Aušra Navickienė (Institute of Book Science and Documentation, Vilnius University), ‘Contrafaction in Lithuanian book publishing during the first half of the 19th century: the case of publishing *Apej brostwą blaivystes*’.

Nominated and introduced by Martyn Lyons, University of New South Wales.

In 1795, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was partitioned for the third and final time between Prussia, the Habsburg Empire and Tsarist Russia. Lithuania Major, incorporating most of ethnic Lithuania including the capital Vilnius, became part of the Russian Empire and would remain so until conquered by Germany in 1915. Lithuania Minor¹, a smaller ethnic Lithuanian territory, became part of Prussia. From the beginning of the nineteenth century, the multi-lingual publishing and book trade business in the annexed territory of Lithuanian Major was directly affected by the Russian censorship regime, which became increasingly repressive over the seventy years of the period studied (1795-1864). Tsarist authorities began to pay more attention to Lithuanian books in the 1840s, when St. Petersburg responded to revolutionary events across Europe. At this time, the position of a special Lithuanian book censor was created and the instruments of control became more severe. The publication of the first planned Lithuanian newspaper was forbidden, and Lithuanian books appeared on the list of banned books for the first time. Repressive or post-print censorship complemented preventive or pre-print censorship.

The most radical measures to suppress the rebellious country, however, were taken in the mid-1860s. In 1864, following the failure of the Polish-Lithuanian revolt of 1863-64, the use of the Latin alphabet in junior schools and in Lithuanian publications was banned by the Russian authorities in favour of Russian script. This policy was not relaxed until the aftermath of the 1905 Revolutions in the Tsarist Empire. The nineteenth century was a period of struggle between imperial attempts at the ‘russification’ of Lithuania and Lithuanian aspirations for autonomy. This struggle had important repercussions for the publishing industry.

---

¹ Lithuania Minor is a historical region formed in the sixteenth century, spanning the Baltic lands conquered by crusaders along the river Nemunas, north of the River Prieglius (Pregel), which since the sixteenth century had become an ethnic Lithuanian province. Here, Lithuanian books in the Gothic script existed, despite not being used in Lithuania Major.
The period between 1795 and 1864 covered by this article is therefore a distinctive era in which the Lithuanian publishing industry had to learn how to survive in the face of severe Tsarist repression. One method used to evade censorship was to falsify imprints, declaring a fictitious place of publication. In her article, which focuses on the years between 1795 and 1864, Aušra Navickienė calls this practice ‘contrafaction’ and, as detailed in this article, the falsified imprints printed in 1860 and 1861 in Lithuania Major represent the first example of contrafaction in Lithuanian book history in the nineteenth century. At that time, a publishing model of opposition to censorship regulations took shape and it influenced the behaviour of those involved in Lithuanian book publishing and distribution following the 1864 ban on Lithuanian publications. Using this model during the later period from 1864-1904, publishers subsequently printed Lithuanian books with falsified imprints in Lithuania Minor and illegally smuggled them into Russian-controlled Lithuania Major. Navickienė’s case study demonstrates that it was possible to circumvent repressive censorship by using a method which will be familiar to scholars of the book trade in other authoritarian regimes, for example Ancien Regime France. In the second half of the nineteenth century, the practice of contrafaction had a significant side-effect: it led to greater communication between the two separated Lithuanian territories and thus contributed to maintaining their common culture in the face of political separation.

Like nineteenth-century Lithuanian publishing, modern book historical studies in Lithuania have themselves been forced to obey a rhythm dictated by changes of political regime. The science of book history was institutionalised at Vilnius University during Lithuania’s first brief period of independence (1918-1940). Its development came to a halt during the Second World War as a result of Soviet occupation and was only revived in the 1960s, thereafter beginning to flourish in the last 25 years with the restoration of independence from 1990.

The Book Science and Documentation Institute of Vilnius University was re-established in 1991, enabling a new generation of book historians to pursue the study of book history, book science, publishing and documentary heritage. Aušra Navickienė, who successfully defended her doctoral thesis at Vilnius University in 1993, is a member of this Institute. The Institute promotes co-operation between book historians in the Baltic region through the regular Vilnius Book Science conferences, as well as through the publication of the scholarly journal *Knygotyra* (Book Science),
where this article was originally published. The Institute, and Aušra Navickienė with it, responds to Lithuania’s demand for national book history research.

The article presented here investigates the phenomenon of repressive censorship and the underground production and distribution of printed texts, detailing an example from Lithuania Major in the first part of the nineteenth century. Navickienė presents a methodological model for illegal publishing research, through a case study based not only on a critical evaluation of bibliographical data, but more importantly on archival and typographical methods.