

Editorial

Most of the 2019 issue of *Lithuanian Ethnology* is thematically focused on the history of the discipline and the beginnings of research on the *nation* in Lithuania. This thematic part of the issue is compiled by Vida Savoniakaitė from the Lithuanian Institute of History, and echoes the 100th anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania that was celebrated last year. In October 2018, the Lithuanian Institute of History held a conference on this occasion entitled ‘The role of Ethnology and Anthropology in the National Awakening’, and most of the papers published in this issue are based on presentations given at the conference.

As Savoniakaitė points out in her introductory article, all four papers in the thematic part of the issue, written by Olga Mastianica-Stankevič, Irma Šidiškienė, Auksuolė Čepaitienė and herself (all from the Lithuanian Institute of History), pursue the same aim, to reveal the beginnings of Lithuanian ethnology from the perspective of comparative and historical relations. She also claims that the beginnings of Lithuanian ethnology and research into the *nation* are historically related to the research into ethnic groups carried out in 19th and early 20th-century Russia, as well as being related to Western ideas of Enlightenment and *Völkerkunde*.

The paper by the historian Mastianica-Stankevič deals with archive-based research on Mečislovas Davainis-Silvestraitis, a prominent figure in the period of the Lithuanian awakening at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century. This research shows that Davainis-Silvestraitis, being known as a collector of Lithuanian folklore and ethnographic material, also managed to use it for politically important causes in the Lithuanian national awakening movement.

In her article on Jonas Basanavičius, the founding father of Lithuanian nationalism from the 1870s to the 1920s, Savoniakaitė draws on his ideas and organisational and creative work relating to anthropology, ethnology and ethnography, and also how this all resulted in many of his ‘nation building’ and ‘ethnography building’ projects, by putting forward the hypothesis that Basanavičius was influenced by German ethnology.

Šidiskienė discusses the historiography of traditional Lithuanian dress in her article, by looking at Lithuanian historians and intellectual leaders of the 19th and the early 20th centuries who contributed to collecting and describing traditional dress codes, and/or paid attention to particular *Lithuanian* details of peasant/folk costume.

Čepaitienė scrutinises images of Lithuanianness by going through all issues of *Aušra*, the first Lithuanian periodical, which was published in the 1880s. She

shows the importance of attempts to build a normative image of Lithuanianness that was to be used in the ideology of nation-building and the national awakening process of the period.

The last two articles in the issue do not belong to the thematic part, and are written by younger colleagues. The doctoral student Dalia Sabaliauskienė, from Vilnius University, presents her fieldwork in Tehran, in an article on the ritual politeness of *ta'ârof*, which shows the importance of first-hand fieldwork research on 'peripheral' rituals from an everyday life studies perspective.

The article by Rūta Staniulytė from Vytautas Magnus University, on the pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostela, is also based on fieldwork carried out among pilgrims en route to the pilgrimage site. Focusing on the construction of togetherness, she puts the emphasis on different ways of making a 'community', including the classic one described by Victor Turner as *communitas*.

The 'Forum' slot includes a discussion by Thomas Reuter, from the University of Melbourne, on the discipline of anthropology, which in his view is dominated by the influence of 'privileged cultures', forming global anthropological knowledge from their own perspective. His article discusses an alternative to this, in the form of the World Council of Anthropological Associations, which aims to give a voice to anthropologies that are 'marginalised' and not listened to.

The 'Reviews' section of this issue contains three review articles. The first, written by the Swiss anthropologist François Ruegg from the University of Fribourg, is a detailed review of a special issue on Lithuania (*Lituanie. Une anthropologie face à l'Histoire*) that appeared in 2018 in *Ethnologie française*, the leading French journal in the field, based on articles mostly prepared by Lithuanian scholars, which is a sign of recognition of Lithuanian anthropologists. Another review, by Dovile Budrytė, a Lithuanian-American political scientist from Georgia Gwinnett College, examines and praises the recent monograph by Monika Frėjutė-Rakauskienė, Neringa Klumbytė, Andrius Marcinkevičius and Kristina Šliavaitytė on the construction of social memory and social justice in contemporary Lithuania, by considering an encounter between majoritarian and minoritarian discourses, and also 'voices' from fieldwork. The review emphasises the success of the new field of cooperation among anthropologists and sociologists. A similar success, this time on an international level, is seen in *The Yearbook of Balkan and Baltic Studies* by Audronė Daraškevičienė, from the Lithuanian Institute of History, who reviews this new publication by Balkan and Baltic scholars, which includes contributions written by researchers of folklore and religion, as well as ethnologists.

This issue of *Lithuanian Ethnology* therefore offers much new material and many new insights, and we hope it will be of interest to readers.

Vytis Čiubrinskas