IQRO JURNALI / 2023
GUVOHNOMA № 060680

E-ISSN : 2181-4341
https://wordlyknowledge.uz
IMPACT FACTOR(SJIF) : 3,934

IMPACT FACTOR (RESEARCH BIB) – 7,245

SPECIAL ISSUE, VOLUME 5, ISSUE 2, 2023

ESTATES IN THE SOGDIAN OASIS IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES

Murodov Shokhruz
Karshi State University magistr

ANNOTATION

This article describes the division of the Sughd Confederation into historical and geographical regions within the Western Turkic Khanate, the dynasties involved in political governance, the political role of local titles, and the military and political ties between Sughd and the Khanate. During this period, some Sughd administrations retained local dynastic rule, while others established dynastic rule related to the khanate.

KEYWORDS

Sughd, Western Turkic Khanate, system of government, local dynasties, Zhao dynasty, titles, Chinese chronicles.

In the early Middle Ages, the Sughd oasis was first under the Hephthalites (420-565), and then under the Turkish Khanate (552-744), Samarkand, Kushania (Kattakurgan), Ishtikhan, Fay, Maimurg, Kabudon, Panch (Panjikent), Kesh (Shahrisabz), Nakhabz. It consisted of dozens of vassal kingdoms such as (Nasaf/Karshi) and so on. If we look at the written monuments of that period (Chinese, Byzantine, Sugdian, Arab-Persian) and numismatic materials, we can see that in this period, local dynasties ruled in some parts, and dynasties related to the Turkish khanate ruled in the rest.

In the early Middle Ages, there were 8 historical-geographical regions in the Sughd oasis, almost all of which had their own ruling dynasties and were named as follows: Samarkand, Kesh, Panch-Maymurg, Nakhlab, Kushonia, Ishtikhan, Kabudon and Fay.

Each of these historical-geographic regions had its own territory, ruling dynasty, political-administrative center - the capital, coinage (with some exceptions), symbol of power - seal, army, title system, etc. For example, in Samarkand - ikhshid, in Kesh - ikhrid, in Nakhab - ispahbad, in Panch - afshin. In the rest, there is no written source information about the title of the rulers. Also, among them, the rulers who minted their own coins were the following: Samarkand, Kesh, Nakhlazh, Panch [1]. Whether the other 4 dominions minted their own coins or vice versa is not yet fully established. Apparently, they used Samarkand coins in trade and other economic relations. At the same time, only 4 out of 8 principalities have known the symbol of power: Samarkand - , Kesh - , Nakhlazh - , Panch - , ().

From the period when the Turkish khanate occupied Sughd until the fall of the khaganate from the historical stage, there was a change in the management of some of the oases, and the local dynasty was replaced by a new dynasty by representatives of the khaganate, while in some of them the local dynasty continued to rule.

As mentioned above, according to the information in the Chinese chronicles, when the Khaganate troops entered the Amudarya-Syr Darya region, the ruling dynasty of most of the oases here belonged to the Zhaowu dynasty, and they were An (Bukhara), Tsao (Kabudon), Shi (Choch), Mi (Maymurg).), He (Kushonia), Khosyun (Khorazm), Maodi (Bitik or Vardona?), Shyshi (Kesh),

Kan (Samarkand) were divided into branches, among which the dynasty in Samarkand was the central house[2].

From this information in the chronicles, it can be understood that 5 dynasties in the Sughd oasis, such as Samarkand, Maimurg, Kushonia, Kesh, Kabudon, belong to the Zhjaovu dynasty, among which Samarkand is not only for these dominions, but also related dynasties in separate oases such as Choch, Bukhara, Khorezm in neighboring or nearby regions. had occupied a central position for a while.

There is information confirming that Kesh, who settled in the south-eastern part of the Sughd oasis and for a time took Nakhab under his control, was a leader in the Sughd oasis along with Samarkand. For example, in the "Tan-shu" chronicle, it is mentioned that in 605 the ruler of Shi (Kesh) Dijche was the first to send an ambassador to China, built a city called Tshi (Kesh), became a powerful ruler, and the territory of his rule reached a distance of several thousand li. ruler Shashebi (Shishpir) is said to have sent an ambassador to China[3]. It is probably due to the fact that Kesh became politically stronger and claimed supremacy in the oasis, and sent an ambassador to China. had attacked[4].

One of the local rulers in the Sughd oasis was Panch (Panjikent). He was placed one or side by side with Maimurg, and often the two were seen as a single ruler. A little later than Samarkand and Kesh, the Panch rule claimed the central authority of Sughd. This is confirmed by some information related to Mi (Maymurg) and some information in the Mugh mountain Sugdian documents [5]. In contrast to Samarkand, Mi / Mimokhe (Maymurg) has repeatedly come into conflict with the Khaganate. In the 640s, the Western Turkish ruler Dulu Khan attacked Kangyu (Sugd) and crushed the Mi (Maymurg) rule [6].

At this point, it is necessary to pay attention to other information that will clarify the issue. In particular, coins minted with the toponym Maymurg have not yet been found among the Sugdian coins, on the contrary, coins with the name Panch in the pncy form form a large group[7]. This once again confirms the idea that Maimurg and Panch were a single political union within the Sughd confederation.

It can be considered that the administrative-political unit, which includes the eastern part of Sughd, or rather, the eastern and southeastern regions of the upper basin of the Zarafshan River, appeared in various language sources of its time under the names Maymurg or Panch. In fact, these toponyms with different geographical locations were applied to a single territory and represented a single dominion, but in some cases were understood as separate geographical areas. Chinese chronicles, Sugdian-language epigraphic monuments related to the Sugdian diaspora found in Eastern Turkestan and Northeast India ("Old letters" of the 3rd-4th centuries AD, Chinanchkand (Turfon) document of 639, Upper Indus / Shatial rock inscriptions, etc. .), without the name Panch, the toponym Maimurg is always mentioned [8], on the contrary, the use of the name Panch in relation to this area in the Mugh mountain Sughd documents indicates that for a while both toponyms were used for the same geographically and politically the same area. Indeed, in the Sugdian documents created in this area, the names of large places such as Samarkand, Ustrushona, and even the names of small villages around Upper Zarafshan and Urgut are recorded, and the absence of the name Maymurg confirms this opinion.

Small principalities such as Kabudon and Ishtikhan in the northern and northwestern regions of the Sughd oasis also had a special place in the political life of the oasis. In the Chinese chronicles, it is mentioned that the dominions of Sughd such as Mi (Maymurg - Panch), Middle Tsao (Kabudon)

and Western Tsao (Ishtikhan) bordered on Ustrushona [9]. In the annals, 3 rulers are mentioned under the name of "Tsao", and although the difference between them is not clearly indicated in "Bei-shi" and "Sui-shu", in "Tan-shu" they focus on each of them separately, and this adjacent to each other the place of the rulers, the center of management and the borders are mentioned. According to the information in it, the administrative center of the "Western Tsao" - Ishtikhan dominion was the city of Sidikhin (Ishtikhan) and the "Middle Tsao" - the administrative center of the Kabudon principality was the city of Gadichzhen[10]. The Kabudon dominion, that is, the Middle Tsao dominion, borders the Western Tsao (Ishtikhan) in the south, and Ishtikhan is shown to be the neighbor of Shi (Kesh) and Bolan (Nakhlab?) to the south. It can be seen that the southern borders of Ishtikhan extended far, and the vast steppe area between Central Sughd - Samarkand and its surroundings and Southern Sughd - Kesh and Nakhlab belonged to it.

Middle Tsao, that is, Kabudon, is located north of Kan (Samarkand) and is recorded as the southern neighbor of Eastern Tsao - Ustrushona. On the other hand, the name of the Kabudon kingdom was mentioned differently in Chinese chronicles at different times, and in "Bei-shi" it is mentioned that "Gabudan is located in the northwest of Siwangin (Samarkand), and its ruler lives in the city of Gabudani" [11], and Xuan Zang calls it Kienputana. mention is also noticeable.

In Arab sources, Kabudon, Kabudonjakas, and it is shown 2 farsakhs (16 miles) north of Samarkand, it is also noticed that this land was located near Samarkand and was a small dominion in the northern direction from Samarkand to Ustrushona [12].

Researchers equate Kabudonjakas in Arabic sources with today's Gubdin[13]. For the first time V. According to the researcher, the seat of Kabudan rulership, which was equated with Gubdin or Kabud by Tomashek, is the same as Kabudanjakas, which is indicated in Arab sources as 2 farsakhs north of Samarkand, and whose traces are preserved today in the name of the village of Gubdan or Gubdun[14]. V.V. Barthold considered that the village of Kabud was in the place of today's Besh-ariq village[15].

Although Ishtikhan's rule was located somewhat further from the center - Samarkand compared to Kabudon and Maimurg, the dynastic affinity between them was much stronger than others. As mentioned above, Samarkand ikhshid Gurak appointed his eldest son Turgar (738-750) to the administration of Ishtikhan. The dynastic relationship between both rulers apparently dates back to the beginning of the 7th century. For example, in the "Sui-shu" chronicle, it is mentioned that this land does not have its own manager, that the ruler of Kan (Samarkand) appointed his son named Tsao (Ishtikhan) to manage it[16]. O.I. Smirnova assumes that this event took place in 600-620 [17].

Information about Fay's political history is relatively rare. In Tabari's work, in the account of the events of the 720s (the first quarter of the 8th century), Fay's ruler is recorded as "Turk Khagan". O.I. Smirnova explains that he is not a ruler with the title "khakhan", but a ruler named Turkkhakhan[18]. Indeed, it is unlikely that the ruler of Fay, a small principality, would have called his title "khagan", specifically "khagan of the Turks". Because, during this period, not only Fay, but also the Sughd confederation, to which he belonged, were part of the Turkish Khaganate, and none of their rulers ruled with the highest title of "khagan". At that time, this title belonged only to the chief ruler of the Turkic Khaganate. If we take into account that Tabari's work represents the chief ruler "khakhan" in all the scenes related to the chief ruler of the Turks who fought against the Arabs, then the Fay ruler "Turk-khakhan" in his work is either the result of some misunderstanding, or else it is in the sense of respect for the chief suzerains of this ruler - the khagans. it turns out that he called himself by this name.

Thus, in the early Middle Ages, especially in the first decades under the rule of the Khaganate, the Sughd oasis consisted of 8 oases - estates, each of which had its own administrative apparatus. Among them, Samarkand acted as the central authority and had strong control over small principalities such as Ishtikhan and Maimurg. This situation is more visible in examples such as the rulers of Samarkand having their residence in these lands or appointing princes to their management. At times, Cash also claimed such a position, but his control was more of a sphere of influence over the Likeness.

Literature

[1] Смирнова О.И. Очерки из истории Согда. М.: Наука, 1970, С. 167-181; Бобоёров Ғ. Турк хоқонлиги даврида Суғд (бошқарув тизими) // Шарқшунослик, №11. - Т., 200. – Б. 119-129.

[2] Бичурин Н. Я. Собрание сведений о народах, обитавших в Средней Азии в древние времена. В 3-х томах. – М. - Л.: Изд. АН СССР. – том II С. 310; Chavannes E. Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Turks) occidentaux // Сборник трудов Орхонской экспедиции. Вып. 6. – СПб., 1903. P. 134; Смирнова О. И. Очерки из истории... – С. 37.

[3] Бичурин Н. Я. Собрание сведений... II. – С. 316; Бобоёров Ғ., Кубатин А. Хитой манбалари / Ўзбекистон тарихи. Хрестоматия, 2/1. – Т.: Фан, 2014. – Б. 43.

[4] Бичурин Н. Я. Собрание сведений... I. – С. 287; Chavannes E. Çin yıllıklarına göre... – S. 90.

[5] Grenet F., de la Vaissiere E. The last days of Panjikent ... P. 364–372.

[6] Бичурин Н. Я. Собрание сведений... I. – С. 287; Chavannes E. Çin yıllıklarına göre Batı Türkleri. Çeviri M. Koç. – İstanbul: Selenge, 2007. – S. 91.

[7] Лурье П.Б. Счастливый правитель, царь Пенджикента Чегин Чур Билгä // Центральная Азия от Ахеменидов до Тимуридов. Археология, история, культура. Материалы международной научной конференции, посвященной 100-летию со дня Pavel B. Lurje 30 рождения А. М. Беленицкого. В.П. Никаноров (ed.). Санкт-Петербург, 2005. p. 127-131; Бабаяров Г., Кубатин А. К вопросу о монетах Согда с титулом «хатун». Б. 106-107.

[8] Vaissière E. de la. Sogdian traders: a history. Translated by J. Ward. (Handbook of Oriental studies = Handbuch der Orientalistik. Section eight, Central Asia; v. 10). – Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2005. P. 120.

[9] Бичурин Н. Я. Собрание сведений... II. – С. 312-313.

[10] Бичурин Н. Я. Собрание сведений... II. – С. 312-313.

[11] Бичурин Н. Я. Собрание сведений... II. – С. 264.

[12] Бартольд В.В. Туркестан в эпоху монгольского нашествия / Соч. Т. 1. – М., 1963. – С. 144; Ахун-бабаев Х.Г. Древний Кабуданжакас (к вопросу локализации, генезиса этапов развития раннефеодальных владении и средневековых рустаков Самаркандского Согда) // Археология Средней Азии. Тезисы докладов. – Ташкент, 1991. – С. 26-27.

[13] Бартольд В.В. Туркестан в эпоху монгольского нашествия ... – С. 146; Ekrem E. Hsüan-Tsang Seyahetnamesi'ne göre Türkistan Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü (Basılmamış doktora tezi), Ankara, 2003. – S. 130.

[14] Tomaschek W. Central asiatische Studien, I. Sogdiana. – Wien, 1877. – S. 85; Ekrem E. Hsüan-Tsang Seyahetnamesi'ne göre Türkistan … S. 130.

[15] Бартольд В.В. Туркестан в эпоху монгольского нашествия ... С. 146.

[16] Бичурин Н. Я. Собрание сведений... II. – С. 287.

[17] Смирнова О.И. Сводний каталог согдийских монет ... С. 424; Ғойибов Б. Суғд тарихидан лавҳалар ... – Б. 116.

[18] Смирнова О.И. Очерки из истории Согда ... С. 244.

Bakhodirovna, S. S. (2022). TURKIC TITLES IN EARLY MEDIEVAL SOGD RULE. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE & INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH ISSN: 2277-3630 Impact factor: 7.429, 11(10), 10-15.

Сулайманова, С. Б. (2022). ИЛК ЎРТА АСРЛАР ЁЗМА МАНБАЛАРИДА СУҒД ВОҲАСИ ТАРИХИ. ВЗГЛЯД В ПРОШЛОЕ, (SI-2).

Sulaymanova, S. (2023). Ethnocultural Processes of Turkish Khanate Administration in the Sugd Oasis. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS DIPLOMACY AND ECONOMY, 2(4), 161-165.

Сулайманова, С. Б. (2023). METHODS IN THE GOVERNANCE OF THE WEST TURK KAGANATE IN THE SOGDIAN OASIS. ВЗГЛЯД В ПРОШЛОЕ, 6(8).

Сулайманова, С. Б. (2023). История Согдийского оазиса в письменных источниках раннего средневековья. In Россия и Восток. К 300-летию СПбГУ (pp. 233-235).

Bakhodir, S. (2022). Modern Trends in the Terminology of Public Administration of the Russian Language. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE LEARNING AND APPLIED LINGUISTICS, 1(5), 41-43.

Sulaymanov, B. (2023). FACTORS OF THE MODERN DEVELOPMENT OF THE TERMINOLOGY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN THE RUSSIAN AND UZBEK LANGUAGES. International Bulletin of Engineering and Technology, 3(3), 20-22.

KNOWLEDGE