

PAPER DETAILS

TITLE: Continuous Culture Of Azerbaijan And Sumerian Civilization

AUTHORS: Nazim HUSEYNLI,Nigar HUSEYNOVA

PAGES: 111-121

ORIGINAL PDF URL: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/1354166>

CONTINUOUS CULTURE OF AZERBAIJAN AND SUMERIAN CIVILIZATION

Nazim Huseynli,

Doctor of philosophy sciences, professor

Nigar Huseynova,

Doctor of philological sciences,

Ac.Hasan Aliyev street, 135 A, Baku Azerbaijan

huseynli-n.1956@rambler.ru

Abstract

The article provides an excursion through the history of the Sumerian realities. The Sumerian facts and realities are being researched within the context of relationship between the past and present and classified as 8 stages. The last stage has dual nature: it is characterized as embezzlement of Sumerian civilization elements, on the other hand detection of objective truth on Sumerian historical facts. The author analyzes the importance of language factor in the genesis and development of civilization, structural parallels embracing parallels between the Sumerian and Turkish languages, classification parallels among the words included the lexicology of the language and lexical parallels, as well as name parallels. It is shown that the name differs from the words in content and volume, due to the structure of both the meaning and price, they are similar. The name creates genetic code fund in content and volume structure. All objects included ethnic group's creativity and other areas turn into thoughts through names and transmit to others. In this case, the names are being changed or distorted. Such act of manipulation serves removing marks of civilization. The author substantiates the parallels between marks of names and marks of civilization based on facts. He summarizes all facts and comes to the conclusion that Azerbaijan lies at the root of the formation of mankind and genesis of civilizations. It is proved that the most continuous culture exists in Azerbaijan.

Keywords: *Sumer, Turkic, Azerbaijan, Mesopotamia, culture, civilization, ethnicity, language*

SÜREKLİ AZERBAJCAN KÜLTÜRÜ VE SÜMER UYGARLIĞI

Özet

Makalede Sümerlerle ilgili gerçeklerin açıklanması tarihine değinilir ve Sümerlerin araştırılmasının sekiz aşaması tasnif edilir; Sümer geçmişi - Sümerlerle ilgili geçmiş - Sümerlerin bugünü arasındaki ilişkilerden hareketle Sümer olgusu ve Sümer gerçekleri incelenir. Sonuncu aşamada bir taraftan Sümer uygarlığı örneklerinin benimsenilmesi, diğer taraftan ise Sümer tarihi olguları hakkında nesnel gerçeklerin tespit edilmesi gibi ikili özelliğin olmasına dikkat çekilir. Uygarlığın genезisi ve gelişmesinde dil faktörünün önemi, Sümer ve Türk

dillerinin yapısal paralelliği, her iki dilin kelime hazinesindeki kelimelerin tasnif paralelliği ve leksik paralellik, ayrıca isim paralelliği analiz edilir.

Gösterilir ki, isim ve kelimeler anlam ve değer yapısında olduğu için birbirine benzeseler de, isim, sözlerden içerik ve hacme sahip olmasıyla ayrılır ve yapısında toplumun genetik kodunun fonunu oluşturuyor. Toplumun yaratıcılığına ve diğer faaliyet alanlarına giren tüm nesneler isimler aracılığıyla düşünce alanına dahil oluyor ve diğerlerine aktarılıyor. Adların sahteleştirilmesi uygarlığın izinin kaybedilmesine yol açıyor. Adların genezisi ve statüsü objektif olarak ele alındığında kültürel izler tespit edilir. Adların izleri ile kültür izleri arasında paralellikler verilere dayanarak kanıtlanır.

Makalede insanlığın şekillenmesinin, özellikle uygarlıkların genezisinin kökünde Azerbaycan'ın durması sonucuna varılır. Dünyada en sürekli kültürün Azerbaycan'da olduğu kanıtlanmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Sümer, Türki, Azerbaycan, Mezopotamya, kültür, medeniyet, etnik köken, dil*

Introduction

Sumer is considered starting point in the history of development of mankind. Thoughts about the formation of early civilization in Sumer have been put forward as historical reality by the scientists, archeologists, historians from America, Europe (especially England, France, Germany etc.), Russia and other countries. Existence of links between historical fact and historical reality is undeniable. Historical facts turn into historical realities as a result of long-lasting processes. Historical realities about the Sumerian civilization were also formed as a result of long-lasting historical processes. Establishment of proper connection between the historical fact and historical reality depends on finding out the essence of genetic-functional links between cognition-process and cognition-effect. This, consequently leading to the necessity interaction and impact between the past and present. Such point of view makes actual significance of endless approaches in the same historical fact. Views accepted as truth lose meanings in this process and it involves new details, intensive searches are being carried out on the true nature of process. If we approach the Sumerian civilization basing on above-mentioned factors, we can see that Sumerian realities have been presented to the younger generation far from the reality. The reality is always accompanied by misapprehension. This fact is undeniable. There are misapprehensions in each reality and there are germs of truth in each misapprehension. If Sumerians were presented us in this way, no serious problems would ever arise. Unfortunately, Sumerians were presented within the context of distortions, lies and appropriation.

Excursion through the history of discovery of Sumerian truths

If we look into Sumerian fact and reality within the background of Sumerian past and Sumerian present, we can prove our claims. Let's start historical tour through post-Sumer points of view and make thought experiments. Then we can see that creations made by great civilization owners attract neighboring or other ethnic groups' attention. Sumerians' clay tablets belonging to different



stages of the history are kept in the museums of various countries. The researchers conduct their researches on the basis of information taken from those countries. In this case, formation of objective truth becomes a problem. Dmitri Likhachov, chairman of the Soviet Culture Fund ordered scientists researching Near East to keep Sumerians' clay tablets in Hermitage Museum in Leningrad (then Saint Petersburg). There can be two purposes in this order: 1) distortion of Sumerians' clay tablets; 2) remove these samples from the subject of study. "Sumerian-Akkadian culture" or "Babel is cradle of civilization" themes weren't widespread in the textbooks, scientific-research works and other spheres in the Soviet Union. Sumerians were creative nation; on the other hand, Babylonians and Assyrians were embezzling nations. In this case, there can be no parallels between the Sumerian civilization and Akkadian culture. According to the information we received, Sumerian clerks taught the students not to get married with Akkadians, as for them it would be humiliation for Sumerians. Let's look through the history from this point of view.

First stage – Akkadian period (2316-2170 B.C). The Akkadian king Sargon (king of the four quarters of the universe) occupied Sumer in 2330 B.C and moved the clay tablet library, as well as other examples of material culture from here to Nineveh and created Akkadian culture with those samples (Харенберг, 2000:24). They used Sumerian language as an official state language, and then made their own Akkadian language setting up Sumerian-Akkadian dictionary. The Sumerian language was taught in the schools as major language in this period (Канева,2006: 13-14).

Second stage – Babylonian Period (XVIII-XVI centuries B.C). Hammurabi founded the Babylonian dynasty in XVIII century B.C. He embezzled the Sumerian king Ur-Nammu's Law-Code and unfortunately "The Code of Ur-Nammu" is widely known as "The Law-Code of Hammurabi" up to date.

Third stage – Hittite period (XVI century B.C). Hattusili I (or Labarna) occupied Babylonia and founded Hittite Kingdom in 1531 B.C. Hittites created their own theology and pictographic writing style on the basis of Sumerians' religious system and pictographs. Hittite culture was made of mixed elements belonging nations living around Caspian Sea, Sumerians, especially Catal-Huyuk ceramics. This culture includes beak-spouted jars (Caspian nations), containers made of animal motifs (Anatolian culture), clothes (Azerbaijani, Anatolian art of weaving) and other samples. Hittites arrived to Eastern Anatolia through the territories around Caspian Sea during the first big removal of Indian-European nations. They brought their own cultural samples during this removal. It is obvious that, the main part of Hittites' wealth consisted of products made of different metals. The first use of metal was seen in the territories of Azerbaijan, Turkmenistan and Anatolia. And Hittites used this factor skillfully. The Hittites wrote symbols from right to left, and from left to right in the next line in XVIII-XVII centuries B.C based on the Sumerian-cuneiform scripts.



Fourth stage – Medians settled in the northwestern part of Southern Azerbaijan in 3-2 millennium B.C and gradually captured all territory living sedentary lifestyles (История и культура Древнего Востока, 2008:229-230). Cyrus II built Achaemenid Empire by conquering the Median Empire. “Avesta” – one of the most significant sources of the history was born in the Median period and misinterpreted by the Persians.

Fifth stage – Alexander of Macedonia began to remove Sumerian cultural marks after defeating Persians. Thoughts of burning “Avesta” by Alexander were occurred after this invasion. The question is why Alexander had to burn “Avesta”? It is well known that, Alexander was educated by the great Greek philosopher Aristotle. Later it became clear that, the ancient Greek philosophers masterly used “Avesta” theses in their works.

Sixth stage – Greeks’ Hellenistic period. The Greeks adopted all elements of Sumerian civilization in this period. Henceforth, gradually the Sumerians and their language were included into “dead nations” and “extinct language” categories. Sumerian ideas intensively improved in the Greek philosophers’ works. We can give an example: team of researchers in the University of California (USA) prepared report about the root of the music in 1974. They highlighted some facts: “We had no doubts about existence of music in the ancient Babylonian-Assyrian civilization. But our researches prove existence of diatonic gammas till them. They are similar to modern Western, as well as ancient Greek music. It is up to date believed that the groundwork for the Western music was laid in Greece. But now it has been revealed that the main aspects of Western music are based on the Sumerian culture. No doubt that music and song definitions also should be included into the Sumerian inventions” (Ситчин, 2007:55-56). At the same time, they added that religious and mythological elements reached to Greece through Mediterranean islands and Asia from Near East (Ситчин, 2007: 72).

Besides, interpretation of “me” in Sumerian as “logos” in Greek, marks of Sumerian political system in Plato’s, Sumerian cosmogony in Aristotle’s works and other similar “historical realities” served not only to reveal the truths, but erase them from the history.

Seventh stage – there was a huge void in exploration of Sumerians till XII century, as if they were forgotten. Medieval Spanish traveller Benjamin of Tudela began to research Sumerians in XII century. Starting from XII century archaeological excavations have been conducted in the south kurgans (raised earth burials) of Mesopotamia (let’s remind that, the phrase “kurgan” belongs only to Turks – N.Z.).

Italian traveller Pietro Della Valle conducted archaeological excavations in the southern part of Mesopotamia in XVI-XVII centuries and firstly brought Sumerian scripts to Europe. This stage can be characterized as a continuous research of the Sumerian civilization.



Eights stage – this stage has dual character: embezzlement of Sumerian civilization examples and on the other hand conduction of researches on discovering objective truths about Sumerian historical facts. For example, English scientist and archeologist H.C.Rawlinson discovered Sumerian city-state Ur under instructions of the British Museum and Pennsylvania University museum in 1922-1934. American philologist S.N.Kramer deciphered, assembled and classified cuneiform tablets in the several museums. He helped to spread the name of Sumer to the world at large.

H.C.Rawlinson conducted researches in Sumer when he worked as a consul of Great Britain in Baghdad, published “The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia” and later J.Smith was involved in these works. His report on “most of the ideas in the Bible were taken from “The Epic of Gilgamesh”” weren’t accepted unambiguously in the meeting of the Bible Society. And “Daily Telegraph” newspaper of London financed him for the next time.

We can increase the number of such periods and approaches. But there is no need to do this. Above-mentioned factors are the past of Sumer, Akkad, Babylonia, Hittite and Greeks and present time approaches is the Sumerian present. We have to step up to the Sumerian past by using the Sumerian present. There are layers in the historical truths as in archeology. The Sumerian present is crust, the past is lower layers. The other side of this issue is Sumer’s status. We must search links between the Sumerian past and present. Sometimes, researchers claim that the Sumerians brought the elements of their civilization from the other planet. According to the Sumerian epics, myths and tablets, they think that “everything is controlled from the sky”. All civilizations were built up by humans and exist only in Earth. The question is where the Sumerians came from? There were and are many answers to this question.

Russian scientists K.Matvejev and A.Sazanov classified the answers in their “Old Land between two rivers”: 1.From Caucasus; 2.Tibet or Assam region of India; 3.Asia or India; 4.Western part of Indochina; 5.India; 6.Caucasus or Caspian region; 7.Asia or Near East (Матвеев, Сазанов, 1968:35-46).

Taking into consideration all above-mentioned facts, we must pay attention to the historical periods before Sumer. According to the principles of dialectics, if present exists, then past exists, too. The very structure of the Sumerian civilization existed in real concrete substance. The Sumerian reality is concrete, too. It is synthesis of abstractions of various aspects and relationships of the Sumerian facts. Each abstraction is formed through the long stages. Let’s take a look at the development history of each aspect of the Sumerian civilization. It includes geographical environment, the formation of human beings, domestication of animals, culturalization of plants, establishment of agricultural and cattle-breeding farms, building social relations among people, division of labor, links



between the Sumerian and other languages, parallels between Sumerian and other ethnics' names which make up the genetic code of Sumer, cultural parallelism and other elements.

We cannot talk about the existence of the formation of human beings, creation of initial cultural elements, transition from hunting and gathering to farming and cattle-breeding, first buildings and their development trends, dynamics of people's religious and scientific outlooks and language factor in Paleolithic (70-9 mil.B.C), Mesolithic (9-7 mil.B.C) and Neolithic (7-5,5 mil.B.C) ages (Бертман, 2007:388-389) in Mesopotamia. Without those elements no civilization could be formed. Then, there is a need to look for such elements around the Sumer culture. If we pay attention to the chronology of world cultures, we can see that first-born culture was formed in Shel, Olduvai, Ashel, Mustie periods. "Guruchay" culture was formed as "Chaydashi" culture among them in the same periods. "Chaydashi" culture firstly emerged in Azykh Cave 1,5 million years ago (Hüseynov, 1981: 39). Azykhanthrop made up this culture. They were similar to first Neanderthals (Hüseynov, 1981: 82-83). Neanderthals (*Homo sapiens neanderthalensis*) lived in Siberia, Central Asia and Azerbaijan (Ситчин, 2007:9). "Chaydashi" culture was formed as a result of their gradual evolution. They used wood, leather, milk, domesticated animals, culturalized plants, and made tools for gathering and hunting beginning from Mesolithic age. First paintings occurred in this period. For the first time in the world, petroglyphs were painted with forging techniques in Gobustan (Azerbaijan) in 8th mil.B.C, paintings were drawn using metal tools in 7th mil.B.C, decorative items were made of pure copper 5 thousand years ago in Anatolia, mud-brick houses were built in Namazgatapa, figurines were made of clay. The history of culture in Gobustan (12th mil.B.C), Gamigaya (6th mil.B.C), Chatal-Huyug (in 8500 B.C) and other regions (8-6th mil.B.C) is more ancient than the Sumerian culture. City building was firstly occurred and developed in 8500 B.C in Chatal-Huyug (Кликс, 1983:122). Then, it is expedient to look for the roots of the Sumerian civilization in the above-mentioned regions. It is impossible to imagine the genesis and development of civilization beyond the language factor.

Initial stage of the language formation is related to the genesis of paintings. Polish-American ancient historian and Assyriologist Ignace Jay Gelb considered paintings as an initial stage of writings (Гельб, 1963:184). He noted: "... writing can exist only in civilized environment; civilization cannot exist without writing, in turn" (Гельб, 1963:211). The first paintings in the world had common character. Such paintings with Venus ornaments symbolizing "morning star" and "polar star" occurred in the Eastern Siberia, and Gobustan. Those total paintings didn't play such a big role in the formation of writings. Differentiated scenes and other drawings played main role in the formation of writings. Such type of paintings were formed and developed in Gobustan (12th mil.B.C), in Chatal-Huyug (in 8500 B.C), Namazgatapa and Gamiqaya (6th mil.B.C). Then, we must search marks of the Sumerian writings in Turkmenistan, Azerbaijan and Turkey.



World languages are divided into three main groups: fusional, agglutinative and monosyllabic. Typologically Sumerian is classified as an agglutinative split ergative language. In this type of language each morphemes remains in every aspect unchanged after their union. Parallels between the Sumerian and Turkic languages manifest itself in the following cases:

Structural parallels. The Sumerian and Turkic languages are similar in terms of structure: words may contain different morphemes to determine their meaning, but each of these morphemes remains in every aspect unchanged after their union. For example, “dumu” means “child”, “dumu-nitah” means “child-man:boy”, “dumu-munus” means “child-woman:girl” in Sumerian.

Classification parallels among the words included into the lexicology of language. One of the characteristics of the Sumerian and Turkic languages is classification of animate and inanimate. Classification means formation of groups according to the homogenous features of items, animate and inanimate. This process is carried out by determinant. In Sumerian “dingir”, in old Turkic language “täŋri”, in Altai “tengeri”, in Azeri Turkish “tanrı”, in Yakut “tangara” mean “sky”, “high”, “huge”, “God”; in Sumerian “utu”, in old Turkic language “ütük”, in Kazakh and Kyrgyz “üyt”, in Azeri Turkish “ütü” means “sun”, “burning”, “flame”, “fireplace”; in Sumerian “dumu”, in old Turkic language, Uighur, Altai “tun”, in Tuvian “dun ool” mean “baby”, “first child”, “newborn”.

Lexical parallels. It is important to pay attention to the similarity of the words in Sumerian and Turkish languages. One of the main features of finding out genetic links between the languages is to define meanings of the words. For example,

1) a: su şum.az.t. → göz yaşı şum.az.t. → daşqın şum. → burulğan yen. → çay dərəsi şum.az.t. → bulaq şum.az.t.;

ab: dəniz şum. → çay dərəsi az.t.;

aba: göl şum. → dəniz şum. → hamam şum.;

ağ: bəyaz alt., az.t, tr., yen, əs.t., uyğ. → təmiz ur., baş., tr. → şəffaf ur., baş., tr. → vicdanlı ur., baş., qaz., qar.q., noq., qar.q., tat., uyğ. → insafılı ur., baş., qaz., qar.q., noq., qar.q., tat., uyğ.;

ag: ağ uyğ. → bəyaz uyğ.;

ak: ağ alt., az.t., tr., yen., qaz., baş. → bəyaz alt., az.t., tr., yen., qaz., baş.

2) a: nəsil şum.az.t.;

ab: yaradıcı, əsasını qoyan şum.az.t. → soy əs.t. → əcdad əs.t. → ulu baba əs.t. → ata əs.t., şum. → ana əs.t. → böyük bacı tr.;



aba: tayfanın böyüyü alt. → ata alt., az.t., şum. → ana alt., az.t., şum. → əmi alt., qır. → böyük bacı alt.;

ağa: ağa tr., az.t, tel, qır., qaz., uyğ., öz. → ağabəy tr., az.t, tel, qır., qaz., uyğ., öz.; tayfa başçısı alt. → el və qəbilə başçısı tr. => fars. → sahib, sahibkar tr. => rus., tel., qaz., qır., az.t., tar., uyğ., tr., öz.; baba öz, az.t., ktat., qır., qaz., noq., qar.q., tat., hak. → ata tel., qaz., qır., az.t., tar., saq., uyğ., tr., öz. → böyük oğul tel., qaz., qır., az.t., tar., saq., uyğ., tr., öz. → böyük qar.q. daş tel., qaz., qır., az.t., tar., saq., uyğ., tr., öz. → xanın əmisi tr. => fars. → xanın qar.q. daşı oğlu tr. => fars.;

aqa: ağa tr., az.t, tel, qır., qaz., uyğ., öz. → ağabəy tr., az.t, tel, qır., qaz., uyğ., öz.;

aka: ağa tr. => rus., öz. → ağabəy tr. => rus., öz.;

ama: ana şum., yen. → nənə şum. → qadın otağı şum. → doğum üçün çadır şum.;

amagal: nənə şum. → nəsil verən ana şum. → ana şum.;

amagan → ana şum.;

ava: ata az.t. → ana az.t.

a: nəsil şum. az.t. ;

ab: ev inəyi şum. → mal-qar.q.a şum.;

aba: anaş ayı tr. => rus. → ayı az.t. → ayı balası qırç., tr.;

am: dişilik orqanı az.t., əs.t., tr. → vəhşi öküz şum. → inək şum. → ev inəyi şum.;

amagan: dişi heyvan şum.

3) a: əlşum. → iş şum.;

ağ: ölçmək şum.;

amac: əmək aləti tr. => fars. → öküz, kotan və s. üçün cütçülük alətləri az.t., əs.t., uyğ., tr, o.t.;

əmac: əmək aləti tr. => fars.

Name parallelism. Name differs from the words in content and volume, due to the structure of both the meaning and price, they are similar. The name creates genetic code fund in content and volume structure. All objects included ethnic group's creativity and other areas turn into thoughts through names and transmit to others. In this case, the names are being changed or distorted. Original Azerbaijani names changed by Armenians during occupation of Azerbaijani territories by Armenia. Such act of manipulation serves removing marks of civilization. There are huge parallels between marks of names and marks of civilization. For example, in Sumerian territorial names such as Kish, Lagash, Dilmun, Sharur, Susa are equivalent to Kish (Shaki), Lahidj (Ismayilli), Dilman (Agsu),



Sharur (Nakhchivan), Shusha (Garabagh) in Azerbaijani. The Sumerians' original name is Kienqer. We can see region and family names such as "Kangarli" in Azerbaijan (Nakhchivan) and Turkmanistan. There are plenty of names beginning with "ur" in Sumerian and we can see similarity with the names of several regions in Azerbaijan (Urmiya, Urartu), Siberia (Ural), Turkey (Urfa) etc.

Kangarli parallels. The Sumerians called themselves "garabashlar" (black head) or "Ki.En.Gir". In Turkish "Ki.En.Gir" is named "Kangar". There are families with "Kangarli" surname in Azerbaijan, Iraq and Turkmanistan.

Conclusion

Summarizing all the above-mentioned, we can say unambiguously:

1. Azerbaijan lies at the root of the formation of mankind and genesis of civilizations. It is proved that the most continuous culture exists in Azerbaijan. The culture of Azerbaijan was a cornerstone in formation of world civilization.

2. Opinions on "Development of mankind begins from Sumer", "The Sumerian civilization is initial civilization" are accepted by the scientists of the world unconditionally and unambiguously. These theses prove leading role of Sumerians in the development of mankind.

3. There are marks of the culture of Azerbaijan in formation of the Sumerian civilization. The culture of Azerbaijan existed before the Sumerians. Ethnic groups living in Near and Middle East, as well as neighboring countries used polytheism model of Sumerians and created their own religious system. Temples built by the Sumerians for Gods were consisted of multi-storey, rectangular structures. Sumeriologists couldn't find answer to the question why the Sumerians preferred to build rectangular temples instead of circular structures which they knew better. Circular buildings were erected in Eneolithic age around Urmia Lake of Azerbaijan, I Kultapa of Nakhchivan, Baba Darvish of Kazakh, Gaya village of Darband and other areas. Such facts (two-wheeled and four-wheeled carts, first tins, wooden plows, and first writings) as creation of initial religious imaginations in Azykh cave and others testify existence of the culture of Azerbaijan before the Sumerians.

4. Within the process of seeking marks of cultures, researchers preferred to use radio-carbon dating method on samples. Historical realities formed by them are a set of separate ideas. Archaeological excavations and generalization of their results are necessary in the formation of historical truth, but not sufficient. Therefore, it is important to investigate properly the ratio of scope and content, meaning and price of the names created by ethnic groups, and establish genetic relationship between the past and present of those groups.



TYPES

alt: Altay language

şum.: Sumer language

az.t. :Azerbaijan language

tr.: Turkey Turkish

yen: Yenisey Turkish

es.t: Old Turkish

uyğ.: Uighur language

baş.: Baskirt language

ur.:

qaz: Qazakh

qar.q.: Black Qalpaq Turkish

noq: Noghay

tat: Tatar language

tel: Teleut language

qır: Kirghız language

öz: Uzbek language

hak.: Khakas language

saq: Sagay language

rus: Russian language

fars: Persian language

ktat: Crimean Tatar language

References

HÜSEYNOV, Məmmədəli (1981). Azıx mağarası. Bakı: Azərnəşr



HÜSEYNLİ, Nazim-MƏMMƏDOVA, Jalə (2012). Türk dillərinin geneologiyası: Şumer və türk leksik paralelləri. Bakı: Nağıl evi

АВДИЕВ, Все́волод (1948). История Древнего Востока: Ленинград

БЕРТМАН, Стивен (2007). Месопатамия: энциклопедический справочник. Москва: Вече

ГЕЛЬБ Н. (1963). Опыт изучения письма. Москва: Радуга

История и культура Древнего Востока: Энциклопедический словарь/ (2008) Москва: РОССПЭН

КАНЕВА, Ирина (2006). Шумерский язык. СПб.: Петербургские Востоковедение

КЛИКС, Фридрих (1983). Пробуждающееся мышление: У истоков человеческого интеллекта. Москва: Прогресс

МАКСАКОВСКИЙ, Владимир (1997). Историческая география мира: Москва: Экспрос

МАТВЕЕВ, Константин- САЗАНОВ, Анатолий (1968). Земля Древнего Двуречья. Мифы, легенды, находки и открытия. Москва: Молодая гвардия

СИТЧИН, Захария (2007). Двенадцатая планета. Москва: Эксмо

ХАРЕНБЕРГ, Бодо (2000). Хроника человечества. 2-е изд. доп. -Москва.: Слово/Slovo

