

Mykolo Römerio 120-osioms metinėms

LIETUVIŲ ATGIMIMO ISTORIJOS STUDIJOS

8

Asmuo: tarp tautos ir valstybės

VILNIUS

 Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla 1996

UDK 947.45.052

Li-191

Redakcinė kolegija:

Antanas Kulakauskas

Česlovas Laurinavičius

Raimundas Lopata

Rimantas Miknys

Egidijus Motieka (vyriausiasis redaktorius)

Vladas Sirutavičius

Giedrius Subačius

Antanas Tyla

Sudarytojai:

Egidijus Motieka

Rimantas Miknys

Raimundas Lopata

Recenzavo:

hum. m. dr. *Zigmantas Kiaupa*

hum. m. dr. *Elmantas Meilus*

Leidinių parengti talkino

Darius Staliūnas

Knygos leidimą parėmė:

Lietuvos kultūros ministerija

Lietuvos istorijos institutas

Atviros Lietuvos fondas

© Lietuvių Atgimimo
istorijos studijos, 1996

© Lietuvos istorijos
institutas, 1996

© Mokslo ir enciklopedijų
leidykla, 1996

ISSN 1392-0391

ISBN 5-420-01318-5

TURINYS

PRATARMĖ	5
I. STRAIPSNIAI. STUDIJOS	9
<i>Giedrius Subačius</i> JURGIO AMBRAZIEJAUS PABRĖŽOS ŽEMAIČIŲ KALBA	10
<i>Rūta Čapaitė</i> JURGIO AMBRAZIEJAUS PABRĖŽOS, JUOZO BUTAVIČIAUS, SIMONO DAUKANTO BRAIŽAI IR CHARAKTERIAI	114
<i>Reda Griškaitė</i> ISTORINĖS SAVIMONĖS IŠTAKŲ IEŠKANT: TEODORAS NARBUTAS 1808–1809 METŲ RUSIJOS–ŠVEDIJOS KARE	143
<i>Zita Medišauskienė</i> ADOMAS HONORIJUS KIRKORAS: TARP LIETUVOS, LENKIJOS IR BALTARUSIJOS	168
<i>Reda Griškaitė</i> BARONAS VASILIJUS VON ROTKIRCHAS – LIETUVIŲ MITOLOGIJOS AUTORIUS	194
<i>Grigorijus Potašenko</i> ALEKSANDRAS HILFERDINGAS. SLAVOFILAI. LIETUVA	224
<i>Egidijus Motieka</i> JONAS BASANA VIČIUS: TARP TRADICINIO IR MODERNAUS VALSTYBINGUMO	239
<i>Vilma Žaltauskaitė</i> APIE LIETUVYBĖS IDĖJĄ KUNIGO JUOZO TUMO-VAIŽGANTO PAŽIŪROSE. IKI 1904 M.	248
<i>Saulius Pivoras</i> UTOPIJOS PILIETIS VYTAUTAS PUTNA	261

<i>Vladas Sirutavičius.</i> APIE „BLOGĄ LIETUVI“ JUOZAPĄ ALBINĄ HERBAČIAUSKĄ	271
<i>Darius Staliūnas</i> „TRUPUTĮ LENKAS, TRUPUTĮ VOKIETIS, TRUPUTĮ LIETUVIS, O VISŲ PIRMA KATALIKAS...“ Vilniaus vyskupas Edwardas von der Roppas tarp etninių, pilietinių ir konfesinių vertybių	291
<i>Rimantas Miknys</i> „SVAJONĖS IŠSIPILDYS, JEIGU BŪSIU NAUDINGAS LIETUVAI...“ Architekto Antano Vivulskio tautinės identifikacijos istorinis aspektas	300
<i>Alfred Erich Senn</i> ANTANAS VISKANTAS: A LITHUANIAN WITH POLISH FRIENDS	312
<i>Alfredas Erichas Sennas</i> ANTANAS VISKANTAS: LIETUVIS SU BIČIULIAIS LENKAIS	318
<i>Raimundas Lopata</i> „TIPAS APSKRITAI LABAI DAR ĮTARIAMAS, BET REIKALINGAS“ Baronas Friedrichas von der Roppas ir Lietuvos valstybingumo atkūrimo planai	321
<i>Česlovas Laurinavičius</i> GRAFAS ALFREDAS TIŠKEVIČIUS NAUJŲJŲ LAIKŲ LIETUVOS POLITIKOJE	351
<i>Gedrius Viliūnas</i> BAJORAS TARPUKARIO LIETUVOJE: FABIJONO NEVERAVIČIAUS GYVENIMAS IR KŪRYBA	365
II. PUBLIKACIJOS	385
ADOMO VARNO KORESPONDENCIJA (1904–1909 METAI) Parengė <i>Asta Giniūnienė</i>	386
SKANDALINGIEJI JUOZO GABRIO-PARŠAIČIO DARBAI Parengė <i>Alfonsas Eidintas</i>	407
OSOBA: MIĘDZY NARODEM A PAŃSTWEM. STRESZCZENIE	456
A PERSON BETWEEN THE NATION AND THE STATE. SUMMARY	470
PERSÖNLICHKEITEN: ZWISCHEN VOLK UND STAAT. ZUSAMMENFASSUNG	484
ASMENVARDŽIŲ RODYKLĖ	500
VIETOVARDŽIŲ RODYKLĖ	515
APIE AUTORIOUS	523

SUMMARY

I. Articles. Studies

Giedrius Subačius

JURGIS AMBRAZIEJUS PABRĖŽA'S SAMOGITIAN LANGUAGE

1. Jurgis Ambraziejus Pabrėža (1771–1849) established his own Samogitian orthography. On the other hand he did not use any other letters than the ones used in Polish orthography. The uniqueness of Pabrėža's writing comes from his effort to adjust 18th century Lithuanian or Polish orthography to Samogitian texts, his selection of letters to convey Samogitian phonemes.

2. Pabrėža perfected his orthography step by step as the years went by. In 1798 in Raudėnai he still used a mixture of Aukštaitish (a more exact 18th century Lithuanian written language) and Samogitian, but in 1799 in Tverai already decided to write consistently in Samogitian: his writings are dominated by *ó* [ɔ], *q* [ɔn] (not at the beginning of words), *ón* [ɔn] (at the beginning of words), *óu* [ɔu], *óm* [ɔm], *yi* [ɛi]. 1800–August 10, 1801 he began to write the combination *kia* [k'e] as *kie* (*gia* [g'e] was turned into *gie* earlier). When already working in Plungė instead of *le* [l'ie] he introduced *lie* from September 29, 1801 to September 8, 1802. Later he still hesitated three times, over whether it would not be better to write *le* again (April 5, 1803, November 1, 1808–October 2, 1809, and January 1, 1810–April 2, 1811). At the same time (September 29, 1801–September 8, 1802) in Plungė he changed *ci* [č'] to *czi* [č']. Ca. November 2, 1805 he decided to denote the Samogitian diphthong [ɛi] not by *yi*, as earlier, but by *yy*, though he soon stopped this experiment. From December 8, 1807 to November 1, 1808, already living in Kartena Pabrėža began to write *gy*, *ky* instead of *giy* [g'ɛ], *kiy* [k'ɛ]. Also in Kartena from October 2, 1809 to April 2, 1811 he rejected the written combination *gie* [g'e], *kie* [k'e] and introduced *ge*, *ke*.

Later (from the end of 1816, living in Kretinga) Pabrėža did not modify his orthography for a long time, the only change to be mentioned is that ca. May 21, 1822 *zi* [ž'i] was changed into *ži* in his sermons. The new reform wave in Pabrėža's orthography appeared only in 1831: although not very consistently, he began to change the orthography of palatalised consonants [č'], [š'], [ž'] for which *ć*, *ś*, *ź* are introduced and began to denote *q* [ɔn] also at the beginning of the words, as earlier in the middle of the words. From 1831 to 1834 he further modified it and began to denote [č'] and [š'] in his own way: *ćz* and *śz*. At the same time he also introduced a new manner to denote long and lengthened vowels, namely, by writing them double (e.g. *aa*, *ee*, *yy*, *oo*, *óó*, etc.) linguistic.

3. There might have been three linguistic motives for Pabrėža's modifications: a) to establish a uniform orthography (*gia* [g'e], *kia* [k'e]>*gie*, *kie*; *ci* [č']>*cz*; *yi* [ɛi]>*yy*>*yi*; *giy* [g'ɛ], *kiy* [k'ɛ]>*gy*, *ky*; *gie* [g'e], *kie* [k'e]>*ge*, *ke*; *q* [ɔŋ] in all the positions; b) to transcribe the sounds of Samogitian more exactly (*le* [l'ie]>*lie*; *zi* [ž'i]>*zi*>*zi*; and the double vowels); c) to give norms for the Standard Samogitian Written Language (SSWL) (*ć*, *ś* double vowels). There might have been extra-linguistic reasons for the further urge to change his orthography, namely, changes of habitat, internal disturbances, social events.

4. Until the very beginning of the new orthographical reform in 1831, Pabrėža apparently uses the same orthography for all his scientific and religious texts. From 1831–1834, however, his religious texts were written according to the earlier orthography (without *ć*, *ś* and double vowels), while in his diverse secular writings he used his innovations. It is possible to claim that ca. 1828–1831 (or perhaps a little later) Pabrėža decided to create a standard Samogitian written language for secular texts. The religious texts continued to be only auxiliary forms of oral language. Though he had written in Samogitian for a long time, he decided to create the SSWL only in his sixties.

5. Pabrėža created the SSWL only for ethnic Samogitians (he acknowledged the different traditions of the written language in Prussia and the GDL). He expected not all future Samogitians, only the more enlightened ones to use his SSWL. He did not model the standard spoken language more profoundly, because while creating written norms he relied on oral use, anyway.

6. He tried to spread his SSWL and implant it into all his and his students' (especially Simon Gross' and Juozas Butavičius') writings. The most important works preserving Pabrėža's SSWL are the following: a) his own *Tayslós augumynis*, i.e. A Systematisation of Plants on 1000 p (1843); b) Simon Gross' *Kalbrieda Ležuwe Zemaytyszka*, i.e. a grammar and a Polish–Samogitian dictionary of the basic 3,000 words (1835); c) Simonas Daukantas' *Istorija žemaitiška* (*Samogitian History*) copied by Juozas Butavičius, ca. 1000 p (ca. 1834–May 16, 1835). We have to emphasise that owing to Pabrėža the Kretinga Bernardine Monastery, especially after the 1831 uprising, became a very important centre of Samogitian culture.

Nevertheless the wide range of Pabrėža's efforts to create and implant a standard language were forgotten for a long time, since there have never been any books printed in his SSWL, even up to now.

Rūta Čapaite

THE HANDWRITING AND CHARACTER OF JURGIS AMBRAZIEJUS PABRĖŽA, JUOZAS BUTAVIČIUS, SIMONAS DAUKANTAS

Jurgis Ambraziejus Pabrėža, Simonas Daukantas and Juozas Butavičius wrote according to the English handwriting style learnt at school, owing to which there are common features in their handwriting. The differences between them go back to two reasons. One of them is that Pabrėža, Daukantas and Butavičius were of markedly different ages, there was a gap of 35 years between Pabrėža and his

student Butavičius. Their handwriting reflects the changes affecting the general appearance of writing which took place during this period. The individuality of their handwriting was further defined by the differences of their personal, physical and psychic features.

The graphic analysis of Pabrėža's and Butavičius' handwriting points out that Butavičius, being in the Kretinga monastery, not only helped his teacher to copy the register of Samogitian-Latin botanical terms, but at his elder's initiative copied 1004 pages *in folio* of Daukantas' *Istorija žemaitiška* (*Samogitian History*), the preface of Simon Gross' grammar and one and a half pages from the beginning of *Taislós augumyynis* (*A Systematisation of Plants*).

The rhythm, pace, and evenness of Pabrėža's, Daukantas', Butavičius' handwriting, the forms of their letters reveal the features of their character: Pabrėža's expressivity, vitality, ascetism and at the same time great joie de vivre, inner harmony and self-confidence. Daukantas seems to have been disposed to mannerisms and introversion, and had a less firm character than Pabrėža. Sometimes his writing shows destructive inner tendencies and disappointment, at the same time also persistence in defending what is dear to him, e.g. historical truth. Butavičius, as it is possible to judge from the less expressive texts copied by him, was a calm, orderly man, who could work hard and carefully for the realisation of his plans and ideas. He was dedicated to his work, especially when he had to copy a text which fascinated him, or when he was inspired by others like Pabrėža, or Daukantas, who were devoted to Lithuanian history.

Reda Griškaitė

IN SEARCH OF THE SOURCES OF HISTORICAL CONSCIOUSNESS:
TEODORAS NARBUTAS IN THE RUSSIAN-SWEDISH WAR OF 1808-1809

In the colourful biography of Teodoras Narbutas (1784-1864), author of *Dzieje starożytne narodu Litewskiego* (*The History of the Lithuanian Nation*) the Russian-Swedish war of 1808-1809 (usually referred to as the Finnish War) was not a negligible episode diminished by the historian's participation in building the fortress of Bobruysk and especially in the Napoleonic Wars. These few years left a deep imprint in Narbutas' consciousness: the extraordinary historical events, the considerable personal experience and impressions are reflected in his chef d'oeuvre as well. Today it is certainly impossible to reconstruct the emotional world of the historian. Nevertheless, with the help of the not over-abundant facts it is partially possible to estimate that Narbutas, regardless of his young age, participated in the Finnish War as a personality who predetermined his future in view of a literary career.

Zita Medišauskienė

ADOMAS HONORIJUS KIRKORAS: BETWEEN LITHUANIA,
POLAND AND BELORUSSIA

This article is devoted to the analysis of the national identity of Adomas Honorijus Kirkoras, one of the most active Lithuanian social activists in the mid-19th century, as well as to an explanation of what Lithuania as a geographical, political, cultural and spiritual environment meant for him.

Kirkoras considered himself Lithuanian, i.e. a citizen of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (GDL), an inhabitant of its territory. Nonetheless Lithuania he conceived and experienced primarily as a Slavonic country. This interpretation is manifested not only by his practical activity which was primarily directed towards the more beloved Belorussian part of Lithuania, but especially by his vision of the old Lithuania in the times of Vytautas on which his Lithuanian patriotism was based. Lithuania occurs in historical sources as Lithuanian Rus, a general political term referring to the two nations – Lithuanians and Rusins – it comprised. This state came into existence by attaching lands of the one-time Kiev Rus to Lithuania, and thus became the successor and cultural heir of the former. Lithuanian Rus was a Slavonic state, the majority of its inhabitants being descendants of the subjects of the former Slavonic state (speakers of Lithuanian made up only one-fourteenth of its total population), the official language being Rusin and it was dominated by Rusin culture. Kirkoras clearly distinguishes Lithuanian Rus from the Duchy of Moscow, which he does not regard as a Slavonic state. After the Lublin Union, which abolished Lithuania's autonomy, Rusin culture was pushed into the background by Polish culture. Only the Rusin language was kept by the Belorussian people. The past existence of a powerful, independent GDL grants 19th century Lithuania the right to maintain its own specific character and to be a partner of equal rank in its relations with Poland.

The 19th century "Kirkorian Lithuania" is a country inhabited by Lithuanians, Belorussians, Poles and other nations. To establish the border between Lithuanians and Belorussians he uses the vernacular, an objective factor. Nonetheless, this objective factor based on the language of commoners is overruled by a more important, subjective factor, namely, national identity manifested by the Poles (those who consider themselves Polish) living in Lithuania, i.e. most frequently the Polonised nobility of Lithuania. In 19th century Lithuania there is a dominance of Polish culture and language which is never questioned by Kirkoras. The basic aim of his activities is to defend Polish culture and the Polish language from Russification. Vernaculars like Lithuanian and Belorussian are benevolently regarded and to be supported as a way to come closer to the peasantry's heart. After all the specificity of all nations should be respected, and the vernacular is the basic feature of national identity.

Polish is the language of the nobility. The nobility (or as Kirkoras often refers to it, the *intelligentsia*) is the primary defender of historical traditions, indispensable for the existence of a nation. It is apparent that Kirkoras considered the Lithuanian nobility, having a national identity, being a defender of historical traditions and a representative of the Polish language and culture, as a guarantee of Lithuanian independence.

According to Kirkoras, the best way to preserve the specificity of Lithuania would be to create a federation of Slavonic people which it could join as a separate unit, a multinational state dominated by Polish culture.

Reda Griškaitė

BARON VASILY VON ROTKIRCH, THE AUTHOR OF LITHUANIAN
MYTHOLOGY

Nobody so far has analysed thoroughly the life and oeuvre of the Commander of the Vilnius Gendarmerie, general, active writer, publicist, dramatist using the pen-name Theobald (The One Inspired by God), the cunning suppressor of the 1863 uprising, who devoted long years to the study of Lithuanian mythology, although one of his works *Литовско-языческие очерки* (*A Review of Lithuanian Paganism*) was often quoted by contemporary monographs of Lithuanian mythology. The indifference towards Rotkirch's personality is explicable mostly by the fact that his greatest and most fundamental work *Полная литовская мифология и свод мнений различных писателей о ней* (*A Complete Lithuanian Mythology and a Collection of the Opinions of Diverse Authors about It*) has never been printed.

Rotkirch, an expert, executor and perhaps initiator of Russian politics in the Lithuanian governorships, soon recognised how he could merge his predilection with state interests. We may duly consider his *Complete Lithuanian Mythology* a consistent part of his oeuvre, and even the merger of the expert of mythology and the Commander of the Gendarmerie seems contradictory only at first sight. The details of Rotkirch's biography testify that 1863 was an essential date in his life. From the very beginning of the uprising Rotkirch felt as if he was on a battlefield where not physical but rather moral force was needed. The purpose he identified himself with might have been to improve and confirm Russian intellectual activity in order to overcome North-Western Polonisation. This supposition is further enhanced by the fact that he clearly kept in touch with the people gathered around Michail Katkov, Michail Semevsky and Aleksandr Piatkovsky.

It would be hard to describe Rotkirch as a typical representative of Russian statesmen in Lithuania. Nonetheless he truly reflects the character of his social stratum, group and environment, and with his help we get an insight into the closed circles which we may call Russian Vilnius.

Grigorij Potašenko

ALEKSANDR HILFERDING, THE SLAVOPHILES AND LITHUANIA

Aleksandr Hilferding (1831–1872) was a Russian philologist, historian, social and political activist. In Lithuanian historiography he features as the scholar adjusting Cyrillic script for transcribing Lithuanian and a maker of projects to russify

Lithuania, and his proposals in the context of the interests of the Lithuanian nation have also drawn considerable attention. Historians disagree in evaluating Hilferding's proposals from the aspect of the Lithuanian nation: some (Vanda Daugirdaitė-Sruogienė) think that the academician was "an ardent supporter of Russification", others (Rimantas Miknys) regard him "moderate", whilst there are even some (Vincas Trumpa) who maintain that he was a scholar favourable to Lithuanians, whose primary goal was to eliminate Polish separatism in Lithuania.

This article is intended to analyse Hilferding's proposals in the context of early Slavophile teachings and to put forward the statement that their essence and the adjustment of the "national principle" in Lithuanian territories in the 1870s coincided with the vital interests of the awakening Lithuanian nation.

Hilferding's proposals were essentially aimed at finding ways to regulate the relations between centre and peripheries, to facilitate the coexistence of big and small nations, the latter formulating their national identity. He made an attempt to conform the reconsidered Russian interests with the strengthening national movements at the time of a turning point in history. The final goal of the academician's proposals was a non-violent, organic integration of Lithuania into the social-political and cultural life of Russia. The Lithuanian nation, having lost its nobility and not having produced its own intelligentsia is going to decide for a pro-Russian orientation under the influence of Russian civilisation and culture. That is the point where the paradoxical character of Hilferding's proposals manifest themselves: having acknowledged the right of each nation to its own specific culture and special mission in the name of humanistic culture, he limited (even if by geopolitical motives) the political aspirations of Lithuanians. The realisation of Hilferding's proposals in the 1870s might have directly served the liberalisation of the state and social life in Russia. The "national principle" defending ethnic values, formulated in the Russian scholar's proposals, and social reforms would have contributed to the awakening of nations and indirectly might have provoked necessary political reforms. The relations between Russia and Lithuania (Lithuanians), however, were defined by the events of 1863 and led to a political annexation of Lithuania by the Russian Empire and police control which provoked an ardent Russian-Lithuanian conflict. The Tsarist policy in Lithuania was basically defined as early as 1831 by the program of Michail Muravyev, the Vilnius Governor General, who was familiar with the characteristics of the north-western reaches of the empire, and his advisors.

Hilferding's proposals formulated the idea of national-territorial autonomy, the actuality of which was emphasised also by Jonas Basanavičius who was familiar with the ideas and writings of the academician.

In my opinion, Hilferding deserves respect as one of the first people who tried to introduce the history, ethnography, literature and language of the Lithuanians to a wider Russian public.

Egidijus Motieka

JONAS BASANAVIČIUS: BETWEEN TRADITIONAL AND MODERN STATEHOOD

This article is devoted to an analysis of the attempts of one of the most important social activists, Jonas Basanavičius, to use the political, legal and cultural potentials of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (GDL) as a model for creating modern Lithuania. These plans of Basanavičius are reflected in most of the documents he wrote. For the majority of the participants in the Lithuanian national movement the idea of referring to the legacy of the GDL seemed inconceivable and unnecessary. Nonetheless, when referring to this legacy Basanavičius never lost sight of the national, "ethnographic" Lithuania. The essential demand at the time was that the Lithuanian nobility, i.e. the direct heir to the historical traditions of the GDL, would join the national movement and uncompromisingly identify with Lithuanian cultural identity. The preference for the nobility's use of the Polish language as a medium of higher culture in cultural life and at home was dismissed. Essentially they intended to assimilate the Lithuanian nobility, to make it Lithuanian, even by force, if needed.

On the other hand Basanavičius clearly separated the legal-political and the territorial aspects of the legacy of the GDL, i.e. clearly distinguished the borders of "ethnographic" Lithuania and formulated claims to the complete state and legal legacy of the GDL. This attitude doubtlessly predetermined the artificial partition of the Lithuanian and Belorussian aristocracy and nobility on territorial grounds. In fact, the concept of the legacy of the GDL, as declared by Basanavičius, was not completely formulated. Therefore, however indispensable the vision of the GDL was for him, it served more as a political instrument in creating modern, national Lithuania.

Vilma Žaltauskaitė

THE CONCEPT OF LITHUANIAN NATIONAL IDENTITY IN THE VIEWS OF FATHER JUOZAS TUMAS-VAIŽGANTAS. UP TO 1904

This article is intended to explain the formation of Catholic liberalism in the process which led to the emergence of modern Lithuania and to point out the modern aspects of the views of Juozas Tumas-Vaižgantas (1869–1933) up to 1904.

"Lithuomania", a positive concept from the aspect of the Lithuanian national movement, began to emerge in Tumas-Vaižgantas' views already while he was studying at the Žemaitish Seminary (1888–1893). Already then being a Catholic for Tumas was closely connected with being a Lithuanian, although he had not yet considered where he should fit the idea, where it should juridically be placed.

He entered into conflict with the clerical leadership and his older colleagues, who, not having pondered over the connection of being a Catholic and being a Lithuanian, opposed Russification, but did not intend to acknowledge the positive role of secular intellectuals in this movement. In the meanwhile for Tumas' Catholic

and Lithuanian identity the issue of the use of the Lithuanian vernacular became an essential criterion in judging both the nobility and the clergy. The "litera latina" did not merely separate but also united the social strata as well as the people belonging to the same confession.

The *Tėvynės Sargas* (*Guard of the Fatherland*), an illegal paper edited and published by Tumas from 1896 to 1904 reflected the standpoint of the younger, more liberal priests. By means of "enlightenment" it tried to raise and "maintain" the nation. The realisation of the latter goal was not merely hindered by Russification but also by Polonisation. The Poles and the Lithuanians were both Catholic but that was the only link between them. The revival of the earlier union had already been dismissed when there were no clearly defined ideas about the future of Lithuania. Cultural work in order to reach cultural autonomy was aimed at broader perspectives, had wider opportunities. Tumas' moderate and consistent position was defined by his tendency to follow the doctrine of the mean, his ability to realistically evaluate the status quo and adjust it to reach his aim.

Žinyčia (*Eternal Fire*, 1900–1903), started by Tumas, being the first newspaper for the clergy directly addressed to intellectuals, also reflected his realistic, moderate position aimed at improving Lithuanian national identity through culture.

Saulius Pivoras

VYTAUTAS PUTNA, CITIZEN OF UTOPIA

Vytautas Putna is known in historiography as a red general who was executed during the Stalinist regime. His Lithuanian origins until now served as a basis for symbolically localising the Soviet regime (his monument in his homeland was the site of official celebrations), or as an example of losing one's national identity. The article is intended to point out that Putna's decision for Bolshevism was ambiguous, since he participated in the national movement of Riga Lithuanians, painted patriotic pictures, acted in a Lithuanian theatre and wrote poetry. In 1920 he became famous in the Russian civil war. Putna hoped that the world revolution would also reach Lithuania.

Putna had a bright career in the Soviet Army, was appointed general, served as a war attaché in foreign countries. But Stalinist demoralisation and disintellectualisation did not overcome him: he had never forgotten his home region, relatives and acquaintances, emphasised his Lithuanian national identity, and when Lithuanian-Polish relations became especially tense in 1927, he sent a personal telegram to Piłsudski interceding for Lithuania, and, as Juozas Linartas has proven, he was an activist among Lithuanians in Riga. On the other hand the social and political structure of inter-war Lithuania was clearly unacceptable for Putna. The national revival did not succeed in consolidating the whole of Lithuanian society, owing to problems emerging as a result of long historical development. Putna's personally unrepachable decision was judged negatively as a result of historical events.

Vladas Sirutavičius

ON A "BAD LITHUANIAN": JUOZAPAS ALBINAS HERBAČIAUSKAS

Double national-cultural identification made Herbačiauskas' integration into the social-cultural life of the Republic of Lithuania, organised on a national basis, rather difficult, whilst Poland, to which he could have belonged by nationality, also remained alien to him. On the other hand this double character influenced the formation of the writer's concepts of Lithuanian culture, national revival and Lithuanian statehood. For Herbačiauskas the only way to create modern Lithuanian national culture was offered by a synthesis of the culture of the nobility (citizens) and ethnic (ethnographical) culture. Thus in his political publicistic writings he tried to attract noblemen from the territory of the former GDL to join the Lithuanian national revival and proposed that Lithuanian statehood would not be restored on a purely national but rather on a federal principle. Nonetheless this federation had to be supported not only by historical tradition, but also by the principles of democracy and free will. The goal of the federation was to resist Russian cultural-political aggression. These views of Herbačiauskas were close to those of the supporters of democracy among the noblemen of historical Lithuania emerging at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries.

Darius Staliūnas

"A BIT OF A POLE, A BIT OF A GERMAN, A BIT OF A LITHUANIAN,
BUT MOST OF ALL A CATHOLIC..."

Edward von der Ropp, archbishop of Vilnius between ethnic,
patriotic and confessional values

Ever since 1917 both in Polish and Lithuanian historiography Edward von der Ropp, Archbishop of Vilnius, has often been referred to as "A bit of a Pole, a bit of a German, a bit of a Lithuanian, but most of all a Catholic". Nevertheless it is rarely explained what this category means in fact. In this short article the author makes the conclusion on the basis of an analysis of the bishop's activity and his few surviving utterances that Ropp was ethnogenetically a German, ethnoculturally, although not completely, a Pole and he was Lithuanian so far as he held the historical tradition of the GDL dear. Catholicism played an integral part in his life.

Rimantas Miknys

"MY ASPIRATIONS WILL BE FULFILLED IF I COULD BE USEFUL FOR
LITHUANIA..."

The historical aspect of the architect Antanas Vivulskis' national identity

Antanas Vivulskis (February 20, 1877–January 10, 1919) was an architect who built the "Three Crosses", the Church of the Sacred Heart in Vilnius, the Šiluva

chapels, the Cracow monument for the 500th anniversary of the battle of Grūnewald/Tannenberg, a close friend of Ignacy Paderewski and a member of the Vilnius self-defence troops (legionaries) in 1919. But who indeed was he? Whether he was Polish or Lithuanian has not been decided up till now.

The problem of Vivulskis' national identity is discussed according to his personal and artistic dependence on one or the other national culture and the aspect of his consciousness. On the other hand, keeping in mind Vivulskis' noble origins, this problem is directly related to the culture of the Lithuanian nobility and to the connections between being a nobleman and being Lithuanian.

It has to be pointed out that at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries, when the Lithuanian democratic national movement openly brought up the demand of the separation from Poland, a part of the nobility split from the Lithuanian nation and joined the newly formed Polish nation, whilst others kept on considering themselves citizens of the former GDL and felt ethnoculturally different from ethnic Poland. But even the latter had complicated relations with the Lithuanian democratic national movement because they disagreed on the issues of relations with Poland and the threat of Polishness.

Vivulskis was a typical representative of the latter "citizenly" nobility of Lithuania and he had to experience the controversies in his soul and conscience between his old concept of Lithuanian identity based on his citizenship of the former GDL and the new concept, based on the vernacular. He established connections with the Lithuanian nation in formation (the Paris "Lithuania", the understanding of the significance of the Lithuanian vernacular for national identity), but at the same time a union with Poland seemed to him natural and unavoidable. Vivulskis' citizenship was and has remained the most important expression of his national identity. Owing to the complicated linguistic and cultural situation of the Lithuanian nobility as well as the geopolitical situation of Lithuania he did not manage to fully identify himself with the new Lithuanian nation. The fact, however, that he belongs to Lithuanian culture, is indubitable, as it becomes clear from the Lithuanian themes of his works and the works themselves, which defined the specific characters of the architecture and art of Lithuanian sub-ethnic groups.

Alfred Erich Senn

ANTANAS VISKANTAS: A LITHUANIAN WITH POLISH FRIENDS

The Reverend Antanas Viskantas (1875–1940) is a mysterious figure in Lithuanian history during World War I and in the inter-war period. Biographers usually preferred to emphasize only Viskantas' "personal relationships" with influential leading personalities owing to which he could significantly contribute to the protection and dissemination of Lithuanian culture in Vilnius occupied by Poland. In historiography, however, there were no attempts to explain the character of these "personal relationships".

There is good reason to say that the period from 1915 to 1918 in Viskantas' biography is worthy of special attention in answering the abovementioned problem.

The stormy events of World War I took him to Fribourg, Switzerland. Here Viskantas tried to establish ties between the movement raising humanitarian aid for war-stricken Lithuania and the similar Polish movement. He made use of his consequent contacts, "personal relationships", not only during the war, but also later, when Vilnius was occupied by the Poles.

The other organization the priest started to co-operate with already in 1915 was the Lithuanian Information Bureau in Lausanne, headed by Juozas Gabrys. Their co-operation was rather problematic, since from the very beginning they became obvious rivals.

The third organization widening the range of his acquaintances was the Eastern Committee, founded on May 12, 1918 together with the French-Swiss journalist, Edmond Privat. The organizers tried to unite the representatives of Lithuanians, Poles, Belorussians and Ukrainians whose task would have been to explain all facts concerning the rights of the nations represented by them and the reasons for the conflicts among them, and to convince the representative organs of the mentioned nations and the future Peace Congress about the rightness of their conclusions. Unfortunately, the Eastern Committee was soon undermined by personal conflicts.

The article also discusses the events of 1919, when Viskantas, having returned to Vilnius, approached the supporters of Józef Piłsudski – Leon Wasilewski and others. The Lithuanian priest informed them of his wish to see co-operation in the territory of the former GDL between Lithuanians and Poles instead of their constant conflict. He even showed Wasilewski his correspondence on this issue with the Warsaw Apostolic Nuncio, Achille Ratti, who was to become Pope Pius XI.

Viskantas' activity from 1915 to 1919 did not yield significant results. His philanthropical efforts remained unsuccessful, the Eastern Committee came to an end and even his 1919 intrigues with the supporters of Piłsudski remained fruitless.

Raimundas Lopata

"A RATHER SUSPICIOUS, HOWEVER, NECESSARY TYPE"

Baron Friedrich von der Ropp and the plans for restoring
Lithuanian independence

This article, verifying the widespread opinion in historiography (Ropp as an agent of the German Foreign Ministry), tries to evaluate Ropp's activity in restoring the statehood of Lithuania. It is doubtless that his origins (October 21, 1879–February 21, 1964), his studies in Germany, working in the colonies of the Reich facilitated a wide range of connections. The most significant was his acquaintanceship and later co-operation with Albert Ballin, director general of the Hamburg–America Shipping Company, who was closely related to Wilhelm II and was especially influential at Wilhelmsstrasse. Ropp's co-operation with the German Foreign Ministry should certainly be evaluated within this context. Ca. 1916 the baron became actively involved in creating a league of nations enslaved by Russia, because the Russian policy of the Reich provided conditions for it. Under the auspices of this league he contacted Lithuanians in Lithuania

and Switzerland (Juozas Gabrys). From the end of 1916 Ropp directed his efforts to realise plans for a limited autonomy of Lithuania in alliance with Germany. In order to achieve this goal, he tried to establish a party in Lithuania which would represent all the social strata and support such a plan. Ropp especially tried to win support among the upper class of Lithuania and seek opportunities for compromise to co-operate with the Lithuanian Council. When he failed in his efforts, in October–November, 1918 he tried to take the initiative into his hands to organise a Lithuanian government. The conflict with the Council became more and more serious. In 1919 Ropp found an ally in Juozas Gabrys. But neither French support, nor their contacts with the supporters of Bermondts provided the expected results. On the contrary, owing to them the baron completely lost the confidence of Lithuanian society.

Česlovas Laurinavičius

COUNT ALFREDAS TIŠKEVIČIUS AND POLITICS IN MODERN LITHUANIA

This article is devoted to Count Alfredas Tiškevičius. Although there is little surviving data on his personality, his activity is reflected in the documents of the Foreign Ministry of Lithuania. The count was a representative of Lithuania in London from the autumn of 1919 to the end of 1920. It was a very important, we may say, vital period to the newly restored Lithuanian state. In this article Alfredas Tiškevičius' personality is revealed through an analysis of the developments in Lithuanian foreign policy in 1919 and 1920. This is not a concession to historical determinism, for special attention is paid to his efforts to change the course of hectic events.

Being in England, Tiškevičius could adjust Lithuanian foreign policy to the tunes of London and Moscow. Unfortunately, his decisions made in August–September, 1920 were unsuccessful in defending Lithuania's interests.

The article comes to the conclusion that Tiškevičius basically failed not as much as a diplomat but more as a citizen. The tension between "true" and "untrue" Lithuanians limited his initiative and subordinated concrete action to ideological but not rational or moral criteria. Tiškevičius tried to protest against the set rules of the game and was dismissed.

Giedrius Viliūnas

A NOBLEMAN IN LITHUANIA BETWEEN THE TWO WORLD WARS: THE LIFE AND WORKS OF FABIJONAS NEVERAVIČIUS

This article is devoted to the manifestations of a nobleman's mentality in the social activity and oeuvre of a less-known Lithuanian writer of the inter-war period. The range of the views of Fabijonas Neveravičius (July 6 (19), 1900–April 17, 1984) is very wide: it comprises political fidelity to Lithuania (he participated

in the struggle for independence, from 1919 was an officer in the Lithuanian Army and later a resistance activist in post-war emigration), oppositional views (participated in the 1934 coup) as well as democratic and liberal tendencies. One of the permanent fields of his wide interests (he was a writer, translator of a few languages and a journalist) is to reopen the Polish-Lithuanian cultural dialogue (manifest in his translations and personal relationships in the forties, his activities in Vilnius during World War II, and in the circles of London emigrants in the post-war period). He was the only inter-war writer who, in his historical novels *Blaškamos liepsnos*, 1936 (*Wandering Flames*), *Erškėčiai*, 1937 (*Thorns*), described the annihilation of the united Lithuanian-Polish Commonwealth at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries suggestively actualising the traditions of statehood and culture in feudal Lithuania which were refuted by the ideology dominating those days. In his works on modern times he chose typical petty bourgeois themes, featuring as one of the first bourgeois writers in Lithuania. The social and literary activity of Neveravičius testifies that the cultural traditions of feudal Lithuania were alive in the Republic of Lithuania between the two World Wars.

II. Publications

THE LETTERS OF ADOMAS VARNAS (1904-1909)

Edited by *Asta Giniūnienė*

This publication includes a minor part of the correspondence, more exactly letters from 1908 and one from 1909, kept in the Adomas Varnas archives of the Mikalojus Konstantinas Čiurlionis Art Museum. The letters included are indirectly related to the Rūta Society, having been written by its members: Adomas Varnas (1879-1979), the writer Juozapas Albinas Herbačiauskas (1876-1944), the musician and choir leader Zigmuntas Skirgaila (1882-1962), the artist Adalbertas Staneika (1885-1962) and Ignas Šlapelis (1881-1955), artist, art historian and art critic. This correspondence was duly completed by the two most important letters by Varnas from 1904 to Povilas Višinskis, kept in the Manuscript Section of Vilnius University Library, which describe in detail how the Rūta Society was founded, what were its plans and unfulfilled desires. The letters of 1908 reflect the often very complicated relationship of the correspondents to their homeland and society and it is possible to evaluate their common situation, relationships and experiences. There are very interesting ideas concerning art themes and existential issues. This far-reaching network of direct, though fragmentary correspondence gives a good insight to the life of artists at the beginning of the 20th century.

The letters are reprinted unabridged, their language is authentic, they are chronologically arranged and have short explanatory notes.

THE SCANDALOUS WORKS OF JUOZAS GABRYS-PARŠAITIS

Edited by *Alfonsas Eidintas*

Juozas Gabrys-Paršaitis (1880–1951) – the first well-known Lithuanian politician and publicist, who did so much to draw attention to the problem of Lithuania in Western Europe and the USA, did not manage to get into the governing élite of the re-established Lithuanian state. He was prevented from it by his impulsive, egocentric character and risky co-operation with the French, German, English and Polish during World War I. In 1917–1918 he entered into conflict with the leaders of the Lithuanian State Council, Chairman Antanas Smetona and Augustinas Voldemaras who later became leading statesmen. Gabrys was compromised by his letter to the Lithuanian Bolshevik leader Kapsukas, to whom he offered a possibility to co-operate on November 5, 1918.

Most of the unknown intrigues of Gabrys came to light during his legal procedure against Voldemaras in Kaunas, 1925, following which Gabrys could go on with his intrigues only behind the scenes of Lithuanian diplomacy and could never again play an important part in social activities.

Translated by *Rita Bendes*