VILNIUS UNIVERSITY

VYTAUTAS VOLUNGEVIČIUS

THE CASTLE AND IT'S SOCIO-POLITICAL TRANSFORMATIONS IN THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA DURING THE PERIOD OF THE 14TH – THE FIRST HALF OF 16TH C.

Summary of Doctoral Thesis
Humanitarian sciences, History (05 H)

Vilnius, 2014

Doctoral dissertation was prepared at Vilnius University in 2009–2014.

Scientific Supervisor:

prof. dr. Rimvydas Petrauskas (Vilnius University, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05 H)

Dissertation is being defended at the Scientific Field of History at Vilnius University:

Chairman – prof. dr. Irena Valikonytė (Vilnius University, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05 H)

Members:

dr. Darius Baronas (The Lithuanian Institute of History, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05H)

dr. Sergey Polekhov (Institute of Russian History, Russian Academy of Sciences, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05 H)

doc. dr. Jurgita Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė (Vilnius University, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05 H)

prof. dr. Rita Regina Trimonienė (Šiauliai University, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05 H)

Opponents:

doc. dr. Artūras Dubonis (The Lithuanian Institute of History, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05 H)

doc. dr. Eugenijus Saviščevas (Vilnius University, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05 H)

The dissertation will be defended at the public meeting of the Council of Scientific Field of History in the 211th auditorium of the Faculty of History at 3 p.m. on 26th of September, 2014.

Adress: Universiteto g. 7, Vilnius, Lithuania.

The summary of the doctoral dissertation was distributed on 26th of August, 2014.

The doctoral dissertation is available at the Vilnius University LIbrary.

VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETAS

VYTAUTAS VOLUNGEVIČIUS

PILIS IR JOS SOCIOPOLITINĖS TRANSFORMACIJOS LIETUVOS DIDŽIOJOJE KUNIGAIKŠTYSTĖJE XIV–XVI A. PIRMOJE PUSĖJE

Daktaro disertacijos santrauka
Humanitariniai mokslai, istorija (05 H)

Vilnius, 2014

Disertacija rengta 2009–2014 metais Vilniaus universitete.

Mokslinis vadovas:

prof. dr. Rimvydas Petrauskas (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05 H)

Disertacija ginama Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos mokslo krypties taryboje:

Pirmininkė – prof. dr. Irena Valikonytė (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05 H)

Nariai:

dr. Darius Baronas (Lietuvos istorijos institutas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05H);

dr. Sergey Polekhov (Rusijos MA Rusijos istorijos institutas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05 H)

doc. dr. Jurgita Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05 H)

prof. dr. Rita Regina Trimonienė (Šiaulių universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05 H)

Oponentai:

doc. dr. Artūras Dubonis (Lietuvos istorijos institutas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05 H)

doc. dr. Eugenijus Saviščevas (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05 H)

Disertacija bus ginama viešame Istorijos mokslo krypties tarybos posėdyje 2014 m. rugsėjo 26 d. 15 val. Istorijos fakulteto 211 auditorijoje.

Adresas: Universiteto g. 7, Vilnius, Lietuva.

Disertacijos santrauka išsiuntinėta 2014 m. rugpjūčio 26 d.

Disertaciją galima peržiūrėti Vilniaus universiteto bibliotekoje.

Research problem

The strategy of research into the dissertation object is based on four criteria. First, it is a study of a phenomenon and its development. Second, the study is not confined to the present territory of the Republic of Lithuania. Third, the research problem and questions raised are interpreted in a broader light of examples from the European historiography, which enable to contextualise past features of the local social reality and search for similarities and/or differences as well as common points in the development of the phenomena which existed in different regions. Fourth, the object under analysis is perceived as a phenomenon with a multifaceted structure. Therefore, an attempt is made to look for new theoretical approaches rather than limit oneself to a traditional historical narrative.

Historiography has seen attempts to disclose the development of society, uneven social structure, its specific features, etc. through the analysis of one phenomenon. However, this is only possible by looking at that phenomenon from different perspectives and analysing it as a product of different spheres of social reality, because focusing on a single aspect of the phenomenon limits the possibilities for interpretation which would reveal the multifunctional nature of the phenomenon and uneven trajectories of its development.

The phenomenon of the castle is one of those problems which has not been analysed systematically and consistently. The existing historiography has mostly perceived the castle as unrelated to the social environment or political circumstances and, therefore, it was frequently presented as a military or architectural object.

The origin and development of the castle in Western European historiography have been evaluated in the context of changes in socio-political circumstances and, therefore, seen as an integral part of social reality for a long time. In his article published in 1938, the French historian Roger Auben adjusted the traditional position of historiography concerning the formation of castles by drawing attention to the relationship between the evolution of the castles in the 10th – 11th c. France and its regions and the genesis of feudalism. Therefore, since then the development of the castle has been interpreted taking into account the socio-political heterogeneity of different territories and local conditions. Though Lithuanian historiography identified the territorial heterogeneity of Grand Duchy of Lithuania (hereinafter GDL) at the end of the

19th c., it lacks studies which would analyse a certain phenomenon, legal institute or social group in its integral heterogeneity.

A qualitatively new perspective to the study of castles in European historiography was given by one of the publications in the series published by the *Constance Work Group for Medieval History*, devoted to the significance of castles and their legal and structural history. In this fundamental two-volume collection of articles the phenomenon of the castle is analysed in a multi-layered perspective and the introductory article written by the Austrian historian Herwig Ebner reveals and provides arguments supporting the multifunctional and multifaceted (political-military, sociological, economic-administrative, judicial, religious) nature of the castle which had hardly been discussed in historiography until then. At the same time the analysis of the castle is divided according to regions/areas in this way reflecting the diversity of the development of castles in different territories.

The research problem of the dissertation is shaped by this particular tradition in Western European historiography. At the same time the examples from Western European historiography provide opportunities to see the drawbacks of Lithuanian historiography and to develop new approaches toward uninvestigated or insufficiently investigated GDL phenomena. It becomes obvious that the phenomenon of the castle in the GDL is neither perceived nor explained systematically, its multi-functionality and heterogeneity are not taken into account. On the other hand, there are no attempts to interpret this phenomenon in the context of GDL territorial (structural) and social heterogeneity. Besides, the castle has not yet been explained in its direct relationship with the socio-political processes in the GDL or its society, i.e. local GDL societies. It is not clear what development trends and forms the castle exhibited in different GDL lands, what relationships with the castle were maintained by local societies, what policy the grand duke was implementing with regard to the castle depending on a particular territory. The subordination and status of the castle, which varied depending on the GDL lands and their role in the state, are not known either.

Research object

The research object of this dissertation is the castle as a qualitatively variable phenomenon, depending on the socio-political circumstances. The castle is perceived as

a spatial, social, symbolic, legal and representative phenomenon of the medieval and early modern society, whose development in the GDL was not even and depended on local (legal, social, political) conditions. At the same time the castle is seen as an integral part of social reality which is interpretable only in relation to society, its transformations and activities, and changing geopolitical circumstances.

The castle can validly be considered the most representative phenomenon of the Middle Ages. Its dynamic development and changing multifunctional nature represent the changes of the whole medieval epoch and its society. According to Georges Duby, '*in any case the new social structure is forming around the fortified building, i.e. the castle*'. It means that the castle represents the formation of a new social structure and configurations of the changing power, i.e. executed and implemented policy.

As has been mentioned, the phenomenon of the castle has not yet been systematically studied in Lithuanian historiography. On the other hand, there is an issue of the origin of the castle, its development and relation to society. To put it metaphorically, the castle could be considered a prism and a pencil of rays directed at it could be seen as society, while the breaking waves (colours) of light could be perceived as different forms of social life with their characteristic structure and content.

Research aim and objectives

The aim of this research is to disclose the development of the castle as a phenomenon in the GDL in the period of the 14th – the first half of the 16th c. in the context of socio-political transformations.

Research objectives:

1. To define the concept of the castle as a phenomenon.
2. To formulate the territorial model of the castle and describe the development of the castle taking into account different GDL territories and societies.
3. To identify different levels of the castle territory.
4. To analyse the internal (*micro*) and external (*macro*) social environment of the castle and their changes.
5. To name the official character (e.g. administrative) of the castle and discuss social categories of the castle in their relation to the castle territory and its economic mechanism.

6. To identify the subordination of the castle (sovereign, dynasty, dukes, nobility, etc.) depending on the lands constituting the GDL and changes in the 14th – the first half of the 16th c.

7. To reconstruct the status of the castle (e.g., office-bound, mortgage, etc.) in different GDL territories.

8. To identify the nature of the castle as a judicial and legal object and its relation to other structures.

9. To identify the development of the castle as regalia and the licence to crenellate in the GDL.

Research methodology

The castle as one of the main territorial-structural components of medieval society is to be understood in relation to different local social environments. Therefore, the castle and its space is a direct expression of socio-political relations and conditions. As the French sociologist Henri Lefebvre has aptly observed, '*every society is creating its own space with its specific features and specific groups in which the concept of society can generally be perceived*'. The phenomenon of the castle in the GDL is to be evaluated in the light of this idea on the assumption that social environments (local societies) of separate lands of the state could be characterised by different traditions of socio-political and legal development which determined the evolution of the castle, transformations and the relationship with the castle itself. Thus, the castle can be seen as one of those phenomena whose development reflects the GDL structure.

In one of his articles on space and time, the German historian Reihart Koselleck treats both categories as conditions of possible history. However, space is given exclusive attention because, according to the historian, '*space has its own history [...] It is perceived in history because it changes socially, economically and politically*'. In this case the GDL space cannot be perceived monolithically, it is rather to be evaluated as a state composed of several territories characterised by uneven development which differ from each other (e.g. with respect to subordination, status, law), therefore, the castle as a phenomenon acquires different development trajectories and forms. Here Koselleck's metaphor of *simultaneity of the non-simultaneous* (*die Gleichzeitigkeit des Ungleichzeitigen*) which presupposes multi-layered time would be appropriate. In the

case of the castle it is clearly expressed in different trajectories of the development of this phenomenon depending on the GDL territories and the existing social environment.

The latter theoretical position is expanded by the methodological position of *the differences in development and the balancing of development* (*die Entwicklungsunterschiede und Entwicklungsausgleich*) expressed in the seminal article of the German medievalist Peter Moraw and illustrated with such phenomena of common European history as church organisation, formation of towns, and universities.

Methodologically the castle is to be interpreted as a certain structure (territorial – social – power) whose perception requires a certain specific approach to source texts, i.e. by trying to connect the messages from the sources distant from each other in time and space into one meaningful chain, therefore, as was aptly pointed out by Koselleck, '*events can only be narrated, structures can only be described*', because empirical material in this kind of work very rarely has a plot and individualised characters, on the contrary, it is static and provides an arena or a stage where the action is taking place. Therefore, the methodological division between the research strategies of 'structure' and 'event' is formulated. The latter assumes that the event is 'evoked' by particular individuals (subjects) and their actions, while the structure is above the individual and is to be perceived from the perspective of multifunctional causality. That is why the reduction of the explanation of the structure to the actions of individuals or their groups simplifies the existing complexity of the phenomenon and its environment and prevents the disclosure of its development and conditions. On the other hand, the structures themselves are recognizable only in relation to the events in which they are articulated and identified.

At the same time the methodological position is based on a certain imperative recorded in a fragment of Marc Bloch's notes which could be interpreted as one of the main features of the historiographical concept of the Annales School that '*the concept **event** is to be substituted by **phenomenon**. An event is an ensemble of facts whose only common denominator is that everything falls into the same category. A phenomenon derives from the analysis of events*'.

This work follows the historiographical traditions of the history of structures and social history. One of the first historians to propose the concept of *the history of structures* (*histoire des structures*) was Fernand Braudel, who explained it as an analysis

of long-term (*longue durée*) structures and conditions. The characteristic features of this model of explanation (in historiography quite often considered as an approach or a methodological position) is that particular relations and circumstances of historical reality, processes above the influence of the individual, development of phenomena become the main object of research leaving separate events and historical personalities in the background. Phenomena and different areas of social reality become the subject matter of this descriptive study. Studies in social history focus on the problems of social groups and their relationships. The heterogeneity of social relations is emphasised and a particular social group is analysed and interpreted at different levels of social reality (e.g. legal, political, etc.) trying to avoid disciplinary isolation.

It should be noted that the position of the *history of structures* provides an opportunity to construct a generalising typological interpretational model without ignoring separate entities. On the other hand, the social history approach as part of the *history of structures* studies social groups, their relationships and development. Therefore, this work combines both approaches and tries to disclose the heterogeneity of the phenomenon under analysis in the greatest possible detail.

Research methods

The research methodology of the dissertation presupposes the choice of methods. In order to reveal the complexity and multi-functionality of the phenomenon of the castle, i.e. the diversity of intermingling and overlapping functions in the phenomenon, an encounter with the *structuralist* method is unavoidable. As an object of research the castle is divided into its components-functions which are interpreted and evaluated in their mutual relationship within the object; thus, the castle is perceived as a whole in its internal relationship of different functions. In short, a systemic-structural analysis is necessary in order to investigate an object as a whole, i.e. by dividing the object into integral logical units which, however, should be evaluated and interpreted without separating them from the whole, i.e. without reducing them to their own autonomy.

The application of the *comparative* method is motivated by the territorial and social structure of the GDL and regionalism of European development and should be divided into two levels: *synchronic* and *diachronic*. This method takes into account the 'diversity' of the castle development in the GDL and allows for the interpretation of

castle development in the contexts of Central and Eastern as well as Western Europe (which would provide a better understanding of the castle development in the GDL) by helping to identify common trends, differences, analogies and processes causing that development. In this case the *synchronic* approach focuses on simultaneous transformations of the phenomenon and processes taking place in their context, though in different regions or development trends. On the other hand, the *diachronic* approach stresses the possibility of comparing societies distant in time, but existing on a similar level of social development.

The *retrospective* method allows for interpreting a period which has not been sufficiently described by historical sources on the basis of chronologically succeeding sources. This extrapolation of sources to earlier epochs may prove useful in the investigation of slowly or slightly changing territorial structures of separate castles and attached territories (manors, villages, etc.).

Theses to be defended
1. The castle is a phenomenon with a complex structure which could be explained only in its relationship with society and taking into account specific socio-political conditions and transformations. The castle is a multi-layered phenomenon exhibiting different spheres of social reality, including territorial-spatial, administrative-economic, political-governing, symbolic-representational-social, legal-judicial.
2. The development of the castle in the GDL was uneven and exhibited different trajectories of development in different regions (*Lithuania propria*, Samogitia, Ruthenian lands).
3. The castle and its spaces are identified on three levels: internal castle territory (*micro*), external castle territory (*macro*), castle regions.
4. The castle as an object of subordination was unequally subordinate to the following subjects: the sovereign, dynasty, dukes, nobility, church, and gentry.
5. The status levels of the castle were of different nature and changeable: nominal (the highest), real, fief-office-bound, and mortgage.

6. Depending on the territory, the (local) castle society was formed by the internal (*micro*) and external (*macro*) social environments of the castle which consisted of different social groups characteristic of agricultural society.

7. The castle had some official characteristics, including administrative and economic functions, which were carried out by certain officials.

8. The castle had exceptional judicial (court, administration of justice, courtroom) and legal (relationship with the town, jurisdiction) functions which directly expressed and symbolised the castle as a 'source' of power and justice related to the sovereign's person.

9. The castle belonged to the group of the so-called sovereign regalia (monopolist rights). However, the regalia (licence to crenellate and manage) of the castle (any fortification) have never been monolithic or belonged only to the sovereign, but changed depending on political circumstances and existing social situation.

Dissertation structure

The dissertation consists of an introduction, four parts, conclusions, a list of sources and literature, and appendices. All sections and their subsections express the structuralist approach toward the problem under analysis which is perceived and interpreted in the comparative perspective of the whole study.

The first part attempts to formulate a definition of the castle phenomenon as manifold and changing in time and describe the concept in the European context.

The second part constructs the model of the castle territory. It presents the conception of different constituents of the external territory of the castle. This model is based on the examples of European historiography devoted to the problem of the castle. The relationship of the castle with other territorial structures (e.g., village, manor) is analysed in this part as well.

The third part investigates the office-bound character of the castle, its (local) society, social groups which belonged to the castle (e.g., unfree peasants, peasant performing military service such as *barčiai*, *keliuočiai*, etc.). The social characteristics of the castle (e.g., administration, economy) is analysed from the perspective of the GDL regionalism and in relation to the castle territory.

The fourth part analyses the subordination-dependency problem of the castle. Different forms of subordination-dependency are identified (nominal, real, fief, office-bound, mortgage) depending on the socio-political circumstances and their changes are explained. Besides, the typology of castle subordination-dependency is provided by distinguishing the sovereign (state) (a), dynasty (b), church (c), dukes (d), nobility (e), gentry (f).

Research chronology

An attempt is made in this work not to limit oneself to formal temporal landmarks which are usually seen as certain dates marking the beginning and the end of a particular epoch. The research chronology in this dissertation was determined by several motives. First, a long-term phenomenon is investigated, therefore, its development and changes are revealed only through the relationship of facts, actions, socio-political circumstances and a particular situation. Second, in dealing with the castle we deal with one of the structural elements of power (state) whose development can be appreciated only in a long-term perspective. Third, the castle itself should be perceived as a (social, territorial) structure whose development is an expression of socio-political transformations. Fourth, different GDL lands could be characterised by an uneven development of the castle phenomenon, therefore, there cannot be a universal model or a research chronology, because what was characteristic of one territory at a particular time might not be characteristic of another.

Chronological landmarks of the study:

- the formation of the GDL as an early feudal monarchy in the 14th c., which marks the emergence of new political and social organisations.
- the structures of the castles emerging in *Lithuania propria* and Samogitia at the juncture of the 13th – 14th centuries are attributable to the establishment of one ruling dynasty.
- integration of regional GDL principalities in the 15th c. and the first attempts at the centralisation of the state.

- the phenomenon of homogial oaths as the start of the transformation of the old organisation of Ruthenian territories and principalities in the late 14th – early 15th c.

- manifestation of the decline and/or transformation of wooden castles in *Lithuania propria* in the late 14th c.

- internal power changes. The rise of the GDL nobility in the juncture of the 15th – 16th centuries and the associated emergence of castles in their land holdings.

- technological changes (of artillery) in the first half of the 16th c. as well as the changing architectonics, function and purpose of castles: from castle to palaces.

- the *valakas* land reform (Wallach Reform) and administrative-judicial (*pavietas*) (*powiat*) reform in the 16th c. which changed the old territorial and social structures of local societies.

The Concept of the Castle

From the object to the structure

One of the many problems encountered by a historian investigating ancient societies is their anachronistic interpretations and concepts which determine them and are used in order to name the social reality of a distant epoch. It is obvious that any theory or model are only as valid as systematically the concepts used as means of analysis are articulated, because each theory is a system of clearly and consistently used concepts and categories, which is not derived directly from sources but enables to identify, describe and interpret reality. The system of concepts is an instrument; however, the concepts used are not adequate for a particular previous social reality and its phenomena. On the contrary, research concepts are formulated in order to 'bring closer' the distant society and its phenomena to modern times.

In general, there is a distinct semantic vagueness between the *word*, *term* and *concept* (of the castle). A *concept* is a word, but not every word is a concept. The semantic dynamics of historical concepts is aptly disclosed in the introductory article by Reinhart Koselleck to the monumental dictionary *Fundamental Concepts of History*. One can talk about a concept only when the meanings of an individual term, expressing the

order of things are bundled and discussed in connection with the function of definition. Meanwhile, the term accommodates features of the existing order of things; its meaning can be substantive (specific), although defined differently. To put it simply, a term has a relatively specific definition. In terms of content, the term is not as capacious as a concept, but its shape is more elaborate, more substantiated, less conditional and contradictory. Thus, talking about the lexicon of sources, the word naming the castle is understood as the simultaneous linguistic expression of a particular object; meanwhile the content which it is given in the text as a historical term (*terminus technicus*) is formulated on the basis of the interpretation of the source. It should be noted that the *castle* is not to be perceived as a concept in the primary sense of this word, but when the castle phenomenon is interpreted over a long time span and in a heterogeneous space, the content of the *castle* 'expands' and becomes problematic and hardly definable in a homogeneous and uncontroversial way.

Several important moments concerning the castle development in the GDL which are directly related to the content of the concept of the *castle* should be noted and highlighted in this section. In the introductory section three names were mentioned which, in a sense, constitute the main theoretical and methodological positions which account for the diversity of the GDL phenomena, including the castle. They deserve to be distinguished here:

- each society is creating a distinctive space with its phenomena which enable getting to know it (H. Lefebvre).
- societies which are close to each other in terms of space have different trajectories of development and phenomena they create, which causes *differences in development* (P. Moraw).
- the topos of *simultaneity of the non-simultaneous* (R. Koselleck).

Where does the *castle* come in here? It is suggested that a castle is a multi-layered phenomenon created by different societies. Though it is usual to perceive the GDL as one society, it must be admitted that it would be more correct to talk about societies constituting this state which 'joined' this political structure at different times and in different ways. A reservation should be made at this point that generalisation is an inevitable part of any science; therefore, various contradictions in the concept of the

15

castle are possible. On the other hand, ignoring the social and territorial heterogeneity of the GDL, which was also noticed in the case of the castle, would prevent an adequate understanding of this phenomenon.

A holistic view attempting to encompass the development of the castle in such a broad and heterogeneous space as the GDL encounters the problem of *part* and *whole*, the problem of concepts of ideographic and history of structures and writing models. In trying to reconcile *part* and *whole*, the controversy between depth and breadth impartially, we encounter a methodological aporia. These approaches presuppose two opportunities for writing history. One is to write about the castle development of a separate historical region of the GDL or about the development of one castle as a specific object (as a side issue) and another is to interpret the GDL as historical entity whose complexity presupposes the diversity of the castle phenomenon depending on the territory, therefore, the castle could be perceived as a phenomenon and analysed in the GDL space. In the first case, due to clarity the castle problem loses its content which can be acquired only by attempting to reconstruct a general, though internally controversial, picture from separate objects of the same phenomenon. In the second case, we are dealing with a heterogeneous GDL phenomenon.

Otto Gerhard Oexle proposes a third – the middle – road. It is to be seen as a reconciliation of *part* and *whole* analyses. Johann Gustav Droysen's suggestion that *'the whole can only be perceived from its parts and parts can only be understood within the whole'* is equally significant. Therefore, the castle phenomenon in the GDL is interpreted as a whole with all its differences depending on the territories of the state, while the latter can be revealed only by looking at particular castles, i.e. by analysing the most representative examples recorded in the sources. In such a way the whole is interpreted through its parts, and the parts are interpreted within the whole.

An attempt to define a castle as a historical phenomenon has some essential aspects. In historiography a medieval castle is frequently presented as an object of architecture or defence. However, the castle should be perceived primarily as a centre of power and authority which evolved and developed depending on particular socio-political circumstances which determined 'divisions' of the subordination and ownership of the castle. In the absence of stable administrative structures of centralised power, the

castle was almost the only entity assisting in the formation and organisation of the emerging power space.

The castle should be perceived as a constituent part of the power implementation mechanism with a judicially and administratively subordinate bet very heterogeneous territory, with a subordinate social-official apparatus and an exceptional judicial structure. It formed a certain territory and served as its administrative centre with internal infrastructure and economic provision mechanism.

A systematic construction of medieval castle in Europe started approximately in the 10th c., and the quantitative leap is linked with the 12th – 13th c. and a breakthrough in the construction of nobility castles. In general, the castle in Western Europe marks the strengthening of feudal political units. Thus, the castle issue is an issue of feudalism. Therefore, an assumption could be made that the nature of the castle development partly expresses the intensity of the formation of feudalism and its institutes.

Considering the castle as a phenomenon of medieval feudal society, it should be noted that this phenomenon acquired uneven forms in different regions in Europe. It reflects the heterogeneous nature of the castle, therefore, a universal definition cannot be provided. We can only talk about certain fundamental features characteristic of the castles in every European region. In this sense, the castle should be perceived as a constantly changing object which is acquiring new structural forms depending on local and central socio-political circumstances.

The definition of a castle is polysemous, and its perception and interpretation depends on the approach adopted for the study. The data provided by the sources are laconic and assumptions have to be made not about the castle itself which depending on the language of the source is given different names (*castrum*, *arx*, *fortalicium*, *hus*, *huszer*, *zamek*, *городъ*, *городокъ*), but about the territorial structures formed with a relatively developed socio-topography and surrounding structures. Besides, the definition of the castle should include the aspect of the castle as a symbolic structure of medieval society. In this context, the castle serves as an expression of power and social status. Therefore, the castle should be perceived as a heterogeneous phenomenon whose development is to be interpreted in the context of the socio-political development of the time depending on a particular GDL territory and its local society. The construction of a

new castle marks an attempt by the sovereign to territorially and symbolically establish his authority in a new territory.

There are two essential criteria which caused the formation of the castle as a structure and which serve as a basis in this work for the understanding of the main condition of castle evolution. First, the formation of large land ownership whose levels (monarch, church, nobility) caused the diversity of castle ownership. Second, the process of subordination and dependency of peasants whose supreme expression was serfdom which started at the juncture of the 13th – 14th centuries and lasted until the middle of the 16th c.

The castle is defined as a structure comprising three aspects: territory (a), society (b), power-authority (c). The castle is perceived as a nucleus which is uniting and forming a territory; this territory was eventually transformed into a legally, administratively and economically subordinate territory with clearly defined boundaries. It consisted of various social categories defined by different subordination-dependency, including individuals of peasant and non-peasant origin, in such a way forming the castle society, its social organisation. In these territorial and social planes of the castle as a local structure unfolded the power-authority hierarchy with its subjects. The castle was that element of medieval society which concentrated power and helped separate powerful subjects establish their authority over a certain territory and its population. Therefore, from the sociological point of view, the castle performed the roles of symbolic (ideological) and real (direct) authority and a representative of justice in the society of its time. The castle is interpreted as a power-authority structure which was unfolding and creating a specific territory with a subordinate social environment.

Conclusions

1. The concept of the castle is formulated on the basis of several interrelated criteria: territorial – GDL, chronological – 14th – first half of the 16th c., cases/quantitative – separate castles. The latter is the central axis of this 'construction'. During the study period the largest possible number of cases when separate castles were mentioned in the surviving sources and all relevant information were collected. In this way an attempt was made to accumulate the most reliable and representative information which enabled to discuss and draw conclusions about the features of all GDL

territories and their castles. In general, each separately discussed GDL castle could be characterised by the same content (territory, subordinate society, power relations), thus, the castle is interpreted as a phenomenon. Due to that this study is not about an object (a case), but about a phenomenon (the whole complex of cases).

2. The names of fortifications and castles in written sources from the period of the 9th – 16th c. are polysemous. Several writing traditions could be distinguished: Latin (*castrum*, *civitas*, *castellum*, *arx*), Middle High German (*hus*, *huis*, *hws*, *haus*, *burc*), Russian-Ruthenian (*город*, *град*), Polonised Ruthenian (*zamok*, *замокъ*). The earliest references in the sources to fortifications in the 'future' GDL space date back to the 9th c.. Some of them were written by Western European chroniclers. They used the words of Latin origin *civitas*, *urbs*, *fortalicium*, *arx*, *castrum* to describe the phenomena of Western European material culture, however, when local Central and Eastern European structures were encountered and no linguistic equivalent could be found in the lexicon to describe them, the only way out was to use a word whose content was the closest to the phenomenon at hand. Therefore, the use of a word (term) does not necessarily mean that such a phenomenon existed, taking into account different perspectives of the historical development of European regions. The same could be said about a mound whose existence does not necessarily mean a site of an ancient castle because mounds are characteristic of the social structure of the tribal (barbarian) period.

3. In many cases the mound marks the place of a fortified settlement or hiding place which was a territorial centre of the tribe as well as served religious functions. Religion and secularism are not in opposition either in a tribal or medieval society, because they cannot be perceived separately in these societies. Similarly, religious and secular authorities were seen as causing and derived from each other. Therefore, a place symbolising and representing any authority was considered sacred.

4. The 9th – 13th c. tradition of Russian chronicles and the use of the word *город*, *град* have specific features. The Indo-European *gardas* marked an enclosed place as a certain centre of a larger settlement. During the times of Kievan Rus it was surrounded by an urban-type settlement. Besides, the Indo-European *город*, *град* shows the genetic relation in the development of a town and a castle. Yet little can be said about the castle in the GDL Ruthenian territories before the 14th c., despite the

fact that the above-mentioned *город*, *град* were subject to the dukes of Rurik dynasty and considered the main trade and power centres of separate territories.

5. Several traditions related to the problem under analysis can be distinguished in historiography. Russian historiography adopted the vocabulary of the sources directly and any *город*, *град* mentioned in the sources became *miestas* (town). Therefore, this tradition, with a few exceptions, did not make a qualitative-typological distinction between a town – fortified settlement – castle. The castle is frequently perceived as the nucleus of the town, a central fortified place. Lithuanian historiography does not consider the problem of the castle and its genesis in a broader socio-political context. On the other hand, any studies of the castles are restricted to the 20th – 21st c. state boundaries, which is not justified either theoretically or empirically.

6. The castle is a socio-political phenomenon whose formation started at the juncture of the 13th – 14th c. in *Lithuania propria* and Samogitia. The formation of the castle as a social and territorial structure in Ruthenian lands should be dated similarly. The castle is interpreted and perceived on the basis of three criteria: territory ('mastering' of space), social environment (serfdom), and power-authority (subordination-dependency). Several condition were necessary for the evolution of the castle according to the model of Western European feudalism and castle formation in the 10th – 14th c.: formation of large landholdings, subordination of peasants to landlords, clear stratification of society. Therefore, the castle characteristic of the GDL in the 14th – 16th c. means concentration of power-authority and its expansion-dissemination in the territory under formation with subordinate people of different social categories.

7. Three territorial levels of the castle were distinguished in the study: regions of castles, internal (*micro*) territory and external (*macro*) territory.

8. Written sources mention castles in *Lithuania propria* from the beginning of the 14th c., and the evolution of the castle dates back to the juncture of the 13th – 14th c. and is related to the establishment of the ruling dynasty. The 14th c. sources provide evidence that in the nucleus of the state the densest network of the sovereign's castles and manors had formed which underwent an essential transformation starting with the first half of the 15th c.: the castles turned into economic units where the main economic potential of the sovereign was concentrated. Besides, in the 14th – 15th c.

when the majority of castles in *Lithuania propria* lost their primary functions, the formation of a network of residential castles started which included the (re)building of some castles (of brick): Vilnius, Trakai, Kaunas, Gardinas (Hrodna), Naugardukas (Navahrudak). It could be claimed that during the time under discussion several breakthroughs took place in *Lithuania propria*: emergence of the castle, formation of the densest network of castles and manors, transformation of castles into manors and emergence of residential castles which marks a quantitative decline of castles starting in the early 15th c.

9. Sources mention fortifications in Samogitia from the late 13th c. The majority were simply fortified (enclosed) settlements where people would run and hide in case of danger. Only a small number of them, built on the Nemunas river (Veliuona, Bisenė), could be considered castles. These castles were built on the initiative of the grand duke and administered by people subject to him. It could be claimed that there were several castles in this region, while in the depth of Samogitia there were at best separate fortified settlements which reflected the structure of a tribal society. The lack of castle structures in this GDL land could be accounted for by a poor integration of Samogitia into the GDL in the period under discussion. It is best represented by the privilege granted to Samogitia in 1441/1442 and the ban imposed on the establishment of the sovereign's castles and manors. In the juncture of the 15th – 16th c. we encounter Veliuona, Skirsnemunė manors subject to the sovereign and located in the places of former castles. It could be stated that the castle in Samogitia does not become a phenomenon in the period under analysis. The castle structures 'cease' developing at the very beginning.

10. In Ruthenian territories state structure had existed before they were subjected to the GDL, but they are not to be defined as castles because in this space it is problematic to talk about the formation of large landholdings before the end of the 14th c. The general social structure should also be evaluated because it includes social institutes typical of tribal society. It is presumed that the GDL 'exported' qualitatively new social relations into Ruthenian territories, especially from the late 14th c., which resulted in the emergence of new social forms. It is stated that the castle is not only a building of exceptional architectonics, but also an expression and a reflection of certain social relations (power, subordination) which were creating a completely

different territorial, and therefore subordinate, structure. Since the 15th – 16th c. there had been a gradual quantitative growth of castles in Ruthenian territories. This process could be related to the strengthening of the Duchy of Moscow and constant attacks by Tartars. The GDL dukes, noblemen and gentry started building castles at the same time.

11. The internal (*micro*) territory of the castle is defined as the space within the walls of the castle. In this internal territory of the castle, the houses of noblemen and gentry and other holdings were concentrated. In the juncture of the 15th – 16th c. real estate objects granted by sovereign's privileges expressed the nobility's and gentry's strive for social prestige, because owning property in the internal territory of the castle meant closeness to the sovereign, and the castle symbolised the power of the sovereign. Among the privileges granting lands and other objects to the members of nobility and gentry in the internal castle territory most frequently mentioned by the sources are the main castles of *Lithuania propria* and Ruthenian territories: Vilnius, Naugardukas, Gardinas, Polotsk, Vitebsk, Lutsk, Kiev.

12. The external (*macro*) territory of the castle was structurally more complex and had no clear contours or borders. According to information in the sources, it is divided into four levels: abstract (general) territory, small rural district (*districtus*, *territorium*, *волость*) (a), concrete territorial structural unit – village, manor (*villa*, *curia*, *село*, *двор*) (b), natural and material holdings (*silva*, *borra*, *fluvius*, *taberna*, *molendinum*, *пуща*, *карчма*, *млын*, *ловы*, *гоны*, *ставы*) (c), fortified settlement not directly attached to the castle *(preurbium*, *suburbium*, *vorburge*, *посадъ*, *острогъ*) (d).

13. The external territory of the castle was not static, it was constantly changing. It was caused by territorial changes in local landholdings related to local interests of small and large landlords and the sovereign's beneficiary policy. Transformation and/or continuation of the external territory of separate castles could be seen by comparing the 15th – 16th c. sources describing a particular castle with the mid-16th c. castle inventories. It is claimed that the external territory of the castle should be perceived as a structure formed by the principle of enclaves and, therefore, cannot be perceived as a homogeneous complex. On the other hand, a comparison of different castles provides a ground for claiming that external territories of the castles differed from

each other on all four levels, therefore, it could be stated that the external territory of the castle expressed the significance of a particular castle and its economic, administrative and social potential.

14. From the early 14th c. when the formation of the territorial structure of the castle started in the GDL until the middle of the 16 c. there were no essential qualitative changes in its development. It is presumed that the *Valakas* land reform in 1557 and the Administrative-judicial reform in 1564–1566 should be considered as breakthrough transformations which were changing the old established territorial structure into the structure of symmetrical land strip holdings and settlements simultaneously creating *pavietas* local organisation with a local centre. This presumption is supported by the nature of information in castle and town inventories in the second half of the 16th c.

15. The concept of the castle society formulated in this work is based on the idea of the external castle territory which suggests subordination-dependency of various social categories in the castle territory. The emergence of castle structure is related to the beginning of serfdom when the individual was 'tied' to a particular territory, in some cases subordinated to the castle.

16. In the first stage of the castle society development (14th c.), a low – binary – level of internal differentiation should be distinguished which is reflected by the following oppositions in the sources: *Castrensi, burcluthen* vs *armigeri, viri bellicosi*; *горожаны* vs *ратники*. In Samogitia, *castrensi – pilėnai*, unarmed people from the vicinity vs *armigeri* – armed individuals should be distinguished. *Горожаны* included a numerous social group not only in Ruthenian territories but also in *Lithuania propria*. It could be concluded that at least until the 14th c. two categories of people related to the castle can be distinguished in the whole territory of the GDL: *pilėnai* (unarmed people from the vicinity) and armed people.

17. A more differentiated castle society is revealed in the general perspective of social stratification from the late 16th c. Two *micro* and *macro* levels of the categories of castle society matching the internal and external territories of the castle are distinguished. Different duties were performed, contributions in kind made and taxes paid depending on the social category subordinated to a particular castle.

18. The social categories comprising the local castle society could be divided according to three levels of subordination-dependency: direct subordination, subordination through labour-contribution-tax, jurisdictional-administrative subordination. The society of every castle was quantitatively and qualitatively different from the others. It is best revealed by the analysis of the 16th c. castle inventories.

19. The castle had a personnel which expanded from the elder (headman) (*capitaneus*) and vicegerent (*намѣстникъ*) mentioned in the 14th c. to a complex multifunctional 'apparatus' in the mid-16th c. The functions and prestige of the highest officials of the castle (elders, vicegerents) degraded and in the juncture of the 15th – 16th c. these offices were held by individuals of lower social status and origin. It could be stated that the personnel 'apparatus' was not equally developed and depended on a particular castle. The personnel 'apparatus' was best developed in the castles of *Lithuania propria*: Vilnius, Trakai, Kaunas, Gardinas and Naugardukas (vicegerent-elder, steward, housekeeper, deputy housekeeper, horse-master, deputy horse-master). It was less complex in the main castles of Ruthenian territories (Brasta (Brest), Vitebsk, Polotsk, Smolensk, Lutsk, Kremenets, Minsk, Kiev, Pinsk, Zhitomyr). Therefore, it could be stated that the development of the castle's personnel 'appartus' correlates with the development of the castle structure.

20. The external territory of the castle was unbalanced. Various *dependencies* were located at different distance from the castle as a nucleus of the territory, therefore, castle *dependencies* (villages, manors, etc.) hierarchically subordinated to the castle formed certain enclaves in differently subordinated territories. The nature of castle-related work was not restricted to the local castle territory and its society, the social environment of the district, thus, a trinomial typology of castle-related work was offered taking into account the criterion of space: local (small rural district), regional, state.

21. On the basis of Western European historiography and references in local GDL sources, it is stated that castle building and governance was an exclusive right of the grand duke as sovereign, however, taking into account the features of medieval state governance and establishment of power in a territory it is claimed that depending on the circumstance the sovereign had to 'share' his power by granting another duke or

nobleman the right to be the real implementer of the supreme power in a particular territory.

22. The GDL power typology in the 14th – first half of the 16th c. is formulated in the work and explained in relation to subordination-dependency, because in the society under analysis the castle expressed legitimate authority and justice. Besides, the castle was the place of administering law and justice. The castle was perceived by medieval society as a power instrument which enabled to rule a territory with its population.

23. The following castle subordination-dependency typology is presented: *nominal* (*highest*), *real*, *fief-office-bound*, *mortgage*, which varied depending on the power subject (sovereign, dynasty, dukes, church, nobility, and gentry).

24. The following castle subordination-dependency model is formulated: sovereign – *nominal*, *real*; dynasty – *office-bound*; dukes – *real*, *office-bound*; church – *real*; nobility – *real*, *office-bound*, *mortgage*; gentry – *real*, *office-bound*, *mortgage*.

25. Depending of the particular GDL territory the grand duke was *nominal* and/or *real* governor of the castle. It is reflected in the monarch's residence practice (itinerary) and the phenomenon of residencies. Members of the ruling dynasty received lifelong licences to govern castles and use them for their needs. It is clearly revealed by *stirps regia* cases of women who were granted lifelong licences for castle governance. The governance of ducal castles is the most problematic because it is hard to establish the nature of rights granted to them. It is claimed that, depending on the dukes, this subordination-dependency relation of a high origin social group with the castle is best defined by *real* and *office-bound* castle governance categories.

26. The castles owned by families of ducal origin (Ostrogiškiai, Sanguškos, Zbaražskiai) emerged chronologically earlier, i.e. in the 15th c., which was caused by their ducal consciousness. Part of ducal families (Ostrogiškiai, Višnioveckiai, Zbaražskiai-Višnioveckiai, Mstislavliai, Olelkaičiai-Sluckiai) derived their family names from their familial landholdings where castles were built in the times under analysis. This trend could be explained by the relatively early consciousness transformation of ducal families which resulted in relating the main family landholding and the later castle with the tradition of a family name.

27. It is stated that the castle is an expression and a result of the formation of large landholdings. Large landholdings were a necessary condition for the emergence of nobility castles. Besides, the castle was the most obvious representation of the nobleman's consciousness and power which emerged from 'looking at' the sovereign. The evolution of the nobility castle in the GDL dates back to the juncture of the 15th – 16th c. and is related to the changes in the consciousness of this social group. The emergence and development of ducal and nobility castles could be geographically marked as follows: Volhynia-Podlachia-Kiev-*Lithuania propria*.

28. The connections between the castle (Goniondzas, Geranainys, Kražiai, Miras) and the title (dukes, counts) is a significant indicator of the self-awareness of the first half 16th c. noble families (Radvilos, Goštautai, Kęsgailos, Iljiničiai).

29. Families of dukes and noblemen owning most castles: Ostrogiškiai (Ostrogas, Dubnas, Zvegola, Zdetelis, Polonė, Rivnas, Stepanė, Dorogobužas, Krasilovas, Černechovas, Žulžinecas, Jampilis, Chlapotynas, Turovas); Sanguškos (Ratnė, Vetlė, Kamenis Koširskas, Kovelis, Kleveckas, Goruchovas, Zvenigorodas, Volodavas); Zbaražskiai-Višnioveckiai (Zbaražas, Kolodnas, Dvoras, Višniovecas, Peremylis, Turijskas, Peremircas, Gricovas); Bohovitinovičiai (Varteliai, Šumbaras, Ozernica, Žukovas); Radvilos (Goniondzas, Dubingiai, Nesvyžius, Olyka, Loskas); Goštautai (Geranainys, Tikocinas, Rokantiškės, Liubečas, Rodoškovičiai, Sidorovas); Alšėniškiai (Alšėnai (?), Stepanė, Gluskas, Višgorodas, Volpa); Olelkaičiai-Sluckiai (Kopylius, Sluckas, Liškiava); Sapiegos (Ikaznė, Kodenis, Moščenica); Kęsgailos (Plateliai, Kražiai).

30. The existence of the central landholding of a particular family is confirmed not only by the evolution of names of ducal families related to an allodium and the castle as its nucleus. The case of Ostrogiškiai family shows that there was a clear perception of one main 'parent' castle (*замок головный*).

31. Apart from really governed (private) castles, dukes and noblemen held castles as offices and mortgages for a certain sum on money.

32. Castles really governed by gentry, encountered in the sources from the third decade of the 16th c., confirm the theory of *popularisation* and prove that certain phenomena were expanding top-down. The use of the diminutive form (*замочокъ*) in the naming of castles of the gentry consciously express not only semantic but also material

difference between the small castles of the gentry and bigger castles. Apart from a small number of private castles, the gentry were granted governance of castles as offices or as temporal mortgages for the sum of money lent to the grand duke.

33. The juncture of the 15th – 16th c. saw not only the sovereign's licences to crenellate. These privileges also granted the right to establish a small town, to organise markets and set up taverns. The content of privileges shows attempts to create and stimulate internal economic infrastructure of the GDL. The castle rises as an important infrastructural element around which other objects were emerging.

34. According to the written historical sources of the 14th – 15th c. there were about one hundred thirty castles in GDL. Also, in the 15th – 16th c. there were about one hundred castles of the grand duke and similarly about one hundred of private castles. In addition, in the middle of the 16th c. about seventy castles of the grand duke and about ninety private castles were present in GDL.

35. The most castles of the grand duke were situated in the lands of *Lithuania propria*, Volhynia and Podlachia. The most of private castles were built in the lands of Volhynia, Podlachia, Kiev and *Lithuania prorpia*.

PILIS IR JOS SOCIOPOLITINĖS TRANSFORMACIJOS LIETUVOS DIDŽIOJOJE
KUNIGAIKŠTYSTĖJE XIV–XVI a. PIRMOJE PUSĖJE

Reziumė

Disertacijos objekto tyrimo strategija remiasi keturiais kriterijais. Pirma, fenomeno ir jo raidos tyrimo. Antra, tyrimas nėra apribojamas tik šiandieninės Lietuvos Respublikos teritorija. Trečia, tiriamoji problema ir keliami klausimai interpretuojami apimant platesnį spektrą europinės istoriografijos pavyzdžių, kurie įgalina lyginamojoje perspektyvoje kontekstualizuoti egzistavusios vietinės socialinės tikrovės ypatumus, ieškoti sąryšio / skirties, bendros raidos taškų tarp skirtinguose regionuose egzistavusių fenomenų. Ketvirta, į tiriamąjį objektą žvelgiama kaip į daugiasluoksne struktūra pasireiškusį fenomeną. Tokiu būdu bandoma ieškoti naujų teorinių prieigų, neapsiribojant vien tik tradiciniu istoriniu pasakojimu.

Disertacijos tyrimo objektas – pilis kaip kokybiškai, priklausomai nuo sociopolitinių sąlygų, kintantis reiškinys. Pilis suvokiama kaip Viduramžių ir ankstyvųjų Naujųjų laikų visuomenės teritorinis, socialinis, simbolinis, teisinis ir reprezentacinis fenomenas. Kartu pilis suprantama kaip integrali socialinės tikrovės dalis, todėl interpretuotina tik siejant ją su visuomene, jos transformacijomis ir veikla, kintančiomis geopolitinėmis aplinkybėmis.

Pilis pagrįstai gali būti laikoma reprezentatyviausiu brandžiųjų ir vėlyvųjų Viduramžių epochos reiškiniu. Jos dinamiška raida ir kintantis daugiafunkcis pobūdis kartu išreiškia ir visos Viduramžių epochos bei jos visuomenės pokyčius. Pasak Georges'o Duby, „*Nauja socialinė struktūra bet kokiu atveju formuojasi aplink įtvirtintą pastatą – pilį*“. Vadinasi, pilis išreiškia naujos socialinės sanklodos formavimąsi ir kintančias valdžios (galios) taigi vykdomos ir įgyvendinamos politikos, konfigūracijas.

Bandant apibrėžti pilį kaip istorinį reiškinį, esminiai yra keli aspektai. Daugeliu atveju istoriografijoje apie Viduramžių pilį kalbama kaip apie architektūrinį ar gynybinį objektą. Tačiau pilis visų pirma suvoktina kaip valdžios ir galios centras, kuris radosi ir formavosi priklausomai nuo konkrečių sociopolitinių aplinkybių, lėmusių ir pačios pilies priklausomybės ir pavaldumo „persiskirstymus“. Nesant pastovių centralizuotų valdžios

administracinių struktūrų, pilis buvo kone vienintelė realija, padedanti formuoti ir organizuoti kuriamą valdžios erdvę.

Pilis vertintina kaip valdžios įgyvendinimo mechanizmo sudėtinė dalis su sau teismiškai ir administraciškai pavaldžia, tačiau itin nevienalyte teritorija, jai priklausiusiu socialiniu-pareigybiniu aparatu, kuris sudarė išskirtinę teisminę struktūrą. Ji formavo tam tikrą teritoriją ir buvo jos administracinis centras su vidine infrastruktūra ir ūkinio aptarnavimo mechanizmu.

Sisteminga Viduramžių pilių statyba Europoje prasidėjo maždaug X a., o intensyviausias pilių kiekybinis šuolis siejamas su XII–XIII a. ir diduomenės pilių proveržiu. Iš esmės pilis Vakarų Europoje – tai stiprėjančių feodalinių politinių darinių požymis. Taigi, pilies problema kartu yra ir feodalizmo problema. Todėl visiškai pagrįstai keltina prielaida, kad pilies raidos pobūdis iš dalies išreiškia feodalizmo formavimosi, jo institutų intensyvumo laipsnį.

Kalbant apie pilį kaip apie Viduramžių feodalinės visuomenės reiškinį, verta pastebėti, jog šis fenomenas skirtinguose Europos regionuose įgavo netolygias formas. Visa tai atspindi pilies daugialypišką pobūdį, todėl vieno universalaus apibrėžimo jam nėra. Galima kalbėti tik apie tam tikrus pamatinius bruožus, kurie buvo būdingi kiekvieno Europos regiono pilims. Šia prasme pilis turėtų būti suvoktina kaip nuolat kintantis objektas, įgaunantis naujas struktūrines formas, priklausomai nuo lokalių ir centro sociopolitinių aplinkybių.

Pilies apibrėžimas yra daugiareikšmis, o jos samprata ir interpretacija priklauso nuo tyrimo specifikos. Šaltinių duomenys, būdami lakoniški, skatina kelti prielaidas ne tiek dėl pačios pilies, kuri šaltiniuose, priklausomai nuo kalbos, įvardijama labai įvairiai (*castrum*, *arx*, *fortalitium hus*, *huszer*, *zamek*, *городъ*, *городокъ*), kiek dėl formuojamos teritorinės struktūros su sąlyginai išvystyta sociotopografija ir apskritai aplinkinėmis struktūromis. Be to, į pilies apibrėžimą būtina įtraukti ir jos, kaip simbolinės Viduramžių visuomenės struktūros, faktorių. Šiame kontekste svarbūs pilies kaip galios ir socialinio statuso išraiškos aspektai. Todėl pilį derėtų suvokti kaip nevienalytį fenomeną, kurio raida aiškintina tik to meto sociopolitinės raidos kontekste priklausomai nuo konkrečios LDK teritorijos ir jos lokalinės visuomenės. Naujai statoma pilis atspindi suvereno bandymą teritoriškai, o kartu ir simboliškai įtvirtinti savąją valdžią konkrečioje teritorijoje.

Esminiai yra du kriterijai, kurie sąlygojo pilies kaip struktūros formavimąsi ir kuriais remiantis darbe suvokiamos pagrindinės pilies radimosi sąlygos. Pirma, stambiosios žemėvaldos, kurios pakopiškumas (monarchas, Bažnyčia, diduomenė) lėmė ir pilies priklausomybės įvairavimus, formavimasis. Antra, valstiečių pavaldumo ir priklausomybės, kurio aukščiausia išraiška tapo baudžiava, procesas, prasidėjęs XIII–XIV a. sandūroje, o jo galutinis įsitvirtinimas ir įteisinimas (*pirmoji laida*) užsitęsė iki XVI a. vidurio.

Pilis apibrėžiama kaip struktūra atsispiriant nuo trijų pjūvių: teritorijos (a), visuomenės (b), galios-valdžios (c). Pilis aiškinama kaip teritoriją telkiantis ir formuojantis branduolys, tokiu būdu erdvė ilgainiui buvo transformuojama į aiškią ir savo ribas turinčią teisiškai, administraciškai, ūkiškai pavaldžią teritoriją. Jus turinį sudarė įvairių socialinių kategorijų, vadinasi ir skirtingo pavaldumo-priklausomybės, valstietiškos ir nevalstietiškos kilmės individai, tokiu būdu formavę pilies visuomenę, socialinę organizaciją. Šiose teritorinėje ir socialinėje pilies, kaip lokalinės struktūros, plotmėse skleidėsi galios-valdžios vertikalė, jos subjektai. Pilis buvo tas Viduramžių visuomenės dėmuo, kuris telkė galią ir padėjo įtvirtinti atskiram galios subjektui savo valdžią teritorijai ir joje pasklidusiems individams. Tokiu būdu, žvelgiant sociologiškai, pilis atliko savo laiko visuomenėje simbolinės (ideologinės) ir realios (tiesioginės) valdžios bei teisingumo reprezentato vaidmenis. Taigi pilis interpretuojama kaip galios-valdžios struktūra, kuri skleidėsi ir kūrė konkrečią teritoriją su jai pavaldžiu sociumu.

Darbo sandara yra probleminio pobūdžio, kiekvieną probleminį klausimą ar jų grupes traktuojant kaip tam tikrą tiriamojo reiškinio – pilies – pjūvį konkrečios socialinės tikrovės lygmenyje. Disertaciją sudaro įvadas, keturios dalys, išvados, šaltinių ir literatūros sąrašas, priedai. Kiekviena iš dalių ir jas formuojantys skyriai išreiškia struktūralistinę nagrinėjamos problemos sampratą, kuri suprantama ir interpretuojama lyginamojoje bendro tyrimo perspektyvoje.

Pirmoje dalyje formuluojamas pilies kaip daugiareikšmio, kintančio laike fenomeno, apibrėžimas ir samprata europiniame kontekste. Pilis suvokiama kaip galios struktūra formuojanti erdvę ir joje telkianti bei organizuojanti visuomenę.

Antroje dalyje formuluojamas pilies teritorijos modelis. Šioje dalyje pateikiama skirtingų pilies išorinės teritorijos dėmenų koncepcija. Toks modelis grindžiamas europinės istoriografijos, skirtos pilies problemai nagrinėti, pavyzdžiais. Šioje dalyje taip

pat nagrinėjamas pilies sąryšis su kitomis teritorinėmis struktūromis (pvz., kaimu, dvaru).

Trečioje dalyje nagrinėjama pilies visuomenė (lokalinė), piliai priklausiusios socialinės grupės (pvz., valkiniai, barčiai, keliuočiai ir kt.), pareigybinė organizacija. Pilies socialinė charakteristika (pvz., administracija, ūkis) analizuojama atsižvelgiant į LDK regioniškumą ir santykį su pilies teritorija.

Ketvirtoje dalyje analizuojama pilies pavaldumo-priklausomybės problema. Išskiriamos skirtingos pilies pavaldumo-priklausomybės formos (nominali, reali, leninė, tarnybinė, įkaitinė), priklausomai nuo sociopolitinių aplinkybių, aiškinama jų kaita. Kartu pateikiama pilių pavaldumo-priklausomybės tipologija skiriant: valdovą (valstybę) (a), dinastiją (b), Bažnyčią (c) kunigaikščius (d), diduomenę (e), bajorus (f).

Išvados

1. Pilies samprata grindžiama ir formuluojama remiantis keliais tarpusavyje susijusiais kriterijais: teritoriniu – LDK, chronologiniu – XIV–XVI a. pirmąja puse, atvejų-kiekybiniu – atskiromis pilimis. Pastarasis yra šios „konstrukcijos" centrinė ašis. Tyrimo metu surinkta įmanomai daug atskirų pilių paminėjimo atvejų ir su jais susijusios informacijos. Tokiu būdu gaunamas reprezentatyvus vaizdinys, leidžiantis daryti išvadas apie LDK sudariusių teritorijų ir jų pilių ypatybes. Kiekvienai atskirai minėtai LDK piliai iš esmės būdingas tas pats turinys (teritorija, priklausoma visuomenė, galios santykiai), tokiu būdu pilis interpretuojama kaip reiškinys. Tai sąlygojo, kad tyrime kalbama ne apie objektą (atvejį), bet apie fenomeną (atvejų visumą).

2. Gynybinių įtvirtinimų ir pilies rašytiniuose šaltiniuose įvardijimai, apimantys IX–XVI a. chronologiją, yra polisemantiški. Išskirtinos kelių raštijų tradicijos: lotyniškoji (*castrum*, *civitas*, *castellum*, *arx*), vokiškoji (*hus*, *huis*, *hws*, *haus*, *burc*), rusiškoji-rusėniškoji (*город*, *град*), lenkiškoji ir polonizuota rusėniškoji (*zamok*, *замокъ*). Ankstyviausios šaltinių užuominos apie gynybinius įtvirtinimus „būsimoje" LDK erdvėje siekia IX a. Dalis jų buvo užrašyti Vakarų Europos autorių. Jų vartoti lotyniški žodžiai *civitas*, *urbs*, *fortalicium*, *arx*, *castrum* yra romėniškos kilmės ir taikyti nusakyti Vakarų Europos fenomenus, todėl susidūrus su vietinėmis Vidurio Rytų Europos struktūromis, teliko vartoti turinio požiūriu artimiausią žodį artimiems reiškiniams įvardyti. Vadinasi, žodžio (termino) vartojimas nebūtinai reiškia

egzistavusį reiškinį, turint omenyje skirtingas Europos regionų istorinės raidos perspektyvas. Turint tai omenyje, problemiškas yra piliakalnio apibrėžimas – manytina, kad jo egzistavimas savaime nereiškia čia buvusios pilies, kadangi piliakalniai būdingi gentinei (barbarinei) epochos socialinei sanklodai.

3. Piliakalnis daugeliu atvejų žymi įtvirtintos gyvenvietės, slėptuvės vietą, kuri buvo teritorinis genties centras, atlikęs kartu ir sakralines funkcijas.

4. IX–XIII a. rusiškoji metraščių tradicija ir joje vartojamas *город*, *град* pasižymi savita specifika. Indoeuropietiškas *gardas* žymėjo erdviškai ribotą, aptvertą vietą kaip tam tikrą platesnės gyvenvietės centrą. Aplink jį Kijevo Rusios laikais telkėsi miesto tipo gyvenvietė. Kartu indoeuropietiškasis *город*, *град* vaizdžiai atspindi miesto ir pilies raidos genetinį ryšį. Vis dėlto apie pilį LDK rusėniškose teritorijose iki XIV a. kalbėti nėra pagrindo, nepaisant to, kad minėtieji *город*, *град* buvo pavaldūs Riurikaičių kilmės kunigaikščiams ir laikytini atskirų teritorijų pagrindiniais prekybiniais ir valdžios centrais.

5. Išskirtinos kelios istoriografijoje susiklosčiusios analizuotos problemos tradicijos. Rusiškoji istoriografija tiesiogiai perėmė šaltinių žodyną, tokiu būdu bet kuris šaltiniuose minimas *город*, *град* virto *miestu*. Tai lėmė, jog šioje tradicijoje, su pavienėmis išimtimis, nesusiformavo kokybinė-tipologinė skirtis tarp miesto, įtvirtintos gyvenvietės ir pilies. Pilis dažnai suvokiama kaip miesto branduolys, centrinė įtvirtinta vieta. Lietuviškoje istoriografijoje pilies ir jos genezės problema nėra siejama su platesniu sociopolitiniu kontekstu.

6. Pilis yra sociopolitinis fenomenas, pradėjęs formuotis XIII–XIV a. sandūroje *Lithuania propria* ir Žemaitijoje. Panašiu laiku datuotinas pilies, kaip socialinės ir teritorinės struktūros, formavimasis rusėniškose žemėse. Pilis interpretuojama ir suvokiama remiantis trimis kriterijais: teritorijos (erdvės „įsisavinimo-įvalstybinimo"), sociumo (įbaudžiavinimo) ir valdžios-galios (pavaldumas-priklausomybė). Pilies, suprantamos pagal Vakarų Europos feodalizmo ir pilies (X–XIV a.) formavimosi modelį, radimuisi buvo būtinos kelios sąlygos: stambiosios žemėvaldos formavimasis, valstiečių tapimas priklausomais nuo žemės savininkų, aiški visuomenės stratifikacija. Iš to išplaukia, jog pilis, būdinga XIV–XVI a. LDK, yra valdžios-galios koncentracija ir jos plėtra-sklaida formuojamoje teritorijoje su joje pasklidusiais pavaldžiais-priklausomais įvairių socialinių kategorijų valstiečiais.

7. Tyrime išskirti trys pilies teritoriniai lymenys: pilių regionai, vidinė (*micro*) teritorija ir išorinė (*macro*) teritorija.

8. Tikrojoje Lietuvoje rašytiniuose šaltiniuose pilys minimos nuo XIV a. pradžios, o pilies genezė datuotina XIII–XIV a. sandūra ir sietina su valdančiosios dinastijos įsitvirtinimu. XIV a. šaltiniai liudija, jog čia, valstybės branduolyje. buvo susiformavęs tankiausias valdovo pilių ir dvarų tinklas, kuris nuo XV a. pirmosios pusės patyrė esminę transformaciją: pilys virto ūkiniais objektais, kuriuose koncentravosi pagrindinis valdovo ūkinis potencialas. Kartu XIV–XV a. sandūroje, didžiajai daliai *Lithuania propria* pilių prarandant savo pirmines funkcijas, pradėjo formuotis rezidencinių pilių tinklas, kurio kokybine išraiška tapo kai kurių pilių perstatymas / naujų pastatymas (mūrinėmis): Vilnius, Trakai, Kaunas, Gardinas, Naugardukas. Teigtina, kad *Lithuania propria* aptariamuoju laiku įvyko keli lūžiai: pilies radimasis, tankiausio pilių ir dvarų tinklo susiformavimas, pilių virtimas dvarais ir rezidencinių pilių atsiradimas, su kuriuo sietinas ženklus, nuo XV a. pradžios prasidėjęs, kiekybinis pilių mažėjimas.

9. Šaltiniuose apie gynybinius įtvirtinimus Žemaitijoje užsimenama nuo XIII a. pabaigos. Didžioji dalis jų buvo tiesiog įtvirtintos (aptvarinės) gyvenvietės, į kurias pavojaus metu subėgdavo apylinkių gyventojai. Tik maža dalis pilių, įkurtų prie Nemuno upės (Veliuona, Bisenė), laikytinos pilimis. Šios pilys buvo pastatytos didžiojo kunigaikščio iniciatyva ir administruojamos jam pavaldžių žmonių. Teigtina, kad šiame regione būta kelių pilių. Pilių struktūrų nesusiformavimą šioje LDK žemėje lėmė menka Žemaitijos integracija LDK aptariamu laiku. Tai geriausiai reprezentuoja 1441 / 1442 m. privilegija Žemaitijai ir joje minimas draudimas steigti valdovo pilis ir dvarus. XV–XVI a. sandūroje susiduriame su ankstesnėse pilių vietose stovinčiais ir valdovui pavaldžiais Veliuonos, Skirsnemunės dvarais. Teigtina, kad pilis Žemaitijoje aptariamu laiku taip ir netampa reiškiniu. Pilies struktūros raida „sustojo" tik jai pradėjus vystytis. „Gedimino pilis" yra tos buvusios galimos raidos pavyzdys, kuris liudija, kad čia galėjo plėtotis pilys ir jų struktūros, jei čia būtų tvirtesnė didžiojo kunigaikščio valdžia.

10. Rusėniškose teritorijose jau egzistavo valstybinės struktūros iki joms patenkant į LDK priklausomybę, tačiau jų kaip pilių apibūdinti negalima, kadangi šioje erdvėje problemiška kalbėti apie stambiosios žemėvaldos formavimąsi iki XIV a. pabaigos.

Keliama prielaida, kad LDK kokybiškai naujos stadijos socialinius santykius „eksportavo" į rusėniškąsias teritorijas, ypač nuo XIV a. pabaigos, o tai lėmė naujų socialinių formų atsiradimą. Tokiu būdu tvirtinama, kad pilis nėra tik išskirtinės architektonikos statinys, bet kartu ir išraiška, ir atspindys tam tikrų socialinių santykių (galia, subordinacija), kūrusių naują teritorinę struktūrą. Nuo XV–XVI a. sandūros rusėniškose teritorijose vyksta laipsniškas pilių kiekybinis augimas. Šis procesas sietinas su Maskvos valstybės stiprėjimu bei nuolatiniais totorių antpuoliais. Kartu pilis pradeda statytis ir LDK kunigaikščiai, didikai, bajorai. Teritoriškai pilių gausa išsiskiria Voluinės, Palenkės, Kijevo žemės.

11. Pilies vidinė (*micro*) teritorija apibrėžiama kaip šiapus pilies sienų esanti erdvė. Šioje vidinėje pilies teritorijoje koncentravosi joje įsikūrusių valdovo, didikų, bajorų namai ir kitos valdos, maldos namai: bažnyčios, cerkvės. XV–XVI a. sandūroje valdovo privilegijomis patvirtinti nekilnojamojo turto objektai išreiškė diduomenės ir bajorijos socialinio prestižo siekį, nes turto turėjimas vidinėje pilies teritorijoje reiškė buvimą šalia valdovo, o pilis simbolizavo suverenaus valdovo valdžią. Valdų ir kitų objektų diduomenės ir bajorijos nariams patvirtinimų vidinėje pilies teritorijoje dažniausiai šaltiniuose sutinkamos pagrindinės *Lithuania propria* ir rusėniškųjų teritorijų pilys: Vilniaus, Naugarduko, Gardino, Polocko, Vitebsko, Lucko, Kijevo.

12. Pilies išorinė (*macro*) teritorija buvo struktūriškai sudėtingesnė ir neturėjo aiškių riboženklių. Remiantis šaltinių informacija, analitiškai ji skaidoma į keturis lygmenis: abstrakčią (bendrą) teritoriją, valsčių (*districtus*, *territorium*, *волость*) (a), konkretų teritorijos struktūrinį vienetą – kaimą, dvarą *(villa*, *curia*, *село*, *двор)* (b), gamtinius ir materialinius *priklausinius,* naudmenas (*silva*, *borra*, *fluvius*, *taberna*, *molendinum*, *пуща*, *карчма*, *млын*, *ловы*, *гоны*, *ставы*) (c), prie pilies tiesiogiai nesišliejusią gyvenvietę-įtvirtinimus (*preurbium*, *suburbium*, *vorburge*, *посадъ*, *острогъ*) (d).

13. Pilies išorinė teritorija nebuvo statiška, ji nuolat kito. Tai lėmė teritoriniai vietinės žemėvaldos pokyčiai, kurie buvo sąlygoti lokalinių smulkiųjų ir stambiųjų žemvaldžių interesų, valdovo vykdytos beneficinės politikos. Atskirų pilių išorinių teritorijų transformacijos ir (arba) tęstinumai atsispindi lyginant atskiras XV–XVI a. pilis liečiančius šaltinius su atitinkamų XVI a. vidurio pilių inventoriais. Teigiama, kad pilies išorinė teritorija suvoktina kaip struktūra, susiformavusi anklavų principu, todėl negali būti suvokiama kaip vientisas kompleksas. Antra vertus, skirtingų pilių

lyginimas leidžia pagrįstai tvirtinti, kad pilių išorinės teritorijos tarpusavyje viena nuo kitos skyrėsi visais keturiais lygmenimis, todėl pilies išorinė teritorija išreiškė ir konkrečios pilies svarbą, jos ūkinį, administracinį ir socialinį potencialą.

14. XIV a. pradžioje LDK pradėjus formuotis pilies teritorinei struktūrai, jos raidoje iki XVI a. vidurio neįvyko kokių nors kokybiškai esminių pokyčių. Manytina, kad lūžinėmis transformacijomis laikytinos 1557 m. Valakų ir 1564–1566 m. Administracinė-teisminė reformos, kurios iš esmės keitė nusistovėjusią senąją teritorinę struktūrą į simetriškai formuotą žemėvaldos ir gyvenviečių struktūrą kartu kuriant pavieto lokalinę organizaciją su vietos centru. Šią prielaidą patvirtina ir XVI a. antros pusės pilių ir miestų inventorių informacijos pobūdis.

15. Darbe suformuluota pilies sociumo (visuomenės) koncepcija grindžiama ir tiesiogiai išplaukia iš pilies išorinės teritorijos idėjos, kuri sugestijuoja teritorijoje pasklidusių įvairių socialinių kategorijų priklausomybę-pavaldumą piliai. Pilies struktūros radimasis sietinas ir su įbaudžiavinimo proceso pradžia, tokiu būdu individas buvo „pririšamas" prie konkrečios teritorijos, tam tikrais atvejais pavaldžios piliai.

16. Pirmoje pilies sociumo raidos fazėje (XIV a.) skirtinas žemas – binarinis – vidinės diferenciacijos lygmuo, kurį šaltiniuose atspindi opozicijos: *Castrensi, burcluthen – armigeri, viri bellicosi*; *горожаны – ратники*. Žemaitijoje skirtini *castrensi – pilėnai*, iš apylinkių subėgę beginkliai gyventojai, ir *armigeri* – ginkluoti individai. *Горожаны* įvardino ne tik rusėniškųjų teritorijų, bet ir *Lithuania propria* tos pačios kilmės socialinę grupę. Iš to išplaukia, kad bent jau iki XIV a. visoje LDK teritorijoje skirtinos dvi su pilimi susijusios kategorijos gyventojų: *pilėnai* ir ginkluoti žmonės.

17. Diferencijuotesnis pilies sociumo vaizdas atsiskleidžia apimant bendrą visuomenės stratifikaciją nuo XIV a. pabaigos. Skiriami du pilies sociumo (visuomenės) kategorijų *micro* ir *macro* lygmenys, atitinkantys pilies vidinę ir išorinę teritorijas. Priklausomai nuo konkrečios piliai priklausiusios socialinės kategorijos, atitinkamai buvo atliekami įvairūs darbai, duodamos natūrinės duoklės, mokami mokesčiai.

18. Pilies socialinės kategorijos, sudariusios lokalinę pilies visuomenę, skirtinos į tris pavaldumo-priklausomybės lygmenis: tiesioginę priklausomybę, darbinę-duoklinę-mokestinę priklausomybę, jurisdikcinį-administracinį pavaldumą. Kiekvieną pilį sudariusi visuomenė buvo kiekybiškai ir kokybiškai skirtinga nuo kitų. Tai reprezentatyviausiai atskleidžia XVI a. pilių inventorių-revizijų analizė.

19. Piliai buvo būdingas pareigybinis personalas, kuris nuo XIV a. minimų seniūnų (*capitaneus*), vietininkų (*намѣстникъ*) iki XVI a. vidurio išsiplėtė į sudėtingą ir daugiafunkcį „aparatą". Pilies aukščiausių pareigūnų (seniūnų, vietininkų) XIV a. funkcijos ir prestižas degradavo, o šias pareigas XV–XVI a. sandūroje užėmė žemesnio socialinio statuso ir kilmės individai. Teigtina, kad pilies pareigybinis „aparatas" buvo nevienodai išplėtotas ir priklausė nuo konkrečios pilies. Geriausiai pilies pareigybinis aparatas buvo išplėtotas *Lithuania propria* pilyse: Vilniaus, Trakų, Kauno, Gardino ir Naugarduko (vietininkas-seniūnas, pilininkas, raktininkas, paraktininkas, žirgininkas, pažirgininkis). Pagrindinėse rusėniškųjų teritorijų pilyse (Brasta, Vitebskas, Polockas, Smolenskas, Luckas, Kremenecas, Minskas, Kijevas, Pinskas, Žitomyras) jis buvo menkesnis. Todėl teigtina, kad pareigybinio pilies „aparato" plėtra koreliuoja kartu ir su pačios pilies struktūros raida.

20. Pilies išorinė teritorija buvo netolygi. Įvairūs pilies *priklausiniai* buvo nutolę skirtingu atstumu nuo pilies, kaip teritorijos branduolio, todėl pilies *priklausiniai* (kaimai, dvarai ir kt.), hierarchiškai pavaldūs piliai, sudarė tam tikrus anklavus kitokio pavaldumo teritorijose. Su pilimi susijusių darbų pobūdis neapsiribojo tik lokaline pilies teritorija ir jos visuomene, apylinkės sociumu, todėl, atsižvelgiant į erdvės kriterijų, suformuluota trinarė pilies darbų tipologija: lokalinis (valsčiaus), regiono, valstybės.

21. Remiantis Vakarų Europos istoriografija ir vietinėmis LDK šaltinių užuominomis, teigiama, kad pilies statyba ir jos valdymas buvo didžiojo kunigaikščio kaip suvereno monopolinė teisė, tačiau atsižvelgiant į Viduramžių valstybės valdymo ir valdžios įtvirtinimo teritorijoje ypatumus, tvirtinama, kad jis turėjo, priklausomai nuo aplinkybių, ja „dalintis", suteikti iš jo gavusiam kunigaikščiui ar kito titulo asmeniui teisę konkrečioje teritorijoje būti realiu-tiesioginiu aukščiausios valdžios įgyvendintoju.

22. Darbe formuluojama XIV–XVI a. pirmoje pusėje LDK galios tipologija, kuri aiškinama remiantis pilies pavaldumo-priklausomybės santykiu, kadangi pilis analizuotoje visuomenėje išreiškė teisėtą valdžią ir teisingumą. Kartu pilis buvo teisės ir teisingumo vykdymo ir įgyvendinimo vieta. Pilis Viduramžiais pačios jos visuomenės buvo suvokiama kaip galios įrankis iš kurio ir tik per kurį buvo įmanoma valdyti teritoriją ir joje pasklidusius individus.

23. Skiriama pilies pavaldumo-priklausomybės tipologija: *nominali* (*aukščiausia*), *reali*, *tarnybinė*, *įkaitinė*, įvairavusi priklausomai nuo valdžios subjekto (valdovas, dinastija, kunigaikščiai, Bažnyčia, diduomenė, bajorija).

24. Formuluojamas ir pagrindžiamas toks pilies pavaldumo-priklausomybės modelis: valdovas – *nominali* (aukščiausia), *reali*; dinastija – *tarnybinė*, *laikymas*; kunigaikščiai – *reali*, *tarnybinė-laikymas*; Bažnyčia – *reali*; diduomenė – *reali*, *tarnybinė-laikymas*, *įkaitinė*; bajorija – *reali*, *tarnybinė-laikymas*, *įkaitinė*.

25. Didysis kunigaikštis priklausomai nuo konkrečios LDK teritorijos buvo atitinkmai *nominalus* ir (arba) *realus* pilies valdytojas. Tai išraiškingiausiai atspindi valdovo rezidavimo (itinerariumas) praktika ir rezidencijų fenomenas. Valdančiosios dinastijos nariai gaudavo teisę valdyti pilis iki gyvos galvos savo asmeniniams poreikiams. Tai ryškiai atsiskleidžia *stirps regia* moterų etveju, kai joms būdavo suteikiamas pilių valdymas iki gyvos galvos kaip dovis. Kunigaikščių pilių valdymas yra problemiškiausias, nes sunku nusakyti jiems suteiktų teisių pobūdį. Teigiama, kad priklausomai nuo kunigaikščių, šios aukštos kilmės socialinės grupės pavaldumo ir priklausomybės santykiui su pilimi nusakyti geriausiai tinka *realaus* ir *tarnybinio* pilies valdymo kategorijos.

26. Kunigaikštiškos kilmės giminių (Ostrogiškiai, Sanguškos, Zbaražskiai) pilys radosi chronologiškai anksčiau, t. y. XV a., o tai nulėmė jų išskirtinė kunigaikštiška savimonė. Dalis kunigaikščių (Ostrogiškiai, Višnioveckiai, Zbaražskiai-Višnioveckiai, Mstislavskiai, Olelkaičiai-Sluckiai) savo giminės vardus suformavo pagal savo tėvoninių valdų branduolių, kuriuose minėtu laiku buvo pastatytos pilys, pavadinimus. Ši tendencija aiškintina kunigaikštiškos kilmės šeimos sąlyginai ankstyva savimonės transformacija, kuri lėmė, kad pagrindinė giminės valda ir vėliau joje atsiradusi pilis buvo tiesiogiai susiejama su giminės vardo tradicija.

27. Pilis yra stambiosios žemėvaldos formavimosi išraiška ir rezultatas. Todėl stambioji žemėvalda buvo būtina diduomenės pilies atsiradimo sąlyga. Kartu pilis buvo savimonės ir kiekvieno didiko akivaizdžiausias galios reprezentantas. Diduomenės pilies LDK genezė datuotina XV–XVI a. sandūra ir sietina su šios socialinės grupės savimonės pokyčiais. Kunigaikščių ir diduomenės pilių radimasis ir plėtra geografiškai žymėtina: Voluinė-Palenkė-Kijevas-Tikroji Lietuva.

28. Pilies (Goniondzas, Geranainys, Kražiai, Miras) ir titulo (kunigaikščiai, grafai) sąsajos yra reikšmingas XVI a pirmos pusės diduomenės giminių (Radvilos, Goštautai, Kęsgailos, Iljiničiai) savimonės rodiklis.

29. Daugiausiai pilių valdžiusios kunigaikščių ir didikų giminės: Ostrogiškiai (Ostrogas, Dubnas, Zvegola, Zdetelis, Polonė, Rivnas, Stepanė, Dorogobužas, Krasilovas, Černechovas, Žulžinecas, Jampilis, Chlapotynas, Turovas); Sanguškos (Ratnė, Vetlė, Kamenis Koširskas, Kovelis, Kleveckas, Goruchovas, Zvenigorodas, Volodavas); Zbaražskiai-Višnioveckiai (Zbaražas, Kolodnas, Dvoras, Višniovecas, Peremylis, Turijskas, Peremircas, Gricovas); Bohovitinovičiai (Varteliai, Šumbaras, Ozernica, Žukovas); Radvilos (Goniondzas, Dubingiai, Nesvyžius, Olyka, Loskas); Goštautai (Geranainys, Tikocinas, Rokantiškės, Liubečas, Rodoškovičiai, Sidorovas); Alšėniškiai (Alšėnai (?), Stepanė, Gluskas, Višgorodas, Volpa); Olelkaičiai-Sluckiai (Kopylius, Sluckas, Liškiava); Sapiegos (Ikaznė, Kodenis, Moščenica); Kęsgailos (Plateliai, Kražiai).

30. Ne tik kunigaikštiškų giminių vardų genezė, susijusi su alodine valda ir jos pilimi kaip branduoliu, patvirtina egzistavus konkrečios giminės žemėvaldos centrą. Ostrogiškių giminės atvejis liudija, kad buvo aiškus suvokimas vienos pagrindinės, „motininės", pilies (*замок головный*).

31. Tarp lygiagrečiai realiai valdytų pilių (privačių) kunigaikščiai ir didikai laikė pilis kaip iš valdovo gautas tarnybas ir įkaitus už numatytą pinigų sumą.

32. Bajorijos realiai valdytos pilys, šaltiniuose minimos nuo XVI a. trečiojo dešimtmečio, patvirtina *populiarizacijos* teoriją ir įrodo, kad tam tikri reiškiniai plito iš viršaus į apačią. Deminutyvinės formos (*замочокъ*) vartojimas, įvardijant bajorijos pilaites, aiškiai išreiškia sąmoningai darytą ne tik semantinę, bet ir materialinę skirtį tarp bajorijos pilaičių ir pilių. Šalia bajorijai negausiai priklausiusių pilių, ši socialinė grupė gaudavo valdyti pilis kaip tarnybas ir kaip įkaitus tam tikrą laiką už paskolintą didžiajam kunigaikščiui pinigų sumą.

33. XV–XVI a. sandūroje pasirodė ne tik valdovo privilegijos pilių statyboms. Kartu šiuose dokumentuose buvo suteikiama teisė įsteigti miestelį, organizuoti jomarkus, turgų, įrengti karčemas. Toks privilegijų turinys liudija bandymus kurti ir stimuliuoti LDK vidaus ūkinę infrastruktūrą. Pilis čia iškyla kaip svarbus infrastruktūrinis dėmuo, šalia kurio galimai kūrėsi kiti objektai.

34. Rašytinių šaltinių duomenimis XIV–XV a. sandūroje LDK buvo apie šimtas trisdešimt pilių. XV–XVI a. sandūroje – apie šimtas valdovo ir tiek pat privačių pilių. XVI a. viduryje – apie septyniasdešimt valdovo ir apie devyniasdešimt privačių pilių.

35. Didžioji dalis valdovo pilių buvo išsidėsčiusios *Lithuania propria*, Voluinės ir Palenkės žemėse. Privačių pilių daugiausiai buvo Voluinėje, Palenkėje, Kijevo žemėje, Tikrojoje Lietuvoje.

Publications on the dissertation theme:

Paskelbti straipsniai disertacijos tema:

Pilis Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės žemėse: statusas ir pavaldumas// Lietuvos Pilys. T. 6. 2010. Vilnius, 2011, p. 5–15.

Pilis Lietuvos Didžiojoje Kunigaikštystėje: istoriografijos tendencijos ir naujos definicijos paieškos// Lietuvos istorijos metraštis. 2011 metai 1. Vilnius, 2012, p. 5–18.

Pilies Lietuvos Didžiojoje Kunigaikštystėje tyrimo modelis: tarp struktūrų ir socialinės istorijos// Lietuvos istorijos metraštis. 2011 metai 2. Vilnius, 2012, p. 5–19.

The Castle in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania: Historiography, Search for Definitions, Research Model// Lithuanian Historical Studies. Vol. 17. 2012. Vilnius, 2013, pp. 1–38.

Grand Duchy of Lithuania ant the Case of the Castle: Context, Problems, Perspectives// Castrum Bene 12. (The Castle as Social Space). Ed. *Predovnik K.* Ljubljana, 2014, pp. 199–205.

Informacija apie disertacijos autorių

Vytautas Volungevičius (1984 m. gimė Vilniuje) 1995–2003 m. mokėsi Vilniaus jėzuitų gimnazijoje. 2003–2007 m. studijavo Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos fakultete istoriją (medievistikos specializacija). 2007–2009 m. tęsė studijas istorijos magistrantūroje. 2009–2014 m. buvo VU Istorijos fakulteto doktorantas.

Doktorantūros studijų metu stažavosi Fribūro universitete (Šveicarija) (2011–2012), Berlyno slaptajame Prūsijos paveldo archyve (Vokietija) (2012), Vokietijos istorijos institute Varšuvoje (Lenkija) (2012). Yra laimėjęs stipendiją Herderio institute Marburge (Vokietija) (2015). Dalyvavo keliose tarptautinėse konferencijose (Slovėnija, Vokietija, Baltarusija).

2008–2010 m. dirbo Lietuvos dailės muziejuje. Buvo kelių tarptautinių parodų koordinatorius (Lietuvos tūkstantmetis, Žalgirio mūšis).

Nuo 2014 m. Istorijos fakulteto Senovės ir Viduramžių istorijos katedros lektorius. Dėsto Lietuvos ir Europos Viduramžius.

Yra paskelbęs keletą mokslinių publikacijų.

Pagrindiniai moksliniai interesai: XIII–XVI a. Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės socialinė ir struktūrų istorija, Viduramžių istorija.

Information about the author of the dissertation

Vytautas Volungevičius was born in Vilnius in 1984. In 1995–2003, he attended Vilnius Jesuit Gymnasium. In 2003–2007, he studied history (specialising in Medieval Studies) at the Faculty of History, Vilnius University. In 2007–2009, did his Master's studies and in 2009–2014 his doctoral studies at the Faculty of History, Vilnius University.

During his doctoral studies he went on a study visit to the University of Fribourg (Switzerland) (2011–2012), Prussian Privy State Archives in Berlin (Germany) (2012), German Historical Institute in Warsaw (Poland) (2012). He has won a scholarship of Herder Institute in Marburg (Germany) (2015). He has participated in several international conferences (Slovenia, Germany, Belarus).

Since 2014 he is a lecturer at the Department of Ancient and Medieval History, Faculty of History, and lectures on Lithuanian and European Middle Ages.

He has published several scientific articles.

Main research interests: 13th – 16th c. social and structural history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Medieval history.

E-mail: vytautas.volungevicius@gmail.com