For this brief consideration of the present state of Baltic musicology, I have chosen to focus upon two problems, both equally loaded and, in fact, interrelated. The first: How has Baltic musicology reflected upon the history of the dramatic events of the twentieth century, namely, World War II and the ensuing occupations? And secondly: Has Baltic musicology found ways and means of disclosing the semantics of the music created in these critical periods of the two great catastrophes, the fascist and communist dictatorships? Or, in other words, has musicological scholarship evinced the reaction of music to the totalitarian systems of the twentieth century?

For this investigation, I determined to look at the obvious carte de visite for Baltic musicology: the relevant entries in our three best and most recent encyclopedias, *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (*MGG*, 1994–); the *Garland Encyclopedia of World Music*, vol. 8, *Europe* (*Garland*, 2000); and the second edition of the *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (*NG*, 2001). All of these encyclopedias were published since the Baltic states regained their independence in 1991. (The relevant articles and their authors published in each of these encyclopedias are provided in Table 1.)

My first question can be partially answered on the basis of a simple quantitative analysis — by observing the length of the text in each entry that relates to the relevant periods of Soviet and fascist occupation. The result will undoubtedly show the extent of the importance that the editor (or the author) attaches to this subject. The results, shown in Table 2, illustrate the situation quite powerfully.

As we can see, coverage of the period of fascist German occupation is completely absent from four entries out of nine, and scarcely mentioned in the remaining five. From the Estonian entry in *MGG*, we learn that “während des Zweiten Weltkriegs und der deutschen Besetzung (1941–44) verringerten sich die Zahl der Chöre, doch setzte man die Symphoniekonzerte und Opernauf-
Table 1. Coverage of the Baltic states in MGG, Garland, and NG: Entries and authors

Reference Literature

Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart (MGG), ed. L. Finscher (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1994–).

Coverage of Lithuania


Coverage of Latvia


Coverage of Estonia


* The name Joachim Braun appeared under the entries ‘Latvia’ and ‘Riga’ without my knowledge, apparently because those entries partly reproduce text that was originally published in the first (1980) edition of the New Grove Dictionary, which was authored in part me. The fact that an encyclopedia of the status of NG has reprinted material over twenty years old, especially pertaining to a geographical region to dramatically transformed during that period, is, to say the least inexcusable. This, however, must remain a topic for future discussion.
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Table 2. Coverage of the Baltic states in MGG, Garland, and NG: Amount of text devoted to Soviet and fascist German occupations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Length of entry (in lines)</th>
<th>Length of text concerning relevant period (in lines and %)</th>
<th>Fascist German occupation (1941–44)</th>
<th>Soviet occupation (1940–41, 1945–91)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lines %</td>
<td>Lines %</td>
<td>Lines %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>MGG</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>1 0.2</td>
<td>82 16.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garland</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>40 8.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>1 0.2</td>
<td>66 10.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>MGG</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>4 0.6</td>
<td>106 17.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garland</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>28 4.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>49 6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>MGG</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>4 0.5</td>
<td>108 14.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garland</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>22 3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>2 0.2</td>
<td>27 2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

führungen fort” (MGG, ii, p. 215). Some additional information is provided in NG on the Estonian Radio Orchestra, which reportedly achieved “particularly high standards during World War II under Olav Roots . . .” (NG, viii, p. 341). In Latvia, the negative impact of World War II is reduced simply to the “Zerspaltung der Gesellschaft – Flucht nach Westen, Departation nach Osten” (MGG, viii, p. 1108). And in Lithuania, the only clearly reported result was the closure of the Kaunas Conservatory (MGG, v, p. 1379).

Is this really all there is to say about the tragic events of fascist German occupation during Second World War? The physical and mental suffering of musicians, deportations to concentration camps, the expropriation of musical instruments and the domiciles of musical institutions – none of it is mentioned. Indeed, entire fields of musical activity were annihilated during the war years; for example, the violin classes created at the Latvian Conservatory by Professor Adolph Metz, a pupil of Auer, who was invited to the Conservatory by Jāzeps Vitols in 1922, were abruptly terminated with the killing of Metz in 1943. There was rude and
vulgar censorship imposed upon music reviewers; as Vizbulīte Bērziņa reports, music reviewers were “not even allowed to call this country Latvia; forbidden was any reminder of the independence period” (Bērziņa 2006, p. 185). And a great deal of music was banned by authorities; for example, the famous song *Lauzts priedes* by Emils Dārziņš and many other songs by both Dārziņš and Vītols. But unfortunately, Baltic musicology has not found it worthwhile to deal with the musical culture of this tragic period. This lack of attention to musical life during the years of fascist German occupation is, in my opinion, a striking lacuna in Baltic historical musicology of the 1990s and 2000s.

On the first Soviet year (1940–41) there is likewise hardly any information at all, except the fact of the Soviet occupation and the deportations that followed. Only a few words are dedicated to music *per se*. This was, however, a most tragic year, which rendered Baltic music lifeless for many years to come, and which shocked the local musical community through the sophisticated and brutal involvement of Soviet authorities in all aspects of musical life. The first inside conflicts between professional musicians (just now being reported in Bērziņa 2006) occurred at this time and led to the division of the musical community into groups of active collaborators, inert professionals, and more or less latent oppositionists. This was the beginning of later developments of the type described, for example, by Kevin C. Karnes in his work on Soviet Latvian music historiography (Karnes 2007). Moreover, during the years of Soviet occupation, some musical and musicological activities took place amongst the Baltic musical communities living in exile in the West. There is, however, no mention of this fact in our three encyclopedias.

We may now turn to our second question: Namely, how have Baltic musicologists of the post-Soviet period dealt with the interpretation of music created under conditions of totalitarian censorship, and how have they sought to disclose the semantics of this music? Surprisingly enough, in the sections on the period of Soviet occupation, which lasted nearly half a century, this subject is barely touched upon in our three encyclopedias. We would expect to find here a relevant critical music historiography and a more or less analytical account of the ways in which intellectuals, in this case musicians and musicologists, responded creatively to
the totalitarian ideological pressures and censorship under which they worked. Instead, what we have in our core reference works is an enumeration of composers active and institutions established during this period. If some latent or open dissent is noticed in the musics of this time, then, in the cases of Latvia and Lithuania, it is attributed to folk musics only. The Estonian entries of MGG and NG are the only ones to mention nonconformity in art music, but here such nonconformity is mentioned only in the most vague and general of ways. On the whole, this presents, to my mind, a misleading picture of the state of the musical art during this period, and a substantial failure of recent Baltic musicology.

In this respect, considering what MGG and NG regard as the exclusive domain of “folk music,” I would like to quote here from a paper on European identity that I delivered some time ago. “The very concept of dividing world music into vernacular music – so-called folk music, recently renamed Traditional Music – and art music – this form of elite audio art, now renamed Western Music – should be abandoned, or at least reconsidered,” I wrote. “It is my opinion that European art music has penetrated Europeans and imbued the people of the Western world to such extent that we have a right to define European art music as the traditional music of Europeans, as music of European identity” (Braun 2006).

It is, I believe, this division of the field of music into “Traditional Music” and “Western Music” that has resulted in the flawed methodology and consequently wrong evaluation of twentieth-century Baltic musical culture that we find so glaringly exhibited in our core encyclopedic reference works. This division ignores the eruption of professional music during the period of Soviet occupation, the latent non-conformism and dissent, the language of double-meaning which, I would venture to say, saturated Baltic art music, at least from the early 1960s, more than any other European regional music. Margers Zariņš and Pauls Dambis, Arvo Pärt und Veljo Tormis, Osvaldas Balakauskas and Bronius Kutavičius and many others exploited a kind of Aesopian musical language, be it in Baroque or Far Eastern stylizations, by using Latin titles or ancient folklore materials, or by employing modern compositional techniques. To disclose these methods of composition, to evince or at least to acknowledge the existence of such methods with reference to one or two examples should, I
believe, be expected from the defining reference literature of the late twentieth century. A study of this phenomenon would surely help us to draw a new and more accurate picture of Baltic music during the years 1940–90.
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Joachim Braun
Baltic Musicology in 1990–2006

This paper concentrates on two problems, both equally loaded and interrelated:

a. what is the reaction of Baltic musicology to the years of World War Two? and

b. did musicological scholarship evince the reaction of music to the totalitarian systems of the 20th century?


The general picture which emerged from this survey is a nearly total neglect of the events and changes of long-running influence during the years of fascist occupation (1941–1944), and a mostly distorted description of the tragic first year of Soviet occupation and the following Russian occupation, the longest occupation in the history of the Baltic states (1945–1990). This wrong judgment of the state of musical art in the years 1940–1990 has several causes, and one of the most decisive seems to be the wrong evaluation of the musical culture in these states, which for a long time has greatly ignored art music as compared to traditional ethnic music.

Joachim Braun
Balti muusikateadus aastatel 1990–2006

See artikkel keskendub kahele probleemile, mis on võrdselt kaalukad ja vastastikuses seoses:

a. Missugune oli Balti muusikateaduse reaktsioon Teisele maailmasojale?

b. Kas muusikateaduslikus uurimistegevuses valjendus reaktsioon 20. sajandi totalitaarsete süsteemide muusikale?


**Joachims Brauns**

**Baltijas Mūzikologiā jaunkākajās enciklopēdijās krīzes gados: 1940–2000**

Šīs referāts koncentrējas uz divām saistībām un kompleksām problēmām:

a. kāda bijusi Baltijas mūzikologiās reakcija uz Otro Pasaules Karu, un

b. kā izpaudās mūzikologiās reakcija uz divu 20. gs. totalitāro sistēmu valdišanas laiku Baltijā.


Aīna ko sniedza šīs pārskats ir gandrīz pilnīga fasistiskās okupācijas iekārtas valdišanas laika neiverošana (1941–44) un notikumu sakroplots izklāsts sakarā ar pirmo (1940) un otro

Joachim Braun
Baltijos šalių muzikologija 1990–2006 m.

Šiame straipsnyje tyrinėjami du tarpusavyje susiję ir labai nevienareikšmiai klausimai:
a. Kaip Baltijos šalių muzikologija vertina Antrojo pasaulinio karo pasekmes muzikos kultūrai? Ir
b. ar muzikologija atspindi XX a. totalitarinių režimų poveikį muzikai?


Bendros situacijos paveikslas, paaškėjės po atlikto tyrimo – beveik visiškas nepaisymas tų istorinių įvykių bei pokyčių, kurie turėjo įtakos užsitęsusių faštistinės okupacijos metais (1941–1944 m.), ir dažniausiai iškreiptas vaizdavimas tragiskų pirmųjų sovietinės okupacijos metų (1940–1941) ir vėlesnės ilgiausiai Baltijos šalyse trukusios Rusijos okupacijos (1945–1990 m., t. y. 45 metų – ilgiau nei visi Nepriklausomybės metai kartu paėmus).

Tokios klaidingos 1940–1990 m. muzikos meno būklės interpretacijos susiklostė dėl kelių priežasčių. Viena svarbiausių yra ta, kad vertinant muzikos kultūrą šiose valstybėse ilgą laiką tradicinė muzika buvo auksčtinama labiau, nei akademinė kūryba. Tokias nuostatas būtina kuo skubiau keisti.