

ON THE FEATURES OF THE SEDENTARY CONSTRUCTIONS OF ZUNGHARS AND DEFENSIVE SYSTEM

Dordzhi G. Kukeev¹, Nina V. Shorvaeva²

¹ Federal State Budgetary Educational Institution of Higher Education Kalmyk State university named after B.B. Gorodovikov, 358000, Pushkin Street, 11. Elista, Russia.

² Federal State Budgetary Educational Institution of Higher Education Kalmyk State university named after B.B. Gorodovikov, 358000, Pushkin Street, 11. Elista, Russia.
E-mail:¹ kukeevd@list.ru

Received: 11.03.2020 Revised: 12.04.2020 Accepted: 28.05.2020

ABSTRACT: Because of the importance of studying the history of relations of the Qing dynasty with the peoples of Central Asia in the 18th and 19th centuries, and the existence of the phenomenon referred to as the “Zunghar heritage”, it is appropriate to study its background in the defensive systems of Zunghar and Qing Empires in Central Asia. There is a recent tendency to mention the so-called “Zunghar legacy” in the works of modern historiography on the history of Central Eurasia. It means like as a combination of political traditions, administrative and economic activities and methods of contacts, which were adopted by the Qing authorities from the Oirats. The researchers, actively using Manchu sources, explain the nature of the using of this “legacy” by the Qing through the model of “North Asian policy”, the “Qing world order” or the “Central Eurasian tradition”. In this regard and according to the logic, a comparative method and an attempt to make clear the genesis of a phenomenon, which had related to the Qing-Oirat relations before the contact of the Qing with Central Asia, west of Xinjiang, should also cause some interest in Qing and Central Asian studies, especially in the area of sedentary constructions of Zunghars and defensive system, named “Karul” or “Karun”.

KEYWORDS: Karul, Zunghar, Shibe, Central Asia, Nomad, Borderland.

I. INTRODUCTION

From the middle of the 18th century to the end of the 20th century, the region of Central Asia was part of two great powers - China and Russia. However, by the middle of the 18th century, there was another empire, referred to as the “last nomadic empire” Zunghar Khanate, which successfully defended its interests in the region (Zlatkin, 1964; Perdue, 2005; Zhungaer 2007). Despite of its historical presence in the vast territories of Central Asia, it should be noted that there was the main focus in study of the political life of Zunghar and its relations with its neighbors, as well as the role of personalities in the events of the 17th-18th centuries in the fundamental works on the history of the Zunghar. Hence there need to study the phenomenon of sedentary constructions of Zunghars, where I try to make an attempt with presenting available information about its defensive system, in order to show their specific features, and thereby give a basis for further research.

Now it becomes known that the Zunghar sedentary settlements are characterized as a combination of a fortress, joss-house and dwelling for lamas in one architectural complex. As a rule, written sources have records about these temples, which called “Khit” or “Sume”. From the other hand, we can see the developed defensive system in Khanate’s borderland with sedentary constructions named “Shibe”.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The methodology of this research consists the use of information from the works of recent Russian, English and Chinese historiography, and it combines the connective and the comparative methods in a new way, focusing on interactions across interstate boundaries in Asia, while comparing this Central Asian borderland with those in other Early Modern empires such as Qing and Zunghar Empires.

Many first-hand sources on theme, one can find in Russian archives: the Archive of Foreign Policy of the Russian Empire and the State Archive of Ancient Acts. The works of Russian researchers I. Ya. Zlatkin “History of Zunghar Khanate (1635 – 1758)” and V.A. Moiseyev’s “Zunghar Khanship and Kazakhs (17 – 18 cc.)” are based on comprehensive overview of the relevant Russian archival materials. Slesarchuk’s “New information on Zunghar Khanship towns”, uses Russian, but not Chinese sources. The representative of Kazakhstan modern historiography I.V. Erofeeva through excavatory archeology shed a light on the sedentary construction of Oirats, which were part of their garrison system. The archeological evidence, found by V.I. Soyonov and S.V. Trifanova in Altai region contributes the research on this phenomenon.

It needs to mention that there are some materials in Qing sources, which were used by Japan scholar Saguchi Toru in “Kazakh pastoralists on the Tarbaghatai Frontier under the Ch’ing” with interesting view of Karun’s genesis. Historian from PRC Bao-yin Chaoketu also uses Qing sources in his monograph “The Research on the Karuns of Northern Borderlands during the Qing”.

Some information we can find in Oirat written materials, which were published in Russia – “Written Memorials on Oirat’s History 17 -18 cc”, Mongolia – “Oirad Mongolyn Tüükhend Kholbogdokh Surbalj Bichgüüd” and China – “Oyirad Teüken Surbulji Bicig”.

If we apply the principle of mention in the chronological order, the modern historiography notes that the beginning of the sedentary constructions building among Oirats referred to the first quarter of the 17th century, and associated with the so-called “Kabalgasun” or “Kalbagasun”, and later known as “Jalin obo” in the Derbet Dalai-Bahadur pastureland in 1616, and it has functioned until 1702. This sedentary construction was located on the left side of the Irtysh river, near the Kalbasunka River, in the distance of about 80 km to the south-west from Yamyshevo Lake. The next phase of the building Oirat construction is dated to 1640, when Batur-Hongtaiji built four Zunghar towns, which located on the territory of the modern Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region of China, and one of them has survived to the present day in relative safety. According to Galina Slesarchuk, when the Zunghar ruler Batur-Hongtaiji began to build his “towns”, he initiated the foundation for the establishment of sedentary Buddhist monasteries. In its turn, this was an image of the increased spread of Buddhism in Zungharia, in particular, related to the appearance of Zaya-Pandita, who was on friendly terms with Batur-Hongtaiji (Slesarchuk, 1973).

Let us provide information about the sedentary construction, named “town”, which was written by Russian envoys and who were able to attest it in contemporaries’ reports. A. Martynov reported that the town was built of the stone and had four walls on all sides. The height of the walls is 2 fathoms (432 cm), and its length was 50 fathoms (108 meters). It is also interesting that there were not any ditches, or paling around this town. There was a lama, named “Usichi” (but “Materials on the history of Russian-Mongolian relations”, 1974 p. 150 says that his name was “Uemchi”, that closer to Oirat word “Emchi” and means “Doctor” - Author’s note) and 300 men with their wives and children of different origins and religion: Chinese, Mongols and “Bukharian” captives, who were engaged in agriculture in the town. I tend to think that above-mentioned Chinese in really were Tibetans, because A. Martynov could hardly see their difference from Chinese. This town was armed with 4 small cannons.

As for the functional load of the town in Khoboksar, it should be noted that Iliya Zlatkin, referring to the information of one of the Russian ambassadors sent to Batur-Hongtaiji by Tobolsk voevoda in the summer of 1640, claims that Kobuk-Saur territory and the town itself were recognized by the Batur-Hongtaiji as the border between East Mongolia and his own domain. The town was located in the south of the Black Irtysh River, between the lakes Zaisan and Ulyungur, a few to the south of them (Zlatkin, 1964, 166 – 167). Thus, this construction, as I suppose, performed functions of the garrison in the system of defensive structures, which I will discuss below in more detail. The Zunghar ruler Batur-Hongtaiji was enthusiastic about his endeavors to build sedentary constructions, and he asked the Russian authorities to send stonemasons, artisans, carpenters and other masters from Russia to him. However, they had so far failed to develop as a going concern: the last time one of the four towns was mentioned in the Baikov envoy’s records in 1654, and it is thought that after the death of Erdeni- Batur-Hongtaiji they lost their value and decayed (Materials, 1974, 417). Some of researchers granted to this town a special significance, and name it as the capital of Zunghar Khanship during the reign of Batur-Hongtaiji in the 17th century (Barfield, 1989;Perdue, 2005).

The building of three more famous Oirat constructions pertained to 1640 – 1650: “Darkhan-Tsordzhi-Khit” near Semipalatinsk; Temple complex of Khoshut Khundulen-Ubashi, which called “Kyzylkent”, and “Ablai-Khit” (Erofeeva, 2010). The beginning of Tibetan studies of Russia is connected with the last construction, when in the 1720-s there were found Tibetan manuscripts in the Ablai-Khit, which aroused a great interest in Russian and European academic circles.

In the 1670-s there appeared “Ochirtu-Tsetsen-Khan-Khit”, however according to Irina Erofeeva it did not exist many years and it was destroyed by Galdan-Boshoktu-Khan in 1676. Developing her ideas on this matter, she is inclined to believe that Galdan had to rehabilitate himself for his previous act of destruction, and that’s why he

rebuilt Galdan-Boshoktu-Khan-Khit (1677-1689), which was the most populous one, according to Miller, Pallas, Chernikov and Erofeeva, and it was located in the Kapshagai. According to Abramov and Erofeeva, it was located in the northern part of the Zaisan valley in the area between the rivers Kaljir and Orda. She also gives details that in 2008 she headed the expedition and carried out archeological excavations, where were searched out two temple constructions with a stupa in the center (Erofeeva, 2009).

In 1730 - 1740 years there were built: 1) "Sumbe", which is mentioned by Golubev and Pantusov, and it also was excavated by F.P. Grigoriev and Akishev in the Raiymbek district of the Alma-Ata region (Erofeeva, 2009); 2) there was built "Galdan-Tseren-Khan-Khit" (according to Erofeeva, Miller and Putintsev) on the river Emel at the south-western foot of the Tarbagatai mountains (Erofeeva, 2009); 3) and two very famous in the Oirat society "Sum", called between Oirats as "Mungen-Deevrte-Sum" and "Altan-Deevrte-Sum", as well as "Gulz" (Kulja) and "Hainuk".

The Oirat source "Monggholiyin Uq Ekiyin Töüke" (Oyirad, 1985; Oyirad 2001; Written, 2016), written in Qing period, inform us that this two temples (Altan-sume and Mungen-sume) were destroyed by the Kazakhs when Coros Baran led Kazakhs, with the Zungar Shereng Noyon along with Dolon-Rinchin-Noyon together, and made invasion and fought against Davachi. Chinese materials also notes that Gulz (Kulja) temple was destroyed during the times of Amursana rebellion (1755-1758), which is confirmed by the information of another 18th century work "Asar Al-Futuh" (Kutlukov, 1987). So as to Hainuk temple, recently we have an evidence from the source "Asar Al-Futuh" ("Traces of conquests"), written between 1780-1790, by the Uighur chronicler Muhammad Imin Sadr Kashgari. He noted that in the second half of the 50-s of 18 century, the Uighurs Khoja Jihan, being under the order of Hodja Burkhan Ad-Din, undertook six campaigns against the rebellious Oirat rulers, and destroyed the famous Buddhist temples in Gulz and Hainuk.

The reasons for the construction of these two temples are more fully reflected in the Oirat written source "Mongolyn Ug Ekhin Tuukh", with a more detailed description of these temples, and in which we can find an opinion about the cause of their destruction.

For the purpose of control the border areas, the settled states had recourse to the creation of a network of military garrisons with the use of auxiliary sedentary personnel. Particular interest is the emergence of this phenomenon in nomadic or semi-nomadic formations. From history we know that the first of such societies began to apply such practice Khitan people in the 11 century in the territory of Yili. After the Khitan, during the Chinggisid epoch, the territories of Central Eurasia have not had record about this practice, which was applied by nomads. But five centuries after the Khitan and in the same territory, the Oirat sources note that in the 1660-s Oirats actively used the system of the military outposts in Zungharia, where the sedentary fortification structures are referred to "Shibe", and the whole system named as "Karul". A little later, the Manchu authorities, imitating the Oirats, also began to use the border guard system on the western and northern borders of Qing empire, which was named in Manchu as "Karun", and in Chinese was referred to as "Kalun". The Japanese researcher Saguchi Toru believes that Kalun (or Karun) is a guard post on the border. So, in his opinion, there were three kind of Karun: permanent, shifting and temporary (Toru, 1985). The specialist on Manchu Qing Karun from the Peoples Republic of China, Bain-Tsoktu also notes that the Manchu Karun is characterized by three varieties: permanent, shifting and temporary (Baoyin, 2005).

In addition, Saguchi Toru notes that there were "Kaici" (k'ai-ch'i) in the Qing Karun after the conquest of Zungharia, and it was a connecting pass which linked two points. A branch from the small Karun with a good overview was called "Buksin" (bu-k'o-shen). Commonly it is names "Karun". Toru assumes that "Bu-k'o-shen" may be identified with Manchu "Buksin", "a hiding place", "ambuscade". "Kalun" is a Machu "Karun" (frontier guard), and he supposes it is derived from Oirat "Qaraul", "Qaraghun" and Turkic "Qaraul". "K'ai-ch'i" may be from Manchu "kaici" (frontier). According to him, each Karun is at intervals of several li or about one hundred li, and it stations ten or thirty soldiers. From the barracks of the Solons, Sibos, Chaqars and Eleuths of Yili, commandants and officials are dispatched every month. According to Baoyin Chaoketu, historical documents shows that there were formed Qing Karun in the north of Gobi, but it became more widespread during the reign of Emperor Yongzheng in 1727 (Baoyin, 2005). Thus, the Oirats began to apply the border guards system on their borders a little earlier than the Qing Manchu and called it "Karul", which contained sedentary constructions named "Shibe". This practice was used by Qing Manchu in Khalkha, which became known from 1677.

The system of defensive structures was called "Karul" by Zunghars, and it consist sedentary constructions called "Shibe". The evidence that the "Shibe" refers to the defensive constructions of the Zunghar Oirats is an information from Ratnabhadra's "Biography of Zaya Pandita", and from the dictionary of John Kruger (Krueger, 1984).

It is interesting that the presence of this phenomenon also exist in Altai, in connection with which the archaeologists of the Altai Mountains have already attempted to research this phenomenon, and according to their

opinion, there were no artificially created fortified constructions before 17 century, on the territory of Altai. The use of fortified constructions (Shibe) was adopted by Altai people from Oirats and it was widespread in Altai region due to the spread of firearms in the 17-18 centuries, and they have partially survived to nowadays.

First news about Altai “Shibe” became known from the report of Alexei Bugrimov, who was the tribute collector. He reported that Tele people and Sayan people built two fortresses to defense against the Qing troops. At the beginning of 21 century, Altai archeologist has announced about such fortifications as Bulukhtu-Kooby, Uittu-Kaya and 5 walls – Bichiktu-Kaya, Shibe, Kuree-Tash, Toolok and Aral. One of the largest fortifications of the Altai people for the defense from the Qing troops in the territory of the Republic of Gorny Altai was the “fortress” near Uytta-Kai, and the total length of the defensive rampart is 422 m. This fortress was built for the circular defense: it was protected by stone walls on three sides, but on the fourth side - by a rock. The size of another fortress of Buluchta-Koba: 90 * 70 m. (Soyonov, Trifanova, 2010).

It should be noted that a salient characteristic of the “Shibe” in Altai is that they are located on traditional routes of communication. They were located in the places where a river valleys narrow (Bichiktu-Kaya, Shibe, Uittu-Kaya, Buluhty-Kooby), along the passes of Teletskoye Lake’s banks (Toolok, Aral) and on the high mountain pass at the top of the mountain (Kurei-Tash). Another feature is the similarity of the structural characteristic of the Altai constructions with the Oirat construction “Ablai-Khit” - both kinds of structures were built without the use of a mortar. The fixed width of the base of the walls is 1 – 2 meters, which was able to protect not only from bullets, but also from flying grenades. I note that the “Shibe” was encamped not only on the northern border of the Khanate with Siberia, but also on the western border with the Kazakh nomads.

The beginning of the developing of guard facilities on the western borders of the Zunghars was connected with the name of the Oirat hero Galdamba from historical materials (Anyrakai, 2008, 5). As a rule, the responsible persons for the effective management of the defensive network “Shibe” were the relatives, most trusted confidant to the Zunghar ruler. The sources do not provide information who was the chief of the garrison system after the death of Galdamba until the beginning of the 18th century. But there was the son of the Zunghar ruler Louzan-Shono responsible for the network of board guard system in 1720-s. After him the responsible one was Latsan-Tseren, who was the son-in-law of the new Zunghar Khan. Since 1735, Shara-Mandzhi commanded this network on the western borders for 9 years, and he was replaced by the son of the khan Lama-Dordzhi by the early of 1744. There was already a network of fortifications on the borders of the Zunghar Khanate in 18 century, and they were divided into large and small ones.

Russian archival materials note that border guards changed every two years: “There are guards at Zunghar borders, on Persian [side are encamping] 300 [gurdians] with Noyon Amyza Gosityamacha, and in Chinese [border are encamping] 500 [guardians] with two Noyons ... [and these guards] change every two years”. According to other information, large guards (Karul) exceeded 1000 people, and from Karul were sent in different directions “temporaries” or so-called “podzorshiki” (Moiseyev, 1991, 74). In the first half of the 18th century, Zunghars encamped at least 19 Shibe at their borders with Kazakhs. Perhaps the emergence of sedentary fortification of Oirat guards was connected with a historical precedent in the beginning of the 17th century, when the Oirat and Khotogoit rulers noticed the practical benefit from Russian wooden burls that served as field fortifications to the Russian settlers of Siberia. Leonid Bobrov and July Khudyakov has referred to the reports of the Tomsk governors (voevods) of I. Shekhovskiy and M. Radilov to the Tobolsk governor (voevoda) M. Godunov notes that in the autumn of 1621, Oirat men named “Toila and Kuragala and Merget-taishi” had already arrived in the Ob and build a town (Bobrov, Khudyakov, 2008, 539). Thus, the remnants of sedentary “Kamal”, found in Kazakhstan are probably the remains of Oirat constructions “Shibe”, which are fixed in the period from the 17 century, when Russians built the same kind of burls in Siberia. Nowadays, the remains of the material heritage of Oirats in Kazakhstan as “Shibe” are closely related with the place name “Kalmak-tobe” and “Karaul-tobe”. As for the adoption by Kazakhs of such a system of guard service with the garrisons of 18-19 centuries, historical materials does not provide any information about it. Kazakhs did not apply such an effective system of border protection, perhaps because of greater disunity, the fragility of the supply mechanism, and further its uselessness after the destruction of the Zunghar Khanate by the Qing and their merged in Russian Empire. Thus, the Oirat “Shibe” had a direct influence on the Qing Karuns on its northwestern borders, because of its early origin.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The origin of the Oirat guard system has not been completely clarified and it is assumed that Oirats as well as the Khitan could come to the invention of the system by themselves using sedentary outposts, or this experience was partially adopted from the Russian burls which Oirats had seen in Siberia. Thanks to the surviving remnants of the fortifications, the historical science has information about the developed Zunghar system of border structures on its northern and western borderlands, but it remains unknown how it condition was at the Qing-Zunghar border.

In this connection, the Manchu materials “Zou zhe” and possible further archaeological searches in Xinjiang can lead to more complete reveal of the essence of the Zunghar guard system. This, in turn, will probably allow us to establish a more accurate origin of the Manchu system of Karuns. Apparently, the system of defensive constructions with “Shibe” advantaged not only to successful consolidation in a certain territory, but also to successful advance into the interior of an alien terrain. In addition, there is some reason to believe that Zunghars, using the system of garrisons with “Shibe”, also developed a system of transportation. Thus, Vladimir Moiseyev, referring to Russian archival materials, notes that after Kazakhs recognition of the subjection in Zunghar Khanate, they received “bread” from Zungharia (Moiseyev, 1991, 137). It has not yet been clarified what way and process occurred the delivery of grain to the outlying Kazakh pastures from the Zunghar Khanate. However, the delivery of “bread” or grain required a special place for storage, i.e. it need presence of sedentary constructions in the form of granaries. In this case, it can be assumed that there were partly storage in sedentary structures, I described it earlier, and which now are found in Kazakhstan, and at that time were not only a part of the defense system network, but also were a logistical network. In view of the fact that large “Shibe” accommodated one thousand people, it is logical to assume that there also was dry provision in these constructions. Although it has not been specified how was exactly the supply of these garrisons “Shibe”, but I dare to suggest that there was a supply chain scheme. In this logistics network, there was a mechanism consisting of auxiliary personnel in the entire security system at the borders of the Zunghar Khanate. Let’s try to find out the mechanism of the system. It can be assumed with a high probability the main role was played by sedentary population among nomads, forming a group of “Taranchi” in this mechanism. “Taranchi” are generally regarded had ancestors from the oases of Turkestan, who were resettled in Yili region from the lands south of the Zunghar Khanate during the spread of Zunghar influence over Tarim basin. Despite the mention in the report of Captain Ivan Unkovsky that Oirats began to engage in farming in Zungharia, nevertheless the “Taranchis” were not recruited from Oirats. The basic work in the modern historiography of the People's Republic of China “Zhungaer Shilue” with reference to the study of Saguchi Toru reports that 30 thousand farmers from oases were resettled in the 1680s. At the same time, except of Ili region, Zunghars settled the “Taranchi” in the territories near the rivers Irtysh, Emel and in the areas of Urumqi and other places (Zhungaer, 2007, 145). It is illuminating that apart from Yili, the other areas were located in close proximity to the border, where there was a network of guards with “Shibe”. Another point was the relatively large number of agriculturists, that definitely indicate about its large-scale state function, rather than as a source of replenishment only for the Khan’s family and for Zunghar elite.

The Zunghar system of border security structures was effective enough, and the Manchus, adopted it and also began to use the system of Karul on their northwestern borders. It is important to keep in mind that for its effectiveness it was required not only the mechanism described above with the use of sedentary civilians, but also a considerable human resource got to be the source of the military contingent. Zunghars were sorely lacking in the male population to recruit adequately staff of all Shibe, because of the existence of a relatively extensive system that hardly complied with the population. The need to increase the number of male population of Oirat, through the mandatory creation of families, is mentioned in paragraph 59 of the Code of Laws “Ik-Tsaaz”, which governed by Zunghars in 18 century: “Every year four of forty /families / must marry their sons”.

IV. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, the feature of the Oirat architecture of the late Middle Ages in Central Asia is the presence of the fortification elements, which are sometimes identified with guard posts (“Shibe”, “Kalun” or “Kamal”). Kazakhstan researchers note that there were more than 19 Zunghar guard posts, and not all of them have disappeared, and some of them are localized in the territory of southern and southeastern Kazakhstan (up to the Karatal river basin) by the middle of the XVIII century, as I have mentioned above. New finds of this type of architectural structures among Oirat are more fully noted by Irina Erofeeva on the example of the Kalmak-Tobe complex with a fortified structure, which was discovered and partially explored in 2005-2007 by scientific expedition of the Monument Collection of Almaty region. The expedition’s findings on this monument inform that this complex occupies the left elevated bank of Sarybulak-river and it consists of a group of different buildings: one fortification (50 m * 50 m) surrounded by a defensive wall, several isolated buildings (12 * 15 m and 15 * 17 m), irrigation facilities and water supply. I would like to note that there is a fine line, according to which it is difficult to distinguish whether the Kalmak-Tobe complex is a military outpost or a “Town”-Khit like as Ablai-Khit. As in the Ablai-Khit, and in the construction on the Kalzhir-river, which referred as “Boshoktu-Khan-Khit”, there also exist fortifications, several buildings and irrigation canals too. In this regard, it should be noted that the classification of Oirat constructions for the temple-towns (“Khit”), guard points (“Shibe”, “Karun”, “Kamal”) requires further research, since many of them are characterized by the existence of a defensive wall, some number of buildings and water supply system.

The emergence of a defensive system with a chain of garrisons in both Zunghars and Manchus has not yet been fully cleared up, but its subsequent employment after annihilation of Zunghar Khanate in Xinjiang occurred in its Zunghar version. For a promising direction for the further studying of Zunghar heritage in China there can serve Renat's map for the localization of the Zunghar sedentary construction, for the purpose to subsequent archaeological excavations.

Both Manchu "Zou zhe" in Taiwan and in Beijing and also survived Oirat's objects of material culture have a great scientific significance, and their use in the future will clarify many topical matters not only in the history of Qing, Central Asia, but also in general history. Therefore, the study of the relations between Qing and the peoples of Central Asia and the recently objectively correct attempts to regard it as part of an inseparable general history prescribes the employing of Russian-language materials on the history of the Volga Kalmyks and objects of the material culture of the Oirat for a better understanding the causes of many historical phenomena.

V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study has been funded by research grant from Kalmyk State University within the framework of the project "Zunghar Heritage and the Borderlands of Qing and Russian Empires in Central Asia".

VI. REFERENCES

- [1] Zlatkin I. Y. 1964. History of the Zunghar Khanate (1635–1758). Moscow: Nauka.
- [2] Perdue P.C. 2005. China Marches West: the Qing conquest of Central Eurasia. Harvard University Press
- [3] Zhungaer Shilue. 準噶爾史略 (An Outline of Zunghar History) (2007). Guilin: Guangxi shifan chubanshe
- [4] Slesarchuk, G. I. 1973. New information on Zunghar Khanships towns. in Olon Ulsyn Mongolch Erdemtniy 2 Ikh Hural. Vol. II. Ulaanbaatar: 113 – 116.
- [5] Materials for the History of Russian-Mongol Relations. 1636-1654: The Collection of Documents. 1974. (Compilers as authors: Mark I. Gol'man, Galina I. Slesarchuk, Iliya Ya. Zlatkin, Nikolai V. Ustyugov). Moscow: Institut vostokovedeniya AN SSSR.
- [6] Barfield T. J. 1989. The Perilous Frontier: Nomadic Empires and China. Cambridge, Mass.: Basil Blackwell.
- [7] Erofeeva I.V. 2010. The History of the Formation of the Cultic Complex Tamgalytas (1677 - 1771) in The Role of Nomads in the Formation of the Cultural Heritage of Kazakhstan. Almaty: Print-S: 490 – 530
- [8] Erofeeva I.V. 2009. The Monuments of Tibetan Buddhism in the Middle of the 17 – first half of the 18 century in Kazakhstan: New Research and Findings. in Scientific Readings in Memory of Nurbulat E. Masanov: The Collected Papers of scientific and Practical Conference. Almaty: Daik-Press: 27 – 49.
- [9] Oyirad Teüken Surbulji Bicig. 1985 (Badai, Altan Orgil, and Erdeni, eds)..Hailar: Inner Mongolia Cultural Press.
- [10] Oirad Mongolyn Tüükhend Kholbogdokh Surbalj Bichgüüd. 2001 (Nadmidiyin Sukhbaatar, ed) Ulaanbaatar: Soyombo Printing.
- [11] Written Memorials on Oirat's History 17 -18 cc. 2016 (Collection. Comp., Translat., Translit. and Comment. of Vladimir P. Sanchirov). Elista: Kalmyk Institute for Humanities Russian Academy of Sciences
- [12] Kutlukov M. On the History of International Relations in Central Asia in 1755 - 1859. (Kashgar historians' information). 1987. in From the History of Central Asia and Eastern Turkestan. 15 – 19 centuries. Tashkent: Fan: 59 - 82.
- [13] Toru S. 1985. Kazakh pastoralists on the Tarbaghatai Frontier under the Ch'ing in Proceedings of the International Conference on China Border Area Studies. 國立政治大學國際中國邊疆學術會講論. Taipei: 953 – 996.
- [14] Baoyin Chaoketu 寶音朝克圖. 2005. 清代北部邊疆卡倫研究 (The Research on the Karuns of Northern Borderlands during the Qing). Beijing: Zhongguo renmin daxue chubanshe.
- [15] Krueger J. 1984. Materials for an Oirat-Mongolian to English citation dictionary. Part two: the Conconants. Bloomington: Indiana University.

- [16] Soyonov V.I., Trifanova S.V. 2010. Field Stone Fortification of Altai. Gorno-Altai: Gorno-Altai State University.
- [17] The Anyrakay Triangle: the Chronicle of the Great Battle and Its Historical and Geographical Area. 2008. (Erofeyeva I.V., Aubekero B. Zh., Rogozhinsky A.Ye. Eds.) Almaty: Daik-Press.
- [18] Moiseyev V.A. 1991. Zunghar Khanship and Kazakhs (17 – 18 cc.). Alma-Ata: Gylym
- [19] Bobrov L.A., Khudyakov J.S.. (2008). Armament and Tactics of the Nomads of Central Asia and Southern Siberia during the Late Medieval and Early Modern Ages (15th – first half of the 18th century A.D.). St. Petersburg, At. Petersburg State University Faculty of Philology.