

LIETUVOS LYGINAMOSIOS LITERATŪROS ASOCIACIJA

*Acta litteraria
comparativa*

EUROPOS KRAŠTOVAIZDŽIO TRANSFORMACIJOS:
SAVO IR SVETIMO SUSITIKIMAI
TRANSFORMATIONS OF THE EUROPEAN LANDSCAPE:
ENCOUNTERS BETWEEN THE SELF AND THE OTHER

MOKSLO DARBAI

5

2010–2011

Vilniaus
pedagoginio
universiteto
leidykla
Vilnius



Sudarytojos / Formers

Prof. dr. *Nijolė Vaičiulėnaitė-Kašelionienė* Vilniaus pedagoginis universitetas
(Lietuva)
Prof. dr. *Aušra Jurgutienė* Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas (Lietuva)
Dalia Kaladinskienė Vilniaus pedagoginis universitetas (Lietuva)

Atsakingoji redaktorė / Executive Secretary

Dalia Kaladinskienė Vilniaus pedagoginis universitetas (Lietuva)

Recenzantai / Reviewers

Prof. habil. dr. *Kęstutis Nastopka* Vilniaus universitetas (Lietuva)
Prof. dr. *Viktorija Skrupskelytė* Kauno Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas
(Lietuva)

Mokslinis komitetas / Scientific Committee

Prof. dr. *Alain Montandon* (Klermon-Ferano universitetas, Prancūzija)
Prof. dr. *Jūri Talvet* (Tartu universitetas, Estija)
Dr. *Lucia Boldrini* (Londono Goldsmo universitetas, Anglija)
Prof. dr. *Aušra Jurgutienė* (Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, Lietuva)
Doc. dr. *Žydronė Kolevinskienė* (Vilniaus pedagoginis universitetas, Lietuva)
Doc. dr. *Genovaitė Dručkutė* (Vilniaus universitetas, Lietuva)
Prof. dr. *Nijolė Vaičiulėnaitė-Kašelionienė* (Vilniaus pedagoginis universitetas, Lietuva)

Adresas / Address

Lietuvos lyginamosios literatūros asociacija / Lithuanian Association
of Comparative Literature
T. Ševčenkos 31, LT-03111 Vilnius
Lietuva / Lithuania
Tel. (+370 5) 2333635, fak. (+370 5) 2335299, el. p. llla@vpu.lt

Leidinių remia

LIETUVOS RESPUBLIKOS KULTŪROS RĖMIMO FONDAS
VALSTYBINIS MOKSLO IR STUDIJŲ FONDAS
LIETUVIŲ LITERATŪROS IR TAUTOSAKOS INSTITUTAS
VILNIAUS PEDAGOGINIS UNIVERSTITETAS

© Lietuvos lyginamosios literatūros asociacija, 2010–2011
© Vilniaus pedagoginis universitetas, 2010–2011

IVADAS / FOREWORD

Aušra JURGUTIENĖ
Kultūros žemėlapių pokyčiai – nauji klausimai komparatyvistikai.....9

I. THE CHANGING CULTURAL MAP OF EUROPE / EUROPOS KULTŪRINIO ŽEMĖLAPIO POKYČIAI

Alain MONTANDON
Progrès techniques et métamorphoses des espaces européens au
XIXe siècle.....19
Techninis progresas ir Europos erdvių metamorfozės XIX amžiuje

Genovaitė DRUČKUTĖ
Un projet de l'Europe dans l'oeuvre d'Oscar Milosz32
Europos projektas Oscaro Miloszo kūryboje

Manfred SCHMELING
De l'humanisme au post-humanisme: Le discours sur l'Europe chez
Thomas Mann, André Gide et Hans-Magnus Enzensberger.....41
Nuo humanizmo iki post-humanizmo: Europos samprata Thomo Manno,
André Gide'o ir Hanso Magnuso Enzensbergerio diskursuose

Jūri TALVET
Western Humanism and the "Other".....54
Vakarų humanizmas ir „Kitas“

Vytautas MARTINKUS
Aksiologinis aspektas XXI amžiaus Europos literatūroje: Tesėjo
(iš Lietuvos?) beiškant65
Axiological Aspect in the European Literature of the 21st Century:
In Pursuit of Theseus (from Lithuania?)

Roumiana L. STANTCHEVA
La notion de "Littérature européenne" et ses problèmes identitaires
inhérents. Quelques échos des zones peu explorées74
„Europos literatūros“ sąvoka ir su ja susijusios tapatybės problemos.
Keletas duomenų iš mažai tyrinėtų teritorijų

**“The world repeats itself in
its boredom”¹. Third Spaces in
Lithuanian Literature**

**„Pasaulis nuobodžiai pasikartoja“².
Trečiosios erdvės lietuvių
literatūroje**

Christina PARNELL
Gutenbergstraße 09
D-99423 Weimar
parnellchristina@hotmail.com

Summary

In this paper, Homi Bhabha's notion of the “third space” will be applied to images and topics of fluctuating identity in Marius Ivaškevičius' novel *Žali* (“The Greens”, 2002) which is a fascinating example of the productive discussion of dichotomous constellations for Lithuanian and European culture. His novel deconstructs the myth of the Lithuanian partisan war against the Soviet army in the years between 1944 and 1953. The antagonism between the Reds and the Greens is being broken up by topoi of equivalence, likeness and repetition as well as continuing identity games. It represents the artistic opening-up of a „third space“ where dualism and essentialism are overcome. This “third space”, the Other, is represented as an intellectual space which benefits from the knowledge of both sides of the existing antagonisms by the author. Hence it appears that Russians as well as Lithuanians are both victims and perpetrators, subjugated to totalitarian power structures. Equivalence and likeness as well as the changeability of identity are the basis to see the Other in an open and processual circle of interpretation.

Key words: colonialism, post-colonial discourse, third space, deconstruction, national myths, Lithuanian partisan war, Soviet occupation

The third-space concept, which refers to Homi Bhabha's widely discussed *Location of Culture* (1994)³, has emerged as the principal category of the post-colonial discourse. Bhabha derives it from the *double vision* of the migrant who, by using his homelessness, grows into a “productive parasite” to the cultures of both his mother and his host country. This inseparable fusion will create the so-called hybrid identity of a “third space”, which is characterized by difference, heterogeneity and instability as well as by the undermining of dichotomous constellations.

Where, how, and in which constellations in Lithuanian literature are colonial relationships described? How far can we talk about a post-colonial cultural situation, and, finally, does it make sense directly to apply post-colonial theory as widely used by Anglo-Saxon critics on Lithuanian literature? Our investigation into possible “third space” in Lithuanian literature will focus on the process of cultural confrontation and fusion which creates the “third space” first of all as an intellectual realm.

If we take the relationship between Soviet Lithuania and Soviet Russia to be a complex case of colonialism, the question must be raised how the specific dependency of the colonized (that is Vilnius) from the colonizer (that is Moscow) is expressed in comparison to the respective constellations described by Edward Said⁴. In contrast to the traditional colonialism in which the imperial power was incorporated by the West or the North while the East and the South represented the colonies, the specific case of colonized Soviet Lithuania can be defined by the fact that the heart of the empire was in the East, the colony itself, which was shaped by a Western self-image, however, in the West.

Furthermore, which would support the idea of applying post-colonial theory on a colonial relationship, since the beginning of the Great Thaw in the Soviet Union, there has been a period of mutual cultural exchange between Lithuania and Russia and the other republics of the former union, so that we can state that even Lithuanian culture did have some influence on the Russian. Evidence for mutual influence and interference may be drawn, for instance, from the connection between the Lithuanian *stream-of-consciousness novel* (Mykolas Sluckis) and the Russian *bytovaja proza* (Jurij Trifonov). That the bilingualism which had been decreed upon public life had contributed to the Russification of the Lithuanian language and that the domination of Russian culture had corrupted and even impaired Lithuanian patriotism cannot be put into doubt⁵.

— However, the comparatively long period of Soviet occupation in Lithuania had, involuntarily or not, permitted creative adoptions of Russian culture and enabled the Lithuanians to move more or less freely and to express themselves in two or more cultures. This is a potential for the new Europe which can hardly be underestimated revealing at the same time the particular nature of Lithuanian colonial past. Any Lithuanian writer, who, due to the experience of the Soviet era and of contemporary neo-liberalism, is familiar both with the West and the East, will benefit from the situation in-between by drawing productive knowledge from it.

Post-colonial theory will help to analyze the challenge to Western hegemony arising from the growing interference of national and ethnic minorities. However, Lithuanian culture is neither a minority culture in its own country nor a migrant one putting West-European culture under the pressure. But with regard to the power centers in the European Union, it is located (once again) at the periphery. This is a specific threshold situation which connects it with the fate of the migrants in the metropolis of the West. Thus post-colonial theory appears to be particularly promising when applied upon contemporary Lithuanian literature.

In recent Lithuanian literature, the rendering of colonial experience differs widely in its artistic strategy: as the day of reckoning with the former colonial empire of Russia and with the opportunism of the father generation in the stories of refusal or the symbolic killing of the father (Ričardas Gavelis, Jurgis Kunčinas; Sigitas Parulskis), in the pounding to pieces of national myth (Sigitas Parulskis), or in the provocative revision of national historiography (Marius Ivaškevičius).

In this paper, I am going to focus on Marius Ivaškevičius⁶, a narrator and playwright born in 1973. The persistent debate of the problem of nation and identity in Ivaškevičius's writings, his debunking of the heroic, is concomitant with the postmodern deconstruction of Lithuanian national myth, with the specific way of re-reading national identity: Lithuanians and their geographical neighbours in the present and past, their political and military allies or enemies – Russian and German, Swedish and French, as well as the foreigners in their own country, the Jews – , have aroused an antagonism which was continuously dissolved, for their interdependence and equivalence would undermine any clear-cut dichotomy. Irony is shed upon sacred national topics (the Lithuanian Partisan War 1944–1953 in the novel *Žali* (“The Greens”); the Siberian deportation in the play *Malviš* (“The Small One”), as the author removes the taboos and stereotypes of Lithuanian historiography. Both the setting and the profaning of the mythical sufferance produce grotesque effects. The irreverence for authority can also be noticed in works of art taking up current causes for conflict, as in the play *Apgaubti* (“Shielded”), which is a parody of the process of transformation. As a postmodern narrator Ivaškevičius enjoys yoking together motifs that are normally incompatible and laying open the constructiveness of situations and characters. By provokingly breaking up national and ideological dichotomies and by reducing them to a common anthropological origin, his books are filled by the boundless enthusiasm in

playfully blending the separate beyond the postmodern practice of “shifting”. Even if the Lithuanian society undergoing the process of transformation is sometimes not immediately present to the audience, the discussion and the interpretation of personal and collective identity problems will provide an original thought-provoking impulse for the rest of present-day Europe.

The novel *Žali* (“The Greens”, 2002)⁷, which centers upon the Lithuanian partisan war against the Soviet army (1944–1953) is narrated from the point of view of both the Lithuanian and the Russians – the Lithuanian partisan leader Jonas Žemaitis and the Russian soldiers Vasilij and Afanasij. This view is expanded through the letters of the Russian corporal Mar'ja Petrovna, of the Russian colonel Lebedev and the Lithuanian-Soviet secret agent Rapolas. The action is concentrated on summer 1950. Both groups are searching for the house of the farmer Žemaitis, who has been soiled with the stain of a traitor by the Russians, in order to lure into a trap the partisan leader Žemaitis, his namesake. There are no victors in this war: Žemaitis is shot in Moscow in the Ljubljanka, the Russian soldiers Vasilij and Afanasij are liquidated on behalf of the secret agent Rapolas, a Lithuanian, and, in the metamorphosis of a very old man, Colonel Lebedev reflects upon the same methods of oppression continuously applied in whichever form of society.

1st main topic: The narrative departs from the confrontation of the parties involved and their critical analysis. Accordingly, the Russian soldier Vasilij takes the Lithuanians as bandits and enemies (“They were them, and we were us, which is sufficient for the war”⁸). But due to the events, this dichotomy is dissolved and replaced by the feeling that any kind of decidedness will be ineffectual: “In the morning I believed the war to be unambiguous: the enemy is close to us, being among us. He must be surrounded and destroyed. This is a demining job, but not a war.”⁹ Partisan warfare in the dugouts of the forest meant that this was not a fight with clear front lines, while the Lithuanian fighters were hidden under the earth and the Russians acting above, but a battle between two different parties which are diverse in themselves: Lithuanians (*Žali* / *Greens*) fought against Russians (*Raudoni* / *Reds*), among whom, as it is said, there were also Lithuanians. And among the Lithuanians “this and that Russian or German served”, while sometimes the “Yellows” (the Jews, C.P.) had to be protected from the Greens¹⁰.

Large space is devoted to both parties recalling past life memories and to their reflections, which are *similar*, indeed. Their recollections merge with current events in time and space and, surprisingly, represent common features in their biographies and social experience, in their language, historical experience and even in personal relationships.

At the very beginning of the novel, the narrator puts himself in the position of the enemy:

Common man, who cannot be blamed for being born Russian [...], has fought in the greatest battle of the world, walks on his own earth, which he has retrieved from the enemy. And suddenly, the rumor comes up that somewhere at the edge of this earth, deformed shapes appear in order to kill his brethren in arms. I, at his place (If I were Russian), without much ado, would have packed my knapsack as fast as possible and gone off to kill the villain. That's what the Russian has done.¹¹

2nd main topic: By neutralizing the dichotomy through figures of equivalence, a series of patterns of likeness is being advanced:

– The likeness of the physical as well as psychic situation results in a state of exhaustion which unifies both parties. Life seems to be for Žemaitis, the partisan leader, a chain of fatiguing repetitions in love and life situations, and his comrade, the milk woman (*pieninė*), can “hardly expect” their enemies arrival: “Because I am very tired.”¹²

– The likeness of worshipping (Both Rapolas, the Lithuanian, and Vasilij, the Russian, call for the Mother of God: “His lips spoke with my own words”, when the bunker is being blown up)¹³.

– The likeness in their relatedness to the earth (Earth draws a deep breath, is evil or not evil. So we are told by the Russian soldiers Vasilij and Afanasij. Earth represents the war-disabled motherhood for Lithuanians and Russians as well. The destroyed earth and the war are depicted as an existential experience of the Absurd)¹⁴.

– The likeness with regard to the power struggle in their respective hierarchies.

– The likeness concerning cruelty (Punitive action taken at night by one party and by day by the other one directs the national fight against the Lithuanian people itself. That the people are not any longer able to distinguish between friend and foe, this is said with regard to the partisan leader Žemaitis¹⁵).

– The likeness in moving in space (Looking for Žemaitis both sides are riding through the Lithuanian forest in a circle and do not find their way).

– The likeness in recognizing the absurdity of this war, which is expressed in nearly the same words by Lithuanians and Russians:

Afanasij: “Why are we here?”¹⁶; Žemaitis: “I want to know, why the hell I am fighting”,¹⁷ Vasilij: “Was it really worth while coming from the Ural to this place?”¹⁸; Kasperevičius: “I just thought, why are we here?”¹⁹

– The likeness of “own” and “foreign” (In retrospective, to his French lover in Paris in the 1930s, the former Lithuanian officer and today’s partisan leader Žemaitis draws a picture of his country as a peaceful, non-specifically European idyll which may have been equally possible in France. This is explicitly emphasized in the text by Natalie, the French woman: “This is France, Žemaitis.”²⁰

3rd main topic: In the following, I am going to describe the playful application of the identical as a function of the work which can be understood as a message according to the intellectual space as initially described²¹.

Patterns of likeness are usually connected with those of the doppelgänger and of compatibility, which is relevant to the understanding of the protagonist Jonas Žemaitis (1909–1953), who is not only an authentic historical person, but being one of the most eminent characters of the Lithuanian partisan movement he has risen into the aura of the hero. So, the postmodern game played by Ivaškevičius upon historical facts and the exchangeability of persons breaks down the atmosphere of taboo. In fact one cannot deny that the great number of mistakes in persons creating a great deal of confusion regarding the partisan leader will leave in a state of utter fragility not only the category of identity, but in particular the identity of the national hero²².

Ivaškevičius raises the point of exchangeability, mutability and the processual nature of identity. The “true Žemaitis”, who is on the run, in tatters and exhausted, is taken for the false one, the false, however, being tall, for the genuine one. If he dies, it is said about Žemaitis, his doppelgänger will be sent (“Thus I am the other one too”²³). In the house of “Sir Washington”, who is the financier of the partisan war, green paint has been deposited. Just with a brush for spreading the colour ‘green’ you are made a fighter²⁴. Thus identity is a construct that remains volatile. The

great Žemaitis appears both repulsive and egotistical, when he amuses himself with his wife in the bed of her former lover who has become an invalid. Or when killing appears customary to him: "We are going to kill somebody. And have a swim in-between."²⁵

In the prologue Ivaškevičius considers the partisan war as a part of the history of all meaningless warfare and, with his remark on the "entertaining character" of it, destroys any possible notion of its pathos. As a variant of the absurd, the "entertaining character" is realized through a series of similar and equivalent elements and the continuously ironic voice of the narrator. Even capture and death appear profane: The Lithuanian partisan Palubeckas is torn out of the swamp by his wriggling legs, shot with bare feet, and, as a dead body, is allowed to sleep in. Fighting action is triggered off by personal and, in many cases banal, motives and appears to be foolish and produces comic effects²⁶.

Even the bitter disappointment of the Lithuanian fighters for being left in the lurch by the Americans is trivialized: "[...] and all those who have not yet booked for their holidays are requested to wait until next June."²⁷

But where, finally, is the third, the new, which is "something else besides"? As soon as essentialism and dualism have been transcended, what about difference and heterogeneity? Will not the pattern of equivalence shift the pattern of equality right into the centre?

At the close of the novel, the frontlines merge in a vision of reconciliation and in the awareness of common existence of life and death: "Jonas, said the comrade", who is no other one than the Russian Colonel Lebedev who was a fellow student of Žemaitis before the war in Paris, "we went through evil times. We inflicted them upon each other."²⁸

However Žemaitis will be shot to death. "Such is the system", Colonel Lebedev regrets, not without offering him a glass of cognac just before the execution²⁹ „Such were the times," dead Žemaitis replies from the grave to the question of the count Tyškevičius³⁰ why his double, the farmer Žemaitis, had to be shot³¹.

And this takes us to another structural effect enhancing the efficiency of the novel: the figure of repetition.

4th main topic: apart from the repetition of the same actions on both sides, accompanied by literally the same comments from the characters, the same situations, patterns of relationships and images are used repeatedly. Represented as an eternal cycle, life casts doubts on any possibility of development. The concatenation of warring and fighting shows the ex-

haustion and absurdity of any action aimed at killing³². War is like spilling a can of milk, Žemaitis says³³.

Due to this figure of repetition the constancy and eternity of life are celebrated, as especially in the series of female characters like Elena (Žemaitis' wife), Natalie (Žemaitis' lover) and the *pieninė* (Žemaitis' last female comrade), who merge in the memory of Žemaitis. They incorporate the other, the repressed, the sensual and the earth itself, which is the opposite of killing. Women incorporate the other, the earth itself, which is the opposite of killing. As the war is conveyed to the reader as a male power game for influence and possessions and any pattern of identity is cast into doubt, there is a constant that comes to the fore: the metaphorical motif of milk and of the woman's breast from which it pours. In this context we have to see the cattle farm owned by the partisan leader's father, which embodies the traditions of the family and the nation. Milk and dairy products stand for Lithuania, its fertile fields and meadows. Consequently, Žemaitis' last female companion is the milk woman (*pieninė*), so called for her large breasts which, due to her continuous pregnancies, always carry milk. But the milk woman is clubbed to death by the Ukrainian soldier. For with the barrenness of the breasts the source of life and the Lithuanians' dream of freedom dry up. Without a bosom no freedom is possible, had proclaimed the sensual milk woman and assumed the role of Lithuania's freedom statue³⁴. Significantly, the death of the women is the author's only instance to allow the narrative turning to tragedy.

In history the colonizer suppresses the rebellion in the colony. In the novel, however, he proves quite similar to the colonized not only with regard to the loss of his illusions, but to the fragility and vulnerability as well. The dichotomy is abandoned, as both sides are not sure any longer about their own pursuits. Through the authoritative voice of Count Tyškevičius the Lithuanians are accused of nostalgia and self-pity, whereas the Russian side is still haunted by the traumata of the last grand war³⁵.

Any obvious distinction between good and evil is thus made impossible. In this regard Ivaškevičius discusses the problem of the betrayal. The partisan leader Žemaitis wants to execute his namesake in order to pass a verdict on an act of treason the true circumstances of which would rather demand forgiveness. And, it cannot be excluded, that even Žemaitis, the leader, had faltered when interrogated in the Ljubljanka ("I admit everything. Agreed."³⁶). By foregrounding this topic Ivaškevičius underlines the relatedness of betrayal. Where betrayal appears to be the construct of

calumny or the result of psychological coercion and blackmail no either-or assessment will be possible. The likeness of treason is persistent. So, Žemaitis adultery committed with his French lover Nathalie³⁷ and the supposed treason by Žemaitis the farmer appear to be connected. If the one, who is to pass Judgment on the traitor and concentrates all military action on him, is equally liable to treason, the phenomenon of treason itself is put to the fore. Thus betrayal, which is traditionally negative, is described as a reaction beyond rational control and loses its identical structure.

The novel terminates with the question raised by the dead Žemaitis what is going to happen if one betrays all those who have never existed. This is what spatial structure and imagery are drifting to: There is no one and only truth and no easy solution, and the enthusiastic quest for the elevation of the just one and the detection of the culprit will only lead to new exclusion and enmity.

Perhaps the unifying moment in the literatures of the transformation states is the breaking up of dichotomies, the fusion of opposites and the undermining of the obvious. And here is the chance for thinking in “third spaces”, where the dualism of Self and Other is abolished in favour of both sides’ common history and destiny: Where old enemies are being overcome, new confrontations will equally become questionable. From the meeting of the equal-ranking centre and periphery raises the fusion of “something else besides”.

References

- 1 **Marius Ivaškevičius**: *Žali*. Vilnius 2002, 25: „Pasaulis nuobodžiai pasikartoja.“
- 2 *Ibid.*
- 3 **Homi Bhabha**: *The Location of Culture*. London 1994.
- 4 This shows us the difficulty of any assignment: formally the Lithuania Soviet republic has been a part of the Soviet Union’s national republics where the Russian republic represented one among others. See **Edward Said**: *Orientalism*. London 1978 and *Imperialism and Colonialism*. London 1993. In either book Said discusses the Orient as a projection of Western thinking.
- 5 See Sigitas Parulskis, *Trys sekundės dangaus*. Vilnius 2002. To depict his generation’s spiritual and moral emptiness Parulskis uses the metaphor of the *interspace*, calling it the topos of physical existence and “existential linguistics” where language operates on a vulgar level using a “non-Lithuanian” sign system. These “non-Lithuanian” signs, made of swear words of Russian and Turkish origin, represent the strange, the Non-European.
- 6 Meanwhile **Ivaškevičius** is well known in the Western European countries too. His Drama *Malbiš* (“The Small one”) was performed in France and Poland,

his Drama *Apgaubti* (Shielded) was produced in Düsseldorf. His novel *Istorija nuo debesies* (Story about a cloud, 1998) was translated into Polish in 2001, the novel *Žali* (The Greens, 2002) was translated into Russian. Furthermore there are translations into German in manuscript by Claudia Sinnig.

- 7 **Marius Ivaškevičius**, *Žali*. Vilnius 2002. Quotations are translated into English by myself. The English translation is checked against the Russian translation by Georgij Efremov.
- 8 *Ibid.*, 117: „Jie buvo jie, o mes buvome mes, kare šito turi užtekti.“
- 9 *Ibid.*, 118: „Nuo ryto ši karą įsivaizdavau vienareikšmiškai: priešas yra po mumis. Jis apsupamas ir sprogdinamas. Išminavimas, o ne karas.“
- 10 Herewith Ivaškevičius refers to the partly unfortunate structure of the Lithuanian partisan army, which enrolled men who had been included in the extermination of the Lithuanian Jews during the Nazi occupation: “[...] people fought for the Green. That is the color of our forests. Particularly, people marched against the Red – the color of the enemy’s blood. Although it happened, that the Yellows had to be protected of the Greens. It happened.” (See Ivaškevičius, Marius: *Žali*. Vilnius 2002, 5: „[...] žmonės kariavo už žalią. Tokia mūsų miškų spalva. Labiausiai jie kariavo prieš raudoną – tai priešų kraujo spalva. Nors pasitaikydavo ginti ir geltoną nuo žalios. Buvo ir taip.“)
- 11 *Ibid.*, 8. „Eilinis žmogus, nekaltas, kad gimė rusas [...], laimėjo didžiausią pasaulyje karą, jis eina per savo miestą, nes jis tą miestą apgynė. Ir staiga jį pasiekia gandas, kad kažkur jo šalies pakrašty esama išsigimėlių, užsimaniusių dar pakariauti. Aš to ruso vietoje, bet jeigu tik būčiau rusas, apie nieką daugiau negalvodamas, susikraučiau kuprinę ir važiuočiau pribaiigt išsigimėlių. Rusas taip ir padaro.“
- 12 *Ibid.*, 295: „– Jau laukiu, kada jie ateis, – prisipažino Pieninė. – Nes aš labai pavargau.“ See also p. 25: „Pasaulis nuobodžiai pasikartoja.“ (Žemaitis)
- 13 *Ibid.*, 33: „[...] jo lūpos tarė mano žodžius.“
- 14 Vasilij: “In Vorosilov there is just the same, [...]. Only the earth there is more peaceful. But the rivulet, one can say, is the same. Only the earth here is evil.” (*Ibid.*, p. 35: „Vorosilove – tokia pat, buvom užtvenkę, išlūžo. Tik ten žemė ramesnė. Nors upė gal ir tokia. O čia žemė pikta.“)
- 15 *Ibid.*, 28: „Bet žmonės nustojo jus painioti.“
- 16 *Ibid.*, 150: „Kodel iš tikrųjų mes čia?“
- 17 *Ibid.*, 152: „Man irgi reikia žinoti, už ka, po galais, aš kovuju.“
- 18 *Ibid.*, p. 204: “Tai, – nusispyjoviau. – Ir dėl to reikėjo atsikraustyti čia iš Uralo?“
- 19 *Ibid.*, p. 217: „Pagalvojau, dėl ko mes čia? – sakau Kasperavičius [...].“
- 20 *Ibid.*, p. 314: „Tai vis dar Prancūzija, Žemaiti.“
- 21 As the action progresses, somebody called Žemaitis (who is the partisan leader and as his Doppelgänger a simple peasant) is repeatedly found and kidnapped, just to disappear again. Right unto the end it is not clear in which shape the “genuine” Žemaitis will reappear or be resurrected. Žemaitis, the partisan leader, believes about himself that he could have been the umpteenth combination of the different men his comrade, the milk woman (pieninė), might have had.

²² Let's have a look at the Doppelgänger: Ivaškevičius' fictitious character of the Lithuanian peasant Žemaitis falls into the clutches of world politics, as soon as he tries to abduct from the hospital the sick wife of Žemaitis the partisan leader. But he fails. So, the Soviet secret service stages him as a traitor and uses him as a decoy to trap the partisan leader Žemaitis, who tries to take his revenge on Žemaitis the peasant.

The peasant's torture by the Secret service is revealed by the remark that the peasant has turned grey within a day. On the cart steered by the farmer Žemaitis, the partisan leader's mate, Kasparevičius, is again taken to the hospital. The Russians believe him to be the partisan leader and draw him into a fight in which his beloved is killed. The peasant Žemaitis seems to be responsible for it ("This Žemaitis served us perfectly." See *ibid.*, 43: „Šitas Žemaitis mums labiau nusipelno [...]“). Žemaitis rides the partisan Kasperavičius into a trap ("Can she shoot?", *Ibid.*, 87: „Šaudyti moka?“). Žemaitis, the farmer, reports Marja Petrovna, the Russian examining magistrate, the fulfilment of the job: "Lady commander, I brought you there, where you commanded me to." (*Ibid.*, 138: „Ponia tardytoja, atvežiau ten, kur įsakėt.“)

²³ *Ibid.*, 112: „Nes aš ir esu tas kitas.“

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 153: „Aš jūsų reikalų neišmanau, – staiga susierzino Seras. – Jei man sako: dusins raudonus, aš einu ir perku žalius. Aš tų šifrų visų nesimokiai.“

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 26: „Mes užmušime vieną žmogų. Maudysimės pakeliui.“

²⁶ Žemaitis, it is said, fought this "second war" because of Elena, his wife; The Lithuanian Bartkus leaves his machine gun in the cottage of Žemaitis the peasant, from where his 70 year old mother will fire on the Russians whom she takes for partisans while riding like an Amazon on the gun (See p. 217).

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 159: „[...] ir tie, kas uždelsė su atostogomis, gaus laukti kito birželio.“

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 326: „Jonai, – sako bičiulis, – mudu išgyvenom baisų laiką. Mudu vienas kitam jį užtaisėm.“

²⁹ *Ibid.*: „Tokia visa sistema.“

³⁰ Tyškevič – a representative of the Polish speaking Lithuanian aristocracy. His family owned many palaces and gardens in Lithuania. Tyškevič was a great patron of the arts, a Maecenas of M.K. Čiurlionis.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 221: „Tokie buvo, grafe, laikai.“

³² Žemaitis, the partisan leader, asks himself, whether he is able to assert that the purpose of his war "is a good one", that it is all that they can do "for our children and grandchildren", and that it "will create jobs for everybody". (*Ibid.*, 151: „[...] ir kas toks būčiau, sakydamas: geras karas, dar užteks vaikams ir vaikaičiams, darbo turės visi.“)

³³ *Ibid.*, 108: „Žinai, kas yra šitas karas? Mums išsprūdo pilnas stiklainis.“

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 159: „Krūtys nė vienai dar nepakenkė, – visu rimumu kalba ji. – Statulos – ne išimtis. Ir jokia laisvė be jų neapsieis.“

³⁵ See Mar'ja Petrovna's, the corporal's, letter, where she reflects her life, destroyed by war and Nazi occupation, as a woman and human being, not allowing her to develop any femininity or delicacy of feeling ("There are no women in my age-group", p. 85). *Ibid.*, 143: „Kai pilnametystė sutampa su karo pradžia,

moters arba lieka vaikais, arba pasiverčia vyrais. Dvidešimt trečiųjų gimimo neteko sutikt nė vienos, kuri būtų tapusi moterim. *Mano amžiaus moterų kaip ir nėra.*“; See also *Ibid.*, 310: „Dvidešimt penktųjų gimimo moteris – visai kas kita.“)

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 325: „Su viskuo sutinku, pripažįstu.“

³⁷ Natalija: “[...] how can you betray without changing yourself?” (*Ibid.*, 224: „[...] kad galima šitaip išduoti ir kartu neišduoti.“).