

# Small Nations in the History of European Anthropology

Vida Savoniakaitė

*Lithuanian Institute of History*

*The paper explores Lithuanian traditions in theory of anthropology and ethnology by comparison with cases of the central schools at the first part of the 20th c. and beyond. It focuses on the concepts of nation in history of European anthropology.*

The anthropological studies reveal the dichotomies of ethnic groups in Lithuania similar too many European studies. At the beginning and the mid of the 20<sup>th</sup> c. anthropology was understood mostly as physical anthropology. Later the perception of anthropology, as the history of mankind, was the prevailing attitude in humanities and social sciences. In the pre-Soviet Lithuania epistemological approach of ethnology “to know the nations culture and state” in some issues has continuity throughout the history of this discipline. Methodologically with epistemological evolutionary and instrumental research one sought to reveal the features of nation. Studies of nationalism had interdisciplinary relations. In the Eastern and Central Europe the boundaries between “anthropology”, “ethnology” and “ethnography” are defined differently; the approach that anthropology and ethnology in history of Lithuania’s science had many close-knit points of contact in concepts of nation are receiving more proof. What peculiar issues had these discourses in Lithuania?

The paper seeks to explore how developed the anthropology in Lithuania to compare with history of anthropology and ethnology in Europe. It will focus on, firstly, the concepts of small nations in Lithuania discourses; secondly, the differences in theory of anthropology between Lithuanian tradition and approaches of central schools prominent figures as Thomas H. Eriksen, Wolfgang Kaschuba, Henrica Kuklick and others; and finally, how wars, political and economic crises impacted themes and theory of European anthropology at the first part of the 20<sup>th</sup> c. and beyond.

**Keywords: anthropology, epistemology, ethnography, Europe, history, small nations, theory**

National movements in Baltics have started when the Russian Empire political crisis had begun in 1860. Ethnography, ethnology and anthropology science became very important for revealing and forming the notion of nation (Löfgren 2001). “Small nations” are considered to be those nations that emerged during national movements in the 19th and 20th centuries. The issues of its forming process are ethnical communities rather than “state” nations which kept continuous nationhood traditions from the early modern times. The national movement of Lithuanian was based on the traditions of Grand Duchy of Lithuania interrelated by union with Poland (Hroch 2012) and other political circumstances in Europe.

Some of the first ethnographic research in Kaunas Province are known from 1842, in 1867 ethnographic research were conducted in Vilnius Province, and in 1869 – in Samogitia Diocese. The science of ethnography in Lithuania, same as in most European nations, was being developed due impact of activities of scientific societies – Russian Geographers, Russian Technicians, Lithuanian Literature, Poland Ethnology, Lithuanian Science, Šiauliai Regional Studies.<sup>1</sup> If we look at a map of Europe we will find a very uneven distribution in the discipline, and in places where it has been established it also has

---

<sup>1</sup> Irena R. Merkienė, Background of Ethnological Field Research, I. R. Merkienė (ed.), *Ethnography of Workdays and Holidays*, Vilnius: Versmė, 2007, p. 18–21; V. Milius, Ethnography of Scientific Fellowship and Lithuanians (second half of 19th century – first half of 20th century), Vilnius: 1993, p. 30; J. Mardosa (ed.), *About the Methodology and Methodological Measures. Material for Ethnography*, Vilnius, 2002. Physical Anthropology studies were also conducted in Lithuania, works of Jurgis Žilinskas are known, as well as archeological research, found collections of museum artefacts, folklore was being studied (see more Savoniakaitė 2008a).

very varying positions in the field of cultural studies and cultural history. One could argue with great simplification that European nations with strong colonial traditions tended to create a global anthropology, whereas late, small colonial nations turned to discover “their primitives within”, either in the form of folklore studies or as a more general cultural anthropology of the nation. It is this latter tradition that is today labeled “European Ethnology” (Löfgren 2001: 85). Ethnocentrism is characteristic even of the anthropologists who support cultural relativism the most. Cultural historians and anthropologists, as ethnologists, claim a “monopoly of the truth” by describing the past of a people, nation or state. I will argue that Lithuanian ethnography and anthropology have many connections and distinctions with European anthropology traditions. Cognition of Lithuanian people which interested humanitarian and social sciences from the 19th century till the middle of the 20th century still stays relevant and invites us to look deeper “from inside” and broader “from outside”.

The paper seeks encourage the dialogues about small nations in histories of anthropology and ethnology in Europe. I’ll focus on: first, classics and ethnography of awakening nation; second, anthropology and nationalism; third, physical anthropology and ethnography of “national group”; forth, transformations of ethnology in early 20<sup>th</sup> century; fifth, late *Volkskunde* discourses and theory in ethnography. Lithuanian cases of anthropology and ethnology will be discussed by comparison with anthropology in theory.

### **Defining awakening nation: classics and ethnography in Liudvikas A. Jucevičius and Motiejus Valančius approaches**

The concept of “small nations” reveals an interdisciplinary approach to anthropology and classics. Robert Ackermann states that:

classics and anthropology in the English speaking world took place mainly in Cambridge and Oxford between about 1875 and 1925, a time when a small number of classicists came to believe that anthropology held the key to a new way of realizing the dream of classical philology – “feeling their way into” the mindset of antiquity – and before anthropology had become the academic, professional pursuit it is today. To understand how this came to be, we must invoke, over and above the content of the educational curriculum, number of large-scale cultural, political, and intellectual movements in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as content (Ackerman 2008: 144).

Classics deal with “savages”, whose lives were being documented by Western traders, travelers and ethnographers; peasants, who live as they had for centuries, and etc. In Central and Eastern Europe ethnographic descriptions about Lithuanians also as in the classical cases of English speaking world anthropology or ethnography mostly appeared in the manuscripts, ethnographers and traveler’s diaries of the 19th and early 20th centuries.

Miroslav Hroch wrote:

Modern nations of Europe have shaped in two conceptually different ways. In other words, only a small number of current researchers pay attention to the fact that the nationalism of state nations under development differed from the „nationalism“ of national movements. What role did the formation of historical categories which we call „small nations“ played in the process of Europe of states transition to Europe of nations? ... new notion of the national could only be propagated after its foundation features and territorial boundaries are clearly defined ... (Hroch 2012: 127).

According to Hroch, the science of enlightenment covered many areas in spite the most important fields for future national movements were philosophy, history, ethnography, economy and geography. The studies of philology were focused on language research and its purpose was to create and legitimize one national language and to

determine the boundaries of diffusion of this language – the territory of the developing nation. In places where national language have existed the traditions of literature were being created (in cases on Czech, Croatians, Catalans), it was considered to be a duty of philologists to study this old literature which, of course, was considered to be a "national" literature. In places where such literature did not exist the philologists have studied the traditions of verbal national myths (Celtic nations, Finnish, Estonian, and Serbian). The folk creations were being explored, namely the new science of ethnography studied folk customs, clothes, constructions, etc. (Horch 2012: 131-132). In Lithuania these both processes were interrelated although Lithuanian language was not a "national" language in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. What special theoretical and ethnographical epistemology is in Lithuanian cases?

Firstly, a bilingual layer of noble-origin intellectuals of Lithuania expressed love for "their country" and "folk". In Vilnius University the ideas of love for own country and folk by Adomas Mickevičius and Simonas Daukantas were spreading among the youth. This stimulated the interest in ethnography, folklore and mythology. Liudvikas A. Jucevičius, one of great romantics who wrote both in Lithuanian and in Polish was collecting and publishing ethnographic materials. In 1836 he published the legend of the fisherman Kastytis from Šventoji, articles *Lietuvių mitologinės metamorfozės (Metamorphosis of Lithuanian Mythology)* and *Lietuvių deivių akmenys (Stones of Lithuanian Goddesses)* in Lithuanian and Polish languages in Polish Encyclopedia. In 1837–1838 works about Lithuanian songs, legends and sayings were published in press. Many articles were printed in Petersburg's weekly magazine *Tygodnik Petersburski*, Polish journal *Piśmiennictwo Krajowe* dedicated for the Kingdom of Poland, almanac *Biruta* published in Vilnius, etc.

Jucevičius has published ethnographic publications and translations of Lithuanian folk songs in Polish language; meanwhile, in Lithuanian language he published fragments of poetry works translated from Polish language. He conducted archeological research, was an active participant of Lithuanian national awakening movement, expressed his opinion against serfdom.<sup>2</sup> He revealed a broad view towards the analyzed object in his cultural research – he compared the features of cultural phenomenon of Western Lithuania and Aukštaičiai, Scandinavian culture (Jucevičius 1959: 328, 447–448). Jucevičius heightened the value of folk works and culture, preserved the features of Lithuanian ethnography of that time. He described the mode of life and customs<sup>3</sup> of Samogitians in his books *Rysy Žmudzi (Features of Samogitia, 1840)*, *Wspomnienia Żmudzi (Memories of Samogitia, 1842)*, and its most famous work *Litwa starożytna pod względem starożytnych zabotków i zwyczajów (Lithuania, 1846; Vanagas 2005)*.

---

<sup>2</sup> Sometimes the ethnographic data was published without any metrics or source, without indicating a place where it was written or ethnical group to which the customs were characteristic. In many cases there were no indications about what the publicator found himself or herself and what was learned from other books. Separate facts were provided and divided into groups in mythological studies. The chronicles of Teodoras Narbutas were used (Lukšienė 1959: 32–43). Ethnographic pictures of Lithuanian social statuses were revealed. The folklore was written in Lithuanian, the way of living was presented.

<sup>3</sup> He exchanged letters with Juozapas Ignotas Kraševskis, admired his published descriptions of travels *Wspomnienia Wołynia, Polesia i Litwy (Recollection of Volynija, Polesė and Lithuania, 1840)*, in which he provided much ethnographic knowledge, details of mode of life. This promoted Jucevičius to write about Samogitians, to reveal youthful romantism, admire native land, people and their culture. He also exchanged letters with Peter Bolen, the professor orientalist of University of Karaliaučius who collected Lithuanian folk songs, and Vaclav Hanka, Czech poet and philologist.

Jucevičius have described Lithuanian people by the evolutionary approach:

Ordinary people in our times almost do not differ from their grandparents with their customs, standpoints and spiritual education. As their grandparents believed earlier, they believe now; things they learned about the life of their predecessors are preserved in their memory (Jucevičius 1959: 56).

Valuable ethnographic facts about the mode of living, everyday life and nation are presented expressively. The topics include language, mythology, reminders of Paganism, casts, customs, clothing, ceremonies, old customs, mode of living, folk medicine, food businesses, and agriculture. He tried to determine the boundaries of Lithuanian language use in his book. He revealed the phenomenon of cultural life of Lithuanians through the eyes of an Observer (Lukšienė 1959: 27–32). Its classifications and local cultural features were also provided. From the methodological point of view, the aim of Jucevičius to explore people opinions and at the same time to reveal their self-consciousness and mentality is very interesting. The images of Lithuanian ethnography filled with historical romantic spirit vividly describe the human and features of its social life of that time.

Secondly, religious moral motives were related with ethno-cultural. In the fiction of priest and nation awakening historian Motiejus Valančius distinct universal religious moral and Lithuanian ethno-cultural interests can be found. His characters live and create in Lithuania – name of places and persons are real, not fictitious. *Palangos Juzė (Juzė of Palanga)* is considered to be an ethnographical tale, picturing the mode of living, folk customs, spiritual works, adaptation of religious scripts and its following of different ethnic regions. Besides, with some helpers Valančius have collected a bundle of folklore and published it in a book *Patarles žemajeziu* (Valančius 1867; also see Merkys 1999.)

In varied mental maps of Lithuania, according to Darius Staliūnas, linguistic-ethnic criterions became especially important since mid of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and beyond (Staliūnas 2015: 9; see more Savoniakaitė 2016). Later, notion of distinctive prehistoric ethnic Baltic culture was described as linguistic (Vadopalas 1972 [1921]: 82).

Even much later, J. Gobis emphasized that “we have in mind here not the feasts of all the estates, but only of the folk and this is mainly in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and these times, because we lack the sources to shed light on the old feasts: the *Būdas (Character)* of Simonas Daukantas, as a romantic piece, does not form a very reliable source, and folklore rations usually do not reach very old times”; Gobis defines an object of *ethnic* culture by analyzing the identity and *difference* of “ethnic feasts”:

Aristocratic feasts as saturated with Polish influence, will not be of interest for us here, also the current feasts of the intellectuals are not included in our topic because they are philistine and therefore distant from our folk, ethnic feasts have also acquired a general European nature with small nuances of folk nationalism (Gobis 1942: 81).

Let us emphasize that in the 19<sup>th</sup> century attention to own “ethnic group”, “language” and “country” or “ethnographic region”, namely territory, was in the center of attention of most scientists who wrote about Lithuania. As in other research of European nations, Lithuanian language usage boundaries are being defined by aristocrats and intellectuals who wrote both in Lithuanian and Polish languages. Evolutionary approach is very vivid in ethnographic texts. Ethnographic stories about folk people are interwoven with archeological, mythological and philological data. During the awakening of Lithuanian nation religious motives interweaved with old pagan beliefs and moral motives were crucial.

## Jonas Basanavičius anthropological research and nationalism

Specific relation of anthropology and classics can be noticed in scientific works of Jonas Basanavičius. Basanavičius became interested in physical anthropology in 1874 during his Medicine studies in the University of Moscow where he was involved in the activities of anthropologists' fellowship and studied anthropological features of Lithuanian people. According to Elvyda Lazauskaitė, besides medicine Basanavičius studied Lithuanian history and prepared a study about Kęstutis, planned textbooks and books for village teachers, translated *Alphabet or Alphabet Book for Girls from Lithuanian Villages* from Polish language (but did not get an approval for publishing; see Lazauskaitė 2011a). The studies of physical anthropology were developed side by side with cultural research.

First of all the biggest attention was paid to Lithuanian language. During his vacations in Lithuania Basanavičius wrote down rarely used words, songs, tales, sayings and incantations. While exploring the culture of Lithuania he was exciting patriotic feelings of nation, associated with Kazimieras Aglinskis, Vincas Pietaris, Petras Vileišis. In 1879 together with other students from Moscow he sent a greeting to *Litauische Litterarische Gesellschaft* in Berlin founded by Germans of Lithuania Minor in which they expressed a belief that this fellowship will accelerate the awakening of Lithuanian nation.

Basanavičius have paid much attention to ethno genesis of Lithuanians. When he did not get a permission to come back to Lithuania, while exploring Bulgarians, he worked in the biggest libraries of Europe, visited the most famous museums, fairs and explored the history of Lithuania, romantic hypothesis of Lithuanian origin coming from Thracian-Phrygians.<sup>4</sup> He actively wrote articles and folklore studies to *Lithuanian Lietuviškas Ceitungas (Newspaper)* and *Naujasis Keleivis (New Traveler)* which were published in Minor Lithuania. In 1892 he published an appeal to Lithuanian society asking them to collect and send folklore material to Bulgaria in *The Bell (Varpas)* and *Žemaičių ir Lietuvos apžvalga (Review of Samogitians and Lithuania)* (Lazauskaitė 2011a).

In 1893 Basanavičius presented a publication *Etnologiškos smulkmenos (Ethnological Details)*; in 1898 he issued a book *Medega musu tautiškai vaistininkystei (Medega for our National Pharmacy)*. During the founding meeting of Lithuanian science fellowship in 1907 Basanavičius have shared a vision of the Institute of Ethnology which was implemented only in 1941 (Merkienė 2011: 128–129). Scientific interests of Basanavičius were interwoven with ideas of nationalism and awakening of the nation.

In Lithuania the research of physical anthropology were developed side by side with ethnology and ethnography, with much attention paid to language, folklore and mythology. Same as in Europe, natural resources and nation peculiarities were especially studied. Based on ideas of Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Johann G. Herder, data of ethnographic expeditions, *Naturdiscourses* originated in the 19th century in England and France, in other words, the wave of romantic interest in nature, nation formatting language, attention to national character, *Volks-Kunde* as an “ethnic paradigm” in the

---

<sup>4</sup> The hypothesis of Lithuanian originating from Thracian-Phrygian was substantiated in many publications: *Žiponas bei žiponė* and *Žirgas ir vaikas (A Horse and a Child, 1885)*, *Etnologiškos smulkmenos (Ethnological Details, 1893)*, *Lietuviškai-Trakiškos studijos (Lithuanian-Thracian Studies, 1898)*, *Prie istorijos musun rašybos (Close to History of our Spelling, 1899)*, *Levas lietuvių pasakose ir prygiškai-trakiškoje dailoje (Levas in Lithuanian tales and Thracian-Phrygian Art – 1907 and 1919)*, „Iš senovės lietuvių mytologijos“ („From the Mythology of Ancient Lithuanian“ (1916; *Lithuanian Nation I. 1910: 1–70; II. 1919: 467–567*), *Apie trakų-prygų tautystę ir jų atsikėlimą Lietuvon (About the nationality of Thracian-Phrygian and their moving to Lithuania, 1921)* and *Trakų kalbos likučiai vietų varduose lietuvių kalbos šviesoje (Remainders of Thracian Languages in Names of Places in light of Lithuanian Language, 1925)*.

universities in Germany was very close to Germanic. As a science *Volkskunde* have strengthened “national steps” with “social issues” (Kaschuba 2012: 37–39). Also the Institute of Lituania (Lithuanian Studies) was founded in Lithuania, although the truth is, it was considerably later. In his anthropological discourses, dedicated to *Self* and *Other*, namely for research of Bulgarian and many other comparative cultures, Basanavičius have demonstrated a strong link with classics and ideas of nationalism which in time influenced the interest in peculiarities of *oneself nation* in science. “Ethnical paradigms” were related with “national paradigms”. Indeed these researches were pursuing to define the *Lithuanian nation*.

### **Physical anthropology and ethnography of “national group”**

Lithuanians who studied in Russia and worked for Russian Empire in international ethnographic research groups we can define both as “insiders” and “outsiders”. In 1896 Povilas Višinskis have won a contest in the Department of Geography in the University of Petersburg to write a characteristic of a selected nation. He was conducting an anthropologic research in Samogitia for two summers; collected folklore works, worked as a teacher in villages, revived and cherished lithuanianism. Lithuanians who studied in Russia and worked for Russian Empire in international ethnographic research groups we can define as “insiders” and “outsiders”. Višinskis have researched Samogitians as a “national group” and stated:

In order to have a clear view and understanding about some nation it is necessary to firstly get to know some other nation and only then, while comparing them the nation which is analyzed will become clear and understandable, its main characteristic features will be noticed. Unfortunately, I did not get to know other nation; I know only my native Samogitian nation. Due to this reason a feature which I consider to be characteristic feature of Samogitian nation might simply be a phenomenon of any other equally educated nation, and vice versa ... (Višinskis 1964: 129).

Anthropology is understood more broadly – not only as physical features of the body but also as a description of culture, living environment and country history (Česnys 2004: 141). The biggest attention was dedicated to anthropologic measurements<sup>5</sup> and ethnographic research, interesting conclusions were provided.

Višinskis in his study *Antropologinė žemaičių charakteristika* (*Anthropological Characteristics of Samogitians*, 1898 unpublished manuscript) described the characteristic features of Samogitians, cultural assimilation, impact of Germans, Latvians, Polish, and Russian cultures to Lithuania. In his chapters “Material Culture”, “Public Life” and “Spiritual Culture” he described buildings, clothing, food, businesses, manners, beliefs and games. In Užventis vicinity Višinskis collected an especially big amount of folklore beliefs, sayings, casts and superstitions, tales which he presented in the chapter about spiritual culture. His publications were based on ethnographic material provided by Žemaitė. The thoroughness of the author, presentation of ethnographic details and broad anthropological view is fascinating. This work takes an honorable place in the historiography of all ethnical research (Milius 2004: 160–163). The methodology of anthropological research is also highly evaluated. Therefore Višinskis is

---

<sup>5</sup> He measured 122 people from various points of view – 67 men and 55 women. During this evaluation he provided 64 questions to the respondents. 45 of these questions were dedicated for measurement and other – of common sense. The measurement was comprehensive. 170 photographs were taken. First chapters were named “Features of History”, “Country Nature” and “Physical Features”.

deservedly considered to be (Česnys 2004: 151) one of the creators of modern anthropology of Lithuanian.

According to H. Glenn Penny, in Germany ethnology and physical anthropology were separated:

The distinction between ethnology and physical anthropology was consistently maintained in the German tradition. When the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie, und Urgeschichte* (German Society for Anthropology, Ethnology, and Prehistory) was founded in 1869, it was the leading association of its kind in central Europe. Initially, physical anthropology was at its center (Penny 2008: 81).

In Germany ethnologist Adolf Bastian distinguished ethnology from physical anthropology, and that distinction remained clear through World War I. Because physical anthropology was slighted in the large ethnographic museums that Bastian and his counterparts created across Germany, ethnology was the more prominent discipline by the turn of the century (Bastian 1869, cit. from Penny 2008: 81).

The case of Lithuania, still being a part of Russian Empire, which was explored by Višinskis is a little bit different comparing to German discourses. More publications about ethnology in Lithuania can be found in the third decade. Only then a broader availability of scientific theories and criticism of views have emerged. Lithuanian people had a specific view to „national group“.

Lithuanian science was open as in Europe. For comparison, Henrika Kuklick states, “that British anthropology today is at least as international as it was in the late nineteenth century” (Kuklick 2008: 77). There was a little number of Lithuanian researches.

According Anthony Jackson, in Germany and Scandinavia a German research system was being followed in which the traditions of material culture and folk way of living were prospering, which was changed to social anthropology only in 1960. Ethnological studies were concentrated in museums which naturally collected things from various races. The works of physical anthropologists, folklorists and archeologists were combined in the museums. Anthropologists, folklorists and historians explored their own communities or societies, trying to exclude peculiar communities. It is being thought that studies of folklore or folk way of living are virtually a part of science dedicated to preserve the legacies of almost faded world (Jackson 1987: 5; see more Savoniakaitė 2008b).

These sentiments contradicted the goals of modern anthropology – it might be the reason why these sciences have intermittently merged. An interesting goal which combined these sciences was to explore minority groups. British and French were interested in studies of ethnical minorities due to the reason that in their states many people from different races lived. 1900 former biggest colonies have researched their reality; same processes were specifically occurring in Russian Empire as well.

## **Transformations**

“Short Program for Collecting Folklore Elements”<sup>6</sup> prepared in 1910 was organized in four chapters:

I. Superstitious beliefs and works; II. Ancient customs; III. Ancient tellings; IV. Proverbs (in more details – minor folklore), in which 294 numerated questions are given; the second

---

<sup>6</sup> In 1909, in the third meeting of the Society of Lithuanian Science a committee of songs and ethnographers was created (Basanavičius, Kazys Grinius, Janulaitis, Tumas, Eduardas Volteris), which task was to create a program for collecting folklore and ethnographic material.

chapter dedicated to ethnography was divided into sub-chapters: a) Festivity customs and superstitions, b) domestic ceremonies, c) games, d) local customs. It was the first scientific methodological program for collection of folklore (prepared based on English system of G.L.Gomme and analogous programs of Polish, Russian and Latvian).

Jonas Basanavičius and other Lithuanian national movements' initiators quickly caught on to ideas of cultural oneness and uniqueness (Basanavičius 1910), who suggested going to the people and describing the characteristics of its particular and unique culture, heritage and art. Lithuanian ethnography was oriented very much towards a description of countryside material culture and the recording of customs, because such cultural objects were researched in other European countries in more depth.

Continued scientific publication *Lithuanian Nation* prepared by Lithuanian Science Society and led by Basanavičius published scientific works and reviews of history of Lithuania, numismatics, anthropology, ethnography, Lithuanian language, literature and folklore (Milius 1993: 118). The first issue of *Lithuanian Nation* which was published from 1907 till 1935 was prepared and published by Basanavičius <sup>7</sup>.

In comparison, a more general ethnological study of the cultural heritage produced departments of European ethnology in countries like Sweden and Germany. The emergence or non-emergence of this tradition in Europe also had to do with the highly varying politics of nationalism. As in most disciplines that were born out of projects at national universities, like history, literature, art history and geography, ethnology was a very national science with the task of discovering, collecting, presenting and analysing a national folk culture (Löfgren 2001: 85; Savoniakaitė 2008b).

According Stasys Skrodenis, ethnography in Lithuania at that time was not separated as an individual science field and it was explored together with folklore in which much attention was paid to collect materials of folk culture. Methodological instructions of how to collect folklore material, how to interview people and describe it in a written form were provided. Collectors of folklore, especially those who wrote down songs of work, calendar or family festivities, were directed to also take notes of various sayings related with objects and phenomenon of nature. The attention was paid to main scientific principles of folklore writing down which included precision, metrics, explanations, fixation of songs together with melody (Skrodenis 1985: 38). The science of anthropology was directed to cultural research. Committees of ethnographers in the program of folklore research reflect obvious interdisciplinary view; the boundaries of ethnography were perceived together with folklore. This example illustrates the divide between physical anthropology and ethnography. The program was also influenced by the ideas of nationalism which were spreading in Europe and related with the research of *Self*.

Penny wrote about the theoretical transformations of German ethnology in 1907–1918:

many younger assistants were looking for theoretical innovations by the turn of the century. A new generation of directors moved into Germany's leading ethnographic museums during first decade of the twentieth century, and found theoretical inspiration outside of Berlin. Friedrich Ratzel, in Leipzig, had long opposed Bastian's ethnographic project. Drawing on Moritz Wagner's ideas that new species were formed by separation stemming from migration, Ratzel argued that a similar kind of historical descend could explain the similarities of forms and objects found among different peoples, some even thousands of miles apart. He also argued that tracing the diffusion of these forms could lead to general history of culture... But the

---

<sup>7</sup> On the 1st of March in 1908 in the board meeting *Nation of Lithuanians* was accepted as an body of the fellowship, which was edited by Basanavičius till 1926 and by editorial board later. *Nation of Lithuanians* was a collection of scientific works published in form of writting-book (1 book was made from 4 writting books). In total 5 books were published made from 15 writting books (see Lazauskaitė 2011b).



generation that had gained control of museums by 1907 pushed German ethnology in new directions...

The diffusionists revolt did not merely usher in a dominant ethnological theory. It signaled dramatic change in attitudes among German ethnologists and anthropologists about what constituted good science... Bastian's focus on particularities in order to understand human universals was replaced by a focus on characterizing and defining particularized Others. And the new ethnology was more compatible with interests in nation and empire... hierarchies and rhetoric were easily seized upon and deployed by other to support radical nationalism, imperialism, and even racial-biological schemes (Penny 2008: 89-91).

What is exceptional in Lithuanian theories? Firstly, anthropology, ethnology and ethnography in Lithuania were developed in own dialogues. We cannot state that there was a distinct divide between physical anthropology and ethnology in Lithuania, like in Germany. It has manifested itself considerably later – during the Interwar period. Analyzed cases of Jonas Basanavičius and Povilas Višinskis illustrate the way physical anthropology studies were complemented by comparable data of ethnography and folklore. Basanavičius' work *Etnologiškios smulkmenos (Ethnological Details)* in theoretical point of view contains many features of European ethnology. From the other side, many ethnographic discourses which relate closely to classics can be found in Lithuania; evolutionary and less diffusion approaches are observed.

Secondly, Lithuanian science was influenced by the universities of Russian Empire and schools of Polish University of Vilnius which were interested in the *Other*.

Thirdly, Lithuanian scientists, as in many small European nations, have in most cases studied their “own native land human”, getting to know his culture – this, I believe, is one of the most important theoretical approaches after Lithuania have gained its independence in 1918 and beyond.

Finally, these discourses as though call to one another with new modern European and broader science discussions and remind the thinking of Thomas H. Eriksen that anthropology flows into “long discussions about what it is like to be human and provides body and blood for philosophical questions” (Eriksen 2010: 201); we allegorically talk about phenomenon of different periods, according to Eriksen, today anthropology invites to understand how different societies look “from inside” by the comparative approach. Cultural relativism cannot be simply opposed to ethnocentrism because it itself has no moral principles. It is necessary to reveal both the uniqueness and ways in which the humanity is homogenous in every society and cultural context (Eriksen 2010: 199–200), or, in other words – to find common cultural aspects in different societies.

## **Theoretical discourses between World War I and World War II**

“Once you know the native land, you know yourself and your nation [...] Today is the very haymaking for the ethnographers” – wrote Ignas Končius raising a question of how many small new settlers have overrun in broad manor homestead with its history, peculiar way of living, specific customs and outlooks. He defined theoretical science approaches:

these questions are revealed by *ethnography* which describes nations and their families; ethnography collects material and provides conclusions using data of anthropology and anthropogeography; ethnology explores differences of relations and transitions of separate nations, without paying attention to the physical side, meanwhile anthropology explores human, that living organism (Končius 1934: 3–5).

During the Interwar, according to Vacys Milius, the folk culture was being explored by at least several institutions – Šiauliai Regional Studies Society, Cultural Museum of Vytautas Magnus, Archive of Lithuanian Folklore, and Chamber of Agriculture. The main institution which published ethnographic material and research was the Vytautas Magnus University (Milius 1994: 45). Juozas Baldauskas who worked in the Vytautas Magnus University in Kaunas analyzed types of culture and forms of „cultured nations“. Linguists were considered to be the first ethnologists. Folk’s material, social and spiritual culture was attributed to the field of ethnology. He separated the notions of “ethnology” and “ethnics” (or *ethnology*), while he referred to the latter as a history of civilization, customs and antiquities<sup>8</sup>. He analyzed its features in German and Slavic countries. In the works of Jonas Balys, who also worked in the Vytautas Magnus University and guided the ethnology archive, cultural historical approach is also very obvious (see more Savoniakaitė 2008a).

In 1939 Antanas Smetona Institute of Lituianistika (Lithuanian Studies) was founded and its main goal was to “explore the country of Lithuania, material and spiritual culture of its residents while organizing the collection of scientific material and research in places”. This institution joined Lithuanian studies research, however, in the opinion of Bugailiškis, it did not developed “the research and preservation of remains” of material culture which is organically related with folklore as “an inseparable part of ethnics, that is ethnology”. He stated that broader researches of material culture which were becoming increasingly popular among foreign ethnologists were left without any scientific institution which would represent them (Chronicles... 1939: 560). This empty niche in ethnology was filled by authors of publication *Gimtasai Kraštas (Native Country)* edited by Bugailiškis, scientists working in above mentioned institutions and in Vilnius University, answering to published invitation:

We often do not pay attention and do not value our historical relics – hill forts, burial mounds, churches, chapels and the whole complex of phenomenon which constitute the foundation of our nation’s culture, that is our being, folk art, folklore and other, and only after we notice the interest from foreigners we open our eyes to these nation’s riches which are finishing to vanish (Our Pursuits...1934: 1).

In such way the cognition of “nation’s status and culture” was revealed broadly<sup>9</sup>. The facts show that *ethnology* boundaries were not entirely unanimous.

In 1934 the article “Today’s Metrics for Getting to Know the Country” in *Native Country* provided discussions about the methodologies of ethnographic research, photography and maps (Končius 1934: 6–8). Paulius Galaunė looked at the work of museologists through an eye of professional and folk art expert (Galaunė 1934: 8–11). P.Tarasenka explored the features of archeological research and preservation of

---

<sup>8</sup> Dr. J. Baldauskas, *Ethnics and other*, Kaunas, 1939, p. 3–5.

<sup>9</sup> From 1933 Fellowship of museologists and ethnographers of Lithuania was publishing a journal *Gimtasai Kraštas (Native Country)* in “Aušra” museum in Šiauliai, edited by Pelikšas Bugailiškis. The publishers united a group of more than 60 famous associates who provided much ethnographic material and articles about history, preservation of cultural monuments, museums and ethnography matters; The editors of *Gimtasai Kraštas* invited to “know our country”. This invitation was close to many cultures; it was inducing to know “myself country”, “antiquities”, “ancient times” and preserve “monuments”; however, this phenomenon was relevant in Western Europe even earlier (Savoniakaitė 2008b). Journal’s pursue of cognition was directed to common ethnographical matters, museums, historical monuments, ethnography and folk art, nature and geography, tourism and affairs. Historical discourses were being developed (Jurginis 1939); historical memories of people about the rebellion in Samogitia in 1863 were explored (Petkevičaitė 1934; Mickevičius 1943).

monuments (Tarasenska 1934: 11–16); Antanas Rūkštelė talked about keeping the inventory of folk art (Rūkštelė 1934: 17–18); Jurgis Dovydaitis presented folklore “details” (Dovydaitis 1934: 23–26); and later Juozas Lingis from Sweden analyzed the managing of collections in a cultural museum opening social issues in broader view (Lingis 1939). The Šiauliai Regional Studies Society issued “questionnaires” and sought to include the broad public – the farmers into the work of *Vokskunde* or regional studies. The research encouraged more societies of regional studies and museums in Lithuania to gather and carry out ethnographic expeditions. Congresses of regional studies and museum workers were organized; there was an effort to influence the cultural policies of Lithuania; in summary, this was the very significant activity of the “agents”.

In the Polish press *Nauka Polska* Michał Brensztejn wrote that he had received from the management of Lithuanian institutions objective news about Lithuania's budget for cultural affairs, science societies and the protection of historical monuments, etc.; he stressed that Lithuania's provincial museums exist due to the very efforts of the public, the concern of regional studies societies (Zdzichauskas, 1943: 395–397). *Vokskunde* in Lithuania had similar approaches as *ludoznawstwo* in Poland and *Volkskunde* in Germany (Merkienė 2011: 128; Kaschuba 2012: 29–39).

In early Soviet times, in 1941, Institute of Ethnology of Lithuania Academy of Science<sup>10</sup>, having stronger material foundation took over the publication of the journal was founded. The editors wrote that “a new leaf in the history of ethnography and ethnology will stimulate more intensive and vivid scientific activity” (Bugailiškis 1941: 1). The society began working more intensively and continued its activities till 1943. The activities of the Šiauliai Regional Studies Society were not closed to the context of only Lithuania; its members cooperate with similar associations of the Baltic and other countries, they exchanged literature and work experience; the Šiauliai *Aušros* Museum was visited by the known in Europe Swedish professor of ethnology Sigurd E. Erixon, German doctor of science O. Thiele, the Austrian professor A. Habulandt and more scholars (From the “Aušros” museum ... 1942: 154–155). The concepts “questionnaire”, “ethnographic expeditions” used in the scientific language at that time has continuity in anthropology and ethnology.

The discussions included religious aspects (Alseikaitė-Gimbutienė 1943), manners of the nation, social aspects (Petrulis 1944) and other.

The motto of *Gimtasai Kraštas* have broadened to getting to know “nation's status and culture”. The issues of *Volkskunde* included the fields related to the nation and especially the history of the village; settlements, the concepts of „homeland”, “native village”, their social characteristics, the social interests of the population, lifestyle, *homo economicus*, the mutual relations of neighbors and material culture, history, memories, narratives, traditions, folklore, etc. were analyzed.

Comparative historical approach in art and folk music studies stand out; some articles delve deeper into the wider realities of Europe (Moszyński 1941: 51–64; Čerbulėnas 1941: 64–78; Mažiulis 1941: 78–81); in this respect the discourses of Kazimierz Moszyński, a known in Eastern Europe Polish researcher, who had worked at the University of Vilnius, are interesting.

Epistemology of the nation through “ethnography” developed Pr. Stukenaitė-Decikienė having dealt with The Lithuanian Science Society, ethnography museum in the article *Etnografijos reikalai Vilniaus krašte* (*Ethnography Affairs in the Vilnius Region*)

---

<sup>10</sup> 1941 Editorial board (P. Bugailiškis – Editor) such name was mentioned by *Gimtasai Kraštas* in Issue No. 28–29 on the first page in column “For our Readers and Associates”, and in journal “Chronicles” the Institute of Ethnology was mentioned. It can be concluded that there was no unified opinion about the title of the Institute. This institution was called Institute of Ethnology by Pranė Dundulienė (Dundulienė 1991) and I. R. Merkienė (Merkienė 2011).

(Stukenaite-Decikienė 1941: 149–158). Maria Znamierowska-Prüffer (1941) wrote about the ethnographic objects collected in the Stefan Batory University in Vilnius and the treated topics, including farm livestock, beekeeping, meals, the processing of flax, clothing, transport and communication, folk art, toys, folk instruments; all of them had a strong continuity – they were actual in the Soviet period and later, and still now. Auksuolė Čepaitienė wrote that the articles in the journal *Gimtasai kraštas* testify that ethnographic material was begun to be collected on specific, relatively narrow topics, gradually moving to a broader and more comprehensive image (Čepaitienė 2014: 388). Many of the small articles in *Gimtasai kraštas* can be considered in certain cases (tiny and larger of various scale) studies, in which there are no discussions about the theory and methodology of the science, but one can see the logic of the methods of ethnographic observation and a comparative historical approach. One can assume that at that time interdisciplinary approaches spread in ethnographic studies – geographical, statistical methods (Končius 1943: 136–172) were used more widely.

### **Lithuanian tradition by comparison**

From the 19th century till the beginning of the 20th century one may find many theoretical parallels between epistemology theories of anthropology known in Lithuania and the world. Physical anthropology was at interest. Cognition of nation was revealed through exceptional histories, interpretations of pre-historical culture and symbols, material objects, customs and other research. The theories of origin were explored. For example, we can find primordialistic generalizations in the statements given in books of M. Račkus printed in USA which stated that “extinct tribe of Gudonai and Lithuanian nation alive today share the same blood and the same origin” (Račkus 1929: 9). The analysis of logics in names of places (Kolupaila 1943) flows into European research of names of places which we developed already for many decades (Mortensen 1927). The development of psychology revealed problems of human groups of races and social status; the questions of mental characteristics were risen, as the research of “nation’s character”.

As mentioned before, there are known research about the nation of Lithuania as a “national group” of Russian Empire, research of Polish, Prussians and *Other* from the 19th century; attention was being paid to *Self*. In 1940 in USA Franz Boas wrote that the science of anthropology have grown from „many exceptional beginnings“. In previous times people were interested in foreign countries and its residents. The problem of human nature and “his place in the kingdom of animals” became an important topic of research. According to Boas sociology, economy, political sciences, history and philosophy have found its value studying the social status “among other people”, pursuing to spread light into our modern social processes (Boas 2014: 22–23). In time the notions “individual” and “group” emerged near the notions of “development” and “evolution”, the areas of interest included biology, kinship, races, dynamic of societies, forms of culture; it was stated that too little attention was being paid to “the relations between individual and his or her culture” (Boas 2014: 31), “individual psychology” emerged, and “social psychology” was analyzed. Besides the variety of human behaviors, common behaviors characteristic to all the humanity was being promoted to explore. In the East ethnos research conducted by Sergej M. Shirokogoroff’s that explored human groups sharing the same nature and language were known (Shirokogoroff 1923).

Firstly, in Lithuania as in many Eastern and Central Europe country *ethology* was being developed later compared to Western Europe. “The notion of *Ethnography* became similar to the notion of *ethnology*”; as Irena Čepienė states, it illustrated the statement of Lithuanian Regional Studies Society founded in 1923 which concluded that

“upbringing and education starts with getting acquainted with own country”. The works of ethnography were related with nation’s past, folklore, ethnography phenomenon, material culture, living language, legends, beliefs, etc. Educational aspects of ethnography are deeply related with ideas of philosophers Stasys Šalkauskis and Antanas Maceina (Čepienė 2008: 248–259). These phenomena are similar in whole Western Europe; “ethnographic particularism” was explored (Kaschuba 2012; Barnard 2000: 39–40; Moore, Sanders 2014). Swedish ethnology, Polish surrealism, Slovenian *Volkskunde*, Slovakian structuralism of 1930 and continuous tradition of German ethnology illustrates examples of several European genealogies of anthropology. Russian anthropology is closely related with German tradition (Eriksen, Sivert 159).<sup>11</sup>

According to Rasa Paukštytė-Šaknienė, the ethnography in Lithuania was considered to be articles covering narrow local place and presenting memories of several presenters (Paukštytė-Šaknienė 2009: 69); sometimes the descriptions were not related with location (Anglickienė 2008: 28). With time passing the “traditional thinking of areal” was replaced by regional (Appadurai 2014: 538; for more see: Savoniakaitė 2015) research.

Secondly, in the beginning of the 20th century and later researches of “national character” were conducted in Lithuania. Ruth Benedict was looking for answers to questions of how the society impacts individuals, what opposites and relations exist between the society and individual dualism. She concludes that “culture shows present social types of people” (Benedict 2014[1934]: 49). Later “national character” research were being developed (Mead 1953: 642–662), which were a little bit different due to its attention to the dualism of individual and society and socialization of individuals though culture compared to the research of *Volkskunde* or „nation’s status and culture“ customs.

Thirdly, functionalism was spreading in ethnography. Polish scientists working in Vilnius University spread Polish school theories of ethnography and intercultural dialogues. In 1939 Bronislaw Malinowski has presented an “axiom” – or more precisely, an empirical truth – *leitmotif* – “individual, group and its interdependence” are repeated in all observational and analytical questions of field research. His descriptions of “individual” and „his or her relation with own “group”, or such notions like “social organization” and “cultural determinism” are understandable after he discussion of various problems (Malinowski 2014: 90). “Material apparatus” complements mental processes of individual and forms of social organization and together they create a whole complex of cultural processes and phenomena. In the opinion of Malinowski:

views of functionalism towards the description and cognition of individual clearly differ from other sociological theories. In cultural analysis functionalists take into consideration not only to emotional intellectual thinking but also the biological human reality. In the research of the body environmental influences and cultural reactions are important; they must be analyzed “side by side” (Malinowski 2014[1939]: 91).

Human was perceived as a biological entity; his psychology, reproduction, growth, recreation, actions, communication, etc. were areas of interest. The culture was described as the first and most important instrumental reality of an individual – social organization, customs, beliefs and values. Every culture constantly cooperates, i.e. human bows for behavioral rules. Cultural systems “economy”, “social control”, “education” and “political organization” are marked out (Malinowski 2014: 91–95). Theoretical aspects of functional research of group and individual conducted by Malinowski group and presented here in several sentences reveals the aspects of ethnographic field research and social theoretical aspects more broadly than mentioned ethnographic discourses in *Gimtasai Kraštas*. Interactions between individual and group were not excluded as a separate

---

<sup>11</sup> T. H. Eriksen and F. Sivert, op. cit., p. 159.

important object of research, notion of “nation” was emphasized in *Gimtasai Kraštas*. Comparative views – comparative theory of culture – represent a broader view which share common theoretical points of view with European realities analyzed by Moszyński. Conclusions about social relations in Lithuanian theories of ethnographic research can be noticed only in some discourses. In cases of Lithuania the attention of researchers was mostly directed towards descriptions and research of local culture in specific locations. It was already the time when questions about the relations between individual and group were risen by Malinowski (Malinowski 2014: 101; 1944: 67–75), which he invited to explore “in parallel” revealing the realities of both environment and material culture. Soviet ideology has brought essential changes in the theory of anthropology. The object of humanitarian science became narrower. This situation reminds the point of view of Alfred L. Kroeber, known at that time, which tells how a person influenced by ideologized culture (Kroeber 2014: 36) sometimes changes its culture involuntarily.

## Conclusions

In Lithuania anthropology and ethnography were being developed by dialogues of *Self*. Cases of Basanavičius and Višinskis illustrate how the studies of physical anthropology were complemented by comparative data from ethnography and folklore. Basanavičius who worked in many European libraries have written a work *Etnologiškios smulkmenos* which from the theoretical point of view shares similarities with the European ethnology of “small nations”. However, ethnographical discourses closely related with classics are mostly found in Lithuania; evolutionistic and less diffusion epistemological discourses are noticed.

Research of Lithuanian nation as people of own country and *Other* were conducted in Russian Empire. Anthropology in Lithuania was influenced by Polish, German and Scandinavian schools in 19th century – early 20th century and beyond.

In early 20th century and beyond the programs of methods, ethnographic research and observations of anthropology as a comparative science of cultural and social life (Eriksen 2010: 198; Kuklich 2008) shared features common to European science, folklore research programs were discussed broadly; in time local interpretations of Lithuanian authors are found.

In Lithuania, later than in the West (Kaschuba 2012: 49) “*ethnology* as a practical science” exploring nation, native land, traditions, creation of museums, etc. became known. Between World War I and World War II in Lithuania *Volkskunde* epistemology was changing: firstly it was defined as *ethnography*, and later – as *ethnology*. Articles about nature and geography sometimes transgress Lithuanian boundaries by its broad comparisons, the logic of names of places reminds of ecological discourses which were spreading at that time (Barnard 2000: 40). The discussions included not only the problematic of material culture, customs, folk art, folklore, but also – to be truth, quite less – aspects of social life, activities of scientific fellowships, turning points of nation history, such as exiles, prisoners and recruits of rebellion in 1863 and similar, religious issues and society chronicles. Historical cultural view was prevailing, functionalism was spreading.

Interest in ideas of “nation” became stronger in light of such events as political announcing of independence of Lithuania, World War I and World War II and Soviet ideology. The boundaries of *ethnology* were not perceived unanimously. Geographical and nation cognition aspects have interweaved; while comparing programs of cognition of “nation’s status and culture” with broader epistemological discourses of anthropological theories of that time we must conclude that *Volkskunde* cognition was based on broad

interdisciplinary scientific interpretations, and theoretical interpretations which transcend the boundaries of Lithuania as a native land. Ethnology theories in Lithuania reminds of Eric R. Wolf thinking that only after getting to know the batch of relations which surround the notions “nation”, “society” and “culture” and “placing them into the field in which they were defined” we can expect to avoid deceptive conclusions and increase the interest in our findings (Wolf 2014[1982]: 293). The field of interests of ethnologists was obviously related with political societies: “oneself nation’s status and culture” was explored during the Interwar period, meanwhile in the early Soviet times the biggest attention was directed towards the research of “culture”, later the object became broader.

## Literature

- Ackermann Robert 2008. Anthropology and the Classics, Kuklick H. (ed.) *A New History of Anthropology*, Oxford: Blackwell, p. 143–157.
- Alseikaitė-Gimbutienė Marija 1943. Pagoniškosios laidojimo apeigos Lietuvoje, *Gimtasai Kraštas: Tautotyros vienkartinis leidinys*, redagavo P. Bugailiškis, Šiauliai: Šiaulių Kraštotyros Draugija, p. 53–80.
- Anglickienė Laima 2008. *Lietuvių etnologijos istoriografija (XX a.)* Kaunas: Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas.
- Appadurai Arjun 2014[2000]. Grassroots Globalization and the Research Imagination, in: *Anthropology in Theory: Issues in Epistemology*, edited by H. L. Moore, T. Sanders. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, p. 535–546.
- Barnard Alan 2000. *History and Theory in Anthropology*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Basanavičius Jonas (red.). 1910. *Lietuvių tauta* I. Vilnius: M. Kuktos spaustuvė.
1919. *Lietuvių tauta* II. Vilnius: Švyturio spaustuvė.
- Benedict Ruth 2014[1934]. The Individual and the Pattern of Culture, in: *Anthropology in Theory: Issues in Epistemology*, edited by H. L. Moore, T. Sanders. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, p. 43–52.
- Boas Franz 2014[1932]. The Aims of Anthropological Research, in: *Anthropology in Theory: Issues in Epistemology*, edited by H. L. Moore, T. Sanders. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, p. 22–31.
- Bugailiškis P. 1941. Pratarė, *Gimtasai Kraštas: Etnografinės medžiagos rinkinys*, Nr. 1–2–(28–29), redagavo P. Bugailiškis, Vilnius: Lietuvos Mokslų Akademija, p. 1.
- Čepaitienė Auksuolė. 2014. Etnografija Lietuvoje: praktika ir (ar) teorija. XX a. tarpukario kontekstai, in: *Savas ir kitas šiuolaikiniais požiūriais / Contemporary Approaches to the Self and the Other*, sudarė V. Savoniakaitė. Vilnius: LII leidykla, p. 367–396.
- Čepienė Irena 2008. *Lietuvių etninė kultūra: raidos įžvalgos*, Vilnius: Alma litera.
- Čerbulėnas Klemensas 1941. Dar apie medžio ražinius, *Gimtasai Kraštas: Etnografinės medžiagos rinkinys*, nr. 1–2 (28–29), redagavo P. Bugailiškis, Vilnius: Lietuvos Mokslų Akademija, p. 64–78.
- 194–202.
- Česny G. (sud.). *Antropologinė žemaičių charakteristika. Višinskis Povilas: 123–159*. Vilnius: Valstybės žinios.
- Dundulienė Pranė 1991[1982]. *Lietuvos etnologija*. Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Eriksen Thomas H. 2010. The Challenges of Anthropology, *Int. J. Pluralism and Economics Education*, Vol. 1, No. 3, p.
- Galaunė Paulius 1934. Muziejininko darbas, *Gimtasai Kraštas nr. 1*. Kaunas: Šiaulių Kraštotyros Draugija, p. 8–11.
- Gerbiama skaitytojai...1995. *Mūsų kraštas*, Nr. 2/7, p. 3.
- Horch Miroslav. 2012. *Mažosios Europos tautos*. Vilnius: Mintis.
- Jackson Anthony, Reflections on ethnography at home and the ASA, A. Jackson (ed.) *Anthropology at Home*, Cambridge: University Press, 1987, p. 5.
- Jucevičius Liudvikas Adomas. 1959. *Raštai*. Lebedys J., Lukšienė M., Slaviūnas Z. (red.). Vilnius: Valstybinė grožinės literatūros leidykla.
- Juknevičius Petras 1996. Levandiškio dvarai, *Mūsų kraštas*, Nr. 1(8), p. 16–17.
- Jurginis J. 1939. Praeities palikimų ieškojimas, *Gimtasai Kraštas*, Nr. 1 (21), Šiauliai: „Aušros“ muziejus, p. 441–444.
- Kaschuba Wolfgang 2012. *Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie. 4., aktualisierte Auflage*, München: C.H.Beck.
- Kolupaila S. Prof. 1943. Vietovardžių logika, *Gimtasai Kraštas: Tautotyros vienkartinis leidinys*, redagavo P. Bugailiškis, Šiauliai: Šiaulių Kraštotyros Draugija, p. 111–126.
- Končius Ignas 1934. Gimtojo krašto pažinimas, *Gimtasai Kraštas*, Nr. 1, Kaunas: Šiaulių Kraštotyros Draugija, p. 3–6.

1934. Kraštui pažinti šios dienos darbo metmenys, *Gimtasai Kraštas*, Nr. 1, Kaunas: Šiaulių kraštotyros draugija, p. 6–8.
1943. Žemaičių padangės kryžių ir koplytėlių statistika, *Gimtasai Kraštas: Tautotyros vienkartinis leidinys*, redagavo P. Bugailiškis, Šiauliai: Šiaulių kraštotyros draugija, p. 136–172.
- Kroeber Alfred L. 2014[1952]. The Concept of Culture in Science, in: *Anthropology in Theory: Issues in Epistemology*, edited by H. L. Moore, T. Sanders. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, p. 32–36.
- Kronika 1939. *Gimtasai Kraštas*, Nr. 1 (21), Šiauliai: „Aušros“ muziejus, p. 560.
- Kronika 1941. *Gimtasai Kraštas: Etnografinės medžiagos rinkinys*, Nr. 1–2 (28–29), redagavo P. Bugailiškis, Vilnius: Lietuvos Mokslų Akademija, p. 159–160.
- Kuklick Henrika 2008. The British Tradition, Kuklick H. (ed.) *A New History of Anthropology*, Oxford: Blackwell, p. 52–78.
- Lazauskaitė Elvyda 2011a. Jonas Basanavičius, Savoniakaitė V (ed). *Lietuvos etnologijos ir antropologijos enciklopedija*. Vilnius: LII leidykla.
- 2011b. Lietuvių mokslo draugija. Savoniakaitė V (ed). *Lietuvos etnologijos ir antropologijos enciklopedija*. Vilnius: LII leidykla.
- Lingis Juozas 1939. Rinkinių tvarkymas kultūriname muziejuje, *Gimtasai Kraštas*, Nr. 1 (21), Šiauliai: „Aušros“ muziejus, p. 444–450.
- Löfgren, Orvar, 2001. Past and Present in European Ethnology: A Swedish Perspective, *Socialinės antropologijos ir etnologijos studijos*, 1(10), p. 85–98.
- Lukšienė Meilė. 1959. Liudvikas Adomas Jucevičius, Jucevičius L. A. *Raštai*: 5–52. Lebedys J., Lukšienė M., Slaviūnas Z. (red.). Vilnius: Valstybinė grožinės literatūros leidykla.
- Malinowski Bronislaw 1944. *A Scientific Theory of Culture and Other Essays*. With a Preface by Huntington Cairns, Capel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- 2014[1939]. The Group and the Individual in Functional Analysis, in: *Anthropology in Theory: Issues in Epistemology*, edited by H. L. Moore, T. Sanders. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, p. 90–101.
- Mažiulis Antanas 1941. Antalieptės skobtiniai karstai, *Gimtasai Kraštas: Etnografinės medžiagos rinkinys*, Nr. 1–2 (28–29), redagavo P. Bugailiškis, Vilnius: Lietuvos Mokslų Akademija, p. 78–81.
- Mead Margaret 1953. National Character, in: *Anthropology Today an Encyclopedic Inventory*, edited by A. L. Kroeber. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, p. 642–667.
- Merkienė Irena Regina 2011. Etnologijos institutas sovietmečio Lietuvoje mokslo politikos ir ideologijos kontekste, *Lietuvos Etnologija: socialinės antropologijos ir etnologijos studijos*, 11(20), sudarė Ž. Šaknys, p. 125–142.
- Merkys Vytautas. 1999. *Motiejus Valančius. Tarp universalizmo ir tautiškumo*. Vilnius: Mintis.
- Mickevičius J. 1943. 1863 m. sukilimas Žemaičiuose, *Gimtasai Kraštas: Tautotyros vienkartinis leidinys*, redagavo P. Bugailiškis, Šiauliai: Šiaulių kraštotyros draugija, p. 316–331.
- Milius Vacys 1994. Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto įnašas tyrinėjant etninę kultūrą, *Liaudies kultūra*, Nr. 2, p. 45–47.
- Milius Vacys. 2004. Etninės kultūros tyrinėjimai, Česnys G. (sud.). *Antropologinė žemaičių charakteristika. Višinskis Povilas*: 160–163. Vilnius: Valstybės žinios.
- Moore Henrietta L., Sanders Todd. 2014. Anthropology and Epistemology, in: *Anthropology in Theory: Issues in Epistemology*, edited by H. L. Moore, T. Sanders. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, p. 1–18.
- Mortensen Hans 1927. *Die litauische Wanderung*. Aus den Nachrichten der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Göttingen: Philologisch-Historische Klasse.
- Moszyński Kazimierz 1941. Kai kurie lietuvių liaudies muzikos instrumentai, *Gimtasai Kraštas: Etnografinės medžiagos rinkinys*, Nr. 1–2 (28–29), redagavo P. Bugailiškis, Vilnius: Lietuvos Mokslų Akademija, p. 51–64.
- Mūsų siekimai 1934. *Gimtasai Kraštas*, redagavo P. Bugailiškis, Nr. 1, Kaunas: Šiaulių kraštotyros draugija, p. 1–2.
- Paukštytė-Šaknienė Rasa 2009. Lietuvos etnologijos mokslas XX a. XXI a. pradžios periodiniuose ir tęstiniuose leidiniuose, *Istorija*, Nr. 73, p. 68–76.
- Penny Glenn H. 2008. Traditions in the German Language, Kuklick H. (ed.) *A New History of Anthropology*, Oxford: Blackwell, p. 79–95.
- Petkevičaitė G. 1934. 1863 metų tremtinių vargai, *Gimtasai Kraštas*, Nr. 1, Kaunas: Šiaulių kraštotyros draugija, p. 43–44.
- Petrulis Juozas 1944[1996]. Liaudies tipų bruožai, *Gimtasai Kraštas*, Nr. 32, sudarė P. Bugailiškis, redagavo V. Milius, R. Sabaliauskaitė, Vilnius: Lietuvos kraštotyros draugija, p. 35–39.
- Račus Aleksanda M. 1929. Gudonai (Gotai) Lietuvių tautos giminaičiai. Traktatas apie gudronų etnologiją, istoriją, gudronų viešpatavimą Italijoje ir Ispanijoje, numizmatiką, kalbą, pavardes etc. / Guthones (the Goths) Kinsmen of the Lituianian People, Chicago: Draugas Publishing Company.
- Rūkštelė Antanas 1934. Keramikos rinkiniai ir inventorizavimas, *Gimtasai Kraštas*, Nr. 1, Kaunas: Šiaulių kraštotyros draugija, p. 17–18.



- Savoniakaitė Vida. 2008a. Apie Lietuvos etnologijos istoriją, *Lituanistica*, Nr. 54, 3 (75), p. 51–58.
- 2008b. Lietuvos etnografija tarp savos kultūros tyrimų, *Lituanistica*, Nr. 54, 4 (76), p. 61–72.
2011. Etnologija, in: *Lietuvos etnologijos ir antropologijos enciklopedija*, sudarė V. Savoniakaitė, Vilnius: LII leidykla, p. 126–134.
2015. Baltic States beyond the Transition: New Approaches to Regional Research, in: *Beyond Transition? Memory and Identity Narratives in Eastern and Central Europe*, edited by Barbara Törnquist-Plewa, Niklas Bernsand & Eleonora Narvselius, Lund: Centre for European Studies at Lund University, 2015, p. 39–54.
- Shirokogoroff S. M. 1923. *Etnos. Issledovanije Osnovnyh Printsypov Izychenijja Etnicheskikh i Etnographicheskikh yavlenij.* Shanghai: Kelly & Walsh.  
<https://books.google.lt/books?id=F74qptail7MC&pg=PA43&lpg=PA43&dq=Shirokogoroff+S.+M.+1923.&source...> [žiūrėta 4-13-2015]
- Skrodenis Stasys 1985. Stukėnaitė-Decikienė Pr. 1941. Etnografiniai reikalai Vilniuje. 1. Lietuvių Mokslo Draugijos muziejus, *Gimtasai Kraštas: Etnografinės medžiagos rinkinys*, Nr. 1–2 (28–29), Vilnius: Lietuvos Mokslų Akademija, p. 149–152.
- Staliūnas Darius. 2015. Įvadas, D. Staliūnas (sud.). *Lietuvos erdvinės sampratos ilgajame XIX šimtmetyje*, Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos institutas, p. 7–20.
- Tarasenka P. 1934. Mūsų muziejų archeologiniai darbai, *Gimtasai Kraštas* Nr. 1, Kaunas: Šiaulių Kraštotyros Draugija, p. 11–14.
- Zdizichauskas Vladas 1943. Šiaulių Kraštotyros Draugijos bibliografija, *Gimtasai Kraštas: Tautotyros vienkartinis leidinys*, redagavo P. Bugailiškis, Šiauliai: Šiaulių Kraštotyros Draugija, p. 394–398.
- Znamierowska-Prüffer Maria 1941. Etnografiniai reikalai Vilniuje. 1. Vilniaus universiteto etnografijos muziejaus rinkiniai, *Gimtasai Kraštas: Etnografinės medžiagos rinkinys*, Nr. 1–2–(28–29), Vilnius: Lietuvos Mokslų Akademija, p. 153–157.
- Vadopalas. Antanas 1972 (1921). Lietuviški antropologiniai tipai / Lithuanian Anthropological Types. Čikaga: [Autoriaus leidinys].
- Valančius Motiejus. 1972a. *Rašai*, t. 1. Vilnius: Vaga.
- Valančius Motiejus. 1972b. *Rašai*, t. 2. Vilnius: Vaga.
- Višinskis Povilas. 1964. *Raštai*. Sprindis A. (sud.). Vilnius: Vaga.
- Wolf Eric R. 2014[1982]. Introduction to *Europe and the People Without History*, in: *Anthropology in Theory: Issues in Epistemology*, edited by H. L. Moore, T. Sanders, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, p. 293–307.