

VILNIUS UNIVERSITY

Rokas Vengalis

EASTERN LITHUANIAN SETTLEMENTS FROM THE  
FIRST TO THE TWELFTH CENTURY

Summary of doctoral dissertation  
Humanities, History (05 H)

Vilnius, 2009

The doctoral dissertation was carried out from 2004 to 2008 in Vilnius University

**Academic adviser:**

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Aleksiejus **Luchtanas** (Vilnius University, Humanities, History – 05H)

**Consultant:**

Prof. Habil. Dr. Mykolas **Michelbertas** (Vilnius University, Humanities, History – 05H)

**The dissertation will be defended at the Research Board for History of Vilnius University:**

**Chairman:**

Prof. Dr. Albinas **Kuncevičius** (Vilnius University, Humanities, History – 05H)

**Members:**

Prof. Habil. Dr. Mykolas **Michelbertas** (Vilnius University, Humanities, History – 05H)

Dr. Vykintas **Vaitkevičius** (Klaipėda University, Humanities, History – 05H)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gintautas **Vėlius** (Vilnius University, Humanities, History – 05H)

Dr. Gintautas **Zabiela** (Klaipėda University, Humanities, History – 05H)

**Opponents:**

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Valdemaras **Šimėnas** (The Lithuanian Institute of History, Humanities, History – 05H)

Prof. Habil. Dr. Vladas **Žulkus** (Klaipėda University, Humanities, History – 05H)

The dissertation will be defended in an open meeting of the Research Board for History on 19 June 2009 at 15:00, in 211 auditorium of Vilnius University's History Faculty  
Address: Universiteto 7, LT-01513, Vilnius, Lithuania

The summary of the dissertation distributed on June 2009

The dissertation is available for reading in Vilnius University's library

VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETAS

Rokas Vengalis

RYTŲ LIETUVOS GYVENVIETĖS I-XII a.

Daktaro disertacijos santrauka  
Humanitariniai mokslai, istorija (05 H)

Vilnius, 2009

Disertacija rengta 2004-2008 metais Vilniaus universitete

**Mokslinis vadovas:**

doc. dr. Aleksiejus **Luchtanas** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05H)

**Konsultantas:**

prof. habil. dr. Mykolas **Michelbertas** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05H)

**Disertacija ginama Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos mokslo krypties taryboje:**

**Pirmininkas:**

prof. dr. Albinas **Kuncevičius** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05H)

**Nariai:**

prof. habil. dr. Mykolas **Michelbertas** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05H)

dr. Vykintas **Vaitkevičius** (Klaipėdos universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05H)

doc. dr. Gintautas **Vėlius** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05H)

dr. Gintautas **Zabiela** (Klaipėdos universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05H)

**Oponentai:**

doc. dr. Valdemaras **Šimėnas** (Lietuvos istorijos institutas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05H)

prof. habil. dr. Vladas **Žulkus** (Klaipėdos universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05H)

Disertacija bus ginama viešame Istorijos mokslo krypties tarybos posėdyje 2009 m. birželio 19 d. 15 val. Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos fakulteto 211 auditorijoje.

Adresas: Universiteto 7, LT-01513, Vilnius, Lietuva

Disertacijos santrauka išsiuntinėta 2009 m. gegužės mėn. d.

Disertaciją galima peržiūrėti Vilniaus universiteto bibliotekoje

## INTRODUCTION

A number of archaeologists have noted in their works that for reconstructing Iron Age society in Lithuania grave material is relied upon exclusively. It's difficult to dispute the marked domination of burial material in works on the Iron Age, but different authors assess this situation rather differently. For some this is a large gap, while others say this is not so bad – burial material sufficiently provides all sorts of information. At first glance these two positions seem irreconcilable, but thorough examination of this problem and the reason for it makes this contradiction comprehensible.

Ethno-historic studies have been one of the main directions in fundamental archaeological studies since the beginning of professional archaeology in Lithuania, the works of J. Puzinas. During the Soviet period this direction in archaeological studies totally dominated and it remains quite important until now. In analyzing ethno-historic problems – origin and continuity of cultures, changes in their borders and similar – the primary sources providing the most important information are burial rites and the distribution of different types of artefacts. In regards to these problems, settlement material does not provide much worthwhile information. Since the 1990s problems of cross-cultural relations (import, cultural influence, cultural orientation and so on) have assumed primary importance. Researchers working in this area are interested by an even narrower spectrum of sources, in essence only separate finds that have analogues in other countries. In this case, even the context in which the artefact is found is usually unimportant, only the region in which it is found is significant. It's self-evident that settlement material is also not very significant for this area of study.

Taking into consideration the themes that interest Lithuanian archaeologists most, the unemployment of settlement material is not so surprising: researchers who mostly research these themes do not encounter the lack of settlements material. The question is can this situation satisfy the modern archaeological studies? Reviewing the generalizing works on the Iron Age in Lithuania, it's not difficult to notice that these works analyze artefacts exclusively, and that very little attention is given to a reconstruction of society, to problems of economy, social relations and ideology. The result of this situation is that although the Iron Age in Lithuania is the most studied compared to other periods, the general picture of this period remains very obscured.

What is clear is that the most studied topics up till the current time are insufficient in attempting a more comprehensive view of society and the way of life in the Iron Age.

However, it's not true to say that other directions of research have been completely neglected. Starting from the beginning of the 21st century, the number of publications analyzing other aspects of the past has noticeably increased. The most noteworthy works treat social relations, territorial and political structure and ideology. These are exactly the topics which are impossible without detailed and exhaustive use of settlement data. Thus we come up against the problem of a lack of research on habitation sites. Perception of Iron Age settlements is especially poor in Lithuania currently, and this is connected as much with scale of investigation as with interpretation methodologies, and just as much with recognition of the processes that lead to the formation of a cultural layer. Therefore if we wish to press ahead in reconstruction of Iron Age society, we must first give some attention to raising the level of settlement archaeology.

Raising the level of settlement archaeology should not be understood simply as broader use of settlements material. First of all, qualitative changes are required: posing of new questions and the application of new methods in attempting to answer those questions. This is not quite simple task because of the nature of available data. Although material from earlier excavations is rather plentiful; it was collected to answer other questions with focus on other aspects. Problems that concern the investigator have a large influence on the methodology chosen for field research and on the information content of reports. In essence, material from settlements (and not only them) is so complex, that it is impossible even theoretically to collect all information attainable in archaeological context; only a portion of information is collected during any archaeological excavation. Which portion of information is in fact collected depends on the questions that interest the investigator. Consequently, material from earlier excavations will not always be satisfactory for analysis from a different point-of-view.

Settlement material is treated here as the main source in reconstructing the lifestyle of the communities which inhabited them as well as their economic and social development. Eastern Lithuanian settlement data are considered from this point of view, although there is no pretence to a more detailed reconstruction of the society of this region: the majority of specific assertions cannot be firmly grounded at this time because

of the lack of data, and each assertion requires special and detailed studies. A more general reconstruction of the society of this region can only be reached by systematically pursuing this goal, but for that problems need to be clearly defined, hypotheses need to be posed and ways to test them must be found. This is exactly what is most relevant in the current stage of investigations.

The goal of this work can be defined as **the assessment of Eastern Lithuanian Iron Age settlement material possessed at the current time in the context of settlement archaeology**. By achieving this task, it should become clearer how informative data collected to date is, and how much of these data can be used to analyze new problems, those which were not considered priorities when the material was collected. At the same time, the largest gaps, the areas which need the most attention in the collection of new data should also become apparent. This goal is pursued by formulating a conception of settlement archaeology adapted to the specific features of Lithuanian archaeology. In addressing each problem, the quantity and quality of currently possessed data applicable to solving them are discussed as well as what methodology can be used and what needs to be done to increase available data.

The following tasks have been defined for achieving the goal of this work:

1. To define the subject, goals and problems of settlements archaeology;
2. To assess the tradition of collecting settlement material in Lithuania, revealing the reliability and subjectivity of data.
3. To refine the chronology of settlements by analyzing pottery found at these settlements.
4. To assess assertions which have become fixed in Lithuanian historiography, revealing which of them are based on firm data and which have no real basis but are nevertheless continuously repeated based exclusively on the historiographic tradition.
5. To define certain areas of investigation for settlement archaeology, to discover for which of these areas we have reliable data and, based upon these data, formulate what can be said currently about Eastern Lithuanian Iron Age settlements, and also to prescribe future directions for research.

Although the questions analyzed in this work in essence cover problems relating Iron Age settlements of whole Lithuania, the work is limited to Eastern Lithuanian

settlements when it is based on definite data. While in essence it is possible to choose regions of different size and complexity in settlement analysis, depending on the size of the territory studied the focus will shift to a different set of specific issues. This work is oriented toward those issues which are significant for analyzing the development of one specific cultural area. This is done while keeping Lithuanian archaeological traditions in mind: in researching the Iron Age, majority of problems are usually illuminated through the prism of separate cultural areas, which are considered as separate tribes. This work treats one region as well; and this region more or less is coinciding with the area of the Eastern Lithuania barrow culture within the current territory of Lithuania. Even so, the work is oriented toward settlement archaeology, considering any single cultural region, rather than Eastern Lithuanian settlements in particular.

The period studied was also defined paying heed to Lithuanian archaeology traditions. The nature of archaeological data has meant that a strict separation according to period has taken place among Lithuanian archaeologists. Different scholars study the Stone Age, the Iron Age and the Middle Ages and the topics of their works only rarely extend beyond these chronological frontiers. In terms of settlement archaeology, the Iron Age is the most forsaken, least studied – almost unconsidered – period. The chronological framework for this work is the entire Iron Age, from the limits of our era to the foundation of the state (1st to 12th centuries). The Early Iron Age (500-100 BC) is not included in the scope of the work; this period not only differs in features of material culture from the period chosen, it also differs in type of archaeological sources, possibilities for research and the general set of problems involved.

Defining the term “archaeological settlement” is no simple task in itself. The name implies it is a place where people lived, but the function of a settlement is never merely inhabitation: it also includes zones of economic activity, defensive fortifications, natural resource extraction sites, cult sites, etc. Some of these are in the same location as the habitation, others adjacent, still others more distant. Connections between the discrete zones are very close, and this relationship is often the main source of information about the social and economic relationships of the people who once lived there. Therefore, in studying a settlement, we cannot limit ourselves merely to its residential function; it must be analyzed as a whole system of various activities, each of which takes place in a specific zone.



## DEVELOPMENT OF SETTLEMENT ARCHAEOLOGY

Interest in archaeological settlements has been present since the inception of the discipline of archaeology, but up until the 20th century the main focus was only on exceptional sorts of settlements, such as the shell middens in Denmark, the Swiss lake-settlements, the French Palaeolithic caves and similar.

The term “settlement archaeology” (Siedlungsarchäologie) was first used by German archaeologist G. Kossinna in 1911. He used the term not to mean studies of archaeological settlements, but rather as the attempt to discover where a certain ethnic group lived at a given moment, and has little in common with settlement archaeology as it appeared later.

Studies of archaeological settlements really gained momentum in the 1910s and 1920s when broad settlement archaeological projects in Europe as well as America have been prosecuted. Even so, the methodological basis for settlement archaeology was only laid in the 40s and 50s. In different countries according to different archaeological traditions settlement archaeology was understood differently, although there are certain significant shared features.

That the rise of settlement archaeology almost everywhere was connected not so much with the settlement sites themselves but with a change in the general aims of archaeology can be named as one of the most important of shared features. It is when there is dissatisfaction with the limitations of problems posed by the culture-historical paradigm, when the priorities of archaeological studies shift from identification, typology and ethnic interpretation of cultures to analysis of social, economic and ideological aspects of cultures, that we usually begin to speak of settlement archaeology. American settlement archaeology arose during the period of the decline of the culture-historical paradigm and became the foundation for the processual archaeology. In Great Britain and Northern Europe the term “settlement archaeology” itself is rarely encountered, although here interest in settlements is also connected with researchers who have criticized culture-historical methods. In Germany and Central and Eastern Europe settlement archaeology did not replace culture-historical studies which continue to this day, it appeared and endured as an alternative to them, raising alternate questions and priorities. The term itself, “settlement archaeology” (excepting G. Kossinna’s

Siedlungsarchäologie method), is usually encountered just when the aims of archaeological studies are in transition, and is thereafter used rarely. This phenomenon can be linked with yet another feature of settlement archaeology common to all traditions – unlike the name implies, it usually does not limit itself exclusively to a single kind of sites, i.e., settlements. Settlement archaeology is understood everywhere as studies of the inhabitation of the land, for which all data provided by archaeology as well as other disciplines on the way of life of communities in the past are significant. In this respect not only are the settlements themselves significant, but other places as well associated with human activity: burial sites, sources of raw materials, agricultural fields and the natural environment itself. The term “settlement archaeology” emphasizes not the settlements themselves so much as the desire to emphasize that the main focus is no longer placed on discrete finds but on the site itself, its function and context. Thus this term is only needed when this kind of perspective is establishing itself. Later, as ever more studies in this area appear, they concentrate on different finer or broader aspects, and the generalizing term itself loses force.

Although settlements in Lithuania have been investigated for a long time, one could say that settlement archaeology here is only in its nascent phase. This situation exists because of certain historical reasons which this chapter will attempt to disclose.

Of work prior to the 20th century, only registration of sites can be mentioned, although in that period only hill-forts were treated and open- or foot-settlements were not entered on the lists of archaeological sites. At the beginning of the 20th century L. Krzywicki performed systematic investigations of hill-forts. He published his results in publications that did not limit themselves to descriptions excavations and finds but that attempted to provide interpretations of these and broader conclusions as well. Later, up till World War II, excavations were conducted only at several hill-forts (Apuolė, Impiltis, Velykuškės), but their results were not published or summarised. The most important archaeological achievements in Lithuania in the inter-war period were associated with the composition of a model of prehistoric periodization, so it is natural that material from burial sites, which provided significantly more data for achieving this goal, received greater treatment.

After World War II, with Lithuania inside the USSR, the discipline of archaeology had to adapt itself to the interests of Soviet archaeology. Because Marxism-

Leninism postulated class struggle and the development of the means of production as the engine driving history, economic and social problems received priority treatment. These problems received the most attention in works from the 1950s analyzing mostly material from hill-forts with attention paid to foot-settlements and open-settlements. Nevertheless, there were no prospects for studies of social relations under the conditions of the Soviet regime: researchers in this field were not free and were required to adapt themselves to already-formulated models of the development of societies. Thus, when somewhat freer conditions arose, archaeologists stopped pursuing this theme and rallied forces around ethnic history studies which had a specific national undertone. Studies in ethnogenesis dominated archaeological works from the 1960s to the 1980s, during which time they were considered the final goal of archaeology, with studies in other areas performed only as much as facilitated answering ethnic-related questions. These trends, however, had a negative effect on settlement studies. The following problems can be named as the most relevant for ethnohistorical studies (related to the Iron Age): analysis of discrete tribes, tribal territories, borders of tribal territories, the formation of Lithuanian ethnicity, ethnocultural processes (migration, assimilation), origin and transmission of cultures. The main sources for all of these problems are obtained from burial sites, with settlement studies data only rarely providing additional information. All of this had an effect on the understanding of the informativity provided by settlement material as well as on the methodology of studies. Although excavations continued to be carried out intensively at settlement sites and hill-forts they were of a rather low quality and results did not provide any desirable information which could be used in the fundamental generalisations.

The long process of European integration began after Lithuania regained independence in 1990. These tendencies were significant in Lithuanian archaeology as well. Unfortunately, archaeologists perceived their task not as raising the level of theory and methodology, but as the search for cultural commonality in the past. All means available are employed to find as many commonalities with western neighbours in the past as possible, the fundamental reason for all cultural changes is laid to the influence of other cultures and diffusionism is on the way to predominance in Lithuanian archaeology. For such studies, separate finds become the most important source of information. It is considered that the context in which the find is found is less important

than find's analogues in other regions. Settlement data are undoubtedly completely useless: imported artefacts are extremely rarely in them.

Despite the foregoing, the range of interests among archaeologists is no longer as narrow as it was in the prior period. First, with a remarkable increase in the number of archaeologists, the spectrum of topics studied has unavoidably expanded and differences in approaches have emerged. Some topics which were never addressed earlier have received quite a lot of attention recently. To name a few of these are settlement patterns, analysis of the territorial structure. These themes have enjoyed ever more interest among scholars, but almost everyone recognizes the lack of settlement data as the main problem. Although many settlements have been excavated, the material is not systematized, not analyzed and interpreted appropriately. To date one has to rely upon burial site data exclusively, but without exploiting all available material it is difficult to come to more reliable conclusions.

It is clear that Lithuanian archaeology has arrived at a new stage where qualitatively new questions need to be asked about the social, economic and ideological aspects of culture. This process has already begun, but evidence of this tendency is only found in a few separate works. Global practice has show that this change is impossible without exploiting settlement material and without due attention to settlement archaeology.

## **CHRONOLOGY AND PERIODIZATION**

One of the most deficient problems associated with Iron Age settlements in Lithuania is chronology. The main indicator of the chronology of settlements, pottery, so far has gone almost unanalyzed in Lithuania and no appropriate classification system has been drafted. Different investigators indicate radically different dating of different types of pottery, thus dating of settlements is very general and vague. This work, in attempting to classify pottery on a chronological basis, analyzes pottery conserved in museums from Eastern Lithuanian Iron Age sites; seven styles are differentiated representing different periods (Fig. 1). Individual finds with reliable dating found in the same context with pottery have been used to define pottery chronology.

Pottery style	Chronology											
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII
Sharply ridged brushed pottery	—————											
Weakly ridged brushed pottery		———										
Early rusticated pottery			—————			---						
Late rusticated pottery				---	—————			---				
Late fine-rusticated pottery							---	—————				
Early pottery with smooth surface								---	—————			
Late pottery with smooth surface										---	—————	

Fig. 1. The chronology of pottery styles.

The earliest of pottery styles differentiated is a *sharply ridged brushed pottery*. This style was widespread even at the beginning of the period in question, and its appearance is dated to the second half of the first century BC. The end of the use of this pottery style is connected with the abandonment of early hill-forts. The abandonment of hill-forts was for a long time dated to the 4th to 5th century, but the basement on actual finds for this dating is unfounded. The latest finds from Lithuanian hill-forts found together with the brushed pottery are the Faustina Augusta coin from the Narkūnai hill-fort, a disc-shaped temple-ornament from the Nemenčinė hill-fort and the cast form of the similar artefact from the “Aukuro kalnas” hill-fort in Kernavė, pins with cylindrical heads (group 2) from the Aukštadvaris and Bradeliškės hill-forts and a pin with a spool-shaped head (group 1) from the Aukštadvaris and Vorėnai hill-forts. All of these artefacts have been dated to essentially the B<sub>2</sub> period, only the pins with cylindrical head were still used in the B<sub>2</sub>/C<sub>1</sub> or even C<sub>2</sub> periods.

The sharply ridged brushed pottery style was replaced by *weakly ridged brushed pottery*. Complexes of this pottery are known from unfortified settlements. Very few datable artefacts have been found in these, only a half-moon shaped pendant from the Pilviškės settlement, and a pin with a barrel-shaped head (group 2), a fibula of type A128 and iron spur from the Semeniškės settlement II at Kernavė can be mentioned. These artifacts are dated narrowly, to the B<sub>2</sub>/C<sub>1</sub> period. Thus one can conclude that the weakly ridged brushed pottery style only existed relatively briefly.

Until now the opinion has prevailed that the brushed pottery did not disappear after the rusticated pottery emerged, but that it was used along the latter until the 5th century. Rusticated pottery replaced brushed pottery after people had moved their dwelling-places from hill-forts to open settlements. Therefore brushed as well as early rusticated potteries are often found together in the foot-settlements of hill-forts. This is what in the 1960s gave rise to the hypothesis that brushed and rusticated potteries existed side-by-side for some time. According to the proponents of this hypothesis, a characteristic feature of the coexistence of both pottery styles is the change in their quantitative relationship, with the rusticated pottery gradually becoming more used and the brushed pottery less. Today there are sufficient data to find this claim false; this is shown by the spatial distribution of both kinds of pottery in the same cultural layer.

Another argument which supports the claim that pottery styles replaced each other in a fairly short time is that rather early complexes exist in which brushed pottery is no longer found. *Early rusticated pottery* complexes without brushed pottery are found in the Guogai-Piliuona, Aukštadvaris, Kernavė, Bačininkėliai, Grabijolai and Karmazinai settlements or in particular portions of them. The earliest artefacts indisputably linked with the rusticated pottery in Eastern Lithuania – a crossbow fibula with a bent foot, a silver Marcus Aurelius denarius found in a settlement in the Pajauta Valley in Kernavė, a wheel-shaped openwork pendant from the Aukštadvaris foot-settlement, an Antoninus Pius dupondius from the Turlojiškės settlement and others – can be dated to the beginning of the 3rd century. Therefore the transition in Eastern Lithuania from brushed to rusticated pottery took place at the end of the 2nd or beginning of the 3rd century and this was a rather short-term process, probably accomplished in one or two human generations.

The transition from early to late *rusticated pottery style* also probably took place in a similar manner. It is not clear whether different pottery features – the shape of pots, roughness – shifted all at once or at different times, but it is likely that no large time period passed between changes of different features. Only few of the latest finds connected with the early rusticated pottery style can be named: a ring-shaped temple ornament from the Migoniai hill-fort and an enamelled penannular fibula from the Bakšiai settlement. These artefacts are dated to the C<sub>3</sub> and D periods. At the same time, the onset of the late rusticated pottery style can be linked with fire strata from the

Migration Period at the Aukštadvaris and the “Aukuro kalnas” hill-forts. The earliest finds – triangled arrowheads from the Aukštadvaris hill-fort, the Kernavė hill-fort and settlement and the Radžiūnai settlement, and also a ring-shaped temple ornament from the Aukštadvaris hill-fort – can be dated to the D period even. Based on only a few finds, it can be asserted that the late rusticated pottery style replaced the early rusticated style more or less in the D period, i.e., the second half of the 4th or the first half of the 5th century.

It is complicated to date the extinction of late rusticated pottery in Eastern Lithuania. So far no finds later than the 5th century that can be confidently associated with late rusticated pottery have been found, but even so, it is unlikely that the date of the disappearance of this style can be put so early. Pottery from sites such as the Kernavė, Krūminai, Mažuloniai foot-settlements and the Kaukai and Bradeliškės hill-forts probably can be considered as the latest finds of late rusticated pottery. It is found together with *late fine-rusticated pottery* and *pottery with smooth surface* at these sites. At the present time we cannot tell when did the change take place from late rusticated to late fine-rusticated pottery styles, but the small amount of the latter style at Eastern Lithuanian settlements leads one to think that it existed for a fairly short time.

Data for dating the disappearance of late fine-rusticated pottery have to be sought in grave mound material. As the tradition to place whole pots in grave mounds spread in the 7th-8th centuries, pottery with a smooth surface already comes to dominate. But in the grave mounds several fine-rusticated pots are found as well, probably representing the final phase of employment of this style of pottery. The final examples of fine-rusticated pottery discovered are likely the pots found at Pabariai barrow 4, Laukiai barrow 1, Čiobiškis barrow D and Jakšiškis barrows 2 and 4. Jakšiškis barrow 2 is dated to the 7th-8th centuries, and while there is complication in dating the other barrows, they are likely to be of similar dates.

From the 8th century one needs to speak about pottery with smooth surface. Three types of pots of this kind belong to the *early style of pottery with smooth surface*. Although firmer data are lacking for dating, it is most likely that the earliest of these were the ridged pots, used about the 8th-9th century. These were replaced by those with a barrel form, the later with slightly profiled pots, seen until the end of the 10th century. Thus this style can likely be dated to the 8th-10th centuries.

The period under discussion is closed by the *late style of pottery with smooth surface*. This style of pottery is found in Varlišškės barrow 2, Žvirbliai barrow 47, Stakai barrow 9 and the Rokantiškės barrow. All of these barrows are dated to the second half of the 10<sup>th</sup> – first half of the 11th century, but this date seems only to indicate when these pots began to be used. It is very likely that very similar ceramics were still used in the 12th century as well, until the very beginning of the production of wheel-turned pottery (whose date in Eastern Lithuania has also not been determined precisely).

The classification and dating of pottery here is used as the basis for the periodization of settlements. The principle is that any settlement investigated in which some pottery is found can be assigned to a specific chronological period. If the settlement was inhabited for a longer duration and several styles of pottery are encountered there, then that can also be identified easily. In more widely investigated settlements it is an easy matter to differentiate discrete zones which were inhabited at different periods. It goes without say that the periodization needs further improvement. Some of the pottery styles differentiated here occupy periods of up to 300 years (Fig. 1), so the hope is that in the future it will be possible to narrow these, to identify more pottery variations.

## **ANALYSIS OF THE SETTLEMENT STRUCTURE**

Works dealing with the Lithuanian Iron Age almost totally skip analysis of the structure of settlements. The lack of works studying settlement structure can be explained by the lack of large-scale excavations: investigating a small portion of a settlement does not tell us much about its structure. All the same, the main reason for this lack is that when settlements have been excavated, almost no attempt has been made to identify their structure; these types of questions were pursued. Settlements are studied with an aim to determine their chronology, borders, in some cases their ethnic background, development of fortifications and similar. It is namely that the settlement structure has not been analyzed that creates the impression about the non-informativity of settlements material: only through the structure of settlements the social organization, economy and even ideology of the community can be analyzed.



The structure of a settlement is understood as the spatial distribution of activity areas and their inter-relationship. Any given human activity takes place in a specific zone. Since many types of activities require specific equipment, tools, spaces, etc., repeatedly performed actions are more efficiently performed in a fixed place. The inter-relationship between different activities is also quite significant: certain activities if performed adjacently disrupt one another. Other actions, on the contrary, are organized close to one another, while others still may be performed in the same place at alternate times. The distribution of all activities performed by a given community is the structure of the settlement, which not only reflects the nature of the community's social relationships, but at the same time is an active factor influencing such relationships.

The identification of activity areas, therefore, is of primary importance for the analysis of the settlement structure. That is not a simple task and it is made more difficult by several factors. Undoubtedly the specific nature of the activity itself has extraordinary significance for success in identifying an area of specific activity in archaeological context. The material expression of various activities varies widely; a given material product is produced at certain times and not at other times, certain activities require tools or facilities which survive in the archaeological record, others do not, and so on. The identification of activity areas is made more difficult because of their spatial intertwining: often different activities are performed in the same place, at long-term sites over time the structure changes, in consequence of which material of different origins mixes, later activities erase traces of earlier activities, and so on. It is also impossible to ignore processes of maintenance – the transportation and recycling of refuse – which are responsible for the rearrangement of artefacts in the archaeological record. Despite the foregoing factors mentioned it is possible in some cases to differentiate distinct activity areas, but to do that, an appropriate methodology of field excavations is of utmost importance. It includes first of all the strict spatial definition of artefacts, no exclusion of some artefacts (e.g., when artefacts such as ceramic fragments, slag, clay plaster, etc. are excluded for their low value as museum exhibits) and methods of natural applied as broadly as possible.

This work attempts to differentiate activity areas not according to how they are encountered and differentiated by certain archaeological data, but rather according to how they should be according to the current imagination of the settlements, society and

lifestyle of the Iron Age in Lithuania. In this fashion nine different types activity areas are defined which should appear in the settlements considered: residential, economic, storage, communication, subsistence, resources, sacral, defensive and midden zones. All of these areas should have been important for the existence of the settlement, so that in investigating settlements they should be considered to at least some degree.

One of the main zones defining the structure of the settlement is the *residential zone*. The residential zone serves many purposes, including sleeping, food preparation, rest, various small occupations, some crafts, and many others. Most activity by women and children usually can be connected with this zone. The major elements of the residential zone are the residential dwelling and its surroundings, the courtyard. In assessing archaeological material, identification of dwellings is of primary importance for analyzing the residential zone. However, a study of material from Eastern Lithuanian settlements investigated shows that clearer traces of buildings are found rather rarely, and to date it is hard to even say whether that is due to poor survival of their traces or for lack of large-scale investigations. Even few buildings which are more obvious have a much different construction, so it is still too early to speak of the development of building traditions in Eastern Lithuania as well as the distribution of houses in settlements. Internal layout, number of rooms in one dwelling as well as the interrelationship of individual buildings is significant in studying the residential zone. It is abundantly clear that none of these features can be studied in more detail using existing data.

The *economic zone* is also an important and distinct part of settlement structure. It is primarily connected with crafts that require separate space: blacksmith, non-ferrous metal crafts and so on. Analysis of the economic zone is extremely important for analyzing social and economic questions. These data are the main source of information for analyzing the development of crafts, the differentiation of a different class of craftsmen and etc. In the archaeological record different activities of economic zones are noted very unevenly. Some are easily recognized, some leave no detectable traces. In Eastern Lithuanian settlements these zones can be identified more often than other zones. Most often, traces of iron smelting and work-places of other metals are encountered. The pressing task for investigating settlement structure is not merely to identify these zones

but to determine their relationship with other zones, however, that can only be done rarely.

*Storage zones* are connected with preservation and storage of products, raw materials, reserves, tools and other items. These zones are important for analysis of social and economic processes in that they facilitate determination of the development of agriculture and production, collection of surpluses in specific places and similar. At the same time in a certain sense they reflect social differentiation in the society, economic capacity and many other social features significant for archaeologists. In investigating Iron Age settlements in Lithuania, utilitarian buildings are often ascribed to this zone. Nonetheless investigation of this zone is made much more difficult because of the poor preservation of products stored and they are thus difficult to identify, often requiring special investigations.

*Communication zones* provide communication between all other zones and support communication between members of the community. Roads, streets, squares and also elements connecting with other settlements: regional roads, bodies of water with docks or ports belong to this zone. These zones can often even be the deciding factor influencing the arrangement of the other zones and thus the entire structure of the settlement. The characteristic feature of this zone is that it can serve separate functions at different times. If it is usually used for communication, at specific times it becomes a site for trade, and a venue for community assemblies, celebrations, religious rituals and other events. These functions of the communication zone can also influence the social and ideological significance of adjacent areas. This zone is quite difficult to detect in the archaeological record as well. Usually these areas were left without construction built over them, so there is no characteristic building of one type or another left behind to aid in identification. During the period of its use this zone might have been maintained and swept, so that larger artefacts should not be typically found there either. This zone doesn't receive much treatment in research on Eastern Lithuanian settlements. For example, the central area of hill-forts is described simply as "uninhabited," without finer analysis of its function.

*Subsistence zones* are basically connected with agriculture fields and pastures. These zones are some of the most important elements of settlements without which their existence would have been impossible. They are also quite significant in the

archaeological sense, providing information about many aspects of society – demographics, economics, social relations, etc. In many cases these sites were also responsible for the choice of settlement site itself. On the other hand, they are among the most difficult to detect in the archaeological record, and indirect sources – products, tools and other data – are usually used as bases for making determinations about them. Although these sources provide some information, they do not always provide all the information desired. In Lithuania mainly agriculture tools, remnants of grain and animal bones have been relied upon in investigations of agriculture and animal husbandry. Only recently, and then intermittently, has analysis of pollen been applied, which provides more comprehensive data on agricultural systems. This is what severely limits the current understanding of agriculture. Distinct agriculture systems and their transitions are based on a rather primitive conception of agriculture and Marxist-Leninist models of societal evolution.

*Resource zones* are also necessary for the existence of a settlement, but because resources are obtained from nature, their locations can be somewhat remote from other zones. These zones could equally be considered part of the natural environment, but resources are consistently extracted at the same sites, so that they become cultural as well as natural parts of the landscape. Certain resource zones can influence the selection of the site for settlement, as well as its abandonment if resources are exhausted. Which resources and in what amounts are needed for the settlement depend mostly on the size of the settlement, its production mode and economy. Uncommon resources, such as those found only in certain regions and exported – non-ferrous metals, precious stones, amber, salt and etc. – usually receive more attention from archaeologists. None of such resources are known to exist anywhere in Eastern Lithuania, so in this context we are only addressing resources needed by the settlement itself.

*Sacral zones* are areas where rituals, sacrifices and religious ceremonies were performed, as well sites with a sacred significance to the communities living next to them. Burial sites, much studied by archaeologists, also belong to these zones. Settlement archaeology is interested in sacral zones mainly in terms of their spatial arrangement. These zones could delimit specific borders of settlements, “no-man’s-land” or wastelands and, viewed from the present perspective, seemingly irrational aspects in the arrangement of the zones of the settlement or the choice of site for the settlement.

Sacral zones are also important from a social point of view; their presence at a settlement could influence that settlement's status among other settlements. In recent times cultic zones have been the focus of much attention in Lithuania, although these investigations are still in their initial state.

*Defensive zones* are designed for community members to protect themselves in case of attack. These are natural or artificial barriers that make offensive actions by enemies more difficult. When we speak of defensive zones at Lithuanian Iron Age settlements, we are considering primarily hill-forts and their fortifications. Fortifications at open settlements, ramparts and natural barriers are also mentioned. The most significant fortifications certainly are those connected with hill-forts. The very existence of hill-forts is impossible to separate from their defensive function. Lithuanian archaeologists have dedicated much investigation to the defensive fortifications of hill-forts as well. In going over works on this theme, one finds that dating is one of the most pressing tasks. Since earth-moving processes take place during the construction of ramparts, ramparts cannot be dated according to artefacts found in them. The only reliable dating method would be radiocarbon, but this is still not used generally. Another matter that becomes clear in research works on hill-forts and their fortifications is that the defensive function of hill-forts is often exaggerated, completely ignoring the other functions they might have had.

*Midden zones* depend mainly on what was considered refuse and on cultural factors dictating behaviour with that refuse. The quantity of waste is directly related to the intensity of recycling. In Eastern Lithuania distinct refuse zones have not been located: no larger collections of refuse or dumps have been found. Refuse zones are usually associated with utility pits into which, it is thought, various types of rubbish were thrown. The main factor hindering investigation of refuse zones is that organic material usually is not preserved at Iron Age settlements. Typically only inorganic refuse is found – ceramic sherds, burnt stones and slag – which do not present a complete picture of these zones.

The totality of the zones enumerated here should be understood as the archaeological settlement. The settlement, however, is often understood in a much narrower sense. Often archaeological conclusions are more influenced by the territories and zoning established by cultural heritage management rather than a conception of the

real settlement that existed in the past. All settlement zones must be considered as a single whole, a seamless settlement, but not as a complex of mutually related archaeological sites. The point in differentiating these zones is that, using the archaeological record of settlements as a basis, it is possible not only to recreate the external appearance of the settlement but, much more importantly, to reconstruct the society that once lived there in its technological, economic, social and ideological aspects.

Returning to the settlements of Eastern Lithuania, it is clear that current data on these zones are minimal. Many zones require special investigation, some of which need to be performed during excavations. Until now, Lithuanian archaeologists have been pursuing totally different directions, so that such investigations have not been performed, or performed only partially. Many of the larger-scale excavations at Eastern Lithuanian settlements were executed during Soviet period when the notion prevailed that the social structure could be reconstructed based on general models of social evolution, so that different details were overlooked. The situation remains little changed today. Many of the assertions concerning settlement structure are supported by citing works several decades old. Such assertions are repeated continually by different authors without considering the validity of primary sources of cited affirmations, nor the comprehensiveness of data at the time they were established.

The result of all this is that discussion of settlement zones is currently oriented more toward critique of old interpretations than to the creation of new ones. These criticisms don't claim that those interpretations are necessarily incorrect, but are aimed more toward showing that they are not sufficiently based on archaeological data, so they must be viewed critically rather than accepting them as proven facts. Although settlement zones are differentiated here in order to facilitate reconstruction of society, such a reconstruction based on existing data is so far premature. In order to complete this task, these zones must first be identified in a concrete archaeological record, and their features and interrelationship discovered. At the same time we see that archaeological investigations conducted so far provide a very minimum of information about them.

Despite the fragmentary nature of current data, we can obtain some tangible results now based on the methodology of the activity areas presented above. By using this method and also the improved chronology of pottery, it becomes clear that the

currently accepted model of development of the function of hill-forts and their relation with a foot-settlement in Eastern Lithuania in the first millennium must be heavily corrected. This is especially true with the function and chronology of hill-forts–refuges. The most essential of such corrections can be singled out as the following:

- a) hill-forts–refuges were not a direct continuation of the hill-forts–settlements of the Brushed Pottery Culture. The abandonment of the latter and the construction of refuges is separated by a span of approx. 300 years;
- b) to date there are no stronger arguments for the assertion that in the first millennium members of the upper social class might have inhabited certain hill-forts on a permanent basis. The horizons of hill-forts of this period have no indications of a residential zone;
- c) hill-forts–refuges did not become feudal castles at the end of the 1st millennium/beginning of the 2nd millennium, and did not do so before the 12th or beginning of the 13th century.

Analysis of activity areas also compels rethinking the traditional conception of the relationship between the hill-fort and its foot-settlement. These sites are often understood as separate parts of an archaeological complex, with priority placed usually on the hill-fort and the settlement considered a sort of appendage to it. Nonetheless this should be understood as a single system, and the diversity of activity zones found at foot-settlements indicates a more significant role within that system than is usually portrayed.

It is clear that not much at all can be said about the structure of settlements at the current time. Even so, current data do allow for forming a general picture in broad strokes of certain specific matters. Here one settlement – Kernavė – is the subject of an attempt at reconstruction of the development of settlement structure. In the 1st and 2nd century a settlement was located in the “Aukuro kalnas” hill-fort, which at that time was a natural hill or terrace outcropping with 6-16 meter high slopes. The settlement is nucleated and small; buildings were arranged on its perimeter with an open central area free of constructions. Most likely all of the community’s activities were concentrated within the nucleated settlement, excepting subsistence areas and extraction of other resources. In the 2nd half of the 2nd century the settlement on “Aukuro kalnas” was suddenly abandoned and the people moved to dispersed farmsteads in the valley. The

farmsteads were arranged away from one another and were likely surrounded by arable fields which apparently belonged to each farm separately. These farmsteads did not remain in one place for a long period of time, over time they moved several tens or several hundreds of meters away from the former farm. New changes at the Kernavė settlement are noted around the 5th century. First of all, the “Aukuro kalnas” hill-fort began to function again and fortifications were erected there. At around the same time the upper terrace of the valley was inhabited, while the valley settlement system did not change. Data on the settlement at the end of the 1st and the beginning of the 2nd millennium remain very fragmentary and the structure of settlement at this time remains unclear. The same is true for the formation of the urban settlement there: we cannot say what changes took place then, nor whether this was a sudden reorientation of the settlement structure or the result of gradual changes.

The structure of the Kernavė settlement and its transformation over the Iron Age can only be painted in very broad strokes; we can locate concentrations of artefacts characteristic of different periods, but cannot assign them to one or another settlement zone. Iron melting and non-ferrous metal working sites have been found, but there are insufficient data to say what their place within the settlement structure was. This is the state of affairs at the most investigated and most archaeologically productive Eastern Lithuanian settlement. All other settlements have been investigated much more sporadically, so it is clear that it is still too early to make pronouncements about their structures. With the model of development of the Kernavė settlement in mind, it must also be noted that it reflects only partially the general development of Eastern Lithuanian settlements; undoubtedly certain settlements underwent individual development outside the general model.

## **SETTLEMENT PATTERN ANALYSIS**

In recent times Lithuanian archaeologists have devoted much attention to the settlement patterns. Even so, this topic is usually investigated in only one regard: considering questions on the formation of a hierarchy of settlements and a political-territorial structure. Unfortunately, much of the work on this theme is based in essence



exclusively upon the arrangement of burial sites; existing data on settlements are too poor to come to even the most general conclusions.

One of the most vital criteria for investigating settlement pattern structure is the representativity of existing data. It is problematic, however, to assess the representativity of the map of archaeological settlements. The number of these sites currently known or knowable in the future will always be only a part of those that existed in the past; the number of known sites is just a portion of those that have survived, and those that survived are a portion of those that once existed. The number of sites that will be found depends on a number of factors – the visibility of objects, knowledge of them among local inhabitants, their present condition and environments, and also on the strategies and intensity of survey. These factors mean that archaeological sites of different types – hill-forts, settlements and burial sites – are known non-uniformly. The percentage of survivals of discrete sites will also be non-uniform; natural as well as human activities will have affected them differently.

An at least approximate calculation of the number of undiscovered and non-surviving sites is extraordinarily important in trying to assess the representativity of the existing archaeological map. Because such a map never includes everything, any analysis of the settlement network structure can only be performed having assessed the factors of their representativity. In Lithuania little regard has been given to this aspect so far, although it is obvious that the distribution of different kinds of sites is very non-uniform. Currently in Eastern Lithuania about 350 hill-forts (140 of them with foot-settlements), 270 barrow-cemeteries and 40 open settlements are conserved. Even the list of the best understood group of sites, hill-forts, cannot be considered very exhaustive at this point in time, while the list of settlements probably only includes a few percent of settlements that existed in the past. The extremely small number of site complexes, represented by a settlement and its burial place, known also demonstrates the low representativity of sites.

With that in consideration, enhancing the list of archaeological sites is much more urgent at the current time than formulating interpretations based on current data. Certainly, some general introductions can be presented based on existing information – sparsely and densely populated regions can be differentiated and their interfaces with the natural environment can be analyzed as much as it has been reconstructed. But

discussions of the stability of settlements, the development of a network structure, or even the differentiation of settlements and the formation of a hierarchy, are matters which the currently-held data do not support.

### **MOST IMPORTANT DIRECTIONS FOR RESEARCH**

In consideration of the problems discussed in this work, settlement archaeology in Lithuania at the current time can be evolved in rather modest directions. The most important direction for further work is the collection of new data corresponding to the questions posed. In order for this to be purposeful and effective, research in the area of theory and methodology needs to take place concurrently. Since the collection of data is a long-lasting process, it is hard to expect broader generalizing conclusions to be made in the near future. In this sense, therefore, micro-regional research is crucial. It is considerably easier and does not require a very long time period to collect data for micro-regional investigations to accomplish, but does provide quite rich data.

Returning to the collection of data, three most important groups whose deficiency is the clearest need to be singled out. First of all this is the need for large-scale settlement excavations. Even now we have no really comprehensively excavated Iron Age settlement in Lithuania, and this severely limits current recognition of their structure. Another large deficit is the almost complete lack of knowledge on the natural environment in the Iron Age. These data can only be obtained by working closely with specialists from other scientific disciplines, performing multidisciplinary studies. Especially needed at this time is collection of and research on palaeo-botanical data. A third but no less important group of data needed is the location of settlements themselves. Although the search for new sites is being carried out constantly, it needs to be more systematic and intensive; only in this manner will it be possible to obtain scientific goals and not merely make gains in monument conservation and protection.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

1. Settlement archaeology lags behind in Lithuania because of the way archaeological traditions have developed over time. The main factor concerns the

conception of the general aims of archaeology: it was used for differentiating cultures rather than a socio-economic reconstruction of society. In Soviet period, the *de rigueur* Marxist-Leninist paradigm emphasizing the development of social and economic relationships gave rise to a contrary reaction and quelled archaeologists' interest in these topics. The cultural-historical paradigm, aimed at studies on defining archaeological cultures and making ethnic interpretations of them, came to the fore as an alternative to the Marxist-Leninist paradigm. Under these circumstances all attention went to burial site material, and research on settlements lost any relevancy. At the present time the interest of archaeologists for the issues addressed by settlement archaeology is noticeable, but gaps that have arisen in the development of archaeology – lack of data, lack of a theoretical as well as methodological foundation – do not allow for the attainment of tangible results.

2. The abundance of pottery found in the settlements is the best indicator for their chronology. Based on existing data at the current time, pottery styles have been identified successfully representing seven different periods characteristic of Eastern Lithuania from the 1st to the 12th centuries. Dating of the different styles is not uniformly precise, but varies by from 50 to 300 years. This is connected with more general problems in dating the Lithuanian Iron Age: the best dating is for Roman Period pottery, the worst for Late Iron Age. The chronology presented here is relative, based on artifacts found together with the pottery, and is thus susceptible to correction. As new data are discovered in the future, the chronological limits of different styles can be corrected, or one style can be subdivided into several sub-styles.

3. Only one style of pottery existed at one given time in Eastern Lithuania. Contrary to accepted opinion, it was not the gradual quantitative disappearance of one type of vessels and the growth in quantity of another type, which is characteristic of change. The evolution of technological, morphological and decorative features of pottery production caused shifts in styles. At a certain point for some reason one feature stopped being used and was replaced by a new one. The sum of features existing at one time was combined into the prevailing style. Thus the following styles have been differentiated: sharply ridged brushed pottery (1st century to 1st half of the 2nd century), weakly ridged brushed pottery (2nd half of the 2nd century), early rusticated pottery (3rd century to 2nd half of 4th century/1st half of the 5th century), late rusticated pottery (2nd half of 4th

century/1st half of 5th century to approximately the 7th century), late fine-rusticated pottery (~7th-8th centuries), early pottery with smooth surface (~8th century to 2nd half of 10th/1st half of 11th century) and late pottery with smooth surface (2nd half of 10th/1st half of 11th century to the 12th century). Although at one time only one of these styles of pottery existed, pots of other types were produced at the same time (e.g., burnished, pinched pottery). These are called secondary types and they are not usually found as more than a few percent of total sherds recovered at a site. Most likely these were vessels for special uses.

4. Analysis of settlement structure by activity areas facilitates the conception of the functioning of the settlement as a whole system, and gives insight into economic, social, ideological and ecological reasons behind the formation of a specific settlement structure. Activity areas are distinguished by functional aspect and residential, economic, storage, communication, subsistence, resource, sacral, defensive and midden zones are recognized at Lithuanian Iron Age settlements. The differentiation of zones is based on the fact that any human activity can be defined spatially, and the structure of the settlement is nothing else than the arrangement of different activities within the zone defined.

5. When Eastern Lithuanian settlement material is applied to the model of activity zones, the problem of a lack of data is clearly encountered. One of the most serious problems is that identification of the main element of residential zones – residential buildings – is only successful in a few separate cases. This in itself forms a barrier to consideration of many questions. Many factors are responsible for the lack of data, including the small scope of excavations, lack of collection of data needed for differentiating zones (small fragments of pottery, palaeo-botanical remains, etc.). Nonetheless, by focusing attention on these aspects, this problem can be solved rather simply by collecting new data.

6. By applying the activity area model, a fresh view of the relationship between hill-forts and foot-settlements is possible. This reveals the functional features of these sites, which has not been done before. It is namely function that determines the significance and importance of a settlement site. The settlement and the hill-fort need to be perceived as a single indivisible system, and the role of foot-settlement within this system is much more important than is usually indicated. Analysis of activity areas

shows as well that the function of the hill-forts is usually understood simplistically, exclusively emphasizing its defensive significance.

7. Analysis of the settlement pattern structure is something for which representativity of data has an exceptional significance. Without having assessed the statistical representativity of the archaeological map, no analysis of the settlement patterns can be successful. This representativity must be considered in two ways: assessing the quantity of sites not surviving and also surviving, but not yet discovered. Assessing the situation in Eastern Lithuania, three of the best known types of sites can be considered: hill-forts, barrow-cemeteries and settlements. A more accurate assessment of the representativity of known sites is a subject deserving of another work in its own right, but the general situation indicates that this representativity is still very poor. This is especially true of open settlements, which are much less known than other kinds of monuments.

8. In expanding settlement archaeology in Lithuania, the main tasks today should concern data collection. More emphasis should be given to large-scale excavations at single sites, to the collection of palaeo-botanical and geological data as well as from other natural sites and the systematic survey for new sites.

## RYTŲ LIETUVOS GYVENVIETĖS I-XII a.

### Santrauka

**Ivadas.** Pastaruoju metu archeologai dažnai pastebi, kad geležies amžius Lietuvoje yra pažystamas beveik vien tik pagal laidojimo paminklų medžiagą. Šis teiginys didesnių abejonių nekelia, tačiau nuomonės dėl tokios situacijos išsiskiria. Vieniems tyrinėtojams tai gali pasirodyti didelis trūkumas, kiti tame problemos gali ir neįžvelgti. Nors iš pirmo žvilgsnio tokie požiūriai prieštarauja vienas kitam, toks jų skirtumas yra natūralus. Tai galima paaiškinti bendresnių archeologijos tikslų supratimu. Ilgą laiką Lietuvoje pagrindinė tyrinėjimų kryptis buvo etniniai tyrinėjimai, po nepriklausomybės atgavimo labai išpopuliarėjo tarpkultūrinių santykių analizė. Suprantama, kad analizuojant šias temas su gyvenviečių tyrinėjimų trūkumu nesusidurta – laidojimo paminklų medžiaga joms teikė kur kas išsamesnę informaciją. Tačiau pastarojo meto darbuose vis dažniau pastebima, kad laidojimo paminklų medžiaga nesuteikia visos pageidaujamos informacijos, taigi, gyvenviečių medžiaga tampa vis aktualesnė. Tai taip pat galima paaiškinti naujomis archeologijos mokslo raidos tendencijomis – etniniams tyrinėjimams skiriama vis mažiau dėmesio, vis dažniau bandoma analizuoti socialinė santvarka, teritorinė apgyvendinimo struktūra ir panašios temos. Būtent čia ir pasireiškia gyvenviečių medžiagos aktualumas, tačiau tyrinėtojams tenka nusivilti, kadangi ši medžiaga pasirodo pernelyg fragmentiška ir nepanaudojama.

Šia disertacija siekta pradėti ir paskatinti sistemingus geležies amžiaus gyvenviečių tyrinėjimus Lietuvoje. Pagrindinė su archeologinėmis gyvenvietėmis susijusi problema yra ne tai, kad jų medžiaga yra mažai panaudojama geležies amžiaus visuomenės rekonstrukcijai, bet tai, kad Lietuvoje nėra susiformavęs teorinis ir metodologinis gyvenviečių medžiagos interpretavimo pagrindas. Tai užkerta kelią gilesniam archeologinių gyvenviečių pažinimui ir sudaro įspūdį, kad jų medžiaga yra labai neinformatyvi ir nesuteikia vertingos informacijos. Dėl šios priežasties formali tyrinėtų gyvenviečių duomenų analizė šiuo metu didesnės naudos neduotų. Visų pirma, reikia apsibrėžti, ką norima sužinoti tyrinėjant gyvenvietes ir koku būdu galima tai padaryti.

Disertacijoje bandyta suformuluoti konkrečiai Lietuvos geležies amžiui pritaikytą gyvenviečių archeologijos modelį – išskirti aktualiausias problemas, ir pasiūlyti metodologiją joms analizuoti. Pagrindinis darbo tikslas – **šiuo metu turimos Rytų Lietuvos gyvenviečių medžiagos įvertinimas sudaryto gyvenviečių archeologijos modelio kontekste**. Darbu siekta išsiaiškinti, kiek informatyvi yra iki šiol sukaupta medžiaga ir kiek šie duomenys gali būti panaudojami analizuojant naujai iškeltas problemas, kurios nebuvo aktualios jų kaupimo metu. Tuo pačiu stengtasi išryškinti ir didžiausias spragas, į kurias reikėtų labiausiai orientuotis kaupiant naujus duomenis. Analizuojant atskiras problemas, aptariama kiek ir kokių duomenų joms spręsti turima šiuo metu, kokią metodiką galima taikyti, ką reikia daryti, kad tų duomenų pagausėtų.

Šiame darbe remtasi tik Rytų Lietuvos gyvenviečių medžiaga, tačiau analizuojamos problemos yra tiek pat aktualios ir kitiems regionams. Iš esmės darbas orientuotas ne tiek į Rytų Lietuvos gyvenvietes, kiek į gyvenviečių archeologiją, analizuojančią vieną kultūrinį regioną.

**Gyvenviečių tyrinėjimų raida.** Gyvenviečių tyrinėjimų istoriją Lietuvoje, stengtasi parodyti bendrame Lietuvos archeologijos raidos kontekste. Šiame skyriuje bandyta ne tiek išvardinti ir aprašyti gyvenviečių tyrinėjimus, kiek parodyti, kaip formavosi Lietuvos archeologų požiūris į gyvenvietes, kokia reikšmė joms buvo teikiama atskirais tyrinėjimų laikotarpiais, tokiu būdu išryškinant šiuo metu susiklosčiusio gyvenviečių archeologijos atsilikimo priežastis. Tarpukariu Puzinas daugiausiai dėmesio skyrė Lietuvos proistorės periodizacijai, todėl savo darbuose gyvenviečių medžiagai skyrė nedaug dėmesio, nors dažnai pabrėždavo jų svarbą. Lietuvai atsidūrus TSRS sudėtyje buvo akcentuojami socialinių santykių tyrinėjimai, ir kaip tik tuo metu galima išvelgti padidėjusį susidomėjimą gyvenvietėmis. Tačiau šis periodas truko neilgai ir jau nuo 7-to dešimtmečio visas dėmesys skiriamas etnogenezei – taip gyvenvietės vėl tampa neaktualios ir tyrinėjimai nukreipiami į laidojimo paminklus. Etniniai tyrinėjimai tuo metu buvo aktualūs ir svarbūs, bet būtent jie ir prisidėjo prie gyvenviečių archeologijos atsilikimo, kuris ryškus dar ir šiais laikais.

**Chronologija.** Chronologijos pagrindu čia laikoma keramika – jos randama visose gyvenvietėse, todėl ji šiam tikslui yra pati tinkamiausia. Peržiūrėta keramika iš Lietuvos Nacionalinio ir Kernavės muziejų. Analizuojant keramiką, stengtasi išskirti, kurie jos bruožai yra reikšmingi chronologiniu aspektu, pagal tai išskirti 7 stiliai,

datuojami skirtingais periodais. Keramikos datavimas nustatytas pagal kartu su ja rastus geriau datuojamus radinius. Tokiu būdu pavyko atskirų stilių keramikos datavimą susiaurinti iki 1-3 šimtmečių. Keramikos analizė leido atmesti ir iki šiol įsigalėjusius teiginius apie tai, kad kelios keramikos rūšys ilgą laiką egzistavo kartu.

**Gyvenviečių struktūros analizė.** Gyvenvietės struktūrą analizuoti yra būtina norint, kad tyrinėjimų duomenys teiktų bent kokią informaciją apie praeities visuomenę. Tačiau Lietuvoje to daryti kol kas dar nemėginta, gyvenviečių duomenys analizuojami be konteksto – tik atskiri radiniai, pastatai, židiniai. Tokiu būdu neįmanoma gauti išsamios informacijos, kurią galėtų suteikti gyvenviečių tyrinėjimai, todėl susidaro įspūdis, kad jos yra neinformatyvios.

Gyvenvietės struktūra yra suvokiama kaip įvairių veiklos zonų išdėstymas erdvėje ir jų tarpusavio santykis. Bet kokia žmogaus veikla yra vykdoma tam tikroje vietoje. Kadangi daugelis veiklos rūšių reikalauja tam tikrų įrengimų, įrankių, erdvės ir pan., pakartotinai atliekamą veiklą yra patogiau atlikti pastovioje vietoje. Visų tam tikros bendruomenės atliekamų veiklų išdėstymas erdvėje ir yra gyvenvietės struktūra, kuri ne tik pasyviai atspindi bendruomenės socialinių santykių pobūdį, tačiau tuo pačiu yra ir aktyvus veiksnys, reguliuojantis šiuos santykius.

Šiame darbe pabandyta išskirti veiklos zonas ne pagal tai, kokios jos yra aptiktos ir išskirtos archeologinių tyrinėjimų duomenimis, tačiau pagal tai, kokios jos turėtų būti pagal dabartinę Lietuvos geležies amžiaus gyvenvietės, visuomenės ir gyvensenos supratimą. Tokiu būdu išskirtos 9 skirtingos veiklos zonos, kurios turėjo būti analizuojamose gyvenvietėse – gyvenamoji, ūkinė, sandėliavimo, komunikacinė, maisto šaltinių, resursų, kulto, gynybinė ir atliekų zonos. Visos šios zonos turėjo būti svarbios gyvenvietės egzistavimui, todėl analizuojant gyvenvietes, jos turi būti bent jau tam tikru lygiu pažįstamos, nors dažniausiai gyvenvietė suvokiama daug siauresne prasme.

Tokių zonų išskyrimo esmė yra ta, kad jos gyvenviečių medžiagos pagrindu leidžia ne tik atkurti gyvenvietės išorinį vaizdą, tačiau, kas yra žymiai svarbiau, rekonstruoti ir tą gyvenvietę palikusią visuomenę technologiniais, ekonominiais, socialiniais ar ideologiniais aspektais.

Analizuojant kiekvieną išskirtą zoną atskirai, darosi aišku, kad visoms joms apibūdinti duomenų dar turima labai mažai. Dėl to kaltas ne tik platesnių tyrinėjimų nebuvimas, bet nemažiau svarbu ir tai, kad ir mažesnės apimties tyrimai dažnai atlikti



nelabai kokybiškai. Tas nekokybiškumas labai dažnai susijęs su gyvenviečių kasinėjimų tikslais – pavyzdžiui, jei gyvenvietės tyrinėjimų tikslas apsibrėžiamas tik kaip ribų ir chronologijos nustatymas, labai tikėtina, kad tokie tyrinėjimai nieko daugiau ir neduos. Viso to rezultatas yra toks, kad aptariant gyvenviečių zonas šiuo metu tenka daugiau orientuotis į senų interpretacijų kritiką, o ne į naujų kūrimą. Kas dėl šios kritikos, tai nuodugniau analizuojant plačiai išgalėjusius teiginius, susijusius su gyvenvietėmis, galima pastebėti, kad daugelis iš jų, nors ir yra ilgą laiką kartojami įvairių autorių, realiais duomenimis nėra pagrįsti, todėl neturėtų būti priimami kaip neginčijamas faktas, o tik kaip hipotezės. Nors patikimesnes interpretacijas šiuo metu daryti dar ankstoka, analizuojant gyvenviečių medžiagą šiuo metodu, bent jau išryškėja į kokių duomenų kaupimą reikia orientuotis norint spręsti kokį nors tam tikrą klausimą.

**Gyvenviečių tinklo struktūra.** Pastaruoju metu šia tema pasirodė gana nemažai darbų, tačiau daugelyje jų susiduriama su duomenų trūkumo problema. Kartais tai bandoma spręsti darant nevisai pagrįstas išvadas, tačiau tokia išeitis nėra labai teigiamas dalykas. Šiame darbe bandyta akcentuoti tai, kad svarbiausias dalykas, kuris būtinas gyvenviečių tinklo arba apgyvendinimo analizei, yra tyrimui naudojamų duomenų išsamumas. Akivaizdu, kad šiuo metu duomenų dar trūksta, todėl kol kas reikėtų labiau orientuotis į gyvenviečių ir kitų objektų paiešką, o ne į mažai pagrįstų interpretacijų darymą.

Atsižvelgiant į šiame darbe aptartas problemas, galima daryti išvadą, kad gyvenviečių archeologijoje Lietuvoje dar negalima daryti kažkokių apibendrinamųjų išvadų. Daugiau dėmesio reikėtų skirti duomenų kaupimui. Čia reikėtų išskirti tris pačias svarbiausias jų grupes, kurių trūkumas yra akivaizdžiausias. Visų pirma, tai plačios apimties gyvenviečių kasinėjimų poreikis. Kitas didelis trūkumas yra tai, kad beveik nieko nežinoma apie geležies amžiaus gamtinę aplinką, todėl reikalingi sistemingi paleobotaniniai tyrimai. Trečia, duomenų grupė – pačių gyvenviečių lokalizacija. Nors naujų objektų paieška nuolat vykdoma, ji turėtų būti sistematiškesnė ir intensyvesnė.

### **Išvados:**

1. Gyvenviečių archeologijos atsilikimą Lietuvoje lėmė istoriškai susiklosčiusi archeologijos mokslo raida ir tradicijos. Pagrindinė priežastis susijusi su bendrą archeologijos tikslų suvokimu – jie buvo orientuoti į kultūrų išskyrimą, o ne į socialinę-ekonominę visuomenės rekonstrukciją. Šiuo metu jau galima pastebėti tyrinėtojų

susidomėjimą gyvenviečių archeologijos nagrinėjamosiomis problemomis, tačiau archeologijos mokslo raidoje susiklosčiusios spragos – duomenų trūkumas, teorinio bei metodologinio pagrindo nebuvimas – neleidžia pasiekti apčiuopiamesnių rezultatų.

2. Gyvenviečių chronologiją geriausiai parodo gausiai jose aptinkama keramika. Šiuo metu turimos medžiagos pagrindu pavyko išskirti 7 atskirus laikotarpius žyminčius keramikos stilius, kurie buvo būdingi Rytų Lietuvai I-XII a. Atskirų stilių datavimas yra nevienodo tikslumo, jis svyruoja nuo pusės iki trijų amžių.

3. Rytų Lietuvoje vienu metu egzistavo tik vieno stiliaus keramika. Priešingai įsigalėjusiai nuomonei, keramikos stilių kaitai nėra būdingas palaipsnis kiekybinis vieno tipo puodų mažėjimas, o kito daugėjimas. Išskirti šie stiliai: ryškiai briaunuota brūkšniuotoji keramika (1 a. – 2 a. I pusė), silpnai briaunuota brūkšniuotoji keramika (2 a. II pusė), ankstyvoji grublėtoji keramika (3 a. – 4 a. II pusė/5 a. I pusė), vėlyvoji grublėtoji keramika (4 a. II pusė/5 a. I pusė - ~7 a.), vėlyvoji kruopėtoji keramika (~7-8 a.), ankstyvoji keramika lygiu paviršiumi (~8 a. – 10 a. II pusė/11 a. I pusė) ir vėlyvoji keramika lygiu paviršiumi (10 a. II pusė/11 a. I pusė – 12 a.).

4. Gyvenviečių struktūros analizė pagal veiklos zonas padeda geriau įsivaizduoti gyvenvietės kaip vientisos sistemos funkcionavimą, be to, tai leidžia išvelgti tam tikras ekonomines, socialines, ideologines, ekologines bei kitas priežastis, lėmusias tam tikros gyvenvietės struktūros formavimąsi. Veiklos zonos skirstomos funkciniu aspektu, Lietuvos geležies amžiaus gyvenvietėse išskirtos gyvenamosios, ūkinės, sandėliavimo, komunikacinės, maisto šaltinių, resursų, kulto, gynybinės ir atliekų zonos.

5. Prie sudaryto veiklos zonų modelio bandant pritaikyti Rytų Lietuvos gyvenviečių medžiagą, akivaizdžiai susiduriama su duomenų trūkumo problema. Viena rimčiausių problemų yra tai, kad tik pavieniais atvejais pavyksta identifikuoti pagrindinius gyvenamųjų zonų elementus – gyvenamuosius pastatus. Vien jau tai užkerta kelią daugelio klausimų nagrinėjimui. Duomenų trūkumą sąlygoja daugelis veiksnių, tarp jų mažos tyrinėjimų apimtys, zonų išskyrimui reikalingų duomenų nerinkimas (smulki keramika, paleobotaninės liekanos ir kt.).

6. Taikant veiklos zonų metodą, galima naujai pažvelgti į piliakalnio ir papėdės gyvenvietės santykį. Taip yra išryškinamas funkcinės šių objektų ypatybės, ko anksčiau nepavykdavo padaryti. Būtent funkcija ir apsprendžia konkrečios gyvenvietės vietos reikšmę ir svarbą. Gyvenvietė ir piliakalnis turi būti suvokiami kaip viena nedaloma

sistema, o papėdės gyvenvietės vaidmuo joje yra daug svarbesnis nei paprastai tai parodoma. Veiklos zonų analizė rodo, kad ir piliakalnio funkcija dažniausiai yra suvokiama per daug supaprastintai, akcentuojant tik gynybinę jo reikšmę.

7. Gyvenviečių tinklo struktūros analizė yra metodas, kuriam išskirtinę reikšmę turi duomenų išsamumas. Tinkamai neįvertinus archeologinio žemėlapiu reprezentatyvumo, jokia gyvenviečių tinklo analizė negali būti sėkminga. Šis reprezentatyvumas turi būti analizuojamas dviem aspektais – įvertinant iki šių laikų neišlikusių ir išlikusių, bet dar neatrastų objektų kiekį. Vertinant padėtį Rytų Lietuvoje, galima analizuoti tris geriausiai pažįstamus objektų tipus – piliakalnius, pilkapius ir gyvenvietes. Tikslesnis žinomų objektų reprezentatyvumo įvertinimas yra atskiro darbo verta problema, tačiau bendra situacija rodo, kad jis yra dar labai žemas.

8. Plėtojant gyvenviečių archeologiją Lietuvoje, šiuo metu pagrindiniai uždaviniai turėtų būti siejami su duomenų kaupimu. Daugiausiai dėmesio turėtų būti skiriama plačios apimties tyrinėjimų viename objekte vykdymui, paleobotaninių, geologinių ir kitų gamtos mokslų teikiamų duomenų kaupimui bei sistemingai naujų paminklų paieškai.

**Topic-related scientific publications**  
**Mokslinės publikacijos disertacijos tema**

Vengalis R., Grublėtoji keramika Rytų Lietuvoje // Lietuvos archeologija. Vilnius, 2007, T. 32, p. 105-132. ISSN 0207-8694

Vengalis R., Rytų Lietuvos keramika VIII-XII a. // Lietuvos archeologija. Vilnius, 2008, T. 33, p. 41-70. ISSN 0207-8694

**Name, surname**

Rokas Vengalis

**Education**

1998-2002 Bachelor studies at Vilnius University, bachelor degree in Archaeology

2002-2004 Master studies at Vilnius University, master degree in Archaeology

2004-2008 Doctoral studies at Vilnius University

**Occupation**

Since 2003 – State Cultural Reserve of Kernavė

**E-mail**

rokasven@gmail.com

**Vardas, pavardė**

Rokas Vengalis

**Išsilavinimas**

1998-2002 m. bakalauro studijos Vilniaus universitete, archeologijos bakalauro kvalifikacinis laipsnis

2002-2004 m. magistrantūros studijos Vilniaus universitete, archeologijos magistro kvalifikacinis laipsnis

2004-2008 m. doktorantūros studijos Vilniaus universitete

**Darbovietė**

Nuo 2003 m. – Valstybinio Kernavės kultūrinio rezervato direkcija

**El. paštas:**

rokasven@gmail.com