

Curriculum Vitae

Dyakova Olga Vasil'evna (Diakova)– Doctor of Historical Sciences (5 April 1990), Professor (2000), Chief of the Laboratory of Archaeology, Institute of History, Archaeology and Ethnography of the Peoples of the Far East Far Eastern Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences;

The main problem of scientific research is the development of cultural relations of the population of the Northern Pacific in the early middle ages and the identification of mechanisms for the formation of the Paleoasian and Tungus-Manchurian ethnic groups according to archaeology.

I. The Role of Koguryo residents in Pohai State

Setting the problem. It is known from written sources that as for structure of population the Tungus-Manchu state Pohai (698-926) was poly ethnic (multinational) one and consisted of tribes: Mokhe (Malgal), Paleo-Asiatics, Chinese, Koguryo residents. **Task one. To answer the question:** what ethnic communities were the native (indigenous) population of Pohai state? Ceramics is the most objective material in this case. My analysis of ceramics revealed that as for technique it is represented by three categories of articles: modeled vessels, ceramics, being completed on potter's wheel and potter's ceramics. All these three categories are done with different technique, that is on different ethnic traditions. The first category – modeled ceramics made with circular band model. Its forms are vases, pots, jars with modeled cylinder under the top, decoration and technique of modeling are traditional for Mokhe tribes (Malgal). Modeled earthenware was made by native indigenous population. Such type of vessels – Mokhe one – was developing on the territory of North East China and the Russian Far East (Priamurye and Primorye) for more than one thousand years. Such earthenware is characteristic for Mokhe culture (Malgal), culture of the Amur Jurchen and it could be met almost on all Pohai sites. In Koguryo state the other modeled earthenware was traditional, and it is absent on Pohai sites. So, the main indigenous residents of Pohai state were the tribes of Mokhe (Malgal), that is the Tungus-Manchus. **Task two. To determine Kogurye materials on Pohai sites.** In this case we could use the second category of ceramics – handcraft pots of definite form, decoration and proportions, modeled on potter's wheel. They are met on all Pohai sites and are analogous to Kogurye handcraft pots. Such type of earthenware is marking Pohai cultures and is defined as Pohai ceramics of Koguryo origin. Besides of Pohai pots, in Pohai culture of sites of North East Primorye – Sinegorye 1 - there appeared long potter's kilns being traditional for Kogurye. The presence of potter's kilns – is an index of native production and indirect presence on Pohai monuments of Kogurye potters. So the conclusion is that in Pohai state Koguryo residents represented the strata of crafts-men. **Task three.** To show : what function, besides handcraft one, was exercised by Koguryo residents? This task could be seen through analyzing fortification constructions. After the fall of Koguryo state on the territory of Primorye, in particular in the north-east, there appeared stone fortresses that were constructed according to Koguryo traditions. They were built out of stones (rocky) and without cement linking. So, a definite part of Koguryo residents was on military service, and judging to location of stone fortresses, Pohai used them for defending his boundaries, in particular, of North East Primorye. **Thus,** the analysis of archaeological material let doing such conclusions: the indigenous residents of Pohai state were tribes of Mokhe (Malgal). After the fall of Koguryo a considerable number of Koguryo residents joined Pohai state.

II. Mediaeval Fortifications in Primorye: Classification, Dating, Genesis

Fortification structures in Primorye are among the most promising fields of Far Eastern mediaeval studies, contributing to reconstructions of extremely complicated and perturbed events in history of the Far East tied to the Migration Period, Tungus-Manchu phenomenon, emergence of states, and military actions of the Kidan, Mongols, and other ethnic groups. Currently Primorye yielded more than 150 fortified sites, of which 60 sites are located in the northeastern part of the region. The earliest Primorye's fortification structures are dated to Paleometal epoch. Most of them were built by the Lidovskaya culture bearers in the end of 1st millennium BC. The Mediaeval fortifications were built by the bearers of three archaeological cultures: Mohe, Bohai, and Jurzhen (Jin period, 1115-1234, and state of East Xia, 1217-1234), in other words, by the mediaeval Tungus-Manchu who played key roles in all noteworthy situations in regional history.

Classification. Since the pre-communist time the mediaeval town sites and fortresses have been divided by topographic features in group of mountain sites and group of valley sites. This approach proved useful and was actually adopted by all scholars involved in the research. Currently, one more type is added to the mentioned two types, namely the cape type. Each type corresponds to a particular archaeological culture, with some exceptions. Cape town sites are associated with the Mohe culture, valley town sites are associated with the Bohai and Jurzhen (Jin period) cultures, while mountain town sites are associated with the Jurzhen state of East Xia.

Mohe Culture. Cape town sites are fortified sites located on prominent rocky outcrops fenced in the narrowest place with curved walls. On three sides such sites are naturally defended by tall steep precipices. As a rule, the site is located by a water source — a river or a creek. This type of fortification is the simplest. It is found on the sites of Mys Tepy (Cape Tepy), Ust-Sobolevskoye, Kuznetsovskoye, Oasis, Edinkinskoye, Talovskoye, Izvestkovoye, Novoselischenskoye, Vetka. Thus cape sites are found all around Primorye. A characteristic trait specific for the Mohe fortified town sites is the earthen wall lacking any stone inclusions or alternating layers of friable and bonding ground, in combination with auxiliary wall at entrance. Planigraphy of such fortifications is simple, fitting the natural terrain, with no artificial terracing. Fortifications in the form of towers, watch platforms, or redoubts have not been found. Usually the sites of this type are not big, with area no more than 2 ha. By functionality, they are dwelling sites with the capacity of stronghold. Archaeological artifacts from these sites basically can be attributed to the Naifeldskaya and Troitskaya groups of Mohe culture permitting the date between the 4th (Mys Tepy – by the presence of vessels with sloping mouth) and 8th centuries AD.

As we noted before, fortifications of this type emerged in Primorye by the end of first millennium BC within cultural contexts associated with Paleometal epoch, for example, Lidovskaya culture. The type lived until first centuries AD, i.e. until the Mohe's invasion of the territory. Apparently, from there the Mohe adopted the cape type of fortified site. Chinese traditions of fortification were different at the time and had no effect on Mohe's practices.

Bohai culture. The basic type for this culture is valley town site. The definition reflects the topographic aspect. Valley sites are fortified ones located in river valleys, usually on elevated terraces that are safe from floods and have flat surface. Valley town sites were built in agriculture-friendly, often swampy, places in the middle, or lower reaches, or estuaries of rivers. By shape of walls the sites of valley type can be divided in two variants: square and polygonal. Square (rectangular) town sites are the following: Brusilovskoye, Sadovy Klyuch, Estonka, Pristanskoye, Cheremshany, Djigitovskoye, Krasnoye Ozero, Malaya Kema, Vysokoye, Sainbarskoye (Steklyanukha-1), Steklyanukha-4, Pavlovskoye, Samarka-cemetery, Lobanovka-II. The following town sites are polygonal: Bogopol, Kemsokoye-Dolinnoye, Kraskinskoye, Okrainka, Novopokrovskoye-1, Lobanovka-1, Otradnenskoye, Nikolaevskoye-II, Nikolayevskoye-1, Maryanovskoye, etc.

Square town sites are interesting in the simplicity of planigraphy, usually without an inner city or redoubt, with level non-terraced surface composed of purposely collected ground. Building process began from corners after delineating walls' position around the site. As a rule, the outer surface of fortification's corner was lined with stone; sometimes other parts were lined too. On two sites (Djigitovskoye and Krasnoye Ozero) walls are made by method of *hantu*, i.e. soil-layered. The walls usually have gaps for 2 or 4 opposing entrances – gates, rarely a single one. Gates are simple, in the form of 2-5-meter-long breaks. Square fortifications are often complemented with supplementary walls and moats of binary usage (as M. V. Vorobyev inferred) – defense and drainage. The valley town sites served as dwelling sites as well as defense posts.

Town sites contain wells and ponds.

Origin. Ability to build valley towns implies serious fortification skills. The square shape has been a characteristic feature of Chinese flat-land fortifications. In Far Eastern Russia the towns of square type became known not before the creation of Bohai state (698-926), therefore the Bohai must have adopted this practice from the Chinese.

Jurzhen culture of East Xia State period (1217-1234). This culture is represented by **mountain town sites located on spurs**. These are the strongholds located on tops of dominating hills that permit control over and ways of access to surrounding terrain. These sites are most numerous, 26 of them are found in Primorye: Krasnoyarskoye, Shaiginskoye, Skalistoye, Yekaterinovskoye, Ananjevskoye, Yurkovskoye, Kishinevskoye, Plakhotyukinskoye, Gornokhutorskoye, Novopokrovskoye, Gusevskoye, Sibaigou, Kunaleiskoye, Sopka Lubvi, Novogordeyevskoye, Konstantinovskoye, Stogovskoye, Dubovaya Sopka, Shkliayevskoye, Koksharovskoye-Gornoye, Lazovskoye, Smolianinovskoye, Izvestkovoye, Scherbakovskoye, Steklianukha-3, Orlovskoye.

Towns on mountain spurs are built according to strict canonized unyielding rules. These town sites are always located in water-supplying ravines usually with a brook which is tributary of fresh and cold mountain river. The preferred location is junction of a tributary and large river. An important objective for choosing a location was the presence of steep rocks protruding to the valley of large river. So we see that the location possesses the qualities of a control point on water and terrain transportation ways linking fortresses around the state. Defensive walls are mounded along the crests of mountain ridges, downward from the top of a hill. Town sites held the military-administrative status. Planigraphic configuration of mountain towns is always standardized and maximally answers topographic peculiarities. The inner space is divided in three parts: redoubt, inner city, dwelling area. Redoubt is located near the wall; the inner city occupies elevated places near the ridge, and has the form of bordered rectangular area or chain of areas. Dwelling zone is located in the ravine on the terraces artificially made on slopes. The building module is the same for all terraces – a cut into the hill and flattening of a platform, earth padding, sheet of layered soil with alternating viscous and friable layers. Dwellings are standardized, with the II or L-shaped *kan*.

Fortifications are represented by walls (including auxiliary ones), towers, stone-throwing platforms, stone shell depots, security posts, and watch posts. By functionality, the mountain towns were military-administrative centers of districts or counties.

Origin. Mountain towns of the Jurzhen's state of East Xia are syncretic and derive from Korean and Chinese fortification traditions. With the Koguryo, as well as with the Jurzhen of East Xia State, the basic criteria for choosing the site location were steep mountainous rocks and the presence of large river. Water was not only important as means of transportation, but as natural protector, an obstacle on the enemy's way.

To build their towns the Koguryo preferred places in the vicinity of plains inhabited by people who could supply food and workforce, and whom the mountain fortress could be sheltering in case of danger. Similar approach to fortifications' positioning we see with the Jurzhen of East Xia. However, the state of East Xia, contrary to Koguryo, emerged as a result of riot in the uneasy time on the verge of Jin empire's downfall. Therefore East Xia needed to cooperate with the Tungus-Manchurian environment. The latter, although of the same kin, was not necessarily friendly and willing to provide the newcomers with food. All the more so because agriculture was not the general practice among the Tungus-Manchurian tribes. Therefore the Jurzhen mountain towns needed the independent supply resources. Consequently, agricultural facilities were arranged on terraces near the fortified sites.

Every mountain Koguryo town is situated by a river (or a brook), otherwise contains a pond and wells. For example, according to ancient records, the Koguryo's site of Teson, in addition to the brook, had 99 ponds. The Jurzhen of East Xia had similar water supplies.

To ensure martial efficiency of their towns, the Koguryo engineers focused on the reinforcement of fortresses' walls and gates, the essentials of fortified sites. Much like the Jurzhen, the Koguryo placed watch towers and turrets above the gates. Near the gates the wall usually doubled, and in front of the gates stood additional shielding wall with embrasures known as *chokte* by its sides. Watch-towers, as a rule, helped to strengthen the corners of a fortification and served as additional commanding posts. The similar fortifications are common for the Jurzhen's mountain towns as well. An important role for the defense of Koguryo fortresses played the embrasures located in walls at the places convenient for shooting the enemy frontally and from sides. Before the invention of embrasures it was impossible to bombard enemies who managed to approach the very walls of a fortress.

Korean scholars believe the embrasures to be the Koguryo's invention while structures like protective wall, gate in the tower-less wall, artificial obstacle, and duplex wall to be the hallmark of Koguryo's mountain fortress.

Concisely, the analysis of the Primorye's mountain town sites associated with the Jurzhen community of East Xia state as compared with the mountain Koguryo's fortifications showed that the influence from the Koguryo's fortifications on the development of the Jurzhen type of mountain towns was tremendous. At least Jurzhen people adopted the Koguryo's principles of fortified site placement in mountainous environment: three sides are protected by heights, the fourth, usually southern, faces the water-bearing ravine; water-supplying techniques; arrangement of fortifications – walls, gates, and corners. At the same time the Jurzhen mountain towns feature the Chinese traditions of fortification as well. In the first place those are earthen wall-mounds erected by the method of *hantu*. Chinese towns are known to be surrounded since antiquity by earthen walls where soil is layered and each layer rammed with wooden roller. Such walls are very solid, reaching the height of eight meters. The technique has been known in China since 4th century BC, and since 6th century BC the Chinese have used stone lining of curtains and built towers. Apparently the Koguryo had adopted the earthen wall-building methodology from the Chinese, but adjusted the techniques to mountainous environment.

Personal books

1. **1984.** Раннесредневековая керамика Дальнего Востока СССР как исторический источник IV-X вв. **Early medieval ceramics of the Far East of USSR as historical source of IV-X cc.**// М.: Наука. 205 P.
2. **1993.** Происхождение формирование и развитие средневековых культур Дальнего Востока (по материалам керамического производства). Ч. 1. **Origin, formation and development of medieval cultures of the Far East (basing on ceramics production).** Part 1.// Владивосток: Дальнаука. 176 P
3. **1993.** Происхождение формирование и развитие средневековых культур Дальнего Востока (по материалам керамического производства). Ч. 2. **Origin, formation and development of medieval cultures of the Far East (basing on ceramics production).** Part 2.// Владивосток: Дальнаука. 110 P.
4. **1993.** Происхождение формирование и развитие средневековых культур Дальнего Востока (по материалам керамического производства). Ч. 3. **Origin, formation and development of medieval cultures of the Far East (basing on ceramics production).** Part 3.// Владивосток: Дальнаука. 118 P.
5. **1998.** Мохэские памятники Приморья. **Mohe sites of Primorye.**// Владивосток: Дальнаука. 318 P.
6. **2004.** Мохэские памятники Приморья. **Mohe sites of Primorye** . Дунбэйя каогу цзыляо ивэнь цзи. У. (Собрание переводных работ с материалами по археологии Северо-Восточной Азии. Вып. 5). **(на китайском языке (In the Chinese language))**// Харбин: изд-во Бэйфанвэньу цзачжишэ, 292 P.
7. **2005.** Городища и крепости Дальнего Востока (Северо-Восточное Приморье) .**Ancient towns and fortresses of the Far East.**// Владивосток: издательство ДВГТУ. 188 P
8. **2009.** Военное зодчество Центрального Сихотэ-Алиня .**Military architecture of Central Sihote-Alin**// М. Восточная литература.

9. **2014. Pohai State: Archaeology, History, Politics.** М. Восточная литература.
10. **2016. THE KURGANS OF PRIMORYE.** Vladivostok: Дальнаука. 318 P.

Scientific articles

1. **1994.** On Some Aspects of the Mediaeval Cultural Studies. **Cultura Antiqua.** 1994. Vol. 46, No. 12.
2. **2014.** The Ethnic Composition of Bohai State on the Archaeological Materials//**Archaeological Discovery.** Volume 2, Number 1, January 2014, pp. 6–12, ISSN Print: 2331–1959, ISSN Online: 2331–1967. (USA).
3. **2002.** Early-Holocene Site Kuznetsovo-3 in Northeastern Primoriye. //**Current Research in the Pleistocene.** A Peopling of the Americas Publication. Center for the Study of the First Americans, Dept. of Anthropology, Texas A&M Univ., Texas, USA. Vol. 19, 2002. с. 21-22.
4. **2004.** Earliest Stone Artillery Ground in Primoriye// **Archaeological Studies** on Trade in the Ancient and Medieval Periods between Sakhalin and the North-East Japan Sea Region. Tokyo, 2004. p. p. 267-268.
5. **2004.** Construction Methods in fortifications of Djigitovskoye Walled Town// **Archaeological Studies** on Trade in the Ancient and Medieval Periods between Sakhalin and the North-East Japan Sea Region. Tokyo, 2004. Pp. 269-272.
6. **2011.** Holidays of Jurchen (proto Tungus Manchus) // **Anniversaries, Feasts and Celebrations in the Altaic World.** Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference (PIAC). Bloomington, Indiana USA, July 10–15, 2011. Bloomington, Indiana, 2015. Pp.57-61.– ISBN 978-0-910980-47-0 – на англ. яз.
7. **2015.** Holidays of Jurchen (proto Tungus Manchus) // **Anniversaries, Feasts and Celebrations in the Altaic World.** Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference (PIAC). Bloomington, Indiana USA, July 10–15, 2011. Bloomington, Indiana,. Pp.57-61.– ISBN 978-0-910980-47-0
8. **2014.** Ol'ga V[asil'evna] D'iakova. Gosudarstvo Bokhai: arkheologija, istoriia, politika / Pohai State: Archeology, History, Politics. Moskva: Nauka—Vostochnaia literature, 2014. 319 pp. + 32ISSN 2152-7237 (print), ISSN 2153-2060 (online) color plates. // The Silk Road. Volume 12.. ISBN 978-5-02-036574-2.
9. **1995.** Djakov Djakova O. V., Мокэно бочи Монастырка-3 исэки (Мохэский могильник Монастырка-3) (Mohes burial ground Monastyerka -3)(**на японском языке**). (**In the Japanese language**).Кодай бунка, Т. 47, № 3 (март).
10. **1996.** О Выделении Средневековых Культур Дальнего Востока России (**на английском языке**) . About Allocation of Medieval Cultures of the Far East Russia (**in English**).// Археология Северной Пасифики. Материалы Международного симпозиума «Археология Северной Пасифики». Россия, Владивосток, 12-15 апреля 1993 г. Владивосток: Дальнаука, P. 59-75.

11. **1998.** Глиняные сосуды бохайской культуры в Приморье (**на китайском языке**). Clay vessels of Bohai culture in Primorye (**in the Chinese language**).//Собрание переводных работ с материалами по археологии Северо-Восточной Азии. Спецвыпуск по Бохаю. Харбин, P 91-120.
12. **1998.** Boldin V.I., Djakova O. V., Sidorenko E.V. Новогордеевское городище как источник для периодизации культур Приморского края (**на китайском языке**). Novogordeevsky site as a source for a periodization of cultures of Primorye Territory (**in the Chinese language**// Собрание переводных работ с материалами по археологии Северо-Восточной Азии. Спецвыпуск по Бохаю. Харбин,. P. 46-71.
13. **1999.** The Technique and Manufacture Technology of the Mohe Pottery.// ISAC '99. Shanghai, P. 48-50.
14. **2002.** Djakov V. I., Djakova O. V. Археологические исследования в долине р. Самарга Archaeological researches in a valley of river Samarga. // Okhotsk Culture Formation, Metamorphosis and Ending. Japan and Russia Cooperative Symposium. The 5th Open Symposium of the Hokkaido University Museum. Саппоро, P. 62-73
15. **2002.** Early-Holocene Site Kuznetsovo-3 in Northeastern Primoriye.// Current Research in the Pleistocene. A Peopling of the Americas Publication. Center for the Study of the First Americans, Dept. of Anthropology, Texas A&M Univ., Texas, USA. Vol. 19, P. 21-22
16. **2004.** Earliest Stone Artillery Ground in Primoriye (в соавторстве с: С.А. Сакмаров)// Archaeological Studies on Trade in the Ancient and Medieval Periods between Sakhalin and the North-East Japan Sea Region. Tokyo,P. 267-268
17. **2004.**Djakova O. V, Sakmarov S.A Construction Methods in fortifications of Djigitovskoye Walled Town Archaeological Studies on Trade in the Ancient and Medieval Periods between Sakhalin and the North-East Japan Sea Region. Tokyo, P 269-272
18. **2006.** Ceramics of the Bohai Culture in Primorye: Geography, Classification, Origins (на корейском яз.) (On the Korean language)//The East Asia and Palhae. The 12th International Symposium on Institute of Koguryo Studies. The East Asia and Palhae P. 49-73
19. **2006.** Koguryo Trsitions in the Primorye's Mediaeval Town-Planning// Proceedings of the World Congress of Korean Studies "Cultural Interactions with Korea" From Silk Road to Korean Wave. –Vol. 1. – The Academy of Korean Studies, P. I-321 – I-331

Total 300 articles.