

Timo Salminen

NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL INFLUENCES IN THE FINNISH ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH IN RUSSIA AND SIBERIA

Abstract

The main question of the article is how national and international factors have influenced the archaeological research made by Finns in Russia and Siberia especially from 1870s to 1930s. The development can be divided into four periods.

In the first period dominated by M. A. Castrén in the 1840s the initiatives came from the Russian institutions but the Finnish interests were already playing a part in the whole. The independent Finnish studies in the east and with them the second period of Finnish archaeology of Russia were started by J. R. Aspelin in the 1870s. It was period of national unity when the essential question concerned the origin of the Finnic tribes and their spreading to the west. When archaeology could show that Finns have had a history and culture it could establish them a position among other nations. The international task was subordinated to the national one.

The period of national unity was followed by the third period when the eastern studies were divided into two parts. The national-archaeological and international-linguistic directions were set against each other. The national-archaeological approach had its background in the Fennoman ideology but it had to admit that the great lines strived for during the previous decades possibly could not be discovered. Therefore the Ural-Altai archaeology should set more reduced goals. The internationally oriented research was based on Turkology and used archaeology mainly to illustrate the linguistic studies.

The archaeological basics were revived in 1908 when A. M. Tallgren started his studies in the east. It was typical of Tallgren's work that he attempted to find a synthesis of national and international approaches in the eastern archaeology. Emphasis was mostly on the international side, because it was already visible that majority of the Finnish archaeologists had concentrated to the prehistory of Finland and there was no such national demand for Finno-Ugric prehistory as there had been 20–30 years earlier. This era of synthesis was the fourth and last period of pre-war Finnish archaeological research in Russia.

The independence of Finland did not immediately prevent Finnish scholars from travelling to Russia and continue their work there. Only when Iosif Stalin closed the western connections of Soviet Union in the middle of the 1930s the tradition came to end.

Keywords: history of archaeology, Russia, Siberia, interaction between national and international demands, Ural-Altai Bronze Age, Early Iron Age.

Timo Salminen, Lopentie 10 B 20, FIN-11100 Riihimäki, Finland. E-mail: timo.salminen@pp3.inet.fi

CASTRÉN

An essential feature of the Finnish archaeological research in Russia and Siberia through its history was interaction between national and international influences. Partly, the national and the international sides served for same goals,

partly they turned against each other. The relationship varied in different times and, according to these changes the whole history of the Finnish archaeological activities in the east can be divided into four periods and some intermediate stages between them. The periods date approximately: I 1840–1870, II 1870–1890,

III 1890–1895/1905 and IV 1908–1935. In this article special attention is paid to the relationship of the national and international sides of the research.¹

The first Finnish scholar to carry out archaeological studies in Russia was philologist Matthias Alexander Castrén (1813–1852) in 1847. Castrén was sent to Siberia by the Russian Academy of Sciences in 1845 to do linguistic and ethnological research. The Finnish-born academician Anders Johan Sjögren (1794–1855), who had made some linguistic expeditions in Russia in the 1820s, chose Castrén to this new task. Both scholars belonged both to the Finnish and Russian traditions of expeditions. The Russian tradition sought for an accurate description of the empire especially for economic purposes. The original objects of the Finnish tradition were mostly in the area of natural sciences but later the researchers turned more and more their attention towards getting information of the assumedly Finnic peoples and their cultures and languages.²

Castrén excavated in the district of Minusinsk and was actually the first scholar ever to dig the Siberian kurgans to solve special research problems.³ Most of his finds got lost before arriving to St. Petersburg.

Castrén adopted the view of the Danish philologist Rasmus Rask (1787–1832), according to whom all the northern peoples from Europe through Siberia and Mongolia to Northern America were related to each other. Especially he assumed connection between Finns and Mongols. The assumption was based on both linguistic and physiological grounds. The theory had not been proved however and Castrén sought as well archaeological as archaeological-anthropological evidence for it. Relationship with Samoyeds bound Finns together with the Altaic peoples. This was confirmed by the kinship of the Finns to the Tatars, considered back then being beyond dispute.⁴

Before Castrén, there had been several hypotheses about the original home of the Finns. Hungarians, Turks and Avars were assumed to be related to the Finns. Castrén's theory of Altaic original home became soon generally accepted but not the only one. Volga region was also a considerable alternative to it.⁵

Later J. R. Aspelin emphasized Castrén's connections to the Herderian Fennophilia

awoken at the Turku Academy in the 1810s and also to the developing political Fennomania, which had its backgrounds in the Hegelian thinking. According to Aspelin, Castrén's central aim was to acquire to Finland an independent name in the history of science. In his article *M. A. Castrénin Muinaistieteellinen Perintö* (M. A. Castrén's archaeological heritage) Aspelin bound himself to the castrénian ideas and the Altaic origin of the Finns.⁶

Because Castrén had got his commission from St. Petersburg, he did not institutionally belong to the Finnish archaeological research in Russia yet. The emancipation process of the Finnish scholarly world had however begun and Castrén never engaged himself permanently to the Russian Academy of Sciences. His ideal starting-point was thus already of national character but the theoretical one was basically international.

Michael Branch has seen three reasons on the background of the emancipation of the Finnish scholarly system: specialization of different branches of science which made the regional studies of the previous century old-fashioned, modernization of the society and nationalism. The centre for the Finnic studies should be located in Finland because of modernization Finland could little by little provide necessary infrastructure, institutions and societies. The Russian Academy of Sciences was more and more transformed to a kind of information bureau of the Imperial government without the independent position it had had in the previous decades. The research of the languages and cultures of the Finnic peoples, based on the spirit of Enlightenment and early Romanticism came under pressure in Russia, because it did not promote reaching the utilitarian goals set by the Russian authorities.⁷

Aspelin in Livonia in 1869

Historian, researcher of the Middle Ages, Johan Reinhold Aspelin (1842–1915) turned his attention towards archaeology and prehistory at the end of the 1860s by getting acquainted with Russian chronicles and other works that no Finn by then had studied. Also he started to collect information of the antiquities in Biarmia.⁸ At the same time he, together with some other enthusiastic young ones, organized the Finnish Antiquarian Society (1870) and canalized the already existent

archaeological interest through it. The Society had later an important part in the archaeological studies carried out by Finns in Russia.⁹

Aspelin became convinced of his Finno-Ugric sense of mission during his voyage in Livonia in 1869. He, like other nationally-minded Finns, had connections to the Estonian national movement.¹⁰ From his visit to the Baltic on, Aspelin considered his task to shed light on the prehistory of the Finnic tribes by using the methods of Scandinavian archaeology. Soon thereafter, in 1871, Aspelin travelled to Sweden for purposes of study and began his archaeological work in Russia.¹¹

Before leaving for Russia, Aspelin had formed himself an idea of the Finnic peoples, though its detailed historical contents were still unclear. Aspelin excluded Samoyeds and late Siberian tribes of his concept and considered the western Finno-Ugric peoples and their history the most essential. He did not question Castrén's Altaic theory but Altai formed only one phase in the history of Finns.¹² Inventing the concept of Finno-Ugric at first as a vague sign and later as a more and more accurately defined one was a precondition for using prehistory for enlightening and educational purposes, forming a myth of the own past of the Finns.

STARTING SYSTEMATIC ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH IN RUSSIA

Aspelin's idea of archaeology took shape partly on the basis of the cultural-historic and ethnographic approach prevalent in Finland, partly it was defined at Oscar Montelius and Hans Hildebrand in Sweden.¹³ Aspelin followed the Finnish early romanticism's lines in his idea of the task of archaeology. The national awakening had got a concrete manifestation in collecting folk poetry and this inspired Aspelin, too. Thus, though he took the Scandinavian comparing method starting-point of archaeology, he sought answers to questions that were determined by the inner Finnish demands and attempted to find people behind the artefacts, especially prehistoric nationalities. Aspelin did not emphasize typology in the Swedish manner but comparing studies in the way that had been established by the Danish archaeologists, especially Sophus Müller.¹⁴

Aspelin wanted to show Finns themselves, Russians and the rest of the world that Finns have had culture and past, which could be found archaeologically. Own cultural history would increase the appreciation and self-esteem of the Finns.¹⁵ Because of their national epic *Kalevala* collected and composed by Elias Lönnrot in the 1830's and 1840's the Finns had already become to the consciousness of larger audiences in Europe than before but otherwise Europeans did not know much of the Finnish culture and history. Aspelin's task was both national and international.

In Finland, Aspelin used the material necessary for comparative archaeology as an official argument for his travel plans to Russia. It would be necessary for investigating the antiquities of Finland. In the political climate after the Polish mutiny of 1863 it was not appropriate to use national arguments, though it was not mere comparative materials Aspelin sought for.

Simultaneously with the excavations made by Aspelin and philologist D. E. D. Europaeus (1820–1884) the Diet of Finland discussed the future legislation for protection of the antiquities. One Leitmotif of the discussion was the question whether archaeology is national or international discipline.¹⁶

SUOMALAIS-UGRILAISEN MUINAISTUTKINNON ALKEITA

J. R. Aspelin's doctoral dissertation (licentiate thesis) *Suomalais-ugrilaisen muinaistutkinnon alkeita* (Elements of Finno-Ugric Archaeology), based on the material he had collected in Russia, came out in 1875. In his book Aspelin formulated an overall explanation of the past of the Finnic tribe and its wandering to Finland. Against the Castrenian view Aspelin adopted Peter Simon Pallas's interpretation, which he had expressed in the 1760's and according to which the Bronze Age antiquities in Minusinsk area belonged to Finnic peoples. He assumed that still unexplained reasons have compelled these tribes to move westwards to the Urals and the Volga region. There was practically no early Iron Age known in Altai region and the western Iron Age artefact forms seemed to Aspelin to developed from the Siberian forms, and that is why he considered the Castrenian theory of Altaic original home of the Finns proved. When the Finns had arrived to the West they had come to

regions where there was no metal in their disposal and therefore they had had to make their utensils, at first at the river Kama, of bone and later in Olonets of stone. This was showed by the animal sculptures that were, to Aspelin, like the ones found in Siberia. The archaeological Ural-Altai idea was not new: it has originally been suggested by the Dane Jens Jacob Asmussen Worsaae but some backgrounds can be found already in the travel books of P. S. Pallas.¹⁷

In his dissertation Aspelin set the theoretical and methodological framework, which he presented separately in his paper at the All-Russian archaeological congress in Kazan' in 1877. The aim of archaeology was to explain "the national peculiarities in the archaeological material" and using them "understand peoples that do not exist any more". Aspelin did not especially emphasize typology, though he spoke how the development of forms can be explained with the series of finds.¹⁸ This kind of defining of the starting-points of archaeology would undoubtedly have been done also without studies in Russia but because of Aspelin's national task just Russia served as a field of experiments where the Scandinavian methods were applied to the Finnish reality of the time.

ANTIQUITÉS

Aspelin's dissertation and especially his three French-language lectures in the archaeological congress of Stockholm¹⁹ aroused international attention and interest towards the East-European material systematized in them. Soon the international audiences have even better opportunities to get acquainted with Aspelin's results.

The first part of the atlas of pictures *Muinaisjännöksiä Suomen suvun asumus-aloilta – Antiquités du Nord finno-ougrien* came out in 1877. The entire five-part publication contained the material Aspelin had collected for his dissertation supplemented with new finds in the last booklets. Aspelin had planned also a sixth part, a synthesis or an updated version of the dissertation, but it was never realized.²⁰

Atlas never got as wide a circulation as Aspelin had wished but despite that it was a significant factor in creating the international reputation of Finnish archaeology. Eventually it was more

important and effective than Aspelin's lectures in the international and Russian congresses in Stockholm (1874), Budapest (1876), St. Petersburg (1876) and Kazan' (1877). In his presentation of Ural-Altai archaeology Aspelin attempted to signify certain prehistoric cultures in the foreign consciousness as property of the Finnic tribes, i.e. Finns. Building the nation demanded presentations of the special features of the Finnish people to foreign audiences and that created a synthesis of national and international tasks of archaeology.²¹

SCIENTIFIC LANDS OF CONQUEST OF FINLAND

In 1874, J. R. Aspelin explained in the Antiquarian Society of Finland his idea to create in Helsinki a Finno-Ugric central museum. This would be the duty of Finns as speaker of all the Finno-Ugric peoples. Finland would be the most natural homestead of Finno-Ugric archaeology. A special Finno-Ugric central museum should be founded in Helsinki, where there already were collections from outside of the own country. In his speech Aspelin put together the Finnish national ideology and the methodological demands of comparing archaeology.²²

A little before Aspelin's disputation philologist Otto Donner (1835–1919) proposed to the Finnish Society of Sciences to send an expedition for studies in natural history, linguistics and archaeology at the Finno-Ugric peoples of Russia.²³

J. R. Aspelin presented his own plan, which he undoubtedly had had in his mind already for a couple of years, in the meeting of Finnish Antiquarian Society on May 9, 1876. There he sketched a plan to study whole Russia archaeologically by Finns in four years. The ideas of Finno-Ugric central museum served as basis for his plan, though the word itself does not appear in the final version of the plan. In the concept version there are more detailed arguments for collecting a large, organized museum in the manner of Swedish and Danish museums. In this way would it be possible to the Finns to secure the future development of Finno-Ugric archaeology, but it would be possible to create such a museum only as long as the authorities of Russia were blind to the archaeological value of the North-Russian graves.

During the first summer the museum collections in the Baltic and westernmost Russia should be investigated. In the second summer the studies should be extended to the gouvernement of Perm'. The third summer would be used for researches at the old Tchud mines in the gouvernement of Orenburg from where the expedition should travel further through the gouvernements of Ufa and Perm' to the sparsely known north-eastern Urals, region of Ostiaks and Voguls. In the fourth summer it would be possible to travel either through Olonets to the rivers Dvina and Mezen' or excavate graves along the rivers Irtyš and Ob' towards Altai. Winters should be used for museum studies in the Slavonic areas in order to distinguish the Finnic and Slavonic antiquities of each other, because "for the prehistoric archaeology there are no 'Russian antiquities'".²⁴

Actually, Aspelin had published an almost similar plan already in December 1875. There he wrote how archaeologically should in first place the relationship between Altai-Uralic Bronze Age and the younger Finno-Ugric cultural layers be investigated. If it were possible to scientifically prove the Finnishness of that Bronze Age, Turan of Assyrian legends would have been found. Finnish culture would have been connected with the oriental cultures, though possibly as a kind of associate member. A striking feature in the plan is how Aspelin emphasizes the uncertainty of the Finnishness of the Ural-Altaiic Bronze Age. That shows clearly how the prehistory of the Ural-Altaiic region was presented to the Finnish educated class more as a research program than complete results.²⁵

When there was only one archaeologist and perhaps some students in Finland, though, the plan was too large to be realized in the 1870s. The general attention of the state authorities and scholarly societies turned more towards creating the system for protecting the antiquities in Finland.

The research and museum plans connected the nationalistic ideology of a national museum to the idea of Russia as a "scientific colony" or a land of conquest of Finland. Some forty years later Hjalmar Appelgren-Kivalo (1853–1937) stated in his speech at Aspelin's grave how Aspelin "reminded of the duties Finnish scholars had towards the kindred peoples whose standard of

education was lower". National and scholarly duties were one to Aspelin and they also formed the basis of the international task of the Finns.²⁶

ASPELIN IN THE BALTIC PROVINCES IN 1880

The influence of Aspelin's plan to the studies realized during the next years cannot be unambiguously showed. Traces of it can however be seen in three expeditions and one publication project. These are J. R. Aspelin's trip to Estonia and Livonia in 1880, Axel Olai Heikel's (1851–1924) partly ethnographic trips to Volga region in 1883 and 1884 and the plan to publish in Finland the Tchud collection of F. A. Teplouhov, outspoken a couple of times in the 1880s but never realized. Also the Enisej expeditions of the Finnish Antiquarian Society in 1887, 1888 and 1889 can be seen as realization of Aspelin's plan.

At the end of 1860s Aspelin had created close contacts to the national circles of Estonia and began to support their efforts. The contacts got concrete archaeological significance when Aspelin got acquainted with the teacher of Abja school, Jaan Jung (1835–1900). In 1880 Aspelin and Hjalmar Appelgren arrived to Livonia to carry out digs together with Jung in Halliste and Karksi. Undoubtedly Aspelin wanted to test his Ural-Altaiic theory in a smaller scale in the Baltic. The contacts with the national movement of Estonia got even closer during the 1880s.²⁷

The most active researcher of the prehistory of Russia in the German circles of Estonia was professor of geology Constantin Grewingk (1819–1887). His article *Zur Archäologie des Balticum und Russlands* was the only scientific work of the archaeology of Russia written in Estonia in the 19th century. Some field investigations were made in the east though, because the Russian professors of Tartu University had interest towards Slavonic archaeology and the German professors towards the Gothic culture in Russia. The most important scholar to study antiquities in the east was the literature professor Pavel Viskovatov.²⁸

Aspelin continued instructing Jung in archaeology also later. An archaeological triangle of Finland, Estonia and Russia. In the first phase Finland was the active member of the triangle. Estonia was seen as such in the future. Russia was object of research.²⁹

Aspelin still used the material he had collected in the Baltic in his lecture in the All-Russian archaeological congress in Moscow in 1890. That was the last time when he appeared in an important archaeological occasion. There he proposed that Russian archaeologists should start to compose an atlas of Slavonic antiquities, but the task was considered impossible at the moment.³⁰

THE ENISEJ EXPEDITIONS OF THE FINNISH ANTIQUARIAN SOCIETY 1887-1889

Already in the 1870s, Aspelin maintained wishes to get able to continue research in the east, especially in Siberia. He was interested especially in the unknown writing found on grave stelae and rocks along Enisej. He also tried to persuade the Finnish clergymen living in Siberia to excavate kurgans.³¹

The first learned men to attempt to decode the writings were P. S. Pallas and O. G. Tytschen in the 18th century. In the next century the major contributions were made by Julius Klaproth and M. A. Castrén, who both thought the script to belong to Kirgizes.³²

Russian scholars were beginning to document the antiquities in the valley of Enisej and the mountains of Saján and Altai more scientifically at the same time. Russian archaeology in all lived a period of intensive development during these decades when the evolutionistic influences spread to Russia.

As a professional should especially Wilhelm Radloff (1837–1918) be mentioned, a researcher of Turkic languages. He was born and studied in Berlin, started his scholarly work in the beginning of the 1860s and formulated soon a general view over the South Siberian antiquities and the prehistoric periods. The Siberian Bronze Age he thought to have only local variants but no chronological phases. Radloff dated the rock inscriptions to the Bronze Age, as also Aspelin had done. In the beginning he thought the Bronze Age population to have been Finno-Ugric or Ugric-Samoyed but later he ended to interpret them as ancestors of the peoples still living in Southern Siberia in the 19th century. The Finnish archaeologists and linguists saw Radloff partly as a cooperation partner, partly as a rival, but undoubtedly he made it easier to the Finns to see

the whole Enisej Bronze Age as Finnic, because he had not included any separate chronological sub-periods into it.³³

In 1886, Aspelin had already almost decided to travel to the Urals, gouvernements of Perm' and Vjatka. He expected to get the trip financed by the Russian Imperial Archaeological Commission, but when he got no further information of the finances he turned to another plan. Johannes Granö, the vicar of the Finnish parish in Omsk had written to Hjalmar Appelgren describing the multitude of graves on the Siberian steppes and referring to the heritage of Castrén as researcher of the inscriptions of the region. Somebody should follow the great Castrén.³⁴

Aspelin stated the question of the oldest metal culture and its spreading to Europe to be one of the most important in the whole archaeology. Some Hungarian Bronze Age artefacts seemed to be common with the Ural-Altai Bronze Age and so the studies would benefit explaining the development of the Bronze Age in whole Europe. Because the Altai-Uralic Bronze Age with its writing system “could not be anything else than the Finnic tribe before its scattering” and because the culture had an immediate connection to the oldest Finno-Ugric Iron Age, Siberia was a conquered land or even a colony of the Finnish science. That is why just Finns should send an expedition to Enisej to copy the rock carvings and excavate graves. Moreover, when the Scandinavian archaeologists had occupied the Western Europe, the Finns should keep the Finno-Ugric regions in their command.³⁵ It was a secondary detail that the connections of Siberian Bronze Age and the Iron Age of the Volga region had remained partly unproven in Aspelin's dissertation.³⁶

There were three expeditions to Siberia, in the years 1887, 1888 and 1889. After that, Aspelin more and more turned his attention to the relationship between the Ural-Altai Bronze Age and the birth of West-European Bronze Age. He referred especially to the works of Grigor'ev, Klaproth and Abel-Rémusat on the Indo-Germanic peoples west of Irtyš and Altai. This region together with Caucasia would solve the problem of the origins of the western Bronze Age.³⁷

That means that the questions seen as the most important ones by Aspelin did not have an

immediate connection to Finnic tribe any more. The task was more international than national. Most probably Aspelin considered the questions relating immediately to the prehistory of the Finno-Ugric peoples so completely studied that no additional information of them could be gained. If one wanted for more it should be searched indirectly and in that connection Aspelin saw the keys of the West-European Bronze Age in the hands of the Finns. They should use them now. Partly the goals set by him were reached by the expeditions in 1890–1891 and 1893. In Finland the national and international sides of the research ran into conflict with each other though.

A. O. HEIKEL AND KARAKORUM 1890–1891

A.O. Heikel left Helsinki in the spring of 1890 for Karakorum, actually Karabalgasun, and the river Orhon. The Russian expedition led by Nikolaj Jadrincev (1842–1894) was after the same region and the same writings but he could not travel before the summer 1891. Jadrincev had however already made a trip to Karabalgasun in 1889.³⁸

Heikel's work was of a decisive importance for decoding the Siberian writings. Otto Donner published the material in 1892, at the same time when the Russian expedition of Radloff, Jadrincev and Klemenc prepared a publication of its collections. The Finnish material was however the one, on which the Dane Wilhelm Thomsen could solve the problem of the unknown writing in 1893.³⁹

Otto Donner had presented the Finnish results in the international congress of orientalists in Stockholm in 1889, and already the publication *Inscriptions de l'Iénisseï* had aroused the interest of foreign scholars. More material was published in 1892 and in 1893 the Danish philologist Vilhelm Thomsen could state that the texts were of Turkic origin dating to the 7th–8th centuries and had no connection to the Finnic tribes or Bronze Age.⁴⁰

This meant on one hand that the national attention of the Finnish scholars turned more towards the Urals and Western Russia, on the other hand that the Siberian archaeology had to be directed towards internationally oriented questions.

PERIOD OF DISSOLUTION

Professor Otto Donner planned new expeditions to Turkestan. His aims were mostly within research of Turkic languages and gave only a minor part to archaeology. The Finno-Ugric Society had received funds from the Diet for studies in Asia, which made the direction the question of day. Hjalmar Appelgren had different thoughts: in his opinion the expedition should be sent to Urals.⁴¹

It was not only conflict between Asia and the west but also between archaeology and linguistics. The decision was made according to Appelgren's proposal. He argued for his thought saying that Turkestan and Siberia are too far away to be studied with the Finnish resources but studying the Permian region was an actual duty of the Finns. New grave finds were needed especially from the periods connecting the Anan'ino culture to the late Iron Age.⁴²

A.O. Heikel and J. E. Ax (later Ailio, 1872–1933) were sent to Russia. They did not find the Iron Age Appelgren had wanted them to but Heikel made an important observation noticing that the oldest finds of the Anan'ino cemetery were related more to the Caucasian than Siberian forms.⁴³ Heikel realized that his find meant the end of Aspelin's Ural-Altai theory, because the connection between Enisej steppes and Volga region could not be maintained any more. Heikel never published his finds though. So it is unclear whether e.g. A. M. Tallgren was aware of them when he started his studies in the east or not. In any case he based his questions originally on the Aspelinian theory.⁴⁴

In the Finnish archaeology of Russia and Siberia the period from the beginning of the 1890s to about 1908 meant dissolution and domination of linguistics. Heikel's trip in 1893 was the last expedition sent from purely archaeological starting-points before Tallgren and it was also the last purely archaeological expedition to be sent on the initiative of a learned society. Fifteen years later the eastern archaeology had become a similar private hobby as it had been in the times of Aspelin in the 1870s.

A. M. TALLGREN

The Finnish archaeological research as organized, institutional activity became extinguished in the

beginning of the 20th century. When also the results of the earlier expeditions remained unpublished, the learned societies were not willing to appeal to the general public in order to get financial support for new ones. At the same time, the domestic archaeology in Finland set the Finno-Ugric questions aside because of both archaeologists' administrative duties and the demands of public education.

Aarne Michaël (Mikko) Tallgren (1885–1945) got his stimulus to study the Russian Bronze Age from J. R. Aspelin around the year 1907. The results concerning the Bronze Age and the problems of Finno-Ugric origin had not been updated since the 1870s, although there was a plenty of new material. In a letter to Aarne Europæus (Äyräpää) Tallgren has indirectly confessed his debt to the romanticism of 1860s, too. In the east he could work more freely than in Finland.⁴⁵

The circumstances of the research had deteriorated since the best years in the 1880s–1890s. The learned societies had become mere supporters instead of initiators, and the research was only one man's private hobby in the same way as it had been in the 1870s. The Finno-Ugric Society had sent the last organized, essentially linguistic expeditions to Mongolia in 1906 and 1909. When also the Aspelinian Ural-Altai theory had begun to falter, Tallgren had to start his work on a entirely new ground. It seems however that he himself did not become conscious of this before in the museums of London and Paris in 1907.

Leaving for Russia in 1908 Tallgren planned to travel to Tobol'sk but at the end he did not have time to continue further than Kazan'. In Kazan' he became familiar with the collection of merchant V. I. Zausajlov, which became later significant both in Tallgren's work and among the Russian archaeological collections purchased to Finland.⁴⁶

What proceeded the trip to Russia was a voyage to western Europe, at least as important as the one made to the east. Especially the observations Tallgren made in the museums and archives of London directed his attention differently than he had originally thought. Caucasia and the Black Sea region did not yet completely set aside the Minusinsk steppes when Tallgren sought for the origins of the Russian

Bronze Age but, importantly enough, he did not believe the Bronze Age cultures to be Finno-Ugric any more. He also assumed that the Ural-Altai Bronze Age should be divided into smaller separate cultures.⁴⁷

The material on which Tallgren based his new interpretations was largely the same that already Aspelin had used in the 1870s, except the Stone Age finds made in the Urals in the 1880s. Because the Castrenian theory did not bind Tallgren's hands, the interpretation was new though. The philologists, in Finland especially E. N. Setälä, tended to seek for the Finnic original home either on the Volga or between the rivers Oka and Kama, which also meant rejection of the Altaic theory. Tallgren was well aware of Setälä's works, though he did not refer to them before the middle of the 1920s.⁴⁸

Tallgren's idea about dividing the Ural-Altai Bronze Age into parts was established during his trip to Russia. He was supported by the British archaeologist Ellis H. Minns who was willing to extend the Scythian culture back to year 700 B.C. and considered Siberia, especially Minusinsk, to be original home of some Bronze Age phenomena. He assumed that there had been two relatively independent cultural areas that had exchanged influences with each other.⁴⁹

In his dissertation in 1911 Tallgren established the new interpretation of the Bronze Ages in Russia. However he was not the first one to propose separate Uralic and Altaic cultures. The Dane Sophus Müller had already in 1882 noted that the Bronze Age remains east of the Volga were more like the European ones than the Siberian ones. They were much older than the Bronze Age along the Enisej, too. A. A. Stuckenberg had published the same idea in Russia stating that the Bronze Age of the European Russia was an independent cultural area compared with both Western Europe and Siberia. What Tallgren did was to prove the hypothesis archaeologically in detail and publish it in a language generally understood in Europe in his German-language dissertation. Müller had written in Danish and Stuckenberg in Russian.⁵⁰

Tallgren's book dealt also in detail with the eastern Bronze Age in Finland, for the first time in the history of archaeology.⁵¹ Recognizing and analysing the eastern Bronze Age of Finland, together with rejection of the Finno-Ugric Ural-

Altaic Bronze Age changed essentially the relationship of the Ural-Altai archaeology and Finland. In Aspelin's works the Ural-Altai cultural area and the eastern Bronze Age had belonged to the past of the Finnish people far away and in distant times. From the studies of Alfred Hackman and A. M. Tallgren on they lost their connection to the Finnish people but because of new Bronze Age finds of eastern character made in Finland they extended geographically to Finland and became part of the prehistory of the land of Finland. Alfred Hackman, Oscar Montelius and A. M. Tallgren were the first ones to recognize and analyse the eastern bronze culture in Finland.⁵²

MANAGING THE FINNISH SCIENTIFIC CONQUESTS

A.M. Tallgren published outlines of future work for the Finnish research in Asia in three articles, in 1916, 1917 and 1919. In the second one he predicted that while Asia will develop into a continent of future in the areas of independent economic and political life, its time as an object of research had already come. The Tallgrenian image of Asian studies proceeded from Castrén through the Enisej expeditions to the studies at the river Orhon. Thanks to the studies of the Finnish Antiquarian Society and Vilhelm Thomsen "huge perspectives [had] opened towards China, Turkestan and Europe". Asian research had got a turkological character. Tallgren asked "whether we Finns could not take part in studying also the Central Asia and possibly in an entirely independent manner". Would Finns have sufficiently resources to extend their interests outside the area from the Baltic Sea to the Enisej, which already belonged to our scientific conquests. In order to get comparative material, it would be necessary to direct one's attention especially to Russian Turkestan and Iran.⁵³

So Tallgren transformed the Castrenian-Aspelinian Ural-Altai questions and made them independent of any special people or tribe. Though the Finno-Ugric Society had taken the research to this direction already in the 1890s Tallgren's plan differed from the earlier ones in being archaeological instead of linguistic. When he also referred to the connections of the Permian region to the Sassanid culture, it is clear how

he strived for making a whole of the Permian-archaeological and Turkological-linguistic cliques of eastern research. The national tasks at the past of the Finnic tribes and the international work in the Asian archaeology should get to cooperate.

More detailed archaeological questions were presented in 1919 in the article *Uraali-altailaisen arkeologian tehtäviä* (Tasks of the Ural-Altai archaeology). The central problems to be studied were according to Tallgren:

The origins of the Fat'janovian Stone Age or whether the culture originated from Central Russia when it would be the source of the European battle-axe cultures, or if it had spread from the west. The roots of this problem were directly in Tallgren's own earlier work and he continued to study it himself together with Aarne Europaeus-Äyräpää. Also Tallgren asked what was the relationship of the Altaic Stone Age to Fat'janovo like. This question remained untouched by the Finnish archaeologists.⁵⁴

Bronze Age studies did not according to Tallgren have any especially urgent tasks but the common source of Uralic and Altaic Bronze Ages should be searched for. It could be found somewhere between China and Hungary, most probably in the steppes of Turkestan and Akmolinsk. The Finns were not able to solve this question either.⁵⁵

Concerning the Iron Ages the most important problems were the trade relationships reflected in the Indian silver bowls found in the Permian region and their iconography and its influences to the Permian style. Also the Altaic influences to the Siberian art and the Scandinavian culture in Russia were so far unstudied. Tallgren himself wrote about the Permian culture and Nils Cleve collected materials of the Scandinavian culture in Russia.⁵⁶

Tallgren emphasized especially the tasks concerning the Permian religion. The archaeological material should be studied with the methods of comparative studies of mythology. Cooperation between history, folklore research, linguistics and archaeology could lead to new important results about prehistory.⁵⁷

For Tallgren it was easier to study the general culture-historical questions of the so-called Finno-Ugric area than it had been to Aspelin, because the basic work had been done and there

were not similar ideological duties either as there had been in the 1870s. The Russian civil war prevented the practical archaeological activity from Finland to the east. This was noted especially by Hjalmar Appelgren-Kivalo in his speech to the annual meeting of the Finnish Antiquarian Society in 1919.⁵⁸

In the 1920s Tallgren outlined how the research duties could be divided between Finns and Estonians. The Estonian side, mainly Estonian National Museum and Tartu University should direct their attention to the Livian and Ingrian regions but also to the more remote areas to the river Oka. Siberia, Central Asia, the southern steppes and Eastern Karelia would belong to the Finns. Two Estonian scholars, Harri Moora and Eerik Laid, started realizing the Tallgrenian plan but the results were few.⁵⁹

Tallgren way of thinking could be seen also in his attempts to found a new publication for eastern archaeology and ethnography, though Tallgren was not the first one to present such a plan in the Finnish Antiquarian Society. A series called *Turania prisca* was even founded already in 1899 but the only number to come out under its name was a publication about Karelian architecture by Yrjö Blomstedt and Victor Sucksdorff. A new publication, *Eurasia Septentrionalis Antiqua*, Finland could establish itself a leading position in the Ural-Altai archaeology, Tallgren thought.⁶⁰

INTERACTION BETWEEN NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL INFLUENCES

The Finnish archaeological research in Russia and Siberia can be divided into four periods and intermediate stages between them, essentially on the basis of the relationship between national and international factors.⁶¹

In the first period the initiatives came from the Russian institutions but the Finnish interests were already playing a part in the whole. The independent Finnish studies in the east and with them the second period of Finnish archaeology of Russia were started by J. R. Aspelin in the 1870s. It was period of national unity when the essential question concerned the origin of the Finnic tribes and their spreading to the west. When archaeology could show that Finns have

had a history and culture it could establish them a position among other nations. The international task was subordinated to the national one. The Finnish archaeological and other scholarly societies and institutions arose, the Finnish Antiquarian Society (1870), the Finno-Ugric Society (1883), the extraordinary chair in archaeology (1878–1885), the Archaeological Commission (1884).

The study objects of the Ural-Altai archaeology were situated in different parts of Russia. The finds were signified according to what they were able to tell about the past of the Finnic tribe. Aspelin with other early archaeologists created the Finnish prehistory in the same way as Elias Lönnrot had created the national epic Kalevala, with the only difference that archaeologists never made up any materials they had not really found. The prehistory of the Finnic tribe was however also a part of the north and east European prehistory in general, not only a Fennoman project, and Finns had lively cooperation with archaeologists from abroad. The archaeology of Russia and Siberia became in the 1880s an integral part of the structures of Finnish archaeological research and knowing the Russian material emerged into an essential part of the archaeological erudition in Finland.

The period of national unity was followed by the third period when the eastern studies were divided into two parts. The national-archaeological and international-linguistic directions were set against each other. The national-archaeological approach had its background in the Fennoman ideology but it had to admit that the great lines strived for during the previous decades possibly could not be discovered. Therefore the Ural-Altai archaeology should set more reduced goals. The internationally oriented research was based on Turkology and used archaeology mainly to illustrate the linguistic studies. The period began from A. O. Heikel's expedition to West Siberia, partly already from the one to the Orhon, and ended, as far as archaeology is concerned, with H. J. Heikel's excavations in Turkestan in 1899. Surveys of antiquities were made also in the later years.

The archaeological basics were revived in 1908 when A. M. Tallgren started his studies in the east. It was typical of Tallgren's work that he

attempted to find a synthesis of national and international approaches in the eastern archaeology. Emphasis was mostly on the international side, because it was already visible that majority of the Finnish archaeologists had concentrated to the prehistory of Finland and there was no such national demand for Finno-Ugric prehistory as there had been 20–30 years earlier. This era of synthesis was the fourth and last period of pre-war Finnish archaeological research in Russia.

The independence of Finland ended the creation process of the Finno-Ugric central museum in Helsinki but it did not prevent Finnish scholars, especially Tallgren, from travelling to Russia and continue their work there. The decisive change in the situation did not come until Iosif Stalin closed the western connections of Soviet Union in the middle of the 1930s.

NOTES

- 1 More detailed see Salminen 2003.
- 2 Pentikäinen 1997:230; Lehtonen 1972:204.
- 3 Белокобыльский 1986:35–37; Окладников 1961; Кононов 1982; Stipa 1990:167–184, 199–200.
- 4 Castrén 1855:10, 76–77; Castrén 1845:184–186. See also Aalto 1971:83.
- 5 Kokkonen 1981:32, 41–42, 54, 62 etc.; Häkkinen 1996:60–75.
- 6 Aspelin 1913–1918:8–13. See also Salminen 1993:11–12.
- 7 Branch 1999:133–136.
- 8 SMY Aspelin Reinhold's and Elina's letters (Hr17): J. R. Aspelin to his mother 6.3.1868, to Rosa or Emmi Aspelin 6.4.1868, to Rosa Aspelin 11.6.1868. Salminen 1996; Salminen in print; Jaanits 1995:9–18.
- 9 Tallgren 1936:208–210; 1920 passim.
- 10 ETA KM F157 M6:2, J. R. Aspelin to Aino Kallas 27.12.1911. Aspelin 1869; Salminen 1996; Stipa 1990:341–343.
- 11 Tallgren 1937:93–97; Salminen 1996:43.
- 12 See e.g. SMY Aspelin personalia (Hr6): sketch for an application to the Senate of Finland for archaeological studies in Ostrobothnia in 1869.
- 13 Tallgren 1936:219–220; 1937; 1944:71–73; Nordman 1968:20–21; Salminen 1992; 1993:14–17.
- 14 Salminen 1993:14–17 with referred literature.
- 15 Aspelin 1872. See also Tallgren 1936:220; Wahle 1950:95.
- 16 Presteståndets protokoll... 1872 I:44–46; Presteståndets protokoll... 1872 III:1571–1573, 1579, 1585, 1588–1590; Protokoll fördt hos Högl. Ridderskapet och Adeln... 1872 II:168–170, 172.
- 17 Aspelin 1875b passim; Worsaae 1872:348–360; Белокобыльский 1986:31–56.
- 18 Aspelin 1877:138–139, 142.
- 19 Aspelin 1874.
- 20 Aspelin 1877–1884:VII–VIII. SMY Jenisei (H1 1): copy of Aspelin's letter to Nikolaj Mart'janov 4.6.1886. Virkkunen 1907.
- 21 See also Smeds 1996:43–44, 152–153, 159.
- 22 Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistyksen pöytäkirjat I:291–292 (9.11.1873).
- 23 KA SSF minutes 17.1.1876. See also Elfving 1938 s. 85.
- 24 Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistyksen pöytäkirjat II:19–21 (9.5.1876). MV/AO Tallgren 24: copy of Aspelin's plan for a Finno-Ugric central museum. Tallgren 1916:273–275; Lehtonen 1972:205; Niiranen 1987:43.
- 25 Aspelin 1875a.
- 26 SMY minutes 7.10.1915, Hjalmar Appelgren-Kivalo's speech in the memory of J. R. Aspelin and Appelgren-Kivalo's speech at the funeral of Aspelin 3.6.1915.
- 27 ETA KM F50 J. Jung: Aspelin to Jung 6.8./25.7.1880, 15.9.1880, 21.12.1880. SMY correspondence 1879–1882:352–355, Jung to Aspelin 16.9.1880. See also SMY correspondence 1884–1885:627–629, Jung to Aspelin 28.6.1884. Salminen 1996:43–44; Löugas 1988:43; Salminen in print. See also Wahle 1950:95–98.
- 28 ÖES catalogues. Wiskowatow 1881; Tartu ülikooli ajalugu II:177; Viiding & Kongo 1993; Jaanits 1993.
- 29 SMY correspondence 1884–1885:872 – 874, Jung to Aspelin 5./17.5.1885. Jung 1883:193, 200; Löugas 1988; Salminen 1996:43–45. Salminen in print.
- 30 Аспелинь 1897; Heikel 1892b:143.
- 31 SMY correspondence 1882–1884:506–508, P. E. Lindholm to Aspelin 25.1.1883. Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistyksen pöytäkirjat II:309–310 (7.12.1882). SMY correspondence 1885–1889:95–98, Johannes Granö to Hjalmar Appelgren 26.2.1886.
- 32 Inscriptions de l'Énissée:3 – 12; Donner 1889.
- 33 Белокобыльский 1986:58–78; Kossack 1995:22–23; Кононов 1982:116–122; Salminen 2003:73, 97–100, 111.
- 34 MTTK minutes 30.12.1886. HYK Lagus: Aspelin to J. J. W. Lagus 13.12.1886, Statsarkeologen No 158. SMY minutes 29.3.1887. SMY correspondence 1885–1889, Johannes Granö to Hjalmar Appelgren, February 1887. SMY Jenisei (H1 1):67 – 70, Granö to Aspelin 17.6.1887 (v.l.). Tallgren 1942:190–191.
- 35 KA STOAD 769/4 1887, resolution of the Economic Department of the Senate 26.5.1887, minutes 26.5.1887. Aspelin 1887. SMY minutes 29.3.1887, 7.5.1887.
- 36 SMY correspondence 1885–1889:565–567: Finnish Antiquarian Society to private supporters 3.4.1887.
- 37 SMY Inskrifter från Sibirien (H1 2): Aspelin to Heikel 12.9.1889.
- 38 SUS minutes 15.3.1890. MV/KTKKA Heikelica correspondence 2: Donner to Heikel 12.9.1890, N. Jadrincev to Heikel s.d. 1890/91, 10.12.1890, Grigorij Potanin to Heikel 1.3.1891.
- 39 KA Donner: Heikel to Otto Donner 11.7.1891. Кононов 1982:117–118, 309–315. MV/KTKKA Heikelica correspondence 1: Donner to Heikel 1.8.1892. Радлов 1892.
- 40 Donner 1889, 1892, Inscriptions de l'Énissée, Radloff 1892; Heikel 1892a; Niiranen 1987:183–185. SUS correspondence: Vilhelm Thomsen to Finno-

- Ugric Society 26.11.1893. MV/KTKKA Heikelica 4: Thomsen to Heikel 22.6.1894. Annual report of the Finno-Ugric Society 1893 (JSFO 1894):5–6. Thomsen 1894; 1896.
- 41 MV/KTKKA Heikelica correspondence 2: Donner to Heikel 4.3.1891; KA Donner: Heikel to Donner 27.3.1891. SMY correspondence 1892–1893:523a–523c, Hjalmar Appelgren to J. W. Juvelius, January 1892
- 42 SUS minutes 22.4.1893, SUS annual report 1893 (JSFO 1894):5.
- 43 SMY correspondence 1893–1894:165–172, A. O. Heikel to H. J. Heikel 29.7.1893.
- 44 More detailed Salminen 2003:105, 117–119.
- 45 Kivikoski 1960:24. MV/AO Äyräpää/Tallgreniana: Tallgren to Aarne Europaeus 13.8.1907.
- 46 MV/AO Äyräpää/Tallgreniana: Tallgren to Europaeus 29.7.1907, 22.2.1908. ÅSA Tallgren to Europaeus 5.8.1907.
- 47 SMY Aspelin correspondence (Hr19): Tallgren to Aspelin 3.3.1908. HYK Tallgren: Tallgren to Europaeus and K. V. Kaukovalta 27.3.1908. MV/AO Äyräpää/Tallgreniana: Tallgren to Europaeus s.d., postmark 25.4.1908. Tallgren 1908:148–159.
- 48 Häkkinen 1996:67–69; Kivikoski 1960:20; Tallgren 1921:65; Salminen 2001:appendix 4.
- 49 HYK Tallgren: Ellis H. Minns to Tallgren 18.10.1908.
- 50 Müller 1882 s. 348–356; Штукенбергъ 1901 s. 167 – 168. See also Tallgren 1919a s. 124–125.
- 51 Tallgren 1911 s. 144–150, 153–186, 198.
- 52 Salminen 2003:126–127.
- 53 Tallgren 1916; 1917b; Tallgren 1917a:492.
- 54 Tallgren 1919b:3–7; Äyräpää 1933:16–23, 49–53, 88–89, 96–109, 149–154.
Aarne Europaeus (1887–1971) adopted a Finnish family name according to the Karelian home parish of his family in 1930.
- 55 Tallgren 1919b:7–8.
- 56 Tallgren 1919b:9–10, 13–16; Kivikoski 1954:131–140.
- 57 Tallgren 1919b:10–12, 17.
- 58 SMY minutes of the annual meeting 7.5.1919.
- 59 Linnus 1995a:39; 1995b:93–94; 1995c; Jaanits 1995:14; Tallgren 1924:24; Moora 1932:29; Salminen in print.
- 60 SMY minutes of the direction 7.2.1924, 22.2.1924, 6.3.1924, 7.10.1926, 13.10.1926.
- 61 More detailed see Salminen 2003:169–175, 201–205.

REFERENCES

Archival sources

The Finnish National Archives (Kansallisarkisto, KA), Helsinki

Archives of Kai Donner.

Archives of the Economic Department, the Imperial Senate of Finland (STO).

Archives of Societas Scientiarum Fennica (SSF).

Archives of the Archaeological Commission (Muinaistieteellinen toimikunta, MTTK), at the hallinto-osasto, National Board of Antiquities Helsinki

Minutes.

Archives of the Finnish Antiquarian Society (Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistys, SMY), in the library of National Board of Antiquities, Helsinki

Collection of J. R. Aspelin (SMY Aspelin).

Materials of the Enisej expeditions (SMY Jenisei).

Inscriptions from Siberia and Mongolia (SMY Inskrifter från Sibirien).

Correspondence.

Minutes.

Archives of the Department of Archaeology, National Board of Antiquities (Museoviraston arkeologian osasto, MV/AO), Helsinki

Collection of A. M. Tallgren.

Collection of Aarne Äyräpää.

Äyräpää family archives (Äyräpään suvun arkisto, ÅSA, Helsinki)

Correspondence of Aarne Äyräpää.

Helsinki University Library (Helsingin yliopiston kirjasto, HYK)

Collection of J. J. W. Lagus (Coll. 113).

Collection of A. M. Tallgren (Coll. 230).

National Board of Antiquities, Ethnological manuscript archives (Museovirasto, kansatieteen käsikirjoitusarkisto, MV/KTKKA), Helsinki

Collection of A. O. Heikel (Heikelica).

Archives of the Société Finno-Ougrienne (Suomalais-ugrilainen Seura, SUS), Helsinki

Minutes.

Estonian Academy of Sciences, Literature Museum (Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia, kirjandusmuuseum, ETA KM), Tartu

F50 collection of Jaan Jung.

F157 Small collections.

Collections of Litterarum Societas Esthonica (Õpetatud Eesti Selts, ÕES), Cabinet of Archaeology, University of Tartu

Catalogues and finds.

Published sources and literature

- Aalto, Pentti 1971. *Oriental Studies in Finland 1828–1918*. The History of Learning and Science in Finland 1828–1918, 10b. Helsinki.
- Annual reports of Société Finno-Ougrienne, passim. *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne*.
- Aspelin, J. R. 1869. Jubelfesten i Dorpat. *Helsingfors Dagblad* 157/1869 (12.7.), 158/1869 (13.7.).
- Aspelin, J. R. 1872. Bref till en vän i Finland. *Morgonbladet* 287/1872 (9.12.1872), 288/1872 (10.12.1872).
- Aspelin, J. R. 1874. Études archéologiques sur le Nord Finno-Ougrien. *Congrès international d'anthropologie et d'archéologie préhistorique à Stockholm*.
- Aspelin, J. R. 1875a. I frågan om en "Sibirisk expedition". *Morgonbladet* 291/1875 (15.12.1875).
- Aspelin, J. R. 1875b. *Suomalais-ugrilaisen muinaistutkinnon alkeita*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia 51.
- Aspelin, J. R. 1877. Vertailevasta muinaistutkinnosta. *Suomen Muinaismuisto-Yhtiön Aikakauskirja* I.
- Aspelin, J. R. 1877–1884. *Muinaisjännöksiä Suomen suvun asumus-aloilta – Antiquités du nord Finno-ougrien* I–V. Helsinki.
- Aspelin, J. R. 1887. Suomen suvun vanhin kirjakieli. *Uusi Suometar* 75/1887.
- Aspelin, J. R. 1913–1918. M. A. Castrénin Muinaistieteellinen Perintö. *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* XXX.2.
- Äyräpää, Aarne 1933. Über die Streitaxtkulturen in Russland. Studien über die Verbreitung neolithischer Elemente aus Mitteleuropa nach Osten. *Eurasia Septentrionalis Antiqua* VIII.
- Branch, Michael 1999. The Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg as a centre for the study of nationalities in the North-East Baltic. *National History and Identity*. Studia Fennica/Ethnologica 6.
- Castrén, M. A. 1845. Anteckningar om Samojediskans förvandtskap med de Finska språken. *Suomi* 5.
- Castrén, M. A. 1855. M. A. Castréns reseberättelser och bref åren 1845–1849. *M. A. Castréns nordiska resor och forskningar* II.
- Donner, Otto 1889. Orientalistikongressista Tukholmassa. *Valvoja*.
- Donner, Otto 1892. Wörterverzeichnis zu den Inscriptions de l'Énisséi. *Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* IV.
- Elfving, Fredrik 1938. *Societas Scientiarum Fennica 1838–1938*. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum. Tomus X. Helsingforsiae.
- Heikel, A. O. 1892a. *Inscriptions de l'Orkhon recueillies par l'expédition finnoise 1890 et publiées par la Société Finno-Ougrienne*. Helsinki.
- Heikel, A. O. 1892b. Kahdeksas arkeologinen kongressi Moskovassa 1890. *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* X.
- Häkkinen, Kaisa 1996. *Suomalaisten esihistoria kielitieteen valossa*. Tietolipas 147. Helsinki.
- Inscriptions de l'Énisséi. Recueillies et publiées par la Société Finlandaise d'Archéologie. Helsingfors 1889.
- Jaaniits, Lembit 1993. C. Grewingki tegevusest arheoloogias. *Teaduse ajaloo lehekülgi Eestist* IX. *Geoloogia rajajooni Eestis*. Tallinn.
- Jaaniits, Lembit 1995. Muinasteadus Tartu ülikoolis 1920–1940. *Muinasaja teadus* 3.
- Jung, Jaan 1883. Liivin- ja Vironmaan muinaishaudoista ja kivilasteista. *Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistyksen Aikakauskirja* VI.
- Kivikoski, Ella 1954. A. M. Tallgren 1885–1945. *Eurasia Septentrionalis Antiqua*, Supplementary Volume.
- Kivikoski, Ella 1960. *Tehty työ elää*. A. M. Tallgren 1885–1945. Helsinki.
- Kokkonen, Jyri 1981. *Suomalaisten alkuperää koskeva tutkimus vuoteen 1905*. Unpublished paper, Finnish and Scandinavian history, University of Helsinki.
- Kossack, Georg 1995. Geschichte und Aufgaben der archäologischen Erforschung Mittelasiens an der Schwelle zur frühen Eisenzeit. *Eurasia Antiqua* 1.
- Lehtonen, J. U. E. 1972. *U. T. Sirelius ja kansatiede*. Kansatieteellinen arkisto 23. Helsinki.
- Linnus, Jüri 1995a. Arheoloogiaprofessor A. M. Tallgren ja Eesti Rahva Muuseum. *Kleio. Ajaloo ajakiri* 11 (1/1995).
- Linnus, Jüri 1995b. Ilmari Manninen ja Eesti etnograafia. *Annales Litterarum Societatis Esthonicae* 1988–1993. Tartu.
- Linnus, Jüri 1995c. Õpetatud Eesti Seltsi tegevus etnograafia valdkonnas. *Annales Litterarum Societatis Esthonicae* 1988–1993. Tartu.
- Lõugas, Vello 1988. Kodu-uurijad ja Eesti arheoloogia kujunemine. Jaan Jung 150. *Kodu-uurimise teateid* 13.
- Moora, Harri 1932. Meie teadusliku töö ülesandeist ja võimalusist väljaspool kodumaad rahvusvahelises ulatuses. *Kultuuri ja teaduse teilt*. Tartu.
- Müller, Sophus 1882. Den europeiske Bronzealders Oprindelse og første Udvikling, oplyst ved de ældste Bronzefund i det sydøstlige Europa. *Aarbøger for Nordisk Oldkyndighed og Historie*.
- Niiranen, Timo 1987. *Axel Olai Heikel. Suomalais-ugrilaisen kansatieteen ja arkeologian tutkija*. Snellman-instituutin julkaisuja 4. Kuopio.
- Nordman, C. A. 1968. *Archaeology in Finland before 1920*. The History of Learning and Science in Finland 1828–1918, 14a. Helsinki.
- Pentikäinen, Juha 1997. Castrénilainen 'pohjoisen etnografian' paradigma. *Kaukaa haettua. Kirjoituksia antropologisesta kenttätutkimuksesta*. Juhlakirja prof. Matti Sarmelalle 6.4.1997. Vammala.
- Preteständens protokoll vid Landtdagen i Helsingfors år 1872*. Helsingfors 1896.
- Protokoll förtdt hos Högl. Ridderskapet och Adeln å Landtdagen i Helsingfors år 1872. *Helsingfors 1872*.
- Radloff, Wilhelm 1892. Vorläufiger Bericht über die Resultate der Expedition zur archäologischen Erforschung des Orkhon-Beckens. *Bulletin de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St. Petersburg* X.
- Salminen, Timo 1992. Mitä arkeologialle on tapahtunut? Suomalaisen arkeologian perustaja J. R. Aspelin on ehkä syytä kaivaa historian koipussista 150-vuotisjuhlavuonnaan. *Helsingin Sanomat* 1.8.1992.
- Salminen, Timo 1993. *Suomalaisuuden asialla. Muinaistieteen yliopisto-opetuksen syntyvaiheet n. 1877–1923*. Helsinki Papers in Archaeology 6.
- Salminen, Timo 1996. Soome arheoloogide Eesti-suhted Aspelinist Tallgrenini – teadusloolisi uurimistulemusi

- ja probleeme. *Stilus. Eesti Arheoloogiaseltsi teated* 1996 (1).
- Salminen, Timo 2001. *Kansallinen ja kansainvälinen Suomen suku. Venäjä ja Siperia Suomen arkeologiassa kansallismuseon esinekokoelmien valossa*. Unpublished licentiate thesis. University of Helsinki, Institution of Cultural Research/archaeology.
- Salminen, Timo 2003. *Suomen tieteelliset voittomaat. Venäjä ja Siperia suomalaisessa arkeologiassa 1870–1935*. Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistyksen Aikakauskirja 110. Helsinki.
- Salminen, Timo in print. J. R. Aspelin ja A. M. Tallgren Soome, Eesti ja Venemaa arheoloogilises kolmnurgas. *Eesti Arheoloogia Ajakiri – Journal of Estonian Archaeology*.
- Smeds, Kerstin 1996. *Helsingfors – Paris. Finlands utveckling till nation på världsutställningarna 1851–1900*. Skrifter utg. av Svenska Litteratursällskapet i Finland 598. Vammala.
- Stipa, Günter Johannes 1990. *Finnisch-ugrische Sprachforschung von der Renaissance bis zum Neupositivismus*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 206.
- Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistyksen pöytäkirjat*. I. 1870–1875. Helsinki 1909.
- Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistyksen pöytäkirjat*. II. 1876–1885. Helsinki 1915.
- Tallgren, A. M. 1908. Uralilais-altailaisesta pronssikaudesta. *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*.
- Tallgren, A. M. 1911. *Die Kupfer- und Bronzezeit in Nord- und Ostrussland. I. Die Kupfer- und Bronzezeit in Nordwestrussland. Die ältere Metallzeit in Ostrussland*. Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistyksen Aikakauskirja XXV:1.
- Tallgren, A. M. 1916. Suomen suvun asuma-alueen muinaisuudesta. Muinaistieteellisiä tehtäviä ja tuloksia. *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*.
- Tallgren, A. M. 1917a. Museon ja muinaistieteemme tehtäviä. *Valvoja*.
- Tallgren, A. M. 1917b. Suomen osuus Aasian muinaisuuden tutkimiseen. *Valvoja*.
- Tallgren, A. M. 1919a. *L'époque dite d'Ananino dans la Russie orientale. Die Kupfer- und Bronzezeit in Nord- und Ostrussland II*. Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistyksen Aikakauskirja XXXI.
- Tallgren, A. M. 1919b. Uraali-altailaisen arkeologian tehtäviä. *Suomen Museo* XXVI.
- Tallgren, A. M. 1920. Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistyksen 50-vuotiskertomus. *Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistyksen Aikakauskirja* XXX:3.
- Tallgren, A. M. 1921. Suomen suvun alkukodista ja esihistoriallisista vaiheista. *Valvoja*.
- Tallgren, A. M. 1924. *Museomiehen työpöydältä. Kirjoitelmia muinaistieteellisten ja antikvaaristen harrastusten historiasta Suomessa*. Helsinki.
- Tallgren, A. M. 1936. Geschichte der antiquarischen Forschung in Finnland. *Eurasia Septentrionalis Antiqua* X.
- Tallgren, A. M. 1937. J. R. Aspelinin uran alkutaipaleelta. *Kalevalaseuran vuosikirja* 17.
- Tallgren, A. M. 1942. Suomalaisia muinaistutkimuksen harrastelijoita Venäjällä. *Terra* 54:1–2. Helsinki.
- Tallgren, A. M. 1944. J. R. Aspelin. Hans livsgärning och svenska förbindelser. *Formvännan* 39.
- Tartu Ülikooli ajalugu II. 1798–1918*. Koostanud Karl Siilivask. Tallinn. 1982
- Thomsen, Vilhelm 1894. Déchiffrement des inscriptions de l'Orkhon et de l'Iénisséi. Notice préliminaire. *Bulletin de l'Académie Royale des Sciences et des Lettres de Danemark* 1893. Copenhagen.
- Thomsen, Vilhelm 1896. Inscriptions de l'Orkhon déchiffrées par Vilhelm Thomsen. *Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* V, 1894–1896.
- Viiding, Herman & Kongo, Linda 1993. Caspar Andreas Constantin Grewing ja ta tähendus Eesti geoloogiale. *Teaduse ajaloo lehekülgi Eestist IX. Geoloogia rajajooni Eestis*. Tallinn.
- Virkkunen, Artturi H. 1907. *Itämeren suomalaiset saksalaisen valloituksen aikana (1159–1227)*. Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistyksen Aikakauskirja XIX.
- Wahle, Ernst 1950. *Studien zur Geschichte der prähistorischen Forschung*. Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philologisch-historische Klasse. Jahrgang 1950, 1. Abhandlung. Heidelberg.
- Wiskowatow, P. von 1881. Auf dem Wege zum archäologischen Congress in Tiflis. *Neue Dörptsche Zeitung* 219/1881.
- Worsaae, J. J. A. 1872. Ruslands og det Skandinaviske Nordens Bebyggelse og ældste Kulturforhold. Bidrag til sammenlignende forhistorisk Archæologie. *Aarbøger for nordisk Oldkyndighed og Historie*.
- Аспелинь, И. Р. 1897. Следы влияния Готёвъ въ северной полосе Россіи. Труды VIII-го археологического съезда въ Москве 1890, Том III.
- Белокобыльский, Ю. Г. 1986. Бронзовый и ранний железный век южной Сибири. История идей и исследований XVIII-первая треть XX в. Новосибирск.
- Кононов, А. Н. 1982. История изучения тюркских языков в России. Дооктябрьский период. Ленинград.
- Окладиков, А. П. 1961. 300 лет сибирской археологии и его сегодняшний день. Вопросы истории Сибири и Дальнего Востока. Труды конференции по истории Сибири и Дальнего Востока. Материалы пленарного заседания и секции истории досоветского периода, археологии и этнографии. Март 1960. Новосибирск.
- Радловъ, В. В. 1892. Труды Орхонской экспедиции. Атласъ древностей Монголіи. С.-Петербургъ.
- Штукенбергъ, А. А. 1901. Матеріалы для изученія меднаго (бронзоваго) века восточной полосы европейской Россіи. Известія Общества археологіи, исторіи и этнографіи при Императорскомъ Казанскомъ университетѣ. Том. XVII. Казань.