

LITHUANIAN ETHNOLOGY: STUDIES IN SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY AND ETHNOLOGY, VOL. 5–6

(Lietuvos etnologija. Socialinės antropologijos ir etnologijos studijos, Nr. 5–6)

Rimantas Sliužinskas

Klaipėda University, Lithuania

This survey continues presentation of ‘Lithuanian Ethnology’, Vol. 1–4, published in our *Acta Historica Universitatis Klaipedensis*, Vol. 12–13, *Studia Anthropologica* 1–2, 2006¹.

So, presented in this survey series ‘Lithuanian Ethnology’ (LE V–VI), as in previous volumes, are devoted to publish scientific articles, conference materials, book reviews on various themes of social anthropology and ethnology studies from Lithuania and Central/East Europe. Texts are published in Lithuanian and in English languages. Since the year 2001 eight volumes appeared, one per year². The Editorial board consists from outstanding Lithuanian and foreign anthropologists and ethnologists, such as Dr. Vytytis Čiubrinskas (editor-in-chief, Centre for Social Anthropology at Vytautas Magnus University in Kaunas), Dr. Auksuolė Čepaitienė (Lithuanian Institute of History in Vilnius), Prof. Jonathan Friedman (École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Lund University, Sweden), Prof. Orvar Löfgren (Lund University, Sweden), Dr. Jonas Mardosa (Vilnius Pedagogical University), Prof. Vacys Milius (1926–2005; Lithuanian Institute of History), Dr. Žilvytis Šaknys (Lithuanian Institute of History) and Dr. Danguolė Svidinskaitė (secretary, Lithuanian Institute of History).

As it was pointed by LE Editor-in-chief Dr. Vytytis Čiubrinskas in the 1st volume, “... this annual journal of ethnological studies, appearing for the first time in Lithuania, seeks to provide its readers with current and important research in the fields of socio-cultural anthropology and ethnology done in Lithuania and abroad. ... In this journal we are looking for interdisciplinary connections, seeking, in particular, to break the border between ethnology and socio-cultural anthropology. ... We want to integrate studies that are clearly cognate in their methodology and aim. ... We seek to encourage scholarly colloquy ... analyzing differences and similarities between cultures and

¹ See: SLIUŽINSKAS, Rimantas. ‘Lithuanian Ethnology: Studies in Social Anthropology and Ethnology’ („Lietuvos etnologija. Socialinės antropologijos ir etnologijos studijos“), Vol. 1-2. Review. In: *Defining Region: Socio-Cultural Anthropology and Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, Part 1. *Acta Historica Universitatis Klaipedensis*, Vol. 12, *Studia Anthropologica* – 1. Ed. by V. Čiubrinskas & R. Sliužinskas, Klaipėda: Institute of Baltic Sea Region History and Archaeology, Klaipėda University, 2006, p. 125–136; SLIUŽINSKAS, Rimantas. ‘Lithuanian Ethnology: Studies in Social Anthropology and Ethnology’ („Lietuvos etnologija. Socialinės antropologijos ir etnologijos studijos“), Vol. 3-4. Review. In: *Defining Region: Socio-Cultural Anthropology and Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, Part 2. *Acta Historica Universitatis Klaipedensis*, Vol. 13, *Studia Anthropologica* – 2. Ed. by V. Čiubrinskas & R. Sliužinskas, Klaipėda: Institute of Baltic Sea Region History and Archaeology, Klaipėda University, 2006, p. 159–167.

² Lietuvos etnologija / Lithuanian Ethnology. Studies in Social Anthropology and Ethnology. Vilnius: Lithuanian Institute of History,
Vol. 1(10), 2001, 311 p. [abbreviation – LE I];
Vol. 2(11), 2002, 215 p. [LE II];
Vol. 3(12), 2003, 203 p. [LE III];
Vol. 4(13), 2004, 205 p. [LE IV];
Vol. 5(14), 2005, 249 p. [LE V];
Vol. 6(15), 2006, 258 p. [LE VI];
Vol. 7(16), 2007, 218 p. [LE VII];
Vol. 8(17), 2008, 193 p. [LE VIII].

societies, between us and them, between majority and minority, dominant and marginal, local and immigrant” (LE I: 6–7).

Mentioned above attitudes are predominant in the following LE volumes as well.

Lithuanian Ethnology, Vol. 5 (14)³

LE V volume is edited by ethnologist Dr. Auksuolė Čepaitienė, and it is devoted to the problems of everydayness. As it is mentioned in Foreword, “this topic does not seem new to Lithuanian ethnologists. Since the inter-war period, ... the interest of the researchers and enthusiasts of ethnography has been focused on the rural daily cycle and lifestyle. The present publication, however, attempts to cast a different glance at everydayness. Instead of analyzing the everyday life of human beings, it investigates the daily social, recurrent condition and people’s environment that can comprise the most varied and unrelated things. The return to topic of everydayness was prompted by the ongoing fundamental social changes, bringing commonplace everyday issues to the fore as well” (LE V: 7).

When the publications were going to press, LE Editorial board member, Professor Vacys Milius died on October 2, 2005. He was a distinguished ethnographer, a long time member and one-time head of the Department of Ethnology of the Lithuanian Institute of History, a professor of Vytautas Magnus University and a teacher of many of our young generation ethnologists. Professor V. Milius devoted his all life to Lithuanian ethnology, which, at present, is virtually inconceivable without his works and activities. The basic concept of LE V issue – everydayness and culture – was an important sphere of his research. LE V volume is dedicated to the memory of Prof. Vacys Milius (1926 12 08 – 2005 10 02).

The first article by **Auksuolė Čepaitienė** ‘An Introduction into the Study of Everyday Life: Everyday Life as the Culture Ordering Space’ (LE V: 11–26) deals with mentioned above idea of this volume, which sets its specific interest in the study of everyday life and culture. It discusses aspects, methodologically significant for the analysis of this research theme, as well as in the papers of other authors of the volume. According to the author, inter-subjectivity of the social world and objectivity of social facts, are the influential aspects which shape the epistemologies of the theme. Within this theoretical and methodological context, the paper aims to look at everyday life as a discourse, and as physically close human reality. It shows how the space of everyday tends to include various phenomena, which are and are not necessarily physically present, and establishes the order in its own particular way. It discusses how the discourse and the space of everyday re-categorises and transforms the human world full of things, ideas, symbols, social relations, rituals, meanings and values, while setting the light on one area or items and shadowing the other. Although it is apparent that everyday reality is defined through detachment from symbolic worlds, and tendencies of routinising are advocating stability the change, dynamism and creativity seems to be its part and parcel as well. The enduring persistence of life rhythm might be changed with the new ordering of time; the distant areas, the celebrity or the symbolic events might enter into everyday and become integrated and transformed easily; the holistic images of the worlds there become fragmented and the details emphasised. The article underlines the ethnographic explicitness and cultural instrumentality of everyday reality and tries to show its conceptual and methodological

³ Full title: *Lietuvos etnologija / Lithuanian Ethnology*. Studies in Social Anthropology and Ethnology. Kasdienybė ir kultūra. Ed. by Auksuolė Čepaitienė. Vilnius: Lithuanian Institute of History, Vol. 5 (14), 2005, 248 p. [abbreviation – LE V]

significance. It suggests that "... everyday life, as the social space situated around the "here" and the "now" and culture, are in reciprocal relationship. It emphasises that everyday life is the space for cultural development where it becomes enduring, and culture is in order, which provides the form and shape for everyday life" (LE V: 26).

An article by (at peace) **Vacys Milius** 'Everyday Works Distribution in a Lithuanian Village of the Second Half of the 19th – First Half of the 20th Century' (LE V: 27-34) continues the everyday life research actualities. On the grounds of previous research and local descriptions, works here are examined in the following sequence: general works; works done by men, women, and children; and seasonal works carried out by the above mentioned group members. Author points, that all traditional Lithuanian village life was connected with agricultural work and animal husbandry. "Women were additionally engaged in food preparation, child rearing, textile production, and textile product conservation. General works included manuring, mowing, rye harvesting, thrashing, flax processing, milling by hand-operated millstones, and mushroom gathering in south-east regions. Men carried out work mostly related to horses, such as fuel provision or building material preparation in winter, yet men also engaged in bee-keeping, barley malt beer brewing and home-made whiskey production, The range of works done by women covered spinning, weaving, knitting, and milk processing for the production of milk products. Children were trained to carry out work tasks as early as possible: children (boys in the main) were engaged in herding, helping adults to carry out housework or look after smaller children" (LE V: 34).

Žilvytis Šaknys (Lithuanian Institute of History) examines Lithuanian village and small town community life in late 19th and early 21st century against the background of rural Lithuania, Belarus, Poland, and Latvia. In his article "Different Time" within the Rhythm of Lithuanian Youth Life' (LE V: 35–52) author emphasizes, that "... a chance to control folk culture directly is determined by numerous factors, and human age is one of them. Given that culture is an integral whole of constituent cultures created by different age groups, special attention is to be given to the culture created or adopted by youth, including teenagers" (LE V: 50). According to author, modelled by family, peers and village community, and controlled by economic needs and the church, youth leisure used to be monotonous during Advent and Lent in traditional culture. In the interwar period, the range of control exercised jointly by parents and church was narrowed by the control imposed by intellectual non-clerical elite. Culture, heading for modernity, introduced definite corrections in favour of a more flexible understanding of Advent and Lent as the periods of "different" time. Essential changes were brought about by the 1940s. Soviet deportations, World War II, and post-war resistance forced a huge number of young people to spend almost a decade suspended in "Advent and Lent time". Shortly after the 1940s, that had checked the cultural modernisation process, we could see efforts made by governmental power elite to dissociate youth from parents' or church control, and to monopolise folk culture, including youth itself. The popular movement of 1988-1990 immediately restored clerical and intellectual elite to power. The period of national rebirth also restored the positive value of old traditions giving power to customs uprooted in the period of Soviet rule; it returned Advent and Lent their traditional seasonal value. Under the current conditions of reduced control over village youth leisure by governmental institutions, parents and church, coupled with the hastened rate of globalisation processes, the specific characteristics of Advent and Lent as the periods of "different" time tend to fade away again (LE V: 51).

The thesis by Stephen Gudeman, that “community equity cannot be ‘traded’ for market efficiency, because they pertain to different realms of value”⁴ is examined in the article ‘Community Equity in Contemporary Economy’ by **Vida Savoniakaitė** (Lithuanian Institute of History, LE V: 53–64). An author investigates the everyday life of *aukštaičiai*. She points: “The culture of *aukštaičiai*, who live in small towns and villages, has been substantially modified by political changes of the last decade. Strategic requirements of the European Union agrarian policy, subsidies, their future and possible influences on the agrarian economy and other spheres of internal policy, or everyday life, are being discussed anew” (LE V: 63). This paper examines the mentality of *aukštaičiai* as a folk economy. Savoniakaitė notes, that mental structure of *aukštaičiai* clearly shows that the farmers’ memories and mentality are deeply rooted in time, experience of daily round as well as the influence of the collective system. During Soviet times it was common to pay for work with grain, vegetables and other goods. The vitality of home economy is, of course, determined by small plots of farmland, low prices of agricultural produce in markets, and, in most cases, limited spending power of the people. The mentality of the *aukštaičiai* daily round and trading activities is quite conservative. Finally, when we remember natural trade, the characteristics of *aukštaičiai* mentality, show the level of work specialization that is associated not with the things of everyday life of a farmer, but with a country’s agrarian policy, activities of institutions, flows of global capital, or problems of less developed rural communities. The generosity at home that *aukštaičiai* show, demonstrates the “equity of community” that is not sold and is not directly dependent on market needs. Morality and identities of *aukštaičiai* are created by the logic of “situated reason” of everyday culture even today, and these identities remain as signs of local culture that demonstrate communal cultural heritage that weaves, currently, into global economic social changes and networks (LE V: 63–64).

The ecclesiastical domain, especially the hierarchical activities and encounters of the ordinary faithful with bishops are usually interpreted as an interruption of everyday life, an antithesis to everyday. This point is examined in the article ‘The Everyday of a Bishop: Antanas Baranauskas, a Concealed Suffragan’ by **Paulius Subačius** (Vilnius University, LE V: 65–74). According to author, the higher clericals had their own forms of everyday life, that were hardly knowable not only to the general public, but to cultural researchers as well. The biography of bishop Antanas Baranauskas (1835-1902), a famous Lithuanian writer and linguist, seems to have been explored in considerable depth. However, there is a rather broad gap, namely, his everyday ecclesiastical activity as a suffragan of the Samogitian diocese (1884-1897). This article discusses the aspects that show up in his routine administrative correspondence and letters to Hugo Weber, Jan Baudouin de Courtenay, etc. The article makes several assumptions. First – that before becoming the official coadjutor of the bishop, Baranauskas had already found himself in the centre of everyday regulation of ecclesiastical life. Second, that together with other incentives, his interest in mathematics could be induced by his first serious encounter with bookkeeping, after becoming the official. The article offers the first documentation of the support, offered by the poet to his brother Anupras Baranauskas by leasing a small estate in Vie vėnai (West Lithuania, near Telšiai), which belonged to him as a suffragan, under favourable auspices. Besides the historical analysis, the article offers methodological remarks on why biographers, influenced by the heritage of Romanticism, tend to an unequal treatment of the everyday occupations of the cultural elite and on how such a tendency might be avoided (LE V: 74).

⁴ See: GUDEMAN, Stephen. *The Anthropology of Economy*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001, p. 65.

Specific historical information is selected and published in the article ‘Italians in the Everyday Life of Lithuanian Grand Duchy in the 16th – 17th C.C.’ by **Aušra Baniulytė** (Vytautas Magnus University, LE V: 75–96). She points, that visitors from other countries made a significant impact on the content of political, cultural, and social life of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania [henceforth – GDL] at that times. These included ambassadors, papal nuncios, merchants, medics, soldiers, nobles, musicians, architects, painters, and sculptors. Within the limits of one article it is difficult to discuss the contribution of many foreigners – French, German, Italian – in the multinational culture of the GDL. This article, therefore, focus only on the Italians who in the 16th – 17th centuries were the most important carriers of the Renaissance and Baroque culture, not only in the GDL, but also in other Central European countries: Germany, Austria, Hungary, and Poland. From the scholarship and sources presented hereby it is known that the interest of Italians in Lithuania, and in Poland coincided with the Christianization of the country when, together with papal legates, came the merchants. During the period of the late middle Ages, Genoese and Venetian merchants, who had their colonies on the Black Sea, passed through Poland and the Slavonic lands of the GDL. In addition to goods such as various cloths, draperies, fur, wine, and oil, which were mostly the luxury goods, the Italian merchants were engaged in slave commerce. In the later period of the 16th – 17th centuries, some of the Italian merchants who had come to Poland, transferred their activity to and settled in Lithuania. In addition to the merchants in the courts, there were also Italian ambassadors, papal nuncios, or Italian humanists. During the period of Reformation, many heretics came to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth to find refuge in this country. Being in close contact with the richest noble families, the Italians very often became the mediators between the Lithuanian nobles and the courts of Italian dukes. (LE V: 94–96). Summarizing, Baniulytė emphasizes, that “the presence of the Italian community of merchants, artists, artisans, and others in Lithuania signified contacts and rapprochement of Lithuania’s culture with that of Europe” (LE V: 96).

“Europa” Everyday: Identities and Strategies’ by **Vilius Ivanauskas** (Lithuanian Institute of History, LE V: 97–112). This article deals with the influence of “european” contexts in the activities and strategies of the participants of Lithuanian youth NGOs. Author certifies that “European contexts” signify financial support from EU and other western donors, who provide assistance to Eastern European societies. By looking at ethnographic observations of few activists in one Lithuanian youth NGO, an author tries to derive coherence between their identities and personal strategies in the “project” environment. Money, partnership networks and “western” themes (civic society, market economy, human rights, etc.) make invasions in the youth “activists” daily-activities. These European contexts support the motivations, strategies and attitudes of the participants. They perform not only in the NGO’s environment, but in social networks as well. These networks reflect possibilities “to participate” in the NGO, and in the “projects”. Ivanauskas points, that instead of paying attention to the NGO’s declarations about “openness” to every young person, we should mention the existence of an informal system of co-option and selection. Thus, people participating in a “project” environment are also tied to informal relations. Having appropriate education, skills of representation and communication, and better opportunities for a future career, they express “otherness” among less active young people. Youth activists live in globalized contexts. They regularly go abroad to participate in different seminars, make personal contacts with foreign activists, invite them to Lithuania. These observations lead to conclusions about the building of double identities among youth activists: they perceive themselves as “Europeans” and at the same

time as “Lithuanians”. These implications give an impetus to look at global and local perspectives, in the contexts of different “European” influences on Lithuanian society (LE V: 112).

An article ‘Ethnic Groups and Social Aspects of Language’ by **Vida Beresnevičiūtė** (Institute for Social Research, LE V: 113–126) deals with aspects of social domination of language in respect to social relations of ethnic groups. The discussion is based mostly on theoretical considerations of P. Bourdieu, W. Kymlicka and secondary empirical data that reflect tendencies of Lithuanian society. In most cases a state has one official language. Social researchers maintain that within the framework of social interactions, residents who know the official language find themselves in a more favourable situation, whereas those who do not know the language or whose mother tongue is different are disadvantaged. Language, as one of the key characteristics of ethnic groups is a reminder of visible and invisible borders that exist and that are drawn in everyday issues, such as deciding on a child’s school, looking for a job or choosing a place of residence (LE V: 126). Beresnevičiūtė points, that majority of Lithuania’s population are uniform in appearance and culture; therefore language could be treated as one of the differentiating categories of ethnic groups. Language is an integral part of social life, and its usage becomes a means of social recognition, evaluation, classification and stereotyping. Also, language could be interpreted as an expression of a position taken in the social sphere or a means of competition in different social spheres. In everyday interactions, we are sensitive to various accents, intonations and vocabularies used and pay attention to different languages, accents or surnames and thereby presume the ethnic origin of the speaker. Author states, that analysing the social aspects of language, as one of the criteria of ethnicity, one conceives the latter’s social weight and influence on social relations. Language, as an instrument of social interaction, supposes symbolic power relations that serve for the interests of one group far more than the other (LE V: 126).

‘Dimensions of Ethnicity in Mass Media: Lithuanian Press in the Russian Language on the Membership in the European Union’ by **Monika Frėjutė-Rakauskienė** (Institute for Social Research, LE V: 127–138). The article focuses on discussion of the role of the Lithuanian press in the Russian language for the ethnic minorities. The author presents the reflections on the process of Euro-integration covered by the Lithuanian press in the Russian language before the referendum of the 10-11 May 2003. The article is based on research conducted in December 2003 by the Institute for Social Research in the framework of the project “The perceptions of European Integration by the ethnic dimension”. Four main Russian language newspapers were reviewed and the following conclusions were reached: It became evident that the press, designed specially for Russians, is declarative: the articles are translated from analogues in the Lithuanian language, reprinted from Russian press, and presents information without any comments. Efforts of the press in mediation between state and citizen were evident, however: the press had low impact on the Euro-integration process in the Russian ethnic community, because it did not try to formulate and respond to specific interests of the Russian audience. Author concludes, that “... the Lithuanian press in the Russian language did not reflect prior and original opinions of Lithuanian Russians towards the EU or the processes of integration. It is difficult to answer the following question: who are the authoritative opinion shapers (leaders) in the Russian community on the question of Lithuanian integration to the EU? Leading articles published in the press in Russian language reflect and convey the prevailing opinion of Lithuanian citizens and repeat popular arguments “for” and “against” Lithuanian integration into the EU (LE V: 138).

The article ‘Environmental Realia Transformation as Reflected in the Names of Ornamental Patterns of Lithuanian Woven Sashes: A Search for Folk Thought Principles’ by **Vytautas Tumėnas** (Lithuanian Institute of History, LE V: 139–154) attempts to reveal the original characteristics of Lithuanian folk visual/mytho-poetical “ornamental” thinking and its relations with the real and the mythical environment of a Lithuanian villager. It examines the semantic qualities of patterns woven onto Lithuanian traditional pick-up sashes (accumulated in museums, or portrayed on paper or other medium during ethnographic expeditions, or found in published sources) investigating into the folk names of ornamental patterns, their origins, and the typology of their component parts (ornamental motives). According to author, semantic meaning of ornamental pattern, together with other cultural signs, symbols and language, is utilised in the general structure of meanings or all-embracing metaphor, involving a wide variety of associations with domestic or wild animals, or plants, or parts of human body, or operations carried out in agricultural and kitchen activities. The mytho-poetical names of such signs, as component parts of a pattern, single the refined objects, or the objects having a ritual context, or their special parts (e.g. their interiors), out of their immediate environment. Apparently, it is tradition that plays a crucial role in the visual mytho-poetical interpretations of everyday, as reflected in the semantic meanings of ornamental pattern woven onto sashes. The following conclusion is made: the names of ornamental patterns imply a multifarious character of folk typology based on the variance of image and name interface, as well as on the fusion of archaic tradition and innovation (LE V: 154).

‘Images of Saints in Everyday Life: Transformations of Functions’ are examined in so titled article by **Skaidrė Urbonienė** (Lithuanian National Museum, LE V: 155–170). She notes that at the end of the 19th – early 20th century, sacral monuments with images of saints were erected in farmsteads or near them, in cultivable fields, at roadsides and crossroads, as well as remote and dangerous places. People had contacts with sacral images everyday, not only in churches on holy days. Soviet occupation was characterized by a planned massive destruction of sacral monuments and prohibition on building new or repairing old ones. But in spite of restrictions, people continued to build monuments in remote places where local authorities rarely came. After restoration of independence this tradition blossomed into massive erection of sacral monuments. Images of saints in farmstead monuments are the objects of this research and include all sorts of images: old and new sculpture (wooden, gypsum, metal) as well as pictures. On the basis of data collected by the author during ethnographic fieldwork in 1995, 2000, 2003, and material from the end of the 19th – early 20th centuries the article seeks to reveal the continuity and transformation of functions of these images. To show the role and place of sacred images in today’s everyday life of rural people attention is directed to a person’s relation to the whole monument. “The monument is more significant in the everyday life of women, who are the mainstay of religiosity. There is a noticeable difference in the perception of function between generations: older people prefer the religious significance of the monument, the younger generation its aesthetic value. Symbolical meaning of the sanctity of a monument as a family memory is important to various age groups”, concludes Skaidrė Urbonienė (LE V: 170)

An article ‘From Monument to “*Smūtkelis*”: Memory and Everyday of the Monument’ by **Rasa Čepaitienė** (Lithuanian Institute of History, LE V: 171–188) analyses socio-cultural representations of public monuments, focusing especially on their anthropological dimension. It is largely based on Western anthropologists’ and heritage specialists’ polemic of this kind in the academic press. Much attention in the text is paid on the analysis of social role of the monument, especially

on its relation to historical memory, as well as to the various aspects of a monuments' utilization. In consideration of this, the vandalism phenomenon of a monuments' is also analysed, especially in the context of post-communist countries. Eventually, points Rasa Čepaitienė, ascertaining differences of the state of monuments between West and East, the question of reasoning, meaning and scope of cross-craft, which has revived in Lithuania after rebirth of independence, is raised. It is noteworthy, that the popularity and scope of this phenomenon contradicts the already mentioned decline of the monument in the West. Taking this into account, the article endeavours to sort out whether this is a temporal or connective status related mainly to the radical changes of historical memory in the post-communist society, especially to its traumatic dimension. The question is raised whether Lithuanian cross-craft has any possibilities to remain authentic and relevant in Lithuanian society struggling with global issues (LE V: 188).

'Toys in Folk Culture' by **Nijolė Pliuraitė** (The Open Air Museum of Lithuania, LE V: 189–208). This article discusses toys made in Lithuania at the end of 19th and beginning of 20th (till 1945) and explores the relationship between toys and the daily life of country people. Craftsmen rarely made toys; they found the task unprofitable, points Nijolė Pliuraitė. The prevailing opinion of villagers was that toys were necessary only for little children; older children had to make toys themselves. At the time, child labour was more valued than their games. The most widespread and popular handmade toys, according to author, were balls, sound making toys (whistles, rattles), moving toys (tops, swivels, mills), guns (throwing and shooting), vehicles (hoops, trundles, push-carts, scooters). Children used to make apple-shaped balls from cow and sheep hair in the spring time. The first factory made ball from rubber and leather appeared in west and south-west part of Lithuania at the beginning of the 20th century. The most ancient toys were tops, made from bone. The oldest one is known from the 14th century. The top toys named 'žvirblis' (sparrow), made from a bow with a spill, 'ožiukas' (goatling) made from breastbone of goose, were not widely spread but were loved by children. Children played with toys to relax, points Nijolė Pliuraitė. They used to spend their leisure time and simply to have fun. The need to make toys by hand encouraged children to be creative, communicable, sharing. Handmade toys were not preserved: they were simple, unstable, undecorated, and short-lived. Such toys survived until the middle of the 20th century and were replaced by factory made toys after World War II (LE V: 208)

There are also reviews on actual publications by Irma Šidiškienė (LE V: 209–211), Arūnas Vaičekauskas (LE V: 211–216), Egidija Ramanauskaitė (LE V: 216–221), Manfred Klein and Gerhard Bauer (LE V: 221–226), Dalia Bernotaitė-Beliauskienė (LE V: 226–233), Rūta Šimonytė-Žarskienė (LE V: 233–237), written by Dalia Marcinkevičienė, Žilvytis Šaknys, Gintautas Mažeikis, Angelė Vyšniauskaitė, Skaidrė Urbonienė, Irma Šidiškienė, and Gaila Kirdienė, as well as information about important conferences (LE V: 239–244), and research projects and programmes (LE V: 245–248) in the last part of LE V volume.

Lithuanian Ethnology, Vol. 6 (15)⁵

“Contemporary European societies are more and more open to and living in highly differentiated modes of life. Such a situation is a challenge to the social sciences. Anthropology and European ethnology are the most sensitive disciples to take the diversity of human lives and cultures. Anthropology does that on a global scale; European ethnology's scope is more regional

⁵ Full title: *Lietuvos etnologija / Lithuanian Ethnology*. Studies in Social Anthropology and Ethnology. Ed. by Vytis Čiubrinskas. Vilnius: Lithuanian Institute of History, Vol. 6 (15), 2006, 258 p. [abbreviation – LE VI]

and distinctive. Fortunately, Anthropology of Europe is a flexible, growing sub-discipline, so the European field can be shared by both disciplines and provides a perfect arena for collaboration”, notes editor of this volume Dr. Vytis Čiubrinskas in Foreword (LE VI: 9). He continues: “*Lithuanian Ethnology: Studies in Social Anthropology and Ethnology* from its very beginning in 2001, as the title of the journal inscribes, stands for the cooperation of these two disciplines, at least methodologically. This volume includes a variety of articles, two of which illustrate this point” (ibid.). In sum, Vytis Čiubrinskas hopes that “the articles included in this volume of *Lithuanian Ethnology* leave message with the reader that both anthropological and European ethnology perspectives, in Chris Hann’s words, are “creatively cross-fertilized” by using of the same ethnographic methodology” (LE VI: 10).

The first one, ‘Comparative Social Structure or Local Folk Culture? Towards a Unified Anthropological Tradition in Eurasia’ (LE VI: 11–30) written by **Chris Hann** (Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle/Saale, Germany), one of the leading experts of post-communist anthropology, focuses on unifying the anthropological tradition and clearly proves that European ethnology and social anthropology are “two different styles of anthropology” and that they are “equally valid” and should compliment each other. (LE VI: 9). Chris Hann points in the Abstract of the article: “Tradition is not a much theorised term in the discipline in which I received my training in Britain, social anthropology. This may seem a surprising shortcoming, given the popular view that anthropologists are specialists in the customs/cultures/traditions of exotic peoples. In the first half of this paper I shall briefly outline how this neglect has come about, in a branch of anthropology which since the late nineteenth century developed its own distinctive academic tradition, based on wide-ranging comparisons and on fieldwork, which carries with it a ‘presentist’ orientation. In the second part I turn to another vision of the anthropological enterprise, one that stakes its *raison d’être* in a specific understanding of tradition. Again the concept may not receive theoretical elaboration, but in this case it has been the key tacit premise of a discipline which, even when fieldwork is undertaken, is oriented fundamentally towards the past. My conclusion is that the different styles of anthropology are equally valid and that they should complement each other. I look forward to the day when trench warfare between various ‘national traditions’ will give way to creative cross-fertilisation, not only within countries but at the level of individual anthropology departments” (LE VI: 11).

Thomas Schippers, the French anthropologist – Europeanist from the Institute of Mediterranean and Comparative Ethnology in Aix-en-Provence, in the article ‘From Things to Signs: Changing Perspectives in the Study of Material Culture in Europe’ (LE VI: 31–45) deals with the changing perspectives in the study of material culture in Europe. He emphasizes that “... the material dimensions of human cultures could be approached as new, more ‘visualized and iconized worlds’ of consumption and thus of central interest to the ‘cultural expertise’ provided by both European and ‘general’ ethnologists” (LE VI: 9). According to the author, “... the central topic of this paper concerns the study of the material aspects of culture within the discipline of European ethnology. This disciplinary sub-field has undergone quite spectacular changes during the last half century. Not only have the methodological and theoretical perspectives in the study of material culture changed in various directions but, even more importantly, the material world of European societies itself has undergone an unprecedented transformation due to industrialisation and post-industrial globalisation. The conception, production, circulation and use of material (as well as of immaterial) goods have become among the main characteristics of the growing complexity of our

contemporary world. In this paper I would like to discuss some milestones in the ways that European ethnology (but also “general” ethnology or social and cultural anthropology) have approached and analysed the material dimensions of human cultures” (LE VI: 31).

According to Vytis Čiubrinskas, the other articles in this volume focus on the collective identity processes as well as the emotional-moral dimensions of post-socialist realities and use the ‘anthropology at home’ perspective (LE VI: 9).

Gediminas Lankauskas, the Lithuanian-Canadian anthropologist from Concordia University in Montreal, in his article ‘On the Sensory Memory of Socialism’ (LE VI: 47–71) uses the case of the Museum of Soviet Sculptures in *Grūtas* Park, Lithuania, to exemplify how the exhibition of the statues and the taste of the ‘Soviet dishes’ in the museum cafe, create a sensory memory of socialism. His conclusion is that the museum offers an alternative reality to capitalist commoditization and consumerism. It provides a ‘nostalgic longing’ not for socialism as an oppressive totalitarian system but for the quotidian sociability centred on kin and friends that the system inadvertently produced and perpetuated (LE VI: 10). Following the author, *Grūtas* Park is also interesting as a site of commemoration where the period of Soviet rule is objectified by using predominantly non-verbal media of recollection. Specifically, this museum is intriguing not only as a site of memory where the socialist past is made present through visual representations, but also as a locus of commemoration that implicates the sense of taste. Distancing itself from logo-centric methodologies that privilege narrative and text in memory research, the present paper insists on the importance of the senses in practices of social recall (LE VI: 71). Gediminas Lankauskas points in the Summary of the article: “The paper begins with a discussion of the key features of public recall in Soviet Lithuania. Then it moves on to examine practices of remembering at the present post-socialist moment of unsettling systemic change. In the ethnographic section, I take the reader for a stroll through *Grūtas* for a more ‘phenomenological’ experience of the Park. The excursion concludes with a Soviet-style lunch at its cafe. I pay particular attention to the manners in which differing artefacts displayed at *Grūtas*, as well as dishes and drinks on offer at the cafe, work to activate the sensorium of sight and taste as means for memorializing socialism” (LE VI: 71).

The article by **Vytis Čiubrinskas** “Migrants of Nostalgia: Identity and Social Uncertainty of Transnational Repatriates in Post-Communist Lithuania” (LE VI: 73–93) discusses the moral imperative ‘to be of use for Lithuania’, coined by the Lithuanian political emigrants of the World War II, as a type of nostalgia. Encultured as Lithuanian patriots, Lithuanian-Americans as well as the other diaspora Lithuanians, on their way back to Lithuania, are challenged by the uncertainty of post-soviet Lithuanian society. Returnees are in need not only of social integration but also acculturation and re-identification with the new Lithuania’s reality (LE VI: 10). According to author, the problems of in-placement, the re-rooting and re-homing of the transnational, up-rooted and displaced Lithuanian migrants, are the focus of this chapter: the transnational model of Lithuanian identity, transplanted to foreign soil and brought back by the Lithuanian transmigrants. Key questions to be answered are: what is brought back to Lithuania by the returnees in terms of social capital and heritage; what are the shapes of identity among transmigrants in a transitional society; how identities that are brought back from the country of domicile are challenged? (LE VI: 91–92).

Petras Kalnius, the ethnologist from the Lithuanian Institute of History, deals with the problem of delineation of regional borders as regional identity markers in his article ‘Self-awareness of the Local Population of the Boundary of Upper Lithuania (*Auk taitija*) and Samogitia (*Žemaitija*)’ (LE VI: 95–121). The case of the border-zone of the two main regions in Lithuania: *Aukštai-*

tija and *Žemaitija* is used. The article explores the mental delineation of the border. It argues that, as the sources for local identity, the popularity of the spoken vernacular language, as well as the numbers of local population, born and raised in the border-zone decreases, so does the regional identity itself (LE VI: 9). The article is based on the newest data, collected during ethnographic expeditions: during the period from 2002 to 2003 the author completed a survey in fifty boundary localities of Upper Lithuanian and Samogitian dialects using the interview method with participation of approximately 300 respondents. The material obtained is compared with the data of studies, completed by linguists, historians and ethnology experts. The author perceives Samogitians not as the territorial political community of Samogitia eldership, which was subordinated by the Great Duchy of Lithuania till the 18th century, but as the cultural community, which identifies itself by the dialect and attributes of traditional culture. Petras Kalnius points, that "... the metamorphosis of the conception of being Samogitian (transition from the political administrative to cultural conception of Samogitian) had started and materialized itself in the 19th century. Although the transition from the territorial conception of Samogitian to cultural conception of Samogitian is closely related to the period of the Lithuanian national movement at the end of the 19th century, the ambivalent conception of the Samogitian at the start of the 20th century was a relatively frequent phenomenon. Being Samogitian was more and more often identified by the use of the Samogitian dialect only after the restoration of the state of Lithuania. Currently, regional self-awareness of Samogitians, from the point of view of historical administrative territorial dependence, is completely extinct" (LE VI: 120–121).

Aušra Simoniukštytė (Vilnius University) presents an ethno-historic account of the history and memory of Roma population in Lithuania. Her analysis, based on life histories, and published in the article 'Lithuanian Roma: between History and Memory' (LE VI: 123–154) shows the centrality of the ethnic identity in the formation, sustaining and reinforcing of the collective memory of this ethnic minority (LE VI: 9–10). The article purposes to overview historical investigations of the Roma community in Lithuania, covering the period from 15th till the middle of the 20th century. Also, on the basis of the Roma's life stories collected in different regions of Lithuania, it intends to uncover Roma perspective on historical events of the 20th century. Aušra Simoniukštytė points, that "... historical and linguistic evidence, as well as field research data, call into question the popular image of the Roma as unrooted wanderers, strangers alien to Lithuanian culture. At least one Roma group calling itself *litovska roma* (or *polska roma* in the Vilnius region) could be considered a historical ethnic minority of Lithuania living in the country since the 15th century" (LE VI: 150). She also reminds, that the Polish romologist Lech Mroz has discovered the use of the ethnonyms 'Lithuanian', 'Polish', 'Hungarian' and 'Wallachian' Roma in historical documents of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth of the 17th century. Mroz argues that historical documents give enough evidence of early ethnic and social differentiation among the Roma in Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The Russian romologist N. Demeter also suggests that the territory of roaming of one Roma group usually rarely exceeds 300-500 square kilometres, and only some very exceptional circumstances may induce them to leave their accustomed locality. This explains the relatively slow rate of historical migration of Roma from India to Europe and ethnic diversification of Roma all over Europe (LE VI: 150–151).

Danguolė Svidinskaitė (Lithuanian Institute of History), in her article 'Troubled Faith: Religion, Self and the Construction of Morality' (LE VI: 155–185), based on her research of everyday life religiosity in Lithuania today, deals with a very sensitive issue: an encounter of the local

population with the local clergy. The author provides the readers with a thorough analysis of how *local knowledge*, morals and ritual, if altered or omitted by the priests, will affect the faith of the believers (LE VI: 10). The article analyses the individual's relationship to religion and pays attention to the perceptions of faith and its discourse related to the priests and the religious institution. During fieldwork 'at home' at the end of the 20th century and at the beginning of the 21st one, based on interviews and, partly, on participant observation, the author derived the impression that the topic of clergy was quite important and related to the individual's attitude to religion in Lithuania. The ethnographic case which is chosen for analysis seems suitable as an example of reflexivity of one's own (and, at the same time, others') faith. At the same time, attention is paid to the individual context of implication. This usually disappears when one treats a group and when an examination is based on many cases, searching for common features between them. The individuality of this case, therefore, should be underlined. It is linked to a person's life story. According to Danguolė Svidinskaitė, "... faith was understood by this practitioner as a system which embodied and ensured the moral and social order in their community and, generally, in society. In this perspective the article also deals with the construction of morality. It seemed that the faith was routine to the individual. His faith and faith in general, as a system, was imagined as always existing and never disappearing. ... Defining the relationship of the individual to religion, it is important to note that the experienced past, which had been localized in the community of the native village, or, in the broader sense, in the native country in pre-Soviet and later time, offered the interlocutor meaning to reflect on his own, and on others', relationship to religion. In this way, it empowered the religious identity of the individual, as well as his moral and social knowledge in reaching decisions about what was proper and not proper at the end of the 20th century (LE VI: 184).

Renatas Delis (Vytautas Magnus University) in his study 'The Neo-pagan Movement in Post-Soviet Lithuania – Constructing an Alternative Lithuanian Identity as a Response to the Conditions of Modernity?' (LE VI: 187–225) explores the processes of representation of the national identity. He suggests that the Neo-pagan movement, known as counter-establishmental during the Soviet regime, is still popular today because it gives an alternative and an attractive model of Lithuanian identity by means of sacralization, archaization and, eventually, ethnification of traditional Lithuanian folk culture (LE VI: 10). This article focuses on the analysis of those main constituent elements of the common discourse of the Neo-pagan movement in post-soviet Lithuania through which we can grasp an understanding of Lithuanianness constructed in that movement. Author points: "First, an analysis is provided of how Lithuanian neo-pagans construct their understanding about Lithuanianness through their interpretation of traditional Lithuanian culture and the construction of neo-pagan belief. Second, suggestions are made as to what that understanding can tell us about the reasons why the movement exists in contemporary Lithuania and what is its meaning considering the wider context of post-soviet Lithuanian society and culture. In the article the author takes the view that ethnicity and nationalism, or to be more specific, national identity, is socially constructed and is not a natural given. In the contemporary modern world, ideas about ethnicity and nationalism are often employed by different social-cultural groups as a powerful strategy to ground their aspirations and goals. It enables them to claim a legitimacy and authenticity for their identity. Lithuanian neo-pagans do this in their own way" (LE VI: 222). According to Renatas Delis, the discussed research material shows that such understanding of Lithuanianness in the neo-pagan movement assumes a clear primordial, anti-civilizational and anti-modern aspect. What can this kind of construct of Lithuanian identity tell us about the reasons for the existence and

persistence of the neo-pagan movement in contemporary Lithuania? What could the existence of the neo-pagan movement in post-soviet Lithuania tell us about the wider context of contemporary Lithuanian culture and society? (LE VI: 224–225).

Reviews of actual publications by Pernille Hohnen (LE VI: 227–229), Daiva Kristina Kuzmickaitė (LE VI: 229–234), Gabor Barna (LE VI: 234–236), Vacys Milius (in peace, LE VI: 236–239), Nastazija Keršytė (LE VI: 239–244), written by Gediminas Lankauskas, Neringa Liubinienė, Ingo W. Schröder, Auksuolė Čepaitienė, and Vytautas Berenis are put in the last part of LE VI, as well as information about conferences (LE VI: 245–248), personal anniversaries (Marija Miliuvienė, Antanas Daniliauskas, LE VI: 249–254) and In Memoriam (Angelė Vyšniauskaitė, 1919 – 2006, LE VI: 255–258).

These way *Lithuanian Ethnology* volumes 5 and 6 reflect the current actualities of Lithuanian, European and world-wide ethnology and socio-cultural anthropology research life.