

Understanding a Discipline and its Object or the Unheroic History of Ethnology and Anthropology in Lithuania

Auksuolė Čepaitienė

DOI: 10.21104/CL.2016.2.01

Abstract Anthropological practices are local in craft, intellectual and disciplinary tradition, and they are just as different. The article will discuss the ways in which ethnology and anthropology are understood, constitute their identity in Lithuania in historical retrospection and among the spectrum of scientific domains, and which aspects appear significant in the process of their institutionalization. It highlights the historical roots of ethnology and anthropology in Lithuania traced to the intellectual environment of Vilnius University of the late 18th century and early 19th century; emphasizes the influences of cultural evolutionism and the Vienna school; discusses the efforts to institutionalize the disciplines within the contemporary politics of science in Lithuania; and claims of the disciplines for the future. The article concludes with an emphasis on the methodological value of ethnography that witnesses the vitality of ethnological and anthropological thought in Lithuania, and affirms the paradigmatic

uniqueness of ethnology and anthropology among the spectrum of sciences.

Keywords disciplining, history of ethnology and anthropology, ethnography as methodology, classificatory systems of science, Lithuania.

Contact Dr. Auksuolė Čepaitienė, Department of Ethnology and Anthropology, Lithuanian Institute of History, Kražių g. 5, LT-01108 Vilnius, Lithuania; e-mail: auksuole.cepaitiene@istorija.lt.

Jak citovat / How to cite Čepaitienė, Auksuolė. (2016). Understanding a Discipline and its Object or the Unheroic History of Ethnology and Anthropology in Lithuania. *Český lid* 103, 163–180. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.21104/CL.2016.2.01>

It is obvious that anthropology and related disciplines developed as modern fields of study which contribute to critical awareness about the cultural and social complexities of human worlds and matters. The mobility of contemporary life, full of unexpectedness, uncertainty, and alteration, afford a lot of issues to trace, and sometimes invite returning to places that are already familiar. Since the fall of the Soviet Union and Berlin Wall, the ethnology and anthropology of Eastern and Middle Europe has made a great shift in a variety of aspects, including disciplinary. The changes there went in different ways and took different perspectives, but one point became clear – this large geographical space is neither monolithic nor as homogeneous as political and geopolitical studies had suggested previously (Berdahl 2000; Hann 2007).

Anthropologists say that anthropological practices are local in craft, intellectual and disciplinary tradition, and they are just as different. The way of development of ethnological and anthropological epistemology in Lithuania is one such case. Discoveries, ruptures, reassessments and reinventions of its intellectual tradition went in accord to historical and political challenges and complexities, needs and visions of society throughout the past two centuries.

Institutionalization of ethnology and anthropology in Lithuania has been discussed by many scholars (Ciubrinskas [Čiubrinskas] 2015; 2001; Šaknys 2011; Savoniakaitė 2008a; 2008b; Apanavičius 2009; Milius 1993; Merkienė 2011; Dundulienė 1978 and etc.). But scholarly identity and institutional place of anthropology and ethnology remains uncertain and marginal, with still very few people working in the field. The disciplines are challenged by the other fields of inquiry despite the variety of efforts taken since the 1990s. Nevertheless, the issue of their development remains on the agenda and provokes serious debates among the academic community, and ethnologists and anthropologists themselves. A question similar to that once asked by Martyn Hammersley (Hammersley 2001) then arises – what's wrong with ethnography, ethnology and anthropology? Or, to be more precise – what's wrong with them in Lithuania?

The article will discuss the ways in which ethnology and anthropology in Lithuania are and have been perceived as disciplines, and what aspects appear significant in the process of their institutionalization. Historical retrospection is a resourceful context of discussion. Anthropology and ethnology here are treated as related disciplines leaving aside the aspect of their contest already revealed by Čiubrinskas (Ciubrinskas 2015). They both provide knowledge for cultural understanding of human worlds and human behaviour. The approach in Lithuania is represented by the journal 'Lithuanian Ethnology: Studies in Social Anthropology and Ethnology'.

Conceptually, the article takes into account James Clifford's attitude to disciplinary formation as a process of 'disciplining' (Clifford 2005). Clifford claims the four theoretico-practical components of object, method, paradigm and telos

at the core of a discipline, and says that during the first three quarters of the 20th century the community of anthropologists managed to agree on them, postulating that the ‘object is “primitive” societies; the method is “fieldwork”; the paradigm is “culture”; the telos is “Man”’ (Clifford 2005: 37). However today, he underlines, they are contested, and no longer look as natural as before – anthropology is experiencing its moment of re-articulation (Clifford 2005: 40–45). Alberto Jiménez’s insight that the knowledge is fashioned and redistributed in society through a form of administration is significant for the discussion in the article as well (Jiménez 2007). Administration relates inside and outside perspectives and makes the discipline visible in society and among the academic community. However, it appears that consideration of the ‘paradigmatic tradition’ which refers to local historical and intellectual concerns and to anthropology in general, outlined by Georg Stocking, is no less significant in the understanding of the process of disciplining (Stocking 1992).

The article begins with historical foundations traced to the late 18th century and early 19th century, when anthropological and ethnological concepts and anthropological reasoning emerged in the intellectual surrounding of Vilnius University. The influences of cultural evolutionism and the Vienna school are of note here as well as the disciplinary situation of the 1920s–1930s. The article continues showing the ways in which the disciplinary place is shaped by the politics of science, and the formalities of classification systems of science and studies. Although science today lays strong emphasis on technological development and R&D, the strategy of the social sciences and the humanities, with three separate fields of anthropology, ethnology and folklore, insists in claiming its way for future. In conclusion, the article emphasizes the methodological value of ethnography in retaining the disciplinary identity of ethnology and anthropology in Lithuania that the fragmented history and practice has illuminated.

Historical foundations

The roots of ethnological and anthropological epistemology in Lithuania are traced to the intellectual environment of Vilnius University of the late 18th century and early 19th century (Maciūnas 1939; Dundulienė 1978). The turn of the 18th century and 19th century was a dramatic time marked by political and social challenges, the loss of statehood in 1795, and, in contrary, by the development of scientific thought and disciplines, the discovery of the ‘other’, and of a local *peasant*, that indigenous ‘other’, ‘local exotics’ and an interesting object of study (cf. Posern-Zieliński 1995; Wyngaard 2004; Čepaitienė 2011). The ideas of the Enlightenment, and French economic thought of physiocracy made a considerable impact on the intellectual contexts of Vilnius University at the time. The physiocratic principle that the national wealth and economic vitality of society is based on local resources, natural law, private property,

individualism and *laissez faire*, social significance of peasantry and its education, land agriculture and labour as a source of value (cf. Jučas 1997) encouraged in Lithuania particular attention to science and an inward perspective of looking (cf. Savoniakaitė 2008b). Moreover, the intellectual environment of Vilnius University was a context where a paradigmatic turn to cultural reasoning of human phenomena emerged.

The first event that marks the beginnings of anthropological and ethnological thinking is the contribution by the naturalist, travel writer and ethnologist Georg Forster, who participated at Captain James Cook's second expedition of 1772–1775 around the globe. Forster was invited to head the Chair of Natural History (*Historiae naturalis*) at Vilnius University, and was expected to investigate local natural resources and to assess the economic, agricultural and medical value of the local vegetation (Švambarytė 2009). Teaching the courses in botany, mineralogy, and zoology with chapters from palaeontology, anthropology and ethnography in 1784–1787, collecting specimens in the Vilnius surroundings, and giving public lectures for Vilnius audiences, he encouraged concern for the universality of natural history and the practice of empirical observation and collecting (Kudaba 1988). Forster, whilst staying at Vilnius University, wrote the outline of New Holland and British Colony at Botany Bay ('Neuholland und die brittische Colonie in Botany-Bay', 1786), an article in which he debated with Immanuel Kant on the concept of race ('Noch etwas über die Menschenrassen', 1786), and the other works.

The second event is the establishment of the Chair of History at Vilnius University in 1783, and the theoretical development of history by Joachim Lelewel, a graduate of Vilnius University and a radical leftist (cf. Norkus 2015). Influenced by Voltaire, Adam Ferguson, David Hume, Johann Gottfried Herder, Immanuel Kant, William Robertson, Leopold von Ranke, Friedrich Rühls, Johann Ernst Fabri and others, he saw history in the broad sense as a general state of being of human beings, societies and nature in time (Lelewel 1815: 34; 1964). According to him, anthropological, ethnological and ethnographic knowledge is methodologically significant in elucidating the history of a nation. He included the definitions of anthropology, ethnology and ethnography into his work *Historyka tudzież o łatwym i pożytecznym nauczaniu historyi* (Historyka or an Easy and Useful Teaching of History) on methodology of history that was published in Vilnius in 1815 (Lelewel 1815). Anthropology and ethnology here are understood as revealing the connections (between national unions and nations) regarding physical form and structure, the origin of languages, religions, and variety of attitudes inherited from ancestry, the degree of perfection of a body and the vitality of spirit, the progress of a word perfection, the potency of mind, and national character that allows identification of capabilities and inclinations, and reasons, principles and interconnections (Lelewel 1815: 34–35). Ethnology, according to his view, is comparable to historical anthropology, while ethnography is an outline of human matters of

a given moment, and is a domain of history (Lelewel 1964: 101, 143–145, 282). Moreover, he considered history related to geography or political geography and statistics with maps as its dominant component (Norkus 2015).

The third event is the book *Antropologia o własnościach człowieka fizycznych i moralnych* (Anthropology of Physical and Moral Traits of a Human Being) by Józef Jasiński, a physician, a surgeon and a physiocrat, graduate of the Medical School of Vilnius University, which was published in Vilnius, 1818 (Tunaitis 2004; Jasiński 1818). The book is likely inspired by Ernst Platner's well-known work *Anthropologie für Aerzte und Weltweise*, 1772 (Anthropology for Physicians and the Worldwide) mentioned in the introduction. Jasiński presents in the book the concept of anthropology defining it as a science concerned with physical and moral properties of a human being that determine his value and place him above other physical creatures. A human being is seen as an organic, social and psychological creature: physical features of organic life connect him to the earth, but he feels necessity to be associated with society, in which he is born, lives, improves and has to stay due to his primary needs; human ties are forged through pain. Describing the social aspects, Jasiński speaks about the relationship between custom and norm, and refers to Rousseau and Montesquieu. He considers obtaining food as a primary human need, and identifies four primordial states of human groupings: gathering; fishing and hunting; pastoralism; and agriculture (Jasiński 1818: V–XX, 47–55).

All these cases illuminate the early influence of German anthropological and ethnological thought, of French and Scottish Enlightenment, and Volterian understanding of history, and the discovery of a cultural aspect (cf. Eriksen – Nielsen 2001: 1–19). Anthropological and ethnological thinking here appears in the contexts of natural history, history and medical science – the constellation of the natural sciences, the social sciences and the humanities that Stocking calls an ‘umbrella association’ nourished by contemporary anthropologists as well (Stocking 1992: 342). Such disciplinary estimation refers to the universalistic style of thinking about the nature of humanity, and contains, as it might be said today, the aspects of multi-, inter-, or actually the proto-disciplinary considerations. Significantly, universalistic attitude to ethnology in Lithuania had its continuity across the 19th century and 20th century and was organized around the place-centred interest of *knowing the country and its people*.

The turn of the 18th century and the 19th century is marked also by the positivistic approach and the practice of collecting. Professors of Vilnius University, students and amateurs took part in collecting of knowledge, ‘customs’ and specimens. It was a novel kind of social activity – like fieldwork – reasoned by the line of distinction *between a man of common observation and a man of scientific observation* brought by Enlightenment and extended further into making the familiar strange, and the strange familiar (cf. Gow 2009; Spiro 1991; Čepaitienė 2011). Indigenous or ethno-knowledge was an

object of observation and collection, and was treated as an empirical material useful for the development of sciences such as history, language, literature, law, and statistics, as well as physics, geology, geography, medicine and agriculture. At that time, questionnaires, notes and publications in the journals published in Vilnius underline the scientific value of rural folk customs and artefacts. The knowledge they provide was conceptualized within the ideas of antiquity, comparison, and progress: 'If we wish to get knowledge from our customs about archaic traditions and their similarity to ancient nations we need to get to know folk customs from all provinces, voivode districts and districts' ([Szydłowski] 1819). Folk songs and wedding customs attracted attention first. However, academic life and activities were interrupted in 1832 when Vilnius University was closed¹ after the uprising of 1831.

Interests in ethnology and anthropology re-emerged in the late 19th century during the period of the Lithuanian National Revival when the language, culture and self-consciousness were assessed, consolidating a nation. The contours of national identity were formulated in accord to 'the value of ethnographic law' (Klimas 1917). Indeed, ethnology and in particular ethnography gained political connotations within the Herderian sense (cf. Ciubrinskas 2015), but not only. The Lithuanian Society of Science (*Lietuvių mokslo draugija*),² which was established in 1907, aimed to study the nation and its inhabited country. Its founding father, Jonas Basanavičius, a physician and a member of the Vienna Anthropological Society who did research in physical anthropology, ethnography and folklore, said in his inaugurating speech that science in Lithuania was still waiting for the studies from anthropological, ethnological, ethnographic, archaeological, and the other points of view. Although the Society accommodated both social and natural sciences, the first paragraph of its statute stated that it aimed to study anthropology and ethnography of Lithuania (Milius 1993). The Folklore Commission of the Society issued a programme, *Trumpa folkloro dalykams rinkti programa*, 1910 for collecting of folklore materials including material artefacts. It laid attention to the customs, beliefs, oral traditions and narratives about the objects of nature, spirits, life cycle rituals, birth and death, occupation and daily life, folk medicine, customary law and festivities. The schedule of systematisation was taken from British folklorist George Lawrence Gomme's book *Ethnology in Folklore*, 1892, translated into Polish in 1901 as a manual for the students of lore – *Folklor: podręcznik dla zajmujących się ludoznawstwem*. Gomme, as

1 There were attempts to revive the scientific activities establishing Vilnius Temporary Archaeological Commission 1855–1865 and Vilnius Museum of Antiquities. However, the Commission functioned shortly.

2 Some of the members of the Society were the former members of the other scientific societies such as Russian Imperial Geographical Society, established in 1845 in Saint Petersburg, Russia, or the Lithuanian Literature Society 1879–1923, established in Tilsit, Prussia. There were also attempts to establish the Lithuanian Scientific Society (*Lietuvių mokslo draugystė*) in the United States, which functioned in 1886–1896 in Baltimore.

well as Edward B. Tylor, is an influential representative of cultural evolutionism in Great Britain, however in the field of folklore. His theoretical thoughts, methodological approaches, and inward perspective of looking, undoubtedly, found responses among those who intended to develop scientific concerns in Lithuania. His ideas on ‘survivals of ancient customs and beliefs’, ‘peasant culture’, folklore as an historical science, and ethnology in folklore are reflected in the publications of Lithuanian ethnographers and folklorists, and in that time scholarly tradition of Lithuanian ethnology.

Ethnology, anthropology and ethnography in general were seen as studies of cultures and peoples of the world within their physical, social and cultural forms. The large work *Ethnologija arba mokslas apie žemės tautas* (Ethnology or the Science on the Peoples of the Earth) was published in the Lithuanian language in Chicago, 1903, and was awarded the Lithuanian medal of a world’s fair – the Exposition Universelle of 1900 in Paris. The book is an ethnographic outline of human groups and races of all continents. It was compiled and translated by a publisher from the works of Michael Haberlandt and Charles Jean-Marie Letourneau. The definition of ethnology here is just a slightly edited Haberlandt’s version from his *Ethnology*, 1900: ‘ethnology is a science, which acquaints with various small and large groups of human beings, dispersed over the face of the earth, and describes the ‘appearance’ and mental characteristics of various national groups living on the earth’ (Šernas 1903: 3). Letourneau’s thoughts on human differentiation and political evolution of the human race once again were approached later in 1920s–1930s by the students of sociology of Vytautas Magnus University in Kaunas (e.g., Leonas 1995 [1939]: 3). The 1920s–1930s were a time of institutionalization of sciences as university disciplines, and anthropology and ethnology were introduced in public by the articles in journals *Kultūra* (Culture), *Kosmos*, or *Gimtasai kraštas* (Native country) (e.g., Endziulaitytė-Gyliienė 1926; Končius 1934). They reflected on disciplines at large, for example, with Pierre Broca seeing anthropology as the history of the origin of mankind.

‘However, Broca’s notion of anthropology might be expanded and understood wider or narrower. Anthropology according to the nature of its object splits into two parts, actually into physical or somatic (=bodily) that means anthropology in its narrow sense, and psychic (mental) that is understood as ethnology and ethnography. [...] The aim of psychic anthropology is the study of the mental life of social groups (nations, classes). [...] The area of action of mental anthropology is defined by the borders of primitive cultures, because the history of higher cultures is already appropriated by the sciences established since long ago such as history, cultural history and the other.’ (Endziulaitytė-Gyliienė 1926: 156–157)

Anthropology was defined as a study of a human being and human races – living organisms – with attention to outward features, and in search for similarities and differences (Končius 1934). It was considered related to physical anthropology, prehistory, primatology, psychology, social anthropology, ethnology, ethnography, archaeology, comparative linguistics, comparative mythology, and anthropogeography as well as to geography, cultural history, sociology and hygiene. Ethnology in turn was interpreted as a study of peculiarities of connections and diffusions among different nations that include outward traits, daily life, culture and living environment (Končius 1934). The ethnological programme for collecting Lithuanian knowledge and antiquities for the study of a nation (*Lietuvių tautotyros žinių ir senienu rinkimo programa*, 1925) by Petras Būtėnas included geographic and historical issues; farmsteads, buildings and their interior; clothing and decorations; food and drinking; lifestyles, crafts and works; family and rituals, and the other national features; ancient gods and beliefs (and calendar festivities); language and human creativity; customary law; human technique; description of river basins; grave inscriptions; collecting of material culture; Lithuanian national sports (Būtėnas 1925). In this programme, the term *tautotyra* ('a study of a nation'), analogous to *Volkskunde* in German or to *ludoznawstwo* in Polish, was used instead of the term 'ethnographic knowledge' (*etnografijos (tautotyros) žinios*) (Čepaitienė 2014). Later, the second term *etnika* ('ethnic studies') was coined. They both consider a multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary approach that might be comprehended, rephrasing Spiro, as an 'ethnoscience of Lithuanian culture' (Spiro 1991: 9). Ethnography was left to define the study of distant, primitive, and exotic world cultures and races.

And there is one more aspect to be emphasized. Disciplinary identities of ethnology, ethnography and anthropology in the 1920s–1930s were influenced by two schools and theories – cultural and social evolutionism and the Vienna school of ethnology, with the ideas of evolution and place, ancient and typical. The impact of theories concerned the scholarship, but no less it concerned the disciplinary understandings in a quite ambiguous way.

Johannes Fabian in his *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes its Object* speaks about anthropology's claim to power that originated at its roots, and says that there is no knowledge about 'the other' which is not also a temporal, historical, and a political act (Fabian 1983: 1). He quotes J. M. Degérando on the philosophical traveller sailing to the ends of the earth, but in fact traveling in time, and exploring the past where every step he makes is the passage of an age. Fabian goes on further with evolution and spatialized naturalization of time, and suggests that the relationships between parts of the world as natural and socio-cultural entities are understood within temporal relations – dispersal in space actually reflects sequence in time (Fabian 1983: 7, 11–12). These thoughts are about 'the other' who is distinct, and far away. But what happens when 'the other' as object of study is a part of the same society and carries the

same name? Dispersal in space then appears to be dispersal in social space, where all are natives. And evolutionary sequencing of time, which however is hierarchical, returns to the question of what ‘the other’ is, and what the disciplines of anthropology, ethnology and ethnography are all about.

Institutional trajectories

It is generally agreed that the institutional history of ethnology in Lithuania begins before World War II, when the Department of Ethnic Studies (*Etnikos katedra*) at the Vytautas Magnus University in Kaunas³ (1934), and the Department of Ethnology and Ethnography at Stefan Batory University in Vilnius⁴ (1927) were established (cf. Čiubrinskas 2001; Apanavičius 2009). The Department of Ethnic Studies in Kaunas offered courses in folklore studies, mythology, Lithuanian literature, history of Lithuanian and folk art, prehistory and archaeology – the subjects seen through the lens of the *ethnic* and with particular attention to folklore. A research institution – the Lithuanian Folklore Archive – was established in Kaunas in 1935. The Department of Ethnology and Ethnography at Stefan Batory University in Vilnius provided courses in ethnography, research methods, the ethnology of Poland and of the world, philosophy, psychology, and prehistory (Apanavičius 2009). Its scholarly interests rested in ethnology with concern to cultural history, however its impact to Lithuanian scholarship at that time was limited.

But the institutional place of ethnology and ethnography in the 1920s –1930s remained marginal. When the disciplines of history, linguistics and folklore were clustered under the research Institute of Lithuanistic Studies in 1939, ethnology and ethnography were left aside. Ethnology or, more precisely, ethnography instead was sheltered in the province by Šiauliai Local Lore Society and Šiauliai ‘Aušra’ museum as of 1934. The museum organized ethnographic field researches and their publication in the journal *Gimtasai kraštas* (Čepaitienė 2014). Only in 1941 were the scholarships of Vytautas Magnus University, Šiauliai ‘Aušra’ museum and Stefan Batory University joined under the Institute of Ethnology in Vilnius, which existed till 1944 (Merkiene 2011).

After World War II there were intentions to keep the discipline of ethnology, named ‘ethnography’, alive at the Vilnius University, but they gradually failed. Throughout the whole Soviet period the discipline stayed a subfield of history. It was just a subject taught for students of history, like folklore was a subject of Lithuanian literature, and anthropology was absent in the curriculum with the exception of physical anthropology being a subject of medical studies. Doctoral dissertations in ethnography, of which there were few,

3 Kaunas was the temporal capital of Lithuania in the interwar period.

4 Vilnius and Vilnius region was under the control of the Second Polish Republic in 1922–1939.

at that time were done in the field of history, and often under supervision from the N. N. Miklukho-Maklai Institute of Ethnography, Academy of Science of the USSR, in Moscow, or the Institute of Study of Arts, Ethnography and Folklore, Academy of Sciences of Belorussia SSR, in Minsk (Šaknys 2004). The researches in ethnography on traditional Lithuanian folk, or in fact peasant culture, its material forms, daily life, and Soviet lifestyles were done mainly at the Department of Ethnography of the Institute of History of Academy of Sciences of Lithuanian SSR. The ‘patriotism’ of the ethnographers of the Institute was implicitly keeping the continuity of interwar ethnographic scholarly tradition of Šiauliai ‘Aušra’ museum, and the journal *Gimtasai kraštas*. Significantly, in 1953 the disciplinary split occurred between ethnography and folklore when the archive materials were shared between the Institute of Lithuanian Language and Literature, and the Institute of History. Folklorists of the Institute of Lithuanian Language and Literature inherited almost all the archives of the previous Lithuanian Society of Science and Lithuanian Folklore Archive, while ethnographers of the Institute of History inherited just a small part, which consisted of records on beliefs to be continued. But it appeared that it was impossible to continue the study on beliefs in the same methodological way. The split between archives actually confirmed the methodological and epistemological slot between ethnography and folklore studies. Since then, the ethnographers of the Institute created an ethnographic archive based on their field researches and questionnaires (Šaknys 2011: 12). Throughout the Soviet period and until today, ethnography as methodology remains the ground of researches done at the Department of Ethnography. In 1996 the Department was renamed to the Department of Ethnology, and in 2016 to the Department of Ethnology and Anthropology.

The fundamental changes in disciplinary positions started with the Independence of Lithuania in 1990, and with the reform of science and education. Ethnology and anthropology entered the universities. The first institution founded in 1990 was the Department of Anthropology at the Faculty of Social Sciences in the re-opened Vytautas Magnus University in Kaunas. It was established with assistance from the scholars of Lithuanian Diaspora in the USA, and its study programme was based on cultural anthropology within its four fields (Ciubrinskas 2015: 177–178). However, in 1993 the Department of Anthropology was restructured into the Department of Ethnology and Folklore Studies at the Faculty of the Humanities with teaching staff of ethnologists from the Lithuanian Institute of History, and folklorists from the Institute of Lithuanian Literature and Folklore. The newly reorganized Department offered a BA study programme in ethnology, an MA study programme in ethnic culture, and doctoral studies in the field of ethnology (07H). It intended to continue the paradigmatic tradition of ethnic studies of interwar Vytautas Magnus University (Apanavičius 2009). But the curriculum composed of folklore studies, folk art, literature studies, ethnography, archaeology, and

ethnomusicology was supplemented with the introductory courses into sociology, and physical and cultural anthropology, world cultures, culture and personality, religious studies – a majority of them left from the previous programme of cultural anthropology. Later they were replaced with subjects in history of antique culture, medieval studies, modern philosophy and modern history, ethnic culture, comparative studies of culture, contemporary ethnic processes, ethnosociology, cultural theory and cultural studies, political and social theories, and semiotics. Evidently, the disciplinary boundaries of ethnology (ethnography) and folklore studies were opened widely. It was considered that supplementing the ethnological studies with the subjects from anthropology, cultural studies and history, sociology, and religious studies establishes more possibilities for the field (Apanavičius 2009). When in 2012 two study programmes on Baltic area cultures and East Asian cultures and languages were established at the Department, it was renamed the Department of Cultural Studies and Ethnology.

The process of institutionalization shows that ethnology is interpreted as interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary or multidisciplinary field with ‘the alignment of skills from different perspectives’ or ‘a common framework shared across disciplines to which each contributes its bit’ (Strathern 2005: [127]). Its framework rests on the twofold aspect of an object – on a concept of *ethnic*, and a concept of *culture* that ranges from anthropological understanding to sociological interpretation, to activities associated to arts, or, even, to the aspect of ‘well-educated’. Such understanding of ‘culture’ keeps boundaries widely open not only for variety of subject constellations but for a variety of methodologies. And ethnology stays perceived as the ‘ethnoscience of Lithuanian culture’. Although from the outside, and may be even for some inside the discipline, its object looks old-fashioned, messy and unproductive without relation to contemporary social life, its actualities and possibilities to apply (cf. Ciubrinskas 2015).

Since 1991 there were attempts to establish anthropology at the Faculty of History, Vilnius University with the co-operation of Scandinavian anthropologists at Copenhagen and Lund universities, and with support from the Open Society Fund Lithuania (the Soros Foundation) and the Nordic Council of Ministers (Ciubrinskas 2015: 178–179). An informal Centre for Social Anthropology and Ethnology was established in 1996. The courses in anthropology, the lectures of visiting professors, student exchange programmes, seminars organized each year, and the first International Nordic-Baltic School of Anthropology for research students (1996) made a considerable impact on the development of a discipline, its popularity among students, and its intellectual influence to ethnologists, and historians. To emphasize, it contributed to anthropologization of ethnology on a large scale (cf. Ciubrinskas 2015: 176–177). The BA Programme in Cultural History and Anthropology that was established at Vilnius University in 2001 is still alive today. However, the

Centre at Vilnius University was closed in 2003, and social anthropology shifted to Vytautas Magnus University to the Department of Sociology. This institutional shift actually was a paradigmatic shift of social anthropology from history to sociology. There the MA programme was established in 2004, and the Centre for Social Anthropology was founded in 2005. Until today it is the only programme in social anthropology in the country (Ciubrinskas 2015: 179–180). Moreover, the BA programme with the title of ‘Sociology and anthropology’ was established in 2013 although its BA degrees are classified in the field of sociology as are PhD dissertations. A considerable number of students graduated social anthropology at Vytautas Magnus University. However, the discipline remains almost invisible in the public sphere with the comments and discourses from the anthropological point of view being very rare as compared to sociologists, historians or philosophers. The public disciplinary image seems stays as it was in 1920s–1930s – anthropology is understood as the study of primitive and exotic societies. This time the exoticization just shifts from societies to social and cultural phenomena.

Evidently, institutional solutions of the 1990s and 2000s suggest a kind of disciplinary ‘bricolage’ of ethnology and anthropology as of multi- or interdisciplinary fields where ethnology is seen within a universalistic style of thinking while social anthropology – as a part of sociology – is adequate, for example, to social issues or demography. Disciplinary uniqueness then appears guarded informally by the tradition of ethnographic research. According to Jiménez, administration carries the scientific knowledge over, ‘publicizes’, and institutionalizes it (Jiménez 2007: 53). Institutions take the knowledge as scholarship, and as a subject potential and resonant to social needs and applicable for standardization, and build their own constellations. Then the politics of science at large appears no less significant in the process of disciplining, and framing the institutional forms of scholarships.

Strategies, taxonomies and practices

Science and education in Lithuania underwent a reorganization in the structural and intellectual sense in terms of post-Soviet transformations and adherence to European standards and integration. The national strategy for development of science and technology aligned with the vision to change society and economy towards innovative, knowledge-based and sustainable social development. It was emphasized that technological advances and innovation are the core of economic and cultural progress that alter the quality of life, and the strategy for development of research and technology is an essential part of the general national development (*Lithuanian Science and Technology White Paper* 2002). The policy-makers of social sciences and the humanities, however, have paid attention to the fact that the central category and concept of Lithuanian science politics is scientific research and experimental development (R&D)

(*moksliniai tyrimai ir eksperimentinė plėtra*), which is a direct translation into the Lithuanian language from *Frascati Manual*, 2002, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (Viliūnas 2004b: 48). The general model inherent in the policy of OECD underlines the development of natural sciences and engineering, and leaves the social sciences as secondary and the humanities in a marginal place allocated close to service activities (Viliūnas 2004b). The magic of high technologies surrounds science in Lithuania as well. Technological advancement and modernity appear influential agents that impact the social and political assessment of science, taxonomic relationships between its fields, and their practical development. But no less significant is the international recognition of a scholarship.

In 2013 a group of ethnologists in Lithuania created a description of the ethnology and folklore study field, which when passed as an Order of the Minister of Education and Science becomes an official document that institutionalizes the field, and aids high schools and universities in making, renewing and evaluating the quality of study programmes. This is in the line with the classification system of studies that provide the standards for the governance of institutions and study programmes. Among a variety of comments on the description there was one that expressed a critical assessment of the main concept, which said that the establishment of ethnology and folklore studies as a field of study was artificial and unmotivated, because such classification is not based on any international documents and does not exist in international classifications. It said that, traditionally, the researches in this field in Lithuania have been done by teams of specialists from various disciplines.

The classification systems of science or studies provide the normative standardization of science, its fields and subfields, and correlate to international conceptualization and national scholarships. They justify the uniqueness of knowledge, methodology and theory, and are the instruments to administration of science at its core, and on the level of governance and funding. Indeed, social relationships flow in and out of them (Jiménez 2007: 53). It seems that classification systems are quite uniform, stable and harmonised outcomes developed in accord to general understandings of science. However, there is a variety of systematizations, international and national. No two systems are identical as no two lists of anthropology nor its sub-fields the same either (Ingold 2015: 341–342). The systems differ according to the idea, purpose and criteria each system has. Moreover, they change as they are revised from time to time following the needs of societies, and the growth of sciences.

As the dominant forms of systematization Lithuania prioritizes the approaches suggested by internationally recognized methodology of the OECD, and by the European Research Council (ERC) although they are quite different. And really, neither provide the disciplinary association of ethnology and folklore studies put together. The latest version of the OECD's *Revisited field of science and technology (FOS) classification in the Frascati Manual*, 2007, places

ethnology and folklore studies in different domains of the social studies and humanities. It puts the subfield of ethnology together with the subfield of anthropology in the field of '5.4. Sociology' of '5. Social sciences' while the subfield of folklore studies is set in the field of '6.4. Arts' of '6. Humanities'. Moreover, the last edition of *Frascati Manual*, 2015, which presents just a list of fields of R&D, neither mentions ethnology or anthropology, nor folklore studies (OECD 2015: 59). There are positions of '5.9. Other social studies' or '6.5. Other humanities' left for such, let's say, unpredictable cases.

Evidently, the national strategies and systematizations remain significant in the defining and institutionalizing of disciplines. In Lithuania there are two main systems – one is the already mentioned classification of studies applicable to institutions and study programmes, and the other is the classification of sciences applicable to institutions, researches and doctoral studies. To be included into one or another system means to be positioned as a study programme or a research field with institutional and funding possibilities. Classifications establish a bureaucratic line for a discipline, define taxonomic relationships between the fields and subfields, and provide the standards for their governance, funding and accountability.

According to the current list of Classification of the Fields of Science, 2012, signed as an Order of the Minister of Education and Science, ethnology (07H) is treated as an independent field of the Humanities. Its place is adequate to that of history (05H), philology (04H), philosophy (01H) or arts (03H). From the institutional point of view, ethnology might then apply to three levels of education, including BA, MA and PhD studies, and the research programmes. However, anthropology as an independent field is absent there. Drawing on the previous classification system of 1998, it might be presumed that anthropology will remain a subfield of sociology (05S) presented together with ethnology under the title of 'cultural anthropology and ethnology' (S220). The classification system of 1998 also provides more information about the composition of the field of ethnology (07H). It shows that ethnology is built up from subfields such as regional history, historical geography beginning with the Middle Ages, archaeology and prehistory, history of art, musicology and theatre studies, onomastics and folklore studies. But all of those subfields belong to other fields and methodologies, such as history, the arts or philology. Evidently, there is no any particular subfield in ethnology that would represent its methodological and theoretical uniqueness.

To underline, the classificatory place of the disciplines of ethnology and anthropology in the national documentation on science places them somewhere in between. This relates to their academic and public positions as well. Their individuality is outlined and exposed only in the strategy for the development of social sciences and the humanities established in 2004 (Viliūnas 2004a). There anthropology, ethnology and folklore studies are classified as three different fields of social sciences and the humanities out of nineteen. They are

conceptualized and described as fields with different histories, institutions, thematic approaches and future perspectives (Čiubrinskas 2004; Šaknys 2004; Sauka – Stundžienė 2004). And their outlines in turn are keeping the points that open space for negation, interdisciplinary considerations or constellations.

Anthropologists discussing the issues of institutionalization and disciplining quite often emphasize their own responsibilities and inside perspectives. But bureaucratic formalities and official considerations from outside are no less significant. Formalities shape the institutional forms of disciplines, establish possibilities to allocate funding, make work and study places, define the relationships between different disciplines or form attitudes concerning disciplinary applicability. However, all in all the development of epistemology returns to scientific communities as ‘collectives of thought’ (from Fleck, see Edwards – Harvey – Wade 2007), and reinforces the aspect of practice on a significant scale. Then encounters with the ways in which epistemologies are disciplined just illuminate the complexity of perspectives that surround ethnological and anthropological approaches and scholarships.

Conclusion: The methodological value of ethnography

Algirdas Julius Greimas’s once said that ‘the science begins from defining its object and developing its methods, but not from the data collected by chance’ (Greimas 1979: 15; cf. Čiubrinskas 2001). In the case of ethnology and anthropology, it is ethnography that stands for methods and methodology essentially. Anthropologists evaluate literary capacities of ethnography and its mastery of language to present a text and description, and postulate its uniqueness as of method and methodology (e.g. Hammersley 2001; Clifford 2005: 38). Ingold in turn underlines ethnography and anthropology as distinct states of being (Ingold 2008; 2014). But without ethnography as a method and scientific practice, ethnology and anthropology stay just a text, a discourse, literature, or, as is often said in Lithuania, a ‘philosophy’, but not epistemology, which approaches human reality *in situ* within its micro-complexity and diversity of perspectives. Strathern, when asked ‘[h]ow aware are you of interdisciplinarity in your career? Is it something you have consciously striven for?’ answers ‘[n]o! I assume that what I do is anthropology. But your question made me reflect on that. I have an *ethnographic* approach to discussions coming from other disciplines – they are all products of a particular culture or society – and use them as source materials’ (Strathern 2005: 128).

The ethnological and anthropological legacy in Lithuania, though fragmented and small in size, is informative about the formation of its paradigmatic tradition. Its historical path has shown that it was the specific practice of the collecting of knowledge that carried ethnological and anthropological curiosity across the ruptures and disorders of historical worlds. The basic line of distinction *between a man of common observation and a man of scientific*

observation established in the late 18th century and early 19th century was that heuristic event which unfolded the epistemological perspective to the future. Then anytime cultural reasoning of human phenomena was approached in Lithuania, ethnography as the practice of *scientific observation* (and collection) played its role in the production of that particular knowledge; the history shows that ethnography as method and methodology is inseparable from the paradigmatic uniqueness and intellectual potentiality of ethnology and anthropology among the spectrum of sciences.

May 2016

Literature

- Apanavičius, Romualdas. 2009. Etnologijos studijos Lietuvoje 1927–2005 metais. *Lietuvos etnologija: socialinės antropologijos ir etnologijos studijos* 9, 18: 139–164.
- Berdahl, Daphne. 2000. Introduction: An Anthropology of Postsocialism. In: Berdahl, D. – Bunzl, M. – Lampland, M. (eds.): *Altering States: Ethnographies of Transition in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press: 1–13.
- Būtėnas, Petras. 1925. *Lietuvių tautotyros žinių ir senienų rinkimo programa*. Šiauliai: „Vilties“ draugijos leidinys.
- Ciubrinskas, Vytis. 2015. Contested Disciplines in New Europe: Ethnology and Sociocultural Anthropology in Lithuania. In: Adam, B. – Retka, T. (eds): *Rytíř z Komárova: K 70. narozeninám Petra Skalníka / Knight from Komárov: To Petr Skalník for his 70th birthday*. Praha: AntropoWeb: 171–185.
- Clifford, James. 2005. Rearticulating Anthropology. In: Segal, D. A. – Yanagisako, S. J. (eds.): *Unwrapping the Sacred Bundle: Reflections on the Disciplining of Anthropology*. Durham and London: Duke University Press: 24–48.
- Čepaitienė, Auksuolė. 2011. Etnologijos (etnografijos) ištakos ir valstiečio atradimas Lietuvoje XVIII a. pabaigoje – XIX a. pradžioje. *Lietuvos etnologija: socialinės antropologijos ir etnologijos studijos* 11, 20: 69–91.
- Čepaitienė, Auksuolė. 2014. Etnografija Lietuvoje: praktika ir (ar) teorija. XX a. tarpukario kontekstai. In: Savoniakaitė, V. (ed.): *Savas ir kitas šiuolaikiniais požiūriais/ Contemporary Approaches to the Self and the Other*. Vilnius: LII leidykla: 367–394.
- Čiubrinskas, Vytis. 2001. Sovietmečio iššūkiai Lietuvos etnologija: disciplina, ideologija ir patriotizmas. *Lietuvos etnologija: socialinės antropologijos ir etnologijos studijos* 1, 10: 99–117.
- Čiubrinskas, Vytis. 2004. Antropologija. In: Viliūnas, G. (ed.): *Lietuvos humanitarinių ir socialinių mokslų plėtos problemos*. Vilnius: LII leidykla: 61–70.
- Dundulienė, Pranė. 1978. *Etnografijos mokslas Vilniaus universitete*. Vilnius: LTSR aukštojo ir specialiojo vidurinio mokslo ministerija.
- Edwards, Jeanette – Harvey, Penny – Wade, Peter. 2007. Introduction: Epistemologies in Practise. In: Edwards, J. – Harvey, P. – Wade, P. (eds): *Anthropology and Science: Epistemologies in Practise*. Oxford and New York: Berg: 1–18.
- Endziulaitytė-Gylienė, M. 1926. Antropologija ir jos pritaikimas. *Kosmos* 4–5: 157–162.
- Eriksen, Thomas Hylland – Nielsen, Finn Sivert. 2001. *A History of Anthropology*. London: Pluto Press.
- Fabian, Johannes. 1983. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gow, Peter. 2009. The Ontogeny of an Anthropological Epistemology in Eighteenth Century Scotland. *Social Analysis* 53, 2: 19–39.

- Greimas, Algirdas J. 1979. *Apie dievus ir žmones: lietuvių mitologijos studijos*. Chicago: Algimanto Mackaus knygų leidimo fondas.
- Hammersley, Martyn. 2001. *What's Wrong with Ethnography? Methodological Explorations*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hann, Cris et al. 2007. *Anthropology's Multiple Temporalities and Its Future in Central and Eastern Europe. A Debate. Working Paper No. 90*. Halle/Saale: Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology.
- Ingold, Tim. 2008. Anthropology is Not Ethnography. *Proceedings of the British Academy* 154: 69–92.
- Ingold, Tim. 2014. That's enough about ethnography! *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 4, 1: 383–395. [2016-04-26] Retrieved from: <http://dz.doi.org/10.14318/hau4.1.021>.
- Ingold, Tim. 2015. Rethinking Euro-Anthropology. *Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale* 23, 3: 341–342.
- Jasinski, Józef. 1818. *Antropologia o własnościach człowieka fizycznych i moralnych*. Wilno: Nakładem i drukiem Józefa Zawadzkiego typografa Imperatorskiego uniwersytetu.
- Jiménez, Alberto Corsín. 2007. Industry Going Public: Rethinking Knowledge and Administration. In: Edwards, J. – Harvey, P. – Wade, J. (eds): *Anthropology and Science: Epistemologies in Practise*. Oxford and New York: Berg: 39–57.
- Jučas, Mečislovas. 1997. Istoriografija Vilniaus universitete 1803–1832 m.: tarp Švietimo ir Romantizmo. *Lietuvos istorijos studijos* 4: 92–102.
- Klimas, Petras. 1917. Etnografinio dėsno reikšmė. *Lietuvos aidas* 27.11.1917, 29.11.1917, 01.12.1917, 04.12.1917.
- Končius, Ignas. 1934. Gimtojo krašto pažinimas. *Gimtasai kraštas* 1: 3–6.
- Kudaba, Česlovas. 1988. Žymus XVIII a. gamtininkas Georgas Forsteris. In: Kilius, J. (ed.): *Georgo Forsterio laišakai iš Vilniaus*. Vilnius: Mokslas: 7–23.
- Lelewel, Ioachim. 1815. *Historyka tudzież o łatwem i pożytecznem nauczeniu historyi*. Wilno: Drukarnia XX Pijarow.
- Lelewel, Joachim. 1964. *Dziela: Pisma metodologiczne* 2(1). Warszawa: Państwowe wydawnictwo naukowe.
- Leonas, Petras. 1995 [1939]. *Sociologijos paskaitos*. Vilnius: Pozicija.
- Lithuanian Science and Technology White Paper*. 2002. Vilnius: Department of Science and Higher Education under The Ministry of Education and Science of the republic of Lithuania.
- Maciūnas, Vincas. 1939. Lituaništinis sąjūdis XIX amžiaus pradžioje: susidomėjimas lietuvių kalba, istorija ir tautytyra. *Darbai ir dienos* 8: 3–344.
- Merkienė, Irena Regina. 2011. Etnologijos institutas sovietmečio Lietuvoje mokslo politikos ir ideologijos kontekste. *Lietuvos etnologija: socialinės antropologijos ir etnologijos studijos* 11, 20: 125–142.
- Milius, Vacys. 1993. *Mokslo draugijos ir lietuvių etnografija (XIX a. antroji pusė – XX a. pirmoji pusė)*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.
- Norkus, Zenonas. 2015. Two Hundred Years of the Theory of Historiography in Lithuania, or How Joachim Lelewel Became the Pioneer of Modern Comparative History, *Sociologija. Mintis ir veiksmai* 1, 36: 5–31.
- OECD. 2015. *Frascati Manual 2015: Guidelines for Collecting and Reporting Data on Research and Experimental Development*. The Measurement of Scientific, Technological and Innovation Activities. Paris: OECD Publishing. [2016-05-16] Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264239012-en>.
- Posern-Zieliński, Aleksander. 1995. Etnologia i antropologia kulturowa w formalnej i rzeczywistej strukturze nauki. In: Posern-Zieliński, A. (ed.): *Etnologia Polska między ludoznawstwem a antropologią*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo DRAWA: 21–36.
- Sauka, Leonardas – Stundžienė, Bronė. 2004. Tautosakos mokslas. In: Viliūnas, G. (ed.): *Lietuvos humanitarinių ir socialinių mokslų plėtros problemos*. Vilnius: LII leidykla: 134–140.
- Savoniakaitė, Vida. 2008a. Apie Lietuvos etnologijos istoriją. *Lituanistica* 3: 59–66.

- Savoniakaitė, Vida. 2008b. Lietuvos etnografija tarp savos kultūros tyrimų. *Lituanistica* 4: 61–72.
- Spiro, Melford E. 1991. On The Strange and the Familiar in Recent Anthropological Thought. Reprinted with permission from Transaction Publishers from the journal 'Anthropological Other or Burmese Brother'. [2016-03-15] Retrieved from: http://wps.prenhall.com/wps/media/objects/12330/12626747/myanthropologylibrary/PDF/NDS_122_Spiro_121.pdf.
- Stocking, Georg W. 1992. *The Ethnographer's Magic and Other Essays in the History of Anthropology*. Madison and London: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Strathern, Marilyn. 2005. Anthropology and Interdisciplinarity. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education* 4, 2: 125–135.
- Šaknys, Žilvytis. 2004. Etnologija. In: Viliūnas, G. (ed.): *Lietuvos humanitarinių ir socialinių mokslų plėtros problemos*. Vilnius: LII leidykla: 117–125.
- Šaknys, Žilvytis. 2011. Ieškant idėjų praeityje: etnologijos istorija ir dabartis. *Lietuvos etnologija: socialinės antropologijos ir etnologijos studijos* 11, 20: 9–32.
- Šernas [Adomaitis Juozas] (ed.). 1903. *Etnologija arba mokslas apie žemės tautas. Pagal Dr-o M. Haberlandtą ir Letourneau*. Chicago: Turtu ir spauda "Lietuvos".
- Švambarytė, Dalia. 2009. Georg Forster in Vilnius: Reverberations of the great age of ocean navigation. *Acta Orientalia Vilnensia* 10, 1–2: 139–164.
- [Szydłowski Ignacy]. 1819. Obrzędy weselne ludu wiejskiego w gubernii mińskiej, w powiecie borysowskim w parafii haieńskiej, obserwowane w latach 1800, 1szym i 2gim, z niektórymi piosnkami I ich zwyczajną notą. Zamówiny. *Tygodnik Wileński* 7, 132: 81–104.
- Tunaitis, Steponas. 2004. *Apšvietos epochos socialinės ir politinės filosofijos metmenys*. Vilnius: Kultūros, filosofijos ir meno institutas.
- Viliūnas, Giedrius (ed.). 2004a. *Lietuvos humanitarinių ir socialinių mokslų plėtros problemos*. Vilnius: LII leidykla.
- Viliūnas, Giedrius. 2004b. Humanitariniai ir socialiniai mokslai šiandieninėje Lietuvos mokslo politikoje: In: Viliūnas, G. (ed.): *Lietuvos humanitarinių ir socialinių mokslų plėtros problemos*. Vilnius: LII leidykla: 48–51.
- Wyngaard, Amy S. 2004. *From Savage to Citizen: The Invention of the Peasant in the French Enlightenment*. Newark: University of Delaware Press.