

MIDDLE AGES ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE RUSSIAN FAR EAST¹

N.N. Kradin

The article examines the main stages in the development of the Middle Ages in the Russian Far East. The development of archeology in the region went through three stages — the period of travelers and local historians, intensive academic study (since 1953) and the international stage (since the early 1990s). The main achievements of the archeology of Bohai and the Jurchens, as well as the development of the Amur region by Russian pioneers, are examined in detail.

Keywords: archaeology, Middle Ages, Russian Far East, Amur region, Primorye, Primorye, Mohe, Malgal, Bohai, Parchae, Jurchen, Jin dynasty, Russian pioneers.

INTRODUCTION

Archaeology of Russia and Eurasia is still not well known in the West in general and in the US in particular. In order to make sure of it, it is sufficient to open any textbook on archaeology. It is unlikely that you find there a description of the prehistoric cultures of the Russian Plain. An examination of a complexity in Cachokia or South-West is more important for the American archaeologists than that in the Central Asia. References to such critical archaeological sites as Kostenki, Sungir', Mal'ta, Arzan are only to be found in encyclopedias. However, the Denisova cave should now be included in textbooks. It is a natural state of any descriptive sciences as a geography, history, or anthropology. The Swedish or Polish archaeologies are also little known in the Americas and vice versa.

Kradin Nikolay Nikolayevich, Member of RAS, Director of the Institute of History, Archaeology and Ethnology of the Peoples of the Far East, FEB RAS, Vladivostok, Russia.

Крадин Николай Николаевич, академик РАН, директор Института истории, археологии и этнографии народов Дальнего Востока ДВО РАН, Владивосток, Россия.

E-mail: kradin@ihaefe.ru

¹This article was written for American readers back in 2016 for a special book about the past of the Russian Far East. The editors spent a very long time putting together the volume, but after 2/24, publishing such a book in the United States has become impossible. Nevertheless, the achievements of Russian archaeologists in this region are very important and I believe that colleagues from many other countries should know about them, even with a great delay. I would like to thank Sergey Glebov and Alexandr Ivliev for the correction of my English and reviewers for the important comments.

The number of scholars who study the post-Soviet space is not too large in USA. It is limited by a group of enthusiasts who visit the Russia and other countries and make excavations with Russian colleagues. At times, they organize the conferences in this area and, following the results of discussion, publish a thick volume (Peterson et al. 2006; Popova et al. 2007; Hartley et al. 2012 etc.). Only a few books for a huge continent! I was luckily enough to visit the “Windy City” (Chicago) in 2008 at such conference and communicate with the American community of Eurasian archaeologists. I became acquainted there with many delightful people who welcome me with open arms, listened forbearingly to my primitive English, presented their books and articles and I am now on intimate terms with many of them and keep a correspondence.

As a joke, rephrasing a known Lenin’s passage from his pamphlet of A. Herzen, I would make of them: “A circle of these revolutionaries is narrow”. A comparison with revolutionaries is not an exaggeration because these scholars discover for the American academic public a very important part of the world prehistory which has played a really revolutionary role in the human life. Among these revolutions are such important events as the colonization of the Eurasia and Americas, horse domestication, appearance of spoke-wheeled chariots and cavalry, formation of early metallurgy, diffusion of Indo-European languages, emergence of mobile pastoralism and nomadic empires (Hanks 2010: 469, 471). I would also add the great transmigration of peoples and medieval Mongol globalization.

The Russian Far East, as it is understood today, includes the extreme part of Eurasia which stretched from Chukotka and the Bering Strait to Posyet Bay and boundary between Russia and North Korea. This region is home to a variety of ecological zones. The coast of the northern Far East, in the Arctic, was inhabited by the native hunters for marine animals and fishermen; deeper into the continent one finds populations of reindeer pastoralists and taiga hunters. In the southern Far East, in the basins of the Amur and the Ussuri, resided the fishers and hunters. A part of the southern Far East is favorable to agriculture and was thus more densely settled in the pre-industrial period and in modern time by colonists from the European part of the former Russian Empire and the USSR (Kocheshkov 2002; Turaev et al. 2011).

The history of this region is known in the English-speaking science from book by John Stephan (Stephan 1994). This book is well-written and reliable, however, its coverage is negligible. Over a hundred scholars work in my research institute focusing on the Far East and many of them have written at least one book. One can imagine what volume of information in Russian remains beyond the reach of the Western colleagues. Unfortunately, Stephan paid little attention to prehistory and the early stages of history. I will try to fill this gap.

For historians and archeologists, it might be interesting that the territory of the modern Russian Far East was to a lesser extent subjected

to the global historical processes. Here, we did not yet find evidence of the lower Paleolithic. The Neolithization began at a later stage here. The number of the bronze metallurgy products is small, but that of stone imitations of bronze spearheads (*replika*) is very high. For this reason, the scholars are in the dead-end situation when it comes to the Bronze and Iron Ages. Most of all, the term “Early metal age (*paleometal*)” is used. One is almost forced to think that we are here at the edge of the populated world (Yanshina, Kluyev 2005).

And yet, Far-Eastern archeology witnessed its own vivid and important discoveries that have global significance. First of all, it is the question of the human discovery of the Americas, which has over and over again attracted the attention of Russian scholars (Vasilyev 2011; Vasil'ev et al. 2015). A process of migration to the Americas began about 15–13,000 BP years ago. Outstanding Far-Eastern archaeologist Nikolay Dikov studied the early stages of this process (1979). In recent decades, Yuri Berezkin gave new impetus to the investigation of this problem. Berezkin is, essentially, a Russian Murdock. The reputation of George Murdock is related to the fact that he established the extensive base of the ethno-historical data of nations (HRAF — Human Relations Area Files). It is a large-scale source of information for the anthropologists². Examining the myths of the peoples of the New World, Berezkin has compiled a very large database³.

Geographic distribution of myths showed the routes of the mankind displacement across the whole globe and the path movement to the Americas. When mapping the myths according to Berezkin, two distinct lines emerge. The first of them connects Central Eurasia and the New World, while the second goes from East India to Australia and South America. It is a reflection of the routes of movement by the earliest humans in the different parts of Oecumene (see in English: Berezkin 2007; 2010; 2017).

The second subject of global significance is paleolithic pottery. Traditionally, it was widely accepted that the discovery of clay properties and the skill to make different things from clay with hardening by afterburning took place during the Neolithic stage. Ceramics was not known by people of the Paleolithic stage. Meanwhile, for the last several decades, the evidences emerged in different parts of the world, demonstrating that the use of clay began as early as the Upper Paleolithic. In particular, the sites with the most ancient ceramics were found in the Far-Eastern region of Russia (Sikachi-Alyan, Khummi in the Amur River region, Ustinovka-3, Chernigovka-1 in Primorye etc.) which fall chronologically into the interval of 14000–9000 years ago (Zhushchikhovskaya 2009).

In this article, I will consider focus on the situation in Russian archeology in the Far Eastern region. To do that, I will explore the archaeology which studies the states in the period of historical empires on China's northern edge, namely, the archaeology of states of Bohai (Balhae)

²<http://hraf.yale.edu>.

³<http://www.ruthenia.ru/folklore/berezkin>.

(698–926), Liao (907–1125) and Jin or Jurchen (1115–1234). English-speaking readers may have only a vague idea of this region's archeological studies conducted in Russia as only a few works of Aleksander Kim, a historian rather than archeologist, mention studies by Russian scholars (Kim 2008; 2009; 2011).

I will focus on the important achievements in the study of prehistory and medieval archaeology of the Russian Far East over the past few decades. It is impossible to cover the work of all, who tend to be working in different organizations (research institutes, universities, museums, cultural heritage offices etc.) within single article. At that, the most potent personnel concentrated, as a rule, in the research institutes of the Academy of Sciences. For this reason, I mostly concentrate on the work of this group. First, I will discuss the most recent trends in historical archeology of the region in general, and then I will turn to the latest tendencies in the field which is especially close to me, namely, the study of the medieval states and empires in the region.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Archeologists in the Russian Far East widely use the term “Middle Ages,” even if they do not really study medieval history as it is understood in the European region. This is the legacy of the Soviet period, when Marxism was the official doctrine, according to which it was presumed that the period between the 5th and the 17th centuries corresponded to the “feudal mode of production” and therefore was called “the Middle Ages”. This crude Marxism has largely left the stage but the terminological tradition remained. Archeologists who study prehistory examine the times before the emergence of states in the Far Eastern region, while the “mediaeval” archeologists focus on the period of early states and empires. I think it is correct to use the term Middle Ages widely, understanding it as a global era of human history (Holmes, Standen 2015; Hermans 2020).

In the first period, beginning from the middle of 1 millennium AD, Mohe (靺鞨, Korean Malgal) peoples who are traditionally identified with the Tungusic populations, inhabited the territory of Manchuria and current Russian Far East⁴. Seven large Mohe polities (chiefdoms, in all appearances) are known. Sumo Mohe (粟末部) are located in the extreme South-West of the Mohe lands and Heishui Mohe (黑水靺鞨) in the North-East, in the valleys of lower courses of Sungari (Songhua), Ussuri (Ussuli) and Amur (Heilongjiang) rivers. According to Chinese chronicles

⁴In this article I don't discuss the archeology of Mohe in Russia. Early research on Mohe in the Russian Far East was based on fragments of Chinese studies and archaeological illustrations (Derevianko 1981). In current time Mohe pottery and material culture have been well studied (Diakova 1984; 1998; Piskareva 2005; 2006). Important topics such as a chronology and local variations are still poorly understood.

and archaeological dates Mohe sowed wheat and millet and turned up the soil by plows. They also engaged in breeding pigs and horses. Development of Mohe's pottery was at one of the transitional stages from home to craft production (Piskareva 2019; Piskareva et al. 2019). Mohe had a significant extend of social stratification. The narrative sources inform us that the wealthy men possessed hundreds of pigs and that there also existed categories of people of lower status. It is reported in Chinese chronicles that each fortress and village had its elder independently of the others. According to archaeological data, the Mohe settlements in Primorye region are divided into several ranks (Kradin 2010).

Seven large Mohe polities (probably, chiefdoms), with different number of fighters, are identified. Each of them was headed by a chief and each occupied a sufficiently large territory. Apart from these seven polities, a number of other ones existed. In Chinese, these polities are referred to as *bu* (部), traditionally this term is translated as “tribe” (Atwood 2010). As far as we can tell, the number of these polities was much greater. The power of a chief ran in the family. Most likely, *bu* (部) could correspond to tribe, chieftaincy, or chiefdoms, while *buluo* (部落) to complex chiefdoms⁵. The Heishui polity was the largest and most powerful. In both versions of the Tang history, it is reported that the Mohe “tribes” were divided into 16 “generations” in course of time. It stands to reason that Heishui Mohe already represented a complex chiefdom or a confederation of chiefdoms.

Early in the 7th century, Sumo Mohe were subjected to heavy pressure by the Tang Dynasty. This pressure promoted the processes of internal unification and resulted in the creation of a large alliance with the centralized power by Sumo Mohe in the middle of the 7th century. In the Turkic epitaphs, it was called the “Bokli khaganate” (Kradin 2005). In 698, the Sumo Mohe chief Da Zuorong declared the creation of a dynasty (initially, it was called Zhen, and then, since 713, Bohai [渤海], Kor. Parhae). The territory of Bohai included Eastern Manchuria, part of North Korea, and South-Western territories of today's Primorye. The Bohai rulers aspired to expand their land by means of inclusion of mostly eastern and northern territories in the 8th–9th centuries. Bohai reached its full flowering during the rule of the Wang Da Qinmao 大钦茂 (737–793) who assumed the postmortem name “Enlightened” for his contribution to the advancement of education and culture in the country. During his rule was constructed the administrative institutions. During the kingship of Da Renxiu (818–830), the system of five capital cities developed and the Heishui Mohe were partly conquered by Bohai, and the territorial expanse of the state reached its zenith (Jiang Yuke, Zhao Yongjun 2021).

The Bohai state generated significant literature in the North-East Asian countries – China, Korea, and Japan (Song Kiho 1990; 1990a; Hamada Kosaku 2007; Jung Yongjin 2007; New History of Parhae 2012;

⁵About differences between tribe, chieftaincy, simple and complex chiefdom see (Earle 2021).

Sloane 2014a; Wang Peixin 2018 etc.), and in Eastern Europe in Russian (Shavkunov 1968; 1994; Ivliev 2007 etc.), but so far there is only one substantial study in any Western European languages (Reckel 1995). In the Bohai state, there were five capitals (Song Yubin 2018). The country was divided into 15 provinces and 62 districts. The notion of five capital cities was borrowed, in all appearances, from the Tang Empire. However, the very existence of five capital cities in Bohai might have been required by the administrative needs locally. The majority of early states had no tightly integrated economical and political infrastructure. Since the administrative control of central authorities was minimal, the ruler of an early state was forced to visit continuously his possessions to personally control the regions and to confirm the legitimacy of his kingship. This system occurred widely in the world of early states (Kobishchanov 1987).

Overall, the Bohai kingdom was a typical early state, characterized by the absence of private ownership of land and the lack of a fully formed bureaucratic apparatus (Claessen, Skalnik 1978). As its complexity increased, the early Bohai state gradually transformed to resemble the “mature” traditional states, in which a certain development of private ownership and formation of the state machinery were common (Kradin 2013; 2019). This was reflected in the changes in the social structure of the Bohai state. Initially, the social structure included the *wang* (king) and his relatives, six noble clans, chiefs and elders, and commoners. In the period of its highest prosperity, the social structure of Bohai consisted of two basic social groups: (1) bureaucratic-administrative elite divided into eight ranks, which included the royal family, great aristocracy and noblemen; (2) the immediate producers, peasants and craftsmen, who were subdivided by communities and different lower categories as slaves (Kradin 1989; 2019).

The administrative machinery of Bohai more or less copied the bureaucratic model of the Tang Empire and included three administrations, six ministries as well as other departments. The ministries were divided into left and right ones. Service bureaucrats were categorized into 8 ranks. They wore clothes of different colors with the credential badges (detailed description see: Polutov 2014). For records management, the Bohai bureaucrats adopted the Chinese writing system. Schools for teaching elite children reading and writing were known in Bohai. Among the elite, the Buddhism acquired some presence. Bohai had diplomatic relations with neighboring countries, such as the Tang Empire, Silla Kingdom on the Korean peninsula, and Inner Asian nomadic empires. Every exchange of embassies was accompanied by exchange of prestige goods. Of special interest are Bohai’s intensive contacts with Japan. During the existence of Bohai, 35 of its missions were sent to the Land of the Rising Sun, while 13 diplomatic missions arrived from Japan (Polutov 2015).

The third period in the region’s history was the era of Jurchens, who created the Jin dynasty (金朝, 1115—1234). The term *Jurchens* (女真)

appears in the 10th century. This name was taken by the tribes and chiefdoms coming of Heishui Mohe, who took over the territories of Northern Manchuria and today's Primorye and Amur River regions, which became depopulated after the Khitan conquest. The Khitans divided the Jurchens into the "civilized" who settled on territories controlled by the Liao Empire, and the "wild people," who lived to the east and north-east of Sungari (Songhua). The Jurchens depended on the Khitans and paid a tribute to them in furs, jewels, medicinal herbs, horses etc. The hunting falcons were especially valued, and, at the request of Khitans, the Jurchens organized regularly trips to the Wuguo people (the term in Chinese means "five nations") to catch falcons. These birds presumably lived in the lower reaches of Sungari (Songhua), Ussuri (Usuli), and in the adjacent Amur River valley (Franke 1978a).

The Russian sinologist Evgeny Kychanov (Kychanov 1966) translated information on the Jurchen from *San chao bei meng hui bian* (*Collected documents on the treaties with the north during three reigns*) about ten years earlier than Herbert Franke (Franke 1975; 1978). Two books by Michail Vorobyev devoted to the Jurchen were published in Russian, which addressed most important question of the history of Jurchens (Vorobyev 1975; 1983). So far, there are no books of the similar standard in other European languages.

In the latter half of the 11th century, the consolidation of Jurchens has commenced under the leadership of Wanyan (完颜) lineage. Gradually, all the more or less significant formations of the Jurchens fell under the Wanyan influence. In 1112, the chief of Jurchens Aguda (阿骨打) refused to dance at the formal party of the Khitan Emperor. This became the cause of conflict and led to the outbreak of war. In 1115, Aguda proclaimed the establishment of the Golden Empire of Jurchens (in Chinese – Jin dynasty) and took the imperial title⁶. Over a period of ten years, the Jurchens defeated the Khitans and captured their entire territory. Ironically, the Khitans escaped to the westernmost town of Zhenzhou (archeological site Chintolgoi Balgas), where they formerly deported Bohai peoples (Kradin et al. 2011: 166–167). In 1130, the Khitans also left Zhenzhou and went to Central Asia, where they established the Empire of Kara-Khitans (Xi Liao or Western Liao in Chinese sources).

Aguda took the investiture in accordance with the Chinese tradition. In order to legitimate his ruling, on the advice of his Bohaian consultant Yang Pu, he sent a letter to the Khitan Emperor. In this message to the Emperor, he proposed to legitimize the status of Aguda as Emperor, to establish diplomatic relations, to pay tribute to the Jurchens and to concede two frontier provinces (Franke 1975: 158–165; 1987: 94). Eventually,

⁶It is believed that the chronology of the Jurchen state origins was inaccurately reflected in the Jin and Liao annals and the Song sources are more reliable. The question concerning the initial name of the state is also debating (Garsia 2012: 171, note 260).

the project fell through as the Khitans sent back a harsh answer. However, Aguda's attempt to legitimize his status through the mechanisms used in the Chinese political tradition is notable.

After the conquest of Liao territory, the Jurchens decided to conquer the China. Gradually, they succeeded to conquer practically the whole North China and the South Song Empire was obliged to pay year on year the vast tribute. Only in 1127, the Jurchens have gotten from Song Empire 1 million liangs of gold, 10 million silver ingots, 10 million pieces of silk and 10 million pieces of fabrics (Theile 1971: 113—115). However, the economic “center” of the Far-Eastern world-system was situated on the south and the gotten silver turned back after a short time. The Jurchens must pay in it for goods acquired in the Song Empire.

The Jurchens inherited many characteristics from their predecessor states in the regions. By annexing lands with Bohai population and seizing the Liao and Northern Song territories, they acquired vast material and human resources. This gave the Jurchens an opportunity to quickly establish a strong state with a developed economy. In as little as four years after the proclamation of Jin dynasty, the Jurchens created their own writing system (the so called “large script” was implemented in 1119 and “small script” in 1138). The following decades saw the expansion of culture, including sciences and medicine, literature and poetry, figurative art, decorative and applied arts and architecture (Vorobyev 1975; 1983; Shavkunov 1990).

The Jurchen Jin Dynasty (similarly to the Khitan Liao Empire) comprised two major cultural layers: the conquering Jurchens and the exploited Chinese peasants and townspeople. In the period of prosperity the Jurchen Empire occupied the whole of Manchuria, the territory that is today the southern Far East of Russia, a part of North Korea and a considerable part of the territory of Northern China properly. The number of population of the Jin Empire early in the 13th century reached more than 53 million people, of whom about 10% were the Jurchens and not less than 83% were the Chinese (Franke 1978a: 12, 14). As with Bohai and Khitan states, the Jurchens had five capital cities. The country was divided into 19 provinces headed by governors-general. The provinces, in turn, consisted of regions, districts and counties.

In order to control the conquered territories, the Jurchens used the dual management system established by the Khitans. In due course of time, at court, the conflict emerged between the so-called “military” and “administrative” parties. Taizong (太宗) Emperor (1123—1135) was suspicious of the separatist sentiments of the “militarists” and submitted to the second party (Tao Jing-shen 1976). Over the period of 1133—1134, the dual administration system was reorganized into the general country-wide bureaucratic apparatus. The new state structure borrowed freely from the traditional Chinese bureaucratic system model. However, a number of elements of the Jurchen public management were also included in it. The basis of the machine of government was composed of six ministries,

such as public works, justice, finance, ceremonies, ranks and military arts. All high posts in the government were occupied by Jurchens, although most of the functionaries in all ministries and departments were Chinese (Vorobyev 1975: 15–178).

Fearing dilution, the Jurchens strove to establish a quota of state officials from among the Chinese in the highest agencies of state power. The proportion of the Chinese increased continuously but never attained a half of all bureaucrats (Vorobyev 1975: 171–173). The examination system borrowed from China was modified in such a way as to make harder the access for the Chinese. It was thus easier for Jurchens to take the *jin-shi* degree than for the Chinese. In addition, the Jurchens could take up an appointment by inheritance or through good relations. As for the Chinese, more favorable terms were created for the former subjects of Liao (“northerners”) than for the subjects of Song (“southerners”) (Tao Jing-shen 1976: 55–57). Still, for a good part of the 12th century, the different written languages (Chinese, Khitan, and Jurchen) continued to coexist in different parts of the state. Only in 1191–1192, an attempt to eliminate the Khitan writing was made (Wittfogel, Feng 1949: 252–253).

As a result of complex acculturation processes, there emerged a multinational social structure of the Jurchen Empire. The Empire was headed by the emperor and his numerous relatives. They were major owners of property and held most of key posts in the political machinery. Below them, there was the Jurchen aristocracy. Its representatives possessed appreciable wealth and served as the main pillars of the state. At the lower level still were the tribal chiefs and, finally, ordinary Jurchens who were the foundation of the army and who practiced farming, cattle breeding, hunting, and handicraft. As for the non-Jurchens, the Chinese officials and great landowners held key social positions in the Empire, although the supreme authority has limited their influence. The status of free Chinese craftsmen, tradesmen and countrymen was much worse. Most governmental taxes and homage were placed on their shoulders. Position of the state-owned and private slaves was even more difficult. To maintain order in the conquered territories Jurchens established a system of military settlement called — *mengan* and *mouk'e* (Vorobyev 1975: 130–142).

In the early 13th century, an external threat was hanging over the Jurchen state. In 1206, the Empire of Chinggis Khan was established in the Mongolian steppe. In four years, the Mongols launched a war against the Jin Empire. The war was of protracted nature and lasted about quarter of a century (until 1233–1234). The Mongols sacked many cities and slaughtered their populations, and took many skilled craftsmen as prisoners. In 1215, the commander of the Jin troops in Liaodong Puxian Wannu proclaimed the creation of the Great Zhen state. After several military defeats from the Jurchen Empire and the rebellious Khitans, he decided to resettle his army and people to the remote north-eastern provinces of the Jurchen Empire. In these remote regions the state of Eastern Xia (in Chin.,

Dong Xia 東夏) was proclaimed and had lasted only 18 years. In 1233, the Mongolian troops invaded the territory of today's Russian Primorye and reached Xupin and Kaiyuan cities. Puxian Wannu, the Eastern Xia ruler (*Tianwang*, in Chin. Heavenly King 天王), was taken captive. Two years later, the military division (*tumen*) of Kaiyuan was established on this territory by the order of Ögödei Khaan. This event marked the end of the independent history of the Jurchen states of Jin and Dong Xia, although the Jurchens will be prominent again as participants in the creation of the Manchu state and thus the Qing Empire, the last dynasty of imperial China.

HISTORY OF REGIONAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTIONS

We can identify three stages in the history of the Russian archeology in the Far East. The archaeological study of the “medieval” states began in the mid 19th century, when this territory was incorporated in the Russian Empire. During this period, archeological work was primarily conducted by the enthusiasts for whom archaeology and ethnology were, to a large extent, leisure activities. The first scholar to explore the ancient past of what is today Primorye was the famous Russian traveler Nikolay Przhevalsky. While he is mostly celebrated for his Central Asian explorations, he visited Primorye in 1867–1869 and published a detailed description of his voyage, which mentioned remains of fortifications and towns in the vicinity of the present-day Ussuriisk. His publication engendered the launching of an expedition by the Russian Geographical Society under the leadership of the Orthodox missionary and Sinologist Palladius (Kafarov). Kafarov was a priest and had served a long time in the Russian Orthodox Mission in Beijing. He translated many Chinese sources in Russian, including *The Secret History of the Mongols* (Kafarov 1877), which was the first translation of this text. Based on the results of his expedition to Primorye, Kafarov published a number of papers, in which he described in details the archaeological sites, as well as attempted to connect these sites with historical episodes from the Chinese chronicles (Kafarov 1879).

In 1884, the Society for the Study of the Amur Region was established in Vladivostok. From that moment, a new discovery rich in the exploration of the archaeological sites in the region began. The first chairman of the Society Fedor Busse conducted excavations of an elite grave from Jurchen period near Ussuriisk. A well-known Russian traveler and ethnologist Vladimir Arseniev compiled perhaps the first detailed map of archaeological sites in the region⁷. A school-teacher from Ussuriisk Aleksandr

⁷ Arseniev is famed, first of all, for his book on the Nanay hunter and his guide Dersu Uzala (Arseniev 1996). In 1975, Akira Kurosawa did a movie based on this book for which got the Oscar Award. In 2022, Russia celebrated the 150th anniversary of the birth of V. Arseniev. Many of his books have been republished, as well five volumes of his detailed works collections.

Fedorov prepared a description and a detailed map of archeological sites near Ussuriisk. Because many sites were destroyed in the course of building of Ussuriisk (then called Nikol'skoe), it remains a very important source on archeological sites in the area. There were also the other publications on archeology during this period (Fedorov 1916).

Following the revolution of 1917 and before the WWII archaeological excavations in the Far-Eastern territory remained scarce. But following the war, things changed. In 1953, the Far-Eastern Archaeological Expedition of the USSR Academy of Sciences was established under the leadership of professor (later Academician) Aleksey Okladnikov. His expedition carried out widespread and systematic excavations in the various parts of Siberia and the Far East. These developments marked the onset of the second stage of the history of archaeology in the Russian Far East. It was a period when the investigations were conducted by professional scholars who worked under the patronage of the USSR Academy of Sciences or in universities.

Archeological research in the region intensified with the establishment of the Institute of History, Philology and Philosophy (Siberian Branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences) in Novosibirsk in 1966 and the Institute of History, Archaeology and Ethnography of Peoples of the Far East (Far-Eastern Research Center of the USSR Academy of Sciences) in Vladivostok in 1971. Step-by-step, there emerged a network of institutions in archaeology in the region. The two above-mentioned institutes were the most important. The Institute in Vladivostok kept its name to the present day. In Novosibirsk, Anatoly Derevianko became the head of the Institute following Okladnikov, while the institution itself divided into several parts and archaeological institute was named Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography of the Siberian Branch of the RAS. Apart from the institutions in Novosibirsk and Vladivostok the multi-discipline Institute of the Far-Eastern Branch of RAS exists in Magadan and includes the archaeological laboratory. The leader of North Asian archaeology was well-known pre-historical archeologist Nikolay Dikov (Dikov 1979; 1997).

The universities and teaching institutes provided another venue for archeological research. In the Soviet times, only Vladivostok, Irkutsk and Novosibirsk were homes to universities. In other cities (centers of regions), a number of teaching institutes was established. During the post-Soviet period, all of them came to be called universities. Many of these schools created archeological laboratories and the number of job openings in archeology increased. In many universities, the departments of cultural studies were established. Some vacancies were occupied by the archaeologists from the younger generation. Some universities introduced social/cultural anthropology as a discipline, with teaching positions occupied by practicing archeologists (for example, in Vladivostok and Chita).

Many local museums provided the third venue for archeological research. Museums existed in each major regional cities and local towns,

and each was home to one or more archaeologists. They arranged the exhibitions, handled the collections, and carried out the excavations to replenish the holdings of the museums.

Finally, the last venue of archeological research was offered by various organizations charged with preservation of cultural heritage. Each administrative region in Russia has a special civil service, whose task is to monitor and control the building and construction. If, in the course of construction, a new site is found then it is supposed to be excavated at the expense of the builders. Often archaeologists from the Academy of Sciences, universities and museums as well as students are engaged to performing these excavations. It is related to the fact that there are not so many archaeologists in regions, while the excavations should be performed at a great pace.

Given the scale of archeological network and the length of time when it existed, a substantially extensive database of sources was created which allowed scholars to synthesize their findings in fundamental volumes, which showed the principal stages of the historical dynamics of archaeological cultures of the region and identified key aspects of archeological problems. The major achievements of this period were reflected in the first volumes of such fundamental composite works as *History of Siberia* and *History of the Far East of the USSR* (Okladnikov 1959; 1964; 1968; Krushanov 1989 etc.).

In archeological scholarship centered in Novosibirsk, the Stone Age was a major priority. Both A. Okladnikov and A. Derevianko, leading scholars in the Institute, focused on the Stone Age⁸. Although both are universal archaeologists, they are best known globally for their discoveries in the Palaeolithic age. Okladnikov famously found remnants of a child in the Teshik-Tash cave (eastern most finding of a Neanderthals) and Derevianko is well-known for his discovery of the *Homo Altaensis* in the Denisova cave. This was the opening of a new line of human evolution (Derevianko et al. 2020). In 2022, Svante Pääbo received the Nobel Prize for sequencing the first Neanderthal genome and sensational discovery of a previously unknown hominin, Denisova.

In Vladivostok, a school of prehistoric archaeology derives from the work of Zhanna Andreyeva, a graduate of Moscow State University, and Ernst Shavkunov from Leningrad State University. Both came to the Far East along with many other young people who arrived here to take part in the development of the region. Gradually, Vladivostok became the largest center of mediaeval archaeology in the region. To a large extent this was due to the fact that Vladivostok is situated in the area of multiple archaeological sites of early states and empires. Consequently, archeologists who studied these historical states outnumbered those focusing on prehistory.

The current, or third, stage of Russian archeology in the Far East began in 1991, when international projects emerged which included both

⁸For many years their book was the main introduction to the archaeology of the Russian Far East (Okladnikov, Derevianko 1973).

Russian and foreign scholars. These developments brought about major changes. On the one hand, the territorial scale of excavations was reduced. On the other hand, the quality of systematic excavations increased. As a result, more sources became available. Archeologists also introduced more techniques from the hard sciences, and the drift of archaeology from humanities to sciences became evident. Active contacts with foreign colleagues stimulated cross-fertilization by new methods and ideas which resulted, finally, in appearance of publications in which many previous assumptions were partly revised while entirely new problems developed. In this paper, the major achievements of the Russian scholars for the last twenty-year period will be shown.

BOHAI EARLY STATE

The study of the Bohai kingdom is, perhaps, the most popular subject in Russian Far Eastern archeology and history of recent decades. This state was situated on the territory of three present-day states: China (Heilongjiang and Jilin provinces), Russia, and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The last circumstance is the cause of disagreements between the historians and archaeologists of different countries. For the Chinese scholars Bohai is a peripheral kingdom which developed under the great influence of the Tang Empire. Korean scholars believe that it is a part of Korea's national history. The Russian and Japanese archaeologists consider Bohai as an independent state with its own history (Song Kiho 1990; New History of Parhae 2012; Diakova 2014; Sloane 2014; Kim, Min 2015; Crossley 2016 etc.).

Previously, historians had assumed that the entire territory of the present-day Russian Primorye and a considerable part of the Khabarovsk region were part of the Bohai state (Shavkunov 1968). Currently however one can more or less ascertain that only the southern and partially western part of the Primorye region belonged to Bohai. This area was home to two administrative units of the Bohai state. The Yanzhou district of Lunyuanfu province of Bohai was partially in the territory of the southern part of contemporary Primorye. Its center was located in the town next to today's settlement of Kraskino. The Razdolnaya (Suifen) river valley was part of the Shuaibin Province of the Bohai state. Many scholars believe that the fortress site of Dachengzi in the China territory today, located next to the crossing of the Russian-Chinese boundary by the Suifen River, was a center of this province. The territory north of Khanka Lake, the Partizanskaya (Suchang) river valley and the eastern part of today's Primorye were not included in the Bohai state (Gelman 2005; Nikitin 2005).

One of the pioneers in the study of the Bohai state was Ernst Shavkunov. On the recommendation of the doyen of Siberian archaeology, Aleksey Okladnikov, Shavkunov began to study Bohai while an undergraduate

at the university. In 1962, Shavkunov defended his candidate of science (PhD) thesis in Novosibirsk and, a few years later, published his book. This book was primarily based on translations of Chinese chronicles. Archaeological materials were barely present in the book (Shavkunov 1962; 1968).

It was only after many years, when Shavkunov's followers began to carry out permanent excavations of various Bohai sites, it became possible to prepare a large synthesizing work on the archaeology of Bohai in Russian Primorye, a task that was completed by Lyiudmila Semenichenko (Semenichenko 1981). In the late Soviet period, excavations of Bohai sites were conducted by Vladislav Boldin. A resulting publication, the book *Bohai State (698–926) and the Tribes of the Russian Far East* became final result of the study of Bohai kingdom in the Soviet period (Shavkunov 1994).

Studies of the Bohai state experienced a real efflorescence in the post-Soviet period, when foreigners were permitted to visit Vladivostok. Beginning in the 1990s, international archeological expeditions focusing on the Bohai state are conducted annually (Ivliev 2007). As a result, we now know many archeological sites (towns, fortress, settlement, temples and burial grounds) on the territory of the Primorye region connected to the Bohai state. The Kraskino town is the best investigated among them.

The Kraskino town was studied by E. Shavkunov, L. Semenichenko, and V. Boldin. Currently, Evgeniia Gelman is leading the excavations on Kraskino. The site is located in the Southernmost Primoriye region of the Russian Far East, on the right shore of the Tsukanovka (Yanchihe) river mouth, at about 400 m from the Posyet Bay shore. The site resembles a horseshoe with its arch oriented towards the north. The site of the town has three gates. A street running from the south gate to the north dividing the town into two parts was laid out by the Bohai builders.

The magnetometer measurements show the presence of traces of quarters and side streets between them as well as individual farm yards (Bessonova 2008). The site is identified as the city of Yan, the center of the similarly named district, and an important port, from which the route to Japan began. Over the years, the intensive exploration of the site revealed different building structures: stone walls enclosing a Buddhist temple complex, a rectangular temple platform consisting of 30 stone bases, tileries, stone foundation of the tower, water well composed of stone etc. The city was a great center of arts and manufacturing (pottery, metallurgy, tile production, civil engineering etc.). Findings in Kraskino site include items of prestige consumption, as well as evidences of the developed external and domestic trade (porcelain, glazed ceramics and ornaments). Excavations also revealed the presence of dwellings equipped with kangas (stove-couches heated with hot air). The thickness of cultural layer of the site exceeds two meters. Archeologists identified five construction horizons related to different stages of life activities. The city had existed throughout several centuries (from the 8th century to the first half of the 10th century). The upper chronological boundary can be dated by the Khitan vessel found

in the well (Gelman 2006; 2018; Ivliev, Boldin 2006; Gelman, Astashenkova 2018; Gelman et al. 2018; Gelman et al. 2020 etc.)⁹.

Most likely, this vessel ended at the bottom of the well in the period of conquest of Bohai by the Khitans (919–926) or directly after these events. Bohai territory became a puppet state Dongdan (东丹 Eastern Khitan) after the Khitan conquest (Ivliev 2018).

Residents of Bohai were subjected to tribute but rose in revolt against the conquerors almost immediately. The revolt was put down by the Khitans but soon other rebellions began. In order to liquidate the focus of discontent, the Khitans relied on the strategy common to the pre-industrial states and during the period of 930–940 AD, they resettled by force about half a million Bohai men, including those from Shuaibin, to the Khitan lands in the valleys of the Shara-Muren and Liao Rivers. A part of Bohai population was later deported to the central Mongolia for the construction of Zhenzhou city (present Chintolgoy Balgas site) (Kradin, Ivliev 2008; Kradin et al. 2011; Ivliev 2020).

JIN AND EASTERN XIA STATES

Following his studies of the Bohai state, E. Shavkunov began to explore the history of Jurchens. He assembled a team consisting of his followers who conducted excavations of the sites of the Jurchen state — or the Golden Empire — during a quarter of a century. The center of this state was in Manchuria. The Russian Primorye region was home to the peripheral regions of the Jurchen state. Provinces such as Helan (adjoining today's North Korea and the extreme south of Primorye), Huligai (in North-Eastern Manchuria) and Xupin (in today's southern and central Primorye, and Eastern Manchuria) were located in the greater region bordering on or including the Russian Far Eastern regions. The South-Ussuriisk medieval town destroyed by the modern construction was the center of Xupin Province. In addition, the province Yelan with its center at Nikolayevka site was located in the Primorye region (Partizanskaya [Suchang] river valley and the neighboring coastal area). The Chuguyevka medieval town was, by all appearances, a center of one more administrative unit in the Ussuri river headwaters. It is possible that the Novonezhino town was also a local center of the coastal areas of the south-eastern Primorye in the Jurchen state.

The mountain fortress and towns in the Jurchen period differ markedly from the lowland site in their constructional features. As a rule, a large creek valley with a water source was chosen for the construction of a site. Along the crest, the embankment was built, so that the creek valley was secured from possible attacks. The famous Shaiga fortress in the Partizansky district in Primorye region is the best-known mountain site

⁹See also the conclusions of Korean scholars on joint research at Kraskino town (Kim Ynguk, Chun Sukbae 2021).

of such type. It was discovered by Ernst Shavkunov and studied for a long time under his supervision (Shavkunov 1990).

As a result of excavations over many years archeologists determined that the Shaiga town was a large center of crafts. On the territory of the site scholars excavated many workshops in which skilled craftsmen engaged in smelting and forging of ferrous and nonferrous metals. The fortress was divided into quarters. Archeologists assume that the metallurgists lived in one part of the town, while the craftsmen-armorers, jewelers, and leather-dressers inhabited other quarters. The inner earthen structures walled off the “forbidden city” inhabited by the governor and his administration. A few archeological finds attest to the relatively high status of the Shaiga site in the political hierarchy of the Eastern Xia dynasty. For instance, among these artifacts are the silver *paiza* (from Chinese *paizi*), an accreditation mark of a dignitary, and the stamp of *zhizhong* (a high-level Jurchen official) (Ivliev 2000).

The site of the Shaiga fortress became the principal field laboratory for most historical archaeologists of Vladivostok. Many of them came to participate in excavations for the first time as school-children, and then they became students, and in the end, research workers. As a result, a certain tradition of Far Eastern archeology emerged. In the first publication on the Shaiga site by Shavkunov he used only some materials from the excavations (Shavkunov 1990). Many of his co-workers though used the findings from the excavations in the Shaiga site for their theses and books. For instance, Vitaly Lenkov published on Jurchen metallurgy (Lenkov 1971; 1974), Svetlana Tupikina explored pottery production (Tupikina 1981; 1996), Vladislav Boldin studied Jurchen agriculture (Boldin 1986), Nadezhda Artemyeva explored dwelling construction (Artemyeva 1987; 1998) and so on. After Shavkunov the excavation in Shaiga site were continued by Lenkov and Artemyeva. Some years ago, the full results are accumulated in a one volume (Artemyeva 2021a).

Far Eastern archeologists also explored other Jurchen sites. For many years Vitaly Lenkov studied in the Lazo fortress town. Outcomes of his research were published posthumously (Lenkov, Artemyeva 2003). The Ananiyevka site situated at a distance of about 10 km from the Suifen River in Nadezhdinsky district can be considered an example of a small military settlement. The area of the site is more than 10.5 ha. It contains over 100 dwellings with *kangs* and various economic and other facilities. The size of site, the absence of administrative and palace buildings as well as its important strategic position allow us to assume that the site can be classified as a Jurchen military settlement — *mouke* (Khorev 2012).

Among other important archeological sites, a group of funeral complexes constructed in honor of representatives of the Jurchen elite was found as early as the 19th century on the left shore of Razdolnaiya (Suifen) river within the boundaries of the present-day Ussuriisk city. Here a stone turtle with stele inscription was found by Russian amateur archeologists.

The whole inscription, unfortunately, was destroyed and only several hieroglyphs remained. They were deciphered as title of the deceased Jurchen.

Russian archeologist Vitaly E. Larichev determined that among the funeral complexes was the tomb of the Jurchen prince Esikui (Digunai, Wanyan Zhong). His life sheds light on little known pages from the region's past. Esikui or Wanyan Zhong was one of the supporters of the first Jurchen Emperor Aguda. He took part in the first campaigns against the Liao dynasty and, on the death of his brother, the leader of the Yelan Jurchens, took the reins of government in what is today the south-eastern Primorye region. In 1124, Wanyan Zhong has re-located the headquarters of his administration from Yelan to Xupin. Scholars believe that the move was caused by the fact that the lands of Yelan were not really fertile and "alkalinized". Most likely, after the resettlement, the city which became the administrative center of the Jurchen province of Xupin was build in a new location. Esikui or Wanyan Zhong lived there until his death in 1137. Later on, in 1171, the Jurchen emperor ordered to unite nominally the Yelan and Xupin mengan, retaining a common name Yelan (Larichev 1966).

One of the most important discoveries in the history of the Jurchen formations was, in fact, made in the office rather than in the archeological field. Aleksandr Ivliev, known archaeologist-Sinologist for his wide-ranging erudition, explored the inscriptions on weight pieces of the Jurchen and discovered era names which were previously unknown among the Jurchen. Analysis of historical sources demonstrated that the era names on the weights belonged to the other state of the Jurchens, namely, the Eastern Xia (in Chinese *Dong Xia*) rather than the Jin dynasty. The Eastern Xia was established by Puxian Wannu in 1215 (Ivliev 1990). The Eastern Xia state formation occupied the territories of three provinces of the Jin Empire: Helan, Xupin and Huligai, located respectively in today's eastern Manchuria, the extreme north of Korean Peninsula, and a large part of the Primorye region) (Ivliev 1993; 1996). The period of Eastern Xia witnessed large scale resettlement and construction of multiple cities with strong fortifications.

Undoubtedly, the Jin state served as a model for the governmental and administrative structure of the state of Eastern Xia. However, it is important to note that the new state formation had a number of specific features. Eastern Xia was characterized by a smaller size. Its economy almost collapsed as a result of war, and was likely based on greater role of natural exchange. Given the constant threat of Mongol invasion and conquest, the rulership of Eastern Xia was under a certain stress, which resulted in even greater concentration of power in the hands of Puxian Wannu and his local administrators. A reduction in the activity of the private economic actors (in any case relatively unimportant in the economic setup of the region) and a drastic militarization of the economy, with construction of fortifications, military metallurgy, and so forth, and of society, was reflected in the military-hierarchical system

of the settlements *meng'an* — *mouke*. Generally, the social and economic machinery of the state of Eastern Xia requires some additional attention.

During this time, the Jurchens of Eastern Xia constructed the city of Kaiyuan near the two existing towns (South and West Ussuriisk fortresses). It was located on the right bank of Suifen River, in three kilometers south of today's Ussuriisk. Kaiyuan was built as an unassailable fortress and the capital city of the state of Eastern Xia. The archeological site of Kaiyuan is located upon a high Krasnoiyarovka bald peak. It was enclosed by strong defense constructions and had a system of additional internal fortifications. Archeologists found remains of numerous palace and temple buildings, residential quarters of ordinary people, as well as housekeeping equipment, ornaments, armament supplies, and other items suggesting a degree of wealth (Artemyeva, Ivliev 2000; 2000a; Artemyeva 2011; 2015; 2021 etc.).

After the conquest of the Jurchens by the Mongols, many residents of the Jurchen state were resettled in different parts of the Mongol Empire which is confirmed by archaeological data. Typical Jurchen *kangs* were found in many archeological sites of the Mongol period: in Karakorum, first capital of the Mongol empire, in the Khirkhira town in the East Baikal region, and in the Den Terek town in Tuva. The sculptured dragon head and the phoenix bird decorations found in the Den Terek town in Tuva, and also later in Xanadu, the capital of the Mongol Yuan dynasty of China, were almost identical to the Primorye region's Jurchen finds. Detailed description of porcelain and slipware from the Karakorum site definitely pointed to its Jin and Song origin, particularly of such known brands as Jun Yao and Cizhou. Some Jurchen artefacts were also found in the Caucasus also (Kiselev 1965: 94—95, 216—258, Fig. 20—22, 29, 33, 41, 74—75, 103—104; Shavkunov 1990: 226; Narozhny 2007: 60—66; An Yongde 2011: 88; Rudenko 2012). One of the vital tasks of the present archaeological studies consists in the examination of the Jurchen contribution to cultural history of different parts of the Great expansive Mongol Empire.

The population of the Amur River basin was also studied by the Russian archaeologists. This territory was usually divided into the Western and Eastern Amur region (Russian *Priamurye*). In the Western Amur region, a few tens of large towns were found (Sapunov, Zaitsev 1993). They are commonly identified with the Jurchen. However, nobody has there performed serious excavations. We don't know to which province of the Gold Jurchen Empire, this territory can be attributed. But it was there that Andrei Zabiyaiko made a unique discovery. He found the earliest inscription in the Jurchen language on a rock cliff (Zabiyaiko 2019).

The East Amur River area was far better studied. Here, the excavations (mainly, burial grounds) were performed since the 1970s. Some hundreds burials in which the different things for the everyday life were preserved in good condition were excavated (Medvedev 1977). The fortresses and settlements were to a lesser degree studied. The central intrigue is related

to the question of the ethnic identity. Vitaly Medvedev from Novosibirsk believes that those are the Jurchen. He uses a term “Amur Jurchen”. These people have later departed to the south and established the Gold Empire (Medvedev 1986). His permanent opponent Yury Vasil’ev has shown that the cultures of the people of Amur River basin and Primorye differ very much. In addition, the density of population in the Amur River basin was low. These dispersive polities could not destroy the Liao Empire. Vasil’ev considered that this was made by early Mongols who went afterwards to Mongolia (Vasil’ev 2006). But it is also opened for dispute. This culture differs essentially from that of early Mongols. Most probably, it is so called Wuguo (“Five Nations”). The government of Liao has sent the Jurchen to Wuguo for the falcons (Wittfogel, Feng 1949: 92, 119, 120, 132, 360).

The population of the Amur region was also closely connected with the history of the Sakhalin and Kurile Islands. At the beginning of the Middle Ages, migrants came to Sakhalin and Kurile. They mixed with the local population and assimilated. This marked the beginning of the Okhotsk culture. Then it was supplanted by the carriers of the Satsumon culture, who came from the south. This is well reflected in archaeology (Vasilevskiy 2018).

DARK AGE AND RUSSIAN COLONIZATION

After the Mongolian conquest, the territory of Manchuria and Primorye became the desert (abandoned) region. The Jurchen craftsmen and farmers were transferred to the towns of Mongolian khans. One of the evidences is the artefacts from the site of Den-Terek in Tuva. There, tiles and clayey heads of dragons were found. The very same dragons were discovered at the site of Nikolayevka (Partizansky district, Primorye) (Kradin 2016).

The archaeologists do not know the towns and handicraft centers of the Mongolian period on the territory of Primorye and Manchuria. One might assume that the majority of population was deported. If some groups stayed put, they became to lead safe mobile life. In the period of the Ming dynasty, the Jurchen pursued a nomadic lifestyle, engaged in cattle breeding, hunting, fishery and, in some degree, agriculture. The chiefs of the Jurchen tribes or chiefdom have sent the embassies to the Ming Emperor. They have received the titles and presents from the Emperor.

In the Ming’s period, China began to pursue the active foreign policy. Admiral Zheng He investigated the Indian Ocean and came to Africa. The Jurchen Yishiha was sent to the Lower Amur in 1411. This expedition numbered a thousand people. They have sailed on 25 ships. In place of the present-day Tyr village, Yishiha has distributed the gifts to local chiefs and, in 1413, has built on the cliff the temple and stele with inscriptions in Chinese, Jurchen and Mongolian languages. On departure, the temple

was destroyed by indigenous people. During new expedition in 1433, Yishiha has restored the temple and cut one more edifying inscription in Chinese.

When the Russian Kozaks arrived at this place, they have found ruins of temples and stele. This information turned out to be in a number of books including book by Nicolaes Witsen *North and East Tartary* where it was said that some Chinese ruler has visited this place and left stones with letters and a bell (Witsen 1692, II, 29b–30a).

It is interesting that there is a comment on the oldest Russian map of Stepan Remezov where it is said that Alexander the Great came to this place. He buried the corpse, left here the bell and people. The substitution of the Chinese ruler for Alexander the Great is symbolic. The young Russian Empire has established its frontier and faced the Qing Empire. Not without reason, the Manchus have considered this territory their own. It was necessary to show that the territorial pretenses of the Russians have the genealogic reasons. If Moscow is the Third Rome, then one line is from Byzantium to Greek (Macedonian) Alexander.

It is amusing but the geopolitical pretenses are mirror-like. In the 20th century, there is an opinion among the Chinese historians that Genghis Khan should be considered as the Chinese Emperor. Mongols are one of the peoples of the great Chinese nation. For this reason, the history of the largest part of Eurasia is a part of the China's history. This particular situation is presented on the maps in many Chinese museums.

The Tyr stele of 1413 is unique. It is the world's only epigraphic monument combining the texts in the Chinese, Jurchen and Mongolian languages. The stele is key source of the Jurchen and Mongolian languages in the 14th century. In addition, the inscriptions contain the important data of the peoples of the Lower Amur basin and their economy and culture. The study of steles began in the 19th century. In 1891, both steles were transported by sea to Vladivostok and, now, they are in the Arsenyev Museum. The inscription on the stele was investigated by scientists of different countries. Recently, the Russian scholars published the most exact texts, their Russian translations and detailed comments (Golovachev et al. 2011).

In 1996–2000, the excavations on this territory were carried out by Aleksandr Artemyev. He found the remains of brick floor, a quantity of tile and other artefacts. He put also a hypothesis that the temple of the 13 century, period of the Yuan Empire, was situated on this territory (Artemyev 2005).

At the turn of the 16th–17th centuries, the chiefdoms of the south Jurchen have received the second historical chance. Already by the name of Manchurians, they have established in 1616 the state Late Jin (later, Qing). In the course of the empire establishment, the Manchurians have conducted a series of depredations on the territory of the North and East Manchuria and Primorye for drafting of peoples in the army. The majority of native population was removed to Manchuria. Only hunters

and fishers — Udige and Golds (the Nanais) stayed put. Such situation was found out here by the first Russian pioneers in the 19th century.

Sites of the indigenous cultures of the Ming and Qing Dynasties time scattered on the territory of the Amur River basin. These were small fortresses and burial grounds. Many of these fortresses were studied by Grigory Novikov-Daursky (Novikov-Daursky 1961). The burial mounds were also found out in the Western Amur River area. They were occasionally studied. Generally, these fortresses are called Dahurian. Such name is related to the old hypothesis of 19th century that the Daurians have arrived at the Amur River in the Mongolian times. However, nobody conducted here the excavations. The relation of these sites has yet to be demonstrated.

The most large-scale excavations of the sites of indigenous cultures in the Western Amur area (Upper Amur River) were performed by Dmitry Bolotin. He has investigated the so called Vladimirovka culture. The excavations were made on 8 burial mounds which became the basis for his PhD Thesis. Bolotin has identified two traditions in the material culture: Tungus and Mongolian. He believes that this is a result of living and contacts of two nations here: Mongolian-speaking Dahurs and Tungus-speaking Duchers. Bolotin dates the culture from the 13th—17th centuries. This dating is only based on the historical events. In the 13th century, the Mongolian Empire was established and large-scale migrations of nations occurred. In the 17th century, the peoples went from here and, by the beginning of the Russian colonization, there was a desolation in this area (Bolotin 1995; 2005).

The following important stage of history is related to the arrival of the Russian people at this territory. The Russian pioneers have moved in the 17th century through the river networks. This was a major transport network. That is why the northern territories were at first developed and, only afterward, the Russian people moved upstream to the southward. The Russians have selected the areas where the local peoples settled. The pioneers and Kozaks have collected the tribute (*yasak*) and sent it to Moscow. The settlement system was characterized by three stages. The first stage included the fortified timber house, verbally, *winter house* (Russian *zimovie*; from *zima* — winter). At the second stage, the picket fort, fortress with the walls made of timber with towers (Russian *ostrog*), was constructed. And, finally, at the third stage, the fortress was transformed into the town (Kradin 1988). In the 17th century, the Russian pioneers, Kozaks and hunters have constructed seven fortresses and more than 30 tribute and commercial winter houses (*zimovie*). The major Siberian towns (Tomsk, Krasnoyarsk, Tobolsk, Mangazeya, Yakutsk, Nerchinsk, Okhotsk etc.) have originated from the forts.

The Russians in the Siberia have basically constructed the timber fortresses. Here, they have conflicted with peoples armed with bows and arrows. The similar situation was observed in America where the European colonizers have fought against the Indians armed with bows and guns. However, in the Amur River area, the Kozaks faced the army of the Manchurians

having the cannons. The timber walls could not protect against the gunpowder and cannon balls. So, the Russians became to construct the fortifications using the timber and earth (Kradin N.P. 2005).

In the 17th century, the fortresses were erected along the Selenga River and Shilka River as well as their tributaries in the Transbaikalia. The Selenga ostrog (1665) and Nerchinsk ostrog were most significant. On the Amur River, the Albazin ostrog was of great importance. It was established in 1665 but the Manchurians have destroyed it in 1685. Afterwards, in 1686, the new fortress of clay, turf and wood was erected again. The construction was managed by Afanasy Beiton, army officer and Prussian. At a later date, he has led the defense of Albazin. The fortress had the powerful fortifications and withstood the long-term siege of the Manchurian forces.

In the 1970s, the Albazin fortress was studied by the Blagoveshchensk's archaeologist Valery Sukhikh (Sukhikh 1980). Later on, the archaeologist from Vladivostok Aleksandr Artemyev has continued these excavations. He has investigated a large area, found the grave site of the defenders of fortress and published the book in which the results of his excavations and investigations of other authors were generalized (Artemyev 1999). The excavation was continued after him (Zabiyako, Cherkasov 2019). The archaeological sites were also investigated in Kuril Islands (Shubin 1992).

The latest by date project in historical archaeology of Modern Time was related to the investigation of the camp of the Second Kamchatka expedition under the direction of Vitus Bering in 1741–1742. It was tragic campaign. The ship was wrecked and the sailors had to winter on the island that was later named after Bering. During wintering, Bering died. Within two field seasons, Vitaly Lenkov and his colleagues investigated the camp and obtained the interesting results (Lenkov, Silant'ev, Staniukovich 1992).

CONCLUSION

In the present article, the principal stages of the historic archaeology in the Russian Far East are shown. The Russian scholars entered the new millennium with quite good results and future prospects. The current state of archaeology is characterized by deep integration with the natural sciences, development of international cooperation and execution of complex scientific projects.

Because, the territory of the Far East is vast, and the extent of archeological knowledge is as yet not too detailed, the crucial tasks include, as before, the search for new sites of different periods and carrying out excavations. We continue to work on the systematization of the artifacts, establishing chronology, and preserving archaeological heritage. Further development of the multi-disciplinary projects and international integration will undoubtedly provide a fresh impetus and will contribute to gaining new knowledge about the past of the Russian Far East.

REFERENCES

- An Yongde (ed.) 2011. *Xanady*. Huhehaote: Inner Mongolia Peoples Press.
- Arseniev V. 1996. *Dersu the Trapper*. New York: McPherson.
- Artemyev A.R. 1999. *Goroda i ostrogi Zabaykal'ya i Priamur'ya vo vtoroy polovine XVII—XVIII v.* [Towns and Fortress of the East Baikal Region and Amur River Area in the Second Half of the 17th—18th Centuries]. Vladivostok: Institute of History, Archaeology and Ethnology FEB RAS.
- Artemyev A.R. 2005. *Buddiyskie khramy XV v. v nizov'yakh Amura* [Buddist Temples of the 15th Century in Lower Amur]. Vladivostok: Institute of History, Archaeology and Ethnology FEB RAS.
- Artemyeva N.G. 1987. *Domostroitel'stvo chzhurchzueney Primoryia (XII — nachalo XIII v.)* [House-building of the Jurchen in Primorye (12th — Beginning of 13th Centuries)]. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Leningrad: Leningrad Division of Institute of archaeology of the USSR Academy of Sciences.
- Artemyeva N.G. 1998. *Domostroitel'stvo chzhurchzeney Primor'ya (XII—XIII vv.)* [House-Building of the Jurchen in Primorye (12th—13th Centuries)]. Vladivostok: Dal'press.
- Artemyeva N.G. 2011. Itogi issledovaniya Krasnoyarskogo gorodishcha Primorskoy arkheologicheskoy ekspeditsiy [The Results of the Krasnoyarsk Site Investigation by the Primorye Archeological Expedition]. *Aktual'nye problemy arkheologii Sibiri i Dal'nego Vostoka* [Actual Problems of Archeology of Siberia and Far East]. Ed. by V.A. Lynsha, V.N. Tarasenko. Ussuriysk, 270—277.
- Artemyeva N.G. 2015. 20 let issledovaniy Krasnoyarskogo gorodishcha — Verkhney stolitsy gosudarstva Vostochnoe Sya (1215—1233 gg.) [20 Years of Research of the Krasnoyarskoe Town — the Upper Capital of the State of Eastern Xia (1215—1233)]. *Vestnik RNGF* [Bulletin of the Russian Science Foundation for Humanities], No 2, 218—230.
- Artemyeva N.G. 2021. 25 let rabot Primorskoy arkheologicheskoy ekspeditsii [25 Years of the Works of Promorsky Archaeological Expedition]. *Trudy Instituta istorii, arkheologii i etnografii DVO RAN* [Proceedings of the Institute of the History, Archaeology, Ethnology FEB RAS] 31, 71—93.
- Artemyeva N.G. 2021a. *Shayginskoe gorodishche* [Shaiga Mediaeval Town]. Vladivostok: Institute of History, Archaeology and Ethnology FEB RAS.
- Artemyeva N.G., Ivliev A.L. 2000. Novye epigraficheskie nakhodki iz Ussuriyska [New Epigraphic Finds from Ussuriysk]. *Rossiyskaya arkheologiya* [Russian Archaeology], No 2, 165—172.
- Artemyeva N.G., Ivliev A.L. 2000a. Pechat' Elan'skogo men'yana [Stamp of the Yelan Mengan]. *Vestnik DVO RAN* [Herald of FEB RAS], No 2, 109—114.
- Atwood C. 2010. The Notion of Tribe in Medieval China: Ouyang Xiu and the Shatuo Dynastic Myth. *Miscellanea Asiatica: Festschrift in Honour of Françoise Aubin*. Ed. by D. Aigle, I. Charleux, V. Gossaert, R. Hamayon. Sankt Augustin: Insitut Monumenta Serica, 593—621.
- Berezkin Yu.E. 2007. “Earth-Diver” and “Emergence from under the Earth”: Cosmological Tales as an Evidence in Favor of the Heterogenic Origins of American Indians. *Archaeology, Ethnology & Anthropology of Eurasia* 32, 110—123.
- Berezkin Yu.E. 2010. Selecting Separate Episodes of the Peopling of the New World: Beringian—Subarctic—Eastern North American Folklore Links. *Anthropological Papers of the University of Alaska* 5, 257—276.

- Berezkin Yu.E. 2017. Peopling of the New World from Data on Distribution of Folklore Motifs. *Maths Meets Myths: Quantitative Approaches to Ancient Narratives*. Ed. by R. Kenna, M. MacCarron, P. MacCarron. New York: Springer, 71–89.
- Bessonova E.A. 2008. *Primenenie magnitorazvedki dlia resheniia arkhelozhicheskikh zadach v beregovoy zone zaliva Petra velikogo (Yaponskoe more)* [Use of Magnetic Survey for Solution of Archeological Problems in the Coastal Zone of the Peter the Great Bay, Sea of Japan]. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Vladivostok: Pacific Oceanological Institute of FEB RAS.
- Boldin V.I. 1986. *Zemledelie i zivotnovodstvo u bohaitsev i chzhurchzueney Primorya* [Agriculture and Cattle-breeding of the Bohai and Jurchen People in Primorye]. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Novosibirsk: Institute of History, Philology and Philosophy, Siberian Branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences.
- Bolotin D.P. 1995. *Etnokulturnaya situatsia na Verkhnem Amure v epokhu pozdnego srednevekovaya (XIII–XVII vv.)* [Ethnic and Cultural Situation in Upper Amur River in the Period of Late Middle Age (13th–17th Centuries)]. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Novosibirsk: Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography of Siberian Branch of RAS.
- Bolotin D.P. 2005. *Narody i kul'tury Priamur'ya v pozdnem srednevekov'e* [Peoples and Cultures of the Amur Region in the Late Middle Ages]. *Rossiyskiy Dal'niy Vostok v drevnosti i srednevekov'e* [Russian Far East in Prehistory and Middle Ages]. Ed. by Zh.V. Andreeva. Vladivostok: Dal'nauka, 615–635.
- Claessen H.J.M., Skalnik P. (eds.) 1978. *The Early State*. Hague: Mouton.
- Crossley P. 2016. Bohai/Parhae Identity and the Coherence of Dangur under the Kitan/Liao Empire. *International Journal of Korean History* 21 (1), 11–45.
- Derevianko A.P., Shunkov M.V., Kozlikin M.B. 2020. Who Were the Denisovans? *Archaeology, Ethnology and Anthropology of Eurasia* 48 (3), 3–32.
- Derevianko E.I. 1981. *Plemena Priamur'ya. I tys. n.e.* [Tribes of Amur Region. 1st Millennium AD]. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Diakova O.V. 1984. *Rannesrednevekovaya keramika Dal'nego Vostoka SSSR kak istoricheskiy istochnik IV–X vv.* [Early Medieval Pottery of the Far East of the USSR as a Historical Source of the 4th–10th Centuries]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Diakova O.V. 1998. *Mokheskie pamyatniki Primor'ya* [Mohe Sites of Primorye]. Vladivostok: Dal'nauka.
- Diakova O.V. 2014. *Gosidarstvo Bokhay: arkhelozhiya, istoriya, politika* [Bohai State: Archaeology, History, Politics]. Moscow: Nauka. Vostochnaya literatura.
- Dikov N.N. 1979. *Drevnie kul'tury Severo-Vostochnoy Azii* [Ancient Cultures of North-Eastern Asia]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Dikov N.N. 1997. *Asia at the Juncture with America in Antiquity (The Stone Age of the Chukchi Peninsula)*. Anchorage, AK: Shared Beringian Heritage Program.
- Earle T. 2021. *A Primer on Chiefs and Chiefdoms*. New York: Eliot Werner Publications, Inc.
- Fedorov A.Z. 1916. *Pamyatniki stariny v gorode Nikol'sk-Ussuriyskom i ego okrestnostyakh* [The Ancient Sites in Nikol'sk-Ussuriysky and Its Areas]. Nikol'sk-Ussuriysky: Izdanie K.I. Lepina.
- Franke H. 1975. Chinese Texts on the Jurchen, I: A Translation of the Jurchen Monograph in the 'San-Ch'ao Pei-Meng Hui-Pien'. *Zentralasiatische Studien* 9, 119–186.
- Franke H. 1978. Chinese Texts on the Jurchen, II: A Translation of Chapter One of the 'Chin shih'. *Zentralasiatische Studien* 12, 413–452.
- Franke H. 1978a. *Nordchina am Vorabend der Mongolischen Eroberungen: Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft unter der Chin-Dynastie (1115–1234)*. Orladen: Rheinisch-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

- Franke H. 1987. The Role of the State as a Structural Element in Polyethnic Societies. *Foundation and Limits of State Power in China*. Ed. by S.R. Schram. London: University of London; Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 87–112.
- Garcia C. 2012. *Horsemen from the Edge of Empire: The Rise of the Jurchen Coalition*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Seattle: University of Washington.
- Gelman E.I. 2005. Vzaimodeystvie tsentra i periferii v Bokhae [Interaction of the Center and Periphery in Bohai]. *Rossiyskiy Dal'niy Vostok v drevnosti i srednevekov'e* [Russian Far East in Prehistory and Middle Ages]. Ed. by Zh.V. Andreeva. Vladivostok: Dal'nauka, 476–516.
- Gelman E.I. 2006. Trade Ceramics from Bohai Sites of Russian Primor'e. *Beyond the Steppe and the Sown: Proceedings of the 2002 University of Chicago Conference on Eurasian Archaeology*. Ed. by D.L. Peterson, L.M. Popova, A.T. Smith. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 411–421.
- Gelman E.I. 2018. Keramika Kraskinskogo gorodishcha [Pottery from Kraskino Town]. *Multidisciplinary Research in Archaeology* 1 (2), 40–64.
- Gelman E.I., Astashenkova E.V. 2018. Kul'tura i povsednevnost' bokhayskikh gorodov [Culture in Everyday Life of Bohai Towns]. *Goroda srednevekovykh imperiy Dal'negο Vostoka* [Towns of Mediaeval Empires of the Far East]. Ed. by N.N. Kradin. Moscow: Izd-vo vostochnoy literatury, 124–148.
- Gelman E.I., Astashenkova E.V., Prokopets S.D., Ivliev A.L. 2018. Goroda bokhayskogo gosudarstva [Towns of the Bohai State]. *Goroda srednevekovykh imperiy Dal'negο Vostoka* [Towns of Mediaeval Empires of the Far East]. Ed. by N.N. Kradin. Moscow: Izd-vo vostochnoy literatury, 68–123.
- Gelman E.I., Ivliev A.L., Boldin V.I. 2020. Fortifikatsionnye sooruzheniya Kraskinskogo gorodishcha [The Fortifications of the Kraskino Town]. *Trudy Instituta istorii, arkheologii i etnografii DVO RAN* [Proceedings of the Institute of the History, Archaeology, Ethnology FEB RAS] 26, 157–174.
- Golovachev V.Ts., Ivliev A.L., Pevnov A.M., Rykin P.O. 2011. *Tyrskie stely XV veka. Perevod, kommentarii, issledovanie kitayskikh, mongol'skogo, chzhurchzen'skogo tekstov* [The Tyr Steles of the 15th Century: Translations, Commentaries, Study of the Chinese, Mongolian and Jurchen Texts]. Saint Petersburg: Nauka.
- Hamada Kosaku 2007. Transition of Understanding Balhae in Japan. *Journal of Northeast Asian History* 4 (2), 173–189.
- Hanks B. 2010. Archaeology of Eurasian Steppes and Mongolia. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 39, 469–486.
- Hartley C., Yaziciglu B., Smith A. (eds.) 2012. *The Archaeology of Power and Politics in Eurasia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hermans E. (ed.) 2020. *A Companion to the Global Early Middle Ages*. Leeds: Arc Humanities Press.
- Holmes C., Standen N. 2015. Defining the Global Middle Ages. *Medieval worlds* 1, 106–117.
- Ivliev A.L. 1990. Novye materialy o srednevekovykh bronzovykh diskakh iz Primor'ya [New Materials on the Mediaeval Bronze Discs from Primorye]. *Problemy srednevekovoy arkheologii Dalnegο Vostoka: proiskhozhenie, periodizatsiya, datirovka kul'tur* [Problems of Mediaeval Archaeology: Origins, Periodization, Chronology of Cultures]. Ed. by O.V. Dyakova. Vladivostok: Institute of History, Archaeology and Ethnology FEB RAS, 5–18.
- Ivliev A.L. 1993. Izuchenie istorii gosudarstva Vostochnoe Sya v KNR [Studying the History of the Eastern Xia State in China]. *Novye materialy po arkheologii Dal'negο Vostoka Rossii i smeznykh territoriy* [New Data on the Archeology

- of the Far East of Russia and Adjacent Territories]. Ed. by V.D. Lenkov. Vladivostok: Institute of History, Archaeology and Ethnology FEB RAS, 8—17.
- Ivliev A.L. 1996. Pis'mennye istochniki po istorii Primor'ya serediny I — nachala II tys. n.e. [Written Sources on the History of Primorye in the Middle Part of the I — Beginning of the II Millennium AD]. *Primorye v drevnosti i srednevekov'e: Materialy region. arkheol. konf. [Primorye in Prehistory and Medieval Period. Materials of regional archaeological conference]*. Ed. by A.M. Kuznetsov. Ussuriysk: Ussuriysk Pedagogical Institute, 30—34.
- Ivliev A.L. 2000. Shayginskaya paytsza v svete dannykh yaponskoy letopisi [Shaiginskaya Paiza in the Light of Data from the Japanese Chronicle]. *Istoriya i arkheologiya Dal'nego Vostoka. K 70-letiyu E.V. Shavkunova [History and Archeology of the Far East. To the 70th Anniversary of E.V. Shavkunov]*. Ed. by N.N. Kradin. Vladivostok: Far Eastern University Press, 181—184.
- Ivliev A.L. 2007. Balhae Studies in Russia. *Journal of Northeast Asian History* 4 (2), 191—208.
- Ivliev A.L. 2018. Gosudarstvo Dundan' i arkheologiya Primor'ya [Dongdan State and Archaeology of Primorye Region]. *Trudy Instituta istorii, arkheologii i etnografii DVO RAN [Proceedings of the Institute of the History, Archaeology, Ethnology FEB RAS]* 20, 177—186.
- Ivliev A.L. 2020. Arkheologicheskie svidetel'stva prisutstviya bokhaitsev na pamyatnikakh severo-zapadnoy granitsy Lyao [Archaeological Evidences of Bohai People's Presence in Sites of Liao North-West Border]. *Multidisciplinary Research in Archaeology* 3 (1), 40—58.
- Ivliev A.L., Boldin V.I. 2006. Issledovaniya Kraskinskogo gorodishcha i arkheologicheskoe izuchenie Bokhaia v Primorye [Studies of the Kraskino Town and Archeological Investigation of Bohai in Primorye]. *Rossiya i ATR [Russia and the Pacific]*, No 3, 5—18.
- Jiang Yuke, Zhao Yongjun 2021. Arkheologicheskoe issledovanie severnoy granitsy gosudarstva Bokhai [Archaeological Research of North Border of Bohai State]. *Multidisciplinary Research in Archaeology* 4 (1), 103—128.
- Jung Yongjin 2007. China's Perspective on Balhae History. *Journal of Northeast Asian History* 4 (2), 157—171.
- Kafarov P. 1877. Starinnoe kitayskoe skazanie o Chingizkhane [Ancient Chinese Story about Chinghis Khan]. *Vostochnyy sbornik* I, 149—202.
- Kafarov P. 1879. Istoricheskiy ocherk Ussuriyskogo kraja v svyazi s istoriey Man'chzhurii [Historical Essay of the Ussuriysk Region in the Context of Manchuria History]. *Zapiski Imperatorskogo Russkogo Geograficheskogo Obshchestva* VIII (2), 221—228.
- Khorev V.A. 2012. *Anan'evskoe gorodishche* [Ananyevka Mediaeval Town]. Vladivostok: Dal'nauka.
- Kim A. 2008. Archeological Studies of Bohai in Russia. *Oriens Extremus* 47, 302—312.
- Kim A. 2009. Archeological Studies of Jurchen in the USSR and Russia. *Ural-Altische Jahrbücher* 23, 247—262.
- Kim A. 2011. The Historiography of Bohai in Russia. *Historian* 73, 284—299.
- Kim A., Min Kyoungyoun 2015. The Problem of the Ethnic Composition of the Bohai State — A Comparative Analysis of Russian and Korean Materials. *Central Asiatic Journal* 58 (1-2), 7—15.
- Kim Ynguk, Chun Sukbae 2021. *Keulaseukino balhaeseong—balgul40nyeon-ui seong-gwa* [Kraskino Town of Bohai: Results of 40 Years Excavations]. Seoul: The Foundation of the Study of North-Eastern Asia.

- Kiselev S.V. (ed.) 1965. *Drevnemongol'skie goroda* [Ancient Mongolian Towns]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Kobishchanov Yu.M. 1987. The Phenomenon of Gafol and Its Transformations. *Early State Dynamics*. Ed. by H.J.M. Claessen, P. Van de Velde. Lieden: Brill, 108–128.
- Kocheshkov N.V. 2002. Tipologiya traditsionnykh kul'tur narodov Severo-Vostochnoy chasti Azii [Typology of Traditional Cultures of the Peoples of North-East Asia]. Vladivostok: Far Eastern State University Press.
- Kradin N.N. 1989. *Sotsial'nyy stroy narodov Dal'nego Vostoka SSSR v I tys. n.e.* [Social Structure of Peoples in the USSR Far East in the 1st Millennium AD]. Preprint. Vladivostok: DVO RAN.
- Kradin N.N. 2005. Tyurkskie runy i problema obrazovaniya bokhayskogo gosudarstva [Turkic Runes and Problem of Bohai State Formation]. *Mezhdunarodnaya konferentsiya Fonda Kogureskikh issledovaniy: Kogureskaya istoriya i kul'tura* [International Conference of the Foundation of Kogurye Studies: Koguryo History and Culture]. Seoul: Northeast Asian History Foundation, 218–222.
- Kradin N.N. 2010. Vozdestva v pervobytnoy arkheologii Primor'ya [Chieftdoms in the Primitive Archeology of Primorye]. *Priotkryvaya zavesu tysyacheletiy: K 80-letiyu Zh.V. Andreevoy* [Opening a Curtain of Millennia: To 80-Anniversary of Zh.V. Andreeva]. Ed. by Yu.V. Vostretsov, N.A. Kliuev. Vladivostok: Reya, 210–223.
- Kradin N.N. 2013. Puti stanovleniya i evolyutsii ranney gosudarstvennosti na Dal'nem Vostoke [Pathways of Formation and Transformation of the Early State in the Far East]. *Rannie formy potestarnykh sistem* [Early Forms of Potestary Systems]. Ed. by V.A. Popov. Saint Petersburg: Museum of anthropology and ethnology of the RAS, 65–86.
- Kradin N.N. 2016. Archaeology of Deportation: Eurasian Steppe Example. *Central Eurasia in the Middle Ages. Studies in Honour of Peter B. Golden*. Ed. by O. Karatay and I. Zimonyi. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 209–219.
- Kradin N.N. 2019. Osobennosti i mekhanizmy dal'nevostochnogo politogeneza [Features and Mechanisms of Far Eastern State Origins]. *Trudy Instituta istorii, arkheologii i etnografii DVO RAN* [Proceedings of the Institute of the History, Archaeology, Ethnology FEB RAS] 25, 7–44.
- Kradin N.N., Ivliev A.L. 2008. Deported Nation: the Fate of Bohai Peoples of Mongolia. *Antiquity* 316, 438–495.
- Kradin N.N., Ivliev A.L., Ochir A., Vasyutin S.A., Danilov S.V., Nikitin Yu.G., Erdenebold L. 2011. *Kidan'skiy gorod Chintolgoy-balgas* [Khitan Town Chintolgoy Balgas]. Moscow: Vostochnaya literatura.
- Kradin N.P. 1988. *Russkoe derevyannoe oboronnoe zodchestvo* [Russian Wooden Fortress Architecture]. Moscow: Iskusstvo.
- Kradin N.P. 2005. Russkie kreposti i poseleniya na Dal'nem Vostoke v XVII–XVIII vv. [Russian Fortress and Settlements in the Far East in 17th–18th Centuries]. *Rossiyskiy Dal'niy Vostok v drevnosti i srednevekov'e* [Russian Far East in Prehistory and Middle Ages]. Ed. by Zh.V. Andreeva. Vladivostok: Dal'nauka, 636–658.
- Krushanov A.I. (ed.) 1989. *Istoriya Dal'nego Vostoka SSSR s drevneyshikh vremen do XVII veka* [History of the Far East of the USSR from Prehistory to 17th Century]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Kychanov E.I. 1966. Chzhurchzeni v XI veke. [The Jurchens in the 11th Century]. *Materialy po istorii Sibiri. Drevnyaya Sibir'. Vyp. 2: Sibirskiy arkheologicheskii sbornik* [Materials on the Siberian History. Ancient Siberia. Vol. 2. Siberial archaeological digiest]. Ed. by A.P. Okladnikov. Novosibirsk: Nauka, 269–281.

- Larichev V.E. 1966. *Tayna kamennoy cherepakhi* [The Secret of Stone Turtle]. Novosibirsk: Zapadno-Sibirskoe kn. izd-vo.
- Lenkov V.D. 1971. *Proizvodstvo i obrabotka metallov u chzhurchzueney v XII v.* [Industry and Handling of the Metals among the Jurchen in XII Century]. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Novosibirsk: Institute of history, philology, and philosophy, Siberian Branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences.
- Lenkov V.D. 1974. *Metallurgiya i metalloobrabotka u chzhurchzeney v XII v.* [Metallurgy and Metal-Working among the Jurchen in 12th Century]. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Lenkov V.D., Artemyeva N.G. 2003. *Lazovskoe gorodishche* [Lazo Mediaeval Town]. Vladivostok: Dal'nauka.
- Lenkov V.D., Silant'ev G.L., Staniukovich A.K. 1992. *Camp of the Bering Expedition: An Experiment in Complex Study*. Anchorage, Alaska: Alaska Historical Society.
- Medvedev V.E. 1977. *Kul'tura amurskikh chzhurchzeney* [The Amur Jurchens Culture]. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Medvedev V.E. 1986. *Priamur'ev kontse I — nachale II tysyacheletiya (chzhurchzen'skaya epokha)* [Amur Region in the End of First — Beginning of Second Millennium (Jurchen Period)]. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Narozhny E.I. 2007. Jurchen Artifacts from the Northern Caucasus. *Archaeology, Ethnology & Anthropology of Eurasia* 32 (1), 60–66.
- New History of Parhae 2012: *A New History of Parhae*. Transl. by J.B. Duncan. Leiden and Boston: Global Oriental.
- Nikitin Yu.G. 2005. Tan, Bokhai i “vostochnye varvary” [T'ang, Bohai, and “Eastern Barbarians”]. *Rossiyskiy Dal'niy Vostok v drevnosti i srednevekov'e* [Russian Far East in Prehistory and Middle Ages]. Ed. by Zh.V. Andreeva. Vladivostok: Dal'nauka, 517–541.
- Novikov-Daursky G. 1961. *Istoriko-arkheologicheskie ocherki: Stat'i. Vosponinaniya* [Historical and Archaeological Essay: Articles. Reminiscences]. Blagoveshchensk: Amurskoe kn. izd-vo.
- Okladnikov A.P. 1959. *Dalekoe proshloe Primor'ya* [The Ancient Past of Primorye Region]. Vladivostok: Primorskoe kn. izd-vo.
- Okladnikov A.P. (ed.) 1964. *Drevnyaya Sibir' (Maket I toma “Istorii Sibiri”)* [Ancient Siberia (Layout of Volume I of “History of Siberia”)]. Ulan-Ude: AN SSSR, Sibirskoe otdelenie.
- Okladnikov A.P. (ed.) 1968. *Istoriya Sibiri* [History of Siberia]. Vol. I. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Okladnikov A.P., Derevianko A.P. 1973. *Dalekoe proshloe Primor'ya i Priamur'ya* [The Ancient Past of Primorye and Priamurye Regions]. Vladivostok: Dal'nevost. kn. izd-vo.
- Peterson D., Popova L., Smith A. (eds.) 2006. *Beyond the Steppe and the Sown: Proceedings of the 2002 University of Chicago Conference on Eurasian Archaeology*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Piskareva Ya.E. 2005. Lokal'nye gruppy mokheskikh pamyatnikov v Primor'e [Local Groups of Mohe Sites in Primorye]. *Rossiyskiy Dal'niy Vostok v drevnosti i srednevekov'e* [Russian Far East in Prehistory and Middle Ages]. Ed. by Zh.V. Andreeva. Vladivostok: Dal'nauka, 419–438.
- Piskareva Ya.E. 2006. *Moheskaia keramika Primorya* [Mohe Pottery of Primorye]. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Barnaul: Altay State University.
- Piskareva Ya.E. 2019. Mokheskaya kul'tura yuga Dal'nego Vostoka: sotsial'no-ekonomicheskie aspekty [Mohe Culture of the South of the Far East: Socio-Economic Aspects]. *Trudy Instituta istorii, arkheologii i etnografii DVO RAN* [Proceedings of the Institute of the History, Archaeology, Ethnology FEB RAS] 25, 136–150.

- Piskareva Ya.E., Sergusheva E.A., Dorofeeva N.A., Lyashchevskaya M.S., Sharyy-ool M.O. 2019. Khozyaystvo rannesrednevekovogo naseleniya Primor'ya (po materialam mokheskoy arkheologicheskoy kul'tury) [Economy of the Early Medieval Population of Primorye (based on Materials from the Mohe Archaeological Culture)]. *Vestnik arkheologii, antropologii i etnografii* [Bulletin of Archeology, Anthropology and Ethnography] 44, 25–36.
- Polutov A.V. 2014. Gosudarstvennyy apparat korolevstva Bokhai [State Apparatus of the Bohai Kingdom]. *Izvestiya Vostochnogo instituta* [News of the Oriental Institute], No 2, 16–27.
- Polutov A.V. 2015. Posol'stva gosudarstva Bokhai v Yaponiyu [Bohai Diplomatic Missions to Japan]. *Srednevekovye drevnosti* [Mediaeval Antiquities] 3, 276–302.
- Popova L., Hartley C., Smith A. (eds.) 2007. *Social Order and Social Landscape*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Reckel J. 1995. *Bohai. Geschichte und Kultur eines Mandschurisch-Koreanischen Königreiches der Tang-Zeit*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Rudenko K.A. 2012. O nekotorykh parallelyakh v material'noy kul'ture Volgo-Kam'ya i Dal'nego Vostoka [About Some Parallels in the Material Culture of the Populations in Volga and Kama Bassin and the Far East]. *Srednevekovye drevnosti* [Mediaeval Antiquities] 3, 67–85.
- Sapunov B.S., Zaitsev N.N. 1993. Srednevekovye gorodishcha Amurskoy oblasti [Mediaeval Fortress and Ancient Towns of Amur Administrative Region]. *Problemy etnokul'turnoy istorii Dal'nego Vostoka i sopredel'nykh territoriy* [The Problems of Ethnocultural History of Far East and Neighboring Territories]. Ed. by B.S. Sapunov. Blagoveshchensk: Blagoveshchensk State Pedagogical Institute, 113–120.
- Semenichenko L.E. 1981. *Materialnaia kultura naseleniia Primorya v period gosudarstva Bokhai (VIII–X vv.)* [Material Culture of the Primorye Population in the Bohai State Period (8th–10th Centuries)]. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Novosibirsk: Institute of History, Philology and Philosophy, Siberian Branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences.
- Shavkunov E.V. 1962. *Gosudarsvo Bokhay i pamiatniki ego kul'tury v Primorye* [Bohai State and Sites of Its Culture in Primorye]. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Novosibirsk: Novosibirsk State University.
- Shavkunov E.V. 1968. *Gosudarsvo Bokhay i pamyatniki ego kul'tury v Primor'e* [Bohai State and Sites of Its Culture in Primorye]. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Shavkunov E.V. 1990. *Kul'tura chzhurchzeney-udige XII–XIII vekov i problema proiskhozdeniya tungusskikh narodov Dal'nego Vostoka* [Culture of Jurchen-Udige in the 12th–13th Centuries and Problem of Origin of the Tungus People of the Far East]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Shavkunov E.V. (ed.) 1994. *Gosudarsto Bokhay (698–926) i plemena Dal'nego Vostoka* [Bohai State (698–926) and Tribes of the Russian Far East]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Shubin V.O. 1992. Russkie poseleniya XVIII–XIX vekov na Kuril'skikh ostrovakh [Russian Settlements 18th–19th Centuries in the Kuril Islands]. *Vestnik DVO RAN* [Herald of FEB RAS], No 1–2, 141–150.
- Sloane D. 2014. Mapping a Stateless Nation: “Bohai” Identity in the Twelfth to Fourteenth Centuries. *Journal of Song-Yuan Studies* 44, 365–403.
- Sloane D. 2014a. Parhae in Historiography and Archaeology: International Debate and Prospects for Resolution. *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies* 27 (1), 1–35.
- Song Kiho 1990. Current Trends in the Research of Palhae History. *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies* 3 (12), 157–174.
- Song Kiho 1990a. Several Questions in Studies of the History of Palhae. *Korea Journal* 30 (6), 4–20.

- Song Yubin 2018. Issledovanie ostatkov stolichnykh gorodov Bokhaya [An Insight into Remnants of Bohai Capital Towns]. *Multidisciplinary Research in Archaeology* 1 (2), 103–125.
- Stephan J.J. 1994. *The Russian Far East: A History*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Sukhikh V.V. 1980. *Khoziaistvennoe osvoenie Priamurya russkimi v XVII v. (po materialam raskopok Albazinskoy kreposti)* [Economical Opening of the Amur Region by Russians in 17th century]. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Novosibirsk, Institute of History, Philology and Philosophy of the Siberian Branch, Academy of Sciences of the USSR.
- Tao Jing-shen 1976. *The Jurchen in the Twelfth-Century China. A Study in Sinicization*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press.
- Theile D. 1971. *Der Abschluss eines Vertrages: Diplomatie zwischen Sung und Chin Dynastie 1117–1123*. Wiesbaden: Harraskowitz.
- Tupikina S.M. 1981. *Keramika chzhurchzueney Primorya XII – nachala XIII v.* [Pottery of Primorye Jurchens in 12th – beginning of 13th century]. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Novosibirsk: Institute of History, Philology and Philosophy, Siberian Branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences.
- Tupikina S.M. 1996. *Keramika chzhurchzeney Primor'ya XII – nachala XIII v.* [Pottery of Primorye Jurchens in 12th – Beginning of 13th Century]. Vladivostok: Dal'nauka.
- Turaev V.A., Sulyandziga R., Sulyandziga P., Bocharnikov V. 2011. *Encyclopedia of Indigenous Peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East of the Russian Federation*. Moscow: Centre for Support of Indigenous Peoples of the North.
- Vasilevskiy A.A. 2018. K kontseptsii epokhi srednevekov'ya ostrovnogo mira Dalnego Vostoka [On Conception of Medieval Epoch of the Island World of Far East]. *Trudy Instituta istorii, arkheologii i etnografii DVO RAN* [Proceedings of the Institute of the History, Archaeology, Ethnology FEB RAS] 20, 147–167.
- Vasilyev S.A. 2011. The Earliest Alaskan Archaeological Record: A View from Siberia. *From the Yenisei to the Yukon: Interpreting Lithic Assemblage Variability in Late Pleistocene/Early Holocene Beringia*. Ed. by T. Goebel, I. Buvit. College Station: Texas A&M University, 119–127.
- Vasil'ev S.A., Berezkin Yu.E., Kozintsev A.G., Peiros I.I., Slobodin S.B., Tabarev A.V. 2015. *Zaselenie chelovekom Novogo Sveta: opyt kompleksnogo issledovaniya* [Peopling of the New World: A Multidisciplinary Study]. Saint Petersburg: Nestor-Historia.
- Vasil'ev Yu.M. 2006. *Pogrebal'nyi obryad pokrovskoy kul'tury (IX–XIII vv. n.e.)* [Funeral Ritual of Pokrovka Culture (9th–13th Centuries)]. Vladivostok: Dal'nauka.
- Vorobyev M.V. 1975. *Chzhurchzeni i gosudarstvo Tszin' (X v. – 1234 g.)* [The Jurchens and Jin State (10th Century – 1234)]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Vorobyev M.V. 1983. *Kul'tura chzhurchzeney i gosudarstva Tszin' (X v. – 1234 g.)* [Culture of the Jurchens and Jin State (10th Century – 1234)]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Wang Peixin 2018. Nekotorye razmyshleniya ob arkheologicheskom issledovanii Bokhaya [Some Thoughts on Archaeological Approach to the Bohai Studies]. *Multidisciplinary Research in Archaeology* 1 (2), 3–19.
- Witsen N. 1692. *Noord en Oost Tartarye, Ofte Bondig Ontwerp van eenig dier Landen en Volken Welke Voormaels Bekent Zijn Geweest*. Amsterdam: François Halma.
- Wittfogel K.A., Feng Chia-Sheng 1949. *History of Chinese Society. Liao (907–1125)*. Philadelphia: Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, new series 36.
- Yanshina O.V., Kluyev N.A. 2005. Pozdnyy neolit i ranniy paleometall Primor'ya: kriterii vydeleniya i kharakteristika arkheologicheskikh kul'tur [The Late

- Neolithic Age and Early Paleometall Age in Primorye: Criteria for Identifying and Characteristics of Archaeological Cultures]. *Rossiyskiy Dal'niy Vostok v drevnosti i srednevekov'e* [Russian Far East in Prehistory and Middle Ages]. Ed. by Zh.V. Andreeva. Vladivostok: Dal'nauka, 187—233.
- Zabiyako A.P. 2019. An Early Jurchen Text among Rock Representations near the Arkhara River in the Amur Basin (History, Research Results, and New Evidence). *Archaeology, Ethnology and Anthropology of Eurasia* 47 (3), 94—103.
- Zabiyako A.P., Cherkasov A.N. (eds.) 2019. *Albazinskiy ostrog (istoriya, arkheologiya, antropologiya narodov Priamur'ya)* [Fortress Albazin: History, Archaeology, Anthropology of the Amur Region Peoples]. Novosibirsk: Izd-vo Instituta arkheologii i etnografii SO RAN.
- Zhushchikhovskaya I.S. 2009. Pottery-Making in Prehistoric Cultures of the Russian Far East. *Ceramics before Farming: The Dispersal of Pottery Among Prehistoric Eurasian Hunter-Gatherers*. Ed. by P. Jordan, M. Zvelebil. London: UCL Press, 121—148.

СРЕДНЕВЕКОВАЯ АРХЕОЛОГИЯ ДАЛЬНЕГО ВОСТОКА РОССИИ

Н.Н. Крадин

Статья посвящена комплексному исследованию этапов развития средневековой археологии Дальнего Востока России. Показано, что развитие археологии в регионе прошло три этапа — период путешественников и краеведов, интенсивное академическое изучение (с 1953 г.) и международный этап с начала 1990-х гг. Подробно рассмотрены основные достижения, связанные с археологией Бохая и чжурчжэней, а также период освоения Приамурья русскими первопроходцами.

Ключевые слова: археология, средние века, Дальний Восток России, Приморье, Приамурье, мохэ, Бохай, чжурчжэни, династия Цзинь, русские первопроходцы.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

- Артемьев А.Р. 1999. *Города и остроги Забайкалья и Приамурья во второй половине XVII — XVIII в.* Владивосток: ИИАЭ ДВО РАН.
- Артемьев А.Р. 2005. *Буддийские храмы XV в. в низовьях Амура.* Владивосток: ИИАЭ ДВО РАН.
- Артемьева Н.Г. 1987. *Домостроительство чжурчжэней Приморья (XII — начало XIII в.): автореф. дис. ... канд. ист. наук. Л.*
- Артемьева Н.Г. 1998. *Домостроительство чжурчжэней Приморья (XII—XIII вв.).* Владивосток: Дальпресс.
- Артемьева Н.Г. 2011. Итоги исследований Краснояровского городища Приморской археологической экспедицией. *Актуальные проблемы археологии Сибири и Дальнего Востока.* Отв. ред. В.А. Лынша, В.Н. Тарасенко. Уссурийск, 270—276.

- Артемьева Н.Г. 2015. 20 лет исследований Красноярского городища — Верхней столицы государства Восточное Ся (1215—1233 гг.). *Вестник РГНФ*. № 2, 218—230.
- Артемьева Н.Г. 2021. 25 лет работ Приморской археологической экспедиции. *Труды института истории, археологии и этнографии ДВО РАН*. № 31, 71—93.
- Артемьева Н.Г. 2021а. *Шайгинское городище*. Владивосток: ИИАЭ ДВО РАН.
- Артемьева Н.Г., Ивлиев А.Л. 2000. Новые эпиграфические находки из Уссурийска. *Российская археология*. № 2, 165—172.
- Артемьева Н.Г., Ивлиев А.Л. 2000а. Печать Еланьского мэнъяня. *Вестник ДВО РАН*. № 2, 109—114.
- Бессонова Е.А. 2008. *Применение магниторазведки для решения задач в береговой зоне залива Петра Великого (Японское море)*: автореф. дис. ... канд. г.-м. наук. Владивосток.
- Болдин В.И. 1986. *Земледелие и животноводство у бохайцев и чжурчжэней Приморья*: автореф. дис. ... канд. ист. наук. Новосибирск.
- Болотин Д.П. 1995. *Этнокультурная ситуация на Верхнем Амуре в эпоху позднего средневековья (XIII—XVII вв.)*: автореф. дис. ... канд. ист. наук. Новосибирск.
- Болотин Д.П. 2005. Народы и культуры Приамурья в позднем средневековье. *Российский Дальний Восток в древности и средневековье*. Отв. ред. Ж.В. Андреева. Владивосток: Дальнаука, 615—635.
- Ван Пэйсинь 2018. Некоторые размышления об археологическом исследовании Бохая. *Мультидисциплинарные исследования в археологии*. № 1 (2), 3—19.
- Василевский А.А. 2018. К концепции эпохи средневековья островного мира Дальнего Востока. *Труды института истории, археологии и этнографии ДВО РАН*. Вып. 20, 147—167.
- Васильев С.А., Березкин Ю.Е., Козинцев А.Г., Пейрос И.И., Слободин С.Б., Табарев А.В. 2015. *Заселение человеком Нового Света: опыт комплексного исследования*. СПб.: Нестор-История.
- Васильев Ю.М. 2006. *Погребальный обряд покровской культуры (IX—XIII вв. н.э.)*. Владивосток: Дальнаука.
- Воробьев М.В. 1975. *Чжурчжэни и государство Цзинь (X в. — 1234 г.)*. Исторический очерк. М.: Наука.
- Воробьев М.В. 1983. *Культура чжурчжэней и государства Цзинь (X в. — 1234 г.)*. М.: Наука.
- Гельман Е.И. 2005. Взаимодействие центра и периферии в Бохае. *Российский Дальний Восток в древности и средневековье*. Отв. ред. Ж.В. Андреева. Владивосток: Дальнаука, 476—516.
- Гельман Е.И. 2018. Керамика Краскинского городища. *Мультидисциплинарные исследования в археологии*. № 1 (2), 40—64.
- Гельман Е.И., Асташенкова Е.В. 2018. Культура и повседневность бохайских городов. *Города средневековых империй Дальнего Востока*. Отв. ред. Н.Н. Крадин. М.: Изд-во восточной литературы, 124—148.
- Гельман Е.И., Асташенкова Е.В., Прокопец С.Д., Ивлиев А.Л. 2018. Города бохайского государства. *Города средневековых империй Дальнего Востока*. Отв. ред. Н.Н. Крадин. М.: Изд-во восточной литературы, 68—123.
- Гельман Е.И., Ивлиев А.Л., Болдин В.И. 2020. Фортификационные сооружения Краскинского городища. *Труды института истории, археологии и этнографии ДВО РАН*. Вып. 26, 157—174.
- Головачев В.Ц., Ивлиев А.Л., Певнов А.М., Рыкин П.О. 2011. *Тырские стелы XV века: Перевод, комментарии, исследование китайских, монгольского, чжурчжэньского текстов*. СПб.: Наука.

- Деревянко Е.И. 1981. *Племена Приамурья 1 тыс. н.э.* Новосибирск: Наука.
- Диков Н.Н. 1979. *Древние культуры Северо-Восточной Азии.* М.: Наука.
- Дьякова О.В. 1984. *Раннесредневековая керамика Дальнего Востока СССР как исторический источник IV—X вв.* М.: Наука.
- Дьякова О.В. 1998. *Мохэские памятники Приморья.* Владивосток: Дальнаука.
- Дьякова О.В. 2014. *Государство Бохай: археология, история, политика.* М.: Наука. Восточная литература.
- Забияко А.П., Черкасов А.Н. (ред.) 2019. *Албазинский острог: История, археология, антропология народов Приамурья.* Новосибирск: Изд-во Института археологии и этнографии СО РАН.
- Ивлиев А.Л. 1990. Новые материалы о средневековых бронзовых дисках из Приморья. *Проблемы средневековой археологии Дальнего Востока: Происхождение, периодизация, датировка культур.* Отв. ред. О.В. Дьякова. Владивосток: ИИАЭ ДВО РАН, 5—18.
- Ивлиев А.Л. 1993. Изучение истории государства Восточное Ся в КНР. *Новые материалы по археологии Дальнего Востока и смежных территорий.* Отв. ред. В.Л. Леньков. Владивосток: ИИАЭ ДВО РАН, 8—17.
- Ивлиев А.Л. 1996. Письменные источники об истории Приморья середины I — начала II тысячелетий н.э. *Приморье в древности и средневековье: Материалы регион. археол. конф.* Отв. ред. А.М. Кузнецов. Уссурийск: УГПИ, 30—34.
- Ивлиев А.Л. 2000. Шайгинская пайцза в свете данных японской летописи. *История и археология Дальнего Востока. К 70-летию Э.В. Шавкунова.* Отв. ред. Н.Н. Крадин и др. Владивосток: Изд-во ДВГУ, 181—184.
- Ивлиев А.Л. 2018. Государство Дундань и археология Приморья. *Труды института истории, археологии и этнографии ДВО РАН.* Вып. 20, 177—186.
- Ивлиев А.Л. 2020. Археологические свидетельства присутствия бохайцев на памятниках северо-западной границы Ляо. *Мультидисциплинарные исследования в археологии.* № 3 (1), 40—58.
- Ивлиев А.Л., Болдин В.И. 2006. Исследование Краскинского городища и археологическое изучение Бохая в Приморье. *Россия и АТР.* № 3, 5—18.
- Кафаров П. 1877. Старинное сказание о Чингизхане. *Восточный сборник.* Т. I, 149—202.
- Кафаров П. 1879. Исторический очерк Уссурийского края в связи с историей Маньчжурии. *Записки Императорского Русского географического общества.* Вып. VIII (2), 221—228.
- Ким Ынгук, Чун Сукбэ 2021. *Краскинское бохайское городище: результаты 40-летних раскопок.* Сеул: Фонд Изучения истории северо-восточной Азии. 김은국, 정석배 2021. *크라스키노 발해성—발굴40년의 성과.* 서울: 동북아역사재단.
- Киселев С.В. (ред.) 1965. *Древнемонгольские города.* М.: Наука.
- Кочешков Н.В. 2002. *Типология традиционных культур народов Северо-Восточной части Азии.* Владивосток: Изд-во Дальневост. ун-та.
- Крадин Н.Н. 1989. *Социальный строй народов Дальнего Востока СССР I тыс. н.э.* Препринт. Владивосток: ДВО РАН.
- Крадин Н.Н. 2005. Тюркские руны и проблема образования бохайского государства. *Международная конференция Фонда Когурёских исследований: Когурёская история и культура.* Сеул: Фонд исследований Когурё, 218—222.
- Крадин Н.Н. 2010. Вождества в первобытной археологии Приморья. Приоткрывая завесу тысячелетий: К 80-летию Жанны Васильевны Андреевой. Отв. ред. Ю.Е. Вострецов, Н.А. Клюев. Владивосток: Рея, 210—223.

- Крадин Н.Н. 2013. Пути становления и эволюции ранней государственности на Дальнем Востоке. *Ранние формы потестарных систем*. Отв. ред. В.А. Попов. СПб.: МАЭ РАН, 65–86.
- Крадин Н.Н. 2019. Особенности и механизмы дальневосточного политогенеза. *Труды института истории, археологии и этнографии ДВО РАН*. Вып. 25, 7–44.
- Крадин Н.Н., Ивлиев А.Л., Очир А., Васютин С.А., Данилов С.В., Никитин Ю.Г., Эрдэнэболд Л. 2011. *Киданьский город Чинтолгой-балгас*. М.: Восточная литература.
- Крадин Н.П. 1988. *Русское деревянное оборонное зодчество*. М.: Искусство.
- Крадин Н.П. 2005. Русские крепости и поселения на Дальнем Востоке в XVII–XVIII вв. *Российский Дальний Восток в древности и средневековье*. Отв. ред. Ж.В. Андреева. Владивосток: Дальнаука, 636–658.
- Крушанов А.И. (ред.) 1989. *История Дальнего Востока СССР с древнейших времён до XVII века*. М.: Наука.
- Кычанов Е.И. 1966. Чжурчжэни в XI веке. *Материалы по истории Сибири. Древняя Сибирь*. Вып. 2: *Сибирский археологический сборник*. Отв. ред. А.П. Окладников. Новосибирск: Наука, 269–281.
- Ларичев В.Е. 1966. *Тайна каменной черепахи*. Новосибирск: Западно-Сибирское кн. изд-во.
- Леньков В.Д. 1971. *Производство и обработка металлов у чжурчжэней в XII в.*: автореф. дис. ... канд. ист. наук. Новосибирск.
- Леньков В.Д. 1974. *Металлургия и металлообработка у чжурчжэней в XII в.* Новосибирск: Наука.
- Леньков В.Д., Артемьева Н.Г. 2003. *Лазовское городище*. Владивосток: Дальнаука.
- Медведев В.Е. 1977. *Культура амурских чжурчжэней*. Новосибирск: Наука.
- Медведев В.Е. 1986. *Приамурье в конце I – начале II тысячелетия (чжурчжэньская эпоха)*. Новосибирск: Наука.
- Никитин Ю.Г. 2005. Тан, Бохай и «восточные варвары». *Российский Дальний Восток в древности и средневековье*. Отв. ред. Ж.В. Андреева. Владивосток: Дальнаука, 517–541.
- Новиков-Даурский Г. 1961. *Историко-археологические очерки. Статьи. Воспоминания*. Благовещенск: Амурское кн. изд-во.
- Окладников А.П. 1959. *Далёкое прошлое Приморья*. Владивосток: Приморское кн. изд-во.
- Окладников А.П. (ред.) 1964. *Древняя Сибирь (Макет I тома «Истории Сибири»)*. Улан-Удэ: АН СССР, Сибирское отделение.
- Окладников А.П. (ред.) 1968. *История Сибири*. Т. I. Новосибирск: Наука.
- Окладников А.П., Деревянко А.П. 1973. *Далёкое прошлое Приморья и Приамурья*. Владивосток: Дальневосточное кн. изд-во.
- Пискарева Я.Е. 2005. Локальные группы мохэских памятников в Приморье. *Российский Дальний Восток в древности и средневековье*. Отв. ред. Ж.В. Андреева. Владивосток: Дальнаука, 419–438.
- Пискарева Я.Е. 2006. *Мохэская керамика Приморья*: автореф. дис. ... канд. ист. наук. Барнаул.
- Пискарева Я.Е. 2019. Мохэская культура юга Дальнего Востока: социально-экономические аспекты. *Труды института истории, археологии и этнографии ДВО РАН*. Вып. 25, 136–150.
- Пискарева Я.Е., Сергушева Е.А., Дорофеева Н.А., Лящевская М.С., Шарый-оол М.О. 2019. Хозяйство раннесредневекового населения Приморья (по материалам мохэской археологической культуры). *Вестник археологии, антропологии и этнографии*. № 1 (44), 25–36.

- Полутов А.В. 2014. Государственный аппарат королевства Бохай. *Известия Восточного института*. № 2, 16–27.
- Полутов А.В. 2015. Посольства государства Бохай в Японию. *Средневековые древности*. Вып. 3, 276–302.
- Руденко К.А. 2012. О некоторых параллелях в материальной культуре Волго-Камья и Дальнего Востока. *Средневековые древности*. Вып. 3, 67–85.
- Сапунов Б.С., Зайцев Н.Н. 1993. Средневековые городища Амурской области. *Проблемы этнокультурной истории Дальнего Востока и сопредельных территорий*. Отв. ред. Б.С. Сапунов. Благовещенск: БГПУ, 113–120.
- Семениченко Л.Е. 1981. *Материальная культура населения Приморья в период государства Бохай. (VIII–X вв.)*: автореф. дис. ... канд. ист. наук. Новосибирск.
- Сун Юйбинь. 2018. Исследование остатков столичных городов Бохая. *Мультидисциплинарные исследования в археологии*. № 1 (2), 103–125.
- Сухих В.В. 1980. *Хозяйственное освоение Приамурья русскими в XVII в. (по материалам раскопок Албазинской крепости)*: автореф. дис. ... канд. ист. наук. Новосибирск.
- Тупикина С.М. 1981. *Керамика чжурчжэней Приморья XII – начала XIII в.*: автореф. дис. ... канд. ист. наук. Новосибирск.
- Тупикина С.М. 1996. *Керамика чжурчжэней Приморья XII – начала XIII в.* Владивосток: Дальнаука.
- Фёдоров А.З. 1916. *Памятники старины в городе Никольск-Уссурийском и его окрестностях*. Никольск-Уссурийский: Издание К.И. Лепина.
- Хорев В.А. 2012. *Ананьевское городище*. Владивосток: Дальнаука.
- Цзян Юйкэ, Чжао Юнцзюнь 2021. Археологическое исследование северной границы государства Бохай. *Мультидисциплинарные исследования в археологии*. № 4 (1), 103–128.
- Шавкунов Э.В. 1962. *Государство Бохай и памятники его культуры в Приморье*: автореф. дис. ... канд. ист. наук. Новосибирск.
- Шавкунов Э.В. 1968. *Государство Бохай и памятники его культуры в Приморье*. Л.: Наука.
- Шавкунов Э.В. 1990. *Культура чжурчжэней-удигэ XII–XIII вв. и проблема происхождения тунгусских народов Дальнего Востока*. М.: Наука.
- Шавкунов Э.В. (отв. ред.) 1994. *Государство Бохай (698–926 гг.) и племена Дальнего Востока России*. М.: Наука.
- Шубин В.О. 1992. Русские поселения XVIII–XIX веков на Курильских островах. *Вестник ДВО РАН*, № 1–2, 141–150.
- Яншина О.В., Ключев Н.А. 2005. Поздний неолит и ранний палеометалл Приморья: критерии выделения и характеристика археологических культур. *Российский Дальний Восток в древности и средневековье*. Отв. ред. Ж.В. Андреева. Владивосток: Дальнаука, 187–233.
- An Yongde (ed.) 2011. *Xanady*. Huhahaote: Inner Mongolia Peoples Press.
- Arseniev V. 1996. *Dersu the Trapper*. New York: McPherson.
- Atwood C. 2010. The Notion of Tribe in Medieval China: Ouyang Xiu and the Shatuo Dynastic Myth. *Miscellanea Asiatica: Festschrift in Honour of Françoise Aubin*. Ed. by D. Aigle, I. Charleux, V. Gossaert, R. Hamayon. Sankt Augustin: Insitut Monumenta Serica, 593–621.
- Berezkin Yu.E. 2007. “Earth-Diver” and “Emergence from under the Earth”: Cosmological Tales as an Evidence in Favor of the Heterogenic Origins of American Indians. *Archaeology, Ethnology & Anthropology of Eurasia* 32, 110–123.
- Berezkin Yu.E. 2010. Selecting Separate Episodes of the Peopling of the New World: Beringian—Subarctic—Eastern North American Folklore Links. *Anthropological Papers of the University of Alaska* 5, 257–276.

- Berezkin Yu.E. 2017. Peopling of the New World from Data on Distribution of Folklore Motifs. *Maths Meets Myths: Quantitative Approaches to Ancient Narratives*. Ed. by R. Kenna, M. MacCarron, P. MacCarron. New York: Springer, 71–89.
- Claessen H.J.M., Skalnik P. (eds.) 1978. *The Early State*. Hague: Mouton.
- Crossley P. 2016. Bohai/Parhae Identity and the Coherence of Dangur under the Kitan/Liao Empire. *International Journal of Korean History* 21 (1): 11–45.
- Derevianko A.P., Shunkov M.V., Kozlikin M.B. 2020. Who Were the Denisovans? *Archaeology, Ethnology and Anthropology of Eurasia* 48 (3), 3–32.
- Dikov N.N. 1997. *Asia at the Juncture with America in Antiquity (The Stone Age of the Chukchi Peninsula)*. Anchorage, AK: Shared Beringian Heritage Program.
- Earle T. 2021. *A Primer on Chiefs and Chiefdoms*. New York: Eliot Werner Publications, Inc.
- Franke H. 1975. Chinese Texts on the Jurchen, I: A Translation of the Jurchen Monograph in the San-Ch'ao Pei-Meng Hui-Pien. *Zentralasiatische Studien* 9, 119–186.
- Franke H. 1978. Chinese Texts on the Jurchen, II: A Translation of Chapter One of the 'Chin shih'. *Zentralasiatische Studien* 12, 413–452.
- Franke H. 1978a. *Nordchina am Vorabend der Mongolischen Eroberungen: Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft unter der Chin-Dynastie (1115–1234)*. Orladen: Rheinisch-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Franke H. 1987. The Role of the State as a Structural Element in Polyethnic Societies. *Foundation and Limits of State Power in China*. Ed. by S.R. Schram. London: University of London; Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 87–112.
- Garcia C. 2012. *Horsemen from the Edge of Empire: The Rise of the Jurchen Coalition*. Seattle: University of Washington.
- Gelman E.I. 2006. Trade Ceramics from Bohai Sites of Russian Primor'e. *Beyond the Steppe and the Sown: Proceedings of the 2002 University of Chicago Conference on Eurasian Archaeology*. Ed. by D.L. Peterson, L.M. Popova, A.T. Smith. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 411–421.
- Hamada Kosaku 2007. Transition of Understanding Balhae in Japan. *Journal of Northeast Asian History* 4 (2), 173–189.
- Hanks B. 2010. Archaeology of Eurasian Steppes and Mongolia. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 39, 469–486.
- Hartley C., Yaziciglu B., Smith A. (eds.) 2012. *The Archaeology of Power and Politics in Eurasia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hermans E. (ed.) 2020. *A Companion to the Global Early Middle Ages*. Leeds: Arc Humanities Press.
- Holmes C., Standen N. 2015. Defining the Global Middle Ages. *Medieval Worlds* 1, 106–117.
- Ivliev A.L. 2007. Balhae Studies in Russia. *Journal of Northeast Asian History* 4 (2), 191–208.
- Jung Yongjin 2007. China's Perspective on Balhae History. *Journal of Northeast Asian History* 4 (2), 157–171.
- Kim A. 2008. Archeological Studies of Bohai in Russia. *Oriens Extremus* 47, 302–312.
- Kim A. 2009. Archeological Studies of Jurchen in the USSR and Russia. *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher* 23, 247–262.
- Kim A. 2011. The Historiography of Bohai in Russia. *Historian* 73, 284–299.
- Kim A., Min Kyoungyoun 2015. The Problem of the Ethnic Composition of the Bohai State – A Comparative Analysis of Russian and Korean Materials. *Central Asiatic Journal* 58 (1–2), 7–15.
- Kobishchanov Yu.M. 1987. The Phenomenon of Gafol and Its Transformations. *Early State Dynamics*. Ed. by H.J.M. Claessen, P. Van de Velde. Leiden: Brill, 108–128.

- Kradin N.N. 2016. Archaeology of Deportation: Eurasian Steppe Example. *Central Eurasia in the Middle Ages. Studies in Honour of Peter B. Golden*. Ed. by O. Karatay and I. Zimonyi. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 209–219.
- Kradin N.N., Ivliev A.L. 2008. Deported Nation: the Fate of Bohai Peoples of Mongolia. *Antiquity* 316, 438–495.
- Lenkov V.D., Silant'ev G.L., Staniukovich A.K. 1992. *Camp of the Bering Expedition: An Experiment in Complex Study*. Anchorage, Alaska: Alaska Historical Society.
- Narozhny E.I. 2007. Jurchen Artifacts from the Northern Caucasus. *Archaeology, Ethnology & Anthropology of Eurasia* 32 (1), 60–66.
- New History of Parhae 2012: *A New History of Parhae*. Transl. by J.B. Duncan. Leiden and Boston: Global Oriental.
- Peterson D., Popova L., Smith A. (eds.) 2006. *Beyond the Steppe and the Sown: Proceedings of the 2002 University of Chicago Conference on Eurasian Archaeology*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Popova L., Hartley C., Smith A. (eds.) 2007. *Social Order and Social Landscape*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Reckel J. 1995. *Bohai. Geschichte und Kultur eines Mandschurisch-Koreanischen Königreiches der Tang-Zeit*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Sloane D. 2014. Mapping a Stateless Nation: “Bohai” Identity in the Twelfth to Fourteenth Centuries. *Journal of Song-Yuan Studies* 44, 365–403.
- Sloane D. 2014a. Parhae in Historiography and Archaeology: International Debate and Prospects for Resolution. *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies* 27 (1), 1–35.
- Song Kiho 1990. Current Trends in the Research of Palhae History. *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies* 3 (12), 157–174.
- Song Kiho 1990a. Several Questions in Studies of the History of Palhae. *Korea Journal* 30 (6), 4–20.
- Stephan J.J. 1994. *The Russian Far East: A History*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Tao Jing-shen 1976. *The Jurchen in the Twelfth-Century China. A Study in Sinicization*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press.
- Theile D. 1971. *Der Abschluß eines Vertrages: Diplomatie zwischen Sung und Chin Dynastie 1117–1123*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Turaev V.A., Sulyandziga R., Sulyandziga P., Bocharnikov V. 2011. *Encyclopedia of Indigenous Peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East of the Russian Federation*. Moscow: Centre for Support of Indigenous Peoples of the North.
- Vasilyev S.A. 2011. The Earliest Alaskan Archaeological Record: A View from Siberia. *From the Yenisei to the Yukon: Interpreting Lithic Assemblage Variability in Late Pleistocene/Early Holocene Beringia*. Ed. by T. Goebel, I. Buvit. College Station: Texas A&M University, 119–127.
- Witsen N. 1692. *Noord en Oost Tartarye, Ofte Bondig Ontwerp van eenig dier Landen en Volken Welke Voormaels Bekent Zijn Geweest*. Amsterdam: François Halma.
- Wittfogel K.A., Feng Chia-Sheng 1949. *History of Chinese Society. Liao (907–1125)*. Philadelphia: Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, new series 36.
- Zabiyako A.P. 2019. An Early Jurchen Text among Rock Representations near the Arkhara River in the Amur Basin (History, Research Results, and New Evidence). *Archaeology, Ethnology and Anthropology of Eurasia* 47 (3), 94–103.
- Zhushchikhovskaya I.S. 2009. Pottery-Making in Prehistoric Cultures of the Russian Far East. *Ceramics before Farming: The Dispersal of Pottery Among Prehistoric Eurasian Hunter-Gatherers*. Ed. by P. Jordan, M. Zvelebil. London: UCL Press, 121–148.