

VYTAUTAS MAGNUS UNIVERSITY
THE LITHUANIAN INSTITUTE OF HISTORY

Laima BUCEVIČIŪTĖ

**THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA IN THE 15TH-16TH
CENTURIES: THE CONCEPT OF STATE DOMAIN AND
ITS TERRITORIAL BOUNDARIES**

Summary of Doctoral Dissertation

Humanities, History (05 H)

Kaunas, 2010

The Dissertation was written at Vytautas Magnus University in 2006–2010.
The right to conduct doctoral studies was granted to Vytautas Magnus University together with Lithuanian Institute of History under the resolution No. 926 of the Government of Republic of Lithuania on the 15th of July, 2003.

Supervisor:

Prof. dr. Zigmantas Kiaupa (History – 05 H, Humanities, Vytautas Magnus University)

The dissertation will be defended at the Council of History (Area: Humanities) of Vytautas Magnus University and Lithuanian Institute of History.

Chairman:

Assoc. prof. dr. Vaida Kamuntavičienė (Vytautas Magnus University, Humanities, History – 05 H)

Members:

Assoc. prof. dr. Vidmantas Daugirdas (The Institute of Geology and Geography, Physical Sciences, Geography – 06 P)

Assoc. prof. dr. Rimvydas Petrauskas (Vilnius University, Humanities, History – 05 H)

Assoc. prof. dr. Edmundas Rimša (Lithuanian Institute of History, Humanities, History – 05 H)

Dr. Ramunė Šmigelskytė–Stukienė (Lithuanian Institute of History, Humanities, History – 05 H)

Opponents:

Assoc. prof. dr. Rita Regina Trimonienė (Siauliai University, Humanities, History – 05 H)

Assoc. prof. dr. Rūstis Kamuntavičius (Vytautas Magnus University, Humanities, History – 05 H)

The official defence of the dissertation will be held at a public sitting of the Council of History (Area: Humanities) in the Adolfas Šapoka auditorium (508 a.) (Vytautas Magnus University) at 13 pm on October 7, 2010.

Address: 52 K. Donelaičio Street, LT–44244, Kaunas, Lithuania

Phone: +370 37 327836

The summary of the doctoral dissertation was distributed on September ..., 2010.
The dissertation is available in the following libraries: National Martynas Mažvydas Library of Lithuania; Library of Vytautas Magnus University; and Library of Lithuanian Institute of History.

VYTAUTO DIDŽIOJO UNIVERSITETAS
LIETUVOS ISTORIJOS INSTITUTAS

Laima BUCEVIČIŪTĖ

**LIETUVOS DIDŽIOJI KUNIGAİKŠTYSTĖ XV–XVI A.:
VALSTYBĖS ERDVĖS IR JOS SIENŲ SAMPRATA**

Daktaro disertacijos santrauka
Humanitariniai mokslai, Istorija (05 H)

Kaunas, 2010

Disertacija rengta 2006–2010 m. Vytauto Didžiojo universitete
Doktorantūros teisė suteikta Vytauto Didžiojo universitetui kartu su Lietuvos istorijos
institutu 2003 m. liepos 15 d. Lietuvos Respublikos Vyriausybės nutarimu Nr. 926

Mokslinis vadovas:

Prof. dr. Zigmantas Kiaupa (Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai,
istorija – 05 H)

**Disertacija ginama Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto ir Lietuvos istorijos instituto
Humanitarinių mokslų srities istorijos krypties taryboje:**

Pirmininkas

Doc. dr. Vaida Kamuntavičienė (Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, humanitariniai
mokslai, istorija – 05 H)

Nariai:

Doc. dr. Vidmantas Daugirdas (Geologijos ir geografijos institutas, fiziniai
mokslai, geografija – 06 P)

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

Doc. dr. Edmundas Rimša (Lietuvos istorijos institutas, humanitariniai mokslai,
istorija – 05 H)

Dr. Ramunė Šmigelskytė–Stukienė (Lietuvos istorijos institutas, humanitariniai
mokslai, istorija – 05 H)

Oponentai:

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

Doc. dr. Rūstis Kamuntavičius (Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, humanitariniai
mokslai, istorija – 05 H)

Disertacija bus ginama viešame Humanitarinių mokslų srities istorijos krypties tarybos
posėdyje, kuris vyks 2010 m. spalio 7 d. 13 val. Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto A.
Šapokos auditorijoje (508 a.)

Adresas: K. Donelaičio g. 52, LT–44246, Lietuva
Tel. +370 37 327836

Disertacijos santrauka išsiųsta 2010 m. rugsėjo ... d.

Disertaciją galima peržiūrėti Lietuvos nacionalinėje Martyno Mažvydo, Vytauto
Didžiojo universiteto ir Lietuvos istorijos instituto bibliotekose

THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA IN THE 15TH–16TH CENTURIES: THE CONCEPT OF STATE DOMAIN AND ITS TERRITORIAL BOUNDARIES

Introduction

The Main Topic and Its Relevance.

The history of the boundaries, territory and space of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the 15th–16th centuries is a broad subject. Issues relating to the territory and boundaries of the Lithuanian State as well as their complex groups have received great attention in the historiography. The changing territory of the state is analysed in the context of political history. Specific issues relating to boundaries are examined in the geographic context, and their localization problems are solved. However, the research also discusses how people perceived the existing state boundaries and technologies used to establish them; what the apprehension of the state boundaries and domain was; whether the parallel process dominated or a varied relationship prevailed. The above mentioned research topics, i.e. the boundaries that existed in reality and their perception in people's minds are the basis of the issues developed in this paper.

Historiography.

The main aspects and problems discussed in the research are based on the works by Jūratė Kiaupienė (*Lietuvos istorija*, t. 4: J. Kiaupienė, R. Petrauskas, Nauji horizontai: dinastija, visuomenė, valstybė. Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštystė 1386–1529 m., Vilnius, Baltos lankos, 2009), Tomas Čelkis (T. Čelkis, Nuo teritorinio ruožo prie linijos: sienų sampratos pokyčiai Lietuvos Didžiojoje Kunigaikštystėje XIV–XVI amžiuje, *Lietuvos istorijos studijos*, 2008, t. 22), and Zenonas Norkus (Z. Norkus, Ar Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštija buvo imperija?, *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštijos tradicija ir paveldo „dalybos“*, Vilnius, 2008; Z. Norkus, Apie antrąjį Kijevo, kurio taip ir nebuvo: Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštystė lyginamosios istorinės imperijų sociologijos ir tarptautinių santykių teorijos retrospektyvoje, *Politologija*, 2007, Nr. 1; Z. Norkus, *Nepasiskelbusioji imperija: Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštija lyginamosios istorinės imperijų sociologijos požiūriu*, Vilnius, Aidai, 2009). The concept of the historic landscape formulated by Jūratė Kiaupienė depicted compelling historic events that at the same time showed the interface between geopolitical, geocultural and

perceptual domain, and possible outcome of the changes. The object and main issues in this research are closely related to the article by Tomas Čelkis in which he aimed to determine the historic development of the western boundaries between the Grand Duchy and the Teutonic (German Order of Knights) and Livonian Orders; and also to determine the genesis and development of the linear concept of the boundaries. Zenonas Norkus' sociohistorical studies that revealed the first signs of the imperial rule in the Grand Duchy were similarly relevant to the discussion of this paper, as well as other historiographic literature on the history of Lithuanian boundaries with its neighbouring states. The research on the northern and western boundaries between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Livonia, and the Teutonic Order, later the Duchy of Prussia was developed by scholars such as *Kurt Forstreuter*, *Hans Jürgen Karp*, *Zbysław Wojtkowiak*, *Władysław Pocięcha*, *Janusz Małek*, *Abdon Kłodziński*, *Marita Jakovleva*, *Zenonas Ivinskis*, *Rokas Varakauskas*, *Bronius Dundulis*. The problem of the boundary between Lithuania and Poland was analysed by *Semion Sholkovich*, *Gotthold Rhode*, *Oskar Halecki*, *Stanisław Zajęczkowski*, *Jan Jakubowski*, *Alina Wilkiewicz-Wawrzyńczykowa*, *Dorota Michaliuk*, *Józef Maroszek*. The study by *Jan Natanson-Leski* was relevant to the issue of the eastern boundary between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Moscow. The most recent historiography was associated with *Viktor Temushev's* name. One of the most significant analyses on the prairie factor in the southern boundary of the Grand Duchy was linked to the scientific works by *Michail Grushevski*, *Fyodor Petrun*, *Feliks Shabuldo*, *Michael Ždan*, *Bertold Spuler*, *Boris Cherkas*.

Sources.

The analysis of mental and ideological discourse on the state domain was based on three groups of sources: a set of narratives of the 16th century (Lithuanian chronicles; chronicles of the 16th century; eristic, poetic and biographic works by Polish and Lithuanian authors); maps of the 15th–16th centuries (maps of Europe, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Poland, The Duchy of Prussia, the state of Moscow, Tartarian hordes); and legal documents of the Grand Duchy (sovereigns' privileges of the Grand Duchy and non Lithuanian regions, and the First Statute of Lithuania).

Another set of sources used in this research was associated with the actual Lithuanian boundaries. The main sources consisted of diplomatic and negotiating

documents between The Grand Duchy and its neighbours (Livonia, the Teutonic Order, Poland, the state of Moscow, and Tartarian hordes); ambassadors' speeches; clerical documents of the Lithuanian Metrica; official published agreements; and delimitation and demarcation documents. In addition, published works by *Motiejus Dogelis*, *Ignot Danilowicz*, *Karol Edward Napierski*, and publications by Russian history assembly in the 19th century were quoted in the dissertation. The messengers' book published in 1545–1572, and the Lithuanian Metrica (book number 560) that was solely devoted to the delimitation and demarcation of the boundary between Lithuania and Livonia in 1542 were used as a reference.

Research Objective, Tasks and Aim.

The domain and boundaries of the Grand Duchy are the main objectives of this paper; while the main aim is to analyse the actual state boundaries and domain, and the way they were perceived on mental and ideological levels. The main tasks undertaken in the paper were the following: to analyse the concept of the state domain in the narrative discourse, old maps, and legal state documents; to point out the delimitation and demarcation procedures in relation to the boundaries between Lithuania and Livonia, the Teutonic Order, Poland, the state of Moscow, and Tartarian hordes, and their influence on the development of the territorial model; and to evaluate the specifics of the changing regional boundaries and territory.

The additional tasks included the histogrammic analysis of research objectives in the works by foreign scholars. This enabled them to interpret certain aspects of the research objectives by drawing parallels. Another task was to study the terminology of the sources of the 15th–16th centuries, and their semantic usage in certain context that helped to understand the language of the old sources.

Methodology.

Descriptive, comparative, textologic, cartographic and structural analysis methods.

Structure.

The paper consists of introduction, the body that is divided into three sections, conclusions, bibliography, and appendices that include copies of old maps, and cartographic charts made by the author herself.

In the first section the theoretical discourse of the problem is described. The second section is aimed at discussing the meaning of the terminology of the old sources and its usage. The third section is the main of the three, divided into two subsections. The first subsection analyses the mental and ideological discourse on the concept of the state domain and boundaries. In the second subsection the analysed objective is geographically divided into northern and western state boundaries, and eastern and southern state boundaries. The last subsection of the third section presents the evaluation of the regional boundary measurement and regional development.

1. Territory, Boundaries and Domain: Theoretical Discourse of the Problem

The theoretical discourse on the formation of the state territory, domain, and boundaries depend on the methodology of different studies. These three dimensions are perceived as a complex phenomenon that links the physical geographic, political administrative and cultural forces. In the boundary development the metaphysical, sociocultural and political administrative levels are distinctive. The interface between the levels represented linear or area boundaries or both as differentiated and dependent on certain political, administrative or mental attribution. The boundaries that restricted the state territory in a structural sense were considered complicated systems which developed in a certain pattern by conquering the territory in a war or defence, in a socioeconomic or cultural and ideological way. The characteristics of the concept of frontier were versatile, and its analysis directly depended on the interpretations of the boundary development.

2. The Boundaries of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania: Terminology Usage

The terminology on boundaries used in the multilingual sources of the 15th and 16th centuries was polysemantic. The delimitation terms described the object itself (e.g. boundary, border), but not its shape, character or features. At the time the content, semantics, and usage of the terminology were not clearly defined. The same term was

used to define the boundary as an object (delimitation), as a sign (demarcation) or both. As a matter of fact, there was no terminology to define the state, and private domains. In multilingual research of the modern times, the terminology on the boundary and domain, their shape and character was differentiated with clear semantics, and corresponding meanings. Furthermore, different terms were used to describe the relationship between boundaries and their domain expressing certain aspects of the characteristic features. Therefore, it was difficult to adapt the modern terminology to the research of boundaries and domain in the 15th and 16th centuries.

3. The Territory, Boundaries, and Domain of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the 15th and 16th Centuries

The State Domain and its Boundaries: mental and ideological aspect of the territorial perception

The mental and ideological attitudes towards the concept of the Lithuanian domain were analysed with the help of old maps, legal documents, and narrative discourse. The research discovered that the examination of the state territory, boundaries and domain in the old cartographic maps directly depended on cartographers' knowledge, interests, and the size of the territory. The shape of the state domain in the map presupposed the mental and ideological aspects of the statehood perception, expansion or territorial loss. It was also possible to trace the tendencies in the development of the state boundaries; however, the chronology of the maps and the time when they were made was inadequate. Almost all of the cartographic maps in the 16th century showed parts of the Lithuanian territory varied in size; however, only the entire state territory in the map could reveal cartographers' ideas and perception. The entire territory of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was represented for the first time in Gerardus Mercator's map of Lithuania in 1595. The representation of the western, northern, and some of the eastern boundaries was partly exact, while in the south-eastern and prairies significant cartographic errors were discovered. Gerardus Mercator's map was the only work of cartography in the 16th century dedicated exclusively to the Lithuanian territory. The Lithuanian territory also appeared in other cartographers' maps in the 16th century; however, it was not their main focus. It was

mainly depicted as a neighbouring state. As a result, the map did not show the whole state territory.

The paper briefly discusses the maps of Prussia. Henenberger's maps depicted a small margin of the Lithuanian territory – the frontier with Prussia. There were localization mistakes and other inaccuracies; however, as a result of the scale, the frontier was depicted quite precisely by marking a lot of settlements, and other objects mentioned in delimitation agreements. In Henenberger and his followers' maps there was a record of the Prostki (German *Prostken*) that was associated with the actual boundary sign of the frontier in 1545.

Furthermore, another significant example of the old cartography that represented mental and ideological concept on the state territory and domain was associated with the Mikalojus Kristupas Radvila–Našlaitėlis's map of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in 1613. The state and administrative boundaries in his map were treated as different territorial boundaries by using different arbitrary signs and symbols. The map depicted binary state boundaries – before the Union of Lublin and after. It defined the boundaries after the union as provisional, and highlighted the Lithuanian territory before the union. This illustration showed that it was possible and efficient to reveal the ideological state foundation and mental state character with the help of cartographic means. The explanatory message that followed the map read as follows: "the regions that belonged to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania are not as evident as they should be; however, the old boundaries are defined precisely". The cartography of the Dnieper River on the right of the map was also an important entry that testified of the former territory during Vytautas rule.

The authors of the map of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in 1613 were involved in the politics of the state and revealed the political evaluation of the Lithuanian territory. They conveyed the mental image of the state domain and territory with the help of graphics. As graphical expressions were not sufficient, numerous texts were used in maps to express the significant declaration of the political solidarity and territorial integrity.

Documents that regulated the legal situation of the state contained facts confirming certain aspects of the state domain. The concept of the state domain had an adequate representation in the main legal state documents, i.e. the privileges of the

Grand Duchy of Lithuania and non-Lithuanian regional sovereigns, and the First Statute of Lithuania. A clear concept of the state domain was first mentioned in Kazimieras' privilege in 1447. It included statements in relation to the stability of the state territory and confirmed the domain integrity. The statements became the foundation for the legal documents in other states. Some of the legal regulations were even included into the First Statute of Lithuania. The third section of the Statute ascertained that the territorial integrity was maintained and protected. Regional privileges marked the political and economic relations between the grand dukes of Lithuania and people of the joined lands. The conditions mentioned in the privileges most often used the phrase that all must remain as "in old times". The emphasis on "the old times" was associated with clearly stated or predicted territorial safety of the region. In a way it was a sovereigns' promise not to decrease territories or negatively affect the integrity in any other way.

The legal state documents in the 15th–16th centuries, mainly general state and regional privileges, formed a regulation to maintain the old order without any new innovations. There was a clear implication not to change the boundaries of the territory or not transfer or give it to any other sovereign. Various agreements regulating the foreign relations between the Grand Duchy and neighbouring countries at the time or afterwards, letters, messengers' speeches and instructions were often based on the above mentioned aspects of the privileges which declared that the only possible compromise was to legalise the state boundary according to the old boundaries (*no старому*).

Another aspect of the research was the narrative texts of the 16th century. They developed the ideological and mental understanding of the state territory and domain. The cultural and genre characteristics of the narrative production in the 16th century could not be discussed through the prism of the modern literature because the concept of literature as a science was not fully developed at the time. Every narrative piece of work could be perceived as a literary text, a historical source or a document emphasising people's mentality and intellectual qualities of the certain period.

Transcriptions of Lithuanian chronicles testified to political events, ability to reason on a political level, and to present evaluations within the ideological framework of the statehood of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Though there were few geographical facts on the state domain and its boundaries, it was stated that the geopolitical dimension in the chronicles was obvious. The geopolitical identity was based on

Vytautas' personality and his territorial achievements. The concept of the Lithuanian domain in the Polish texts was characteristic of the problem regarding the lands of Podole and Voluine that received a lot of attention and was explained in the framework of the Polish statehood. The eastern territories in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania received some attention as well, but the concept of the domain was too proprietary. It could be assumed that the Polish efforts to protect the expansion of the Lithuanian territory and its domain stability were a frequent topic in the Polish chronicles. It held a clear ideological foundation that the Polish were superior to the Lithuanians, and if that had not been for their military support, Vytautas would not have achieved such significant territorial victory.

The issue of the state domain in the 16th century in narrative sources was part of individual authors' experience, interests, and ability to think on a geopolitical level. This led to the multilayered concept of the state domain. The image of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania as a regional and geopolitical power revealed a specific character of the state domain built on the concept of the state formed in the beginning of the 15th century. Significant territorial losses in the 16th century influenced the strong image of Vytautas as a conqueror and founder of the state domain.

The concept of a geopolitical influence of Lithuania in the 16th century that reached the shores of the Black Sea in the written texts became a mythological image of the state that influenced the minds of the intellectual. The image of the state territory that was evident in the first quarter of the 15th century made it possible to adequately evaluate the historic changes, and encouraged the formation of the existential state patterns within the above mentioned discourse.

State territory and its boundaries: structure, development, and regional features

Northern and western state boundaries. The analysis of the boundary between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Livonia in the 15th–16th centuries emphasised that the evolution of the borderline from territorial concept to linear which limited and legally authorised what was within the state territory was a natural development, and parallel to the settlements of the frontier. In less populated areas of the frontier natural barriers had to be overcome, i.e. to conquer the landscape. Therefore, as the need arose to divide

state areas and create a clear borderline, the choice for boundary markings was limited. There were attempts to look for less distinctive signs such as trees, stones, hills etc. However, the best sign was lakes and river-beds. Those natural geographic objects created the effect of trajectory; as a result, they were used for the route subordination. As the population density increased, there was a broader variety of signs to mark the boundaries. Dense segments of boundaries made it easier to define precisely the distance that connected the signs while using exact units of measurement. Thus, measurements of boundary segments appeared in the texts on delimitation until eventually the populated frontier became a landmark. Due to increasing social and economic resistance in the populated frontier, the administrative relationships developed with the central authority. Frontier districts that had territorial contact with another state were regarded as a boundary landmark. In that instance, the segments of boundaries had not only a clear starting point, measured landmarks, but also their own names were identical to the names of districts. The borderline was clear, and the landmarks were sufficiently dense. It was possible to start writing coordinates of landmarks in the delimitation documents in a numeric order: the seventh, the eighth, the sixteenth etc. The function of the boundary signs was not only to establish state boundaries within the state but also to guarantee territorial state distinctiveness as shown by the signage practice where the signs were oriented oppositely. Boundary signs were standardised to a physical form, later symbolic state attributes were added to them.

On a political and administrative level, the western boundary marked the territorial contact between Lithuania and the Teutonic Order; after secularisation of the Order in 1525 – with the Duchy of Prussia. However, the changes were not significant to the development of boundaries and concept of territory. On the contrary, the boundary development was a natural process which similarly to Livonia was influenced by settlements in the frontier and antropogenisation of forests that divided parts of populated territories. The arbitrary signs on the boundary appeared at the end of the 14th century. They marked new solutions of the problems between the states, and presented the state domain in a context of actual territory. That was influenced by the Teutonic Order which was considered one of the most developed European countries in territorial organisation, and structural rule system. The neighbouring states of the Order dictated the rules and diplomatic code. Regardless of military conflicts and incompatible

political aspirations, the “division model” of the European territory suggested by the Germans was a positive factor which affected the conceptual changes of the western Lithuanian territory and development of the borderline.

The Treaty of Melno in 1422 included a description of subordination on natural and geographic objects and measurements of the linked objects. However, differently to the simultaneous delimitation of the boundaries between Lithuania and Livonia in 1426, the arbitrary signs were not used in defining the borderline. After the Treaty of Melno, the western boundary between the Grand Duchy and the German Order of Knights was not entirely demarcated. The regulations were constantly renewed, and there was a requirement to specify and mark certain segments of the boundary. The latest unsuccessful attempt was in 1492 but it resulted in signing formal statements by renewing the regulations of the Treaty of Melno (1422). The demarcation works from the Širvinta River to the Šventoji River were only completed in 1517. Those conditions could not deny the improvements in the development of the state territory and borderline.

The 16th century in the historical context of boundaries between Lithuania and the Order and the Duchy of Prussia since 1525 was a period not only of well organised delimitation and demarcation processes but also of never ending conflicts in the frontier. The boundary demarcation in 1545 led to the political and legal status of the boundary signs.

As per a decision in 1545, the boundary was moved to the southeast in favour of Prussia, and Elko city was in the periphery of the Grand Duchy, Poland, and Prussia. It became a landmark too. As ordered by leaders’ of the two states, it was decided to build a sign of the state boundaries on the newly formed state borderline. The sign already had the physical features characteristic of the ones in today’s demarcation practice. It was a vertical stone post marked with state armorial symbols and words. That pointed to a modern and European outlook towards the establishment of the state domain.

In the general history of the Lithuanian and Prussian boundaries, the boundary renovation act in 1545 set precedent for the development of standardised system of boundary signs, and showed a final result of the state territory and linear concept of the boundaries. The borderline of the actual boundaries were represented by posts marked with armorial state signs.

The development of the boundary between Lithuania and Poland in the 15th–16th centuries was regarded in an ambiguous manner. The actual form of the linear boundary characteristic of the vicinity of Lithuania, Livonia and the Teutonic Order was represented in the agreements between states but in a different way. Though the corrective and regulatory works took place, the official agreements were not made. The delimitation and demarcation procedures were recorded in the committee documents and had legal power; however, they did not influence legal agreements between the states. One of the most important delimitation and demarcation actions between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Poland was in 1546. The members of the committee checked and clarified all of the boundaries going from the Lyko River which was chosen as a starting point in the north, the periphery of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Masovia and Prussia, and up to Podole in the south of Khamenecas.

The approved laws spoke of the existence of the independent Lithuanian and Polish states and their political character of the boundaries. The major problem that determined the specifics of the Lithuanian and Polish boundaries was the division of Podlesia and Podole lands that caused the long-term confusion and influenced the perception of boundaries. According to the old dwellers of the frontier, they were well aware of the boundaries and extent of their domain associated with Vytautas and Švitrigaila's times. However, there was no clear understanding what the "boundary with Poland" phenomenon meant or where it led to. Therefore, people essentially realised that there were two separate states, i.e. Lithuania and Poland, but not what "the boundary of the Crown" actually represented. In addition, it could be clearly seen that there was poor orientation in relation to the administrative units of the frontier. In other words, it meant that people could see that boundary of their land was in the district which belonged to the Grand Duchy but they did not realise that the boundary of the district in the frontier was also the boundary of the state.

Eastern and southern state boundaries. The boundaries between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and its neighbours in the east and south were determined by different concepts and procedures as no clear or detailed boundary geography existed. One of the main features that predetermined the principle of territory division was according to special records without drawing a borderline. Contrary to the boundaries between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Teutonic Order, these boundaries were

not under any special agreements but the ones that mainly dealt with peace and truce issues, and regulated the changing state territory. Such practice between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Moscow was used in 1449, 1494, 1503, 1508, and 1522, and afterwards when the truce and peace agreements were made. After the last conflict, the peace agreement that defined the boundary in 1537 when Gomel and Liubech returned to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and the political and military situation was stabilised, the conditions were favourable for the boundary development between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Moscow. However, there was no exact information regarding the delimitation and demarcation processes. One can state that the situation in the frontier after 1537 remained stable and peaceful for around 20 years, i.e. till the beginning of Livonia war. As per each of the above mentioned agreements, the state boundaries would change according to the political situation at the time. However, the demarcation process did not take place, and the eastern part of the Lithuanian territory did not acquire features characteristic of the territorial state.

Truce agreements implied a continuous war or temporarily interrupted war actions; therefore, the boundary issue was solved not as a final result of the war but as an intermediate result. Territorial division based on the records was one of the most acceptable decisions.

The issue of the southern boundary was more complicated. The prairies were the cause of conflicts between the Lithuanian sovereigns and khans of the Tartarian hordes. The issue of precise borderlines or domain division was too problematic. The analysis of the regional duchies in relation to the development of the eastern boundaries in the last decade of the 15th–beginning of the 16th century pointed out that an uncertain status and self-governance of the regional sovereigns while deciding upon the service and territory had a negative influence on the boundary development in the east between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Moscow in the upper reaches of the Oka and Ugra Rivers. In other words, these conditions gave no preconditions for the formation of a more precise borderline. The territory obtained by Moscow after the Grand Duchy of Lithuania lost the territories of Mstislavl, Obolensk, Kozelsk, Odojev, Vorotinsk, Belyov, Novosil and others had an important strategic meaning. The occupancy of the upper reaches of the Dnieper River, expansion to the upper reaches of the Oka and Ugra

Rivers by taking over the strategically favoured natural habitat of the Ugra River opened the way to further expansion to the territory of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

According to certain records, the political relations between Lithuania and Moscow that divided the territories formed a nonlinear concept of the boundaries, and a completely different model of the state territory to the one of the western part. Nevertheless, there were instances in the boundary geography between the Grand Duchy and Moscow that were regarded as similar to the western part of the state based on the structure, and perception. They were in the sections of Sebezh, Gomel, Polotsk and Vitebsk based on linear boundary development, and showed fragmentary and topical features the process. However, the actual linear boundary forms in the frontier between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Moscow were formed by the dynamics of the territorial loss, and the initiative of the process lay in the political decisions of the state of Moscow.

The strategic development of the Lithuanian territory between the Dnieper and Dniester rivers towards the Black Sea occurred during Vytautas rule. It did not lead to the actual boundary development process. The Lithuanian sovereigns acknowledged the necessity to colonise the prairies in order to maintain them. Those attempts were unsuccessful, and eventually the cultural and regional differences between the Tartarians and Cossaks became the main reasons for conflicts against the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the prairies. The prairies that separated the Tartarian world and the Grand Duchy did not belong to anyone. As a result, there were no conditions or possibilities for the boundary development. The former borderline which was mentioned in agreements and other documents should be treated as provisional. Building the network of castles in the Ukrainian lands during Vytautas rule embodied a certain sense of the state boundary in the south. It was probably the only factor that represented the settlements.

Conclusions

1. Mostly all cartographic sources in the 16th century contained examples of parts of the Lithuanian territory that varied in their size; however, solely the entire state domain on the map could reveal cartographers' ideas of the time. The entire domain of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was shown in Gerardus Mercator's map in 1595 and in

Mikalojus Kristupas Radvila–Našlaitėlis's map in 1613. The scale of the maps of the 16th century Europe was too small to estimate the details of the cartographic picture of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania; it only confirmed the fact that the state was indeed cartographed. The map of the Grand Duchy in 1613 showed a political perspective on the Lithuanian territory: it depicted the mental image of the state domain and reflected territory with the help of graphs.

2. The regional privileges on the Grand Duchy in the 15th–16th centuries were treated as state documents that confirmed the idea to unify the state territory, and protect it on a legal level. Kazimieras' privilege in 1447 declared the necessity for a stable state territory which appeared in almost all other sovereigns' privileges and was used in the First Statute of Lithuania. The legal foundation for the regional privileges was also based on the demonstrations of political solidarity towards the Lithuanian state in exchange for the verification that certain rights and privileges would remain. The discussed privileges declared the legal territorial integrity which formed and influenced the concept of the common domain consisting of the Lithuanian state territory and integrated non-Lithuanian lands, and ways to maintain it. It was a representation of the state territorial unity.

3. The analysis of the narrative discourse on state territory, boundaries, and domain of Lithuania in the 16th century revealed two perspectives. Firstly, according to the Lithuanian Chronicles and other literature of the Grand Duchy, the Lithuanian domain was expressed by emphasising the statehood while the geopolitical identity was associated with Vytautas, the conqueror and founder of the domain. Secondly, in the Polish Chronicles, the expansive territory of the Grand Duchy was acknowledged as a fact; however, there was emphasis on the political and military support from Poland which ensured the Lithuanian domain in the east. The narrative discourse in the 16th century presented with the dimensional model of the Lithuanian domain. In addition, the history of boundaries did not receive same attention: it mostly highlighted the concept of eastern and south-western state domain while northern and western boundaries were considered less important.

4. While defining the Lithuanian boundary there was an evident distinction between delimitation and demarcation procedures that were exercised by persons of different legal competencies and based on bilateral relation. As a result, the legality of

the procedures was not grounded entirely on legal norms of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. In most cases, the legal regulations regarding the boundaries of private land was likely a solution while trying to handle the delimitation and demarcation problems of the state territory.

5. The development of the Lithuanian boundary with Livonia and the Teutonic Order took different directions. The boundary dividing the states evolved from the concept of the frontier zone or territorial strip characteristic of the period before the state system to the concept of linear boundaries that limited and legally authorised what was within the state and outside it, and created the model of state territory. The whole process was parallel to the settlements of the frontier influenced by colonization. Regardless of regional differences it influenced the populated frontier, and was considered the most important factor in the borderline formation and its physical marking.

6. The first manifestations of the concept of linear boundary and of the state territorial model in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania were linked to actions to develop boundaries between the Grand Duchy and Livonia and the Teutonic Order in the first decades of the 15th century. During that period the frontier line was outlined by subordinating physical, geographic, social, and economic signs, and measuring the distance between the interconnected objects. The same applied to delimitation and demarcation procedures. The concept of linear boundaries and territorial state of the Grand Duchy developed into its complete form in the middle of the 16th century. This was associated with the first indications of the unified boundary sign system with the national attributes. The improvement in the perception of the Lithuanian territory and its boundaries was considered a result of the cultural communication between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the states of the Order. There was an actual grasp of the state boundaries (the course of boundary signs in their physical shape on the ground surface), and the distinctiveness of the territory (the symbolism of the state in the boundary signage – personalised relationship between authority and territory).

7. In the case of the Lithuanian and Polish states, the concept of linear boundary was present. It was determined by geographical, social, economic objects, and their subordination though the boundary structure had binary jurisdiction, i.e. the domain line of the same frontier was recognised as a private property and also as belonging to the

state. As for physical shape, the boundary between Lithuania and Poland was not different from the model of a private border; however, its political aspect was expressed through the institutional Lithuanian sovereign's agency.

8. The boundary between Lithuania and Moscow was defined in the records from both states. Therefore, it was considered the most distinctive way of defining state boundaries in the 15th–16th centuries. Signs of an existing boundary on the separate sides of Lithuania and Moscow that may be found in some written sources in Moscow brought changes to the concept of the nonlinear boundary. The political program of the state of Moscow oriented towards the idea of uniting all Russian lands was the main factor preventing the development of the boundary line. The constant truce when Moscow was claiming back all the Russian lands conquered by the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was regarded as a deliberate political intention, and delay to carry out delimitation and demarcation.

9. The regional factor of the development of the eastern boundary of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the last decade of the 15th century and beginning of the 16th century was regarded as an example of boundary heterogeneity, and a subject of manipulation by the Moscow state. The regional dukes of the upper reaches of the Oka River, who declared their political independence to the Grand Duchy or Moscow, perceived their land on a state level but they could change the boundaries if they decided to move onto the other side. The vague status and autonomy of regional dukes while solving appointment issues or the fate of the controlled territory had negative impact on the development of the eastern boundary between Moscow and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the upper reaches of the Oka and Ugra rivers.

10. The development of the Lithuanian southern boundary in the 15th–16th centuries and conditions for change were greatly affected by the prairies. The problem of prairie as a natural barrier was considered very important. It also determined the actual non-existent boundaries with the Tartarian world. The network of castles in the Ukrainian prairie was the factor that formed the disjuncture of the boundaries.

11. The study of the Lithuanian territory, boundaries and domain in the 15th–16th centuries showed that the actual state boundaries and outline of their mental and ideological perception correlated. The evaluation of the mental and ideological perception of the state boundaries and domain and of (non)existing actual boundaries,

their delimitation and demarcation procedures pointed out that the most sensitive points in the perception of the domain and its boundaries were associated with the eastern and southern territories in the Lithuanian state. Those territories were characteristic of a lot of political pressure and uncertainty of the actual separation of boundaries, and technical ways to define it. The confusion in the communication between the neighbouring states, the structurally faulty system of determining the boundaries in the region which prevented the countries gradually seek for the territorial state model and the effect of prairie as a complex natural barrier induced the vision of a safe geopolitical identity. This vision, as a result, was associated with the Lithuanian territory when ruled by Vytautas, and political efforts to win back and protect former territorial integrity were approved by a set of legal state documents. This insight was based on all sources selected to analyse the question of mental and ideological state domain. On the contrary, the linear model of the state boundaries and territory gradually developed from the boundaries and territorial zones. It was characteristic of the times before the state system, associated with the neighbouring states – the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Order. In addition, the linear model was not reflected in the ideological and mental evaluation level of the state territory and its boundaries. The western and northern state boundaries in the old maps were viewed as the most accurate and with very few interpretations; and historians maintained objectivity while describing the neighbouring states – Lithuania and the Order – in their narrative discourse. In the discourse on ideological perception of Lithuania and its territory, the issue of boundaries between Lithuania and Poland consisted of two main parts – the subject of Voluine and Podole, and also the political and territorial outcomes of the Union of Lublin to the Lithuanian state. Meanwhile the actual practice of defining boundaries and communication between the states was regarded as causing less political pressure than the mental image of the facts and factors that motivated Lithuania to defend its geopolitical identity against the Polish influence.

LIETUVOS DIDŽIOJI KUNIGAIKŠTYSTĖ XV–XVI A.: VALSTYBĖS ERDVĖS IR JOS SIENŲ SAMPRATA

Santrauka

XV–XVI a. Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės (toliau – LDK) sienų, teritorijos ir erdvės istorija yra plati ir daugialypė tema. Atskiri Lietuvos valstybės teritorijos ir sienų klausimai ar kompleksinės jų grupės istoriografijoje yra sulaukę deramo dėmesio. Valstybės teritorijos kaita analizuojama politinės istorijos šviesoje, konkretūs sienų klausimai gvildenami istorinės geografijos kontekstuose, sprendžiamos jų lokalizacijos problemos ir kt. Tačiau svarbia tyrimų kryptimi laikytina ir tai, kaip greta realiai egzistavusių sienų, jų nustatymo technikos ir technologijos, valstybės ribos egzistavo mentalinėje žmonių sąmonėje, koks buvo valstybės sienų suvokimas bei valstybės erdvės pajauta; ar tai buvo lygiagretūs ir paraleliniai procesai, ar tarp jų egzistavo genetinis ryšys. Būtent šie du tyrimo lygmenys – realiai egzistavusios sienos ir jų mentalinis suvokimas – suformavo šio darbo problemos rėmus.

Pasirinktos problemos ir koncepcijos požiūriu svarbiausios tyrinėjimų pozicijos sietinos su *Jūratės Kiaupienės, Tomo Čelkio, Zenono Norkaus* vardais. J. Kiaupienės formuluojama istorijos kraštovaizdžio samprata atskleidžia įtikinamą istorijos įvykių horizontą, kuriame vienu metu galima matyti geopolitinės, geokultūrinės, mentalinės erdvės sąveiką bei jos pasekmes ir sukeltas permainas. Tyrimo objekto ir problemos požiūriu artimas T. Čelkio straipsnis, skirtas LDK vakarinių sienų su Vokiečių ir Livonijos ordinais formavimosi istorijai, linijinės sienų sampratos genezei ir raidai nustatyti. Z. Norkaus socioistorinių tyrimų ciklas, skirtas atskleisti LDK prigimtyje slypėjusias imperijos užuomazgas, taip pat buvo aktualus šio darbo koncepcijai išgryninti. Be kita ko minėtina gausi istoriografija skirta Lietuvos ir jos kaimynų sienų istorijai. Šiaurinėms ir vakarinėms LDK sienoms su Livonijos bei Vokiečių ordinu, vėliau Prūsijos kunigaikštyste daug dėmesio skyrė *Kurtas Forstreuteris, Hansas Jūrgenas Karpas, Zbysławas Wojtkowiakas, Władysławas Pociecha, Janusz as Małtekas, Abdonas Kłodziński, Marita Jakovleva, Zenonas Ivinskis, Rokas Varakauskas, Bronius Dundulis*. Lietuvos ir Lenkijos sienos problemą analizavo *Semionas Šolkovičius, Gottholdas Rhode, Oskaras Haleckis, Stanisławas*

Zajączkowski, Janas Jakubowski, Alina Wilkiewicz–Wawrzyńczykowa, Dorota Michaliuk, Józefas Maroszekas. LDK rytinės sienos su Maskva problematikai itin aktualios *Jano Natanson–Leskio* studijos. Naujausia istoriografija, liečianti LDK ir Maskvos sienos istoriją sietina su *Viktoro Temuševo* vardu. Vieni svarbiausių LDK pietinės ribos, stepės faktoriaus tyrimų sietini su *Michailo Gruševskio, Fiodoro Petrūnio, Felikso Šabuldo, Michaelio Ždano, Bertoldo Špiulerio, Boriso Čerkaso* darbais.

Mentalinio ir idėjinio valstybės erdvės diskurso vertinimui buvo pasirinkti trys galimi tyrimo sluoksniai ir jų pagrindu suformuota reprezentatyvių šaltinių bazė. Tai XVI a. naratyvinių šaltinių kompleksas (Lietuvos metraščių masyvas, XVI a. kronikos, lenkų ir lietuvių autorių poleminiai, poetiniai, biografiniai kūriniai), XV–XVI a. kartografija (Europai, LDK, Lenkijai, LDK ir Lenkijai, Prūsijai, Maskvos valstybei, totorių ordoms skirti žemėlapiai) bei LDK teisiniai dokumentai (XV–XVI a. visai LDK bei nelietuviškoms LDK sritims suteiktos valdovų privilegijos bei Pirmasis Lietuvos Statutas). Kita dalis darbe naudotų šaltinių sietini su realiai egzistavusių Lietuvos valstybės sienų vertinimu. Čia svarbiausi šaltiniai – tai LDK ir jos kaimynų: Livonijos, Vokiečių ordino, Lenkijos, Maskvos valstybės, totorių ordų diplomatinių santykių ir kontaktų, derybų tekstų, pasiuntinių kalbų, kanceliarinių Lietuvos Metrikos dokumentų, oficialių tarpvalstybinių sutarčių medžiaga, publikuota įvairiuose šaltinių rinkiniuose, delimitacijos ir demarkacijos dokumentų sąvadaai. Minėtini *Motiejaus Dogelio, Ignoto Daniłowicziaus, Karolio Edwardo Napierskio* publikuoti šaltinių rinkiniai, XIX a. „Rusų istorijos draugijos“ publikacijos. Išskirtina atskirai išleista 1545–1572 metų pasiuntinybių knyga ir Lietuvos Metrikos knyga nr. 560, skirta išimtinai 1542 metų Lietuvos ir Livonijos sienos delimitacijai ir demarkacijai.

LDK valstybės erdvė ir sienos laikytina šio darbo objektu, o svarbiausias darbo tikslas – realiai susiformavusių valstybės sienų ir jos erdvės bei mentaliniame idėjiniame lygmenyje egzistavusio sienų suvokimo ir erdvės sampratų atodangos. Šiam tikslui pasiekti buvo keliami uždaviniai: įvertinti valstybės erdvės sampratos modelį naratyviniame diskurse, senuosiuose žemėlapiuose ir teisiniuose valstybės dokumentuose bei atskleisti Lietuvos sienų su Livonija, Vokiečių ordinu, Lenkija, Maskvos valstybe bei totorių ordomis delimitacijos ir demarkacijos procedūrų visumą bei jų pagrindu besiklosčiusį valstybės teritorijos modelį, įvertinti regioninę sienų ir

teritorijos klostymosi specifika. Kaip gretutiniai tyrimo uždaviniai išskirtina užsienio autorių darbų tiriamo objekto istoriografinė analizė, įgalinusi išgryninti tyrimo orientyrus ir leidusi analogijų būdu interpretuoti tam tikrus tyrimo objekto aspektus; dar vienas darbo uždavinys – tai XV–XVI a. šaltinių terminijos tyrimas, jų turinio semantinių ribų ir vartosenos kontekstų analizė, įgalinusi suvokti senosios šaltinių kalbos specifika.

Tyrime naudotas deskriptyvinis, lyginamosios, tekstologinės bei struktūrinės analizės metodai, kartografinis metodas. Darbą sudaro įvadas, dėstomoji dalis, suskirstyta į tris skyrius, išvados, šaltinių ir literatūros sąrašas bei priedai – senųjų žemėlapių kopijų fragmentai ir autorės sudarytos kartoschemos. Pirmajame skyriuje apibrėžiamas teorinis problemos diskursas, antrajame skyriuje dėmesys kreipiamas senųjų šaltinių terminijos turinio suvokimui bei vartosenos aptarimui. Trečiasis skyrius yra pagrindinis, turintis du darbo tikslą atspindinčius poskyrius; pirmajame analizuojamas valstybės erdvės bei sienų sampratos mentalinis bei idėjinis diskursas. Antrajame poskyryje analizuojamas objektas skaidomas geografiniu principu: tiriamos šiaurinės ir vakarinės valstybės sienos bei rytinės ir pietinės valstybės sienos, siekiant delimitacijos ir demarkacijos procedūrų visumos pagrindu atskleisti valstybės teritorijos modelio sampratą. Paskutiniame trečiosios dalies poskyryje pateikiamas sienų nustatymo ir vystymosi vertinimas regioninės specifikos požiūriu.

LDK erdvės samprata mentaliniu ir idėjinu požiūriu buvo analizuota pasitelkus senuosius žemėlapius, teisinius dokumentus ir naratyvinį diskursą. Tyrimas atskleidė, jog beveik visoje XVI a. kartografijoje galima rasti Lietuvos teritorijos didesnės ar mažesnės dalies atspindį, tačiau tik visos valstybės erdvės atspindys žemėlapyje gali išryškinti žemėlapių autorių brandintas idėjas bei egzistavusią kartografinę nuovoką. Visa LDK erdvė buvo pavaizduota 1595 m. G. Merkatoriaus žemėlapyje bei 1613 m. M. K. Radvilos–Našlaitėlio LDK žemėlapyje. Europai skirtuose XVI a. žemėlapiuose mastelio galimybės neleidžia vertinti LDK kartografinio vaizdo detalių, o tik konstatuoti faktą, jog ši valstybė buvo kartografuojama. 1613 m. LDK žemėlapis atskleidė politiškai angažuatą Lietuvos teritorijos vertinimą, jame grafinėmis priemonėmis perteiktas mentalinėje plotmėje slypėjęs valstybės erdvės vaizdinys ir jos teritorijos refleksijos pojūtis.

XV–XVI a. LDK bendravalstybinės ir sritinės privilegijos taip pat gali būti traktuojamos kaip valstybinio pobūdžio dokumentų grupė, kuri teisiniame lygmenyje atskleidžia valstybės teritorinio vientisumo ir poreikio jį išlaikyti idėją. 1447 m. Kazimiero privilegijoje deklaruota idėja užtikrinti nekintamą valstybės teritoriją buvo atkartota bene visose kitų valdovų privilegijose ir perkelta į Pirmojo Lietuvos Statuto turinį. Sritinių privilegijų teisinis pamatas taip pat buvo paremtas politinio solidarumo demonstravimu Lietuvos valstybei mainais už įvairių teisių ir lengvatų užtikrinimą. Šiose privilegijose fiksuojama teisinė teritorijos vientisumo garantija kūrė ir formavo Lietuvos valstybės ir integruotų nelietuviškų žemių bendrą erdvės sampratą ir jos užtikrinimo būdus; kartu tai buvo valstybės teritorijos idėjos reprezentavimas.

Dar viena tyrimo plotmė, kurioje buvo ieškota Lietuvos valstybės teritorijos, sienų ir erdvės idėjinio ir mentalinio suvokimo, tai XVI a. naratyvinis diskursas, atskleidęs dvi vertinimo perspektyvas. Lietuvos metraščio tradicijoje bei LDK autorių kūriniuose Lietuvos erdvės refleksija vienareikšmiškai buvo orientuota į LDK valstybingumo išryškinimą, valstybės geopolitinę tapatybę sietina su Vytautu, kaip užkariautoju ir valstybės erdvės kūrėju. Lenkų kronikų siužetuose LDK ekspansyvi teritorinė perspektyva vertintina kaip realus ir pripažintinas faktas, tačiau akcentuojama Lenkijos politinė ir karinė parama, kuri užtikrina LDK gyvybinės erdvės įtvirtinimo rytuose galimybę. XVI a. naratyviniame diskurse Lietuvos valstybės erdvės modelis daugiaplanis ir orientuotas skirtingomis kryptimis, sienų istorijai skiriama nevienodai dėmesio: daugiausiai – valstybės rytų ir pietvakarių erdvės pojūčio išryškinimui, mažiausiai – šiaurinėms ir vakarinėms sienoms.

Lietuvos valstybės sienų nustatymo delimitacijos ir demarkacijos procedūros buvo aiškiai atskirtos ir šias veiklas vykdė skirtingas teises kompetencijas turintys asmenys. Sienų su besiribojančiomis valstybėmis delimitacijos ir demarkacijos procesai buvo vykdomi dvišalių santykių pagrindu, todėl teisinis šių procedūrų pamatas buvo grindžiamas ne tik LDK teisinėmis normomis. Tikėtina, jog daugeliu atvejų privačių valdų ribų teisinis reglamentas tapdavo išėjimu, sprendžiant valstybinės sienos delimitacijos bei demarkacijos problemas.

Lietuvos valstybės sienos su Livonija ir Vokiečių ordinu vystėsi kryptingai, valstybes skiriančios ribos evoliucija nuo pasienio zonos arba teritorinio ruožo savivokos, kuris buvo charakteringas ikivalstybiniam laikams, prie linijinės sienos

sampratos, ribojančios ir teisiškai sankcionuojančios tai, kas yra valstybės viduje ir išorėje bei sukuriančios teritorinės valstybės modelį, vyko dėsningai, lygiagrečiai pasienio apgyvendinimo procesui. Kolonizacija, nepriklausomai nuo regioninių skirtumų, sukūrusi apgyvendinto pasienio situaciją, laikytina svarbiausiu veiksniu, įtakojusiu sienos objekto – linijos – formavimąsi ir jos fizinį žymėjimą. Linijinės sienos sampratos gimimas ir valstybės teritorinio modelio kūrimosi apraiškos LDK sietinos su XV a. pirmųjų dešimtmečių LDK sienų su Livonija bei Vokiečių ordinu nustatymo akcijomis, kurių metu regimą pasienio liniją išreiškė fizinių geografinių objektų bei socialinių ekonominių ženklų subordinacija bei objektus jungiančių atstumų matavimas. Paraleliai vyko delimitacijos ir demarkacijos procedūros. Linijinės sienos bei teritorinės valstybės samprata LDK atveju baigtinį pavidalą įgijo XVI a. viduryje ir tai sietina su unifikuotos sienos ženklų sistemos su valstybine atributika kūrimo apraiškėmis. Lietuvos valstybės teritorijos ir ją ribojančių sienų suvokime įvykę kokybiniai poslinkiai vertintini kaip civilizacinio kontakto su Ordino valstybėmis pasekmė. Buvo realiai suvoktos valstybės sienos (fizinį pavidalą turinčių sienos ženklų trasa žemės paviršiuje) ir mentalinėje plotmėje reflektuojamas jos teritorijos išskirtinumas (valstybinė simbolika sienos ženkluose – įasmenintas valdžios ryšys su teritorija). Lietuvos bei Lenkijos valstybių atveju egzistavo linijinės sienos samprata, kurią apsprendė fizinių geografinių bei socialinių ekonominių objektų ir jų subordinacijos išraiška atstumais, tačiau sienos struktūra išreiškė dvigubą pavaldumą – tos pačios pasienio valdos riba buvo suvokiama kaip privataus asmens nuosavybė, tačiau kartu buvo ir valstybinė siena. Fiziniu pavidalu Lietuvos ir Lenkijos siena iš esmės neturėjo skirtumų su privačios ribos modeliu, tačiau valstybinis jos charakteris buvo išreiškiamas per institucinį Lietuvos valdovo tarpininkavimą.

Ribą tarp Lietuvos ir Maskvos valstybių išreiškė vienos ir kitos pusės valdomų teritorijų sąrašai ir tai vertintina kaip charakteringiausias šių valstybių sienų nustatymo XV–XVI a. praktikos bruožas. Atskirose Lietuvos ir Maskvos valstybės sienos atkarpose egzistavę sienos linijos buvimo ir suvokimo simptomai, atsiskleidę Maskvos valstybės šaltinių medžiagoje, koreguoja nelinijinės LDK ir Maskvos valstybinės sienos sampratą. Maskvos valstybės politinė programa, orientuota į visų rusiškų žemių suvienijimo idėją, buvo pagrindinė priežastis, trukdžiusi vystytis sienos linijai. Nuolatinė paliaubų būseną, Maskvai pretenduojant į visas LDK užkariautas rusėnų

žemes, vertintina kaip sąmoninga Maskvos valstybės politinė laikysena ir sąmoningas delsimas tarpvalstybinių susitarimų pagrindu vykdyti delimitaciją ir demarkaciją. XV a. paskutiniojo dešimtmečio – XVI a. pradžios sritinių kunigaikštysčių faktorius LDK rytinės sienos klostymosi kontekste vertintinas kaip sienos sampratos nevienalytiškumo iliustracija ir Maskvos valstybės manipuliacijų objektas. Okos upės aukštupio sritiniai kunigaikščiai, deklaruoję politinę priklausomybę LDK arba Maskvos valstybei, savo valdos ribas suvokė valstybiniu lygmeniu, tačiau jie buvo savo valdų ribų savininkai ir galėjo jas keisti, nusprenddami su visa valda pereiti į kitą pusę. Neapibrėžtas sritinių kunigaikštysčių statusas ir savarankiškumas, sprendžiant tarnybos pasirinkimo klausimą bei valdomos teritorijos likimą, turėjo neigiamų pasekmių Maskvos ir LDK rytinės sienos klostymuisi Okos aukštupio ir Ugros upių arealuose. Lietuvos valstybės pietinės ribos klostymasis XV–XVI a. ir jos kaitos aplinkybės buvo stipriai įtakojamos stepės faktoriaus. Stepės, kaip gamtinio barjero, antropogenizavimo problema laikytina svarbiausiu veiksniu, lėmusiu realiai neegzistavusios sienos su totorių pasauliu specifiką. Pasienio pilių tinklas Ukrainos stepėse laikytinas realiausiu ir objektyviai apytikrių ribų atskirtį galėjusiu formuoti veiksniu.

XV–XVI a. Lietuvos valstybės teritorijos, jos sienų ir erdvės tyrimas atskleidė, jog realiai ant žemės egzistavusių valstybės sienų ir mentalinio bei idėjinio valstybės teritorijos bei jos sienų suvokimo metmenys turi daug bendrų sąlyčio taškų. Mentalinio ir idėjinio valstybės erdvės suvokimo analizė ir realiai „ant žemės“ (ne)egzistavusių sienų, jų delimitacijos ir demarkacijos procedūrų vertinimas atskleidė tai, jog erdvės ir jos ribų suvokimo valstybės mentalinės sąmonės žemėlapyje jautriausi taškai sietini su Lietuvos valstybės rytinėmis ir pietinėmis teritorijomis – ten, kur egzistavo daug ir įvairių politinių įtampų, nebuvo aišku, kur yra tikroji valstybių ribų atskirtis ir kokiais techniniais būdais ją reikia įprasinti. Šiame regione egzistavusi tarpvalstybinio dialogo sumaištis, struktūriškai ydinga sienų nustatymo praktika, neleidusi sienų kontaktą turėjusioms valstybėms dėsningai artėti prie teritorinio valstybės modelio, stepės, kaip ypatingai sudėtingo gamtinio barjero, įtaka skatino mentaliniame lygmenyje kurti saugios geopolitinės tapatybės viziją, sietiną su Vytauto laikų Lietuvos teritorijos plotu ir politinėmis pastangomis atkovoti ir išsaugoti buvusio teritorinio vientisumo neliečiamybę, kurią saugojo ir sankcionavo valstybės teisinių dokumentų kompleksas. Šią įžvalgą pagrindžia visos šaltinių grupės, pasirinktos mentalinio ir idėjinio valstybės

erdvės klausimo vertinimui. Ir priešingai – realybėje iš ikivalstybiniam laikams charakteringos valstybių erdves skiriančios ribos, kaip teritorinės zonos, palaipsniui gimusi linijinės sienos bei valstybės teritorinio modelio samprata, sietina su LDK ir Ordino valstybių kaimynyste, mentaliniame bei idėjiniame valstybės teritorijos ir jos sienų vertinimo lygmenyje iš esmės neatsispindi. Senuosiuose žemėlapiuose vakarinės ir šiaurinės valstybės sienos gali būti įvertintos kaip tiksliausiai brėžtos ir turinčios mažiausiai interpretacijų; naratyviniame diskurse Lietuvos ir Ordino valstybių kaimynystės vertinimas taip pat traktuotinas kaip santūri, iš esmės objektyvi tekstų autorių pozicija. Idėjiniame Lietuvos valstybės ir jos teritorijos suvokimo diskurse Lietuvos ir Lenkijos sienos vertinimas buvo stipriai angažuotas išskiriant du leitmotyvus – Voluinės ir Podolės temą bei Liublino unijos politinių ir teritorinių pasekmių Lietuvos valstybei klausimą. Tuo tarpu realiai egzistavusi sienų nustatymo, tikslinimo praktika, tarpvalstybinis dialogas vertintinas kaip mažiau politinių įtampų kėlęs atvejis, nei mentaliniame valstybės sąmonės žemėlapyje egzistavęs šių faktų ir aplinkybių atspindys, skatinęs Lietuvą saugoti savo geopolitinę tapatybę nuo Lenkijos įtakos.

PUBLICATIONS LIST

Publications on the dissertation theme:

Articles in the reviewed scientific periodicals approved by the department of Science and Studies of Lithuania

- Bucevičiūtė L., Lietuvos valstybės teritoriniai kontaktai rytuose XV–XVI a.: keletas sienų istorijos epizodų, *Istorija*, 2010, t. 78, p. 3–14.
- Bucevičiūtė L., Valstybės erdvės samprata Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės teisės dokumentuose (XV–XVI a.), *Lietuvos istorijos metraštis, 2009 metai/1*, Vilnius, 2010, p. 51–68.
- Bucevičiūtė L., Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės erdvė: geopolitinė perspektyva XVI a. naratyviniuose tekstuose, *Lietuvos istorijos metraštis, 2008 metai/2*, Vilnius, 2009, p. 5–32.

Other publications:

- Bucevičiūtė L., Lietuvos teritorinio–administracinio modelio evoliucija kartografijoje, *Lietuvos istorijos metraštis, 2008 metai/1*, Vilnius, 2009, p. 145–151. (Recenzija leidiniui: A. A. Gliožaitis, *Lietuvos administracinis suskirstymas žemėlapiuose: nuo seniausių laikų iki XXI amžiaus pradžios*, Vilnius, Gairės, 2008, 397 p.)
- Bucevičiūtė L., Pasivaikščiokime po XIX a.–XX a. I p. Kauną, arba ką byloja apie miestą jo planai? *Kauno istorijos metraštis*, Kaunas, VDU leidykla, 2008, t. 9, p. 301–310. (Recenzija leidiniui: *Kauno miesto planai: XIX a.–XX a. pirmoji pusė*, sud. Nijolė Ambraškienė, Vitalija Girčytė, Kaunas, Kauno apskrities archyvas, 2007, 60 p., [25] planų vnt. (1 aplankas).
- Bucevičiūtė L., XVI a. pr. Žemaitijos katalikų bažnyčių tinklo atspindys Bernardo Wapowskio 1526 metų *Lenkijos žemėlapyje*, *Lietuvos istorijos metraštis, 2006 metai/2*, Vilnius, 2007, p. 43–68.
- Bucevičiūtė L., Meninė intelektualinė kūryba egzilyje, *Oikos: Lietuvių migracijos ir diasporos studijos*, Lietuvių išėvijos institutas, Versus aureus, 2006, nr. 2, p. 95–114.
- Bucevičiūtė L., Kauno ir Vilniaus moterys: XVI a. I p. gyvenimas mieste, *Kauno istorijos metraštis*, Kaunas, VDU leidykla, 2006, t. 7, p. 229–236. (Recenzija J. Karpavičienės monografijai: *Moteris Vilniuje ir Kaune XVI a. pirmojoje pusėje. Gyvenimo sumiestinimo Lietuvoje atodangos*, Kaunas, 2005).
- Bucevičiūtė L., Vandens kelias Kaunas–Karaliaučius XV–XVIII a. kartografijoje, *Kauno istorijos metraštis*, Kaunas, VDU leidykla, 2005, t. 6, p. 55–104.

Reports on the topic of dissertation at scientific conferences

- Tarptautinė mokslinė konferencija, skirta profesoriaus Zenono Ivinskio 100-osioms gimimo metinėms paminėti: *Zenonas Ivinskis ir Lietuvos praeities tyrimai*. 2008 m. spalio mėn. 16–17 d., Kaunas. Pranešimo tema: „Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės vakarinių sienų tyrimų problematika istoriografijoje: metodologinis aspektas“.
- Pirmoji mokslinė VDU studentų humanitarų konferencija: *Hominem quaero–ieškau žmogaus*. 2007 m. kovo mėn. 30 d., Kaunas. Pranešimo tema: „Lietuvos valstybės erdvės samprata XVI–XVII a. naratyviniuose tekstuose“.

About the author

Name	Laima BUCEVIČIŪTĖ
Education	2004–2006 – Master studies of History at the Vytautas Magnus University 2000–2004 – Bachelor studies of History at the Vytautas Magnus University
Phone	+370 689 57794
E-mail:	l.buceviciute@bibl.vdu.lt laima82@yahoo.com