

MOUNTAIN FORTIFIED SETTLEMENTS OF CISBAIKALIA AND SOUTH SIBERIA AND THEIR SIMILARITIES WITH KOREAN FORTRESSES

Mountain fortified settlements with coarse stone block walls have been studied in Cisbaikalia. The settlements fortified by walls are built on uplands. There are no fortifications erected on plains among them. The settlements are divided into two main types.

Type 1: Cape settlements. Plans of these fortified settlements match the form of a cape on which they are situated, being separated from the plateau by a stone wall. Wall length is variable and, depending on the size of the cape, it varies from 120 to 200 meters. Wall height is up to 3 meters. Masonry is dry and stone blocks are laid on flat. A circular reveted hole in the ground was found on Shibete settlement on the river Anga. Two similar holes were found on Shibete settlement on the island of Ol'khon. One hole, also reveted, was found on Horgoi settlement.

Type 2: Settlements on mountain tops. A stone wall of no particular form depends on the local terrain. Shara-Tebseg settlement situated in the Tugnui valley in Buryatia is of this type.

Settlements similar in architectural and plan details are known in Khakassia, Tuva, and Altai. Our familiarity with mountain fortresses of Korea allows speaking about a significant typological similarity of Korean and Siberian fortifications (Korean fortresses: a historical and archeological outline, 1991; Album of archeological monuments and relics of Korea, 1992; Sasanson fortress on Mount Chiksan, 1994).

Scholars refer mountain settlements of Cisbaikalia to the Kurumchi culture of the medieval epoch. In our opinion this archeological culture was created by early Khori-Mongols. Ethnogeny and culture genesis of the Khori-Mongols was connected with the Far Eastern region. Therefore, the proximity of archeological evidence and artifacts of Cisbaikalia to those of the Far East in general and Korean ancientries in particular, becomes clear.

Far Eastern cultures significantly influenced the specific character of the material outlook of the Kurumchi culture (the construction of mountain fortified settlements in particular) and determined its peculiarities. Let us turn directly to the Kurumchi culture materials.

Let us consider the burial ritual of the Kurumchi culture population. It is notable that the burial ritual is a rather conservative and slowly changing trait of culture. Comparative analogies here are methodologically more plausible than, for instance, an exposure of similarities between items of material culture, which can be explained by territorial proximity, trade or other contacts. A similarity of burial rituals, in its turn, testifies to more significant and deep ties as well as common spiritual beliefs apparently having same roots.

The Kurumchi graveyards are divided into two main groups according to presence or absence of tomb superstructures. They are burial mount type graveyards and ground graveyards without tomb superstructures. If a tradition of the burial mount tombs is widespread among Siberian and Central Asian monuments, the ground burial tradition is less represented in the archeology of Cisbaikalia.

Ground graveyards of the Kurumchi culture were situated close to a reservoir, usually by a river. It is notable that dry open uplands or terraces, usually formed by sandy soils were chosen, which led to their practically universal destruction when the upper layer was damaged.

In the ground tombs characteristic of the early medieval period most bodies were laid into the ground without any in-tomb constructions. In the rest of the cases half-rotten wooden planks were found. Most probably they were remnants of a frame coffin. Surviving funeral beds in some tombs of Bayangol graveyard in the Barguzin valley testify to it.

In those cases when it is possible to determine the position of a corpse the deceased laid on the back with a right side turn; on the back with legs bended and turned to the right; crouched on left side. Skeletons are orientated head to the north and north-east.

On the territory of Bayangol graveyard vase-like pots were found. These vessels were placed out of the tombs and were, apparently, associated with commemorative cults. Possibly fire was used in commemorative rituals or there were rather rare cases of cremation, but it should be noted that no burnt bones of a deceased were found. There are only burnt iron items with characteristic blue-black shine and cinder. In the same Bayangol graveyard a ritual burial of a bear's head was found in a separate circular pit.

In burial mound tombs the bodies were most often placed into stone boxes or a rare ritual of building a gable roof covered with reed over a corpse was indicated. The position of a corpse was crouched, lying on the right side, or, rarely, lying on the back with legs bent and turned to the right. As with ground tombs the corpses are orientated predominantly to north-east.

Let us consider medieval burial rituals of the Far Eastern people possible thanks to a large amount of work done by the Siberian and Far Eastern archeologists. This material was published both in part, which is very important (Derevyanko E.I., 1975, 1977; Medvedev, 1977, 1982) and in generalizing works (Derevyanko E.I., 1981, Medvedev, 1986; Shavkunov, 1990; *The Bohai State...*, 1994). There are comparative studies of burial traditions based on archaeological, ethnographic, and written sources (Vasiliev, D'yakova, 1987) which significantly foster our work.

The majority of studied medieval graveyards of the Far East are ground and the graveyards are mostly situated on the river banks on sandy uplands. The bodies lie simply in tomb pits and in some cases in frame coffins. In a pit or on the surface vessels were placed, quite often with pierced bottom or broken off crowns. The position of the corpse is mostly on the back with bent knees and in other cases crouched on the left or right sides. The predominant orientation is to the west.

In this way we see that, except the orientation, the burial traditions of the medieval peoples of the Amur region resemble those of the peoples living on the shores of Lake Baikal. Many features of burial rituals, from the choice of burial place to commemoration cults match.

Let us compare the burial inventory found in the graves. Similarity and sometimes identity of not only instruments of labor and everyday life items, but rather specific items of cult, demonstrating religious beliefs should be highlighted. This, undoubtedly, testifies to the unity of worldview images that inspired their creators.

The main type of medieval Far Eastern dwellings is a semi-dugout of quadrangular form (close to quadrangles) the entrance to which was with a door and a special dip. Plank beds edged the perimeter of the dwelling. The fireplace of quadrangular or square form was with stone lining or without it. There are fireplaces in a form of a rectangular platform edged from four sides with wooden planks. The walls were made from vertically mounted pillars or planks. For the Bohai people it was characteristic to daub the walls and roofs with clay (Derevyanko E.I., 1981; D'yakova, 1987). Cellar pits were dug near or in the dwellings. They were used to store meat which is proved by pig bones found in them (Okladnikov, Derevyanko, 1973. P. 310). The look of the Kurumchi culture settlements is completely similar in the Far Eastern region. Connections with the Hunnu traditions are important in understanding of Far Eastern elements in the cultural complex of the Kurumchi culture.

Let us note a characteristic feature which draws together the graveyards of the Hunnu and the population of the Kurumchi culture. Both cultures are characterized by ground burial sites and, in our view it is not accidental that the ground burials of Hunnu and the Kurumchi culture were situated on sandy soils. The choice of burial places in these two cultures was determined by common principles which, perhaps, formed sometime ago on the sandy loess of South Manchuria. It is not by chance that the Hunnu dug deep grave pits – graves of their kings of more than 10 meters deep and common tombs of 3 meters. This tradition may have formed on soft and easy to dig loess soils. That is why when the Hunnu came to Central Asia and Siberia they tried to choose similar soils for their burial places.

Some planigraphic peculiarities of several Kurumchi settlements are connected with the Hunnu-Uighur traditions. We mean the fortified settlements of quadrangular form. The peculiarity of the Kurumchi settlements was that they were mostly constructed on capes, though the Baronomukhinskoe settlement in the flood-plain of the river Kuda is of quadrangular form. As a rule, Hunnu and Uighur settlements were built in the flood-plains of rivers.

A number of items characterizing the outlook of the Kurumchi culture have analogies in the inventory of Hunnu monuments. Analogies have been found among the Hunnu ceramics and vase-like vessels found in the Kurumchi graves and commemoration places.

Far Eastern origins of the Hunnu culture and its proximity to the sedentary centers of South Manchuria have been quite convincingly proven. A considerable part of analogies which bonds together the Hunnu and the Kurumchi cultures is mostly connected with East Asian ancientries. Items of the Kurumchi and Burkhotui cultures are typologically compatible with Korean and Japanese ancientries. Among the artifacts of the Kurumchi culture bronze drops with six jingles are connected with the solar

cult. They resemble similar bronze jingles called “pkhaljuren” in Korean ancientries. Shuicheng Li, professor of Archeology Department of Beijing University, confirmed after familiarizing himself with our findings that such drops are considered typically Korean decorations. Analogous drops with jingles are known as a part of the Zorgol culture of East Transbaikalia. The tradition of these jingles in its relic form survived until the 19th century in the culture of Far Eastern Ulchi people.

It should be said that the anthropology of the Kurumchi peoples is comparable with the Hunnu of Mongolia and Transbaikalia (Buraev, 2000). In scholars’ opinion, the anthropological outlook of the Hunnu bears traits of the Far Eastern race. Possibly, these traits are traced in the anthropology of the Kurumchi culture peoples because their similarity with contemporary peoples of the Lower Amur, such as the Ulchis and Negidals, has been noted (Buraev, 1993).

Therefore we have reasons to regard the Kurumchi culture in one line with the Far Eastern medieval archaeological complexes. Yet it is good to highlight that it is also a Central Asian phenomenon which encompasses traditions of the steppe south. In this it is analogous to the Hunnu culture and is its natural successor. A culture of any nation is a complex phenomenon which embraces many layers reflecting a controversial and complex history of its development, because there were no absolutely isolated “clear” nations.

Marking out of the Far Eastern or, broadly taken, East Asian substratum in the Kurumchi culture allows tracing Mongolian origins in it. Presence of archaic elements that suggest a sedentary way of life also points at the Far Eastern roots of these phenomena.

The first investigators of Mongolian history considered them to be native dwellers of Central Asian grasslands. In the end of the XIX century, runic writing monuments and ancient Turkic statues were discovered in Mongolia. This was a proof of the fact that medieval Mongolia had been inhabited by ancient Turkic nations. A study of the Altaic languages has shown that most of the Mongolian words which reflect grassland landscape and fauna have been borrowed by Mongols from Turks. Consequently, linguistics data have pointed that Mongols inhabited the grasslands later than Turks. Meanwhile, translations of Chinese materials have shown that Mongols inhabited regions to the East of Xing An mountains.

Science has two hypotheses on the origin of the Mongols. They are the indigenous hypothesis and the migration hypothesis. We have decided to see if these hypotheses are true. For that, it was necessary to use the data of a scope of sciences - archaeology, anthropology, folklore studies, and linguistics. Newest genetic studies were also taken into consideration. We supposed the sources to preserve some facts, remnants or memories of the Mongolian previous non-nomadic way of living.

The research was carried out in the territory adjoining Lake Baikal. Significant attention was paid to Buryats who present the northern border of the Mongolian habitat. In order to understand ancient Mongolian history, it is particularly important to use materials from the remote parts of the area. Grassland Mongolian culture is located on the focal point of Eurasian nations movements, therefore it is extremely complicated and heterogeneous. We consider that woodland areas around Lake Baikal could preserve elements of the ancient Mongolian culture. These elements were untouched by the grand migrations which changed the ethnic and political map of Mongolia many times.

This supposition is well supported by the fact that the Buryat language is closest to medieval Mongolian, the language of “The Secret History of the Mongols”. Also, it is mentioned in “The Secret History of the Mongols” that Alan Qo’*a*, the ancestor of Chingghis clan was from the land of the Khoritumat tribe. All researchers agree that the lands adjoining Lake Baikal were mentioned in the chronicles. These lands have preserved geographical and tribal names, significant for Mongols, such as Bargujin and Horilar. These names have been mentioned in the epos. It is also quite important that the areas around Lake Baikal have been archaeologically investigated. Representative anthropological material has been gathered, genetic studies are expanding. The epos, mythology, and language of the Buryats have been investigated thoroughly.

A study of the Buryat folklore finds a fact which is non-characteristic for a nomadic nation – plots connected with pig-breeding. It has been reflected in all kinds of Buryat verbal art, both in minor folklore genres - proverbs, sayings, wishes, riddles, and in major genres – fairy-tales and epos.

Here are some examples. Proverbs: *Nokhoin ugide gahai husaha* (When there is no dog, the pig barks); *Gahaihaa halyu bulgan turehegui, tenegehee sesen uge garahagui* (No pig shall deliver otter and sable, no fool shall say smart words). Riddles: *Gahain guya ganzagaldazha yadaab* (One could not load a boar ham - ice); *Geegegui aad, bederdeg, gemteegui aad, yolodog* (It has not lost anything but it looks for; it is not injured but it moans - pig). Wishes: *Gazar hadarha gahaitai bolozho, galabtaduuldaha*

neretei bolozho baigaarayt! (May you have a pig to dig the ground, may you have a name to sound forever!). Fairy-tales: Buryats have a “Pig-breeder” fairy-tale which is devoted to an only son keeping seven pigs. Pig-breeders are also met in the “Stupid wolf” fairy-tale. By now, people have almost forgotten the expression – “*gahain myahan amtatai, gazar ger dulaahan*» (pork is tasty, life in a dug-out is warm). This expression points at a settled life-style and pig-breeding of Buryats’ ancestors.

Among medieval Mongolian nations, Kidans received wide popularity. They were known to have a cult of pigs. Their culture originated in South Manchuria, a region with an ancient tradition of pig-breeding. V. Starikov has published quite interesting materials connected with the cult of pigs. There are Mongols in South China, YunNan province. They have been dwelling there since the times of Qubilai Qahan (Yuan dynasty, XIII-XIV centuries). They are surrounded by the Chinese and Dungan nations who call them “MengGu”. Their self-name is “MengGuWa, MengGuLe». On their ancestors day these Mongols slaughter pigs in order to sacrifice them to their spirits.

Mongols are mentioned in Mongolian chronicles as MengWu or MengWa. Sources say that they “... use pigs and dogs as their domestic cattle. They are fattened for slaughter”. Consequently, pigs and dogs are among the main animals bred by Mongols. We have to pay attention to the fact that the term *gahai* “pig” is an independent one in the Mongolian language. This is a proof of independent pig-breeding.

There is an excellent Buryat proverb: “*Dalain olzo dalan honogoi, daidyn olzo dalan zhelei*» - “Marine quarry lasts seventy days, soil crops last seventy years”. Central Asian cattle-breeders did fishing in a sea so the event of receiving enough food for seventy days came into a proverb. The names of marine animals are well preserved in Mongolian languages: Buryat *hab zagahan*, Khalkha-Mongolian *hav zagas*, Kalmyk *hav* “seal”; Buryat and Khalkha-Mongolian *halim* “whale”. Besides, the Mongolian language has such a notion as whalebone - *elzhin*. Rivers and lakes of Mongolia and Buryatia have no plaice and lamprey, but their names are present in the language – *halbin* и *nud zagas*. Probably, ancient Mongols’ ancestors ate marine trepangs (holothurian). The Mongolian word *hizhi* points at this. It is also important that the Mongolian language has independent words which stand for animal fat (*ooh*) and fish fat (*eer*). Also, animal and fish bones are divided in the language.

A special study of geographical terminology in Altaic languages was carried out by L.V. Dmitrieva. She compared the main geographical terms and notions which stand for natural phenomena as most of them have a relation to the most ancient epochs in the histories of these languages. This work has proved earlier conclusions about Turks’ grassland origin. Their botanic vocabulary was connected with this conclusion. A principally important conclusion was made about Mongolian languages: “This list proves that ancient Mongols lived in places with mountains and rocks with passages and passes. However, at the same time there was a grassland with hollows, sands and this region adjoined a sea”.

We should notice that the main character of a well-known Buryat epos “Alamzhi Mergen” was born in the East “where the sea slumbers”. When he goes to battle with foes, Alamzhi Mergen puts on fish skin boots characteristic for Oriental cultures. Certainly, this ethnographical detail in clothes is a relic of a non-grassland culture. This can be correlated with Chinese chronicles which say that “MengGu Mongols make armor of shark skin». Therefore the emergence of the above-mentioned Buryat proverb is not occasional.

We should say that agricultural themes in folklore are widely spread. These proverbs contain ancient roots: «*Anzahanaa husor argaa oloho*» - “to use a plough to make a living” and “*Uhehooshie baigaa haa anzahanaa argali bu alda*” – “even if you die, hold the plough”. This proverb says that soil provides not only bread but other meals – fruit and vegetables: “*hainaar gazaraa eldee haash - eldeb hooltoi huukhash*» - “the better you work on your land – the more food you will have”. There are riddles which are connected with agricultural tools: “*Gazar dooguur galba nuube*” – “something flat sleeps in the ground” (ploughshare). “*Zuun yamaan soo zuudah shara taby*” - “a gray wolf was let in a flock of a hundred goats” (sickle).

The latest genetic research of Buryats have shown their closeness to Koreans which is quite clear if we take into consideration the given material.

In this way, the similarity of the archaeological complex of Cisbaikalia such as, particularly, mountain settlements with the analogous monuments of the Korean peninsula can be explained in ancient migrations of people from the Pacific shores. Those Far Eastern traditions preserved their peculiarities for a long time and influenced the cultural genesis of Buryats and Mongols.

러시아 과학 아카데미의 몽골학 불교학 및 티베트학 연구소
부랴트 국립 대학교, 동양 학부

다시발로브 E.B., 다시발로브 B.B.

바이칼 주변 지역과 남 시베리아 산 고도 유적 및 한국 유적(성)과의 유사관계

바이칼 주변 지역에서 가공안된 돌 블록으로 쌓인 산 고도유적이 조사되었다. 돌벽으로 지은 유적들은 고지에 위치하며 그들 중에 평지에 있는 유적이 없다. 그 유적은 두 개의 유형이 있다.

유형 1. 갑(岬)모양의 유적. 갑모양의 유적은 자연적으로 생겨난 갑의 모양을 따라 돌벽을 쌓고 육지에서도 갑의 양쪽을 연결하는 돌벽을 쌓아 성을 만들었다. 돌벽 길이는 갑 크기에 따라 120 미터에서 200 미터까지이다. 돌벽 높이는 3 미터까지 이른다. 돌벽을 쌓은 것은 혼합체 없이 편평한 돌을 얹혀 칸 것이다. 안가강에 위치하고 있는 ‘시베테’라고 하는 유적에는 돌로 쌓은 둥그란 구멍이 있다. 올혼(바이칼의 섬)에 있는 ‘시베테’ 라는 유적에도 똑 같은 구멍 2 개가 있고 ‘호르고이’ 유적에 돌로 칸 구멍이 하나 있다.

유형 2. 산꼭대기에 위치하고 있는 유적은 돌벽이 특별한 모양이 없고 기록에 따라 지은 것이다. 부랴트 공화국 툽누이 계곡에 있는 유적은 제 2 유형의 유적이다. 하카씨야 공화국과 두바와 알타이에 건축 양식과 위치로 비슷한 유적들이 있다.

다시발로브의 연구 결과로는 동시베리아의 고대 및 중시대 문화는 (훈누 문화, 쿠룸친스키 문화, 부르호투이 문화) 동아시아에 기반을 가지고 있다. 그 연구는 고대 몽골인들과 한국인들의 관계를 보여주고 있다. 시베리아에서 (바이칼 남쪽) 고대 한국인들과 관련된 물건들이 발견되었다. 그 것들 가운데 한국식 허리띠 짐쇠, 고구려인 특유의 장식 등이 있다. 그리고 바이칼 남쪽 및 한국의 도자기에 찍힌 무늬 유형도 비슷한 점이 많다 [다시발로브, 2005].

한국의 산 요새(유적)에 대한 책을 읽어보고 한국과 시베리아의 축성 건설이 유형적으로 가깝다고 할 수 있다 [조선 요새, 1991]. 시베리아의 그런 기념물들은 보통 ‘숨다’, ‘피하다’ 라는 이름을 가지고 있다. 그 건축 설비는 몽골족인 산비와 관련된 것이 아닌가? 산비의 조상인 둔후도 한국인들의 조상이라는 관점도 있다. 몽골인들과 한국인들의 고대 고고학 비슷함은 그것으로 설명될 수 있다.

This research was made possible by support of RFFI (№ 06-06-80192, 05-06-80183).

Picture 1. The plan of Shibete fortress

Picture 2. Shara-Tebseg fortress

Picture 3. The wall of Shara-Tebseg fortress

Picture 4. The part of wall of Shara-Tebseg fortress