. 95-97.

90 Т.В. Грек, Е.Г. Пчелина, Б.Н. Ставиский, Каратепе - буддийский пещерный монастырь в Старом Термезе, М., 1964.

91 В.А. Булатова-Левина, Буддийский храм в Куве, -СА,

1961, т. 4.

92 Л.Р. Кызласов, Археологические исследования на городище Ак-Бешим в 1953-1954 гг., - "Труды Киргизской экспедиции", т. П, М., 1959.

93 М.А. Итина, Памятники энеолита и бронзового века Средней Азии, автореферат, М., 1951; А.В. Виноградов, Кельтеминарская культура, автореферат диссертации, М., 1957.

94 Б.В. Андрианов, Из истории земель древнего орошения Хорезмского оазиса. - in: "Памяти академика Л.С.Берга", М.-Л., 1955.

95 М.Г. Воробьева, Изображение львов на ручках сосудов из Хорезма, - КСИЭ, в. XXX, М., 1958.

96 С.П. Толстов, Огузы, печенеги, море Даукара, - СЭ, 1950, № 4; С.П. Толстов, М.А. Итина, Проблема Суярганской культуры, - СА, 1960, № 1; Ю.А. Раппопорт, Хорезмийские астоданы (К истории религии Хорезма), - СЭ, 1962, № 4.

97 In Leningrad, Kh. A. A. Alpysbayev, M. R. Kasymov, R. Kh. Suleimanov took a post-graduate course in the Paleolithic; U. Islamov, A. A. Askarov and M. Orazbayev took a course in the Neolithic and Bronze Age.

98 "История таджикского народа", т. I. "С древнейших времен до У в. н.э.", под редакцией Б.Г. Гафурова и Б.А. Литвинского, М., 1963.

99 "Sovetskaya arkheologiya" ("Soviet Archeology") carried from time to time surveys of published literature on Tajikistan (1958, № 2), Turkmenia (1962, № 2, 1964, № 1) and Kazakhstan (1964, № 2).

100 See, for example, G.S. Frumkin's surveys, published in "Central Asian Review" and reviews in "East and West."

Printed in the USSR