with the mysticism of the Eurasian ‘collectivist’ spirit” (p. 54). Considering transculture’s desire to transcend politics, and also Epstein’s argument for “utopianism after utopia” and “non-totalitarian totality,” this particular historical (and ideological) context really needs to be addressed.

Eliot Borenstein  
New York University


Krapauskas’ book-length historiographical essay fills an essential spot in the corpus of Lithuanian historical writing. The appearance of ethnic nationalism in East Central Europe in the nineteenth century would change the political landscape in the twentieth. Krapauskas traces the appearance of this brand of identity formation in the historical works — professional, journalistic and dilettante — in Lithuania during the century leading to independence in 1918.

Krapauskas’ monograph is solid despite persistent problems with intent and theory. Thus, he writes, “Historicism mediated between the prejudices of nationalism and the dispassion of historical research,” using Maurice Mandelbaum’s definition of historicism that an event could only be understood “in terms of the place it occupied and the role it played within a process of development.” Presumably, Krapauskas’ monograph should then trace this approach to history in nineteenth century Lithuania. It does not do so, except tangentially. Nationalism and Historiography is about the development of Lithuanian historical writing as part of the Lithuanian national awakening. Krapauskas’ approach, not his subject matter, may be historicist.

Nationalism and Historiography is also conceptually tentative. References to theories of nationalism as a historical phenomenon and to other stateless nationalisms analogous to modern Lithuania’s are only tantalizing hints. Nonetheless, neither theoretical limitation nor unpursued directions detract from the value of this very worthwhile study.

After an introductory chapter on historicism and Lithuanian history, the section, “Identity Problems,” discusses the birth of a modern Lithuanian identity in the nineteenth century. In contrast to the national identity of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, modern Lithuanian identity is based on language, a romanticized history and the myth of Polish oppression. The insights into the delayed development of modern national identity are not new, but they do need repeating. Although Krapauskas does mention in passing a political nationalism with the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as the object of loyalty, he stresses the confusion of religious, regional or estate identities during early modern times. But this confusion would largely disappear with a clearer acknowledgement of political identification with the old Commonwealth.

The central point of “Identity Problems” is the emergence of a romanticized Lithuanian history from 1803 to 1832 that traced a Lithuanian identity from the defunct Commonwealth but “used Poland as its foil,” idealized the pagan past and “em-
phasized the role of the peasants as guardians of the nation’s culture.” Such themes dominated the work of the only trained Lithuanian-language historian in the nineteenth century, Simonas Daukantas (1793-1864). Only with the appearance of the Lithuanian language newspaper, Auszra (1883-86) did a “modern” Lithuanian intelligentsia arise. It was during this period that, according to Krapauskas, the “Lithuanians invented the idea of Polish national oppression as essential to a distinct identity. “Germans and Russians were too distant and too powerful for the Lithuanians to deal with.” Krapauskas observes that this was a common phenomenon: two “powerless nations with similar cultures” developed national hatred of each other. Though Krapauskas does not make a reference to Czesław Milosz, his pithy scholarly description of the phenomenon is consistent with the literary description of national awakening presented in Milosz’s Issa Valley.

Krapauskas traces a familiar pattern, reminiscent of Hans Kohn’s analyses. Beginning with “a nebulous Lithuanian cultural phenomenon” (more recently presented as the “Samogitian national movement”), individuals fascinated with the language of the peasantry would eventually create an elite culture, separate from the Poles and based on “differences in social class, language and psychology.” Unfortunately, no explanation or description of the psychological differences between Lithuanians and Poles is offered. Krapauskas only chronicles the dilettante efforts of individuals such as Poska and Jucevicius and their imagined histories of Lithuania.

The monograph then examines the birth of Lithuanian historiography at the University of Vilnius, a stronghold of the Polish intelligentsia, with special emphasis on the pivotal figure of Daukantas. Alone among the faculty, he expressed an anti-Polish historical vision that after a generation of silence would merge with that of Auszra. Krapauskas evenhandedly criticizes Daukantas for his uncritical, idealized history, poor and less than transparent methodology and commends his genuine contact with peasant culture. Like the pattern elsewhere, pre-history Lithuania became a mythical land of glory and flourishing virtues, such as democracy, absent in contemporary society. Daukantas’s works had more literary than historical value, yet he set the tone for Lithuanian historiography not withstanding the more critical, if still unscientific, works of Simonas Stanevicius and Motiejus Valancius.

Major Russification efforts after the 1830 Uprising resulted in underground schools among the Lithuanian peasants who then would lead the awakening associated with Auszra. Yet Lithuanians, such as Antanas Baranauskas, remained loyal to the Old Commonwealth and condemned the Lithuanian separatist movement. But Russification did drive a wedge between Poles and Lithuanians. Anti-Polish, “combative, secular and nationalist,” Auszra perpetuated the dominance of Romanticism over Lithuanian historiography in the late nineteenth century. An idealized history of Lithuania became a basis of national consciousness. Reclaiming the Polonized nobility became a goal. In effect, though Krapauskas does not state it directly, Lithuanian historians fabricated the “truth” necessary for Lithuanian national consciousness. Even Jonas Basanovicius, who played a vital role in the move towards solid research, insisted on a Thracian origin for Lithuania. The more accurate Jonas Sliupas proved less influential. Krapauskas concludes that socioeconomic reasons may have played a greater role in the awakening but Auszra symbolized it. After the brief Auszra period,