

## SUMMARIES

THE REFERENCE POINTS OF MUTUAL COGNITION AND CULTURAL COOPERATION OF  
 JEWS AND LITHUANIANS IN INTERWAR LITHUANIA: MEANS AND RESULTS

*Jurgita Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė*

SUMMARY

More solid preconditions and orientations for better mutual cognition of Lithuanians and Jews were established for the first time in the history of Lithuanian society in the independent state of the interwar period. The process designated as mutual cognition is two-directional and embraces the Jewish efforts to understand and absorb Lithuanian culture or its segments, as well as the readiness of Lithuanians to accept their Jewish compatriots and adapt their culture as part of their own. While discussing the ideal Lithuanian-Jewish relations, contemporaries used several concepts of similar meaning to specify the means of their achievement: “rapprochement”, “cognition”, and “making friends”, which gradually developed into a form of cognition that acquired a new quality – cultural cooperation. The aim of the research presented in the article is to define the situation of mutual cognition in the interwar Lithuanian society, the preconditions of formulating this need, the most adequate means applied to encourage mutual cognition and cultural cooperation, which means turned out to be the most effective and attractive, and who took the initiative to popularize Jewish culture among Lithuanians and correspondingly Lithuanian culture in the Jewish community. For the discussion of the process of cognition in interwar Lithuania, two newspapers published by Jews in Lithuanian – *Mūsų garsas* (Our Voice, 1924–25) and *Apžvalga* (Review, 1935–40), – as well as the works of various contents by Lithuanian and Jewish authors addressing the research of mutual cognition (translations of fictional works, reviews and memoirs about the activities of similar nature) have been used. Documents held in the archive of bibliographer and teacher of the Lithuanian language Isidor Kissin (1904–58) revealing the circumstances of preparing an anthology of Lithuanian literature in Hebrew, as well as the documents and publications of the Union of Jewish Soldiers who Participated in the Struggle for Lithuania’s Independence are introduced into scholarly circulation; while referring to the statute of the Society for Lithuanian and Jewish Cultural Cooperation and the documents of the Society’s liquidation, the scanty information about the activity of this organization contained in historiography is supplemented.

The Lithuanization of Jews that took place in interwar Lithuania affected different generations of Jews not equally: the generation of Jews of interwar independent Lithuania was Lithuanized, the process of acculturation took place by mastering the language, getting to know Lithuanian literature and culture, and agreeing upon the common shifts of national histories and their hardly differing interpretations, and the types of Jewish heroes of outstanding merit to the state were distinguished. Manifestations of cognition and recognition of Jewish culture and its adaptation to the Lithuanian contexts began to appear among Lithuanians, and the rhetoric of discourse about the coexistence of the two nations and its crucial moments was formed; however, time was too short for Jewish integration into society, which was also hindered by social and economic problems and the traditionalist view. The Lithuanian majority was not ready to assimilate the Jews who had experienced rapid acculturation and were building a new identity of “Lithuanians of the faith of Moses”.

“ON A BRIDGE OF WORDS”: THE JEWISH ENCOUNTER WITH LITHUANIAN CULTURE  
IN INTERWAR LITHUANIA

*Mordechai Zalkin*

SUMMARY

Did all the above efforts bear fruits? Did ethnic Lithuanian culture become part and parcel of the cultural world of most contemporary local Jews? To a certain extent the answer to that question is, most probably, in the negative. First and foremost, one has to remember that most of the aforementioned Lithuanian Dainas, proverbs and short stories translated into Hebrew were characterized by a primordial primitive nature representing an early stage of the human cultural development. Concentrating on the basic experience of the rural human existence alongside pagan-type mystic elements, it belonged to the realm of folklore which was considered as a “Low Culture”. This perception highly correlated with the common image of contemporary Lithuanian people as an undeveloped and uncivilized society. A typical expression of this still existing perception is the caption placed under a photo of a Lithuanian shepherd in the above mentioned Isaac Kissin’s anthology: “A typical Dzūkijen shepherd, never changing his dress, through winter and summer wearing the same garment and fur, always barefoot”.<sup>1</sup> What could be considered as a legitimate anthropological description, turned in the present context into a judgmental saying of a colonialist character. Against this background it is understandable why local Jews, a mostly urban group with an inherent historical self perception as “the people of the book” could hardly cross the conscious and mental barriers that separated them from this type of culture. Thus, only the Zionists, who ideologically fostered such values as productivity and land farming could identify, though to a very limited extent, with certain relevant elements of this cultural world as show above. Thus, a careful examination of the Lithuanian works incorporated in the contemporary Zionist press and educational publications reveals that the main elements “borrowed” from these works were of the idyllic natural and human atmosphere of the countryside, while almost totally ignoring most real aspects of local daily life. Moreover, contemporary local cultural arena offered to the reading public a wide variety of options “imported” from Russian, Polish, German and other nearby societies, which the Lithuanian ethnic cultural experience and works had to compete with. Thus, for instance, on the shelves of the schools’ libraries local Jewish students could find the books of Lithuanian authors such as Vincas Mykolaitis-Putinas, Vincas Krėvė-Mickevičius and Juozas Tumas-Vaižgantas next to the works of world famous writers such as Pearl Buck, Fyodor Dostoyevsky, Charles Dickens, Leo Tolstoy, Thomas Mann, Stefan Zweig, Alexander Kuprin and Erich Kästner, to mention but a few.<sup>2</sup> However, while almost any graduate of a Jewish school in interwar Warsaw or Cracow was able to quote by heart whole paragraphs of Adam Mickiewicz’s epic poem *Pan Tadeusz* or Alexander Pushkin’s novel *Yevgeny Onegin*, Krėvė’s *Šarūnas*, *Dainavos kunigaikštis* remained, at best, a blurry memory from school days.

<sup>1</sup> Kissin, *Anthology*, p. 133. For a different attitude see Livshin, *Geography*, p. 64.

<sup>2</sup> See Mordechai Zalkin, “The ‘Yavneh’ Jewish Educational Network in Lithuania”, in: Shmuel Glick (ed.), *Zekhor Davar le-’avdekha: Essays and Studies in Memory of Dov Rappel*, Jerusalem 2007, pp. 121–143.

## JEWISH ARTISTS ON THE ART SCENE OF INTERWAR LITHUANIA

*Giedrė Jankevičiūtė*

## SUMMARY

The object of analysis of the present article is the interest in Jewish art in interwar Lithuania and the influence of the views formed in that period on the assessments of the work and activity of Jewish artists, its later reception and becoming part of artistic heritage.

Jewish art and artists in interwar Lithuania are well known and highly acclaimed. Though the social integration of Jewish artists in interwar Lithuania was not easy due to society's cautious attitude to people of non-Lithuanian nationalities, the artists themselves showed a huge interest in Jewish art, and it received positive acclaim, as can be seen from pieces of art criticism, contemporaries' memoirs, and examples of Jewish art held in museum collections. On the other hand, it is conspicuous enough that Jewish artists did not succeed in acquiring high professional authority and securing themselves a more stable social position.

In constructing the narrative presented in the article, examples confirming the successful integration of Jewish artists in the cultural milieu of independent Lithuania have been used. For that purpose, two case studies have been chosen: a review of creative work and activity of the painter and set designer well known in and outside Lithuania Neemija Arbitblat (1908–99; Arbit Blat), and the still underrated graphic artist Khaim Meyer Fainshtein (1911–42?).

For the first time in the historiography of Lithuanian art, attention has been drawn to the ideological guidelines of the work of Jewish artists and a possible influence of the socialist ideology on their art. While referring to the works by graphic artists Fainshtein and Mark Ginzburg (1909–?) and contemporaries' texts analyzing these works, the author of the article advances a hypothesis about the participation of Jewish artists in the activity of left-wing intellectuals. It is presumed that more consistent studies of the influence of the left-wing ideology on Jewish art would be helpful in assessing the heritage of the unique but so far little known painter Zale Beker (1896–1941?), which has so far been analyzed purely as an example of genre art having the sole aim of conveying the daily life of poor Jews, particularly the inhabitants of small towns or suburbs.

At the end of the article the author draws a conclusion that the art of Lithuanian Jews was not a homogeneous phenomenon, and the research into this art could be expanded not only by deeper insights into the hardly addressed Jewish social history, but also by a study of the relation of art and politics, covering the work of artists of various nationalities and going beyond the limits of a single art form. In other words, the research into the art of Lithuanian Jews obviously does not fit into the framework of the existing interpretations.

EXPRESSION OF LOYALTY OF LITHUANIAN JEWS:  
VARIATIONS OF SELF-DETERMINATION 1918–39

*Saulius Kaubrys*

SUMMARY

The current article aims to discuss the loyalty of the Lithuanian Jewish community as one of the most important aspects of its collective behavior. Loyalty characterizes its relation with the outside (in this case the titular majority – Lithuanians). The insights of sociological research seem to recognize that competition between groups increases their perceptible differences, while close cooperation decreases though does not eliminate them completely. However, even in the case of cooperation the final result of intergroup relations may depend on the success or failure of a particular activity. With the aim of confirming the functioning of the above mentioned preconditions in interwar Lithuania, unpublished sources – reports of state security institutions, military commandants, etc. – have been used. These sources testify to certain variations in the Jewish attitudes towards the outside, especially with a view to the fact that the Lithuanian government and society also employed different forms of activity.

The models of behavior of Lithuanian Jews and their dominants varied. This was probably caused by the circumstances and changes of the intergroup relations as well as situational events. The implemented research shows that loyalty demonstrated by Jewish community was not always accepted adequately by the dominant majority, whose expectations with regard to other groups including the Jews were too high. Such misunderstanding did not encourage harmony in the perception and demonstration of loyalty. Loyalty which appeared as a result of cognition was complicated – different contexts of circumstances determined a different quality of loyalty.

## JEWISH HISTORY IN THE CONTEXTS OF LITHUANIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

*Darius Staliūnas*

## SUMMARY

The author of the current article seeks to answer the question how the change of historiographic paradigms, the political order of the day and other similar factors influenced Jewish studies in Lithuania. It is asserted in the article that the Jews were basically excluded from the Lithuanian ethnocentric narrative formed in the 19th century. In the interwar period, it was only Augustinas Janulaitis who took a greater interest in the history of Lithuanian Jews. In the Soviet period, according to the dogmas of classical Marxism, the social classes (progressive versus non-progressive) and ethnic Lithuanians were the key figures of Lithuanian history. Thus, the historical narrative that prevailed in 1940–88/90 only minimally discussed the Jewish past (most often in the context of the socialist movement). The Holocaust as a specific expression of Jewish suffering was also eliminated from the Soviet historical discourse. At that time it was common to write about Nazis killing “Soviet citizens”. The author of the article also asserts that a larger amount of historical research devoted to Jewish history has been published in Lithuanian historiography in the last twenty years than during the entire earlier period of professional Lithuanian historiography. This increased interest in Jewish history is related with the paradigmatic change, when part of the historians renounced the ethnocentric treatment of history and began to write a history of Lithuanian society, as well as with certain political considerations. Obstacles that prevent both professional historiography and mass historical consciousness from integrating Jews into the Lithuanian historical narrative are also discussed in the article.

## THE STORIES OF RESCUED JEWS: THE FACTORS OF COGNITION OF LITHUANIAN CULTURE

*Eglė Bendikaitė*

### SUMMARY

While taking into account the fact that the existing sources are limited both in terms of quantity and quality, and in view of the extent of the research carried out, as well as the relevance and sensitivity of the problem under discussion, the author of the current article seeks to focus the attention on the factors of cognition of Lithuanian culture and their possible influence on the motifs of actions of one or another national group in the extreme conditions of German occupation (1941–44), rather than presenting the usually escalated statistics of the rescued and rescuers and discussing the incredible humanism and heroism of the latter. The main references are both published and unpublished sources, accumulated and/or published by the Department of the Rescue of Jews and Perpetuation of Memory of the Vilna Gaon State Jewish Museum, the Genocide and Resistance Research Centre of Lithuania, and Yad Vashem Museum.

The features of classification into kin and alien, i.e. a different appearance, the ability to speak Lithuanian, knowledge of the Christian religious tradition and lifestyle, social integration, and the ability to find direct informal contacts in the neighbouring community have been chosen as the criteria for the angles of research, which allowed us to reconstruct at least partially the forms and meaning of cognition of Lithuanian culture.

The phenotypical actualization of the difference of Jews and Lithuanians, so distinct in the stories of rescued Jews, demonstrates the consciously realized – although schematized – and observation-based cognition of the society that surrounded Jews, which helped them to identify with and “melt away” in the Lithuanian environment in the war years. The factor of the language of communication, which in fact does not appear in the stories of rescued Jews who pleaded for help, shows that the knowledge of the Lithuanian language seemed obvious and self-understandable, and confirms the supposition that on the eve of World War II, the majority of the members of the Jewish community in Lithuania spoke Lithuanian, which fulfilled their daily needs in terms of their relations with the outside world. As the Jews found themselves in “the group of the eliminated” in the war years, Christening gave them a hope of a possibility of physical survival. On one hand, the reckless wish to convert to Christianity can be understood as a conscious act of pragmatic nature seeking to avoid persecutions and survive. On the other, such actions reveal the moments of cognition of the social structure of Lithuanian society and religion as one of the basic parts of the Lithuanian world outlook and cultural identity, which implied corresponding modes of behaviour.

A large number of rescuers and a much smaller number of the rescued in Lithuania reveals that the organic integration of Lithuanian Jews and the tendencies of Lithuanian-Jewish cultural cooperation and better mutual understanding in different social groups was at different stages of development in the 1930s. The direct daily communication of Lithuanian and Jewish neighbours and friendships that had begun before the war in a home, professional or education environment appeared to be the most enduring and reliable contacts, which opened the ways to the outer world for the rescued Jews. There were very few cases of separate individuals or families hiding in one place with the same rescuers from the first to the last days of war; the absolute majority of the rescued Jews were impelled to change their hiding place at least temporarily and most often more than a dozen or even several dozen times, once and again finding themselves with new “silent strangers”. The latter constituted the largest group of Lithuanian rescuers and were a secondary and further link in the rescue operations. The success of finding these people was not related with the quality of the victims’ interaction with the Lithuanian cultural environment, but

was proportionally dependant on the circle and closeness of social and family relations of their rescuers.

It is understandable that in Lithuania's case, definitive conclusions cannot be expected without the statistical analysis of the rescuers and the rescued, and without the possibility to analyze all stories of rescuing. However, the analysis of typical examples which appear in one or another form in the absolute majority of stories of the rescued Jews allows us to make a supposition that the "Lithuanian-like appearance", the knowledge of the Lithuanian language, studies in Lithuanian schools, and close professional, social, and personal contacts with the Lithuanian environment were not always the decisive factors of the rescue of Jews, but most often merely a big chance in the long chain of failures, disappointments, despair and coincidences. The prewar empiricism of cognition of Lithuanian culture in the war years was transformed into learning to recognize the cultural segments, which manifested itself in various models of adaptive behaviour. Like the rescuers' motivation, the choice of the rescued was subjective, i.e. related with their environment or reversely proportionate to the level of cognition of Lithuanian culture.

THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE AS A MEANS OF COMMUNICATION BETWEEN LITHUANIANS AND JEWS: THE NEWSPAPER *NASH KRAY* (1914)

*Darius Staliūnas*

SUMMARY

The main object of research of the current article is the weekly “Nash kray” [Our Land] published in Russian in 1914. Though the newspaper was in circulation for a very short time – one and a half months (from July 2nd till August 15th), there are at least two reasons for looking more closely into this episode. Firstly, the appearance of this newspaper was not accidental – it was part of quite consistent attempts of certain Lithuanian Jewish intellectuals, above all Uriya Kacelenbogen, to encourage peaceful coexistence among various nations living in the country, firstly the Jews and the Lithuanians. The second reason is related with the choice of the Russian language.

In the current article, the following issues are addressed: first, when and how the Russian language was introduced on the “Jewish street” and in the villages of ethnic Lithuania; second, to what extent the Russian language was spread in the Jewish and Lithuanian communities; third, Kacelenbogen’s previous (and very brief later) attempts to encourage the mutual rapprochement of Jews and Lithuanians; fourth, the contents, addressee and reception of the newspaper “Nash kray”.

At the end of the article, the project conceived by Kacelenbogen and his peers is compared with other attempts to conquer nationalisms in Lithuania and to achieve agreement among various nations.

TOWARDS HISTORICAL SOCIO-LINGUISTICS: LITHUANIAN JEWRY  
AND THE WEEKLY *APŽVALGA* (1935–40)***Anna Verschik***

## SUMMARY

The current article analyzes the Lithuanian-language Jewish periodical *Apžvalga* as a source of historical socio-linguistic research. It is argued that in the late 1930s the socio-linguistic profile of the Lithuanian Jews was more complex than just either Yiddish with or without Hebrew or a non-Jewish language. In less than 20 years, the process underwent rapid development, resulting in a working command of Lithuanian as a starting point, and, at least for some Jews, the “appropriation” of Lithuanian as a language of artistic expression and culture. The discourse on language developed in the *Apžvalga* differs somewhat from the discourses developed in the periodicals published in the Jewish languages. The Yiddish-Hebrew controversy received no attention at all, while the periodical actively argued against the stereotype of Jews as Russifiers and emphasized the importance of Lithuanian as a lingua franca for Lithuania’s minorities.

## JEWISH SOCIETY, LITHUANIAN CULTURE AND THE RUSSIAN PRESS

***Pavel Lavrinec***

## SUMMARY

Russian periodicals in interwar Lithuania are a complicated phenomenon. Newspapers and magazines were published in Russian, but with the financial support of Jewish businessmen; the heads of the newspapers and the majority of the journalists were of Jewish origin. Most of the published material covered the life of the Jewish community and was clearly intended for the Jewish audience. On the other hand, Lithuanian writers and journalists contributed to the newspapers *Echo*, *Litovskiy kur'er* and other dailies. Translations of Lithuanian poetry were published in Russian newspapers, and various events of Lithuanian cultural life, as well as social and political processes were discussed. Thus it can be presumed that Russian periodicals played an important part in the communication and consolidation of Lithuanian society, and the formation of a new civic consciousness; it was also a meeting point of journalists, writers and public figures of the Lithuanian and Jewish origin, which served as a means of better acquaintance of Lithuanians and Jews.

REFLECTION OF LITHUANIA'S URGENT POLITICAL AND SOCIAL ISSUES  
IN THE INTERWAR JEWISH PERIODICAL *DI YIDISHE SHTIME***Larisa Lempertienė**

## SUMMARY

The focus of analysis of the current article is the Yiddish daily *Di yidishe shtime* published by the Lithuanian Zionist Organization in the interwar period with the aim to understand how and to what extent it reflected important political and ideological directions, the country's social problems and culture, as well as the integration of the Jewish community at that time. *Di yidishe shtime* published in Kowno from 1919 till 1940 was one of the most readable and long-lived among the regularly and irregularly published Jewish periodicals. The pages of *Di yidishe shtime* contained a consistent presentation of Lithuanian life reflecting the state's politics, the activity of official institutions, as well as social and cultural life. The way the editors of the *Di yidishe shtime* chose to present the current events and political news, their constant attention to cultural life, and the style and rhetoric of analytical articles allows us to conclude that the newspaper aimed to form Jewish community as a group of citizens interested in everything what happened in the country, and regarded "the Jewish voice" as a form of expression of Lithuanian citizens differing only in their ethnic origin and language.

THE IMAGE AND MEMORY OF LITHUANIA IN AMERICAN  
AND SOUTH AFRICAN FICTION

*Aušra Paulauskienė*

SUMMARY

Despite the temporal and physical distance from the land of their ancestors, descendants of Lithuanian Jews hold on to their Litvak identity and the memory of ancestral Lithuania. American and South African literatures in particular abound in allusions to Lithuania, as these two countries were the principal points of destination for Lithuanian Jews from the end of the nineteenth century till the 1920s. Lithuania remembered by the first generation American immigrants Abraham Cahan and Ezra Brudno contains few signs of recognizable Lithuanianness. The autobiography of their peer Goldie Stone, on the other hand, paints a picture of a familiar Lithuania and tells a story of a surprisingly positive symbiosis between Litvaks and Lithuanians. The contrasting images and memories of Lithuania were conditioned by the authors' differing choices for acculturation, as well as their different ideological agendas as writers. Stone can be seen as a harbinger of the trend of nostalgic remembrance among East European Jews, which became distinct in the 1950s. The same trend manifested itself among South African Litvaks as demonstrated by the texts of Rose Zwi and Dan Jacobson written between the early 1950s and the late 1990s. However, in South African English Literature, the discourse of nostalgia competes with the discourse of traumatic remembrance and the practice of therapeutic writing.

THE ISSUE OF THE MEMORY OF THE HOLOCAUST AND ITS IMPACT  
ON THE LITHUANIAN-JEWISH RELATIONS

*Hektoras Vitkus*

SUMMARY

From the viewpoint of today's assessment it is obvious that the difficulty to forget the experience of the Holocaust has radically transformed the social and psychological space of the Lithuanian-Jewish relations. The aim of the current article is to analyze the separate phases and socio-cultural contexts of the impact of the memory of the Holocaust on the Lithuanian-Jewish relations, while emphasizing its controversial aspects. In this regard, the research into the historiographic, periodical, and archival sources and memoirs has revealed the following features of the genesis of the memory of the Holocaust and its impact on the Lithuanian-Jewish relations:

Images of the Holocaust and the motifs of (un)awareness of the Jewish experience began to form in the Lithuanian collective consciousness already during the period of the Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. The criticism of the sources allows us to discern two phases in the genesis of memory of the Holocaust in the Lithuanian social consciousness: 1) the first phase – the period from the middle of 1941 till the beginning of 1942: the emergence of viewpoints based on the theory that the basis of the Holocaust was the reaction to terrorism in Soviet Lithuania; 2) the second phase – the beginning of 1943: the emergence of viewpoints claiming that the Lithuanians “involved” in the assassinations of Jews were victims of the fraud of the occupational Nazi regime in the Lithuanian collective consciousness. Besides, during these two periods the structure of the memory of the Holocaust in Lithuania apparently did not develop in parallel, but had two versions – the Lithuanian and the Jewish. It was related with the fact that these two national groups used essentially different semantic categories while trying to reflect on the same historic events in their collective memory, and later – in the long-term historical memory. This aspect had a great influence on the Lithuanian-Jewish relations, especially on their psychological context.

The system of historical memory related with the Holocaust experience formed in the intellectual environment of Lithuanian exiles followed the defensive strategy, which recognized only those elements of the memory of the Holocaust that allowed to support the standpoint that the Holocaust experience was a problem of the Jews rather than the Lithuanian historical memory.

The policy of the Soviet historical memory that employed different means of neutralization of the impact of the memory of the Holocaust sought to recreate historical images and semantic structures emphasizing their uniqueness, rather than recreating the memory itself. Thus the Soviet version of the memory of the Jewish genocide was being created: it developed a concessive memory discourse acceptable to both national groups and memory practices, which supported “socialist solidarity”. The psychological meaning of the situation, however, resulted in a rather strong inner pressure in the Lithuanian-Jewish relations, which shows that in Soviet Lithuania neither Lithuanian nor Jewish models of the memory of the Holocaust lost their socio-cultural function.

In the post-Soviet period, both Lithuanians and Jews confronted not only ideological (images and stereotypes formed in Soviet Lithuania and emigration), but also socio-psychological (compromise and martyr egocentrism) problems of “dealing” with the Holocaust experience. They brought about new complications of the adaptation of memory of the Holocaust to the culture of memory in post-Soviet Lithuania, which, in its turn, tends to influence the current development of the Lithuanian-Jewish relations. The most important of them is the sacralization of the memory of the Holocaust, which provokes the appearance of new mystifications.

THE ATTEMPTS TO TEACH JEWS LITHUANIAN IN INTERWAR LITHUANIA:  
THE ANALYSIS OF TEACHING AIDS

*Veronika Žukaitė*

SUMMARY

In 1919, when Lithuanian was proclaimed the state language and became a compulsory subject in non-Lithuanian schools, the need for textbooks arose. The first textbook of the Lithuanian language for the ethnic minorities (Jewish, Russian, and Polish) written by the schoolteacher Pranas Vikonis was published in 1921. His other textbook, published in 1928, was widely used in Jewish schools in 1929–30. These two were followed by other textbooks written with the contribution of Jewish authors Jokūbas Kaplanas, Jurgis Talmantas, Ignas Malinauskas, Simonas Vainbergas, Leonardas Dambrauskas, and others.

Avrom Shulman's textbook published in 1923 was the first textbook of Lithuanian written in Yiddish. It was a systematic course that could also be used for independent studies. In addition to this textbook, some other textbooks (ABCs for Jewish schools), Yiddish-Lithuanian dictionaries, conversation and grammar books were published as well (e.g. the grammar by L. Harifas, the dictionary by the brothers Kolodnis, A. Kacergis and Ic. Jenkelevicius, A. Mertis and L. Graifas). Two textbooks of Lithuanian geography and history by A. Livsinas were published in Hebrew.

One of the most interesting textbooks titled *The Artisan. Lithuanian Readings and Grammar Exercises* was written by two authors – a Jew and a Lithuanian, J. Kaplanas and J. Talmantas. This textbook was aimed at the social group of artisans (tailors, joiners, glaziers, bookbinders, etc.), and had the purpose of teaching them Lithuanian words and conversations that would be useful in their trade. The textbook contained a glossary of terms grouped according to the crafts.

It should also be emphasized that some Jews – for instance, Chackelis Lemchenas, Izidorius Kisinias, Benjaminas Sereiskis and others – had perfect command of Lithuanian and were irreplaceable in teaching Lithuanian to Yiddish-speakers.