Bronislava Kerbelytė: Innovator of Folktale Research

Dedicated to the memory of Bronislava Kerbelytė (1935–2024)

Jūratė Šlekonytė

Senior researcher, Department of Folk Narrative, Institute of Lithuanian Literature and Folklore, Vilnius, Lithuania

E-mail: jurates@llti.lt

Abstract: This article presents the scholarly legacy of Bronislava Kerbelytė (1935–2024), a pioneering Lithuanian folklorist whose lifelong work significantly advanced the study of narrative folklore. Kerbelytė developed a unique methodology of structural-semantic text analysis, which redefined the classification of Lithuanian folktales, belief legends, local legends and anecdotes. Her approach challenged the limitations of the Aarne-Thompson (AT/ATU) and Proppian systems by introducing the concept of elementary plots, fundamental narrative units based on causality and semantic coherence. This method was applied to the extensive Catalogue of Lithuanian Narrative Folklore, covering over 85,000 texts. Although complex, her system offers deep insights into the thematic structure and cultural significance of folktales, revealing patterns in plot variation and human behaviour across narratives. Despite some international criticism regarding clarity and practicality, Kerbelytė's work is praised for its originality and empirical rigor. Her contributions have influenced both national and international folkloristics, offering new perspectives on narrative analysis and folklore comparison. This article not only evaluates her methodology

but also commemorates her role as a teacher, scholar, and leading figure in the field of folklore research.

Keywords: narrative folklore, methodology of structural-semantic text analysis, Lithuanian folktales, Catalogue of Lithuanian Narrative Folklore, elementary plot.

Introduction

Last autumn, the world of science suffered a great loss when the famous scientist, folklorist and expert on Lithuanian narrative folklore, Bronislava Kerbelytė (1935–2024), passed away just short of celebrating her 90th birthday. Although Kerbelytė has completed her earthly journey, her meaningful life is evident through the impressive number of scientific works, popular science articles and folklore collections she leaves behind.

Kerbelytė took a long, consistent, path in her journey to scientific heights. She didn't have to search for or select that path. Born in a village in central Lithuania, she lived in an environment steeped in folklore from childhood: her grandmother was a great storyteller of traditional tales and even a charmer. It was a happy coincidence that led her to the Department of Folkloristics at the Philological Faculty of Moscow's M. Lomonosov University, where many excellent professors taught courses in linguistics and literature. Here the future scientist gained knowledge of Slavic and Asian folklore.

After graduating from university, she returned to Lithuania and started working at the Institute of Lithuanian Language and Literature. She then went on to prepare and defend her dissertation, titled "Lithuanian Local Legends", at Vilnius University in 1965 (for more on the biography see Korzonaitė, Šlekonytė 2005a). From that moment Kerbelytė was completely dedicated to collecting and researching Lithuanian narrative folklore. During her time at the Institute (1963–1999), Kerbelytė produced her most significant scientific work and developed a distinctive methodology for the study of narrative folklore. In addition to her scientific work, the professor gave lectures to students at the Department of Ethnology and Folklore Studies at Vytautas Magnus University (1996–2010). Kerbelytė educated a large group of folklorists. Some students who were interested in folklore topics chose to pursue further educa-

tion under the professor's guidance. They wrote and defended their dissertations and continue to work in the field of folkloristics.

Thus, the professor devoted her entire life to the study of folklore. Even after retiring, she continued to compile one collection of Lithuanian folklore after another and translated the folklore of other nations into Lithuanian. She is the author of more than two dozen scientific books and several hundred articles in Lithuanian, Russian, Polish, German and English (for more scientific works see Korzonaitė, Šlekonytė 2005b, Balsys 2010). Kerbelytė also prepared a number of folklore sources that enrich the understanding of the Lithuanian narrative tradition and open up broader perspectives for its research.

It is also important to acknowledge Kerbelytė active participation in scientific conferences and seminars for teachers, as well as her interesting public lectures. Her contribution to Lithuanian folklore studies, and to culture in general, is immeasurable. Her scientific work will be an inexhaustible source for current and future Lithuanian scholars.

Kerbelytė established contacts with foreign scientists, taking an interest in their research. Cooperation with foreign folklorists developed into closer relations. Kerbelytė was accepted into international folklorist organisations[1], was a member of the editorial board of periodicals[2], and wrote commissioned articles for the *Enzyklopädie des Märchens* (the Encyclopedia of the Folktale)[3]. It should be noted that Kerbelytė's active participation in the international scientific community was also motivated by personal incentives. She developed a unique methodology for studying narrative folklore and wanted to present it to foreign folklorists for an assessment of its effectiveness and value to narrative research.

This article aims to present Kerbelytė's contribution to narrative folklore research and evaluate her structural-semantic text analysis methodology, which she considered to be the core of her research and the most important work of her life.

Figure 1. Bronislava Kerbelytė delivering a scientific report in Klaipėda University. 15 November 2012. Photo by Žilvytis Šaknys.

The prerequisites for the emergence of a new method of narrative research

At the beginning of the 20th century the historical-geographical method flourished. This method of analysis was particularly actively applied to the study of folktales. Using this method, motifs of a certain type are distinguished and analysed from a spatial and temporal perspective: the locations of motifs are marked on a map and the time of their recording is specified, thus attempting to determine the place of origin of the motifs, the direction of their spread, and the most archaic form. The historical-geographical method has encouraged comparative historical studies of the similarities, interactions, and influences of folktales of various nations.

However, despite significant achievements, the shortcomings of this method eventually became apparent. There was unevenness of the material under study – folktales are assigned to a particular type due to one or another feature or recurring motif – producing vague research results.

Gradually, the need to create abstract models and structures to help us better understand and explore folktales arose. Vladimir Propp, a Russian scholar, is one of the most important representatives of structuralism. After analysing the plots of Russian tales of magic collected by Alexander Afanasyev, Propp

created a typical narrative scheme, which he described in the monograph *Morphology of the Folktale* (Propp 1928). Propp divided folktales into their smallest structural parts, which he called functions, and concluded that folktales consist of thirty-one functions arranged in a consistent sequence. This method of folktale analysis proved attractive and even gained a number of followers. For example, the American folklore professor Alan Dundes developed Propp's ideas, distinguishing a new unit of narrative structure, the motifeme. This allows for a freer interpretation of the structure of a folktale (Dundes 1962). In his analysis of folktales, Dundes combined structuralism and psychoanalysis.

These were the prevailing trends in narrative research at the time that Kerbelytė started working at the Institute of Lithuanian Language and Literature. The director of the institute asked her to prepare a prospectus for a new catalogue of narrative folklore. At that time, a large array of narrative folklore had accumulated in the folklore archive of this institution. The oldest manuscripts date back to the end of the 19th century. Folklore was actively collected during the interwar period and this work continued during Soviet-era expeditions. Kerbelytė faced a great deal of work to identify works of narrative folklore and thus create favourable conditions for their systematic study.

Kerbelytė began to systematise folktales according to the internationally recognised Aarne-Thompson (AT)[4] classification system. Unfortunately, the system used in this catalogue to identify and assign folktales to certain types proved inconvenient for her. According to this system, a folktale is treated as a set of components (motifs). The concept of motif, its defining characteristics, and its boundaries have been, and continue to be, subjects of debate among scholars. For example, the American scientist Stith Thompson claimed that "A motif is the smallest element in a tale having a power to persist in tradition. In order to have this power it must have something unusual and striking about it" (Thompson 1946: 415). Based on such a definition, it is difficult to accurately assess what the boundaries of a motif are and what it is. In this case, a motif can be both an action and an object.

While working with this classification system, Kerbelytė found that many works either did not correspond to the reference type descriptions, or only corresponded partially. The system also seemed confusing because it was difficult to find the right folktale. This was because they were assigned to specific types based on a specific storyline, rather than by evaluating their abstract semantic meanings. Nevertheless, it became increasingly clear that this work required

the use of abstract structures to allow related folktales to be discovered and grouped together.

It became clear that a more precise tool was needed to classify folktales. Kerbelytė turned to the ideas proposed by Propp in *Morphology of the Folktale*, which were extremely popular in the scientific world at that time. According to Propp, a fairy tale (tale of magic) can be divided into composite units, or 'functions'. At the theoretical level, this system divided folktales into abstracted units and therefore satisfied the condition raised by Kerbelytė. However, unfortunately this research method did not meet expectations and proved ineffective. This is a more theoretical model that is practically inapplicable (perhaps this is why Propp, the creator of the method, did not develop a system for classifying folktales). The obstacle to using Propp's classification system turned out to be simple: he used a general linear scheme to study folktales despite the fact that this does not accurately reflect their structure. According to this theoretical model, the functions must be arranged in a specific, unchangeable order. Unfortunately, folktale plots do not always correspond to this model in reality, leaving the researcher faced with the question of how to analyse non-standard works. Due to this limitation, Kerbelytė later strongly criticised Propp's research after developing her own research methodology (Kerbelytė 1991, 2015).

Kerbelytė based her criticism on rich empirical experience. By conducting field research, taking notes on new folklore works from storytellers, and systematising manuscript versions of narratives, Kerbelytė became very familiar with the range of Lithuanian narrative folklore[5]. She delved particularly deeply into folktale plots and their variations, identifying trends in how plots could change. She gradually refined her vision of how the text of folktales (and other narratives) should be broken down and how these texts should be analysed to reveal their essence. Kerbelytė began to look for a new way to analyse and classify works of narrative folklore by reading and comparing them. She viewed folktales as profound, multi-dimensional works. Texts are composed of structural units that are connected by causal relationships. These relationships are not only linear, but also interpenetrate each other. The composite parts of folktales can form a mosaic. All that was needed was to give this vision a material form, to describe the structural units of the tale and the principles of their identification. Kerbelytė also faced the most difficult task of all in the creation of a new system of text classification.

Figure 2. Bronislava Kerbelytė records folklore from Ona Gedminienė in the village of Paskynai (Jurbarkas district) in 1967. (LTRFt 3974)

Structural-semantic text analysis methodology and its application to the creation of catalogues

Analysis of folktales and the creation of folktale catalogues was based on the idea that folktales have a relatively stable narrative core consisting of interconnected motifs (GEFF 3: 938), with motif understood as the smallest element of a folktale that exist in the traditional narrative. These motifs are then combined into larger units of the folktale plot known as 'episodes'.

When developing a methodology of structural-semantic text analysis, Kerbelytė observed that the concept of motif, which is widely used as a structural narrative unit, is characterised by heterogeneity. The concept of motif can refer to a character's activities and the full range of his or her actions, as well as the description of the situation (Kerbelytė 1991: 18). Thus, having critically evaluated the classification principles of previous folktale researchers and the laws of tradition revealed by many folklorists, Kerbelytė formulated one of the most important insights: "Each folktale type changes over time". Therefore, it is pointless to compare the variants with each established 'ideal' plot model (Kerbelytė 2011: 29). The conclusion has consistently been reached that, in

narrative plots, the most stable elements should be sought out, as their role in organising the elements of the work into a harmonious whole is the most important. Such elements can be identified by analysing a wide range of folktales and legends. Kerbelytė first turned her attention to tales of magic as the genre with the most interesting and diverse motifs. After analysing more than 12,000 variants, she divided tales with magic plots into smaller parts (see more: Kerbelytė 1991). This is how the concept of the elementary plot as a smaller unit of a folktale was formulated. An elementary plot (EP) is either an independent work or a fragment of a larger work which depicts a single encounter between the hero and antagonist as the hero achieves his or her goal (ibid.: 30–31). We would describe this as a kind of cell within a folktale. Using this method, the folktale is divided into EPs, with the most important one being identified. This forms the semantic core of the folktale, according to which folktales are classified. The semantics of an EP is explained using three-level abstraction.

Thus, after many years of researching folktales, the structural-semantic methodology of text analysis was developed. The next step was to apply this methodology to other works of Lithuanian narrative folklore, such as different types of folktale, belief legend and local legend.

It is important to note that the methodology of structural-semantic text analysis is not only applied to text analysis, but also underlies the classification of narratives. This approach is based on the creation of a significant publication, the four-volume Catalogue of Lithuanian Narrative Folklore (KbLPTK 1–4), which summarises information on over 85,000 folklore texts. This catalogue includes folktales, belief legends, local legends, orations and life stories. An intermediate variant was applied to the classification of folktales, combining the old AT system with the identification of elementary plot types (KbLPTK 1–2). The indexes of elementary plots provided at the end of the books reveal a broader picture of the variations in the structure and semantics of folklore works.

Meanwhile, belief and local legends have been classified using the system created by Kerbelytė. They are also published using the same principle in the English–Russian Catalogue of Lithuanian Legends (KbTNS). The catalogue of Lithuanian folktales, which was later published in Russian and English, was organised according to the new system of elementary plot types (KbTS, KbSSTLT).

Thus, the classification of Lithuanian narrative folklore has gradually shifted towards identifying elementary plot types. This represents a significant development in the field of international folkloristics, which traditionally relied on the AT (or updated ATU) system for classifying folktale texts.

Jūratė Šlekonytė

Advantages and disadvantages of the new method in the context of international folkloristics

In folklore studies, each research method is a tool that should help effectively analyse texts. Structural-semantic text analysis provides an opportunity to take a fresh look at folktales, examining their structure and semantics. These two aspects enable researchers to evaluate the purpose of the folklore works, considering what they meant to the storytellers and the reasons why they were told. Having discovered a way to analyse, summarise, abstract and semantically interpret a wide range of folklore material, new opportunities have emerged for exploring the deeper meanings of narratives and, more precisely, for comparing folklore works of different genres and nations.

Although Kerbelytė used complex semantic language to describe the abstract levels of texts when applying this methodology, the research results were nevertheless presented in simple, easy-to-understand categories. For example, after studying 12,000 Lithuanian tales of magic and evaluating their semantic meanings, Kerbelytė identified five main human aspirations reflected in tale plots:

1) the desire to be free and unconstrained by the environment, or to control it;
2) the desire to have the necessities of life, or to seek comfort;
3) the desire to be an equal member of a tribe or society, or to seek high status;
4) the desire to find an ideal marriage partner;
5) the desire to have harmonious relationships within a tribe, family, or society (Kerbelytė 1991: 94–95).

The analysis revealed the pragmatic purpose of folktales and their clear connection with legends, as both genres document the rules of human behaviour. After the entire systematised Lithuanian narrative folklore (including folktales, legends and anecdotes) was abstracted, the exact number of elementary plot types became clear at 152 (Kerbelytė 2011: 34).

The summarised material shows that people took folktales seriously and treated them as a source of knowledge about the environment and about behavioural patterns. Kerbelytė emphasised the didactic value of these works in particular. An in-depth analysis of folktales revealed how these works were affected by new social problems and how new plot elements emerged as a re-

sult. Structural-semantic analysis provides better opportunities for comparing similar plots in folktales and legends from different nations, and for answering the question of why such similarities are found in the folklore of neighbouring countries and distant nations that have never had contact. Additionally, research based on a new method of text analysis has shown that it is possible to distinguish between falsified and reworked literary folktale plots. This is particularly important when evaluating unique folklore works to assess the competence and honesty of the collector of a folklore text. Additionally, the new method of studying folktales enables researchers to identify variations and trends in plot development, and even predict how plots might evolve.

Kerbelytė's first monograph, which revealed the essence of structural-semantic analysis, was published in Russian, significantly expanding the circle of readers. Meanwhile, the Catalogue of Lithuanian Narrative Folklore was published in Lithuanian, with no concise annotations of the types of folktale provided in any international language. Therefore, for a long time, the layers of Lithuanian narrative folklore were *terra incognita* for foreign folklorists. This changed radically with the publication of the aforementioned bilingual catalogue of Lithuanian legend types, as well as the catalogue of Lithuanian folktale types in Russian.

A little later, in a prestigious series, a collection of Lithuanian folktales was published in English, presenting them in two volumes. The published system of folktale and legend classification attracted the attention of folklorists both for its valuable new material and for its original method of presentation (Janeček 2017). However, these publications have not escaped criticism. The catalogues of belief legends (Jason 2002) and folktale types (Jason 2017) have been criticised for inaccurately translating some formulations into English. Another reviewer found the new folktale typology limited, stating that "the categories often seem somewhat arbitrary". He noted that elementary plots are not distinctive enough to justify a general typology of folktales. Kerbelytė's system really does not seem to be an independent classification system, but rather a system to be used together with AT/ATU. At the same time, he noted that the AT/ATU classification actually provides a more accurate representation of the narrative's nature, both structurally and semantically. However, the reviewer acknowledged that Kerbelytė's work contains a great deal of useful information about the extensive collection of Lithuanian folktales, although this

information could only be obtained by studying the new folktale classification patiently (Gay 2016).

One remark can be added to these observations. By dividing narratives into smaller units, i.e. elementary plots, Kerbelytė ignored the fact that Thompson's six-volume *Motif Index of Folk Literature* (MIFL) had been published. This work collects information about the constituent parts of texts, i.e. motifs, as identified in various folklore texts (especially folktales). Thompson distinguished and classified motifs conceptually into twenty-three groups, encompassing both supernatural and real-life phenomena. This classification made it possible to identify similar motifs in works of folklore from different genres. This has had a significant impact on comparative narrative studies. Of course, one could debate whether motif or elementary plot is a more effective unit of comparison. As an analysis has not yet been conducted, we will leave this question for the future.

One of the shortcomings of the methodology developed by Kerbelytė is its complexity, and this should be emphasised. Both the identification of narrative structures and their abstract language are quite difficult to understand for folklorists. A researcher of folktales who is not familiar with the new system will face the major puzzle of how to navigate an array of tales arranged in an unfamiliar way. This is different from the internationally used system that has been in place for many years. In order to start using this catalogue, it is necessary to become thoroughly familiar with its theoretical basis, i.e., to read the introduction to the book, and even better the book, as it justifies the effectiveness of this system (Kerbelytė 1991). Fortunately, the links between the new system and the AT classification are presented at the end of the book, which makes the work somewhat easier.

Will this system find its way into the research of other scholars? On the one hand, the information summarised in the new classification of Lithuanian folktales and legends will be analysed and incorporated into comparative narrative research. The Structural-Semantic Types of Lithuanian Folk Tale could become something similar to Thompson's catalogue of motifs, which contains valuable information that can be used to identify similarities. However, it is difficult to say whether structural-semantic text analysis methodology itself will become a tool for scientific research. Let's leave that for the future.

Figure 3. Professor Bronislava Kerbelytė and Dr Jūratė Šlekonytė with scientists from the S. S. Surazakov (Gorno Altajsk) Altaic Studies Research Institute in 2008.

Conclusions

Bronislava Kerbelytė undertook the enormous task of recording, identifying, classifying and studying Lithuanian narrative folklore. Through her research, she significantly expanded our understanding of the plots of folktales, belief legends, local legends and anecdotes, as well as their variations and development. Perhaps her greatest contribution to folkloristics research was her study of Lithuanian tales of magic. She knew these tales not only theoretically, but also through first-hand experience during field research, where she observed how they were performed and how they functioned in people's everyday lives.

The professor formulated universal laws governing the structure of folktales and other folk prose works. She created rules for the semantic interpretation of their elements and compiled a descriptive dictionary. She also identified basic plots – the fundamental components of folk narrative structure –, enabling her to conduct in-depth research into folktales and legends, making significant discoveries in the process. While this system, which was used to create a catalogue of Lithuanian narrative folklore, will probably not replace the AT/ATU system of folktale classification, it will nevertheless be useful as an auxiliary typology for researchers of Lithuanian and comparative folklore.

It is important to note that Kerbelytė not only became a prominent figure among Lithuanian folklore researchers, but also inscribed her name in global folklore research. She actively promoted her research at international conferences, giving lectures to foreign students and publishing her monumental research in Russian and English.

Only time will tell if the international scientific community will evaluate structural-semantic text analysis positively and recognise it as an effective instrument for text research. However, one thing is certain: the methodology of structural-semantic analysis has already been recorded in the history of folkloristics as a way of studying folklore narratives.

Notes

[1] Member of the International Society for Folk Narrative Research (ISFNR), full member of the Folklore Fellows (Finland).

[2] *Humanitaro zinatnu vestnesis* (Latvia) and *Estudos de Literatura Oral* (Portugal).

[3] This German research project (1980–2015) on international folkloristics comprises fifteen volumes and is widely regarded as the most comprehensive work in its field. It was published by the Göttingen Academy of Sciences. It is a reference book that presents the results of almost two centuries of international research into past and present folktale traditions in detail. It covers all forms of popular storytelling, including folktales, legends, religious tales and humorous stories (EF).

[4] By the way, this systematisation work was started in interwar Lithuania, by Jonas Balys, who systematised 16,000 works of narrative folklore and published a catalogue based on his work (BLPTMK), so Kerbelytė continued the work he had begun.

[5] Kerbelytė systematically organised more than 85 thousand variants of folktales, legends and anecdotes published and preserved in the Lithuanian Folklore Archive in the index of the Lithuanian Narrative Folklore Catalogue.

Abrevations

AT – The Types of Folktale: A Classification and Bibliography, Antti Aarne's Verzeichnis der Märchentypen, translated and enlarged by Stith Thompson. FF Communications, 1964, No. 184.

ATU – Uther, Hans-Jörg 2004. The Types of International Folktales: A Classification and Bibliography, part I: Animal Tales, Tales of Magic, Religious Tales and Realistic Tales, with an Introduction; part II: Tales of the Stupid Ogre, Anecdotes and Jokes, and Formula Tales; part III: Appendices. FF Communications, No. 284–286.

BLPTMK – Balys, Jonas 1936. Lietuvių pasakojamosios tautosakos motyvų katalogas (Motif-Index of Lithuanian Narrative Folklore). Tautosakos darbai, Vol. 2.

EF – Encyclopedia of the Folktale https://adw-goe.de/en/enzmaer/

GEFF – Haase D. (ed.) 2008. The Greenwood Encyclopedia of Folktales and Fairy Tales, 3 vols. Westport (Connecticut), London: Greenwood Press.

KbLPTK – Kerbelytė Bronislava. Lietuvių pasakojamosios tautosakos katalogas (The Catalogue of Lithuanian Narrative Folklore), Vol. 1: Pasakos apie gyvūnus. Pasakėčios. Stebuklinės pasakos (Animal Tales. Fables. Tales of Magic), Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 1999; Vol. 2: Pasakos-legendos. Parabolės. Novelinės pasakos. Pasakos apie kvailą velnią. Buitinės pasakos. Melų pasakos. Formulinės pasakos. Pasakos be galo (Religious Tales. Exempla. Realistic Tales. Tales of the Stupid Ogre. Anecdotes and Jokes. Tall Tales. Formula Tales. Catch Tale), Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas; Vol. 3: Etiologinės sakmės. Mitologinės sakmės. Padavimai. Legendos (Origin Legends. Belief legends. Local Legends. Legends), Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2002; Vol. 4: Pasakojimai. Anekdotai. Oracijos (Life Stories. Anecdotes. Orations). Kaunas: Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto leidykla, 2009.

KbSSTLT –Kerbelytė, Bronislava 2015. The Structural-Semantic Types of Lithuanian Folk Tales: Vol. 1 (FF Communications 308), Vol. 2 (FF Communications 309). Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.

KbTNS – Kerbelytė, Bronislava 2001. Tipy narodnykh skazaniy: strukturno-semanticheskaya klassifikatsiya litovskikh etiologicheskikh i mifologicheskikh skazaniy i predaniy =The Types of Folk Legends: the Structural-Semantic Classification of Lithuanian Legends. Sankt-Peterburg: Yevropeyskiy dom.

KbTS – Kerbelytė, Bronislava 2005. Tipy narodnykh skazok. Strukturno-semanticheskaya klassifikatsiya litovskikh narodnykh skazok (Types of Folk Tale: Structural-Semantic Classification of Lithuanian Folk Tales), Vol. 1–2. Moskva: RGGU.

LTRFt – Lithuanian Folklore Archives at the Institute of Lithuanian Literature and Folklore (photograph collections)

ThMIFL – Thompson, Stith (ed.) 1955–1958. Motif-Index of Folk Literature: A Classification of Narrative Elements in Folktales, Ballads, Myths, Fables, Medieval Romances, Exempla, Fabliaux, Jest-Books and Local Legends, Vol. 1–6. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger.

References

Dundes, Alan 1962. From Etic to Emic Units in the Structural Study of Folktales. *Journal of American Folklore*, Vol. 75, No. 296, pp. 95–104.

Kerbelytė, Bronislava 1991. *Istoricheskoye razvitiye struktur i semantiki skazok: na materiale litovskikh volshebnykh skazok* (Historical Development of the Structure and Semantics of Folktales: Based on Lithuanian Tales of Magic). Vilnius: Vaga.

Kerbelytė, Bronislava 2011. *Tautosakos kūrinių prasmės* (The Meaning of Lithuanian Folklore Works). Kaunas: Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas.

Kerbelytė, Bronislava 2015. Neosushchestvlennaya ideya klassifikatsii skazok (Zametki o «Morfologii skazki» V. YA. Proppa) (The Unrealised Idea of Classifying Folktales (Notes on the "Morphology of the Folktale" by V. Propp)). In: A. Toporkov (ed.) *Neizvestnyye stranitsy russkoy fol'kloristiki* (Unknown Pages of Russian Folklore Studies). Moskva: Indrik, pp. 230–244.

Korzonaitė, Edita; Šlekonytė, Jūratė 2005a. Pasakų išminties skleidėja (The Spreader of Folktale Wisdom). *Tautosakos darbai*, Vol. 22 (29), pp. 294–297.

Korzonaitė, Edita; Šlekonytė, Jūratė 2005b. Bronislavos Kerbelytės darbų bibliografija [Bibliography of Scientific Publications by Bronislava Kerbelytė]. *Tautosakos darbai*, Vol. 22 (29), pp. 298–313.

Balsys, Rimantas 2010. Pagrindinių mokslinių publikacijų sąrašas 2005–2009 m. (List of Main Scientific Publications 2005–2009). *Res Humanitariae*, Vol. 7, pp. 287–289.

Gay, David Elton 2016. Review of Bronislava Kerbelytė "The Structural-Semantic Types of Lithuanian Folk Tales, Vol. I & II (Folklore Fellows Communications 308)". *Journal of Folklore Research Reviews*. https://scholarworks.iu.edu/journals/index.php/jfrr/article/view/38470

Janeček, Petr 2017. Bronislava Kerbelytė, The Structural Semantic Types of Lithuanian Folk Tales. Volume I. Genres and Tale Types. Volume II. The Classification and Index of Elementary Plots and Their Types. Folklore Fellows' Communications 308. Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia – Academia Scientiarum Fennica 2015, 477 s., 331 s. *Český lid* 104 (3), pp. 527–528.

Jason, Heda 2002. KERBELITE BRONISLAVA. Tipi Narodnyh Skazanij. The Types of Folk Legends. The Structural-Semantic Classification of Lithuanian Aetiological, Mythological and Historical Legends. St. Petersburg: Evropejskij Dom, 2001. Russian text by B. Kerbelite; English text by I. Antanaitis and A. Chistova. *Asian Folklore Studies*, Vol. 61, No. 1, pp. 177–179.

Jason, Heda 2017. Kerbelyte, Bronislava. Structural-Semantic Types of Lithuanian Folk Tales. Vol. I, *Genres and Tale Types* 2015. *Fabula*, Vol. 58, No. 3–4, 2015, pp. 403– 405. https://doi.org/10.1515/fabula-2017-0037

Propp, Vladimir 1928. *Morfologiya skazki* [Morphology of the Folktale]. Leningrad: Academia.

Thompson, Stith 1946. *The Folktale*. New York: The Dryden Press.

Jūratė Šlekonytė, PhD, is a senior researcher at Institute of Lithuanian Literature and Folklore, Department of Folk Narrative. Her main research interests are Lithuanian folk narratives; archiving, classification of folktales; Lithuanian tales of magic; folktales and their storytelling contexts.

E-mail: jurates@llti.lt

ORCID: 0000-0002-8023-6114