

Lietuvos archeologijos draugija  
Lietuvos istorijos institutas  
Klaipėdos universitetas

L I E T U V O S

---

# ARCHEO*logija* 35



---

VILNIUS 2009

### **Redaktorių kolegija:**

Dr. Andra Simniškytė (ats. redaktorė)  
(Lietuvos istorijos institutas, Vilnius)

Dr. Anna Bitner-Wróblewska  
(Valstybinis archeologijos muziejus Varšuvoje, Lenkija)

Prof. dr. Rimantas Jankauskas  
(Vilniaus universitetas, Lietuva)

Prof. dr. Eugenijus Jovaiša  
(Vilniaus pedagoginis universitetas, Lietuva)

Prof. dr. Vladimir Kulakov  
(Rusijos archeologijos institutas, Maskva)

Prof. dr. Valter Lang  
(Tartu universitetas, Estija)

Doc. dr. Algimantas Merkevičius  
(Vilniaus universitetas, Lietuva)

Dr. Tomas Ostrauskas  
(Lietuvos istorijos institutas, Vilnius)

Dr. Gintautas Rackevičius  
(Pilių tyrimo centras „Lietuvos pilys“, Vilnius)

Dr. Arnis Rādiņš  
(Latvijos nacionalinis istorijos muziejus, Ryga)

Dr. Eugenijus Svetikas  
(Lietuvos istorijos institutas, Vilnius)

Doc. dr. Valdemaras Šimėnas  
(Lietuvos istorijos institutas, Vilnius)

Dr. Vykintas Vaitkevičius  
(Klaipėdos universitetas, Lietuva)

Doc. dr. Ilona Vaškevičiūtė  
(Lietuvos istorijos institutas, Vilnius)

Dr. Gintautas Zabiela  
(Klaipėdos universitetas, Lietuva)

Dovilė Urbonavičiūtė (ats. sekretorė)  
(Lietuvos istorijos institutas, Vilnius)

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



## THE EVOLUTION OF CURRENT TRENDS IN LITHUANIAN ARCHAEOLOGY: SOVIET PAST AND POST-SOVIET PRESENT

IEVA PABERŽYTĖ, ANDRE COSTOPOULOS

*During the Soviet period, Lithuanian archaeologists developed a highly descriptive tradition in Lithuanian archaeology. In post-Soviet Lithuania, archaeologists continue to practice the descriptive tradition and rarely engage in theoretical debates. In order to understand the evolution of the descriptive tradition in Lithuanian archaeology, we provide an evolutionary analysis of current trends in Lithuanian archaeology. The overall goal of the article is to generate discussion between archaeologists about Lithuanian archaeology's past, present and future.*

**Keywords:** Soviet archaeology, post-Soviet archeology, evolution, history of archaeology.

*Sovietmečio politika darė įtaką aprašomosios archeologijos įsitvirtinimui Lietuvoje. Nepriklausomybės laikotarpiu Lietuvos archeologai tęsia aprašomąją tradiciją ir retai įsitraukia į teorines diskusijas. Straipsnyje analizuojamos aprašomosios tradicijos ištakos, evoliucija ir įsitvirtinimo priežastys. Pagrindinis darbo tikslas – skatinti diskusijas tarp archeologų apie Lietuvos archeologijos praeitį, dabartį ir ateities tendencijas.*

**Reikšminiai žodžiai:** Sovietinė archeologija, posovietinė archeologija, evoliucija, archeologijos istorija.

### INTRODUCTION

In some ways, ideas are like species (Richards, 1987), and the development of science can be analyzed using the familiar Darwinian concepts of diversity, mutation, selection, and drift. Lithuanian archaeology is a good case study for the application of Darwinian evolution to science, because it has undergone significant and rapid changes in environment during its development. These changes of environment have led to powerful changes in selective pressure that have shaped the discipline and its traditions as we can now see them.

Starting in the 1940s and following the Soviet occupation, Soviet ideology imposed a new selective environment on Lithuanian archaeology. Ideas, practices, and even people were selected

out, or removed from the Lithuanian archaeological landscape by the powerful selective force represented by the Soviet state. The Soviet period, as a whole, represents a period of strong, directional selection of ideas and people that greatly reduced the potential variability present in Lithuanian archaeology until the 1930s.

This is the period during which Lithuanian archaeology developed its very descriptive character, a trait it shares with many of its cousins in other ex-Soviet republics, and in post-colonial contexts in general (Trigger, 2006). During the Soviet period, description of material culture and of phases was the safest archaeological activity, as it carried the least ideological implications. Those who specialized in description during the Soviet period were selected into the system, whereas, those who attempted theory building ran



the risk of not fitting into the rapidly changing ideological framework of the Soviet state, and risked being selected out of the discipline, sometimes forcefully.

The end of the Soviet period led to a second great environmental change in the history of Lithuanian archaeology. Since the soviet selection was strong and directional, inexorably moving Lithuanian archaeology in a descriptive direction, favouring certain practices over others, and thus greatly limiting the ideological and practical variability of the discipline, the removal of these strong selective pressures in the 1990s could lead to greatly increased variety in the near future. New variants, new ideas, and new practices are no longer aggressively removed from the pool of variability. They are allowed to compete and to spread. There is now a greater potential for drift in Lithuanian archaeology.

Lithuanian archaeology stands at an important cross-road. The ideologically more permissive environment allows the evolution of very interesting new versions of archaeology contributing to the discipline in general. However, the recovery of variability runs slowly. The discipline entered the immediate post-Soviet era with a highly selected set of ideas, practices, and practitioners.

This text tells the story of sudden changes in ideological environment and in selective pressures, and tries to give an account of the evolution of Lithuanian archaeology. There is no attempt here at charting its future course. But there is hopefully the realization that this is an important moment where the greater variability of ideas, practices, and people, is creating new possibilities.

We wish to show the current situation of Lithuanian archaeology and foster a discussion about the problems the Lithuanian archaeology is facing today. This is not a review of literature. We examine the main threads of Lithuanian archaeology in two time periods that represent different selective environments. The

next logical step in better understanding the post-Soviet archaeologies is a comparative analysis of the Lithuanian case with other post-Soviet contexts, in the Baltic States, but also in other post-colonial and imperial contexts. That comparative exercise outside the scope of the present work will form the heart of an upcoming paper.

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Policy and the broader social milieu are very important factors in development of science (Trigger, 1984; 1989; 1995; 2006; Kohl, 1998). Policy and the social milieu is the environment of agents, individual researchers, who are the carriers of conceptual systems. Given the abrupt changes in Lithuania's political and social environment in the 1940s and again the 1990s, we expected to see corresponding changes in archaeology. The stability of old conceptual framework of the descriptive and nearly atheoretical Lithuanian archaeology after the political changes of the 1990s is puzzling. Confronted with this apparent contradiction, we decided to seek a general model of scientific change, which would be helpful in understanding the situation of Lithuanian archaeology and explaining the process of major shifts in science.

General Darwinian evolutionary theory is applied to biology and culture. Both applications, the biological evolutionary theory and the cultural evolutionary theory, share fundamental traits. Yet, they are different from each other because they are applied to different objects. If there is an evolutionary theory of science, it must be a subset for a cultural evolutionary theory. Its elements will be found in the works of thinkers who consider change in science. There are several models of scientific change in the philosophy of science literature. We draw from a few of them, which together form a firm theoretical framework.



We synthesize three models of scientific change: the refutationist model of Karl Popper (Popper, 1959), Thomas Kuhn's 'paradigm shift' model (Kuhn, 1962) and Robert Richards' 'natural selection of ideas' model (Richard, 1987). We take an evolutionary perspective and concentrate on the explanation of change and on the role of scientists in it.

### Popper

Popper's model is built around the concept of falsifiability. Falsifiability, according to Popper, is the characteristic of a hypothesis that allows it to be proven false when confronted with observations of nature (Popper, 1959). From an evolutionary perspective, falsifiability is a selective process that ensures survival of the fittest ideas. The fittest ideas in a Popperian context would be those that survive falsification attempts.

If nature selects the fittest ideas, according to Popper's model, human agency introduces variability: *'it is we who always formulate the questions to be put to nature (...). And in the end, it is again we who give the answer; it is we ourselves, who after severe scrutiny, decide upon the answer to the question which we put to nature – after protracted and earnest attempts to elicit from her an unequivocal 'no' (Popper, 1959, 280).* Therefore, the scientists have an active role in this model. They need to deliver a wide enough variability of hypotheses to assure rich choice for selection.

The model presented by Popper is interesting for two reasons: for the shape of the model itself and for the falsifiability principle. However, we see one element missing in this model in order to ap-

ply it to the case of Lithuanian archaeology. Popper does not consider the environmental factor. The environment of scientific ideas, Soviet policy, was crucial in shaping of Lithuanian archaeology.

The falsifiability criterion was not employed during the 20th century in Lithuanian archaeology. Archaeologists who would suggest the falsifiability criterion for the evaluation of high level<sup>1</sup> or middle-range level<sup>2</sup> theories would simply not have fit in the social and policy environment. Newly uncovered archaeological remains were interpreted within political constraints, which proscribed any doubt in the main postulates of Soviet archaeology at the official level. The traditionally employed culture-historical approach, with its concerns for ethnicity and the roots of the Lithuanian nation, encouraged the confirmation of expectations, rather than the challenge of existing assumptions. For example, statements about ethnic roots and cultural heritage were important for local as well as for the Union's nationalism. In Popper's terms, expectations need to be overthrown because the critical evaluation of ideas does not limit the advance of knowledge. However, in the case of a politically constrained environment, the falsifiability criterion is difficult or impossible to employ at least for a certain period of time. As the history of astronomy during the Middle Ages shows, this period may sometimes be very long.

### Kuhn

According to Kuhn, there are a few stages of scientific development – emergence of a paradigm, the stage of normal science, crises of normal science, and finally paradigm shift (Kuhn,

<sup>1</sup> High level theories (general theories) consist of abstract rules that explain relations among theoretical prepositions that are relevant for understanding major categories of phenomena. Examples of high level theories are idealism, materialism, relativism, positivism, etc. (see Trigger, 2006, 1989).

<sup>2</sup> Middle-range level theories relate observable facts to theoretical concepts. Scientific testing happens at this level (see Trigger, 2006, 1989). For example, the statement that among hunter-gatherers birth spacing is inversely proportional to mobility is a middle range statement that relates a materialist (high level) theory of human behaviour with ethnographic observations.



1962). In Kuhn's words *'Paradigm is an object for further articulation and specification under new or more stringent conditions'* (Kuhn, 1962, 23). Articulation of a given paradigm is the stage of *'normal science'*. When normal science faces a crisis and scientists are not able to solve emerging problems within the framework of the current paradigm, there is paradigm shift.

Kuhn claims that the generation of scientists raised in the old paradigm will not be able to reject it, *'they can at best help to create a crisis or, more accurately, to reinforce one that is already very much in existence'* (Kuhn, 1962, 78). Kuhn believes, that the paradigm is a prerequisite to perception: *'What a man sees depends both upon what he looks at and also upon what his previous visual-conceptual experience has taught him to see'* (Kuhn, 1962, 112). This belief assumes that scientists are the prisoners of their mindset to a great extent. According to Kuhn, it is the new generation that overthrows the old paradigm and eventually makes a new one into normal science.

Like Popper, Kuhn does not give great weight to the environment in the process of paradigm shift. He does not look at the paradigm shifts caused by external events. Kuhn considers the internal crises of the paradigm. He looks at the scientific problems caused by the failure of models to deal with reality. Over time, scientists discover an increasing number of cases that don't seem to fit their paradigm. Those observations don't fit the predictions that are based on the assumptions that form the paradigm. These are the internal scientific problems that new generations of practitioners eventually seize on to reject the old paradigm.

However, his model is useful because it addresses the role of generations of researchers during paradigm shift. His statement about the difficulty of rejecting the old paradigm could help to explain the stable nature of the approach to archaeology in post-Soviet Lithuania.

## Richards

Richards' model of change in the history of science is based on the natural selection principle (Richards, 1987). According to Richards, individuals carry ideas and concepts that are related by logic and common evolutionary history. In order to be expressed, ideas and conceptual systems go through selection in three different environments – the minds of individual scientists, the scientific community, and the general culture (Richards, 1987). The transmission of ideas between individuals happens depending on the context in which information is transmitted (book, lecture, scientific discussion, etc.) and on the baggage of conceptual systems of the receiver (Richards, 1987). This assumption accords with Kuhn's model, which assumes that scientists' minds are dependent not only on the content of information received but also on the mindset of receiver. Richards' model gives a role to the environment in which the ideas are transmitted in addition to examining the content of the ideas themselves. To use a biological analogy, the phenotypic expression of the ideas takes different shapes not only because of the various perspectives of the receivers, or because of the content of the ideas, but also because of the environment in which they are transmitted. Richards' model is largely comparable with Popper's. For Popper, the process of selection of ideas is falsifiability, while for Richards it is the pressures from different environments – personal, scientific and the general culture. Richards does not specify the selecting pressures; therefore these three environments might include falsifiability as a selective pressure. Both models rely on the introduction of variability for selection by human minds.

## Synthesis

Richards and Popper rely on human agency to introduce variability of ideas for selection. Scientists who introduce ideas in certain environment are already fit, because they are already selected



by years of success in educational systems that impose sometimes strong selective pressures. Their ideas, having carried them through their schooling, cannot be very harmful or distracting for the existing political system. If they were, the scientists would not have been selected. In other words the variability of ideas of selected scientists is limited and accords well with the environment. When change is introduced in the political environment, different scientific leaders are selected and their ideas are naturally fit, at least until the next significant change in political or ideological landscape.

For Lithuanian archaeology under Soviet rule, the main selecting factor was neither personal environment, nor scientific environment, nor general public. All these three aggregates were already selected by the political environment and the carriers of ideas survived or were successful in the system only because they were fit to the political environment. The rest of the carriers were silent or selected out of the game. This process of selection of the carriers of ideas was very real, and at some periods, deadly. Archaeologists in Lithuania and other parts of the Soviet Union were sent to prison camps or were executed (P. Baleniūnas, A. A. Miller, S. N. Bykovskii, O. V. Kiparisov, P. S. Rykov, B. S. Zhukov, I. M. Grevs, L. S. Klejn, B. A. Latynin, etc.). Some Lithuanian archaeologists left the country because they were not able to function in the political environment and somehow managed to migrate (M. Gimbutas, J. Puzinas, P. Tarasenska, V. Nagevičius etc.).

During the rule of Stalin, the Soviet policy was selecting scientists in a very straightforward fashion – keeping them in prisons, executing or exiling them to Siberia. There were also less straightforward measures taken, especially during the later periods – firing people from work, not allowing them to publish, leaving them without living accommodations, refusing trips abroad, putting them in mental hospitals etc. (see Клейн,

1993). In other words, the political environment reduced the existing variability of ideas by selecting carriers, and constrained the variability of new ideas introduced for selection. The result of these two pressures was a much narrower and less diverse range of ideas in Soviet archaeology. Scientists who tried practicing the old pre-Soviet paradigm, or were the carriers of ideas that were disadvantageous in the new political environment, did not survive the system. Therefore, the landscape of ideas became very homogenous during the Soviet period.

In the political change of the 90's, there was the second big shift in environment: independence. This was a change from a very constrained to a less constrained environment. In this favorable new environment, archaeologists were not selected out of the system as literally as in the early 40s. During the course of the second change, scientists faced landscape of ideas into which they could safely introduce a much broader range of ideas for selection. Despite this new potential for diversification of the archaeological landscape, the old paradigm in post-Soviet Lithuanian archaeology is not changing as fast as some would expect.

Perhaps Lithuanian archaeologists continue to use the Soviet paradigm because they are comfortable with it. In other words, they are used to the old way things work. Archaeologists use the same tools and approaches to archaeology, because they are in their comfort zone, their local optimum, in evolutionary terms, and it is difficult to leave it. They also face much less selective pressure from the environment. Therefore, the old paradigm continues to be stable. Since the environment is now much more permissive, ideas, both old and new, can survive. This can make it difficult for new ideas to displace old ones that have a long history and are well adapted to their environment.

The generation of the old paradigm reached local optimum and the most available mutations



can only move them off their peak in the fitness landscape, and therefore are not selected. They don't provide an advantage. The mutations, which might be selected, are the space of human agency. Some carriers of the old paradigm are capable of leaving their comfort zone and becoming carriers of a new paradigm. In Kuhn's view, it is clear that the shift of paradigm is the mission of the new generation, who has a mindset formed already in a different environment. The broader the mindset, the broader the conceptual system, the greater variability of ideas might be introduced for selection by nature.

In this case, Lithuanian archaeologists now have access to a greater diversity of traits, however, they are facing relaxed selective pressure<sup>3</sup>. Considering all these conditions, it is possible to conclude that in the long term, a new paradigm will emerge. The velocity of change and the nature of the paradigm will depend on the variability of the concepts introduced by the archaeologists for selection – by the ones, who will leave their comfort zone and the ones who have a new mindset developed under a new political system.

This synthesis of three general models is just one of several possible ways to analyze and explain the evolution of Lithuanian archaeology in the 20th century. It includes the introduction of new ideas for selection through human agency (from Popper's and Richards' models), Kuhn's paradigm shifts, which explain why paradigm shift is slow after abrupt change in the policy, and Richards' evolutionary perspective.

Now, we shall see in greater detail how this model can be applied to the analysis of Lithuanian archaeology. We shall consider the first change of

the environment (Soviet occupation), and the application of Soviet environmental conditions to archaeology, which resulted in the descriptive tradition of Lithuanian archaeology. Then we shall briefly discuss the consequences of the second and most recent change of environment (independence).

### THE FIRST CHANGE IN THE ENVIRONMENT – LITHUANIAN ARCHAEOLOGY'S INCORPORATION INTO THE SOVIET SYSTEM

The first abrupt change in political environment occurred when the Red Army occupied Lithuania in 1944. Under Soviet policy, Lithuanian archaeologists had to forget the archaeological literature published during the first independence period and to reject terminology considered bourgeois by the Soviet state. They were forced to adopt the Marxist-Leninist framework, to base their periodization system on the development of economic stages in society, and to identify the progressive influences of Slavs on the Baltic tribes.

However, the concept of ethnogenesis<sup>4</sup> and the notion of archaeological culture (culture-historical approach), both promoted by Soviet archaeology, were already used by Lithuanian archaeologists in the years of the Independent state. Ethnogenesis and the distinction of different peoples in prehistoric times was one of the most important issues for Jonas Puzinas (Čivilytė, 2005, 48), who is considered to be the founder of scientific archaeology in Lithuania. Puzinas brought these ideas from Germany in 1934, where he de-

<sup>3</sup> A concept from biological evolutionary theory (see Darwin, 1859). Different environments impose different selective pressures on organisms. Relaxed selective pressure means that the environment is relaxed, which will result in more organisms surviving than in the environment of high selective pressure. In this particular case we use 'relaxed selective pressure' to describe the political environment after the declaration of independence in 1990, while contrasting it to 'high selective pressure' environment in 1944, after the occupation of Lithuania by the Soviets.

<sup>4</sup> The process of formation of ethnic groups. In many national archaeological traditions, there is a concern for the reconstruction of the origin of the nation through the identification of unique artifact, burial, settlement types.



fended his doctoral dissertation at Heidelberg University. It was entitled *Vorgeschichtsforschung und Nationalbewusstsein in Litauen* (Studies of Prehistory and National Consciousness in Lithuania) (Paberžytė's translation). Puzinas 'was sure that the archaeological culture is a synonym for a nation and an ethnos' (Čivilytė, 2005, 48). When Puzinas came back in 1934 he was the first to educate professional archaeologists in Lithuania. He taught in Kaunas and Vilnius universities from 1934 till 1944. Puzinas was a professor of the four Lithuanian archaeologists who graduated before the Soviet occupation in 1944 and who continued their work in archaeology later. Marija Gimbutas, one of his students, together with Puzinas emigrated to the West in the early Soviet period, while Pranas Kulikauskas, Rimutė Rimantienė and Regina Volkaitė-Kulikauskienė continued archaeological practice in Soviet Lithuania. The three archaeologists who stayed in Lithuania had a firm background of culture-historical archaeology, a tradition brought by Puzinas from Germany in the early 30s.

In terms of our model, the Soviet occupation brought about an abrupt environmental change and imposed new selective pressures that selected the carriers of ideas that were compatible with the general Soviet science framework. Those whose ideas did not fit were selected out of the archaeological system. But at least some of the traits that had evolved already in Lithuanian archaeology before the Soviet occupation, allowed it to survive as an entity under the new Soviet environment. The focus on ethnogenesis and culture history were both fit in the new environment.

This can be exemplified by the claims of some Lithuanian archaeologists who worked in the Soviet period and believed that Soviet policy did not have much influence on archaeological research. Rimutė Rimantienė, one of the most outstanding Stone Age specialists in Lithuania, claims that she did not face any political constraints and served

neither Marx nor Engels during the Soviet years (Zemlickas, 1998).

It is not surprising that some archaeologists did not feel any pressure to conform, since, without trying, they were broadly compatible in their practice, with the environment created by the Soviet state. Archaeologists that continued research in the Soviet environment had an approach that could be expressed into an advantageous phenotype after the abrupt environmental change. Without wanting to conform, or intentionally trying to, they had traits that allowed them to survive and practice in the Soviet system. At the very least, they had traits that allowed them to avoid being selected out.

#### THE DESCRIPTIVE TRADITION IN THE SOVIET PERIOD

Many Lithuanian archaeologists that went through the Soviet years would interpret these events differently and would contribute valuable information and perspectives that are not included in our treatment. For many of the more senior readers, most of this information will not be new. However, it will be useful for younger scholars and foreign readers to briefly review the application of Soviet ideology to Lithuanian archaeology. For many of them, the Soviet period is not a memory or an experience, but simply another page in a history with which they might not be very familiar.

Because of the strong selective pressures imposed by Soviet policy, it became advantageous to avoid expressing risky interpretations of data, and to express a previously neutral trait: a heavy emphasis on collection of archaeological data and its description. This practice resulted in a homogeneous landscape of ideas and continuation of the descriptive tradition in Lithuanian archaeology.

The traits that allowed archaeologists to continue practicing during the Soviet period were not



limited to agreement with Soviet policy. The ability to express their own ideas in a voice and format compatible with Soviet requirements became an important attribute. This plasticity allowed some archaeologists to adapt to the new environment.

The main strategy of Lithuanian archaeologists during the Soviet period was to comply with official policy requirements, while engaging in practices that were more or less compatible with their own convictions. Even in expressing the officially required surface message in their literature, Lithuanian archaeologists had a tendency to stay as neutral as possible.

Archeologists had to have good knowledge of central policy requirements in order to publish, work, and 'survive' in the Soviet system. Their main concern, then, was to try to express their ideas as best as they could while minimizing risks. Archaeologists had to comply with Soviet rules about the content of their work, its format, terminology, and text structure.

Archaeologists started looking for the best compromise between the need to express their own ideas, the need to observe political rules, as well as ways to circumvent these rules while minimizing risk. They gradually developed methods for reducing the distortion of their ideas in their published work. Readers, in the meantime, became well trained in recognizing these methods and strategies, and were able to discern ideas that belonged to the author and ideas that were imposed by the Soviet political system. This implicit comprehension between authors and readers increased the possibilities of expression, while reducing the risk of being selected out by the political environment.

When dealing with sensitive topics in archae-

ology, Lithuanians employed two main strategies in their publications to circumvent political rules and to survive in the system. Klejn titled these strategies '*payment of tribute*' and '*pose of silence*' (Клейн, 1993, 82).

'Pose of silence' was one of the most adaptive methods in Soviet era in Lithuania. Archaeologists avoided topics that were politically sensitive or unacceptable<sup>5</sup>. Such topics included the interpretation of archaeological data, and theory building. Silence was used as a statement of disagreement (Клейн, 1993, 82). The only relatively safe way of disagreeing with an official position was to keep out of the discourse entirely. Lithuanian archaeologists who survived the change of political environment in 1944 employed this rule of silence, both consciously and unconsciously. In the long term, this interpretive and theoretical silence contributed greatly to the development of a strongly descriptive archaeological tradition in Lithuania. This tradition did not require or encourage the expression of opinion and dealt mostly with low-level theory<sup>6</sup>.

'Payment of tribute' allowed scientists to separate the main text from politically enforced statements. The Soviet system and the classic ideas of Marxism were discussed apart from the main text in a separate chapter, usually the introduction, the foreword or the conclusion.

Dealing with politically sensitive topics, Lithuanian archaeologists could not avoid the presentation of central Soviet positions, and this is where they paid their tribute to the system. Most of the time they tried to separate politically enforced statements from the rest of the information. On the other hand, Lithuanian archaeologists did not engage in the research and analysis of politically sensitive topics (except Lithuanian

<sup>5</sup> Notes from the lecture 'Lietuvos archeologijos istorija' (by prof. A. Luchtanas, 2003).

<sup>6</sup> Low level theories are low level generalizations. They are based on correlating observable fact with not observable fact. Archaeologists often look for low level generalizations, for example, the discovery of kiln in a settlement is an indication of ceramics production on the site (see Trigger, 2006, 1989).



ethnogenesis) and this is where they employed the 'pose of silence'. In the Lithuanian case, 'pose of silence' resulted in the emergence of a descriptive archaeological tradition. These mechanisms not only allowed archaeologists to adapt to the system, but they effectively contributed to the narrowing of the range of ideas discussed in the archaeological literature and available for selection.

### Interpretations of Politically Sensitive Topics

There were several politically sensitive topics in Soviet archaeology. These topics were seen by the government as playing a role in the education of society and in the creation of Soviet identities that conformed to the system. These sensitive topics included discussion of the goals of archaeology, archaeological periodization, the history of Lithuanian archaeology, foreign influences on local population (trade, contacts), cultural heritage, ethnogenesis and religious beliefs.

In the Introduction to *Lietuvos archeologijos bruožai* (The Traits Of Lithuanian Archaeology)<sup>7</sup> (LAB, 1961), Kulikauskas presents a definition of archaeology and its goals: 'Archaeology is a sub-field of historical science, which studies the oldest history of human societies through material culture' (Paberžytė's translation) (LAB, 1961, 5). In Soviet terms, this means that the archaeological artifact is only a source of data but not, as in antiquarianism, an end in itself. Artifacts need to be analyzed and interpreted in order to reconstruct processes within historical societies: 'It became necessary to enlighten the Lithuanian past correctly, historically; based on Marxist-Leninist science, which studies society and its development' (Paberžytė's translation) (LAB, 1961, 3).

Tautavičius in the same volume criticizes 'bourgeois archaeologists' for wasting their time on the description of artifacts, which leads to formalism in archaeology (LAB, 1961, 20). These goals set for archaeology in the Soviet system seem to be useful and promising. However, the Soviet political context very much narrowed the ways in which these goals could be achieved. The requirement of interpreting data and reconstructing historical societies was largely disregarded in Lithuanian archaeology, even though the authors of the volume claim the opposite. Lithuanian archaeologists largely kept silent on any high-level interpretations and mostly dealt with the description of local material culture, the classification of artifacts and their affiliation with local ethnic groups.

This is illustrated through the later work *Senasis geležies amžius Lietuvoje* (The Old Iron Age in Lithuania)<sup>8</sup> (Michelbertas, 1986), in which the description of sites and artifacts takes more than half the space. The part on reconstruction of society's subsistence strategies and social relations takes only a very small part of the book and stays away from original interpretation. The tendency to keep away from data interpretation is seen in all archaeological publications of the Soviet period in Lithuania. Lithuanian archaeologists simply avoided discussions that needed to involve theorizing.

Avoidance of theorizing can also be seen in the structure in *Senasis geležies amžius Lietuvoje* compared to the early work *Lietuvos archeologijos bruožai*. *Lietuvos archeologijos bruožai* is divided into four main parts: Foreword, Introduction, chapters on the Stone Age, Bronze Age, Iron Age and an Appendix. The sequence of topics covered

<sup>7</sup> *Lietuvos Archeologijos Bruožai* published in 1961, represented the Soviet paradigm in archaeology and became a model for later archaeological publications. The work was used as a teaching material for archaeology students at university.

<sup>8</sup> *Senasis geležies amžius Lietuvoje* published in 1986, showed the well-developed descriptive archaeological tradition in Lithuania that was fostered by the Soviet system. The work is used as main teaching material for archaeology students at university until today.



in each chapter on an archaeological period is dictated by political requirements: the topics of greater concern are discussed at the beginning; the topics of lesser concern are discussed at the end. In the description of archaeological sites, priority is given to settlements and hillforts. The description of burial sites comes later. In the description of artifacts, priority is given to working tools and weapons. Those are followed by descriptions of ceramics and jewellery.

This latter structure accords well with the typical Marxist framework. According to Marxist archaeology, domestic context and working tools reveal the modes of production and are the key to understanding the economic and social development of societies. Burials, ceramics, and jewellery are secondary concerns – they help to resolve questions of archaeological cultures and ethnogenesis. An important place is given to the discussion of contacts and trade routes, because they can reveal foreign influences on local populations. The Soviet state had a strong interest in controlling statements about foreign influences on local populations. The aspect of beliefs in prehistory was not of much concern because religion, according to Engels, is ‘*nothing but fantastic reflection in the heads of humans... reflection in which natural phenomena are taken for supernatural.*’ (Paberžytė’s translation) (quoted in Румянцев, 1981, 129; Окладников, 1952, 177). Descriptions of prehistoric belief systems were accordingly often kept for last.

In the later *Senasis geležies amžius Lietuvoje* (Michelbertas, 1986), the structure described above has undergone some change. Descriptions of burials occupy more space than the description of settlements. Jewelry is discussed prior to working tools (Michelbertas, 1986). Towards the end of the Soviet period, Lithuanian archaeologists found themselves with a great deal of archaeological data from burial grounds and very little data from domestic sites. Between 1948 and 1960, 58 burials grounds and only 17 dwelling

settlements were excavated. The relative proportion of excavation remained the same throughout the Soviet period (Sidrys, 1999, 212).

Sidrys (1999) argues that in the Soviet era, Lithuanian archaeologists avoided the excavation of domestic sites because it would have involved them in the politically difficult subject of social reconstruction and interpretation (Sidrys, 1999, 212). We agree that this is a valid point. Because of the Soviet political context, of the more attractive sites for excavation, such as burials or hillforts, burials will be more likely selected over hillforts, because they are less likely to generate controversy. It is difficult, for example, to discuss a hillfort without also discussing power and social structure, whereas graves and grave goods can more easily just be described. Even though *Lietuvos archeologijos bruožai* deals with settlements and hillforts, it limits itself largely to description and does not get into much analysis or discussion.

As a result, the Lithuanians directed their archaeological tradition towards excavation of burials and description of the artifacts from burial sites. Significantly, those concerns were peripheral to the interests of Soviet archaeology, but not hostile to the Soviet system. Specializing in topics of lesser theoretical interest was apparently a successful adaptive strategy. The affiliation of the artifacts with local ethnic groups, and determination of the territorial and chronological boundaries of those groups based on data from burials was another adaptive subject. Even though ethnogenesis was a politically sensitive topic, it was compatible with Soviet as well as Lithuanian national interests, but for different reasons (see below).

Periodization was also sensitive. Marxist-Leninist archaeology divided human history into several stages, based on Engels’ (1884) *Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*. The Marxist-Leninist stage system, adopted in Lithuanian archaeology, implied that the Meso-



lithic represents matriarchal clan society, the Neolithic sees a change to patriarchal clan society and paints the Bronze Age as a patriarchal clan society. The Iron Age was regarded as a period of break up of tribal societies and a period of class formation. Prehistory, beginning with the Stone Age and ending with the Iron Age, was seen as the primitive barbarian stage. The stages could be moved back and forth in time in different archaeological contexts, but their sequence and the social processes within the stages could not be modified. Archaeologists kept repeating the same stages in development of economy and social relationships all through the Soviet period. The falsifiability principle necessary for the selection of the fittest ideas was not employed: newly retrieved archaeological data was put in already existing frames established by Soviet policy requirements: expectations and assumptions were rather confirmed than challenged.

The Soviet paradigm tended to divide influences into positive and negative ones. It clearly identified who should be the object of sympathy and who shouldn't. Negative characters during the Soviet period were 'Western imperialists', 'local Lithuanian bourgeois', 'Polish landlordish-bourgeois', 'German occupants' (LAB, 1961, 28–30). All of them, according to the Soviet ideology, were destroying the cultural heritage of Lithuania and not producing any valuable data (LAB, 1961, 28–30). Negative attitudes were also linked to influences from the West: the Roman Empire, Vikings, Goths or Germans (LAB, 1961; Michelbertas, 1986, 9). This affected how archaeology treated prehistoric trade and contact (LGPR, 1972; Zemlickas, 2005).

Discussion of the history of Lithuanian archaeology faced tight political restrictions during the Soviet period. The main goal of the policy in this regard was to convince the public that the Soviet system encouraged archaeological research and only through Soviet style archaeology would the Lithuanian past be correctly revealed. In such cir-

cumstances several historical facts and important personalities of Lithuanian archaeology, who had been selected out of the system, could not be mentioned. One of them was Puzinas – the first professional archaeologist in Lithuania (Zemlickas, 2005). Another was Gimbutas, who emigrated from the country and continued her research in the United States.

The names of these archaeologists started to appear in the literature in the late periods of the Soviet Union under the guise of criticism. Criticism became a covert way to discuss existing archaeological research, which earlier could not be discussed in any context. In LAB these selected personalities are dismissed or mentioned only very briefly (1961, 22–33). Michelbertas, by contrast, presents the works of Puzinas, but at the same time criticizes him for overestimating the influence of the Roman Empire and the Goths on Baltic culture (Michelbertas, 1986, 9).

Positive attitude was expressed towards activities and influences from Russian archaeologists in Lithuania during the 19th century. Special attention was paid to the Soviet period, proudly listing the achievements of archaeologists in data production and in formulation of new questions, such as the formation of the Baltic tribes, social classes and finally the Lithuanian nation (LAB, 1961, 32). It was concluded that all progress that took place in Lithuanian archaeology was due to the Soviet Marxist-Leninist methodology (LAB, 1961, 28–32).

Lithuanian ethnogenesis and the protection of archaeological heritage were widely discussed in the Soviet era literature (Таутавичюс, 1980; Проблемы, 1985; Lietuvių etnogenezė, 1987). Those topics, for different reasons, concerned both Soviet authorities and Lithuanian archaeologists. The preservation of the archaeological heritage and the study of ethnogenesis had one goal – the construction of cultural identity based on past events and material remains. The Soviet Union



was eager to construct Soviet identities by interpreting the material heritage from a Marxist-Leninist perspective, while Lithuanians wanted to preserve and to discover their Lithuanian identity without the influence of Soviet ideology. As a result, archaeologists often discussed both of these topics in the literature.

Early archaeological publications of the Soviet period seem to satisfy the central political requirements. However, the surface message did not represent archaeological practice in reality. This controversy showed up in later archaeological publications (see above). Later publications still preserved a politically appropriate tone, kept the same Soviet vocabulary and the same Marxist-Leninist framework, but they were not able to provide any new interpretations on the growing archaeological databases gathered since the beginning of the Soviet period. Lithuanian archaeologists became specialists in collecting archaeological data and placing it into a stagnated Marxist-Leninist framework. Descriptive work became the main part of the archaeological literature. The political environment and the continuous efforts of Lithuanian archaeologists to avoid political debates led to the descriptive tradition, which was neither in the intention of the Union, nor the intentions of Lithuanian archaeologists themselves.

The reinforcement of a descriptive archaeological tradition as an advantageous trait in Lithuania during the Soviet period was thus the unintended consequence of the existence of an active archaeological community in a totalitarian but theoretically sophisticated political framework. Since the declaration of independence in 1990 and the abandonment of the Marxist-Leninist framework, Lithuanian archaeologists have found themselves with huge databases and no obvious successor framework in which to interpret them.

## SECOND ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE – LITHUANIAN ARCHAEOLOGY SINCE INDEPENDENCE: THE DESCRIPTIVE TRADITION CONTINUES

In 1990, Lithuania declared its independence from the Soviet Union. The new political environment did not impose strong selection on the carriers of ideas in the way that the Soviet occupation had. In this more permissive political environment, Lithuanian archaeologists found themselves with a broader choice of ideas and the possibility of moving Lithuanian archaeological research in new directions. The new variability that is naturally generated by cultural systems was suddenly not under intense selective pressure. New variants were allowed to remain on the landscape of ideas.

According to our model, there are two main sources of new variability of ideas. First, there is diffusion from external sources. New ideas come from outside and are either adopted or rejected. For example, Ian Hodder's *Reading the Past* was translated into Lithuanian in 2000, and its ideas became available for selection in the ideological landscape of Lithuanian archaeology. It is also not unusual for Lithuanian university instructors to assign passages of foreign works for translation and summarization in their courses. The students thus become aware of ideas brought from the outside and diffused into Lithuanian archaeology. This teaching strategy increases the variability of ideas available for selection.

Second, as suggested by Kuhn (see above), new students and practitioners bring their new and unique perspectives to old problems and generate new ideas and solutions. Each individual is unique and has a unique baggage of experiences. Each individual, when confronted with a problem for the first time, brings to that problem a new



perspective and therefore, has the possibility of generating a new solution. Even a high school graduate, encountering significant archaeological questions for the first time, can contribute a new and unique perspective to a debate. While younger students lack some of the training that allows more experienced researchers to sometimes discriminate between more or less valuable approaches, their minds are not yet as constrained by that same training, and they are in a sense more free to experiment. Because students are considering research problems from unique new perspectives, their reactions often represent new variants that then become available for selection by their teachers and their peers. As Richards argues (see above), selective pressures then eliminate some of this new variability from the ideological landscape, and allow some of it to prosper and become dominant.

The pressure of the Soviet political environment over 50 years had affected the local archaeological tradition significantly and homogenized the landscape of ideas. Now, because of this homogeneity, Lithuanian archaeologists were having difficulty coming up with innovative questions, employing the archaeological theory and engaging in critical analyses of their data. After independence, Lithuanian archaeologists rejected the Marxist-Leninist framework, imposed by Soviet policy, but never deeply espoused in Lithuania, and continued practicing the same descriptive tradition that had emerged during the Soviet years as a consequence of political restrictions. Lithuanian archaeologists, selected under the Soviet regime, had a hard time leaving their comfort zone in the new more permissive environment: even after environmental change they continue using the old tools to approach archaeological data. Examples of a slow change of the old paradigm are noticeable in the literature published since independence, as well as in post-secondary education in archaeology.

### **Persistent Aspects of the Soviet Era Paradigm. Examples from the literature on the Stone Age and Postsecondary Education**

The concept of ethnogenesis played a significant role in Lithuanian archaeology both before and during the Soviet period, and continues to do so after independence, as shown by some of the contributions to Brazaitis et al. (2005, 112, 250, 317). And this is not limited to the current published literature. A visit to the prehistoric exhibit of Lithuanian National Museum in Vilnius will show a strong concern for identification of the origin and formation of the Lithuanian national identity, and also for the formation of tribal identities within Lithuania. Just as ethnogenesis was an important concern both before and during the Soviet period, it continues to be a central concern in post-Soviet Lithuanian archaeology. Under the relaxed selective environment of the post-Soviet era, there is no strong selection against practices and ideas that were successful in the past.

As we have seen, the focus on ethnogenesis was partly responsible for allowing Lithuanian archaeology to continue existing during the Soviet period. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, ethnogenesis remained important in Lithuanian scholarship and society. In the different selective environments of all three periods discussed here, this trait (the focus on ethnogenesis) was fit, but for different reasons. In the inter-war republic, ethnogenesis, like in many other countries, fit into the project of building a national identity through exploration of past roots. During the Soviet period, a focus on ethnogenesis fit into the Soviet project of building a vision of a union of nationalities, as long as the focus on nationality did not threaten the central state. Now, in the post-Soviet period, there is continued interest in the origin and history of the Lithuanian identity, and studies of the Lithuanian past no longer need to avoid threatening a central narrative imposed from outside.



It is not a coincidence that one of the first archaeological monographs published in post-Soviet Lithuania was concerned with the roots of Balt culture – *Baltų kultūros ištakos* (The Origin of the Balt Culture) (Girininkas, 1994). This work conforms to aspects of the old paradigm in that it is basically descriptive. However, it provided possible starting points for discussion about archaeology and Lithuanian prehistory. While it has led to a diversification of ideas in the Lithuanian archaeological literature, it has not yet led to extensive critical discussion (Lietuvos istorija, 2005, 249, 317).

The old paradigm is represented by the culture-historical approach and the description of the archaeological material of the Neolithic Narva culture, which Girininkas associates with the roots of the Balts (Girininkas, 1994). On the other hand, in his analysis, Girininkas challenges the traditionally accepted theory, which says that Balt culture was brought by Indo-European invasions in the late Neolithic. Girininkas argues for local development of the Balt culture (Girininkas, 1994).

This statement is not as important in its content as it is important in its very presence and in its potential, largely unfulfilled up to now, to evoke debates on the issues of the Neolithic in the Baltic region. For example, in his work, Girininkas rejects the demi-diffusion model (Ammerman, Cavalli-Sforza, 1973) as the only appropriate model for the spread of Indo-Europeans into the Baltic. This idea encourages the introduction and examination of other possible socio-cultural transition models. So far, alternative models have been introduced, but they have not been extensively discussed and compared.

Even though Girininkas is mostly concerned about the ethnogenesis of the Balts, his ideas give guidelines for further discussion on a wide range of other issues, such as the transition to farming in the Baltic region, reconsideration of the concept of archaeological culture in general, discussion of different models of socio-cultural change,

consideration of Neolithisation processes in the Eastern Baltic, etc. Even though rooted in the old paradigm, this monograph inaugurates a new era in independent Lithuania by bringing out an opinion and giving a hint of discussions and debates to come.

On the education front, most courses in the undergraduate archaeology program have not changed in approach since Soviet times – students are required to learn local typologies of archaeological artefacts and archaeological sites. There is little discussion of the material, and few tools for approaching it critically. There is little incentive for students to discuss or interpret the data. The university curriculum is designed to prepare collectors of archaeological remains, and does not emphasize analysis.

Since independence, only one publication, a translation of Hodder's *Reading the Past* (2000) focuses on archaeological theory. The book is neither employed nor discussed in archaeology programs; therefore, the content is hardly understandable for archaeology students, who do not have the required theoretical background. Hopefully, this will change in the very near future.

It is important to mention that recently, there has been a course established on archaeological theory for the graduate level students at Vilnius University. We would still argue that archaeological theory and method are inseparable. Theory needs to be taught at the undergraduate level.

This situation can also be partly blamed on the difficult financial situation of Archaeology Departments, which restricts the number of faculty members who could be specialized in different areas (archaeological theory for example). The lack of financial resources likewise creates a situation in which the faculty and staff have unreasonable workloads.

The mindset that evolved in the Soviet environment has influenced the slow pace of the paradigm shift in Lithuanian archaeology in the post-



Soviet period. This mindset could be easily traced in many spheres of social life in Lithuania, including the archaeological milieu. Judging by several archaeological publications and Paberžytė's own experience, critique aimed at traditionally accepted views in Lithuanian archaeology is not well received and generates hostile responses (Sidrys, 1999; Michelbertas, 2001). However, it is important to be curious and open-minded in science in order to broaden knowledge, hear different views, and to form positions with well grounded arguments. There is also a strong hierarchy between the older and younger generations of researchers, faculty, and students in archaeology, which sometimes result in disrespectful behaviour from both sides and constrains the flow of innovative ideas and productive scientific dialogue.

#### **Diffusion of New Ideas into Post-Soviet Lithuanian Archaeology. Examples from the literature on the Stone Age**

Under the relaxed post-Soviet selective environment, how quickly will sources of new variability allow Lithuanian archaeology to diverge from its Soviet-era ancestor? How are some of the ideas and debates recently introduced (both by diffusion from the outside, and by reactions of Lithuanian archaeologists to old material) faring under the new selective environment?

The pace of change in archaeological thought and the development of archaeological trends in Lithuania since the 1994 volume can be evaluated by looking at the recent first volume of the series *Lietuvos istorija: akmens amžius ir ankstyvasis metalų laikotarpis Lietuvoje* (T. I) (History of Lithuania: Stone Age and Early Metal Period in Lithuania) (2005) written by Lithuanian Stone Age specialists Brazaitis, Girininkas, Juodagalvis and Ostrauskas.

Generally, broad history surveys are aimed at a wide public: general reader, school and university students, teachers, future specialists of the discipline, etc. They are landmarks of their time. The content of the histories reflects the latest trends and discussions that have been going on in the discipline. They also show the current state of the discipline. The first history volume on the Lithuanian Stone Age written by the leading Lithuanian archaeologists is a representation of the results and developments in Lithuanian archaeology during post-Soviet years.

The authors of the volume present the prevalent theoretical trends and recognize stagnation of ideas in the post-Soviet years. The part on the Neolithic period includes discussion of Indo-Europeans, which again brings out the question of ethnogenesis of the Balts discussed by Girininkas (1994). Brazaitis notes that scientists in Lithuania have not lost their interest in ethnogenesis. However, the author recognizes that all current publications, with the exception of Girininkas (1994), unconditionally accept one theory on the formation of Balt culture. The traditional view holds that Balt culture, together with agriculture and Corded-Ware culture, were brought by Indo-Europeans during the late Neolithic. According to Brazaitis, apart from the traditionally accepted theory, other possible theories are not mentioned in the literature and not discussed (Lietuvos istorija, 2005, 249).

Concern about ethnogenesis in the Baltic region could be illustrated by the goals set for the flagship project (1999–2008) of the Lithuanian Institute of History, *Akmens ir žalvario amžiai Lietuvoje* (The Stone and Bronze Ages in Lithuania)<sup>9</sup>: 1. to establish the time when what is now Lithuania was inhabited by humans and the conditions of life at that time; 2. to establish the

<sup>9</sup> Lietuvos Istorijos institutas (The Lithuanian Institute of History). *Akmens ir žalvario amžiai Lietuvoje* (online, accessed 15 Oct. 2006). Available at: <<http://www.istorija.lt/en/archaeology.html>>.



outlines of farming, craft development in the Stone and Bronze Ages; 3. to examine the development of ethno-cultural processes in the Stone and Bronze Ages; 4. to examine and reconstruct the development of people's material and spiritual culture; 5. to establish and research a series of essential landmark sites from separate periods and cultures to supplement our knowledge and help us achieve the aims stated above; 6. to seek out landmark sites throughout Lithuania.

In the light of this project, contemporary Lithuanian archaeology seems to be looking for a package of the Baltic culture, which would contain prototypical finds. This approach limits the number of insights that could help reveal the complex socio-cultural processes in the past, especially when researchers consider development of culture within the present political borders of Lithuania.

These observations show that ethnogenesis is still a significant concern in Lithuania, but at the same time, there are no firm arguments presented in support of any alternative theory of Balt ethnogenesis. Stagnation of the ethnogenesis debate could be resolved by changing the tools to approach the issue, reformulating the questions, or reevaluating the importance of ethnogenesis to archaeology. There are several archaeologists outside Lithuania that question the value and place of the concept of ethnicity in archaeology in general, especially prehistoric archaeology (Sackett, 1977; 1985; Trigger, 1989; 1994; 2006; Olsen, Kobylinski, 1991; Jones, 1997; Lang, 2005).

Alternatives to the study of ethnogenesis are available. Instead of focusing on the projecting identity into the past and looking for traces of the origins of contemporary ethnic identities, these approaches use regional interaction models to explain social change. Colin Renfrew (1986) proposes peer-polity interaction models for studying the development of Neolithic political systems. Other authors use complexity theory (Bentley,

2003) or economic and demographic models (Zvelebil, 2006) to explain long-term social change.

*Lietuvos istorija* (2005) is an attempt to view the Lithuanian Stone Age in the European context and reconstruct the historical and cultural genesis of societies that existed within the political borders of present-day Lithuania. Sometimes the reconstruction of the Stone Age societies and their economy is done through the application of straight ethnographic analogies referring to 'primitive cultures' (*Lietuvos istorija*, 2005, 40, 100). The straight ethnographic analogies of prehistoric societies and 'primitive cultures' that assume unilinear cultural evolution are found in other recent works (Daugnora, Girininkas, 2004; Brazaitis, Piličiauskas, 2005). This approach has become problematic and an object of intense debate in anthropology and archaeology (Wobst, 1978; Kuper, 1988). This ongoing debate is not reflected in Lithuanian archaeology. Debates that are ongoing in world archaeology are still not well represented in Lithuanian literature, which indicates the lack of communication with different schools of world archaeology and the presents of the old paradigm.

Understandably, *Lietuvos istorija* (2005) avoids detailed technical description of individual archaeological artefacts, because it is a volume for wider audience. However, they end up with rigorous descriptions of the Stone Age archaeological cultures and archaeological sites. The authors use the culture-historical approach and emphasize the need to study the genesis of separate archaeological cultures in the Lithuanian Stone Age (2005, 112). The latter goals seem to continue the descriptive tradition that prospered under the Soviet regime.

Even though the work represents and reflects the unchanged paradigm of Lithuanian archaeology, it calls for a change. The work pays more attention to the socio-cultural processes and reconstruction of prehistoric social structures than ear-



lier publications. The authors also consider subsistence strategies of the societies and discuss the Neolithisation process in the Baltic. They present some theories on different topics and reference a wider range of sources, including western sources, compared to earlier publications. For example, while discussing the issue of transition to farming in the Baltic, they consider the models proposed by Zvelebil and Rowley-Conwy (1984) and Gimbutas (*Lietuvos istorija*, 2005, 170). While discussing the Indo-European issue, they consider the theories of Colin-Renfrew (1988) and Gimbutas (*Lietuvos istorija*, 2005, 249). Even though the presentation of the models and theories is descriptive and is not highly critical, it does present the reader with several different views and theories. As Trigger (1989, 2006) amply demonstrates, histories can and should be critical examinations.

Between 1994 and 2005, several monographs were released on different time periods (Grigalavičienė, 1995; Rimantienė, 1995; 1996; 2005; Tautavičius, 1996; Volkaitė-Kulikauskienė, 2001; Kuncevičius, 2005). The monographs concerning different time periods in archaeology are employed as teaching material at university. These publications in their format and their approach to archaeological data are similar to the Soviet period publications discussed in the earlier chapters. The descriptive tradition is continued. There is a strong culture-historical approach and the typology of artefacts seems to be the main concern. Local Lithuanian material is not analyzed in the global context. The main tendency remains to publish and to describe the database collected during excavation. It is difficult to develop productive discussions under these circumstances.

By recognizing unchanged elements in post-Soviet archaeological literature, we do not argue that these works are of no value, far from it. They do compile more and more information about the material past of the Baltic and this is a very valuable outcome of archaeological excavations. This

valuable material will be very useful for model building and data analyzing. However, these few examples show that the old paradigm is still widely employed and the new one has not emerged yet.

### UNDERSTANDING THE PAST AND FORMING THE FUTURE

In its new, less restrictive environment, Lithuanian archaeology has diverged to some extent from its Soviet era ancestor: Soviet terminology was largely abandoned, Western and Nordic influences are more obviously present and acknowledged, more space is dedicated to reconstruction of the belief systems of Balt tribes – *Alkai: Baltų šventviečių studija* (The Alkai: Research into Baltic Sacred Places) (Vaitkevičius, 2003). While archaeological theory is still a new subject and has not yet built up much critical mass, some important changes have taken place during the last few years towards understanding and developing of archaeological theory in the Baltic States. Lithuanian archaeologists have taken an active role in this process. For example, the first Baltic Archaeological Seminar (BASE) on archaeological theory was organized in Estonia (2003), the second one was held in Lithuania (2005) and the third one in Riga (2007). There are already two publications resulting from the theoretical seminars and hopefully this event will continue producing useful debate between Baltic archaeologists.

According to our model, the main task for archaeologists today is to introduce variability in the landscape of archaeological ideas for selection. The relaxed selective pressure of the present political environment allows greater variability of insights compared to the Soviet environment. According to our model, it is archaeologists who introduce ideas for selection, and this process can be accelerated if the old generation finds a way of



leaving its comfort zone, and if the new generation has greater opportunity to communicate its new insights and perspectives. The new generation is the main source of a new variability and the driving force of the new paradigm. As Vytautas Kazakevičius, specialist of the Lithuanian Iron Age has stated: *'we still do not have a person who is specialized in archaeological theory, is familiar with the newest theoretical literature and able to convey it to local archaeologists. This person will probably be one of the new generation, and will have to graduate in the West, because our universities do not provide the required level of theoretical education'* (Paberžytė's translation) (quoted in Sidrys, 1999, 230).

In order to introduce greater variability of ideas to the archaeological discipline, Lithuanian archaeologists need to create a welcoming environment. External sources are very useful for broadening local perspectives. Lithuanian archaeologists need to develop contacts with colleagues abroad, participate in collaborative research projects and produce co-authored publications, participate in international conferences, read different world archaeology literature, and provide as many opportunities as possible for archaeology students to have some archaeological fieldwork abroad or to receive education elsewhere. It is important to be curious and open-minded, to explore new ideas and different schools of archaeology, as well as different theories and different views, but not without critical thinking. This will lead to a constructive debate among archaeologists inside and outside of Lithuania.

## CONCLUSION

The Soviet period in Lithuanian archaeology is still not analyzed and not discussed to any great extent. For example, Kulikauskas and Zabiela (1999) explicitly adopt a Pre-Soviet definition of archaeology that rejects social reconstruction,

merely because of its Soviet era association (Kulikauskas, Zabiela, 1999, 8). Some archaeologists say that the Soviet period is still too sensitive to touch and therefore, it remains a task for future generations. Another task for Lithuanian archaeologists is to review the work that has been done in the Soviet period, evaluate its advantages and disadvantages, to name openly the problems that need to be solved and decide how they could be solved. The ideas of Soviet archaeology are still available for selection, and because of the relaxed selective environment, no doubt, some of them are still fit.

Lithuanian archaeologists have a huge database of very important and valuable material collected during Soviet period that needs to be evaluated in a new light, probably raising different questions about it or applying different theoretical frameworks and creating new models in order to understand societies through material culture.

In sum, Lithuanian archaeologists need to create a theoretical framework for their further research. This would help to get into discussion with foreign archaeologists, broaden their knowledge and share their own experience. The developing of a clear picture of the history of Lithuanian archaeology, including the Soviet period, can significantly contribute to establishing a new paradigm and continue conscious development of Lithuanian archaeological thought. Working at the period of a paradigm shift, in a favorable environment, Lithuanian archaeologists finally have the opportunity to introduce great variability of ideas for selection and to shape a new direction and forge a new tradition of Lithuanian archaeology.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to thank the editor and three anonymous reviewers for their very useful comments on earlier drafts of this paper. We must also thank the students of the archaeology departments at



Vilnius and Klaipėda for their support and for providing additional bibliographic materials. Finally, this work would not have been possible without the example and inspiration provided by Professor Bruce Trigger.

This research was supported by the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research through a Professional Development International Fellowship.

## REFERENCES

- Ammerman A., Cavalli-Sforza L. L.**, 1973 – A population model for the diffusion of early farming in Europe // *The explanation of cultural change*. Ed. C. Renfrew. London: Duckworth, 1973, p. 343–357.
- Bentley R. A.**, 2003 – An introduction to complex systems // *Complex systems and archaeology*. Ed. R. A. Bentley, H. D. G. Maschner. Salt lake City: University of Utah press, 2003, p. 9–23.
- Brazaitis Dž., Piličiauskas G.**, 2005 – Gludinti titnaginiai kirviai Lietuvoje // *Lietuvos archeologija*. Vilnius, 2005. T. 29, p. 71–118.
- Bulkin V. A., Klejn L. S. and Lebedev G. S.**, 1982 – Attainments and problems in Soviet archaeology // *World archaeology*. 1982, 13/3, p. 272–295.
- Čivilytė A.**, 2005 – Jonas Puzinas Heidelbergo Universiteto daktaras: archeologijos profesionalumo link // *Lietuvos archeologija*. Vilnius, 2005. T. 29, p. 39–48.
- Daugnora L., Girininkas A.**, 2004 – Rytų Pabaltijo bendruomenių gyvensena XI–II tūkstantmetyje pr. Kr. Kaunas, 2004.
- Girininkas A.**, 1994 – Baltų kultūros ištakos. Vilnius, 1994.
- Grigalavičienė E.**, 1995 – Žalvario ir ankstyvasis geležies amžius Lietuvoje. Vilnius, 1995.
- Hodder I.**, 2000 – *Praeities skaitymas*. Vilnius, 2000.
- Jones S.**, 1997 – *Archaeology of ethnicity: constructing identities in the past and present*. London; New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Klejn L. S.**, 1993 – To separate centaur: on the relationship of archaeology and history in Soviet tradition // *Antiquity*. 1993, 67/255, p. 339–348.
- Klejn L. S.**, 1997 – A panorama of theoretical archaeology // *Current anthropology*. 1997, 18/1, p. 1–42.
- Kohl Ph. L.**, 1998 – Nationalism and archaeology: on the constructions of nations and the reconstructions of the remote past // *Annual review of anthropology*. 1998, 27, p. 223–246.
- Kuhn T. S.**, 1962 – *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago press, 1962.
- Kulikauskas P., Zabiela G.**, 1999 – *Lietuvos archeologijos istorija (iki 1945 m.)*. Vilnius, 1999.
- Kuncevičius A.**, 2005 – *Lietuvos viduramžių archeologija*. Vilnius, 2005.
- LAB**, 1961 – *Lietuvos archeologijos bruožai*. Vilnius, 1961.
- Lang V.**, 2005 – Archaeological cultures and ethnic history: some examples from the East-Baltic Early Iron Age // *Interarchaeologia*. 2005, 1, p. 11–28.
- Lietuvių etnogenezė**, 1987 – *Lietuvių etnogenezė*. Vilnius, 1987.
- Lietuvos istorija**, 2005 – *Lietuvos istorija: Akmens amžius ir ankstyvasis metalų laikotarpis*. Vilnius, 2005. T. 1.
- LGPR**, 1972 – *Lietuvos gyventojų prekybiniai ryšiai I–XII a.* Vilnius, 1972.
- Michelbertas M.**, 1986 – *Senasis geležies amžius Lietuvoje: I–IV amžius*. Vilnius, 1989.
- Michelbertas M.**, 2001 – Amerikiečio žvilgsnis į Lietuvos archeologiją. Pastabos R. V. Sidrio straipsnio paraštėse // *Archaeologia Lituana*. Vilnius, 2001. T. 2, p. 144–148.
- Olsen B., Kobylinski Z.**, 1991 – Ethnicity in anthropological and archaeological research: a Norwegian-Polish perspective // *Archaeologia Polona*. 1991, 29, p. 5–27.
- Popper K. R.**, 1959 – *The logic of scientific discovery*. New York: Basic Books, 1959.
- Renfrew C.**, 1986 – Introduction // *Peer polity interaction and socio-political change*. Ed.



- C. Renfrew, J. F. Cherry. Cambridge university press, 1986, p. 1–18.
- Renfrew C.**, 1988 – Archaeology and language: the puzzle of Indo-European origins. Cambridge university press, 1988.
- Richards R. J.**, 1987 – Darwin and the emergence of evolutionary theories of mind and behavior. Chicago: University of Chicago press, 1987.
- Rimantienė R.**, 1995 – Lietuva iki Kristaus. Vilnius, 1995.
- Rimantienė R.**, 1996 – Akmens amžius Lietuvoje. Vilnius, 1996.
- Rimantienė R.**, 2005 – Akmens amžiaus žvejai prie pajūrio lagūnos. Šventosios ir Būtingės tyrinėjimai. Vilnius, 2005.
- Sackett J. R.**, 1977 – The meaning of style in archaeology: a general model // American antiquity. 1977, 42/3, p. 369–80.
- Sackett J. R.**, 1985 – Style and ethnicity in the Kalahari: A reply to Wiessner // American antiquity. 1985, 50/1, p. 154–59.
- Sidrys R. V.**, 1999 – Kasinėjimai be teorijos? Kritiškas optimisto žvilgsnis į Lietuvos archeologiją // Lietuvos sovietinė istoriografija. Teoriniai ir ideologiniai kontekstai. Vilnius, p. 205–238.
- Tautavičius A.**, 1996 – Vidurinis geležies amžius Lietuvoje (V–IX a.). Vilnius, 1996.
- Trigger B. G.**, 1984 – Alternative archaeologies: nationalist, colonialist, imperialist // Man. 1984, 19, p. 355–70.
- Trigger B. G.**, 1989 – A history of archaeological thought. Cambridge university press, 1989.
- Trigger B. G.**, 1994 – Ethnicity: an appropriate concept for archaeology? // Fennoscandia archaeological. 1994, XI, p. 100–103.
- Trigger B. G.**, 1995 – Romanticism, nationalism and archaeology // Nationalism, politics and the practice of archaeology. Ed. Ph. L. Kohl, C. Fawcett. Cambridge: Cambridge university press, 1995, p. 263–279.
- Trigger B. G.**, 2006 – A history of archaeological thought. Cambridge university press, 2006.

**Trigger B. G., Glover I.**, 1981 – Editorial. Regional traditions of archaeological research // World archaeology. 1981, 13/2, p. 133–137.

**Vaitkevičius V.**, 2003 – Alkai: baltų šventviečių studija. Vilnius, 2003.

**Volkaitė-Kulikauskienė R.**, 2001 – Lietuva valstybės priešaušriu. Vilnius, 2001.

**Wobst H. M.**, 1978 – The archaeo-ethnology of hunter-gatherers or the tyranny of ethnographic record in archaeology // American antiquity. 1978, 43/2, p. 303–309.

**Zemlickas G.**, 1998 – Ištikimybė akmens amžiui // Mokslo Lietuva. Vilnius. 1998, kovo 25, Nr. 6 (164).

**Zemlickas G.**, 2005 – Lietuvos mokslinės archeologijos pradininkas // Mokslo Lietuva. Vilnius, 2005 gruodžio 30, Nr. 22 (334).

**Zvelebil M.**, 2006 – Mobility, contact, and exchange in the Baltic sea basin 6000–2000 BC // Journal of anthropological archaeology. 2006, 25/2, p. 178–92.

**Zvelebil M., and Roley-Conwy P.**, 1984 – Transition to farming in northern Europe: a hunter-gatherer perspective // Norwegian archaeological review. 1984, 17/2, p. 104–128.

**Таутавичюс, А. З.**, 1980 – Балтские племена на территории Литвы в I тысячел. н. э. // Из древнейшей истории балтских народов (по данным археологии и антропологии). 1980, с. 80–88.

**Клейн Л. С.**, 1993 – Феномен советской археологий. Санкт-Петербург, 1993.

**Окладников А. П.**, 1952 – О значении захоронении неандертальцев для истории первобытной культуры // Советская этнография. 1952, 3, с. 159–180.

**Проблемы**, 1985 – Проблемы этногенеза и этнической истории балтов. Вильнюс, 1985.

**Румянцев А. М.**, 1981 – Возникновение и развитие первобытного способа производства. Москва, 1981.



## ŠIANDIENOS TENDENCIJŲ LIETUVOS ARCHEOLOGIJOS EVOLIUCIJA: SOVIETINĖ PRAEITIS IR POSOVIETINĖ DABARTIS

Ieva Paberžytė, Andre Costopoulos

### Santrauka

Evoliucijos teorija yra taikoma tiek biologijoje, tiek sociokultūrinams reiškiniams analizuoti ir paaiškinti. Idėjos tam tikra prasme gali būti prilygintos biologinėms rūšims arba organizmams (Richards, 1978), o mokslo vystymasis gali būti analizuojamas naudojant Darwinizmo koncepcijas, tokias kaip įvairovė, mutacija, atranka ar dreifas. Biologinėje sistemoje organizmai turi adaptyvius, neutralius ir neadaptyvius bruožus. Idėjos taip pat gali būti adaptyvios, neutralios ir neadaptyvios, priklausomai nuo aplinkos sąlygų. Politinė ir socialinė aplinka yra labai svarbūs veiksniai, darantys įtaką mokslo vystymuisi, mokslo idėjų evoliucijai.

XX a. staigūs ir svarbūs sociopolitiniai pokyčiai sudaro palankią terpę evoliuciniam modeliui pritaikyti ir pabandyti suprasti Lietuvos archeologijos mokslo raidą, kaitos priežastis ir šiandienos tendencijas. Todėl, žvelgiant iš evoliucinės perspektyvos ir panaudojant elementus iš mokslo kaitos teorijų (Kuhn, 1962; Popper, 1959; Richards, 1987), mes sukūrėme modelį, kurį pritaikėme Lietuvos archeologijos raidai XX a. išanalizuoti.

Mokslo sistemoje mokslininkai yra aktyvūs veikėjai, idėjų ir praktikų įvairovės kūrėjai. Kita vertus, jie jau yra pritapę prie sociopolitinės aplinkos, nes jau praėjo natūralią atranką (t.y. baigę mokyklas, universitetus). Mokslo sistema yra viena iš atrankos jėgų, kuri atsijoya netinkamus individus bei idėjas konkrečios politinės ideologijos sąlygomis. Todėl idėjos negali būti per daug žalingos ar trikdančios politinei sistemai. Pastarajai pasikeitus kiti mokslininkai tampa lyderiais ir jų idėjos vėl natūraliai atitinka tuometinę politinę sistemą, mažiausiai iki kito žymaus pokyčio politiniame ir ideologiniame klimate.

Aplinkos pokyčiai, t.y. permainos politinėje ir socialinėje sistemoje, veikė skirtingo pobūdžio natūralios atrankos jėgų (*selective pressure*)

įsigalėjimą skirtingais XX amžiaus etapais. Šios jėgos ir suformavo Lietuvos archeologijos discipliną bei jos tradicijas tokias, kokias jas matome šiandien. Žvelgiant į permainas Lietuvos politinėje sistemoje 1940 ir 1990 metais, tikimasi pamatyti atitinkamų pokyčių archeologijos moksle, T. Kuhn (1962) žodžiais tariant, paradig-  
mų kaitą. Tačiau senosios paradigmos, kurios vienas iš bruožų yra aprašomoji archeologijos tradicija, stabilumas po 1990-ųjų metų nepriklausomybės paskelbimo yra akivaizdus.

1940-ais metais, sovietams okupavus Lietuvos valstybę, susiformavo visiškai nauja politinė ir socialinė aplinka. Idėjos, praktikos ir net individai buvo intensyviai šalinami iš Lietuvos archeologijos mokslo. Tai reiškia, kad aplinka nebuvo palanki idėjų įvairovei ir kad veikė stiprios atrankos jėgos (*high selective pressure*), kurias įkūnijo sovietinė valdžia ir jos politika. Idėjų ir individų atranka žymiai sumažino potencialią idėjų įvairovę, Lietuvos archeologijoje egzistavusią nepriklausomoje Lietuvoje. Lietuvos archeologai, tęsę archeologinę praktiką sovietmečiu, buvo natūraliai prisitaikę prie sovietinės sistemos. Vienas pagrindinių adaptyvių bruožų sovietmečiu tapo aprašomasis metodas. Archeologinių radinių ir periodų aprašymas buvo saugiausia archeologinė praktika, kadangi tokio pobūdžio veikla neįpareigojo archeologų įsitraukti į ideologijos diskusijas, netrikdė tuometinės politinės sistemos.

Sovietmečio pabaiga buvo kitas žymus aplinkos pokytis Lietuvos archeologijos istorijoje. Priešingai nei sovietiniais metais, kuomet natūralios atrankos jėgos kryptingai stūmė Lietuvos archeologus į aprašomąją praktiką, po nepriklausomybės paskelbimo 1990-aisiais metais, sociopolitinė aplinka tapo žymiai laisvesnė. Joje archeologai nebėra „atrenkami“ tokiais drastiškais



būdais kaip po 1940-ųjų metų ir gali pateikti žymiai didesnę idėjų įvairovę natūraliai atrankai. Tačiau nepaisant ryškaus politinio pokyčio, senoji paradigma posovietinėje Lietuvos archeologijoje keičiasi gana lėtai. Aprašomoji archeologijos tradicija išlieka pastebimai stabili.

Naujos, kaip ir senos idėjos, laisvesnėje politinėje aplinkoje nebepatiria agresyvios atrankos (*relaxed selective pressure*). Šios aplinkybės sukuria situaciją, kurioje sunku naujoms idėjoms pakeisti senąsias, turinčias ilgą istoriją ir gerai prisitaikiusias. Dabar Lietuvos archeologijoje vyksta idėjų dreifas, kuris natūraliai lėtina paradigmos kaitą. Senąją paradigmą yra įprasta ir patogiu naudoti, ypač vyresniajai archeologų kartai. Evoliuciniais terminais tariant, ji pasiekė savo vietinį optimumą (*local optimum*), – zoną, kurios sunku atsisakyti.

Kuhn'o nuomone, naujos paradigmos sukūrimas yra naujosios kartos užduotis, kurios mąstymas ir pasaulėžiūra yra susiformavusi jau naujoje sociopolitinėje aplinkoje. Vis dėlto vyresnioji karta gali paskatinti naujos paradigmos kūrimą, palikdama savo komforto zoną, praktikuodama skirtingus metodus, toleruodama skirtingas perspektyvas ir skatindama naująją kartą semtis idėjų įvairovės.

Norint sukurti naująją paradigmą būtina pristatyti kuo didesnę idėjų įvairovę natūraliai atrankai. Yra keli pagrindiniai idėjų įvairovės skatinimo keliai ir šaltiniai. Visų pirma, tai jaunoji karta archeologijoje, – studentai ir jauni archeologai, kurie žvelgdami į senas problemas turi originalų požiūrį ir tokiu būdu gali generuoti naujas idėjas ir naujus sprendimus senoms problemoms spręsti. Nors jaunesiems studentams

ir trūksta profesinio paruošimo ir patirties, jų mąstysena formuojasi kitomis sąlygomis nei jų dėstytojų. Jų supratimas apie archeologiją dar tik formuojasi, todėl jaunoji karta tam tikra prasme yra laisvesnė eksperimentuoti ir pateikti netikėtų bei vertingų išvalgų. Naujos kartos idėjos yra vienas iš svarbiausių įvairovės šaltinių. Kitas svarbus idėjų įvairovės šaltinis yra išorinė informacija – kontaktai su užsienio specialistais, tarptautiniai projektai, tarptautinės publikacijos bei konferencijos, užsienio literatūra, stažuotės ir kita.

Esant silpnoms atrankos jėgoms, sovietmečio idėjos ir praktikos vis dar egzistuoja archeologijos idėjų pasaulyje. Kai kurios iš tų idėjų bei koncepcijų be abejonės yra vertingos šiandieninei Lietuvos archeologijai, jau nekalbant apie empirinės medžiagos klodus, sukauptus sovietmečiu. Juos galima analizuoti keliant skirtingus klausimus, pritaikant įvairias teorijas ir kuriant naujus modelius, kurie padėtų suprasti kultūrą ir jos kaitos priežastis.

Lietuvos archeologijos mokslas yra svarbioje kryžkelėje. Staiga atsidūrusi laisvesnėje aplinkoje, Lietuvos archeologija gali plėtoti įvairias ir vertingas tyrinėjimų kryptis, kurios gali tapti svarbiu indėliu visai disciplinai. Tačiau paradigmos kaita yra lėta, nes archeologijos disciplina Lietuvoje į posovietinį laikotarpį įžengė su labai kruopščiai ir kryptingai atrinktomis idėjomis bei praktikomis. Idėjų įvairovei atsirasti reikia laiko. Įvertinus praeities sunkumus ir pasiekimus, Lietuvos archeologai dabar turi galimybę paskatinti naujos archeologinės teorijos atsiradimą ir sąmoningai formuoti Lietuvos archeologijos tradiciją norima linkme.

Ieva Paberžytė

Department of Anthropology, McGill University, Leacock Building,  
855 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal Quebec, Canada H3A 2T7  
ieva.paberzyte@mail.mcgill.ca

Andre Costopoulos

Department of Anthropology, McGill University, Leacock Building,  
855 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal Quebec, Canada H3A 2T7  
andre.costopoulos@mcgill.ca

Gauta 2008 12 15