

REVIEWS

‘LITHUANIAN ETHNOLOGY: STUDIES IN SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY AND ETHNOLOGY’

**„Lietuvos etnologija. Socialinės antropologijos ir etnologijos studijos“
Vol. 1-2**

Rimantas Sliužinskas

Klaipėda University, Lithuania

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.

It is the very new step in the whole history of humanities and social sciences in contemporary Lithuania. Editor in chief Dr. Vytis Čiubrinskas wrote in the Foreword of the 1st volume: “Only five years have elapsed since the first volume of the monograph series, Lithuanian Ethnology, appeared in 1996. Today, instead of that series, we offer you a journal of ethnological scholarship, Lithuanian Ethnology: Studies in Social Anthropology and Ethnology. (...) 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. We are hoping to engage readers in social sciences and humanities, anthropology and ethnology students, and colleagues from a wide circle of disciplines. (...) In this journal we are looking for interdisciplinary connections, seeking, in particular, to break the border between ethnology and socio-cultural anthropology. As the journal’s subtitle suggests, we want to integrate studies that are clearly cognate in their methodology and aim. We believe that it is time to benefit from world-wide integrative processes in knowledge and give the two disciplines more than nominal institutional bonds. (...) We seek to encourage scholarly colloquy, (...) analyzing differences and similarities between cultures and societies, between us and them, between majority and minority, dominant and marginal, local and immigrant.” (LE I: 6-7).

Let’s look through the content and the main themes of presented here journal (vol. 1-2) in this survey.

Lithuanian Ethnology, Vol. 1

According to Vytis Čiubrinskas, “(...) we support the analysis of that which could appear to be uniquely Lithuanian, such as our own ethnic culture, only if the methodology used is comparable to that applied in the study of foreign cultures, for instance, Hawaiian culture in Oceania.” (LE I: 7).

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].

Such is the case with the first article in the volume 'History, Political Identity and Myth' (LE I: 41-62). Written by **Jonathan Friedman**, it compares contemporary Hawaiian and Modern Greek identity processes with a special focus on mobilization of history and memory. An article is based on the publication which first appeared in *Cultural Anthropology*. Journal of the Society for Cultural Anthropology, Vol. 7, No. 2, May 1992. J. Friedman writes: "History and discourse about the making of history is positional, that is, it is dependent upon where one is located in social reality, within society, and within global process. This is even applicable to the present discourse, which in no way represents an attempt to stand in some objective truth-sphere above or outside of the goings-on of the world. Objective history, just as any other history, is produced in a definitive context and is a particular kind of project. The discourse of history as well as of myth is simultaneously a discourse of identity; it consists of attributing a meaningful past to a structural present. An objective history is produced in the context of a certain kind of selfhood, one that is based on a radical separation of the subject from any particular identity, and which objectifies and textualizes reality" (LE I: 41). An author examines the construction of histories as products of particular social positions. These social positions constitute the conditions of existence and formants of identity spaces or *habitués*, which in their turn select and organize specific discourses and organization of selfhood, including histories of the self. He argues elsewhere that "this is an aspect of the fragmentation of the world system where peoples who were formerly 'spoken for' are intensely engaged in defining themselves in their struggles for autonomy" (LE I: 42). According to J. Friedman, by bracketing out 'truth-value', we can begin to see more clearly the relation between making history and constructing identity.

The article by **Pernille Hohnen** 'The Marginalization of *Gariūnai*: an Anthropology of the Market as a Culturally Significant Place' (LE I: 63-84), reflects the contemporary ethnographic practice in Lithuania and refers to the post-communist changes in Lithuanian trade and actual here trading practices through a case study of this market near Vilnius, "a zone of social and cultural marginality and stigmatization" (LE I: 81). P. Hohnen presents her actualities this way: "The choice to study *Gariūnai* market was made out of methodological as well as empirical considerations. I do not mean to generalize *Gariūnai* market practices in any simple way to make them 'representative' of Lithuanian: market conduct or social processes of transition in general. I do attempt, however, by means of an analysis of the socially significant marginal position of the market, to shed light on some social processes and on some aspects of cultural meaning that seem to be, or at least recently have been, widespread in Lithuanian society. (...) In my study I was not only interested in the political and economic reforms of Lithuanian society, following its independence, but even more in how such changes came about and how they were being evaluated by the social agents involved. In other words, I wanted to focus on changes in peoples' social practice and on how the economic and political changes were being culturally and socially experienced by Lithuanians. Within economic anthropology, which forms part of the framework for the present study, one may be concerned with different understandings of 'money' and the relationship between various money-earning activities and social status, or ethics, in a given social context or society" (LE I: 81-83). According to the author, this article has two principal and interconnected aims. The first is to show the close social and symbolic connection between *Gariūnai* market and surrounding Lithuanian society. The second aim is to show how the stigmatization of the market may be related to the continuous social and moral importance of 'work' within Lithuanian culture on the one hand and the legalization of trading and entrepreneurship combined with increased unemployment, on the other.

Orvar Löfgren in the article ‘Past and Present in European Ethnology: a Swedish Perspective’ (LE I: 85-98) examines change and continuity in European Ethnology, with particular reference to the Swedish experience. He admits: “European nations with a colonial tradition tended to create a global kind of anthropology, those without, turned to discover ‘their primitives within’ in the form of general cultural anthropology of the nation. This tradition today is labelled ‘European Ethnology’, and it is no longer kept together by a given empirical field but rather by a certain mode of doing research. Behind the changing faces of European Ethnology there also remain some stable features, such as the use of a historical perspective, a focus the ethnography of everyday life as well as a bricolage tradition of combining different methods and materials, sometimes using back doors to big issues.” (LE I: 85). He writes on believing that there is a real system behind the division of labour in the various disciplines of the humanities and social sciences, and emphasizes, that the most part of these disciplines were created according the actual conditions and political and cultural interests in the past. The making of European Ethnology is a clear example of such processes: “The disproportional number of studies of such marginal settings was a quest for communities that were as ‘exotic’ or ‘anthropological’ as possible. With this search profile, for instance, the study of working-class settings was chiefly concentrated to small factory towns, and metropolitan studies focused on ‘urban villages’, like traditional, close-knit neighbourhoods. (...) There was a paradox in this development, in many ways it felt like a liberating period of internationalization. We were all busy reading international anthropological theory, but on the other hand research became intensively Swedish. We all went out to look for local communities. Compared to the perspective of diffusionist and culture area studies of earlier generations our geographical space was narrowed down. The prefix ‘European’ of the discipline became more of a rhetorical statement, very few Swedish ethnologists of my generation did their research outside Sweden in the 60’s and 70’s.” (LE I: 86).

Vytis Čiubrinskas discusses the trials and tribulations of Lithuanian ethnology during the Soviet period. The aim of his article ‘Challenges to Lithuanian Ethnology during the Soviet Period: the Discipline, Ideology and Patriotism’ (LE I: 99-117) is “(...) to examine resistant conformist ideologies in the disciplines of the social sciences and humanities during the Soviet period. The discipline of Ethnology is used as the case in point. It is an attempt not only to draw a line between these two ideologies but also to exemplify how they influenced Ethnology, converting it into an applied research field governed by Soviet and nationalist ideologies. This was particularly visible in the field and research methods used in Lithuanian Ethnology of the period.” (LE I: 114). An author writes about the Soviet regime Lithuanian Ethnology, proclaimed as *bourgeois discipline* since 1932, the introducing of the term ‘ethnography’ here. He defines the term of ‘Soviet Ethnography’, which was called upon to do research on *labour masses* by exploring their culture and everyday life. In general, concludes V. Čiubrinskas, “(...) the discipline of Ethnology (Ethnography) in Lithuania, during the Soviet period, threatened to become a tool for the dominant ideology and a source of scientific argumentation for the assimilation of Lithuanians into the melting pot of the Soviet Russian Empire. At a minimum, it had to follow the methodology of historical materialism. (...) Two ideologies countered one another in the discipline: the dominant one, based on the creation of the socialist traditions and opposing that, a nationalist one, based on the neo-Romantic zeal of the recreation of ‘the golden past’. Nevertheless, both of them merged into the same methodological paradigm of search for *authenticity*, which enabled Lithuanian scholars to confront the Soviet establishment and gave the discipline a way for the archaiz-

ing project of modernity by securing a *status quo* for the *survivals* of the traditional culture. This was particularly evident in the applied field of the discipline dominated by the ethnologists working as experts dealing with *folk traditions*.” (LE I: 114-117).

Jonas Mardosa published here his article ‘The Presentation of pre-Christian Culture in Lithuanian Ethnology’ (LE I: 119-144). He delves into the interpretation of religious motifs in contemporary Lithuanian ethnology. An author analyzes the place of pre-Christian culture and its role in the Lithuanian Christian culture up to the middle of the 20th C. According to the J. Mardosa, “(...) the elucidation of this issue is an urgent ethnological problem, because it is seen as important in the general comprehension of Lithuanian folklore in the latter centuries. The nature of these studies allows the assessment of various components in traditional culture, their interrelation, and traces the nature of the function of Christian elements in folklore. On the other hand, it is important to clear up what is the base in culture elements that appeared under the influence of the Christian world outlook or popular traditions, beliefs, even superstitions that may have played an entertainment function or often were elements of folk erudition. Christian traditions, on the other hand, were widely spread out and were a part of the village culture. Especially problematic in ethnological literature is the recording of the pre-Christian (the so-called Baltic) culture remains, even in 20th C. analyses of peasant culture.” (LE I: 143). This article tries to elucidate, whether the statements on pre-Christian origin or simply Pagan meaning of separate folk traditions, rites or their elements that appeared in publications of various authors in the last decades of the 20th C. are substantiated. Published here materials does not attempt to cover the whole complex of such statements. However, it deals with interpretations of two pre-Christianity related folklore spheres that are found in scientific works of professional modern Lithuanian ethnologists. This relates to the cross and questions of its use as well the explanation of separate parts of calendar holidays. In these areas, the presence of pre-Christian culture is most clearly emphasised.

The actual problems of Lithuanian identity are addressed by **Andreas Roepstorff** and **Aušra Simoniukštytė**. The authors of the article ‘Modern Lithuanian Identity: a Century of Re/creating Tradition’ (LE I: 145-166) focussed their research aims this way: “In the late 80’s and early 90’s Lithuania re-emerged forcefully on the European scene as one of the new states striving for recognition and independence. Before that, it was one of the Baltic republics within the Soviet Union for almost fifty years. The ‘re-emerged’ rather than ‘emerged’, since almost exactly 100 years ago roots for a comparable common conception of the ‘Lithuanian nation’ could be found. The process of the formation of the modern idea of the Lithuanian nation was a complex interplay between observations and descriptions of outside scholars, including linguists and ethnologists who came to study and write about the ‘Lithuanians’ and local men of letters who looked on this epithet as a mark of self-identification.” (LE I: 165-166). The article attempts to identify the Lithuanian conception of national identity, mainly in the fields of the relationship to nature and the understanding of history. The authors conclude that “(...) the nation should be thought of as an entity which may be seen as a metesign, a semantic function that organises a whole set of other signs around it, not unlike the interpretation that Levi-Strauss assigns to *mana*. There is, however, more to the nation than simply categorising and organising. The actual historic development of Eastern Europe demonstrates that the idea of the nation, as all other proper concepts of the *mana* type, can indeed do effective social magic.” (LE I: 166). The Lithuania is a sovereign state at present, and “(...) in terms of identity is more homogeneous than it ever was since the idea of a modern Lithuania arose” (LE I: 166).

The relative problems of Lithuanian identity are presented in the article 'Reviving Ethnic Identity: Individual, Symbol, Place' (LE I: 167-198) by **Auksuolė Čepaitienė**. She discusses the factors which play an important role in the understandings of ethnic identity. A. Čepaitienė writes: "(...) I focus on the factors, and situations, which evoke ethnic feelings, and actualise the need for identification. I consider ethnic identification as one of the systems of categorization, which institutionalise the cognition of ethnic sameness or distinctiveness as 'species' categories. (...) But I would like to add that images and feelings related to the values, symbols, or common histories, and maintained in the content of ethnic identity, are significant in the understanding of ethnic categorization as well." (LE I: 197). She pays her attention to the relationship between individual and institutional aspects of identification in this article. The same way she tries to show that the line between individual and institutional is a fuzzy one, because individual self-ascription to a certain ethnic group goes parallel with the strategy oriented towards institutionalisation of personal decision. In general A. Čepaitienė emphasizes, that "(...) ethnicity negotiations actually go on between individuals who employ material objects or practices, primordial attachments or gained experiences, to refresh ethnic feelings and to bring the essence of a 'species' group to their identities" (LE I: 197).

Vaidotas Pakalniškis in his article 'Samogitian Identity in the Globalized World' (LE I: 199-216) follows with an analysis of the Lithuanian Lowlander (Samogitian) identity and its politicization under the processes of Euro-integration. He writes: "Contemporary Europe is undergoing processes of unification and globalization. More and more, the continent is considered as community of unified countries. Influence of the nation state on European political life has decreased to the minimum. Processes of Euro-integration are strongly influenced by the aspirations of multiculturalism as well as by the discourse of globalization." (LE I: 215). According to V. Pakalniškis, the category of so called 'Samogitianness' appears as a cultural critique of homogeneity, critique of Lithuanianness as the consequence of nationalistic ideology and national identity model itself. Samogitianness is considered as an opposition to Lithuanianness. At the opposition between Samogitianness and Lithuanianness, the former becomes a high value quality, to be cherished and preserved, while Lithuanianness is left with only a single function, to keep the link with the Lithuanian state. Samogitia and Samogitianness itself become as an alternative to Lithuania, to its current economic hardship. Samogitianness also displays itself as a critique of absolute and extreme Lithuanianness, which manifests through the policy of education with its acceptance of only standard Lithuanian, even at primary schools. V. Pakalniškis summarises, that "(...) the crash of the Soviet system forced a rebirth of small-scale ethnic-based nationalisms. These have led to re-emergence of states, which previously existed, as well as influenced the birth of new ones. Processes, which conducted rebirth of Lithuanian nationalism, affected rebirth of Samogitianness as well." (LE I: 216).

'Ethnicity: Lithuanians on the Latvian Border'. This is a title of the article by **Vida Savonikaitė** (LE I: 217-230). She writes: "The first generation of Lithuanians of Latvian border regions, born in Lithuania during the first half of the 20th century, the second generation, born in Lithuania or Latvia during the second half of the 20th century, are mostly all 20th century economic migrants, political exiles and their descendants, and the third generation, their children who were born in Latvia, link ethnicity with social, political, economic circumstances and family roots. This notion stands out with Lithuanian migrants' original psychology of 'choice' and the conception of 'home' (native land) nostalgia. The culture of ethnic minorities merges with cultural proc-

esses of the wider society at the verge of the 20th and 21st centuries. (...) Though ethnicity's place in the narrow academic world was non-essential, its importance in the wider world grows." (LE I: 229). According to V. Savoniakaitė, "(...) the research on Lithuanian emigrants in Latvian border regions may enrich the growing interest in ethnicity and cultural peculiarities, where, among others, lies an unused potential of economic resources that could help integration into a purposeful development of European economy" (LE I: 229). In this article we are able to discuss the notion of ethnicity, its social and cultural limits; to see, how Lithuanians of Latvian border regions identify themselves and retain their ethnicity; and how the emigrant communities create their ethnicity. The article is based on field research that was conducted in the Latvia-Lithuania border regions in 1996-1999.

The same way acculturative processes of the Lithuanian Diaspora in Latvia, based on extensive ethnographic studies, are examined by **Žilvytis Šaknys**. In his article 'Lithuanians in Southeast Latvia: Culture, Ethnicity and the Community of Peers' (LE I: 231-250) we are able to find analyses the interaction between the culture of a nation and the cultures of its constituent ethnic groups. Ž. Šaknys gives us the following information: "(...) In the interwar period, when Lithuania and Latvia were independent states, the life style of youth and the model of peers' community differed rather markedly even in neighbouring small towns and villages located along the border of the two states. These differences could be accounted for by the prevailing religious affiliation (Roman Catholics dominated Lithuania, while Evangelical Lutherans dominated Latvia), a higher level of economic development of the Latvian state, and, consequently, by a significantly richer presentation of modern urban elements of culture in the everyday life of Latvian residents. This determined a clear-cut ethnic and cultural identity of Lithuanian youth living in Latvia." (LE I: 250). When the USSR collapsed and the Russian language, together with the so-called 'international culture', lost its privileged position, Latvians and Lithuanians and their culture came to occupy a special position in their respective states. According to the author, "(...) the ethno-demographic situation in Latvia is complicated. It determines Latvian legislation regulating citizenship. As a result, the part of Lithuanian youth that has decided to live in Latvia seeks to integrate into Latvian culture and to demonstrate its own ethnic culture as seldom as possible. Thus, a Lithuanian community formed within a polyethnic space, in terms of locality, neighbourhood, age and common interests is almost totally devoid of points of contact and dependence on Lithuanian ethnic culture." (LE I: 250).

Venantas Mačiekus analyses the customary law configurations in Lithuania in the second half of the twentieth century. In the article, titled 'Customary Law in Lithuania: Transformation of Norms (1940-2000)' (LE I: 251-260) he discusses changes in four rules of Lithuanian customary law (offence against property; trespass; barter and sale contract conclusion) during the years of Soviet occupation and in the post-Soviet period. The author emphasizes, that "(...) the rules of Lithuanian customary law defined theft as a surreptitious appropriation of any form of someone else's property. Wilful felling on landowner's estate or state forest was an exception to the rule: customary law tolerated such stealing, and public opinion – the chief guarantor of traditional morality – did not denounce it." (LE I: 260). According to the author, over the past 50 years the very process of bargaining at market places has become simpler, loosing a lot of its former charm. The striking of hands by purchaser and seller has been traditionally considered an act of concluding a contract; it had legal power. Hands were struck only over a horse or a cow, or some other expensive commodity. A change of mind after the striking of hands, that is, to sell, for example, the

subject of contract to a third person offering a higher price was deemed dishonest. Such behaviour was denounced by public opinion. According to the author's data, "very rarely a person ventured to change his mind after striking hands at the market after World War II, while today, more than one third of respondents aged 70-90 do not denounce such behaviour of the seller any more." (LE I: 260).

The concluding article by **Neringa Klumbytė** 'Problems of Ethnography Writing: Critics of the Traditional and Alternative Conventions' (LE I: 261-274) provides a comparison and critique of historical and contemporary ethnographic writings. N. Klumbytė says: "Traditional texts apply certain writing conventions aimed to fulfil the scientific paradigm – particular narrative structure that claims to represent totality of social or cultural life, scientific observer image, 'people' image, native point of view, rapport, and objective and generalizable style. However, despite scientific claims, traditional ethnographies are subjective, contextual and ideological. They fail to deal with history, change, political economy, and situational issues. (...) Alternative paradigms question conventions of traditional ethnography. They advocate new writing strategies that are sensitive to anthropologist – informant relations, social and contextual situatedness of the researcher, relevance of political economy and history, as well as ethical and political issues. As a result, the new style includes subjectivity, reflexivity, dialogue, different perspectives, openness, and conflict. It engages into experimenting with different writing strategies, inquires into new objects and applies different methods. (...) The inquiry into both traditional and alternative problems let us conclude that both traditional and non-traditional ethnographies are textual constructions, they are shaped by political and historical contexts, moral and ideological imperatives, are also bound to disciplinary constraints and limited to the theoretical models they apply." (LE I: 273-274). That way N. Klumbytė analyse problems of early functionalist and structuralist texts as well as ethnographical writings of 1960's up to present times.

The 1st volume of Lithuanian Ethnology is dedicated to the outstanding ethnologist **Vacys Milius**. Honouring his seventy fifth year jubilee, the article 'Lithuanian Folk Culture Studies by Exile Authors after World War II' (LE I: 30-40) by V. Milius is published here, as well as a bibliography of his works compiled by Rita Strazdūnaitė (LE I: 16-29) and a tribute by Žilvytis Šaknys (LE I: 9-16). V. Milius reminds in his article, that "(...) in 1944 a large number of intellectuals left Lithuania. Many of them had distinguished themselves as researchers during the interwar period in publishing and collecting ethnographic specimens and data. At the end of the war, they were able to publish the results of their research in the West. At home, in the meantime, new professionals had to be trained. (...) All in all, 25 books and major studies on Lithuanian folk culture were written by émigré authors and published in the West. These research works can be divided into three groups: 1) ethnographic memoirs and archival material; 2) scientific monographs and studies; 3) publications of educational and practical character. The most thoroughly researched areas include folk architecture, clothing, folk arts and customs. Publications on material culture and folk arts are richly illustrated with drawings and black-and-white or colour photos. Some are published in English or German, or in two languages, to make them available to foreign readers wishing to become acquainted with Lithuanian folk culture. Since regaining independence, in 1990, these publications were sent to libraries in Lithuania and, in some cases, their second editions were published." (LE I: 40).

This survey shows enough wide and specific actualities of local and European ethnology in the context of social anthropology approaches, published in the 1st volume of 'Lithuanian Ethnology'.

Lithuanian Ethnology, Vol. 2

This volume² appeared in the times of new social and political changes in Lithuania. In the fall of 2002 news about Lithuania's joining the EU in 2004 was received without much surprise. Institutional accommodation to EU standards is gaining speed and requires Lithuanian society to have more and more to do – at least in public sphere – with ‘westerners’, still assumed as ‘they’. Although it is obvious that Lithuanians belong to the European cultural tradition and share the same values, symbols and discourses, it appears that this commonality it is not a sufficient grounds for identity. People still maintain their own lifestyles, strategies, attitudes which they use to construct and express themselves in their own ways. According to Editor in chief of this volume Vytis Čiu-brinkas “We see here an urgent need for the ethnology and socio-cultural anthropology to be particularly engaged in studies of human similarities as well as differences in behaviour and mentality. It should strive to tackle both, the universal phenomena, like secularization or acculturation as well as particular imaginations, constructions and expressions evident in separate, often very different communities. The similarities derived from a shared European civilization and a common cultural tradition and heritage nevertheless take a particular shape among separate ethnic, local, marginal or subculture groups. Scrutiny should go beyond the balance between ‘typical’ and ‘specific’. What cultural heritage is assumed to be ‘one’s own’? How are traditions retained, ‘re-discovered’ as well as newly constructed? How are stereotypes on ‘others’ used? In what ways is cultural heritage, cultural tradition, even institutionalized and official culture, challenged?” (LE II: 7).

In the contemporary fragmented society the debate on a shared common tradition is difficult. Even more problematic is it to speak on behalf of ‘all’ and in ‘unison’, especially in terms of a ‘common heritage of forefathers’. While Lithuania is joining ‘Euroland’, therefore its ethnology has to challenge the grounds for identity shaping / configurations which end up in ‘given’ or ‘inherited’ tradition. The vigorous creation of sameness and otherness produced by the people themselves comes into focus instead. Eventually the major question stands: what is recognized as our own in the others and how much and what kind of difference is tolerated among us? One of the possible answers is given in **Reinhard Jöhler**'s article ‘Europe, Identity Politics and the Production of Cultural Heritage’ (LE II: 9-22). The European ethnologist from Tübingen University gives us a profound analysis of how re-conceptualization and manipulation of local cultural heritages and traditions is going on *vis a vis* Europeanization. According to the author, “Tradition and Cultural Heritage have become as the main path for the worldwide production of identity during the late 20th century. Especially in Europe, this process (running under the banner of an all-beseached ‘unity in diversity’) has led to an astonishing and successful propagation of the ‘local’, the ‘differentiable’, and supposedly ‘rooted’. This can be seen in innumerable museum openings, the creation of regional foodstuffs, the care of one’s own typical landscape and a conspicuous revival of customs. The mobilisation of this cultural heritage and the multifarious revivals of regional traditions have complex causes. But especially it is worth taking a closer look at the European Union from an ethnological point of view and to see it as a mighty agency of culture and to understand it as an important manufacturer of European difference, because the articulation of a shared European identity consciously stresses cultural distinction. This self-image of the EU, as well as the effects of the innumerable EU subsidies are topics which are discussed in this essay” (LE II: 9).

² Lietuvos etnologija / Lithuanian Ethnology. Studies in Social Anthropology and Ethnology. Vilnius: Lithuanian Institute of History, Vol. 2(11), 2002, 215 p.; [abbreviation – LE II].

One can also notice a zeal for ‘deconstruction’ in **Petras Kalnius’** article ‘‘*Others’* Among ‘*One’s People*’: the Stereotypes of the Lithuanian Ethnographic Groups’ (LE II: 23-52). The Lithuanian Institute of History expert in ethnic relations discusses the stereotypes shared by those who belong to the Lithuanian regional groups. The thorough analysis he presents proves the significance of Lithuanian regionalism, as the marker for local culture identity politics. The article deals with autostereotypes and heterostereotypes in residents of four ethnographic regions of Lithuania (*Aukštaitija*, *Žemaitija*, *Dzūkija*, and *Suvalkija*) differing in terms of dialect and original characteristics of folk culture. The author uses the data provided by historical sources, literature, long-term personal observations, a survey, as well as stereotypical characterisations found in Lithuanian folklore. According to P. Kalnius, “(...) the comparison of stereotypes provided by historical sources, the literature of former centuries, present-day oral folklore and thought of Lithuanian residents indicates that some of them originated several centuries ago. As a result of transition from generation to generation the earliest fixed stereotypes were modified. At the same time, they influenced the emergence of new stereotypical images. For example, modern Lithuanians have stereotyped views on *Žemaitija* (Samogitia) local people (Samogitians), a community living in the western part of Lithuania by the Baltic Sea. Dialect and certain characteristics of traditional culture distinguish Samogitians from the rest of Lithuanian residents who see them as a very obstinate and conservative community. Historical sources prove that the said stereotype was accepted universally, several centuries ago. Obstinacy and conservatism are generally viewed as negative characteristics of the Samogitian collective character. However, currently people express the unanimous opinion that in certain situations such people qualities prove positive, when one has to achieve one’s goal or has to cope with objective difficulties. Out of these peculiarly Samogitian characteristics stereotypes such as courage, bravery and abnormal striving to protect one’s identity, have evolved in recent years.” (LE II: 51-52).

Sachiko Hatanaka, University of Chubu, Japan – who, during the last decade, was so helpful to Lithuanian ethnologists familiarizing them with Western methodologies – this time presents important overview on the ‘manufacturing’ of tradition. In her article on local handicraft tradition ‘Tradition in Modern Japan: the Invention of Tradition’ (LE II: 53-70) she also focuses on increasing popularity of the regions in modern Japan. She stresses that ‘the time of the provinces’ ends up both in revival of local communities and the reinvention of traditional craftsmanship and admits: “Ever since E. J. Hobsbawm employed the phrase ‘the invention of tradition’ many cultural anthropologists have started to reconsider the idea of ‘tradition’. ‘Tradition’ does not necessarily mean only a cultural inheritance handed down from the past. It is also expected to have a certain significance and utility in contemporary life. Since ‘tradition’ forms an attachment and affection for, as well as the sense of being confined to, it serves to make members recognise the importance of unity in community life. For the revitalisation of regional communities, traditional craft industries have obtained a higher opinion throughout Japan along with the increasing popularity of the provinces, which is well represented by the catch-phrase, ‘the time of the provinces’.” (LE II 53-54). In this article S. Hatanaka consider traditional crafts manufacture, their modernization, their extant tradition and the making of the tradition in order to depict a real image of ‘tradition’ in modern Japan. She shows how traditional craftsmanship was newly invented while using traditional raw materials. S. Hatanaka became interested in traditional craft industries that have survived in Ishikawa Prefecture on the coast of the Sea of Japan, and conducted investigations into their actual conditions. An author doesn’t intend to discuss the historical changes of craftsmanship or its artistic values. She

admits: “It is said that scores of cities in Japan are economically dependent on traditional industries. As traditional craft originally developed under the protection of feudal lords in the Edo Period (1601-1866), some craftsmen endeavoured to reach higher standards to satisfy their lords. Ishikawa Prefecture, which is situated on the coast of the Sea of Japan, was the central part of Kaga Han, a domain well-known as Kaga Hyakuman-goku for its wealth in the Edo Period. Even in the Meiji Era, this region was distinctive for its wealth and tradition. The fact that the family of the feudal lord, the Maeda clan, had a keen interest in the protection and promotion of culture resulted in a sufficient background for the birth of crafts. Hence even in the Edo Period, lacquer ware in the Wajima and Yamanaka areas and Kutani Pottery, as well as Gold Foil and Family Buddhist Altars in this region were already famous throughout Japan.” (LE II: 54-55).

Rasa Paukštytė-Šaknienė, an ethnologist from the Lithuanian Institute of History also draws upon the same issue of local tradition with a case of family circle, birth-giving customs in Dzūkija region, Lithuania. In her article, based on field work ‘Contours of the Structural Change in Local Culture: the Cycle of Birth Customs in the 20th Century Dzūkija’ (LE II: 71-88) she argues for the rejection of the concept of a ‘tradition resistant to change’, by pointing out its inutility both from a synchronic and a diachronic perspective. The author’s return to the subjects of birth customs’ cycle was urged by a collection of articles titled ‘Child’s Birth in the Customs and Rites of West Europe’, published in Russia in 1999 and edited by N. N. Gracianskaja and A. N. Kozanovskij. R. Paukštytė-Šaknienė points, that “(...) in the Lithuanian village of late 19th - early 20th c. the cycle of birth customs started with pregnancy. It finished with the woman’s return (following the ceremonial leading into the church – ‘churching’) to her everyday social life after birth-giving. In that period the woman enjoyed an exceptional position in terms of her family and village community. Based on a local pattern (Merkinė District Administration located in the boundaries of Dzūkija National Park), the author of the present article seeks to view the problem of modernization of Lithuanian culture through the diachronic change of structural elements of the birth cycle in the perspective of woman’s life cycle. Having distinguished the following five consecutive stages in the cycle of birth customs: 1. Pregnancy; 2. Birth-giving; 3. First visiting of the baby and mother; 4. Baptism; 5. Churching of the woman, the author tries to reveal their change in the 20th c. in terms of historical development, modernisation, local representation, chronological duration, and social interaction. Previous research on birth customs in Dzūkian villages revealed a stable custom of visiting women after childbirth. So, this article focuses on the *lankynos* (or *palankynos*) custom complex. It shows the interrelation between an individual and his/her local community.” (LE II: 86). R. Paukštytė-Šaknienė admits in her conclusions, that her research “(...) revealed the expression of solitary elements of traditional culture in the diachronic perspective. As a result of interaction with the changing cultural environment, they assume other meanings retaining, rather often, their old form. So, regarding birth as a social or cultural phenomenon of the 20th C. we have to reject the concept of ‘traditions’ resistant to changes in terms of time. We must look for the characteristic dynamics of birth cycle elements in the synchronic and the diachronic perspective, analyze the reasons of existing differences, and relate to the changing social and cultural environment.” (LE II: 87-88).

Lithuanian youth culture is the main field of research of **Egidija Ramanauskaitė**, Vytautas Magnus University in Kaunas. In her article ‘Construction of Neopagan Identity in Lithuanian Youth Underground Culture’ (LE II: 89-124), among other youth groups, she tackles the ‘pagan metal’ group subcultures. They attract many young people who are seeking an unconventional lifestyle, and the ancient-pagan folklore, mythology and traditions are reinvented and successfully

used for metaphorization of their identities. The research on which this paper is based was conducted to reveal indicators of late modernity (post-modernity) in the culture of Lithuania, illustrated by examples of subcultures. E. Ramanauskaitė points, that “(...) the youth underground subculture, with an orientation toward the West is analysed to achieve the aforementioned objective. This genre encompasses the subculture of metal music, named metalist-Pagans. This world outlook within the metal music subculture formed around 1990, though its origin was the Black Metal style, known in Lithuania since about 1985. Analysis of the subculture reveals the means of its experimentation whose essence is the formation of a symbolic game-playing world, where the main characteristics are generating aesthetics of cultural space, ritualization, and frequent mythologization and mystification, as well as experimentation in the field of artistic creativity. The analysis of the cultural text (image, symbols, symbolic actions, artistic creativity) of a subculture, and its meanings to the initiators, reveals the principles of creating a cultural identity by the subcultural group.” (LE II: 122-123). These conclusions by E. Ramanauskaitė are relevant to the theory of post-modern culture and the arts (particularly the assertions of I. Hassan, F. Lyotard, D. Hebdige, and other authors), and show indicators of post-modern consciousness in Lithuania within the sphere of subcultural life. She points here: “Analysis of the historical evolution of youth subculture in Lithuania shows that the vanguard period of a late modern cultural consciousness occurred at about 1960. During that time, first cultural movements of the youth began to appear after the war under conditions of Soviet ideology. Some were oriented to the ideas of Western culture, such as hippies, rock music enthusiasts, and others. Others were oriented to the preservation of ethnic culture, such as the *Žygeiviai* (trippers), the ethno-cultural *Ramuva* movement (from which the *Romuva* ethnic religion movement developed after 1990), and student folk music ensembles.” (LE II: 124).

The hippie movement in Soviet Lithuania is discussed by **Živilė Tamkutonytė**, a postgraduate student at Vilnius University. In her article ‘Hippie Movement in Soviet Lithuania: Fashion and/or Resistance?’ (LE II: 125-146) she provides a very clear perspective on how hippies were marginalized by the regime and became a counter-culture to the dominant Communist Youth organization. The hippie movement was suppressed and politicized by the regime so that it eventually transformed into resistance. This movement in the years of Soviet rule is an obscure subject. Originated in the middle of sixties in the West, which means the USA and Great Britain, the new alternative youth movement reached the Soviet Union and Lithuania, as its constituent member, in several years. The Lithuanian hippie movement was one of the brightest alternative youth movements in the period of Soviet rule. The present article purposes to answer the following question: what was the movement’s form and contents in Soviet Lithuania? From this question follows the basic problem of the present article: was it just a fashion extending into Lithuania from the West, or was it an instance of resistance to the Soviet regime? In other words, the author seeks to find out whether the movement originated from Western opposition to middle-class values turned into a cultural and political opposition to Soviet structures in the environment of Soviet Lithuania. The article deals with the characteristics of hippie worldview. It analyses slang used by hippies and music popular among the members of hippie movement. It discusses such subjects as the use of drugs, modes of travel, the structure of hippie communities, the relation between the hippie movement and Soviet ideology, and repression used to deal with its members. According to Ž. Tamkutonytė, “(...) symbolic dissociation from Soviet reality allows us to speak of symbolic resistance to the regime. This resistance is expressed through forms of cultural opposition, generally an alternative way of life and the basic symbols of the hippy movement. The Soviet regime also sought legitimization

through the forms of culture. Thus, culture and political aspects of power were closely interrelated categories during the period of Soviet rule. Any opposition was also treated in terms of politics. Thus the Lithuanian hippie movement's opposition, expressed through cultural forms, inevitably developed into political opposition to the Soviet regime." (LE II: 145-146).

The social historian **Vladas Sirutavičius**, the Lithuanian Institute of History, presents his article 'Offences 'by Reason of Disgrace': Murder of Newborns in the 19th Century Lithuanian Society' (LE II: 147-158), actual up to present times. Basing his research on an extensive analysis of the historical sources he establishes the importance of the historical context of the local patterns of social control. To show of how disgrace and punishment functioned in the 19th Century, he provides examples from elite as well as folk culture. The article tackles several closely-interrelated problems. First, what socio-economic circumstances caused the dynamics of new-borns' murder, a specific offence in itself. Second, what determined the character of punishment for the offence. Third, to what extent the moral mechanism regulated the behaviour of girls charged with the murder of illegitimate new-borns. The empirical basis of the research involves penal cases investigated by various court institutions of Vilnius Province and, since 1847, of Kaunas Province as well. The cases concern female defendants charged with the murder of their newborns, usually, illegitimate. (LE II: 157). The author comes to the following conclusion: "low social status of girls (single, unmarried, farm labourer) was the basic reason that determined the intensity and the stigmatising character of shame and shaming. On the other hand, an illegitimate baby could deprive a girl of her only source of living, and, possibly, doom her to vagrancy. Thus, girls expecting illegitimate babies did not have many options open to them. The death of a newborn was perhaps the optimum choice." (LE II: 158).

There is a new Fieldwork chapter in this journal. The importance of ethnographic material is obvious and they begin with **Dalia Bernotaitė-Beliauskienė**, who deals with the results of her field investigations 'Weaving Traditions in the Southwest of Dzūkija: Ethnographic Research in the Area of Meteliai' (LE II: 159-180). This article analyses the textile in the Meteliai regional park (district of Alytus and Lazdijai) in the period comprising the end of the 19th Century and the whole 20th Century. The material is based upon 41 interviews, museum exhibits and negatives. The article discusses the development of mastery of weaving in the past hundred years to the present. The article investigates various types of bedspreads, towels, table cloths, bed linen as well as sacks, horse cloths, draperies and similar items. The author of the article goes into a detailed analysis of each of the above mentioned groups, the development of fabric patterns, their colours, the materials used and adornment. Most attention is paid to bedspreads, especially with pick-up ornaments. Even now they are being woven and the weavers are quite proud of their complicated weaving. It should be noted that the greatest changes in white and coloured textiles took place after World War II. Textiles very popular in earlier times, for every day use, are no longer functional. Only decorative textile units, such as bedspreads, towels and table cloths are being woven nowadays. In addition to the traditional ones, new patterns, materials and, especially, colours are being used. A remarkable quality of the region is that weaving traditions have been fostered to the present (LE II: 158).

It's important to remind the following remark by V. Čiubrinskas, editor in chief of presented here scientific journal: "This new volume of the Lithuanian Ethnology: Studies in Social Anthropology and Ethnology, given the current political situation in Europe, should remind our readers of the journal's credo: 'recognize yourself in the other and the other in yourself' " (LE II 7).

It is actual to get acquaintance with the materials of both first two volumes of 'Lithuanian Ethnology', and to follow the last statement for all contemporary Lithuanian ethnologists and anthropologists.

PERNILLE HOHNEN 'A MARKET OUT OF PLACE? REMAKING ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, AND SYMBOLIC BOUNDARIES IN POST-COMMUNIST LITHUANIA: ANTHROPOLOGICAL STUDIES AT GARIŪNAI MARKET'

Gediminas Lankauskas

Concordia University, Montreal, Canada

Among salient features of the ongoing systemic change in contemporary Eastern Europe is the expansion and institutionalization of informal trade and petty mercantile activity. Recently, such economic practices and their socio-cultural parameters have become the object of sustained scrutiny by anthropologists working in post-socialist settings.¹ Pernille Hohnen's monograph on market trading in today's Lithuania² – the first of its kind – is a significant contribution to this growing body of ethnographic research and writing.

Focusing on Gariūnai, a marginalized open-air 'bazaar' on the outskirts of the capital Vilnius, Hohnen explores the ways in which various market activities become implicated in reconfigurations of gender identities and ethnic subjectivities, as well how those activities articulate with altering notions of work and morality. The author's argument coheres around boundary remaking, broadly conceived, which she sees as a key strategy used by Lithuanians to negotiate the disorienting social environment engendered by the nation's current 'transition' from authoritarian socialism to liberal capitalism. She suggests that the process of 'transitioning' can be productively examined and critiqued through 'new' institutions such as Gariūnai, a market place that speaks, more abstractly, to the "spatial, social, and symbolic reterritorialization" (Hohnen 2003: 3) of Lithuania after Communist rule.

Hohnen proposes that emerging in the nation's post-Soviet economy are 'new' ways of conceptualizing commodities, money, and exchange, which she presents as evidence of 'the development of a new economic field' (Hohnen 2003: 31). While there is certainly much that is new in this field, I find its novelty exaggerated. Many economic practices, knowledges, and identities that appear unprecedented, upon closer examination, turn out to be 'socialist' or 'old'. In the wake of state socialism, the categories of 'old' and 'new', of change and non-change, as it were, often coexist in mutually constitutive dialectic and deserve our equal consideration. This monograph could be more attentive to ways in which Lithuania's Soviet past and its post-Soviet present interplay and inform each other at the Gariūnai market and in the society at large that surrounds it.

Hohnen's study offers a rich account of Gariūnai traders, but says surprisingly little about the market's purchasers. Selling implies buying and vice versa; one transaction is inconceivable without the other. The author does mention in passing "Lithuanian, Latvian, and Byelorussian middle-

¹ Humphrey, Caroline 2002. *The Unmaking of Soviet Life: Everyday Economies after Socialism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press; Kaneff, Deema 2002. *The Shame and Pride of Market Activity: Morality, Identity and Trading in Postsocialist Rural Bulgaria*. In *Markets and Moralities: Ethnographies of Postsocialism*. Mandel, R. and Humphrey, C., eds., pp. 33-52. Oxford: Berg.

² Hohnen, Pernille, 2003. *A Market Out of Place? Remaking Economic, Social, and Symbolic Boundaries in Post-Communist Lithuania*. Oxford University Press, x + 164 pp. index. ISBN 0-19-926762-6.

aged women... walking around the market with alert eyes and big carrier bags” (Hohnen 2003: 17). Are the gender, nationality, and generation of these shoppers relevant? In another comment she points out that most sellers assumed a rather passive stance vis-à-vis their customers: “Goods were principally believed to be selling themselves” (Hohnen 2003: 56). An intriguing observation. But what does this merchant ‘passivity’ bespeak? The author notes that buying at Gariūnai was less stigmatized than selling. This insight could potentially provide some clues as to sellers’ disengagement from shoppers. I was also left wondering how this seller-buyer distancing – a fact so reminiscent of Soviet retail – would fit into the monograph’s underlying argument of ever shifting boundaries. Some of them come across as being rather static.

In Chapters 3 and 4, Hohnen examines the multiple ways in which market traders generate, exchange, communicate, conceal, and reconfigure their commercial expertise. The fine-grained description and smart analysis of merchants’ agency as it pertains to ‘reading’, knowing, and acting in the market is one of the greatest strengths of this book. The author demonstrates that trader knowledge at Gariūnai is not just a product of practice but, in effect, *is* practice.

Again, left out from this stimulating discussion are the buyers. We do find out, for instance, that Gariūnai shoppers “were by no means ignorant of prices and quality” (Hohnen 2003: 64), but we are told virtually nothing about how they ‘read’ and came to know the market. One presumes that their knowledge, like that of traders, was continuously reshaped in response to the changing realities of Gariūnai. How was customer expertise made and remade, and how did it contribute to the market’s dynamics? It is unfortunate that an ethnography concerned with the market place neglects to address such questions in a more rigorous way and largely overlooks some of its principal actors.

The discussion of Lithuanian nationalism could be more nuanced. The author maintains that the market’s ‘global’ commercial links to the Asian East (most consumer goods sold at Gariūnai are imported from that part of the world) clashes with “the idea of Lithuanian cultural homogeneity inherent in the developing national discourses” (Hohnen 2003: 93). How really resonant are these discourses? Ever since this Baltic republic broke away from the USSR in 1991, nationalist sentiment has been progressively on the wane, rather than somehow ‘developing’. It has not ceased to exist, of course, as is attested by sporadic calls for national togetherness by right-of-centre politicians and intellectuals.

What has come unmistakably to dominate the public sphere is the relentless futuristic rhetoric valorizing the ‘modernity’ and ‘civilization’ of what is perceived to be Europe and the West. Although the number of so-called euro-sceptics has recently increased in Lithuania, for most citizens ideals and imaginaries associated with ‘the modern West’ continue to hold the promise of material prosperity, socio-moral order, and overall existential normalcy. Perceived by many as an epitome of *bardakas* – that is, a morally dubious, legally ambiguous, disorderly, and uncivilized place – Gariūnai in this context stands in the way of Lithuania’s current project to reinvent itself as a progressive nation-state geopolitically allied with *Europe*.

The monograph could be strengthened not only by a more thoughtful discussion of Gariūnai in relation to this ‘civilizing’ project but also by considering this ‘messy’ market place vis-à-vis other sites of *bardakas* in today’s Lithuania. During my fieldwork in Vilnius in 1998-1999 and more recently in 2004, I heard the word *bardakas* invoked in reference to the nation’s universities, hospitals, law courts, *Seimas* or Parliament and, so forth. My interlocutors saw these institutions as sites of profound ‘disorder’ and ethical breakdown. Situating the Gariūnai market in such discourses

would provide the reader with a broader view of contemporary Lithuanian society and its ongoing ‘disorderly’ transformation.

In Chapter 6 which deals with ethnicity, I was taken aback by the author’s claim that Russians who immigrated to Soviet Lithuania shortly after World War II had “a higher education level than... the [local] Lithuanians” (Hohnen 2003: 93). How really resonant are these discourses? Ever since this Baltic republic broke away from 1981? A perusal of Lithuania’s demographic surveys reveals that the majority of those ‘immigrants’ were soldiers of the Red Army, low-level bureaucrats, and industrial sector workers with limited formal training. In comparison to Lithuanian intelligentsia in urban centres, especially Kaunas and Vilnius, the educational levels of the post-War arrivals from Russia were inferior. This asymmetry persisted throughout the socialist years. In addition to this factual error, there are numerous mistakes in the spelling of Lithuanian words – another editorial lapse.

Overall, *A Market out of Place?* is a sophisticated and ambitious account of market trading in a post-socialist setting. This pioneering monograph is a welcome contribution to the study of the Baltic States, a region of the ex-Soviet bloc that as yet has not received much attention from ethnographers.³ As well, this study offers a sobering counterpoint to abstract economic theorizing which all too often overlooks post-socialism’s ‘actually existing’ markets and their actors. Hohnen’s monograph will undoubtedly be a valuable resource for students and scholars interested in ‘transitioning’ Lithuania, Eastern Europe, as well as in economic anthropology more generally.

³ But see: Skultans, Vieda 1998. *Testimony of Lives: Narratives and Memory in Post-Soviet Latvia*. London: Routledge. Rausing, Sigrid 2004. *History, Memory, and Identity in Post-Soviet Estonia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.