
ИСТОРИЯ И АРХЕОЛОГИЯ

HUNNS OF ASIA

S. BOTALOV

e-mail: grig@sci.urfu.ac.ru

South Urals Department of the Institute of History and Archaeology
of the Ural Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Chelyabinsk, Russia

Article was presented in September 12, 2000

Hunns the most known peoples of the world history. Their fates also legendary, as well as are unknown. The history of this people is investigated insufficiently. Today at the end of the twentieth century we collide with a number of problems Hunns archaeology. Let's try to designate them.

1. There is a cultural communication between Hunns (Hunnus) of Mongolia and gunns of Europe?*

2. If Hunns finally have left Mongolia in second half II centuries (defeat northern Hunns and Chesh in revolt against China, capture Tanshihuay (leader syanbi) East Turkestan), and they rush into Europe at the end of IV A.D. (rout Volga alanes 371 year), where they were two centuries?

3. There is a steady history-cultural complex, characteristic for European gunns?

The Hunns history has here periods:

1. Early-hunns (junn-diss) — epoch Inn — end II millennia B.C. — IV—III B.C. It is formed in extensive territory of north of the Chinese provinces (Shansy, Shensy, Gansu, Hebej, switching Ordos, part of Internal Mongolia and southwest Manjuria). Its basic features: the rule of skeletons is extended on a back, head to the north, fulfillment burials in extend — rectangular holes, presence of face niches, ledges, altars as heads of home animals. Key monuments are burials complexes Tanhubala, Maocingou, Huhusitaya, Yuyluntaya, Aluchaydena, Sigounanay etc. [5].

2. "Classical Hunns" (end III B.C. — I A.D.). The territory its is well known: Large Mongolia, Transbaikalia, Ordos. In the given period the basic features gunns Historical-Culture Complex (HCC) were finally generated: the presence round stone embankment, narrow rectangular holes, coffin, northern orientation — for the ordinaries burials and structure complex multichamber rectangular with passage(on the south) crypts, presence of deep holes, which at the bottom inside bellying is located a coffin with dead person, stacked with a head on north — for aristocratic burials.

3. Hunn-sarmatian (north-hunnian) (II B.C. — I A.D.). The final unification hunnian or hunn-sarmatian HCC has taken place, probably, in territories of northwest Mongolia, Transbaikalia, and also Tuva (monuments of shurmak and kokel cultures) in (I B.C. — I A.D.), that was expressed in reduction of the sizes embankment, simplification burials of the chamber and wooden designs. Probably this stage corresponds with the period of localization northern Hunns.

4. The Middle Asia-Kazakhstan period less long, but, perhaps, most key in a problem of genesis of Hunn-gunnian culture. It proceeds in frameworks gunn-sarmatian of a stage (I—IV A.D.).

In middle II centuries Hunnes finally have left East Turkestan and have moved in the Middle Asia-Kazakhstan steppes. Many researchers consider this fact indisputable [1. P. 42—42; 6. P. 176—179; 3. P. 220—225; 2. P. 80—112; 10. P. 100; 8. P. 24]. However this idea about this day continues to exist, as hypothesis. Attempt N.Bernshtam bind monuments of kenkol type with Hunnes of Central Asia have not crowned by success [2; 9. P. 97—117; 4. P. 71], though it and today this idea has the supporters [11. P. 195—201].

* In Russian we have discriminate between definitions Hunns (of Asia) and Gunns (of Europ).

As a result of ordering and map-marking of the Central Asian material six are allocated of burials groups.

The early complexes with II A.D. (and early) contain in Layvandac, Tulhar and Chilpec groups.

1. *Lyavandac* group make small barrows cemetery with earthen embankments, by burial places with niche and catacombs by structures in a face wall and steady southern orientation deaf persons. They borrow northern and northwest borderland of the Middle Asian oases (Tashkent, Bukhara oases and Horezm). From north these monuments are closed with similar by South Ural complexes, which are formed by new eastsarmatian wave of the end III—I B.C.

In this connection Lyavandac type is conditionally named as us *Eastsarmatian* HCC.

2. *Tulhar* type is submitted also small cemeteries: stone embankments, deep of a hole with niche, northern orientation. Among things — characteristic subjects of east origin. They settle down by an original arch from Bukhara and Samarkand oases up to the south of Tadjikistan. These monuments belonged uedji, routing Bactria. They have the further development subsequently in monuments Kushans time of a type Telya–Tepe. This group forms *uedjis* HCC.

3. *Chilpec* group includes small barrows cemetery. Barrows with stone embankments, including ring. Simple or hole with niche. With stone overlapping and western orientation. The ware stock is poor. Characteristic are pots with thick sides and round bottom. They settle down by a strip, switching upper waters Irtysh, Semirechye and further along northern slope Tyanshan. In this connection given HCC has received the name sak–usunian.

The following two most numerous types include monuments to later time (first centuries AD).

4. Kenkols group, which includes large cemetery with earth barrows, can be ground graves with catacombs structures perpendicularly long passage. Orientation unstable. The ware accompanying material bears on itself traditions East Turkestan (wooden little tables, scaffolds from arch, burials masks, types of ceramics). These monuments belong, probably, settled or half-settled to the cattle breeding population of Fergana, Ketmen–Tube, Tashkent oasis and average current Sirdarya, borrowed by the earlier states Davan and Kanguy. This complex is conditionally named as me Kanguy–Davan (alanian) HCC.

5. Djeteasars type is made by the numerous monuments compactly which are settling down in the bottom current Sirdarya (a dried up channel Kashkadarya). In spite of the fact that the earlier complexes of Djeteasars culture occur still in VI—V B.C., the absolute majority barrows occurs in I—II B.C. This culture has two–compound shape. It was reflected in burials ritual (presence reusable of brick–clay crypts and earth barrows with simple and holes with niche with orientation dead persons to north) and ceramic complex (presence of ceramics with furnaces and firing). In opinion L. Levina, this population was subject strong gunns to influence with 1 B.C. [7. P. 374].

And at last, north Kazakhstan and South Ural of steppes borrows so-called by me Gunn–sarmatian monuments. Today them the rather plenty (more than 300) is investigated. Many researchers carry these monuments to late sarmatian culture deduced for monuments lower reaches Volga. However, Gunn–sarmatian monuments have a number of essential distinctions.

1. If late sarmatian monuments arise on the basis of cultural transformation middle sarmatian of culture, Gunn–sarmatian arise unexpectedly in second half II A.D. In territory before not populated.

2. As against late sarmatian they form independent lumpsum cemetery.

3. Late sarmatian barrows have small earthen embankments. Gunn–sarmatian on 10 % are combined from a stone, and earthen embankments have large variants of the forms (earth crypts, dumb–bell, long etc.).

4. A conducting type late sarmatian of holes are with niche (50 %) long–rectangular (27 %), square (19,5 %). At Gunn–sarmates simple long–rectangular holes absolutely prevail (72 %). In western (contact) cemetery occur burials with niche (25 %), which basic part — female.

5. In late sarmatian burials a very rare find are the coffins (4 cases). Among smaller quantity(amount) Gunn–sarmates of complexes more 20 death designs are found.

The distinctions are observed and in a ware material. So, the ceramics Gunn–sarmates in overwhelming majority as against late sarmates has the origin from Middle Asia. Large percent military burials and large share in Gunn–sarmatians burials of finds of boiler hunnes of a type. At last among Gunn–sarmatians of monuments there are some marking ware complexes. Those are: a zone set — sword–belts with wide rectangular overlays and yarns with round by overlays — clips for pendant belts or ring suspension brackets, horses bridle with round by overlays by clips and leads by suspension brackets, and also special “hunns” set beads. The named distinctions do not allow to speak about

monuments II—IV A.D. lower reaches Volga and Ural–Kazakhstan steppes as incultural. The border between them the most probably passed on the lower reaches and average current Ural. They the given characteristic it be visible, that Gunn–sarmatians monuments are closest nomadic burial ritual to a complex of djeteasar type. They coexist in uniform time within the framework of Ural–Aral pasture–nomadic province.

Whence there is this population. As we see from the characteristics, among HCC it is difficult of Middle Asia and Southern Kazakhstan also to find monuments close Gunn–sarmatians.

Conclusions

North Kazakhstan and South Ural of steppes borrows so–called by me Gunn–sarmatian monuments. Today them the rather plenty (more than 300) is investigated. Many researchers carry these monuments to late sarmatian culture deduced for monuments lower reaches Volga. However, Gunn–sarmatian monuments have a number of essential distinctions.

The border between them the most probably passed on the lower reaches and average current Ural. They the given characteristic it be visible, that Gunn–sarmatians monuments are closest nomadic burial ritual to a complex of djeteasar type. They coexist in uniform time within the framework of Ural–Aral pasture–nomadic province.

References

1. Artamonov M.I. History of the Khazars. L., 1962. (rus).
2. Bernshtam A.A. Articles from the history of the Hunns. M., 1951. (rus).
3. Gumilev L.N. The Hunnus. M., 1960. (rus).
4. Kojomberdiev I. The new materials about the Kenkol barrow // KSIIMK. — 1961. (rus).
5. Konovalov P.B. About the origin and early history of the Hunns // 100 years Hunns Archeology. Nomadism, last and present in a global context and the historical prospect. The Hunns phenomenon. No 1. Ulan–Ude, 1996. (rus).
6. Kuner N.V. The Chinese news about the peoples of Southern Siberia, Central Asia and Far East. M., 1961. (rus).
7. Levina L.M. The Ethnic–cultural history of the East Arals. M., 1996. (rus).
8. Mandelshtam A.M. The monuments of the nomads of the Kushans time in the North Bactria // The works of the Tadjiks Archeological expedition of the Institute of the history AN USSR. T. VII, 1975. (rus).
9. Sorokin S.S. The Middle Asian niches and catacombs burials as the monuments of the local culture // SA. — 1956. — No 26. (rus).
10. Tolstov S.P. The towns of the guzes // SE. — 1937. — No 3. (rus).
11. Habdulina M.K. The Hunns barrows on the ways migrations on west // The Complex societies of Central Eurasia N III—I millennium B.C. Chelyabinsk, 1999. (rus).