Table of Contents

List of Illustrations

Introduction

Question: What is Lithuania?
Answer: Lithuania is a country, in which Lithuanians, Poles and Belarusians, and Latvians in Inflanty have lived for ages, coming to terms among themselves and they all compose one Lithuanian nation.

Question: What area does Lithuania encompass?
Answer: At this time Lithuania encompasses six provinces, officially called the Northwestern provinces, they are the Vilnius, Kaunas, Grodna, Minsk, Mahileŭ, and Vitsiebsk provinces.
Caution—the real Lithuanians at this time still live in the full range of the Naumiestis, Vilkaviškis, Marijampolė,[1] and Kalvarija districts and in part of Sejny District of the Suwałki Province, as well as in the Palanga District of the Courland Province. Real Poles, except for those in the provinces of Poland, live in the Belsk, Białystok, and Sokolsk districts of the Grodna Province.

Question: Why is the country called Lithuania?
Answer: This country is called Lithuania because in the thirteenth century the dukes of Lithuania had already begun to be concerned with the union of the abovementioned six provinces into one country; from the fourteenth century, this country carried a uniform fate with Poland until the latter days.[2]

—Bolesław Jałowecki (1907)

---

1 At the beginning of the twentieth century Senapilė in Lithuanian.

2 B. J.....is [Bołeslaw Jałowecki], *Lietuva ir jos reikalai … Tautiškas Lietuvos katekizmas* (Vilnius, 1907), 1–2. All place names are written according to their present nomenclature. Another solution would be to use official terminology from the nineteenth century but that would create more problems, since it was not adopted in some discourses (Lithuanian, Polish), and it had been changed over time (e.g., Vil'no was typically used in the first half of the century, and Vil'na, in the late imperial period).

This above quote from a small booklet published in 1907 by Bolesław Jałowecki—a Pole living in Vilnius—is one of many nineteenth-century "national catechisms," in which the leaders of national movements tried, as simply as possible, to convey national ideology to grassroots. The text is important as much for what it says as for what it leaves unspoken. On the one hand, the interpretation presented essentially reflects the Polish nationalist attitude that no independent Lithuanian, and even more so Belarusian, nation exists; though the society of (ethnographic) Lithuania and Belarus is uniform, Lithuania's fate was closely tied with Poland's. On the other hand, Jałowecki was forced to take into account other (non-Polish) concepts of Lithuania. From practical considerations, he used the imperial terminology and explained to the reader that Lithuania was the (Russian Empire's) Northwest Region (NWR); at the same time, he reacts in a peculiar way to the program of Lithuanian nationalism, and the northern part of the Suwałki Province (Kingdom of Poland)—where Lithuanians composed a majority—entered the geographic concept of Lithuania. Yet Jałowecki did not include Prussian Lithuania, which at this time in the Lithuanian discourse was usually treated as the Lithuanians' "national territory." Jałowecki also does not mention the territories beyond the borders of the NWR, to which Belarusian nationalism sometimes expressed claims; nor did he include the Jews and Russians when talking about "national territory."

Jałowecki's text shows that the present-day concept of Lithuania differs from the one that existed at the beginning of the twentieth century, when more than one geographic image of it existed. Although they were not clearly explicated in the text—but the author, even if indirectly, pointed out that the concept of ethnic Lithuania also existed, and its presented image was ideologically motivated. Because Jałowecki was forced to take into account other concepts of "national territory," a sort of a polylogue occured among the different discourses. Finally, the images created by the elite were spread among the masses (in this case, the Polish concept of Lithuania was instilled in the minds of Lithuanian speakers).

For a long time, historians in Lithuania, as in many other countries, did not raise the question about the borders of investigated regions.

In those cases, when the object of the research was the state of Lithuania, it was as if the problem did not exist: here were the borders of the country, which determined the geographic coverage of the research. In other cases, it was usual to extrapolate the spatial concepts of the present to the past: for example, the nineteenth-century history of Lithuania researched in the Soviet period covered the territory corresponding to the borders of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic. Only relatively recently did Lithuanian historians direct their attention to Lithuania's changing spatial concept. In the mid-1990s, Egidijus Aleksandravičius and Antanas Kulakauskas raised the question: What was Lithuania in the nineteenth century?[3] In their book *Carų valdžioje: XIX amžiaus Lietuva* (Under the rule of the tsars: Nineteenth-century Lithuania), these two authors showed that in the first half of the nineteenth century, local society understood Lithuania as the territory that encompassed the former lands of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (GDL), while at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, Lithuanian society gave priority to the concept of ethnographic Lithuania. The authors also briefly touched on the Russian discourse of "national territory."

In this volume, we analyze the question of the spatial concept of Lithuania.[4] For the greater part of the nineteenth century, there was no political or administrative derivative such as Lithuania, although various concepts of Lithuania existed and often competed among themselves.[5] Moreover, looking at the wider context, essential changes in

3 Egidijus Aleksandravičius and Antanas Kulakauskas, *Carų valdžioje: XIX amžiaus Lietuva* (Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 1996), 21–25.

4 Separate aspects of the problem were also later analyzed by Zita Medišauskienė, "Lietuvos samprata XIX a. viduryje," in *Praeities baruose* (Vilnius: Žara, 1999), 175–182; Medišauskienė Zita, "Lietuva ir jos ribos 1795–1915 metais," in *Lietuvos sienos: Tūkstantmečio istorija* (Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 2009), 66–75; Tamara Bairašauskaitė, Zita Medišauskienė, and Rimantas Miknys, *Lietuvos istorija,* vol. 8, pt. 1, *Devynioliktas amžius: Visuomenė ir valdžia* (Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 2011), 34–55; Vytautas Petronis, *Constructing Lithuania: Ethnic Mapping in Tsarist Russia, ca. 1800–1914* (Stockholm: Stockholm University, 2007); and Vasilijus Safronovas, "Apie istorinio regiono virsmą vaizduotės regionu: Mažosios Lietuvos pavyzdys," *Istorija* 86 (2012): 66–80.

5 In this book, the spatial concept of Lithuania that functioned in various discourses of the nineteenth century (1795–1914) is analyzed in detail. The spatial images functioning in earlier or later periods are only discussed episodically; for example,

the understanding of Europe's internal borders occurred specifically in the nineteenth century, as the language-ethnic criteria gradually became more important. In the nineteenth century, Lithuania was treated not only as a territory belonging to the Russian Empire; the name was also associated with part of the Kingdom of Prussia's lands (German Empire).

However, we cannot limit this research to the analysis of the spatial concept of Lithuania, because other space names always existed that either "competed" with the term Lithuania or were of a different taxonomic level. That is, they were understood as an integral part of Lithuania (Samogitia, Prussia's Lithuania, Lithuania Minor), or a larger unit (Poland, the Western Region, the NWR, Lita/Lite, East Prussia, and so on) of which Lithuania was also a part.

This problem of changing geo-images is related to the discussion that began during the late twentieth century about the *spatial turn*[6] that ensued after the earlier *linguistic* and *cultural turns*. Some researchers assert that the *spatial turn* is more characteristic of the German academic tradition, while in other academic traditions, for example, the French, the spatial dimension has never been forgotten.[7] Moreover, sometimes it is emphasized in scholarly literature that different disciplines understand this "discovery" of space in different ways, so perhaps it would be more correct to talk not about the *spatial turn* but about *spatial turns*.[8] Some researchers, for example, Karl Schlögel, understand it as quite streamlined, as the necessity to focus attention on the social space in which "history takes place."[9] Others emphasize that not every mention

---

when it is clear that the concepts that functioned in the nineteenth century were formed earlier.

6 Jörg Döring and Tristan Thielmann, "Einleitung: Was lessen wir im Raume? Der *Spatial Turn* und das geheime Wissen der Geographen," in *Spatial Turn: Das Raumparadigma in den Kultur- und Sozialwissenschaften*, ed. Jörg Döring and Tristan Thielmann (Bielefeld: transcript Verlag, 2008), 7–9.

7 Frithjof Benjamin Schenk, "Der spatial turn und die Osteuropäische Geschichte," *H-Soz-Kult*, June 1, 2006, accessed October 15, 2014, http://www.hsozkult.de/article/id/artikel-736.

8 Döring and Thielmann, "Einleitung," 10–13.

9 Karl Schlögel, "Kartenlesen, Augenarbeit: Über die Fälligkeit des spatial turn in den Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften," in *Was sind Kulturwissenschaften? 13*

of "space" is considered an integral part of the *spatial turn*. Often this new paradigm is related to the approach of the French Marxist Henri Lefebvre.[10] This new approach understands (social) space as a product of social creativity, and it emphasizes the relation of space and power.[11]

Lefebvre's theory claims that three dialectically related processes—"spatial practice," "representations of space," and "spaces of representation"—create (social) space. The first process encompasses social activities and interactions, for example, the formation and action of various social networks in everyday life; material production happens here. The second creates space with characterizing images; usually these are various discursive practices, encompassing not only written texts but also areas such as the planning of spaces, pictures, and maps. In other words, the creation of knowledge, where science (primarily geography) can fill an important role. The third process in the creation of space—that is, the symbolic dimension of space—embodies a more general idea. These symbols can be both objects of nature and creations by human hands (buildings, monuments); in this way, space is endowed with meaning.[12] Lefebvre's approach is especially valuable when we are investigating how the elite of non-dominant national groups (Lithuanians, Belarusians, etc.) created "national territories." The contributions to his volume address whether the region of national elites' "spatial practice" corresponded to the concept of the "national territory." This problem will appear somewhat different when we analyze the Russian imperial case. Then we compare various discursive practices with nationality policy and explain what various projects of territorial-administrative reform tell us about the Russian mental map.

Antworten, ed. Heinz Dieter Kittsteiner (Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2004), 261–83.

10 Doris Bachmann-Medick, *Cultural Turns: Neuorientierungen in den Kulturwissenschaften* (Reinbek: Rowohls Enzyklopädie, 2007), 291; Barney Warf and Santa Arias, "Introduction: The Reinsertion of Space into the Social Sciences and Humanities," in *The Spatial Turn: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, ed. Barney Warf and Santa Arias (London: Routledge, 2009), 3.

11 Bachmann-Medick, *Cultural Turns*, 292.

12 Christian Schmid, "Henri Lefebvre's Theory of the Production of Space: Towards a Three-Dimensional Dialectic," in *Space, Difference, Everyday Life: Reading Henri Lefebvre*, ed. Kanishka Goonewardena et al. (New York: Routledge, 2008), 27–45.

The *topographical turn*—research that is interested in the *techniques* of the representation of space, primarily with the creation of maps—was an integral part of the *spatial turn*.[13] In the 1980s, new impulses arrived from the science of geography, more specifically, the post-modern approach, which says that maps are not neutral or objective reflections of reality but complex semiotic creations that have to be deconstructed in the same way as texts. This approach, whose most famous founder was John Brian Harley,[14] states that the creation of maps is one of the instruments for acquiring power.[15] Researchers emphasize that in the creation of every map, selection is unavoidable (e.g., choosing the "topic," the language in which the objects are named, and what is pictured, as well as was is not); moreover, the very technique of its preparation is biased (selecting the sizes of the symbols and letters, the thickness of the lines, the colors). This approach is widely applied in historical studies: analyzing the role of maps in German propaganda campaigns in 1918–45,[16] creating and instilling the image of Finland within the minds of the masses in 1899–1942,[17] politically instrumentalizing the maps in Central and Eastern Europe in the long nineteenth century.[18] In this study we analyze several aspects of maps. First, we treat them as an integral part of the appropriate national discourse, so we look at what territory is defined as "one's own" using the instruments that legitimized the claims to a "national territory." Moreover, the maps are analyzed as visual material used in the process

13 Bachmann-Medick, *Cultural Turns*, 299.

14 John Brian Harley, "Maps, Knowledge, and Power," in *The Iconography of Landscape: Essays on the Symbolic Representation, Design and Use of Past Environments*, ed. Denis Cosgrove and Stephen Daniels (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 277–312; John Brian Harley, "Deconstructing the Map," *Cartographica* 26, no. 2 (1989): 1–20.

15 "Maps are preeminently a language of power, not of protest": Harley, "Maps," 301.

16 Guntram Henrik Herb, *Under the Map of Germany: Nationalism and Propaganda 1918–1945* (London: Routledge, 1997).

17 Katariina Kosonen, "Making Maps and Mental Images: Finnish Press Cartography in Nationbuilding, 1899–1942," *National Identities* 10, no. 1 (2008): 21–47.

18 Petronis, *Constructing Lithuania*; Steven Seegel, *Mapping Europe's Borderlands: Russian Cartography in the Age of Empire* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012).

of nationalizing the masses. For example, the illustration on the book's cover is taken from the satirical publication *Garnys* (Heron) in 1913: this caricature-map not only "reminds" the reader of ethnographic Lithuania's borders[19] but also explains visually who Lithuanians' and Lithuania's main enemies were.[20]

The term "map" is not only used to describe a specific physical object in scholarly literature. Behavioral psychology, investigating an individual's ability to orient himself in space, uses terms such as cognitive map, while human geography uses mental map.[21] A cognitive map is usually defined "as a process composed of a series of psychological transformations by which an individual acquires, codes, stores, recalls, and decodes information about the relative locations and attributes of phenomena in the everyday spatial environment."[22] The cognitive map is a subjective reflection of the environment surrounding us. Psychologists are interested, for example, in how people become acquainted with a new environment, how they orient themselves in a familiar environment, how they draw a map of a locality from memory, how they indicate a road, and what images of the environment they rely on to make decisions for their place of residence, work, or rest. These images also have qualitative characteristics, that is, they also have value. Therefore, the term "map" does not have to be understood literally; in other words, a

19 This caricature-map essentially reproduces the map of ethnographic Lithuania prepared by V. Verbickis and financed by "Lietuvos ūkininkas" (Lithuania's farmer) published somewhat earlier. Petronis, *Constructing Lithuania, 262.*

20 Along with the caricature-map an explanation was provided for who these neighbors were, that is, Lithuania's enemies: the Poles-National Democrats, Germans, perhaps the Jews, and even the leftist Lithuanians: Smidras [Adomas Jakštas (Aleksandras Dambrauskas)?], "Iliustruotas Lietuvos žemlapis," *Garnys* 1 (1913): 6. Russia, or Russians, is not mentioned in this list, most likely for two reasons: censorship and the unwillingness of the Lithuanian rightist figures (in this case, Catholics) to confront the imperial government, which they often even saw as an ally in the fight against their main enemy, the Poles.

21 These terms specifically were most often used, although researchers count at least twenty other, similar terms used to describe the same or similar processes: Rob Kitchin and Mark Blades, *The Cognition of Geographic Space* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2002), 1–2.

22 Roger M. Downs and David Stea, "Cognitive Maps and Spatial Behavior: Process and Products," in *Image and Environment: Cognitive Mapping and Spatial Behavior*, ed. Roger M. Downs and David Stea (London: Edward Arnold, 1973), 9.

cartographic or other type of map does not exist in an individual's brain. The term serves as an accurate metaphor because the phenomena discussed, as with maps, are spatial representations.[23] Clearly, historians cannot investigate such phenomena. However, they adopted the metaphor of mental maps.

Though they have adopted that metaphor, historians understand that their research objects and methods differ from those applied in psychology and geography. Historians are interested in what factors (or, more broadly, worldviews) influence an individual's images of space, how they are transferred culturally, and how they affect the formation of group identities. If psychologists and geographers are usually interested in individual cognitive representations "of the immediate environment," then historians usually focus on spaces, going far beyond the experiences of a specific individual,[24] for example, concepts such as Europe, the West, Central and Eastern Europe, and Siberia. Research sources also appropriately differ: if psychologists and geographers undertake observation studies and surveys**,** then historians' main sources are historical documents—both written and various visual materials. In other words, historians investigate various discursive practices.[25]

In review articles on the study of mental maps, postcolonial studies is also mentioned. According to Edward Said, in his book *Orientalism*, when this concept was created in Western societies, it was not neutral but biased—that is, Eurocentric—and had imperialistic connotations pointing to the all-encompassing Orient, which was viewed as "Other" from the West.[26] Said's work inspired many studies, for example, those by Larry Wolff and Maria Todorova. Wolff states that the current

23 Kitchin and Blades, *The Cognition of Geographic Space*, 2.

24 Andreas Langenohl, "Mental Maps, Raum und Erinnerung: Zur kultursoziologischen Erschließung eines transdisziplinären Konzepts," in *Mental Maps—Raum—Erinnerung: Kulturwissenschaftliche Zugänge zum Verhältnis von Raum und Erinnerung*, ed. Angelika Hartmann, Béatrice Hendrich, and Sabine Damir-Geilsdorf (Münster: LIT, 2005), 67.

25 Frithjof Benjamin Schenk, "Mental Maps: The Cognitive Mapping of the Continent as an Object of Research of European History," European History Online, July 5, 2013, accessed December 12, 2013, http://www.ieg-ego.eu/schenkf-2013-en, 6–7.

26 Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978).

Western world's concept of Eastern Europe appeared at the time of the Enlightenment, and it, like similar concepts, was not neutral but had clear value connotations and was an instrument of power, expressing the West's domination over Eastern Europe.[27] In Todorova's analysis of the concept of the Balkans, this concept, used over the course of two centuries, was nothing other than the image of an "incomplete self" created in the discourse of the West—as the underdeveloped, half-civilized, and eastern-like West. In other words, the Balkans were treated as a bridge or crossroad between the West and the East; that is, unlike the Orient, the Balkans are not comprehended as the "other."[28]

Having looked over studies dealing with this group of problems, Frithjof Benjamin Schenk noted that they are not distinguished by any clearly defined research method or theory. The research methods used in these works on mental maps are borrowed from other fields: research into borders and stereotypes, discourse history, cartographic history, or history of travel.[29]

Studies of mental maps are similar to those that we see in studies of nationalism. In them—in the summarizing works of Anthony D. Smith[30] as well as in the journal *National Identities*—attention is drawn to the importance of territoriality in the ideologies of identities, when nationalists seek to define the specific social space—the "national territory" or the "geo-body"[31]—that "belongs" to the nation. As studies of nationalism indicate, the modern nation cannot be envisioned without

27 Larry Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994). For critical remarks about this book, see Schenk, "Mental Maps," 22. According to Hans Lemberg, Russia in the Western discourse "was moved" from the "North" to the "East" only in the first half of the nineteenth century, between the Congress of Vienna and the Crimean War: Hans Lemberg, "Zur Entstehung des Osteuropabegriffs im 19. Jahrhundert: Vom 'Norden' zum 'Osten' Europas," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 33, no. 1 (1985): 48–91.

28 Maria Todorova, *Imagining the Balkans* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

29 Schenk, "Mental Maps," introduction.

30 Anthony D. Smith, *National Identity* (London: Penguin, 1991).

31 Thongchai Winichakul, *Siam Mapped: A History of the Geo-Body of a Nation* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1994), x. See, for example, the map on the cover of this book: the map of Lithuania is drawn as a human skull.

the real, or at least the imagined, "holy" or "historical" lands.[32] And this modeling of the "national territory" occurs in the same way as in the case of imagining the nation.[33] In Peter Haslinger's opinion, the imagined territory theoretically has greater potential to demonstrate immutability than the imagined community,[34] so "one's own territory" becomes an important attribute of the modern nation.[35]

Nationalist ideology demands that the "national territory" acquires clear contours and not "overlap" with other "geo-bodies." A more complicated situation is when we encounter nationalism, which is "equated" with the empire, for example, with Russian nationalism in the Romanov Empire. Then, the "national territory" does not necessarily have to coincide with the politically controlled territory.[36]

Researchers of nationalism have noticed that "geo-ideological" concepts, especially their competition or change, reflect the dominant values, goals, or fears of the time.[37] Rogers Brubaker talks about certain cultural idioms, or in a more narrow sense, idioms of nationhood, which determine the nature of national identity along with spatial images.[38] As we have seen, scholars engaged in the research of mental maps,

32 David H. Kaplan and Guntram H. Herb, "How Geography Shapes National Identities," *National Identities* 13, no. 4 (December 2011): 349.

33 Michael Billig, *Banal Nationalism* (London: Sage, 1995), 74.

34 Peter Haslinger, *Nation und Territorium im tschechischen politischen Diskurs 1880–1938* (Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 2010), 31.

35 Historians have analyzed in detail different cases of the creation of "national territories": Helen Schmitt, "No Border, No Nation? Raumkonzepte im Nationalisierungsprozess von Letten und Finnen," *Neues Osteuropa* 1 (2010): 9–25; Haslinger, *Nation und Territorium*; Anton Kotenko, "The Ukrainian Project in Search of National Space, 1861–1914" (PhD diss., Central European University, Budapest, 2013).

36 Alexei Miller, *The Romanov Empire and Nationalism: Essays in the Methodology of Historical Research* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2008), 163; Stefan Berger and Alexei Miller, ed., *Nationalizing Empires* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2015).

37 Mark Bassin, "Imperiale Raum/Nationaler Raum. Sibirien auf der kognitiven Landkarte Rußlands im 19. Jahrhundert," *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 28, no. 3 (2002): 379.

38 Idioms of nationhood, according to Brubaker, are methods of thinking and speaking, which can be quite different (in France it is more oriented to the state, the civic nation; in Germany, ethno-cultural values are stressed). The cultural idioms, differing from ideologies, "have a longer-term, more anonymous, and less

which we can consider an integral part of studies of nationalism, comprehend these interactions in a similar way. Discussing the case of Lithuania, we not only search for those cultural idioms that influenced the formation of spatial images but also ask whether there was a "reverse" impact: did the images of "national territory" have an influence on the definitions of national identity?

The arguments formulated by nationalists justifying pretensions to a certain territory, in our understanding, can be divided into three groups.[39] To the first we would assign arguments of a cultural nature (ethnicity, civilizational or cultural mission, various types of historical right); to the second, arguments related to power (the goal to take over an ever-greater territory and strategically important habitats or economically important centers); and to the third, geographic arguments (references to "natural" borders, which allegedly mark objects of nature such as bodies of water, mountains, being on an island).[40] In this book, we clarify which criteria leaders of non-dominant national groups or officials chose. However, we do not limit ourselves to the analysis of these criteria, because we also discuss whether the arguments stated in the "competing" discourses were taken into account.

In this book, we will also look at another observation found in the studies of nationalism, which say that the imagined "national territory" is often not uniform, that its core and semi-core, as well as its periphery, can be distinguished. The nationalists associate themselves more with the core than with the periphery, thus they put the most effort into the

partisan existence": Rogers Brubaker, *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and German* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994), 14, 16, 162–63.

39 Colin Williams and Anthony Smith, "The National Construction of Social Space," *Progress in Human Geography* 7 (1983): 502–18; Brian A. Porter, "Who Is a Pole and Where Is Poland? Territory and Nation in the Rhetoric of Polish National Democracy before 1905," *Slavic Review* 51, no. 4 (Winter 1992): 639–53; Robert Gehrke, *Der polnische Westgedanke bis zur Wiedererrichtung des polnischen Staates nach Ende der Ersten Weltkieges: Genese und Begründung polnischer Gebietsansprüche gegenüber Deutschland im Zeitalter des europäischen Nationalismus* (Marburg: Herder Institut), 356–58.

40 Many of these arguments were seen not only in nationalistic arguments but also in other argumentation, when claims to a certain territory underwent attempts at justification.

preparations to fight for this zone.[41] However, when the "national body" (geo-body) is finally constructed, for example, after creating a nation state, then each one of its parts becomes sacred and cannot be handed over under any circumstance.[42]

At the same time, researchers draw attention to the fact that nationalists not only define the "national territory" but also designate certain "sacred centers," which reveal the "moral geography" of the nation—what Paulius Subačius has dubbed "space-gathering centers."[43] Such centers, according to the nationalistic logic, become the targets of pilgrimages. Sometimes such centers are even more important than the clear delimitations of "national territory."[44]

As is emphasized in the scholarly literature, the national construction of social space usually takes place with the assistance of two tools: the nationalizing of the landscape and historical narrations.[45] The appropriation of the landscape occurs when certain objects of nature or works created by people (such as buildings) are given value connotations, making these objects historical or humanizing or relating them with certain historical episodes,[46] for example, proclaiming the Nemunas "the father of Lithuania's rivers." The national landscape and the territory of the imagined homeland became the "sacred space."[47] In this way, says Mark Bassin, the geographic concept of homeland is not of constant and

41 Andrew F. Burghardt, "The Bases of Territorial Claims," *Geographical Review* 63 (1973): 225–45.

42 George W. White, *Nationalism and Territory: Constructing Group Identity in Southeastern Europe* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000).

43 Anthony D. Smith, "Sacred Territories and National Conflict," *Israel Affairs* 5, no. 4 (1999): 17.

44 Paulius Subačius, *Lietuvių tapatybės kalvė: Tautinio išsivadavimo kultūra* (Vilnius: Aidai, 1999), 153.

45 Béatrice von Hirschhausen, "Zwischen lokal und national: Der geographische Blick auf die Erinnerung," in *Europäische Errinerungsräume*, ed. Kirstin Buchinger, Claire Gantet, and Jacob Vogel (Frankfurt: Campus, 2009), 23.

46 Guntram H. Herb, "National Identity and Territory," in *Nested Identities: Nationalism, Territory, and Scale*, ed. Guntram H. Herb and David H. Kaplan (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999), 18–19; Sverker Sörlin, "The Articulation of Territory: Landscape and the Constitution of Regional and National Identity," *Norsk geografisk Tidsskrift—Norwegian Journal of Geography* 53, nos. 2–3 (October 1999): 103–12.

47 Smith, "Sacred Territories," 18–21; Bassin, "Imperiale Raum," 379.

objective size but rather the discursive topos, which is constantly being reinterpreted.[48] Meanwhile, the nationalist historical narrative morally obligates people to equate themselves with the historical homeland[49] it was emphasized especially often that the land was "drenched in the blood of ancestors." When a certain territory was "nationalized" in different discourses, then a sort of race began, in which each side strived to prove that it had been settled in this territory the longest.[50] As Smith observes, these two processes, the nationalizing of the space and the creation of the historical narratives, were tightly related because of the "territorialization of memory"—separate elements of the national landscape become the embodiment of the national past.[51]

At the same time, ethno-symbolists emphasize that modern nationalists usually are not radical inventors: they simply take over the existing images in the ethno-culture and adapt them to new ideology.[52] Therefore, in this book we compare certain geo-images in different periods. For example, we look into whether the spatial images in the first half of the nineteenth century were also seen at the beginning of the twentieth century.

Studies on nationalism reiterate that in the process of the creation of "national territory," not only were certain border signs determined but significant efforts were made to create strong emotional ties between the "national territory," which the specific individual most likely had not seen, and the national community.

As we have already mentioned, historians investigating mental maps borrowed approaches from the other sciences as well as from the research on discourse used by historians. In this book, we also address the discourses about the relationship between nation (and the state) and territory. Historical discourse studies[53] offer a look at communication in the public space as an arena in which the hierarchization of values occurs and

48 Bassin, "Imperiale Raum," 380.
49 Haslinger, *Nation und Territorium*, 18.
50 Haslinger, *Nation und Territorium*, 31.
51 Smith, "Sacred Territories," 13–31.
52 Smith, *National Identity*, 78.
53 Haslinger, *Nation und Territorium*, 22–30.

the normative frames for speaking on a particular topic are formed. The setting of these frames is nothing less than the manifestation of power.[54]

An important question for Lithuania, as for other multiethnic societies, is how the different discourses in a multilingual society interact. That is, it must be determined how the "younger" nationalisms (Lithuanian, Belarusian) reacted to Polish or Russian discourses on "national territory"; or vice versa—did the "old" narratives change in response to the challenges of "younger" nationalisms? This book shows that the different discourses on Lithuania not only had a certain internal logic and dynamics but were also in a constant dialogue or polylogue with one other.

The book opens with Darius Staliūnas's chapter, "Poland or Russia? Lithuania on the Russian Mental Map," in which an answer is sought to the question of whether the ruling and intellectual Russian elite treated the former GDL lands, and more narrowly, ethnic Lithuania, as an imperial holding of the Romanovs or if it was also part of the Russians' "national territory." The answer to this question is explored by analyzing the renaming of this territory, historical writings and ethnographic descriptions, the projects of territorial-administrative reforms, and the practices of symbolic appropriation of space.

Zita Medišauskienė's chapter, "Images of Lithuania in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century," analyzes the variety of the concepts of Lithuania in the first half of the nineteenth century. This study reveals that the coexistence of different collective identities led to Lithuania (like Samogitia or Lithuanian Rus') being perceived in different ways during this period. Among other geographic images in the middle of the nineteenth century, the concept of Lithuania as a region in which Lithuanian speakers dominate can be clearly seen. In the Lithuanian discourse, according to Medišauskienė, only this area was given the name of Lithuania.[55]

At the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century, defining Lithuania by linguistic and ethnographic criteria developed

54 The concepts of "frame" and "mental maps" or discourses about territory are often used as synonyms: Maria Todorova, "Der Balkan als Analysekategorie: Grenzen, Raum, Zeit," *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 28, no. 3 (2002): 470–71.

55 An earlier version of this chapter, as well as the chapters by Mastianica and Staliūnas on Lithuanian "national territory," was published in *Ab Imperio* 16, no. 1 (2015).

into a political program. Staliūnas's "The Pre-1914 Creation of Lithuanian National Territory" explains why the Lithuanian intelligentsia focused on "ethnographic Lithuania" and what criteria helped them argue for such a choice. The same issues are raised in the next two chapters: Olga Mastianica and Staliūnas's "Lithuania: An Extension of Poland" and Mastianica's "Between the Restoration of Ethnographic Belarus and the GDL." The authors analyze Lithuania's functioning and other geographic images in the Polish and Belarusian discourses.

Meanwhile, Vladimir Levin and Staliūnas's "*Lite* in the Mental Maps of the Jews" analyzes how and why the historically formed Jewish geographic images (*Lite*/Lithuania, *Zamet*/Samogitia, *Raysn*/Rus') changed in the nineteenth century, influenced by the official territorial-administrative nomenclature as well as by the cultural differences among the Jews. Here the question of whether the Jews "saw" a *Lithuanian* Lithuania is raised as well.

Unlike the discussed research, which speaks about the competing spatial images in the Russian Empire, Vasilijus Safronovas's study examines how and why the concept of Lithuania in Prussia (in both the German and Lithuanian speakers' discourses) underwent change. More specifically, he asks the following questions: How did the main social strata representing Lithuania in Prussia change? How was the concept of Lithuania nationalized and included in the system of geographic and ethnographic knowledge of East Prussia? And what space could Prussia's Lithuanians treat as their own?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aleksandravičius, Egidijus, and Antanas Kulakauskas. *Carų valdžioje: XIX amžiaus Lietuva*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 1996.

Bachmann-Medick, Doris. *Cultural Turns: Neuorientierungen in den Kulturwissenschaften*. Reinbek: Rowohls Enzyklopädie, 2007.

Bairašauskaitė, Tamara, Zita Medišauskienė, and Rimantas Miknys. *Lietuvos istorija,* vol. 8, pt. 1: *Devynioliktas amžius: visuomenė ir valdžia*, 34–55. Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 2011.

Bassin, Mark. "Imperiale Raum/Nationaler Raum. Sibirien auf der kognitiven Landkarte Rußlands im 19. Jahrhundert." *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 28, no. 3 (2002): 378–403.

Berger, Stefan, and Alexei Miller, eds. *Nationalizing Empires.* Budapest: Central European University Press, 2015.

Billig, Michael. *Banal Nationalism.* London: Sage, 1995.

Brubaker, Rogers. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.

Burghardt, Andrew F. "The Bases of Territorial Claims." *Geographical Review* 63 (1973): 225–45.

Colin, Williams, and Antony D. Smith. "The National Construction of Social Space." *Progress in Human Geography* 7 (1983): 502–18.

Döring, Jörg, and Tristan Thielmann. "Einleitung: Was lessen wir im Raume? Der *Spatial Turn* und das geheime Wissen der Geographen." In *Spatial Turn: Das Raumparadigma in den Kultur- und Sozialwissenschaften*, ed. Jörg Döring and Tristan Thielmann, 7–45. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag, 2008.

Downs, Roger M., and David Stea. "Cognitive Maps and Spatial Behavior: Process and Products." In *Image and Environment: Cognitive Mapping and Spatial Behavior*, ed. Roger M. Downs and David Stea, 8–26. London: Edward Arnold, 1973.

Gehrke, Roland. *Der polnische Westgedanke bis zur Wiedererrichtung des polnischen Staates nach Ende der Ersten Weltkieges. Genese und Begründung polnischer Gebietsansprüche gegenüber Deutschland im Zeitalter des europäischen Nationalismus.* Marburg: Herder Institut, 2001.

Harley, John Brian. "Deconstructing the Map." *Cartographica* 26, no. 2 (1989): 1–20.

_____. "Maps, Knowledge, and Power." In *The Iconography of Landscape: Essays on the Symbolic Representation, Design and Use of Past Environments*, ed. Denis Cosgrove and Stephen Daniels, 277–312. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Haslinger, Peter. "Diskurs, Sprache, Zeit und Identität—ein Plädoyer für eine erweiterte Diskursgeschichte." In *Historische Diskursanalysen: Genealogie, Theorie, Anwendungen*, ed. Franz X. Eder, 25–50. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2005.

_____. *Nation und Territorium im tschechischen politischen Diskurs 1880–1938.* Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 2010.