

**Rūta Brūzgienė  
(Lithuania)**

**Juozas Baltušis's Novel „Sakmė apie Južą“ [Saga about Juza]:  
an Archetypal Expression of the Nation's Vitality**

The life story of Juozas Baltušis: the divide of political duality and human drama. Since the beginning of the Soviet occupation in Lithuania, after becoming a political figure and holding various important political positions<sup>1</sup> almost to the end of his life, Juozas Baltušis was one of the most popular writers not only in the republic but also outside the borders in the socialist countries and some Western states. The life story of Baltušis is complicated, but there was always a marked divide between the adept of communist ideology and the peculiar patriot of Lithuania, the cunningness of the Lithuanian peasant, who exploited the power of Soviet occupation but also loved his native land and his people.

Baltušis's life can be divided into three different stages. The first stage was a post-war stage, when he was the party secretary of the Writers' Union, waving and threatening with Siberia at party meetings to his colleagues who did not follow Ždanov's instructions to literature. After Kazys Boruta, a former creative teacher who encouraged him to work was imprisoned after Baltušis's accusations. He taking Boruta's place was pursuing a political career in the Soviet governing bodies (Striogaitė 2009). There is evidence that the Lithuanian writer Kazys Jakubėnas's security file included Baltušis's testimony (1946) (Jakubėnas 1950, according to his brother Alfonsas, Kazys was killed by Soviet KGB agents in his apartment, as per (Kuolys 2019). Baltušis had mastered obligatory Soviet jargon (according to the documents of the writers' union communist party, mandatory waving of the fists, but it seemed it was enough for him; at the same time, it was like some type of firewall, a kind of defence, when the party's instructions are vigorously and loudly followed, but in reality, everything ended just here meetings (see in Rašytojas pokario metais [Writers In The Post-War Years], 1991).

Had Baltušis ever had the pricks of conscience about his behaviour towards teacher Kazys Boruta? Perhaps in letters or diaries one could get a hint, but on the other hand, he actually wrote the diaries, not for himself, but his literary heritage, the creation of a myth about himself (according to the ironic article by Imelda Vedrickaitė "Sketches Of The

---

<sup>1</sup> From 1944 to 1946, he was the Chairman of the Lithuanian Radio Committee, 1946-1954 Secretary of the Writers' Union Party Organization, Chief editor of the Pergalė magazine and the Chairman of the Organising Bureau of the Lithuanian Cinematographic Workers' Union. In 1947-1975 and 1980-1990, he was the member of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian SSR, 1959-1967 the first vice-chairman the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet. 1958-1961 Baltušis became a candidate to the Central Committee member of Lithuanian Communist party. 1970-1975, 1980-1991, he was elected as the Chairman of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace of Lithuanian SSR.

Writer's Mausoleum In Juozas Baltušis's Documentary Prose And Sakmė Apie Južą [The Saga Of Juza]" (Vedrickaitė 2010).

During the Soviet era, the life of the top people of the nomenklatura was supplied differently from the ordinary people. (In the special shops, the wives of the ruling men freely bought mandarins, bananas, canned peas, corn, and mayonnaise considered to the highly deficient without any restrictions. <...> Such shopping in Vilnius was organised in a special shop behind the restaurant Šešupė. The top people of the authorities also attended a special tailor's shop on Algirdas Street, a specialised hospital and a retreat sanatorium)<sup>1</sup>. However, everyone also knew that the writer, as a Chairman of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace of Lithuanian SSR, as a member of the Supreme Soviet, helped a lot to other people, and everyone turned to him with problematic questions. On the other hand, Baltušis secretly listened to the broadcasts of the radio Voice Of America, possibly the radio Laisvė [Freedom]. For such offence, even in the 1970s and 1980s, the Soviet authorities exiled people to the lager-camps.

During this, the second period and later, his literary evenings became very popular. With his evening presentations, Baltušis travelled all over Lithuania and was not afraid to criticise the authorities, certainly not directly, but instead through details. Nevertheless, the audience understood the language of Aesop and appreciated his courage. The courage was to go to America and write many positive things about the country in the book *In The Fathers' And Brothers' Footsteps*, 1967, which became like a ray of light and a balm of faith in Lithuania's future freedom behind the Iron Curtain, hopefully stroking the heart. Baltušis really enjoyed being popular and loved by people. The authorities liked him as well: in 1954, he was proclaimed the Merited Worker of Arts of the Lithuanian SSR, in 1969, he was announced as the People's Writer of the LSSR, in 1976, an honorary citizen of Anykščiai region (in 1990 this name was taken away), in 1977, an honorary citizen of Kupiškis region, etc.

His books were also popular: the collection of short stories *Kas dainon nesudėta* [What Is Not In The Song], 1959, *Valiusei reikia Alekso* [Valiusė Needs Aleksas], 1965. In 1966, the short story from the following collection *Ko nepasakė Laukys* [What Laukys Did Not Say] was awarded the Žemaitė Literary prize. In 1967, the travel essay of *Tėvų ir brolių takais* [In The Fathers' And Brothers' Footsteps] and in 1957-1969, the collection of novels *Parduotos vasaros* [Sold Out Years], two volumes, was published, reprinted in 1985. In 1957, Baltušis received the Lithuanian SSR State Prize for this novel. In 1971, a collection of short stories called *Nežvyruotu vieškeliu* [On The Non-Gravel Road], in 1973, memoirs *Su kuo valgyta druska* [With What You Eat The Salt], two volumes. In 1976, Juozas Baltušis created *Sakmė apie Južą* [The Saga Of Juza] (1979, 1981, 1984

<sup>1</sup> Since the 8th decade, there was an opportunity to communicate more closely with Baltušis's wife, the famous Lithuanian actress Monika Mironaitė. (Her uncle was a priest, a signatory of the Lithuanian Independence Act, a Prime Minister (1938-1939), a chaplain of the Lithuanian Armed Forces, a political prisoner, and her brother Ričardas was a professional in Latin and ancient Indoeuropean languages, a translator). For us—the children, smoked sausages, hams, skilandis, peas on their dinner table was like a mirage in front of our eyes.

<...> 2007, in total seven editions) (further book is referred only in English or just The Saga). In 1980, this novel was awarded the Lithuanian State Prize for literature. When The Saga Of Juza was printed, it was read as a monument to the beautiful Lithuanian language, as a text bearing the mystery of mythopoetic Baltic sacrality. At that time, The Saga Of Juza was perceived as a secret resistance to Soviet culture and ideology.

Many of his novels and short stories were translated into foreign languages: Belarusian, Kazakh, Latvian, Moldavian, Russian, Ukrainian, Tajik, Armenian, Estonian, English, Bulgarian, Hungarian, Spanish, German, Polish, Czech, French. In France, according to literary scholar Jūratė Sprindytė, The Saga Of Juza is praised for portraying an old ethnographic village. The work depicts a village in France that has long since disappeared, and it is unique to the French (see Jackevičius 2016). As Genovaitė Dručūtė puts in, “So far, only a few novels by Lithuanian writers have been translated into French<sup>1</sup>, one of them being Juozas Baltušis's The Saga Of Juza, which has had considerable publishing success. The first three editions were completely sold out, the latest novel edition, reprinted last year, is being well purchased too (The Saga Of Juza was reprinted in France in 1993, 2003 and 2009). Knowing that the French are the nation, which still reads a lot, the success of the Lithuanian writer is a surprising phenomenon”. In 1990, the novel The Saga Of Juza, translated in French was awarded the prestigious Prix du Meilleur Livre Etranger—the prize for the best foreign author's book of the year published in France (Dručūtė 2010: 105). In 2008, the novel was presented at the Presentation Event of the EU Countries in Strasbourg.

When Lithuania began its fight for independence during the Sąjūdis years, J. Baltušis, a popular folk writer, unlike some other members of the echelon of the communist nomenklatura, was never included in any organisational structures more favourable to the Singing Revolution. J. Baltušis very emotionally lived through his condemnation. At this time, the third period of his life began. In his memoirs actor Laimonas Noreika describes his meeting with a writer: “Ah, the Sąjūdis person, and I am not; and when it came to signing a letter condemning Pasternak, I refused it; here, of course, it is not a Sąjūdis movement. And to stand against the destruction of the cemetery—it is also not Sąjūdis, and the Vaižgantas bas-reliefs restored on the Tumas-Vaižgantas bridge—it is not Sąjūdis, and the resistance of the secretaries' of the Central Committee—it is not Sąjūdis. And my care about Jonas Jurašas: I attended his wedding at Aušros vartai [The Gate of Dawn] and waived him when he left abroad when others were afraid to come even closer—it is also not Sąjūdis”, J. Baltušis feverishly argues, almost screams (as cited in Tamošaitis 2016: 15). (Later, in 1990 J. Baltušis wished all God's help, no anger was felt towards them (Jakševičiūtė 2013: 233)). Apparently, it caused him great pain, he was accustomed to being in the Olympus of the nomenklatura all along but at the same time remained in his heart a patriot of Lithuania. The chairman of the Lithuanian Writers' Union Valentinas

---

<sup>1</sup> It was translated into French: *Ichokas Meras's Lygiosios trunka akimirka* [A Stalemate Lasts But A Moment], 1979, later editions in 1992, 1998, 2003 and Tomas Saulius Kondrotas's *Žalčio žvilgsnis* [A Glance Of The Serpent] (1991, 1993) (Dručūtė 2010: 105).

Sventickas considered that “maybe it would have been different if Sąjūdis forces have turned to the folk writer” (as cited in Jackevičius 2016). Moreover, at the time of the creation of the Sąjūdis (the late 1990s), the writer was already of respectable age (about 80 years old) and was peasantly smart and cautious.

Journalist Rita Baltušytė recalls: “Father had diverse moods—doubtful, angry, happy, argumentative even with himself, and examined the political situation in many ways. Sometimes he liked everything; other times he was very critical. However, one thing I can say for sure—Lithuanian language, Lithuanian nation and Lithuanian literature was very important. It was unshakeable and undeniable to him”(Rupinskienė 2019). However, after being invited by the Russian Broadcasting division of the Lithuanian TV, Baltušis publicly stated that Lithuania is tied with the Russian nation for centuries, did not support Lithuania’s independence and attacked Sąjūdis. According to his wife, the actress Monika Mironaitė, presenters of the show have deceived him: in her words, one thing was to quibble with each other, and the different thing was to speak to the listeners of the Union (Tamošaitis 2016: 15), and Baltušis’s speech was passed on to the Moscow radio and television where it had a wide response. The nation regarded such writer’s action as a betrayal and could not forgive him: the outraged people carried his books back to the libraries, piled them ripped at the writer’s door, even burned them, and obscenely smeared the entrance of his apartment with faeces, and Monica washed them off. J. Baltušis was deprived of the title of Honorary Citizen of Anykščiai region, Baltušis’s books, as well as the popular *The Saga Of Juza*, were deleted from the school curriculum.

R. Baltušytė believes that the Lithuanian nation will never rehabilitate him “simply because he urged to protect every person of our nation, respect the language, the writers” (as cited in Jackevičius 2016). After visiting the writer a few of days before his death, Vytautas Martinkus, the chairman of the then Writers’ Union of that time, quoted his words: “I love Lithuania, but I do not understand such sudden and hardly possible independence” (ibid.). But on the last day of his life, according to Rita Baltušytė, Juozas Baltušis was happy: visiting French translator, Denise Yoccoz-Neugnot brought a newspaper from France where “an author’s photo featured on the front page, a great review and the news about an honourable award was printed” (as cited from Jackevičius 2016). Nevertheless, after the writer passed away, the Lithuanian Writers’ Union decided to organise the funeral, although, among the people who wished to contribute, there were the enemies of Lithuania’s independence as well (from *Jedinstvo* movement). In the words of the Honourable Monsignor Kazimieras Vasiliauskas, who walked with the writer on his last journey, “J. Baltušis was a writer by the grace of God” (ibid.). These words seem to indicate God’s forgiveness for human misery and poverty.

Evaluation of the Soviet literature and *The Saga Of Juza*. In recent decades, Lithuania has been the re-evaluation of the literary heritage of the Soviet period. It analyses what criteria should be used when discussing the Soviet literature, what works should remain in the literary canon, how to evaluate talented artists who collaborated with the Soviet occupants and what to do with their monuments. The perception of literature of this period

also depends on the age and experience of literary scholars: usually the younger ones, armed with the post-colonial literary theory, deconstruction, structuralism or other instruments of modern research, perform vivisections of these works, schematically throwing on the writings a network of their own theoretical and methodological dispositions (see Juodytė-Žižienė 2002). They have never experienced the persecution of the Soviet occupation and the labour camps, they often mock the writers of that period for their cautious adaptation to the actual circumstances, sometimes hear more strongly publicly uttered but coercively forced out by Soviet ideology words, see the boundaries of socialist realism in the work, which were mandatory to literature of that time, than in principle understand its pathos, the right values and behaviour of the creator. In such case, when the tragedy of the era and its silent resistive pulsation are no longer felt, after pushing the life of the Lithuanian culture into the deep mysteries, it is so easy to condemn, ironise, mock, stigmatise, sitting in the chair of the omniscient Olympian judge, while forgetting what it really meant to survive in Soviet times and to take care of the Lithuanian word, Lithuanian culture, and secretly help people. Sometimes the relevance of the literature of that period is simply questioned and as Nerija Putinaitė puts in “Today the literary section of J. Baltušis and his contemporaries is simply non-actual and no longer interesting” (as cited in Jackevičius 2016). There are also representatives of the generation of expatriate writers who have repeatedly called the remainers in Lithuania as collaborators and sought not only for the expression of Lithuanian culture and love for Lithuania but for the theme of betrayal and saw only that. (Correspondingly, they receive occasional feedback and are called traitors themselves, irrespective of the circumstances why they left Lithuania, claiming that the country remained Lithuanian only because of the victims who suffered through of the Soviet occupation).

The older generation of literary scholars who survived the Soviet era are not so arrogant; they try to look at works and their creators with a keen eye. For example, Jūratė Sprindytė, recognising that Baltušis “was definitely an official writer with the high position in the party” states: “One thing is the writer’s attitude, his relation to the system, and the other is his creative work. These things are mixed here. And needlessly. Attitude and creation have to be described separately, works, in which writers have transgressed historical truth, must be valued as such, and works, in which writers have remained on the high, must remain in literary history and possibly should be read” (as cited in Jackevičius 2016). According to R. Baltušytė, “By the way, if it were not a success in France, which is rarely publicly mentioned fact, he would have been even more suppressed... At the end of life, the words of Mohamed came up that you cannot be a prophet in your own country. Today he is no longer criticised at all. He is simply non-existent as if he never lived.” This is how she spoke in 2016, 25 years after his death (Rupinskienė 2019). Valentinas Sventickas, a literary scholar of senior generation and the chairman of the Lithuanian Writers’ Union, defended Baltušis’s works: “What is important here, it is what Baltušis has written. They must perceive him as a writer and not expel him from our lives, from one of the brightest manifestations of prose in literature. We do not have to throw the most

talented works of our literature into the trash because a person said or did something” (as cited in Jackevičius 2016). In the words of the writer Vytautas Martinkus, *The Saga Of Juza* is an existential work, in which the “golden nuggets of literature” shine, and we are not “too rich to overlook them” (as cited in Šerelytė 2007).

In 2007, Juozas Baltušis’s *The Saga Of Juza* was published in the series *The Treasure House Of Lithuanian Literature: The 20th Century* now is read by young people, although it is not included in the school curriculum. Renata Šerelytė, the writer, commented on it: “The strange thing is that now, in the times of the aggressive surplus of new books, you can read the ‘old’ book so vividly and in its own way. You realise with amazement how ridiculous are all the templates applied to a talented piece of writing. And in the case of *The Saga*, many of them are entirely crushed” (Šerelytė 2007). Teachers-experts include the texts of *The Saga* in the textbooks, specially designated for learning syntax.

The interplay of mythopoetics and archetypal musicality in *The Saga Of Juza*. In the Bernardinai Internet portal, annotation of *The Saga Of Juza* holds “a symbolic autobiography of J. Baltušis, written in the gorgeous and rich dialect of the Aukštaičiai, with rich lexis carefully polished by the quill of an experienced literary master” (Bernardinai 2007). According to the literary critic V. Martinkus, “in any literary concept, *The Saga Of Juza* is unique in its genre, the form of artistic expression, questions posed by the characters to readers, the author’s experience, and the readers’ ability to compare it with their personal experience” (ibid.). Writer R. Šerelytė believes that this novel expresses what is accumulated “in the depths of the heart, what is heavy and pounding, what the surface cannot carry around” (Šerelytė 2007). So, according to the writer, as the title implies, *The Saga* represents “an immersion into the chthonian Lithuanian character and the various ideologies which must testify the adjustments to the ‘new’ life simply revolve around as the intersecting spirals of time” (ibid.). The novel, with its depth of senses and feelings, the polyphonic consonance of Christian and pagan mythical symbolism of the beginning of the world creation and intersections of reality, with the language of rare beauty and richness, sounds like an anthem to Lithuania, a testament to its ancientness and eternity. Therefore, the analysis of the novel can be multifaceted, presupposing extremely rich aspects of views: archetypal fabula dimension (myth of the eternal love), expression of national mentality, accords of Christian and folkloric mythological culture, ethno-cultural traditions, and infinitely rich Lithuanian language vocabulary, musical and rhythmic language (by the way, Baltušis used to say words aloud when writing because of his poor hearing), the inner musicality of the text as an archetypal model. In this article some of these aspects will be reviewed.

The motto of the novel is a quote from a kupiškėnai (Kupiškis region) folk song, written in their dialect: *Pamatyčio ir pažinčia, / Kas ataina kialaliu...* [I would see and recognise / Who is coming on this road...] (from the merry kupiškėnai songs). Its symbolism is multilayered: it is not only a kupiškėnai love song but also a sign of waiting and hope. The semantics of the words *pamatyčio, pažinčia, kas, ataina, kialalis* [I would see, recognise, who, is coming, road] are infinitely broad, both in folklore songs of love

and in the philosophical or theological discourse of interpretations of eternity. The fact that a folk song has become the motto of the creation demonstrates the author's chosen style of speaking as a folk narrator. This reference would presumably also determine the whole work as a love song in the dimension of sacral dimension of eternity to Lithuania, its culture, and the common man (Baltušis 1979: 5, further, the reference will be only to the page numbers).

Fabula of the novel focuses on two parallel lines. The first line would be that after Juza's romantically beloved Vinciūnė marries to the other man, he retreats to Kairabalė marsh and starts building a home on a hill, works the land, plants the orchard, builds a path, and so on. Other line is about the events in the left-behind village, in the family of brother Adomas and sister Uršulė, the tragedy of Karusė, who had unhappily fallen in love with Juza, the change of historical events (Soviet and fascist occupation, genocide and rescue of Lithuanians and Jews, the establishment of collective farms). However, these events are far from the world of Juza: distant from the reality of the village, entirely drowned in agroculture, holding a sacred dimension, and being in contact with the villagers only when he needs to sort out some farm, market, parish or church matters. On the other hand, he helps those who come for help: Stonkiukas, the fascist inclined son of his beloved Vinciūnė, the Jewish Koneliai family, and Adomėlis, the communist minded son of his brother, his beloved Akvilė, and their fellows. As Vytautas Kubilius writes, the “figure of Juza, quite conditioned by his patriarchalism, as if he repeated the primordial establishment of a Lithuanian farmer among the forests and rivers, his skillfulness, the hardening described in the writings of S. Daukantas, sacred respect for the land, the bees (Juza buried dead bees like close beings), his naive kindness, gentle and pure soul, his hidden depth of emotion, (chill goes over Juza's back when a beloved girl touches his cheek with her palm), his wisdom inherited from his ancestors” (Kubilius 1991: 390).

At the same time, he was a small-talker (Juza's favourite phrase was ‘long-drawn speeches’), frugal, scrooge as a peasant, and unsupportive of his brother when he came to ask for money in a difficult time, allowing Stonkiukas to drown in the bog when he asked to help to pass through the secret underwater cobblestone path. Apparently, in both cases, it is a subconscious revenge: to brother Adomas who, after their father's death, bought a golden watch for all his family money and bragged around in the village, to Stonkiukas for Akvilė, killed by other fascist-minded fellows, and other people killed because of him, including the Jewish Koneliai family. In this case, Juza becomes like a decision-maker from the mythological lineages of the past who carries out justice.

The novel suffers from the implied ‘happiness’—a mandatory element for the Soviet ideology when Juza raises calves in collective farm barns, but like with hands tied at the back, like he had lost the authentic charisma of recluse. (According to J. Sprindytė, the writer rewrote the end of the novel five times until it satisfied the Soviet ideological demands (see Jackevičius 2016). Cursed by the beloved Vinciūnė, as if a thread of his life was broken, Juza knelt on the chest, stretching his hands “above the white linen shirt” (p. 277) for eternal rest. Such he was found by his brother Adomas (here it can be delved into

both the semantics of the box in Lithuanian ethno-culture and the sacred purpose of white linen shirt).

I will mention some of the symbols of Christian culture in the novel—firstly there are biblical names: Adomas [Adam], Adomėlis, Juza (Juozapas [Joseph]) (Does his hut building work not resemble the biblical St. Joseph, the carpenter?), grandfather Jokūbas [Jacob], Vinciūnė (Vincenta), Uršulė, Karusė (Aukštaitian version of Karolina), village name Maldyniškės (from the word malda-prayer), yes as well as commemoration of bells, hymns, priests, and mass. The cross on the Kairabalė marsh hill built by grandfather Jokūbas was restored by Juza, who preserved the heritage of the pagan sacred krivis [High Priest]—omniscient messenger; he was the only one in the whole village to know the secret passage through the bog, the secret underwater cobblestone path (kūlgrinda), which survived since the pagan Lithuanian times. Next to that cross, the homesteads were built and the land cultivated. And on the same hill under the cherries, the unearthed remains of German and Russian soldiers from the First World War were buried again and Karusė too, who in the bog pool drowned for her unfortunate love to Juza. (In folklore culture, cherries are planted at the gates of the orchard and mark the crossing of another world). The divine sign of the Cross redeems the world, the whole and diverse, and the all world finds the place beneath it, the whole and diverse. (Writing by communist Baltušis about the Christian cross in Soviet times was an expression of a secret resistance-oriented attitude, was not it?)

The names of the brothers Juza and Adomas are mentioned in the first paragraphs of the work and the last two. This is a reflection on the biblical myth and the lost paradise, evidenced by the very warm and benevolent relationship between Adomas and his sister Uršulė, their generosity sharing everything when Juza split off. The creation of the cultivated land in the marsh, in the bog resembles the repetition of etiological Lithuanian myths—sagas. The vocabulary is infinitely rich and varies in the repetitive cycle of agriculture and the seasons as if traverses into a dimension of the Pre-Indo-European agro-cultural subconsciousness, which has neither the beginning of time nor the end.

Elements of mythopoetics—folkloric poetics are even related to Proto-Indo-European language (PIE) and ancient Baltic mythology, according to which gods and warriors live on the mountain, and the chthonic world exists in the swamp often associated with the aggression of strangers and enemies (Razauskas 2013, Vaitkevičienė 2007). In the Lithuanian mentality, the semantics of the marsh carries the significance of archaic fertility of the mother nature, generosity (process of gathering of cranberries), nature's inviolability, prosperity in various forms of life, and in the protection of man, especially fighting with enemies (there are many other aspects in Lithuanian culture (see in Pelkė lietuvių kultūroje [The Marsh in Lithuanian Culture], ed. by Butkus, Stankuvienė 2008). The mysterious waters of the marsh take a form of bottomless bog pools, puddles, mires, creek:

“Čia lėtai krutino samanas Pavirvė, ėmusi pradžių juodose Kairabalės provėrose. Ta pati Pavirvė, metų metais matyta, pažįstama ir nelabai pažįstama. Ne iš karto suprasi,

pasižiūrėjęs, kurion pusėn ji stumia surinktą savo vandenį. Daug kur nė iš po samanų neprasilaūžia, šlamena gilumoj, tiktai ties jų kalva lyg ir tikru upeliu pavirsta. Čia ir traškūs karklai, ir tamsraudoniai juodalksniai, sustoję pagretomis krantuose, žiūri ir neatsižiūri, kaip Pavirvė gurgena, gilesnį ir platesnį taką sau laužia”

[Here, Pavirvė slowly stirred the moss, the creek, which got its start in the black openings of Kairabalė; the same Pavirvė, which was seen and known for years and yet not well understood. One will not immediately see in which direction it pushes the gathered water. In many places, it even does not break out through the moss, rustles somewhere in the depth, only at their hill, it turns into a real stream, where the crisp basket willows and dark red black alder trees, standing along the shores, watch and cannot have enough how Pavirvė ripples, breaks a deeper and wider path for itself] (p. 25).

The sacred concept of *kūlgrinda*—a hidden underwater cobblestone road in the form of the secret path of salvation, as the preservation of life, as well as the lively Pavirvė creek, is connected with the mysticism of pagan mysteries. Danguolė Sakavičiūtė writes: “In folk art, especially in the sagas, the marsh traditionally misleads people, entices them with supposed treasures, and the marsh space is filled with threatening fun arriving from the underworld; the marsh can be generous, only rarely anyone guesses its overpass code, if one does, it almost always by accident” (Sakavičiūtė 2008: 155-156). Juza, who sees red alder in winter, remembers mythical grandfather Jokūbas's wisdom: if alder is red in winter, the great misery (war) awaits.

The mythical saga is also created by distancing the main character from the change of historical events and domesticity of rural realities. All Juza's works acquire the sacred dimension of the creation of the world, repeating the eternal cycle of nature; they are uplifted, happening on a mysterious hill in a mythological swamp, and the time passes here unlike in the parish of their native village. The encounter with the villagers is marked by a sharp rhythm, short sentences, and a picturesque but sometimes rude countryside vocabulary, enriched by the imaginative expressions of the village narrator:

“Tai šitaip buvo. [That's how it was.]

O dabar, sustoję po kryžium ir pakėlę akis aukštyn, sužiuro abu broliai: užglaistymai nubirę, stiklas seniai iškritęs, medinis Jėzus, lietaus plautas, šalčių tratintas, saulės skeldėtas, sėdi nuliūdęs... / Now, stopping under the cross and lifting their eyes, both brothers glanced up: crumbled putty, glass was long gone, wooden Jesus, washed by the rain, bitten by frost, cracked from the Sun, sat so lonesome...

Ilgai tylėjo abu. Adomas ir Juza. [Both sank into silence for a long time. Adomas and Juza.]

Teisybę, matyt, kalba žmonės: žmogus ką daro, paskui jo vaikas dar padaro, o anūkas – jau ne.

Nebesaugo anūkai, ką palikę seneliai. Net senelių kapų nebelanko. Neateina Vėlinių naktį ar mirties metinių dieną, neuždega žvakės, gėlelės nepadedą galukojoj. Mirę seneliai anūkams nebereikalingi. [Apparently, people speak the truth: a man does something, then

his child does it, but his grandchild does not. The grandchildren no longer protect what the grandparents left behind. Even older people's graves are not attended. Nobody comes on All Saints Day or the day of death anniversary, nobody lights a candle or lays the flowers at the foot of the grave. Dead grandparents are no longer needed for grandchildren.]

Niekam jie neberekalingi. Mirė žmogaus vaikai, ir nebeliko žmogaus.[Nobody needs them anymore. The children of the man died, and no man was left.]

– Negerai, – pasakė Juza. [‘It is not good,’ Juza said.]

– Negerai, – pasakė ir Adomas. [‘Not good,’ Adomas responded.]

– Žinia, negerai. [‘Wrong, of course.’]

– Tik iš kur laiko viskam sugriebsi?.. [‘Only where will you find the time for everything?..’]

– Skalsu kalbos, Adomai. [‘Long-drawn talk, Adomas.’]

Nieko neatsakė Juzai Adomas. Žengė abu toliau. Traukė avižų lauku, šniūrais nurainavusiu iki miško. [Adomas said nothing to Juza. Both went further. They went through a field of oats, snarling up to the forest.]

– Pats išdrošiu, – pasakė Juza. [‘I will carve it myself,’ said Juza”] (p. 22).

The contrast between Juza's reticence in the world of rural people, short though picturesque language of other characters, exalts the infinite richness of the natural world, its colourfulness, extraordinary vocabulary, the expression of forms, the echoing of old, rare or unheard words, extending or created from the layers of the Pre-Indo-European subconscious (Toporov 1967; Valentas 2007). As states Jūratė Lubienė, the following lexemes used by J. Baltušis have never been recorded in the Corpus of Vytautas Magnus University: *brumgzti, brumzdenti, dumstelėti, dzvingtelėti, girgenti, kaukinėti, kerkštelėti, korkti, krakštelėti, kvakštelėti, liurliuoti, mannend, parptelėti, plokštelėti, siaudėti, skambalioiti, tirtenti, umzgėti, urliuoti, žliugėti, žliurgti*; Lithuanian vocabulary does not give entries to words *svimbti, umgzti* (Lubienė 2004). The rhythm of the language in The Saga is enchanting:

“Taip ėjo abu. Taip ir į Šiaudinių kalvą įkopė. O čia pamatė: guli po kojomis ji, Kairabalė.

[So both continued their walk. And so, they climbed on the Šiaudiniai hill. And here they saw: it was right under their feet, Kairabalė.]

Užgursi, užaugusi gailiais ir uogienojais, užtreškinusi visus pakraščius nei gyvulio, nei žmogaus nepraskiriamais šalteksnės, šašuoto karklo ir alksnio brūzgynais, atrodo, saugo ji liulančias savo platybes, nesibaigiančius kimsynus, samanose ir švendrynuose užsislėpusius, didžiausių šalčių nesurakinamus akivarus. Iš bedugnių maurynų šen ir ten tino retos kalvų kupros, apaugusios išlakiom smalingom pušim, nepermušama kadugių juodybe. O kur ne kalvos, ne išlakios pušys ir ne kadugiai, plynėjo žiemą vasarą rudojančių viksvų ir baltų puplaiškių lygumėlės, nusidaigščiusios pušelėm ir berželiukais, taip užskurdusiais ir nusiverkusiais, kad per dvidešimt ir penkiasdešimt metų nė vienas žmogaus ūgio nesiekė. pušelyčių, žiojėjo juodo mauro provėros, ilgos ir plačios, tykojančios užsižiopsojusio žmogaus ar žvėries. Nuo senų senelių neatminė

žmonės, kad kas gera valia būtų žengęs arčiau jų. Net paukštis, netyčia užskridęs, rėkė ir plasnojo šalin, kiek sparnai nešė. Tiktai bimbaldas su uodu laikėsi čia, ieškojo multoninių karklų, susipynusių su aštriagumbe gervuoge, o suradę grojo linksmąjį savo šalamojų. Ir visoje apylinkėje buvo tiktai vienas žmogus, žinojęs taką per tas provėras, galėjęs praeiti pro visus akivarus nuo vieno daugiavalakės Kairabalės pakraščio ligi kito. Senelis Jokūbas buvo tas žiniuonis. O kai jis mirė, žmonės tarė, kad jau niekas nebežino, todėl saugotis reikia Kairabalės dvigubai ir trigubai. Nė vienam į galvą neatėjo, kad yra gyvas likęs dar vienas toks žiniuonis: anūkui Juzai parodė senelis Jokūbas slaptatakį, išmokė jį ilgą šiekštą užčiuopti po liulančiu maury nu tokius raisto gungulus, kur koją galėjai statyti drąsiai, tarytum eitum lauko taku. Nežinojo šito net Adomas.

[Dense, overgrown with wild rosemary and wild berry shrubs, the undergrowth of glossy buckthorn, spotted willows and alder trees covering all the edges and impassable to a man or an animal, it seems to protect its vast boggy stretch, its endless marshes, hiding its bog pools among the moss, which never closed up even under the grip of the harshest cold. Here and there out from the bottomless bog, the rare humps of the hills swell up, overgrown with straight sappy pines and murky juniper blackness. And where there were no hills, no pine, and no junipers, the flatlands of white bogbeans and brownish sedge, the same look through the summer and winter, sprouted with pines and tiny birches, so bleak and miserable that none of them had reached man's height in twenty or fifty years. And among that sedge and weeping pines, the openings of black underwater mud, long and wide, skulking for a gawking man or beast. From the old days, people did not remember that anyone in goodwill would have come closer to them. Even the bird, accidentally flying over, screamed and fluttered away as far as the wings could carry. Only mosquitoes and horseflies survived here, looking for sallow basket willows, intertwined with prickly lumps of blackberries, and, when they found it, kept playing in their cheerful swarm. And there was only one person in the whole vicinity who knew the trail through those openings, who could pass all the bog holes from one edge to the other through the acres of Kairabalė. Grandpa Jokūbas was this wise man. And when he died, people said that nobody knew the way anymore, so you should stay away from Kairabalė more than before. No one could think that there was one more wise man alive: grandfather Jokūbas showed his grandson Juza a secret passage, taught him how to find the clumps of solid ground poking with a long pole, where you could put your foot like on a field path, under the quaking blanket of moss. Even Adomas did not know this.]

Ilgai stovėjo dabar broliai Šiaudinių kalvos viršūnėje. Žiūrėjo. Tylėjo.”

[Brothers stood on the top of the Šiaudiniai Hill now for a long time. Watched. They were silent] (p. 23-24).

Aspects of musicality in *The Saga Of Juza*. The hero's constant immersion in the sacred and mysterious world of nature of the bog, which is a constant escape from the village people, interweaves of the harmonies of the nature-based and other senses hidden in the text engulf the reader as a cyclic circle of nature within its melodic, rhythmic language. Such euphonic shifts of rhythmic content and soundscapes form something

like another layer of a text, which takes the reader into the depths of archetypal cosmic rhythmic pulsations (Karbusicky 1997). In this respect, the principle of form creation in Saga is close to archetypal rondo, where the refrain (theme) is repeated variably between different episodes ( $ABA_1CA_2DA_3EA_4\dots A_n$ ).

Werner Wolf's concept of intermediality (Wolf 2009) is usually applied to the analysis of the musicality of a literary work, in which several relevant aspects can be highlighted. In the broad sense of the concept of intermediality, the interactions of the arts are to be analysed in terms of transmediality (narrativity: variability, repetition, archetypalism, principles of stylistics, etc.) and intermedial transpositions (that is a transposition of the text into opera). In terms of transmediality, the musicality of the novel goes back to archetypal layers; it is the folk-narrator-story teller's stylistics, sacred mythical thinking (reticence, synthesis of folkloric and Christian worldviews, existential metaphysics of life and death, agricultural work cycle, the rich sense of nature, manifested in the variant repetition principle).

In the narrow sense of intermedial art interactions, The Saga would have a relevant aspect of intermedial reference, which manifests in explicit referencing (thematisation), i.e. musical images. There are not many of them in The Saga. They are motifs of a hymn, a bell, a song, accordion, play or fiddle around. Implicit referencing (imitation) is divided into three types: (a) evocation (the reproduction of the impression of a musical work), (b) (partial) reproduction (presentation of a song or its quote), (c) formal imitation (structural musical analogues in literature). These aspects are interacting. As the evocation of a musical work, The Saga is close to the linearity of the mythical narrative, in a sense, it is associated with a sacred hymn when the cosmogony of the creation of the world is encoded in the seemingly simple structure of continuous singing. The reproduction aspect could be matched by the mentioned above quotation of kupiškėnai folk song. Baltušis's texts contain very little of the song or chanting lexicon. In the formal imitation part, the concepts of the musical theme and the analogues of the musical form are essential. The theme analogue in the literature is characterised not only by the semantic motif but also its structure, poetic language and features of phonics. Sometimes the verbal musicality (phonics) dominates the text, then the poetic language analyses instrumentation and intonational-syntactic derivatives. When the compositional aspects of form development become more important in the text, then it is about the nature of thematicism, the logic behind the development of form, i.e. the internal form (Brūzgienė 2007). The rondo-like character of The Saga form has been mentioned before, but in this text the vocabulary depicting the sounds of nature, human and animal birds is also very important.

It is discussed in greater detail by J. Lubienė in her article "The World of Sounds and its Expression in Juozas Baltušis's The Saga Of Juza". As she puts it, "reviewing the same length texts by some Lithuanian writers (J. Aputis, J. Baltušis, M. Katiliškis, V. Krėvė, I. Simonaitytė, Vaižgantas, Žemaitė), it was found that J. Baltušis used the biggest number and the most varied lexemes of sounds" (Lubienė 2004). According to her, the novel contains almost 55 sentences (combinations of words) to describe various sounds. The most common of these are verbs (200), nouns (15: *aimanos, giedojimas, verksmas*

[moans, chanting, crying]), onomatopoeic interjections (8: bar bar bar, trakšt trakš trakšt [knock knock knock, crack crack crack]), consequently the article mostly focuses on verbs. 58 of them (in total they are used 90 times) are used to represent the sounds of birds: cypsėti, girenti, karkti, kukuoti, čirkšti, ūbauti [squeak, honk, caw, cuckoo, chirp, hoot]. There are 19 lexemes for animal and beast sounds in 20 sentences (kaukti, mauroti, žvengti [howl, moo, neigh]), 5 types of beetles emit the sounds of insects (9 lexemes, 20 sentences: Bimbaldas su uodu grojo, vabalėliai dūzgia, zvimbia ir bimbias [Horsefly played with mosquitoes, beetles drone, buzz and whine]). 45 words are used to denote human sounds (aikčioti, aiktelėti, kikenti, zurzti, šūkalioti [moan, gasp, giggle, yell]). It is written almost 200 times about them in the novel. The most common are lexemes describing crying, laughter and shouts (verkti, kuktelėti, raudoti; kvatoti, prunkstelėti; riktelėti, šaukti [cry, sob, weep, laugh, snigger, shout, scream]). There are also a number of words used for various other human sounds (over 20: krenkštelti, šnarpšti, murmėti [cronk, snort, murmur]).

The sounds of natural phenomena and inanimate objects are mentioned almost 200 times, and almost 100 lexemes are used to name them (Lubienė 2007: 26). Commonly used are traškėti, skambėti, dundėti, šlamėti, ūžti [crackle, sound, rumble, rustle, hum]. For water sounds 12 lexemes are used (burbuliuoti, gurgenti, šniokšti, bubble, gurgle, roar), and 10 lexemes represent plant sounds (murmėti, siausti, šlamenti [murmur, rage, swish]). The wind in The Saga groja, stūgauja, ūkauja [plays, howls, hoots], snow girgžda, traška [squeaks, crunches], thunder muša [strikes]. There are also a lot of sounds emitted by personalised inanimate objects (murma šalčio rakinamos samanos, stūgauja vėjas [frost-locked moss murmur, wind howls]), various tools, devices (bildėti, ciksėti [clatter, click]), sounds from impact, explosion (dundėti, pykšėti, [hum, crack, a total of 39 words]), or touching and rubbing (girgždėti, čerškėti [squeak, rattle, in total 17 words]). In her article, J. Lubienė also discusses the expression of acoustic features, i.e. (loudness-silence), intensity (length-shortness), emotional evaluation of sounds (mergina linksmai nusijuokė, varnos rudeniškai rėkia [girl laughed cheerfully, crows cawed autumnally]), etc. (Lubienė 2007: 28). In my article I quoted a tiny part of the words representing sounds in Baltušis's novel; however it is evident that they create one more layer of profound deep rhythm of prose and instrumentation, enchanting and immersing in the cosmic sacrality of nature and myth.

## Generalisation

The life of the talented Lithuanian writer Juozas Baltušis was marked by duality during the Soviet occupation like that of many cultural and political figures and can be divided into three stages. The first stage is leftist idealism of the youth, collaboration with the Soviet authorities in Lithuania, partially marked in part by peasant cunningness and caution. Stage two encompassed the times when the most popular folk writer in

the country held high positions, enjoying all the privileges of the Soviet Union, and not afraid to criticise the authorities in numerous literary evenings, secretly listening to the radio The Voice of America, and helping anyone who asked for support. The third stage began when, after the emergence of the Sąjūdis and the start of the struggle for Lithuanian independence, J. Baltušis recklessly delivered a speech on the Russian programme of the Lithuanian TV, which was transmitted to Russia and became widely known. The popular writer, beloved and loving of people, unexpectedly became a traitor to the homeland and received tremendous public condemnation. Public renounced him as a writer but also his books.

Nowadays, reviewing the Soviet literary heritage, the criterion of talent of writers' but not only of mistakes they made through the life, (V. Martinkus, V. Sventickas, V. Kubilius, J. Sprindytė, etc.), which helped the Baltušis's novel *The Saga Of Juza* to accredit to *The Treasure House Of Lithuanian Literature: The 20th Century*.

*The Saga Of Juza* for its multilayered nature, mythical-folkloric and Christian worldview and symbolism, Lithuanian ethics, diligence, stylistics of the village storyteller and realistic, filled with poetry stories about nature and the cycle of agricultural work on the land, abundance and infinite variety of soundscapes, constant, repetitive, rondo retreat from the rural realities of life to the mysterious shelter of the natural world, along with the extraordinary richness of the lexicon, the melody and rhythm of the language, creates a sense of existential – mythical poetics.

Lithuanian archetypal vitality has survived because of this extraordinary beauty and richness of language, the subtlety of the world view of the ordinary people, the noble ethics, the infinitely sensitive nature, through the fusion of folklore and Christian spiritual culture.

*The Saga Of Juza* is a monument of rare beauty, a literary masterpiece, which testifies about the archetypal Lithuanian vitality. This literary masterpiece was left to us by the communist Juozas Baltušis. He bequeathed this writing as his creative testament of love for Lithuania, its people and culture.

#### References:

- Baltušis Juozas. *Sakmė apie Južą*. Vilnius: Vaga, 1979.
- Brūzgienė Rūta. *Musicianship Of Form In A Literary Work*. *The Grove: Working Papers On English Studies*, Vol. 14, 2007, accessed 12 August 2019; available from <https://revistaselectronicas.ujaen.es/index.php/grove/article/view/1248/1037>; Internet.
- Drukutė Genovaitė. Juozo Baltušio fenomenas Prancūzijoje *Colloquia*, Nr 24, 2010, 105–112.
- Inter-studia humanitatis*, 2008, Nr 7, *Pelkė lietuvių kultūroje* (sud. Vigmantas Butkus ir Rūta Stankuvienė), Šiaulių universitetas, 2008, 204 p.
- Jackevičius Mindaugas. Už ką J. Baltušiai Lietuva niekada neatleido, *Delfi.lt*, 2016 m. gegužės 29 d., accesed 10 April 2019; available from <https://www.delfi.lt/news/daily/lithuania/uz-ka-j-baltusiui-lietuva-niekada-neatleido.d?id=71140498>; Internet.

- Jakševičiūtė 2013: Jakševičiūtė Dagnė. Gyvenom socializme: prisiminimai apie Juožą Baltušį. Vilnius: Alma littera, 2013.
- Juodytė-Žizienė Aurelija. Tarp kūrybiškumo ir stereotipų (Ko verta Juozo Baltušio proza?). Darbai ir dienos, 2002, Nr. 29, p. 7–46, Kaunas: VDU leidykla, 2002.
- Karbusický Vladimir. Antropologinės ir gamtinės universalijos muzikoje. Baltos lankos, Nr. 9. Vilnius, 1997.
- Kubilius 1995: Kubilius Vytautas. XX amžiaus literatūra. Vilnius, Alma littera, 1995.
- Kubilius Vytautas (ed.) at all. Rašytojas pokario metais. Vilnius: Vaga: 1991.
- Kuolys Darius. Kazio Jakubėno likimą lėmė Petras Cvirka? Tikrovė kur kas sudėtingesnė, accessed 3 November 2019; available from <https://www.facebook.com/kuolys/posts/967548420279131>; Internet.
- Lubienė Jūratė. Garsų pasaulis ir jo raiška Juozo Baltušio „Sakmėje apie Južą“. Filologija, 2004 Nr. 7, Šiauliai: Šiaulių universiteto leidykla, p. 24–29, 2004.
- Ražauskas D. Maironis ir senoji tradicija. Liaudies kultūra, 2013, Nr. 2 (149), p. 11–25, 2013.
- Rupinskienė Dalina. Rašytojo J. Baltušio dukra: su tėvu nesikalbėdavom ir pusmetį. Alfa.lt, April 27, 2019, accessed 5 July; 2019; available from <https://www.alfa.lt/straipsnis/50388463/rasytojo-j-baltusio-dukra-su-tevu-nesikalbedavom-ir-pusmeti>; Internet.
- Sakavičiūtė Danguolė. Pelkės semantika angažuotuose tekstuose. Inter-studia humanitatis, 2008, Nr 7: Pelkė lietuvių kultūroje, Šiaulių universitetas, p. 155-164, 2008.
- Šerelytė Renata. Juozas Baltušis, Sakmė apie Južą. Šiaurės Atėnai, 2007-09-29, accessed 7 August 2019; available from <https://www.rasyk.lt/knygos/sakme-apie-juza/3129.html>; Internet.
- Seriijoje “Lietuvių literatūros lobynas. XX amžius.” Juozo Baltušio “Sakmė apie Južą”. Bernardinai.lt, 19 September 2007, accessed 8 August 2019; available from <http://www.bernardinai.lt/straipsnis/2007-09-07-serijoje-lietuviu-literaturos-lobynas-xx-amzius-j-baltusio-sakme-apie-juza/13340>; Internet.
- Striogaitė Dalia. Juozas Baltušis partinio budrumo sargyboje. Naujasis Židinys-Aidai, 2009, Nr. 8-9, p. 320–324, 2009.
- Tamošaitis Mindaugas. Juozas Baltušis ir Eduardas Mieželaitis tautinio atgimimo ir pirmaisiais Lietuvos nepriklausomybės metais, LITUANISTICA, 2016. T. 62. Nr. 1(103), p. 12–24, Vilnius: Lietuvos mokslų akademija, 2016.
- Топоров В. Н. К истории связей мифопоэтической и научной традиции: Гераклит. To Honour Roman Jakobson. Essays on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday, Vol. III. The Hague-Paris: Mouton, 1967.
- Vaitkevičienė Daiva. Tarp emocijos ir ritualo: Baltų karo papročių pėdsakais. Tautosakos darbai, XXXIII, 2007.
- Valentas Skirmantas. Mė(lynojo)nulio lingvistika Vlodo Braziūno ir Sigito Gedos poezijoje. Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 2007.
- Vedrickaitė Imelda. Rašytojo mauzoliejaus apmatai Juozo Baltušio dokumentinėje prozoje ir pysakoje Sakmė apie Južą. Colloquia, Nr 24, 2010, p. 84–104.
- Wolf Werner. Relations between Literature and Music in the Context of a General Typology of Intermediality. Comparative Sharing Knowledges for Preserving Cultural Diversity, Vol. 1. 2009. p. 133–156. EOLSS Publications, accessed 10 August 2019; available from <https://www.eolss.net/Sample-Chapters/C04/E6-87-02-02.pdf>; Internet.

## რუტა ბრუზგიენე (ლიტვა)

### იუზას ბალტუშისის რომანი „საგა იუზის შესახებ“: ერის სასიცოცხლო ძალის არქეტიპული გამოხატულება

#### რეზიუმე

**საკვანძო სიტყვები:** ლიტველი მწერალი იუზას ბალტუშისი, რომანი „საგა იუზზე“, იდეოლოგია, მითოპოეტიკა, არქეტიპული მსოფლხედვა, ენა, მუსიკალობა.

იუზას ბალტუშისი (1909-1991) ცნობილი ლიტველი მწერალი, პოლიტიკური და საზოგადო მოღვაწეა, რომლის კალამსაც ეკუთვნის ათეულობით პროზაული და დრამატული ნაწარმოები. ისინი თარგმნილია მსოფლიოს მრავალ ენაზე, მათი ავტორი კი არაერთი ჯილდოს მფლობელია. რომანმა „საგა იუზზე“ (1979) 1980 წელს ლატვიის საბჭოთა რესპუბლიკის სახელმწიფო პრემია მიიღო, 1990 წელს კი პრესტიჟული ფრანგული პრემიის ლაურეატი გახდა. ლიტვაში საგამ განსაკუთრებული პოპულარობა მოიპოვა, როგორც ორიგინალურმა მითოლოგიურმა პოემამ, რომელმაც ამოხეთქა, როგორც ლიტველთა არქეტიპული მსოფლგანცდის გამოხატულებამ და წინააღმდეგობის საიდუმლო ნიშნად იქცა. იმ დროისათვის ი. ბალტუშისმა პოლიტიკურ ისტებლიშმენტში ზენიტს მიაღწია: 1980-1990 წლებში იგი ლიტვის საბჭოთა რესპუბლიკის უმაღლესი საბჭოს წევრი იყო. გარდაქმნების დასაწყისში მწერალი ცდილობდა ლოიალური ყოფილიყო (1988) მაგრამ ვერ ამჩნევდა ახალ პოლიტიკურ სიოს; იგი მოსკოვის იდეოლოგთა მხარეს დადგა და საზოგადოებამ გარიყა, როგორც ერის მოღალატე.

თითქმის ოცდაათი წლის შემდეგ, ღირს მისი მწერლური ოსტატობის ანალიზი, პოლიტიკური ეპოქისა და საბჭოთა იდეოლოგიის მიუხედავად. სტატიაში გაანალიზებულია რომანის მითო-პოეტური არქეტიპულობა, რომელიც ვლინდება ლიტვური ხასიათის შეგრძნებით, მდიდრული და ცოცხალი ლექსიკით, მელოდიურობით, ტრადიციული ეთიკით და ა.შ. კვლევა დაფუძნებულია გ. დრუჩუკუტეს, ა. ჯეკევიჩუსის, ა. იუდიტე-ჟიჟენეს, ვ. კარბუსიცკის, ი. ლიუბენეს, დ. საკავიჩუტეს, მ. ტამოშაიტისის, ს. ვალენტასის, ვ. ვოლფის და სხვათა ნაშრომებზე; გამოყენებული შედარებითი ლიტერატურათმცოდნეობითი მეთოდი. სტატიაში გამოტანილია დასკვნა, რომ ბალტუშისის „საგა იუზის შესახებ“ არა მხოლოდ საიდუმლო ეროვნული წინააღმდეგობის გამოვლენა საბჭოთა იდეოლოგიის მიმართ, არამედ რომანი განხილული უნდა იქნას, როგორც ლიტვური კულტურის მემკვიდრეობა, მისი ენობრივი სილამაზისა და სიმდიდრის, მითოლოგიური, არქაული მსოფლ-ჭვრეტისა და მუსიკალურობის გამო. ყოველივე ზემოთქმულიდან გამომდინარე კი, ის სამართლიანად უნდა ჩაითვალოს ლიტვური ლიტერატურის შედევრად.