

L I E T U V O S

ARCHEOlogija 48

Lietuvos istorijos institutas

L I E T U V O S

ARCHEOlogija 48

LIETUVOS
ISTORIJS
INSTITUTAS

VILNIUS 2022

Leidybą finansavo

LIETUVOS MOKSLO TARYBA

PAGAL VALSTYBINĘ LITUANISTINIŲ TYRIMŲ IR SKLAIDOS 2016–2024 METŲ PROGRAMĄ
(Finansavimo sutarties numeris S-LIP-22-44)

Redaktorių kolegija / Editorial board:

Atsakingoji redaktorė / Editor-in-chief dr. Agnė Čivilytė
(Lietuvos istorijos institutas, Vilnius / Lithuanian Institute of History, Vilnius)

Dr. Laurynas Kurila (Lietuvos istorijos institutas, Vilnius / Lithuanian Institute of History, Vilnius)

Dr. Valdis Bērziņš (Latvijos universitetas, Latvijos istorijos institutas, Ryga / University of Latvia, Institute of Latvian History, Riga)

Habil. dr. Anna Bitner-Wróblewska (Valstybinis archeologijos muziejus Varšuvoje, Lenkija / State Archaeological Museum in Warsaw, Poland)

Dr. Christoph Jahn (Baltijos ir Skandinavijos archeologijos centras, Šlėzvigas, Vokietija / Center for Baltic and Scandinavian Archaeology, Schleswig, Germany)

Prof. dr. Rimantas Jankauskas (Vilniaus universitetas, Lietuva / Vilnius University, Lithuania)

Akad. prof. dr. Eugenijus Jovaiša (Lietuvos mokslų akademija, Vilnius / Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, Vilnius)

Habil. dr. Bartosz Kontny (Varšuvos universitetas, Archeologijos fakultetas, Lenkija / Faculty of Archaeology, University of Warsaw, Poland)

Prof. dr. Valter Lang (Tartu universitetas, Estija / University of Tartu, Estonia)

Doc. dr. Algimantas Merkevičius (Vilniaus universitetas, Lietuva / Vilnius University, Lithuania)

Habil. dr. Tomasz Nowakiewicz (Varšuvos universitetas, Archeologijos fakultetas, Lenkija / Faculty of Archaeology, University of Warsaw, Poland)

Habil. dr. Grzegorz Osipowicz (Mikalojaus Koperniko universitetas, Torunė, Lenkija / Nicolaus Copernicus University, Toruń, Poland)

Dr. Gytis Piličiauskas (Lietuvos istorijos institutas, Vilnius / Lithuanian Institute of History, Vilnius)

Dr. Eve Rannamäe (Tartu universitetas, Estija / University of Tartu, Estonia)

Dr. Andra Simniškytė (Lietuvos istorijos institutas, Vilnius / Lithuanian Institute of History, Vilnius)

Dr. Roberts Spirģis (Latvijos universitetas, Latvijos istorijos institutas, Ryga / University of Latvia, Institute of Latvian History, Riga)

Dr. Eugenijus Svetikas (Lietuvos istorijos institutas, Vilnius / Lithuanian Institute of History, Vilnius)

Dr. Elena Pranckėnaitė (Lietuvos istorijos institutas, Vilnius / Lithuanian Institute of History, Vilnius)

Dr. Andris Šnė (Latvijos universitetas, Ryga / University of Latvia, Riga)

Doc. dr. Gintautas Zabiela (Klaipėdos universitetas, Lietuva / Klaipėda University, Lithuania)

Prof. dr. Šarūnas Milišauskas (Niujorko valstijos Bafalo universitetas, JAV / New York State University at Buffalo, USA)

Prof. dr. Timothy Cheval (Niujorko valstijos Bafalo universitetas, JAV / New York State University at Buffalo, USA)

Prof. dr. Johan Ling (Gioteborgo universitetas, Švedija / University of Gothenburg, Sweden)

Sekretorė / Secretary Irma Kaplūnaitė

Redakcijos adresas / Editorial Board address:
Lietuvos istorijos institutas, Archeologijos skyrius
Tilto g. 17, LT-01101 Vilnius
Tel. (+370) 5 2614436, fax (+370) 5 2611433
e-mail: lietuvsarheologija@gmail.com;
civilytea@gmail.com

Žurnalas registruotas: EBSCO Publishing: Central and Eastern European Academic Source European Reference Index for the Humanities and Social Sciences (ERIH PLUS)

TURINYS / CONTENT

Agnė Čivilytė	PRATARMĖ.....7 FOREWORD 11
Christopher Barber Troskosky, Tianyu Chen, Katie Nicole Troskosky	ALICE'S ADVENTURES IN COMPUTATIONAL MODELLING OF THE SUB-NEOLITHIC BOUNDARY: CURIUSER AND CURIUSER DYNAMICS GOVERNING THE ADAPTIVE MORPHOGENESIS OF CULTURE.....15 ALICE NUOTYKIAI KOMPIUTERINIAME MODELIAVIME: SUBNEOLITO PARIBYS IR SMALSUMO DINAMIKOS VALDYMAS KULTŪROS EVOLIUCIJOJE35
Aleksander Koško, Marzena Szmyt	MARIJA GIMBUTAS AND HER VISION OF THE STEPPE INDO-EUROPEANIZATION OF EUROPE: RECEPTION, REJECTION AND REVITALIZATION.....39 MARIJA GIMBUTIENĖ IR JOS EUROPOS STEPINĖS INDOEUROPEIZACIJOS VIZIJA: RECEPCIJA, ATMETIMAS IR ATGAIVINIMAS.....53
Agnė Čivilytė, Vytenis Podėnas, Karolis Minkevičius, Heidi Luik	VĖLYVOJO BRONZOS AMŽIAUS EKONOMIKA RYTŲ BALTIJOS REGIONE: NAUJO MODELIO LINK.....57 LATE BRONZE AGE ECONOMY IN THE EASTERN BALTIC REGION: TOWARDS A NEW MODEL96
Rokas Vengalis, Gytis Piličiauskas, Karolis Minkevičius, Mantas Valančius, Miglė Stančikaitė, Giedrė Vaikutienė, Giedrė Piličiauskienė	NEW DATA ON THE STRUCTURE AND ECONOMY OF UNENCLOSED SETTLEMENTS IN THE LATE STRIATED WARE CULTURE: THE SKUDENIAI SETTLEMENT SITE IN SOUTHEASTERN LITHUANIA101 NAUJI DUOMENYS APIE VĖLYVOSIOS BRŪKŠNIUOTOSIOS KERAMIKOS KULTŪROS NEĮTVIRTINTŲ GYVENVIEČIŲ STRUKTŪRĄ IR EKONOMIKĄ: SKUDENIŲ GYVENVIETĖ PIETRYČIŲ LIETUVOJE..... 150
Laurynas Kurila	MIRUSIŲJŲ DEGINIMO PAPROČIO PLITIMAS RYTŲ LIETUVOJE: NAUJAS CHRONOLOGINIS MODELIS, PAREMTAS RADIOKARBONINIO DATAVIMO DUOMENIMIS155 THE SPREAD OF CREMATION CUSTOM THROUGHOUT EASTERN LITHUANIA: A NEW CHRONOLOGICAL MODEL BASED ON THE DATA OF RADIOCARBON DATING..... 181

Rytis Jonaitis, Irma Kaplūnaitė	TRACES OF CHRISTIAN CULTURAL INFLUENCES IN PAGAN VILNIUS: THE CEMETERY ON BOKŠTO STREET.....185 KRIKŠČIONIŲ KULTŪRINIŲ ĮTAKŲ PĖDSAKAI PAGONIŠKAME VILNIUJE: BOKŠTO GATVĖS KAPINYNAS..... 203
Larissa Kulakovska	TYPOLGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE INDUSTRY IN LAYER VI OF THE KOROLEVO SITE IN THE TRANSCARPATHIA REGION..... 207 KOROLEVO ARCHEOLOGINĖS VIETOVĖS (UŽKARPATĖS REGIONAS) VI SLUOKSNIŲINDUSTRIJOS TIPOLOGINĖ CHARAKTERISTIKA218
Baranov Vyacheslav, Ivakin Vsevolod, Shiroukhov Roman	BURIALS WITH BUCKETS AT THE OSTRIV THE 11 th CENTURY CEMETERY IN THE MIDDLE DNIPRO REGION221 PALAIDOJIMAI SU KIBIRAIŠ OSTRIVO XI A. KAPINYNE VIDURIO DNEPRO SRITYJE..... 262
Oleg Petrauskas, Mykhaylo Syvolap	THE MONSTROUS (MONSTRUOSO) FIBULA FROM THE DNIPRO RIVER REGION..... 265 MONSTRIOZINĖ SEGĖ, APTIKTA DNEPRO REGIONE..... 282
Svitlana Biliaieva, Natalia Danute Bimbirayte	THE HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL HERITAGE OF THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA IN THE SOUTH OF UKRAINE: TYAHIN FORTRESS..... 285 LIETUVOS DIDŽIOSIOS KUNIGAİKŠTYSTĖS ISTORINIS IR KULTŪRINIS PAVELDAS UKRAINOS PIETUOSE: TYAGINO TVIRTOVĖ..... 308
Alla Valeriivna Buisikh, Dmytro Mykolayovych Khmelevskiy	THE EARLIEST FINDS OF PANATHENAIC PRIZE AMPHORAE IN OLPIA PONTICA 311 ANKSTYVIAUSI PANATĖNAJOS PRIZINIŲ AMFORŲ RADINIAI OLPIJOJE325
	<i>KITAIP APIE ARCHEOLOGIĄ / ALTERNATIVE PERCEPTIONS OF ARCHAEOLOGY</i>
Eligijus Raila	APIE KAULŲ KVAPĄ IR SKONĮ327 AUTORIŲ DĖMESIUI.....330 GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS.....333

FOREWORD

Dear readers of ‘Lithuanian Archaeology’,

This 48th volume of *Lietuvos Archeologija* is exceptional. It was written in the midst of the 21st – century tragedy that has shaken Europe. We woke up to a different world on February 24th and were confronted with a reality that shocked our conscience. This forced us to search for a greater yet purpose in our daily academic activities. It was very difficult to muster the motivation to write, deliver lectures while our minds were preoccupied, and undertake our other conventional duties.¹

After a few weeks (the so-called twenty-one day recovery rule), we realized that we could not remain idle. Some sense of normalcy had to resume because there was no war in Lithuania. Our experience of the Ukraine war was real but vicarious, and so, the least we owe life in a free country is to keep going.

The texts in this volume reflect a determination not to yield to frustration or hopelessness. It contains articles by scholars from the USA, Poland, Estonia, Germany, Lithuania, and Ukraine on various aspects of Lithuanian and Baltic archaeology.

In the article by Christopher Troskosky, Tianyu Chen, and Katie Troskosky, we learn how theoretical knowledge and computational methods can be combined to answer a particular archaeological question. In this case, it concerns the interaction between Sub-Neolithic hunter-gatherer-fisher and CW pottery agropastoral groups in an agricultural frontier zone around 3000 BC.

The authors are interested in how communities exchanged knowledge and the impact of information exchange on adaptive cultural morphogenesis. The

most important factor for change turns out to be the stress experienced by communities as a dissonance between expectations and reality. The authors coined the original logarithm ALICE, so it is not surprising that the article starts with a quote from Lewis Carroll’s “Through the Looking Glass and What Alice Found There” – a work by the writer, poet, photographer and mathematician (sic!). This is a deliberate and certainly not accidental play on words. Incidentally, this very quotation from the above-mentioned work has already been used in the introduction to the famous American archaeologist David Clark’s book *Analytical Archaeology* (Clark 1972, 3).

Clark, like the authors of this article, proposes that we learn about the past and its processes through the tools of analytical thinking we have developed. The ALICE proposed by Troskosky and his colleagues shows how the exchange of information can change the behaviour of communities living on the margins. The paper presents eight archaeological dynamics that allow a better understanding of cultural changes under stress and states of quiescence, and provides us with insights on the reasons why agriculture appeared much later in the Neman basin than in surrounding regions.

Indeed, it is an intriguing attempt to trace how information about innovations was transmitted from one community to another and the consequences of such communications. Certainly, some innovations (e.g., agriculture) may have led to the emergence of the most important means of communication: language.² ALICE is a universal method which the authors propose for future research as they consider

¹ A special thank you is extended to Mingailė Jurkutė for her letter, which, as if in one breath of air, embodies the spirit of the brothers of the feather, and of all human senses (*Laiškas redaktoriui, Naujasis židinys / Aidai*, 2022, 3, 1–3).

² For more information on the European Research Council-funded project at the Max Plank Institute in Jena, see <https://www.shh.mpg.de/102128/archaeolinguistic-research-group>.

it to be an objective attempt to follow the path of hard science (even if it is within the humanities).

Aleksander Koško and Marzena Szymt discuss the evolution of Maria Gimbutas's concept of Indo-Europeanization – its reception, rejection, and revival – as well as its importance for European archaeology. The authors directly examine Gimbutas's work and reveal the methods and keywords that she used in her studies. Reading this volume enables one to see Gimbutas's global thinking, ability to recognize processes in the past and the overall breadth of her scientific approach. It was as though Gimbutas had been participating in the popular quiz “Who, Where, Why?”, adding another question of her own: “When?” The authors believe that Gimbutas's logical structure, linguistic skillset, and deep geographical understanding of prehistoric Europe allowed her to formulate the renowned hypothesis.

This article explores that trajectory of Gimbutas's archaeological thought by drawing on her very first through last texts, and describes how the terms “Indo-Europeanisation”, “Kurgan culture” and “Migration” came into being. It will also endeavor to shed light on Gimbutas's contributions to the so-called “third science revolution” by explicating her ideas on the complex processes and causes of the waves of human migrations. The authors intriguingly ask whether DNA research in archaeology is a return to Gimbutas's theory, and invites the reader to meaningfully think about this difficult question. This theoretical part of this volume of “Lithuanian Archaeology” is followed by two articles on recent archaeological research concerning prehistoric settlements and economies.

The article by Agnė Čivilytė, Vytenis Podėnas, Karolis Minkevičius, and Heidi Luik gives us an excellent opportunity to learn about the Late Bronze Age economy of the recently excavated fortified settlements of Garniai I (Utena c. municipality) (811–478 cal BC) and Mineikiškės (Zarasai c. municipality) (983–388 cal BC). The interdisciplinary research of

the archaeological material used in the study has significantly changed the previous conception of the Bronze Age economy. The authors address what took place during the economic turning point of the Late Bronze Age, including but not limited to the kind of settlements people inhabited, how they lived, what they ate, and what they produced.

The new economic model proposed by the authors corrects misconceptions based on older research findings and broaches new questions about the particularities of Late Bronze Age economies and the relevant dynamics at play. It turns out that the inhabitants of Northeastern Lithuania fertilized their soils and were very fond of pigs and molluscs, which was not necessarily self-evident.

This article describes the factors that led to the certain crop and animal choices. We also learn about specialized activities and the level of craftsmanship in the Late Bronze Age settlements. The authors' interesting and novel conclusion is that agriculture was by no means extensive and marginal, but that local communities cultivated a well-diversified and shock-resistant plant package. The defensive fortifications discovered at Mineikiškės evince the inhabitants' desire to distance themselves from their surroundings and provide security. Metal did not have a significant impact on people's lifestyles. On the contrary, economic innovations stimulated the emergence of metallurgical activities, but these were only episodic.

Rokas Vengalis, Gytis Piličiauskas, Karolis Minkevičius, Mantas Valančius, Miglė Stančikaitė, Giedre Vaikutienė, and Giedre Piličiauskienė continuously explore the theme of prehistoric settlements through their investigations of the Roman-period settlement of Skudeniai (Kaišiadorys d. municipality), which was discovered during pipeline construction works. This article is yet another example of interdisciplinary cooperation, providing new insights into the lifestyles of the people of the Late Striated Ware Culture.

Until now, it has been argued that people lived almost exclusively in fortified settlements (hillforts). Evidence shows that this was not the case, in that unfortified settlements played an important role in the settlement system. Skudeniai stands out from other contemporary settlements because of the almost pure material collected from a short period (~130–230 cal AD), which has provided new and important insights into the structure of the unfortified settlements of the Roman Age, buildings, the pottery complex, agriculture, metallurgy, and trade relations. This data also raises a number of questions about the treatment of the Late Striated Ware Culture as a whole, its settlement system, and its economy.

Laurynas Kurila's article opens a window to the custom of cremation in Eastern Lithuania. Based on radiocarbon data, the article discusses the pattern of the spread of cremation in the culture of Eastern Lithuanian burial mounds. Contrary to previous assumptions, the author argues that the inhumation and cremation burials coexisted for a longer period of time, probably around two centuries, and that the change in burial customs was not a sudden, but rather, a long process. Kurila argues that the custom of burning the dead in the region was widespread much earlier, i.e., between the middle of the third century and the first half of the fourth century (248–335 cal AD)—and perhaps even around the turn of the second to third centuries. This premature cremation horizon changes its historical, cultural, and social context. The new evidence encourages us to take a second look at the vectors of cultural influences or immigration that led to changes in burial customs and the intensification of warfare.

The article by Irma Kaplūnaitė and Rytis Jonaitis focuses on an important archaeological and historical site in Vilnius – the Bokšto Street cemetery, where

representatives of the Christian Orthodox faith have been burying their dead since the last decades of the 13th century. The authors discuss themes that were not touched upon in the monograph on the Bokšto Street burial ground (Jonaitis, Kaplūnaitė 2020). I.e., the cemetery is viewed as a site that not only reflects the features of the burial, but also shows the potential Catholic and Pagan influences on the other inhabitants of Vilnius. The new approach to the Bokšto str. cemetery enables scholars to discuss the influence of the Christian Orthodox community on the urban landscape as well as its burial practices and crafts.

This volume of “Lithuanian Archaeology” provides readers with a unique opportunity to get acquainted with the trends in Ukrainian archaeological scholarship from the earliest prehistoric times until the Middle Ages. The idea of publishing articles by colleagues from Ukraine was conceived several years ago in cooperation with researchers from various Ukrainian scientific institutions.³ When the war broke out, we realized that sharing our colleagues' discoveries during this difficult period was only a small part of what we could do to express our solidarity with Ukrainian researchers. These articles deal with themes that reflect the diverse contacts, cultural influences, and legacies of prehistoric and historic communities.

In Larissa Kulakowska's article, we learn about an Early Palaeolithic technocomplex in Layer VI of Korolevo in Transcarpathia. Early Palaeolithic people were able to develop production technologies and make various tools prior to the use of handaxes. The so-called monstrous fibula, recently found in the Dnieper River valley from the Chernyakhov culture's cremation grave (late 3rd – 4th century AD), is the subject of an article by Oleg Petrauskas and Mikhail Syvolop. Both authors try to answer the question of

³ My sincere thanks to Rytis Jonaitis for suggesting this idea and encouraging Ukrainian colleagues to publish their research in Lithuania.

how a fibula of this type arrived at the region and even raises the possibility of its local production.

Vyacheslav Baranov, Vsevolod Ivakin, and Roman Shiroukhov introduce readers to a unique archaeological monument, the Ostriv cemetery (11th century), which was associated with people from the Eastern Baltic Sea region. One of the key characteristic features of the Ostriv burial rituals was the sacrifice of food in containers (buckets), which was atypical for Western Baltic tribes. As such, the authors try to solve the riddle of the placing of buckets in graves and link this phenomenon to the impact of Christianization on newcomers.

Svetlana Belyaeva and Natalia Bimbiraytė's article sheds light on the significance of the Tyagin Fortress for Ukrainian and Lithuanian history. They provide us with an overview of historical archaeological research at this unique site. The fortress on the territory of Bolshoye Gorodishche Island was built between the end of the 14th and the beginning of the 15th century per the order of the Lithuanian Grand Duke Vytautas. The archaeological material therein provided valuable information about the syncretism of the monumental complex on the island as well as its typology, layout, and fortress's size.

Alla's Buisikh and Dmytro Chmelevskiy's article introduces us to the relics of classical archaeology – the Panathinaikos prize amphorae found in the ancient city of Olbia (Ukraine). The authors found that the two fragments belong to the same amphora, dating from the last third of the

sixth century BC, which was probably made by the artist, Antimenes.

The volume concludes with a “Alternative perceptions of Archaeology” section complemented with Eligijus Raila's essay about the smell and taste of bones. The author intriguingly reveals the influence of Heinrich Schliemann's discoveries on the intellectual and archaeological activities of prominent Lithuanian activists. Tadas Daugirdas, one of the pioneers of scientific archaeology in Lithuania, perceived artefacts that had been lying in the ground for centuries in terms of aesthetic categories. Daugirdas was able to revive dead objects that had been brought out of the underground and into the daylight. After reading this text by Raila, the reader will understand what a contemporary archaeologist can experience at certain moments of discovery – to feel life in the silence of graves. The volume will also touch on Jonas Basanavičius's inspiration for writing about Lithuanian folk songs and the gold and silver motif they contain, including reflections of the Lithuanian „Atlantis.” I.e., lyrics that reflect the search for romanticism and idealism in the national movement at the end of the 19th century.

To conclude this preface, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Irma Kaplūnaitė for supporting the idea and the creative process of the journal. I also thank Mindaugas Maskoliūnas, for his input and patience, and to all the authors, reviewers, and editorial board for your thoughts and interesting work.

*Agnė ČIVILYTĖ,
Editor-in-Chief*