

REVIEWS

'LITHUANIAN ETHNOLOGY: STUDIES IN SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY AND ETHNOLOGY'

**(„Lietuvos etnologija. Socialinės antropologijos ir etnologijos studijos“)
Vol. 3-4**

Rimantas Sliužinskas

Klaipėda University, Lithuania

As it was mentioned earlier, social anthropology in Lithuania has new series of its scientific publications. Since the year 2001 already five volumes of 'Lithuanian Ethnology'¹ appeared up to the year 2006 in the Lithuanian Institute of History in Vilnius.

Surveys of the 1st and the 2nd volumes (years 2001 and 2002) of this scientific journal were published in the previous our edition 'Defining Region: Socio-Cultural Anthropology and Interdisciplinary Perspectives, Part 1.'² And now we'd like to introduce the following two volumes.

What new it has happened in the field of Lithuanian ethnology and socio-cultural anthropology during the year 2003?

According to Editor in chief of the journal V. Čiubrinskas "(...) at least three new initiatives, which recently appeared in the field of Lithuanian ethnology are worth mention. First is the founding of the Lithuanian Anthropological Association in the summer of 2003. The fact of establishing a professional organization whose membership includes a number of ethnologists speaks for itself and proves that the interdisciplinary direction taken by the journal 'Lietuvos Etnologija', in combining fields of regional ethnology and social anthropology, is productive. Equally important was the inaugural conference of the Association held in Vilnius in the fall of 2003 and titled 'Defining Ourselves: Establishing Anthropology in the Baltic States'.³ It was emphasized that Lithuania, like the other post-Communist countries ongoing rapid social change, is facing distinct socio-cultural problems and these could be well challenged by the new anthropological approaches, never previously employed in these countries. Many such problems could be very well scrutinized by the qualitative analysis method, central to anthropology.

Secondly, – continues V. Čiubrinskas, – an important initiative has been taken by Auksuolė Čepaitienė, an ethnologist at the Lithuanian Institute of History. She has become the leader of a local research team sponsored by the European Commission of the project 'Public Understanding of Genetics: A Cross-cultural and Ethnographic Study of the 'New Genetics' and Social Identity'. The

¹ 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].

² Sliužinskas, Rimantas. Lithuanian Ethnology: Studies in Social Anthropology and Ethnology (Vol. 1-2). Review. *Defining Region: Socio-Cultural Anthropology and Interdisciplinary Perspectives, Part 1*. Acta Historica Universitatis Klaipedensis XII, Studia Anthropologica I, Klaipėda, 2006, p. 125–136.

³ See: Ivanauskas, Vilius. The First Baltic States Anthropology Conference 'Defining Ourselves: Establishing Anthropology in the Baltics'. *Defining Region: Socio-Cultural Anthropology and Interdisciplinary Perspectives, Part 1*. Acta Historica Universitatis Klaipedensis XII, Studia Anthropologica I, Klaipėda, 2006, p. 141–145.

project, started in 2002, in seven European countries, is led by the Department of Anthropology at the University of Manchester. It aims to investigate the way in which different communities across Europe identify the social implications of new genetic technologies. It will provide new empirical data that will inform the investigation of the relationship between genetics and kinship, race and governance. It is of particular importance that Lithuanian ethnologists are given recognition as partners in the project. A. Čepaitienė herself takes opportunity to introduce the project to the readers of this issue.

Lastly, of importance to the national field of ethnology, was the interdisciplinary discussion, 'Text as a Source', held in the fall of 2003 at the Lithuanian Institute of History, moderated also by A. Čepaitienė. For the first time ethnologists took initiative to attract colleagues from other fields such as history, archaeology, and museology by offering to exchange ideas on textualization. The latter phenomenon is central in contemporary European Ethnology. Ample insights were given by large number of participants in the discussion recognizing the importance of the problem, as well as validity of the interdisciplinary approach for local researches." (LE III: 10).

Many aspects of presented here last events are reflected in the following two volumes of 'Lithuanian Ethnology'.

Lithuanian Ethnology, Vol. 3

This volume⁴ is devoted for further discussions on the place and the role of ethnology and socio-cultural anthropology in the contemporary Lithuania. According to V. Čiubrinskas, "(...) it is obvious today that, on its way of integration to the EU orbit of social sciences and humanities, the discipline of Lithuanian Ethnology would gain from its openness towards sister disciplines. But such openness could also be uncomfortable in terms of melting into the other fields. It was close to that condition during the Soviet period when ethnology had its status reduced to that of a sub-discipline of history. The situation in quite a few Western European and North American countries, where anthropology and folklore studies cover almost the whole field of ethnological competence, is comparable. Ethnology is rooted differently in Central, Northern and Eastern Europe, and has its own scope of expertise here. Nevertheless, it needs modern social theory as well as modern reflexive ethnography. What it needs most is, first of all, the avoidance of generalized cultural historical reconstructions" (LE III: 8).

In this respect, **Wolfgang Kaschuba's** (Humboldt University, Berlin) article 'Historizing the Present? Construction and Deconstruction of the Past' (LE III: 11-32), which opens this issue of journal, is outstanding. "The author puts forward the most sensitive question of European Ethnology: how to deal with the history horizon. And he gives a clear answer: instead of creating a positivist reconstruction of certain cultural-histories, construct it as answer to the questions put to history by the present. According to Kaschuba, the ethnologists, *vis-a-vis* history, are as foreigners in a strange land. They have to reflect on their methodologies if they dare tackle upon issues of history. There is no doubt, that we are used to building our projects of historical images and socio-cultural representations on vivid manifestations of the present: like foreigners who conceive a foreign country from the perceptual framework of their own. Kaschuba also argues for the deconstruction of certain well established concepts, such as nation, folk culture, tradition as well as warns

⁴ Lietuvos etnologija / Lithuanian Ethnology. Studies in Social Anthropology and Ethnology. Vilnius: Lithuanian Institute of History, Vol. 3(12), 2003, 203 p. [LE III].

us to reflect upon new paradigms appearing in the present, like regionalism and multiculturalism. In this case, we can expand Kaschuba's trope '*Abschied von Volksleben*' by saying farewell both to the old *Volkskunde* as well as to the 'old' historical reconstructions in order to start a firm ethnological dialogue with the past.", points V. Čiubrinskas (LE III: 8). According to the author, "(...) the aims of this contribution are, first, to give a short review of the conditions of development of the ethnographic disciplines – especially of the German variant '*Volkskunde*' – and of their shaping as historical sciences. Second, it is an attempt to balance the new orientations of historical research as they have crystallized in the last two decades. Third, the present, seemingly ambivalent, role of a 'cultural history' is discussed: on the one hand, it is characterized by growing public attention to the ethnological interpretation of the cultural and the historical process; on the other, it is characterized by problems of the current scientific as well as socio-political position. In an ethnological understanding, 'historizing the present' should mean to reconstruct that specific 'ethnic paradigm' which influenced social as well as scientific self-images in past and present – and to deconstruct the ethnic discourse as a phenomenon of 'politics of identity'." (LE III: 30).

The utility of such an approach could be well proven in the article 'Transmission by Jumping over a Generation and Re-inscription Process' by **Carole Lemée-Gonçalves**, the French anthropologist from Bordeaux University (LE III: 61-77). Like Kaschuba she also deals with the past, but her point of departure is different. She draws upon social memory as inscribed in distinct memories of certain groups rather than organized as a total pattern of the past. Social memory of displaced groups of European Jews is taken for exemplification of the distinct way of transmission and inscription of certain traumatic events of the past. C. Lemée-Gonçalves splendidly proves how complicated is the work of 'consumption' of history in terms of forgetting and remembrance of the Holocaust among different generations of Jewish descendants. According to the author, "(...) inter-generational transmission of memory, and, more precisely, again narration of social events experienced by our relatives, is a capital issue in all societies. It gets a larger dimension when stateless cultures are concerned because it has indeed a direct link with identities maintaining problematic and cultural productions and renewed expressions." (LE III: 75). She points: "Transmissions by jumping over a generation inscribe themselves in a processual cycle through several generations and lead to a global process of so-called 'intrication process'. As a result, for example, through five generations corresponding to generational relationships as observed by ethnographic study, the principle is: members of a first generation transmit to those of the third generation, members of the second generation transmit to those of the fourth generation, and members of the third generation transmit to those of the fifth generation. And, looking this time at what happens when transmitting from a generation to its immediate one, one may observe that grand children often transmit back to their parents, events, comments, remembrances etc. which were transmitted to them from their grand parents." (LE III: 76-77).

Irma Šidiškienė, an ethnologist at the Lithuanian Institute of History, in her article on traditional Lithuanian wedding rituals 'Transmission by Jumping over a Generation and Re-inscription Process' (LE III: 61-77) seems to have no problem in 'travelling into the past'. V. Čiubrinskas points: "She does apply a well established (in ethnology, in particular) approach on culture change and argues that symbolic behaviour is rooted in local tradition and its chronological correlation by area, extensively proven by the cartographic method as crucial for the understanding of culture change. Even the regularities of its dynamics could be proven by such correlation. I. Šidiškienė comes to the conclusion that the understanding of symbolic behaviour goes through the scrutiny of

sequences of ritual symbolic acts and eventually is culturally contextualized. In this respect, further investigation urges for a holistic – which is primarily anthropological – perspective to be employed. The holistic perspective promises being fruitful, in particular, if applied for delineation of cultural identity processes.” (LE III: 8-9). According to the author, the present research covers the following tasks: to group symbolic acts by their motivated purpose and to cartograph the ones that were not universally distributed in the 1st half of the 20th C. Out of the whole marriage cycle, only wedding rites were chosen for the purpose of the present article. As is indicated by the results of Lithuanian wedding research, the meanings of both symbols and rites are interdependent and subject to perpetual change. The cultural context accounts for wedding rites, and vice versa: the rites reflect the cultural context. Symbolic acts and symbols of wedding rites reveal definite cultural meanings. This article stresses the importance of structural analysis of rites and the interrelation among symbolic acts. The investigated period is characterised as a turning point in the practice of customs where separate elements have undergone rapid change, while the surviving meanings have found themselves on the threshold of transformation. (LE III: 59). This research showed that the sense of symbolic acts was revealed not only by their sequence but also by their structural complex relations. The distinguished areas of symbolic acts and their correlation indicate changes in cultural meanings.

Vida Savoniakaitė, also from the Lithuanian Institute of History, is a pioneer of electronic publications in the field. According the information from V. Čiubrinskas, in 2002 she released a CD version of her research on traditional Lithuanian textiles. In her article ‘Multimedia: an Anthropologic Approach’ (LE III: 113-128) she shares her experience on multimedia challenges to and impacts on the contemporary information society as well as ethnological scholarship. V. Savoniakaitė stresses the importance of the application of multimedia in wide areas of scholarship. Even more, she argues for an urgent need to take into consideration the new social networks, identities, and values created by multimedia and World Wide Web. Her thrust is that all these new domains should be studied as much as traditional fields of ethnological research. (LE III: 9) According to the author, the aim of this article is to analyze and discuss academic publications about Lithuanian cultural history experience. The discussion includes: 1) what are the possibilities in the use of ‘multimedia language’ to assist academics in presenting their research findings about a society’s culture, and what benefits can be demonstrated in the use of multimedia to help publish information about people’s identity and local culture; 2) what these new publications can bring to society, what kind of audience is interested in the identity of the Lithuanian people, their traditional culture, and what kind of new social connections come about. (LE III: 127-128). V. Savoniakaitė concludes: “Through the use of ‘multimedia language’ platforms to publish information on the cultural history of the Lithuanian people and their weaving traditions a wide variety of interested readers may be reached. First, new connections are made because communications are easier on the internet. Second, cultural traditions are becoming part of the economic stratum of society. Lithuanian representatives have been invited to worldwide textile tradeshows, have been sought out for new circles of import partners, and woven materials are considered today in a variety of contexts. Thirdly, diasporas increase connections, émigrés use electronic publications as a means of making connections to their family and their heritage. Fourth, Lithuanian and international academics alike use these publications in their study and research: there are many ways to use ‘multimedia language’ to organize and present information, to discuss historical items in present day context with the use of video, interactive text and sound clips, illustrations, and academic text” (LE III: 128).

Kristina Šliavaitė (PhD Candidate at Lund University at that time, came from the Institute of Social Research in Vilnius; PhD, lecturer at the Vytautas Magnus University in Kaunas at present) in the article ‘Between *Risk* and *Security*: Perception of Nuclear Power and Unemployment in Visaginas’ (LE III: 79-112) deals with Visaginas inhabitants’ perceptions of Ignalina nuclear power plant and its closure in the near future. K.Šliavaitė conducted anthropological fieldwork in Visaginas in 2000-2002 and her article is based on analysis of more than 40 in-depth unstructured or semi-structured interviews and participant observation data. The author discusses what her informants define as ‘risk’ and how they perceive and resist possible social or environmental risks. Analyzing her fieldwork material K.Šliavaitė employs the theories on risk by Mary Douglas and Aaron Wildawsky, Ulrich Beck, Anthony Giddens, Leonardas Rinkevičius, refers to the works of other Lithuanian researchers who studied Visaginas area (Antanas Čiužas, Ričardas Baubinas, Algirdas Kavaliauskas, etc.). K. Šliavaitė’s fieldwork material reveals that most of her informants do not consider themselves as endangered because of living by the nuclear power plant. The author argues that the majority of her informants were against the decommissioning of the Ignalina nuclear power plant in the near future since this was perceived by them as causing rise of unemployment, increase of social problems in the town’s population and even the death of the town of Visaginas. K.Šliavaitė demonstrates that her informants’ attitudes towards Ignalina nuclear power plant are also influenced by such factors as importance of the town and the plant for local people’s identities, previous experience of work at different industries in the former Soviet Union, trust in specialists employed at the plant and plant administration, trust in modern technologies to control the risks, “mistrust in promises given by Lithuanian authorities and Western countries to help local people fight social and economic problems” (LE III: 112). The article also deals with different ways people in Visaginas try to resist future social and economic problems caused by the plant closure.

V. Čiubrinskas concludes in the Foreword of this volume: “Let us hope that the new initiatives in the field of national ethnology, as well as inspiration coming out of sharing academic and analytic experience from inside and outside of the country, will be of interest and use to the readers of this issue” (LE III: 10).

The time came to be sure for it, especially for Lithuanian ethnologists. All of them have to be interested and indoctrinated with anthropological perspectives, reflected in published here materials.

Lithuanian Ethnology, Vol. 4

This volume⁵ is dedicated to the outstanding Lithuanian ethnologist Professor **Angelė Vyšniauskaitė**. Honouring her eighty-fifth anniversary it is published her article ‘Changing into ‘Others’ as Reflected in Lithuanian Customs’ (LE IV: 13-32) and a tribute, written by her student Rasa Paukštytė-Šaknienė (LE IV: 9-12).

The mentioned above article by **Angelė Vyšniauskaitė** analyses specific attempts undertaken by 19th – 20th C.C. She points: “Lithuanian ethnic culture exponents on special occasions – related to important calendar, or farm work, or family life events – to step out of their own selves in order to become ‘others’, in terms of appearance and behaviour by imitating the characters of chthonic world. This custom was characteristic, above all, of the winter solstice, when transformation into

⁵ Lietuvos etnologija / Lithuanian Ethnology. Studies in Social Anthropology and Ethnology. Vilnius: Lithuanian Institute of History, Vol. 4(13), 2004, 205 p. [LE IV].

the so-called ‘aliens’ was accompanied by food, drinks, and gifts and was one of the main rites connected with the ‘first-day magic’, that is, the practice of securing economic success to the family” (LE IV: 30). According to the A. Vyšniauskaitė, “(...) as early as the 19th C. characters in masks – males, as a rule – appeared after dark and were obliged to visit every farmer’s family. In early 20th C. females could be seen among such ‘aliens’, while in the 2nd half of the 20th C. the action was taken over exclusively by children” (LE IV: 31). Up to the present, – continues A. Vyšniauskaitė, – during a wedding party, people transform into ‘another young couple’, a ‘matchmaker’, ‘*svočia*’ (matron of honour), ‘brides’ maids’, or ‘bridegrooms’ men’. Sometimes the ‘others’ come transposed into ‘Gypsies’ who jokingly steal things and wish good luck to the young family. A carnival-like dragging of a midwife seated in a trough, at the end of a christening party, may be seen as the return of another-world creature to its own realm. “Gradually, the ritual functions of ancient customs lost their former sacral meaning, and by the 2nd half of the 20th C. the transforming into ‘aliens’ had become mere entertainment or had disappeared completely”, concludes A. Vyšniauskaitė (LE IV: 32).

The article ‘The Need for Culture (Even if it Doesn’t Exist): A Lithuanian Example’ (LE IV: 33-47), written by **Victor C. de Munck**, anthropology Professor from New York State University at New Paltz, is a theoretical one and deals with the paradigm of culture. “It raises the rather distinctive question of ‘the need for the concept of culture’ and gives a provocative answer to it by saying that ‘culture is needed, even if it doesn’t exist’. A pragmatic theory of culture is presented that does not reject either empirical or post-modern approaches to the study of culture. It is argued that conceptions of culture are cognitive mediating devices that individuals use to find either commonalities or differences between groups of people” (LE IV: 33). Speaking about ‘the proliferation of the cultural concept’ (LE IV: 33) the author admits, that “(...) ‘culture’ has become, perhaps, the most used common buzzword in university departments other than the physical or natural sciences. For instance, almost all (if not all) the recent hires in the social sciences, liberal arts, and in the business school at my college, the State University of New York-New Paltz, used ‘culture’ as a key word to define their research agenda. (...) Popular and professional media outlets casually refer to ‘the culture of ...’ where the blank can be filled in by: business, sports, gangs, women, men, cities, slums, the poor, the rich, tourists, gangs, nations, ethnic groups, religions, etc. The very use of such statements as ‘Lithuanian culture’ presumes that this culture (and other cultures) exists as a social entity with observable and definable characteristics, artefacts, or mannerisms” (LE IV: 33). In the conclusions V. C. de Munck emphasized, that “(...) anthropologists must reclaim the concept of culture, but I disagree with his approach to culture. I argue that culture cannot be primarily based on regular interaction between people, even if we include second-order interactions (that is on telephone or via various media outlets). I hope I have indicated that culture cannot exist as an entity or in any straightforward causal manner, but the presumption of its existence is a necessary fiction” (LE IV: 44-45). The present study advances a pragmatic cognitive theory of culture and illustrates its usefulness. An author expects that future researchers could use and further develop this theoretical approach to their advantage.

Gintautas Mažeikis, Professor and head of the Centre of Cultural Anthropology at the University of Šiauliai in his article ‘Transparency and Functions of the Lithuanian Bazaar’ (LE IV: 49-66) presents a splendid socio-cultural analysis of local market places by pointing to the problems of the stasis and dynamics of market place. His argument is that the market is not only a public space, but also a process of ‘public-ness’, where such social functions as socialization and compensation are

made visible. On such and other grounds, he argues with Pernille Hohnen, the Danish anthropologist who recently published the first anthropological book on Lithuania, on the Vilnius-Gariūnai market place⁶. The bazaar is interpreted by G. Mažeikis “(...) as a complex, multicomponent process that enables an elementary sphere of free market. The processional character of the bazaar involves not only trade and commerce but the different economic relations of various territories as well. A preparation for marketing, local and international trips and the trade actions imply a series of specific events which could be interpreted as a moment of common process” (LE IV: 65). According to the author, political, economic, and moral overtness of the bazaar are considered in this article. The compensative, from the economical point of view, socialing and carnival functions and the problems of historicity, stigmatization and marginalization of the bazaar are also analysed (LE IV: 65). “These market relations are analyzed in the article as a process which consists of several stages, – points G. Mažeikis, – (...) The first stage is preparation for going to the bazaar; sometimes to foreign capitals – Kiev, Moscow, Warsaw, Istanbul, etc. The second stage is the trip itself, the third – an entrance to the bazaar, the fourth – the trading, the fifth – leaving the bazaar, and, sixth – returning home. There are many stories and folklore narratives about each one of these stages” (LE IV: 66). Some of them are presented in the article.

The following four articles deal with the cultural past by offering new perspectives on Lithuanian modernization.

Andželika Bylaitė-Lapinskienė (PhD Candidate in the Department of Ethnology, the Vytautas Magnus University in Kaunas at that time; PhD, lecturer at the Klaipėda College at present) writes on romantic love among the Lithuanian youth in her article ‘Romantic Friendship and Intimacy among Young People in Villages of *Suvalkija* and *Žemaitija*, from 1920’s to 1980’s’ (LE IV: 67-88). She shows very precisely, how emancipation and pragmatism, step by step, have been eroding ‘romantic love’ during the whole period of the last century. This article analyses aspects of the socialization process of youth – communication in groups of contemporaries of the 20th century, in the 20s – 80s in Southwest and West ethnographical regions of Lithuania. The article is based on field research gathered by the author in 1998-2000, in eleven regions of *Suvalkija* and *Žemaitija*. Additionally, it is based on archival material of the Ethnology Department, Institute of Lithuanian History. According to A. Bylaitė-Lapinskienė, “(...) the most attention is paid to the adolescence (16-20 years) stage of socialization, when a teenager is maturing physiologically and psychologically. In this stage, young people usually search for their identity; in the main, for closeness, love and friendship. At the same time, this age group is getting ready for marriage. These are topics that, from the ethnographical point of view, have been poorly analysed in *Suvalkija* and *Žemaitija*. Only few researchers have examined forms of communication among young people (...). Socialization is not only the process of personality formation. It also reflects changes in the environment, surrounding an individual, many of which manifested in the 20th century. The 20th century, from 20s to the 80s is well known for momentous changes in Lithuania: the Second World War, Soviet occupation and the more recent modernization of society. Young people are quick to react to various changes, innovations, which they may accept or ignore” (LE IV: 87).

Rasa Račiūnaitė, ethnologist from Vytautas Magnus University, in her article ‘The Development of National Values and Urban Awareness: Interwar Kaunas and its Suburbs’ (LE IV: 111-133) examines how urbanization, secularization, and commercialization went hand by hand with

⁶ See: Hohnen, Pernille 2003. *A Market out of Place? Remaking Economic, Social, and Symbolic Boundaries in Post-Communist Lithuania*. Oxford University Press.

the popularity of the values of civic nationalism. How it shaped the civic form of the national identity in Kaunas, the capital city of the interwar period of the Lithuanian nation-state. In view of the fact that Lithuanian ethnologists have failed to provide an exhaustive analysis of value orientation in different strata of interwar Kaunas society, the present work seeks to consider the values of urban society through the lifestyle of different social classes, and attempts to reveal the mentality of 1918-1940 Kaunas residents as well as the forms of their national self-expression. According to the author, "(...) the research seeks: (1) to investigate the value orientation of Kaunas intelligentsia and people inhabiting Kaunas' suburbs, mainly farmers or fishermen; (2) to find out how the town influenced the national awareness of two suburbs of interwar Kaunas, Lampėdžiai and Aleksotas; and (3) to determine the influence produced by urban culture phenomena on the lifestyle, occupation, and cultural self-expression of Aleksotas and Lampėdžiai residents" (LE IV: 131).

Žilvytis Šaknys, ethnologist and the head of the Ethnology Department at the Lithuanian Institute of History, in his article 'Ethnic and Confessional Tolerance Shown by Young Ethnic Lithuanians in Interwar Lithuania' (LE IV: 135-158) explores the ethnic and confessional tolerance of ethnic Lithuanians, mainly towards Jews and Jewish-Lithuanians during interwar period. He defines the lack of tolerance by 'cultural confrontation', but, at the same time, he emphasizes that it was not radically ethnocentric and based solely on anti-Semitism. This article deals with problems of ethnic and confessional tolerance shown by young ethnic Lithuanians in interwar Lithuanian communities existing inside the territory of Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, and Belarus. The problems are especially urgent for the understanding of the situation of Jews on the eve of the Holocaust. Based on representative material gathered for the purpose of compiling the Lithuanian Ethnic Culture Atlas and the analysis of interaction among young people belonging to different confessions and ethnic backgrounds, an attempt is made to give an answer to the following questions: was interwar Lithuanian village culture conducive to the feelings of ethnic and confessional intolerance? Did the ethnic majority tolerate Jews, as members of the Judaic religious community, differently from other ethnic or confessional minorities? According to the author, "(...) the goal of the article is pursued through the analysis of the understanding of tolerance in village culture by village community members, the investigation into the specific cultural character of youth behaviour, and the functioning of village and small town youth communities in the light of polyconfessional and polyethnic interaction" (LE IV: 157).

Rasa Paukštytė-Šaknienė, ethnologist at the same Ethnology Department at the Lithuanian Institute of History, student of Professor Angelė Vyšniauskaitė, in her article on the cultural aspects of reproduction shared by rural Lithuanians 'Expression of Cultural Aspects of Reproduction in Village Culture' (LE IV: 89-110) shows how the bearers of 'modern traditional culture' (author's term) are suspicious about 'old traditions' as well as scientific medicine, in matters of sexual education, for example. The authority and decision making on social and cultural problems of birth giving is allocated to the local community leaders. This article offers an analysis of the traditional attitude towards the expression of reproduction in modern rural territories of North-Eastern Lithuania. The analysis looks at social control operation affected by different institutions within the areas of sex education and pregnancy regulation: (1) attitudes to sex education; (2) respondents' attitude to family planning; (3) specific characteristics of attitude to pregnancy control measures; (4) attitudes to a childless family. The research is based on material recorded by the author during the 2002 field investigation carried out in the rural districts of Molėtai, Anykščiai, and Kupiškis region in Lithuania based on the 'Births regulation' questionnaire composed by the author. The survey

was performed by itinerary expeditions, giving one respondent 1-2 hours of researcher's attention, and surveying 1-2 female respondents per locality. For the purpose of comparative analysis, archival records (including the ones accumulated by the author in the course of field research), published records and investigation materials were used.

Finally it is actual for us to cite the opinion by V. Čiubrinskas concerning humanities and social sciences in Lithuania and in the Europe, presented in the Foreword of the 4th Volume of 'Lithuanian Ethnology': He notes: "(...) humanities and social sciences today are more and more interconnected with the values and ideologies of culture and society and often stand as its adjudicators. It is not surprising therefore, that contemporary European ethnology, as well as history, archaeology, folklore studies, ethnomusicology and related disciplines in Lithuania are challenged to become pivotal to the ideology of cultural heritage. Applied science perspective is one possible outcome. In public discourses particularly, ethnology and other disciplines, primarily focused on cultural past are not only encouraged to deal with cultural heritage, but also to convey the expected novel perspective. Moreover, there is a need for new 'analytic tools': refreshed methodologies and paradigms; up-to-date research problems; as well as application of new points of departure to address problems of manipulation of tradition and diffusion of new social values" (LE IV: 8).

All already published and forthcoming volumes of 'Lithuanian Ethnology: Studies in Social Anthropology and Ethnology' have a nice field and wide possibilities to continue discussions on this theme, and to present us more and more new materials on socio-cultural anthropology and related disciplines.

The surveys on them will be presented in our following volumes of anthropological series, "Acta Historica Universitatis Klaipedensis".