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Abstract

A bronze fibula from Dailidės near Joniškis in eastern Lithuania is compared with its analogies found in Mazuria (the Olsztyn group), the Carpathian Basin, the Middle Dnieper region and southeastern Romania. The chronology of the group is established to the late sixth and early seventh century. The series may have originated in Mazuria and spread to other regions in the context of gift-giving exchange between regional elites.
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More than thirteen years ago, in a paper on the cultural and trade relations of early medieval Lithuania, Adolfs Tautavičius published a bronze fibula said to be from Dailidės near Joniškis in eastern Lithuania (Tautavičius, 1972, p. 145 pl. 2/26). Although nothing else is known about the whereabouts of the discovery, its good state of preservation suggests that the fibula in question may have been part of a burial assemblage, perhaps a cremation in one of the cemeteries of the so-called East Lithuanian Barrow Culture, which are known from that region of Lithuania. The size and ornamentation of the fibula, including the typically linear decoration (Fig. 1.1) make it relatively easy to assign to Werner’s class I J (Werner, 1950, pp. 154-155). In addition to the Dailidės fibula, nine other specimens are currently known for this class, four of which have been found in the Baltic region. Werner called this and other classes of bow fibulae “Slavic,” because he thought that they had been worn singly, not in pairs, a supposedly typical feature of the “ethnic costume” of Slavic women. Moreover, Werner believed that “Slavic” fibulae were typically associated with cremations, the supposedly standard burial rite of the early Slavs, not with inhumations (Werner, 1950, p. 172). However, the “Slavic” fibulae from cemeteries excavated before World War II in Eastern Prussia (a region now divided between northeastern Poland and the Kaliningrad oblast of Russia) were found in assemblages, which had nothing to do with what both Werner and subsequent generations of archaeologists would have recognized as typically “Slavic.” Werner realized that his theory of the Slavic migration responsible for the distribution of “Slavic” bow fibulae in Eastern Europe would not work with specimens from the Baltic region. He proposed instead that in that, and only in that, case, bow fibulae be interpreted as a result of long-distance trade between the Baltic coast and the Danube region, along the so-called Amber Trail (Werner, 1950, p.167; Werner 1984). Like many others in the 1950s, Werner

1 The fibula was found at some point before World War II and is now in the Vytautas the Great War Museum in Kaunas (inv. 1836). I am grateful to Audronė Bluijiene for having kindly procured a photograph of the fibula and allowed for its publication.

2 The closest to the presumed find spot is the cemetery of Degsnė-Labotiškės, for which see Tautavičius, 1970-1971. For the East Lithuanian Barrow Culture, see Tautavičius 1959. Fifty years after the publication of Tautavičius’s paper, a new, updated survey of the problems raised by the East Lithuanian Barrow Culture is much needed. In the meantime, see Vaitkevičius, 2005.

3 Out of four specimens known to Werner, only one had been discovered in the Baltic region (Kielary). Werner also included in his class I J a fibula from an unknown location in Hungary, which in fact belongs to his class I K. The number of finds of I J fibulae from the Baltic region increased after Herbert Kühn published two specimens from Tumiany (Kühn, 1956, p. 101)). For variant 2 of his class P (fibulae with diamond-shaped foot-plate), Liudmil Vagalinski (Vagalinski, 1994, pp. 280 and 295; see also Vagalinski, 2003) linked the specimens known to Werner and Kühn to the fibulae from Ōõldeâl and Sārata Montoro (he relied for the latter on oral information, although the fibula had by then been published by Fiedler, 1992, p. 83 fig. 11/9). The same number of specimens was known to Christina Katsougiannopoulou (Katsougiannopoulou, 1999, pp. 58-59), while Dan Gh. Teodor (Teodor, 1992) offers no discussion of such fibulae. No author dealing with bow fibulae of Werner’s class I J seems to have been aware of the existence of the Dailidės specimen.

4 For the role of the “ethnic costume” in the German archaeology of the early Middle Ages, both before and after World War II, see the pertinent remarks of Fehr, 2000. The influence of the German school of archaeology is certainly responsible for the widespread acceptance in Eastern Europe of such ideas as those espoused by Joachim Werner. To this day, the idea of an “ethnic” (almost “national”) costume to be used for ethnic attribution of the archaeological evidence has very rarely, if ever, been questioned by Lithuanian or Latvian archaeologists. See, for example, Zariņa, 1959 and 1980; Vaškevičiutė 1992; Kazakevičius 1994.

5 By contrast, Werner advanced a fundamentally different model of interpretation for other classes of fibulae found in the Baltic region. According to him (Werner, 1961, pp.
strongly believed that mortuary practices were a direct indication of status hierarchy (see Bartel, 1982; Berta ius, 2005). He therefore interpreted bow fibulae from the Baltic region as marking the status of the rich “amber lords” of the North (Werner, 1984). Until recently, Werner’s ideas were fully embraced by many archaeologists, who never bothered to question his assumptions.6

My purpose in this paper is to re-examine the idea of explaining the distribution of “Slavic” bow fibulae in Eastern Europe in terms of migration, on the basis of the evidence of fibulae of Werner’s class I J. Were brooches found in the Baltic region truly obtained from the Slavs in the Danube region by means of trade with amber? Conversely, was the presence of such brooches in the Danube region the result of emigration from territories farther to the north and northeast? In order to answer those questions, one needs to consider first the distribution of ornamental patterns and the chronology of the archaeological assemblages in which specimens of Werner’s class I J were found. Only one fragmentary specimen is known, and all known fibulae of that class are remarkably similar to each other in terms of the general layout and decoration. With the exception of the Dailidės fibula, the size of most specimens varies around five centimeters (the shortest being the fibula from Pastyr’s’ke, with 4.5 cm, the longest after Dailidės being the brooch from grave 56 in Tumiany, with 5.5 cm). Fibulae found at considerable distance from each other, such as Novi Banovci (Serbia) and Kielary (Poland) are not only of the same size, but also similar in many other details, such as the terminal lobe (Fig. 1.3 and 5).7 The Dailidės fibula does not have any such parallel, as no analogy exists within Werner’s class I J for its narrow bow or for the lack of a frame for the linear decoration of the foot-plate, which is otherwise distinctly visible even on specimens supposedly deformed by fire, such as that from grave 1321 in Sârata Monteoru. The same appears to be true for the Óföldéak brooch, the foot-plate knobs of which are conspicuously more prominent than those of any other fibula in the class. Despite such differences in detail, all members of Werner’s I J class share the following characteristics: a semicircular head-plate covered with a vertically arranged linear motif; five knobs, all of equal size and shape; a ribbed bow; a diamond-shaped foot-plate with a horizontally arranged linear motif and three pairs of more or less prominent knobs; a terminal lobe with no decoration.8 Defined in such a way, Werner’s class I J is not different in terms of proportions and location of the ornament from class I F, for which clear links can be identified to the late fifth- or early sixth-century metalwork in the Lower and Middle Danube region (Curta and Dupoi, 1994-1995, pp. 222, 231 figs. 12-13, and 232 fig. 14; Curta, 2008, p. 468).9 Given that the two classes have also similar distributions in Eastern Europe (Figs. 2-3), it

7 On the other hand, the Negotin and the Novi Banovci fibulae, both found in northern Serbia are also very similar to each other.
8 Despite the fact that Werner’s class I J belongs to his group of “Slavic” bow fibulae with terminal lobes in the form of a human mask.
9 For fibulae of both classes (I F and I J), the ratio between the length and the width of the diamond-shaped foot-plate, with its three pairs of knobs, is remarkably similar. Moreover, some of the smallest fibulae of Werner’s class I F – such as that from grave 501 in Kielary – are of the same size as some of the largest fibulae of Werner’s class I J.

Fig. 1. Fibulae of Werner’s class I J. Numbers refer to the list of finds in Annex 1. Drawings by author (3-6, 9, 10), all others after Simoni, 1980, fig. 2; Fiedler, 1992, p. 83 fig. 11.9; Korzukhina, 1996, p. 618 pl. 28.8. The photograph of the Dailidės fibula is published courtesy of the Vytautas the Great War Museum in Kaunas.

317-318), luxurious gilded silver, “Frankish” brooches found outside their production centers in northwestern Europe did not signal trade, but matrimonial alliances, gift giving, and the like. Although not supported by any shred of evidence, Werner’s idea of an early medieval Amber Trail is remarkably resistant: it has recently been adopted by both Russian and American scholars (Kulakov, 1994a, pp. 117-118; McCormick, 2001, pp. 78 and 370). For a critique of such views, see Curta, 2007.8

But see Curta, 2004 and 2005. For Werner’s ideas taken at face value, see Okulicz-Kozaryn, 1997; Kowalski, 2000, p. 235.
is quite possible that fibulae of Werner’s class I J were imitations of I F fibulae, with a simple linear ornament replacing the scrollwork decoration. But where did that linear ornament originate? At a first glimpse, the closest analogy is the chip-carved, linear ornament on the fifth-century brooches of the Cluj-Someşeni-Ţaga or Hács-Bendékpuszta series (Protase, 2003; Harhoiu, 1990, p. 186; Kiss, 1995, pp. 297 and 299; 298 fig. 12.4; 300 fig. 13.1, 2, 8, 9). However, and leaving aside the chronological problems raised by such analogies, none of the fifth-century brooches offers quite the same visual contrast between the vertical arrangement of the linear decoration of the head-plate and the horizontal arrangement on the foot-plate. The same ornamental principle may be found also on imitations of fibulae of the Csongrád class produced in the early sixth century in Mazuria (Hilberg, 2003, pp. 301-302; 302 fig. 7 lower row). Can the “Slavic” bow fibulae of Werner’s class I J be of the same date?

Another imitation of a fibula of the Csongrád class is known from the Middle Dnieper region (Parczewski, 1991, p. 121 fig. 3.4 and pl. 2.3). The parallel has been first noted by Katsougiannopoulou, 1999, p. 59. On the other hand, a similar principle was applied to the linear decoration of

---

Fig. 2. The distribution of fibulae of Werner’s class I J in Eastern Europe. Numbers refer to the list of finds in Annex 1.
Only three of the ten specimens known so far have been found in burial assemblages, and of those only two may be used for a discussion of chronology. The Öföldeák fibula was found in an inhumation grave together with twelve glass beads (Fig. 4). Three of them have an eye-shaped ornamental pattern, with wart-like applications. Those are beads of Pásztor’s class I F (Pásztor, 1995, pp. 87 with Table 1 and 92 with Diagram 3), which is abundantly represented in Early Avar assemblages in Hungary. Of all those assemblages with such beads, two have also produced coins, the latest of which was struck for Emperor Phocas (602-610). Together with that coin was also a segmented bead of Pásztor’s class T, very similar to that from Öföldeák.

Fig. 3. The distribution of fibulae of Werner’s class I F in Eastern Europe. Numbers refer to the list of finds in Annex 2.
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Finally, three simple beads from Óföldeák (Fig. 4, second and fourth on the left, and third on the right) belong to Pásztor’s class S, the dating of which is secured by specimens found together with coins struck for Emperor Heraclius (610-641). The beads from Óföldeák thus point to a date for that assemblage, which may be placed within the first two decades of the seventh century. This is not contradicted by the evidence from grave 56 in Tumiány (Fig. 5). The copper-alloy belt buckle found together with the I J fibula has no analogies in Mazuria. However, judging from the published drawing (Kulakov, 1989, p. 252 fig. 36.3), this appears to be a much older piece recycled for a new buckle, as the fragment of the plate attached to the buckle loop is most certainly of a later date. Silver or copper-alloy loops with a scrollwork decoration and characteristic, undecorated “beds” for the tongues often accompany lavishly decorated buckles with diamond-shaped plates produced in the Carpathian Basin around AD 500. Similar in size and decoration to the Tumiány buckle is the loop of a buckle found in Gyula (Hungary) with an intricate animal-style ornament, most typical for the late fifth or early sixth century (Csallány, 1941, p. 132 and pl. 39.2; Nagy, 2007, pp. 85 and 173 pl. 39). Like the Tumiány

The buckle, the Gyula specimen is a hybrid, most likely recycling an older plate and loop. Unfortunately, nothing is known about the circumstances in which the buckle was found. If any conclusion may be drawn from this analogy, it is that an early sixth century date for the production of the Tumiány buckle loop does not necessarily apply as well to the assemblage in which the buckle was found. Without contextual information, it is impossible to tell how much later after being produced was the loop re-used for the buckle, which eventually was deposited in grave 56.

Nonetheless, there may be indirect evidence that the I J fibula found its way in that grave together with the buckle during the second half of the sixth century or around AD 600, at the latest. As already mentioned, the only other group of fibulae using the linear ornament so typical for the I J class in the same manner (vertical arrangement on the head-plate and horizontal arrangement on the footplate) are imitations of Csongrád-type fibulae produced in Mazuria (Fig. 6). One such imitation was found in grave 629 in Miętkie together with a bronze buckle with rectangular plate and rectangular loop (Kulakov, 1989, pp. 182 and 233, fig. 17.2). Similar buckles are known from Tumiány (grave 13; Kulakov, 1989, p.187), but also from a cremation grave in Elblag, which also produced a spear-shaped strap end (Kulakov, 1990, p. 97 pl. 3.15), of a type dated in Tumiány to the middle or second half of the sixth century (Kowalski, 1991, p.76; Kowalski, 2000, p.214). The buckle in grave 13 of the Tumiány cemetery was associated with a silvered bronze, rectangular brooch. Such brooches appear in other graves of that same cemetery in association with spear-shaped strap ends (grave 30a: Kulakov, 1989, pp.189 and 243 fig. 27.3), trapeze-shaped pendants (grave 64: Kulakov, 1989, pp.192 and 254 fig. 28.3), or spectacle-like pendants (grave 103: Kulakov 1989, pp. 195 and 262 fig. 46.13), all of


13 The same combination is documented for grave 109 from the Miętkie cemetery (Kulakov, 1989, pp. 183 and 234 fig. 18.2).
which have been attributed by Jacek Kowalski to the earliest of the two chronological phases he claims to have found in the Tumiany cemetery (Kowalski, 2000, p. 214). I have shown elsewhere that a careful examination by statistical means of the burial assemblages from that cemetery proves Kowalski’s idea of two phases to be wrong (Curta, 2006, pp. 440-442 and 446). The Tumiany cemetery may have begun shortly before the middle of the sixth century and was abandoned at some point during or shortly after the first quarter of the seventh century. Neither the rectangular brooches, nor the buckles with rectangular plate and rectangular loop can be attributed to the latest burial phase, because of the association with grave goods most typical for the second half of the sixth century, especially spectacle- and trapeze-shaped pendants and spear-shaped strap ends. This further suggests that the local imitations of the Csongrád-type fibulae may also be of the same date. If so, it is at least possible that they coincided in time with fibulae of Werner’s class I J with a similar linear ornament. Should a blanket dating to the late sixth century be accepted for the three Mazurian brooches of that class, then the lingering question is whether or not they served as source of inspiration for the manufacture of other fibulae found outside Mazuria. In other words, can one speak of a dissemination of brooch forms and design details? The great similarity between the fibulae from Novi Banovci and Tumiany (stray find) suggests that specimens found in the Carpathian Basin may have been produced in Mazuria or imitations of Mazurian originals. The slight chronological difference between the Tumiany (if the proposed dating is correct) and the Öföldeák fibulae substantiates the idea of I J brooches originating from the Baltic region. Most imitations of the Csongrád-type fibulae with linear ornament similar to that of the I J fibulae have been found in Mazurian assemblages.

Although the Dailidės fibula was most likely produced locally, it may well have imitated a Mazurian original. This is most remarkable, given that relations between the Olsztyn group in Mazuria and communities of the East Lithuanian Barrow Culture have so far not received sufficient scholarly attention, especially when compared with the much more studied relations between western Lithuania and Sambia (Žulkus 1991; Kulakov 1994b). Judging from the existing evidence, Mazuria may have been the intermediary through which the cultural influence from the Middle and Lower Danube region reached Eastern Lithuania. This may indeed be the case for the silver belt buckle found in a female burial in Ziboliškė near Švenčionys, in the vicinity of the Lithuanian-Belarusian border, which is said to have a good analogy in Transylvania (Bluiuienė, 2006, p. 147). In terms of decorative elements, the “Slavic” bow fibula of Werner’s class I D found on the other side of the border in a settlement excavated in Mikol’tsy, on the shore of Lake Narach, near Myadel (2005, pp. 104 and 121 fig. 68.2) is linked to specimens from Budapest and Bačko Petrovo Selo (Serbia), but also from Tumiany (Curta, 2006, pp. 427 fig. 3 and 428 fig. 4). The Dailidės and Mikol’tsy fibulae are unique finds in that they are both similar to specimens from Mazuria, but not to those from the neighboring regions in Belarus and Latvia. Werner’s classes I D and I J are not represented among the “Slavic” bow fibulae found during the excavation of the early medieval stronghold in Nikadžimava near Horki, in eastern Belarus (Sedin 1994). Conversely, no analogies exist in Mazuria for the large fibula of Werner’s class II B (Sedin, 1997, 14). This may also be true for the foot-plate of a gilded, copper-alloy fibula from a male cremation burial in the Sudota 1 burial mound cemetery near Švenčionys. Although its scrollwork decoration suggests that the fibula in question may have been produced in the Middle Danube region, it may have been obtained through some intermediary in Mazuria. See Bluiuienė, 2006, pp. 134 and 137 fig. 9.
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p. 285 fig. 2.6).\(^{15}\) Nor are there any analogies in Mazuria for the northernmost finds of “Slavic” bow fibulae in Eastern Europe, the two specimens of Werner’s class II D found in Boki (Latvia; Ciglis, 2001, pp. 53 and 58 fig. 7.2) and Jāgala Jēssu near Tallinn (Korzukhina, 1996, pp. 414 and 686 pl. 96.4) or the I D brooch from Stříkí (Latvia; Ātāģīzs, 2001, p. 286 fig. 199/2).\(^{16}\) Finally, no fibulae of Werner’s class I B appear in Mazurian assemblages, which may be compared to those from Linkuhnen (now in Kaliningrad) and Schreitlauken (now in Sovetsk), on the border between Lithuania and the Kaliningrad oblast of Russia (Kūnh, 1981, pp. 209 and 317; pls. 50.319 and 75.502).\(^{17}\) The evidence thus strongly suggests the existence of separate, mutually exclusive networks for the distribution of different types of bow fibulae in the Baltic region. The Olsztyn group in Mazuria may have mediated the contacts of the Danube region with communities of the East Lithuanian Barrow Culture, but not with those in the neighboring territories in western Lithuania or eastern Belarus. How can this privileged relation be explained?

It has been noted that the dissemination of a brooch form or of ornamental details may indicate one of three types of movement: of brooches (through gift-giving or trade), with or without their owner; of models of brooches, including templates for the reproduction of ornamental patterns; and of craftsmen carrying manufactured brooches of models (Leigh, 1991, p. 117; Hines, 1997, p. 213). Until recently, prevailing views about the organization of production in the early Middle Ages favored the third type of movement. However, the discovery of soapstone mold for bow fibulae in a sunken-featured building at Bernashivka near Mohyliv-Podil’skyi in Ukraine, together with other molds, smelting implements, and domestic pottery suggests a different model of interpretation, which allows for the possibility of a local production using a technology (the “lost-wax” procedure) capable of producing similar, but never identical fibulae (Vynokur 1997; see also Curta, 2006, p. 450).\(^{18}\) Moreover, the absence of exact replication of any known fibula is a strong indication that each brooch or pair of brooches was produced as required, probably for one occasion at a time. That fibulae such as those from Novi Banovci and Tumiany look alike is an indication of imitation, but also of the movement of fibula designs across a vast area of Eastern Europe, on a north-south direction. Whether or not this may also indicate movement of people, it is hardly evidence for outright migration. Nor can there be any question of itinerant craftsmen. Between the Carpathian Basin to the south and the Baltic region to the north, there is a vast corridor completely devoid of fibula finds. This large area was however not devoid of settlements, yet no fibula of Werner’s class I J was found on any of the many sites of the so-called Prague culture of southern Belarus, western Ukraine, or southern Poland (Gavritukhin 2003; Terpilov’s’kyi 2005). Some have interpreted the general distribution of “Slavic” bow fibulae as a deliberate rejection of neighboring cultural models (Barford 2004). If so, then bow fibulae are not the only example of such a focused distribution.

Both before and after 600, amber traveled southward as a form of gift exchange between elites in the Baltic region and those in the Avar qaganate or in the Middle Dnieper region (Curta 2007). The “amber lords” of the North did not exchange fibulae for amber; instead, they sent both to the south in exchange for regional alliances. In other words, instead of “index fossils” for migration, fibulae of Werner’s class I J indicate long-distance contacts between East European elites.

I have argued elsewhere that despite the notorious danger associated with “reading” gender in burial assemblages as a direct reflection of social practices (Härke 2000), bow fibulae were not just part of the female dress, but also emblems of high social status (Curta 2005). “Slavic” bow fibulae may have marked aristocratic, married women in death, if not also in life. Brooches belonged to the outermost layer of clothing and were thus easily visible, perhaps the most visible of all dress accessories, a particular sort of badge. If that was a badge of social identity, then bow fibulae may have been exchanged between elites as gift-giving, possibly associated with matrimonial alliances. It has been noted that female cremation burials of the late fifth- and early sixth-century East Lithuanian Barrow Culture were relatively poor and included a standard “grave good kit” of one to four spindle whorls, an awl, a knife, and a sickle (Bliujienė, 2006, p. 137). Although little is known about how that “grave good kit” changed, if at all, during the late sixth or early seventh century, a burial marked with a I J fibula such as that from Dailidės was clearly exceptional. The status of the woman buried with such a brooch (if indeed the Dailidės fibula was part of a burial assemblage, and
if that grave was that of a woman) may have derived from her or her husband’s relations with the elites in Mazuria, themselves connected with the distant elites in the Carpathian Basin. That such a status may not have been simply ascribed to the woman at death results from the fact that bow fibulae, such as that from Mikol’tsy, have also been found on settlement sites, an indication that such dress accessories were used as badges of social identity not only in death, but also in life. At a time of shifting alliances and changing social and political relations within communities of the East Lithuanian Barrow Culture, producing and wearing a “Slavic” bow fibula may have been a strategy for creating a new sense of identity for social elites.

Summary

More than thirteen years ago, Adolfas Tautavičius published a bronze fibula from Dailidės near Joniškis in eastern Lithuania. Although nothing else is known about the whereabouts of the discovery, its good state of preservation suggests that the fibula in question may have been part of a burial assemblage, perhaps a cremation in one of the cemeteries of the so-called East Lithuanian Barrow Culture, which are known from that region of Lithuania. This is a specimen of Werner’s class I J. In addition to the Dailidės fibula, nine other fibulae are currently known for this class, four of which have been found in the Baltic region. Werner called this and other classes of bow fibulae “Slavic,” but the evidence does not support his idea of explaining the distribution of such fibulae in Eastern Europe in terms of migration. Nonetheless, fibulae of Werner’s class I J found at considerable distance from each other (e.g., Novi Banovci and Kielary) are very similar. However, the Dailidės fibula appears so far to be a unique piece within its own class, in terms of both size and ornamentation. Using proportions and location of the ornament as criteria, fibulae of Werner’s class I J do not differ much from brooches of Werner’s class I F, for which clear links can be identified to the late fifth- or early sixth-century metalwork in the Lower and Middle Danube region. Given that the two classes have also similar distributions in Eastern Europe, it is quite possible that fibulae of Werner’s class I J were imitations of I F fibulae, with a simple linear ornament replacing the scrollwork decoration. On the other hand, a very similar ornament may be found also on imitations of fibulae of the Csongrád class produced in the early sixth century in Mazuria.

On the basis of the associated glass beads, the fibula from Ōföldeák may be dated to the Early Avar period, perhaps to the first two decades of the seventh century. Fibulae from Kielary and Tumiany may be slightly earlier (late sixth century), if any value may be placed on their sharing the same ornamental principle with imitations of Csongrád-type fibulae, one of which, at least, may be dated to the late sixth century. If Werner’s class I J originated in Mazuria, then the Dailidės fibula, although of local production, may well have imitated a Mazurian original. Relations between the Olsztyn group in Mazuria and communities of the East Lithuanian Barrow Culture are poorly understood, although they must have been responsible for other similar phenomena, such as the silver belt buckle from Ziboliškė near Švenčionys, or the “Slavic” bow fibula of Werner’s class I D found in Mikol’tsy near Myadel’. By contrast, no analogies exist in Mazuria for the fibulae from the neighboring regions in Belarus (Nikadzimava), Latvia (Boķi and Strīki), Estonia (Jägala Jõesuu), and the Kaliningrad oblast’ of Russia (Linkuhnen and Schreitlauken). The Dailidės fibula may indicate gift-giving exchange between the elites in the region of the East Lithuanian Barrow Culture and in Mazuria, the latter also connected with the distant elites in the Carpathian Basin.
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Annex 1: Fibulae of Werner’s Class I J

1. Dalidēs near Joniškis (Molėtai district, Lithuania); stray find; copper-alloy; L=6.25; Tautavičius, 1972, pp. 145 and 146 fig. 16.

2. Donji Stenjevec, in Zagreb (Croatia); stray find; copper-alloy; Vinski, 1954, pp. 79 and pl. 50; Werner, 1960, p. 118; Kudlaček, 1964, p. 42 pl. 5.2; Vinski, 1958, pp. 28 and pl. 17.9; Simoni, 1981, p. 156 and fig. 2.

3. Kielary (former Kellaren, Olsztyn district, Poland); stray find; copper-alloy; L=5.0; Werner, 1950, p. 154 and pl. 30.46; Kühn, 1956, p. 101 and pl. 38.8,3; Kühn, 1981, p. 185 and pl. 42.265.

4. Negotin (Serbia); stray find; copper-alloy; L=5.0; Csallány, 1961, p. 356 and pl. 213.7.

5. Novi Banovci (Zemun district, Serbia); stray find; copper-alloy; L=5.0; Brunšmid, 1905, pp. 217-218 and 213 fig. 32.8; Csallány, 1961, p. 240 and pl. 213.3; Kühn, 1956, p. 101 and pl. 27.8,2; Vinski, 1958, p. 28 and pl. 17.8.

6. Özdödeák (Csongrád district, Hungary); found in an inhumation burial, together with 12 glass beads with eyeshaped inlays ("Augenperlen"); copper-alloy; L=5.1; Csallány, 1961, p. 38 pl. 191.16 and 259.1.

7. Pastys’ke (Cherkasy district, Ukraine); copper-alloy; L=4.5; Kalitinskii, 1928, p. 209 and pl. 36.49; Werner, 1950, p. 154 and pl. 30.45; Kühn, 1956, p. 101 and pl. 37.8; Korszukhina, 1996, pp. 378 and 618 pl. 28.8.

8. Săratea Monteoru (Buzău district, Romania); found in the cremation burial no. 1321; copper-alloy; L=2.8; Nestor, 1961, p. 446; Fiedler, 1992, pp. 81 and 83 fig. 11.9.

9. Tumiany (former Daumen, Olsztyn district, Poland); found in the cremation burial no. 56, together with a copper-alloy belt buckle with chip carved decoration; copper-alloy; L=5.5; Kühn, 1956, p. 101 and pl. 27.8,4; Kühn, 1981, pp. 106-107 and pl. 19.116; Kulakov, 1989, pp. 191 and 252 fig. 36.3.

10. Tumiany (former Daumen, Olsztyn district, Poland); stray find; copper-alloy; L=5.0; Kühn, 1956, p. 101 and pl. 27.7,5; Kühn, 1981, p. 110 and pl. 21.132.

Annex 2: Fibulae of Werner’s Class I F

1. Adâmești, in Alexandria (Romania); stray find; copper-alloy; L=8.1; Spuru, 1970, p. 531 and fig. 1; Teodor, 1992, pp. 138 and 148 fig. 7.8.

2. Bucharest-Băneasa (Romania); settlement find; silver, fragment; L=3.3; Constantiniu, 1965, pp. 77-78 and 92 fig. 18; Constantiniu, 1966, pp. 667 fig. 2.2; Teodor, 1992, pp. 138 (where the fibula is of copper-alloy, L=4) and 149 fig. 8.5.

3. Bucharest-Soldat Ghivan Street (Romania); found in the sunken-floored-floored building no. 12, together with wheel- and hand-made pottery; copper-alloy, fragment; L=3.25; Constantiniu, 1966, pp. 667 fig. 2.1; Dolinescu-Ferche and Constantiniu, 1981, pp. 324 and 323 fig. 20; Teodorescu, 1972, p. 79 fig. 3; Teodor, 1992, pp. 138 (where L=3.8) and 149 fig. 8.8.

4. Chyhryn (Cherkasy district, Ukraine); stray find; silver; Prykhodniuk, 1980, pp. 140 and 70 fig. 48.

5. Davideni (Neamţ district, Romania); settlement find; copper-alloy; L=8.6; Mitrea, 2001, pp. 162-163 and 329 fig. 68.3.

6. Desa (Dolj district, Ukraine); stray find; copper-alloy; L=6.6; Popescu, 1941-1944, pp. 505 and 504 fig. 11/121; Nicolaeusu-Plopoș, 1945-1947, pp. 310-311; Werner, 1950, p. 155 fig. 3; Teodor, 1992, pp. 138 (where L=6.7) and 148 fig. 7.3.

7. Dudari (Kaniv district, Ukraine); stray find; copper-alloy; L=7.8; Korzukhina, 1996, pp. 354 and 684 pl. 94.11.

8. Duleaunca (Teleorman district, Romania); settlement find; fragment; Dolinescu-Ferche, 1992, p. 152.

9. Filiuş (Harşita district, Romania); found in the sunken-floored-flooring building no. 20, together with a copper-alloy earring with twisted end; copper-alloy, fragment; L=3.9; Székely, 1971a, pp. 147-148 and 156 fig. 5.1; Székely, 1971b, pp. 131 and 133 fig. 3.2-2a; Székely, 1974-1975, p. 39 and pl. 9/10 and 10a; Teodor, 1992, pp. 138 and 149 fig. 8.6.
10. Kamenovo (Razgrad district, Bulgaria); found in a hoard, together with three other bow fibulae (Werner’s classes I C and I F), four human-shaped figurines, a cast, perforated strap end, and two bronze appliqués; copper-alloy; Pisarova, 1997, pp. 286-287 and 294 fig. 1.9; Rashev, 2000, p. 189 pl. 83/2.

11. Kamenovo (Razgrad district, Bulgaria); found in a hoard together with three other bow fibulae (Werner’s classes I C and I F), four human-shaped figurines, a cast, perforated strap end, and two bronze appliqués; copper-alloy, fragment; Pisarova, 1997, pp. 287 and 294 fig. 1.6; Rashev, 2000, p. 189 pl. 83.15.

12. Keszthely-Dobogó (Zala district, Hungary); stray find; copper-alloy; L=6.8; Werner, 1950, p. 154 and pl. 30.33.

13. Kosewo (former Alt-Kossewen, Magowo district, Poland); found in the cremation burial no. 501; copper-alloy; L=5.6; Kühn, 1956, p. 95 and pl. 24.12; Kühn, 1981, p. 59 and pl. 3.18; Kulakov, 1989, pp. 183, 216 fig. 4a and 236 fig. 20.4.

14. Kosewo (former Alt-Kossewen, Magowo district, Poland); found in the cremation burial no. 553b, together with an identical fibula; copper-alloy; L=6.4; Kühn, 1956, p. 95 and pl. 24.7; Kühn, 1981, p. 60 and pl. 5.23; Kulakov, 1989, p. 184.

15. Kosewo (former Alt-Kossewen, Magowo district, Poland); found in the cremation burial no. 553b, together with an identical fibula; copper-alloy; L=6.4; Kühn, 1956, p. 95; Kühn, 1981, p. 60; Kulakov, 1989, p. 184.

16. Miętkie (former Miingień, Ołszyn district, Poland); found in the cremation burial no. 424, together with a bow fibula of Werner’s class I D and an amber bead; Kühn, 1956, p. 95 and pl. 24.8; Kühn, 1981, pp. 220-221 and pl. 54.343; Kulakov, 1989, pp. 181 and 230 fig. 14.1.

17. Miętkie (former Miingień, Ołszyn district, Poland); found in the cremation burial no. 579, together with an identical fibula, a copper-alloy buckle, and glass beads; copper-alloy; L=6.3; Kühn, 1956, p. 95 and pl. 24.9; Kühn, 1981, p. 221 and pl. 54.347; Kulakov, 1989, pp. 182 and 232 fig. 16.3.

18. Miętkie (former Miingień, Ołszyn district, Poland); found in the cremation burial no. 579, together with an identical fibula, a copper-alloy buckle, and glass beads; copper-alloy; L=6.3; Kühn, 1956, p. 95; Kühn, 1981, p. 221; Kulakov, 1989, p. 182.

19. Pastyrs’ke (Cherkasy district, Ukraine); copper-alloy, fragment; Korzukhina, 1996, pp. 379 and 618 pl. 28.13.

20. Pietroasele (Buzău district, Romania); stray find; silver, fragment; L=4.4; Curta and Dupoi, 1994-1995, pp. 217 and 219 fig. 1.

21. Răcari (Dej district, Romania); stray find; copper-alloy, fragment; L=4.1; Werner, 1950, p. 154 and pl. 30.34 (where the fibula was found in Banat); Csallány, 1961, p. 196 and pl. 272.7; Tudor, 1964, p. 254 and fig. 11.2; Toropu, 1976, p. 133; Teodor, 1992, pp. 138 and 148 fig. 7.7.

22. Semenki (Vinnytsia district, Ukraine); found in the sunken-floor building no. 8, together with wheel- and hand-made pottery, including clay pans, and an earring with twisted end; copper-alloy, fragment; Khaviuluk, 1974, pp. 207 and 202 fig. 11.2.

23. Smila (Cherkasy district, Ukraine); stray find; copper-alloy, fragment; L=6.1; Bobrinckii, 1901, p. 28 and pl. 1.8; Werner, 1950, p. 154 and pl. 30.32; Korzukhina, 1996, pp. 373 and 669 pl. 79.12.

24. Sztymáz-Fehértó (Csongrád district, Hungary); found in the inhumation burial no. 33 of the cemetery A, together with an identical fibula, two copper-alloy earrings with bead-shaped pendant, glass beads, and a wheel-made jar; silver; L=8.3; Csallány, 1961, p. 228 and pl. 309.17; Madaras, 1995, pl. 5.

25. Sztymáz-Fehértó (Csongrád district, Hungary); found in the inhumation burial no. 33 of the cemetery A, together with an identical fibula, two copper-alloy earrings with bead-shaped pendant, glass beads, and a wheel-made jar; silver; L=8.3; Csallány, 1961, p. 228 and pl. 309.18.

26. Tumiany (former Daumen, Olszyn district, Poland); found in the cremation burial no. 3, together with glass beads and a copper-alloy torc; copper-alloy; L=6.6; Heydeck, 1895, p. 43 and pl. 3/4; Kühn, 1981, p. 104 and pl. 17.105; Kulakov, 1989, pp. 187 and 241 fig. 25.2.

27. Tumiany (former Daumen, Olszyn district, Poland); found in the cremation burial no. 20, together with a copper-alloy buckle, two spurs and a copper-alloy finger-ring; copper-alloy; L=6.5; Heydeck, 1895, p. 45; Kühn, 1981, p. 105 and pl. 17.108; Kulakov, 1989, pp. 188 and 242 fig. 26.1.

28. Tumiany (former Daumen, Olszyn district, Poland); found in the cremation burial no. 44, together with an identical fibula; copper-alloy; L=6.6; Kühn, 1981, p. 113 and pl. 24.148.

29. Tumiany (former Daumen, Olszyn district, Poland); found in the cremation burial no. 44, together with an identical fibula; copper-alloy; L=6.6; Kühn, 1981, p. 113.

30. Tumiany (former Daumen, Olszyn district, Poland); found in the cremation burial no. 105; copper-alloy, together with an identical fibula; Heydeck, 1895, p. 59; Kulakov, 1989, pp. 195, 216 fig. 4g, and 263 fig. 47.1.

31. Tumiany (former Daumen, Olszyn district, Poland); found in the cremation burial no. 105; copper-alloy, together with an identical fibula; Heydeck, 1895, p. 59; Kulakov, 1989, pp. 195, 216 fig. 4g, and 263 fig. 47.1.

32. Tumiany (former Daumen, Olszyn district, Poland); stray find; copper-alloy; Kühn, 1981, pl. 21.131.

33. Tumiany (former Daumen, Olszyn district, Poland); stray find; copper-alloy; Kühn, 1981, pl. 21.133.

34. Tumiany (former Daumen, Olszyn district, Poland); stray find; copper-alloy; Kühn, 1981, pl. 21.134.

35. Tumiany (former Daumen, Olszyn district, Poland); stray find; copper-alloy; L=6.2; Kühn, 1981, pp. 102-103 and pl. 22.138.

36. Tumiany (former Daumen, Olszyn district, Poland); stray find; copper-alloy; L=6; Kühn, 1981, pp. 102-103 and pl. 22.139.

37. Tumiany (former Daumen, Olszyn district, Poland); stray find; copper-alloy; L=6; Kühn, 1981, pp. 102-103.

38. Tylkowo (former Scheufelsdorf, Szczyno district, Poland); copper-alloy; L=6.8; Kühn, 1956, p. 95 and pl. 24.5; Kühn, 1981, p. 94 and pl. 17.108; Kulakov, 1989, pp. 195, 216 fig. 4g, and 263 fig. 47.1.

39. Unknown location (Banat region, Romania); copper-alloy, fragment; Tănase and Mare, 2001, pp. 190 and 203 pl. 5.2.

40. Unknown location (Eastern Prussia); copper-alloy; L=5.1; Kühn, 1956, p. 95 and pl. 24.11; Kühn, 1981, p. 264 and pl. 63.410.


Pagal stiklo karolių duomenis, sege iš Óföldeák gali būti datuojama ankstyvosius Avarų periodą – 7-ojo amžiaus pirmąją puse. Segės iš Kielary ir Tumiany gali būti šiek tiek ankstyvesnės (VI a. pabaiga), jų dažnai ornamento motyvų yra perimtos iš Csongrád tipo segių, ir datuojamos VI a. pabaiga. Wernerio I J tipo seges kildinamos iš Mozūrijo, o Dailydžių tipo, kaip lokališkes produkcinės gamybos, gali būti pagamintas pagal Mozūrijo segių originalus. Ryšiai tarp Olštino grupės Mozūrijoje ir Rytų Lietuvos pilkapių kultūros bendruomenių mažai įtikėtini, tačiau jis yra kitų patikimų duomenų, kad tokie ryšiai egzistavo. Tai diržo sagistis iš Ziboliškių (Svenčionių r.) ar „slaviška“ pagal Wernerį I D formas sege iš Mikolcy netoli Medelio (Baltarusija). Priešingai – Mozūrijoje nėra segių, kurios žinomos Baltarusijos (Nikadzimava), Latvijos (Boķi and Strīķi), Estijos (Jägala Jõesu) ir Kaliningrado srities (Linkuhnen and Schreitlauken) teritorijose. Dailydžių segė, aptikta Rytų Lietuvos pilkapių kultūros teritorijoje, matyt, yra pasekmė maimų, vykusius tarp to meto Mozūrijos ir Rytų Lietuvos pilkapių kultūros didumoje ir vėliau užsimegusią ryšį su nutelesia Karpatų regiono didumomene.

Vertė Algirdas Girininkas

Florin Curta