

VILNIUS UNIVERSITY

AURELIJUS GIEDA

HISTORIOGRAPHY AND SOCIETY: *HISTORIK* AND THE DIMENSIONS OF THE
PROFESSION OF A HISTORIAN AND THE HISTORICAL CULTURE IN LITHUANIA
IN 1904-1940

Summary of doctoral dissertation
Humanitarian sciences, history (05 H)

Vilnius, 2013

Doctoral dissertation was prepared at Vilnius University in 2002–2013

Scientific supervisor:

prof. dr. Alfredas Bumblauskas (Vilnius University, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05H).

The dissertation is being defended at the Council of Scientific Field of History at Vilnius University:

Chairman – prof. dr. Rimvydas Petrauskas (Vilnius University, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05H).

Members:

prof. dr. Alfredas Bumblauskas (Vilnius University, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05H);

doc. dr. Vigmantas Butkus (The Institute of Lithuanian Literature and Folklore, Humanitarian Sciences, Philology – 04H);

doc. dr. Rimantas Miknys (The Lithuanian Institute of History, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05H);

doc. dr. Nerijus Šepetys (Vilnius University, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05H).

Opponents:

habil. dr. Alvydas Nikžentaitis (The Lithuanian Institute of History, Humanitarian Sciences, History – 05H);

prof. habil. dr. Zenonas Norkus (Vilnius University, Social Sciences, Sociology – 05S).

The dissertation will be defended at the public meeting of the Council of Scientific Field of History in the 30th auditorium of the Faculty of History of Vilnius University at 3 p.m. on 15 November 2013.

Address: Universiteto 7, Vilnius, Lithuania.

The summary of the doctoral dissertation was distributed on October 2013.

A copy of the doctoral dissertation is available for review at the Library of Vilnius University.

VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETAS

AURELIJUS GIEDA

ISTORIOGRAFIJA IR VISUOMENĖ: ISTORIKA, ISTORIKO PROFESIJOS IR
ISTORINĖS KULTŪROS ASPEKTAI LIETUVOJE 1904–1940 M.

Daktaro disertacijos santrauka
Humanitariniai mokslai, istorija (05 H)

Vilnius, 2013

Disertacija rengta 2002–2013 metais Vilniaus universitete.

Mokslinis vadovas:

prof. dr. Alfredas Bumblauskas (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05H).

Disertacija ginama Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos mokslo krypties taryboje:

Pirmininkas – prof. dr. Rimvydas Petrauskas (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05H).

Nariai:

prof. dr. Alfredas Bumblauskas (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05H);

doc. dr. Vigmantas Butkus (Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04H);

doc. dr. Rimantas Miknys (Lietuvos istorijos institutas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija - 05H);

doc. dr. Nerijus Šepetytis (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05H).

Oponentai:

habil. dr. Alvydas Nikžentaitis (Lietuvos istorijos institutas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05H);

prof. habil. dr. Zenonas Norkus (Vilniaus universitetas, socialiniai mokslai, sociologija - 05S).

Disertacija bus ginama viešame Istorijos mokslo krypties tarybos posėdyje 2013 m. lapkričio 15 d. 15 val. Istorijos fakulteto 30 auditorijoje.

Adresas: Universiteto 7, Vilnius, Lietuva.

Disertacijos santrauka išsiuntinėta 2013 m. spalio mėn.

Disertaciją galima peržiūrėti Vilniaus universiteto bibliotekoje.

Introduction

The social dimension of scientific, literary, musical, artistic and other intellectual phenomena has long been an object of scientific research and study. Historiography, the study of the development of the science of history, is no exception. History of historiography may be and in fact is multifarious. For a while it was written as an epic of the biographies and oeuvres of the most prominent historians. The issue of the characteristics and scope of the history of historiography is not new, and it places the inquirer at the very center of self-reflection of the history of historiography. As long as two decades ago, a prominent German historian Horst Walter Blanke summed up ten paths that are taken in studying the development of historiography, from portraits (i.e. monographs on personalities) to metatheoretical reflection on the practice of the science of history. The history of historiography and its reflection have made several more steps towards diversity since Blanke proposed his typology. Furthermore, during this period, specialized essay collections, focused on presenting new forms of and new approaches to the history of historiography, were prepared. However, despite the diversity of the approaches to contemporary history of historiography in terms of both form and content, it is possible to distinguish several levels of historiographical research and the historiographical process that most of today's work on the history of historiography focuses its analysis on. We can hardly detect a certain standard in the variety of contemporary approaches to historiographical research; however, it would be obviously simpler to trace certain basic components of historiographical studies while at the same time discerning certain recurrences in the practice of historiographical research. Either way, this is a relevant question in each sub/discipline's self-reflection: what is and what should be at the center of our attention? We can look at the question of a thematic standard actualized in the history of historiography as, on the one hand, the contemporary historiographical researchers' attempt at self-reflection, and, on the other hand, as a debate taking place in the present. The characterization of contemporary historiographical research presented by Stephan Berger, a prominent British scholar of historiography and author of long-term historiographical research projects, which suggests that anyone who wants to be reliably informed about the

development of the profession of history in the 20th century would like to hear about the institutions, about relations among historians, about the relationship between historians and the broader historical culture, and about the methods and theories that have had an impact on the writing of history, can be perceived as a certain attempt at standardizing the history of historiography.

This characterization in its thematic focus is close to the initial intentions of the author of this thesis. Starting the examination of the subject-matter with the assessment of the theoretical-methodological orientations of prewar Lithuanian science of history, eventually the problem arises of how to view separate theoretical-methodological orientations observable at the level of a particular individual historian's deliberation as a group (or collective) phenomenon in the broader field of the development of the science of history and the profession of a historian. Therefore it was necessary to scrutinize those approaches to the social history of science which treat the science of history and the whole writing of history as a social institution, the processes of professionalization and institutionalization that would allow seeing the development of historiography as a process determined by not only an individual, but also a group/ social interest. Finally, socially oriented history and the relationship between historians and the broader historical culture became unavoidable if one wants to understand the question of the popularity of certain historical narrations along with certain historians. In this way, the development of historiography was interpreted as an integral totality of the development on three levels – the individual, the group and the society. This thesis is an attempt to substantiate and justify such an interpretation. It is an attempt to present a complex construct of the development of historiography in a certain society, focusing exclusively on the aspects of development of the theory and methodology of history, of the profession of a historian, and of historical culture. The central component of the title of this paper, *Historiography and society*, first of all points towards the leading idea of this work regarding the social nature of historiography and the sociality of historiography, of the community of historians, of a particular historian, and of the theory of historiography (*Historik*).

Relevance of research

Claims regarding the lack of reflexive theoretical thought in the Lithuanian science of history often appear in the tradition of Lithuanian historiography. Such remarks can be found both in current texts and in those of interwar independent Lithuania. In narrower terms of historiographical research contexts, we can see certain obvious steps forward in the theoretical work of Zenonas Norkus and Jūratė Baranova, or Alfredas Bumblauskas' attempt to apply the theory of paradigm shifts in historiography to the Lithuanian tradition of the science of history. Furthermore, translations of prominent works analyzing the development of the science of history and its current situation have appeared in contemporary Lithuania, and Lithuanian historians more frequently undertake writing about historiography and historians, in other words, reflecting upon traditions of historiography and the *kitchens of history*. In the light of these changes, research of the national historiography tradition, by taking on various additional stimuli, encourages the reflexivity of the contemporary science of history, although nowadays the limitations of historiographical research focused on the cognizance of one national tradition are widely discussed. Despite these limitations, as well as those of this thesis, the relevance of the topic has two inherent undercurrents: the subject of sociality of historiography in the context of Lithuanian historiographical research is a fairly new question. On the other hand, this study tries not to enclose itself within the limits of national historiography; – to the contrary, it attempts to open the signification links between the shifts of Lithuanian and of European historiography. One way or another, contemporary Lithuanian historiographical research is rather lacking in such links. For example, we could say that we do not yet possess a deliberation field which would clearly connect the shifts in the theory and methodology of history in Lithuania and in Europe. In this case we not only risk losing the possibility to adequately explain Lithuanian texts dedicated to the area of the theory and methodology of history, but also find it difficult to identify them on the common map of the dispersion of European *Historik*. The same can be said about the history of the development of a historian's profession and about the subject of the great national narratives and historians' relations with the latter. Therefore, opening a certain nexus between the Lithuanian

historiographical tradition and the European practice and shifts of historiography constitutes one of the main components of the relevance of this study.

It is customary and still popular to ground the relevance of historical research in a certain strategy of *eliminating white spots*. However, it is obvious that there is a great many white spots in various branches of historiography, and each historian can ask him/herself why s/he chose this particular subject-matter when there are many other unexplored topics. The problem of relevance in historiographical research lies not in the quantity of works on one or another subject and certainly not in the lack of knowledge about one or another historian, but in the topic of historiography itself, which can be, in the most general sense, defined as a dialogue (as well as a polylogue and a debate) between a historian on the one hand, and his/her assumptions and the premises of other historians on the other hand. Studying and knowing historiographical traditions is important in the context of contemporary historiography more and more often when talking not only about the content of history, but also about the nature, purpose, and social functions of history as science, various forms of history, etc. Finally, it is evident that studying the development of historiography is beneficial for the pursuit of the identity of contemporary historiography.

The research problem and the characterization of the situation/context of research

The question that Lucian formulated many centuries ago – *how should history be written?* – remains relevant and obligates historians of different time periods and regions. Admittedly, the basic premises of writing about the past mutate, and the aforementioned question gains a different ring at different times, but it does not detract from its significance. In terms of this question, the first four decades of the 20th century were a singular period of the building of the national historiographical tradition. The researchers of this tradition have noticed and emphasized this time and again. However, the representation of Lithuanian interwar historiography, which gets much more attention than the first decades of the 20th century, in contemporary historiography is too single-minded and unidimensional. Contributing to that, in our opinion, is the frequent researchers' choice of the excessively narrow chronology of the development of historiography of the two decades, inherited from political history,

which inhibits looking at either Lithuanian or European historiographical processes at the end of the 19th century – beginning of the 20th century in a broader context. In other words, monitoring contemporary research may make it appear that, for a while, there have been only two answers to the Lucian's old question of *how history should be written* (and what should be emphasized therein): writing should be *positivistic*, and the emphasis should be focused first of all on *looking for Lithuanians in the history of Lithuania*. While the concept of positivism was clearly ideologized in the historiography texts written during the Soviet period (it was much better to be a positivist than a romanticist, clericalist or nationalist), in contemporary research, this concept appears vague and trivial, and it seems that the label of a positivist can be affixed to practically any historian who has had the fortune of carrying out archival work, looking for and critically analyzing primary and secondary historical sources, and preparing detailed descriptions of various historical fragments. Furthermore, everyday usage of the term of positivism inhibits comprehending the difference between the empirically minded historians of the first half of the 20th century and the 17th century Jesuit Bollandists who started critical studies of history and endeavored to publish *Acta Sanctorum*. On the other hand, when speaking about the historiographic renewal strategies formulated during the interwar period, a certain retrospective approach is often unavoidable, i.e. the aspects of the science of history that come into focus in the future are used to judge which principles, visions or even slogans of renewal of historiography were the most important, mature or dominant in interwar Lithuania.

Nevertheless, the postulate of aforementioned unidimensionality of the representation of Lithuanian historiography before 1940 is more than merely incorrect approaches of individual researchers or some similar issues. The problem that at first sight might appear to be local and dependent on the research situation emerges as contextually embedded in the broader subject-matter upon closer examination.

The genesis of the unidimensional representation of interwar Lithuanian historiography should also be located in the sociocultural and sociopolitical situation of the 20th century Lithuania. Ideologized texts of the Soviet period often attempted either to completely circumvent the beginning stage of professional Lithuanian historiography, or to take on only

the works and theories of the most prominent historians for the purposes of illustrative critique of bourgeois historiography. A more conceptual approach, taking into account the circumstances of the period, was directed essentially only towards those prewar historians who stayed in Soviet Lithuania. A significant interruption between the *past* and the *present* took place in the tradition of historiography as well as in society. During the 50 years, both the interwar period and its historiography and historical culture were in the grip of purposeful and intensive propaganda. For the distorted, forbidden and persecuted interwar historiographical tradition, and for the interwar period in general, the national reform movement and the first years of independence were a time of astounding renaissance, intensive reprinting of works on historical subjects, new reading, and a true career in terms of societal interest. During the years of the Lithuanian reform movement *Sąjūdis*, the legacy of interwar historiography and various other representations of interwar historical culture not only received tremendous attention and wide circulation, competing with the whole Soviet historiography of 1945-1990 Lithuania, but also gradually became one of the crucial forces restructuring the historical consciousness, identity and evaluations of history. Unsurprisingly, the most important *memorial sites* of prewar Lithuanian historical culture became the foundation of the activation of ethnonational identity and of historiography escaping indoctrination and mandatory approaches to history. It is not difficult to notice that the reception of prewar historiography, historical culture, and even particular historians, was axiologically opposite to the official judgment functioning in the public sphere during Soviet times. Therefore, since the years of the *singing revolution*, the valuation of the prewar historiographical tradition and of the most prominent components of historical culture have been eminently positive, and the reception of particular works of history and the activities of historians often had the attributes of dimensionality that is almost obligatory for any ideologized societal reception, i.e. a certain measure of ideologization, a focus on anniversaries, and, unsurprisingly, an uncritical bearing. Half a century separates prewar historiography and the interwar period from the *present*, thus it is natural that the aforementioned reception was first and foremost focused on presenting, reminding and reviewing. Such circumstances lack a critical distance on principle, and schematization and

unidimensionality are inevitable. Essentially, in Lithuania of *March 11th*, interwar historiography and some elements of the then historical culture have established themselves at the center of the hierarchy of highly appreciated national heritage. Whatever way you look at it, this is illustrated by printing of the several runs of hundreds of thousands of copies of the *History of Lithuania* edited by Šapoka that became a school reading in the beginning of the last decade of the 20th century. Societal transformations like the ones taking place in Lithuania in 1988–1992 are unavoidably accompanied by the generation of some kind of *mythological constellations*. Such societal processes would be quite natural, since they are not unusual during the times of societal changes. However, in regard to the problem under consideration here, it is relevant to also reflect upon and take a broader look at the genesis of the unidimensional interwar historiography constructs and at their expression in the sphere of academic work related to sociopolitical underpinnings of the changes in Lithuania. Interwar historians already repeatedly emphasized that historians and their work are the products of their times and worldviews. For quite straightforward and understandable reasons, it is easy to identify the signs of the times in academically oriented interwar historiographical research and reviews after 1990. The contemporary community of historians first of all needed to establish some kind of relationship with its professional predecessors. As early as 1988, the professional organization of historians (the *Historical Society of Lithuania*, the *Lithuanian Historical Society*) that had operated between 1929–1940 was reestablished and began to publish a journal *Mūsų praeitis* (*Our Past*) under the difficult conditions of the economic blockade of Lithuania, as well as produced the third volume of the journal *Praeitis* (*The Past*) that was worked on in the interwar period but not published, prepared articles analyzing prewar LHS activities, the biograms of all writers of *Praeitis* (*The Past*), etc. Certainly, under such circumstances, the interest in prewar historiography encouraged placing the emphasis on some aspects of the prewar historians' scientific contributions, it was mandatory and natural to *honor the then generation of Lithuanian historians*.

Despite these circumstances, shorter, but more critical and conceptual studies soon emerged. However, a solid layer of inertia matured in the sociopolitical and sociocultural environment

which reflects the unidimensional approach to the interwar period, its historians, and historical culture, awakened during the years of societal transformation, and appears to remain in the broadest versions of interwar historiography research. In the aforementioned most comprehensive versions of interwar historiography, one can discern a certain combination of *preconceived respect* and meticulous description which is approached by this thesis as one of the more important prerequisites of the unidimensional representation of interwar Lithuanian historiography.

The point here certainly is not only in valuations. It is likely that what is crucial in this situation is the relative dependency of more comprehensive researchers on the general research setting. Authors have provided interesting and valuable insights into the development of the prewar Lithuanian historiography. However, the aforementioned dependency on the general research situation and on certain preconceived notions hindered them from attaining a less unidimensional representation of interwar historiography.

Treating the studies of the theoretical-methodological program of the development of historiography as one of three significant components of the history of historiography provides additional stimuli to the broader outlook on the tradition of Lithuanian historiography. Still, one should not presume that a comprehensive examination of the theoretical-methodological orientations of the interwar Lithuanian science of history would suffice to overcome the unidimensionality of the representation of interwar historiography. A reason for such a standpoint could be, for example, the lack of essential conceptualization of the research on interwar historiography in the works dedicated to biographies of various historians, and, more generally, to dimensions of the profession of a historian predominant, among the sum total of contemporary Lithuanian historiographical studies. In other words, the attained results do not fundamentally differ whether we look at the case of research on the theory and methodology of history (where there are few studies) or at the field of research on the various dimensions of the profession of a historian (where there are many more studies).

The activities of historians or of their organizations, investigation of historians' biographies or particular works often lack an overall perspective on the cognizance of the development

of the profession of a historian. Knowledge of numerous facts and stories regarding the profession and activities of historians is certainly important for a broader approach, but it does not always nor necessarily become a prerequisite of a *better* understanding of the shifts in the profession of a historian. The majority of individual studies focus on one or another particular question of the development of historiography. In this way, the basis and the tradition of historiographical research build up and grow; however, it is natural that authors of such studies do not aim to examine the broader issue of the development of the historian's profession or the development of a specific professional community of historians as a totality. Nevertheless, one cannot doubt the value of such studies. Once the broader questions are raised, the outwardly detailed and specialized historiographical studies on certain aspects of the activities of historians, societies, or the university, turn into indispensable material for the history of historiography. Therefore, the attainments of historiographical research in Lithuania are used in the search for the answers to various questions in this study as well.

This work has a similar approach to the research on the culture of history and of memory which does not have a solid tradition in Lithuania but has been vigorously fostered and activated in recent years. Comprehensive research on interwar Lithuanian culture of history has been carried out in Lithuania for over a decade already, but there are not many studies covering the narrower question of the place of historical narratives and the works of historians in the historical culture, which is the specific focus of this thesis. Notwithstanding, the edited volumes of articles and individual authors' works that have come out recently allow us to consider research on *socially oriented history* and on the historians' role in creating the latter that raises questions and identifies problems to be possible and relevant.

Treating the development of historiography as three integral levels and the temporal analysis of particular historiographical processes (theoretical-methodological, professional, societal-ideological) should allow us to at least get somewhat closer to overcoming the unidimensionality of the representation of the interwar Lithuanian historiography and to take a different look at the profession of a historian and the historical culture in Lithuania,

the tradition of Lithuanian theory and methodology of history of the first four decades of the 20th century, and the interconnections and interrelationships of these dimensions of historiography.

The object, chronology and geography of research

The object of this study is the development of Lithuanian national historiography in 1904-1940 on three levels of signification: theoretical-methodological orientations, the development of the profession of a historian, and the plane of the development of historical culture. Such an outwardly heterogenic object of historiographical research was presupposed by one of the key premises of this thesis regarding the social nature of historiography which allows us to treat the development of the theory and methodology of history, the profession of a historian, and the historical culture, as integral components of the same historiographical process that are connected to each other via various mutual links and rootings.

Choosing a chronological perspective that differs from the mainstream approach to studying Lithuanian historiography (1918–1940, 1922–1940) plays an important role in this thesis. Since the development of historiography is perceived as a part of the sociocultural history of Lithuania, we do not maintain the popular periodization of the development of historiography presupposed by political history that is the basis for claiming that the 1920s–1930s were a *distinctive stage in the development of national historiography*.

The opinion that the first pack of Lithuanian students who dedicated themselves to more systematic and specialized studies of history and related disciplines appeared at the *junction of centuries* has not yet become an unquestioned verity in the research on the development of historiography in Lithuania. Fundamental changes on all three levels of analysis of the historiographical process examined in this study – the theoretical-methodological program of substantiation (critically minded thought passes quite severe judgment on historiographical pragmatism), the institutional-professional (the *Lithuanian Scientific Society* founded in 1907 becomes actively involved in the discussions of Lithuanian history questions, simultaneously attempting to institutionalize piecemeal and accidental interest in

history), and the realm of historical culture where the sound of the term *history* conspicuously gains a polyphonic form and a scope of culturally diverse activities, – took place during the decade between the lift of the ban on printing in the Latin script (1904) and the First World War (1914) that was exceptional in Lithuanian sociocultural history. Therefore we can consider the first two decades of the 20th century cannot be chronologically bypassed not only if we want to elaborate on the key changes taking place during this period, but also if we attempt to interpret the later interwar historiographical process in a proper perspective.

In general, this thesis follows the sociopolitical and sociocultural chronology of 1904 / 1905–1939 / 1940 periodization, but it keeps open the option of stepping over these chronological landmarks if it is necessary for explaining certain phenomena.

In terms of generations, the chronology of this thesis is marked by looking at what three generations of public activists and historians present in Lithuanian historiography and historical culture: the oldest, the representatives of the so-called Auszra historiography¹; the middle ones, rebelling against historical pragmatism; and the *young historians* educated in independent Lithuania and furthering the cultivation of critically minded historiography.

Time is definitely associated with space. Consequently, by looking at the first decades of the 20th century we also expand the geographical space of the expression of Lithuanian historiography. Clearly, the geographical Lithuania of the first decades of the 20th century is not a definite and unambiguous category, even the narrowing down of *historiography of Lithuania* to *Lithuanian historiography* may appear geographically quite pretentious: Saint Petersburg and Moscow, Chicago and Boston, Krakow, Warsaw and Sejny, Leuven and Fribourg, and, last but not least, Vilnius and Kaunas, as well as other cities, formed the geographical sample of the elements of Lithuanian historical culture and historiography in the beginning of the 20th century.

It is important to note that, from the first decade of the 20th century until the period of the interim capital with the *University of Lithuania* (*Vytautas Magnus University* since 1930),

¹ See Krapauskas, Virgil. *Nationalism and Historiography: the Case of Nineteenth-Century Lithuanian Historicism*. Boulder: East European monographs; New York : Distributed by Columbia University Press, 2000, p. 107-187.

Vilnius was one of the key geographical centers of the development of Lithuanian historiography and historical culture, obviously referring to the activities of the *Lithuanian Scientific Society*. The city in which a cultural turning point was taking place in 1904–1907 is viewed in this thesis as the center of revival and inception of the professional Lithuanian historiography, as if reiterating the processes of the development of historiography that had started in Vilnius almost a century ago and had been severed under the impact of czarism.

The aims and objectives of research

The aim of this study is to offer a model of historiographical research in which certain dimensions of the theory and methodology of history, of the profession of a historian, and of historical culture, are treated as integral levels of the historiographical process that require in-depth analysis. Since this historiographical research model is examined by employing the material on the development of Lithuanian national historiography in 1904–1940, attaining the aims of this study requires fulfilling the following objectives: a) to analyze the changes in Lithuanian theory and methodology of history during the period under scrutiny; b) not only to focus the attention of research of the *Historik* tradition on incidental theoretical-methodological historiographical inquiry, but also to attempt to identify the dominant and alternative forms of the theory and methodology of history; c) to investigate the issues related to the spread of the profession of a historian during the period under inquiry in an attempt to assess the social underpinnings of the profession of a historian and the processes of professionalization and institutionalization of historiography in Lithuania; d) while studying the development of the profession of a historian, to not only focus on the formal elements of the progress of this profession, but also foreground and specify the temporal shifts of the then particularities of the profession of a historian in Lithuania, the distribution of power in the community of historians, and the social undercurrents and issues of the germination of historiography; e) to discover the trajectory of exemplary expressions of historical culture and *canon* historical narratives during the period under investigation; f) in the exploration of the most significant expressions of historical culture, to focus not only on

the content of particular historical narratives, but on the social undercurrents of their societal popularity as well, ascertain the role of historians in the popularization of history, and to raise and problematize the question of alternatives to the then dominant historical narratives; g) to view the process of the development of historiography itself as a complex, searching for and recording the connections among the three levels of the process of the development of historiography distinguished in this thesis; h) to seek a contextualized understanding of the development of historiography in Lithuania on two levels by focusing both on the foreign historiographical experiences and on the more general dimensions of sociocultural history of Lithuania in the period under scrutiny when analyzing various levels of the historiographical process; i) to assess the heuristic value of analyzing the development of historiography as an inquiry into three integral levels of the historiographical process for the history of Lithuanian historiography.

Theoretical-methodological approach

In this thesis, the starting point of the search for a historiographical research model suitable for studying the development of historiography can be found in Thomas Samuel Kuhn's concept of scientific paradigm shifts whose underlying assumptions underscore the historical and social nature of science and emphasize the revolutionary character of scientific progress and the significance of sociological features of scientific communities. One of the most influential essays on the history and philosophy of science published in the second half of the 20th century (*The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago, 1962) and the analytical model implied by this book are not expressly intended for the analysis of changes in historiography. Jörn Rüsen, a German historian and theorist of historiography, suggested an interpretation of the Kuhnian concept of scientific paradigm shifts adapted for understanding the development of historiography. According to this model, the key levels of change in the development of historiography and the factors that shape the *disciplinary matrix* and the historiographical paradigm are the following: a) epistemological interests, b) theories, ideas and concepts, c) methods of research of sources, d) forms of expounding, e) practical life orientation functions. There has been criticism of the attempt to introduce the

dimension of a *historiographical paradigm* into Lithuanian historiographical research. Although critics were essentially aiming at the specific question of the place and significance of Zenonas Ivinskis in Lithuanian historiography rather than at the suitability of the concept of a historiographical paradigm for Lithuanian historiographical research itself, taking note of the emerging indirect debates, a routine expression of anomalies from the perspective of *normal science*, was important both for problematizing the search for historiographical paradigms in Lithuanian historiography and for the pursuit of central analytical components of a *historiographical research model*.

Detecting all the main historiographical paradigms designated by Rösen – pragmatism; historicism; hypothetically, even certain signs of overcoming historicism (the modern post-historicist paradigm); – in the relatively short period of the development of historiography (the first half of the 20th century) when applying the concept of paradigm shifts to Lithuanian historiography is subsistent. This is evident first of all due to not only a relatively easy interpretation of the concept of historiographical paradigms, but also to the indirect actualization of research on Lithuanian historiography of the first half of the 20th century as a potential domain of pursuit of a *historiographical research model*.

Following Rösen's and Kuhn's suppositions regarding historical and scientific change, the development of historiography is understood as an intellectual, professional and worldview process taking place in the interactions of three levels – individual, community (group) and society. When specifying this process in terms of historiography, the center of attention is devoted to the dimensions of the development of historical metatheory (*Historik*), the profession of a historian, and historical culture, which comprise the foundation of the *historiographical research model* in this study.

Researching the structure of the community of historians becomes particularly significant based on the premises of both Kuhn and Rösen. Moreover, the professional historian community (provided one already exists and is identifiable) can be interpreted as the sphere of socialization and selection, a meeting place of individual creative initiatives, the plans and undertakings of the professional group that gain a collective form, and the requirements for temporal orientation of the society in which the aforementioned professional community

is operating, i.e. the functions of social historiography, including *subtly making the past more like the present*, performed by writing history. Although Kuhn claimed that communities exist on multiple levels and the research on paradigms should start precisely with identifying the group(s), he also emphasized certain difficulties of identifying communities on the temporal dimension. For many centuries, writing history in Europe was practiced by historian amateurs, and only in the 19th century, especially from the middle of the 19th century until the First World War (1914), with the professionalization of history and the expansion of academic institutions, history became a part of academic research, and historians became a professional group who could make a living off of their professional activities.

We can obviously locate national professional historian communities in the making. However, the processes of institutionalization and professionalization were not synchronic and had quite varied trajectories in different countries on both the European and the global scale. Having a community of historians undoubtedly would have been a certain kind of luxury for the second half of 19th century–beginning of 20th century Lithuania who lacked a national state and its national institutions, was suffering under the ban on printing in the Latin script (1864–1904), and was a *society without a university*. *Hoc sensu*, Lithuania belonged to the stateless group of those who were only beginning to nurture the national historiographical traditions, where for a while history was first of all the occupation of educated clergy, doctors, lawyers, teachers, etc. Taking into account these conditions and the assumption that even historiographies of the 20th century Central Eastern Europe, including Lithuania, were compelled by particular sociopolitical and sociocultural circumstances to repeatedly turn to their ethnocentric *great narratives*, and historians, individually and in groups, rose solely to the defense of ethnonational political projections and ethnonational historical values, the question of the community of historians is approached in this thesis through the lens of the genesis, spread and potential autonomization of the profession of a historian.

The development of the profession and the community of historians is firmly associated with how well the historians are able to answer the questions of identity and legitimation

that the society and the government are concerned with. At this point we should take a look at the practical function of temporal orientation performed by historiography, and at the relationship between historians or their works and the contemporary cultural and political projections of the government or the society, as well as at the in/direct impact of the government or the society on the works of historians and writers of history, and at the ideological-societal-worldview premises of the development of historiography. In this case this thesis invokes certain Rüsen's insights regarding the theory of historical culture. They are the basis on which the subject-matter of this study expands to encompass the historiographical expressions of cultural history as well as the field of the issues of popularization of history. It is also noteworthy that Rüsen's concept of the disciplinary matrix of the science of history connects the worldview-oriented elements of historical culture and the theoretical-methodological dimension of the development of historiography. Therefore, we can treat the historian, the profession of a historian and historical culture not as three different versions of the development of historiography, but as levels of the same historiographical process.

Sources of research

This study uses certain archival sources from the Lithuanian Central State Archives, the Manuscript Department of the Wróblevski Library of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, and the Manuscript Department of the Martynas Mažvydas National Library of Lithuania. The key sources are divided into several groups: a) authentic texts that allow us to identify theoretical-methodological notions and standpoints, especially of those authors who taught disciplines related to theoretical-methodological underpinnings of history at the LU / VMU (Jonas Totoraitis, Augustinas Voldemaras, Lev Karsavin); b) individual historical works, reviews, responses, debates (both on theoretical and on subject-matter issues of history), theoretically minded articles, evaluations of final theses and dissertations, in other words, the depot of sources susceptible to the reconstruction of the implicit theory and methodology of history, appears at the center of attention; c) sources that enable characterization of institutions most important for the emergence of the profession of a

historian in Lithuania: statutes that regulate the aims and activities of various institutions related to the development of the science of history; meeting minutes of various institutions (associations, committees, university departments, etc.) and their divisions, description of institutional activities (including reviews of the projects, events organized by the institutions and the implementation of their plans, etc.), normative institutional documentation; d) raising the question of the genesis of the profession of a historian is enabled by looking at the testimony and expressions of the societal significance of history in the 19th century Lithuanian national movement (individual historical works and their reviews, articles, calendars, translations, etc.), at the programmatic designs of the national movement activating and employing cognitive interest in history, at the public discussions on questions of history (as knowledge and as a story) that are relevant to learning about the development of the profession of a historian; in the studies of the emergence of the profession of a historian, both the sources that allow to record the changes in sociocultural and intellectual conditions, and the individualized, personal, subjective aspects of the profession of a historian and their interpretations; the structure of the community of historians, its changes and the distribution of academic power, and personal relationships of historians, can also be understood and interpreted with the help of other traditional sources of the history of historiography: memoirs, autobiographies, correspondence of historians that bears testimony to their personal and scientific relationships, diaries, scientific communication (reviews, debates, participation in events, translations, etc.); e) sources that demonstrate the social underpinnings of publicly oriented histories, their potential influence and popularity, the opportunities for a public career (taking into account circulation, reviews, responses, discussions); f) sources that allow to adopt a long-term perspective outlook on the social background of the *grand narratives*, traditions of societal interpretation, support, strengthening, and critique, and on the issues of popularization of history and alternative narratives.

Novelty of research

Frequently the novelty of a scientific study is defined first of all by incorporating new material into the subject-matter under discussion. In this case that would mean that a historian of historiography who brings a formerly unknown document, letter or biography into scientific circulation, or who discovers a new fact, potentially presumes that in this way he *increases* the amount of scientific knowledge. This would be the typical conception of historical knowledge as a cumulative process which was conceptually called into doubt by Kuhn already half a century ago. The characterization of the sources of this thesis should clearly indicate that novelty is understood not only through the lens of employing new material. Exploring the historiographical research model as levels of representation of the theory and methodology of history, the profession of a historian and the expression of historical culture signifies the most crucial aspect of the novelty of this work. Viewing the Lithuanian national historiography of the first four decades of the 20th century in the broader perspective of Lithuanian humanitarian sciences and the general contexts of European historiography marks the second component of the novelty of this research. Accordingly, in this thesis, the history of historiography is treated not as a process of cumulative increase in knowledge, but as critical self/reflection of historiography.

Hypotheses

Formulating a historiographical research model in which the theory and methodology of history, the profession of a historian, and the dimensions of historical culture are constituent parts of the same process (which can be analyzed in one study) obviously posits the hypothesis of this study in the theoretical sense. The most important direction of the hypothesis of this study can be presented in the context of specific research as a certain thesis regarding the multiplicity (non-homogeneousness) of the Lithuanian national historiographical tradition. However, it is clear that a hypothesis formulated in such a way would be too general to be productive and to open the space for new research, thus it needs to be specified.

Historiographical paradigms is only one of the potential models for explaining the development of historiography and only potentially most aggregate formations in the development of historiography, one dimension, one approach to explaining changes in historiography. It can quite possibly be interpreted and applied in practice both as one of the models of the development of historiography, and as a background for a more focused analysis of the development of historiography that generalizes and conceptualizes only crucial shifts. However, other articulations and ways of explaining the development of historiography, especially of the kind that only lasted several decades, should be employed when analyzing a particular historiographical tradition. Thereupon, historians of historiography talk about schools, directions, waves and similar categories covering ideological and social elements of development whose size designates them as certain intermediate links between the historiographical paradigms and activities of individual historians in the development of historiography.

This thesis does not avoid looking at the political polarization of historians and their works. However, it also raises the question of the significance of theoretical-methodological creed, *Historik*, for a historical school, which allows us to specify the main direction of the hypothesis of this study: looking at the development of the theory and methodology of history from the perspective of several decades allows us to talk about *Kaunas historical school* which had certain common conceptual foundations, opposed the pragmatic *Auszra historiography* in the beginning of the 20th century, and somewhat consolidated institutionally and ideationally during the interwar period. It was united by the hostility towards historiographical pragmatism, the recognition of the methodological premises of history as a critical specific science and of the methodological presumptions, and by applying them in the practice of one's research. However, when specifying the *school* situation, it is noteworthy that it was not united in its ideational, institutional and historical culture (eventual synthetic history sightings). Both in terms of ideas and of institutions, we can distinguish two main trends in the Kaunas historical school already during the 1920s: empirical (Biržiška, Janulaitis, Jonynas) and theoretical (Voldemaras, Karsavin). The empirical division of the Kaunas historical school had the broadest institutional expression

base; therefore, it is not surprising that it was dominant in the Kaunas historical school when compared to the theoretical branch.

Structure of the thesis

This thesis is comprised of an introduction; three investigative parts devoted to the analysis of the theory and methodology of history, of the profession of a historian, and of the historical culture as certain aspects and levels of the historiographical process; conclusions; and the list of sources and literature (Bibliography).

I. Grounding history as science: theoretical inquiry, dominants and alternatives

The first part of this thesis is dedicated to the theoretical and methodological underpinnings of Lithuanian historiography in 1904–1940. Since theoretical inquiry emphasizing history and its methodology was not frequent in the context of Lithuanian science of history, numerous approaches need to be reconstructed, which is what this part of the thesis sets out to accomplish. In this way, we are trying to open up the prospects of the theoretical-methodological orientation in Lithuanian science of history, taking into account both the dominant and the alternative positions.

Three key issues are analyzed in the first chapter: the theory and methodology of European history (*Historik*) splitting into two barely connected branches at the end of the 19th century; the question of the popularity of the prominent German methodologist of history, Ernst Bernheim, in Lithuania; and the criticism of the pragmatist *Auszra* historiography by cultural intelligentsia oriented towards new methodology of history (expressed in the first decade of the 20th century), which indicated the start of paradigm shifts in Lithuania. In the latter case we examine three historiographical manifestos that demonstrate new developments in the context of Lithuanian historiography. The analysis in this chapter suggests that the commencement of the historicist paradigm with a European orientation should be relegated to the beginning of the 20th century when an independent Lithuanian state did not yet exist.

The second chapter examines how a need for broader theoretical substantiation of the theory and methodology of history arose in Lithuania once the University of Lithuania was established in 1922. Its various forms were taught as compulsory subjects to university students. These versions of the theory and methodology of history, explicitly expressed in the form of university courses, constitute the subject of analysis in this chapter. Such a course was taught by Jonas Totoraitis at the Department of Theology and Philosophy of the University of Lithuania. This course was directly associated with the established European tradition of the textbooks on the method of history. Augustinas Voldemaras who taught a course on the *Theory and Methodology of the Study of History* at the Department of Humanities of the University of Lithuania developed an original and distinctive version of a critical philosophy of history. This thesis asks whether Voldemaras' intellectual biography and his works have been adequately appreciated in Lithuanian historiography.

The third chapter of this part of the thesis deals with the problem of the dominant theoretical orientations in Lithuanian historiography. This issue becomes especially relevant in light of the fact that the majority of historians have not left any works testifying to their theoretical and methodological positions. Taking into account certain intimations and tangible examples of orientation towards French historiography, we raise the question regarding a certain parallelism of French and Lithuanian historiography. Due to these presuppositions a more detailed focus is placed upon the methodological underpinnings of the *École Méthodique* that prevailed in French historiography at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century. In-depth analysis allows us to discern an undeniable affinity between French pre-*Annales* historiography and the Lithuanian *École Méthodique*.

An exclusive place in Lithuanian historiography belongs to the historical approach of Lev Karsavin who came to Kaunas from Paris in 1927. The fourth chapter of this part of the thesis is devoted precisely to this issue. We look at Karsavin's viewpoint in the broader context of the development of European historiography. We analyze his book *Theory of History* that was published in Lithuanian in 1929 in an attempt to assess its potential impact on Lithuanian historiography. Despite the initially unwelcoming reception of Karsavin in Lithuanian academia, his influence on theoretically minded historians and Lithuanian

historiography is a relevant question that merits consideration. Focusing on Karsavin's work and theoretical positions, as well as on his impact on younger historians, allows us to discern a theoretically minded trend in the *Kaunas historical school*. We take into account the express attempts by some of Karsavin's students (Jakštas, Trumpa, Štuopis) to follow up on certain theoretical and methodological achievements of the professor.

The fifth chapter examines the theoretical viewpoints of the youngest generation of historians who began and completed their studies already in independent Lithuania. Firstly we raise the more general issue of the place and the significance of a generation in the development of historiography. Taking into account the broader sociocultural context of contemporary Lithuania, we look for prerequisites for activating the theoretical and methodological thought. We look for elements of a certain discourse that transcends individual utterances in the theoretically minded texts of the youngest generation historians. The aim of this analysis is to discover common positions in the texts of young historians and to use them to potentially estimate whether these historians are likely members of the empirical or of the theoretical branch of the Kaunas historical school. A text by an original but nowadays mostly forgotten young historian Povilas Štuopis, *Mūsų istorija (Our History)* (1931), is analyzed as a potential historiographical manifesto of the young generation of historians. However, in the thirties, other young historians (Jakštas, Ivinskis, Trumpa) expressed their theoretical positions and the critique of certain trends in the science of history more clearly and in a more academic manner. The last section of this chapter is dedicated to some of their texts and works, or to what we call *towards the theory of history and reflexiveness of historiography*. Questions and issues discussed in this section allow us to ponder the lack of unity and homogeneity in interwar Lithuanian historiography and in *Kaunas historical school*.

II. Towards *normal science*: the development of the profession and its attributes

In the second part of the dissertation, the focus lies on the profession of a historian. In an attempt to explain the emergence of this phenomenon in Lithuania, we employ an international perspective on the development of the profession of a historian. Despite certain

palpable differences between the sociocultural development in the West vs. in Lithuania, and even between Russian scientific centers and the working conditions of the emergent Lithuanian intelligentsia, the prerequisites of the development of the profession of a historian were similar in all cases. The attempt to answer the question of the origin, emergence and development of the demand for historical knowledge allows us to view the genesis of Lithuanian historiography and the development of the profession of a historian as pan-European phenomena.

The first chapter examines the sociocultural origins of the profession of a historian and traces the phenomenon of *historiography without historians* well known in European and global historiography. Historiography and historical narratives produced by doctors, clergy, and representatives of other occupations, comprise the content of *historiography without historians* that is closely related to the program and priorities of the Lithuanian national movement at the end of the 19th century. Therefore this chapter dwells in more detail on the issue of the influence and impact of the phenomenon of nationalism on the trends in the development of historiography and on the question of professionalization of historiography. At the end of the 19th century – beginning of the 20th century Lithuania belonged to a European region in which the processes of professionalization of historiography were falling behind heavily. Although a *Vilnius historical school* existed in the milieu of Vilnius University in the first half of the 19th century, the university was closed in 1832 courtesy of tsarist Russian administration. Scientific policy in 19th century Lithuania was not conducive to the development of history, Vilnius University resumed its operations only after the First World War. The leaders of the Lithuanian national movement were often amateur historians. This chapter scrutinizes how the overlap between participation in politics and engagement with history and writing historical works became even more pronounced in the beginning of the 20th century. In a sense, political debates in Lithuania in the beginning of the 20th century prompted emulation of the Western experiences by rationalizing the study of the past.

The second chapter takes a look at the debates that arose in the Lithuanian cultural print media at the beginning of the 20th century regarding establishment of a special historian

society or publishing of a historical magazine. The leading thought clarified in the discussion explicated that the Lithuanian cultural intelligentsia was not yet sufficiently differentiated. Therefore particular attention was paid to the activities of the *Lithuanian Scientific Society* (established in Vilnius in 1907). We look at the place and significance of history in the activities of this society, and at which historians who later became famous participated therein. The activities of the *Lithuanian Scientific Society* are viewed as the inception of institutionalization of history. Starting with the activities of this society, we analyze the subsequent processes of the development of the profession of a historian in Lithuania. In the last section of the second chapter, we survey the issues of sociocultural and intellectual institutionalization, discuss the lack of qualified historians after establishing independence, and analyze the issues of periodicals specializing in history.

The third chapter focuses on the activities of the *Lithuanian Historical Society* (1929). The key issue addressed here is the question whether this society became the epicenter of the development and operation of the profession of a historian in interwar Lithuania, i.e. whether the society lead by Augustinas Janulaitis managed to become an organizational embodiment of professional excellence of a historian. In order to answer this question, we examine the activities of Janulaitis, the chairman of the society, from the beginning of the 20th century, the various spheres of activity of the *Lithuanian Historical Society*, and the relationship between its leaders and historians who did not belong to this society. A case study of a young historian Juozas Jakštas helps explicate the role of the *Lithuanian Historical Society* (whose membership during various times amounted to 26 persons) in the system of social links and interpersonal relationships of the community of historians. We raise the question whether *Lithuanian Historical Society* was an organization that united the representatives of one of the branches of *Kaunas historical school* (the empirical one).

The fourth chapter examines the development of historiography and of the science of history in independent Lithuania in several senses of the term. We also take into account the social undercurrents that encourage this growth and the priorities of a young state in preparing a necessary number of original researchers of Lithuanian history. What was earlier termed *historiography without historians*, and was cultivated by representatives of

various occupations, gradually gained some solid competition in the form of a professionally minded science of history. This chapter explores the manner and the reasons of the radical changes in the situation. We investigate what determined the career advances made by history, from the library classification of bibliography and the entrenchment in encyclopedias to solid personal library collections. Attention is drawn to the development of specific historian education, to the fluctuations in the number of student historians, and to the emergent system of scholarships which enabled young professional Lithuanian historians to pursue the furtherance of their historical studies in Berlin, Vienna, Paris, etc. In addition to these factors encouraging growth, we point out other significant factors in the processes of the development of historiography. However, the growth of historiography in interwar Lithuania is not presented as an unlimited process, thus we ascertain and identify the factors and issues that determined and hindered the growth of historiography.

III. History oriented towards society: historians and the field of historical culture

The third part of this thesis is devoted to a complicated issue of the significance of historical narratives produced by amateur and professional historians for the Lithuanian society and its ethnonational identity. It also touches upon a narrower question of the potential role of the works of historians in the general historical culture of Lithuania during the period of 1904–1940. Such inquiry requires in-depth examination of the factors that determined the popularity of a certain work or a certain author. In Lithuania, just as in contemporary Europe, we can readily observe the paradox of the professionalization of historiography: when history becomes more scientific, it loses the ability to strongly influence the historical culture and communal representations of the society's past. Nevertheless, this part of the thesis takes up the inquiry into parallels between the scientification of history and the suggestions of representations of ethnonational identity.

The first chapter of this part of the thesis discusses the origins of the canon of ethnonationally minded history. We analyze the version of the *History of Lithuania* written by the poet and writer of history Jonas Mačiulis-Maironis at the end of the 19th century, taking into account the contemporary context of the Lithuanian national movement. In

addition to contemporaneous critiques and commentaries which help to interpret the reasons for the popularity of Maironis' *History of Lithuania*, a major focus falls on the retrospective analysis of the phenomenon of Maironis the historian. The Maironis' historical narrative, although a compilation, is interpreted as a point of departure of the ethnonational narrative of Lithuanian history, supplemented and extended by the *History of Lithuania* written by Antanas Alekna before the First World War. In this view, it is characterized as one of the most influential textbooks on the *history of Lithuania* in the first half of the 20th century. Since the Lithuanian society experienced a political differentiation at the beginning of the 20th century, the emergence of a slightly different version of the *history of Lithuania* also analyzed in this chapter is natural.

The second chapter focuses on the topic of popularization of history and actively pursues the question of the role of academic historiography in historical culture. We analyze issues, assessment and discussions facing professional Lithuanian historiography when it comes to the popularization of history. We look for a suitable explanation of the determinants of the risk faced by the historians during the period of the professionalization and specialization of history of losing the authentic connection with the needs and priorities of the society in which they operate. In the last section of this chapter we attempt to locate the evident connections between the priorities of the government and the society and the products of historians' work.

The third chapter examines the exceptional phenomenon of the historical culture of the 20th century Lithuania, the *History of Lithuania* edited by Adolfas Šapoka and published in a substantial printing in 1936, intended for both society and public education. Since the significance and popularity of this opus cannot be sufficiently explained based only on interwar sources, it is interpreted in the broader perspective of Lithuanian historical culture of the 20th century. We analyze the conditions and circumstances in which the aforementioned book was reprinted in a run of hundreds of thousands of copies during the years of the national reform movement Sajūdis. We also take into account the popularity of this book among the Lithuanian diaspora. We investigate the circumstances in which it was

commissioned by the Ministry of Education of the government led by the Lithuanian Nationalist Union in 1936.

Potential innovations in historical culture, alternative ideas and minor narratives, are introduced in the last chapter of this part of the thesis. Since this topic has hardly been analyzed in Lithuanian historiography, we use two typical cases as the point of departure of this chapter. In the first instance, we return to the historical beliefs and positions on the theory of history espoused by Augustinas Voldemaras and investigate in what ways his ideas were new or unusual in the context of Lithuanian historiography (starting in 1925, Voldemaras belonged to the History Section of Henri Berr's Centre International de Synthèse, well-known in Europe). We attempt to estimate whether the synthesis of a theoretically minded viewpoint not indifferent to sociology could be treated as an unfulfilled opportunity of Lithuanian historiography. This chapter approaches the works and activities of Zenonas Ivinskis as the second alternative. We investigate how the particular institutional and social position of Ivinskis in the *Kaunas historical school* could affect the conceptualizations of Lithuanian history that he proposed. We scrutinize the social undercurrents of the Eurocentric interpretation of Lithuanian history proffered by Ivinskis. The research findings are summarized and presented in the Conclusions. The list of the sources and literature used in this thesis can be found in the Bibliography.

CONCLUSIONS

The historiographical research model proposed in this thesis, encompassing the theory and methodology of history, the profession of a historian, and certain dimensions of historical culture, was tested using Lithuanian historiographical material. The research allows us to formulate several conclusions:

1. In 1904–1940, the theoretical-methodological program of the development of Lithuanian historiography experienced a paradigm shift:

a) in the Lithuanian historiography of the first decade of the 20th century, we can locate a moment of durable rupture – the shift from historiographical pragmatism to historicism and history as a particular critical inquiry;

b) the courses on the theory and methodology of history in the interwar *University of Lithuania* (VMU since 1930) adequately reflected the situation of the theoretical grounding of history experiencing changes since the end of the 19th century: the courses covered both the classical forms of the theoretical grounding of history established by historicism (Totoraitis) and the pursuit of new ways which could not be contained in the theoretical foundations of late historicism (Voldemaras, Karsavin);

c) the version of the pursuit of the theoretical grounding of history that had implicitly been dominant in Lithuania for four decades alludes to the theoretical foundations of the French *methodological school*; this fact, including the sparse direct appeals by Lithuanian historians to the French historiographical contexts, substantiates the applicability of the term of Lithuanian *methodical school* to define certain trends in the development of the theory and methodology of history in Lithuania; it is notable that what this thesis designates as the empirical branch of the *Kaunas historical school* is comparable to a distinct and independent historical school due to its significance and influence;

d) the beliefs of L. Karsavin exemplify an original conception of history as science, whereas his theoretical deliberations and his impact on certain young historians allows us to consider the theoretical branch of the *Kaunas historical school*;

e) the generation of young historians (also named the *generation of 1929* in this thesis) did not constitute nor create, and was not unified by, a singular platform of the theoretical-

methodological substantiation of history: the contributions of those who were proceeding with the idea of history conceptualized within the limits of the methodical school, its theoretical underpinnings, and specific works (Matusas, Šapoka), were significantly supplemented and updated (sometimes by explicitly opposing the methodical school) by some of the representatives of the young historians generation (Jakštas, Ivinskis, Štuopis, Trumpa) who were distinguishable by their accomplishments in the theory and methodology of history.

2. The development of the profession of a historian in Lithuania, although stunted, experienced an upturn in interwar Lithuania:

a) the demand for history, Lithuanian historiography, and the profession of a historian, is inseparable from the programmatic framework of the Lithuanian national movement of the end of the 19th century (this brought forth the phenomenon of *historiography without historians* and substantiated the theoretical-methodological pragmatism of the *Auszra* historiographical tradition focused on the construction of ethnonational identity; the differentiation of the Lithuanian public life and the competition of societal groups in the beginning of the 20th century, combined with emulating foreign experiences, nurtured the demand for rationalization of history and the dissociation from historical pragmatism, long alive in historical culture, which defined the Lithuanian identity but could not withstand intellectual critique (this brought forth the demand for specialized studies and, subsequently, for the profession of a historian, as well as the phenomenon of a critically oriented historicist historiography which obtained its most mature expression in the *Kaunas historical school*);

b) the institutionalization of history in Lithuania did not take place overnight: the first public societies for inquiry into Lithuanian history and initiatives for publication of a periodical dedicated to history (1905) were accompanied by public debates in which the establishment of a specialized society for historical research was qualified as an idea that was too narrowly specialized and not sufficiently focused on the general national interests (as a result of such debates, a more broadly focused Lithuanian Scientific Society was established in 1907); the professionalization was accompanied by sociocultural

(organizations) and intellectual (specialized publications) forms of institutionalization which provided an impetus for the development of the profession of a historian, as well as an opportunity for the differentiation of the historian community in terms of the theory and methodology of history, institutions, and, in a sense, cultivated and highlighted historical narratives;

c) the maturation of the Lithuanian historiographical tradition and the emergent community of historians was substantiated by the activities of the Lithuanian Historical Society (established in 1929, headed by Janulaitis) who, in their mission statement, envisaged potentially becoming the coordinating center of historical research in Lithuania (some later studies explicitly treated this *volition* as a potential scenario of the development of interwar Lithuanian science of history); however, the empirical branch of the Kaunas historical school failed to become synonymous with the interwar Lithuanian science of history; the representatives of the aforementioned theoretical branch either did not belong to the Lithuanian Historical Society (Voldemaras, Jakštas, Štuopis, Trumpa), or their membership was tokenistic (Karsavin) or ambiguous (Ivinskis);

d) Lithuanian historiography of 1920s-1930s experienced an undeniable leap in quantity and quality, however, the same societal contexts that brought forth the development of history and of the profession of a historian were a hindrance and an impediment to this process from another vantage-point (conditional development of the institutions of history, selective national and gender policy of scientific personnel recruitment, the bias in the subject matter of investigative history due to authoritarianism, etc.); either way, 1940 marks the turning-point when a large part of the Lithuanian community of historians was pushed into multitasking that has been a constant companion of both amateurs interested in history and the Lithuanian community of historians that emerged during the interwar period since the days of the national movement.

3. In terms of historical culture, an explicitly ethnonationally oriented canon of historical culture developed by both amateur and professional historians came into being during the period under scrutiny:

a) the most significant expressions of historiographical culture of history are inseparable from the identitarian demands of a certain society, subtly making the past more like the present, and the practice of temporal orientation of public life; the Lithuanian historical narrative produced by Jonas Mačiulis-Maironis (1891, 1903, 1906, 1926) is one of the archetypical versions of history that imply Lithuanian ethnonational identity and establish the canon of national history; the post-Maironis versions of Lithuanian history (Aleksa, Matulaitis) demonstrate the differentiation of public life and greater attention to facts versus literary contrivances, but Aleksa's greatly popular version of the *History of Lithuania* from the conceptual point of view essentially extends the Mačiulis-Maironis' Christian-national, anti-Polish, romantically medievalist (with the emphasis on Vytautas' times as the golden age) historical narrative of Lithuanian history;

b) having professionalized and institutionalized the science of history and channeled the energy of research carried out within the confines of the profession of a historian towards specific monographic work, there emerged the relevant issue of potential synthesis and popularization of history and the societal response that agitated intelligentsia and the historians themselves; in public debates (1930s), historians demonstrated an adequate appreciation of the significance of this question, however, making the epistemological dimension of historical culture absolute (which is typical for the science of history) brought forth a crisis of a broader impact on historical consciousness and historical culture; metaphorically speaking, we could say that politicians (e.g. by declaring 1930 the year of Vytautas the Great) and litterateurs (e.g. by organizing a literary competition of works dedicated to Vytautas the Great), by invoking the political and the aesthetical dimension of historical culture, played a significant part in preventing the historians' crisis of the popularization of history from becoming a general crisis of historical culture;

c) nevertheless, interwar Lithuanian historians did not remain outside of the purview of orientations and topicalities of historical consciousness and historical culture, on the contrary, they aimed to reflect, imitate and even shape (the degree of their success is a different issue) those orientations through their works (collective monographs, special studies, articles, textbooks, reviews of historical works, etc.), which is best exemplified by

the 1936 printing of the run of 17 050 copies of the *History of Lithuania* edited by Šapoka and intended for the intelligentsia and schools, initiated by the nationalist Ministry of Education; its most significant novelty in terms of the national historical narrative and the science of history was the attempt to re-occupy the epoch of the 16th-18th centuries from Poland, treating it as the age of independence and separateness of Lithuania (the Grand Duchy), but this innovation essentially paled in comparison to what the Lithuanian society with its *Šapoka's history* had to endure in 1940–1990. The fact that certain parts of the *History of Lithuania* edited by Šapoka were written by Jakštas, Ivinskis, Šapoka and other authors belonging to distinct branches of the *Kaunas historical school* certainly enables us to speak about *Kaunas historical school* in another aspect; however, this common work does not mean the disappearance of long-term conceptual differences between the two trends in the *Kaunas historical school*;

d) while looking at the development of historiographical expressions of historical culture in Lithuanian historiography, the issue of potential alternatives to the dominant canon of ethnonational history appears to be especially significant, but quite complicated; especially when we aim to investigate the insights and remarks that have found themselves on the margins of the historiographical tradition, the novelties that were emphasized but unfulfilled, and, finally, the alternatives that have stayed on the outskirts of the mainstream historical culture, the non-dominant, minor narratives; some cases of the analysis of the alternatives reveal that in the interwar period there were conceptual attempts to shape and rework the theoretical approach to history (Voldemaras); since there have been overtures to suggest such alternatives to the dominant Lithuanian historical narrative which did not receive sufficient attention and appreciation in their day, but had their sequels in the future of the historiographical tradition (e.g. the Eurocentric Christian interpretation of the history of Lithuania by Ivinskis and the conception of Lithuania's adjustment to Europe, or Europeanization, formulated by Gudavičius), this enables us to ponder the meaningfulness of researching historiographical alternatives and minor narratives.

ISTORIOGRAFIJA IR VISUOMENĖ: ISTORIKA, ISTORIKO PROFESIJOS IR ISTORINĖS KULTŪROS ASPEKTAI LIETUVOJE 1904–1940 M.

Reziumė

Šiame darbe analizuojama Lietuvos profesionalios istoriografijos genėzė ir sklaidos tradicija 1904–1940 metais. Tai pirmas mėginimas imtis detalios tuometinio istorijos mokslo Lietuvoje teorinių pagrindų interpretacijos. Išskirtinę vietą šioje interpretacijoje užima Lietuvoje plėtoto istorijos mokslo teorinių ir metodologinių orientacijų nagrinėjimas europinės istoriografijos pokyčių kontekste. Tam tikrą europinę dimensiją turi ir darbe nagrinėjami istoriko profesijos bei istorinės kultūros vystymosi Lietuvoje procesai. Istorinė kultūra, istoriko profesija ir istorijos teorija bei metodologija yra tokios kategorijos, kurių identifikavimas ir analizė XX a. pirmosios pusės Lietuvoje sudaro šio darbo ieškojimų šerdį.

XX a. pirmieji keturi dešimtmečiai lietuviškajai istoriografijai buvo ypatingas nacionalinės istoriografijos tradicijos kūrimosi metas. Tai ne kartą pastebėjo ir akcentavo tos tradicijos tyrinėtojai. Vis dėlto tarpukario, kuriam yra skirta kur kas daugiau dėmesio nei pirmiems XX a. dešimtmečiams, lietuviškosios istoriografijos vaizdas šiandieniniuose tyrimuose yra pernelyg vienaplaninis ir vienmatis. Prie to, manytume, prisideda ir dažnai tyrimams pasirenkama pernelyg siaura, iš politinės istorijos paveldėta dviejų dešimtmečių istoriografijos raidos chronologija, neleidžianti kiek plačiau, platesniame kontekste pažvelgti nei į Lietuvos, nei į Europos istoriografinius procesus XIX a. pabaigoje–XX a. pirmojoje pusėje. Kita vertus, kalbant apie tarpukariu formuluotas istoriografijos atnaujinimo strategijas, neretai neišvengiama tam tikro retrospektyvinio požiūrio, t. y. iš ateityje išryškėjusių mokslo istorijos aspektų sprendžiama apie tai, kokie istoriografijos atnaujinimo principai, vizijos ar netgi šūkiškai buvo svarbiausi, brandžiausi ar dominuojantys tarpukario Lietuvoje.

Vis dėlto minimo lietuviškosios istoriografijos iki 1940 m. vaizdo vienaplanškumo prielaida nėra tik atskirų tyrinėtojų nepakankamai korektiškos traktuotės ar panašūs dalykai.

Problema, kuri iš pirmo žvilgsnio gali pasirodyti lokali, priklausoma nuo tyrimų situacijos, atidžiau pažvelgus yra kontekstualiai išsisknijusi bendresnėje problematikoje.

Istoriografijos raidos kaip trijų integralių lygmenų traktuotė ir atskirų istoriografinių procesų (teorinių-metodologinių, profesinių, visuomeninių-ideologinių) analizė laike turėtų sudaryti sąlygas nors kiek priartėti ir prie tarpukario Lietuvos istoriografijos vaizdo vienmatiško įveikimo, o taip pat leisti kiek kitaip pažvelgti į XX a. pirmų keturių dešimtmečių lietuviškosios istorikos tradiciją, istoriko profesiją ir istorinę kultūrą Lietuvoje, šių istoriografijos matmenų tarpusavio jungtis ir sąryšius.

Šio tyrimo tikslas – pasiūlyti istoriografinio tyrimo modelį, kuriame istorikos, istoriko profesijos ir tam tikri istorinės kultūros raidos aspektai yra integralūs, detalios analizės reikalaujantys istoriografinio proceso lygmenys. Šis istoriografinio tyrimo modelis darbe tikrinamas remiantis lietuviškosios nacionalinės istoriografijos vystymosi 1904–1940 m. laikotarpyje medžiaga.

Darbe siūlomo modelio kaip istorikos, istoriko profesijos ir istorinės kultūros išraiškų istoriografinio proceso lygmenų tyrimas žymi ir svarbiausią šio darbo naujumo perspektyvą. XX a. pirmųjų keturių dešimtmečių Lietuvos nacionalinės istoriografijos matymas ir bendresnėje Lietuvos humanitarinių mokslų perspektyvoje, ir bendruose Europinės istoriografijos kontekstuose žymi antrą svarbų šio darbo naujumo sandą. Atitinkamai istoriografijos istorija šiame darbe suprantama ne kaip komuliatyvus žinojimo prieaugio procesas, o kaip kritinė istoriografijos refleksija ir savirefleksija.

Istoriografijos raidos tyrimams pritaikyto *istoriografinio tyrimo modelio* paieškoje šiame darbe išėties tašku tapo Thomo Samuelio Kuhno paradigmė mokslo kaitos samprata, kurios pamatinės nuostatos pabrėžia mokslo istorinę ir socialinę prigimtį, akcentuoja revoliucinį mokslo pažangos pobūdį bei mokslinių bendruomenių sociologinių bruožų reikšmę. Istoriografijos raidai suprasti pritaikyta T. Kuhno paradigmė mokslo kaitos sampratą pasiūlė vokiečių istorikas ir istoriografijos teoretikas Jörn Rūsenas.

Vadovaujantis J. Rūseno ir T. Kuhno istorijos ir mokslo kaitos prielaidomis, istoriografijos raida buvo suprasta kaip trijų lygmenų – individo, bendruomenės (grupės) ir visuomenės, – interakcijose vykstantis intelektualinis, profesinis ir pasaulėžiūros procesas. Istoriografiškai

konkretizuojant šį procesą, dėmesio centre atsidūrė istorijos metateorijos (istorikos), istoriko profesijos ir istorinės kultūros raidos aspektai, kurie šiame darbe ir sudaro *istoriografinio tyrimo modelio* pagrindą.

Darbą sudaro įvadas, trys dalys, išvados, darbo šaltinių ir literatūros sąrašas.

Pirmoji darbo dalis skirta Lietuvos istoriografijos 1904–1940 m. laikotarpiu istorijos teorijos ir metodologijos pagrindams. Bandoma atverti teorinių-metodologinių orientacijų Lietuvos istorijos moksle panoramą, atsižvelgiant tiek į dominuojančias, tiek į alternatyvias pozicijas.

Antroje disertacijos dalyje dėmesys koncentruojamas į istoriko profesiją. Norint paaikškinti šio fenomeno atsiradimą Lietuvoje, pasitelkiama tarptautinė istoriko profesijos vystymosi perspektyva. Mėginimas atsakyti į klausimą, iš kur kilo, atsirado ir plėtėsi istorinio pažinimo poreikis, leidžia lietuviškosios istoriografijos genezę, o kartu ir istoriko profesijos klostymąsi pamatyti kaip bendraeuropinius reiškinius.

Trečioji darbo dalis skirta sudėtingam probleminiam klausimui, – kokią reikšmę Lietuvos visuomenei ir jos tautinei tapatybei turėjo istorikų mėgėjų ir istorikų profesionalų kuriami istoriniai pasakojimai. Paliečiamas ir siauresnis klausimas apie tai, kokį vaidmenį istorikų darbai galėjo vaidinti bendroje 1904–1940 m. laikotarpio Lietuvos istorinėje kultūroje. Ieškoma paralelių tarp istorijos sumokslinimo ir siūlomų tautinės tapatybės vaizdinių.

Istoriografijos raida neatskiriamai susijusi su visuomene, kurioje ji plėtojama. Šiuo požiūriu, žinoma, Lietuva nebuvo Europos pirmūnė. Tačiau daugelis procesų, nors ir gerokai vėluodami, Lietuvoje vyko pagal europietišką modelį. Užtenka paminėti tai, kad 1922 m. įkūrus *Lietuvos universitetą* Kaune jo profesoriai mokė istoriją pasiryžusią studijuoti jaunuomenę iš pačios naujausios, prieš 2–5 metus Europoje pasirodžiusios literatūros. Kita vertus, istoriko profesijos vystymasis Lietuvoje turėjo specifinių problemų – tam ilgai nebuvo netgi elementarių sąlygų. XX a. pradžios kultūrinės inteligentijos diskusijos apie tai, ar reikėtų kurti specialią istorijos studijomis susidomėjusiųjų draugiją, rodė, kad interesas istorijai dar nėra pakankamai specializuotas ir nėra istorijos tyrinėtojų kritinės masės. Kita vertus, jau tuo metu populiarūs istoriniai pasakojimai Lietuvoje apie Lietuvos praeitį buvo orientuoti į Europoje žinomą tautinės istorijos paieškų pavyzdį.

Darbe parodoma, kaip Lietuvoje iki 1940 m. susiformavo europietišškai orientuotas istorijos mokslas, turintis savo metodą ir naujų istorijos šaltinių paieškos vektorių. Tam fenomenui pavadinti darbe siūloma *Kauno istorinės mokyklos* sąvoka. Ši mokykla sugebėjo įvaldyti Vakaruose išstobulintą istorijos metodą, šaltinių paiešką, kritišką įvertinimą ir detalią interpretaciją. Tai buvo vėlyvojo istorizmo metodologinius principus atitinkanti istoriografinė mokykla, kurios artimumas prancūzų istoriografini *École Méthodique* mokyklai leidžia samprotauti apie tam tikrą lietuviškosios metodinės mokyklos variantą. Tačiau tuo metu Europos istoriografija jau buvo žengusi keletą žingsnių pirmyn, o šiame darbe pastebima, kad Kauno istorinė mokykla nebuvo homogeniška. Darbe bandoma parodyti, kad Kauno istorinė mokykla turėjo ne tik savo istoriją kaip mokslą pagrindžiančią empirinę kryptį. Kauno istorinėje mokykloje egzistavo ir teorinė kryptis: ji pagrindžiama konkrečiais Augustino Voldemaro ir Levo Karsavino idėjų ir veiklos pavyzdžiais (turint galvoje ir jų studentus). Jais mėginama parodyti potencialią Lietuvos istoriografijos galimybę išsivaduoti iš tam tikro mokslinio provincializmo.

IŠVADOS

Šiame darbe siūlomas istoriografinio tyrimo modelis, apimantis istoriką, istoriko profesiją ir tam tikrus istorinės kultūros aspektus, buvo tikrinamas remiantis lietuviškosios istoriografijos medžiaga. Tyrimas įgalina padaryti keletą apibendrinimų:

1. 1904–1940 m. Lietuvos istoriografijos raidos teoriniame-metodologiniame plane įvyko paradigminis pokytis:

a) XX a. pirmame deš. lietuviškojoje istoriografijoje galime fiksuoti ilgalaikio lūžio – perėjimo nuo istoriografinio pragmatizmo prie istorizmo ir istorijos kaip kritinio specialaus tyrinėjimo momentą;

b) istorijos teorijos ir metodologijos kursai tarpukario *Lietuvos universitete* (nuo 1930 m. – VDU) gana gerai atspindėjo nuo XIX a. pabaigos besikeičiančią istorijos teorinio pagrindimo situaciją: kursai apėmė tiek klasikinius istorizmo įtvirtintus istorijos teorinio įprasminimo pavidalus (J. Totoraitis), tiek naujų kelių ieškojimus, kurie jau neišsiteko vėlyvojo istorizmo teorinėje bazėje (A. Voldemaras, L. Karsavinas);

c) implicitiniu pavidalu keturis dešimtmečius dominavęs istorijos teorinio pagrindimo paieškų variantas Lietuvoje mena prancūzų *metodinės mokyklos* teorinę bazę; būtent tuo, įskaitant ir tiesiogines, nors ir negausias, Lietuvos istorikų apeliacijas į prancūzų istoriografijos kontekstus, pagrindžiamas lietuviškosios *metodinės mokyklos* istoriografijoje sąvokos tinkamumas tam tikroms istorikos raidos tendencijoms Lietuvoje apibrėžti. Pažymėtina, kad taip darbe vadinama *Kauno istorinės mokyklos* empirinė kryptis, dėl savo svarbos ir įtakingumo panašėjanti į atskirą bei savarankišką istorinę mokyklą;

d) L. Karsavino pažiūros gerai iliustruoja originalią istorijos kaip mokslo pagrindimo sampratą, o jo teoriniai svarstymai ir įtaka tam tikriems jauniems istorikams leidžia samprotauti apie teorinę Kauno istorinės mokyklos kryptį;

e) jaunųjų istorikų karta (darbe ji dar vadinama *1929-ųjų karta*) nesudarė, nekūrė ir nebuvo vienijama vienos teorinės-metodologinės istorijos įprasminimo platformos: tuos, kurie tęsė metodinės mokyklos konceptualizuotą istorijos sampratą, teorinį pagrindimą ir konkrečius darbus (J. Matusas, A. Šapoka), reikšmingai papildė, atnaujino (kai kada ir aiškiai

oponuodami metodinei mokyklai) savo įdirbiais istorikoje išsiskyrę keletas kitų jaunųjų istorikų kartos atstovų (J. Jakštas, Z. Ivinskis, P. Štuopis, V. Trumpa).

2. Istoriko profesijos vystymasis Lietuvoje, nors ir apsunkintas, tarpukario Lietuvoje išgyveno savo pakilimą:

a) istorijos, lietuviškosios istoriografijos ir istoriko profesijos poreikis neatskiriama susijęs su XIX a. pabaigos lietuvių tautinio judėjimo programinėmis nuostatomis (tai suformavo *istoriografijos be istorikų* fenomeną bei įprasmino į tautinės tapatybės konstravimą orientuotos aušrinės istoriografijos tradicijos teorinį-metodologinį pragmatizmą). XX a. pradžios lietuvių visuomeninio gyvenimo diferenciacija ir visuomeninių grupių konkurencija subrandino, nusižiūrint kartu ir į užsienio patirtis, istorijos racionalizavimo poreikį bei atsiribojimą nuo istorinėje kultūroje dar ilgai gajaus, lietuviškąją tapatybę apibrėžiančio, tačiau intelektualinės kritikos neatlaikančio istoriografinio pragmatizmo (tai pagimdė specialių studijų ir, atitinkamai, istoriko profesijos poreikį, taip pat kritiškai orientuotos istoristinės istoriografijos fenomeną, kuris brandžiausią savo išraišką pasiekė *Kauno istorinėje mokykloje*);

b) istorijos institucionalizacija Lietuvoje neįvyko staiga: pirmąsias visuomenines draugijas Lietuvos istorijai tyrinėti ir specialaus istorijai skirto laikraščio leidimo iniciatyvas (1905 m.) lydėjo viešos diskusijos, kuriose specialios draugijos istorijai tyrinėti steigimas buvo įvertintas kaip pernelyg specializuotas ir į bendresnius tautinius interesus nepakankamai orientuotas sumanymas (kaip diskusijų pasekmė 1907 m. buvo įkurta bendresnio profilio Lietuvių mokslo draugija). Profesionalizaciją lydėjo sociokultūrinė (organizacijų) bei intelektualinė (specialios spaudos) institucionalizacijos formos, suteikusios pagreitį istoriko profesijos tapsmui, o kartu ir galimybę istorikų bendruomenės diferenciacijai istorikos, institucijų, o tam tikra prasme ir puoselėjamų bei akcentuojamų istorinių naratyvų požiūriu;

c) lietuviškosios istoriografijos tradicijos ir atsirandančios istorikų bendruomenės tam tikrą brandą įprasmino *Lietuvos istorijos draugijos* (įkurta 1929 m., vadovas – A. Janulaitis) veikla, kuri savo tiksluose numatė galimybę tapti istorijos tyrimus Lietuvoje koordinuojančiu centru (kai kurie vėlesni tyrinėjimai šį *norą* akivaizdžiai traktavo kaip galimą tarpukario Lietuvos istorijos mokslo raidos scenarijų). Vis dėlto *Kauno istorinės*

mokyklos empirinei kryptčiai nepavyko tapti Lietuvos istorijos mokslo tarpukariu sinonimu; minėtos mokyklos teorinės krypties atstovai arba nepriklausė LID (A. Voldemaras, J. Jakštas, P. Štuopis, V. Trumpa), priklausė formaliai (L. Karsavinas), arba jų priklausymas draugijai buvo nevienareikšmis (Z. Ivinskis);

d) XX a. trečiojo–ketvirtojo dešimtmečių lietuviškoji istoriografija išgyveno neabejotiną kiekybinį ir kokybinį šuolį, tačiau tie patys visuomeniniai kontekstai, kurie lėmė istorijos ir istoriko profesijos plėtrą, kitais atžvilgiais tą procesą stabdė ir ribojo (sąlyginė istorijos institucijų plėtra, tautiškai ir lytiškai selektyvi mokslinio personalo atrankos politika, autoritarizmo nulemtas tiriamosios istorijos tematikos vienpusiškumas ir pan.). 1940 m. ženklina lūžį, kuomet didelė dalis Lietuvos istorikų bendruomenės, vėl buvo nublokšta į daugiadarbiškumą, kuris nuo tautinio judėjimo laikų buvo nuolatinis tiek besidominčių istorija mėgėjų, tiek ir tarpukariu susiformavusios Lietuvos istorikų bendruomenės palydovas.

3. Istorinės kultūros požiūriu nagrinėtu laikotarpiu susiformavo aiškiai tautiškai orientuotas istorinės kultūros kanonas, prie kurio plėtojimo prisidėjo tiek istorijos mėgėjai, tiek istorikai profesionalai:

a) reikšmingiausios istoriografinės istorinės kultūros išraiškos yra neatskiriamos nuo tam tikros visuomenės tapatybės poreikio, rafinuoto praeities sudabartinimo ir visuomeninio gyvenimo orientavimo laike praktikos. Jono Mačiulio-Maironio Lietuvos istorijos (1891, 1903, 1906, 1926) naratyvas yra viena tipiškiausių tautinę lietuvių tapatybę implikuojančių ir tautinės istorijos kanoną įtvirtinusių istorijos versijų. Pomaironinės Lietuvos istorijos versijos (A. Alekno, S. Matulaičio) rodė visuomeninio gyvenimo diferenciaciją bei didesnę dėmesį faktui, lyginant su literatūrine išmone, tačiau itin populiarį A. Alekno *Lietuvos istorijos* versija koncepcine prasme iš esmės pratęsė J. Mačiulio-Maironio krikščioniškai tautišką, antilenkišką, romantiškai medievistinį (su Vytauto laikų kaip aukso amžiaus akcentu) Lietuvos istorijos naratyvą;

b) profesionalizavus ir institucionalizavus istorijos mokslą, o istoriko profesijos atstovų atliekamų tyrimų energiją nukreipus specialiu, monografinių darbų kryptimi, iškilo aktualus, inteligentią ir pačius istorikus jaudinantis galimos istorijos sintezės bei istorijos

populiarizacijos, atsako visuomenei klausimas. Viešose diskusijose (IV deš.) istorikai pasirodė kaip pakankamai gerai suprantantys to klausimo svarbą, tačiau, absoliutizavus pažintinę istorijos kultūros dimensiją (kas būdinga istorijos mokslui), išgyventa platesnio poveikio istorinei sąmonei ir istorinei kultūrai krizė. Metaforiškai galima sakyti, kad politikai (pvz., 1930 metus paskelbdami Vytauto Didžiojo metais) ir literatai (pvz., 1930 m. rengdami Vytautui Didžiajam skirtų kūrinių literatūrinį konkursą), pasitelkdami politinę ir estetinę istorijos kultūros dimensijas, suvaidino reikšmingą vaidmenį, kad istorikų istorijos populiarizacijos krizė nevirstų visuotine istorinės kultūros krize;

c) vis dėlto tarpukario Lietuvos istorikai neliko istorinės sąmonės ir istorinės kultūros orientacijų bei aktualijų užribyje, atvirksčiai, savo darbais (kolektyvinėmis monografijomis, specialiomis studijomis, straipsniais, vadovėliais, istorinių darbų recenzijomis ir pan.) jie bandė atliepti, sekti, netgi formuoti tas orientacijas (kitas klausimas – kaip jiems tai pavyko), o tai geriausiai iliustruoja ryški, visuomeniškai orientuota, tautininkų Švietimo ministerijos iniciatyva parengta, 1936 m. 17 050 egzempliorių tiražu pasirodžiusi, A. Šapokos redaguota inteligentijai ir mokyklai skirta *Lietuvos istorija*. Tautinio istorijos naratyvo ir istorijos mokslo požiūriu reikšmingiausia naujovė joje – tai bandymas reokupuoti iš Lenkijos XVI–XVIII a. epochą, ją traktuojant kaip Lietuvos (LDK) atskirumo ir savarankiškumo amžius, tačiau ši naujovė iš esmės nublanko prieš tai, ką lietuviškajai visuomenei kartu su sava *Šapokos istorija* teko išgyventi 1940–1990 metais. Tai, kad A. Šapokos redaguotoje *Lietuvos istorijoje* atskiras dalis rašė J. Jakštas, Z. Ivinskis, A. Šapoka ir kt. autoriai, priklausę skirtingoms *Kauno istorinės mokyklos* kryptims, žinoma, leidžia dar vienu aspektu kalbėti apie *Kauno istorinę mokyklą*, tačiau šis bendras darbas nereiškia, kad su juo išnyko ilgalaikiai ir konceptualūs skirtumai tarp dviejų *Kauno istorinės mokyklos* krypčių;

d) žvelgiant į istorinės kultūros istoriografinių išraiškų raidą lietuviškojoje istoriografijoje, ypatingos svarbos, tačiau gana painus pasirodo dominuojančio tautinio istorijos kanono galimų alternatyvų klausimas; ypač tuomet, kai nusitaikoma nagrinėti istoriografinės tradicijos paraštėje atsidūrusias, dažnai marginalizuotas išžvalgas ir pastabas, akcentuotas, tačiau nerealizuotas naujoves, pagaliau, pagrindinio istorinės kultūros srauto nuošalyje

likusias alternatyvas, nedominuojančius, mažuosius naratyvus. Kai kurie alternatyvų nagrinėjimo atvejai rodo, kad tarpukariu būta konceptualių bandymų formuoti, atnaujinti požiūrį į istoriją teorine prasme (A. Voldemaras); kadangi būta mėginimų siūlyti tokias dominuojančio Lietuvos istorijos naratyvo alternatyvas, kurios nesulaukė pakankamai amžininkų dėmesio ir įvertinimo, tačiau turėjo savo tęsinius istoriografinės tradicijos ateityje (pvz., Z. Ivinskio europocentriškai krikščioniška Lietuvos istorijos traktuotė bei prof. E. Gudavičiaus Lietuvos pritaipimo prie Europos, europeizacijos samprata), tai leidžia samprotauti apie istoriografinių alternatyvų bei mažųjų pasakojimų tyrimų prasmingumą.

Mokslinių publikacijų sąrašas

1. (su A. Švedu) Kuo svarbi istoriografijos istorija? Istorikų identiteto problemos Lietuvos istoriografijoje // Lietuvos istorijos studijos, 2005, nr. 16, p. 42–47.
2. Lietuvos istorikų bendruomenė: nuo pirmos disertacijos iki pirmo suvažiavimo. // Naujasis Židinys-Aidai, 2005, nr. 11–12, lapkritis–gruodis, p. 550–555.
3. Jono Puzino ir jo kartos kultūros paveldo tyrinėtojų šimtmetis. // Kultūros paminklai, 2005, nr. 12, p. 190–197.
4. Filosofinės istorikų nekaltybės įveikos modusai // Inter-studia humanitatis: Kaltė kaip kultūros fenomenas, (sudarytojas V. Butkus). Nr. 4 / 2007, p. 166–179.
5. Adolfo Šapokos redaguota Lietuvos istorija: populiarumo kontekstai // Naujasis Židinys / Aidai, 2007, Nr. 3, p. 115–123.
6. Viduramžių kautynės *lietuviškosios visuomenės* fokuse // Acta Historica Universitatis Klaipedensis XXII, 2011, p. 102–128.

Istoriografinės recenzijos:

1. Kolektyvinės biografijos ištekliai istoriografiniame tyrime [recenzija Valdo Selenio knygai Lietuvos istorikų bendrija 1918–1944 metais: kolektyvinės biografijos tyrimas. Vilnius: Vilniaus pedagoginis universitetas, 2007, 220 p.] // Istorija, 2007, t. 67, p. 66-69.
2. Istorikas ir istoriografija transformacijų laikmečiu: tarp naujos istorijos proveržių ir Klėjos sugrįžimo refleksijų [recenzija Alfonso Eidinto knygai Istorija kaip politika: įvykių raidos apžvalgos. Vilnius: Versus aureus, 2008, 440 p.] // Istorija, 2009, t. 73, p. 63-66.

Trumpos žinios apie disertacijos autorių

Aurelijus Gieda (g. 1976 Kretingos raj., Baulbių km.) studijavo istoriją Klaipėdos universiteto Socialinių mokslų fakultete 1995–1999 m. Nuo 2000 m. studijavo Vilniaus universitete, kurį baigė 2002 m. magistro laipsniu. 2002–2006 m. Vilniaus universiteto doktorantas. Nuo 2004 m. – Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos fakulteto Istorijos teorijos ir kultūros istorijos katedros asistentas. Tais pačiais metais Vilniaus universiteto Matematikos ir informatikos fakultete pradėjo skaityti *Civilizacijų istorijos* kursą. Nuo 2005 m. keletą metų vedė profesoriaus Alfredo Bumblausko skaitomo *Civilizacijų istorijos* kurso seminarus Vilniaus universiteto Tarptautinių santykių ir politikos mokslų institute ir Tarptautinėje verslo mokykloje. Bendrauniversitetinio *Civilizacijų istorijos* kurso seminarus Istorijos fakultete disertacijos autorius veda iki šiol. Nuo 2008 m. Istorijos fakulteto studentams skaito kursą *Europos sampratos ir jų istoriografinės pasekmės*. 2012 m. startavusioje naujoje Istorijos fakulteto modulių dėstymo sistemoje disertacijos autorius bendradarbiauja keturiuose teminiuose moduluose: 1) Kultūros istorijos įvadas. Europa; 2) Europos regionai: idėjos, tapatybės, istoriografijos; 3) LDK kultūros profiliai: praeitis, tradicija, paveldas; 4) Istorijos didaktika mokytojams.

Be savo akademinės veiklos, disertacijos autorius nuo 2001 iki 2013 m. dirbo mokytoju Vilniaus „Laisvės“ gimnazijoje.

Svarbiausios tyrimų sritys – istorika (*Historik*), istoriografijos teorija ir istorija, kultūrinė ir sociokultūrinė istorija, istorijos didaktika.

Yra paskelbęs keletą mokslinių publikacijų, su pranešimais dalyvavęs filosofų, etnologų, archeologų, literatūrologų ir istorikų organizuotose mokslinėse konferencijose, dalyvavęs istorijos populiarizacijos projektuose, vedęs mokslo populiarinimo laidas radijuje.

Telefonas: +370 611 28733

El. paštas: aurelijus.gieda@gmail.com

Biographical notes on the author of the dissertation

Aurelijus Gieda (born in 1976 in Kretinga region, Baubliai village) studied history at the Department of Social Sciences of the Klaipėda University in 1995–1999. Starting in 2000, he studied at the Vilnius University, graduating with a master's degree in 2002, and was a Ph.D. student at the Vilnius University in 2002–2006. The author has been an assistant lecturer at the Department of the Theory of History and Historical Culture at the Department of History, Vilnius University, since 2004. During the same year, he started teaching a course on *History of Civilizations* at the Department of Mathematics and Informatics, Vilnius University. Starting in 2005, he led seminars of the course on *History of Civilizations* taught by prof. Alfredas Bumblauskas at the Vilnius University Institute of International Relations and Political Science and the International Business School for several years. The author of this dissertation still leads the seminars for the interdepartmental course on the *History of Civilizations* at the Department of History. Since 2008, he has been teaching students of the Department of History a course on the *Conceptions of Europe and Their Historiographical Implications*. In the new module teaching system at the Department of History that started in 2012, the author is working on four modules: 1) Introduction to the history of culture. Europe; 2) European regions: ideas, identities, historiographies; 3) The cultural profiles of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania: the past, the tradition, the heritage; 4) Didactics for history teachers.

Apart from his academic activities, the author of this dissertation has worked as a teacher at the Vilnius *Laisvės (Freedom)* High School from 2001 until 2013.

Key areas of research: *Historik*, theory and history of historiography, cultural and sociocultural history, didactics of history.

The author has published several scientific publications, presented at conferences organized by students of philosophy, ethnologists, archeologists, students of literature, and historians, participated in history popularization projects, hosted a radio show aimed at popularizing science.

Phone: +370 611 28733

E-mail: aurelijus.gieda@gmail.com