Preface

The search for answers to a long string of uncertainties prompted the writing of this monograph. The initial question centred on what is the paradigm of 20th-century Modernism in music and how it disseminates in the stories of musical works of a specific nation. What can national cultures that seemingly developed on the periphery of compositional innovations and did not have an impact on the major experiences of 20th-century Modernism and the avant-garde testify about Modernism? On the other hand, are these national cultures merely passive consumers of active ‘novel’ ideas and found themselves to be observers in the throng of historical circumstances, according to the ‘grand’ storytellers of Modernism? It turned out to be impossible to answer these sequences of questions without a broad inter-disciplinary interface with a number of theories, archival documents, musical traditions and innovations, the works of various authors, and the composers themselves. However, the aspiration merely results in the effect of a snowball thrown at the contemplative tranquillity of tingling whiteness. It inevitably leads to an avalanche of new questions. Like Martin Heidegger, who represented his philosophy by formulating sequences of questions rather than suggesting answers, this determination to invade the marked territories evokes the desire to consider new book writing challenges and dislodges new swarms of questions.

Studies based on such inquiries become an interesting process, and the search for solutions encourages bypassing pre-packaged, static and passive answers. The search for indefinite solutions also becomes a subtle provocation to think, stimulates further questioning, as well as activities that look deeper and beyond. Thus, the decision on how to talk about the modernisation of a local national culture or Lithuanian music in the face of hypothetic ‘New Modernism’ (Post-modernism was conceptualised in this way by Jean Francois Lyotard, Leonard B. Meyer, Jonathan D. Kramer) becomes undeniably important. Even more so, when we want the prospective view to innovatively explain the pronounced verdicts and underlying causes thus contributing to the interpretation of the main focus of this study.

What am I to do when the myth and illusion of the ‘innocent eye’ and the ‘absolute given’ have long been crucified as unholy accomplices in art philosophies by Ernst Gombrich and Nelson Goodman? Back in the 60s of the 20th century Goodman astutely rephrased Immanuel Kant: ‘The innocent eye is blind, and the virgin mind is empty.’ This makes it easier to step into the territory created by the consequences of radicalism of avant-garde artistic practice or the radicalism of modern socio-cultural scepticism. We are met there
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by the sense of an enormous ‘turn’ in the development of culture and daring overstepping of conventions and limits. Confusion in the minds of those summarising art processes and conflicting theoretical narratives rearranged a number of ‘shelves’ housing works of the positivist era. The state of explosive passionarism messed up not only coherent stories of events and theoretical ‘talmuds’ but also the established canonised hierarchies and undisputed standing conceptions. Attention to mainline, core cultural phenomena faded away, the investigative eye turned to previously poorly lit or marginal frontiers. Although Post-modernism did not result in massive ‘removal from pedestals’ of authority figures fed by bloodthirsty revolutions, new lists of the major art ‘players’ are compiled and yet unseen faces appear.

To what extent should the confusion of the Post-modernism turn be incorporated into the active statements of the monograph about the path of modernisation of Lithuanian music and composition schools in the process of exploration and decision-making? Although the identity of post-modern theorisation advocates critical reflection permeated with Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche and Jean-Paul Sartre’s nihilism or Karl Popper’s scepticism, deconstruction and pluralism, and promulgate indeterminism and has claims to meta-theoretical wisdom, I am no less critical about all of this. The epistemic crisis of scientific knowledge was called by one of its instigators, philosopher Jean François Lyotard, as the state of ‘war against unity’. Having demolished the ‘metal constructions’ of positivist logical thinking, Lyotard hotly argued with and sneered at, as he called it, the attitude of the slave of normative thinking attempting to think about the world as a united organic structure. This naïve interpretation created merely for practical ‘convenience’, in his opinion, is destined to fail because it is impossible to reduce the immense diversity of the world down to unity without huge losses. Reflection of different issues is certainly impossible when they lack a philosopher’s imagination and critical interpretation.

Thus, having shattered the fundamental positivist disposition, in exchange, the post-modernist way of thinking suggests a more complicated perception of the world. One of its components would be an assertion that the world, and the development of art in our case, is impossible to understand by relying only on rational construction efforts of a teleological nature. And in fact, the totality ‘exploded’ by critical relations and partitioned into a consistency of organically unrelated fragments, exuded a number of concepts ‘without a common denominator’ and a multiplicity of theories. I have noted one of these ‘fission’ products and chose it for the interpretation of the objects studied. It was a fresh deconstruction which inspired the study and Susan Stanford Friedman’s idea of cultural parataxis with a whiff of new positivism (Friedman, 2001; 2006; 2007). In suggesting a new strategy for ‘reading’ cultural texts, Friedman chose a non-imperial keyword for the construct of Modernism, i.e. ‘parataxis’ (Greek ‘parataxis’ for the ‘act of placing side by side’). She emphasised the parallelism of imperial and peripheral Modernism, as well as pointed out the precedence of geo-modernism and post-colonial investigation of art.
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history. The ‘reread’ texts of 20th century musical culture reveal a more complicated trans-cultural picture of formation and early development of musical Modernism. Friedman did not target Modernism incidentally: post-modernist agents who were ready for a substantial revision first smashed the linear, teleological concept of Modernism and its meta-narratives. The time was ripe for reconsideration and a new interpretation of the concept, especially since the dynamic origins of 20th century music, i.e. Modernism (a synonym for adjectives like ‘new’, ‘modern’, ‘advanced’) has not yet been a definitively delineated theoretical constant. According to Leon Botstein, it developed into a solid scientific concept only after it became a polemic and analytical category.

By the way, Friedman’s studies of the development of trans-national Modernism strategies, where she attempted to reflect upon European literature, music and painting pertaining to the period from 1900 to 1916 through an intermediary syncretic glance, also cover the most important part of Mikalojus Konstantinas Čiurlionis’ (1875-1909) works. The earliness of Čiurlionis’ non-imperial Modernism may explain why Čiurlionis’ compositional discoveries were hidden under mysterious concepts of ‘own’ and ‘new’ in his letters and they were not interpreted more thoroughly. He stepped into the most important trend of 20th century music from a romantic world of the ‘religion of art’ by looking for new solutions (‘I do not want to be unfaithful to myself, what I want is to set a more difficult task for myself’) and finding inspiration (‘and I feel so much energy and belief in myself that I will fulfil the task’). In this way, material documents appeared in his musical compositions as early as 1904–1909 which formulated the motto of Modernism in the art of sounds in Lithuania of the time. Its essence was described by Daniel Albright building on the recommendation of Confucius to ‘make it new’. Despite the fatal non-performance of Čiurlionis’ works, through other, perhaps metaphysical channels, they evoked and stimulated the development of 20th century Lithuanian music and interjected themselves into the unwritten stories of musical Modernism.

However, the position of the grand narratives of Modernism which was based on the opposition of clearly-distinguished Modernism centres, metropolises (in music, the New Viennese School, Darmstadt, etc.) and the remaining world as periphery was critically reviewed by Friedman and like-minded scholars (Anthony L. Geist and Jose B. Monléon, George Yúdice, Jani Scandura, Laura Doyle, Laura A. Winkiel, Michael Thurston, Howard J. Booth, Nigel Rigby, Astradur Eysteinsson). For many people,
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cosmopolitan, urbanised Modernism of metropolises, according to Friedman, embodied a form of internationalism and was fundamentally opposite to what was perceived as 'local', 'parochial', 'regional' and in the local language. Not surprisingly, in narratives of Modernism, the centres (the West) were observed and adored, whereas the remaining world (the Rest) with its local forms of Modernism was viewed as successors, imitators and plagiarists of artists in metropolises (musical Modernism was similarly viewed by George Perle, Ernst Křenek, Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt and others). Thus, the 'grand' narratives of Modernism ignored the regions which were in the shadow of the gleaming centres and modernising in their own particular way. The call by the advocates of parataxis to perceive Modernism as the entirety of different types of Modernism from different parts of the world created a more complicated construct of modernity. It encouraged a post-colonial feel in art spaces, destroyed and changed the insights of positivist views. Heterogenic modernity or the expanded concept of non-imperial Modernism opened broader horizons for modernisation of music and national configurations of modernisms.

Events discussed in this book, in many cases are distinguished by a specific manner of cognition, thinking and investigation. The current state of many art categories may be perceived as a traumatic experience, a move from a sober epistemological order of knowing, where defined concepts, terms and categories were used, to a viscous field of ruins of indeterminist 'decomposed metanarratives' ('great stories'). Immense diversity of phenomena appeared not only after weakly reflected or peripheral objects were elevated, but also after the discursive viewpoints of researchers and thinkers changed. The abundant prefix 'post-' in denoting phenomena does not constitute merely external morphological solidarity with the form of post-modernist thinking. However, the answer to the question whether the human mind is capable of understanding the art of sounds that has wound up in the centre between Geistwissenschaften and Naturwissenschaften; whether our observations and analytical experiments reveal the reality of modernisation of Lithuanian music or merely creates it – this leaps into the area of metaphysical subsystems (philosophy of mind, philosophy of cognition, and philosophy of science). Let philosophers and readers of this book answer these questions.

Like in many other sciences, a firmer philosophical foundation is tirelessly sought for art studies. Previously, insights were based on evidence that is now devalued, and modern art science is fed by hypotheses because the pluralistic state of philosophy loses the systematicity of a discipline, as well as the status of being the foundation of many sciences. Shaky ontological foundations and shaken epistemologies of many sciences reacted painfully to the closing of its metaphysical dimension. A radical conversion of artistic practise inevitably requires a modern interpretative attitude. It becomes difficult to define not only a piece of art, but also the natural intent of writing a story is paralysed by a number of conventionalities. George Dickie, one of the scholars who validated the conception of institutional art, defined an artwork as a 'candidacy for evaluation'. It is declared by the author's intent, the attitude expressed towards the product of their creation, and participants of the world of art recognising it (according to Dickie, the artefact having acquired this status becomes an artwork). Later, Dickie formulated, in his opinion, an even more precise definition: 'A work of art is an artefact of a kind created to
be presented to an artworld public... And the questions why it becomes nearly impossible to write new stories and why an ironic post-modernist glance capitulates when faced with story writing tasks were answered by Janko Kos who provided a literary example: it is a heyday of nihilism (truths are not interpretative), decadence or identity crisis and anarchism (writing as an irrational game and an area of freedom). We nearly end up in a situation where it is hard to substantiate webs of affirmations, although they do not become meaningless, yet reliable theories and methodological instruments to negate them are lacking. Thus, it is impossible to state that they are right or wrong.

Musicology is not an exception. It is lost among already-written stories that have absorbed positivist insights and whose fundamental concept of values was based on cause and effect. It seems that it misses the links to *logos* and *ratio*, which allowed us to believe that the entirety consists of organically coordinated separate parts of cognition. These have withdrawn into the shadow of post-modernist uncertainty under a statute of limitations. How should I write about the path of modernisation of local musical culture when musicology as a discipline experiences and realises in practice the lessons of Derrida's deconstruction concept, and interpreted musical meanings have been saturated with the euphoria of differences. The epoch's interpretative liberalism and simulacrum-like essence of things also emerged in the field of musicological ideas. The response to the disintegration of musicology as a discipline has been painful. The result was not only the split of musicological fields into new musicology, critical musicology, feminist musicology and other fields. Dynamic alternatives in musicology shook the belief that the core of the discipline is based on the concept of historical and theoretical musicology. The opinion that music can be studied apart from musicology as a discipline, without its binary backbone, directly through the historiographic and cultural context by revealing socially constructed meanings of music, started to emerge.

On the other hand, reviews of the development of music phenomenon quite often get entangled in the consequences of statements that are weakly based in art practice; therefore, a review of the neo-positivist attitude is called for. Why? Innovations in art theories and methods in post-modernist discourses were formed on the basis of considerations in philosophy, literary theory, cultural anthropology, linguistics, communication, media theories, etc. Insights or even entire theories were quite often transposed into the texts of art studies nearly mechanically by bypassing the barriers of critical distance and the procedures aimed at habituating them to the ‘body’ of the art of sounds. Unprecedented convergence with other sciences supressed the general watchfulness of art studies. In a state of confusion and a kind of stagnation, musicology took on the job of scanning, ‘expropriating’ and the further development of ideas. However, independent creation of new theories regarding the sound art made no progress. As Gilles Deleuze philosophically described the situation, we are incorporated in someone else’s dream, we dream the
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dream of the other, and do not dream our own dream. However, readers will not find firm evidence of an ‘unlove of theories’ (Aušra Jurgutienė) or ‘the resistance to theory’ (Paul de Man) which are abundant in the age of ‘New Modernism’. Although one fundamental position of Post-modernism coincided with disregard to earlier mandatory principles of objectivity and substantiation, i.e. ‘physical’ data, conditional evidence, there remains an attempt to preserve the elements of systematic thinking, which still have not been devalued in sciences related to analytical, hermeneutic and semiotic traditions.

The discourse of the monograph is created at the intersection of two fundamental problem axes. A broadly perceived concept of Modernism is to be mentioned among the features generating the landscape of 20th century musical composition that shaped the character of the profile for a long time. Modernism of the first half of the 20th century or the ‘old’ avant-garde (1914–1949), the radical processes of the post-war ‘new’ avant-garde (from 1949), as well as Post-modernism emerging from John Cage’s intellectual anarchies in *Music of Changes* (1951), *Musicircus* (1967), and Luciano Berio’s *Sinfonia* (1968) became the most important concept of inquiry in this monograph. Thus, the path of modernisation of Lithuanian professional music is reconsidered from the perspective of post-modernist musicology and culture theories. In the face of the present, the doctrine of modernity certainly is not an official ideology of relevant current musical composition. However, a specifically-expressed relation with artistic practice and canons of Modernism obviously sketches the outlines of the development of Lithuanian professional music in the 20th century. Operational inventions of compositional techniques, their canonisation and fetishism as well as later individual creative interpretations are certainly the constants of modernist musical composition and its teleological confidence.

Another question: what do the dates of Čiurlionis’ later works (1904–1909) that marked the birth of Lithuanian Modernism mean to Lithuania and Europe? Firstly, that meant that his later music was attributed to early European Modernism or the transitional period (1890–1910/14) inspired by breakthroughs in compositions by Claude Debussy, Gustav Mahler, and Richard Strauss. Secondly, Čiurlionis’ new constructivist experiments and solutions of combinatorial rebuses coincided with the start of the New Viennese School. They even preceded an advertisement printed in one Viennese newspaper in the autumn of 1904 regarding private lessons with Arnold Schönberg’. Alban Berg and Anton Webern noticed the ad and took several modest pieces of music to him and Schönberg agreed to teach them composition. Thus, composition, teaching and learning are intertwined and I aimed to demonstrate this in the pages of this monograph.

The sound of musical Modernism of new Europe returned to Lithuania at the end of the 20s of the 20th century when composers returned from studies abroad and were integrated into local musical life. Young people who returned from rebellious Paris and Prague and more moderate 20th century new music centres in Leipzig or Berlin stirred up the calm waters of the sound of the tonal system and local topicalities. To a certain extent, their incursion evoked a sense of collision between global romantic and modern art: the sincere, dreamy and sentimental sound of Lithuanian music was replaced with the ‘taste of metal’ of strong musical construction, the courage of dissonances, the euphoria of progress, and a belief in the fatality of progress. When Romanticism clashed with the urbanised spirit of
Modernism, a number of new composition aspects became evident in Lithuanian music at the end of the 20s. The conception of the task of creating national music changed from the opposition of ‘national’, ‘universal’, ‘cosmopolitan’ towards their compatibility with a move towards eliminating one component. ‘Material’ levels of national representation also changed and there was a move away from declarative and descriptive use of folk melodies at a ‘linguistic’ level. ‘By considering that the foundations of nationality should derive from old folk songs, we would usurp the freedom of contemporary creators of Lithuanian music’, declared Jeronimas Kačinskas in 1933 after his return from Prague. The aim was a more organic in-depth representation of nationality. Besides, experiences of 20th century composition were opening up. Perhaps changes in the conception of Debussy and Varèse’s musical forms accompanied Vytautas Bacevičius back to Lithuania with an aim to create individual forms even for every individual piece of music because ‘the basis of the form was spiritual rather than physical construction’ and in a number of pieces of music ‘the form is my own’ (Vytautas Bacevičius). Kačinskas returned with an equally radical idea of atemthic composition suggested by Alois Hába. Along with the micro-interval system introduced in Lithuanian music, it was even intended to buy special instruments. Attention to metamorphoses of tonality was becoming increasingly evident, and utopian visionariness was tentatively being projected.

The first Lithuanian 20th century Modernism is validated by the structural form building, octatonicism, micro-ostinatic forms of Čiurlionis’ musical opuses, Kačinskas’ atemthic and micro-interval music, Bacevičius’ atonality, neo-classicist and constructivist trends. In this monograph, the continuation of the modernisation of post-war Lithuanian music is represented by the individual creative system and compositions of Osvaldas Balakauskas. At the turn of the 21st century, the most pronounced neo-avant-garde position in this monograph’s discourses is represented by the micro-dimensional method and system of Rytis Mažulis’ musical composition. Studies of the modernisation of Lithuanian music using the theory of cultural parataxis and methodology of parataxical comparativism have only started.

Research shows that in different cultures cherishing the aesthetics and compositional principles of Western music, composers of the first half of the 20th century were moving in a similar direction in their quest that was pioneered by the 20th century searchers of New Music. This was the expansion and in-depth transformation of the tonal system and the compositional method based on it. Composers in metropolises and the periphery were taking the same path independently of each other. They were fellow-travellers on the path of modernity. They were searching for and created individual composition methods (Claude Debussy, Alexander Scriabin, Igor Stravinsky, Josef Matthias Hauer, Fritz Heinrich Klein, Ferruccio Busoni, Béla Bartók, Anton Webern, Edgard Varèse or Charles Ives). They were approaching individual twelve-tone techniques and systemic twelve-tone tonality constructed on a new logical basis. However, the seal

of Modernism in compositions and historiographies highlighted formalism, technocentric values and newness, the teleological conception of progress and success criteria for solving compositional rebuses. A geo-modernist view and interpretative analysis in this monograph will probably substantiate the opinion that Lithuanian composers suggested their own visions of Modernism rather than being passive consumers of compositional innovations coming from technology-dictating centres (the West). The path of modernisation of Lithuanian music and compositional discoveries broaden the conception of musical geo-modernism and makes local modernisms that sprang up together with Austrian and German Modernism relevant. Therefore, the monograph is an attempt to join the discussion that is starting in Lithuania about the specificity of the development of Lithuanian national music and an urge to speak about the transnational nature of musical Modernism, its tradition, the diversity of identities and geographies.

On the other hand, reflection on linear Modernism was favourable not only for the rise of Modernism centres (the West) and placing of frozen figures of ideal heroes on pedestals, but also for the marginalisation of other cultures and geographic peripheries. The studies of this monograph will probably support the Post-modernist fight against the idea of ‘linear Modernism’ by means of examples of modernisation of Lithuanian music and will join the discussion whether composers ‘were called’ to perform the tasks related to the progress in music evolution.

When looking at the changes in the scope of the concept of musical Modernism and research of canonised phenomena, at least three research stages may be pointed out. The first one is related to the studies of works by composers from musical Modernism centres (the West), which include a number of works by global 20th century scholars. Works by composers belonging to the Second Viennese School (Arnold Schönberg, Alban Berg and Anton Webern), which were based on an art philosophy developed by Theodor W. Adorno (1949, 1958, 1970, 1978) were studied by Ernst Krenek (1937, 1952), Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt (1951), Hans Jelinek (1952), Boguslaw Schäffer (1958), George Perle (1962), Arnold Schönberg (1967), Christoph von Blumröder (1981), Yuri Khlopov (1984, 1999), Rudolf Stephan (1990), Kathryn Bailey (1991), Jim Samson (1993), Arved Ashby (1995), Arnold Whittall (2008), Julian Johnson (2010, 2011) et al. The second stage of theoretical interpretations of musical Modernism is related to the review of the conception of musical Modernism and actualisation of ‘other’ modernisms (mainstream). Other different and dissimilar modernisms by Béla Bartók, Ferruccio Busoni, Igor Strawinsky and Edgar Varèse, Alois Hába, Henry Cowell and Charles Ives, which coexisted at that time and formed an overall pluralistic picture of Modernism in the first half of the 20th century were recognised and designated. The third stage of the studies of musical Modernism developed together with the geomodernist conception and emerged as an intellectual idea of the post-modernist post-colonial era. This perspective opens up the authentic anatomy of 20th century musical modernity, cultural and national identities, the media and networks of modernisation of former ‘peripheries’ (the Rest). These studies evidence innovation in recent research of cultural studies, history of art, philosophy and anthropology.

Back in 1933, Thomas Stearns Eliot described modern criticism as observing the history of literature from ‘different and more remote perspectives’ in his book The Use of Poetry and
the Use of Criticism. According to Eliot, modern works are perceived as new and strange objects appearing in the proscenium newness of which pushes better known works into periphery. In this way, modernity is placed in the focus. On the other hand, interest in individual creativity did not subside even in Post-modernism, other researchers dive into radical contextualisation of this creation or analyse the components of the creation — performance — perception — assessment chain and their interfaces.

The second problem axis of the monograph is focussed on yet another studied object, i.e. the teaching or education part of creation of the art of sounds, which was expelled to the periphery of academic science and characteristic of Western musical tradition infused in different ways into composers’ aesthetical concepts and specific scores of works of the art of sounds. By focussing on the conceptual educational conception of the phenomenon of a ‘composition school’ and the changes in its development, I aim to distinguish the major features and branches of pedagogical schools of Lithuanian composers, and discuss composition classes that operated in Lithuania — from the activities of Stasys Šimkus to Mārtiņš Viļums. These are the factors stimulating the development, modernisation and maturity of the nearly one-hundred-year-long Lithuanian musical culture. Incidentally, the teaching of music composition in Lithuania was begun at the initiative of Stasys Šimkus when a composition class established in the Klaipėda Music School (Memeler Konservatorium für Musik) in 1923. When this role was taken over by the temporary capital Kaunas, the first composition school in Lithuania was instituted there. Later, through Juozas Gruodis’ efforts, Lithuanian composition schools and composition classes formed. The ‘tree’ of Osvaldas Balakauskas’ composition school grew up in another cultural ‘soil’: Both trunks of Lithuanian composition schools were fed by German and Russian musical culture and composition pedagogy.

Music composition schools undergo transformation through their students. Students carry on the school’s tradition, however, as they develop as individuals, students-artists quite often oppose their teachers, revise the foundations of the school and create a new tradition. Nevertheless, from a post-modern perspective it becomes clear that the idea of ‘school’, even the concept ‘composition school’, is weakly represented in the discourses of modern music. Its relevance is undeclared, definitions are not considered and in critical discourses it is just a general concept, which is additionally inundated with post-modernist indefiniteness. Thus, like Jean Baudrillard’s concept of simulacra, it is paradoxical, artificial, open and polysemous, a ‘hyper-real shadow’ (simulacra emerges from simulacra, according to Baudrillard), having left its ‘original’ and definiteness in the times of positivist thinking and the interpretative lexicon of music history. Attitudes towards national composition schools differ as well. Disputes of Western and Eastern European scholars quite often clash on the conception of the ethnic orientation of a composition school, and conceptions are affected by historical and ideological views. The Western position is well revealed in observations by Carl Reinecke, Niels Wilhelm Gade, Hans Heinrich Eggebrecht, Willi Apel and others who are insensitive to the idea of
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national music. They posit the opinion that the peripherality of musical phenomena is acknowledged by the stated theses of national music or national composition schools. The fact is that in research of philosophy, anthropology and musicology dedicated to the development of professional music, the phenomenon of a composition school is not and was not actively and seriously considered, although the importance of its levels has never been argued. In Lithuania, studies of this phenomenon are still new and fragmented, sporadically touched upon from different points of analysis. Algirdas Jonas Ambrazas is the one who accomplished most in this area. Dissatisfied with historiographic, factological data, the author focusses on the pedagogical and artistic practice, and analyses the forms of expression of creativity and didactics of the creative process in the context of Lithuanian music. The analysis related to art studies highlights two aggregates of studies. They are viewed as vectors that raise questions about the conception of a canonised (pedagogical) school, including complicated questions about the true origins of the phenomenon. Fundamental trajectories of modernisation are also viewed from the school’s perspective in this monograph. In the context of these objectives, I considered the possibilities and strategies of the creation of modern national musical culture.

I join those who observe and are interested in how national musical culture formed, its institutions and composition school (Juozas Gruodis) were established, creative orientations crystallised and expressed, an individual relation with the paradigms of Modernism formed, and the dilemma of integrating national music into modern composition was solved in the 20th century. These moments genetically validated the development of Lithuanian professional music in the second half of the 20th century and their certain qualities are evidence of the narrowing cultural gap. This is confirmed by Lithuanian minimalism (Bronius Kutavičius), a nearly simultaneous wave of ‘new romanticists’ (Algirdas Martinaitis, Onutė Narbutaitė, Vidmantas Bartulis), trends of intertextuality, the trend of micro-dimensional creation and polychronicity (Rytis Mažulis), features of hyper-complexity (Šarūnas Nakas), and creation of individual compositional systems (Julius Juzeliūnas, Osvaldas Balakauskas, Rytis Mažulis). The development of transformational processes in 20th century European and Lithuanian music shows general technological ideas, their Lithuanian interpretations, encourages revelation of unique and universal areas in the development of Lithuanian professional music. In order to avoid pure empiricism or in Derrida’s view, all the matrixes of flaws and shortcomings of a discourse, when faced with the phenomenon of Lithuanian pedagogical composition schools, monographs attempt to answer a new spate of questions: Does the body of music still contain the gene which typifies a ‘school’? What is its code and what provides it with an identity? How does the gene programme generations of a specific musical genre and their changes? How should we write histories of (pedagogical) composition schools in the environment of Post-modernism?

The monograph is structured as a binary system of stories of different scopes. The monograph’s specific discourse is created by the plasticity of concepts in both parts of its structure which is interpreted as a possibility to support each other or equalise differences in art. In other words, I avoid static declarative statements and the aim is to model an active situation where interacting problems are tackled. There is integration of theories
that have escaped the positivist and anti-positivist state, interdisciplinary information of different origins about objects I have studied, which caused spontaneous upheavals and coloured reflections on a number of phenomena, yet hopefully does not petrify into a static narrative. Baudrillard did not doubt that reality was replaced with hyperreality and an endless game of simulacras, and, according to him, the removal of boundaries between reality and simulation became the main feature of the epoch\(^{13}\). Simulation of theories and scientific methods broadly disseminated a number of affirmations that have not been definitively proven, because everything was permeated with the so-called simulation process: one simulacra emerges from the other simulacra, and the original no longer exists.

This monograph probably contains some remains of reality. The new authenticity constructed by post-structuralism, the ‘trueness’ may also be demonstrated and its meanings interpreted anew. In this way, even musical traditions or movements, art ideologies or trends are hybrid, ‘chromatic’; they may be studied as new constructions. Intersections between the modernity of Lithuanian musical culture and its composition schools became this new construction in this monograph. Penetrative multidimensional interactions criss-cross the two blocks of thematic critical interpretation in this book. Although my inclination to look for in-depth and ‘authentic’ features of the new construction are not abandoned in the texts of the book, the comparison of analytical and historiographic trends negates the positivist belief that there is only one right path in studying ‘authentic’ features.

Depending on a monograph’s aims and goals and taking into account specific thematics of research, firmly established interdisciplinary approaches, different combinations of structuralist and post-structuralist methods are used in modern art studies. I strove to achieve my objectives by making use of comparative, systemic, analytical, interpretative and culturological methods and their combinations. Aspectual and critical analysis of the fundamental and most recent musical Modernism theories, selected musical texts, documents from the Lithuanian (Lithuanian Archives of Literature and Art, Lithuanian Central State Archives, M. K. Čiurlionis National Museum of Art (ČDM), Čiurlionis Fund, Rare Publications Sector at the Klaipėda University Library) and Ukrainian (Central State Archives-Museum of Literature and Art) archives, authentic accounts, manuscripts and documents, published scores, epistolary sources, etc., formed the basis for the monograph. My unpublished conversations with Lithuanian and Ukrainian composers, their contemporaries, students and witnesses form a significant part of the monograph’s sources.

From thematic, musicological and methodological perspectives, the monograph Exploration of the Modernistic Identity of Lithuanian Music, as mentioned before, is divided into two interrelated and intertwined blocks. Each of them reflects the structure of fundamental musicology: systematic and historical musicology, however, the analytical and historiographic discourses constantly interact by means of symbiosis in the pages of the monograph. It may be stated that the monograph consists of different-scope hierarchies where I attempt to avoid the monotony of musicological narratives and employ different ‘optical’ axes of research methodology, themes and narration manners.

Five chapters constitute the first block of texts in the monograph (‘Five Analytical Portraits’). Expositions of the creation of several of the most important figures on the path of Lithuanian music to modernisation (Čiurlionis, Balakauskas and Mažulis) are displayed there. It is notable that the structure of this block and its dramaturgy are reminiscent of the symphonic sonata form. Thus, the narrative pertaining to the time of modernity and post-modernity is composed of musicians’ analytical expositions of different activity. As mentioned before, the main dramaturgical weight is carried by the first and the last parts of the series, i.e. three chapters ‘Modernity in the Musical Compositions of Mikalojus Konstantinas Čiurlionis’, ‘Turning Points and Crossroads in the Modern Works of Osvaldas Balakauskas’ and ‘Rytis Mažulis’ World of Micro-Dimensional Music’. The middle parts of the series, where problems diversify the standard of the sonata form by casting ‘genre’ and thematic shadows of colour on it constitute the centre of the first block of the monograph. This includes deliberation over the dilemma of sacralisation of modern music (‘Rebellious Quest for God in Missa in musica by Feliksas Bajoras’) and a phenomenological discourse of an individual post-modernist ‘historical reconstruction method’ (‘Chants in the Memorial Music of Bronius Kutavičius’).

In the overall picture of modernisation of Lithuanian music, five analytical portraits specify and provide identities for Lithuanian composition schools. The idea of a composition school is represented in its broad sense as the unity of artistic forms affected by the ethnic consciousness of national culture and examples of creation by Lithuanian composition school teachers and students. The second part of the monograph ‘Accounts of Schools of Composition: Desks and Blackboards’ is dedicated to the stories of genealogical ‘trees’ of two Lithuanian composition schools. Its binary form, two chapters ‘Roots of the Osvaldas Balakauskas’ Composition School’ and ‘Genealogy of Lithuanian Composition Schools’, reveals the unknown web of microstories related to Balakauskas’ studies at the Kiev Conservatory, and is completed by genealogical studies of Lithuanian composition schools. The author hopes that this research will contribute to dissemination of Lithuanian musical culture at the international level, help to contextualise Lithuanian musical culture in the international environment and on the global geo-modernist map.

I express sincere gratitude to my colleagues for their efforts to create an intellectual environment, which is favourable for critical reflection and discussions in Lithuania. I extend special thanks to the reviewers of the book: Prof. Dr. Danutė Petrauskaitė, Prof. Dr. Habil. Algirdas Jonas Ambrazas, and Prof. Dr. Jonas Bruveris for their valuable remarks. Sincere thanks to everyone who contributed to the preparation of this book.