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ABSTRACT
At the turn of August and September 2017, the third season of the research in the oases of the Kugitang Piedmont, South Uzbekistan, resumed the field survey of the three oases that had been researched in previous seasons (2015: Zarabag; 2016: Zarabag, Karabag, Kampyrtepa). The 2017 survey was conducted in the areas of the modern villages of Maydon and Goz. The following report presents new archaeological data gained from these two oases and their hinterlands. The methods used during the survey were the same as in the previous seasons. The evidence of settlement shows similar patterns and dynamics that were recognized in the other oases in the previous seasons.

KEYWORDS
Central Asia; Uzbekistan; field survey; oases; water sources; karezes; Bronze Age; Early Iron Age; Medieval Period.

INTRODUCTION
The third season of the field survey in the oases in the Piedmont of the Kugitang Mountains resumes the prospection of the previous two years (Augustinová et al. 2015, 262–281, 313–316; Augustinová et al. 2017, 104–148, 185–188). During four weeks in the field (23rd August–22th September 2017), we focused on two main points. Firstly, we put an emphasis on the investigation of the settlement pattern in two oases (Maydon and Goz) continuing the research aim started in seasons 2015 in the Zarabag Oasis, and resumed in 2016 in the oases of Zarabag, Karabag, and Kampyrtepa. The second point represented a trial excavation at the site of Bobolangar that was detected in 2016. Based on the finds collected on the surface during the previous season, this site was preliminarily dated to the Late Bronze Age / Sapalli culture (Augustinová et al. 2017, 125–128). This year, this assumption was confirmed and supplemented by finds dating to the Medieval Period. The complete results of the excavation will soon be published separately. The aim of the present paper is to bring forward the main conclusions of the field survey in the oasis after the season 2017.

The project – study of the settlement dynamics in the Kugitang piedmont oases – is a part of the long-term research aim of the Institute of Classical Archaeology (Charles University, Prague) led by L. Stančo in collaboration with Termez State University represented by Sh. Shaydullaev in the Surkhan Darya Province.

The field survey in the oases has been conducted by a team of three students of the Faculty of Arts, Charles University led by A. Augustinová – Anna Augustinová, Ladislav Damašek, and Tobiáš Kolmačka – in collaboration with Odiljon Khamidov from the Archaeological Institute of the Uzbek Academy of Sciences in Samarkand.
LOCATION

The work of the third research season focused on the prospection in two oases (Maydon and Goz) of the steppe belt in the Paskhurt Basin (altitude between 700–1500 m.a.s.l.) that forms a part of the piedmont of the Kugitang Mountains (Pl. 7/1) (Maydon: 695–766 m.a.s.l., E 66°51' / N 37°44'; Goz: 668 m.a.s.l., E 66°44' / N 37°37'). Generally, the micro-region in question is situated in the Surkhan Darya Province, south Uzbekistan, more precisely in the western part of the Sherabad District in the close proximity of Pashkhurt village (Maydon: 7.9 km to the north-east; Goz: 9.6 km to the south-west of Pashkhurt). The border with Turkmenistan runs near the research area on the ridge of the Kugitang Mountains (17.7 km to the north of Goz Oasis).

METHODS AND AIMS

The methods used during the survey are described in detail in the previous reports (Augustinová et al. 2015, 262–281, 313–316; Augustinová et al. 2017, 104–148, 185–188). The aim of the research is to recognise historical evidence of a settlement in the oases and their hinterland and to observe the changes over the course of time.

We focused on the detection of the archaeological sites (concentrations of ceramic fragments, morphological features in the landscape), on the verifying of the toponyms that should indicate the anthropogenic origin and on verifying the spots that were pointed out as ‘of historical meaning or value’ by local inhabitants (KuPi_XX; Figs. 1–2; Tab. 1). In order to capture the complex view of the researched oases, we surveyed also private plots of the local inhabitants (gardens, fields, places for building activities etc.). For each of the prospected areas/plots we have created in GIS a polygon with archaeological finds (POL_XX) or with negative results (NEG_XX), (Pl. 7/2–4). Besides this, we paid attention to the collection of the archaeological finds (mostly represented by ceramic fragments) together with the spatial data, that are processed in the QGis.

As is attested by the previous prospection in the lowland Sherabad oasis (Stančo 2018, in print) the recent burial activities could often disrupt the older cultural layers and there is the possibility that archaeological finds will be unearthed during the digging of contemporary graves. Therefore, we paid attention also to such areas as well as to prominent tombs. Unlike in previous seasons, no significant archaeological finds were detected during the survey neither at the cemeteries in Maydon nor in Goz.

An inherent part of the research represents the mapping of water sources (Figs. 3–4; Tab. 2), because they represent today – just as they did in the past – the main prerequisite for settling and the archaeological sites are often situated in their close proximity. In each of the oases several springs were detected and in the village of Goz and its hinterland there were also found the relics of an underground water system of canals called karezes.2

---

1 The numbers follow the previous numbering in the oases of Zarabag, Karabag and Kampyrtepa (Augustinová et al. 2017, 143–145).

2 The water supplying of villages by karezes was not documented in each oasis of the Kugitang Piedmont. During our three-year survey we detected such an irrigation system in the Goz and in the Zarabag oases only.
Fig. 1: Noticeable spots with finds and morphological features (KuPi_xx) in the Maydon Oasis (map by Anna Augustinová).

Fig. 2: Noticeable spots with finds and morphological features (KuPi_xx) in the Goz Oasis (map by Anna Augustinová).
MAYDON

The village of Maydon spreads along both sides of the River Maydon along a length of 3.6 km and the current extent of the oasis is approximately 166 ha. Based on the official census in 2016, 1,400 people and 450 families live in the present-day village of Maydon and most of the inhabitants are Uzbeks.3

Unlike the oases researched in the previous seasons, the village of Maydon is not mentioned in the monograph based on ethnographic research conducted in the region in the 1950s by B. Kh. Karmysheva (1976).

As can be seen in the survey results (Pl. 7/2), the area of the current village of Maydon is not densely covered by finds and the main archaeological sites were discovered on its margin. The current village is certainly or relatively recent foundation and local inhabitants still keep as living tradition that its area prevalently consisted of fields serving the neighbouring villages.

WATER SOURCES

The village of Maydon is situated along both banks of the Maydon Say4 and besides that, there are a number of springs along the river basin. The water is distributed on the plots and fields by an irrigation system of small surface canals and therefore the village is very well supplied with water.

Twelve springs (buloq = Uzb. ‘spring’) have been detected during the field survey in the oasis of Maydon (Fig. 3; Tab. 2; MY_S01–MY_S12). Most of them are clustered in the north part of the village, while in the lower (south-east) part only two water sources appear (MY_S02 and MY_S12). All of them (except MY_S11) are in close proximity to the riverbed. Three of the springs have local names – Surkh Buloq (surkh = Taj. ‘red’); Mrza Khodja Buloq (MY_S02) is named after an unknown person, and Bosh Buloq (MY_S11) means the ‘Spring of the Chief’ (bosh = Uzb. ‘chief’).6

Two other springs are situated outside the village itself in the direction of Pashkhurt, as we found out based on the testimony of a local man. Khuduk Ota Buloq (khuduk/quguq = Uzb. ‘water well’; ota = Uzb. ‘father’) springs in close proximity to an isolated house, and Üchtol Buloq (üch = Uzb. ‘three’; tol = Uzb. ‘osier’) springs among several trees near the road connecting Maydon and Pashkhurt.

---

3 Official census report kept in the Maydon school.
4 The naming of the watercourses used by local people are typically derived from the names of villages where the river flows. Thus, passing more than one bigger village, a stream can change its name one or more times. The River Maydon flows from the smaller streams in the piedmont of the Kugitang mountains and approximately 12 km past the village of Maydon it empties into the Sherabad Darya under the name of yet another village on its way – Loylig.
5 The term surkh, which is also part of the name of the province Surkhan Darya, could be also translated as the ‘colour of blood’ or ‘the water coloured by a soil’.
6 The spring of the same name was documented also in the Kampyrtepa oasis (KT_S01; Augustinová et al. 2017, 121).
CEMETERIES AND CENTRAL PROMINENT TOMBS

Four cemeteries (mazaristan = Uzb. ‘cemetery’) are situated in the village of Maydon. Two of them (Maydon Ota Mazaristan and Shakar Ota Mazaristan) were disrupted in the 1940s during the construction of a new asphalt road that runs through the village. Maydon Ota Mazaristan (ota = Uzb. ‘father’; NEG_065) is situated in the southern part of Maydon on both sides of the road. The oval prominent grave (Mazaristan Ota; KuPi_062) made of stones is ca. 1 m high and is located to the north of the road. In its close proximity, there are visible oval stone circles that represent graves (ca. from 1.5×1.5 m to 2×1.2 m). The second half of the cemetery is located to the south of the road and apart from one well marked grave hidden behind an iron fence, the area is littered with rubbish and bushes.

The second cemetery disrupted by the modern road, called Shakar Ota Mazaristan (shakar = Uzb. ‘sugar’; ota = Uzb. ‘father’; NEG_066), is situated in the central part of the contemporary village. Local inhabitants had discovered human bones and skulls in the part that lies to the north of the road during the building activities several years ago, but this particular area was later built up.

A third cemetery Garibni Gori (Uzb. ‘the cave of the homeless/lonely person’; NEG_067) is situated on the short slope in the north-west part of the village and there are numerous graves that are visible on the surface as stone circles (d. ca. 0.8 m).

The fourth one (NEG_069) is still used as a cemetery without any local name.
MORPHOLOGICAL FEATURES AND THE LOCATIONS WITH ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE

Two main archaeological sites (Maydon Kurgan and Gaza Kutan – **Fig. 4**) are situated in the hinterland of the Maydon Oasis. Except for them, only several of the surveyed areas in the oasis yielded traces of past human activity (6 polygons with finds: POL_211, 216-218, 220, 223; **Pl. 2**), while the majority – 33 surveyed areas (NEG_065-096) gave negative results.

**Fig. 4:** The newly detected Early Iron Age site Gaza Kutan on the top of the range above the Maydon Oasis (visible on the right), (photo by Anna Augustinová).

The first of the significant archaeological sites – Maydon Kurgan (POL_210-POL_213; KuPi_063) – has already been mentioned in the earlier works (Rtvveladze – Khakimov 1973, 22–23; Rtvveladze 1974, 77; Arshavskaya – Rtveladze – Khakimov 1982, 134; Stride 2004, Uz-SD-164; Danielisová – Stančo – Shaydullaev 2010, 82) and it was dated to the Late Antiquity and High Medieval Period (12th century; **Fig. 5**). The site is situated in the east margin of the Maydon Oasis, elevated high above the left bank of the Maydon Say. There are still well-visible morphological features in the terrain such as several mounds and artificial flat platforms. The local legend associated with this place says that there had been the residence of a rich man standing there, and it was destroyed by Macedonians upon their arrival from the north. During our field survey, we recorded the precise extent of this site, and based on the surface finds we were able to confirm the dating of the more or less intensive use of this place as a continuous one, starting from the turn of the 3rd to 4th century AD and lasting to the High Medieval Period. Only one fragment dated to the Bronze Age was discovered here.

The second important settlement was newly discovered by our team at the site of Gaza Kutan (**gaza** = Uzb. ‘hill top’; **kutan** = Uzb. ‘cattle corral’; POL_219; KuPi_066; **Pl. 7/2; Fig. 1, 4**). Based on the very plentiful ceramic fragments collected from the surface it is obvious that the site belongs solely to the Early Iron Age (Yaz I culture; **Fig. 6**). It is situated at the north margin of the Maydon Oasis on the flat summit of a hill. It is elevated 65 m above the riverbed of Maydon Say. The place provides an excellent view over that part of the Kugitang Piedmont, where the oases Karabag, Zarabag, Kamyrtepa and Shalkan are situated, and where numerous archaeological sites belonging to the same period had already been recently detected. There are relics of stone walls clearly visible around the site and in the interior of the site, it is possible to recognize yet more stone structures. The considerable size and clearly visible stone structures make Gaza Kutan an extraordinary representative of the settlement sites belonging to the Early Iron Age in southern Uzbekistan with the highest potential for in-depth investigation, which is planned in the near future.

---

7 In total, there were surveyed 39 areas in the village of Maydon – mainly represented by plots of the inhabitants (gardens, fields), and by cemeteries, public places, disruptions of terrain etc.
Another area, called Kalapush Tepa⁸ (kallapush = Uzb. / Taj. ‘doppa’,⁹ POL_218; KuPi_065), and situated on the south-west margin of the oasis, yielded a number of archaeological finds. At this site, which has the shape of a mound (ca. 20 × 30 m), were found ceramic fragments dated to the Bronze Age. They were found by local inhabitants during building activities and several pieces were also found during our prospection. Nevertheless, the density of finds was not high and our investigation of several disruptions of the surface on this mound ended up without results.

---

⁸ The top of the hill on the ridge that runs from the site Gaza Kutan to Maydon Kurgan has the same name, but no finds were found there and also the terrain does not seem to be modified.

⁹ The term ‘doppa’ describes a traditional local square or round male skullcap.
In close proximity of this site a small tepa was detected (NEG_076; KuPi_064) where the locals reportedly found ceramic fragments. Although this feature seemed to be of the same type as the tepas with finds in other oases (no name site KuPi_013 in Zarabag – Augustinová et al. 2015, 266–269, mentioned here as B3; Khush-Vakttepa KuPi_051 in Karabag – Augustinová et al. 2017, 112; Eishntepa KuPi_056 in Kampyrtepa – Augustinová et al. 2017, 122–123), during our field survey we did not discover any finds here.
Two other noticeable places with finds are situated in close proximity to the known site Maydon Kurgan in the south-east of the oasis. The first of them has the shape of a mound and the ceramic fragments had been dispersed mainly on the fields surrounding this small tepa (POL_223; KuPi_067). Several pieces were also found at the tepa, but on the top of it a modern house stands and therefore it could not be investigated generally. The second one was detected as a dense pottery scatter in the field (POL_224; KuPi_070), but because of the poor state of preservation of the given fragments, it was not possible to date this site.

GOZ

The oasis of Goz is situated on the road running from Pashkhurt to the villages of Aktash and Charvak and continuing across the state border into Turkmenistan. The current extent of the village is approximately 172 ha. There are two ridges to the south-east of the oasis – the southern one is called Pyshtykara and the northern one Karachazyl. The watercourse of Goz Say (called Muzrabad Say downstream) and a path that follows it closely flows from the village of Goz in the direction of the Sherabad lowlands through the gorge Goz Dagana (dagana = Uzb. ‘mountain pass’) between these two ridges.

During the survey of Goz we did not record the official census of the people and families living there. The estimation – or rather a guess – of a teacher 10 from the local school was 500 people and 180 families. The people living in Goz are, according to this informant, mostly Tajiks. During the field survey we recorded the narrative of Bozor Bobo,11 one of the oldest men in the village. Based on his testimony, the Tajik people (Chagatay) came to settle here from the village of Vandob and from Turkmenistan. Another group of people came to this area from Khwarezm and settled at the place called Turk Korez, where there were enough water sources (probably the place with karezes in the north-west margin of the village). The name Goz (Uzb. g'oz = ‘war’), which was given to the village, hints at an old armed conflict. During this fight one man lost his head 4 km from Goz in a path that runs through Goz Dagana via the Sherabad lowlands. The legend says that he took his chopped off head and walked with it for more than 4 km. At the place where he eventually died, a grave known today as Goz Ota (KuPi_076) was built, and in the course of time a cemetery arose around it.

The village of Goz is mentioned in the ethnographic work of B. Kh. Karmysheva (1976). Based on her investigation, the village was divided into two parts – the first part should have been inhabited by Tajiks (named Chagatay), the second part, reportedly called Tentak-Kishlak12, was inhabited by Uzbeks (Karmysheva 1976, 50).

WATER SOURCES

The oasis of Goz was reportedly a member of a group of villages in the Piedmont of Kugitang once called Karezat (KARMYSHEVA 1976, 50) that had been irrigated by artificial water-bringing systems of karezes. In the current village and its hinterland, there were detected 17 individ-

---

10 Ural Khusachatov (aged 50?); village of Goz – Sherabad District, south Uzbekistan; August 29th, 2017.
He accompanied us during the first day of the prospection, helped us to communicate with local inhabitants, and showed us the historically / archaeologically important places in the village.

11 Bozor bobo (aged 87); village of Goz – Sherabad District, south Uzbekistan; August 29th, 2017.

12 In consideration of the translation of the term (tentak = Uzb. ‘stupid’; kishlak = Uzb. ‘village’) it apparently reflects the bias of Karmysheva’s respondent against the inhabitants of this part of village.
ual pits – remains of the karezes (GZ_K01–K17; Fig. 7; Tab. 2) during our field survey. They are situated mainly in the central part of the village and on its south-east margin (Pl. 7/5:A). The relics have a similar shape as those recorded in the village of Zarabag in previous seasons (Augustinová et al. 2015, 269–270). Predominantly, they are visible as a regular line of rounded depressions of the surface/pits (d. 3–10 m), with spacing of ca. 10 m. At the bottom it is possible to see water still running or even vegetation, and sometimes there can be seen the remains of the wood cladding of the tunnels (Pl. 7/5:B–C). On the south-western margin of the Goz Oasis, a part of the remains of the underground water system collapsed completely and has gradually taken the shape of a stream bed. It is possible to track the underground course of the karez in the south-east direction again by following the circular depressions on the surface as in the centre of the village. From this spot (GZ_K017) the underground system of karezes continues to the north in the direction of the mountains.

Except for karezes, the important part of the water economy in the oasis is represented by springs. Seven springs were documented (GZ_S01–S07; Tab. 2), and an additional one (Dam Buloq = dam = Uzb./Taj. ‘quiet’; GZ_S08) had been mentioned in the testimony of the local inhabitant Bozor Bobo, but despite our efforts to do so it has not been located.

Fig. 7: Water sources – springs and karezes – in the Goz Oasis (map by Anna Augustinová).

13 The literal translation of the Uzb./Taj. word *dam* is ‘quiet’, nevertheless in the case of toponym it is also possible to translate the word *dam* as ‘dammed’ – e. g. Damkul = Uzb. ‘the dammed lake’ (Karaev 2015, 297–298).
The most abundant spring Goz Kala Buloq (kala = Uzb. ‘fortress’; GZ_S01) gives enough water to be taken away by pipeline to the remote village of Talashkan, situated ca. 20 km to the south. The place is also known under the name ‘Kirkkiz’ and it is associated with a local legend.14

A second spring called locally Gum Buloq (gum = Taj. ‘bottomless’; GZ_S02), provides the water in several spots in the vicinity of the main source in the spring season. A third one, Shor Buloq (sho’r = ‘salt’; GZ_S03) is said to give mineral water, even if again only during the spring season. Near the cemetery of Goz Ota, there are two more springs. The Goz Ota Buloq (GZ_S04) springs on the east side of the cemetery and a no name spring (GZ_S05) on the west side flows only during the spring season. In the centre of the village, there is located Okh Buloq Ota (GZ_S06) in close proximity to the prominent grave of Okh Buloq Ota (KuPi_078). The last documented no name spring (GZ_S07) is situated near the prominent grave of Suleyman Ota (KuPi_079) on the south-west margin of the village.

MORPHOLOGICAL FEATURES AND THE LOCATIONS WITH ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE

The field survey inside the village itself was hindered by an unexpected difficulty: access to the plots and gardens of local inhabitants was obstructed by a number of fierce dogs protecting the plots even though we had the agreement of the owners. Nevertheless, among the 25 surveyed areas, there were detected 16 places with archaeological finds, especially ceramic fragments (POL_225–231; POL_240–249), and only nine places gave negative results (NEG_097–105; Pl. 7/2–4). The apparently most important archaeological sites have been discovered in the hinterland of the Goz Oasis. There is a high probability that some of them are connected with the possible corridors through the mountain ridges that had been investigated during the field survey focused on these issues (Stančo in print).

In the centre of the village, there was documented an ‘old place’ in the vicinity of the prominent tomb of Okh Buloq Ota (KuPi_078) that was reconstructed five years ago. The remains of karezes run along this grave, and there is a well-marked accumulation of stones that may represent a kurgan. During the field survey, no chronologically sensitive finds were unearthed. Only in the neighbouring garden (POL_246), one pottery fragment dated to the 12th century was discovered.

A large quantity of ceramic fragments (POL_242; KuPi_075) was found in the south margin of the Goz Oasis, more precisely to the west of Goz Ota cemetery, which is still in use. This flat area has no distinct demarcation lines and lies on the right bank of the Goz Say. Roughly an equal proportion of the ceramic fragments collected during the survey were dated to the turn of the Late Kushan and the Early Medieval Period (4th–5th century; 28 fragments), and into the High Medieval Period (12th century; 26 fragm.). There were also sporadic fragments dated to the Early Iron Age (Yaz I culture; 1 fragm.), to the earlier High Medieval (10th–11th century; 2 fragm.) and to the Pre-Modern Period (18th–19th century; 4 fragm.) respectively.

The second area with a large concentration of finds is situated beyond the scope of the Goz Oasis itself (3.6 km from the centre of the village; Fig. 2; Pl. 7/4). It is situated on the right

---

14 It tells of 40 young girls that bathed in the river of Surkhan Darya at the place called Salavat. Suddenly Basmachi appeared and the girls started to run away to save themselves. When they reached this place, they prayed to God to change them into the stones so that Basmachi could not catch them. Their wish was granted and they were turned into stones and now their tears supply the spring with water.
side of the road connecting the village of Goz with the villages of Aktash and Charvag. The place is known by the local people as Kyzyl Bay and there are numerous relics of walls, stone structures, tepas and artificial platforms clearly visible in the terrain. It is possible to recognize three concentrations of ceramic fragments – in the area of the remains of the medieval village (KuPi_071; Figs. 8–10), a concentration on a small tepa (KuPi_072; Figs. 11–12) and a concentration on a tepa connected with a flat platform (KuPi_073).

Fig. 8: Selected pottery from the surface survey in the hinterland of the Goz Oasis. Find spot and dating: 1–8 Goz (KuPi_071 - Kyzyl Bay): 1 - Late Bronze Age, 2 - Late Kushan Period (4th c.), 3, 4 - Early Medieval (5th–6th c.), 5–8 - High Medieval (12th c.); (drawing by T. Kolmačka and L. Damašek).
Fig. 9: Selected pottery from the surface survey in the Goz Oasis. Find spot and dating: 1–9 Goz (KuPi_071 – Kyzyl Bay): 2–4 – Early Medieval (5th–6th c.), 1, 5–9 – High Medieval (12th c.); (drawing by L. Damašek).
The most dominant feature of the defunct medieval village of Kyzyl Bay (KuPi_071; Figs. 8–9) represent the wood remains of an old mosque (Pl. 7/6) that was apparently situated in the centre of the village. The second well marked feature in this area is a prominent grave surrounded by the modern iron fence. In the area, there are numerous relicts of the mud-brick walls and stone structures that are still highly visible in the terrain just as on the satellite images (Pl. 7/4). The size of the village could be determined roughly as ca. 330×170 m. Ca. 400 m to the west of the western end of the defunct village, it is possible to recognize the remains of fields and of irrigation systems, which most probably belonged to the village. Judging from the pottery assemblage collected on the surface, the main period of use of the area was the Early Medieval one (5th–6th century; 40 fragm.), nonetheless there are also numerous fragments belonging to the High Medieval Period (10th – 12th century; 18 fragm.). Unfortunately, it is not possible to connect the relics of particular walls with a specific period only according to the dating of the surface pottery finds.

Fig. 10: Selected pottery from the surface survey in the hinterland of the Goz Oasis. Find spot and dating: 1–3 Goz (KuPi_071 – Kyzyl Bay); 1–3 – High Medieval (12th c.); (drawing by L. Damašek).

To the north-east of the abandoned village lies a small tepa (KuPi_072; oval shape 65×50 m). The pottery fragments are dispersed not only across the tepa, but also in its vicinity. Most of the fragments belong again to the High Medieval Period (12th century; 33 fragm.), but there are also finds of Bronze Age material (12 fragm.). Only one fragment potentially belongs to the Early Iron Age (Yaz I culture), and one to the Greco-Bactrian Period.

The third site (KuPi_073) in this area is situated about 85 m to the north-east of the previously mentioned tepa (KuPi_072). It consists of the tepa itself (d. 60 m), and of an adjacent flat platform (170×80 m). Most of the pottery fragments collected at this place are dated to the High Medieval Period (12th century; 25 fragm.), but there are several pieces also from the Bronze Age (4 fragm.) and Early Medieval Period (5th–6th century; 4 fragm.), too.
Cemeteries and Central Prominent Tombs

There are two cemeteries in the Goz micro-oasis. The currently-used one – Khojib Ota (NEG_097) –, which is situated in the north part of the village, provided us with no archaeological evidence whatsoever.
Fig. 12: Selected pottery from the surface survey in the hinterland of the Goz Oasis. Find spot and dating: 1–6 – Goz (KuPi_072 – Kyzyl Bay): 1 – Late Bronze Age, 2–3 – Bronze Age, 4–6 – Early Medieval (5th–6th c.); (drawing by L. Damašek).

The older one – Goz Ota (NEG_103) is situated on the way from Goz to Goz Dagana and consists of two parts. The earlier one arises in the surroundings of the prominent grave Goz Ota (KuPi_076) at a small platform on the right bank of Goz Say close to the gorge (dagana). This place is connected with the aforementioned local legend on the origin of the village name. When there was not enough space for burying it extended to the west on a neighbouring small mound. In the east direction from the older part of this burial ground (NEG_105), detected 16
old graves were on a small ridge up the valley that are visible on the surface as the outlines (circular or rectangular) of stones. In most cases, there is a small stele erected on the grave made of unworked stone (approx. 40×40×10 cm). This area is situated exactly on the opposite side of the valley to the newly detected Bronze Age site (Stančo in print; POL_241; KuPi_074; Pl. 7/3; Fig. 2).

Except for the prominent grave of Goz Ota (KuPi_076), three other ones were documented in the oasis of Goz. In the north of the village there is located an isolated prominent grave of Kyzyl Tepa Ota (kyzil = Uzb. ‘red’) on a small mound (KuPi_077). According to the testimony of local inhabitants, there was no burial ground around in close proximity to the grave and also no finds came from this area. The second one – Suleyman Ota (KuPi_069) – is near the detected system of the karezes and in the vicinity of the spring (GZ_S06). The last one – Okh Buloq Ota (KuPi_078) – situated in the centre of the village near the systems of karezes was reconstructed a few years ago.

CONCLUSION

The survey in the oases of Maydon and Goz has been conducted as the third part of the project focused on the settlement patterns and dynamics in the Paskhurt Basin in the foothills of the Kugitang Mountains. We focused on the reconstruction of the historical development of the oases based on the prospection in the areas of currently inhabited villages and their hinterlands. At these actively used places, the archaeological evidence is strongly affected by the construction, agricultural and other activities that disregard the historical value of the finds.

During the prospection in the oases of Maydon and Goz there were collected plentiful assemblages of pottery fragments, that allow us to preliminarily date the surveyed areas. Overall, 1,528 ceramic fragments were gathered in these two oases and their hinterlands, and 1,401 of these fragments were suitable for dating (968 fragm. from the Goz Oasis and 434 fragm. from the Maydon Oasis). As shown in the graph (Fig. 13), the settlement dynamic evidences a more or less similar tendency. In the comparison with the evaluated data from the previous seasons (the oases of Zarabag, Karabag, and Kampyrtepa – Augustinová et al. 2017, 130), the fluctuation of the settlement density is again more or less similar.

The evaluation of the finds is summarized in the table (Tab. 1). The settlement evidence begins in both oases or their hinterland in the Bronze Age. In Goz, except for the two principal sites (KuPi_074 and KuPi_067 – Qushilish; Stančo in print), there are four other spots with finds from the Bronze Age. The most significant one (KuPi_072) represents the small tepe near the defunct Medieval village of Kyzyl Bay, where also the pottery fragments dated to the Early Iron Age (Yaz I culture) were found. In the oasis of Maydon, two spots with Bronze Age material were found. The first of them is the poly-cultural site of Maydon Kurgan (KuPi_063), but it is represented only by one fragment of pottery. The second one, which yielded more complex data, is represented by the site of Kalapush Tepa (KuPi_065).
The Early Iron Age was detected at three places in the oasis of Goz and in its hinterland. The most significant is the site mentioned above as KuPi_074; (Stančo in print) in the context of the Bronze Age sites. The two other spots are represented only by one fragment of pottery each. In the oasis of Maydon there was found only one site with evidence dating it to the Early Iron Age, i.e. the site of Gaza Kutan (KuPi_066), which, however, represents a settlement of regional significance.

Then there is a long temporal gap in the settlement as shown by evidence in both oases. This hiatus ends in the 3rd century AD, during the Late Kushan Period. The new settlement wave is represented by four sites in Goz and three sites in Maydon. As in the previously surveyed oases (Augustinová et al. 2017, 104–148, 185–188), the distinct increase of the settlement density begins only in the Early Medieval Period (5th–6th century), and with a small decrease in the 7th–8th century15 continues rising to the High Medieval Period (12th century).

In later periods, the archaeological evidence of settlement in the oases of Maydon and Goz strongly decrease and actually almost disappears. While in the oasis of Maydon the Late Medieval Period is represented only by one pottery fragment dated to the 17th century (POL_220), in the oasis of Goz the evidence is more plentiful, nevertheless it is insignificant compared to the previous periods (13th century at the two sites – KuPi_071 and KuPi_072; 14th century at one site KuPi_069; 16th century at one site – Qushilish = KuPi_068; 17th century at two sites – KuPi_069 and Kyzyl Bay, KuPi_071).
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Tab. 1: The morphological features and noticeable spots (KuPi_062–079) in the oases of Maydon and Goz.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Local Name</th>
<th>Coordinates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MY_S01a</td>
<td>Maydon</td>
<td>Surkh Buloq</td>
<td>66,84355300 37,74623600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY_S01b</td>
<td>Maydon</td>
<td>Surkh Buloq</td>
<td>66,84226536 37,74647747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY_S01c</td>
<td>Maydon</td>
<td>Surkh Buloq</td>
<td>66,84246846 37,74687896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY_S02</td>
<td>Maydon</td>
<td>Mrza Khodja Buloq</td>
<td>66,85959954 37,73503796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY_S03</td>
<td>Maydon</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>66,85042592 37,74048165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY_S04</td>
<td>Maydon</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>66,84663692 37,74381565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY_S05</td>
<td>Maydon</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>66,84661616 37,74420235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY_S06</td>
<td>Maydon</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>66,84512100 37,74521104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY_S07</td>
<td>Maydon</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>66,84502791 37,74513074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY_S08</td>
<td>Maydon</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>66,84518870 37,74544524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY_S09</td>
<td>Maydon</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>66,84333200 37,74779673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY_S10</td>
<td>Maydon</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>66,84162308 37,74901565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY_S11</td>
<td>Maydon</td>
<td>Bosh Buloq</td>
<td>66,84205108 37,75011335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY_S12</td>
<td>Maydon</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>66,86854946 37,73232996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZ_S01</td>
<td>Goz</td>
<td>Goz Kala Buloq</td>
<td>66,74231895 37,62473151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZ_S02</td>
<td>Goz</td>
<td>Gum Buloq</td>
<td>66,73774514 37,62845049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZ_S03</td>
<td>Goz</td>
<td>Shor Buloq</td>
<td>66,74545186 37,62752864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZ_S04</td>
<td>Goz</td>
<td>Goz Ota Buloq</td>
<td>66,74358895 37,62199883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZ_S05</td>
<td>Goz</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>66,74097205 37,62149917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZ_S07</td>
<td>Goz</td>
<td>× (in the vicinity of prominent tomb Sulayman Ota)</td>
<td>66,72699214 37,6342117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZ_S06</td>
<td>Goz</td>
<td>Okh Buloq Ota</td>
<td>66,73854923 37,62553838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZ_S08</td>
<td>Goz</td>
<td>Dam Buloq</td>
<td>not localized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZ_K01</td>
<td>Goz</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>66,73831714 37,62952651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZ_K02</td>
<td>Goz</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>66,73819367 37,62588420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZ_K03</td>
<td>Goz</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>66,72697496 37,62362608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZ_K04</td>
<td>Goz</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>66,72695423 37,62353973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZ_K05</td>
<td>Goz</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>66,72691846 37,62374873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZ_K06</td>
<td>Goz</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>66,72685149 37,62369073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZ_K07</td>
<td>Goz</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>66,72679179 37,62377193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZ_K08</td>
<td>Goz</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>66,72675523 37,62399669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZ_K09</td>
<td>Goz</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>66,72672384 37,62409883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZ_K10</td>
<td>Goz</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>66,72666943 37,62417383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZ_K11</td>
<td>Goz</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>66,72658991 37,62425426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZ_K12</td>
<td>Goz</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>66,72651457 37,62435204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZ_K13</td>
<td>Goz</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>66,72644342 37,62444320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZ_K14</td>
<td>Goz</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>66,72638273 37,62450619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZ_K15</td>
<td>Goz</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>66,72631995 37,62465686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZ_K16</td>
<td>Goz</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>66,72594327 37,62478464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GZ_K17</td>
<td>Goz</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>66,72607720 37,62530673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 2: The water sources detected in the oases of Maydon and Goz.
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Pl. 6/7: Survey area V, Khojaunkan – Gurjak.

Pl. 7/1: Researched area on the Soviet military topographic map created in 1983 (1: 100 000)
- highlighted areas of the Maydon and Goz Oases.
Pl. 7/2: Overview of the surveyed polygons with the number of finds (POL_XX) and with negative results (NEG_XX) in the Maydon Oasis (map by Anna Augustinová).
Pl. 7/3: Overview of the surveyed polygons with the number of finds (POL_XX) and with negative results (NEG_XX) in the centre of the Goz Oasis (map by Anna Augustinová).

Pl. 7/4: Overview of the surveyed polygons with the number of finds (POL_XX) and with negative results (NEG_XX) on the southwest margin of the Goz Oasis in the vicinity of the defunct medieval village Kyzyl Bay (map by Anna Augustinová).
Pl. 7/5: The remains of karezes in the oasis of Goz. A: Relicts of a karez in the southwest margin of the Goz Oasis; B, C: Relicts of the wood constructions in the karezes (photo by Anna Augustinová).

Pl. 7/6: Kyzyl Bay – the defunct medieval village on the southwest margin of the Goz Oasis. The remains of the wooden construction of the mosque in the centre of the defunct village (photo by Anna Augustinová).