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INTRODUCTION

Research Relevance, Topic Formulation and Research Problem

Relevance of the topic. The land, which for long centuries embodied the fundamental asset of the society of the time, was the social, economic and political foundation of the noble part of the society. The ideal of the epoch is expressed by the maxim of that time: “No land without the lord, no lord without the land.” Despite its significance, the analysis of the problem of land-ownership in scientific literature is not sufficient.

The historians engaged in the research of manorial development in the region of Central Europe pay special attention to the 16th century. It should be noted that its evaluations in historiography are rather controversial. On the one hand, this century is characterised by the rise of economy; on the other hand, historians tend to describe it as the period of decline and crisis caused by remote commercial markets, reduced economic viability and production of agriculture in certain European regions (the concept of medieval decline). Some historians believe that the aforementioned crisis reached those territories and estates, which were located at a considerable distance from commercial centres at that time. It should be noted that it was not a sustainable and absolute economic stagnation. The very essence lied in the decline of income of szlachta or landlords, as they were not actively involved in economic life at that time. According to historians, the general level of national income was on the growing scale; therefore, on the contrary, we should speak about economic growth. Yet another opinion maintains that this period (1450–1550) shows the traces of universal economic revival, which followed the economic depression, in other words, a typical transition from one period to another.

The result of economic changes, which occurred in the land-ownership of Central Europe at that time, was serfdom-based manors (folwarks). Structural organisation of the lord’s manor farm with the measured and respectively distributed land depending on its scope and quality and the peasants paying their dues and services had to ensure, in
the economic dimension, a more efficient use of land and more active participation of manor farms in the markets as well as the growth of income to the interest of the landlords. The structures of land-ownership and land-use developed at that time determined the economic, political and cultural positions of the country and the region and laid down the guidelines determining the development of economic structures of subsequent times and economic activity models of European countries.

The period of prosperity of manorialism in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (hereinafter referred to as the GDL) as well as the neighbouring Poland and Livonia coincided with the end of the 15th century – the 16th century. Researchers universally agree to refer to this period as the period of economic revival. Even though Samogitia distinguished by the peculiar characteristics of its political, judicial-administrative and social-economic development in the context of the GDL, it was nevertheless influenced by economic changes occurring in the GDL and across Europe. Nevertheless, according to some historians the changes took a rather peculiar form in this territory. It is generally agreed that by contrast to the remaining territory of Lithuania, the manorial-serf economy did not establish its positions in Samogitia.

The political changes seen in Europe from the 1980s made a significant impact on the development of the science of history. As soon as historians realised the inadequacy of the paradigm of manorial-serf system, a number of Central European countries embarked on the historiographical revision of social-economic relations. The established historiographical clichés, such as manorial-serf system, the process of “the second serfdom phenomenon”, were refused. It was realised that the essential mistake of previous research was the study of manorial relations in separation from the relations of this system in the West. We may conclude that the same problem existed in the Lithuanian historiography, even though the research of manorial system of the GDL and Samogitia alike is not sufficiently developed. During the last two decades the research of the GDL nobility has been developed in the directions of genealogical research of individual families and social-political research of the elite, whereas such aspects as economic activities of the nobility, land-ownership or its structure remained out-
side the scope of reflection. The rise of research based on the range of social problems encourages historians to gain a deeper knowledge and to make a more comprehensive analysis of the economic life of the noble class, its directions and peculiar characteristics.

The lagging character of Lithuanian economic historiography was partially determined by the absence of stronger positions of this research field in Lithuania. When Lithuania restored its independence in the last decade of the 20th century, social-economic research remained in the periphery of scientific interests. While the research of GDL land-ownership still remains rather unpopular in scientific literature, the growing number of research studies of European and American economic history has proposed new research methods and theoretical approaches for a number of years. Such a situation opened a vast gap between the paradigms of economic history of Europe and Lithuania. Therefore, it is essential for Lithuanian historians to make use of the experience of economic historiography, which has been developing in the world on a rapid scale. It may promote the rise of new research fields and interpretation of economic history and economic model of our country. Finally, such new research studies would lay the foundations for synthetic and applied research contributing to the better understanding of the place and role of Lithuania in universal history.

Research problem. The 20th century social-economic historiography of Central Europe witnessed the consolidation of the paradigm coined by the historians supporting Marxist methodology, according to which large manors, the so called folwarks, based of peasant labour (corvée) and covering the areas from several to more than ten lans, established their positions in the 16th century Central Europe, eastwards from the River Elbe. For that reason most attention was paid to the research of social-economic relations in this region for a long time. In the context of the afore-mentioned paradigm, the phenomenon of the manorial-serf system was defined as the manorial-serf system itself, which historians accepted as the axiom and never questioned. When serf system was taken as the norm, other phenomena, even though widely spread, were treated as marginal and not affecting the created vision of social-economic relations. Contemporary science has
already questioned this theoretical approach for several decades, therefore, more and more previously unreflected historical topics find their way to research field, economic activities of the noble class and their forms being one of the most important topics among them.

The absence of consistent research of land-ownership of the medieval Europe (bearing in mind the model of periodization introduced by the new Annales School) and the established historical paradigm on different developmental processes of land-ownership in European regions are among the most significant theoretical problems of this topic as well. The complexity of contemporary land-ownership research also lies in the necessity to apply a new viable theoretical model, the search for which has already been one of the key objectives of this research study as well as contemporary European economic historiography in general for quite a long time. On the other hand, we may not forget that one of the theoretical aspects of model development is the fact that there is no single and correct theoretical model, which could be applied to collect the knowledge of reality.

Today, the directions for the afore-mentioned research are outlined by the consolidation of Europe, which began in 1989 and called for historiographical revision, as well as the rise of the new historical paradigms. The discussions on the issues of social-economic systems, such as feudalism and capitalism, and their application in different regions and countries have been ongoing to this day.

The absence of consistent economic historiographic tradition in Lithuania determines several other specific problems. One of them is the insufficiency of historiographical-methodological context. It determines the necessity to include rather broad theoretical-contextual considerations relating to both general European problems of manorial history and specific local issues of manorial history into the dissertation.

Historiography has been dominated by the opinion that Samogitia was one of the few regions of the GDL and Central Europe where neither folwarks nor serf system was developed. This opinion is used to conclude that the provision of the Wallach Reform on the establishment of manors engaged in agricultural production was neither implemented in the ruler’s and church’s nor private estates. We tend to forget in this
way that manors, otherwise referred to as folwarks in historiography, were not a 16th century innovation and the roots of economic activity of the noble part of the society stretch to far older times.

Even though there were certain attempts to study the 16th century Samogitian private manors, however, the information available on them in historiography is not sufficient: 1) the research of the 16th century manorialism was carried out in the ruler’s and church’s lands seeking for arable lands and paying little attention to other structural parts of the manorial economy; 2) even though historiography discusses all forms of rent, corvée (forced labour) was highlighted as one of the key indicators of folwarks/manors; 3) the possibilities of the methods applied to this day were rather narrow and limited, therefore, we do not yet have answers today to a number of questions raised in historiography.

It was determined that after the measurement of land, until the 17th century and afterwards, neither the ruler’s nor the church’s lands seen the establishment of folwarks in Samogitia. What processes evolved in private landownership; why weren’t the ruler’s activities relevant to private landowners; could they have their own vision of economic activity depending on the conditions of European and local conjuncture and the social position of the owners themselves? If the system of folwarks was not established in Samogitia and the objectives expressed in the provisions of the Wallach Reform were not followed, what were the economic activities of the numerous noble class in Samogitia, which accounted for around 10% of the total population of the region and which owned the larger part of land? Was Samogitia actually the region of unique social-economic development? If yes, what was peculiar about the development of manorialism in Samogitia?

The revision and consideration of the afore-mentioned problems and the answers to the questions raised may not only contribute to the better understanding of the situation of private estates at that time, social-economic issues, but also enable a new evaluation of the place and role of Samogitia and the entire GDL in the economic domain of Europe at that time.

Formulation of the topic. By means of research of land-ownership in the GDL and Samogitia in the context of development of European manorial system, the main social and economic structural elements of the 16th century Samogitian private manors are analysed by focusing on the
most important directions of manorial economic activity and their internal economic organisation. Theoretical manor models shaped by the western historiography and the historians of economy of the neighbouring Poland were employed in the formation of research object. The most important social and economic manorial structures will be distinguished, the scheme of organisation of private estates of that time and the peculiar economic characteristics will be identified by means of this theoretical approach.

By seeking to find out whether manors were organised on the basis of the conditions of economic conjuncture established in Europe at that time, the thesis will try to distinguish the indicators of economic profitability of the manor/folwark. By means of correlative-regressive analysis, the characteristics of change of the 16th century Samogitian manors will be identified.

Manor townships were not included into the research field, even though their consistent development is recorded in the 16th century historiography. Historians acknowledge that they were rather weak at that time and could not play a decisive role in the economy. It should also be mentioned that the type and scope of research does not make it possible to focus on all manorial economic structures and their problems but the key ones, which, though do not provide the opportunity to get an exhaustive picture of the manorial economy engaged in production at that time but may help to understand the key changes of the manor and its economic structure as well as specific forms of the private manor determining the economic and social situation in Samogitia at that time.

**Research Object, Goal and Objectives**

The 16th century Samogitian private manor adjusting to the new European economic conditions and its social and economic organisational structure were chosen as the research object.

The goal of the dissertation is to identify, by means of the discussion of the general macroeconomic tendencies of the European economy determining the development of the medieval Samogitian manor, whether the manors of private estates of this voivodeship of the GDL (otherwise referred to as the Eldership of Samogitia at that time) adjusted to the new economic conditions in the 16th century and to find out the organisation of
manorial economy and the branches of the economy playing the key role within it, its peculiar characteristics and type of development.

The following objectives were raised to achieve the aforementioned goal:

1) To distinguish and discuss the key problems of research of the European manorial system with a special focus on the peculiar characteristics of Central Europe and the range of problems of Samogitia and to identify the framework ensuring the relevance and novelty of this research with reference to the most up-to-date Lithuanian and foreign historiography;

2) By analysing the problems of the origins and development of European manors, which have been little reflected upon in Lithuanian historiography, discuss and identify the type and development of the manorial system in the GDL and Samogitia and its place in the context of development of the European manorial system;

3) To clarify the theoretical concepts of the manor applied in European historiography and to formulate the theoretical organisational scheme of Samogitian estates enabling the research of manorial economic structure on the basis of the typologisation of the terms used to denote the manor in the 16th century historical sources of Samogitia;

4) In comparison to personnel structures of the manors in neighbouring areas, determine and analyse the manorial personnel model of Samogitian private manors, distinguish the key personnel categories and groups and discuss their interaction and significance to the production-oriented manorial economy;

5) To identify the key segments of the economic structure of private manors determining the production capacity of the manors of that time; to discuss their condition and specific features.

6) To identify the most important indicators of commodity output of manorial system and specific developmental characteristics of the 16th century Samogitian manors.
Research Novelty and Significance

The novelty of the topic chosen for research is grounded on the following arguments:

1. Despite rather old traditions of the research of manor related topics in Europe, the social-economic research of manorial system in Lithuanian territories of the GDL, including Samogitia, is still rather scarce. The situation became even more complicated due to the 20th century political circumstances, which made the issues of manorial history remain in the margins of historiography;

2. Considering that a rather one-sided aspect of manorial research was established in historiography due to the afore-given reasons, the analysis of the problems of manorial system was framed inside the context of classical contradictions. Due to such a situation, the most innovative research of foreign historiography, including certain structures of the manor itself, remained outside the scope of research field;

3. The treatment of the 16th century Samogitia – as the region where neither folwarks nor serf system established its firm positions – continues to increase the gap between the historical and historiographical context of the GDL region and Central Europe, as well as the remaining part of Europe to an even greater extent;

4. Social and economic structures developed in Samogitian manors have not been revealed in historiography; their peculiar features have not been analysed and their situation in the context of the neighbouring countries has not been comprehended;

5. The dissertation proposes and applies the theoretical and practical levels of manorial research for the first time in Lithuanian historiography;

6. The research system enabling the systemisation of source material and helping to specify the peculiar features of the mentioned structures was developed by means of the analysis of structural manifestations of private manors.
Chronological and Geographical Limits

The chronological research limits can be defined by the period of the 16th century, when, by contrast to the prevailing opinion to this day, not only other regions of Central Europe but also Samogitia witnessed the rise of private manors (folwarks) as well-developed stable objects of land-ownership with a rather fully developed social and economic structure. In the context of European history this century is universally defined as the period of manifestation of economic differences across the European regions, when European agricultural systems moved in different developmental directions. It used to be thought that at approximately that time large manors based on corvée labour of peasants established their firm positions in Central Europe and Samogitia was one among few territories of this region where manorial (folwark) economy was not developed.

The chronological limits of the research were partially determined by the sources of manorial history and their information possibilities. The base of the sources used covers the period of 1539–1600. The first inventory of the small manor of Ona Daugėlaitė located in the former volost of Vilkija, which provides a rather detailed reflection of the manorial property, dates back to 1539. It is also considered the oldest inventory of private property. The year 1600 was chosen as the final chronological limit. The mentioned sources reveal both the pre-reform period of private estates and the post-reform period, when the land was divided into wallacks and was possibly prepared for the establishment of “new folwarks”. The sources selected in such a way can potentially reveal both external and internal organizational changes evolving at that time. Historians believe that it was this period, which must have seen the most prominent processes of manorial development and the strengthening of positions of the manor.

Geographically, the research covers the Eldership of Samogitia (otherwise called the Duchy of Samogitia from the 17th century), which, being one of the voivodeships of the GDL from the 15th century, constituted a separate administrative unit, which did not only distinguished by its peculiar geographical, natural and demographical situation but also specific law, economic and social system.
**Research Methods**

To the larger part, the dissertation is an analytical and statistical analysis of social and economic structure of the 16th century Samogitian private manors based on local micro-analytical research combined with the comparative contexts of European manorial development. The theoretical and methodological basis of the thesis comprises of historical-economic analysis of land-ownership forms and their structure, which applies the principles of “long-term” processes and continuity of the “modern historiography” introduced by the *Annales School*. Linguistic, typological and correlative-regressive methods were also employed for the reconstruction of the purpose of these economic objects, their structures and change dynamics.

**Structure of the Dissertation**

The thesis consists of the introduction, five chapters, conclusions, references and annexes. The first chapter discusses the theoretical framework of the topic under analysis. The second chapter consists of the analysis of development of the medieval European land-ownership and manorial system as well as the factors determining its local developmental characteristics. Such approaches provide the opportunity to better understand the circumstances of the manorial development in the GDL and Samogitia and make it possible to integrate it to the theoretical considerations of European historiography and, once all the differences are harmonised, apply the theoretical model to the 16th century Samogitian manor. The third chapter distinguishes two levels of interpretation of the manor: theoretical and practical. Their analysis led to create and apply the organisational scheme of Samogitian manors of that time as economic objects. The fourth chapter is dedicated to the discussion of personnel structure of the 16th century private manors in Samogitia and its characteristic features. The fifth chapter discusses the key and most significant economic branches and crafts of private manors and analyses manorial production and its specific features.
STRUCTURE OF THE DISSERTATION AND SUMMARY OF THE CONTENT

The dissertation constitutes of the introduction, research-analytical part subdivided into five chapters, conclusions, references and annexes. The presentation of the material follows thematic and chronological principles. The summarised empirical research and the results are provided in the summary.

The first chapter of the thesis — Range of Problems of Land-Ownership Research Studies and Theoretical Framework — focuses on four land-ownership research problems, which are most often addressed in historiography and which are discussed in the four sections of this chapter.

The first theoretical problem is the specific characteristics of the European regional historical processes, which have been highlighted by some historians for quite a while and which are taken into consideration when modelling the systems of periodization of individual countries differing by their chronological and geographical contexts.

In the context of the concept of the three regions of Europe introduced by the Hungarian historian Jenő Szűcs, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (GDL), along with Samogitia, falls to the region of Eastern (Central) Europe, otherwise called the region of Central Europe. For that reason, the medieval historians perceived this territory as the eastern or peripheral border part of Central Europe. Due to such a position, the GDL and other Eastern European countries alike became the participants of European processes in political, public and economic life, though they always were the successors to these processes rather than their active initiators.

Both the critics and advocates of European regional comparative studies agree that the greatest advantage of this theoretical approach is its contribution to the better understanding of individual phenomenon and determination of the common limits of interpretation of European phenomena. According to some historians, one of the most solid links between the mentioned theoretical solutions today is the synthesis between economic world spheres (according to Marian Małowist) or
The second important research problem is the differences between the systems of periodization of Western and Central Europe and the search for their compatibility. The question is essential in pursuit of integrity of one’s country in the history of Europe. It has been determined that the “practical” (introduced by C. Keller, G. Horn), Marxist (Karl Marx), malthusian (R.T. Malthus) theories are not sufficient due to the strictness of historical landmarks or they are hardly applicable to the Eastern European region due to other specific characteristics of social and geographical factors inherent to Western Europe.

The schemes of periodization based on gradual economic development and evolutionist development of land-ownership forms applied by K. Bücher, E. Meyer and representatives of the Annales School are much closer to the topic under analysis. The model of periodization of the Long Middle Ages introduced by Jacques Le Goff, which enables the perception of development of land-ownership as a solid process characterised by specific local characteristics, was chosen for the interpretation of development of agrarian history of the GDL and Samogitia. Also, this system of periodization best applies for the discussion and solving of the problems of land-ownership in the medieval Western Europe as a “maximum” region and Central Europe as the region of lagging developments.

The third theoretical problem is the problem of interpretation of the concept of feudalism and its application in land-ownership research. Even though there are a number of available definitions of feudalism, the literature of economic history construes it as the dominant social-economic system of the Middle Ages with fief system and the divided ownership of land as its basis. The formulation and application of feudalism models in the discussion of social and economic relations may help historians determine the social-economic characteristics of the region, country or land; however, its overestimation may lead to the treatment of the phenomenon of feudalism, which, in the opinion of some historians, has never even existed as such, as the absolute rule. Nevertheless, researchers of land-ownership forms find certain problems of this theoretical concept particu-
larly relevant. Among such problems are the problems of the so-called crisis or decline of feudalism in the 14th–15th centuries and the genesis of capitalism in the 15th and 16th–18th centuries, which help to explain the changes in land-ownership and specific characteristics of their development in European regions.

Yet another fundamental problem of land-ownership research characteristic of a number of European countries is the diversity of the terms of land-ownership and their multi-sidedness. The term manor (Lith. dvaras) used in historiography (literal loan-translation of the terms curia, alodium, praedia, dwor used to denote the late medieval estate) is only a historiographical construct of the concept, which is not always consistent with the terms used during the Middle Ages to refer to the objects of land-ownership. As a phenomenon in the real and symbolic dimension, the manor played a number of functions – economic, political, administrative, legal, cultural – therefore, the shaping of its concept is a complex process. The research is also made complicated by the fact that apart from the term manor, the historiography of Central Europe of the 14th-17th centuries, in particular, the 16th century, uses the term folwark to refer to the organised land estate engaged in agricultural production.

In Central Europe, the manor has for a long time been studied as the starting point of manorial-serf system, which originated at the end of the Late Middle Ages – the beginning of the early modern period, where a larger share of income of the landlord/steward of the estate was generated from the owned plot of land cultivated by means of forced labour (corvée) of peasants. In search of the genesis of manorial-serf system, a number of historiographical theories were introduced. The theory of markets has been extensively developed and provides the highest number of possibilities for land-ownership research studies. However, its problem is that the model of theoretical interpretation was formulated for the interpretation of the structure of large serfdom-based folwarks (the model of the “maximum” manor/folwark), i.e. only a large manor/folwark based on crop production and forced labour (corvée) falls into the research field. For that reason, the early manor/folwark and its evolution into the commercial
farm of the landlord based on corvée labour remains beyond adequate research attention.

To enable a more flexible and consistent interpretation of land-ownership forms, a number of historians have lately followed the “evolutionist” interpretation of the origins of manors or folwarks. It contributes to bringing the early, average and large manors/folwarks engaged in crop production and based on forced labour (corvée) into a single developmental process, as well as studying them as the phenomenon of economic activity of the ruling class.

The second chapter – *Genesis of the Manor and its Structures in Western and Central Europe (7th-16th centuries, 18th century) Based on Historiographic Data* – is devoted to the issues of origins of the manorial system determining the European social, political and economic spheres, as well as the formation and development of its local forms. In respect of the development of the manorial system and its specific characteristics, the chapter is subdivided into three sections.

The first section is entitled *Origins and Development of Manorial System in Europe in the 7th-14th centuries*. It discusses the origins of manors and their system and developmental tendencies in Western and Central Europe.

The development of the manorial system in Europe dates back to the 9th-13th and 14th centuries. The Roman domains referred to as *villae* are considered its prototype. After the collapse of the Roman Empire, they evolved into the farms (allodia) of individual producers, who were no longer slave-owners but peasants. The strengthened positions of large farms and landlords determined a gradual deterioration of the peasant’s allodium and the consolidation of the feudal form of land-ownership. In legal and economic terms, *fief* system (*manorialism, seigneurialism*) formed the basis of manorial system, whereas the formation of the bipartite system of land-ownership (comprising of the landlord’s and peasant’s lands) and the origins of the phenomenon of fortifications in Europe (*ICASTELLAMENTO, Villikationsverfassung*) were important impulses for the development of manorial system (*manorial system, manorial lords, Guthsherrschaft*).
Historians highlight that different European regions showed different developments of manorial system. Due to the differing manor size and economic structure, manorial management and peasant dependence on the manor differed as well. It is important not to overestimate the spread of manorial system. Even though in some places manorial system was developed only partially or did not exist at all, other places showed successful existence of allodial system even in the areas, where manorial system was most extensively developed.

Until the 15th century the development of land-ownership in Central Europe essentially coincided with Western Europe, but the development did not occur simultaneously from the very beginning. The 12th–13th centuries witnessed a gradual collapse of manorial system in Western Europe. It was replaced by the farms of peasants, who were levied a fee in exchange for the use of land.

The 12th century was only the starting point in the development of manorial system in Central Europe. It passed through two stages in its development: local allodial traditions and German colonization structures. When the allodium established its positions and fief system was about to emerge, the land did not belong to the community as it used to in Western Europe but to the king or dukes (patrimonia). The ruler’s lands given to his servants or soldiers in the form of benefice gradually formed private estates in the vicinity of communal or allodial land.

Another important group of factors, which accelerated the origins of manorial system in Central Europe, was the intensifying relations between Western and Central Europe, which occurred from the 13th century and which gradually determined regional economic developments. The inter-dependence of the two continental parts acquired certain peculiar characteristics – the West maintained links with Central Europe as the supplier of raw materials. Therefore, historians refer to German expansion of that time as the most important factor of economic revival of Central Europe.

The second section *European Agrarian Dualism and its Genesis: Changes of Manorial System and Reasons for Change in the 14th-16th century* discusses the economic characteristics of European regions, which were most apparent in the ownership of land. The growing re-
Regional differences in the 15th century led to the European economic dualism in the 16th century. In historiography, the subsequent agrarian development of Western Europe is treated as the continued development of the previously evolved feudal land-rent farming, whereas in Central Europe it is understood as the shift from the same land-ownership forms, except that they were grounded on forced labour (corvée).

Such a separation of economic activity across European regions and the differences in urban development in European regions caused the conservativeness of economy in the southern and eastern part of the continent. The landlords of the lands located eastwards from the River Elbe used to refuse rent in cash and imposed forced labour (corvée) in their farms. According to some historians, the remoteness of the markets determined the necessity of such a form of organization of land-ownership.

Until the very end of the 14th century, the ownership of land in Central Europe was organised on the basis of allodia. In the midst of the 15th century, the holdings of royal domains used to become the principal integral part of private estates, which became more and more numerous. In the sphere of land-ownership, such a phenomenon contributed to the unprecedented expansion of private estates. Economic and social organisation became one of the most characteristic features of such estates: large manors based of peasant labour (corvée), the so called folwarks, covering the area from several to more than ten lans (Polish land measurement unit), emerged in the economic landscape of Central Europe.

The third section Specific Characteristics of Land-Ownership in the GDL and Samogitia: the Rise of Manorial System and Formation of Folwark Manors in the 14th-16th Centuries is devoted to the discussion of land-ownership formations in the GDL and Samogitia.

Even though the economic development of Samogitia in the 13th–14th centuries was slightly lagging behind compared certain other lands of Central Europe, including the GDL, it distinguished by rather active processes of private land-ownership development. They reached their peak in the 15th–16th centuries. However, historiography became domi-
nated by the opinion that Samogitia was a rather peculiar region in the context of Central Europe in the 16th–18th centuries, where neither folwarks nor forced labour (corvée) were spread on a larger scale.

Due to political reasons, the principles of Marxist historiography played the most significant role in the research, which shaped the afore-mentioned opinion. For that reason, the research of the 16th-century manorial system limited with the analysis of social relations of the manorial community (lords and peasants) and the formation of their groups, as well as the search for the criteria to describe the folwark. Other structural elements of the manor as a peculiar formation of that time, or even manors themselves, which could also be referred to by the terms other than 'manor' or 'folwark' in the sources, remained outside the scope of research studies. Such one-sidedness of historiography makes to come back to both the research of the mentioned manorial structures and the range of problems relating to manorial terminology. The studies of such topics and problems have to play their part in contemporary research studies of the GDL manorial system because they may help reducing the vast gap between the research of economic historiography in Lithuania and European countries.

The third chapter The Problem of the Concept of the 16th Century Manor in Historical Sources and Historiography. Typology of Land-Ownership analyses the problem of the concept of manor as well as the differences in the research of manorialism established in the historiography of Lithuania and European countries. The terms denoting the manor used in the sources of Samogitian manors and their meanings are discussed. The chapter is subdivided into two sections.

The first section is entitled Theoretical Problem of the Concept of Manor. It raises and discusses the issue of necessity to construct the theoretical model of the manor. A broad manor terminology and its multiple meanings, when the same object is referred to by several terms, which, in turn, render several meanings, have long been problematic both in people’s everyday language and for specialists publishing sources or studying the manor. For that reason, the thesis makes the first attempt to distinguish two research levels. One of them is the practical level associated with source analysis and their interpre-
tation. The other is the theoretical level covering the theoretical problems of manor interpretation. One of the most important issues in contemporary research of land-ownership is the combination of the two approaches in research.

The European historiography has realised the necessity to theorise the concept of manor long time ago, because that is the only way to include land-ownership objects referred to by seemingly different names into the research field. The research carried out by Lithuanian researchers has so far limited with construing and interpretation of manor terminology; therefore, the concept of manor/folwark in the Lithuanian historiography did not go through significant changes from the early 20th century to this day. Two folwark types are distinguished: 1) folwark as an individual small manor, and 2) folwark as an economic-administrative formation subordinate to a larger economic-administrative formation.

One of the most important weaknesses of the mentioned historiography is the one-sidedness of the comparative European historiographic research as well as empirical and theoretical manor interpretation. Considerations on the role or place of one or another object in estate structure prevent from the understanding of their essence and deprives of the possibility for research development. Due to the aforementioned reasons, such objects as именицо, дом or certain meanings of дворец are barely included into research field and remain without adequate reflection upon them.

While our historiography is still dominated by terminological analysis, theoretical models, which historians find prerequisite to the research of medieval land-ownership structures, have already been discussed in Western Europe, including other Central European countries, for a number of years.

The position of western historiography grounded on the principles of the Annales School integrating the approaches to research of different fields of science enables the distinction of practical and theoretical manorial structures. The theoretically formulated manor model is referred to as manor estate or economic unit, etc. It is proposed to apply such a concept to refer to the estate accumulated within a single area
(enclosed territory) exclusively. Historians refer to scattered estates belonging to the same landholder as the complex of individual detached estates. According to such criteria, such a manor estate could cover both a single village with a folwark and several or more than ten economic units of such type.

As far as the theoretical manor concept is concerned, administrative, land-use, legal and economic aspects are taken into consideration. In respect of administrative and organisational aspects, the manor constituted of the following elements: land, buildings and people. In terms of land use, the land was divided into arable land, pastures and meadows, forest and hunting areas and unused land. In legal terms, it was divided into the lord’s holding or the lord’s part, agricultural land plots held by peasants and the land of common use. According to historians, the lord’s manor estate was an agricultural enterprise of certain type, the activities of which were targeted at production and product realisation. As an object, it consisted of two integral closely interrelated parts – the folwark (or the lord’s part) and the village providing services to it. The manor estate could not normally function without either of the two parts.

Historiography refers to the folwark of the 16th century as the lord’s farm engaged in agriculture and stock-raising, where the lord himself did not contribute by physical labour but organised the labour of others (peasants). Apart from agriculture and stock-raising, hay, production of vegetables, beekeeping, fishing, forestry, mills and other types of farming and crafts could be cultivated within the folwark and beyond its borders.

The second section *Manor Estates and Typology of Terminology* is devoted to the practical research of the spread of Samogitian manors in the 16th century and their terminology used in the sources. The analysis of the sources dating back to the period of 1539–1600 and the application of the afore-mentioned theoretical criteria led to identifying 97 economic objects referred to by different names, which could be defined by the concept of manor/folwark. Even though the data cannot be described by absolute objectivity, they enable the distinction of certain processes in the formation of land-ownership. The first reference to the manor object in the sources dates back to the 1530s only. Although the
number of the mentioned economic objects changed only marginally from the 1530s to the 1580s (the sources include references to 1 object at the end of the 1530s, 0 – in the 1540s, 2 – in the 1550s, 3 – in the 1560s, 10 – in the 1670s, 9 – in the 1980s), the 1590s show a significant increase in manor estates. At that time their number increased by 71 objects. The data show a rather rapid leap of manorial development. Such tendencies of manorial development are associated with several factors. A rather low number of estates until the late 1580s could be determined by the lagging social-economic development in Samogitia recorded by historians, as well as the Livonian War during the period of 1558–1583 and the resulting epidemics.

It has been determined that as many as seven different terms were used to refer to these objects in the sources at that time: dwor (двор), imenije (имение), folwark (фольварк), dworec (дворец), folwarok (фольварок), imenice (именице), dom (дом). Considering that the stated terms and their meanings have not been extensively studied in historiography, their adjustments to the Lithuanian language are a rather complex problem, the coverage of which requires a broader scientific discussion. Therefore, the proposed Lithuanian forms are not questioned in the thesis.

By their meaning, the terms denoting the mentioned objects of land-ownership were divided into two groups: 1) terminology of independent manor estates: manor (contemporary Lithuanian form – dvaras; forms used in the sources dwor, двор), estate (valda; imenije, имение); and 2) terminology of independent and integrated manor estates: small manor (dvarelis; dworec, дворец), small manor subordinate to a larger manor (dvarčius; dworec, дворец), folwark (palivarkas; folwark фольварк). By applying the theoretical concept of manor estate, it has been determined that in terms of land-ownership all the mentioned names could be used to refer to an independent economic object and some of them – dworec, дворец and folwark, фольварк – could be used to refer to the objects integrated to larger estates. Certain diminutive forms of the mentioned terms denote a smaller scope of land-ownership object; in other cases (for instance, the case of dworec, дворец as stockyard) they may imply structural differences as well.
The fourth chapter *Social Manor Organization: Personnel Structure and Its Characteristics* is subdivided into four sections. The data from the sources of the private Samogitian manors, which include information on manorial personnel, enable to make conclusions on its composition, number, size of family or landholding; occasionally, the information on the dues and services owed to the manor can be found as well. Inventories of 84 manors were used as the source of information on personnel composition – they account for around 87% of the total number of manors, which fall to the scope of research. There is considerably less data on personnel competences and their services, but the existing data are very incomplete and fragmentary. For that reason, the information is not of use to the statistical analysis and may only be used as the material illustrating personnel structures and the processes evolving within them. The documents of the ruler of the GDL dating back to the 16th century testify that the objective was such organisation of the manor, which would be cost-efficient and profit-making. The mentioned interest coincided with the interests of private estate owners.

The first section entitled *Manor Administration* asserts that production-oriented manor required the administration, which would contribute to more effective management and administration of the manor. The size of manor administration depended on the manor itself. The inventories of Samogitian manors do not include management-administration structures of more extensive composition but they nevertheless do include records on two-level administrations: central or upper administration and lower or local administration. The upper administration was usually formed from noble persons. Their competence was rather broad – from property management to crop planning and harvest selling. Ordinary people or peasants used to be appointed the officers of local administration. They contributed to the performance and implementation of the economic plan drawn up by the landlord or the administration.

The second section *People from the Manorial Familia* analyses the personnel group, which took the positions closest to the manor. 64 manor inventories, or as many as 66% of all the manors, include the mentions of the familia. *Manorial familia* or simply *familia* was a cer-
tain personnel category, which included several groups characterised by different social status: 1) the workers maintained by the manor – women, *bernai* (male helpers), *mergos* (female helpers) and shepherds – who neither had their implements of production nor household, and 2) *parobkai*, who constituted of the people of higher level in the familia. The maintenance of manorial livestock and *corvée* labour in the cultivation of arable land of the manor and other household activities were the main functions of the manorial familia. Familia was an open personnel category: people could hire themselves out to this group for longer or shorter periods (e.g. during the labour season) and withdraw from it upon the change of marital status when they got married.

The third section *Daržininkai* focuses on the personnel group, which made up an intermediary group between the familia and bound peasants (villeins). When the Wallach Reform was introduced to the lands of the grand duke, the status of a part of the familia in ruler’s manors was turned into *daržininkai* (literally – gardeners). Similar to the people who belonged to the familia, they owed their services to the manor.

*Daržininkai* were given small strips of land situated at some distance from the manor. The insufficient size of their land-plots could not ensure their existence. Therefore, the people belonging to this personnel group used to engage in various other activities, for instance, crafts, forest protection, etc. The analysis leads to the conclusion that the personnel model applied at the ruler’s manors was not introduced to all private manors, though it is obvious that some tried not to lag behind as well. However, *daržininkai* are not that commonly found in the manors and they existed in rather small groups only. It would be reasonable to think that there was no need to expand this social group of peasants.

The fourth section – *Peasants* – provides the discussion on the group of peasants, which depended on the manor, and the services that they owed to it. To evaluate the relations maintained between the peasants and the manor in the 16th century, historians group them by the performance or non-performance of their services to the manor, or, to be more precise, personal dependence ties with the manor: whether they owed the services to the manor or they did not, or perhaps, they agreed to perform them by
their free will and their freedom was not in any way restricted. In other words, free and bound peasants (villeins) can be distinguished – the same way that they used to be divided after the Wallach Reform.

Two groups of bound peasants (villeins) are distinguished in historiography: 1) the peasants who had to work for the manor on a permanent basis, and 2) the peasants who bought themselves out from permanent labour and only participated in working bees. The manorial inventories analysed in the research showed the presence of the peasants owing their services to the manor, who were referred to as людие тягльце, ciegle, люди очистые, or were not referred to in anyway, in as many as 59 manors, i.e. around 61% of all economic objects in the study. By means of the methodology introduced by the historian Jerzy Ochmański, Samogitian manors were divided into four groups. 20 manors were attributed to the group of minor manors, which had 1–5 villein families; 32 manors belong to the group of average manors, which had 6–50 villein families. The observation was made that in the manors estates attributed to large and very large land-ownership the land was divided into wallachs, therefore, peasants already had to perform their services from the measured land plot rather than from the family. Four large manors, which each had 50–100 peasant families, were identified, whereas the number of very large manors, which had over 200 villein families at their disposal, accounts for 3 manors. Even though we do not have sufficient data to identify the spread of forced labour (corvée) in Samogitian manors, however, the information available in the sources show that the norm of corvée could be considerably large – around 4–4.7 days. That shows that by contrast to the prevailing opinion to this day, the estates of both minor and average land-ownership did not refuse to impose corvée labour as well.

Duoklininkai (payers of rent in kind) made up the other group of villeins. 29 mentions of the peasants of this group were identified in 23 manors in Samogitia, i.e. around 24% of all the economic objects under analysis.

The analysis of the spread, number, composition and services owed by duoklininkai at the private Samogitian manor estates shows that they might have constituted a separate group, which probably was a transitional link to the partially formed group of činšininkai (payers of
rent in cash). The fact that duoklininkai included the people of different social status and professions shows that they made up a group of manor personnel, who depended on the estate in some way but were rather free and more qualified. Through their belonging to the group of duoklininkai and paying the established rent in cash and a rather small amount of labour (corvée), those people could not only subsist on their activities but earn as well.

According to a number of historians, the free people, who had the right to move, were neither a more numerous nor a separate group of peasants at the manor. In the second half of the 16th century, all peasant categories included a certain part of free people, which had a right to move out: lažininkai, činšininkai, daržininkai, families of poor nobles and manorial familia. According to the inventories studied in the research, the free people are mentioned in 14 manor estates, or around 14% of all economic objects. A rather low number of free peasants and their specific characteristics show that the demand for hired labourers and peasants was relatively low. Nevertheless, even if it was not numerous but the group of free peasants, who could hire themselves out to the manor, did exist. Such a phenomenon complied with general tendencies of social manorial organisation in the region of Central Europe at that time.

The fifth chapter of the dissertation Manor Production focuses on the analysis of the structure of the 16th century Samogitian manor farms and their products. It is subdivided into three sections.

The first section Crop Production discusses one of the mostly wide-spread and probably most profit-making branches of agriculture at that time. The use and cultivation of land was of particular importance to this branch. In the second half of the century, the division of land into wallachs gradually found its way to private estates as well. 25 private manors under analysis witnessed the division of land into wallachs at that time. However, the information on the use of three-field system in them is rather scarce. Certain data show that varied solutions of field cultivation and crop rotation could still prevail – that was a usual practice in Europe at that time.
Most attention was paid to those types of crop production, as one of the key branches of agriculture, which generated actual benefit to the farm. It has been determined that the cultivated crops showed little differences compared to, for instance, the crops cultivated in the lands of the neighbouring Poland.

Out of 97 manors mentioned in the inventories, crops are mentioned in 32 manors only, or 33% of all economic objects. Crop production was dominated by four main types of grain crops cultivated at that time: rye, wheat, barley and oat. Rye and oat were most important among them. On the average, 14 barrels of rye, 5.8 barrels of oat, 0.8 barrel of wheat and 0.6 barrel of barley were sowed in a single manor.

Historians engaged in the research of manorial (folwark) farming paid attention to the structure of grain crops, which enables the calculation of both the areas of cultivated land and the marketability of crop production, long time ago. Whereas the inventories of Samogitian manors provide scarce data on crop areas or their harvest, the analysis of crop structure was carried out by calculating the amount and ratio of the cultivated grain crops. The manors, which included data on grain crops, showed the following data of crop cultivation: 58% of crop areas were sowed with rye; 4% – wheat, 3%– barley, 25% – oat and 3% of crop areas were devoted to the mixture of grain crops, the so called “summer-corn”. The analysis data show that the cultivation of rye in the form of monoculture prevailed in Samogitian crop farms. Some historians see it as one of the most important features of expansive, or commercial, folwark oriented towards foreign market.

The crop ratio analysis revealed that winter rye accounted for as much as 58% of all the grain crops at Samogitian manors during the period of 1539–1600. Summer-corn made up 42%. The data led to confirm another important parameter of the farm – the sizes of arable land at the manor. The calculations showed that the average area of cultivated land within a single economic object accounted for 2.17 wallachs. This number was quite similar to the size of the arable lands in the folwarks of Polish private estates in the 16th century, which is a slightly unexpected discovery correcting, to a certain degree, the
prevailing opinion in Lithuanian historiography on rather small areas of arable land in the 16th century Samogitia.

The data show that special attention should be paid to the dynamics of change in arable areas. The average number of cultivated land plots showed a declining tendency within the entire period under analysis. Even if it should be associated with objective factors, such as the Livonian War, epidemics, etc, it also shows the extensive character of this branch of agriculture, which could have been determined by other reasons as well. It should also be noted that the researchers of Polish and Livonian manorial farms recorded the same tendency in the 16th century – first half of the 17th century as well.

Apart from the four types of grain crops – rye, wheat, barley and aot – which, as a tradition, are mentioned in the manors under analysis, pease and buckwheat cultivated in crop fields played a rather important role in Samogitia as well. On the average, 0.3 barrel of pease and 1.4 barrels of buckwheat were sowed per manor. The plants grown at vegetable and fruit gardens did not play a more significant role at that time. Even though the sources include quite extensive information on them, we may presume that the products of vegetable gardens were mostly used for local needs. Among the vegetables grown in vegetable gardens, cabbages, cucumbers, carrots and parsnips were more important. Turnips and beetroots, which were particularly popular in Western Europe and played a significant role in local farms at that time, were cultivated to a far lesser degree. The range of vegetables show that the vegetables of the highest nutritional value and the vegetables, which could be stored for the longest periods, were mostly preferred. Fruit gardens did not yet play a significant role in Samogitia in the 16th century; hence, their numbers, sizes and agricultural value were rather trivial.

Hay production was yet another important branch of crop production. It was essential to the manors, which were quite actively engaged in stock-raising. However, the information of the sources show that apart from the mentioned function, the produced hay used to be sold as well – that was also characteristic of manors in certain neighbouring regions.
The second section *Livestock Production* discusses the branches of stock-raising cultivated in the 16\textsuperscript{th} century Samogitian manors: horse-breeding, cattle breeding, small livestock and poultry farming. Samogitia distinguished by the natural environment, which made the region favourable for stock-raising. Stock-raising provided natural fertilisers for arable land, improved the harvest, whereas harness livestock were used to cultivate the land. Stock-raising guaranteed the supply with meat and proteins and it also was a certain capital of the manor owner.

The inventories of Samogitian private estates under analysis included references to livestock in 41 manors, i.e. around 42.2\% of all the manors, which fall to the scope of research. Harness livestock were primarily required for crop production – both oxen and horses. The number of the mentioned livestock testified the scope of works for which they were used rather than the strength of the farm. Horses are referred to in 26 economic objects, which make up 63\% of all the farms, which include mentions of livestock. Even though data show that the local livestock breed could prevail at that time, the attempts to improve livestock breeds and to produce more valuable traits can already be observed in the 16\textsuperscript{th} century. The thesis also discusses the names of horses, which have not been extensively covered in historiography; the numbers of horses kept have been identified as well. Workhorses accounted for 85\% of all the horses kept, whereas other types of horses (offspring and old horses) made up 15\%. It has been determined that 5 horses on the average were kept by each manor. Horses accounted for 10\% of all the livestock kept at the manors.

Cattle breeding was another important branch of stock-raising. Historians believe that the number of cattle and small livestock was that indicator, which showed the capacity of the farm. In the framework of Samogitian manors under analysis, cattle are mentioned in 38 economic objects, or 95\% of all the manors, the inventories of which included the mentions of livestock. In total, cattle made up 35\% of all the livestock kept at the manors. The information provided by the sources enables the distinction of two groups in the category of the cattle: working oxen (12\% of the total number of livestock), cows (10\%), bulls (less than 1\%) and offspring (13\%).
In the 16th century, the manors of East-Central Europe began the process of improvement of livestock breeds and started raising the cattle of Dutch breed. At that time, breed purity was not yet pursued in Samogitia, but there were certain attempts to improve the breed. A cow of Dutch breed was recorded in one of the manors, which could belong to large land-ownership, slightly earlier than the time established in historiography to this day. The calculation of the average number of cattle per manor revealed that the average number of cattle equaled to 17 cows per manor. Compared to other western areas of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the differences in the number were rather trivial.

Sheep breeding prevailed among the breeding of small livestock, which included sheep, goats and pigs. The popularity of this branch of farming was determined by circumstances: the arable lands abandoned at the times of war and covered with grass were excellent pastures for sheep. Little efforts and a comparatively low number of personnel sufficed for their maintenance. The popularity of sheep breeding was also determined by the demand for wool. Besides, not only meat and wool but also sheep milk was the product of consumption at that time.

Sheep were kept at 32 farms of Samogitian manors, which accounted for 78% of all the farms, which included records on livestock. The total number of sheep accounted for as much as 27% of all the livestock kept at the manors. The average number of this type of livestock per manor, which equaled to 12.8 units, and a rather even distribution of sheep kept at the manors (which most likely complied with their economic capacities) testify the important role of sheep at the farm.

Sheep breeding was followed by pig breeding, which was the second most important type of small livestock kept at the farm. Pigs are mentioned in the inventories of 34 manors, which make up 83% of all the manors including references to livestock. They accounted for 25% of the total number of livestock in the structure of Samogitian livestock farming. The average number of pigs per one economic object accounted for 10.8 units. Goats were least popular at the manor— they made up only 5% of all the livestock.
In the 16th century, the farming of small livestock supplemented the products provided by large livestock or cattle with meat, milk and fur. The orientation of small stock-raising towards the breeding of sheep and pigs testifies the resemblance of stock-raising in Samogitia to the manorial farming of the Polish nobles (szlachta), which was considered most developed at that time.

Poultry supplemented the livestock kept at the manor. In the 16th century, geese, chickens and ducks were raised at Samogitian manors. Though peasants had to pay their dues in the mentioned poultry to the manor, poultry farming was still rather popular. Geese were those fattening birds, which were most commonly mentioned in the property documents of Samogitian manors and predominantly raised at the manor. They accounted for the total of 59% of all the poultry. The average number of geese kept by one manor equaled to around 15. Such a high number can be explained by their simple maintenance – geese breeding incurred the lowest costs.

Chickens, which were primarily kept for eggs, made up the second most popular type of poultry. Hens and roosters are mentioned in 24 inventories of manor estates (58.5% of all the manor inventories including the mentions of livestock and poultry). Apart from hens, roosters and chicks, the average number of which accounted for 9.4 birds per manor, the mentions of capons, which have already been forgotten today, are found as well. They were eaten as delicacy.

Ducks were also reared for meat and partially for eggs. Due to special conditions required for these birds, they were kept in considerably smaller numbers. The first mentions of ducks in the inventories date back to the 1590s; they were recorded in two manors. Two turkeys were recorded in the flocks of poultry of each of the two manors. Being rather particular about the conditions of keeping and sensitive to humidity, these birds were not very suitable for the conditions of Samogitia, therefore, they were not popular.

The third section of the fifth chapter Other Sources of Income provides a discussion on auxiliary branches of economy and crafts. Fishery was one of the branches of economy, which became rather popular in Central Europe in the 16th century. Neither the abundance of rivers, lakes
nor other natural water bodies could provide stable or considerably larger revenues at that time. For that reason the practice of fishing in natural water bodies gradually declined. The growing needs of that time could only be satisfied by systematic fishing. Its main goal was a wholesale fish supply to the market. Fish were reared in ponds, which were mentioned in 11 Samogitian manors (11.3% of all the manor inventories under analysis). Historians believe that the presence of more than one pond at the manor may testify systematic fish farming. The analysis revealed that the average of around 1.5 ponds fell per one manor, which makes one pond less than in Poland at that time.

Though comparatively scarce in number but occasionally well-developed pond systems show that fish breeding, which required considerable expertise and efforts, was not only known but actually developed in Samogitia. However, such fish farming was not affordable to everyone but the manors of the largest economic capacities only.

Beekeeping known since the old times was highly appreciated and even protected by the legal acts of the ruler. The lord did not need to keep bees for a long time, because honey was available at the forest from wild bees. However, with the growing demand for bee products in foreign markets, manors became interested in beekeeping as well. The need for these products at Samogitian manors was solved in several ways. In some cases hives were kept in the village at the homesteads of those people, who had the right to a portion of honey. In other cases hives could be kept at the manor itself. A strict registration of hives and manor control show that special attention was paid to manorial beekeeping.

The forest, which was the source of raw materials and export revenues, played an important role in the farming of that time as well. It provided wood for constructions, fuel, meat, fur, honey, mushrooms and berries. Cattle were pastured in forests; forest crafts were also developed: extraction of potash, tar, coal. In the 16th century, the forest had already passed over to the legal disposition of the manor and it was subsequently given over to peasants. The sources of Samogitian manors do not include any data on forest crafts, such as extraction of tar, potash or coal. It is most likely that the largest benefit was gener-
ated by measuring the forest and distributing it to villages or individual peasants for a fee. Such a practice of taxation and division of forest areas to peasant farms improved the general organisation of farming and enhanced its efficiency.

The products made by way of processing and crafts were primarily targeted at the needs of local residents; they did not play an important role at the manor farm. However, different forms of processing show that manors tried to adjust to the general economic conjuncture.

Two types of manorial processing or crafts are distinguished in historiography. In the first case, production used to take place at the farm or next to it; all the required equipment, servicing and raw materials were directly associated with the manor and belonged to it. The production, which belonged to the manor but was not of folwark type, is attributable to this type; it was pursued within the borders of the estate but by means of the third persons exclusively. Brewing and mead making, milk and mill production belonged to such type at Samogitian manors.

Saloons made up another type of activities, which was spread to a certain degree but was not extensively developed and was passed over into the disposition of peasants. Saloons retained a certain degree of independence from the manor, but their activities were rather strongly restricted by laws. On the other hand, saloons were also considered craftsmen enterprises because beer was not only sold but produced as well. For these reasons and the mentioned restrictions, saloons are not considered a typical manorial craft of the GDL and Samogitia alike.
CONCLUSIONS

1. The fields of research of Samogitian private manors and the GDL land-ownership in general are determined by research contexts of European land-ownership historiography as well as specific economic, political and natural characteristics of Samogitia. The analysis of historiography enabled the distinction of four historiographical problems, which we find most important and the theoretical basis of which makes it possible to construct relevant land-ownership research of Samogitia in the 16th century. They have never been previously discussed and applied in the Lithuanian historiography as a whole. The concept of European regions is the first and most innovative historiographical approach. It enables the perception of the interaction among European regions and countries and their place in the European space, as well as creates the opportunity to provide evidence to the regional differences of historical processes.

The greatest advantage of the study of the relationship among the regions is their potential contribution to the better knowledge of specific phenomena and the opportunity to help identify the possible limits of common solutions. The research is supported by the opinion expressed in historiography that a number of factors characterising specific differences between the East and the West are actually more related with the differences between the centre and the periphery of Europe (in general). Therefore, it is believed that it is only the synthesis of the local and global contexts that may provide a more objective reconstruction of the social-economic reality of Central and Eastern Europe in the 16th-18th centuries.

Another important problem of contemporary historiography is the differences between the systems of periodization of the history of Western and Central (Eastern) Europe and their combinability. The convenience of the model of periodization of the Middle Ages introduced by Jacques Le Goff, which was chosen for the determination of chronological research limits, lies in the opportunity to explain the development of land-ownership of European economic regions, including Samogitia as the composite part of this region, as the phe-
nomemon of evolving land-ownership forms depending on local and global conditions.

The problem of feudalism is yet another problem of particular complexity, which takes the central position in the research of medievalists. The theory of feudalism plays an important role in the research of the manor, as it explains the social relations based on the origins of allegiance determining the rise of the vassal-fief system. In other words, the forms of land-ownership and its system were determined by mutual obligations of land-owners and land-keepers. In our case, the concepts of decline of feudalism (14\textsuperscript{th}–15\textsuperscript{th} centuries) and transitional period from feudalism to capitalism (15\textsuperscript{th} century and 16\textsuperscript{th}–18\textsuperscript{th} centuries) were employed in Samogitian land-ownership research. They play a role in the formulation and interpretation of the link between the Samogitian manorial system and the social and economic aspects of the European manorial system.

The fourth problem of the topic under analysis, which may be considered as one of the most fundamental problems, is the issue of multiple meanings and diversity of land-ownership concepts. Two historiographical constructs – manor and folwark – established their positions in scientific literature. The Western and Central European historiography took a different approach towards them for a long time. For that reason the Central European historiography shaped a rather peculiar approach towards manorial system, which was referred to as manorial-serf system. The problem of this approach has for a long time been its inherent disregard of the origins and developmental peculiarities of the manor as the European phenomenon. The application of contextual-evolutionist approach in this research provided the opportunity to interpret the 16\textsuperscript{th} century Samogitian manors as one of the forms of expression of European manorial system rather than a phenomenon of specific developments.

2. In search of the answer to the question what the 16\textsuperscript{th} Samogitian private manor was, we would not be able to answer it in full without the European context of development of manors and their system. Both Lithuanian historiography and the historiography of other Cen-
Central European countries have not applied such a practice for a long time. In the interpretation of the development of manorial system in medieval Europe, historians highlight the origins of manors from Roman domains. The ruins of such domains witnessed the formation of bipartite system of land-ownership (peasants and lords), otherwise called classical, and the combination of the two parts formed unique and closely interrelated European phenomena – feudalism and manorialism.

Though the disputes among historians are ongoing, it is nevertheless generally agreed that manorial systems in Europe developed in the 9th–13th centuries and the 14th century, with their first manifestations in the West gradually spreading further eastwards. In Western Europe social structures acquired suzerainty character as far back as the 9th century, and the decline of the peasant’s allodium determined the rise of the feudal form of land-ownership. From the very beginning of manorial system, the development of manorial structures did not evolve in identical direction. The difference in the size and economic structure of manors determined the differences in manorial administration and peasant dependence on the manor. In some places manorial system was developed only partially or was not developed at all, whereas in other places allodial system successfully co-existed even in the areas of most developed manorial system. Long considerations on what the manor actually was led to the conclusion that the very essence of the medieval manorial system was not the level of its development but the special form of organisation of manorial production and consumption.

The 12th–13th centuries witnessed the gradual decline of manorialism in Western Europe and its replacement by the farms of peasants, who were to pay the rent in cash in exchange for the use of land. Though the development of land-ownership outside the borders of the former Roman Empire took a slower pace, their orientation towards Western European manor forms was very clear (process of feudalization). The main difference of Central Europe in the development of manorial system was the establishment of manorialism on the basis of the land owned by the dukes (i.e. the state) rather than communal
land. For that reason this European region was the first to witness the formation of large-landownership. The colonists possessing more progressive farming skills accelerated the process helping the land to acquire a more organised form.

The growing manifestations of regional differences seen from the 15th century determined economic dualism in Europe in the 16th century. Historiography treats the subsequent agrarian development in Western Europe as the sequel to the previously evolved land-rent farming, whereas in Central Europe it is understood as the shift from the same land-ownership forms, except that they were grounded on corvée labour based economic forms. Influenced by Marxist historiography, the region stretching eastwards from the River Elbe was treated as the territory of new serfdom-based folwarks with a number of secluded islands, where manorial-serf system was not developed. Along with Czechia and Eastern Belarus, Samogitia fell into this category as well. When the researchers (in particular, Polish) turned back at Western Europe and its historiography during the last three decades, the fact was again brought to light that such undeveloped manorial territories were not a new phenomenon in the 16th century or in earlier times. Therefore, historians started taking a closer look at the development of the economic forms of the Lithuanian manor and the manorial system itself.

The clear development of land-ownership related legal framework seen from the 14th century and its strengthening on the national level testify the involvement of the GDL in the social-economic as well as manorial development processes evolving at that time (as a periphery in the context of the global economic system). Therefore, manors were not a new phenomenon in the 16th century. The lagging character of Samogitia pointed out by historians was for a time being determined by social and political circumstances: comparatively insignificant distinction of the noble class from other members of the society, long-lasting wars, political and social restrictions enforced by Lithuanian grand dukes. Despite the afore-mentioned, the processes of formation of land-ownership did occur and they were likely to be more rapid than it has been thought to this day. The distribution of land among the people from the immediate circle of the grand duke taking place
from the late 14th century – the early 15th century accelerated the processes to an even greater degree. Due to the social changes in the mid-16th century the legal situation of private manors strengthened and the circumstances for the growth of their number emerged. The manors of lords and nobles acquired the administrative and legal (and even financial in the case of lords) immunity.

The private estates of Lithuania and Samogitia alike distinguished by large diversity during this period – in terms of both internal organisation of their size and structure. Historiographical traditions determined that other elements of the manor as a peculiar economic formation of that time, which could also be referred to by the terms other than 'manor' and 'folwark' in the sources, remained outside the scope of research. Such one-sidedness of historiography encourages the coming back to the research of the afore-mentioned structures and the range of problems related to the terminology of the manor. The studies of such topics and problems may contribute to reducing the vast gap between the research of economic historiography of Lithuania and European countries.

3. The existing diversity of land-ownership terminology and the complexity of their meanings is one of the key problems in the field of manorial research. The naming of a number of land-ownership objects by the same historiographical – manor – construct does not only fail to solve this problem but deepens it to an even greater degree. Due to the afore-mentioned reasons, two research levels were distinguished in the analysis of the range of manor-related problems for the first time: practical or source interpretation previously applied by historians and theoretical covering the construction of theoretical definitions of the manor. The latter level has not been discussed in the Lithuanian historiography to this day.

The analysis revealed that due to the practical source analysis alone applied in Lithuanian historiography for a long time, the concept of manor and folwark acquired a slightly different meaning than in other countries of Central Europe or Western Europe. The hierarchical perception of manor and folwark applied in our historiography lacks ac-
accuracy and such definitions of folwark as 1) independent object, and 2) a small object subordinate to another administrative formation, are not accurate as well.

When discussing the manor as the object of land-ownership western historians propose to understand it in terms of several aspects: administrative-organisational, land-use and legal. Polish researchers developed the theoretical manor model of Central European region by supplementing this concept with the aspect of production. In their view, the lord’s manor was an agricultural enterprise of a certain type (with various agricultural branches, trades and crafts characteristic of such an enterprise) oriented towards production and realisation of products. As an object, it consisted of two integral closely interrelated parts – folwark (or the lord’s part) and the village owing services to it. The manor estate could not normally function without either of these parts. Apart from corvée labour, the Polish historians of the new generation also add land-rent (Lith. činšas) to this concept, which has not been previously discussed as the object of dues and services owed by peasants to the manor.

The afore-mentioned theoretical model referred to as *manor estate* in the thesis was applied to the following terms mentioned in the historical sources of the 16th century Samogitian manors: manors (*dwor, dvor*), estates (*imenie, имение*), small manors (*dworec, дворец*), small estates (*imenicze, именицо, именичё*), folwarks (*folwark, фольварк*), home (*dom, дом*). Such an approach enabled the typologization of the mentioned terms and the formulation of the theoretical organizational scheme of Samogitian estates enabling the research of manorial economic structure. This scheme, along with the role of the afore-mentioned terminology of land-ownership, was used to determine the spread of terminology and the objects themselves, as well as two typological types of terminology were distinguished: 1) terminology of independent manor estates: manor (contemporary Lithuanian form – *dvaras*; forms used in the sources *dwor, dvor*), estate (*valda; imenije, имение*); and 2) terminology of independent and integrated manor estates: small manor (*dvarelis; dworec, дворец*), small manor subordinate to a larger manor (*dvarčius; dworec, дворец*), folwark (*palivars*—...
such a diversity of land-ownership terminology and the complexity of their meanings show once again that the process of manorial formation began far earlier than the introduction of the Wallach Reform.

The study of meanings of terminology denoting land-ownership objects led to the conclusion that at least seven terms rendered the meaning of an independent manor estate or economic object, the insufficient research of which still makes it rather difficult to find Lithuanian equivalents for them. It requires a broader historical research and scientific discussion. Therefore, the Lithuanian terms applied to some of them (e.g. dworec, дворец) are not questioned in the dissertation.

It has been identified, by means of the theoretical concept of manor estate, that in terms of land-ownership all the mentioned names could be applied to refer to an independent economic object. Certain diminutive forms of the stated terms denote a lesser scope of land-ownership object and even structural differences in some cases.

The establishment of integrated economic centres within an economically organised estate had to intensify the cultivation of land, other branches of agriculture, as well as the efficiency of farming in the estate itself. A comparatively low number of them shows that it could only be done by the owners of economically strong estates, which means that manorial (folwak) economy was more intensively strengthened in such estates. The process was slightly slower in the estates of lower economic capacities.

The research of the content of inventories of the 16th century Samogitian private estates revealed once again that the manorial terminology was not settled in the 16th century sources of Samogitia. That is testified by a large number of terms, their diversity and complexity of meanings. Despite the afore-mentioned problem the terminology nevertheless had its logical system and was related with the size of the object of land-ownership and its legal position.

4. The analysis of personnel structure of Samogitian manors during the period of 1539–1600 shows that the development of commercial
manors (folwarks) in the 16th century triggered a rather successful adjustment of private Samogitian manors to the new circumstances. The Wallach Reform introduced to the estates of the grand duke encouraged the social reform of private estates as well. The positions assigned to peasants at the manors were gradually replaced by their services established from the wallach. Also, similarly to the manors owned by the ruler, a part of the people from the manorial familia, the so called parobkai, was turned into villeins, thus expanding the category of the peasants forced to perform different services.

In respect of social manor organisation, the personnel composition at Samogitian private estates did not show remarkable differences compared to the neighbouring regions. Central and local administration structures formed in larger manors contributed to more effective organisation of the manor farm and its maintenance. Minor and average manor estates limited with a lower number of administrators (or stewards), or management and administration were in the hands of the landlords themselves. As in other areas of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the so called manorial familia, which was involved in household activities and livestock farming, as well as the so called parobkai, daržininkai and kaimynai, who gradually acquired the status of villeins, were most closely linked with the manor.

Even though the approach prevails in historiography, according to which the manorial-serf economy was not developed in the estates of the church and the ruler in Samogitia in the 16th century, the research studies of private estates prove otherwise.

The dominance of the personnel capable of forced labour (corvée) over other dependants of the manor and rather high norms of weekly corvée (4 – 4.7 days), as well as the imposition of labour rent on duok-lininkai testify that the practice of corvée was more popular in private than in the mentioned church’s and ruler’s estates. It should also be noted that in private estates corvée was equally important to minor, average as well as large and very large farms.

Even though additional research studies are required to confirm the stated tendencies, nevertheless, this fact slightly corrects the prevail-
ing approach in historiography, according to which corvée was used to a far lesser extent in large landownership on the territory of the GDL.

Apart from labour rent (corvée), rent in cash and rent in kind were equally important in private estates, which fully corresponded with the dominant tendencies of rent forms in Central Europe at that time. Apart from corvée peasants referred to as tiaglai, the number of peasants, referred to as duoklininkai, who were imposed both cash and labour rent, was slightly lower. Due to the absence of the fully established and settled rent, their situation could be considered as intermediary between duoklininkai (payers of rent in kind) and činšininkai (payers of rent in cash).

The free peasants included into the composition of the manorial familia, the circle of tiaglai or duoklininkai, as opposed to, for instance, certain Polish regions, did not make up a separate personnel group in Samogitia in the second half of the 16th century. However, as in other regions of Central Europe, the social structure of the manor used to be supplemented by the hired labour force at their expense.

5. The following key segments of economic structure of Samogitian private manors were distinguished by means of source analysis: crop production, stock-raising, fishery, beekeeping, forest-use, processing and crafts.

Crop cultivation has been highlighted in the study of manor production for a long time. Other structures of agriculture have only been addressed as a marginal phenomenon in the research. The 16th century European economy witnessed remarkable changes, which determined their positions in the European and even global economic domain. The reason of this growth was the demand for agricultural products in the international market. Crop products were among the most marketable goods.

The system of land cultivation was the primary factor of success of this type of farming. Even though it is believed that a three-field system was no longer a rare phenomenon in the GDL at that time, the division of land into wallacks attempted to accelerate its use. Comparatively scarce data show that the use of three-field system was not a universal rule in
Samogitia. Apart from it, other systems of land-cultivation were also used in the 16th century: unbroken soil, two-field, four-field land cultivation. The sorting of land introduced by the Wallach Reform was also used for harvest improvement. Besides, it was realised that the land had to be fertilised. It has been determined that the fertilisation of land in Samogitian manors took place in three ways: slash and burn (fertilised by ash), fertilising with manure and cultivation of old farms, the soil of which was rich in organic substances. Even though little information was found on a more extensive scope of soil fertilisation, the available information shows that such a practice was actually applied.

The available data make it possible to conclude that grain crops played the key role in crop production. Four main types of grain crops prevailed at that time: rye, wheat, barley and oat. Due to broad possibilities of use and demand in the markets rye and oat were most important among them. The analysis of crop structure revealed that rye, which accounted for 58% of all crops, took the dominant position; they were followed by oat (25%), wheat (4%) and barley (3%). The dominant position of rye as monoculture is one of the indicators showing that they used to be cultivated for the market.

Yet another indicator of marketability was the area of arable lands. Larger or smaller plots of arable land were established in all categories of land-ownership. The data of the research show that the development of arable land among the owners of Samogitian private estates was far more active compared to state and ecclesiastical estates. The calculations revealed that the average area of arable land per one economic object accounted for 2.17 wallachs. It means that they were slightly smaller but their differences from the average size of arable land in Polish folwarks were not very significant. Historiography treats such a size of arable land as a sign of autonomous economy, i.e. production for personal needs and local market. However, the monoculture rye system may also indicate the attempts of manors to produce it for foreign markets.

Historiography, Lithuanian in particular, is dominated by the opinion that the second half of the 16th century was the period of rather stable development of folwarks and the increase of arable lands. In-
deed, the number of economically organised manor estates considerably increased in the last decade of the 16th century but the same cannot be told about the area of arable land. The dynamics of change of arable land showed that the arable land was on the falling scale in the manors in the course of the 16th century.

Apart from traditional crops, pease and buckwheat showing a rather significant scope of cultivation played a rather important role in Samogitia. However, like the cultures cultivated at vegetable and fruit gardens at that time, they were mostly used for domestic needs. It should be noted that their range little differed from the crop cultures cultivated in the neighbouring Polish lands at that time.

Hay production played a significant role in crop production. Its production was closely related with another branch of farming actively cultivated in manors, i.e. stock-raising. It is interesting to note that the inventories testifying the importance of hay provide the data that some manors could cultivate and prepare hay for selling, which was a well-known and rather widely spread phenomenon in Central Europe at that time.

Stock-raising was another equally important branch of manorial farming. At Samogitian manors, stock-raising was developed in four main directions: horse-breeding, cattle breeding, small livestock (sheep, goats, pigs) and poultry farming. In the general livestock structure (despite poultry) horse-breeding accounted for 10%, cattle breeding – 35%, small livestock – 55% (among them sheep made up 27%, goats – 5% and pigs – 23%). Such data show that apart from the use of livestock for agricultural labour, meat and milk production played the important role as well. Unfortunately, we may not tell what profits were generated from this production; nevertheless, the attempted increase in this type of production by enhancing the traits of livestock was recorded. The study showed that such attempts manifested slightly earlier than it has been thought to this day.

Even though the manor was supplied with poultry and their products through the dues and services paid by peasants, poultry farming was cultivated as well. The research has shown that geese accounted for as much as 59% in poultry farming, followed by chickens (38%)
and ducks (3%). The benefit generated by them and low keeping costs were the main factors in poultry farming. Geese and chickens best complied with the stated criteria. Unfortunately, the absence of direct information makes it difficult to speak about profitability of poultry farming.

Compared to the lands of the neighbouring Poland, the average number of livestock and poultry per one economic object was lower in Samogitia; however, the composition or structure of the livestock kept was rather similar. The data show that stock-raising tendencies in Samogitian private manors resembled other western parts of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

Other sources of manorial income were fishery, beekeeping, forest use, processing and crafts. The rise of artificial fishery and beekeeping in manors was stimulated by the demand for their products in the market. Nevertheless, the sources show that fish farming in artificial ponds or beekeeping in hives was not very common. Fishery demanded considerable investments and labour force from the manor. Beekeeping required more or less qualified specialists. Apart from the afore-mentioned, the manor required the possibilities of supplying the products to the market. Therefore, such activities could only be practised by economically strongest manors.

Such activities as forest use show that the owners and keepers of Samogitian manors did not practice forest crafts – production of tar, coal or potash. The sources do not include records of extensive activities of hunting forest animals. It is likely that the possibilities of harvesting of wood from the forest and generating a rent in cash upon forest division into land plots and distribution to peasants were far more preferred.

The products made by way of processing of raw materials and crafts were primarily targeted at the needs of local residents; they did not play a significant role in the manor. Two types of processing and crafts were identified in Samogitian manors: 1) production within the area of the manor from the raw materials found at the manor carried out by the people from the same manor or the third persons, and 2) manorial enterprises of larger or smaller economic independence, which were passed over to peasants on a temporal basis.
Brewing, milk processing and grain milling widely spread at Samogitian manors and mills spread to a considerably lesser degree were attributed to the first type. Even though the processing of raw materials was rather widely spread, it was carried out by means of rather primitive production methods at the manor. Even though in some cases the improvement of technologies may be observed, e.g. the use of water mills or the work of brewers (apparently professional), etc, we still have too little data to speak about larger profits generated from them.

The selling of alcoholic beverages and saloon business is attributed to the second type. Even though it was developed on the territory belonging to the manor, historians do not consider it a typical manorial craft. The first reason is that saloons were considered craftsmen enterprises, where alcoholic beverages were not only sold but also produced, and, secondly, such activities were rather strongly regulated by the provisions and legal acts of the grand duke.

6. The research carried out in the thesis revealed that Samogitia, being a typical part of the periphery of the European economy, participated in the European economic conjuncture of that time as one of its typical territories. From the very origins of development of the allodium Samogitia witnessed the phenomena of land-ownership development characteristic of Central European region. Depending on the location and macroeconomic conditions, certain specific features emerged in land-ownership relations correcting the place of Samogitia in European and Central European regional economic context.

The study shows that by contrast to the prevailing opinion to this day the manors that complied with the Central European economic manor model and developmental characteristics were founded in Samogitian private land-ownership in the 16th century. The general structure of their manors and economic organisation testify their orientation towards the production of agricultural raw materials, such as grain crops and livestock products, which were particularly popular in foreign markets at that time. Apart from them, hay production, forest-use, fishery, beekeeping, processing of manorial raw materials and
crafts were cultivated at the manor. In social dimension, it meant the use and imposition of all forms of rent. Even though the manor personnel model and certain economic activity directions show the orientation towards production to foreign markets, the average of economic indicators shows the prevalence of autonomous manorial (folwark) economy meeting the needs of local market.

The research data show that the owners of Samogitian private estates developed their manorial farming far more actively compared to state and ecclesiastical estates. The Samogitian manor farms were slightly smaller and possibly less developed than, for instance, in Poland, but they nevertheless little differed from the folwarks of Polish szlachta, which prevailed in the 16th century.

The research of the change dynamics of Samogitian manorial economy revealed another tendency, which has not been previously recorded in our historiography. Even though the number of manor estates significantly boosted from the 1580s, the indicators of economic production at the manors were on the decreasing scale throughout the entire 16th century. This fact was used to conclude that the development of Samogitian manors was of extensive type – it increased in quality but did not change in quantity. The distinction of such a tendency in the development of manorial (folwark) economy can so far only be explained by the factors of lifting trade restrictions, the Livonian War and its outcomes. However, there is no doubt that the research helping to specify and explain this tendency to an even greater extent needs to be continued in the future.

All the mentioned economic changes of Samogitian private manors brought the structure of Lithuanian production closer to the European manor model and contributed to the establishment of commercial relations in the economy.
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TYRIMO AKTUALUMAS, TEMOS FORMULAVIMAS IR PROBLEMA

Temos aktualumas. Žemėvaldos struktūros, nuo savo formavimosi pradžios iki pat industrializacijos epochos XIX a., buvo svarbiausia institucija, kuri lėmė Europos ekonomiką, valstybinių ir visuomeninių darinių raidą bei jų pažangos lygmenį. Žemė, ilgus amžius įkūnijusi didžiausią to meto visuomenės turtą, buvo socialinis, ekonominis ir politinis klimingosios visuomenės dalies pagrindas. Šios epochos idealą išreiškia to meto maksima „nėra žemės be pono, nėra pono be žemės“ . Nepaisant reikšmingumo, žemėvaldos problemas nėra pakankamai išnagrinėtos mokslinėje literatūroje.


To meto Vidurio Europos žemėvaldoje vykusią ūkinių permainų rezultas buvo lažiniai-palivarkiniai dvarai. Struktūriškai organizuotas pono dvaro ųkis su išmatuota ir atitinkamai išdalinta žeme, atsižvelgiant į jos kiekį ir kokybę, mokesčius mokančiais ir prievoles atliekančiais valstiečiais, ekonominėje plotmėje žemės savininkams turėjo užtikrinti efektyvesnį žemės naudojimą, aktyvesnį ūkių dalyvavimą rinkose ir pajamų didėjimą. Kaip tik tuo metu susiformavusios žemėvaldos ir žemėnaudos struktūros nulemė to meto krašto bei regiono
ekonomines, politines ir kultūrines pozicijas, nubrėžė gaires, lėmusias vėlesnių laikų ūkio struktūrų ir Europos šalių ekonominės veiklos modelių susiklostymą.


Ekonominės Lietuvos istoriografijos atsilikimą iš dalies lėmė tai, kad Lietuvoje ši sritis niekada neturėjo tvirtesnių pozicijų. XX a. paskutiniame dešimtmečyje, Lietuva atgavus nepriklausomybę, socialiniai-ekonominiai tyrimai liko mokslinių interesų paribyje. Tuo metu, kai LDK žemėvaldos tyrinėjai mokslinėje literatūroje ne itin populiarūs, daugėjantys


Kaip reikšmingas šios temos teorines problemas taip pat reikėtų įvardyti ir nuoseklų Europos viduramžių (turimas galvoje Naujosios Analų mokyklos periodizacijos modelis) žemėvaldos tyrimų nebuvimą, įsigalėjusią istoriografinę paradigmą apie skirtingus Europos regionų žemėvaldos raidos procesus. Šiandienos žemėvaldos tyrimai sudėtingi dar ir tuo, kad reikalauja naujo perspektyvaus teorinio modelio taikymo, kurio paieškos jau kuris laikas yra vienas svarbiausių ne tik šio darbo, bet ir apskritai dabartinių Europos ekonominės istoriografinės uždavinių. Kita vertus, negalima pamiršti, kad vienas teorinių mode-
lių kūrimo aspektų yra tas, kad vienintelio teisingo teorinio modelio tikrovei pažinti nėra.

Minėtiems tyrimams šiandien kryptis nusako istoriografinės revizijos pareikalavęs, 1989 m. prasidėjęs Europos jungimasis bei naujų istorinių paradigmų gimimas. Iki šiol aktyviai diskutuojama dėl vi-suomeninių-ekonominiių sistemų, tokių kaip feodalizmas ir kapitalizmas, ir jų taikymo skirtiniose regionuose ir šalyse.

Lietuviškos nuoseklios ekonominės istoriografinės tradicijos nebuvo sąlygoja dar keletą specifinių problemų. Viena jų – istoriografinio-metodologinio konteksto nepakankamumas, susijusius ne tik su bendromis europinėmis dvaro istorijos problemomis, bet ir su specifiniais lokaliniai dvaro istorijos klausimais.

Iki šiol istoriografiuje įsitvirtinusi nuomonė, kad Žemaitija buvo viena negausių LDK, taip pat ir Vidurio Europos teritorijų, kurioje neįsivyravo nei palivarkai, nei lažinė sistema. Remiantis tuo, yra konstatuojama, kad nei paties valdovo, nei bažnytinėse, nei privačiose valdose čia nebuvo įgyvendinta Valakų reformos nuostata steigti žemės ūkio produkciją gaminančius dvarus. Šitaip lyg ir pamirštama, kad dvarai, istoriografiuje dar vaadinami palivarkais, nebuvo XVI a. naujiena, o kilmingosios visuomenės dalies ūkinės veiklos šaknys siekia gerokai senesnius laikus.

Nors ir buvo bandymų tirti privačius XVI a. Žemaitijoje dvarus, tačiau jų pažinimas istoriografiuje kol kas nepakankamas: 1) XVI a. dvaro tyrimai buvo atliekami valdovo ir bažnytinėse žemėse, ieškant arimų ir menkai kreipiant dėmesį į kitas dvaro ūkio struktūros dalis; 2) nors istoriografiuje aptariamos visos rentos formos, labiausiai buvo akcentuojamas lažas kaip vienas svarbiausių palivarkinių dvarų rodiklių; 3) iki šiol taikytų metodų galimybės buvo gana siauros ir ribotos, todėl šiandien dar negalima atsakyti į daugelį istoriografiuje keliamų klausimų.

Nustatyta, kad Žemaitijoje ir po žemės matavimo iki XVII a., ir vėliau nei valdovo, nei bažnytinėse žemėse palivarkai kuriami nebuvo. Kokie procesai vyko privačioje žemėvaldoje, kodėl valdovo veikla nebuvo aktuali privatiems žemės savininkams, ar jie galėjo turėti savo, nuo europinių bei lokalinių konjunktūros sąlygų ir pačių savininkų

Minētām problemām pēriūrējāmās un apsvarstāmās, taip pat atsakāmai ī iškeltus klausīmus gali leisti ne tik geriau suvoktō to meto privačiā valdī situācijā, socialinēs-ekonomīnes aktūlās, bet ir padētā naujā jā īvertinti Žemaitijos un LDK vietās beis vaidmēnā to meto Euzpēs ekonomīnē ērdevē.


Aiškinantis, ar ķvarai buvo tvarkā to meto Euzpēs nusišuējumās ekonomiskās ķonjunktūru salīgas, sīkiemā nurodīty pali-varkiā ķvaro ķīdu pelnēgumā rodiklus, o ķoreliacine-regresīne analīze – nustatītī XVI a. Žemaitijos ķvaru kitimā ērdevē.

Ī tyrimā lauku ķibuvo ķtraukī ķvaru miestelī, nors XVI a. īstoriogrāfijos fiksuojama tolygi jū plētra. Īstoriķai prīpažēsta, kad tās metu jē tebebuvo gana silpni un lemiāno vaidmēnā ķījē negalējo ķavindī. Be to, ķaro specīfika un āpīmīs leidīja suskoncentruotī toli gražu ne ī visas, o ķī svarbūs ķvar dvaro ķīdu struktūras un jūs problēmas, kuris, nors un nesudaro galīmēs visiškā išsamī un susipažīnti su to meto gaminānčio dvaro ķīdu vaiždu, tāciāu gali padētī suvokti esmīnu to meto dvaro un jo ķīdu struktūros pokyējūs, specīfīnes to meto Žemaitijos ekonomikē un visuomenē situācijā ēmusias priva-tās dvaro formas.
Darbo objekts, tiksلاs ir uždaviniai

Tyrimo objektu pasirinktas prie naujų Europos ekonominių sąlygų besitaikantis XVI a. Žemaitijos privačių valdų dvaras ir jo socialinė bei ūkio organizacijos struktūra.

Disertacijos tikslas – aptariant viduramžių Žemaitijos dvaro raidą lėmusias bendrasius makroekonomines Europos ūkio tendencijas nustatyti, ar XVI a. prie pasikeitusių ekonominių sąlygų buvo pritaikyti šios LDK vaivadijos ( tuo metu dar vadintos Žemiaiščių seniūnija) privačių valdų dvarai, išsiaiškinti, kaip buvo organizuotas ir šokas orientuotas dvarų ūkis, kokia jo specifika bei plėtros pobūdis.

Uždaviniai:
1) Išnagrinėti svarbiausias viduramžių Europos dvarų tyrimo problemas, ypač akcentuojant Vidurio Europos specifiką ir Žemaitijos problemą, taip pat, remiantis naujausia Lietuvos bei užsienio istoriografija, nustatyti šio darbo tyrimų aktualumą ir naujumą užtikrintančius metmenis;
2) Analizuojant iki šiol lietuvių istoriografijoje menkai reflektuotas Europos dvarų atsidainimo ir plėtojimosi problemas, nustatyti LDK ir Žemaitijos dvaro sistemas ir jos raidos pobūdi bei vietą Europos dvarų sistemos raidos kontekste;
3) Išaiškinti Europos istoriografijoje taikomas teorines dvaro sampratas ir tipologizavus XVI a. Žemaitijos istorijos šaltiniuose dvarui įvardyti naudotus terminus, suformuluoti dvaro ūkio struktūros tyrimus įgalinančią teorinę Žemaitijos valdų organizacinių schema;
4) Lyginant su kaimyninių teritorijų dvarų personalo struktūromis, nustatyti ir išanalizuoti Žemaitijos privačių valdų dvaro personalo modelį, nurodyti svarbiausias personalo kategorijas ir grupes bei aptarti jų sąveiką ir reikšmę gaminančio dvaro ūkio;
5) Nustatyti svarbiausias privačių dvarų ūkio struktūros segmentus, lėmusius to meto dvarų gamybinę galią, aptarti jų būklę ir specifiką;
6) Nustatyti XVI a. Žemaitijos dvarų svarbiausius dvarų ūkio sistemas prekingumo rodiklius ir plėtros specifiką.
Mokslinio darbo naujumas ir reikšmė
Pasirinktos temos tyrimo naujumas grindžiamas šiais argumentais:
1. Nepaisant gana senas tradicijas Europoje turinčių dvaro tematikos tyrimų, lietuviškų LDK teritorijų, tarp jų ir Žemaitijos, dvaro socialiniai-ekonominiai tyrimai vis dar yra gana kuklūs. Šią padėtį dar labiau komplikavo XX a. susiklosčiusios politinės aplinkybės, dėl kurių dvaro istorijos klausimai liko istoriografijos paraštėse;
2. Dėl šių priežasčių nusistovėjus gana vienus dvarų tyrinėjimą, jo problemų nagrinėjimas buvo įsprausotas į klasinių priėmėtaravimų kontekstą. Susiklosčius tokiais situacijos į tyrimų lauką nepakliuvo naujausi užsienio šalių istoriografi jos tyrinėjimai, taip pat net kai kurios dvaro struktūros;
3. XVI a. Žemaitijos traktavimas kaip krašto, kuriame neįsivyravo nei palivarkai, nei lažas, šiandieną dar labiau didina šio LDK regiono atskirtį nuo Vidurio Europos, taip pat ir likusios Europos dalies istorinio ir istoriografinio konteksto;
4. Istorijos istorijos nėra atskleistų Žemaitijos dvarų plėtotos socialinės ir ūkio struktūros, nėra išanalizuota jų specifika ir suvokta jos situacija kaimyninių kraštų atžvilgiu;
5. Disertacijoje pirmą kartą lietuvių istoriografijoje buvo pasiūlyti ir pritaikyti teorinis ir praktinis dvaro tyrimų lygmenys;
6. Darbe analizuojant privačių dvarų struktūrų raišką, buvo sukurta tyrimo sistema, leidžianti susisteminti šaltinių medžiagą ir padežant konkrečius minetų struktūrų bruožus.

Chronologinės ir geografinės ribos
Chronologiskai darbas apibrėžiamas XVI a. laikotarpiu, kada ne tik kituose Vidurio Europos kraštuose, bet ir Žemaitijoje, priešingai nei iki šiol manyma, iškyla privatūs palivarkiniai dvarai kaip galutiniai susiformavę, stabilūs žemėvaldos objektai su gana visapusiškai išplėtota socialine ir ūkio struktūra. Šis šimtmetis Europos istorijos kontekste sutartinių įvardijamas kaip ūkinių Europos regionų skirtingų pasireiškimų laikmetis, kurio metu Europos žemės ūkio sistemos pasuko skirtingiais raidos keliais. Manyta, kad maždaug tuo metu Vidurio Europoje įsigalė-
jo stambūs, lažinį valstiečių darbą naudoj dvarai, o Žemaitija buvusi viena negausių jos teritorijų, kuriose palivarkinis ūkis neįsigalėjo.


Geografiniu požiūriu tyrimas apima Žemaičių seniūniją (nuo XVII a. dar vadinamą „Žemaičių kunigaikštyste“), kuri nuo XV a. būdama viena iš LDK vaivadijų sudarė atskirą administracinių vienetų ne tik su savita geografine, gamtine, demografine padėtimi, bet ir specifine teise, taip pat ūkio bei visuomenine sistema.

**Tyrimo metodai**

Disertacija daugiausia yra analitinė ir statistinė Žemaitijos XVI a. privačių dvarų socialinės ir ūkio struktūros analizė, paremta lokalinių mikroanalitinių tyrimų, derinamais su lyginamaisiais Europos dvaro raidos kontekstais. Darbo teorinių ir metodologinių pagrindų sudaryti ūkio struktūros ekonominė įvairių dvarų atskirą administracinių vienetų, bet ir specifinių teisės, taip pat ūkio bei visuomenine sistema.

**Darbo struktūra**

Darbą sudaro šeši skyriai, penki dėstymo skyriai, išvados, šaltinių ir literatūros sąrašas bei priėdai. Pirmajame skyriuje aptariami teoriniai nagrinėjamos temos metmenys. Antrajame nagrinėjama viduramžių
IŠVADOS


Medievalų tyrimuose vieną centrinių pozicijų užima ir yra laikoma itin sudėtinga – feodalizmo problema. Dvarų tyrimams feodalizmo teorija svarbi tuo, kad ji paaškina iš tikimybės ištakomis pagrįstus visuomenės santykius, lėmusius vasalinės lenų sistemos atsiradimą. Kitaip sakant, žemėvaldos formas ir jo sistemą lėmė žemės savininkų ir žemės laikytojų tarpusavio įsipareigojimai. Mūsų atveju, Žemaitijos
žemėvaldos tyrimuose pritaikytos feodalizmo nuosmukio (XIV–XV a.) ir pereinamojo laikotarpio iš feodalizmo į kapitalizmą (XV ir XVI–XVIII a.) koncepcijos. Jos reikalingos formuluoja ir aiškina Žemaitijos dvarų sistemos ryšį su socialiniu ir ekonominiu Europos dvarų sistemos aspektais.


Nors istorikai dar ginčijasi, visgi priimta manymų, kad dvarų sistemos Europoje formavosi IX–XIII ir XIV a., pirmiausia atsirasdamos vakarinėje jos dalyje ir sklisdamos toliau į rytus. Vakarų Europoje jau IX a. socialinės struktūros įgijo senorinį charakterį, o dėl valstiečių alodo nykimo, žemėvalda – feodalinę formą. Nuo pat dvarų sistemos formavimosi pradžios dvarų struktūros vystėsi netolygiai. Skiriantis dvarų dydžiui ir ekonominėi struktūrai, dvarų valdymas ir valstiečių priklausomybė nuo dvaro taip pat buvo nevienodi. Vienur dvaro sis-
tema buvo išvystyta dalina arba net visai jos nebuvo, o kitur alodinė sistema sėkmingai gyvavo net labiausiai išsivysčiusios dvaro sistemos arealuose. Po ilgų svarstymų, koks buvo dvaras, prieita prie išvados, kad viduramžiais susiformavusio dvaro sistemos esmė – ne jo išsiplečtojimas, o ypatinga dvaro gamybos ir vartojimo organizavimo forma.


Šiuo laikotarpiu tiek Lietuvoje, tiek Žemaitijoje privačioms dvaro valdoms buvo būdinga didelė lyvairė – tiek dydžio, vidinės organizacijos, tiek struktūros prasmės. Dėl istoriografinės tradicijos iki šiol į tyrejų akritatį nepateko kiti dvaro, kaip savito to meto ūkinio darinio, elementai, kurie šaltiniuose galėjo būti įvardijami ne tik dvaro ar palivarko terminais. Toks istoriografinios vienpusiškumas verčia sugrįžti ne tik prie minėtų struktūrų tyrimų, bet ir pačios dvaro terminijos problematikos. Šių temų ir problemų studijos gali pasitarnauti sumažinant didžiulį atotrūkį tarp Lietuvos ir Europos šalių ekonominės istoriografinės tyrimų.


Analizė parodė, kad lietuvių istoriografiijoje įlgą laiką taikant vien praktinius šaltinių tyrinėjimus, dvaro ir palivarko sąvoką įgijo kiek kitokią prasmę nei, pvz., kitose Vidurio Europos šalyse arba Vakarų Europoje. Mūsų istoriografiijoje taikomas hierarchinis dvaro ir palivarko suvokimas yra netikslus, o tokie palivarko apibrėžimai kaip: 1) savarankiškas objektas, ir 2) nedidelis objektas, hierarchiškai pavaldus kitam administraciniam dariniui, – yra netikslūs.


Žemėvaldos objektų termininių reikšmių tyrimas leido nustatyti, kad savarankiškos dvarų valdos arba ūkio objekto prasmę turėjo bent septyni terminai, kuriems pritaikyti lietuviškus atitikmenis vis dar yra gana sudėtinga (dėl nepakankamų tyrimų). Tam reikalingi platesni istoriniai tyrimai, mokslinę diskusiją. Todėl kai kuriems terminams (pvz., *dworec, дворец*) darbe pritaikyti lietuviški pavadinimai nėra nekvestionuojami.
Taikant teorinį dvaro valdos konceptą, buvo nustatyta, visi minėti pavadinimai (žemėvaldos prasme) galėjo būti taikomi savarankiškam ūkio objektui. Kai kurios mažybiniškų minėtų terminų formos žymi mažesnę žemėvaldos objekto apimtį, o kartais ir struktūrinius skirtumus.

Integruotų ūkio židinių steigimas jau įki organizuotoje valdoje turėjo suintensyvinti žemės įdirbimą, kitas ūkio šakas, taip pat pačios val-dos ūkio efektyvinimą. Palyginti nedidelis jų skaičius rodo, kad tai daryti galėjo tik ekonomiškai stiprių valdų savinininkų, o tai reiškia, kad palivarkinis dvaro ūkis labiau buvo stiprinamas tokių savinininkų valdose. Mažiau ekonomiškai pajėgos valdo šis procesas buvo kiek lėtėsnis.


Nors istoriografijoje vyrauja požiūris, kad XVI a. Žemaitijoje bažnytinėse ir valdovo valdose lažinis-palivarkinis ūkis neišsispėjo, tačiau atlikti privačių valdų tyrimai rodo ką kitą. Lažinį darbą galėjusio dirbti personalo persvara kitų dvaro valdinių atžvilgiu ir gana aukštos (4 – 4,7 dienų) savaitinio lažo normos bei duoklininkų atodirbiai liudija, kad lažinio darbo taikymas buvo populiaresnis privačiose, o ne bažnytinėse ar valdo-vo valdose. Taip pat svarbu pastebėti, kad privačiose valdose lažas buvo vienodai svarbus tiek smulkiems, vidutiniams, tiek stambiems ir labai stambiems dvarų ūkiams.

Nors šioms tendencijoms patvirtinti reikėtų papildomų tyrimų, vis dėlto šis faktas šiek tiek koreguoja šiuo metu istoriografijoje vyraujančį požiūrį, kad LDK stambiojoje žemėvaldoje lažinis darbas buvo žymiai mažiau plėtojamas.

Be atodirbinės rentos, privačiose valdose ne mažiau svarbios buvo ir piniginė bei natūrinė rentos, ir tai visiškai atitinka to meto Vidurio Europoje vyraujančių rentos formų tendencijas. Be lažinio darbą dirbu-sių valstiečių tiaglų, kiek mažesnis buvo piniginę ir atodirbinę rentą atlikusių valstiečių, vadintų duoklininkais, skaičius. Dėl galutinių nesusikloščiusios ir nenusistovėjusios rentos jų padėtį galėtume laikyti tarpinė duoklininkų ir įvairių atžvilgiu.

Laisvieji valstiečiai, įtraukiami į dvaro šeimynos sudėtį, tiaglų ar duoklininkų tarpą, atskiros personalo grupės XVI a. antrojoje pusėje Žemaitijoje nesudarė, skirtina nei, pvz., kai kuriuose Lenkijos regionuose. Tačiau jų sąskaita visuomeninė dvaro sudėtis, kaip ir kituose Vidurio Europos regionuose, pasipildydavo samdomo darbo jėga.

5. Šaltinių analizės dėka buvo išskirti šie pagrindiniai privačių Žemaitijos dvarų ūkio struktūros segmentai: augalininkystė, gyvulininkystė, žuvininkystė, bitininkystė, miško eksploatacija, perdirbimas bei verslai.

Ilgą laiką istoriografijoje nagrinėjant dvarų produkciją buvo akcentuojamas javų ūkis. Kitos ūkio struktūros tyrimuose būdavo paliečia-mos tik kaip marginalinis reiškinys. XVI a. Europos ūkyje vyko didžiulės permainos, skirtinoms valstybėms nulemėsios jų pozicijas Europos ir netgi pasaulio ekonominėje erdvėje. Šio augimo priežastis


Istoriografijoje, ypač Lietuvos, yra įsitvirtinus nuomonė, kad XVI a. antroji pusė buvo beveik stablius palievarkų plėtros ir dirbamų plotų didėjimo laikotarpis. Iš tiesų ūkiškai organizuotų dvaro valdų, ypač paskutinių XVI a. dešimtmečių, gerokai padaugėjo, tačiau to negalima pasakyti apie dirbamos žemės plotą. Arimų ploto kitimo dinamika parodė, kad XVI a. dvaruose arimai palaipsniui mažėjo.

Be tradicinių įvairių kultūrų nemažą reikšmę Žemaitijoje turėjo žirniai ir grikiai, kurių buvo sėjama gana nemažai. Vis dėlto jie, kaip ir tuo metu dirbtuose žemėse augintų kultūrų, labiau buvo skirti saviems poreikiams tenkinti. Svarbu pažymėti, kad asortimentas mažai skyrėsi nuo tuo metu kaimyninės Lenkijos žemėse augintų kultūrų.

Augalininkystės ūkyje svarbią vietą užėmė šieno ruoša. Jo produkcia buvo glaudžiai susijusia su kita dvaruose aktyviai plėtojama šaka – gyvulininkystė. Šiuomis pastebėti, kad šieno svarbą liudijantys inventoriai, pateikia duomenų, kad šienas kai kuriuose dvaruose būtų auginamas ir ruošiamas parduoti. Šis reiškinys to meto Vidurio Europoje buvo žinomas ir gana paplitęs.


Nors dvaras paukščiais ir jų produktais būdavo aprūpinamas per valstiečių duokles, vis dėlto paukščių auginimo nebuvо vengiamą. Tyrimai rodo, kad paukštininkystėje net 59 proc. viso paukščių ūkio sudarė žąsys, 38 proc. vištų ir tik 3 proc. antys. Auginant naminius paukščius, pirmiausia buvo atsižvelgiama į jų teikiamą naudą ir mažesnį laikyto kaštus. Geriausiai šiuos kriterijus atitiko žąsys ir viš-
tos. Deja, nesant tiesioginių žinių, sudėtinga kalbėti apie paukštininkystės rentabilumą.

Lyginant su kaimyninės Lenkijos žemėmis, vidutinis gyvulių ir paukščių skaičius vienam ūkiu objektui Žemaitijoje buvo mažesnis, tačiau pati laikomų gyvulių sudėtis, arba struktūra, buvo panaši. Šie duomenys rodo, kad gyvulininkystės tendencijos Žemaitijos privačiuose dvaruose buvo panašios kaip ir kitose vakarinėse ATR valstybės dalyse.


Tokia veikla kaip miško eksploatacija rodo, kad Žemaitijos dvarų savininkai ir laikytojai nepraktikavo miško verslų – deguto, anglies, potašo gamybos. Šaltiniai nefiksuoja didesnio aktyvumo ir medžiojant žvėris. Panašu, kad daug labiau buvo vertinama galimybę iš miško gauti medienos, o išdalinus miškus sklypais valstiečiams, – ir piniginį mokesčių.

Žaliavų perdirbimo ir verslų produkcija pirmiausia buvo skirta vietas gyventojų poreikiams tenkinti, jos reikšmė dvaro ūkyje nebuvo didelė. Žemaitijos dvarų ūkyje nustatyti du perdirbimo ir verslų tipai: 1) gamybą, kurią vykdė to paties dvaro žmonės arba trečiųjų asmenys dvaro ribose iš dvaro žaliavų; 2) didesnį ar mažesnį ūkinių nepriklausomumą turėjusios dvaro įmonės, laikinai priklausiusios valstiečiams.

Pirmajam tipui priskyrėme Žemaitijos dvaruose plačiai paplitusią alaus gamybą, pieno perdirbimą ir grūdų malimą be rečiau pasitaikancius malūną. Žaliavų perdirbimas dvaruose buvo vykdomas naudojant gana primityvius gamybos metodus. Nors kai kuriais atvejais galime stebėti technologijų gerinimą, pvz., vandens malūnų, aludarių (matyt,
profesionalių) darbo naudojimą ir pan., tačiau turime per mažai žinių, kad galėtume kalbėti apie bent kiek didesnį iš to gaunamą pelną.

Antrajam tipui priskirtume svaigiuų gėrimų pardavimą, karčemų verslą. Nors jis buvo plėtojamas dvarų teritorijoje, vis dėlto istorikų nėra laikomas tipišku dvaro verslu. Pirmiausia dėl tos priežasties, kad karčemos laikytos amatinkų įmonėmis, kuriose svaigieji gėrimai buvo ne tik pardavinėjami, bet ir gaminami, o antra – ši veikla buvo gana stipriai reglamentuojama didžiojo kunigaikščio nuostatomis ir teisės aktais.


Iš atlikto tyrimo matyti, kad XVI a., priešingai nei iki šiol manyta, Žemaitijoje privačioje žemėvaldoje buvo steigiami Vidurio Europos ekonominių dvarų modelių ir plėtros specifiką atitinkantys dvarai. Bendroji dvarų struktūra ir ūkio organizacija liudija orientaciją į tuo metu itin populiarų užsienio rinkose žemęs ūkio žaliavų, tokių kaip grūdai ir gyvulininkystės produktai, gamybą. Be jų, dvaruose buvo kultivuojama šieno produkcija, miškų eksploatacija, žuvinininkystė, bitininkystė, dvaro žaliavų perdirbimas ir verslai. Socialinėje srityje tai reiškė visų rentos formų naudojimą ir eksploataciją. Nors dvarų personalo modelis bei kai kurios ūkinės veiklos kryptys rodo, kad buvo orientuojama į gamybą užsienio rinkoms, tačiau ūkio rodiklių vidurkis liudija, kad labiau vyravo autonominis, vietos rinkos poreikius tenkinęs palivarkinių dvarų ūkis.

Šie tyrimų duomenys leidžia daryti išvadą, kad Žemaitijos privačių valdų savininkai savo ūki plėšojo gerokai aktyviau, nei tai buvo daroma valstybinėse ir bažnytinėse valdose. To meto žemaičių dvarų ūkiai buvo šiek tiek mažesni ir galbūt ne tiek išplėtoti, kaip, pvz., Lenkijoje, tačiau nedaug skyrėsi nuo vyrausvų XVI a. lenkų šlėktų palivarkų.

Visi minėti Žemaitijos privačių dvarų ūkio poslinkiai artino Lietuvos gamybos struktūrą prie europinio dvaro modelio ir padėjo įsigalėti prekiniam-komerciniam santykiam ūkyje.
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