

Ina PUKELYTĖ

Vytautas Magnus University, Kaunas, Lithuania

REPRESENTATION OF “THE OTHER” IN THE THEATRE JOURNALISM DURING THE FIRST LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Summary. The article discusses the notion of *the Other* as it reveals itself through the content of the Lithuanian press media in the time period between 1926 and 1940. Articles describing the performances of the Lithuanian National Theatre are discussed. The content of these articles shows that Russian artists working in independent Lithuania were considered as a dangerous *Other* who exploits Lithuania ideologically and economically. Although such artists as Andrius Oleka-Žilinskas, Mikhail Chekhov, Vera Solovjova and others came to work in Kaunas in order to escape the Soviet regime, they were accused in Lithuania as being pro-Bolshevik and pro-Communist. The research shows that Lithuanian theatre journalists only considered Russians as dangerous to the young independent state but not Jewish or Polish artists. One can presume that Lithuania feared the communist regime so much that it tried to avoid any collaboration, including this with artists, which could harm the development of the independent state. In spite that Russian theatre artists enriched Lithuanian National Theatre, they were forced to leave Lithuania and never come back.

Keywords: Lithuanian theatre during the first independence, representation of *the Other* in Lithuanian theatre, theatre and *the Other*, theatre journalism.

The first Lithuanian independence (1918-1940) is known as the time period when the notion of Lithuanian national identity was created. Starting with 1926, this notion was supported by the so called *tautininkai* (nationalist) government. One of the objectives of this government was to implement and defend the Lithuanian language – national language of Lithuania. Other objectives were to express nationality in different art forms – architecture, visual arts, literature, music, and theatre. However, a big part of the population of that time was used to express itself in other languages, not Lithuanian. Lots of Lithuanian citizens were using Russian, German or Polish as their everyday languages. In 1935, 60 percent of Kaunas citizens considered themselves as Lithuanians, whereas 26 percent of them considered being Jewish, 4 percent – Polish, and 3,5 percent – German, 2,8 percent were of other nationalities.¹ This situation continued till the occupation of Lithuania by the Soviets.

The aim of this article is to analyze the way other nationalities (not Lithuanian) were represented in Lithuanian national press of that time. In order to

realize this objective, we shall take advantage of the philosophical notion of the *Other* since it allows to understand the general condition of the Lithuanian state at that time. Using this perspective, we shall analyze the content of certain Lithuanian newspapers and journals which had the task to present processes in Lithuanian theatre to its readers. Various descriptions of Lithuanian theatre events can be considered as representative ones since theatre was held by the government as *the* most important tool for the creation of national identity. When we talk about Lithuanian theatre, we have in mind only Lithuanian National theatre, an institution that consisted of three theatre groups – drama, opera, and ballet – and that had a significant building in the heart of Kaunas city. This was the only theatre in Lithuania that was solidly supported by the state, whereas other theatre groups had to survive on their own means and could never last for longer.

Before we go into the analysis of the content of the articles, we would like to discuss the notion of the *Other* and the role this notion could play in Lithuania during the discussed period. The concept of the

Other was established at the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th century by German philosophers, and it was coined in the middle of the 20th century by French intellectuals Jacques Lacan and Emmanuel Lévinas. In the context of our article, we would like to develop briefly the notion of the *Other* as it was discussed by German thinkers Johann Gottlieb Fichte and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel. According to Fichte, the predecessor of this term, the *Other*, rises from the concept of *I* that is already in a relation with the surrounding world. *I* appears in the act of self-consciousness and self-perception, before any concrete external relationships with the other have come into action yet. Self-consciousness can constitute the identity of *I* only when it neglects *Other*. That is why the *Other* is the deny of myself, that is why subjects – individuals, consciousnesses-- are in the confrontation.² While expanding the insights of Fichte, Hegel adds that a being can comprehend itself only when it desires something. While satisfying its natural desires, the desiring self destroys, transforms, neglects and thus establishes itself. To understand and to justify its own identity, it needs not only a direct relation with itself but also a mediator. In order to constitute self-consciousness, the *I* needs the *Other* not only as an object but also as a desire. Thus, the *Other* as a mediator can allow the consciousness of the *I* to know itself objectively. One must admit, that the *Other* is not a passive object but an active one, a consciousness that is also trying to define its *I* as an object.³ This relationship between the two consciousnesses is defined by Hegel as the relationship or the battle between a master and a slave.

This relationship of the battle between *I* and the *Other*, as well as the desire of the slave to break out of the shackles of the master, can be compared to the relationship between Lithuania and Russia. Having been a part of Russian Empire for more than a century, Lithuania made every effort to stay away from this country after the First World War. Lithuania needed to establish itself as a solid nation, therefore, starting with 1918, when it declared its independence, the country used every possible tool to create it. Lithuanian press was used as a tool to neglect Russia, or the *Other*. The analysis of different

theatre articles allows presuming that Lithuanians considered Russians as the most dangerous *Other* for establishing Lithuanian identity.

In order to illustrate this thesis, theatre articles written in such Lithuanian journals as *Naujoji Romuva* (*New Romuva*), *Tautos kelias* (*The Way of the Nation*), *Dienos naujienos* (*Daily News*), *Teatras* (*Theatre*) were chosen. The analysis of these articles allows to conclude that Lithuanian minorities deserved different evaluations from the press. There are no articles about theatres of Polish or German minorities – several amateur troupes existed in the discussed time period, but they were not considered as being important or of interest. There were quite a lot of articles about different Jewish theatre troupes in such journals and newspapers as *7 meno dienos* (*7 Days of Art*), *Dienos naujienos* (*Daily News*), *Lietuvos aidas* (*Echo of Lithuania*), *Diena* (*Day*), *Lietuvos žinios* (*Lithuanian News*), *Rytas* (*Morning*), *Vairas* (*Steering Wheel*). There existed one to three Jewish troupes in the discussed time period, but neither Jewish theatre nor Jewish artists were considered by the journalists of these newspapers as being a menace to the Lithuanian theatre.⁴ Sometimes the press was making mockeries of Jewish audiences while describing their bad behavior habits in the theatre, but it never considered Jewish artists as making any damage to the Lithuanian theatre. For instance, one of the *Rytas* journalists was writing about Jewish spectators:

“There is a real problem with the Jewish audience! The time period when “Habima” is performing in our theatre [Lithuanian National Theatre] is called the Jewish week, because everyday the theatre is stuffed with Jews. There is a real traffic jam around the theatre: everyone is pushing, hustling, trampling. Four policemen have difficulties protecting the doormen: everyone is trying to get in, whatever you try to do. By the time you get into the theatre, you feel like you have crossed a dog mill. When will these people learn to be polite!”⁵

The only reproach to Jewish audiences is that they are impolite, but there are no accusations that would

have political background. Sometimes the press accused Jewish theatre entrepreneurs of employing to their troupes not Jewish residents of Lithuania but foreign Jews, however again, the press did it in favour of local Jewish artists, in order to protect their rights. Prima's article in the journal *Theatre* illustrates it:

"We cannot talk about a permanent Jewish theatre in Lithuania indeed. A businessman who has a theatre enterprise invites either a group from a foreign country (and then all the actors here can starve) or a star actor who already has a lot of plays and then local actors are invited to play with him. Of course, still many actors stay without a job if they do not agree to be paid as bad as they are by the local theatre businessmen. In that case, actors from foreign countries are invited without any obstacles to work here instead of giving jobs first to the local actors. ... If [the performance] is successful and the star actor is appreciated by the audience, actors can be happy not because they get salaries but because they get, as it was always before, their share from the revenues. From these revenues, one also covers travel tickets of the foreigners and – what is really strange – Lithuanian citizens pay for their visas and permissions to live and work in Lithuania."⁶

That is, Jews and Jewish theatre was not regarded as a dangerous *Other* that would harm the Lithuanian *I*. One can presume that the collision was not so much between the cultures as between the political regimes – even though Lithuania was in conflict with Poland and tried to control the behaviour of Jews in Lithuania,⁷ Russia and its communist ideology represented nevertheless the most dangerous enemy of Lithuania. Therefore, the government tried to take necessary measures to prevent the spreading of communist ideas in Lithuania and it used the press as a tool for this prevention. This can be illustrated by the behaviour of the Lithuanian government led by nationalists (*tautininkai*), just in the time period they overtook the power from the folk's party (*valstiečiai liaudininkai*) in 1926.

Robert W. Heingartner, American Consul residing in Kaunas at that time, wrote about the censorship of the press in his diary in December 1926, day after the putsch in Lithuania: "The Kovno newspapers appeared again today but under military censorship. The *Litauische Rundschau* (newspaper in German language) shows two blank spaces in its columns which were deleted by the military censor."⁸ In the next two days, "the situation did not change – news stands were forbidden to sell German or other foreign newspapers that would give their opinion about the military events in Kaunas."⁹ One month later, the situation in the country was still not normal, not only because of the putsch but also because the new governors sentenced to death four communists. Protests for this event took place in different countries of Europe. As Heingartner noticed in his diary, "The papers of today report that there was rioting in Berlin yesterday when communists tried to storm Lithuanian legation. One man was killed and several were wounded. The communists all over the world are enraged at the Lithuanian government for shooting the four communists last month."¹⁰

The situation was still not stable in March. A printing office of the daily *Lietuvos žinios* was blown up in the night of the 11th, and it was presumed that it happened because it was the only oppositional paper published in Lithuania. According to Heingartner: "Owing to the press censorship, the newspapers are not permitted to express their views on the explosion."¹¹ *Lietuvos žinios* continued nevertheless its existence and gave its opinion concerning the bombing. It affirmed that it will continue its course without a fare. According to Heingartner, this incident "gave some idea of the hatred between political parties in this country and it is not a hopeful augury for the future of the republic."¹²

As the above mentioned quotations show, the newly formed government, that was led by the President Antanas Smetona and the Prime Minister Augustinas Valdemaras, was desperately afraid of any revolutionary movements that could be organized by the supporters of communist or other leftist ideologies, therefore, it strictly forbid any kind of free expression in the press. This situation lasted for some time.

Later on, some of the newspapers were obliged to change their editors in chief so that they would be more loyal to the government, and the ordinary life of the press continued.

Nevertheless, as the analysis of the content of the articles on theatre matters in different press means shows, the intention to protect Lithuanian nation from the “communist enemy” continued to be of importance during the coming years, and was especially visible in 1931-1932, in time period when prominent Russian actors – Andrius Oleka-Žilinskas, his wife Vera Soloviova and one of the leaders of Russian theatre, Michail Chekhov – worked in Lithuanian National Theatre. All of them were former students of Konstantin Stanislavsky. The latter was considered as the most important theatre reformer in the world, at the same time, Stanislavski’s Theatre of Art in Moscow was considered by Stalin as *the* model of the Soviet theatre that should be followed by all other Soviet theatres. We shall show below what narrative was used by Lithuanian theatre journalists in order to reveal Russian artists as the *Other*, the *Other* that is presupposed to be menacing to the young independent country.

Andrius Oleka-Žilinskas was invited to Kaunas in 1929 by the director of the Lithuanian National Theatre Jurgis Savickis.¹³ Although born in Russia, Oleka-Žilinskas was of Lithuanian origin, therefore, his supporters, such like the prominent Lithuanian poet, drama writer and theatre critic Balys Sruoga, and Jurgis Baltrušaitis, also a poet and diplomat, wanted to see him at the lead of the Lithuanian National Theatre. The latter, in the opinion of Sruoga, was suffering due to the lack of new ideas and better quality. Oleka-Žilinskas accepted the invitation and came to Kaunas from Moscow, where he was working before at the progressive Art Theatre 2. The Stanislavsky pupil was supposed to give new creative impulses to the most important Lithuanian cultural institution. He succeeded doing this while creating an original performance based on the legend of Lithuanian knight Šarūnas, in 1929.

The text (written by Vincas Krėvė and adapted for stage by Petras Vaičiūnas) was interpreted by the actors as a kind of Lithuanian folk song – this

interpretation confirmed the expectations of most of the Lithuanian audience and the actors. Oleka-Žilinskas had explained to the troupe as well as to the press the idea behind the performance.¹⁴ In other words, the press knew beforehand the purpose of the play and could explain it to the audience while the actors understood the sense of their being on stage. Second, the form of the performance demanded that the troupe acted as if it was an orchestra. The actors had to coordinate their instruments – bodies and voices – in a way that the whole would again resemble a song. With the performance of *Šarūnas*, several things became evident concerning the Lithuanian National Theatre and its relationship with the theatre reforms going on in Russia. Ultimately, *Šarūnas* crowned the efforts of the Lithuanian intellectuals, especially Sruoga, to create a National Theatre that would be relevant to contemporary society by giving rise to profound questions about the newly reborn nation. *Šarūnas* corresponded to what the Theatre Council had described, ten years before, as an authentic Lithuanian theatre. It was a dramatic poem, a song, and a fairy tale at the same time, about the heroic Lithuanian past and the ability of the people to sacrifice themselves in the name of the homeland.

The critic in general was favorable for this interpretation, nevertheless, there were already some critics who reproached Oleka-Žilinskas for spreading the “disastrous principles of anarchism” in the society as well as serving the Bolshevik propaganda.¹⁵ Most of the newspapers, as said, praised the performance and treated Oleka-Žilinskas as a serious candidate for the leadership of the theatre. He was nominated for the post of the director the same year and, with the help of Sruoga, started not only working on the repertory but also creating an image of a serious modern theatre institution. Therefore, he organized intensive public relations campaigns. As we shall see later, these campaigns were only partly appreciated by the representatives of the Lithuanian press.

One of the first accusations that Oleka-Žilinskas had to confront was the fact that he employed Russian actors instead of Lithuanian ones. For instance, the nationalistic minded newspaper *Tautos kelias* criticized the leader of the theatre for wanting to

employ five Russians since the Lithuanian ones "seemed to be not convenient for him."¹⁶ Even if Oleka-Žilinskas tried to justify himself about the necessity of high quality actors despite their nationality, the pro-nationalist press accused him of Bolshevik intentions.

Every time they could, Lithuanian intellectuals, such as Faustas Kirša, Juozas Keliuotis, Jonas Kossu-Aleksandravičius, blamed him for serving the communist ideology. For instance, in his article about *Sabbatai Cevi*, performance that was staged by Oleka-Žilinskas in the beginning of 1931, Kirša wrote that the director "could not reveal a Man on stage; as Russians would say, everything in the performance seemed colourless ("niešto v sierom") as it would probably be in a communist state."¹⁷ He also accused the director that his interpretation of the prophet Sabbatai Cevi, whose make-up reminded of another religious hero, Jesus Christ, was not correct. According to him, the director took a path that was very common to Russian nihilists, that is, to "drag the name of Christ around."¹⁸ It is clear that the critic of a catholic trend could not be satisfied with the way his idol was interpreted on stage.

Another intellectual, Juozas Keliuotis, who was the editor in chief of one of the most important cultural magazines *Naujoji Romuva*, responded to the considerations about the national theatre, that Oleka-Žilinskas had shared during one of his press conferences, organized for the beginning of the new theatre season in 1932. He reproached the director's locution that he could not find a ready-made Lithuanian national ideology, therefore, could not stage national performances. According to Keliuotis, nationalism could not be learned, "one can maybe become a patriot when ordered, but one cannot definitely become a nationalist when ordered."¹⁹ Keliuotis did not like Oleka-Žilinskas's appeal to journalists where he asked them to explain the national character of the nation: "nationalism is not a beigel that could be taken out from somewhere and eaten."²⁰ He suggested that theatre artists should "love their nation from the bottom of their hearts ..., then the nation would also love them and would not accuse them any more for Russification and indifference for the highest ideals of the nation."²¹ He

invited theatre artists to kick out Russian language and customs from the temple of theatre art.

In his article, Keliuotis concluded that "Lithuanian nation is not satisfied anymore with only its political independence in the beginning of the thirties. It wants as well to be independent culturally and artistically."²² Lithuania, according to him, will not slave someone any more, especially not Russians. He finished his long article in an exalted note: "Everything and everybody, who will not want or will not be able to serve sincerely the creation of national culture, will have to leave our cultural life! ... Lithuanian nation will not wait any more. ... It requires from Jews not to speak Russian any more, otherwise they should search for another homeland. It cuts with Russian, Polish and German rudiments in all the fields of society – politics, army, university, literature, visual arts, economics, and also theatre."²³

The spirit, in which Keliuotis expressed himself, reveals that nationalism was considered the most important ideology in Lithuania in 1932, and it was not favorable for the artists, especially when they were of foreign origin, to reveal cosmopolite approaches to the culture.

Another intellectual, Kossu-Aleksandravičius, continued in the same vein, although his message about nationalism was rather contradictory. In one article that appeared in *Naujoji Romuva* in 1932 he considered Oleka-Žilinskas's performance Šarūnas as not national enough because the costumes of the performance "smelt very much like mother Russia."²⁴ In the same article, he also discussed the Russian staff of the ballet of the National theatre. According to him, Russians should not dance Lithuanian dances since the way they were doing that resembled more of a caricature than of a dance. At the end of the article, he nevertheless criticizes the defenders of the Lithuanian nationalism since the demand to perform art in a national manner, according to him, was an exaggeration that finally became comic.

In his later article of 1933, Kossu-Aleksandravičius defined the situation of Lithuanian national theatre as tragic, but he avoided to blame Russian artists who were working at the theatre at that time. Instead, he debated Lithuanian nature that needed

foreign nannies and would still need them for a long time. Lithuanian theatre, according to him, had lips to talk but it “did not have neither lungs nor the heart.”²⁵ It was not the fault of the director but of the Lithuanians themselves, declared the journalist. That is, the critic treated Lithuania as being inferior to Russia, a sort of Hegelian slave, meanwhile Russia was serving as a master.

As the above mentioned discussions show, Lithuanian pro-national press was playing kind of a censor at the Lithuanian national stage. In addition to this, it reproached to the theatre the quality of the repertoire and performances, and the constitution of the staff. According to the press, Russian artists were infiltrated by Soviet ideology *per se*, no matter what they were really thinking and what their beliefs were. It accused the director Oleka-Žilinskas of employing Russian artists and firing from the theatre Lithuanian ones. Lithuanian press was concluding that “all the fields of our life were impregnated with the Soviet spirit, and we do almost nothing in order to fight it.”²⁶

Another reproach made by the press was of a more pragmatic nature. According to journalists, it was not decent to pay big royalties to Russian artists who were not really attached to the country they were working in, and thus make financial harm to the Lithuanian economics. This discontent was especially visible after Michail Chekhov staged Gogol’s *Inspector General* in the National Theatre in 1933. Chekhov was one of the most famous actors of the Moscow Art Theatre 2. Oleka-Žilinskas invited his colleague to Kaunas to stage some performances and give acting courses for the students. The press criticized *Inspector General* since it was based on Russian customs that, according to the press, had nothing to do with our young independent country. As *Dienos naujienos* wrote, “To whom the performance was applying? ... We do not have such degenerates here. ... We should only be happy that *Inspector General* has nothing to do with us and that it was not Lithuanians who treated Gogol so badly.”²⁷ Soon after the premiere, Chekhov left Lithuania for Riga. The press commented this departure in a sarcastic way comparing Chekhov with the main character of the play, Chlestakov, the inspector general. The

same daily wrote: “Chekhov took some thousands Litas for his *Inspector General*, waved his hat, got into the train for Riga, and just sang a song about not staying in this place anymore.”²⁸

Soon after Chekhov’s departure, Oleka-Žilinskas abandoned the post of the director of the National Theatre as well. One can presume that the pro-national press did its job since rumours and discussions spreading out in the press started harming the reputation of the theatre, as well as of the state itself. Therefore, the Ministry of Education decreased the salary for Oleka-Žilinskas so that soon he was confronted with serious financial difficulties. These difficulties, as well as the concerted critic of Russification and Sovietization, forced Oleka-Žilinskas and his wife to leave Lithuania for other Western countries.²⁹ One can presume that Lithuania feared the communist regime so much that it tried to avoid any collaboration, including this with artists, which could harm the development of the independent state. In spite Russian theatre artists enriched Lithuanian National Theatre, they were forced to leave Lithuania and never come back.

As we could see, part of the Lithuanian theatre press did not support the fact that artists of Russian origin or sympathizers of Russian culture would take part creating Lithuanian national theatre or Lithuanian culture in general. In order to present them as an enemy and to stress their political background, adjectives such as *Bolshevik*, *communist* or *soviet* were used. These adjectives implicated such pejorative associations as external menace, forced protectorate, cruelty and degeneration. In general, Russians were seen in Lithuania as a dangerous *Other* who was not there to enrich the young country but to exploit it economically and ideologically. No matter that Russian artists working in Lithuania were of a very high professional level, they were seen as a menace to the Lithuanian state, therefore they had to be expelled. One can presume that such a discourse of hatred and distrust impregnated not only the minds of ordinary people but also that of Lithuanian intellectuals. Only later, after the Second World War and its disasters in Europe were experienced, Emmanuel Lévinas, French philosopher originated from Jewish of Kaunas, developed another notion

of the *Other*. This notion was meant not to establish the relationship between the *I* and an objective *Other* but to establish the relationship between *I* and the God, a footprint, an invisible Face, *Visage* that is visiting a human being.

Notes

¹ Kauno miesto statistikos metraštis 1937 [Statistic chronicles of Kaunas city 1937]. Kauno miesto statistikos biuro leidinys [Publication of the Statistic Office of Kaunas city], Kaunas 1938, p. 10.

² Fichte, Johann Gottlieb. *Foundations of Natural Right*. 1796-7. Translated from German in 2000, Cambridge University Press, 2000, p. 18-53.

³ Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Phenomenology of Mind*. Translated by W. Wallace, 1971, Oxford Clarendon Press, p. 47-59.

⁴ More about Jewish theatre in Lithuania in: Ina Pukelytė. Reconstructing a Nomadic Network: Itineraries of Jewish Actors during the First Lithuanian Independence. *Nordic Theatre Studies*. 2015; vol. 27, no 1: 78-89.

⁵ Menas ir kūryba. Habima [Art and Creation. Habima]. *Rytas*. 1926 vasario 18, p. 2.

⁶ Prima. Jewish Theatre in Lithuania (Žydų teatrai Lietuvoje). *Teatras*. 1938; nr. 4: 6-7. (translated by I. P. – Ina Pukelytė)

⁷ The Jewish Ministry that was established in Lithuania in 1919 was closed in 1924. Lithuanian government considered that Jews should obey Lithuanian laws as all other nationalities living in the country should do. More in: Šarūnas Liekis. *A State within a State? Jewish Autonomy in Lithuania in 1918-1925*. Vilnius: Versus aureus, 2003. (translated by I. P. – Ina Pukelytė)

⁸ Heingartner, Robert W. *Lithuania in the 1920s. A Diplomat's Diary*. Amsterdam-New York: Rodopi, 2009, p. 77.

⁹ Ibid., p. 79.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 97.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 117.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Andrius Oleka-Žilinskas joined the Moscow Art Theatre in 1913 as an associate. He stayed at the theatre for one year after which he was recruited to serve in the army. He returned to Moscow in 1917, and was accepted as a student at the First Studio. Between 1917 and 1920, he played in several performances of the Studio, including *Twelfth Night*, *The Wreck of the Ship 'Hope'*, and *Baladine*. The dream of the Studio's founders, Stanislavsky and Leopold Sulerzhitsky, was 'to create something that would be similar to a spiritual order of actors. Members of the order had to be more noble-minded, with wider horizons, perceiving human nature, being able to sacrifice themselves for a cause'. At the time when Oleka-Žilinskas was working in it, the aspirations of the Studio were starting to change; however, Sulerzhitsky had died in 1916 and Stanislavsky would soon distance himself from the Studio as it would become more of a formal theatre, with an emphasis on production of performances rather than training. Striving for new

challenges while trying to escape post-revolutionary Russia, Oleka-Žilinskas left Moscow for Kaunas in 1920 with the goal to become a leader of the newly-founded national theatre. In the summer of the same year, the Lithuanian Art Association elected him, together with Sruoga, as a member of the Theatre Council which had to develop a unique Lithuanian theatre concept based on rituals, fairy tales and ancient songs, or the plays of certain Lithuanian modern writers. Nevertheless, the Council decided that the theatre should be led by a personality that would have stronger links with Lithuanian actors, which led to Oleka-Žilinskas being offered to head the newly established Acting Studio rather than the National Theatre. Since the ambitions of the young leader were not met, Oleka-Žilinskas soon left Lithuania for Paris, even before the opening of the Theatre. In the summer 1921, he joined the Mchat group of Prague, led by Vasily Kachalov, and toured with it in Europe until 1922, when he returned to the First Studio in Moscow. In 1924, the First Studio became the Mchat II, where Oleka-Žilinskas worked until his return to Lithuania in 1929. More in: Aleknonis, G. *Režisierius Andrius Oleka-Žilinskas [Director Andrius Oleka-Žilinskas]*. Vilnius: Scena, 2001; Česnulevičiūtė, P. *Andrius Oleka-Žilinskas, Balys Sruoga ir kiti [Andrius Oleka-Žilinskas, Balys Sruoga and others]*. Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2012; Stanislavskis K. S. *Mano meninis gyvenimas [My Life in Art]*. Vilnius: Valstybinė grožinės literatūros leidykla, 1951, p. 393.

¹⁴ Sruoga, Balys. *Apie tiesą ir sceną [About truth and stage]*. Vilnius: Scena, 1994, p. 123-126.

¹⁵ Šilkarskis, Vladas. Oleka Žilinskas ir jo „kritikai“ [Oleka Žilinskas and his "critics"]. *Naujoji Romuva*. 1931; vol. 11: 252.

¹⁶ Lietuvis. Ir vėl 700.000 litų [Lithuanian. 700000 Litas again]. *Tautos kelias*. 1930 06 19; p. 3.

¹⁷ Kirša, Faustas. „Sabbatai Cevi“ pastatymą prisiminus [Remembering building of "Sabbatai Cevi"]. *Naujoji Romuva*, 1931, vol. 9, p. 219.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Keliuotis, Juozas. Tetro sezonui prasidėjus [After the beginning of theatre season]. *Naujoji Romuva*. 1932; nr. 39: p. 837.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Ibid.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Kossu-Aleksandravičius, Jonas. Valstybės teatro parada ir kiti dalykai [Parades and other things of the governmental theatre]. *Naujoji Romuva*. 1932; 48: p. 1040.

²⁵ Kossu-Aleksandravičius, Jonas. Dėl baletu išsišokimo [For ballet dancing]. *Naujoji Romuva*. 1933; 133: 205.

²⁶ Alkis. Ne tik patys lietuviai, bet ir užsienis nori lietuviško teatro [Hunger. Not only Lithuanians but foreigners want Lithuanian theatre]. *Naujoji Romuva*. 1932; 30-31: 693.

²⁷ M. Chekhov. Revisor. *Dienos naujienos*. 1933; p. 4.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Oleka-Žilinskas Andrius left Lithuania in January 1935 in order to join Chekhov in Paris. Subsequently, both of them moved forward to other destinations: Oleka-Žilinskas ended in New-York in 1935, whereas Chekhov received an invitation to work in Great Britain. More in: Aleknonis, G. *Režisierius Andrius Oleka-Žilinskas [Director Andrius Oleka-Žilinskas]*. Vilnius: Scena, 2001.

Ina PUKELYTĖ

Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, Kaunas, Lietuva

„KITO“ REPREZENTACIJA PIRMOSIOS LIETUVOS NEPRIKLAUSOMYBĖS TEATRO ŽURNALIZME

Santrauka

Straipsnyje nagrinėjama *Kito* koncepcija, kuri atsiskleidžia vertinant 1926–1940 m. lietuviškos spaudos publikacijas. Analizuojami straipsniai, kuriuose rašoma apie Lietuvos Valstybės teatro spektaklius. Tekstų turinys rodo, kad rusų artistai, kurie dirbo tuo metu nepriklausomoje Lietuvoje, buvo laikomi pavojingu *Kitu*, išnaudojančiu Lietuvą tiek ideologiškai, tiek ir ekonomiškai. Nors teatre dirbę menininkai Andrius Oleka-Žilinskas, Michailas Čechovas, Vera Solovjova ir kiti atvyko į Kauną bėgdami nuo sovietinio režimo, Lietuvoje jie buvo kaltinami bolševizmu ir komunizmu. Tyrimas rodo, kad tik rusų, o ne, pavyzdžiui, žydų ar lenkų, menininkai buvo laikomi pavojingais jaunai nepriklausomai valstybei. Galima daryti prielaidą, kad Lietuva, bijodama komunistinio režimo, visais būdais stengėsi vengti bendradarbiavimo, kuris pakenktų nepriklausomos valstybės vystymuisi, ypač su rusų menininkais. Nepaisant to, kad rusų menininkų darbai praturtino Lietuvos Valstybės teatrą, jie vis dėlto buvo priversti palikti Lietuvą ir daugiau į ją niekada nebegrižo.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: Tarpukario Lietuvos teatras, *Kito* reprezentacijos Lietuvos teatre, teatras ir *Kitas*, teatro žurnalizmas.

Gauta 2016-10-11

Paruošta spaudai 2016-11-28

INA PUKELYTĖ

Humanitarinių mokslų daktarė, Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto Menų fakulteto

Teatrologijos katedros docentė

Ph. D. in Humanities, Associated Professor at Vytautas Magnus University, Faculty of Arts,

Department of Theatre Studies

Adresas / Address: Muitinės str. 7, LT-44280 Kaunas, Lithuania

El. paštas / E-mail: ina.pukelyte@vdu.lt.