QAZAQSTAN RESPÝBLIKASY
ULTTYQ MÝZEIÍ

МӘДЕНИ МҰРА
ғылыми журнал

КУЛЬТУРНОЕ НАСЛЕДИЕ
научный журнал

CULTURAL HERITAGE
science journal

ISSN: 2708-3365

№ 1 (100)

Астана
2023

РЕДАКЦИЯ АЛҚАСЫ:

СЫДЫҚОВ Айбек Жексенәліұлы – PhD докторы (алқа төрағасы) (Қазақстан)

АЯҒАН Бүркітбай Ғылманұлы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор (Қазақстан)

АРТЫҚБАЕВ Жамбыл Омарұлы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор (Қазақстан)

САМАШЕВ Зайнолла Самашұлы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор (Қазақстан)

ТАЙМАҒАМБЕТОВ Жәкен Қожахметұлы – ҚР ҰҒА академигі, тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор (Қазақстан)

ЫБЫРАЕВА Ақмарал Ғосманқызы – Қазақстан ұлттық жаратылыстану ғылымдары академиясының академигі, тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор (Қазақстан)

СҰРАҒАНОВА Зүбайда Қабиқызы – тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, этнограф (Қазақстан)

БЕКНАЗАРОВ Рақым Ағыбайұлы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор (Қазақстан)

АЙМҰХАМБЕТ Жанат Әскербекқызы – филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор (Қазақстан)

ФАЙЗУЛЛИНА Ғалия Шаукетовна – тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, музейтанушы (Қазақстан)

БИҒОЖИН Ұлан Зейноллаұлы – PhD докторы (Қазақстан)

ШЕГЕБАЕВ Пернебек Шегебайұлы – өнертану ғылымының кандидаты (Қазақстан)

РОМАНОВА Екатерина Назаровна – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор (Ресей Федерациясы, Саха Республикасы)

АЙТПАЕВА Гулнара Амановна – филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор (Қырғызстан)

СТАВСКАЯ Людмила Георгиевна – тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, доцент (Қырғызстан)

АНДРАШ Биро Жолт – антрополог (Мажарстан)

ОСМАН Каратай – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор (Түркия)

МАЗМҰНЫ / СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

Музей өмірі / Жизнь музея

«Берел» ғылыми-зерттеу қоры 4
Қазақстандағы археологиялық зерттеулердің жетістіктері 6

Самашев З. Новый памятник раннесакского времени в Восточном Казахстане 8
Чугунов К.В. Раннескифский период в Центральной Азии в русле концепции культурно-хронологических горизонтов: опорные памятники и новые открытия 19
Утубаев Ж.Р. Бәбіш мола кешеніндегі жаңа зерттеулердің кейбір нәтижелері 37
Подушкин А.Н. Қаңлы мемлекетінің жоғары өнерінің сюжеттеріне интерпретация 51
Джафаров Г.Ф. О тандеме неолит – энеолит 71
Джафарова Д. Памятники Карабахской группы Ходжалы-Кедабекской археологической культуры (по материалам курганов Довшанлы – Баллукая – Ахмахи) 83
Серхан Ч. Түркиядағы ЮНЕСКО-ның мәдени мұралары тізіміне енген кейбір археологиялық ескерткіштер.....101
Байтлеу Д.А., Искаков А.Ш., Акшабаева Е.Б. Памятники наскального искусства Мугалжар 107
Дарменов Р.Т. История изучения неолитических памятников северо-восточного Приаралья ... 121
Нағашбекова С.М. Ортағасырлық Түркия қолжазбаларындағы Шу, Талас өңіріне қатысты деректер 127
Шильдебаева Ж. Интересные археологические находки древнего городища Тараз 134
Жунисханов А.С. Из истории археологического изучения и предварительные итоги аварийных раскопок на территории г. Семей 140
Чотбаев А.Е., Ержанова А.Е. Жер шаруашылығымен айналысқан Ақбауыр-III қонысы 147

CONTENTS

Museum life

Research Foundation «Berel» 4
Achievements of archaeological research in Kazakhstan 6

Samashev Z. A new site of the Early Saka time in East Kazakhstan 8
Chugunov K.V. The early Scythian period in Central Asia within the concept of cultural-chronological horizons: leading sites and new discoveries 19
Utubayev Zh. Some results of research in the Babish mola complex 37
Podushkin A.N. To the interpretation of the subjects of the high art of the Kangju state 51
Jafarov G.F. About Neolithic-Eneolithic tandem 71
Jafarova D. Sites of Karabakh group of Khojaly-Gedabek archaeological culture (by the materials of the Dovshanly-Ballukaya-Ahmakhi mounds) …. 83

Serhan C. Some archaeological sıte areas ın UNESCO cultural heritage list in Turkey 101

Baitileu D. A., Iskakov A. Sh., Akshabayeva E. B. Sites of rock art of Mugalzhar 107
Darmenov R.T. History of studying Neolitic sites in the north-eastern Aral region 121
Nagashbekova S.M. Data in the medieval Turkish manuscripts related to the Talas, Shu region 127

Shildebayeva Zh. Interesting archaeological finds of the ancient Taraz settlements 134

Zhuniskhanov A.S. From the history of archaeological studies and preliminary results of emergency excavations on the territory of the city of Semey 140
Chotbayev A.E., Yerzhanova A.E. The settlement of Akbauyr-III, engaged in land farming 147

МӘДЕНИ МҰРА

https://doi.org/10.47500/2023.v13.i1.07

Serhan Cinar
Ankara University, Türkiye
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2381-3739
e-mail: *serhancinar@mail.ru*

SOME ARCHAEOLOGİCAL SITE AREAS IN UNESCO CULTURAL HERITAGE LİST İN TURKEY

With the ancient Taurus and Kachgar regions, Euphrates, Aras, and Kızılırmak basin and Menderes and Firtina valleys it features, Anatolian's geography is among the earliest that has been shaping the Asia Minor since the archaic period. In these regions, there exist numerous substantial archeological sites, sanctuarie, necropolises and urban remains of Anatolian Turkish archeological heritage from the Stone, the Bronze and the Iron, and the Early Medieval Age. Throughout Asia Minor's deep-rooted and multifaceted past, the Hittite, Lydia, Hellenistic Period, Roman Empire, Byzantine, Seljuk State and Ottoman Empires ruled in its lands. Seventeen archeological remains are present in Turkey's Unesco World Heritage List of cultural and natural history sites.

In this study, Turkish archaeological sites in the Unesco Cultural Heritage list will be examined. In this context, excavation sites of Gobeklitepe, Catalhoyuk, Hattusa, and Troy will be introduced.

Keywords: *Gobeklitepe, Chatalhoyuk, Hattusa, Troy, Archaeological Site, Unesco Cultural Heritage.*

Introduction

Asia Minor, which has a long archeological past, offers a unique and multicultural scope to the researchers in archeological and historical studies. Asia Minor has established political and economic relations with communities in different parts of the world in the historical process. As an example of these relations, we can show Alexander's famous Asian expeditions. Thanks to these expeditions, the first cultural relations between Anatolia and Kazakhstan started. These relations continued increasingly during the Roman, Byzantine, Seljuk and Ottoman Empires. Despite these long-standing relationships, the course of today's Kazakh archeological studies continue to be carried out in line with Russian archaeology. Especially, enlightening the archaeological and historical aspects of Kazakstan in the 19th and 20th century and local archaeological sites as Marxism, materialism and Communism were prioritized by the researches active in the Kazakh Arhaeology. As a result, the studies and the anthropological researches on the Asia Minor region were not properly recognized and cannot be used by the scientific circles of the Kazakh historiography. Thus, transferring the multi-disciplinary studies of the global and Turkish archaeology circles to the researches on the Kazakh cultural history is essential. This study features a general overview of the archeological studies that are conducted in

the Turkey's region and yet not used in the studies on Kazakh cultural history of archaic ages.

1. Gobekli Tepe

Turkish name Goebec'li te'pe: Potbelly Hill is a Neolithic archaeological site near the city of Shanlıurfa in Southeastern Anatolia, Turkey. Gobeklitepe is located in the foothils of the Taurus Mountains, overlooking the Harran plain and the headwaters of the Balikh River, a tributary of the Euphrates. The site is a tell (artifical mound) situated on a flat limestone plateau. In the north, the plateu is connected to the neigghbouring mountains by a narrow promontory. In all other directions, the ridge descends steeply into slopes and steep cliffs (Gobeklitepe Site of Unesco World Heritage Center; 2021).

Predating the Egyptian pyramids by 6.500 years, Gobeklitepe is the oldest place of worsihp ever discovered. Radiocarbon dating shows that the earliest exposed structures at Gobeklitepe were built between 9500 and 9000 BCE, towards the end of the Pre-Pottery Neolithic a (PPNA) period. The site was significantly expanded in the erarly 9th millennium BCE and remained in use until around 8000 BCE, or perhaps slightly later to the early Pre Pottery Neolithic period (Clare 2020, 81).

Monumental structures, interpreted as monumental communal enclosures, were erected by groups of hunter-gatherers in the Pre-Pottery Neolithic period. Evidence indicates that the inhabitants were hunter gatherers who supplemented their diet with early forms of domesticated cereal and lived in villages for at least part of the year. (Scham, 2008: 5). Probbably, Gobeklitepe was not a settlement but a sanctuary where early humans met in order to engage in sacred rites.The sites were used in connection with social events and rituals and feature distinctive limestone t-shaped pillars, some of which are up to 5.50 meters tall. The communities that built the monumental megalithic structures of Gobeklitepe lived during one of the most momentous transitions in human history. Most carvings depict animals: serpents, foxes and boars for the most part, but also aurochs, gazelles, mouflons, onagers, cranes, ducks and vultures. Insofar as they can be identifed, the animals are male and often depicted with an aggressive posture (Schmidt, 2012: 30).

As a result; Gobeklitepe is regarded as an archaeological discovery of great importance since it could profoundly change the understanding of a crucial stage in the development of human society.



Gobekli Tepe

Gobeklitepe contains all the elements necessary for the expression of its Outstanding Universal Value and is of adeguate size to ensure the complete presentation of the features and processes which convey its significance.

2. Chatalhoyuk

Chatalhoyuk is located overlooking the Konya Plain, southeast of the present day city of Konya in Turkey, approximately 87 miles from the twin coned volcano of Mount Hasan. Chatalhoyuk, Turkish spelling: Çatal Höyük (from Turkish çatal «fork»+ höyük «tumulus») was a very large Neolithic and Chalcolothic proto-city settlement in southern Anatolia, which existed from approximately 7500 BC to 6400 BC, and flourished around 7000 BC (Renfrew, 2006: 397-398). Two hills form the 37 hectar site on the Southern Anatolian Plateau. The taller eastern mound contains eighteen levels of Neolithic occupation between 7400 BC and 6200 BC, including wall paintings, reliefs, sculptures and other symbolic and artistic features. Together they testify to the evolution of social organization and cultural practices as humans adapted to a sedentary life (Chatalhoyuk Site of Unesco World Heritage Center; 2021).

Chatalhoyuk is a very rare example of a well preserved Neolithic settlement and has been considered one of the key sites for understanding human prehistory for some decades (Chatalhoyuk Site of Unesco World Heritage Center; 2021). The site was first excavated by James Mellaart int 1958. He later led a team which further excavated there for four seasons between 1961 and 1965. These excavations revealed this section of Anatolia as a centre of advanced culture in the Neolithic period (Mellaart, 1962: 45). The sites were set up as large numbers of buildings clustered together. Households looked to their neighbors for help, trade and possible marriage for their children. The inhabitants lived in mudbrick houses that were crammed together in an aggregate structure. No footpaths or streets were used between the dwellings, which were clustered in a honeycomblike maze. Most were accessed by holes in the ceiling and doors on the side of the houses, with doors reached by ladders and stairs. Houses had plaster interiors characterized by squared off timber ladders or steep stairs. These were ussually on the south wall of the room, as were cooking hearths and ovens. (Mary, 2012: 8-9).

As a result; the house clusters of Chatalhoyuk, characterized by their streetless neighbourhoods,



Chatalhoyuk

dwellings with roof access, and house types representing a highly circumscribed distribution of activity areas and features according to a clear spatial order aligned on cardinal directions, from an outstanding settlement type of the Neolithic period. The comparable sizes of the dwellings throughout the city illustrate an early type of urban layout based on community and egalitarian ideals.

3. Hattusha Capital of the Hittite Empire

The Hittite empire rose to dominance between the middle and late Bronze Age, between the 14th and 12th centuries BC. By 1280 BC., the Hittite empire was large enough to negotiate a treaty with the Egyptians at Qadesh, a city in the Levant. In the Amarna Letters, which have been dated to the 14th centruy BC, the Hittites were referred to by the Egyptians as a major power, alongside Assyria, Mitanni, Babylonia, and they were treated as equals (Hattusa Site of Unesco World Heritage Center; 2021).

Hattusa was the capital of the Hittite Empire in the late Bronze Age. Hattusha is an ancient city located near modern Bogazkale in the Corum Province of Turkey's Black Sea Region. Its ruins lie near modern Corum, Turkey, within the great loop of the Kızılırmak River. It lies at the south end of the Budaközü Plain, on a slope rising approximately 300m above the valley and is divided by the Kızlarkayası creek into the lower city in the north and the upper city in the south (Bryce, 2005: 8-9).

Hattusa was established by the Hatti, the indigenous people who were living in that area prior to the comming of the Hittites. The name Hattusa is first discovered from written documents dated to Assyrian period. Hattusha is an archaeological site remarkble for its urban organization, the types of construction and rich ornamentation that have been preserved and for the ensemble of rock art. The city was found to have been defended by a monumental wall that was more than 8km in length. Additionally, the upper city was further fortifed by a double wall with more than a hundred towers. (Hattusa Site of Unesco World Heritage Center; 2021). This wall is known to have five gates, including the famous Lion Gate and Sphinx Gate. Apart from these defensive structures, many temples have also been uncovered in Hattusa. There are remains of older walls around the lower city and section walls dividing the large city area in separate districst. The best preserved ruin of a Hittite Temple from the 13th centruy B.C., known as Great Temple, is located in the Lower City. Other temples of similar date and shape, albeit generally smaller, are situated in the Upper City, which mostly consisted of a temple city for the gods and goddesses of the Hittite and Hurrian pantheon. (Ceram, 2008: 44).

The famous rock sanctuary of Yazılıkaya, which is an open air temple with two natural chambers cut into the bedrock, lies 2 km northeast of the capital, on a slope of a mountain barrier. First mentioned in cuneiform inscriptions, it is a large fortifed settlement located 1.5 km east of the King's Gate (Hattusa Site of Unesco World Heritage Center; 2021).

The city was destroyed, together with the Hittite state itself, around 1200 BC, as part of the Bronze Age collapse. Excavations suggest that Hattusa was gradually abandoned over a period of several decades as the Hittite empire disintegrated. The site was subsequetly abandoned until 800 BC, when a modest Phrygian settlement appeared in the area(Bryce, 2005: 295).

4. Archaeological Site of Troy

Troy is located on the mound of Hisarlık, which overlooks the plain along the Turkish Aegean coast, 4.8 km from the southern entrance to the Dardanelles. Troy is the name of the Bronze Age city attacked in the Trojan War, a popular stroy in the mythology of ancient Greece and the name given to the archaeological site in the north-west of Asia Minor which revealed a large and prosperous city occupied over millennia (Carls, 1963: 15).

In Ancient Greek literature, Troy is portrayed as a powerful kingdom of the Heroic Age, a mythic era when monsters roamed the earth and gods interacted directly with humans. The city was said to have ruled the Troad until the Trojan War which led to its complete destruction at the hands of the Greeks (Brian , 2014: 115). Homer describes Troy as well founded, strong- built and well-walled; there are also several references to fine battlements, towers and high and steep walls. Indeed, in Greek mytholohy the walls were so impressive that they were said to have been built by Posedion and Apollo, who after an act of impiety were compelled by Zeus to serv the Trojan king Laomedon for one year. The story of its destruction was one of the cornerstones of Greek mythology and literature, featuring prominently in the Illiad and the Odyssey, as well as numerous other poems and plays (Schielman, 1875; 20).

Литература

1. Брайан К. Р., (2014) Археология греческой и римской Трои. издательство Кембриджского университета, Нью-Йорк. – С. 406.

2. Брайс Т., (2005) Царство хеттов. Происхождение хеттов / Оксфордский университет. Нажимать. Нью-Йорк. – С. 554.

3. Карл Б., (1963) Троя и троянцы, Темза и Гудзон, Лондон: Дайк Экспресс. – Стр. 240.

4. Ceram C.W., (2008), Tanrıların Vatanı Anadolu. Ремзди Китабеби. Анкара. – С.192

5. Клэр Л., (2020) Гёбекли-Тепе, Турция. Краткий обзор исследований нового объекта всемирного наследия (2015–2019 гг.) // E-Forschungsberichte, Немецкий археологический институт. – С. 81–88.

6. Мэри М., Уолтнер А., (2012) Семья: всемирная история, издательство Оксфордского университета. – С. 168.

7. Меллаарт Дж., (1962) Раскопки в Чатал-Хююке, Первый предварительный отчет 1961 г., Анатолийские исследования, т. 12, Кембриджский университет, Нью-Йорк. – С. 41-65.

8. Ренфрю К., (2006) Начало земледелия и животноводства на Ближнем Востоке, Палеонтология человека и предыстория, № 5. – С. 395-404.

9. Шам С., (2008) Первый в мире храм, археология // т. 61, № 6, Вашингтон. – С. 4-5.

10. Schielman H., (1875) Троя и ее останки, изд. Джонни Мюррей, Лондон. – С. 392.

11. Шмидт К., (2012) Гёбекли-Тепе, Святилище каменного века в Юго-Восточной Анатолии, Ex Oriente, Берлин. – С. 286.

References

1. Brıan C. R., (2014) The Archaeology of Greak and Roman Troy, Cambridge University Press, New York, p. 406.

2. Bryce T., (2005) The Kingdom of the Hittites the Origins of The Hittites/ Oxford University. Press. New York. p 554.

3. Carl B., (1963) Troy and the Trojans, Thames and Hudson, London, Daik Express, p.240.

4. Ceram C.W., (2008), Tanrıların Vatanı Anadolu. Remzdi Kitabebi. Ankara.p.192

5. Clare L., (2020) Göbekli Tepe, Turkey a Brief Summary of Research at a New World Heritage Site (2015-2019)// E-Forschungsberichte, Deutches Archaologisches Institut, pp. 81-88.

6. Mary M., Waltner A., (2012) The Family: A World History, Oxford University Press, p. 168.

7. Mellaart J., (1962) Excavations at Chatal Hüyük, First Preliminary Report 1961, Anatolian Studies, v. 12, Cambridge University, New York, pp. 41-65.

8. Renfrew C., (2006) Inception of Agriculture and Rearing in the Middle East, Human Palaeontology and Prehistory, No 5, pp. 395-404.

9. Scham S., (2008) The World's First Temple, Archaeology// v. 61, no 6, Washington, pp. 4-5.

10. Schıelman H., (1875) Troy and its remains, ed. Johny Murray, London, p. 392.

11. Schmidt K., (2012) Göbekli Tepe, A Stone Age Sanctuary in South-Eastern Anatolia, Ex Oriente, Berlin, pp. 286.

Websites

https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/377/: Hattusha: the Hittite Capital
https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/849 : Archaeological City of Troy
https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1572 : Göbekli Tepe
https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1405 : Neolithic Site of Çatalhöyük

Серхан Чинар
Анкара университеті, Түркия
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2381-3739
e-mail: *serhancinar@mail.ru*

ТҮРКИЯДАҒЫ ЮНЕСКО-НЫҢ МӘДЕНИ МҰРАЛАРЫ ТІЗІМІНЕ ЕНГЕН КЕЙБІР АРХЕОЛОГИЯЛЫҚ ЕСКЕРТКІШТЕР

Анадолы географиясы, Ежелгі Тавр және Қашғар аймақтары, Евфрат, Аракс және Қызылырмақ бассейндері, сондай-ақ Мендерес пен Фиртина алқаптарымен, архаикалық дәуірден бері Кіші Азияны қалыптастырған ең ежелгі мекендердің бірі болып табылады. Бұл аймақтарда тас, қола, темір және ерте орта ғасырлардағы Анадолы-түрік археологиялық мұраларына жататын көптеген археологиялық ескерткіштер, қорымдар, қасиетті орындар мен қала қалдықтары бар.

Кіші Азияның соқпалы, сан қырлы өткенінде, хет, лидия, эллиндік дәуірлерде бұл жерлерде Рим империясы, Византия, Селжук мемлекеті және Осман империясы билік құрды. Он жеті археологиялық нысан ЮНЕСКО-ның Дүниежүзілік мұралары тізіміне енгізілген Түркияның мәдени мұра нысандары мен табиғи тарихи ескерткіштері тізімінде бар.

Бұл зерттеуде ЮНЕСКО-ның мәдени мұра тізіміне енгізілген түрік археологиялық нысандары зерделенеді. Осы тұрғыда Гобеклитепе, Чаталхойюк, Хаттус және Троядағы қазба орындары таныстырылады.

Кілт сөздер: *Гобеклитепе, Чаталхойюк, Хаттуса, Троя, археологиялық қазбалар, ЮНЕСКО-ның мәдени мұрасы.*

Серхан Чинар
Университет Анкара, Турция
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2381-3739
e-mail: *serhancinar@mail.ru*

НЕКОТОРЫЕ АРХЕОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ПАМЯТНИКИ, ВКЛЮЧЁННЫЕ В СПИСОК КУЛЬТУРНОГО НАСЛЕДИЯ ЮНЕСКО В ТУРЦИИ

География Анатолии, с древними регионами Тавр и Качгар, бассейнами Евфрата, Аракса и Кызылырмака, а также долинами Мендерес и Фиртина, является одной из самых ранних, которая формировала Малую Азию с архаического периода. В этих регионах существует множество археологических памятников, святилищ, некрополей и городских остатков анатолийско-турецкого археологического наследия эпохи камня, бронзы, железа и раннего средневековья.

На протяжении многогранного прошлого Малой Азии в хеттский, лидийский, эллинистический периоды на её землях правили Римская империя, Византия, государство Сельджуков и Османская империя. Семнадцать археологических памятников находятся в списке объектов культурного наследия и естественноисторических памятников Турции, включённых в список всемирного наследия ЮНЕСКО.

В этом исследовании будут изучены турецкие археологические памятники, внесенные в список культурного наследия ЮНЕСКО. В этом контексте будут представлены места раскопок в Гобеклитепе, Чаталхойюке, Хаттусе и Трое.

Ключевые слова: *Гобеклитепе, Чаталхойюк, Хаттуса, Троя, археологические раскопки, культурное наследие ЮНЕСКО.*