Rūta Stanevičiūtė-Goštautienė

Narratives of Lithuanian National Music: Origins and Values

The Historiography of Music and National Music History Writing

In the current musicological discussion on the issues of historiography and the need to overcome the entrenched canons of historical writing, questions concerning the history of national music often become marginalised, and, to some extent, placed into a paradoxical situation. On the one hand, encouraged by the tendencies, which gained prominence in the last decades of the 20$^{\text{th}}$ century, that is, the critique of traditional methods in historical research and writing, and the deconstruction of their ideological foundations, the writers of new general histories of music increasingly tend to integrate the so-called peripheries. In the latter category, the music histories of smaller European nations found their place alongside the "suppressed" worlds of non-European cultures and women's art, the phenomena of non-academic music, and pre- and post-textual musical contexts (by those I refer, first of all, to the reproduction and reception of music). For example, a necessity for that was formulated a decade ago at the round table discussion of the 16$^{\text{th}}$ IMS Congress, which addressed historiography as it main theme.

Eurocentrism, combined with the concept of the main musical nations, will relegate the study of Western musical peripheries to the rank of regional or local studies with little relevance for the knowledge of "mainstream" history. If for no other reasons, however, the knowledge of musical life in the peripheries and its often complex relation with the main centres is certainly essential to our understanding of the spread and interaction of musical traditions, of the development of musical markets and musical industries (opera or music printing to give two examples). A musical history of the centre(s) which disregards the periph-

Page (PS/TeX): 40 / 26, COMPOSITE

eries will thus remain truncated and incomplete (Strohm 1997: 25).[1]

The attempt to avoid concentrating exclusively on the history of main musical nations and mainstream has clearly impacted upon the way new general histories were conceived and structured, which is especially obvious with regard to research of the 20th century music. A number of different recent writings (such as Taruskin 2005, Cook & Pople 2004) can also be mentioned in this respect. In most cases, however, music histories of the so-called small European nations were integrated as isolated territories of musical landscape, as strains of diversity, or additional arguments to ground certain ideas that developed in the so-called musical centres. This relates to a paradoxical position of national music histories, mentioned above, within general historiography, which might be primarily associated with the widespread habit to treat them solely within the context of nationalistic ideology. Treated this way, the histories of national music become dissociated from the fundamental issues of musical art and are bound to the aspects of nationalism, which commonly bear certain negative flavour. Thus music is turned into ideology's servant and instrument. The roots of such restrictive understanding of musical nationality can be traced in the work by the pioneers of academic musicology (such as Guido Adler and others); even musicologists of such fairly dialectical thought as Carl Dahlhaus did not escape it:

> it is precisely Russian, Czech, Hungarian and Norwegian historians of music who should be particularly sensitive about the concept of a 'national school', for the very expression implies, tacitly but unmistakably, that 'national' is alternative to 'universal' and that 'universal' was the prerogative of the 'central' musical nations. The term 'national school' is a concert admission that the phenomenon it describes is peripheral. (Dahlhaus 1980: 85)

Certainly, that not only caused marginalisation of national music histories within general music historiography, but also downplayed the prestige of investigating the spread of nationality in music. It is only in recent years that it is possible to witness

[1] The entire congress programme was dedicated to various traditions in musicology, to its current situation and future prospects, and to its relationships with other disciplines.

Page (PS/TeX): 41 / 27, COMPOSITE

the increase of interest and research in this area, which might have been spurred by the popularity that the new approaches to study of nationalism gained in the humanities and social sciences since the 1970s. According to the apt remark by Michael Murphy (Murphy 2001: 1), to testify the obvious change in this field the latest edition of *The New Grove Dictionary* included an exhaustive article on "Nationalism" written by Richard Taruskin, whose approach towards nationality in music is quite controversial.

Both recent general socio-humanist research and musicological studies show that no normative definitions of "nation" or "nationalism" exist nowadays. Within the diversity of ideas prompted by the new wave, two aspects are of special importance for present research. The first is Ernest Gellner's concept of nationalism as an attribute of the modern world (Gellner 1983). This means that nationalism and its cultural manifestations are part of the great project of modernity, inseparable from both political and social emancipation and modernisation of art. This aspect became particularly important in revisions of national music histories in the 20th century, when neo- and post-folk music tendencies were quite radically separated from the innovations of modernism and avant-garde. The second aspect relevant for present research concerns a popular distinction between Western and Eastern European nationalisms, with an emphasis on a more cultural nature of Eastern European nationalisms, not necessarily related to the official state structures (Murphy 2001: 3). This provides an opportunity to explore and verify the political aspirations of artistic phenomena and discourses defining them during the years of political oppression and ideological constraints.

Narratives of Lithuanian Music History: Origins and Key Tendencies

Within this theoretical context just outlined, narratives of Lithuanian music history represent a fairly symptomatic phenomenon. First of all, it is obvious that nationalism here unfolds as a sub-discourse of modernistic ideology. This was, beyond doubt, also determined by the fact that the "shortened" version of Lithuanian music history, which formed within the ideological

Page (PS/TeX): 42 / 28, COMPOSITE

framework of 20th-century nationalism (that is, history of Lithuania's national music), was confined to the 20th century. (Whereas speaking of professional musical art, its roots in Lithuanian cultural history reach back to the Late Middle Ages.) In this respect both national tradition and Lithuanian varieties of avant-garde and modernism were formed mostly in the course of the 20th century alone. This caused a continuing search for the ways the national interacts with the modern both within musical practices and musicological discourses that helped legitimate them. Like in many other Eastern and Central European countries, it was not until the second half of the 20th century that such phenomena were canonised. In a surprising concurrence of events, nearly all canons of national music – including both new music and national classics – were formed in Lithuania during the same period and their creators and legitimators came from the same circle of musicians and musicologists. Due to the above, traditional representations of the formed national tradition have influenced the way modern Lithuanian music was validated in musical criticism and musicology in the 1960s and 1970s.[2]

The role of musicology in grounding canonical versions of Lithuanian music during the period in question had not been thoroughly examined. Recent writings nonetheless show an increasing interest in the images of composers, historical narratives and hierarchies of value that had been created at the time and endured to this very day (e. g., Gruodytė 2005, Nakas 2003a, Nakas 2003b). Certainly, it was due to political situation of the time that the Lithuanian music canons acquired essentially discursive character: ideological and cultural constraints imposed by the Soviet Union have notably debased and distorted the contribution of other factors of music reproduction and reception to these processes (primarily of traditional institutions, such as concert organisations, education system, etc.). Musicology did not escape the compromise either. However, it was during the 1960s and 1970s that the fundamental musicological approaches towards interpretation of musical tradition were formed under the influence of diverse aesthetic and historiographic concepts.

[2] On the formation of Lithuanian music's canons and the canonising of the Lithuanian musical mainstream of the 1970s, see Goštautienė 2006.

Page (PS/TeX): 43 / 29, COMPOSITE

In this respect, two key tendencies might be distinguished, represented by the writings of musicologists Vytautas Landsbergis (1932) and Algirdas Ambrazas (1934). Their articles and books provide different interpretations of works by various composers and general processes in Lithuanian music, forming more generalised conceptions that might be regarded as emblematic versions of the spread of national self-consciousness in musicology.

Before turning to the writings by the aforementioned scholars, a few words should be said about the musicological context of their work in Lithuania. It is important, since neither of the authors had produced a generalised study of Lithuanian music history. Strange enough, for the only comprehensive history was published in several volumes between 1958 and 1964 (Gaudrimas 1958–67).[3] This book was for the most part written by academician Juozas Gaudrimas – an important official figure of the time, who attempted to integrate the method of historical materialism into the study of general Lithuanian music history. No wonder that the musicological writings of both Ambrazas and Landsbergis, the representatives of younger generation and opponents of Gaudrimas, have appeared as attempts to revise the official versions of Lithuanian music history, that is, they were driven by the need to distinguish between Lithuanian musical phenomena and Soviet ideological approach, and to emphasise the artistic and cultural nature of the development of music.

Both musicologists discussed here grounded their conceptions on two fundamental ideas: tradition of national music as part of a modernisation project and the possibility of defining national identity through the means of music. It shall be noted that these ideas are part of more extensive modernity project and, in their own right – its derivatives, resulting from the so-called great modernistic narratives. Here the aspirations of inventing tradition (to use the term of Eric Hobsbawm [Hobsbawm & Ranger 1983]) are inseparable from its constant need for modernisation, yet the

[3] Though edited by Gaudrimas, the third volume contains only a few entries by him. Most chapters were written by other Lithuanian musicologists, although the general structure of the collection follows the typical Soviet stereotypes of historical writing and artistic hierarchies as chosen by the editor.

Page (PS/TeX): 44 / 30, COMPOSITE

successions of predecessors and followers were determined by individual explications of musical evolution.

The institutional frame dominates the version provided by Ambrazas – a concept of national school, inseparable from the notion of national style. In his musicological research he allotted a special position to Lithuanian composers who had a major influence upon the development of the Lithuanian national music school, both in terms of musical language, as a stable set of rules to follow, and an institutional network. It is for this particular reason that Algirdas Ambrazas paid special attention to works and public life of Juozas Gruodis – a classic of Lithuanian music, head of many musical institutions and prominent composition teacher of the first half of the 20$^{\text{th}}$ century. Same motives prompted him to choose Julius Juzeliūnas as his next subject of research, who was one of leading figures in modernism of the latter half of the 20$^{\text{th}}$ century, influential teacher and theorist. In both cases, he detects the predecessors of certain stylistic trends and genres by examining individual works, and traces continuity of tradition based on confidence and strict observation of rules established by the teacher.[4]

The kind of framework, in which Landsbergis builds his historical narratives, might be described as symbolic. This musicologist focuses on charismatic personalities, cult figures or 'maverick' composers (Mikalojus Konstantinas Čiurlionis, Bronius Kutavičius, Feliksas Bajoras, Osvaldas Balakauskas), who invent tradition *ex nihilo*, or break existing rules. Such artist always steps over the artistic context of the time, defeats the standing rules and stereotypes. His or her creation unfolds as a generalisation of originality, an invention of individual idiom. It shall be noted that such individual findings are not limited to pursuit of artistic-technological inventions. All of them serve the spread of national identity, or, to paraphrase Benedict Anderson – creation of nation as a product of common cultural imagination, kind of collective subjectivity (Anderson 2006). Nationality here emerges as an ineffable insight into the nation's spirit, traces of which can be found in mysterious imprints – details, musical gestures, at-

[4]For a comprehensive list of Algirdas Ambrazas's publications, see Ambrazas 2007: 414–23.

Page (PS/TeX): 45 / 31, COMPOSITE

mospheres and symbolism of musical works. All these artists are not related through institutions and rules; the binding substance for them is the cultural soil itself, their esoteric insight into genuine creativity and understanding of their mission as creators. In this case, one may speak about a succession of predecessors and followers connected by creative insights and symbolic references rather than relationship between teachers and pupils conforming to patriarchal order.[5]

These factors comprising the narratives of Algirdas Ambrazas and Vytautas Landsbergis are illustrated in Figure 1.

	Algirdas Ambrazas	**Vytautas Landsbergis**
Framework	National style as representative of national school	National music as representative of national spirit
Categories	Stylistic trend Compositional rules Invention of genre	Individual idiom Intra/extramusical connotation Symbolic imprint
Featured composers	Founder of stylistic trend Influential teacher of composition	Charismatic innovator Cult figure
Mission	Creation of professional musical life/institutions Nationality as denominator of originality of musical language	Cultural and political emancipation National cultural imagination National identity as collective subjectivity

Figure 1. Narratives of Lithuanian National Music: Ambrazas *versus* Landsbergis

[5]For a comprehensive bibliography of Vytautas Landsbergis's publications from 1956 to 1996, see Landsbergis 1999. Despite his involvement in political activities (currently Vytautas Landsbergis is a member of the European Parliament), he still publishes on music and musicology.

Page (PS/TeX): 46 / 32, COMPOSITE

Ambrazas *versus* Landsbergis: Artistic Values and Political Positions

The principal difference between the concepts of national tradition by Ambrazas and Landsbergis lie in their understanding of creativity, where we can easily trace types of authoritative creators – a teacher and a prophet – as distinguished by Max Weber and Pierre Bourdieu. Extending the insights of elder sociologists, Laurent Thévenot and Luc Boltanski presented a theory of different creative configurations, in which they analysed the formation of new knowledge and creative discoveries and models of their social acceptance, or evaluation and justification. According to the authors, there exist different creative styles in the arts and sciences, and the novelties created within their framework are either appreciated or rejected by applying different kinds of legitimating judgement. The sociologists refer to these styles as *grandeurs* and distinguish the following three types: technocratic grandeur (*grandeur industrielle*), inspired grandeur (*grandeur inspirée*) and patriarchal grandeur (*grandeur domestique*). The value-oriented matrix enables the artists (or the scientists) to discover individual creative strategies – those of productive, efficiently operating inventor, canon-breaking inspired maverick or the keeper of tradition established by the *maître* (Figure 2).[6]

It is possible to trace the manifestations of discussed creative configurations in the genealogies of national Lithuanian music tradition distinguished by Ambrazas and Landsbergis: the concept of national school is based on the variants of the 1st and 3rd creative styles, while the framework of individual language generalization is based on the variants of the 1st and 2nd styles. Obviously, similar concepts of creativity have had significant influence upon the formation of hierarchies of Lithuanian composers and detection of succession of canonical works.

The choice of artistic ideology is essential in comparing the musical history narratives discussed above. The national tradition here is seen as a framework and nationality – as a specific objective and value measure in defining the creative achieve-

[6]The figure is adapted from Teveno [Thévenot] 2006. See also Thévenot 2006, Thévenot & Boltanski 1991.

Page (PS/TeX): 47 / 33, COMPOSITE

	Creative style	Value features
The industrial world/ technocratic grandeur	Productive, efficiently operating inventor	Progress, future, functionality, efficiency, performance, productivity, professionality, reliability, system
The world of inspiration/ inspired grandeur	Canon-breaking inspired maverick	Singularity, difference, innovation, originality, imaginary, spirituality, unconscious, chance
The domestic world/ patriarchal grandeur	Keeper of tradition established by the maître	Confidence, merit, responsibility, dignity, respectability, convention, tradition, hierarchy; parents, children, generation;

Figure 2. Creative Styles as *grandeurs* (adapted from Thévenot and Boltanski)

ments or failures of individual artists and Lithuanian music in general. Essentially, tradition and nationality are the substitutes and, at times, even inversions of some important ideological constructs of 20th-century musical modernism and avant-garde – that is, progress and innovation. It is also important to know what artistic ideology musicologist professes, for it helps articulate manifestations of tradition and nationality in music. In this respect, Ambrazas might be regarded a consistent supporter of modernism in art and the understanding of music formed by it. As a specialist of music theory and analysis, he focuses on formal elements of musical language, and thus the continuity of tradition does not pose a problem to him. According to Ambrazas, the dependence of the creator and his/her position within the national school are determined by his/her creative biography and professional qualifications. Nationality here is perceived as a denominator of original style, which is often based on the innovative incorporation of folklore into a universal set of rules of musical language. By such incorporation one expands and complements compositional procedures or musical systems invented by foreign

Page (PS/TeX): 48 / 34, COMPOSITE

composers. The cultural mission of music is guaranteed by its artistic achievements, rather than additional extra-musical elements or messages.

The attitudes of Landsbergis represent an entirely opposite artistic ideology. His position might be described as pre- and/or post-modernistic. He addresses the inheritance of tradition as a problem and sees the completeness of tradition as an incident, an unexpected fulfilment or creative revelation. Every time the tradition is invented *ex nihilo*, but, at the same time, its endurance is secured by a vision of ineffable imaginary foundations. Connection with this imaginary cosmos of tradition is guaranteed by symbolical mediums not available to every composer – a musicologist discovers them as extra-musical connotations or imprints in the musical material. To use the Saussurean distinction between the signifier and the signified, we might say that Lithuanian musicologists relate the spread of nationalism within the musical material with different sign elements: Landsbergis – with the *signifier*, while Ambrazas – with the *signified*. Thus Landsbergis sees the cultural mission of music as reaching beyond narrow professional objectives of its development. Music becomes an important factor in national emancipation and musicological discourse becomes a metaphoric expression of nation's political aspirations.

The fundamental attitudes and works of both musicologists were developed during the time of Soviet occupation. Political regime and ideological atmosphere had certainly affected (albeit in different way) their value orientations and the musicological research based on them. Ambrazas turned towards the de-ideologisation of music, attempting to dissociate from the political-ideological context and remain solely within the framework of artistic ideology (a position we might refer to as semi-conformist). Landsbergis, on the other hand, employed musicological discourse for political and cultural opposition, which we may surely regard as non-conformist approach. All these differences in Ambrazas's and Landsbergis's artistic preferences and political positions are illustrated in Figure 3.

Because of this, the two musicologists, as most significant authorities among Lithuanian musicologists of the second half of the 20^{th} century, have had very different influences upon the

Page (PS/TeX): 49 / 35, COMPOSITE

	Algirdas Ambrazas	Vytautas Landsbergis
Artistic preferences	Modernistic art ideologies	Pre- and postmodernistic art ideologies
Political positions	Semi-conformist attitude: musicological research as dissociation from political-ideological context	Non-conformist attitude: musicological discourse as tool for political and cultural opposition
Understanding of national tradition	Genealogical approach: tradition as succession of "musical fathers" and their pupils	Hermeneutical approach: tradition as incident, unexpected fulfilment or creative revelation

Figure 3. Ambrazas *versus* Landsbergis: Artistic Preferences and Political Positions

field of musicological research. Undoubtedly, Landsbergis's vision of national tradition and his judgements about individual artists have had major impact on reception of Lithuanian music on both national as well as international level. The influence of Landsbergis was instrumental not only in legitimating the cult figures of Lithuanian music and special status of their individual works, but also in cultivating the metaphorical language of music and the understanding of its cultural mission. From other side, it was Ambrazas's ambitious objective to define specificity of the Lithuanian national school and to substantiate its continuity that influenced further development of Lithuanian musicology. All this consolidated the influential conceptions of the hierarchy of composers and the relation between their works in Lithuanian musicology.

Musicology in Transition: Narratives of National Music History during the Post-Soviet Years

In post-Soviet times, the orientations of Lithuanian musicology formed by Landsbergis and Ambrazas were subject to significant and, at the same time, paradoxical transformations. The canon

Page (PS/TeX): 50 / 36, COMPOSITE

formed by Landsbergis had inspired productive critical reinterpretations during the past decade, but in general, the Lithuanian musicology turned in totally different direction. More general conceptual investigation of the national tradition does not appeal to the younger generation of Lithuanian musicologists. Present musicological works have a dominant biographical frame or focus on adoption of new musicological methods, while the actual music criticism had altogether renounced discussions on nationalism as an old-fashioned devalued category. Despite significant renewal of musicology, the works of Lithuanian musicologists in the area of national music history narratives have become shallower. A good example of that would be the first volume of new de-ideologised Lithuanian music history project, conceived in the first years of regained independence (Palionytė 2002). The group research issued in 2002 (compiled and edited by Danutė Palionytė) is aimed at one of the most complex periods in Lithuanian culture – the junction of the 19^{th} and 20^{th} centuries – marked with political and cultural repressions by Russian imperial rule and continuous struggle to re-establish the country's independence. The title of the publication "Years of National Rebirth" and the historiographic frame (years 1883 to 1918) witness narrow nationalistic aspirations in writing the new version of Lithuanian music history. In fact, this edition is limited to the works of Lithuanian composers only, ignoring both the music by non-Lithuanian composers who lived in our country, and the more problematic interpretations of the spread of national tradition. From the methodological point of view, the new narrative of Lithuanian music history might be qualified as a backward step towards positivism.

To conclude it might be emphasized that the present day Lithuanian musicology lacks most is thorough revision of its own implicit ideological attitudes. Such revision could not only encourage creative narratives of Lithuanian music, but could also stimulate the formation of more dialectical and fruitful insights into the fairly mythologised pantheon of Lithuanian music through use of new theoretical approaches.

Page (PS/TeX): 51 / 37, COMPOSITE

References

Ambrazas, J. (2007) *Muzikos tradicijos ir dabartis*, ed. G. Daunoravičiėnė (Vilnius).

Anderson, B. (2006) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, rev. ed. (London: Verso).

Cook, N. & Pople, A. (eds.) (2004) *The Cambridge History of Twentieth-Century Music* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Dahlhaus, C. (1980) "Nationalism and Music," trans. Mary Whittall, *Between Romanticism and Modernism: Four Studies in the Music of the late Nineteenth Century* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press).

Gaudrimas, J. (1958–1967) *Iš lietuvių muzikinės kultūros istorijos*, 3 vols. (Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla).

Gellner, E. (1983) *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Goštautienė, R. S. (2006) "Canonizing a Lithuanian Sound: Post-war Lithuanian Mainstream and Its Changing Reception During the Post-Soviet Years," paper given at the 2006 Conference of the IAML-IAMIC-IMS (Göteborg).

Gruodytė, V. (2005) "Nauja muzika, senos tradicijos," *Pažymėtos teritorijos*, ed. R. Goštautienė & L. Jablonskienė (Vilnius: Tyto Alba).

Hobsbawm, E. & Ranger, T. (eds.) (1983) *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Landsbergis, V. (1999) *Kultūros darbai: bibliografija. 1956–1996* (Vilnius: Vaga).

Murphy M. (2001) , "Introduction," *Musical Constructions of Nationalism. Essays on the History and Ideology of European Musical Culture 1800–1945*, ed. H. White & M. Murphy (Cork: Cork University Press).

Nakas, Š. (2003a) "Europasimuistymai," *Kultūros barai* 8–9: 82–84.

Nakas, Š. (2003b) "Despite the Warming of the Climate, Notes Are Still Being Written," online: http://www.osf.lt/lt/nutik/Nakas.htm.

Strohm, R. (1997) "Enlightenment Traditions and Post-Modern Criticism in the Historiography of Music," *16th International Congress of the IMS: Round Tables* (London: International Musicological Society).

Taruskin, R. (2005) *The Oxford History of Western Music*, 6 vols. (New York: Oxford University Press).

Teveno [Thévenot , L. (2006)] "Kreativnye konfiguratsii v gumanitarnykh naukah i figuratsii sotsial'noy obshchnosti," *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 77(1): 285–313.

Thévenot, L. (2006) *L'action au pluriel :sociologie des régimes d'engagement* (Paris: Découverte).

Thévenot, L. & Boltanski, L. (1991) *De la justification. Les économies de la grandeur* (Paris: Gallimard).

Page (PS/TeX): 52 / 38, COMPOSITE

Abstract – Kopsavilkums – Anotacija – Apzvalga

Rūta Stanevičiūtė-Goštautienė

Narratives of Lithuanian National Music: Origins and Values

In the current musicological discussion on the issues of historiography and the need to overcome the entrenched canons of historical writing, questions concerning the history of national music often become marginalised. This relates to a paradoxical position of national music histories within general historiography, which might be primarily associated with the widespread habit of treating them solely within the context of nationalistic ideology. Treated this way, histories of national music become dissociated from the fundamental issues of musical art and are bound to the aspects of nationalism, which commonly bear a certain negative flavour. Certainly, that not only caused marginalisation of national music histories within general music historiography, but also downplayed the prestige of investigating the spread of nationality in music. It is only in recent years that it has been possible to witness the increase of interest and research in this area, which might have been spurred by the popularity that new approaches to the study of nationalism gained in the humanities and social sciences since the 1970s.

Within this context just outlined, narratives of Lithuanian music history represent a fairly symptomatic phenomenon. First of all, it is obvious that nationalism here unfolds as a sub-discourse of modernistic ideology. This article examines the formation of narratives of Lithuanian national music and distinguishes two trends represented by two prominent authorities in the tradition of Lithuanian musicology, Vytautas Landsbergis (1932) and Algirdas Ambrazas (1934). Their articles and books provide different interpretations of works by various composers and general processes in Lithuanian music, forming more generalised conceptions that might be regarded as emblematic versions of the spread of national self-consciousness in musicology.

Both musicologists discussed here grounded their conceptions on two fundamental ideas: tradition of national music as part of

Page (PS/TeX): 53 / 39, COMPOSITE

a modernisation project and the possibility of defining national identity through the means of music. The institutional frame dominates the version provided by Ambrazas – a concept of national school, inseparable from the notion of national style. In his musicological research he allotted a special position to Lithuanian composers who had a major influence upon the development of the Lithuanian national music school, both in terms of musical language, as a stable set of rules to follow and an institutional network. The kind of framework in which Landsbergis builds his historical narratives might be described as symbolic. This musicologist focuses on charismatic personalities, cult figures or 'maverick' composers, who invent tradition *ex nihilo* or break existing rules. The other principal difference between the concepts of national tradition by Ambrazas and Landsbergis lie in their understanding of creativity, artistic preferences and political positions.

Because of this, these two musicologists, as most significant authorities among the Lithuanian musicologists of the second half of the 20^{th} century, have had very different influences upon the field of musicological research in Lithuania. To conclude, special attention is also given to the impact of the Ambrazas' and Landsbergis' work on the further development of Lithuanian musicology.

Rūta Stanevičiūtė-Goštautienė
Narratiivid Leedu rahvuslikust muusikast: paritolu ja vaartus

Nuudses muusikateaduslikus diskussioonis historiograafia kusimuste ule ja vajaduses jagu saada ajalookirjutuses juurdunud kaanonitest jatab rahvusliku muusika ajalugu puudutavad kusimused tihti marginaalseks. See viitab rahvuslike muusikalugude paradoksaalsele positsioonile uldises historiograafias, mida voib eelkoige seostada laialdase harjumusega kasitleda neid vaid rahvusliku ideoloogia kontekstis. Rahvuslik muusika muutub saaraselt kohelduna eraldunuks muusikakunsti pohikusimustest ja on seotud rahvuslikkuse kusimustega, mis tavaliselt kannavad teatud negatiivset varjundit. Kindlasti ei

Page (PS/TeX): 54 / 40, COMPOSITE

ole see pohjustatud ainult rahvusliku muusika ajaloo marginaalsusest uldises muusikaloo historiograafias, vaid ka muusika rahvuslikkuse leviku uurimise prestiizist. Ainuuksi viimastel aastatel on voimalik tunnistada huvi suurenemist ja uurimisi selles valdkonnas, mis võib olla kannustatud populaarsusest, mida rahvuslikkuse uurimise uus lahenemisviis on saavutanud humanitaar- ja sotsiaalteadustes alates 1970. aastatest.

Selles kontekstis vaid uldjoontes kirjeldatult esindavad Leedu muusikaloo narratiivid kullaltki sumptomaatilist fenomeni. Eelkoige on ilmne, et rahvuslikkus koorub siin valja modernistliku ideoloogia ala-diskursusena. See artikkel uurib Leedu rahvusliku muusika narratiivide moodustumist ja eristab kahte arengusuunda, mida esindavad kaks prominentset autoriteeti Leedu muusikateaduse traditsioonis: Vytautas Landsbergis (1932) ja Algirdas Ambrazas (1934). Nende artiklid ja raamatud interpreteerivad eri heliloojate teoseid ja uldisemaid protsesse Leedu muusikas erinevalt, moodustades uldisemaid kontseptsioone, mida voib vaadelda rahvusliku eneseteadvuse leviku sumboolsete versioonidena muusikateaduses.

Mõlema nimetatud muusikateadlase nagemused toetuvad kahele peamisele ideele: rahvusliku muusika traditsioon kui osa moderniseerimise projektist ning voimalus defineerida rahvuslikku identiteeti muusika tahenduse kaudu. Ambrazase versioonis domineerib institutsionaalne raam – rahvusliku koolkonna kontseptsioon, mis on lahutamatu rahvusliku stiili mõistest. Oma muusikateaduslikus uurimistoos tostis ta erilisele kohale Leedu heliloojad, kes olid saanud peamise mojutuse Leedu muusika rahvusliku koolkonna jargsest arengust, nii muusikalise keele kui reeglite, mida tuleb jargida, stabiilse hulga, kui ka institutsionaalse vorgustiku mottes. Sellist võrgustikku, kuhu Landsbergis ehitab oma ajaloolise narratiivi, võib kirjeldada kui sumboolset. Muusikateadlane fokuseerib karismaatilistele persoonidele, kultus-figuuridele voi "'isemotlejatele"'-heliloojatele, kes leiutavad *ex nihilo* traditsiooni voi murravad olemasolevaid reegleid. Teine peamine rahvusliku traditsiooni konseptsiooni erinevus Ambrazase ja Landsbergise vahel on nende arusaamine loovusest, artistlikest eelistustest ja poliitilisest positsioonist.

Seetottu on kahel 20. sajandi teise poole koige olulisemal Leedu muusikateadlasel olnud vaga erinev moju Leedu muusikateadus-

Page (PS/TeX): 55 / 41, COMPOSITE

likule uurimisele. Eriline tahelepanu on omistatud Ambrazase ja Landsbergise toode mojule Leedu muusikateaduse edaspidises arengus.

Rūta Stanevičiūtė-Goštautienė
Lietuviešu Mūzikas Narativs: Izcelsme un Vērtības

Mūsdienu muzikoloģiskajā diskusijā historiografiskās problēmas un nepieciešamība pārvarēt ierūsejošos vēsturiskos rakstīšanas kanonus bieži noved pie nacionālās mūzikas marginalizācijas. Šīs parādības rezultātā nacionālas mūzikas vēsture vispārejās historografijas ietvaros paradoksālā veidā tiek lielāko ties ieraduma deļ interpretitēta tikai nationalsistiskās ideologijas ietvaros. Šādā veidā diskutēta, nacionāla mūzika tiek atrauta no fundamentālām mūzikas mākslas problēmām un tiek saistīta ar nationalistiskajien aspektiem, kuri parasti ir negatīvi krāsoti. Tas ne tikai rezultē nacionālas mūzikas marginilizācijā vispārejas historiogrāfijas robežās, bet ari minimalizē nacionālas mūzikas izpētes plašuma prestīžu. Tikai pēdejos gados var noverot plašāku interesi šajā nozarē, kura acīm redzami bija aktivizēta no nationalisma izpētes metodēm humanistisko un socialo zinātnu laukā sākot ar 1970iem gadiem.

Šinī kontekstā Lietuviešu mūzikas vēsture prezentē simptomatisku fenomenu: nationalsims šeit tiek diskutēts ka modernās ideologijas sub-kultura. Šis raksts pēta Lietuvas nacionālas mūzikas formācijas un atškir divus virzienus, kas pārstāveti no prominentākajām Lietuviešu muzikas zinātnes pārstāvjiem – Vytautas Landsbergis (1932) un Algirdas Ambrazas (1934). Viņu rakstus var raksturot kā emblematiskas versias pašapziņas stiprināšana Lietuviešu nacionālās mūzikas ietvaros.

Abi muzikologi diskutē pamatojoties uz diviem fundamentāliem konceptiem: nacionālās mūzikas tradicija kā moderns projekts, un iespēja definet nacionālo identitāti ar mūzikas kultūras lidzekliem.

Ambrazas nacionālas mūzikas koncepts dibinājas uz nacionālas mūzikas skolas nesaurajām saitēm ar nacionalo stilu. Savos pētijumos viņš speciālu uzmanību pievērsa Lietuviešu komponistiem kuriem bija stiprs iespaids uz Lietuviešu nacionālo skolu, gan

Page (PS/TeX): 56 / 42, COMPOSITE

šīs skolas mūzikas valodas ziņā, gan skolas institutiu izveidošanas ziņā. Vēsturisko narativu ko veidoja Landsbergis var aprakstīt ka simbolisku. Vinš pievēršas harizmatiskajām personībām, kulta personām vai „maverik komponistiem" kuri rada tradiciju *ex nihilo*, vai ļauz pastāvošos likumus. Principālā starpiba starp šiem diviem muzikologiem ir viņu radošā procesa izpratne, viņu artistiskajām preferencēm un politiskajai pozicijai.

Rūta Stanevičiūtė-Goštautienė
Lietuvių nacionalinės muzikos naratyvai: ištakos ir vertybės

Šiuolaikinėse muzikologinėse diskusijose apie istoriografijos mokslo problemas ir poreikį įveikti įsigalėjusius istorinio rašymo kanonus nacionalinės muzikos istorijos klausimai dažniausiai marginalizuojami. Tai susiję su nacionalinių muzikos istorijų paradoksalia vieta bendrojoje istoriografijoje, kurioje ją iki pat šiol apibrėžia įsigalėjęs įprotis vertinti vadinamųjų mažųjų Europos valstybių muziką vien nacionalizmo ideologijos kontekste. Tokiu būdu nacionalinės muzikos istorijos atribojamos nuo pamatinių meninių muzikos klausimų ir susiejamos su dažniausiai negatyvų atspalvį turinčiais nacionalizmo sklaidos aspektais. Šios priežastys neabejotinai lėmė ne vien nacionalinių muzikos istorijų marginalizavimą bendrojoje muzikos istoriografijoje, bet ir menką nacionalumo sklaidos muzikoje tyrinėjimų prestižą. Tik pastaraisiais dešimtmečiais galima pastebėti tokio pobūdžio darbų gausėjimą, kurį paskatino naujais požiūriais grindžiamų nacionalizmo tyrinėjimų populiarumas humanitariniuose ir socialiniuose moksluose dar pradedant XX a. 7 dešimtmečiu.

Šiame kontekste lietuvių muzikos istorijos naratyvai yra pakankamai simptomiškas reiškinys. Visų pirma, akivaizdu, kad nacionalizmas čia skleidžiasi kaip modernybės ideologijos subdiskursas. Straipsnyje nagrinėjami pamatiniai lietuvių nacionalinės muzikos naratyvai. Pabrėžiama, kad XX amžiaus septintuoju ir aštuntuoju dešimtmečiais susiformavo pamatinės muzikologinės prieitys interpretuojant nacionalinę tradiciją, kurias lėmė įvairuojančios estetinės ir istoriografinės sampratos. Šiuo atžvilgiu muzikologijos darbuose išskiriamos dvi svarbiausios tendencijos, kurias at-

Page (PS/TeX): 57 / 43, COMPOSITE

stovauja muzikologų Algirdo Ambrazo (1934) ir Vytauto Landsbergio (1932) darbai. Minėtų autorių straipsniuose ir knygose pateiktos paskirų kompozitorių kūrybos ir bendrųjų lietuvių muzikos procesų interpretacijos susiklosto į visuotinesnes koncepcijas, laikytinas nacionalinės savivokos sklaidos muzikologijoje emblematinėmis versijomis.

Aptariamų muzikologų koncepcijas grindžia dvi pamatinės idėjos – nacionalinė muzikos tradicija kaip modernizavimo projektas ir galimybė apibrėžti nacionalinį tapatumą muzikos priemonių pagalba. Ambrazo pateiktoje versijoje dominuoja institucinis rėmas – nacionalinės mokyklos konceptas, neatsiejamas nuo nacionalinio stiliaus sampratos. Savo muzikologiniuose tyrinėjimuose jis teikė išskirtinę vietą tiems lietuvių kompozitoriams, kurie labiausiai nulėmė nacionalinės lietuvių muzikos mokyklos raidą – tiek muzikos kalbos kaip tvaraus sektinų taisyklių rinkinio, tiek institucinio tinklo požiūriu. Landsbergio istorinius pasakojimus organizuojantį rėmą tiktų pavadinti simboliniu. Muzikologo tyrinėjimų centre – charizmatinės asmenybės ar kūrėjai vienišiai, išrandantys tradiciją *ex nihilo* ar laužantys nusistovėjusias taisykles. Ambrazo ir Landsbergio lietuvių nacionalinės tradicijos koncepcijas labiausiai skiria kūrybiškumo sampratos, meninės vertybės, meno ir politikos santykio samprata.

Dėl šių priežasčių aptariamų muzikologų kaip ryškiausių XX amžiaus antrosios pusės lietuvių muzikologijos autoritetų įtaka muzikologijos laukui buvo labai skirtinga ir įvairiakryptė. Straipsnyje įvertinama Algirdo Ambrazo ir Vytauto Landsbergio darbų įtaka tolesnei lietuvių muzikologijos raidai.

Page (PS/TeX): 58 / 44, COMPOSITE