

SOME COMMENTS ON THE FORMATION OF MEDIEVAL WARRIORS IN BALTIC AND FINNISH SOCIETIES (IN THE 12TH AND EARLY 13TH CENTURIES)

Marius Ščavinskas

Abstract

The first part of the article presents historiographical problems relating to the warrior classes in Baltic and Finnish societies. In the second and third parts, it analyses Baltic and Finnish societies relating to the formation of the warrior classes, with regard to the relationship between the chief/nobleman and the warriors, the meaning of the management of property and inheritance, and the vertical formation of relationships between noblemen and warriors. The written sources presented in the article show that at the turn of the 12th and 13th centuries, there was a stable institution of management and inheritance of property, which enabled noblemen and the warriors subordinate to them to increase their power with regard to other members of the community. This provided conditions for the formation of a 'military democracy', where the most important decisions concerning the community are approved not by all free members of the community, but by the noblemen and warriors subordinate to them. The basic idea of the article is that the 'inheritance' of the power/status of the noblemen is related to the right to inherit property (the castle and the surrounding territory, the homeland). It should be noted that by relating the management and inheritance of property to 'inherited' and acquired power, a vertical relationship appears between the nobleman and the warrior, which is based on subordination, not on consensus.

KEY WORDS: Baltic and Finnish societies, warriors, vertical power/subordination relationships, real estate, hill-fort/castle.

41

Anotacija

Straipsnio pirmojoje dalyje pristatomos baltų ir finų kariauninkų sluoksnio formavimosi problemos istoriografijoje. Antrojoje ir trečiojoje dalyse analizuojamas baltų ir finų kariauninkų sluoksnio formavimasis, atsižvelgiant į vado / kilmingojo santykį su kariauninkais, nekilnojamojo turto valdymo ir paveldėjimo reikšmę bei kilmingųjų ir kariauninkų vertikalų santykių formavimąsi. Straipsnyje aptariami rašytiniai šaltiniai rodo, kad XII–XIII a. sandūroje būta nusistovėjusio nekilnojamojo turto valdymo ir paveldėjimo instituto, kuris leido kilmingiesiems ir jiems pavaldiems kariauninkams išplėsti savo galią kitų bendruomenės narių atžvilgiu. Tai sudarė sąlygas įsigalėti vadinamajai „karinei demokratijai“, kai svarbiausi bendruomenės sprendimai buvo priimami ne laisvųjų bendruomenės narių, o kilmingųjų ir jiems paklustančių kariauninkų. Straipsnio pagrindinė mintis ta, jog kilmingųjų galios / statuso „paveldėjimas“ yra susijęs su teise paveldėti nekilnojamąjį turtą (pirmiausia pilį ir aplink ją esančią teritoriją, t. y. tėvonines žemes). Pažymėtina, kad nekilnojamojo turto valdymą ir paveldėjimą susiejus su „paveldima“ ir įgyjama galia, atsiranda vertikalūs kilmingojo ir kario santykis, grįstas pavaldumu, o ne susitarimu.

PAGRINDINIAI ŽODŽIAI: baltų ir finų visuomenės, kariauninkai, vertikalieji galios / pavaldumo ryšiai, nekilnojamasis turtas, piliakalnis / pilis.

Marius Ščavinskas, dr., research fellow, Klaipėda University, Institute of Baltic Region History and Archaeology, Herkaus Manto g. 84, LT-92294 Klaipėda, Lithuania. E-mail: scavinskas.marius@gmail.com.

Historiography that describes the epoch of 'military democracy' in Europe highlights several important structures of segments of tribal society embracing the territory of the tribe, the meeting of the community, and the power of the chiefs based on military power.¹ The latter power, backed by the authority of the chief, the bravery of the warriors and the nominal power granted to them by the community, laid the foundations for the formation of social and political structures.² Due to the influence of Christianity, these structures experienced significant changes and transformations, which led to the appearance of 'barbarian' states, not only in the former Roman Empire, but also in so-called New Europe, the territories east of the River Elbe.³ Having experienced the cultural influence of the Roman Empire, and having experienced fusion in the period of the Great Migration, this vast territory gave birth and maturity to military unions of a different level, chiefdoms⁴ (the best example being the military structures of the Polabian Slavs which Emperor Otto I the Great encountered⁵). Historiography describing the development of Baltic societies and the breakthrough of Baltic military activity in the Iron Age also talks about the class of warriors, and the formation of certain military-political structures.⁶ Research into Baltic society from the tenth to the beginning of the 13th century allows us to distinguish the structural segments of tribal society,⁷ showing that they could not remain static in the flow of time.

The question of the formation of the warrior class of Baltic society has not been thoroughly investigated in historiography, even though researchers (especially archaeol-

¹ MODZELEWSKI, Karol. *Barbarzyńska Europa*. Vilnius, 2007, p. 308–377. In Polish: MODZELEWSKI, Karol. *Barbarzyńska Europa*. Warszawa, 2004.

² URBAŃCZYK, Przemysław. *Władza i polityka we wczesnym średniowieczu*. Wrocław, 2008, s. 84–102.

³ KURNATOWSKA, Zofia. Formowanie się państw słowiańskich w aspekcie porównawczym. In *Europa barbarica, Europa christiana. Studia mediaevalia Carolo Modzelewski dedicata*. Red. Roman MICHAŁOWSKI et. al. Warszawa, 2008, s. 84–91.

⁴ Cf. TYMOWSKI, Michał. Organizacje plemienne na obszarze Polski w IX–X w. w świetle antropologicznych teorii systemu segmentarnego i wodzostwa (*chiefdom*). In *Europa barbarica...*, s. 269–282. For more about chiefdoms and political structures in the Baltic sea region: BLOMKVIST, Nils. *The Discovery of the Baltic. The Reception of a Catholic World-System in the European North (AD 1075–1125)* (The Northern World. North Europe and the Baltic c. 400–1700 AD. Peoples, Economies and Cultures, vol. 15). Leiden, Boston, 2005, pp. 40–44, 60–62, 264–266, 507. Cf. ŠČAVINSKAS, Marius. Some Notes on the Issue of the Development of Balt Society in the Ninth to the 13th Centuries in the Context of the Socio-political Structures of the Baltic Region. In *Societies of the Past: Approaches to Landscape, Burial Customs and Grave Goods* (Archaeologia Baltica, vol. 19). Ed. by Audronė BLIUJENĖ. Klaipėda, 2013, pp. 82–101.

⁵ LÜBKE, Christian. Forms of Political Organisation of the Polabian Slavs (until the 10th Century A.D.). In *Origins of Central Europe*. Ed. by Przemysław URBAŃCZYK. Warsaw, 1997, pp. 115–124.

⁶ MICHELBERTAS, Mykolas; VITKŪNAS, Manvydas. Baltų karybos senajame geležies amžiuje (I–IV a.) bruožai. *Karo archyvas*, 2003, t. XVIII, p. 51–56, 61–62. Cf. BLIUJENĖ, Audronė. Armed People of East and Southeast Lithuania in the Geocultural Context of the Migration Period. In *Societies of the Past...*, pp. 146, 152, 162.

⁷ SIKORSKI, Dariusz Adam. *Instytucje władzy u prusów w średniowieczu (na tle struktury społecznej i terytorialnej)*. Olsztyn, 2010, s. 166–172, 183–184, 202–213, 218–222, 226–228, 234–237, 259–278, 282–302; DŁUGOŁĘCKI, Wiesław. Prusy we wczesnym średniowieczu (IX–XIII wieka). In *Bruno z Kwerfurtu. Osoba – dzieło – epoka*. Red. Marian DYGO, Wojciech FAŁKOWSKI. Pułtusk, 2010, s. 35–58.

ogists), speaking about the period prior to the formation of the state of Lithuania at the beginning of the 13th century, have paid much attention both to the problematic of the differentiation of Baltic society and to the problematic of military shrouds. The same direction of investigation in historiography was kept to when speaking about the development of Finnish society and the class of warriors before the beginning of the 13th century.⁸ At the end of the 19th century, when the first archaeological excavations of graveyards of the Balts began, some graves were discovered preserving richer shrouds, which were related to the social differentiation of property of that time, and also to the status/influence in the community, or even power; and the weapons of the warriors which were found emphasised the military activities of the deceased, which, as is thought, became more active during the period of the Great Migration and later. This example of military activity, or even of the origin of the 'duke' in the Middle Ages (apart from the well-known Szwajcaria graveyard, now in the Suwalki district in Poland), the grave of the 'Taurapilis duke' (in the Utena region in Lithuania), was investigated during archaeological excavations in 1970 and 1971. The bones of a deceased man, a double-edged sword and two spearheads lying at his right side, a cone-form overflow between his foot bones, and a buried horse on his left, were found in grave 5. Brass spurs, a long knife blade, an axe, and the plating of a drinking horn were also found.⁹ A significant part of these shrouds were not of local origin. The inventory of the grave is dated to the second half of the fifth century or the first half of the sixth century.¹⁰ All of these abundant 'warrior' shrouds provided the possibility to speak about a buried individual who enjoyed a high social and military status, the more so that his escort was found buried next to him: a number of buried people, probably warriors, although the grave of a child was also found nearby.¹¹ The grave of the 'Taurapilis duke' permitted Soviet researchers to speak about federations of the land, although temporary, about counties/administrative centres (true, by mistake naming the administrative centres counties, which are considered to be land units of the already formed state of Lithuania, not of pre-state Lithuania¹²), and about the power of the elected chief or 'duke', and the rapid growth of property inequality.¹³

⁸ Cf. MAGI, Marika. In *Austrvegr. The Role of the Eastern Baltic in Viking Age Communication across the Baltic Sea* (The Northern World. North Europe and the Baltic c. 400–1700 AD, Peoples, Economies and Cultures, vol. 84). Leiden, Boston, 2018, pp. 41, 68–71, 78–90, 154, 176, 217, 222, 264, 336.

⁹ TAUTAVIČIUS, Adolfas. Taurapilio „kunigaikščio“ kapas. *Lietuvos archeologija*, 1981, t. 2, p. 19, 22–23, 27–29.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 31.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 32–37.

¹² PETRAUSKAS, Rimvydas. Socialiniai pokyčiai Lietuvoje valstybės formavimosi laikotarpiu. In *Lietuvos valstybės susikūrimas europiniame kontekste*. Sud. Alvydas NIKŽENTAITIS, Rimvydas PETRAUSKAS, Michael BORGOLTE. Vilnius, 2008, p. 161–162.

¹³ TAUTAVIČIUS, A. Op. cit., p. 31–32. Cf. the situation in East-Central Europe: URBAŃCZYK, P. Op. cit., s. 84–85.

Soon the data from the grave of the 'Taurapilis duke' was related to data from later research, such as the graveyard of Plinkaigalis, where shrouds attributed to high-quality military equipment have also been found. Not accidentally, researchers started speaking about a military elite¹⁴ of that time, the Early Middle Ages (the period of the Great Migration and the Iron Age), at the top of which were 'kings', 'dukes', and chiefs. All this data possibly allows us to speak about the appearance of a class of warriors in the fifth and sixth centuries, because in the graveyards of that time, war axes, designed for war, not work, have been found; also, rich imported jewellery and other items have been found,¹⁵ which proved the active contact of the buried with neighbouring countries, or their participation in military conflicts of that time in the middle of Europe.¹⁶

44

Despite this latter data, it would be too brave to envision such an early appearance of the class of warriors in Baltic society.¹⁷ Since the formation of the class of warriors in Baltic and Finnish societies was a more complicated problem, it cannot be limited to the ability to use weapons efficiently and to participation in military expeditions.

I

Analysing the formation of Balt and Finnish warrior society, we encounter several research problems that so far have no answers. First of all, the relationship between military shrouds (as well as other shrouds) and the Great Migration or later times (the turn of the 12th and 13th centuries). It is not clear whether such an abundant shroud meant a high or the highest status of the buried individual in the community, or if it was just the wish of the community to demonstrate the exceptional status of the buried, which did not necessarily have to match his high social status in the community. On the other hand, knowing nothing about the world outlook of that time, putting things into the grave did not necessarily mean the 'transference' of the social status of the deceased into the other world. The status of the deceased in the other

¹⁴ ROWELL-BANYTĖ, Rasa; BITNER-WRÓBLEWSKA, Anna; REICH, Christine. Did they Exist? The Question of Elites in Western Lithuania in the Roman and Early Migration Periods, and their Interregional Contacts. In *People at the Crossroads of Space and Time (Footmarks of Societies in Ancient Europe) II* (Archaeologia Baltica, vol. 18). Klaipėda, 2012, pp. 192–220. Cf. BLIUJENĖ, Audronė. *Romėniškasis ir tautų kraustymosi laikotarpiai* (Lietuvos archeologija, t. III). Klaipėda, 2013, p. 546–564; MICHELBERTAS, Mykolas. *Paprūdžiai. Žemaičių karinio elito kapinynas*. Vilnius, 2014.

¹⁵ For more about imports and their influence on the local social elite on the east Baltic shore and in East-Central Europe in the fifth to ninth centuries, see: BLIUJENĖ, A. *Romėniškasis...*, p. 556–561. URBAŃCZYK, P. Op. cit., s. 87–88.

¹⁶ ŠIMĖNAS, Valdemaras. *Etnokultūriniai procesai Vakary Lietuvoje pirmojo mūsų eros tūkstantmečio viduryje*. Vilnius, 2006, p. 103–111; JOVAIŠA, Eugenijus. Baltų visuomenė ankstyvųjų viduramžių pradžioje (V–VI a.). *Istorija*, 2006, nr. 64, p. 6–7.

¹⁷ ŽULKUS, Vladas. *Kuršiai Baltijos jūros erdvėje*. Vilnius, 2004, p. 174–175.

world could be idealised, 'improved', discarding 'improper' household items and the weapons of the deceased, or by substituting them by imitating so-called miniature items. The more so that there is no evidence that Balt (as well as Finnish) warriors of the Early Middle Ages and later times (before the first half of the 13th century) could have specific honourable 'military' gods according the example of the Vikings (Valhalas), and for this reason the graveyards of the warriors had to be of exceptional importance among the graves of other rich senior members of the community. True, in Prussia, on the Sambian Peninsula, a new type of burial under the name *Aschenplätze*, i.e., when the bones and the ashes of the deceased, together with the non-burnt shroud, are scattered in a field was used.¹⁸ In applying this form of burial, though, the social status of the deceased or hierarchy is reduced to a common collective grave,¹⁹ where it is not clear which person possessed a very high or very low status in the eyes of living people. *Aschenplätze* burials are assessed as collective burials of warriors. It is worth remembering that similar burials took place in the middle of Lithuania at approximately the same time.²⁰ Thus, there appears a reason to speak about a specific form of burial of warriors, the content and the meaning of which remain a subject for debate.

The influence of the Vikings is noticeable in the eastern part of the Baltic region (for example, the Balts actively took over 'plunder economics'²¹ from the Vikings): the Vikings established colonies-trade factories²² etc, on the eastern shore of the Baltic Sea. It is still not clear, though, how their military mentality influenced Baltic and Finnish societies, the more so that the military mentality of the Vikings themselves is known from sagas written by Christians, which were epic literary creations, the heroes of which were transferred to very early times, the seventh to the ninth centuries, and the eschatology of the Vikings is very similar to the Christian one.²³ One

¹⁸ WRÓBLEWSKI, Wojciech. *Aschenplätze* – the forgotten burial rituals of the Old Prussians. *Archaeologia Litwana*, 2006, t. 7, p. 222–224, 229, 232.

¹⁹ BERTAŠIUS, Mindaugas. *Vidurio Lietuva VIII–XII a.* Kaunas, 2002, p. 85.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 80–96.

²¹ BLOMKVIST, Nils. Culture clash or compromise? The medieval Europeanisation process of the Baltic Rim region (1100–1400 AD). Problems for an international study. In *Culture Clash or Compromise? The Europeanisation of the Baltic Sea Area 1100–1400 AD. Papers of the XIth Visby Symposium held at Gotland Centre for Baltic Studies, Gotland University College, Visby, October 4th–9th, 1996*. Ed. by Nils BLOMKVIST. Visby, 1998, p. 15. Cf. BLOMKVIST, N. *The Discovery of the Baltic...*, pp. 134, 148, 344–345; MAGI, M. *Op. cit.*, pp. 19, 21, 35, 136, 178–179, 183, 192, 298–299, 357–360.

²² Cf. VIRSE, Ingrida Līga; RITUMS, Ritvars. The Grobiņa Complex of Dwelling Locations and Burial Sites, and Related Questions. In *People at the Crossroads of Space and Time (Footmarks of Societies in Ancient Europe I)* (Archaeologia Baltica, vol. 17). Ed. by Audronė BLIUJENĖ. Klaipėda, 2012, pp. 34–42. Cf. MAGI, M. *Op. cit.*, pp. 243–255, 268.

²³ HULTGÅRD, Anders. Óðinn, Valhøll and the Einherjar. Eschatological Myth and Ideology in the Late Viking Period. In *Ideology and Power in the Viking and Middle Ages. Scandinavia, Iceland, Ireland, Orkney and the Faeroes* (The Northern World. North Europe and Baltic c. 400–1700 AD. Peoples, Economies and Cultures, vol. 52). Ed. by Gro STEINSLAND, Jón Viðar SIGURÐSSON, Jan Erik REKDAL, Ian BEUERMANN. Leiden, Boston, 2011, pp. 307–318, 325–326.

way or another, researchers tend to believe that if the shrouds did not necessarily show the social status of the deceased in his community, or his preferences concerning gods, they could reflect the role of the deceased individual and the possibilities of his activity in the community. We also cannot reject the idea that this role, or the possibilities to act, were projected towards the 'society' of the other world, 'managed' according a different logic to that of living people's societies.

The second question is whether the deceased buried with a military shroud could only be a warrior; that is, whether the deceased also performed some other social functions in the community. The point is that other household items have been found in so-called warrior graves, which makes us believe that those warriors were farmers, cattle breeders, craftsmen and/or traders in times when there was no war. Also, there is a point of view that cannot be ruled out that putting weapons in the grave could symbolise not the deceased belonging to the class of warriors, but rather the status of a free man,²⁴ hence the individual buried with military weapons might not necessarily be a 'professional' warrior, as it may seem at first sight. In that case, researchers tend to create 'common averages' for military/horse rider equipment: if more military weapons than household items are found, then the deceased is more likely to be a warrior than a farmer or a craftsman, and vice versa. In other words, the 'non-military' items found next to the 'military' finds could possibly witness the formation of the warrior class of society, but not its ultimate formation. It should be emphasised that in early descriptions of Old Prussian weapons, and in iconographic sources (for example, the bas-reliefs on the doors of Gniezno Cathedral, where Old Prussian warriors are depicted), spears and shields are mentioned most commonly, and swords less frequently; therefore, the question remains how much these weapons (besides armour) are typically common to all Old Prussian warriors and noblemen.²⁵ On the other hand, the analogy with Viking warriors would allow us to speak about a multi-functional warrior/man who was engaged in other different activities apart from warfare. For example, the famous Viking hero Egill not only took part in different wars, but also traded, and this activity does not deny his 'military' character, even though his burial itself is presented in the 'Saga of Egill' as a military one.²⁶ Without resolving the question which items can be considered to be 'purely military', and which ones just 'muscular', belonging to free members of the community, it is not possible to state strongly when 'absolute' burials, typical only of warriors, appeared. On the other hand, while solving the issue of the 'professionalism' of warriors, more

²⁴ BERTAŠIUS, M. Op. cit., p. 219.

²⁵ TOEPPEN, Max. Excurs über die Verschreibungen des Ordens für Stammpreussen im 13. Jahrhundert. In *Scriptores rerum Prussicarum* (hereafter, *SRP*). Bd. I. Hrsg. von Theodor HIRSCH, Max TOEPPEN, Ernst STREHLKE. Leipzig, 1861, S. 254–269.

²⁶ EGILL Skallagrímsson. *Egilio saga*. 2-oji laida. Vilnius, 2012, p. 125, 233.

important is the question of living off warfare than found items of a different sort and shrouds, which can hardly provide a meaningful answer.

The issue of living off warfare formulates the third very important question: what forms of property and inheritance allowed the warrior to survive, despite the size of a harvest, unfavourable weather conditions, and other factors, now called *force majeure*. We should remember that the conditions for the warrior to survive consisted not only and not so much of moveable property and its management, but more of the disposal and management of property (mainly land, preferably farmland).

It is worth considering the fact that there existed nominal and real disposal and management of property²⁷ (which are not the same thing), which should also be dated, i.e., if the management of property is recorded in written sources from the turn of the 12th and 13th centuries, that does not mean that the same management took place in Baltic and Finnish societies in the 11th century and before it.

47

The latter problems analysed in this article will allow us to better understand that, during the period of the formation of the professional warrior class of society, great importance was attributed to the development of the disposal and management of property (first of all land, both farmland and land in the form of meadows and forest), and not only to the capacity of the men-warriors to use weapons professionally and to participate in military expeditions (which were of equal importance as well). Of course, we can only very hypothetically speak about a period when the relationship between the management of property (not just its disposal), which was of crucial importance to the formation of the warrior class of the society, began. At that time, as we shall see further in the article, we can state rather exactly that around the 12th century and the beginning of the 13th century, based on rather scanty written sources, there already existed in Balt and Finnish societies the right of close relatives to inherit property; which, together with moveable property, provided the opportunity for the class of professional warriors to develop; which, in the case of Lithuania, led to the formation of the Lithuanian state. At the social peak of these societies, we can see the chiefs, often called noblemen (*seniores*), dukes (*dux*), or even rulers (*principes*, *rex*), by Western chroniclers. There is no doubt that they formed around them a vertical of power, with the help of which they expanded their power with regard to the less important noblemen, and at the expense of the free members of the community.

²⁷ GUDAVIČIUS, Edvardas. Baltų alodo raida. In GUDAVIČIUS, Edvardas. *Lietuvos europėjimo kelias. Istorinės studijos*. Sud. Alfredas BUMBLAUSKAS, Rimvydas PETRAUSKAS. Vilnius, 2002, p. 89–95; GUDAVIČIUS, Edvardas. Baltų alodo paveldėjimas ir disponavimas juo. In GUDAVIČIUS, E. *Lietuvos europėjimo kelias...*, p. 106–110.

It becomes clear from the very scanty written sources that at the very beginning of the 13th century on the east shore of the Baltic Sea, there already existed a hierarchical vertical of power. For example, Henry of Livonia, a chronicler of German (or Estonian) origin,²⁸ in his chronicle written in the first half of the 13th century, mentions *cognati / consaguinei* and *amici*, that is, relatives and friends, of the Lyvian nobleman Caupo,²⁹ who accepted baptism. We can see a similar situation in Prussia.³⁰ There is no doubt that these *cognati* and *amici* were very close relatives and warriors of chiefs such as Caupo, and formed the power and the authority of their chief, among the free members of the community and the rich who were at the bottom of the social hierarchy, and who were not capable of achieving such heights in the social hierarchy as Caupo enjoyed, and who did not have such an abundant escort of *cognati* and *amici* as he had.

When writing about the conquest of Prussia that took place around the beginning of the 13th century, Peter of Duisburg, a German chronicler from the first half of the 14th century, also presented the same characteristic cases of the chiefs/noblemen. For example, he mentioned a nobleman by the name of Pipin, who lived in the lands of Pomesania, and was probably engaged in plundering, that is, he had a squad of warriors.³¹ The chief of one of the castles, Raguva, was allegedly the son of his sister, which alludes to a certain landed property near a lake named after Pipin. It is not clear, though, if this property was in the hands of Pipin's family; also, it is not clear if Pipin himself was the head of this family (the context of the description of his plundering possibly provides us with a reason to think so). This would allow us to draw the conclusion that the family of Pipin did not dispose of but managed property located not only close to Lake Pipin, but in a wider area as well.³² Penetration into communal land, or land belonging to 'nobody', not only provided conditions for an increase in the property of a certain family (the material resources of the family increased together with it as well, which allowed them to designate them for the maintenance of military squads or their support in cases of need), but also the displacement of free members of the community from the management of commu-

²⁸ For more about the origin of Henry of Livonia, see: GAŚSOWSKA, Maja. *Kronika Heinricha von Lettland o podboju i chrystianizacji Inflant*. In *Causa creandi. O pragmatyce źródła historycznego* (Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis. Historica, nr. CLXXI). Red. Stanisław ROSIK, Przemysław WISZEWSKI. Wrocław, 2005, s. 125–128, 131–132.

²⁹ *Heinrici Chronicon Livoniae* (Scriptores rerum Germanicarum, 31) (hereafter, *HCL*). Ed. Leonid ARBUSOW, Albertus BAUER. Editio altera. Hannoverae, 1955, cap. X, § 10; BLOMKVIST, N. *The Discovery of the Baltic...*, p. 507.

³⁰ SIKORSKI, D. A. Op. cit., s. 257–278.

³¹ PETRI de Duisburg. *Chronicon terrae Prussiae* (hereafter, *PDC*). In *SRP*, Bd. I, Lib. III, cap. 7.

³² Cf. BIAŁOŃSKI, Grzegorz. *Studia z dziejów rycerskich i szlacheckich rodów pruskich (XIII–XVI wiek)* (Monumenta Literaria Prussiae, Seria C: Monografie, nr. 3). Olsztyn, 2012, s. 199–202.

nity matters, and, on the other hand, the subjugation of property belonging to free members of the community to the interests of the local nobleman.

In other words, there were possibilities for an increase in the property on account of the land belonging to free members of the community, or land belonging to the community (*almend*), and this process developed not by means of conquests and military expeditions, but by the noblemen forcing their will on other members of the community.³³ The description of Pipin's activities makes us believe that this process of taking over property was well under way (the lake named after Pipin is the best example of this process), that is, it had begun before the beginning of the 13th century.

It seems that the archaeological and topographical material can also confirm such cases of one family taking over lands belonging to 'nobody', or lands belonging to the community. In historiography, the idea has already been expressed that the so-called miniature hill-forts located in the middle of the banks of the River Nemunas could possibly have been 'residences' of the local noblemen / social elite.³⁴ True, all these 'residences' had to appear during the period of the Great Migration, because the appearance of these miniature hill-forts dates back to that time. Could individual 'residences' of noblemen have appeared at that time? The question remains unanswered, but these miniature hill-forts survived until the 12th century.³⁵ Such assumed 'residences' began to be mentioned from the 11th century.³⁶ For example, researchers speak about the establishment of Ringove hill-fort in Paštuva land in the 11th century. This hill-fort, according to its structure, was better in comparison with the huge settlement of the Mikytai community, where the hill-fort had fewer fortifications.³⁷ In the case of the balance of power, it is evident that the newly established and fortified Ringove hill-fort was of better quality than the old hill-fort at Mikytai with its huge settlement.³⁸ The appearance of the well-fortified Ringove hill-fort in Paštuva land allows us to assume that a local nobleman settled there, separating himself from the inhabited communities of Paštuva and Mikytai. Because of the lack of more thorough investigations, there is no possibility to say more precisely how and to what degree the appearance of Ringove hill-fort 'unbalanced' the already-existing balance of power in Paštuva land for the sake of the users of Ringove hill-fort. The local 'aristocrat' at Ringove hill-fort could enforce his power over the local com-

³³ GUDAVIČIUS, E. Baltų alodo paveldėjimas..., p. 106–110; GUDAVIČIUS, Edvardas. Aukščiausia žemės nuosavybė „barbarinėje“ Lietuvoje. In GUDAVIČIUS, E. *Lietuvos europėjimo kelias...*, p. 118–123.

³⁴ VOLKAITĖ-KULIKAUSKIENĖ, Regina. *Lietuva valstybės priešaušriu*. Vilnius, 2001, p. 348.

³⁵ ZABIELA, Gintautas. *Lietuvos medinės pilys*. Vilnius, 1995, p. 170–171.

³⁶ Cf. an example in the basin of the River Western Dvina (Daugava) and Estonia in the Viking Age: BLOMKVIST, N. *The Discovery of the Baltic...*, pp. 160, 163, 506–507. See also MAGI, M. Op. cit., pp. 267–268, 273–276, 280, 285, 288, 303–304, 307–308, 310–317, 348, 367–369, 376, 378–379, 387–389, 401.

³⁷ TUČAS, Rolandas. *Lietuvos teritorijos apgyvendinimo raida I–XII a.* Doktoro disertacija. Vilnius, 2012, p. 178–179.

³⁸ Ibid., p. 179.

munities. Without presenting far-reaching conclusions, we can just assume that the appearance of hill-forts such as Ringove could be related to the changes taking place in Baltic societies in the 11th century, and leading to the separation of the lands of the noblemen from the lands used by other free members of the community.

It is interesting to note that the 12th-century Polish chronicler Gallus Anonimus, describing the 'barbarity' of the Old Prussian tribes, mentions that they inherited the land by employing witchcraft, spreading it among farmers and citizens (inhabitants of hill-forts and/or inhabitants of enforced settlements?).³⁹ It is also possible that the distribution of land by witchcraft was taken from Holy Scripture (cf. Joshua 13:6, 14:1–2, 15:1 etc), but that is not the important thing here. It is obvious that at the beginning of the 12th century, there already existed 'stationary' land, which would be shared out by applying witchcraft, and not intensive farming which would 'move' from one place to another (e.g. by cultivating a form of agriculture, when, after cutting down the trees, land would be cultivated for several years, and after the soil had lost its fertility, it was replaced by other felled and cleared areas).⁴⁰

The process of the development of the inheritance of property shows⁴¹ that the 'attachment' of noblemen to the land had acquired the outlines of a qualitatively new stage of development. In parallel, the practice of the three-field system was being implemented,⁴² which influenced the quality of the added value, and a more intensive distribution of the goods gained from agriculture. Even though the military expeditions to neighbouring countries at the time (including lands of the Balts themselves, and not only lands belonging to Christians) were an important means of consolidating the social elite, the formation of solid ground under their feet, that is, the formation of the management/inheritance of land, was of equal importance, and was possibly the most important factor that allowed a small group of noblemen to concentrate both economic and military power in their hands. Besides this emerging power, military expeditions were also important in just performing the supplementary function of increasing additional income (property). Thus, military expeditions, being a quick and easy but risky way of acquiring wealth, could not directly influence the emergence of the political elite of the West Balts. This point of view is held with reference to the 'Viking style' raids ('plunder economics') by the Curonians (partially

³⁹ Galli Chronicon. In *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*. T. I. Ed. August BIEŁOWSKI. Lwów, 1864, Lib. III, cap. 24: '[...] per sortes hereditarias ruricolis et habitatoribus dispartita'.

⁴⁰ VOLKAITĖ-KULIKAUSKIENĖ, Regina. Žemdirbystė, gyvulininkystė ir medžioklė. In *Lietuvių materialinė kultūra IX–XIII amžiuje*. T. I. Red. Regina VOLKAITĖ-KULIKAUSKIENĖ. Vilnius, 1978, p. 60–61. Cf. VOLKAITĖ-KULIKAUSKIENĖ, R. *Lietuva...*, p. 246–247.

⁴¹ For more, see: GUDAVIČIUS, E. Baltų alodo paveldėjimas..., p. 100–111.

⁴² For more about the practice of the three-field system in the Baltic, see: LAUŽIKAS, Rimvydas. Dubingių mikroregiono ekonominės raidos I amžiuje – XVI amžiaus viduryje specifika. *Lietuvos istorijos studijos*, 2013, nr. 32, p. 55–56; KUNCEVIČIUS, Albinas; LAUŽIKAS, Rimvydas; JANKAUSKAS, Rimantas; AUGUSTINAVIČIUS, Renaldas; ŠMIGELSKIS, Ramūnas. *Dubingių mikroregionas ir Lietuvos valstybės ištakos*. Vilnius, 2015, p. 246–247, 252–254; ŽULKUS, V. Op. cit., p. 151.

Old Prussians) becoming more frequent at that time, when the economic boom in the Baltic region was felt.⁴³ When this boom slackened, the number of raids became smaller as well, without leaving a significant trace in the development of the political structures of society, even though the military expeditions played an important role in the formation of the warrior class of society, as well as the processes of taking over the land and its cultivation. The actions of these warriors were based on an agreement with the chief elected from their people, and hence on a horizontal relationship of subordination to their chief.

It should be emphasised that in the cases of Caupo and Pipin, it would be better to speak about *cognati* and *amici* who were subordinate to their chiefs (noblemen), because of the family and/or subordinate relationships, and that is a qualitatively different level of subordination to the chief. Of course, the subordination of family members to the head of the family could have meant horizontal relationships, then the relation of subordination to the chief/duke (thus vertical) could have appeared when the possibility for the inheritance of the institutions of the chief/duke emerged. For example, after Caupo accepted baptism, some of his *amici* remained faithful to him, but his relatives in Turaida Castle explained their disobedience, on the basis that, by accepting Christianity, he had lost his right to manage the castle.⁴⁴ Thus, we can see a situation where the management of the castle is related to obedience/subordination, and these are undoubtedly vertical hierarchical relationships between the chief and his relatives and warriors. The more so that some close relatives of Caupo believed that they not only had the right to take the castle away from Caupo (together with the land surrounding it, homeland lands, of course), but also to take away from him the right to inherit; that is, not only Caupo but also his children and his close relatives were deprived of the right to the property.

The latter nuance allows us to make a *working* conclusion relating to the inheritance of property: depriving Caupo of his property was based on the already-established legal norm which ensured not the functioning of the direct father-son inheritance institution (the principle of agnatic inheritance), but the functioning of the right to a certain inheritance for the closest relatives, because the deprivation of the castle, in the eyes of the pagan relatives, was considered 'legal', and this 'right' grew up from the close relatives' right to generally influence the inheritance and the management of the land belonging to the whole family. At that time, by accepting baptism, Caupo ignored that 'right' of the relatives; he and the relatives supporting him (who had also been baptised) considered themselves to be the legal holders of the property, whose right to manage the property was illegally limited by the pagan relatives who occupied Turaida Castle. On the other hand, Henry of Livonia named Caupo's castle

⁴³ ŽULKUS, V. Op. cit., p. 159–160.

⁴⁴ HCL, cap. X, § 10.

‘their own’, which could possibly prove that Caupo had inherited it from his parents, perhaps without any objections from those relatives who had remained pagans, and then allegedly ‘legally’ deprived Caupo, who had accepted baptism, of his castle. In other words, we can suggest with great confidence that noblemen such as Caupo already owned the so-called homeland lands, which had been formed before the beginning of the 13th century. It is not clear, though, if this inheritance was implemented strictly by the male line, that is, if it was of an agnatic character.⁴⁵

A similar situation was possibly recorded by the chronicler Henry of Livonia, when speaking about the lands of the Estonian nobleman Thalibaldus and his heirs, his sons.⁴⁶ In this case, it is also not clear if the inheritance of property of an agnatic character had already been formed, but another thing is evident: we can see the sons of Thalibaldus by his side (there were at least four), who, their father being killed, took over the management of the homeland. The activities of Thalibaldus’ sons, when their father was still alive, allows us to assume that they considered themselves to be the legal heirs of their father’s affairs, which would indicate not only the development of the agnatic character of the inheritance of the property, but also the ‘inheritance’ of the status of the father in the eyes of more distant relatives and society. That would allow us to speak about the roots of agnatic inheritance in Finnish society at the beginning of the 13th century, with the understanding that the further development of the institution of property was implemented with the direct influence of Christian law, transferring it to Livonia (the agnatic character of inheritance was predominant in Christian law). It is important to emphasise here that Thalibaldus tried to get support from his sons, presenting them as the future legal supporters of the legal lands and the works/status of their father in the eyes of society. This process of enforcing the power of his sons was taking place when the father was still alive; that is, it was based on the authority of the father, which ensured the natural taking over of the lands and the power of the father, without initiating any conflicts among the close relatives. In this context, it is worth going back to the idea that the ‘inherited’ power/status of the noble father given to his sons was based on inherited property.

Similarly, the son of Pipin’s sister, to whom the management of Raguva Castle was entrusted, according to Peter of Duisburg, also depended on the authority of his uncle; that is, the status given to Pipin’s nephew related to property.

⁴⁵ ŁOWMIAŃSKI, Henrik. *Studia nad początkami społeczeństwa i państwa litewskiego*. T. 1. Wilno, 1931, s. 373–376.

⁴⁶ Cf. *HCL*, cap. XV, § 7; cap. XVII, § 2; cap. XIX, § 3.

III

As has been mentioned before, all these noblemen were escorted by relatives and 'friends', i.e., warriors. They gathered closely around their noblemen, and we can *relatively* consider these warriors to be the military retinue of the noblemen (cf. the above-mentioned case of Pipin). This conditionality arises from the fact that it is not clear whether these warriors, as the French medievalist Mark Bloch said when speaking about knights, lived 'under their senior's roof', because this kind of life needed not only a developed institution of inheritance, but also a lot of property, making it possible to provide for the whole retinue. For this reason, we cannot oppose the assumption that some of these warriors came to take part in raids at the order of their noble. The Lithuanian medievalist Edvardas Gudavičius envisions exactly this type of army in the gentile lands of the Baltic societies in the first half of the 13th century.⁴⁷ By stating that we should stress that the noble himself summoned such an army at his own discretion, and not at meetings of the free members of the community, even though in the event of an emergency the free members of the community joined the army of the noble, with the purpose of defending the land from an intruding enemy.⁴⁸ For example, according to Peter of Duisburg, the above-mentioned Pipin tried to divert the brothers of the Teutonic Order away from his castle, and the right to 'weaken' arose not as a sanction from a community meeting legalising Pipin's 'plundering', but from the right of Pipin himself, as a noble, to engage in acts of 'plunder'. Thus, Pipin summoned his warriors on the basis of his authority. The similar case of the Varmian nobleman Pijop shows that he also used his own right and authority in summoning his warriors to a raid against the knights of the Teutonic Order at Balga Castle.⁴⁹

53

It is characteristic of the case of Pijop that, having summoned the warriors, he discussed further military action with them. Thus, it was not the free members of the community, taking up weapons in the event of an attack, but the warriors, with regard to their chiefs' interests, who took the decisions concerning the route and the character of the military campaign. Describing the raid by Sambian noblemen on the newly appeared Klaipėda Castle (Memelburg), the Rhymed Livonian Chronicle points out that the noblemen discussed further action among themselves, while ordinary warriors were given decisions 'from above down', i.e., without allowing ordinary warriors to take part in the discussions.⁵⁰ Essentially, such meetings between noblemen and the best warriors, who were very close to them, were the essence of the whole 'military democracy'. Necessary decisions were taken at meetings between the no-

⁴⁷ GUDAVIČIUS, Edvardas. Lietuvių pašauktinės kariuomenės organizacijos bruožai. *Karo archyvas*, 1992, t. XIII, p. 43–47.

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 47.

⁴⁹ PDC, Pars III, cap. 20.

⁵⁰ *Livländische Reimchronik*. Hrsg. von Leo MEYER. Paderborn, 1876, Verse 3784–3806.

blemen and the warriors under them, but not at meetings of the free members of the community. Thus, the times of Caupo, Pipin, Pijop and Thalibaldus were no longer the times of a tribal society, when all matters would be discussed at meetings of free members of the community.

Noblemen such as Caupo and Pipin were not *primus inter pares* among their own *amici* and other warriors, as it used to be in the times of tribal society, and their power and status with regard to their warriors was based on vertical relationships: through the castle or property managed by them and the right to leave it to their heirs, warriors were subordinate to the chief who had the right to manage the castle or property, and belonging to such a nobleman arose from subordination relationships, and not from a common agreement to become subordinate to a certain nobleman, a leader in war, in exchange for some of the booty acquired during warfare. This is the reason why Caupo, disagreeing with his relatives' decision to take possession of his castle, took action to regain his castle with the help of his warriors and the warriors of the Bishop of Riga. These warriors followed him, not because they wanted part of the booty (the castle, by the way, was burnt down during the siege), but because of the subordination relationships, which did not disappear when Caupo accepted baptism (the warriors themselves probably accepted baptism; as an analogy, Henry of Livonia mentioned elders who were the first to receive baptism, and then their people and/or other ordinary free members of the community⁵¹).

Henry of Livonia and Peter of Duisburg present a number of examples when noblemen summoned warriors to take part in raids (such as the cases of the above-mentioned Thalibaldus and his sons, Caupo, Pipin and Pijop). It is highly doubtful that all these warriors were free farmers, eager to participate in raids when they were not busy working in the fields. These kinds of warriors used to be summoned in different seasons of the year, when they had to react to 'pressing' events, but not in accordance with the seasonal agricultural work of the year (cf. the above-mentioned cases of Pijop and Thalibaldus and his sons). The warriors did not necessarily have to live 'under the roof' of their noble; they could live in farmhouses located around the castle of the nobleman, and come as quickly as possible at their master's call. And this means that these warriors did not do any agricultural work, and that the work had to be done by other people.

Peter of Duisburg indicates such a situation. For example, Pipin is mentioned as the owner of the castle from which he used to organise his 'plundering' raids. The participants in these raids were not a small number of personal guards of the chief of the castle, but warriors who regularly performed military functions. It is possible that the closest warriors, related to each other by 'blood ties' (but not necessarily relatives), could possibly have lived in Pipin's castle; perhaps they contributed to supporting it, but most of them were probably based somewhere close to the castle. The above-

⁵¹ HCL, cap. I, § 4.

mentioned situation of Pipin's nephew, the lord of Raguva Castle, shows that Raguva Castle belonged to Pipin's family as well. Thereby, Pipin's nephew, probably submitting to Pipin himself, managed Raguva Castle; and this shows the vertical relationship in subordination between Pipin and his nephew, and the rather large portion of property that was at their disposal. In describing the occupation of Pomesania, Peter of Duisburg mentioned the villages and smaller castles⁵² scattered around the castle, where the warriors of noblemen such as Pipin could possibly have lived. Therefore, these warriors were not yet a regular army, which appeared together with the appearance of the state, when warriors became a 'personal' part of the ruler's army (as in the case of the warriors of Mindaugas, or in Kyivan Rus' when the 'great *družina*' society formed⁵³). These warriors were no longer free members of the community, however, rallying around their chief who 'has grown' his authority. Members of the guards of such small castles were on constant watch; therefore, they were in a permanent state of 'war', and subordination to their noble.

The horizontal relationship between the chief and his warriors was marked by ignoring any ties between the power of the chief and a certain castle, the role of the chief as *inter pares* among his *amici* and other warriors; i.e., the chiefs were elected and appointed based on their authority, but not on the function of inheritance of the chief (nobleman), which we can see in the cases of Caupo and Pipin. With the role of the chief being non-inheritable, the warriors would elect their chief, and obey him by common agreement during a raid, usually with regard to his physical ability, wisdom and courage, and other characteristics providing conditions for his exceptionality and authority. Such military squads existed until the death/assassination of their chief, and his son did not necessarily 'inherit' his father's position by agreement of the warriors; i.e., the death/assassination of the chief could also mean the dispersal of a military squad, and the role of the chief could not necessarily be taken over by the son of a dead/assassinated chief or his close relatives. The chief and the warriors around him probably had in mind the traveller Wulfstan, when describing the Old Prussian 'kings' and their quarrels in the ninth century. It is important that such warriors, relatives, and so on, who had strong horses, were able to inherit the moveable property of such a chief/'king'; and that the horse race mentioned by Wulfstan shows that in these horse races, items such as the moveable property abandoned by the chief/'king' could be taken possession of.⁵⁴ All warriors who had horses were able to

⁵² PDC, Pars III, cap. 14.

⁵³ Риг. СТЕФАНОВИЧ, Петр. «Большая дружина» в Древней Руси. In *Восточная Европа в древности и средневековье. Ранние государства Европы и Азии. Проблемы политогенеза*. [Т.] XXIII: Чтения памяти члена-корреспондента АН СССР Владимира Терентьевича Пашуто. Москва, 19–21 апреля 2011 г. Материалы конференции. Отв. ред. Елена МЕЛЬНИКОВА. Москва, 2011, с. 265–269.

⁵⁴ Wulfstan's Reisebericht über Preußen, um 890–893 = Wulfstano pranešimas apie kelionę per Prūsiją, apie 890–893. In *Baltų religijos ir mitologijos šaltiniai*. T. I: Nuo seniausių laikų iki XV amžiaus pabaigos. Sud. Norbertas VĖLIUS. Vilnius, 1996, p. 166–169.

claim this possessed property, and in this way summon all the warriors of the dead/assassinated chief; and all this could be done by a braver, better-armed person who possessed great authority among other warriors.

It is also notable that the physical abilities of the chief remained very important in the future, as well; i.e., when the function of the chief became inheritable through inherited and disposed castles. An example of bravery and authority was demonstrated by the Varmian nobleman Pijop. During the assault on Balga Castle, he was on the front line together with his warriors, and was hit by an arrow and soon died; and his warriors, seeing what had happened, abandoned the castle.⁵⁵ Among the warriors, on the first line perhaps, was Caupo himself, also with the intention of getting back his castle possessed by his relatives. On the other hand, noblemen did not always participate in battles and military action. For example, according to Henry of Livonia, the Lithuanian nobleman Svelgate was attacked and killed on his sledge when a battle was taking place around him; he was probably coordinating the action in the battle without participating in it himself.⁵⁶ All these facts show that participation by a chief himself in a battle was no longer a necessity, but the wish of his warriors rather than a desire by the chief to show his skill as a leader, thereby demonstrating his bravery, as happened in the case of Pijop.

56

Conclusions

All these remarks show that: 1) the problem of the formation of the warrior class in Baltic and Finnish societies lay not only in the capacity of the warrior to use weapons professionally, to participate in raids, and in 'plunder economics', but also in the formation of the disposal, management and inheritance of property; 2) the disposal/management of property, and also its enlargement and inheritance, provided conditions for noblemen to increase their power with relation to the free members of the community, and to increase their material resources, but it also allowed them to form conditions for the 'inheritance' of their power and status by their people/relatives who were at the top of the social scale; 3) by relating the management and inheritance of property to 'inherited' and acquired power, a vertical relationship appears between the nobleman and the warrior which is based on subordination, not on agreement; 4) with regard to the formation of the management and inheritance of property, the preliminary conclusion can be made that vertical relations of power and subordination between noblemen and warriors and other free members of the community appeared before the beginning of the 13th century, but we cannot say

⁵⁵ *PDC*, Pars III, cap. 20.

⁵⁶ *HCL*, cap. IX, § 4.

exactly when. With these factors at play, with a layer of professional warriors in Baltic and Finnish societies, the time of prosperity that was called 'military democracy' formed; 5) due to the appearance of vertical power and subordination, the growth of the meaning of property, and the development of the institution of inheritance, this period of 'military democracy' no longer belongs to the tribal epoch of society, since 'military democracy' goes beyond the boundaries of the actions taken by the power institutions of free communities.

List of printed sources quoted in the article

- EGILL Skallagrímsson. *Egilio saga*. 2-oji laida. Vilnius, 2012.
- Galli Chronicon. In *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*. T. I. Ed. August BIEŁOWSKI. Lwów, 1864, p. 379–484.
- Heinrici Chronicon Livoniae* (Scriptores rerum Germanicarum, 31). Ed. Leonid ARBUSOW, Albertus BAUER. Editio altera. Hannoverae, 1955.
- Livländische Reimchronik*. Hrsg. von Leo MEYER. Paderborn, 1876.
- PETRI de Dusburg. *Chronicon terrae Prussiae*. In *Scriptores rerum Prussicarum*. Bd. I. Hrsg. von Theodor HIRSCH, Max TOEPPEN, Ernst STREHLKE. Leipzig, 1861, S. 3–269.
- Wulfstan's Reisebericht über Preußen, um 890–893 = Wulfstano pranešimas apie kelionę per Prūsiją, apie 890–893. In *Baltų religijos ir mitologijos šaltiniai*. T. I: Nuo seniausių laikų iki XV amžiaus pabaigos. Sud. Norbertas VĖLIUS. Vilnius, 1996, p. 166–169.

List of previous studies quoted in the article

- BERTAŠIUS, Mindaugas. *Vidurio Lietuva VIII–XII a.* Kaunas, 2002.
- BIAŁOŃSKI, Grzegorz. *Studia z dziejów rycerskich i szlacheckich rodów pruskich (XIII–XVI wiek)* (Monumenta Literaria Prussiae, Seria C: Monografie, nr. 3). Olsztyn, 2012.
- BLIUJENĖ, Audronė. Armed People of East and Southeast Lithuania in the Geocultural Context of the Migration Period. In *Societies of the Past: Approaches to Landscape, Burial Customs and Grave Goods* (Archaeologia Baltica, vol. 19). Ed. by Audronė BLIUJENĖ. Klaipėda, 2013, pp. 145–165.
- BLIUJENĖ, Audronė. *Romėniškasis ir tautų kraustymosi laikotarpiai* (Lietuvos archeologija, t. III). Klaipėda, 2013.
- BLOMKVIST, Nils. Culture clash or compromise? The medieval Europeanisation process of the Baltic Rim region (1100–1400 AD). Problems for an international study. In *Culture Clash or Compromise? The Europeanisation of the Baltic Sea Area 1100–1400 AD. Papers of the XIth Visby Symposium held at Gotland Centre for Baltic Studies, Gotland University College, Visby, October 4th–9th, 1996*. Ed. by Nils BLOMKVIST. Visby, 1998, pp. 9–36.
- BLOMKVIST, Nils. *The Discovery of the Baltic. The Reception of a Catholic World-System in the European North (AD 1075–1125)* (The Northern World. North Europe and the Baltic c. 400–1700 AD. Peoples, Economies and Cultures, vol. 15). Leiden, Boston, 2005.
- DŁUGOŁĘCKI, Wiesław. Prusy we wczesnym średniowieczu (IX–XIII wieka). In *Bruno z Kwerfurtu. Osoba – dzieło – epoka*. Red. Marian DYGO, Wojciech FAŁKOWSKI. Pułtusk, 2010, s. 35–58.
- GAŚSOWSKA, Maja. *Kronika Heinricha von Lettand o podboju i chrystianizacji Inflant*. In *Causa creandi. O pragmatyce źródła historycznego* (Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis. Historica, nr. CLXXI). Red. Stanisław ROSIK, Przemysław WISZEWSKI. Wrocław, 2005, s. 121–133.

- GUDAVIČIUS, Edvardas. Aukščiausia žemės nuosavybė „barbarinėje“ Lietuvoje. In GUDAVIČIUS, Edvardas. *Lietuvos europėjimo keliais. Istorinės studijos*. Sud. Alfredas BUMBLAUSKAS, Rimvydas PETRAUSKAS. Vilnius, 2002, p. 118–123.
- GUDAVIČIUS, Edvardas. Baltų alodo raida. In GUDAVIČIUS, Edvardas. *Lietuvos europėjimo keliais. Istorinės studijos*. Sud. Alfredas BUMBLAUSKAS, Rimvydas PETRAUSKAS. Vilnius, 2002, p. 89–95.
- GUDAVIČIUS, Edvardas. Baltų alodo paveldėjimas ir disponavimas juo. In GUDAVIČIUS, Edvardas. *Lietuvos europėjimo keliais. Istorinės studijos*. Sud. Alfredas BUMBLAUSKAS, Rimvydas PETRAUSKAS. Vilnius, 2002, p. 106–110.
- GUDAVIČIUS, Edvardas. Lietuvių pašauktinės kariuomenės organizacijos bruožai. *Karo archyvas*, 1992, t. XIII, p. 43–118.
- HULTGÅRD, Anders. Óðinn, Valhøll and the Einherjar. Eschatological Myth and Ideology in the Late Viking Period. In *Ideology and Power in the Viking and Middle Ages. Scandinavia, Iceland, Ireland, Orkney and the Faeroes* (The Northern World. North Europe and Baltic c. 400–1700 AD. Peoples, Economies and Cultures, vol. 52). Ed. by Gro STEINSLAND, Jón Viðar SIGURÐSSON, Jan Erik REKDAL, Ian BEUERMANN. Leiden, Boston, 2011, pp. 297–328.
- JOVAIŠA, Eugenijus. Baltų visuomenė ankstyvųjų viduramžių pradžioje (V–VI a.). *Istorija*, 2006, nr. 64, p. 5–16.
- KUNCEVIČIUS, Albinas; LAUŽIKAS, Rimvydas; JANKAUSKAS, Rimantas; AUGUSTINAVIČIUS, Renaldas; ŠMIGELSKIS, Ramūnas. *Dubingių mikroregionas ir Lietuvos valstybės ištakos*. Vilnius, 2015.
- KURNATOWSKA, Zofia. Formowanie się państw słowiańskich w aspekcie porównawczym. In *Europa barbarica, Europa christiana. Studia mediaevalia Carolo Modzelewski dedicata*. Red. Roman MICHAŁOWSKI et. al. Warszawa, 2008, s. 84–91.
- LAUŽIKAS, Rimvydas. Dubingių mikroregiono ekonominės raidos I amžiuje – XVI amžiaus viduryje specifika. *Lietuvos istorijos studijos*, 2013, nr. 32, p. 33–63.
- ŁOWMIAŃSKI, Henrik. *Studia nad początkami społeczeństwa i państwa litewskiego*. T. 1. Wilno, 1931.
- LÜBKE, Christian. Forms of Political Organisation of the Polabian Slavs (until the 10th Century A.D.). In *Origins of Central Europe*. Ed. by Przemysław URBANŲCZYK. Warsaw, 1997, pp. 115–124.
- MAGI, Marika. In *Austrvegr. The Role of the Eastern Baltic in Viking Age Communication across the Baltic Sea* (The Northern World. North Europe and the Baltic c. 400–1700 AD, Peoples, Economies and Cultures, vol. 84). Leiden, Boston, 2018.
- MICHELBERTAS, Mykolas. *Paprudžiai. Žemaičių karinio elito kapinynas*. Vilnius, 2014.
- MICHELBERTAS, Mykolas; VITKŪNAS, Manvydas. Baltų karybos senajame geležies amžiuje (I–IV a.) bruožai. *Karo archyvas*, 2003, t. XVIII, p. 8–64.
- MODZELEWSKI, Karol. *Barbarų Europa*. Vilnius, 2007.
- PETRAUSKAS, Rimvydas. Socialiniai pokyčiai Lietuvoje valstybės formavimosi laikotarpiu. In *Lietuvos valstybės susikūrimas europiniame kontekste*. Sud. Alvydas NIKŽENTAITIS, Rimvydas PETRAUSKAS, Michael BORGOLTE. Vilnius, 2008, p. 160–183.
- ROWELL-BANYTĖ, Rasa; BITNER-WRÓBLEWSKA, Anna; REICH, Christine. Did they Exist? The Question of Elites in Western Lithuania in the Roman and Early Migration Periods, and their Interregional Contacts. In *People at the Crossroads of Space and Time (Footmarks of Societies in Ancient Europe) II* (Archaeologia Baltica, vol. 18). Klaipėda, 2012, pp. 192–220.
- SIKORSKI, Dariusz Adam. *Instytucje władzy u prusów w średniowieczu (na tle struktury społecznej i terytorialnej)*. Olsztyn, 2010.
- ŠČAVINSKAS, Marius. Some Notes on the Issue of the Development of Balt Society in the Ninth to the 13th Centuries in the Context of the Socio-political Structures of the Baltic Region. In *Societies of the Past: Approaches to Landscape, Burial Customs and Grave Goods* (Archaeologia Baltica, vol. 19). Ed. by Audronė BLIUJENĖ. Klaipėda, 2013, pp. 82–101.
- ŠIMĖNAS, Valdemaras. *Etnokultūriniai procesai Vakarų Lietuvoje pirmojo mūsų eros tūkstantmečio viduryje*. Vilnius, 2006.
- TAUTAVIČIUS, Adolfas. Taurapilio „kunigaikščio“ kapas. *Lietuvos archeologija*, 1981, t. 2, p. 18–43.

- TYMOWSKI, Michał. Organizacje plemienne na obszarze Polski w IX–X w. w świetle antropologicznych teorii systemu segmentarnego i wodzostwa (chiefdom). In *Europa barbarica, Europa christiana. Studia mediaevalia Carolo Modzlewski dedicata*. Red. Roman MICHAŁOWSKI et. al. Warszawa, 2008, s. 269–282.
- TOEPPEN, Max. Excurs über die Verschreibungen des Ordens für Stammpreussen im 13. Jahrhundert. In *Scriptores rerum Prussicarum*. Bd. I. Hrsg. von Theodor HIRSCH, Max TOEPPEN, Ernst STREHLKE. Leipzig, 1861, S. 254–269.
- TUČAS, Rolandas. *Lietuvos teritorijos apgyvendinimo raida I–XII a.* Daktaro disertacija. Vilnius, 2012.
- URBAŃCZYK, Przemysław. *Władza i polityka we wczesnym średniowieczu*. Wrocław, 2008.
- VIRSE, Ingrida Līga; RITUMS, Ritvars. The Grobiņa Complex of Dwelling Locations and Burial Sites, and Related Questions. In *People at the Crossroads of Space and Time (Footmarks of Societies in Ancient Europe I)* (Archaeologia Baltica, vol. 17). Ed. by Audronė BLIUJENĖ. Klaipėda, 2012, pp. 34–42.
- VOLKAITĖ-KULIKAUSKIENĖ, Regina. *Lietuva valstybės priešaušriu*. Vilnius, 2001.
- VOLKAITĖ-KULIKAUSKIENĖ, Regina. Žemdirbystė, gyvulininkystė ir medžioklė. In *Lietuvių materialinė kultūra IX–XIII amžiuje*. T. I. Red. Regina VOLKAITĖ-KULIKAUSKIENĖ. Vilnius, 1978, p. 48–72.
- WRÓBLEWSKI, Wojciech. *Aschenplätze – the forgotten burial rituals of the Old Prussians*. *Archaeologia Lituana*, 2006, t. 7, p. 221–234.
- ZABIELA, Gintautas. *Lietuvos medinės pilys*. Vilnius, 1995.
- ŽULKUS, Vladas. *Kuršiai Baltijos jūros erdvėje*. Vilnius, 2004.
- СТЕФАНОВИЧ, Петр. «Большая дружина» в Древней Руси. In *Восточная Европа в древности и средневековье. Ранние государства Европы и Азии. Проблемы политогенеза*. [Т.] XXIII: Чтения памяти члена-корреспондента АН СССР Владимира Терентьевича Пашута. Москва, 19–21 апреля 2011 г. Материалы конференции. Отв. ред. Елена МЕЛЬНИКОВА. Москва, 2011, с. 265–269.

KAI KURIOS PASTABOS DĖL VIDURAMŽIŲ KARIAUNINKŲ SLUOKSNIO FORMAVIMOSI BALTŲ IR FINŲ VISUOMENĖSE XII AMŽIUJE IR XIII AMŽIAUS PIRMOJOJE PUSĖJE

Marius Ščavinskas

Santrauka

Istoriografijoje iki šiol nėra išsamiai nagrinėtas baltų ir finų kariauninkų sluoksnio formavimosi klausimas, nors tyrinėtojai (ypač archeologai), kalbėdami apie laikotarpį dar iki Lietuvos valstybės susiformavimo XIII a. pirmojoje pusėje, didelį dėmesį skyrė tiek baltų visuomenės diferenciacijos, tiek kariškų įkapių problematikai. Tokią susiklosčiusią situaciją istoriografijoje nulėmė keletas svarbių iki galo neišnagrinėtų problemų, pristatytų pirmojoje straipsnio dalyje: pirmiausia nėra aišku, ar iki XII–XIII a. sandūros archeologų randamos gausios įkapės reiškė aukštą ar net aukščiausią palaidotojo statusą vietos bendruomenėje, ar tai buvo mirusįjį laidojusios bendruomenės noras pademonstruoti tam tikrą laidojamojo asmens išskirtinumą, kuris nebūtinai turėjo sutapti su aukštu socialiniu individo statusu bendruomenėje. Juolab nėra jokių įrodymų, kad ankstyvųjų viduramžių ir vėlesnių laikų (iki XIII a. pirmosios pusės) baltų (kaip ir finų) kariauninkai būtų turėję

specifinių gerbtinų „kariškų“ dievybių, sekdami vikingais – vikingiškų „valhalų“, dėl kurių kariauninkų kapavietės turėtų ženkliai išsiskirti iš kitų turtingesnių ir aukštą socialinį statusą užėmusių bendruomenės narių. Prūsijoje išplitęs vadinamasis *Aschenplätze*, t. y. kolektyviniai kapai, kai viename lauke išbarstomi mirusiųjų kaulai su pelenais ir nedegintomis įkapėmis, deja, nieko negali pasakyti apie taip palaidotųjų socialinį statusą konkrečioje palaidotųjų grupėje, nors tokie kapai priskirtini kariams (akivaizdu, kad tarp kario ir vado būta skirtumo, kurio *Aschenplätze* tipo palaidojimuose negalime nustatyti).

Antroji problema – ar mirusysis, palaidotas su karine ekipuote, buvo tik karys, t. y. ar mirusysis jį laidojusioje bendruomenėje vaidino ir kitas socialines funkcijas. Esmė ta, kad vadinamuosiuose kariauninkų kapuose neretai randama ir kitų buities daiktų, kas lyg ir verstų manyti, jog šie kariai laisvu nuo karo metu buvo žemdirbiai, gyvulių augintojai, amatininkai ir / ar prekiautojai. Iš šios problemos kyla trečioji – šiame straipsnyje turinti ypatingą reikšmę, kokios turto nuosavybės ir jo paveldėjimo formos leido kariui išgyventi nepriklausomai nuo auginamo derliaus, nepalankių klimato sąlygų ir kitų veiksmų. Atsižvelgtina į tai, kad būta nominalaus ir realaus nekilnojamojo turto disponavimo bei valdymo (o tai ne tas pats!), ką taip pat reikėtų chronologizuoti, t. y. jeigu nekilnojamojo turto valdymas fiksuojamas XII–XIII a. sandūros rašytiniuose šaltiniuose, tai nereiškia, kad toks pat valdymas baltų ir finų visuomenėse egzistavo XI a. ar net anksčiau.

Pastarosios problemos nagrinėjimas šio straipsnio antroje ir trečiojoje dalyse leidžia geriau suvokti, kad formuojantis profesionalių kariauninkų sluoksniui didelę reikšmę vaidino nekilnojamojo turto (pirmiausia – žemės, tiek ariamos, tiek ir pievų bei miškų pavidalu) disponavimo ir valdymo santykių klostymasis, o ne tik vyrų kariauninkų gebėjimas profesionaliai valdyti ginklą ir dalyvauti karo žygiuose (kas taip pat buvo svarbu). Žinoma, tik labai hipotetiškai galima kalbėti apie laikotarpį, kai ėmė formotis kariauninkų sluoksniui lemiamas nekilnojamojo turto valdymo (o ne tik disponavimo) santykis. Kita vertus, kariauninkų sluoksnio formavimuisi lemiamą vaidmenį suvaidino ir hierarchizacijos galios vertikalės atsiradimas. Viduramžių kronikose neretai minimi *amici* ir *cognati* traktuotini ne kaip šiaip kariauninkai, vykstantys laisvųjų bendruomenės narių susirinkimų valią, bet kaip kariauninkai, paklūstantys vadui ir kilmingajam. Tokie kilmingieji kaip lyvių Kaupas, prūsų Pipinas ar estų *Thalibaldus* nėra *primus inter pares* tarp savo *amici* ir kitų kariauninkų, kaip buvo gentinės visuomenės laikais, o savo galią ir statusą kariams grindė vertikaliais ryšiais: per valdomą / paveldimą pilį / valdą, t. y. kariauninkai paklūsta tam vadui, kuris turi teisę valdyti pilį / valdą, o priklausymas tokiam kilmingojo kariauninkų būriui kyla iš pavaldumo ryšio, o ne iš bendro susitarimo mainais į įgyjamą karo grobį paklusti konkrečiam karo žygio vadui. Kronikininkas Petras Dusburgietis, aprašydamas Pamedės užkariavimą, minėjo aplink pilis išsidėsčiusius kaimus ir mažesnes pilaites, kuriose, numanu, ir gyveno tokių kilmingųjų kaip Pipinas kariauninkai. Taigi šie kariauninkai dar nebuvo reguliarioji kariuomenė, kuri atsiranda tik susikūrus valstybei, kariauninkams tapus „asmenine“ valdovo kariuomenės dalimi (kaip buvo su Mindaugo kariais arba, pvz., Kijevo Rusijoje – susiformavus „didžiajai družinai / draugijai“). Bet šie kariauninkai jau nebuvo laisvieji bendruomenės vyrai, suburti autoritetą „užsiauginusio“ vado. Šių pilaičių įgulos nariai nuolatos budėjo, taigi jos buvo nuolatiniam „karo“ ir pavaldumo savo kilmingajam režime.

Horizontaliuosius vado ir jo kariauninkų ryšius žymėjo vado galios nesaistymas su konkrečia pilimi, vado, kaip *primus inter pares* tarp savo *amici* ir kitų kariauninkų vaidmuo, t. y.

vadai buvo renkami, skiriami remiantis jų autoritetu, o ne vado (kilmingojo) funkcijos paveldimumu, ką matome Kaupo, Pipino, *Thalibaldus* ir kitų atveju. Tad visos aukščiau išdėstytos pastabos leidžia formuoti mintį, kad nekilnojamojo turto disponavimas / valdymas, turto gausinimas ir paveldėjimas sudarė sąlygas kilmingiesiems ne tik plėsti savo galią laisvųjų bendruomenės narių atžvilgiu, gausinti savo materialinius išteklius, bet ir leido formotis socialinio elito viršūnėje esančių žmonių / giminių galios ir statuso „paveldėjimui“. O tai lemia, kad nekilnojamojo turto valdymą ir paveldėjimą susiejus su „paveldima“ ir įgyjama galia, atsiranda vertikalusis kilmingojo ir kario santykis, grįstas pavaldumu, o ne susitarimu, kaip buvo gentiniais laikais. Konstatuotina, kad vertikalieji galios ir pavaldumo ryšiai tarp kilmingųjų bei kariauninkų ir kitų laisvųjų bendruomenės narių, kas sudaro vieną iš „karinės demokratijos“ pagrindų, atsirado dar iki XIII a. pr., tačiau negalima tiksliai pasakyti nuo kada. Vertikaliaisiais pavaldumo ir galios ryšiais grįsta visuomenė jau nebebuvo gentinė visuomenė, kurioje sprendimus priimdavo ne kariauninkų ir kilmingųjų, o laisvųjų bendruomenės narių susirinkimai.