

History of Research on the Ancient Latgallians

ANTONIJA VILCĀNE

The Latgallians were a Baltic people, which can be traced with certainty to the area of eastern Latvia from the sixth - seventh centuries by their distinctive mortuary practices and grave goods.

In written sources the Latgallians are first mentioned in the early twelfth century in a list of inhabitants of the ancient Baltic, alongside the Old Prussians, Lithuanians, Semigallians, Couronians and the Livs in the ancient Russian *Povest' vremennykh let* ("Tale of bygone years"), compiled on the basis of earlier eleventh century ancient Russian chronicles (Mugurēvičs 1995: 7), and it is mentioned that they speak a separate language. The Latgallians (Letti, Letthigalli) are mentioned in the early thirteenth century in the Livonian Chronicle of Henry, where they are shown to have inhabited the areas of present-day eastern Vidzeme and Latgale (Indriķa hronika: 438).

Since written sources on the Latgallians are exceedingly sparse and the authenticity of some has even been questioned (Mugurēvičs 1995: 7), the main source for research on the earliest history of the Latgallians remains archaeological material, which began to accumulate in the middle and second half of the nineteenth century. The earliest research on the ethnic history of the Latgallians can be found at this time.

The first Latgallian burials were discovered 1837 at the Liv and Latgallian cemetery at Aizkraukle. This material was interpreted by Prof. F. Kruse of Dorpat (Tartu) University, who considered the finds to be Norman-Varangian artefacts (Kruse 1842). This view was refuted in 1850 by J. Bähr (Bähr 1850: 1-20). Later research by A. Bielenstein also showed that this assertion was unfounded, while R. Hausmann showed on the basis of archaeological material that Livs and Latgallians had lived together at Aizkraukle (Bielenstein 1892; Hausmann 1896, IX-LXXXV).

The establishment of the Statistical Commission of the Vitebsk Gubernia in 1853 was also of some significance for research on archaeological monuments, since archaeological monuments were reviewed in its annual reports by A. Sementovsky and A. Sapunov (Latvijas PSR arheoloģija 1974: 10)

The first scientific research in the Latgallian area is represented by the large-scale excavations at Odukalns in Ludza District in 1891-1892 in the period leading up to the Tenth All-Russian Congress of Archaeologists. 338 burials were investigated under the direction of the Russian researchers J. Romanov and

V. Sizov. This research provided an insight into and rich archaeological data on the material culture and mortuary practices of the inhabitants of eastern Latvia between the seventh and twelfth centuries, although A. Spitsin, who brought together the excavated material considered the cemetery to be a Liv monument (Спицын 1883).

The first serious discussions of the origin of the Baltic peoples appeared in the second half of the nineteenth century, when the geologist K. Grevingk put forward the hypothesis that Lithuanian-Latvian tribes arrived in the East Baltic in the fifth and sixth century AD from the east, as a result of pressure from the Slavs (Mugurēvičs, Tautavičs 1978: 112). The German linguist and archaeologist A. Bezzenberger suggested the idea that the Baltic tribes had inhabited the eastern shore of the Baltic Sea from the Neolithic period (Mugurēvičs, Tautavičs 1978: 112).

In connection with the preparations for the Tenth All-Russian Congress of Archaeologists, a review of archaeology in the Baltic was compiled by N. Haruzin (Latvijas PSR arheoloģija 1974: 11). A. Bielenstein systematised the study of hillforts in Latvia and on the basis of written sources and linguistics established the extent of the areas inhabited by the Baltic peoples in the thirteenth century (Bielenstein 1899: 20-34; Bielenstein 1892: 74-101). R. Hausmann compiled a catalogue of artefacts and divided the monuments into two groups. He separated the Latvians from the Livs over the period from the eighth to the thirteenth century. In general the Latgallian material was not distinguished from material of the rest of the Baltic region and no specific features of Latgallian culture were identified (Hausmann 1896: IX-LX).

At the beginning of the twentieth century, in spite of new, successful excavations and additions to archaeological material, reviews of Baltic archaeological material divide the East Baltic into only two cultural regions, associating the northern part with the Finns and the southern part with the Lithuanian-Latvian tribes (Hausmann 1908: 42-50; Ebert 1913: 528-559).

At this time F. Balodis began to study individual Baltic tribes (Баллод 1910: 12-36, 57-115). In a thesis defended at the Moscow Institute of Archaeology, Balodis distinguished two Latvian tribal regions - an eastern region (central Vidzeme, Latgale and eastern Kurzeme) and a western region (the western part of Kurzeme) - on the basis of the earlier research by A. Bielenstein. The first region he associated with the Latgallians and Selonians, while the second he linked to the Semigallians. In a map compiled by Balodis, in the ninth-thirteenth century the Latgallian area covered the lands on the right bank of the River Daugava (Dūna, Dvīna): Latgale, central Vidzeme and part of northern Vidzeme, while the Selonian area was located on the left bank of the Daugava. This thesis also deals with the physical types represented by the Baltic tribes, mentioning the variety of opinions among researchers of the time. Turning to the description of Latgallian dress and ornaments, Balodis reflected the features that characterised Latgallian material culture in the ninth-thirteenth centuries. The limited amount of archaeological material, the lack of excavation technique and inaccurate recording were the reasons for the unfounded and erroneous interpretations of the material occasionally found in the study by Balodis.

In the nineteenth century and the first two decades of the twentieth, which is considered the Baltic German period in the history of archaeological research in Latvia, generally little attention was paid to the history of particular Baltic tribes.

This was a consequence not only of the tendentious approach of some scholars towards Latvian prehistory, but also of the small scale of excavation.

A more complete picture of the local features of archaeological monuments in Latvia, the differences in mortuary traditions and grave goods appeared in the 1920s and 1930s, when Latvian archaeologists assumed the leading role in research work and when the scale of archaeological excavation at monuments of various periods increased significantly (Šnore 1938: 39-72; Latvijas PSR arheoloģija 1974: 11-12).

The discovery in Vidzeme and Latgale of Finnish cemeteries with stone settings was very important. These had been known in northern Vidzeme from the second half of the nineteenth century. The discovery of new cemeteries and excavations at such sites were important for establishing the ethnic boundaries of the Baltic and Finnish tribes and for the study of the mutual interaction of the two cultures.

Multiple-burial barrows from the Early and Middle Iron Age had also been insufficiently surveyed and studied in all areas of Latvia. Excavations at Gailīši (Īle District) and Rūsiši (Ruba District) in Zemgale, at Slates sils, Razbuki (Sauka District), Melderišķi (Rite District), Lejasoķēni (Krape District), Ūsiņi (Ķeipene District), Midzenīcas (Laudona District) and elsewhere in Augszeme and Vidzeme showed that there were no identifiable differences between the construction of barrow cemeteries in Augszeme and Vidzeme and provided a firm foundation for associating the central and eastern Latvian group of barrow cemeteries with the Selonians and Latgallians, and the western group with the Semigallians.

Excavations at Middle Iron Age sites made it possible to establish the time when barrows with multiple burials ceased to be used. In certain cases these were transformed into flat cemeteries. Also, the northerly migration of Latgallian tribes was identified. Important excavations were conducted at the flat cemeteries of Vidzeme and Latgale relating to the Middle and Late Iron Age: Ainava (Kārlī District), Kampas (Priekuļi District), Kristapēni (Kapiņi District), Maskava (Višķi District), Dzērves (Mērdzene District), Jersika cemetery etc., as well as at barrow cemeteries that characterised the eastern part of the Latgallian area in the Late Iron Age: Ķesteri (Liepkalne District), Rikopole etc. More substantial excavations were also carried out at a few hillforts: Taniskalns, Dignaja and Jersika.

In the 1920s and '30s the view first expressed in the second half of the nineteenth century, that the ancient Balts inhabited the East Baltic from the Stone Age (Šturms 1926: 25; Balodis 1938: 45), came to be widely held. Thus, archaeologists based their work on the view that there was an uninterrupted development of Baltic culture from the end of the Neolithic onwards. H. Moora considered that the Balts as an ethnic unit became divided into separate tribes or tribal confederations during the first centuries AD (Moora 1938: 599-637, 656-682). This view was accepted by Balodis, who described changes in the area inhabited by the Balts during this time (Balodis 1938: 79-110). Ideas relating to the local characteristics of Early Iron Age sites, differences in mortuary traditions and grave goods, also took shape at this time. As a result, the view that there were two groups of Baltic cemeteries, a western and an eastern group, came to be generally accepted (Riekstiņš 1935: 5-19; Šnore 1936: 9-15, map 1). More complicated was the question of the ethnic affiliation of the collective barrows of the eastern group and their relationship with the flat cemeteries of the Middle Iron Age.

In her discussion of the excavation material from the barrow cemetery at Slatē sils, E. Šnore noted the differences between the barrow cemeteries of the eastern and western groups and established that the cemetery was in use from the third to the eighth century AD, thus providing a foundation for the view that there was continuity between Early and Middle Iron Age material (Šnore 1933: 22-26)

A hypothesis expressed by the Lithuanian linguist K. Būga gained acceptance in the late 1920s: this stated that the ancestors of the Baltic peoples had once lived in the Upper Dnieper Basin north of the Pripyet and had arrived in the East Baltic only in the middle of the first millennium AD. Under the influence of this view, F. Jākobsons considered that the Latgallians appeared in eastern Latvia in the sixth-seventh centuries. Jākobsons's view was based on the appearance of new forms of artefacts in Latgallian flat cemeteries, which could not have derived from the artefacts uncovered at barrow cemeteries and on the superficial nature of the similarity of certain forms of artefacts, because there is no gradual transition showing the development of these forms. Jākobsons also noted that there was a certain time-gap between the two cultures, because the flat cemeteries can only be dated from the seventh century, while the use of barrow cemeteries had ceased earlier (Jākobsons 1929: 2-10). In the late 1930s E. Šturms also adopted this view. He justified his opinion on the basis that it was only in the sixth-seventh centuries that a form of cemetery and forms of grave goods appeared which are found throughout later Latgallian lands. Šturms also considered that the association of the Latgallians with the Barrow Grave Culture of the Early Iron Age is unfounded, since these barrows are almost unknown in Latgale. Linguistic research that showed the continuation of Selonian dialects into the area of the right bank of the Daugava in the River Aiviekste Basin supported this idea. Šturms concluded that the distribution of these dialects coincides with the area of distribution of the Early Iron Age barrows. Thus, the eastern group within the Barrow Grave Culture of the Early Iron Age was linked to the Selonians (Šturms 1936: 38062-38065).

R. Šnore considered that there was a continuity of Latgallian culture and stated that its course of development could be traced almost from the time of Christ, and that no definite links with earlier periods were visible due to the lack of archaeological material. She associated the eastern group of Early Iron Age barrows with the Latgallians, remarking that the ethnic characteristics are best seen in the regions of Jēkabpils and Madona (Šnore 1933-1934: 20270-20294). Moora also described the eastern group of the Barrow Grave Culture as one entity, without distinguishing Latgallian and Selonian sites, and he admitted that there was a certain similarity between Early and Middle Iron Age forms of artefact (Moora 1938: 599-637, 656, 682).

In the late 1930's Balodis's hypothesis, which differed from his initial views, prevailed. The Early Iron Age barrow cemeteries on both the right and left banks of the Daugava were associated with the Latgallians. The appearance of flat cemeteries in the sixth-seventh centuries was linked to the degeneration of the barrow cemeteries. The Selonians as an ethnic group no longer exist in maps compiled by Balodis (Balodis 1938: 81, 87). This view was reflected in an exhibition at the State History Museum of Latvia in 1937 (Latviešu kultūra senatnē, VII-XIII).

The accumulation of archaeological material in the 1920s and '30s paved the way for important typological studies (Karnups 1928: 16-140; Šnore 1930), which provided a good chronological basis and laid a sound foundation for

research on ethnic questions. The variety of different views on Latgallian ethnic history made clear the complexity of the problem and indicated the directions for future research.

After the Second World War, archaeologists paid much attention to excavations at Latgallian sites. Already in 1947-1948 under the direction of E. Šnore and J. Graudonis complete excavation took place of the cemetery in the village of Nukšas, Ludza District (218 burials). The material found during these excavations concerning mortuary practices, specific grave goods and the social and property relations in society are discussed in a monograph (Шнопе 1957) At the same time E. Šnore began excavations at another cemetery in eastern Latvia, Kivti, which was completely excavated in the late 1950s, uncovering a total of 175 burials. The burial traditions and the development of the forms of grave goods could be traced over five centuries, from the seventh to the twelfth century. It is interesting that this cemetery was established on the former settlement site of a Finnish community, and this provided new information on ethnic processes in eastern Latvia during the second half of the Middle Iron Age. The material excavated at Kivti is also the subject of a monograph, which gives a detailed analysis of grave goods, the original forms, development and distribution of certain ornaments. The material from Kivti cemetery reflects ethnic processes in the transitional period from the Middle to Late Iron Age and shows the stability of mortuary practices over a long period (Šnore 1987a). In 1960 and 1961 excavations took place at Lejasdopeles cemetery. Ten barrows, with 42 burials were excavated under the Šnore's direction. These excavations provided the first detailed picture of the differences between material culture and mortuary traditions between the Selonians and Latgallians in the eleventh to thirteenth centuries (Latvijas PSR arheoloģija 1974: 226). In the early 1960's large-scale excavations were directed by V. Urtans at Lejasbiteni cemetery, where a total of 451 burials were uncovered. At this site it was possible to trace the development of flat cemeteries from the collective barrows with stone circles of the Early Iron Age. A similar picture emerged from the excavations by L. Vankina in 1961 at Boķi cemetery (Ābeļi District), where a seventh-eighth century flat cemetery adjoins the barrows on the outside of the stone circle (Latvijas PSR arheoloģija 1974: 149). In the 1970's and 80's large-scale excavations were also conducted by J. Apals at Liepini cemetery (158 burials) (Apals, Apala 1974: 5-6), by J. Graudonis at Jaunākēni in Ērgļi District (89 burials) (Graudonis 1973: 34-39) and by Z. Apala at Guģeri cemetery (160 burials) (Apala 1992: 8-15). In Latgale I. Kuniga carried out excavations at Kristapini cemetery, uncovering 258 burials (Kuniga 1988: 82). Excavations were conducted at Koknese cemetery in the boundary zone between the Latgallian, Selonian and Liv areas (162 burials) (Žeiere 1980: 191). Excavations at cemeteries in various parts of Vidzeme and Latgale opened up considerable possibilities for comparing the material from cemeteries and to trace local characteristics of mortuary practices and grave goods in the Late Iron Age. It should be mentioned that most of the material recovered from cemeteries has only been discussed in articles on particular themes. Apart from the above-mentioned Nukšas and Kivti cemeteries and some cemeteries excavated on a smaller scale (Daugava Oglenieki, Kalnieši and Radzes in Pļaviņas District and Beteli) (Шнопе 1961: 49-54; Urtāns 1962: 37-57; Mugurēvičs 1977: 105-118; Šnore 1987b: 68-81) the rest of the excavation material still awaits evaluation.

The post-war years saw the successful continuation of pre-war research on Early Iron Age collective barrows with stone circles. Šnore excavated a whole series of these barrows both in Augszeme (Ratulāni in Sauka District, Zvanītāji in Jēkabpils District and Kunci in Sēlpils District) and in Vidzeme (Kalnabrici in Vecpiebalga District, Lejnietki in Mārciena District etc.). The material from the Early Iron Age barrows excavated by Šnore was brought together in a monograph which provides a detailed analysis of the ethnic processes in eastern Latvia in the Early and Middle Iron Age (Šnore 1993)

Also important for research on ethnic history were the excavations at Late Iron Age cemeteries in the eastern part of the area inhabited by the Latgallians (Danilovka, Cibla, Jaunpiebalga, Kucini, Cakuli etc.) (Latvijas PSR arheoloģija 1974: 224). The only differences between the flat and barrow cemeteries are in the mound heaped over the deceased individual, and so there is no generally accepted interpretation of these monuments.

The study of settlement sites has also been important for distinguishing ethnic characteristics. Excavations at hillforts, proto-urban sites and open settlements have made it possible to establish the forms and plans of dwelling and defensive structures, the economic activities and change over time. Of the more extensively excavated hillforts, mention should be made of Asote, Oliņkalns, Lokstene and Koknese (Шнопе 1961; Mugurēvičs 1977; Stubavs 1967: 35-38). Since 1990 excavations have been taking place at Jersika hillfort (Vilcāne 1996: 120-123). Some of the excavated hillforts had an important role in the economic and political life of the regions inhabited by the Latgallians, they were important administrative centres (Jersika, Koknese). Systematic treatment of the material obtained in hillfort excavations made it possible to refute Balodis's view that the external form of a hillfort serves to distinguish the ethnic affiliation of the inhabitants (Balodis; Teikmanis; Kundziņš, Kundziņš 1928: 10-11). Since the above-mentioned hillforts are concentrated along the River Daugava, particular attention should be paid to the excavations by A. Vasks at the Brikuli fortified settlement, since this is the only completely excavated Latgallian settlement in the north-eastern part of eastern Latvia (Vasks 1994). Lengthy excavations were conducted by J. Apals at Araisi lake fortress, a special form of Latgallian settlement, where the remains of ninth - tenth century wooden structures were found (Latvijas PSR arheoloģija 1974: 14).

Archaeological excavations have led to the accumulation of an enormous amount of material relating to Latgallian material culture, mortuary practices, contacts with neighbouring peoples and social and ethnic processes in the area inhabited by the Latgallians. As mentioned above, part of the excavated material has been brought together in monographs or articles on specific themes. Some monographs deal with particular questions relating to Latgallian culture. The study by A. Zariņa "Ancient Latgallian dress from the seventh to the thirteenth centuries" (Zariņa 1970) involved systematic treatment of Latgallian dress and research into the methods of its manufacture and ornamentation. The monograph provides a clear picture of ethnic traditions of dress manufacture, describes the common features and differences between Latgallian, Selonian and Semigallian dress and notes Slav influences.

The contacts between the Latgallian lands and neighbouring ethnic units are traced in a monograph by Ē. Mugurēvičs (Мугуревич 1965). Economic con-

tacts with territories inhabited by other ethnic groups influenced material culture, and in particular this may be said of the development and changes in ornaments, which are with justifiably considered an ethnic characteristic.

A review of Latgallian ethnic characteristics in terms of the burial traditions of the fifth to ninth centuries, the ornaments, weapons and tools buried along with the dead and the placement of the grave goods is given by V. Urtāns (Urtāns 1970: 61-83). These questions are discussed in a collective work on Latvian archaeology (Latvijas PSR arheoloģija 1974: 128-130, 171-172, 277-282) and in the above-mentioned publications on particular cemeteries. A more recent review of Latgallian burial traditions is to be found in an article by A. Radinš (Radinš 1993: 13-41; 1994: 9-29).

Research on the ethnic history of the Baltic tribes, including the Latgallians, became particularly active starting with the 1970's, when conferences on Baltic ethnic history, involving several republics, were organised (in 1977, 1981, 1985 and 1991). Important ideas concerning the Balts were also put forward at international meetings devoted to the Slavs and the Baltic Finns (Mugurēvičs 1996: 84).

The archaeological material confronted archaeologists with the difficulty of distinguishing the Latgallian and Selonian cultures and tracing the different routes of development of these cultures. In view of the information provided by written sources and the studies conducted by linguists, the term "Latgallian-Selonian tribes" was coined, the area inhabited by these tribes being taken to include all of the lands to the east of the Semigallians. One of the first to introduce this term was H. Moora (Moora 1952: 75-76, 81, 110; 1954: 6-22). Moora identifies the territory of the Latgallian-Selonian tribes in the Early Iron Age with the eastern group of the Barrow Grave Culture, i.e. Augszeme, south-eastern Vidzeme and the central and southern part of Latgale. The long continuation of collective barrows in this area, in comparison with the western group of barrows, is explained in terms of differences in the form of production and in the social relationships ensuing from this. Moora mentions the greater conservatism of Latgallian burial traditions as another reason for the comparatively long continuation of barrows with multiple burials among the Latgallians.

In spite of the differences seen in burial traditions, grave goods and their placement in the grave, V. Urtāns also did not recognise distinct Selonian and Latgallian cultures (Urtāns 1970: 67-76). He related the appearance of flat cemeteries in the sixth and seventh centuries to the immigration of new inhabitants - the Latgallians. The kinship and common cultural aspects linking the newcomers and the old inhabitants meant that in general the same forms are found among grave goods as are known from burials dating from the time of Christ onwards. Urtāns explained the continued presence of Selonian dialects on the right bank of the Daugava in terms of the initial numerical superiority of Selonians in these areas.

Anthropological research casts doubt on the validity on the term "Latgallians-Selonians" (Денисова 1964: 19-30; 1990: 35, 46, 68-70), showing the heterogeneity of the people of this culture in terms of physical anthropology. It has been found that the people of the Barrow Grave Culture were of narrow-faced anthropological type, and evidence of this type has been obtained at the eleventh-thirteenth century cemetery of Lejasdopeles, which is considered a Selonian cemetery. On the other hand, the craniological material from seventh-twelfth century burials at Latgallian flat cemeteries indicates a broad-faced physical type, which in addition is not

homogenous over the whole area of distribution of these cemeteries. The Latgallians of Vidzeme are characterised by a very robust broad-faced anthropological type, the origins of which are sought among the tribes in Lithuania in the fifth-eighth century who had flat cemeteries. A lower degree of robustness has been found among the Latgallians of Latgale, at cemeteries of central and southern Latgale. Closer analogies for this type can be found with the Kriviches of Polotsk. A third type is represented in the early burials from the seventh-eighth century and its origins are not associated with the Balts, but rather with Finnish elements.

In linguistic research one can also find evidence that the Latgallians and Selonians had different courses of development. Linguists have repeatedly drawn attention to the distinctive features of the Selonian dialects and pointed to the correspondence with the areas of distribution of the early barrows, noting that the simultaneous existence of barrows and flat cemeteries in the River Aiviekste Basin reflects the co-existence of Selonians and Latgallians (Ancītis; Jansons 1963: 52-56; Rudzīte 1964: 408, 409). The latest phonetic, morphological and lexicological studies testify to the presence of the Selonians on the right bank of the Daugava, and this leads to the question: When did the Latgallians and Selonians merge? (Рудзите 1980: 159-163). The Lithuanian linguist V. Mažiulis has put forward interesting ideas on the areas of the dialects of the ancient Baltic language. Here we also see differences: the Latgallians are associated with the central area, while the Selonians are linked to the peripheral area (Мажулис 1981: 102-103).

Interpretations of the differing features of the Selonian and Latgallian cultures are also to be found in the works of archaeologists. In a study of tanged iron spear-heads with barbs in Latvia, M. Atgāzis came to the conclusion that some sixth-eighth century types of such weapons could help to distinguish Selonian and Latgallian burials. He found that the distribution of some of these types of spears coincides with the area of the eastern group of second-sixth century barrows and the area of Selonian dialects (Атгазис 1980: 97-98, fig. 4).

On the basis of the concentration of barrows in the area of Selonian dialects (70) and the small number of barrows (6) outside of this area, A. Stubavs considered these sites to be Selonian. The similarity between the culture of the Aiviekste Basin and Latgallian culture is explained through the immigration of Latgallians into the area inhabited by the Selonians (Стубавс 1981: 48-52).

J. Graudonis has indicated the possibility of distinguishing the Selonians as the people of the East Latvian Barrow Grave Culture on the basis of the specific features found in south-eastern Latvia in earlier periods (Latvijas PSR arheoloģija 1974: 130, fig. 58).

Šnore has always defended the idea that the Latgallians originated from the culture characterised by barrows with stone circles (Ванкина, Граудонис, Шноре 1964: 8-9; Šnore 1993: 79, 87; Latvijas PSR arheoloģija 1974: 171; Шноре 1985: 39-46). Her ideas are based on the conclusion drawn by several researchers that separate Baltic tribes had not yet formed in the Early Iron Age. The concentration of Early Iron Age barrows in the area of a geological feature, the Selonian Bank, and the hydronyms containing the roots "sel-" and "lat-" in the area of present-day eastern Lithuania are indications of the route along which the ancestors of the Selonians and Latgallians entered the eastern part of Latvia. The Selonians settled in Vidzeme, while a proportion of the newcomers settled to the east of Lake Lubana where linguists have found the non-Selonian dialects

of the Augszeme dialect and where a few Early Iron Age barrows and stray finds have been recovered, indicating destroyed barrows. The Middle and Late Iron Age burials found in certain Early Iron Age barrows characterised by similar mortuary practices and grave goods are considered by Šnore as evidence of uninterrupted cultural development.

Šnore considers that the study of ethnic processes in eastern Latvia should take into account the role of the Striated Pottery Culture and the Baltic Finns. A shortcoming of E. Šnore's version is that, in spite of the very convincing arguments for continuity in Latgallian material culture, it does not fully explain the heterogeneous character of the Latgallians in terms of physical type.

Anthropologists have also discussed the question of Latgallian ethnic origins. R. Denisova has shown that the craniological material does not support the origin of the Latgallians from the Barrow Grave Culture.

R. Denisova finds the beginnings of Latgallian ethnic origins in areas outside of Latvia (Denisova 1990: 79-81). In her view, migration processes in Lithuania, which were caused by the Great Migrations in Europe, led to the arrival of new tribes in Latvia from the east (south-east). Around the sixth-seventh centuries, these tribes established flat cemeteries in Augszeme, south-eastern Vidzeme and western Latgale. In terms of physical type they resembled the tribes of central Lithuania. On the other hand, the similarity between the Latgallians of eastern Latgale and the Krivichi of the upper Daugava led Denisova to conclude that the eastern Latgallians arrived in Latvia from northern Belorussia. The rapid increase in the number of flat cemeteries in Vidzeme and Latgale in the ninth-tenth centuries is linked to another episode of immigration of tribes into central and eastern Lithuania, which had the result of again forcing the robust broad-faced type into Latvia.

A. Vasks considers that there is no foundation for the view that the Latgallians are immigrants. He regards them as having formed locally in eastern Latvia, in a process of ethnogenesis that involved several components with varying origins: people of the Barrow Grave Culture, Eastern Baltic tribes from Lithuania belonging to a broad-faced type, Baltic Finns and descendants of the Striated Pottery Culture (Vasks 1997: 67).

The idea of a local origin of Latgallian culture is also supported by A. Radins (Radiņš 1994: 18-25). He considers that the Flat Grave Culture developed in the fifth-seventh centuries on the right bank of the Daugava to the west of the Aiviekste through the interaction of the people associated with the south-western (Semigallian) and southern (central Lithuanian) flat cemeteries, which finds confirmation in the anthropological material, these being the robust narrow-faced and robust broad-faced types. From the area of their development the flat cemeteries came to be distributed further east, in Latgale. When they spread among the Baltic Finns they also integrated components of this ethnic group, as well as the descendants of the Striated Pottery Culture in south-eastern Latvia. Latgallian culture became fully developed in the eighth-tenth centuries with the arrival of new Eastern Baltic tribes in Latgale. At this stage a movement in the opposite direction began, from east to west, consolidating the whole of present-day eastern Latvia and assimilating the Selonians. This model of Latgallian ethnic origins deals with the discrepancies between archaeological, linguistic and anthropological approaches.

J. Ciglis has also expressed his view on the development of Latgallian culture, but unfortunately, apart from his opinions on south-eastern contacts and the possible influx of people from these areas during the formation process of the Latgallians (Циглис 1996: 87-88), his ideas have not been published.

Two forms of burials with similar grave goods are found in the area inhabited by the Latgallians in the Late Iron Age: flat cemeteries and barrow cemeteries with single graves. The question of the origins of the barrows has not been resolved. Until now researchers have maintained the view that these developed through the influence of the eastern neighbours of the Latgallians. This view was expressed in the 1920s and '30s in Balodis's work (*Latvijas arhaioloģija* 1926: 88; Balodis 1938: 184). H. Riekstins, in his discussion of forms of burials and mortuary practices in the Iron Age, has also accepted this view (Riekstiņš 1935: 49). R. Šnore also considered that the Latgallians derived the form of the barrow from the Slavs, while the burial traditions and grave goods remained the same (Šnore 1933-1934: 20292).

More excavation work at these sites and the accumulation of archaeological material from the whole of the area inhabited by the Latgallians has not served to alter this view on the origin of the barrows. Moora discussed the appearance of the barrows as a tradition borrowed from the Slavs (Moora 1952: 149), while E. Šnore described these barrows as a foreign characteristic and entertained the possibility that there were Slav immigrants in eastern Latvia who had become assimilated into Latgallian culture (*Latvijas PSR arheoloģija* 1974: 171). V. Sedov considers that those buried in the sixth-eighth century barrows were descendants of the Krivichi who had pressed into eastern Latvia and had assimilated, as well as people of mixed Latgallian-Krivich birth (Седов 1987: 362).

Ideas about the origin of the Latgallian barrow graves have most recently been put forward in studies by A. Rādiņš. He established that most of the Latgallian barrow graves are located in eastern Latvia, where in the previous period the area of distribution of Latgallian flat cemeteries lay adjacent to cemeteries of various forms belonging to various ethnic groups, as well as along the margins of the area of Latgallian sites. In view of the chronological and ethnic diversity of barrow graves, he rejects the view of the barrows as a group of monuments linked to the Krivichi. In his opinion the barrow cemeteries developed under the influence of those Eastern Balts who were pushed westwards by the Slavs. Rādiņš considers that the broadening of the distribution of barrow graves westwards in the eleventh century may have been the result of socio-political motives: the spread of Orthodox Christianity and the process of state formation (the Latgallian land of Lotigola) (Rādiņš 1994: 11-18).

The earliest history of the Latgallians comes to an end with their participation in the process of ethnogenesis of the Latvian people. It became possible to study questions of the consolidation and assimilation of the separate peoples inhabiting the area of present-day Latvia in the post-war period with the accumulation of a large body of material from settlement sites and cemeteries, dating back to the thirteenth-seventeenth centuries (*Latvijas PSR arheoloģija* 1974: 285, 295-296, 320-322). The disappearance of specific and local Latgallian features has been traced by Mūgurēvičs on the basis of archaeological material (Мугуревич 1981: 33-35), while written sources have been analysed from this point of view by T. Zeids (Зейдс 1980: 57-61). These studies have led to the conclusion that the

Latgallians not only gave their name to the Latvian people, but also played the leading role in the process of development of the Latvian people, which was a consequence of several factors: superiority in terms of area and population, a high degree of political organisation etc. (Mugurēvičs 1997: 84; Зейдс 1980: 59).

A great deal of work has been accomplished in the field of Latgallian ethnic research, both in terms of bringing together and systematising of material, and in analysis of this material. However, the research to date does not cover all of the complicated developments in Latgallian history. This research has indicated the need for thorough and detailed analysis of the relationships between earlier cultures, the contacts between various neighbouring tribes, cultural interaction, population migration and the assimilation processes of various ethnic elements. The study of Latgallian ethnic origins should be based not only on archaeological material, but should also make use of the possibilities offered by the fields of linguistics and anthropology. It is important that studies of the role that the Latgallians played in the development of the Latvian people should cover specific features relating to the geographical and chronological extent of this process.

Literature

Ancītis, K., Jansons, A. 1963. Vidzemes etniskās vēstures jautājumi. Arheologija un Etnogrāfija. Rīga.

Apals, J., Apala, Z. 1974. Āraišu arheoloģiskās ekspedīcijas darbs 1973. gadā. Zinātniskās atskaites sesijas materiāli par arheologu un etnogrāfu 1973. gada pētījumu rezultātiem. Rīga.

Apala, Z. 1992. Ģūģeru arheoloģiskā kompleksa izpēte. Zinātniskās atskaites sesijas materiāli par arheologu 1990. un 1991. gada pētījumu rezultātiem. Rīga.

Balodis, F., Teikmanis, A., Kundziņš, L. Izrakumi Raunas Tanīsa kalnā 1927. gadā. Arheoloģijas Raksti. 4.sēj., 1.daļa.

Balodis, F. 1938. Senākie laiki. Latviešu senvēsture.- Latviešu vēsture. F.Baloža un A.Tenteļa redakcijā. 1.daļa. Rīga.

Bähr, J. K. 1850. Die Gräber der Liven.Ein Beitrag zur nordischen Alterthumskunde und Geschichte. Dresden.

Bielenstein, A. 1892. Die grenzen des lettischen Volkstammes und der lettischen Sprache in der Gegenwart und im XIII. Jahrhundert. St. Peterburg.

Bielenstein, A. Die lettischen Burgberge. Труды десятого Археологического съезда в Риге в 1896 г. Под.ред. П.С. Уваровой. 2. Рига.

Denisova, R. 1990. Latgaļu etniskās vēstures jautājumi.- Zinātniskās atskaites sesijas materiāli par arheologu un etnogrāfu 1988. un 1989. gada pētījumu rezultātiem. Rīga.

Ebert, M. 1913. Die Baltischen Provinzen : Kurland, Livland,Estland .Sonderabdruck aus der Prachistorischen Zeitschrift V, Heft 3/4.

Graudonis, J. 1973. Ērgļu Jaunākēnu kapulauks. Zinātniskās atskaites sesijas materiāli par arheologu un etnogrāfu 1972. gada pētījumu rezultātiem. Rīga.

Hausmann, R. 1896. Einleitung zur Abtheilung Archäologie. Katalog der Ausstellung zum X. archäologischen Kongress in Riga 1896. Riga.

- Indriķa hronika. 1993. Ā. Feldhūna tulkojums. Ē.Mugurēviča priekšvārds un komentāri. Rīga.
- Jākobsons, F. 1929. Senlatviešu ienākšana Latvijā. Senatne. 1.
- Karnups, A. 1928. Die Haupttypen der lettischen Halsringe in der jungeren Eisenzeit. Sitzungsberichte der Gelehrten Estnischen Gesellschaft 1861-1923. Tartu (Dorpat).
- Kruse, Fr. 1842. Necrolivonica oder Alterthümer Liv-, Esth-, und Curlands bis zur Einführung der Christlichen Religion in den Kaiserlich Russischen Ostsee-Gouvernements. Dorpat-Leipzig.
- Kuniga, I. 1988. Kristapiņu kapulauks. Zinātniskās atskaites sesijas materiāli par arheologu un etnogrāfu 1986.un 1987. gada pētījumu rezultātiem. Rīga.
- Latvijas arheoloģija. 1926. Rīgā.
- Latviešu kultūra senatnē. 1937. Attēlu sakopojums F. Baloža un R.Šnores redakcijā. Rīgā.
- Latvijas PSR arheoloģija. 1974. Rīga.
- Moora, H. 1938. Die Eisenzeit in Lettland bis etwa 500 n. Chr.II Teil. Analyse. Tartu.
- Moora, H. 1952. Pirmatnējās kopienas iekārta un agrā feodālā sabiedrība Latvijas PSR teritorijā. Rīgā.
- Mugurēvičs, Ē. 1977. Oļiņkalna un Lokstenes pilsnovadi. 3.-15. gs. arheoloģiskie pieminekļi. Rīga.
- Mugurēvičs, Ē., Tautavičs, A. 1978. Baltu tautu etnoģenēzes arheoloģiskās izpētes stāvoklis un uzdevumi. Latvijas PSR Zinātņu Akadēmijas Vēstis. 2.
- Mugurēvičs, Ē. 1978. Rakstītie avoti un arheoloģijas materiāli par latgaļu senāko vēsturi. Baltu filoloģija. V rakstu krājums. Latvijas Universitāte. Rīga.
- Mugurēvičs, Ē. 1996. Latvijas vēstures institūta arheologu darbs piecdesmit gados (1946.-1995.). Zinātniskās atskaites sesijas materiāli par arheologu 1994.un 1995. gada pētījumu rezultātiem. Rīga.
- Mugurevičs, E. 1997. Ethnic processes in Baltic inhabited territories and the emergence of the Latvian nation in the 6th to the 16th century. Latvian Ethnic History. 3.
- Radiņš, A. 1994. 10.-13.gs. kapulauki latgaļu teritorijā un daži Austrumlatvijas etniskās vēstures jautājumi. Latvijas Vēstures Institūta Žurnāls. 4. 1993., 1.
- Riekstiņš, H. 1935. Latviešu kapu tipi un apbedīšanas paražas dzelzs laikmetā. Rīgā.
- Rudzīte, M. 1964. Latviešu valodas dialektoloģija. Rīgā.
- Stubavs, Ā. 1967. Arheoloģiskie izrakumi Koknesē 1966. gadā. Zinātniskās atskaites sesijas referātu tēzes par arheologu, antropologu un etnogrāfu 1966. gada pētījumu rezultātiem. Rīgā.
- Šnore, E. 1933. Izrakumi Slates sila uzkalniņu kapos 1927. gadā. Arheoloģijas Raksti. 1.sēj., 1.daļa. Rīgā.
- Šnore, E. 1987. Kivtu kapulauks. Rīga.
- Šnore, E. 1987. Beteļu kapulauks Augšzemē. Arheoloģija un Etnogrāfija. 15.laid. Rīga.
- Šnore, E. 1993. Agrā dzelzs laikmeta uzkalniņi Latvijas austrumu daļā. Rīga.
- Šnore, R. 1930. Dzelzs laikmeta latviešu rotas adatas. Latviešu aizvēstures materiāli. 1. Rīgā.
- Šnore, R. 1933-1934. Latgali. Latviešu Konversācijas vārdnīca. 10. sēj. Rīgā.
- Šnore, R. 1936. Latvijas aizvēstures kartes. Agrais un vidējais dzelzs laikmets (1.-8. gs. pēc Kristus). Otrs Baltijas aizvēstures kongress Rīgā, 19.-23.VIII.1930. Latvijas Universitātes Raksti. Filoloģijas un filosofijas fakultātes serija, 1.sēj. papildinājums Nr. 2. Rīgā.
- Šnore, R. 1938. Latvijas senvēstures pētīšanas darbs valsts pastāvēšanas 20 gados. Senatne un Māksla. 4.
- Šturms, E. 1926. Akmens laikmets. Latvijas arheoloģija. Rīgā.
- Šturms, E. 1939. Sēji. Latviešu Konversācijas vārdnīca. 19.sēj. Rīgā.
- Urtāns, V. 1962. Kalniešu otrs kapulauks. Latvijas Vēstures Muzeja Raksti. Arheoloģija. Rīgā.

Urtāns, V. 1970. Etniskās atšķirības apbedīšanas tradīcijās un kapu inventārā Latvijā 5.-9.gs. Arheoloģija un Etnogrāfija. 9. laid.

Vasks, A. 1994. Brikļu nocietinātā apmetne. Lubānas zemiene vēlajā bronzas un dzelzs laikmetā. 1000 g. pr. Kr. 1000. pēc Kr. Rīga.

Vasks, A. 1997. The cultural and ethnic situation in Latvia during the early and middle Iron age (1st-8th century AD). Humanities and social sciences Latvia. Latvian Ethnic History. 3.

Vilcāne, A. 1970. Arheoloģiskie izrakumi Jersikā. Zinātniskās atskaites referātu tēzes par arheologu 1994. un 1995. gada pētījumu rezultātiem. Rīga.

Zariņa, A. 1970. Seno latgaļu apģērbs 7.-13.gs. Rīgā.

Žeiere, I. 1990. Izrakumi Kokneses senkapos. Zinātniskās atskaites sesijas materiāli par arheologu un etnogrāfu 1988. un 1989. gada pētījumu rezultātiem. Rīga.

Атгазис, М. 1980. Вопросы этнической истории земгалов. Из древнейшей истории балтских народов по данным археологии и антропологии. Рига.

Баллод, Ф. 1910. Некоторые материалы по истории латышского племени с IX-XIII столетия. Записки Московского археологического института. 8. Москва.

Ванкина, Л., Граудонис, Я., Шноре, Э. 1964. Археологические данные по этногенезу Латвии. VII международный конгресс антропологических и этнографических наук, Москва VIII 1964 г. Москва.

Денисова, Р. 1964. К вопросу об антропологическом типе селов XI-XII вв. в связи с краниологическим материалом из могильников Леясдопелес. Latvijas PSR Zinātņu Akadēmijas Vēstis. 5.

Денисова, Р. 1990. География антропологических типов балтских племен и этногенетические процессы и I- начале II тысячелетия н.э. на территории Литвы и Латвии. Балты, славяне, прибалтийские финны. Этногенетические процессы. Рига.

Зейдс, Т. 1980. Образование латышской народности в отображение письменных источников. Этнографические и лингвистические аспекты этнической истории балтских народов. Рига.

Мажулис, В. 1981. О связях литовского-латышского с другими древнебалтийскими диалектами. Проблемы этногенеза и этнической истории балтов. Тезисы докладов, март 1981. Вильнюс.

Моора, Х. 1954. Археологические памятники I-IV вв. в Прибалтике. Краткие сообщения о докладах и полевых исследованиях Института истории материальной культуры АН СССР. вып. 53. Москва.

Мугуревич, Э. 1965. Восточная Латвия и соседние земли в X-XIII вв. Рига.

Рудзите, М. 1980. К вопросу о селах на правом берегу Даугавы. Этнографические и лингвистические аспекты этнической истории балтских народов. Рига.

Седов, В. 1987. Финно-угры и балты в эпоху средневековья. Москва.

Спицын, А. 1983. Люцинский могильник. Материалы по археологии России, изданные Археологической комиссией. 14. Спб. Санкт Петербург.

Стубавс, А. 1981. Некоторые аспекты этнической истории селов II-XII вв. Проблемы этногенеза и этнической истории балтов. Тезисы докладов, март. Вильнюс.

Циглис, Я. 1996. Роль юго-восточных связей в процессе формирования латгальской культуры. Беларусь у сістеме транссеурапейскіх сувязяў у I тысячагодзі н. э. Тезісы дакладу I паведамленняў міжнароднай канферэнцыі. Мінск, 12-15, сакавіка 1996. Мінск.

Шноре, Э. 1957. Нукшинский могильник. Рига.

Шноре, Э. 1961. Асотское городище. Рига.

Latgalių tyrinėjimų istorija

ANTONIJA VILCĀNE

Santrauka

Latgaliai, viena iš baltų genčių, gyvenę rytinėje Latvijoje, rašytiniuose šaltiniuose minimi XII a. pradžioje.

Pirmieji latgalių kapai buvo tyrinėti Dorpat (Tartu) universiteto profesoriaus F. Kruzės 1837 metais lyvių ir latgalių kapinyne Aizkrauklėje. Pirmieji moksliniai latgalių teritorijos plataus masto tyrinėjimai atlikti 1891–1982 metais Uodukalno, Ludzos raj. kapinyne. Rusų mokslininkai J. Romanovas ir V. Sizovas atidengė 338 kapus su turtinga VII-XII a. archeologine medžiaga. A. Spicinas teigė, jog tai lyvių paminklas. Ruošiantis visos Rusijos X archeologų kongresui A. Bylenšteinas susistemino Latvijos piliakalnių ir, remdamasis rašytiniais bei lingvistiniais duomenimis, XIII a. baltų apgyventą teritoriją praplėtė. R. Hausmanas sudarė dirbinių katalogą, o archeologinius paminklus suskirstė į dvi grupes atskirdamas latvius nuo lyvių. VIII-XIII a. latgalių medžiaga dar nebuvo išskirta.

XX a. pradžioje Rytų Pabaltijys buvo padalintas į dvi etnokultūrinės grupes: šiaurėje ugro-finai, pietuose lietuvių-latvių gentys. Tuo metu F. Baluodis pradėjo atskirų baltų genčių tyrinėjimus. Jis išskyrė ir latgalių apgyventą teritoriją, esančią dešiniajame Dauguvos krante – Latgalėje, centrinėje ir iš dalies šiaurinėje Vidzemėje, taip pat aprašė IX-XIII a. latgaliams būdingus materialinės kultūros bruožus. Labai svarbus buvo fino-ugrų kapinynų atradimas Vidzemėje ir Latgalėje. Nauji kapinynų tyrinėjimai padėjo patikslinti baltų ir fino-ugrų etnines ribas bei jų tarpusavio sąveiką.

Po II Pasaulinio karo Latvijos archeologai daug dėmesio skyrė latgalių materialinei kultūrai tyrinėti. Daugiau kaip 90 kapinynų ir pilkapynų buvo ištirta keli tūkstančiai įvairių laikotarpių kapų. Tyrinėjami taip pat piliakalniai ir gyvenvietės. Archeologiniai tyrinėjimai leido apibendrinti latgalių materialinės kultūros bruožus, laidojimo tradicijas, ryšius su kaimynais, socialinius ir etninius procesus, vykusius Latgaloje. Šiomis temomis buvo parašyta keletas monografijų (Mugurēvičs 1965; Šnore 1957; 1961; 1964; 1987; 1993 Urtāns 1970, Vasks 1994, Zariņa 1970). Antropologai ir kalbininkai taip pat įnešė savo dalį į latgalių etnoso tyrinėjimus (Denisova 1964; 1990; Ancītis, Jākobsons 1963; Rudzīte 1964; 1980).

Latgalių istorijos tyrinėjimai ir toliau turi remtis ne tik archeologine medžiaga, bet taip pat lingvistiniais ir antropologiniais duomenimis. Svarbu, kad latgalių vaidmuo latvių tautos raidoje būtų gerai ištyrinėtas.

Vertė V. Kazakevičius

*Antonija Vilcāne
Latvijas Vestures Instituts
Akadēmijas laukumā 1,
Rīga LV-1050
Latvija*