

## Monuments of the Early Iron Age of the Aral-Caspian Region as a Historical Source

Yerdan Oralbay<sup>1</sup>, Azil Khan Tazhekeyev<sup>2</sup>, Gulzhan Meirmanova<sup>3</sup>, Rustem Darmenov<sup>4</sup>,  
Seidali Bilalov<sup>5</sup> and Gulmira Amirgalina<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1,3</sup>*Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Al-Farabi Avenue 71, Almaty,  
Republic of Kazakhstan, 050040*

<sup>2,4,5,6</sup>*The Korkyt Ata Kyzylorda State University, Aitekebie Str. 29A,  
Kyzylorda, Republic of Kazakhstan, 120014*

**KEYWORDS** The Early Iron Age. Archaeological Sites

**ABSTRACT** Studying antiquities of the Aral-Caspian region early Iron Age is the urgent task of modern archeology in the course of solving the ethnic and cultural problems. At the same time special attention should be given to funerary monuments and places of worship, carrying a large amount of defining ethnic and ethno-differentiating information. These monuments, due to the wide use of stone, apparently extracted from a deep canyon, are well preserved. From the standpoint of historical geography and archeology, the area is very valuable, as it is situated at the crossroads of ancient cultures and civilizations. It is a transboundary area that formerly served as the staging point on migration routes, ancient and medieval times. It was an important link in the cultural diffusion processes on the territory of Kazakhstan, between the Central and West Asia and the Caucasus and Eastern Europe. The authors made a comparative analysis of a chronologically and culturally related neighboring monuments and remote regions of Eurasia. The authors identified common trends in the establishment, development and transformation of the early Iron Age cultures.

### INTRODUCTION

A great contribution was made to the study of the material heritage of the Aral-Caspian region (monuments of the Early Iron Age) (Oralbay et al. 2014: 431) by a Strategic Research Program of the historical heritage of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

Proceedings of the archaeological sites of the early iron Aral-Caspian region can be divided into three phases: before the October Revolution of 1917, the Soviet period (1917-1991), and the period of independence of the Republic of Kazakhstan (1991-present). During the Soviet period and the period of independence, scientists are divided into three parts: 1960-1987, 1988-2004, and 2004 to present day (Oralbay 2015: 143). The researchers described the pre-revolutionary historical and cultural sites in general, as they are not isolated monuments of the Early Iron Age (Oralbay 2015: 143). The head of the Khorezm expedition SP Tolstoy became the first to explore in the 30<sup>th</sup> year of 20<sup>th</sup> century, the Aral-Caspian Sea (the Aral Sea area) (Itina et al. 1996: 19-21), in turn, the researchers did not study the Caspian Sea region to the sixties of the XX century. For example, "Archaeological Map of Kazakhstan" does not contain monuments named area (Aki-

shev 1960: 367-369). Other researchers explored the monuments of the Early Iron Age Aral-Caspian Sea from 1960 to 2004 (Yagodin 1976; Dzhenitto et al. 2000; Oralbay 2015: 144-147). The national program "Cultural Heritage" started a new stage in the study of the monuments of the early Iron Age Aral-Caspian in the year 2004. Scientists of Kazakhstan and foreign countries are conducting research in the area. (Samashev et al. 2007a; Samashev et al. 2007b; Samashev et al. 2011; Azhigali 2002, 2011, 2014, 2015; Tazhekeyev and Kurmankulov 2014; Kurmankulov and Utubaev 2015; Oralbay 2015: 144-154). Z. Samashev classified Aral-Caspian region as an area of contact between cultures and civilizations of early Iron Age (Oralbay et al. 2014).

Early Iron Age in Central Eurasia has not been studied. Not defined chronological framework as the period as a whole, and its individual stages. Do not clear the species belonging creators of industries during the early Iron Age. Poor explored the cultural and genetic connections identified cultures of the studied period. Aral-Caspian region, which occupies the territory of the Volga in the west to the Turgai Trough in the East, from the foothills of the Southern Urals steppes in the north to the sandy deserts of Turkmenistan to the south, is no exception.

Domination in arid conditions in the study area throughout the Quaternary period hampered the process of sedimentation over a wide area outside the river valleys and seacoasts. This led to the formation of a special type of archaeological sites with “superficial cultural horizons”. The main feature of such monuments is the representation on the same surface at different times of complexes that, on the one hand, makes it impossible to obtain the direct dating and deprives researchers accompanying archaeological information, and on the other, provides a wealth of stone artifacts, which as a rule, provide a good relative periodization industrial complexes. A comparison of the archaeological periodization and climate stratigraphy of the Quaternary period, sufficiently detailed for the Caspian region, allows for valid geochronological reconstruction of monuments on the identified surface-cultural horizon.

Study of the Stone Age to modern archeology items, anthropology, geology, paleogeography allow understanding for many anthropogenesis processes taking place in this era, and determined the further development of cultures and ethnic groups in the Aral-Caspian region.

Thus, in recent years has made a great advance in the study of Early Iron Ages in the region, there is a rethinking of views on the region’s history. Currently, work on the study of the Aral-Caspian Early Iron Ages is continuing. However, many areas still are still on the map as “white spots”.

### Objectives

The subject of research is the Paleolithic of Aral-Caspian region in the light of the current state of knowledge of the region. It plays a huge role in the understanding of the ancient history of the period, both the region and adjacent territories, which has had an impact on the development of industries subsequent crop period Early Iron Age, as an object of research and applied geological sciences data (geomorphology, palynology). The purpose of this paper is to study the archaeological monuments of the Early Iron Age Aral-Caspian region, together with the monuments of other regions in the context of their overall contribution to the history of Eurasia I millennium BC.

- The author reviewed all archaeological sites of the Early Iron Age Aral-Caspian region, which have been investigated in accordance

with national strategic programs of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

- The author carries out a comparative analysis of the existing monuments of the Early Iron specified geographical area.
- The author defines the contribution of the investigated object as a source on the history of Eurasia in the I millennium BC.

The purpose of work is to study Early Iron Ages Kazakh part of the Aral-Caspian region (timing and pace of settlement in the region, archaeological sites, its species, adapting to the open spaces of arid steppes, cultural and chronological correlation of identified archaeological complexes with adjacent regions materials) based on the analysis and systematization of stone implements collections resulting from field research, compilation of published and archival materials.

### Tasks

The objective will be achieved by formulating and solving a number of successive objectives of the study:

- To analyze the topography of the locations of cultural monuments of Early Iron Ages depending on geomorphological characteristics of the region.
- Examine the technical and typological structure available for the study of the monuments.
- To correlate the identified industrial complexes of the Aral-Caspian region with complexes adjacent territories.
- To carry out cultural and chronological interpretation of the Early Iron Ages monuments in the region.

### METHODOLOGY

The authors adopt the method of comparative historical analysis to identify the general and the specific, in the development of the Early Iron Age monuments of the Aral-Caspian region and other regions of Eurasia.

Available at the researchers’ disposal sources of housing is quite wide and full of important and responsible opinions. At the same time, the Early Iron Ages phase is not uniformly understood. Some periods are represented settlements and burial grounds, examined a wide area, the other, only marginally studied objects. Among the studied settlements are often found single

and multi villages, part of which gives the sequence stratigraphic column existence of complexes of different periods of the Bronze Age. The presence of “pure” single-layer monuments allows to isolate complexes of nestrati-infected settlements and create an objective picture of the development of settlements for a long time.

Research methodology includes both traditional archaeological methods of studying the sources and methods borrowed it from the arsenal of natural and exact sciences. Analysis of sources as possible was carried out comprehensively. In the analysis of ceramics and tools used comparative-typological and statistical methods. During the reconstruction of the burial rites-nur Thai, Atasusk and Nura groups used paleo-anthropological materials. Characteristics of the population of animal, breed cattle morphological features, the specifics of its cutting of carcasses based on data paleozoology. Historical constructions of the author are based on the correlation of the results transcultural sync Central Kazakhstan Antiques complexes with neighboring regions and comparing them with the radiocarbon dates obtained for the Early Iron Age monuments.

## OBSERVATIONS AND DISCUSSION

### **Archaeological Sites of the Early Iron Age Aral-Caspian Region, According to the Research of National Strategic Programs of the Republic of Kazakhstan**

One of the important tasks of modern archeology of Kazakhstan is studying the antiquities of the Aral-Caspian region early Iron Age. This is to address the issues of ethno genesis and evolution of material and spiritual culture. Drawing insights from the framework of national strategic programs temple-sanctuary Sarmatian culture, Kyzyl Uyik, which is located in the North Ustyurt, scientists have considered it as one of the most important monuments of the Aral-Caspian region in the early Iron Age. The provisional date of construction of the temple-sanctuary is IV centuries B.C. to II centuries A.D. Temple sanctuary Kyzyl Uyik had a powerful ‘closed’ religious center, which conducted the service and worship of deities. To understand how the deities were devoted and erected in Ustyurt sanctuary, it is necessary to study the structure and the main religious building of the temple of objects (stone statues). Anthropomorphic sculp-

tures were located mainly to the South and East of the iconic circular design, forming small ranks and groups with the person. They have always been oriented to the West or North, towards the sunset, a mythical ‘land of the dead’. The existing ideas, then, were that the priest ‘restored’ world order that disrupted death or disaster. Temple sanctuary, “Kyzyl Uyik” is the most grandiose in Kazakhstan multistage circular stone structure plan relating to the middle and the end of I millennium BC (Oralbay et al. 2014: 431-432).

Another important monument studied in the framework of national programs has a settlement in Chirik-Rabat in the Aral Sea. Mound occupies the entire area of a natural hill (850 x 600 m), which is strengthened by the powerful fortification system. At the bottom of the hill, fort residents dug trenches with a width of 40 meters, a depth of 4.5 m of extra land, where they built the outer shaft. Currently, the height of the shaft is 3m wide at the base, up to 8m-10 m (Oralbay et al. 2014: 432). Archaeologists have excavated one mound, while the most ancient group of monuments in the territory of the settlement consists of six earthen mounds, four of which are located within the central rectangular reinforcement. The researchers also uncovered some mound on the site of two funerary buildings.

Originally, Chirik-Rabat was a fortified settlement, which inhabitants built on the bank of the river Zhanadarya. It served as a refuge for the local tribal chiefs while burial mounds are located in the mausoleums (Kurmankulov 2015).

Monuments of Chirik-Rabat consist of a dynamic complex consisting of a number of housing and commercial, burial and funeral characters Chirik-Rabat (1,2), settlement and mausoleums Balanda (1,2,3,4) Babishov Mullah (1,2).

Mausoleums research has shown that a significant portion of them is subjected to internal restructuring and they are repeatedly used for burials, in the same mausoleums made with cremation and inhumation in wooden coffins on stretchers and mats.

Research mausoleums Chirik-Rabat culture makes it possible to assume that among the main, their mass is likely to refer to the earliest structures, to bypass the corridor where the initial combustion occurs.

General dating sites Chirik-Rabat culture within the IV-II centuries BC (Tazhekeev and Kurmankulov 2014: 236-248).

### **A Comparative Analysis of All Archaeological Monuments of the Early Iron Age Aral-Caspian Region**

Firstly, the authors considered the archaeological sites of individual areas. For example, archaeologists have studied the 13 monuments of the Early Iron Age within the Mangistau. They have funeral-memorial complexes and temples, shrines, some of which are distinct and unique. A variety of funeral rites show different chronological framework and the tribal affiliation of the dead. The cemetery Beit-tube from 6-5 century B.C. is the earliest of the studied. It was located on a coastal sand dune and was destroyed by wind erosion. Materials of Early Sarmatian time have a position in the group looted graves cult-burial structures Dikiltas, Meretsay 2 Tubezhik 1, Tubezhik 2 and Teren (Samashev et al. 2007a: 140-144).

The ossuary burial rite was performed sporadically. Burial catacomb types abroad are located in areas like Syrlytam and Shagatay. At the beginning of the XXI century, archaeologists have unearthed a series of religious buildings: Bayte 3, Meretsay 2, Tubezhik 1 and 2, Baskuduk 5 in the Mangistau region. During the archaeological survey, researchers have identified 20 more sites of this type in the Mangistau region.

A high domed structure located at the base of these structures was built by the builders of the perimeter stonewall with soil and stone filling. The height of the retaining wall reached 2m to 5m with a diameter of 10m to 20m and height of the dome, at least 4m to 12m. The builders have built a retaining wall of the processed and were carefully matched to other stone blocks and the vertical plane of the wall had a positive bias. These structures resembled a round shape in terms of a mausoleum with a high dome. The input, openings builders issued, was in the form of a narrow corridor, or the well manhole from the surface of the retaining wall. The interior had a different plan to form a circle, cross and square. Sanctuary Byte 3 is the most famous monument in this series (Samashev et al. 2007a: 147-152).

Ustyurt in the historical and cultural heritage of the Caspian region is known to the scientific world for its famous sanctuaries with anthropomorphic sculptures. Recently, scientists have identified more than a dozen sites where they found fragments of stone sculptures depicting people. Their number in the sanctuaries may be

small sculptures from 2-3 to whole pantheons (about 40 in the sanctuary of anthropomorphic Byte 3). The sculpture could achieve growth of the child or simply be a gigantic (more than 2m). Some of the sculptures are very realistic and are similar to the classical sculpture, but a large part is sketchy. Stone-cutter gave the stone block outline of a human figure and they carefully worked through the details of the face, usually with a mustache, hair or headdress, jewelry (bracelets, hryvnia), hand position (right stretched along the body, left lying on his belly), shoulder belt and weapons on it (swords and daggers in scabbards on). A sacrificial altar in the form of large stone table was placed near the statues (Samashev et al. 2007a: 202-213).

Monuments of the Early Iron Age of the Aral Aral-Caspian geographic area were represented in the majority of tangible heritage Saka and Saka-Massaget cultures. For example, they were represented by world famous burials in the cemeteries of the South Tagisken and Uygarak. The scientists of the South Tagisken cemetery discovered about 50 burial mounds, of which they have unearthed 38 and in Uygarak, archaeologists examined about 80, and have unearthed 70.

South Tagisken cemetery is divided into two sets, the first one contains 12 burial mounds, while the second one has southern 29. Nine mounds are located in the territory of the necropolis, North Tagisken. South Tagisken dates back to VII-V centuries. The mounds V century B.C. grouped in the Southern part of the cemetery were previously located at the Northern end. Uygarak burial mounds date back to VII-VI century B.C. and the mounds of the V century B.C. are concentrated in the three groups, the East (30), central (27) and Western (21).

Burials in South Tagisken and Uygarak are performed in the ancient horizon and groundwater wells for ritual burials and cremation is done on some of them. Relatives of the dead and tribesmen always poured on top mound. The preserved height of mounds is 0.3-2m, while the diameter is 10-40m.

Monuments of the developed period of the early iron in Aral district were developed on the basis of culture Saka tribes, Syr-Darya, preceding the period (burial Uygarak, South Tagisken). They also experienced the strong cultural influence of agricultural oases, South of Central Asia, which is manifested in the methods of machin-

ery construction, architecture features and forms of pottery ceramics (Tazhekeev 2011: 160-175).

Despite the fact that the influence of Southern culture gave Saka tribes, IV-II centuries BC, in the lower reaches of the Syr-Darya a new look, the continuity of this culture in relation to the early Saka monuments were traced, not only to ceramics, but also in the funeral ceremony (Tazhekeev and Kurmanlulov 2014: 246).

Archaeological evidence of the Caspian region shows that the burial and memorial tradition of ancient nomads of the region were associated with the cult of worship of the spirit of the ancestors. The findings of Bayte I, Bayte III, Karamonke, Teren, Kaynar, Kyzyl Uyik were located on the Western and Northern escarpment of Ustyurt and they referred to IV-II centuries B.C., which illustrate the existence of such a tradition. Sacred places are fixed in the center of each temple, they consist of rounded stone blocks and on the outside, and there are Sarmatian tamga and engraving.

The main religious building played a key role in the life of ancient nomads of the region. It was a center of worship and the administration of rituals, for example, the announcement of a new leader, care for the world other lords during wars, natural disasters, and ceremonial hunting trips.

Researchers studied the content of the Sarmatian tamga signs and believed that these places of worship were built for certain patriarchal families or private delivery, perhaps for the representatives of the left tamgas during frequent visits. They also believed that the temple was a place of worship and sacrifice (Samashev et al. 2011: 128-134).

While stone carvers, architects, sculptors have been extremely popular, ancient nomads erected unique architecture, which required a huge investment of human resources, some required amount of raw materials, ease of production and suitable for processing all over the great Eurasian steppe belt.

For the reconstruction of the world, cultural and economic type of ancient nomads, researchers need to use an integrated approach in the study of archaeological sites in the region. The study of architecture buildings requires a special approach and scientists need to develop self-direction in science of archaeo or architecture. Of course, the churches have a unique structure, different from others and are the ritual monu-

ments in the region (Samashev et al. 2011: 171-179).

In the North, Ustyurt the Kyzyl Uyik is the only major temple, which belonged to the tribe or confederacy of tribes. Sanctuary Kainar, Kyzylkuys, Tasastau I, II, III were located not far from it and they were local temples. The authors believe that these shrines were built by builders of about one century before the Kyzyl Uyik. Tasastau system of wells, springs Kainar, settlements paleo metal era (Manaysor I, II), reconstructed nomadic routes and trade routes in the region, testified to the development of an earlier era.

The main religious building on the specifics of the topography and on the scale is the main and most important object of the sanctuary of Kyzyl Uyik. Sanctuary is a monument, as it was not bunk as Bayte III and was not like the sanctuary Karamonke and Teren, which were based on two concentric walls made armor.

Construction Kyzyl Uyik in from IV B.C. to II in B.C. played the role of the cult of the temple, and later it was used for different purposes. Therefore, researchers found objects in its interior (at various depths), which belonged to different chronological periods. These research results by the method 14C, showed the operation of the monument and that of the Middle Ages (Samashev et al. 2011: 171-185).

The findings of the investigated objects of Chirik-Rabat testify to a high social level, residents of settlements and villages, which were headed by the king and the military aristocracy. The society is divided into several hierarchical categories, Kings took the top step (huge mounds), and the priesthood and the military aristocracy were located below (archaeologists have discovered one of their burials in the year 2005). The other members of the society occupied the lowest rung and settled in numerous villages in the vicinity, such as unfortified settlement of Chirik-Rabat. Research on the material culture of the Chirik-Rabat tribes showed that the region is in close contact with the tribes of the Middle East, the Mediterranean and the civilization of Egypt (Oralbay et al. 2014: 432). In order to identify the authors of carriers, Chirik-Rabat culture, with one of the popularly written sources or tribal peoples, they do not need to know the geographical position of the monuments of this culture. Firstly, people of Chirik-Rabat archaeological complex are the successor to the

culture of Saks lower reaches of the Syr Darya (Uygarak, South Tagisken), so there was a significant population of ethnic unity from VII to II century B.C in this territory. Secondly, the researchers identified a complex offer, Chirik-Rabat culture dayami (dahami) or apasiakami (Tazhekeev 2011: 169-172).

### **Monuments of the Early Iron Age Aral-Caspian in Studying the History of the Peoples of Eurasia in the I millennium BC**

The Aral-Caspian historical and cultural region geographically includes the territory of the country plains of Turan. Experts have recognized the Caspian lowlands and the southern tip of the Ural Mountains as an important center of ethno-cultural and ethno-genetic processes in Eurasia (Azhigali 2002: 9). Geopolitically in the region, since ancient times, it takes the docking position, which, along with the neighboring Saryarka was surrounded, and to 'wedge' in the major historical and cultural areas, Central Asia, the Altai-Sayan highlands and the Caucasus, Eastern Europe. Links here lie in a continental scale and combined these regions, Asia and Europe. In the northern part of its Aral-Caspian, the region eventually becomes part of the larger historical and cultural space, the Great Belt steppes. Overall, the region appears to one as the most important cultural and genetic center, which is connected to the historical destiny of many peoples of antiquity, the Middle Ages and modern times including the Sarmatians, Saka, Massagets, Dakh-Parthians, Alans, Magyars, the Hungarians, the Seljuk-Oguzs, Kipchaks, the Kazakhs, Turkmens, and Bashkirs. Formation of cattle in the temperate zone occurred in the area (the centers of domestication of horses and sheep in the north) and major ethno-political association, the state, a confederation of tribes Sarmatians, Massaget Turan, State of the Oguz Yabgu, Nogai Horde has also come and gone on this territory (Oralbay et al. 2014: 432-433).

Currently, scientists are considering the Aral-Caspian region as the major intermediate area in the path of Saka-Scythian culture in Europe, outside the Caucasus and the Near East on the basis of the analysis of archaeological, written and other data (Gasnov 2011: 49-53). Some scientists who explore the Alans, famous people in ancient times, left an imprint on the history of Rome, ancient and medieval history of Europe,

Asia and the Caucasus, according to the ancestral home of the powerful conglomerate of tribes of the Aral-Caspian region (Tsutsiev 2011: 120-121). From the early Iron Age tribes of the Aral-Caspian region, scientists have linked the combat power of the Parthian Empire, a formidable opponent and multiple winner of the mighty Roman Empire (Azhigali 2014). Some researchers have suggested a possible association between specific hunting traditions of the Aral-Caspian Sea with a similar fishing activity on the Arabian Peninsula, which emerged in the middle of I millennium BC (Yagodin and Betts 2011: 281-285), so its close resemblance suggests the deep diffusion connections within the Eurasian continent in the era of antiquity. Therefore, the theory of the relationship between Konovyaznoy tradition of Central Asia and Siberia looks ordinary because there is a genetic link element between gravestones designs, Aral-Caspian and Northern Eurasia (Romanova and Danilova 2011: 272).

Substrate early Iron Age tribes of the Aral-Caspian have played a prominent role in the genesis of a number of Turkish-speaking peoples of Eurasia. This powerful ethno-cultural formation is manifested in the anthropological features of the Turkmen, as well as ethnic Kazakhs Western morphological characters. As a result of severe climate, the authors do not rule out the psychological features that have been established among the Kazakhs and were forced each year to develop more space in the centuries-old 'camp' lifestyle. Also, there are ethnonyms and toponyms Massaget ethnocultural formation: "Daha/dai", "Tochars" or Turkmen "Teke" and Kazakh "A-Dai", "Alan" or Turkmen "olam", Dakhistan bay Caspian Golf de Dayo, ruins Alankala, Konyralan, Sumbetemiralan.

Traditionally, Kazakhs and Turkmens cultures meet ethnographic characterization Massagetae and their direct descendants, Alans. In this regard, the authors consider the breeding association Massagetae as a distant predecessor of the Kazakh Junior Juz.

Characteristically, Turkmens and Kazakhs horse breeding tradition, with a pronounced cult of the horse (Azhigali 2011: 18), receiving a special development, the greatest flourishing of which was recorded in the early Iron Age.

Currently, scientists isolated a number of controversial issues of ethno-cultural and linguistic identity of carriers, as well as early Iron Age cultures of the Aral-Caspian region. If they

are regarded as representatives of the Scythian-Siberian world, scientists need to consider them as Iranian-lingual. The authors believe this is a fallacy, therefore, new researchers thought it is necessary to reconsider the issue in the future.

### CONCLUSION

Study materials heritage of the Aral-Caspian region have made notable contributions to the study of the history of Eurasia I millennium BC. This area is very valuable from the standpoint of historical geography and archeology, as it is situated at the crossroads of ancient cultures and civilizations. It is a transboundary area that formerly served as the staging point on ancient migration routes and medieval times. It was an important link in the cultural diffusion processes in the territory of Kazakhstan between the Central and Western Asia and the Caucasus and Eastern Europe. They were all national strategic programs and have made significant contributions to the study of two monumental monuments of the Early Iron Age, within the Caspian and Aral districts. These studies have shown the historical and genetic relationship with both mono territorial, neighboring and rather remote synchronous monuments and preceding archaeological cultures, following historical periods of the Aral-Caspian region.

On the basis of the study of published and archival sources compiled the register of monuments Early Iron Ages, an analysis of the state of knowledge of the Aral-Caspian region.

Geology analyzed data paleogeography and other natural sciences to reconstruct environmental conditions in different epochs Early Iron Age and their impact on the life and evolution of inhabited it people, their culture, traditions and customs.

The scientific revolution introduced materials excavation of cultural monuments Chirak Rabat Kyzyluyyk. The regularities and features of the topography of monuments of early Iron Age realized their zoning.

Analysis of industrial complexes allows one to pose the question of autochthonous Early Iron Age monuments with some other cultures influences.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

Scientists in the future consider it necessary to conduct comprehensive and multidisciplinary

research that uses a comparative analysis of the data of archeology, linguistics, anthropology, genetics, ethnography, art, involving methods of the natural sciences. Since the author's position is difficult to justify using only theoretical interpretations and the research topic itself, which covers the entire region, involves the use of complex analysis, authors have prepared a number of researches within the claimed range with an interdisciplinary methodology.

Studying the era monuments Early Iron Ages of the Aral-Caspian region has shown the importance of this area as one of the centers of formation and development of culture medium and the Late Bronze Age. The population of the Aral-Caspian region has had a significant impact on the evolution of the cultural traditions of the Eurasian steppe.

The importance of the region for the reconstruction of the Bronze Age due to historical processes: the territorial and geographical location (located in the depths of the steppes, free from the influence of forest and forest-steppe cultural traditions of the Volga region, the Urals and Siberia), mineral wealth (the population living here is the largest supplier of copper, tin and precious stone rocks on the adjacent territories), the role of the transfer and the link between agricultural cultures of Central Asia, and the farming and cattle-breeding population of forest-steppe and steppe zones of Trans-Urals, Western Siberia and Kazakhstan.

Evolution of the Early Iron Ages complexes in the Aral-Caspian region took place in two major eras in the Middle Bronze period there developed cultural traditions Andronovo community, in the final phase of the Bronze Age functioning Alekseevsk-Sargarinsk and Dongalsk complexes included in the common cultures of the roll ceramics.

The monuments of the region are concentrated in four main areas: Mankystau on the peninsula, in the mountains Mugalzary in Northern and Eastern Aral Sea region, in the Northern Caspian. Monuments are usually complex and bear traces of very ancient hominids long stay at the same geomorphological positions.

Monuments of the Aral Sea region, with a greater degree of similarity with materials of Uzbekistan, Kyzylkum, are typical of cultures around the Aral-Caspian region. The technique of splitting the primary prevail Levallois and prismatic system, radial cores and pebble tech rare

cleavage. The set is dominated by the gun rack and notched shape, scrapers of various modifications, Levallois tools bifacialnye products.

### REFERENCES

- Akizhev KA 1960. *Archaeological Map of Kazakhstan*. Almaty: Publishing Academy of Science KazSSR.
- Azhigali SE 2002. *The Architecture of Nomads - The Phenomenon of the History and Culture of Eurasia (Monuments of the Aral-Caspian Region)*. Almaty: Gylym.
- Azhigali SE 2011. *Aral-Caspian in the Historical Fate of the Kazakh and Turkmen*. Almaty: Gylym.
- Azhigali SE 2014. Outline of the cultural heritage of the Aral-Caspian region. *Scientific Editions Almanac Space and Time*, 1(2): 5-15.
- Azhigali SE 2015. *Monuments Mangistau and Ustyurt*. Almaty: Oner.
- Dzhenito B, Olhovskiy VS, Samashev ZS, Frankfor AP 2000. *The Study of Ancient Shrines Aral-Caspian Steppes: Results and Prospects. Archaeology, Paleoeology and Paleodemography Eurasia*. Moscow: GEOS.
- Gasanov ZG 2011. *On the Problem of Archaeological Sites Early Scythians in the Context of identifying the Messages of Ancient and Medieval Written Sources*. Mahazhkala: Progress.
- Itina MA, Levina LM, Nerazik EE, Rappoport UA 1996. On the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Khorezm archaeological and ethnographic expedition. *Ethnographic Review*, 6: 19-33.
- Kurmankulov Zh, Utubaev ZhR 2015. Ancient monuments of the lower Syr Darya. *Scientific Journal Kazakhstan History*, 2: 37-45.
- Oralbay YK, Samashev Z, Kariyev YM 2014. Aral-Caspian region the contact area of the early iron age cultures and civilizations (The analysis of the archaeological sites investigated as a part of the "Cultural Heritage" National Program). *Life Science Journal*, 11(12): 431-433.
- Oralbay YK 2015. Mangistau and the history of the study of the early Iron Age monuments of the area. *Bulletin of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan*, 4(302): 147-154.
- Oralbay YK 2016. History of the study sites Mangistau and Ustyurt. *Bulletin of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan*, 4(302): 147-154.
- Romanova EN, Danilova NK 2011. *The Cultural Tradition of Early Nomads North Asia Symbolism Konovyaznyh Pillars (Serge) Turki-Sakha*. Yakutsk: Vympel.
- Samashev Z, Koshberbaev K, Amanshayev E, Astafjev A 2007a. *Treasures from the Ustyurt and Manqystau*. Almaty: Gylym.
- Samashev Z, Oralbay E 2007b. Kyzyl Uik - a monument of religious architecture in Western Kazakhstan. *Bulletin VEGU*, 31(32): 188-191.
- Samashev Z, Ongar A, Oralbay E, Kiyasbek G 2011. *Temple-Sanctuary Kyzyl Uik*. Astana: Master PO.
- Tazhekeev AA 2011. *The History of the Development of South-Eastern Aral Sea Region from Ancient Times to the End I Millennium BC*. PhD Thesis, Unpublished. Moscow: Moscow State University after MV Lomonosov.
- Tazhekeev AA, Kurmankulov Zh 2014. The Types of Burial Structures and the Question of Their Genesis (Chirp Rabat Culture). Riders Great Steppe: Tradition and Innovation. *Proceedings of the Branch of the Institute of Archaeology Named AH Margulan in Astana*, 4: 336-348.
- Tsutsiev AA 2011. *Alans in the Ethnic History of the Peoples of the Aral-Caspian Region*. Mahazhkala: Progress.
- Yagodin VN 1976. Ustyurt and the Aral Sea delta, some results of archaeological investigations 1971-1975. *Social Sciences in Uzbekistan*, 11: 47.
- Yagodin VN, Betts AV 2011. *"The Desert Snakes" Northern Arabia "Swept Plan" Aral-Caspian*. Almaty: Gylym.