

# BALTIC MUSICOLOGICAL CONFERENCES: NATIONAL MUSIC HISTORIOGRAPHIES AND TRANSNATIONALISM\*

---

*Rūta Stanevičiūtė*<sup>1</sup>

Professor of Music History, Lithuanian Academy of Music and Theatre,  
Vilnius, Lithuania

Received: 15 March 2019

Accepted: 1 May 2019

Original scientific paper

## ABSTRACT

The article explores the Baltic musicological conferences as a non-hierarchical network and its role and meaning in the changing political and cultural contexts. Starting from 1967, when the first conference took place, the annual meetings of the Baltic musicologists soon became a transnational space for the professional exchange and crosscultural discussion. Based on the results and the impact of cooperation between musicologists of neighbouring countries, the Soviet formation of the national history writing and the development of the Baltic musicological comparativism is discussed, given the political and cultural factors of these changes. The theoretical foundations and cultural aspirations of the concept of national music historiography by Vytautas Landsbergis is highlighted as representative example of the national self-confidence in Lithuanian musicology during the Soviet period.

**KEYWORDS:** Baltic musicological conferences, Lithuanian musicology, national music history writing, transnationalism, comparative music study, Vytautas Landsbergis

\* This article was written as a part of the project *Music of Change: Expression of Liberation in Polish and Lithuanian Music Before and After 1989* (Nr. P-LL-18-213), funded by the National Science Centre (Poland) and Lithuanian Research Council (Lithuania).

<sup>1</sup> ruta.staneviciute@gmail.com

## INTRODUCTION

For decades, the canons of national music historiography – especially in the so-called peripheral countries – have been dominated by a research paradigm of advance of national music culture. Recent paradigmatic shifts in historiography as well as in the humanities at large, including numerous turns (e.g. material, transnational, diasporic, global, affective, etc.) coincided with the epistemic crisis in national history writing. This relates to the current position of national music histories within post-national historiography, which might be primarily associated with two directions: critical re-assessment of the canons of the national music history in relation to the theory of nationalism or illumination of muted transnational elements in national music traditions.

The transnational perspective encourages both the detection of elements that may have been not assimilated or have been marginalised as part of national music and the exploration of the impact of cultural comparativism in the formation of national historiographies of music. Even though transnational processes are most frequently associated with the expansion of globalisation, according to Steven Vertovec, cross-border relationships, patterns of exchange, affiliations, and social formations are not a new phenomenon, thus transnationalism is even earlier than "nation" (Vertovec 2009: 3). Likewise, transnational music practices have inevitably left a deep imprint on the formation and development of national music cultures. A typical example is national music education institutions: particularly in smaller countries, they formed in the period of the international standardisation of music education, taking over the values and standards established in such cosmopolitan music centres as Paris, Vienna, Berlin, St. Petersburg, or other music metropolises having emerged as early as in the 18th–19th centuries. Here, just as in other fields of musical culture (e.g., composition, performance, musicology, music criticism, etc.), we are facing the transfer of the practices of one cultural milieu to another. In the attempts to find out how the process of transfer was proceeding, traditional comparativism studied in depth the similarities and differences of interacting cultures. The contemporary transnational turn, on the contrary, promotes attention to trends of a different character. On the one hand, it becomes important to study the process of change when the norms and representation of one culture are transferred to the context of another culture. On the other hand, the process is believed to usually be not one-way, which makes it possible to highlight the histories of cultural tangles. The concept of entangled history, or *histoire croisée*, proposed by Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmermann, points to another category important for transnationalism, i.e. that of a network (Cf. Werner and Zimmermann 2006). From the viewpoint of the researchers on transnationalism, it is the network as a complex system of interactions that is the central category „to the analysis of transnational social formations [that] are structures or systems of relationships” (Vertovec 2009: 4).

Lately the concept of network interaction has spread in the studies of social and cultural processes in the USSR. Such an approach deepened the understanding

of the structure of the Soviet society through the dissociation from the concept of hierarchised society, formed by the totalitarianism theories of the Cold War period. The change in the approach simultaneously gave special prominence to the phenomenon of informal networking by opening its impact on diverse social and cultural practices.<sup>2</sup> However, the said approach was mainly used for the studies of the formation and development of local social and cultural networks in the USSR, while transnational processes less frequently came into focus of the research on that kind of themes.<sup>3</sup>

A transnational dimension was undoubtedly characteristic of the field of Soviet musicology. In it, we can identify hierarchical relationships, based on the official ideology of internationalism and developed from the centre to the periphery, and horizontal relationships forged between musicological organisations and individual musicologists either in the Soviet republics or stretching beyond the Iron Curtain.<sup>4</sup> A vivid example of such a transnational interaction was the Baltic musicological conferences launched in 1967 as an interinstitutional musicological research network of three Soviet republics, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. The conferences were launched simultaneously with the formation of the national canons of music historiography in those countries. In this context, it is important to find out the significance of transnational cooperation for the writing of the history of national music in the Soviet era, and at the same time to see whether the transnational network of conferences had an impact on the comparative studies in the Baltic region.

### FOUNDING OF THE BALTIC MUSICOLOGICAL CONFERENCES: FROM OFFICIAL RELATIONSHIPS TO AN INFORMAL NETWORK

Like most of the Soviet cultural cooperation initiatives of a similar character, the Baltic musicological conferences were initiated as regional forums of the official culture. In the musicological conferences of three Baltic states, i.e. Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, first launched in 1967, science and politics intertwined from the very start. Officially, the first conference was dedicated to the 50th anniversary of the October Revolution. On 26–29 September 1967, in the capitals of the three Soviet republics – Vilnius, Riga, and Tallinn – influential official figures, musicologists Juozas Gaudrimas, Jēkabs Vitoļiņš, and Avo Hirvesoo gave the same presentations, while the concert programmes

2 In Lithuania, the most significant study on this topic is conducted recently by a team of researchers led by Ainė Ramonaitė. See Ramonaitė 2015.

3 The rare exception in the field of musicology is the publications by Peter J. Schmelz on transnational informal networking between Russian, Ukrainian and German musicians. For more see Schmelz 2015.

4 For example, the horizontal relationships between Russian and Lithuanian musicologists which transformed into informal networking during late Soviet period have been analysed in article by Gražina Daunoravičienė (2017).

consisted of symphonic and chamber compositions of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian composers. However, even then, the organisers and participants of the conferences unofficially, in private conversations, remembered the interrupted prewar tradition of cooperation of the musicians of the Baltic states – the meetings of the Baltic musicians in Kaunas in 1939 and in Tallinn in 1940 that had set an example for the conferences. Latvian musicologist Arnolds Klotiņš, one of the most active members of the Baltic meetings, recalls the atmosphere of the 1967 conference: “At our founding conference no one mentioned these events of 1940, few even knew of them. But the formal nod to the founding of soviet rule ensured that our conferences would not be found guilty of that which the Russian soviet rule hated with biblical hatred – namely, the cultivation of Baltic unity. By flirting with the devil we actually invited Beelzebub again into our home, but this time – to our advantage. A paradox.” (Klotiņš 2007: 98).

The 1967 conference was the only one to be held in all capital cities of the Baltic republics. The subsequent conferences were in turn organised in the capital of each time different republic; later other cities were included as well. The musicological section of the composers’ union of the respective republic acted as a counsel for generating ideas, and then organising and implementing the entire event. Soon the conferences became thematic, addressing the matters relevant to the musicologists of all three Baltic republics.<sup>5</sup>

At the same time, the most important goals in the establishment of the Baltic musicological conferences were scientific exchange and professional development. As stated by Lithuanian musicologist Jūratė Burokaitė, “in the 1960s, the Baltic musicologists who attended the plenary sessions, congresses, and seminars for musical critics organised by the Soviet Composers’ Union, had limited opportunities to participate in discussions and voice their opinions. Secondly, a new generation of musicologists, educated at the local conservatories in Riga, Tallinn and Vilnius, was up and coming, with their first books being published and their candidate (a Soviet equivalent for PhD) dissertations defended, and establishing their careers as teachers, scholars, and critics. Observing this, their senior colleagues understood a necessity of regular meetings and closer cooperation between the nearest neighbours in order to stimulate the advancement of musical science, address the pressing issues of the day, and exchange experience as well as latest news.” (Burokaitė 2007: 83). From the historical perspective, those ideas presented in 2007 sound somewhat naive, especially on the limited opportunities to speak in the events held by the institutional Centre, however, it is certain that, as early as in the Soviet years, the Baltic musicologist cooperation initiatives were forming as an alternative network to the hierarchical Soviet system of the musicology, based on the colonial relations between the centre and the periphery.

5 The programmes of the 1st–39th Baltic musicological conferences published in bilingual collection on the history and reception of the conferences, see Stanevičiūtė, Burokaitė 2007: 43–69, 125–154.

## SOVIET-TIME LITHUANIAN MUSICOLOGY: PHENOMENOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF THE INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE

In order to understand the place of the Baltic musicologist networking in the field of official Soviet musicology, the institutional structure of the science of music must be taken into account. In the Soviet era, Lithuania, just as all the other Soviet republics, did not have an institutional network of musicology as an alternative to governmental organisations, and therefore the divides between the official and unofficial cultures, and particularly between the official and unofficial science, were rather imaginary *modi operandi*. Should we try to draw a boundary between the *modi*, in the case of musicology, the divide between the censored and uncensored activities would be more appropriate. The latter especially makes it possible to understand the way in which official events eventually transformed into spaces of gatherings and communication of musicians connected by informal relationships. For the purpose, it is useful to distinguish between the phenomenological and axiological aspects of the Soviet system of science.

In the post-Soviet research on the Soviet science system from the phenomenological perspective, two trends of its analysis formed: exploring the external characteristics (the place, the role, and the function) or the internal characteristics (the state, the structure, internal rules, priorities, prevailing themes, methodology, and style) (Cf. Švedas 2009). I shall mention several characteristic trends in this regard, based on the analysis of the Soviet time Lithuanian musicology field.

During the Soviet years, the main centres of Lithuanian musicology from the institutional viewpoint included the Section of Musicology of the Lithuanian Composers' Union and the divisions of the Lithuanian State Conservatoire: the Departments of Musicology and the labs of Folk Music and Music Theory. Thus, the official music research infrastructure was weak and had no coordinating centre, while in the evaluation of the Soviet science policies, an opinion formed that the area of music was hardly supervised from the ideological viewpoint, compared to other areas of the humanities. Valdemaras Klumbys who analysed the politicisation of Lithuanian culture indicated that "the humanities were treated differently: philosophy was particularly supervised, as well as history, while philologists were in a better position, and linguists in a still better one. In other words, the closer the science was to ideology, the more the regime was interested in it, and the more rigorous control that science experienced. Creators in some areas of arts that did not easily yield to ideologisation, and particularly musicians, found themselves in an intermediate position between the exact sciences and the humanities." (Klumbys 2009: 30).

Nevertheless, the research on music, especially in the area of musical heritage, experienced ideological constraints and faced the barriers of conjuncture. However, in the field of musicology, to recreate the impact of political decisions through inculcation of the mix of ideology and methodology is not so simple. As an example, we can use the situation of Lithuanian music historiography during Soviet times, as there was no academic institution that officially coordinated research on the history of music or assumed the responsibility for it.

The inculcation of the provisions and methodologies of Soviet musicology was particularly manifestly expressed in the preparation of comprehensive histories of Lithuanian music: three volumes of the “new”, Sovietised, history of Lithuanian music were published in the period between 1958 and 1967. The collective works were a tribute to the official science policy, even though they were coordinated not by an institution, but by an official figure that rose in the postwar years, academician Juozas Gaudrimas (Gaudrimas 1958, 1964, 1967). Immediately after publishing, the syntheses of the official history of Lithuanian music were sharply criticised in the articles of the younger generation musicologists Jonas Bruveris and Vytautas Landsbergis as examples of superficial traditional historicism, lacking solid foundations of the theory and methodology of historiography, the “space of historical summaries”, and „significant historical conclusions” (Bruveris 1969: 166).

Therefore, the Baltic musicological conferences were launched by already critically evaluating, or ignoring, the official discourse of the music historiography. To illustrate, during the conferences, Vytautas Landsbergis stated that the main objective of Lithuanian musicology was to develop a model of the historiography of Lithuanian music, thus ignoring the works that had established an official Soviet discourse (Landsbergis 1982). In consequence, the conferences brought together critics of the Soviet science doctrine imposed upon the musicology of the Baltic countries and became a productive laboratory of the search for alternative historical narratives.

### THE BALTIC MUSICOLOGICAL CONFERENCES IN THE SOVIET YEARS: THE AXIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

In the analysis of the factual situation of musicology from the axiological perspective, first and foremost, the criteria of the research culture and openness are important. In the late Soviet years, in the discussion of the tradition developed by the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian musicologists, Landsbergis emphasised the 5th Baltic Musicological Conference held in Vilnius and devoted to the general problems of musicology: he remembered the early 1970s as the time of self-evaluation of the situation of Baltic musicologists, the projections of study and science updating, and opening up for broader discussions (Landsbergis 1988b: 23). When disclosing the contribution of those conferences to the development of the aforementioned ideologically unrelated horizontal relations, the Soviet-time introspection cannot be ignored. In the mid-1980s, comprehensive overviews of the scientific contribution of the Baltic conferences were published by Lithuanian Vytautas Landsbergis and Estonian Mart Humal (Landsbergis 1988b, Humal 1985). The meaningful accents highlighted by the authors are structured below:

- Origins and stimuli: scientific exchange and the Baltic solidarity.
- Culminations: the 5th conference (1971), the 12th–15th conferences (1978–1981).
- Thematic focus: musicological problems, national composer schools, the new music.
- Problematic focus: the interaction of the national uniqueness and cultural integrity.

- Theoretical and methodological exposures: the methodology of music historiography, theoretical national research, and comparativism.
- Scientific value: cumulation of musicological knowledge and theoretical and methodological insights.
- Cultural meaning: the discourse of liberation.

Humal believed that scientific exchange was of “great significance in the field of comparative musicology” (Humal 1985: 109), while Landsbergis was impressed by the summary of the “becoming, developing, and flourishing” of national cultures, and he was especially interested in the “historical consideration, inventory and strategy” of national musicology as well as the integration of Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian musicology (Landsbergis 1988b: 24).

To sum up the role of the Baltic musicological conferences before 1990, it should be noted that the culminations of their development, as identified by both musicologists – Vytautas Landsbergis and Mart Humal, were important conceptual turning points in getting rid of the Sovietisation of musicology. It is typical that the changes took place in the early 1970s and in the late 1970s and early 1980s, when in the USSR the fights about the interpretations of musical, and more broadly, cultural heritage escalated and the new Soviet strategies of falsification of the past in the official scientific discourse surfaced.

### BALTIC COMPARATIVISM AND MAPPING NATIONAL CULTURES OF MUSIC

The impact of the Soviet science doctrine on the historiography of music manifested itself primarily through ideological schemas, defining the field of research in national cultures from the geopolitical and chronological viewpoints. It is only natural that the official discourse of the history of music in the Baltic countries was squeezed into the framework of the historical period preferable for research: from the mid-19th century through the Soviet period, thus ignoring and severely distorting the early music history and the period of independence between the First and the Second World Wars. Equally mandatory was the emphasis of the essential impact of Russian musical culture on national schools of composers and performers, simultaneously ranking the canon of national classic musicians in accordance with their closeness to the normative guidelines of Soviet music – links with folklore, commitment to social progress, and stylistic models convenient for the development of Soviet music.

By opposing the imposed Sovietised approach to the development of national culture, the Baltic musicological conferences were expanding the geopolitical and chronological research field of the music of their countries. First of all, the research focused on the “rehabilitation” of the interwar period: three conferences on its critical reconsideration were held (1978, 1979, 1989). In the late Soviet era, the historical musical heritage and the music of emigration were actualised, although in the concerts accompanying the conferences the music of émigré composers was

performed as early as in the late 1960s. The said geopolitical and chronological research expansion opened up the space for comparative studies. Even though Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have been often considered as a homogeneous region, the cultural traditions and geocultural identifications of the three countries are different. The linguistic and religious identity differences here are complemented by different centres of cultural attraction, predetermined by political history: Germany and Northern Europe in the case of Estonia and Latvia, and Eastern and Central Europe in the case of Lithuania. Still, the dependence on the Russian Empire in the long 19th century and the Soviet occupation encouraged the musicologists of the three Baltic countries to look for similarities of their cultural development both during the periods of oppression and independence. Efforts were inspired to identify the similarities and differences in the transformation of the institutional structure of musical culture, stylistic changes in composition, educational systems, and musicological discourses in a broader historical context than advocated in the official historiography of music. Here, extremely rare cases of comparative analysis on selective issues should be noted: from that viewpoint, the works of Latvian musicologist Arnolds Klotiņš devoted to the comparison of the composition schools in the three countries and the stylistic development of symphonic music deserve special mention.<sup>6</sup>

Modest attempts to develop comparativism were best promoted by the common efforts to define the concept of national music culture and the categories typical of the concept: national school and national style. The comparative perspective was particularly characteristic of the presentations of Arnolds Klotiņš, Mart Humal, Vytautas Landsbergis, and Algirdas Ambrazas who summarised their fundamental research in the fields of music as a cultural practice and music styles. However, even in the works of the said musicologists, a more universal aspect was overshadowed by the traditional conception of the nationality expression in music. The fundamental ideas underlying the conceptions of the above mentioned musicologists were the national music tradition as a modernisation project and the definition of national identity through the means of music. As an example, the conception of possible theoretical-methodological approaches of the historiography of Lithuanian music laid out in 1979 by Vytautas Landsbergis<sup>7</sup> can be presented. The periodisation of the history of Lithuanian music proposed by Landsbergis and disproportionate attention to the period of Lithuanian history which highlighted the narrative of the political liberation of a modern nation (mid-19th through the 20th century) proved that he did not move away from the ideology of cultural nationalism.

6 In this context, the papers by Latvian musicologist "Issues of New Directions in Contemporary Music of the Baltic Republics" (1970) and "On the Parallels of Compositional Schools of the Baltic Republics" (1978) delivered at the Baltic musicological conferences must be distinguished.

7 Vytautas Landsbergis (b. 1932) – Lithuanian musicologist, pianist and politician. In 1988, he became one of founders and leaders of Sąjūdis, Lithuanian pro-independence movement which led to the reestablishment of the Lithuanian Republic in 1990.



Up to now, the only sketch of the theory of Lithuanian music historiography by Vytautas Landsbergis was intended not only to develop a research model but also to homogenise the image of national tradition. For its analysis, it is useful to consider a more general conception of music as a cultural practice in the works of Landsbergis. Without any more specific references to the theoretical foundations of his conception, Landsbergis defined music as a way of aesthetic self-expression and self-awareness of human communities and described its specificity as a system of three chains: creator-performer-perceiver. The conception of music as a socio-cultural practice allowed the author to overstep the distinction between the creation and the functioning of music in culture and society, characteristic of the works of Baltic musicologists at that time. When looking deeper into the theoretical inspirations of the musicological works of Landsbergis, his efforts should be noted to renew national musicology by including the approaches of music semiotics, hermeneutics, and sociocultural analysis, popular in the international musicology of the time, in the interpretation of music. The interaction of his activities as a music historian and critic highlighted Landsbergis' attention to the cultural significance and the social function of creation, which encouraged some researchers to emphasise the meaningful values of the sociality of music in Landsbergis' works.

For Landsbergis' conception of music, both its signification and communicative powers seemed to be equally important: he emphasised that music could *model* (a movement, a thought, life, or the Universe), *express* (spiritual and emotional states), and *encode* (cultural messages defined as containing metaphysical and psychological contents). Based on the concepts typical of the semiotic tradition, music was eventually defined as a *system of signs* serving communal communication ("music becomes people's communication") and the *affirmation* of reality ("music in a general sense is the expression of love for life in all its variations").<sup>8</sup> At the same time, it should be noted that Landsbergis avoided defining music as a language, which indirectly suggested a reserved attitude to the approaches typical of the structuralist semiotics of music in the 1960s to the 1970s that influenced the use of the that time concept of music language. Based on in-depth studies of the notional accents of Landsbergis' interpretations, one can state that individual creative innovations reflected upon by him and their cultural messages were interpreted as serving the dissemination of national identity or, to paraphrase Benedict Anderson, the creation of a nation as a product of common cultural imagination (Cf. Anderson 1999: 152). Nationality unfolded there as the non-verbalised perception of the 'national spirit' whose traces could be detected in mysterious imprints – details of compositions, musical gestures, atmosphere, and symbolism. From Landsbergis' viewpoint, music creators were linked not by institutions or rules, but rather by the cultural soil, esoteric cognition of "genuine music" and creativity, and the awareness of the creative mission (Cf. Landsbergis 1988a: 48–52).

8 The most comprehensive summary of musicologist's concept of music is represented in Landsbergis' post-soviet article "Music" written for national music encyclopedia (Landsbergis 2003: 495–496).

In the explanations of the historical and cultural development of national music, Landsbergis was particularly attentive to the interaction of individual intentions and public expectations. He was concerned with the creator's commitment to national culture as an ideological position, presented in a broad context of a wide variety of artistic phenomena as well as individual-psychological and cultural-social tensions. On the one hand, Landsbergis emphasised that composer's creativity unfolded at a specific time and place, under definite, and simultaneously contradictory, historical, cultural, and socio-political circumstances. On the other hand, the absorption and resonance of the cultural messages of composer's music were predetermined not merely by some special features of a musical style, but also by the historical situation, cultural awareness, and the horizons of the audience expectations. Following the hermeneutical interpretation of music, the inheritance of tradition was debated there, and the fullness of the tradition itself turned into an event, unexpected fulfillment, and creative illumination. Tradition was each time invented *ex nihilo*, however, simultaneously its sustainability was ensured by the vision of a non-verbalised imaginary foundation. The connection with that imaginary cosmos of tradition was preconditioned by the "subconscious reflections of cultural heritage" (Landsbergis 2008 [1979]: 86).

Landsbergis had never written an exhaustive study of a historical character on the development of music of Lithuanian composers or a theory of the meaning of music, however, the ideas laid out in his individual works were a vivid example of the self-awareness of Lithuanian musicologists in the Soviet and early post-Soviet periods. Opposition to the official discourse of Soviet musicology and commitment to the ideology of cultural nationalism predetermined their historical significance for the renewal of the national musicology, yet at the same time defined the limitations of the efforts to de-Sovietise musicology.

## UTOPIA OF THE BALTIC UNITY

Another special topic, matured in the early history of the Baltic musicological conferences, was the idea of the Baltic unity. Although even as early as in the Soviet years the Baltic Region was believed to be a Soviet geopolitical construct, artificially uniting the states with different histories and different cultural memories, the common political experience and cultural co-existence encouraged musicologists to consider such a utopia of Baltic unity.

In 1986, when the conferences only gathered pace and political and cultural changes were beginning to take shape, Vytautas Landsbergis shared his thoughts:

"One can speak of tangible and obvious results such as perception of music and diverse musical and musicological ideas generated in neighbouring republics; [...] the feeling of professional solidarity, and mutual perception of musicologist's lot in given environment and time. Today we are happy not only about our own achievements, but also about the Latvian and Estonian ones. That is different from the

way we were in the past. And, respectively, we are saddened not only by our own failures and difficulties. However, even if we look at the two recent decades self-critically and acknowledge myriads of unsolved questions, our life is dominated by moderate joy. We existed and were doing something.” (Landsbergis 2007: 96).

An extraordinary uplift was experienced by the participants of the Baltic conferences during the years of political and cultural revival, which have inspired discussions about the more general search for Baltic cultural identity and the possibilities of institutional establishment thereof. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, some of the old-timers and activists of the conferences, like Estonian musicologist Mart Humal, called for the institution of the association of Baltic musicologists and a centre for regional culture studies. At the 23rd Baltic Musicological Conference held in Kaunas in 1989, the joint declaration to found a non-governmental organization – a Baltic Musicological Association was accepted by the representatives of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania (Goštautienė 1989: 70). These initiatives, however, were not destined to be realised.<sup>9</sup> The Baltic unity idea seemed to have lost its past appeal, and the international integration of Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian music cultures and musicology became the key incitement for the renewal and further development of the conferences.

## CONCLUSION

The illusionarity of the Baltic unity became especially evident after 1990, when the three Baltic states regained their independence. In the second half of the 20th century, in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, their specific musicological traditions, original research trends, and priorities formed. Despite the diversity of the Baltic musicological orientations surfacing after 1990, two distinct periods of the new self-awareness can be distinguished in the Baltic musicological conferences.<sup>10</sup> To sum up the themes of the conferences in the last decade of the 20th century, those were attempts to deal with the past and to critically review the musical heritage and the relations with the neighbouring musical cultures. In the 21st century, a more global approach to the situation of national cultures in the international science and culture

9 The fall of these initiatives were analysed in the article by Mart Humal (Humal 2007).

10 After the three Baltic states had regained their independence in 1990, the tradition of the Baltic conferences was resumed. The ranks of their organisers, next to the musicologist sections of the Composers' Unions, were joined by other musical institutions, such as music academies and musicological associations. In the very first conference held in the years of independence – that was the 24th Conference in Viljandi, Estonia – musicologists from abroad took part. After 1990, the Baltic musicological conferences developed into an open international forum, especially consolidated by the collaboration with the International Musicological Society since 2007. However, over the last decade, the conferences were held every two years, and the institutional relations of the musicologists of the three countries significantly weakened.

area became relevant. The need to integrate the national experience into a wider context and to respond to the change in the paradigms of musicology itself exacerbated the problems formed as early as during the period of uplift of the Baltic musicological conferences, i.e. in the 1970s and 1980s. In the analysis of the problems of historiography of Baltic musicologists, as early as in 1999, Estonian musicologist Urve Lippus noted: “However, a music history written basically from this point of view – advance of national music – brings up several problems. <...> Discussions about the essence of national individuality of some composer and descriptions of a national style were among the favourite themes at the Baltic conferences. It is clear that many musicologists avoided going directly into ideology and aesthetics. Those fields had double censorship - official doctrine from the outside and the need to support, not to question national values from inside.” (Lippus 1999: 55, 58).

Urve Lippus’ evaluation of the Soviet period works of Baltic musicologists leads to critical evaluation of the historical role of Baltic musicological conferences as a non-hierarchical musicological network. Formed as an alternative to the Soviet system of official musicology manipulated from the centre, the network of Baltic musicological conferences served as a catalyst for science and a platform for the exchange of scientific ideas. Within the framework of an increasing interest in non-formal networks and microcommunities in the post-Soviet research on the USSR history, Baltic musicological conferences can be assigned to numerous movements of that type that contributed to the emancipation of the Soviet Empire and its political fallout. The history of the conferences simultaneously shows that transnational interaction and the accompanying cultural comparativism can be promoted by political processes and the changing geocultural identifications.

#### LIST OF REFERENCES

- Anderson, Benedict (1999) *Įsivaizduojamos bendruomenės. Apmąstymai apie nacionalizmo kilmę ir plitimą*. [Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism]. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.
- Bruveris, Jonas (1969) “Seniai laukta knyga” [Long Awaited Book]. In: *Muzika ir teatras*. Vilnius: LTSR Kompozitorių sąjunga, LTSR Teatro draugija, 166–169.
- Burokaitė, Jūratė (2007) “Preface”. In: Rūta Stanevičiūtė, Jūratė Burokaitė (eds.) *Baltijos muzikologų konferencijos. Istorija ir tradicijos. I-XXXIX Baltijos muzikologų konferencijų programos, prisiminimai, komentarai / Baltic Musicological Conferences. History and Traditions. 1st–39th Baltic Musicological Conferences. Programmes, Recollections, Reflections*. Vilnius: Lietuvos kompozitorių sąjunga, 83–87.
- Daunoravičienė, Gražina (2017) “Muzikos teorijos diskurso atsinaujinimas vėlyvojo socializmo Lietuvoje: modernėjimo procesas ir profesinės partnerystės tinklas” [The Battle for New Music in Lithuania of Late Socialism: The Process of Modernization and Network of Intercultural Partnership]. *Lietuvos muzikologija XVIII*, 10 – 45.
- Gaudrimas, Juozas et al. (1967) *Iš lietuvių muzikinės kultūros istorijos. Tarybinė muzika 1940–1965* [From the History of Lithuanian Music Culture. Soviet Music 1940–1965] Vilnius: Mintis.

## RŪTA STANEVIČIŪTĖ

BALTIC MUSICOLOGICAL CONFERENCES: NATIONAL MUSIC HISTORIOGRAPHIES...

- Gaudrimas, Juozas (1964) *Iš lietuvių muzikinės kultūros istorijos. 1917–1940* [From the History of Lithuanian Music Culture. 1917–1940] Vilnius: Mintis.
- Gaudrimas, Juozas (1958) *Iš lietuvių muzikinės kultūros istorijos. 1861–1917* [From the History of Lithuanian Music Culture. 1917–1940] Vilnius: Mintis.
- Goštautienė, Rūta (1989) “XXIII Pabaltijo muzikologų konferencija” [The 23rd Baltic Musicological Conference]. *Krantai* 12: 70.
- Humal, Mart (2007) “The Idea of the Baltic Musicological Association”. In: Rūta Stanevičiūtė, Jūratė Burokaitė (eds.) *Baltijos muzikologų konferencijos. Istorija ir tradicijos. I-XXXIX Baltijos muzikologų konferencijų programos, prisiminimai, komentarai / Baltic Musicological Conferences. History and Traditions. 1st–39th Baltic Musicological Conferences. Programmes, Recollections, Reflections*. Vilnius: Lietuvos kompozitorių sąjunga, 105–110.
- Humalas, Martas [Humal, Mart] (1985). Bendradarbiavimo vaisiai [Results of Collaboration]. In: Jūratė Burokaitė (ed.) *Muzika* 5. Vilnius: Vaga, 107–109.
- Klotiš, Arnolds (2007) “Forty Years After...”. In: Rūta Stanevičiūtė, Jūratė Burokaitė (eds.) *Baltijos muzikologų konferencijos. Istorija ir tradicijos. I-XXXIX Baltijos muzikologų konferencijų programos, prisiminimai, komentarai / Baltic Musicological Conferences. History and Traditions. 1st–39th Baltic Musicological Conferences. Programmes, Recollections, Reflections*. Vilnius: Lietuvos kompozitorių sąjunga, 97–99.
- Klumbys, Valdemaras (2009) *Lietuvos kultūrinio elito elgsenos modeliai sovietmečiu*. Daktaro disertacija. [Behaviour Models of the Lithuanian Cultural Elite in the Soviet Times: a PhD dissertation]. Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas.
- Landsbergis, Vytautas (2008) Lietuviško fakyro žydinti nostalgija. Apie B. Kutavičiaus muziką [Blooming Nostalgia of a Lithuanian Fakir. On Kutavičius’ Music] [1979]. In: Inga Jasinskaitė-Jankauskienė (ed.) *Broniaus Kutavičiaus muzika. Praeinantis laikas* [Music by Bronius Kutavičius. The Passing Time]. Vilnius: Versus Aureus, 75–88.
- Landsbergis, Vytautas (2003) “Muzika“ [Music]. In: *Muzikos enciklopedija, II*. Vilnius: Lietuvos muzikos akademija, Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 495–496.
- Landsbergis, Vytautas (1988a). Broniaus Kutavičiaus muzikos podirvis [Subsoil of Bronius Kutavičius’ Music]. In: Jūratė Gudaitė (ed.) *Muzika* 8. Vilnius: Vaga, 48–52.
- Landsbergis, Vytautas (1988b) “Dvidešimties metų baras. Mintys po 20-osios Pabaltijo muzikologų konferencijos” [A Field of Twenty Years. Some Thoughts after the 20th Baltic Musicological Conference]. In: Jūratė Gudaitė (ed.) *Muzika* 8. Vilnius: Vaga, 23–26.
- Landsbergis, Vytautas (1982) “Основные этапы развития литовской музыкальной культуры (возможности периодизации)”. In: *Прибалтийский музыковедческий сборник I*. Vilnius: Vaga, 117–134.
- Lippus, Urve (1999) “Baltic Music History Writing: Problems and Perspectives”. *Acta Musicologica*, Vol. 71, Fasc. 1 (Jan.–Jun.), 50–60.
- Ramonaitė, Ainė et al. (2015) *Nematoma sovietmečio visuomenė* [Invisible Soviet Society]. Vilnius: Naujasis židinys-Aidai, 2015.
- Schmelz, Peter J. (2015) “Intimate Histories of the Musical Cold War: Fred Prieberg and Igor Blazhkov’s Unofficial Diplomacy”. In: Jessica C.E. Gienow-Hecht (ed.) *Music and International History in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Berghahn, 189–225.

Švedas, Aurimas (2009) *Matricos nelaisvėje. Sovietmečio lietuvių istoriografija 1944–1985* [In the Captivity of the Matrix. Soviet Lithuanian Historiography, 1944–1985]. Vilnius: Aidai, 2009.

Vertovec, Steven (2009) *Transnationalism*. London and New York: Routledge.

Werner, Michael; Zimmermann, Bénédicte (2006) "Beyond Comparison: *Histoire croisée* and the Challenge of Reflexivity". *History and Theory* 45 (2): 30–50.

### РУТА СТАНЕВИЧИУТЕ

#### БАЛТИЧКЕ МУЗИКОЛОШКЕ КОНФЕРЕНЦИЈЕ: НАЦИОНАЛНА МУЗИЧКА ИСТОРИОГРАФИЈА И ТРАНСНАЦИОНАЛИЗАМ

#### (РЕЗИМЕ)

Балтички културни простор – да ли је то реалност или фикција, спонтана транскултурална традиција или вештачка геополитичка конструкција? Ова питања, која доводе под сумњу балтичке музиколошке конференције, које се у континуитету одржавају већ педесетак година, уопште нису реторичка. Од 1967. године, када је одржана прва конференција, годишња окупљања балтичких музиколога нису била ограничена само на остваривање професионалних циљева. Политичке промене и културне пукотине увек изнова остављају своје отиске у историји транснационалне балтичке музиколошке сарадње. Приликом покретања прве конференције пре више од пет деценија, примењен је совјетски метод обредног посвећења: окупљање музиколога из три балтичке државе формално је било посвећено 50. годишњици Октобарске револуције, чиме је је успостављена традиција која је пркосила совјетској централизацији.

Ускоро су конференције постале простор за професионално самоизражавање и транснационално нехијерархијско умрежавање младих музиколога који су стасавали током шездесетих година XX века, као и каснијих генерација. Ова традиција је допринела успостављању институционалног статуса балтичке музикологије, настале као алтернатива званичној доктрини совјетске музике и музикологије у другој половини XX века.

Супротстављајући се наметнутом совјетском приступу развоју националне културе, балтичке музиколошке конференције прошириле су геополитичко и хронолошко истраживачко поље у вези са музиком својих земаља. Скромни покушаји да се развије компаративизам најбоље су промовисани заједничким напорима да се дефинише појам националне музичке културе и

категорије типичне за овај концепт: национална школа и национални стил. Компаративна перспектива била је посебно карактеристична за презентације Арнолдса Клотинша (Arnolds Klotiņš), Марта Хумала (Mart Humal), Витаутаса Ландсбергиса (Vytautas Landsbergis) и Алгирдаса Амбразаса (Algirdas Ambrazas), који су сумирали своја фундаментална истраживања у области музике као културне праксе и музичких стилова. Међутим, чак и у радовима наведених музиколога, универзалнији аспект је био засењен традиционалном концепцијом националног израза у музици. Успостављање алтернативних канона националне класичне и модерне музике, као и модернизација музикологије, спадају у резултате ових конференција. Током година политичких промена деведесетих година прошлог века, културно оживљавање је инспирисало дискусије о општијој потрази за балтичким културним идентитетом и могућностима његовог институционалног успостављања. Међутим, истовремено су се отворила питања идентитета ове манифестације, доводећи у питање сам формат балтичког музиколошког простора као могуће совјетске геополитичке конструкције.

Кључне речи: балтичке музиколошке конференције, литванска музикологија, писање националних историја музике, транснационализам, компаративне студије музике, Витаутас Ландсбергис