BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 http://www.bgpulseusa.com/index.php/bg

INTERPRETING METALLURGICAL REMAINS AT TUGUNBULAK

Safarali Bolliyev

Institute of Anthropology, Academy of Sciences of the

Republic of Uzbekistan, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0002-3885-4768
Email: safaralibolliyev@gmail.com

Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24135207

Abstract: Archaeological materials associated with high-temperature activities can provide evidence of past metal production, but their technological interpretation requires caution. This short methodological study examines the preliminary metallurgical evidence described for Tugunbulak, a medieval highland settlement in Uzbekistan. It uses a qualitative assessment of the author's existing descriptive observations, supported by published archaeometallurgical guidance. Possible ore, slag-like material, furnace-wall fragments and iron artefacts are considered according to the distinction between observed properties and inferred production activities. The assessment identifies three unresolved questions: which materials are metallurgical, which stages of metalworking they represent, and whether local mineral resources supplied production. The available descriptions justify further investigation but do not independently establish iron smelting or ore provenance. A staged approach combining contextual recording, macroscopic classification and targeted laboratory examination is proposed. The study provides a basis for organizing subsequent analysis without treating preliminary identifications as confirmed technological results.

Keywords: Tugunbulak; archaeometallurgy; metallurgical residues; macroscopic examination; technical ceramics; medieval Uzbekistan

Introduction

Metallurgical residues can reveal activities that are difficult to reconstruct from finished objects alone. Slag and heat-affected ceramics may preserve evidence of furnace operation, while possible ore and metal fragments can help define the range of materials present at a settlement. Their interpretation nevertheless depends on how reliably they are identified and how they relate to their archaeological contexts. Archaeometallurgical research therefore considers features, artefacts and production waste together rather than relying on a single class of find (Historic England, 2015).

Tugunbulak offers a useful setting for considering these issues. Published UAV–lidar research has documented the extensive urban layout of this medieval highland settlement in Uzbekistan and placed it within a wider discussion of mountainous Silk Road communities (Frachetti et al., 2024). The author's preliminary descriptions of materials from the site include possible ore, slag, furnace-wall fragments and iron artefacts. These categories raise questions about production, but their presence does not establish which metallurgical operations occurred.

This article asks how those preliminary descriptions can be organized for further investigation. Its purpose is to distinguish the evidence already available from interpretations that require additional testing. It does not present completed laboratory analyses or attempt to quantify the scale of production.

Materials and Methods

The study takes the form of a qualitative methodological assessment. Its primary descriptive basis is the author's existing account of materials recovered at Tugunbulak. No new excavation, specimen measurements, laboratory analyses or statistical tests were conducted for this article. Published guidance and materials-science literature provide the interpretive background for distinguishing macroscopic description from technological identification (Historic England, 2015; Hauptmann, 2020). The assessment is selective rather than a systematic literature review.

The material was considered under four provisional categories: possible ore, slag-like material, furnace-wall fragments and iron artefacts. For each category, the assessment separates the reported observation, the question it raises and the evidence still needed to answer that question. A description of a material as iron-bearing, for example, is treated separately from the claim that it was deliberately selected as furnace ore. Likewise, the recovery of a metal artefact is distinguished from evidence for its manufacture at the site.

The spatial scope is limited to the settlement and its surrounding resource landscape as described in the source account. No reconstruction of ore-supply routes is attempted. Find concentrations are treated as distributions of recovered material, because the available account does not establish that they represent undisturbed working areas.

Results

The assessment reveals that the preliminary assemblage raises several different technological questions. These cannot be resolved by assigning every object to a single production sequence. Each category contributes a different kind of evidence, summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Preliminary material categories and questions for further investigation

Material category	Current descriptive basis	Question requiring verification
Possible ore	Material provisionally identified as ore; iron-bearing formations reported nearby.	Was the material selected for metallurgical use, and can it be linked to a particular source?
Slag-like material	Residues provisionally classified through macroscopic examination.	Is the material metallurgical, and does it represent smelting, smithing or another process?

Material category	Current descriptive basis	Question requiring verification
Furnace-wall fragments	Ceramic fragments interpreted as parts of high-temperature installations.	What installation produced the fragments, and what do their surfaces and sections preserve?
Iron artefacts	Iron objects described among the recovered materials.	Do they represent use and discard, or is there separate evidence for manufacture or repair?

First, the descriptions support retaining the provisional material groups for documentation and sampling. They do not yet provide independently verified mineralogical or chemical classifications. In particular, the distinction between metallurgical slag and other vitrified material remains a matter for examination rather than an assumption built into the catalogue.

Second, the assemblage leaves the production stage unresolved. Furnace-related material and iron artefacts raise the possibility of metalworking, but their coexistence does not demonstrate that ore reduction and subsequent smithing occurred in the same location or period. Evidence for these operations must be evaluated separately.

Third, the reported presence of nearby iron-bearing formations establishes a potential resource context only. The current descriptive evidence does not connect a specific geological source with the recovered residues. Local ore supply therefore remains a hypothesis.

Discussion

The principal contribution of this assessment is a separation of descriptive categories from technological claims. This is particularly useful while laboratory work is incomplete. Recording a fragment as possible furnace wall preserves a working identification; calling it an iron-smelting furnace fragment makes a more specific claim that requires additional evidence. Consistent terminology allows uncertain identifications to be revised without changing the original observations.

Further work should begin with contextual and macroscopic recording. Find location, context, preservation, material category and visible surface features should be recorded consistently. Sampling can then address explicit questions, such as whether a ceramic surface was affected by adhering metallurgical slag or whether a residue contains phases compatible with a particular process. Materials-science approaches can relate slag composition and structure to technological questions, but interpretation must account for the material's formation and heterogeneity (Hauptmann, 2020).

Optical microscopy, SEM–EDS and pXRF are relevant candidates for this work, as already envisaged in the author's research. Here they are proposed investigative tools, not completed analyses. Their results would need to be interpreted alongside excavation records; chemical measurements alone would not resolve whether a deposit was formed during production or accumulated through later disposal.

The spatial dimension also needs restraint. A concentration of residues may identify an area worth investigating, but it may reflect dumping, redeposition or uneven recovery. Its interpretation as a workshop requires supporting contextual evidence. Similarly, proximity to a mineral occurrence can guide survey and sampling without proving that the occurrence was exploited during the settlement's occupation.

The present assessment is limited by its reliance on preliminary descriptions. It provides no new specimen-level dataset, stratigraphic comparison or analytical results. It cannot determine the dominant metal, production volume, furnace design or organization of labour. Those questions remain for subsequent research. The framework is intended to make that research more explicit by tying each proposed analysis to a defined interpretive problem.

Conclusion

The preliminary materials described at Tugunbulak provide a basis for further archaeometallurgical investigation, but they do not yet establish iron smelting or a local ore-supply system. Their immediate value lies in the questions they allow researchers to formulate. Separating material description, technological identification and provenance inference provides a practical structure for contextual recording and laboratory sampling. Future conclusions about production should follow from the combined archaeological and analytical evidence.

References:

1. Frachetti, M. D., Berner, J., Liu, X., Henry, E. R., Maksudov, F., and Ju, T. (2024). Large-scale medieval urbanism traced by UAV–lidar in highland Central Asia. Nature, 634, 1118–1124. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-024-08086-5

2. Hauptmann, A. (2020). Archaeometallurgy – Materials Science Aspects. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-50367-3

3. Historic England. (2015). Archaeometallurgy: Guidelines for Best Practice. Historic England, Swindon. https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/archaeometallurgy-guidelines-best-practice/