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I will always remember August of 1996. It was the month of our arrival in Rīga. It was a month of excitement and anticipation for the unknown. The energy of the city was rampant. Rīga was electric – a dazzling array of endless sights, sounds, and smells. It was a place where the dark held no meaning for the night was filled with the light of day.

I remember when I saw the other side of the cheery façade of that summer in Rīga. My husband and I were standing before the main entrance to No. 1 Baron Street [Barona iela]. As we pushed on the heavy, wooden door, I was filled with a great sense of trepidation. The building looked foreboding. The exterior was decaying and colorless. A myriad of questions raced through my mind. Would the door budge? Was it locked? Would anyone be inside? Were they, too, away for the summer holiday? It seemed as if all the local inhabitants were away on vacation. What new and completely unfamiliar experience would assail us once inside? We had traveled a great distance to be in this very place – the building occupying No. 1 Baron Street.

The swollen door finally opened under our combined weight and effort.

We entered. Total darkness. The sun had been unusually bright, and now we were suffering the immediate effects of light deprivation. I blinked. Nothingness. Slowly, my eyes adjusted. A thought flashed. Was the building officially closed for the
summer or not? Where were the lights? Later, I was to discover that electricity in this building was a luxury not easily afforded at any time, except on special occasions.

As I stood in the receding shadow, I was struck by the interior character of the building. It was not only dark, it was dank. The stillness was unsettling, unnerving, and most of all, haunting. It was not at all the picture of bustling activity that I had naïvely envisioned in my mind's eye.

For months, I had been daydreaming of doing research in a foreign country, in a conservatory steeped in Russian tradition, theory, and pedagogy. Instead I was here, in this place. “Here” was the Jāzeps Vītols’ Latvian Academy of Music. “Here” was where I would spend the majority of the next seven months of my life. Had we made a mistake? Was this really No. 1 Baron Street? My addled brain refused to reconcile my preconceived notion of a resplendent “European” conservatory with the images that now surrounded me, pervading my every sense.

I remember pity. My initial disbelief had turned to pity and remorse. The Academy had been beautiful at one time. That much was painfully evident. The building had suffered years of neglect and disrepair. I could only assume that renovations would soon be under way. Upon our arrival, the city’s energy had been palpable. Riga was undergoing not only a political and economic renovation, but an architectural one as well. Years of abuse and abandonment due to the unsympathetic former Communist regime were symbolically scoured away with fresh coats of paint and remodeling. The necessary renovations in the Academy, however, had yet to take place.
A musty, pungent miasma filled the air. It was thick, enveloping us in the decay of the once magnificent structure. The vibrant hues of the tiled floors were no longer rich with color. There were no explosions of red against white, but rather faded pink and ecru left in its place. In some places, tiles were chipped, cracked, or altogether missing.

We pushed ahead. Once beyond the glass enclosure of the entry, we proceeded past the information/key control booth, towards the first set of stairs. Massive columns supported the ceiling. The tiles of the stairway, although more intricately detailed than those on the floor, were also in a sad state of disrepair.

At the top of the stairs, a likeness of the conservatory’s founder, Jāzeps Vītols (1863-1948), greeted us in silent disapproval. The rendition was not a bust in the usual sense of the word. It was simply a large granite sculpture of his head, his features forever etched in a very generalized and brooding manner. The stone head peered down at us from a huge wooden base.

To our immediate left and right, as well as behind Vītols’ mammoth pate, darkened corridors ran. Sunlight streamed through the window at the far end of the left hallway. It was a bright contrast to the gloom and desolation around us. Another window of colored glass held Vītols’ silhouette before us. Adjacent to both corridors was another pair of stairs, one leading to the left and the other to the right. Ultimately, we chose to explore the left.

As we climbed the slate-gray cement steps, sunlight continued to pour through the windows. Our sense of despair diminished. Wood replaced cement. In the distant past,
someone had take great pains to lay the beautifully crafted wooden floor that was now beneath our feet. Years of use had robbed the wood of its lacquer and lustrous, blond color. With every footfall in those hallowed halls, the boards moaned, creaking in protest against our presence. We moved slowly, examining the oil paintings of two highly regarded Latvian composers, the first of which I recognized to be Andrejs Jurjāns, the focus of my research for the next seven months. A glass display case, locked doors, and thankfully, more sunlight occupied our attention. We noisily creaked our way to the end of the hall, basking in the sunlight pouring through the windows that faced the courtyard on the right and Raiņa Boulevard in front of us. The sunlight became our refuge and our shelter from the dark silent corridors and winding passageways. Currently, we passed one such hallway. It possessed no light whatsoever. Peering into the blackness, we decided against further exploration. We paused one last time at the far window. Cars of all foreign makes sped by our vantage point. Reflecting on all that had transpired, we absorbed as much of the sun's rays as we could before descending into the eerie stillness of the first level. It was time to leave.

Metaphorically, the levels of the Academy represented how I would pass through the transition from the summer into the colder months ahead, fading warmth and frivolity into the bleak winter. As I made my descent, how could I have known the mental and emotional challenge awaiting me. At best, I was naïve about what lay ahead. The greatest obstacle to my research would not be my neophyte comprehension of the language, which was an obstacle of enormous magnitude, but the effort and discipline required to
overcome the depression and hardship of daily survival in the approaching sunless, cheerless winter. Waking up in the mornings would become a chore. I later discovered the irony in my first impression of the conservatory. The Academy would become the source of my greatest happiness and pleasure, a place of newly-forged friendships and dedicated study, despite its gloomy appearance.

A few weeks after our initial inspection of the school, I was introduced to the man who would eventually become my mentor and friend. Professor Jānis Torgāns, the Assistant Rector of Jāzeps Vītols’ Latvian Academy of Music [Jāzepa Vītola Latvijas Mūzikas akadēmijas] and a leading musicologist in the Baltic region, was nothing short of a God-send.

I immediately liked Professor Torgāns. He was a jovial man of medium-build with a warm smile and a pleasant, unassuming demeanor. He welcomed me to his country with the most robust handshake that I have ever felt. Had I had the time, or the presence of mind, to get a better grip, I might have saved my hand from being utterly crushed. I relate this anecdote because Professor Torgans approached his instruction, my tutorials, and life with the same gusto as one of his infamous handshakes. His enthusiasm was infectious, and to his credit, I must add that without his guidance and support, the work presented here would not have been possible.

I have never seen an individual as busy as Professor Torgāns, and yet he always made the time to fit me, an unofficial student, into his hectic schedule. In addition, he was more than willing to converse in English during our weekly meetings. For that, I am most
grateful, although I have often wondered if perhaps the thought of my butchered Latvian was simply too much to bear. In which case, I can hardly blame him.

Professor Torgāns directed the path of my research in terms of what to get and where to find it. Sometimes, he even took it upon himself to locate materials if he felt that I might run into problems. He taught me how to use the cataloguing system in the conservatory libraries, which was a detailed process indeed considering their lack of a computer database. He opened any bureaucratic channels that could have been a hindrance in obtaining the necessary materials for my study.

Professor Torgāns also played a pivotal role in my concept of a teacher. By his example, he showed me what it is to be a true pedagogue while maintaining his own humanity. I will always remember his patience and kindness. He was a man of unlimited talent and knowledge, known to his colleagues as a "walking encyclopedia." His mental prowess never failed to astound me. Despite his two doctorates from the Moscow Conservatory, however, he was never condescending when I lacked the ability to comprehend an abstract or theoretical concept. His capacity for nurturing his students' thinking was beyond anything I had ever experienced. Ultimately, it was Professor Torgāns' innate abilitiy to relate to me as an individual, as well as his pupil, that fortified my inner strength, conviction, and determination. His humility and unabounding wit put me at ease. With all of his accomplishments and extraordinary talents, he certainly had the power to intimidate. Instead, he treated me with the utmost respect and paternal guidance. No matter what my barriers, Professor Torgāns never allowed me to think that
I could not accomplish the monumental task of completing my research and thesis. I am in his debt for whatever success I may achieve with this body of work.
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Today it would be hard to find another nation in Europe that deserves to be called a nation of poetry, or a land that should so well deserve the name “land of poetry”, as do the Latvian people and the Latvian land.

-Johann Kohl, Nineteenth-century German geographer

INTRODUCTION

The idea of nationalism was a powerful force that affected the arts and, more specifically, music in nineteenth-century Europe. According to Carl Dahlhaus, it was during the nineteenth century that a resignification of folk music was spawned by Johann Gottfried Herder's *Volksgeist* hypothesis. The *Volksgeist* hypothesis is Herder's inference that folk music, typical of a regional or social character, should be automatically interpreted as a national element within the confines of a created work, since “the spirit of a people” is the fundamental, creative element in art. Nineteenth-century bourgeoisie further romanticized the role of folk music in the concept of nationalism. The bourgeoisie believed that national character was the primary quality of folk music. Their erroneous conclusion that folk music was the music of a nation was, thus, a hope created by nationalism, as well as a justification of their national consciousness and ethnic authenticity. As a result, the question of authenticity and originality changed the course of nineteenth-century music history, even though folklorism is simply an expression of musical nationalism and not vice versa.

Dahlhaus, however, fails to mention that Herder laid the foundations for his *Volksgeist* hypothesis and his future theories on language, aesthetics, beauty, psychology and sense perception, and historical relativism in Riga, Latvia, 1764-1769. Many European countries including Russia, the Balkans, Scandinavia, and the Slavic countries, have been studied to illustrate how people have collectively identified with folk references in their respective musics. Consequently, the lack of investigative studies concerning the impact of folk influences on Latvian art music is ironic especially in light of the possibility that Herder formulated his *Volksgeist* hypothesis in Riga during the 1700s. Believing that the spirit of a people was the patent, creative element in art, Herder realized the inherent beauty and power of Latvian folk music. In addition to his duties as an assistant pastor and author of secular essays reconciling rationalism and religion, Herder became the first to collect and translate Latvian and Estonian folk texts into German. He later introduced his collection to Goethe and Schiller.³ His enthusiasm regarding the Latvian *dainas*, or the text of Latvian folk songs, was expressed by such epithets as “The Latvians have a specific kind of poetry and music; it points to Nature which still remains their real teacher.”⁴

In general, Herder believed folk songs lay at the true heart of the Latvian nation.

---


³Alfred Bilmanis, *A History of Latvia* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1970), 237. Herder eventually fled Riga due to his expostulations against the oppression of the Latvians by the German nobility and the tsarist government of Russia. Notably, it was his view that “Humanity shudders with horror at the blood which was shed there. Perhaps the time will come when they will be set free, will be established again for Humanity’s sake.”

⁴Irbe, *op. cit.*, 8.
The question for historians of Western art music, however, still remains today as to what exactly was taking place in nineteenth-century Latvian art music and its subsequent reception. Even a cursory review of general music histories would confirm the egregious oversight of composers from the Baltic region, Latvia in particular. Although Andrejs Jurjāns, the focus of this work, is briefly mentioned in sources such as the New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians, Sohlmann's, and Baker's Biographical Dictionary, Latvian composers have been sorely overlooked when compared to the attention paid to Russian composers, for example. In fact, one would be hard-pressed to name any composer of Latvian origin from this era, an era in which the idea of nationalism as an epiphenomenon within the parameters of nineteenth-century art music was pervasive throughout the European continent. This is a rather unthinkable occurrence since there is a figure who stood as a perennial symbol of Latvian national identity during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Andrejs Jurjāns (1856-1922) is still highly venerated by Latvians for his use of residual strands of folk extraction, the retentions from a folk tradition that remain unchanged so that they serve as formative elements in his symphonic and choral repertoire. That is not to say that Jurjāns' use of folk songs confirms the Volksgeist hypothesis in any way, but rather exemplifies the theory that folklorism is an expression of

---

nationalism. According to Malena Kuss, the argument concerning residual strands of folk extraction is rather that:

Selectivity not only regulates the structural level at which residual strands appear assimilated but also reveals cultural focus: if many composers select a certain element over many others, this strand assumes cultural value by collective consensus among its users, the composers.⁶

Consequently, Jurjāns is considered to be the father of Latvian art music and a symbol of Latvian identity not only by his colleagues, but also presently by the Latvian people and scholars of history and ethnography. Jurjāns is the nexus of a long line of Latvian composers that essentially spans four generations leading up to the present day. In his own milieu, there is only one other composer of equal importance, Jāzeps Vītols (1863-1948). Although both composers attended the St. Petersburg Conservatory, only Vītols returned to Latvia, bringing with him the respected, time-honored traditions of his school. He is most noted for establishing the first and only conservatory in Latvia. Like Jurjāns, Vītols’ pedagogical prowess and compositional abilities enabled him to bring recognition to Latvian music. In his humility, however, Vītols believed that Jurjāns held the same meaning for Latvia as Glinka did for Russia.⁷ This thesis presents a study of Andrejs Jurjāns’ significant symphonic works as informed by a native musicologist, Professor Jānis Torgāns, and illuminates Jurjāns’ role within the cosmopolitan framework of the national idea in music.

⁶Kuss, op. cit., 100.

Chapter I examines the socio-political climate of Latvia’s history that contributed to Jurjāns’ canonization as a national composer, and includes a concise biography on Jurjāns. Significantly, the historical sources for the first chapter are drawn from authors of differing nationalities. Four of the histories were by Latvians, three by Americans, and one by an author of German origin. The importance of the authors’ backgrounds is relevant. As I sifted through the voluminous amounts of information, I noticed how severely biased was each history depending on the author’s nationality. The authors’ subjectivity became a major obstacle in constructing my own account of past events. After digesting several politically motivated histories and several inaccuracies, I took great pains to reconstruct a history that is intended to be as objective and insightful as it is respectful of the Latvian people. Professor Torgāns graciously guided me through the process of deciphering what was historically accurate, what was not, and what was absolutely offensive.

The works discussed in the subsequent chapters are the most important in Jurjāns’ repertoire, that is, all of his large-scale symphonic works. His other works include some of the first choral arrangements of folk songs in Latvia, as well as his smaller symphonic pieces. Consequently, the availability of scores became a factor in the decision to research his large-scale works. In addition, Professor Torgāns’ musical concepts and terminologies are included in each chapter. Professor Torgāns’ background is pertinent not in so much as he could offer a native perspective as a biographer of Jurjāns, but more importantly because both he and Jurjāns were trained in Russian conservatories. Thus, Professor Torgāns is conversant in the same theoretical concepts and systems with which Jurjāns,
himself, composed. The works are considered in chronological order, following Jurjāns' own musical progress. One very important distinction, however, must be made. Although the *Concerto elegiaco*, Op. 11 is considered the pinnacle of his oeuvre, it is the *Liberation of the Latvian People*, Op. 12 [*Latvju tautas brīvlaišana*, Op. 12] that is the richest in folk references.

The final chapter is a critical response on how the Latvian people identified with and essentially canonized Jurjāns as a symbol of national identity. It also places Jurjāns' accomplishments among those of other composers influenced by the nineteenth-century idea of nationalism, drawing tentative conclusions about Jurjāns' use of native folk songs and his stylistic proclivities. An appendix of Jurjāns' entire compositional output is included.
CHAPTER I

HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL SURVEY

National Antecedents Affecting the Musical Life
of Nineteenth-Century Rīga

Andrejs Jurjāns (1856-1922) gave the Latvian people a gift through his music far more prodigious than any single composition or theoretical essay. A versatile man who was active in composition, pedagogy, aesthetics, and folklore, he gave them a unified voice with which to express their national pride and ethnic heritage against centuries of oppression by the Baltic German nobility and the tsarist governments of Russia. Consequently, Jurjāns’ art stems from the Latvians’ innumerable years of strife and tumult.

The Baltic Provinces underwent long periods of domination from numerous nations seeking continental ports with access to the Baltic Sea. As early as 1290, the “Brethren of the Sword,” and later in 1346 the Teutonic Order, brought Christianity to Latvia.¹ The Teutonic Knights, acting as baronial lords, enserfed the population in order to create the Livonian state of what is now the present-day region of Latvia and Estonia, while trying to convert pagan Latvian tribes to Christianity. After two hundred years passed under the dominion of the Teutonic Order, the Livonian state was simultaneously conquered by the Swedes and Poles, and subsequently dismembered in 1561.

Estonia became a province of the Swedish Empire, and the present-day region of Kurzeme in the western part of Latvia became the Duchy of Kurland under the Polish monarchy. The area of Livonia proper, the present-day Vidzeme region of Latvia, became a dependency of the Polish Commonwealth. It was later subjugated to Swedish rule under Charles XI in 1622.²

The peasants would later remember the Swedish interregnum as the “good old Swedish days,” for the Swedish sovereignty attempted educational reform in order to increase the abysmally low literacy rate of the peasantry.³ For nearly twenty years, the peasants experienced slight social, cultural, and economic progress, much to the pique and chagrin of the Baltic German nobility, the descendants of the Teutonic Order, who were still interested in their own authoritarian control and autocracy over Livonia and its inhabitants.⁴ The barons eventually turned to Peter I of Russia (1682-1725) for assistance, when his promises of territorial autonomy for Livonia kindled their desire for power and control.⁵

Peter’s fulmination against Charles XII of Sweden during the Great Northern War (1700-1721), however, was horribly destructive. In addition to the monarchies of Denmark and Poland fighting Sweden’s domination of the region, Peter I of Russia turned

²von Rauch, op. cit., 2.


⁴Ibid. According to Bilmanis, the landowners’ reprehensible, unchecked treatment of the serfs before Swedish rule had been in close propinquity to that of the brutalization of the African-American slave in the United States.

⁵Ibid.
Livonia into his own personal battlefield. In his vengeful desire to destroy all that represented Sweden, he ordered thousands of farmsteads to be burned, leaving the peasants homeless and disease stricken. The decimation of the peasants was exacerbated when the tsar conscripted thousands of doomed laborers from Livonia to build his new capital of St. Petersburg and the Ladoga Canal. Eventually Swedish rule ended in 1710, when Riga fell to Peter I after he also discomfited the Swedes at the Battle of Poltava in 1709. Proclaimed the first Emperor of Russia, Peter was granted his moniker of “the Great.” Ironically, Peter’s second wife and confidant, Martha Skavronska, was an orphan girl of Livonian descent. Although she was among the peasants who suffered under his vengeful attack against the Swedes, he later crowned her Empress Catherine I.

With the Treaty of Nystad (1721), Sweden officially ceded Estonia and Livonia to Russia, facilitating the latter’s entry into the European community. The Russians further annexed present-day Latgale (Latgalia) in 1773, as well as Kurzeme (Kurland) in 1795 from the Polish Commonwealth, uniting the whole of Latvia and Estonia after years of internal separation.

---


7 Suzanne Massie, Land of the Firebird: The Beauty of Old Russia (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1980), 96-98. According to Massie, Martha was raised as a servant of a Lutheran minister. She was then married off at sixteen to a Swedish dragoon, who disappeared during the wars. As a result, Martha was taken as a spoil of war by a Russian soldier. “Legend says that she was brought to the commander, Count Sheremetev, dressed only in a shift, and that he threw a soldier’s cloak around her and then bought her with a few coins. She was first attached to his household as a servant, but later Peter’s closest friend and lieutenant, Menshikov, spied her and brought her into his household, perhaps even as his mistress. It was in Menshikov’s house that Peter first saw her in 1702.” They were officially wed in 1711. Martha bore twelve children, only two of whom survived.

8 von Rauch, op. cit., 2.
During this period of upheaval, the tsarist government allowed the Baltic German nobility to remain in a position of dominance over the enserfed peasants in exchange for their services in Livonia's restoration. The nobility were more than willing to oblige, giving them the opportunity to quell whatever hopes the peasants secretly harbored in regard to their own personal freedom, with a polity consisting of only the German élite. Furthermore, the tsarist governments of the eighteenth century demonstrated little sympathy for their newly acquired peoples. Not only did Russian officials refuse to intervene in the internal relations between the serfs and German landowners, but they flagrantly ignored the Treaty of Nystad. In his own treaty, Peter I had guaranteed the peoples of Livonia and the surrounding territories all of the inalienable rights they had enjoyed under the protection of Sweden. In addition, the churches and schools would continue to have the same support they received under the Swedish regime. Instead, the serfs were sacrificed to the German élite who in turn reversed all of Sweden's agrarian and educational reforms, including the abrogation of serfdom. The peasants were again chattel, their fate determined by their ruthless squires.⁹

Binding the serfs to the land of their progenitors did have one positive effect. Unaware of how this would benefit the peasants, the Baltic Germans completely lost sight of the intensified localism which would later unite the Latvian serfs. The term "Latvian," however, is used here only to denote language similarities and a localized, fledgling class consciousness. Prior to the nineteenth century, there could not have been a collective

⁹Bilmanis, *op. cit.*, 216.
“Latvian” identity because the serfs were far too dispersed to share one. Additionally, they still had a high illiteracy rate despite the efforts of the Swedes. A small number of serfs were fortunate enough to have found patrons in their German lords, who were committed to assisting those peasants ready and able to achieve social mobility. Unfortunately, the peasants’ cultural and intellectual development did not lead to a Latvian-speaking élite. Such a group could have advanced “Latvian” opinions as well as national sentiment. Instead, the newly emerged Latvian literati allowed themselves to be absorbed into the German and Russian nationalities either by marriage, change of surname, or recruitment into the Russian army. True native élites would not emerge until the latter half of the nineteenth century during the “National Awakening” of the 1860s-1880s.

Although the universal treatment of the peasants did improve due to tsarist intervention under the reign of Catherine the Great (1762-1796), the lot of the serfs remained abominable since her evanescent reforms were followed only in a perfunctory manner by the local, ruling oligarchy. It was not until the Tsarina took steps to extinguish Livonian autonomy altogether that the landed gentry finally installed minute, agrarian

---

10 Andrejs Plakans, “The Latvians,” Russification in the Baltic Provinces and Finland, 1855-1914, ed. Edward C. Thaden (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), 211-12. Although a book which included translations of the Old and New Testaments was written in Latvian at the turn of the sixteenth century, it was authored by the Baltic German clergy, who were loath to increase the literacy of the peasants. Furthermore, it is possible that only a scant percentage of the peasants were even capable of reading the literary works of the day, which were mostly of a sacred nature. It was not until the eighteenth century when secular materials were written. Until that time, the clergy used their Christian beliefs as a method of spiritual restraint instead of spiritual enlightenment to keep the serfs in check. In fact prior to the 1840s, the Lutheran pastors inculcated acceptance of authority in the peasants as their duty as God-fearing Christians. Consequently, Latvian attitudes were restricted to individual manors since there was no means of communication beyond the farmsteads, and peasant uprisings were usually of an ephemeral nature.

11 Ibid., 214.
reforms in order to avoid Russian investigations into much larger abuses on their personal estates. By this time, however, Catherine had abolished the nobility’s authority to govern locally, without taking away their lands.  

With Catherine’s death in 1796, her son Paul I acceded the throne. Paul vindictively sought to efface all of Catherine’s political and cultural influences throughout Russia, which at the time had included what is now present-day Latvia. Furthermore, it was his maniacal phobia of Catherine’s inclination towards French culture, as well as the full import of the French Revolution itself, that compelled him to reign with a tyrannical hand and a hostile attitude towards peoples of non-German origin. Thus, as a German sympathizer of conservative beliefs, Paul reestablished the oligarchical rule of the German patricians over the serfs. His brief rule and policies ended with his assassination and the ascension of his son, Alexander I, to the throne in 1801. Alexander I, by contrast, was concerned with ameliorating the conditions of the peasants through agrarian reforms and emancipation.

The serfs’ freedom, however, was that of a recently uncaged bird. Alexander’s reforms for Kurland (1817) and Livonia (1819) liberated the serfs, but not their land. The land remained in the hands of their German oppressors who continued to manipulate their hold over the peasants with control over the police and educational, administrative, 

---


and judicial systems.\textsuperscript{15} Despite these German countermeasures, an increasingly larger percentage of peasants attempted either a new occupation or enrollment in Dorpat (Tartu) University in Estonia. Others acquired self-education through kindly German benefactors.\textsuperscript{16} Eventually, Alexander’s reforms gave the peasantry responsibility for local affairs. Even though the landowners retained many of their rights, including corporal punishment, the peasants could participate in local government. They were allowed to discuss and solve problems concerning primarily themselves and their townships as never before. Some held official posts within their townships. As a result, a “Latvian” consciousness and local solidarity had begun to take shape, and the Latvian language had finally evolved from a peasant’s dialect into a means of intellectual exchange.\textsuperscript{17}

Despite initial progress under Alexander I, reforms stagnated under Nicholas I (1825-1855), his successor. In fact, during the last decade of his reign, Nicholas’ regime even relegated peasant reform once again to the discretion of the German landowners.\textsuperscript{18} Nicholas established the foundation for further Russification policies by making the Russian language compulsory at Dorpat University, and in all secondary schools and commercial institutions. Although most of these attempts would prove to be unsuccessful, Russian remained mandatory at Dorpat University.

\textsuperscript{15}Bilmanis, \textit{op. cit.}, 226.

\textsuperscript{16}Plakans, \textit{op. cit.}, 216.

\textsuperscript{17}\textit{Ibid.}, 217.

Finally, the Reform Bill of 1861 was passed under Alexander II. This decree reiterated the peasants' emancipation status and forced the nobility in the Latgale region to sell half of their property to the freed serfs. Fearing that the region of Vidzeme was the next in line for reform, the squires of that region attempted to sell small plots of land to the peasants as well. The beneficent appearance of these reforms was only a natural reflection of that which was unavoidably occurring in Russia at roughly the same time. Liberation of the serfs in Russia had to be extended to those also in Vidzeme and Kurzeme (Kurland). With the exception of Alexander I's court, Russian officials more often turned a blind eye to the landowners' control and exploitation of the Latvian peasants, preferring to view the peasants as a wholly ignoble people. Since the German nobility was prominent in Russia, the Germans' scorn for the Latvian peasants could easily be transferred to the Russians. According to Bilmanis, the German nobility "occupied from a third to a half of the high offices of the St. Petersburg government," and as such were considered to be "the backbone of the Russian throne."^19^19

While Alexander II was on the throne, he and his officials also sedulously implemented the program of Russification first attempted by his father, Nicholas I. In essence, the program's purpose was to increase usage of the Russian language in Baltic schools and administrative offices, to defend the interest of the Russian Orthodox Church against the Lutheran theology of the Latvians, and to conform Baltic judicial and

^19^Bilmanis, op. cit., 228-29.

^20^Ibid., 230.
municipal institutions to those in the rest of the empire.\textsuperscript{21} Alexander's program served as a warning to the Baltic Germans that the special rights and privileges they enjoyed under almost every single tsar since 1721 were soon coming to an end.\textsuperscript{22} The Baltic Provinces were to be fully assimilated into the Russian motherland. Despite Russia's attempts to absorb the Baltics, the Latvian peasants continued to consolidate their position. Slowly, a majority of their ancestral land came into their own possession, allowing them the freedom to strive for spiritual and intellectual emancipation against the Russification policies implemented during the "National Awakening" of the 1860s-1880s.\textsuperscript{23} The idea of Latvian nationality and identity flourished during the late 1850s and thereafter among those peasants who prepared themselves intellectually and culturally to lead their people.

\textbf{Andrejs Jurjāns' Life and Times}

Andrejs Jurjāns was born in the town of Ergļi located in the Vidzeme region of Latvia on September 30, or 18th by the Julian calendar, 1856. Both of his parents were peasants committed to the ideals of the "National Awakening." At the time of Jurjāns' birth, a group of Latvian élites and literati known as the "new Latvians" was attempting to advance a radical concept of nationalism.

Led by Kristjānis Valdemars and Atis Kronvalds, the "new Latvians" believed that peasants should be educated not only for general enlightenment, but also to appreciate

\textsuperscript{21}Thaden, \textit{op. cit.}, 170.

\textsuperscript{22}Ibid., 195.

\textsuperscript{23}von Rauch, \textit{op. cit.}, 6.
their national heritage.\textsuperscript{24} Unfortunately, those educated were a minuscule percentage of the actual Latvian population. Unlike the Jurjāns family, it would take many years for the vast majority of the peasants to follow suit. Therefore, it must be stressed that the national awakening of Latvia took place over the course of decades, especially in view of the fact that upward mobility still meant possible adoption of a non-Latvian culture.\textsuperscript{25}

According to Plakans, such was the case with Valdemars, whose own ambition for upward mobility was characterized by compromise. Valdemars was "a symbol of how a heartfelt Latvianess could be combined with complete loyalty to the interests of the [Russian] crown."\textsuperscript{26} Adoption of a non-Latvian culture was considered unacceptable by many of the peasants, including Jurjāns' family. Fortunately, there also existed nationalists of probity who were intransigent, refusing to compromise their beliefs. Although Plakans believes Atis Kronvalds to be the antithesis of Valdemars, the distinction between the two men was not always so clearly defined.

Kronvalds saw in the Latvians not a group of docile peasants, but a people capable of taking back what was rightfully theirs as a nation.\textsuperscript{27} The whole philosophical theory behind Latvian nationalism during the awakening belongs to Kronvalds. He believed that the central issue behind the concept of nationality was that of language and that the spirit of a people manifested itself in it. Prior to the 1850s, language was the only real bond

\textsuperscript{24}Plakans, \textit{op. cit.}, 221.

\textsuperscript{25}\textit{Ibid.}, 222.

\textsuperscript{26}\textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{27}\textit{Ibid.}, 223.
uniting the Latvians as a people and one of the only bonds that would keep them from
denationalization. Consequently, Kronvalds believed that the key to nationality was the
preservation of their language. Valdemars sought economic advancement. Kronvalds’
theory also came into direct conflict with the Russification policies of the tsarist
governments of Alexander II, Alexander III and Nicholas II, which attempted to obliterate
the Latvian language altogether in an effort to denationalize the Latvians. Although both
Kronvalds and Valdemars felt that upward mobility should not require a loss of identity,
only Kronvalds was morally committed to preserving the idea of nationality through
preservation of the language.

The other bond uniting the peasants was an increasing cultural awareness.
In general, the national awakening was a time when art, literature, journalism, theater,
and music flourished for the Latvian people, as did industrialization. Riga became a city
of industry and commerce due to the influx of peasants seeking to change their status.
Thus, the Latvians, who were improving their literacy rate at a phenomenal pace, turned
to the arts for further enrichment and edification. Jurjāns’ parents instilled the values of the national awakening in their children.
As a part of their education, Jurjāns’ father, Andrievs, entertained all nine of his
children, four of whom became musicians, with narrations of ancient Latvian legends.
Furthermore, both Andrievs and his wife, Annuža, gave their children a passion for music.

28Plakans, op. cit., 223.

29According to Alfred Bilmanis, by the 1897 tsar’s census, illiteracy was down to only two percent of the
Latvian population.
Jurjāns’ youth was filled with the sounds of his father’s violin and his mother’s folk songs. Later, Jurjāns would document his mother’s songs in order to make one of his first collections. Striving to teach their children the importance of their ethnic heritage, Jurjāns’ parents enrolled him in schools that would heighten this awareness by teaching all subjects in the Latvian language, rather than German or Russian. In his formative years at these schools, Jurjāns’ musical ability was discovered, and he received his first formal training in voice, violin, and piano.

The Jurjāns family, however, suffered for their independence. Although some of the nobility in the Vidzeme region had sold small portions of their land to the peasants in order to prevent further agrarian reforms by Alexander II, the Jurjāns’ landowner refused to sell his land at a reasonable price. Instead, he increased their rent to an exorbitant amount, making it virtually impossible for Jurjāns’ parents to exercise their newly acquired

30The text of Latvian folk songs, or dainas, survived the ravages of time and oppression through oral transmission beginning with the earliest pagan tribes. In fact, the perennial life of the dainas is unparalleled in most of the world, for the folksongs are still sung by the Latvian population even to this day. The sheer number of dainas also surpasses that of the Kalevala, Finland’s national epic poem. Due to the difficulty in translating Latvian into other languages without destroying the lyricism of the text, however, the Kalevala is more widely known than the dainas. Collected by Krišjānis Barons during the national awakening, the dainas filled eight books of six official volumes with 217,996 different text versions consisting of approximately one million lines. This is approximately 74,000 lines longer than the Kalevala. In essence, the dainas embody a respect for nature and harmony, as well as the virtues of diligence, community, happiness, compassion, tolerance, family, and honesty. Depicting the full cycle of life, the dainas could be sung for any occasion, however, the early German clergy would persecute Latvian peasants for doing so. The clergy regarded the dainas as pagan in their delineation of the Latvians’ pre-Christian deities.

For more detailed research on the dainas, there are excellent writings in the Journal of Baltic Studies published by the Association for the Advancement of Baltic Studies and in Linguistics and Poetics of Latvian Folk Songs: Essays in Honour of the Sesquicentennial of the Birth of Kr. Barons, edited by Vaira Viķis-Freiberg (Kingston: Queen’s University, 1989).
right to purchase their home and their property. This would have a profound impact on Jurjāns, who later remonstrated German autocracy during his visits home from school.

Upon graduation from his parish school in 1873, Jurjāns had the opportunity to attend the First National Song Festival in Rīga as a member of the school’s choir. Organized by the Latvian Association of Rīga, the purpose of the song festival was to acquaint urban and rural Latvians with the power of a collective consciousness.31 Central to the Association’s message was the debut of the Latvian national anthem, God, Bless Latvia [Dievs, svētī Latviju]. Reputedly, Jurjāns was so impressed by the music and uplifting spirit of the First Song Festival that he decided to devote his life to the development of Latvian music.32

For Jurjāns and many other Latvian musicians, serious musical training was synonymous with attendance at the St. Petersburg Conservatory of Music.33 In order to facilitate his entrance as one of the first Latvians to attend St. Petersburg’s conservatory, Jurjāns supplemented his training and finances with amateur musical events and assistance from his friends. Acceptance soon followed in 1875.

At the conservatory, Jurjāns studied organ, composition, and French horn under the auspices of the generous financial aid provided by his fellow Latvians residing in

31 The tradition of the National Song Festivals continues today drawing tens of thousands of musicians united in their ethnic heritage and independence.

32 Several Latvian sources state the influence of the First Song Festival on Jurjāns. None, however, cite evidence of the festival as being the only decisive factor in Jurjāns’ decision to devote his life to Latvian music. It is highly probable that there were other elements contributing to Jurjāns’ career choice, but in so far as Latvian historical sources are concerned, the Song Festival appears to be the sole catalyst.

33 A conservatory in Rīga would not be available until 1919.
St. Petersburg. During his tenure at the conservatory, Jurjāns' awareness of the Latvians' past and present oppression grew. He became involved in organizations and events that would have a direct impact on the Latvian nationalist movement. At this time, Jurjāns contributed to a journal produced by the Latvians' unofficial literary society in St. Petersburg, attended meetings of Latvian intellectuals, and organized musical and theatrical performances protesting German oppression. He even commenced work on an opera based on G. Merkel's literary legend, *Vanems Imanta*, depicting the feudal era of Latvia. By 1877, Jurjāns published his first collection of original songs, *Daiqa*, consisting of patriotic and lyric works for solo voice and piano as well as choral arrangements. Other works from his composition classes became some of the first Latvian scores in the symphonic genre. These included the *Latvian Song Festival March*, Op. 1 (1880) which was debuted at the Third National Song Festival and the first movement of an unfinished symphony, *Symphonic Allegro* (1880). Both works are discussed in this study. For his diploma in composition, Jurjāns wrote a cantata, *Belzacara dzīres*, based on *Belshezzar's Feast* by Heinrich Heine, whose prose had always been a favorite of Jurjāns. His use of foreign themes and instrumentation in *Belzacara dzīres* was also a first in Latvian music. In addition to his already exhaustive efforts in composition at this time,

---

34 The satire of the journal, *Dundurs* [*Gadfly*], lampooned the Baltic Germans and those Latvians who adopted another nationality for social and economic advancement.

35 Unfortunately, what remains of this unfinished opera are a few fragments of the original manuscript.

36 See Appendix for Jurjāns' complete compositional output.
Jurjāns began to formulate his theories on Latvian folk music, which he would refine in his research on folklore.

Upon graduating from Lui Homilius’ organ class (1880), Rimsky-Korsakov’s composition class (1881), and Friedrich Homilius’ French horn class (1882), Jurjāns’ artist diplomas signified his official liberation from peasant status and any military obligation to the Russian army. His position changed from one of financial need to one of assisting others. Immediately following his graduation from St. Petersburg in 1882, he was invited to head the theory, French horn, and choral classes at the Russian Imperial Music Society’s Conservatory at Khar’kov in the Ukraine. Jurjāns remained at the Khar’kov school until 1916, when his deteriorating health forced him to leave his teaching position. Although absent from his native land, he did not forsake his ethnic heritage even in the face of the most intense Russification reforms taking place in the 1880s.\(^{37}\)

Aside from his duties as a professor, Jurjāns actively sought to further the development of Latvian art music and the preservation of Latvian traditional musics while remaining active in the musical life in the Ukraine. During the course of his career, Jurjāns was fortunate enough to hear his own music performed and praised. One of his many activities was concertizing as a horn player with his brothers in the Jurjāns Brothers’ French Horn Quartet, and as an organist. Additionally, Jurjāns organized, conducted, and composed music for the third, fourth, and fifth Latvian Song Festivals of 1888, 1895,

\(^{37}\)Russian was to be the only acceptable language of instruction in all of the Latvian schools, replacing both Latvian and German. Those teachers who could not or would not teach in Russian were replaced with inferior Russian substitutes. By the turn of the century, illiteracy was on the rise once again.
and 1910 respectively, introducing the Latvian people to the value of art music as a unifying factor, with his settings of national folk music. He was also the first to establish a tradition of research on Latvian folk music with the publication of his *Materials of Latvian Folk Music* (*Latvju tautas muzikas materiali*) 1894-1926, in which he collected 2700 Latvian folk songs. Jurjāns literally traversed the countryside, visiting each farmstead along the way. He would then record the folk songs that were sung to him. Eventually, Jurjāns built a network of musicians, folklorists, and other various colleagues who would send their own findings for incorporation into his research. His compilation became the foundation for an understanding of how Latvians approached folk music and would serve as the basis for further research in Latvian ethnography.

By 1920, suffering an undisclosed illness and hearing loss, Jurjāns retired to his home in the Latvian countryside. Andrejs Jurjāns died on September 28, 1922. Before his death, however, he would witness his country’s independence from the tyranny of Russia as a result of World War I and the debacle of Nicholas II’s tsarist regime. Struggling with the same forces of spiritual oppression that had affected his ancestors, Jurjāns gave back to his people what was rightfully theirs, that is, self-respect and national solidarity through music.

---

38 The last two of the six volumes were published posthumously.

39 Jākabs Vītoliņš and Lija Krasinska, *Latviešu mūzikas vēsture* [The History of Latvian Music] (Rīga: Liesma, 1972), 232-3. With *Materials of Latvian Folk Music* (*Latvju tautas muzikas materiali*), Jurjāns was also the first to divide Latvian music history into three periods: “Ancient,” “Pre-Christian,” and “Modern Era.” The Ancient Era included those melodies whose range encompassed only a fourth. The Pre-Christian Era melodies encompassed anywhere from the 5th to the octave and utilized modality and tetrachordal patterns. Finally, the melodies of the Modern Era included major and minor tonalities with leading tones.
I began my search for *Symphonic Allegro* [*Simfonisks Allegro*] at the libraries of the Latvian Academy of Music. What I discovered was intriguing. Although the conservatory possessed one of the rare sound recordings of Jurjāns’ unfinished symphony, it did not have a score of the music. I went to Professor Jānis Torgāns, the Assistant Rector of the Academy and my temporary mentor, with the news. He instructed me to visit the Music Department of the Latvian National Library.

Like the conservatory, the National Library was also a foreboding structure. It’s exterior was gray, without the benefit of paint or plaster. Built at the turn of the century, the library was also beautiful at one time, but no longer. The foyer was dark and, impossibly, more dank than that of the school’s. A foul odor invaded my nostrils - urine. I surpressed the urge to gag. Racing up the marble staircase to the second floor, and the Music Department, I held my breath. My lungs were burning, straining against the demand for oxygen, yet forced to comply with my current aerobic activity. The staircase spiraled upwards as I passed a dilapidated stained glass window and circled around a defunct elevator shaft. Glancing through the wrought iron enclosure of the shaft, I realized from where the stench was emanating. Another convulsion racked my body. Finally, I reached the second floor. Throwing open the door, I was greeted by another
door only twelve inches from the first. The effluvium was everywhere. Was there no escaping it? I pushed on the second door. Release. I was in the Music Department of the Latvian National Library. The noxious odor was gone. Grateful for the fresh air and sunshine pouring in through the window-lined room, I acquainted myself with the library's procedures for obtaining materials. After I met the requirements, the librarian procured the score for *Symphonic Allegro* with amazing alacrity. Evidently, she was delighted by the fact that I was a foreigner researching a Latvian composer.

Many of the librarians that I encountered were more than willing to assist me in my endeavor. They viewed Jurjāns as the father of their art music. To have an American researching him delighted the librarians to no end. The reaction of Latvian scholars and musicians to my topic, however, was markedly less enthusiastic than that of the general public. Although Jurjāns was the father of Latvian art music, they believed that there were other composers more deserving of my attention. I refused to avert from my course of research. Jurjāns was the pioneer, and as such, would be the basis of my work. I reminded myself of this fact as the librarian placed the massive tome in my hands.

The score of *Symphonic Allegro*, as it turned out, was the only holograph in the country. It was unpublished and hand-copied. I made the necessary arrangements to have the librarians make a facsimile of the holograph. Unfortunately, neither librarian knew the whereabouts of the original manuscript. My quest for the *Symphonic Allegro* was fruitful, but still left me with the question of where Jurjāns' manuscript was located. I would address the issue with Torgāns months later.
Our discussion of the misplaced manuscript happened quite by accident. In one of our numerous tutorial sessions, Professor Torgāns noticed my scribbled thoughts about the lost manuscript written on a draft of my thesis. He divulged the answer to the mystery that the city’s librarians could not. My search had brought me full circle. I listened in silent fascination. Out of necessity, Torgāns always spoke with utter economy. His description of what followed fell upon the air between us like a great weight.

Fire had destroyed the manuscript. *Symphonic Allegro* was housed in the archives of the Emīls Melngailis House [Emīla Melngaila Nams], a museum dedicated to the preservation of musical artifacts. In the 1960s, a fire obliterated the historical landmark and all of its treasured contents, which chronicled the history of Latvian music, including Jurjāns’ manuscript.

Ironically, little has been documented about the first movement of Jurjāns’ unfinished symphony. The fact remains that the *Symphonic Allegro*, along with his *Latvian National Song Festival March* [Latvju visspārējo dziesmu svētku maršs], is the earliest extant symphonic score written by a Latvian.¹ Composed during his studies with Rimsky-Korsakov at the St. Petersburg Conservatory (1880), the *Symphonic Allegro* is considered to be a young pupil’s attempt to compose in the symphonic genre by most critics, theorists, and historians. According to Torgāns, one possibility as to why Jurjāns chose to leave the symphony unfinished may be that, as a student, he felt unqualified to

¹The earliest symphonic scores in Latvian art music belong to Jānis Bērziņš (1830-1912). Premiered at the First National Song Festival of 1873, these scores are no longer in existence today.
compose a full-scale symphony. He would later remedy this perceived shortcoming in his oeuvre by writing the *Concerto elegiaco* (1889), which many Latvian scholars believe surpasses any symphony he could have ever written. Consequently, a study of the *Symphonic Allegro* has been overlooked even in Latvia.

Although the *Symphonic Allegro* is entirely devoid of folk references, its inclusion in this study is significant. Structurally, one particular feature of this work shapes the basis for the thematic construction in Jurjāns' subsequent works. The smaller \(aba^1\) structure of theme II in the *Symphonic Allegro* returns not only in the \(A\) section of the *Latvian National Song Festival March*, but also in theme II of the *Concerto elegiaco*. Jurjāns, however, elevates the importance of the \(aba^1\) structures found in both pieces by projecting folk songs onto them. Consequently, discussion of Jurjāns' later works would be hindered without an examination of his first work.

In the *Symphonic Allegro*, Jurjāns sought to imitate the great masters of the Classical and Romantic eras by modeling it after the symphonies of Mozart and Beethoven. The one-movement work is shaped by a teleological design that relies on Sonata-Allegro principle with introduction (Fig. 1). *Symphonic Allegro* begins in F minor and ends in F Major. Jurjāns utilizes a conventional key scheme for the themes in both the exposition and recapitulation. The themes are related by the relative major of the tonic key, that is, theme I is in F minor, while theme II is essentially in \(A^b\) Major. The recapitulation returns to F minor for theme I, but creates a perfect fifth relationship between the presentations of theme II in the exposition and recapitulation. In the
exposition, theme II is a third above the tonic. In the recapitulation, it is a third below the tonic, in the key of D♭ Major.

Theme I is a rhythmic, driving melody, while theme II is contrasting and lyrical. In fact, the \( \text{\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet} \) motive of theme I is what gives rhythmic unity throughout the dance-like movement. Generally, the nature of the phrases is closed. The melodic profiles are diatonic with a limited degree of chromaticism and, therefore, referable to conventional thematic construction. In regards to the orchestration of both themes, the thoughts of one composer/critic are relevant to understanding how Jurjāns’ compositional technique was perceived by his contemporaries.

In 1906, Emīls Dārziņš discussed Jurjāns’ merits and faults as an orchestral composer in an article for Zalktis [Garter Snake], an independently published almanac dedicated to the promotion of the arts. It was Dārziņš’ conclusion that Jurjāns demonstrated a natural instinct and unfahtering understanding of the symphonic genre with the Symphonic Allegro, but even Dārziņš was quick to qualify his admiration for Jurjāns’ early orchestral works. In his opinion, they were “academic.” Dārziņš believed that although Jurjāns’ music was completely “orchestral,” with every instrumental group properly placed, Jurjāns was by no means a virtuoso of instrumentation.²

Throughout most of the movement, Jurjāns relies on the strings and the woodwinds. Significantly, Jurjāns incorporates the brass instruments only at penultimate

moments. The brass announce the augmented $b$ of theme II in the final section of the development and again for the same theme in the coda.

The mood of the slow, dramatic introduction is similar to the one elicited by the Stone Guest's entrance in the finale of Mozart's *Don Giovanni* (1787). The power of the orchestral chords contrasting the softer, ascending soli lines lend ominous foreboding to the soundscape. Within the introduction are initial statements of two cyclic elements. The first element is comprised of an ascending figure in the strings and is complimented by the motive of the woodwinds (Ex. 1.1 and 1.2). The string figure is highly relevant as Jurjans also places it in: 1) the close of the introduction, 2) as part of theme I and the bridge material in both the exposition and recapitulation, 3) the second section of the development with the bridge motive in m. 179, 5) the $A^\text{b}\text{Dom}^7$ preparation before the climax of the development in m. 250, and 6) in the underlying texture of the viola and bassoon at the beginning of the coda. The woodwind motive returns in the turning point of the recapitulation (m. 415), or transition to the coda. The second cyclic element is the introductory theme. The theme of the introduction not only returns in the turning point, but also foreshadows the compound duple meter and themes of the exposition.

According to Professor Torgans, in Russian music theory, the "turning point" is the moment within the second theme of the exposition and recapitulation whereby the lyricism of the contrasting passage is suspended by a driving, rhythmic interpolation which propels the second theme toward the closing theme.
Figure 1. Sonata-Allegro Principle of the Symphonic Allegro.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allegro</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intro.</td>
<td>(mm. 1-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclic motives and theme.</td>
<td>(mm. 145-276)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torņās' Analysis:</td>
<td>Torņās' Divisions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ((aba'))</td>
<td>I ((a b a'))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ((a b a'))</td>
<td>II ((a b a'))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((a = 31-46))</td>
<td>((a = 77-92))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((b = 47-54))</td>
<td>((b = 55-73))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Possibly: | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I Bridge | II \((a b a')\) | Close | Possibly: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| \((31-46)\) | \((47-73)\) | \((77-114, see above)\) | \((115-144)\) | \((145-160)\) | (161-206) | (207-234) | (234-276) |
| New material that also incorporates \(a\) material. | Related to new material of Bridge. | Real Climax on Aug. \(b\) of II. |

| Retransition | Recapitulation | Coda |
| (mm. 277-329) | (mm. 330-475) | (mm. 476-514) |
| Torņās' Analysis: | | |
| I \((aba')\) | II \((a b a')\) | Turning Point | |
| I \((a b a')\) | \((a = 330-45)\) | \((a = 381-96)\) | \((b = 346-53)\) | \((b = 397-404)\) | \((d' = 354-80)\) | \((d' = 405-414)\) | Cyclic Intro. Material as transition to conclusion. |
| | \((d' = 55-73)\) | \((a' = 101-114)\) | \((a' = 115-144)\) | \((b = 93-100)\) | \((b = 55-73)\) | \((a = 77-92)\) | \((a = 31-46)\) |
| Possibly: | I Bridge \(II(a b a')\) | Turning Point | |
| \((330-45)\) | \((346-80)\) | \((381-414, see above)\) | (see above) |
| D\(^b\)M pedal | \(A^{b\text{dom}}\) | D\(^b\)M | EM | FM | FM | FM (Harm. Instab.) | FM | FM |
Example 1. Thematic Table of the *Symphonic Allegro*.

1.1 *Introductory Motive of Strings*  
(Returns throughout the movement).  
m. 2 of the cello:

1.2 *Introductory Motive of Woodwinds*  
(Returns in the turning point of the recapitulation).  
mm. 3-4 of the clarinets:

1.3 *Introductory Theme*  
(Returns in the turning point of the recapitulation).  
mm. 11-13 of the violin:

1.4 *Exposition - Theme I*  
mm. 31-38 of the violin:

1.5 *New Material of Bridge*  
( Related to Closing theme).  
Antecedent phrase in mm. 47-50 of the flute:
Example 1, con't.

1.6 Exposition - Theme II (aba' structure)
   a mm. 77-84 of the cello/violin:

1.7 b (Returns augmented in the Development and Coda to construct climax of the work).
   mm. 93-100 of the viola:

1.8 a' Embellished a in mm. 101-104 of the cello:

1.9 Exposition - Closing Theme
   (Related to bridge theme).
   Antecedent phrase in mm. 116-120 of the cello:
Example 1, con’t.

1.10 Development, Section III
(Combination of rhythmic motives from themes I and a of II).

mm. 216-217 in the viola and cello:

\[ \text{Example 1.10 Development, Section III} \]

Jurjāns emphasizes imitative strings and woodwinds for the theme of the
introduction, a tender melody with regret (Ex. 1.3). The repeated accompanimental notes
of the strings continues throughout the introduction and heightens the expression of heart-
filled longing.

Imitative entrances build, leading to a brief moment of release from the brooding
drama characteristic of Jurjāns’ introduction. A dark, climactic crescendo propels the
listener into the exposition, where Jurjāns continues his reliance on the woodwind and
string timbres.
There are two ways of examining theme I of the exposition. One method proposed by Professor Torgāns is that theme I is composed of a smaller $aba'$ structure, which would allow for the absence of a formal bridge section between the first and second themes (Fig. 1). If this were the case, however, $b$ is not long enough and $a'$ is not closed enough to contribute to a three-part structure. Furthermore, $a'$ is developmental in its treatment of thematic material. Therefore, it logically follows that theme I instead consists of the driving, rhythmic $\text{lJ-} \text{lJ}$ patterns that unify the movement. Torgāns' $b$ section is in actuality an intervening fragment of new material, which later incorporates the rhythmic elements of theme I (Fig. 1). In general, the sections within the themes follow symmetrical phrase structure and periodic construction throughout the course of the movement. Theme I is characterized by a balanced line consisting of small leaps and mostly step-wise motion in the compound duple meter foreshadowed in the introduction (Ex. 1.4). The opening string motive comprises part of theme I and the forthcoming bridge section.

The new material of the bridge theme is a rhythmically repetitive melody of upward leaps and descending skips (Ex. 1.5). Jurjāns places the first statement of the bridge in the flutes followed by another statement in the bassoons and low strings.

The statement of theme I in the bridge consists of rhythmic fragmentation and sequences. The climax of the sequences occurs in m. 69 with the motives of theme I and the bridge, $\text{\text{lJ-} \text{lJ}}$, simultaneously juxtaposed on an $E_{b}^{\text{dim}}$ preparation. In m. 74, confirmation of an impending key change/new theme arrives with the melifluous,
descending clarinet line on an E♭dim7 introducing the second key area of A♭ Major, the relative major of F minor (Ex. 2).

Example 2. *Symphonic Allegro*, Exposition, mm. 74-76 of the clarinet solo.

Unlike theme I, theme II follows a smaller, closed \(aba'\) structure.

In comparison to the propulsive rhythms of the first theme, the contrasting association of \(a\) of theme II is that of a brisk, carefree Viennese waltz, also in compound duple meter, characterized by a preponderance of lyrical leaps and skips (Ex. 1.6). Thus, Jurjāns contrasts themes I and II by where he emphasizes the melodies. The first theme stresses the last note of the line, whereas the second stresses the first note. For rhythmic continuity, Jurjāns fuses the predominant \(\text{\textcopyright}\) motive of theme I throughout the repeat of \(a\) of theme II. From the key of A♭ Major in the \(a\) of theme II, Jurjāns then modulates to C♭ Major for the new key of the more restrained, regal \(b\) section.

The \(b\) of theme II constitutes a total of eight measures (Ex. 1.7), concluding with a return to A♭ Major. The antecedent phrase of the \(b\) section located in the viola and cello returns expanded and augmented for climactic purposes in the final section of the development (mm. 234 and in m. 261 of Ex. 3) and coda (m. 476).

The contrabasses resume the swirling motion of the waltz as they continue with \(a'\) of theme II. An embellishment of \(a'\) (Ex. 1.8) is in the first bassoon, viola and cello,
which later moves to the flutes, oboes, clarinets and violins in m. 105. The original $a$ of theme II is in the basses. The rhythmic $\frac{3}{4}$ motive of theme I and the primary melody of the bridge are distributed throughout the orchestra.

Jurjāns devotes the remaining measures of $a$ of theme II (mm. 111-115) to the rhythmically aligned setting of theme I and the bridge. Within the $aba'$ structure of theme II, Jurjāns obviates a driving, rhythmic interpolation in the midst of the lyrical second theme. Such an interpolation, known as a “turning point,” propels the second theme toward the closing theme and development by contrasting and suspending the second theme. Examples of such a turning point are found within the first movements of Mozart’s *Symphony No. 40*, Schubert’s *Unfinished Symphony*, and Chopin’s *Piano Concerto in E minor*. Although the *Symphonic Allegro* lacks a turning point due to an already contrasting $aba'$ structure, this in itself is not unusual. A turning point is not necessarily a normative element, but rather an optional one.

The closing theme of the cello is related to the bridge (Ex. 1.9). The rhythmic $\frac{3}{4}$ motive of theme I in the upper strings accompanies the closing theme. The repetition of theme I and the bridge theme in the closing enables Jurjāns to grow dynamically, resulting in an increased tension as both elements expand and pass throughout the orchestra. Eventually, the closing theme fragments, dissolving into the repetition of the $\frac{3}{4}$ motive from theme I in the first and second endings. As a result, the exposition is not a closed section since the development continues with the same process of rhythmic fragmentation.
Two audibly differentiating features of the exposition and development are the change of key and the descending strings. Otherwise, the exposition would appear to be seamless.

Three strategies are followed in the development - fragmentation, imitation, and augmentation. In addition, thematic content overlaps harmonic construction. Consequently, it is possible to analyze the development in one of two ways. The first method of analysis, used by Professor Torgåns, incorporates a division of five sections based on key structure. The second is a division of four sections based on treatment of thematic material (Fig. 1).

In the first section of the development (mm. 145-60), Jurjåns aligns fragmentation and imitation of theme I in the upper strings with the motive from the bridge in the French horn. The imitative entrances of the strings reappear in the coda (m. 505) to bring the movement to a close. Fragmentation and imitation of theme I moves to the upper woodwinds. The timbre of the woodwinds evokes pastoral imagery in comparison to the imitative string entrances. Overall, the first section of the development is a short, relatively passive interlude which does little thematically, other than to prepare for the second section.

Instead of theme I, Jurjåns develops the bridge material through inversional counterpoint and imitative entrances in the second section of the development (mm. 161-206). Occasional bursts from theme I are interpolated. The second section is over twice the length of the first and as such, it is more active and lyrical in its thematic presentation. Consequently, the second section is reserved for Jurjåns' interweaving of the bridge theme
throughout the woodwinds and strings. As the theme is passed around, it is transformed into an ascending line that grows and stretches with each successive entrance. Eventually, bridge material fragments and divides between the upper woodwinds and strings in a playful, scherzo-like exchange of the motive. This motive finally subsides into the third section of the development.

Jurjāns concentrates on the lilting waltz from the \( a \) of theme II for the third section, which is characterized by sparse orchestration in the strings. For the accompaniment, he uses the rhythmic motives from theme I and the bridge. Additionally, Jurjāns combines the representative motives of the \( a \) portions of both themes I and \( a \) of II in mm. 216-21 (Ex. 1.10). This technique in regards to the combination of motives does not appear in the rest of the movement; its purpose may be to give motion and contrast to the developmental material. Later, Jurjāns separates and simultaneously juxtaposes the two segments. The incipit of \( a \) of theme II fragments, creating more tension and suspense for the arrival of the final section of the development. The incipit from \( a \) of theme II grows in significance as it moves to the forefront of the orchestral texture, for within every occurrence of the motive or theme, the swelling waltz-like motion becomes erratic when combined with the increasingly frantic rhythm from theme I.

The beginning of the final section is merely a continuation of the heightened suspense. Furthermore, the appearance of a new theme is nothing more than the augmentation of \( b \) of theme II from the C\(^\text{#}\) Major key area of the exposition (Ex. 1.11). Jurjāns places the augmented theme against the embellished triplet melody of \( a' \) of
theme II (m. 239), witnessed earlier in m. 101 of the strings. The rhythmic \( \frac{3}{4} \) motive of theme I is also interpolated.

Jurjāns finally incorporates the brass within the orchestral texture at the climax (mm. 261-276) of the development. Along with the woodwinds, the augmented \( b \) of theme II is majestically announced (Ex. 3). The significance of \( b \) of theme II for dramatic purposes in the development is problematic since Jurjāns emphasizes a melody that occurs for only seven measures of the entire movement (mm. 93-100). Prior to the final section of the development, this particular melody has not been a factor of any importance, other than its role as the contrasting phrase of theme II in the exposition.

Example 3, con't.
Acting in direct opposition to the grandiose treatment of $b$ of theme II, the retransition (mm. 277-329) serves as a lengthy interlude from the mounting tension of the development through Jurjāns' reliance on the strings. The retransition begins with a fugato (Ex. 4).

Example 4. *Symphonic Allegro*, beginning of Retransition in mm. 277-87 of the upper string parts.
Jurjāns expands the fugato by incorporating the cello in m. 286. Although it appears that he alters the entrances, the violins are still the principal voices. The woodwinds imitate the fragmented incipit of b of theme II over the D\textsuperscript{b} pedal and long tones of the strings. Suspense builds again with the timpani's entrance on the \texttt{♩♩♩} rhythm from theme I. Jurjāns uses this rhythm throughout the rest of the retransition against a larger fragment from theme I. The retransition gradually returns to F minor and the recapitulation.

The recapitulation acts as a formal balance to the exposition and to the movement as a whole. In general, Jurjāns uses precisely the same orchestration as that found in the exposition, that is, woodwinds and strings. Presentation of themes I and II follow. The descending clarinet solo, now on an A\textsuperscript{b7}, again confirms the new key area and second themes. Although the A\textsuperscript{b7} preparation for the new D\textsuperscript{b} Major key area is also found in the climax of the development and, therefore, not unique to the movement, it is a conventional key to move toward with regards to a minor tonic key. In effect, the D\textsuperscript{b} Major key allows Jurjāns to achieve a more "exotic," or brighter color, as an element of surprise for the listener.

Jurjāns incorporates the aforementioned turning point (mm. 415-75) in the recapitulation as a transition to the coda. Within the turning point, the main body of material is based on the woodwind motive and theme of the introduction, either against or in combination with the fragments and rhythmic motive of theme I. Harmonic instability characterizes the turning point, which resolves to the final statement of the introduction's
theme in F Major and the timpani's second solo entrance on the $\begin{array}{c} 4 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 3 \end{array}$ motive prior to the coda.

The coda (mm. 476-514), like the development, serves a climactic and dramatic purpose. Jurjāns augments $b$ of theme II again. The augmented theme, located in the orchestral background of the trombone section, is combined with the motive of theme I in the violins, fragments of the embellished melody of $a'$ in the upper woodwinds, and fragments of the bridge in the bassoons, horns and low strings (Ex. 5). The result is an overwhelming mixture of the majestic climax of the development, the frenzied, driving rhythms of theme I, and the churning triplets of $a'$ of theme II. Furthermore, the rising string figure of the introduction returns as an afterthought to those cyclic elements of the introduction stated in the turning point. Each line vies to be heard above the others, leaving the listener with a profusion of thematic influences.

The $b$ of theme II plays a subordinate role to the rest of the orchestra. Jurjāns instead stresses either theme I or the bridge material. Restating the imitative entrances of the upper strings, from m. 145 of the development, Jurjāns initiates the close of the movement, concluding with the $\begin{array}{c} 4 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 3 \end{array}$ motive from theme I.
Example 5. *Symphonic Allegro*, beginning of Coda in mm. 476-479, full orchestra.
CHAPTER III

LATVIAN NATIONAL SONG FESTIVAL MARCH, OP. 1
(Latvju vispārējo dziesmu svētku maršs, Op. 1)

Jurjāns wrote the Latvian National Song Festival March in 1880, the same year he composed his Symphonic Allegro, while studying at the St. Petersburg Conservatory. Although the march was assigned opus one, the Symphonic Allegro preceded it. Jurjāns did not feel it necessary to give the Allegro an opus number since it was part of an unfinished symphony.

Originally, Jurjāns dedicated the Song Festival March to the Second National Song Festival of 1880, as a result of his experience with the first festival held in 1873. In particular, the premiere at this festival of the present-day Latvian national anthem, God, Bless Latvia [Dievs, svētī Latviju], by Karlis Baumanis had a reputedly profound impact on the young musician.¹ Jurjāns was so impressed by Baumanis' work and its uplifting message that he not only decided to dedicate his life to the development of Latvian art music, but he would later use God, Bless Latvia in the climactic coda of his Song Festival March. Unfortunately, Jurjāns' march was not premiered until the Third National Song Festival in 1888.

¹ God, Bless Latvia became the official Latvian national anthem when Latvia first gained independence from Russia in 1918.
The work is constructed in three parts with an introduction and coda (Fig. 2).

Jurjāns stresses a sub-dominant key relationship in each of the parts. For the introduction, A section, and coda, he relies on the key of C Major. The B section emphasizes F Major.

One of the most interesting features of the Song Festival March is that each of its parts is based on folk songs or works from other sources. For example, both the A and B sections rely on folkloric sources, while the coda consists almost entirely of God, Bless Latvia.

Another important feature coinciding with the folk song influence is the aba' construction of the A section, which is identical to the thematic construction of theme II in the Symphonic Allegro. Furthermore, it could be successfully argued that the thematic construction of the march evolved from a compositional process Jurjāns first experimented with in his symphony. Although theme II of Symphonic Allegro exhibits a ternary form, it is not of folkloric origins. In the Song Festival March, the extrapolated elements from a particular folk song project onto the ternary form of the A section. Jurjāns then creates a small climax in the A section by uniting the elements for full disclosure of the folk melody (Fig. 2).
Figure 2. March and Trio form of *Latvian National Song Festival March*, Op. 1


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intro.</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>(Small Dev. Section)</th>
<th>(Small Climax)</th>
<th>Closing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(mm. 1-4)</td>
<td>(mm. 5-89)</td>
<td>(mm. 16-30)</td>
<td>(mm. 37-45)</td>
<td>(mm. 46-82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motive x of Rīga Resounds [Rīga dimd]</td>
<td>motive x</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a′</td>
<td>full, unbroken folk song - melody of x &amp; y together with the presentation of z, the second phrase of Rīga Resounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>CM GM</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>EM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Coda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(mm. 90-164)</td>
<td>(Small Climax)</td>
<td>(mm. 165-193)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>(mm. 90-111)</td>
<td>God, Bless Latvia [Dievs, svētLatviju]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>līgo song</td>
<td>(mm. 112-145)</td>
<td>Full Climax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM dm FM</td>
<td>(mm. 146-164)</td>
<td>Close on Introductory material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fm D♭M b♭m CM</td>
<td>CM am FM D♭M FM</td>
<td>CM (on GM) CM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The introduction and A section are based on a folk song called Rīga Resounds [Rīga dimd], which is classified as a rotalu [game] or deju [dance] melody. Rotalu [game] songs were sung to children and at group events such as celebrations, weddings, and even funerals. For the most part, rotalu [game] songs are built on eight-measure phrases or are a simple two-part song form, the tempo of which depends on the text or character of the "game." It is also typical for the rotalu to have two tempi. As a result, the first phrase is sung slowly, while the second phrase is faster. The classification of Rīga Resounds as a rotalu is evident in its text, which is a conundrum regarding the gift given to a young bride. The text of Rīga Resounds follows.

Text of Rīga Resounds [Rīga dimd].

Refrain:
Rīga dimd! Rīga dimd!
Kas to Rīgu dimdināj’?
Tral-la-lā, tral-la-lā!
Kas to Rīgu dimdināj’?

Tai meitiņai pūru kala,
Kam trejādi bāleliņ’,
Tral-la-lā, tral-la-lā!
Kam trejādi bāleliņ’.

(Refrain)

Tēva brālis pūru kala,
Mātes brālis atslēdziņ’,
Tral-la-lā, tral-la-lā!
Mātes brālis atslēdziņ’.

(Refrain)

Refined:
Rīga resounds! Rīga resounds!
Who is making Rīga resound?
Tra-la-la, tra-la-la!
Who is making Rīga resound?

A dowry is forged to a girl.
For whom (there is) a brother in three ways,
Tra-la-la, tra-la-la!
For whom (there is) a brother in three ways.

Father’s brother forges a dowry,
Mother’s brother (forges) a key,
Tra-la-la, tra-la-la!
Mother’s brother (forges) a key.

Text con't.

Vīņas pašas tīstais brālis
Zelta vāku liedināj,
Tral-la-la, tral-la-la!
Zelta vāku liedināj.

Her own true brother
is pouring a lid of gold,
Tra-la-la, tra-la-la
is pouring a lid of gold.³

*Rīga Resounds* was arranged by Jānis Cimze (1814-1881), an influential vocal pedagogue and folk song arranger. Although Cimze was one of the first Latvians to collect and arrange folk songs, his arrangements did not retain all of the original notes. Instead, Cimze arranged most of his folk songs according to Western principles of music theory and traditional harmonization. Consequently, it was not unusual for Cimze to create leading tones at cadential points, though, he would leave what he considered to be the more highly regarded melodies untouched. In regard to folk song arranging, Jurjāns refused to accept the methods proposed by Cimze. He reputedly believed that changing any note of a folk song tantamount to losing a part of one’s history. As a result, Jurjāns abstained from adulterating the melody even when inclined to use traditional harmonies in his folk song arrangements, as distinct from his folk song elaboration in his symphonic works. In comparison to Cimze, Latvian scholars consider Jurjāns the more ethnographic arranger due to his preservation of the original folk melody.

The principal melody in the first eight measures, or refrain, of *Rīga Resounds* (Ex. 6) is divided between themes a and b of the A section. The *Song Festival March* opens triumphantly on a motive located in the first two measures of *Rīga Resounds.*

³Author’s translation.
motive $x$ (Ex. 6). This motivic fragment prepares the listener for theme $a$, also derived from motive $x$ of *Rīga Resounds*.

Example 6. Original folk melody of *Rīga Resounds* [*Rīga dimd*], mm. 1-8.  

![Original folk melody](image)

The main difference between the introductory material and theme $a$ is the rhythms of the brass and percussion. Otherwise, the general populace perceive both the introductory material and the theme as "patriotic," though the content of the folk song contradicts any underlying message of patriotism. Jurjāns’ use of full orchestration with powerful brass supplies the characteristic sound the Latvian populace deems synonymous with loyalty to one’s nation. The introductory material is interpolated throughout the body of the march as means of transition or closure. For example, the introductory material is in: 1) mm. 43-45 as preparation for the small climax in the $A$ section, 2) mm. 70-74 as preparation for the final statement of $a$ prior to the closing, 3) mm. 83-89 as closing of the $A$ section, and finally in 4) mm. 118-193 as the closing of the coda.

---

Despite the public's identification with the Song Festival March, many critics consider it Jurčs' weakest symphonic work due to his fragmentation of the folk song, Rīga Resounds. Darziņš, in particular, believed that the use of motive x for a large-scale work was unwise. In choosing motive x, Jurčs limited himself to the range of a third. Unfortunately, his critics believed the march was unimaginative due to his use of repetition and imitation. In fact, Darziņš went so far as to state, "...there still remains the impression that the composer has squeezed the last bit of juice from his motives." Imagination, however, did not obstruct Jurčs' ability to explore the motive's potential. It was the motive's limited range of motion.

Theme a is composed of two elements - motive x and two measures of Jurčs' own composition, not derived from Rīga Resounds (Ex. 7).

Example 7. Latvian National Song Festival March, A section, theme a in mm. 5-13 of the violin part.

Theme b also consists of elements from Rīga Resounds. The defiant sounds of the opening measures, however, are gone. Relying primarily on the warmth of the woodwinds and strings, Jurčs embellishes motive x before introducing motive y (Ex. 6 and Ex. 8).

\footnote{Darziņš, op. cit., 54.}
Example 8. Latvian National Song Festival March, A section, embellished motive x with motive y of theme b in mm.16-19 of the violin part.

The new motive's contrast to motive x lies in its soaring leap and gradual descending line with ornamented turns and trills. This light-hearted section is set over a stereotypical march accompaniment repeated eighths in the French horn. Before the statement of a', the French horns move to the foreground with the embellished theme of Rīga Resounds.

Although the real climax of the entire march is in the coda with the full orchestration of God, Bless Latvia, Jurjāns grandly discloses Rīga Resounds in its entirety for a smaller climax in a'. Motives x and y are in the brass, while the second phrase of the folk song (z in Ex. 6) follows in the strings. In contrast to the forceful brass of theme a, the melodious lullaby of the strings with the delicate triplet accompaniment in the upper woodwinds evokes a childlike mystique. Theme z remains in the woodwinds and strings. In addition to the climactic disclosure of the folk song, Jurjāns later augments x and y in the brass (Ex. 9).
Example 9. *Latvian National Song Festival March*, *A* section, augmented statement of motives *x* and *y* in mm. 58-63 of the trumpet and trombone parts.

The Trio, or *B* section, of the *Song Festival March* (mm. 90-164) is a contrasting lyrical section based on another folk song known as a *īgote*, or *īgo* song. The singing of *īgo* songs, also known as St. John’s Day songs, has a long history among the Latvian people. During the pre-Christian era, *īgo* songs were sung to honor *Saule*, the sun. If pleased, *Saule* would grant her pagan worshippers abundance of crops, fertility, love and unity.

Today, *īgošana*, or the act of singing *īgo* songs, usually begins the week before St. John’s day and continues until St. Peter’s day. The singing and communal events reaches its peak from June 23 through the 24th, when the shortest night of the year meets the longest day of the year in Latvia, or Midsummer’s Eve. The spirit of the Midsummer’s festival is one of gaiety and merriment. It is a time in which Latvians adorn themselves

---

6It must be mentioned that the term “īgo” does not have a literal English translation because of its lack of real ethnological roots. Perhaps, in some way, the closest English equivalent is “rejoice.”

7Tomsons, *op. cit.*, 125.
with crowns of garlands and light the “St. John’s fire” to celebrate the heritage of the Midsummer’s festivities. In general, līgo songs have a refrain in which the word “līgo” or some variant thereof is sung. The form of the līgo songs depends on where the refrain is placed, but the most usual placement of the refrain is at the end of each line of text. Consequently, the typical form of a līgo is such that one line of text corresponds to two measures of music. This first line of text is then followed by two measures of līgo refrain. The second phrase is also composed of two measures of a single line of text, but is followed by only one measure of līgo refrain. As a result, a līgo song, in its simplest form, has the possibility of being only seven measures in length and thus, asymmetrical (Ex. 10).

Example 10. Asymmetrical form of a līgo song.

The festive līgo song in the Trio is represented as theme c in the sub-dominant related key of F Major (mm. 90-105) in the violins and upper woodwinds (Ex. 11).

During the course of the līgo section, Jurjāns aligns two variations of theme c. The first

---

8Tomsons, op. cit., 125.

9Ibid., 126

10Ibid., 127.
variation is in the lower extremities of the orchestra (i.e., the bassoons, cello and contrabass), while the second is in the upper strings.

Example 11. *Latvian National Song Festival March*, Trio, antecedent phrase of theme c in mm. 90-93 of the violin parts.

Theme d of the Trio is not a theme in the strictest sense. It is a modulatory section based on motive x of *Riga Resounds*, which is aligned with the first variation of theme c. Jurjāns emphasizes the woodwinds and strings once again.

The c\textsuperscript{1} section of the Trio returns to a fuller, more percussive orchestration, while the upper woodwinds and strings carry the thematic ideas - theme c and the variation of c. Like the d section, c\textsuperscript{1} is also modulatory. Fragmentation, imitation, and augmentation, Jurjāns' preferred developmental techniques, ensue until the return of the A section.

The entire coda is a self-enclosed setting of the current Latvian national anthem, *God, Bless Latvia*. Significantly, there is evidence that Jurjāns was thinking in a symphonic manner not only because the A section returns, but also because A is related to the coda. In a similar binary form as *Riga Resounds*, the anthem contains the same rhythmic structure of motive x in its own melody. Furthermore, the contrabass accompaniment of the A section returns as the accompaniment to the anthem. Therefore, it is only logical that he would close the coda with the introductory material of the march.
CHAPTER IV

LATVIAN DANCES, OP. 3
(Latvju Dejas, Op. 3)

The Latvian Dances [Latvju dejas] were composed over the course of eleven years, from 1883 to 1894, while Jurjāns was teaching at the Russian Imperial Music Society’s Conservatory in Kharkiv.\(^1\) As with his Symphonic Allegro and Latvian National Song Festival March, the suite of four Latvian Dances was one of the first works of its kind. Prior to Jurjāns, no other composer of Latvian descent had written a symphonic suite of dances based on folk songs.

The suite consists of four movements, each representing a folk dance. These are Hullabaloo [Jandāls], followed by At Once, Right Away [Tūdaliq, tagadiq], Dance of the Paupers [Nabagu deja], and finally Ažikops. Within each movement, Jurjāns incorporates a block approach to composition, each block balanced in accord with the others. Regular phrase structure, jaunty polka-like rhythms in duple meter with subdivision of the eighth note, and diametrically balanced ascending and descending phrases are all characteristic features in this suite. Of the four movements, Ažikops is the one that is a strict arrangement of its folk melody. The first three movements are derivational settings
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of folk quotations with interpolations of Jurjāns’ own composition. Due to the semantics of musical definitions, Professor Torgāns’ descriptive terminology is mentioned along with the author’s own analytical observations.

Hullabaloo [Jandāls] - Dedicated to His Friend and Colleague, Jāzeps Viāts

The basic form of Hullabaloo [Jandāls] is a modified Minuet and Trio with an introduction (Fig. 3). Opening in C Major, the introduction (mm. 1-19) is a fragmentation of theme a, quoted in full in mm. 20-27 (Ex. 12).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intro.</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Allegro Moderato</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Trio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Torgāns’ terminology: March-like/stable)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Torgāns’ terminology: Contrastling Scherzo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(mm. 20-67)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(mm. 68-174)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a a b a' b' a</td>
<td>c c' d c'' d' c''' d c'''' a a a b a' b' a a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM CM E M A M CM</td>
<td>FM B pedal FM CM FM CM E M A M CM CM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ a=Hullabaloo \]
\[ [Jandāls] \]

\[ c=Pigs in the Rye \]
\[ [Cūkas Rudzās] \]

Figure 3. Minuet and Trio form of Hullabaloo, movement I of Latvian Dances.

Within the stable, march-like A section, theme a is initially introduced in the first clarinet and violins as a gay, gradually rising melody. Within the setting of Hullabaloo as a march, Jurjāns has preserved the frolicking, easy spirit of a bucolic celebration. There is, however, some doubt as to whether the source of the melody is of folk extraction since there is little evidence to support such a claim. Although there exists a folk song entitled Hullabaloo in Jurjāns’ own collection of folk music, it bears little resemblance to theme a,
other than it, too, is a spirited, textless dance. Consequently, it was necessary for Professor Torgāns to point out theme $a$ as the quotation in Hullabalo$\text{oo}$ and that which was of Jurjāns' own devising. In Dārziš's critique of Hullabalo$\text{o}$, however, he flatly stated that he had never heard the melody of Jurjāns' folk elaboration, not even in the Latvian countryside. He did concede that Jurjāns' version of Hullabalo$\text{o}$ exhibited certain unnamed characteristics that had become a part of Latvian folk dances and, more specifically, the tunes played at a "rural wedding." As the theme progresses, the orchestral texture expands over a syncopated drone in the French horns, a characteristic of folk music.

Example 12. Hullabalo$\text{o}$ from Latvian Dances, theme $a$ in mm. 20-27 of the woodwind parts.

In contrast to the first theme, the second is more in keeping with the style of a march. Theme $b$ balances theme $a$ in its gradually descending line with accented polka-like syncopation. A coloristic modulation to $E^b$ Major, $^b$III of C Major, differentiates this new theme. Theme $b$ is related to theme $a$ by its accented upbeats and the inversion of its

---

$^2$Dārziš, op. cit., 53.
prevailing turn figure followed by the same eighth-note intervals in m. 31 (Ex. 12 and 13).

Theme $b$, however, is clearly of Jurjāns’ own composition and not a quotation from Hullabaloo. It is his attempt to imitate the stylistic character and spirit of the first theme.

Example 13. Hullabaloo from Latvian Dances, antecedent phrase of theme $b$ in mm. 28-32 of the first violin part.

\[\text{un poco rubato}\]

In general, the return of $a'$ in $A^b$ Major fragments and imitates the principal sixteenth-note motive of theme $a$ (Ex. 12), while $b'$ combines fragments of themes $a$ and $b$. Jurjāns then balances the $A$ section with the restatement of theme $a$ in $C$ Major.

The $B$ section of Hullabaloo (mm. 68-174) is a playful, contrasting Trio in $F$ Major. Professor Torgāns believes the Trio possesses a scherzo quality. Theme $c$, first stated in the clarinets, is a slightly embellished quotation of Pigs in the Rye [*Cūkas rudzos*], a polka-like folk song that Jurjāns’ father would play on the violin during the composer’s childhood (Ex. 15). The embellished figure of Pigs in the Rye can be seen in m. 71 of the clarinet as the inverted turn figure from theme $b$ (Ex. 13 and Ex. 14).

Furthermore, Jurjāns combines what at first appears to be the motive of theme $a$ in the bassoon (Ex. 14) with theme $c$ and its inverted sixteenth-note embellishment.
Example 14. *Hullabaloo* from *Latvian Dances*, theme c and accompanimental motive in mm. 68-77 of the clarinet and bassoon.

The significance of the bassoon motive, however, is of beguiling importance. Jurjāns’ choice of *Pigs in the Rye* as theme c is not just for the sake of sentiment. Although similar to the turn motive of theme a, the accompanimental pattern in the bassoon line is also a motive found in the original folk melody (Ex. 15). The bassoon, therefore, serves as not only a reminder of theme a, but more importantly as the juxtaposition of the two phrases of *Pigs in the Rye*. As a result, the sixteenth-note motive is the unifying factor between the A and B sections of *Hullabaloo* as a whole.

Example 15. Original folk melody of *Pigs in the Rye* [*Cūkas rudzos*].

---

3Andrejs Jurjāns, “Rotaļu un dziedamo deju meldijas un tautas instrumentu meldijas” [“Game and Singing Dance Melodies and Instrumental Folk Melodies”], vol. IV of *Latvju tautas muzikas materiāli* [*Materials of Latvian Folk Music*], 6 vols. (Rīga: Drukats “Latvijas” grāmatu un nošu drukatavā, 1912), 53.
Text of *Pigs in the Rye* [Cukas rudzos].

Cūkas rudzos,  
cūkās rudzos,  
sivenīši kāpostos.  
Pigs in the rye,  
Pigs in the rye,  
Little pigs in the cabbage.⁴

After the statement of c', the lyrical d theme appears in m. 86 of the French horns (Ex. 16) against the unifying turn figure of the flutes and an accompaniment related to *Pigs in the Rye* in the strings.


The remainder of the B section is primarily devoted to the extensive alternation of themes c and d (Fig. 3). In the middle of the B section, however, Jurjāns layers the three major elements of the Trio for the first and only occurrence in the entire movement. Those elements are located specifically at m. 110. Theme d returns to the French horns. The same accompaniment that was related to *Pigs in the Rye* also appears in the violins. In addition, Jurjāns places theme c, *Pigs in the Rye*, in the cello and bass as an ostinato pattern (Ex. 17).

⁴Author's translation.
Example 17. *Hullabaloo* from *Latvian Dances*, theme *c* and related material of *d* in m. 110-113 of the string parts.

\[\text{\textit{un poco meno mosso}}\]

The closing statement of *Hullabaloo*, mm. 175-87, is merely the continuation of theme *a*. The purpose of the closing is to build to a climactic finish.

*At Once, Right Away [Tūdaliņ, tagadīj] - Dedicated to J. Ciezarevičs*

Due to the compositional method with which Jurjāns composed *At Once, Right Away [Tūdaliņ, tagadīj]*, many critics of the past and present judge this movement to be the weakest of the *Latvian Dances*. According to Latvian scholars, the major flaw of *At Once, Right Away* is its excessively long thematic development with intonations of theme and variation principle. Moreover, many musicians agree with Emils Dārziņš, who believed that the “thematic development” of the themes was detrimental to the cultural value placed upon the original folk dance. In light of how Latvians regard this melody, such averse reaction is not surprising.

*At Once, Right Away* was, and still is, a highly beloved and cherished folk dance taught to most Latvians from the time they are children. Performers of this particular dance are called “pastalnieks” in reference to the special leather slippers they wear.

---

The slippers cover the foot in the same manner as a ballet slipper and lace up the dancer's ankle. Special woolen socks are worn over the foot and leg underneath the laces.

The text of the song illustrates the importance placed on the preferred footwear for the dance and is as follows.

Text of *At Once, Right Away* [*Tūdaliņš, Tagadiņš*].

*Tūdaliņš, tagadiņš.*
*Pastalnieki dancos.*

At once, right away,
the pastalnieks are in dance.

Es ar būtu lidzi lecis,
*Man ta kurpe pušu.*

Naturally, I will jump along,
My shoe is split in two.

*Cits ar vīžem, cits ar kurpēm.*

Some (dance) with bast shoes, some with (plain) shoes,

*Cits ar bāsam kājām.*

Some with barefeet.

Nēm to lūku, sien to kurpi,
*Lec ar citiem lidzi!*

Take that bast, bind those shoes,
Jump along with the others!

One of the unique characteristics regarding the form of *At Once, Right Away* is Jurjāns' use of two themes derived from the first and second phrases of the folk dance.

The theme of section A is a quotation of the first four measures of *At Once, Right Away* (Ex. 18 and 19). The theme of section B is an embellishment of the second four measures

---

6 Jurjāns, “Rotāļu un dziedamo deju meldijas un tautas instrumentu meldijas” [*“Game and Singing Dance Melodies and Instrumental Folk Melodies”*], vol. IV of *Latvju tautas muzikas materiali* [Materials of Latvian Folk Music], 27.

7 “Bast” refers to special bark found in the Ukraine. In this instance, it refers to the oil derivative of the bark.

8 Author’s translation.
(Ex. 18 and 20). Thus, the form of *At Once, Right Away* inspired Jurjāns to create two full-fledged themes in the same relationship as is found in the folk song.

Example 18. Original folk melody of *At Once, Right Away* [*Tūdaliņ, tagadiņ*].

\[ \begin{align*}
1. & \text{Tū-dá-liņ, ta-ga-diņ, pa-stal-nee-ki dancos. Cits ar vízém,} \\
2. & \text{Es ar butu li-dzi lec-is—man-ta kurpe pu-su. Ñem to lí-ku,}
\end{align*} \]

Example 19. *At Once, Right Away* from *Latvian Dances*, theme of section A in mm. 25-28 of the first violin part.

**Allegro moderato** \( J = 92 \)

Example 20. *At Once, Right Away* from *Latvian Dances*, theme of section B in mm. 41-44 of the flutes.

---

*Jurjāns, “Rotaļu un dziedamo deju mēlodijas un tautas instrumentu mēlodijas” [“Game and Singing Dance Melodies and Instrumental Folk Melodies”], vol. IV of *Latvju tautas mūzikas materiali [Materials of Latvian Folk Music]*, 27.
In addition, Jurjāns applies variation principle to the first and third statements of the second theme (Fig. 4). Other examples of this compositional strategy are evident in Liszt’s symphonic poems and Chopin’s ballades. At Once, Right Away deploys a block approach to composition and its form exhibits an overtly three-part structure with coda, the individual blocks representing an exposition, development, and recapitulation.

Professor Torgāns, however, was adamant that the form should not be confined to the parameters of sonata-allegro principle, but as a simple thematic development of a double theme with variation principle. He also believed that the statements of the themes in A and B act as a “couplet and refrain” (Fig. 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intro.</th>
<th>Section A</th>
<th>Section B</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Coda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(mm. 25-40)</td>
<td>(mm. 41-64)</td>
<td>(65-90)</td>
<td>(91-145)</td>
<td>(145-60)</td>
<td>(161-225)</td>
<td>(226-252)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Acts as Expo. Variations within Theme B: B1 B2 B3

Acts as harmonic Development. (Still var.) Acts like a Recapitulation.

DM DM bm F#M bm D Eb E (A# C E) A♯pedal DM bm F♯ped. b (D A) DM

Figure 4. Variation principle in a three-part structure of At Once, Right Away, movement II of Latvian Dances.

As was evidenced in Hullabaloo, the introduction of At Once, Right Away also contains elements of its first theme. More specifically, the introduction consists of fragments and an eventual full statement of the theme from the A section in mm. 17-24 of the clarinets and upper strings in D Major. The A section with the first theme shortly follows in mm. 25-40 (Ex. 19).
The initial statement of the theme from section $B$, the embellished second phrase of *At Once, Right Away*, comprises three orchestral variations. The first variation ($B_1$) in $B$ minor begins in m. 41 in the flutes (Ex. 20) and an eighth-note pizzicato accompaniment in the strings. By m. 49, the second variation ($B_2$) in $F^*$ Major, begins with the melody switching to the violins and the eighth-note accompaniment in the upper woodwinds.

A new ascending, repeated accompanimental figure also appears in the clarinet. The main feature of the final variation ($B_3$), which has modulated back to $B$ minor in m. 57, is the full statement of the melody fragmented in alternating measures between the oboe and second violin and viola (Ex. 21).

Example 21. *At Once, Right Away* from *Latvian Dances*, $B_3$ in mm. 57-60, full orchestra.
Shortly after B3, the second segment begins with the theme of section A (m. 65). This second segment serves as a type of harmonic development. Within the parameters of the A section, Jurjāns settles on E♭ Major (m. 69) from D Major then to E Major (m. 77), broadening the orchestral texture in each modulatory passage. In general, he develops the theme through fragmentation and finally, triplet diminution (mm. 83-90 of the strings).

The second appearance of the theme from the B section (mm. 91-145) continues the process of harmonic development that previously occurred in section A, that is, the B section travels through another set of key areas, A♭ Major, C Major (m. 95), and E Major (m. 99), before settling on an A♭ pedal point (m. 109). Eventually, this theme also fragments and collapses into the sixteenth-note diminution of the flutes and violins until the return of theme A. The A♭ pedal finally resolves to the unusual key of D Major by way of an Augmented 6th chord for the third section. Instead of resolving to a C Major chord in first inversion, the A♭ acts enharmonically as G♯. The B♭ and enharmonic G♯ of the Augmented 6th chord can then resolve to the A in D Major.

Although the last statement of section A is still a variation, both themes from A and B act as a recapitulation in the sense that there is a return to the tonic key and the same key structures found in mm. 25-64, which encompasses the presentation of themes, as well as the three variations of B (Fig. 4). By m. 194, Jurjāns introduces an A pedal point, while continuing intimations of the primary motives from section A (m. 195 of the violins) and section B (m. 210 of the violins and upper woodwinds). Both motives
are then reduced to their respective triplet or sixteenth-note diminution (m. 216) before the arrival of the coda in m. 226.

The coda is the teleological climax in which Jurjāns states the first and second themes together in their entirety (Ex. 22), finally uniting the two phrases of the folk dance after innumerable measures of thematic separation and systematic variation of the theme from section B.

Example 22. *At Once, Right Away* from *Latvian Dances*, themes A and B in mm. 226-252 of the Coda, violin part.

Jurjāns’ treatment of the themes in *At Once, Right Away* can be only construed as what Carl Dahlhaus has called the principle of “contrasting derivation,” in which two themes, initially presented as unrelated, prove to be part of one another. The final statement of both themes at the end of the piece discloses the relationship between them.
Unlike Chopin, with whom the principle of contrasting derivation is more closely associated, Jurjāns did not invent two original themes that are later presented as one in the same. Instead, he started with two themes that comprise a single tune, *At Once, Right Away.*

*Dance of the Paupers [Nabagu deja] - Dedicated to His Brother, Pāvuls Jurjāns*

In comparison to the Minuet and Trio form of *Hullabaloo,* the ternary form of *Dance of the Paupers [Nabagu deja] (Fig. 5)* differs in Jurjāns' stylistic treatment of the A section. According to Torgāns, instead of the contrasting styles of *Hullabaloo* in which a stable, march-like A section contrasts with the scherzo-like quality of the Trio, *Dance of the Paupers* retains its playful, scherzo character throughout the entire movement, the orchestration of which lends much to its charm.

Jurjāns emphasizes the upper registers of the piccolo, flute and strings, eschewing the low strings and brass altogether. He also incorporates celesta, triangle and string harmonics to produce a setting reminiscent of the distant, whimsical memories of dancing marionettes with their scintillating treble and simple harmonies.
**Figure 5. Ternary form of Dance of the Paupers, movement III of Latvian Dances.**

The a and b themes of *Dance of the Paupers* are quotations from the first and second phrases of the instrumental dance of the same title (Ex. 23).

Example 23. Original folk melody of *Dance of the Paupers [Nabagu deja].*

---

The first statement of theme a, in D Major, is embellished in mm. 2-9 of the piccolo and follows the same symmetrical phrase structure of the original folk dance.

In both this first statement and its subsequent repeat (mm. 10-17), the melody is also given to the first violin in the consequent phrases of each period (Ex. 24).

Example 24. *Dance of the Paupers* from *Latvian Dances*, theme a in mm. 1-14, full orchestra.
Although theme \(b\) begins as a quotation of the second phrase of *Dance of the Paupers*, Jurjans alters a few notes in m. 26 to embellish with the \(\frac{3}{4}\) rhythm (Ex. 23 and 25). The ornamentation leads to the exact restatement of theme \(a\) and its repeat in mm 46-53.

Example 25. *Dance of the Paupers* from *Latvian Dances*, theme \(b\) in mm. 18-28 of the flute and piccolo parts.

In the playful, scherzo-like style of the previous section, the \(B\) section in G Major opens with the oboe on introductory downbeats syncopated by the clarinets. The celesta and violin enter with theme \(c\), *For Five Years, I Was a Servant* [*Pieci gadi kalpiņš biju*] (Ex. 26) two measures later.
Example 26. *Dance of the Paupers* from *Latvian Dances*, theme c, quotation of the antecedent phrase of *For Five Years, I Was a Servant* in mm. 56-59 of the celesta and violin part.

![Musical notation for the celesta and violin parts of *Dance of the Paupers* from *Latvian Dances*.]

The antecedent phrase of *For Five Years, I Was a Servant* is then answered by the flute and violin together (mm. 60-63) before its next statement (mm. 64-67); here Jurjāns instead places the antecedent phrase in hocket between the flute, celesta, and violin (Ex. 27).

Example 27. *Dance of the Paupers* from *Latvian Dances*, hocket treatment of the antecedent phrase of *For Five Years, I Was a Servant* in mm. 64-67 of the flute and violin parts.

![Musical notation for the flute and violin parts of the hocket treatment from *Dance of the Paupers*.]

Similar to *Dance of the Paupers, For Five Years, I Was a Servant* as theme c is also a folk song depicting the life of the poor. Consequently, *For Five Years, I Was a Servant* belongs to a classification of folk songs known for their social commentary.
Socialo attiecību dziesmas [Songs of Social Protest]. These were songs sung by the peasants and serfs during their indentured servitude to the Baltic German nobility. Some of the social commentaries denouncing the peasants’ exploitation were contemptuous, but most were written with a great degree of humor and wit. For Five Years, I Was a Servant combines humor and contempt, resulting in a highly satirical text. This particular folk song lampoons the dilapidated “wage” earned by a servant in his five years of bondage and the foul treatment by his landowner. The text of For Five Years, I Was a Servant follows.

Text of For Five Years, I Was a Servant [Pieci gadi kalpiņš biju].

Piec gadi kalpiņš biju,  
Pieci kalpa kažociņ',  
Tra-rā, ra-ra-rā!  
Pieci kalpa kažociņ':  

Jāju sievas lākotiesi,  
Visi pieci mugarā,  
Tra-rā, ra-ra-rā!  
Visi pieci mugarā.  

Rej sunīšī qigu qegu,  
Iet kažoki briku brak.  
Tra-rā, ra-ra-rā!  
Iet kažoki briku brak.  

Sievas māte brinījāsi:  
Vai no elles tas izjāj's?  
Tra-rā, ra-ra-rā!  
Vai no elles tas izjāj's?

For five years, I was a servant,  
(For five years), five servant’s furs,  
Tra-ra, ra-ra-ra!  
(For five years), five servant’s furs.  

I am riding, looking for a wife,  
All five furs are on my back.  
Tra-ra, ra-ra-ra!  
All five furs are on my back.  

Dogs are barking “bow wow, woof, woof;”  
(For) the furs go “crickle-crack.”  
Tra-ra, ra-ra-ra!  
(For) the furs go “crickle-crack.”

The wife’s mother is wondering:  
“From what Hell does he ride out?”  
Tra-ra, ra-ra-ra!  
“From what Hell does he ride out?”

Text con't.

Meitu māte, vilku māte,
Vai man savu meitu dos'?
Tra-rā, ra-ra-rā!
Vai man savu meitu dos'?

Jāj projāmi, elles kruķi,
Tev es meitas jau nedos'.
Tra-rā, ra-ra-rā!
Tev es meitas jau nedos'.

Mana meita smalka, balta,
Tev sakaltis kažociņš.
Tra-rā, ra-ra-rā!
Tev sakaltis kažociņš.

Daughters’ mother, wolf’s mother,
Will you give me your daughter?
Tra-ra, ra-ra-ra!
Will you give me your daughter?
Ride away, you rake of Hell,
I won’t give you my daughter.
Tra-ra, ra-ra-ra!
I won’t give you my daughter.
My (own) daughter (is) fine and white,
But you have (such) a bad, dried fur.
Tra-ra, ra-ra-ra!
But you have (such) a bad, dried fur.12

The second theme of the B section is not d, but c1 of For Five Years, I Was a Servant beginning in m. 72 of the strings. By m. 88, theme c is restated without deviation from its initial statement (mm. 54-71). After the return to the A section in D Major, there is a brief coda on theme a at mm. 106-13.

Ačikops - Dedicated to His Brother, Juris Jurjāns

Although Jurjāns utilized quotation in all the movements of Latvian Dances, Ačikops is the only movement that strictly follows the structure of the five interrelated themes of its original folk source found in the fifth volume, “Dances,” of Jurjāns’ Materials of Latvian Folk Music (Ex. 28).

12 Author’s translation.
Example 28. Original folk melody of Acikops.13

As a result, the form of the final movement is unique in contrast to the other dances of the suite. Hullabaloo and Dance of the Paupers are in ternary form with quotations in their B sections of Pigs in the Rye and For Five Years, I Was a Servant respectively. At Once, Right Away is a three-part structure that relies on variation principle.

Ačikops is a synthesis of two macrocosmic principles. On the one hand, it is a strict arrangement of the five eight-measure episodes of the folk dance, while at the same time, its ternary form is based on key structure and return to an A section (Fig. 6).

Furthermore, all five episodes are unified by their rhythmic content.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction (mm. 1-9)</th>
<th>A (mm. 10-40)</th>
<th>B (mm. 41-73)</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Coda (74-91)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a'</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>a a' b b'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>d'</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>a a' b b'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>a a' b b'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>a a' b b'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Ternary form of Ačikops, movement IV of Latvian Dances.

The first thematic episode of Ačikops takes place after a nine-measure rhythmic preparation with the full orchestra in C Major. In general, Jurjāns deploys sparse orchestration with theme a carried in the violin, and supported by the remaining strings. For the repeat of theme a (m. 18), he uses additive instrumentation in the strings and woodwinds. The result is a bold, dynamic crescendo on theme a. The brass plays a subordinate role in its powerful, accompanimental syncopation.

Theme b is treated in the same manner as theme a. Again a solo instrument, the oboe in this case, introduces the theme (m. 26). Emphasis returns to the woodwinds and strings without brass accompaniment. Although the woodwinds and strings share in the presentation of theme b, Jurjāns delegates different groupings of those timbres to characterize the different aspects of the melody. Fragmentation of theme b occurs in the areas where the melody is relegated elsewhere in the woodwind and string groupings.
The repeat of theme \( b \) is similarly reorchestrated with additive woodwinds and brass contributing to a huge, dynamic contrast.

From C Major, Jurjāns moves to the relative minor for the \( B \) section and theme \( c \) (mm. 41-49), which is stated twice with full orchestration. Both times, the antecedent of the theme is in the upper woodwinds and violins. Although Jurjāns reserves the consequent phrase for the second flute and first violin, its fragmentation occurs in the bassoons, low brass, and low strings.

Deviating for the first time from the key of the original, theme \( d \) appears not in C Major, but A Major (m. 52). Jurjāns divides the theme among the upper woodwinds. Between themes \( c \) and \( d \), there is a magnificent contrast. In theme \( c \), heavy orchestration and overwhelming dynamics create an image of a runaway locomotive, whereas theme \( d \) is delineated as a delicate, playful melody, which is related to the \( līgo \) (loosely translated as "rejoice") songs of Midsummer’s Eve in its light, joyful tone.

Finally, theme \( e \) closes the \( B \) section in A minor. Jurjāns places the first statement of \( e \) again in the upper woodwinds and violins. This time, however, he allows the brass to join the first statement, though, solely in an accompanimental manner. In the restatement, the whole melodic episode is retained in the woodwinds and strings. Momentum builds as flute arpeggios and additive brass push toward a frenzied accelerando. After the return to the \( A \) section, the coda is characterized by fragmentation of theme \( a \) in C Major.
CHAPTER V

CONCERTO ELEGIACO, OP. 11
(for Violoncello in E minor)

Jurjāns achieved the pinnacle of his symphonic output with his only work for solo instrument with orchestra, *Concerto elegiaco* (1889), the first instrumental concerto by a Latvian. He dedicated the concerto to Alfred von Glehn, a Russian cellist and friend. According to Professor Torgāns, the concerto is an example of Jurjāns’ knowledge of the innovative form taking place in the concertos elsewhere on the continent during the second half of the nineteenth century.

Influenced by Weber’s *Konzertstück* (1821) and Beethoven’s last two piano concertos (No. 4, Op. 58 in G Major and No. 5, Op. 73 in E♭ Major), Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy introduced two significant modifications in the form of the concerto. In regard to the first movement’s Ritornello-sonata form of the 18th century, Mendelssohn combined the opening ritornello and first solo section into one unrepeated exposition with the presentation of themes shared by both the soloist and the orchestra. Mendelssohn’s other influential contribution to the concerto form is evidenced in his virtuostic masterpiece, the *Violin Concerto* (1844). Mendelssohn alters the usual three-movement

---

form by connecting all three movements with the bassoon line, thereby creating a synthesis of Sonata-Allegro principle and a symphonic cycle. This new formal scheme and sharing of themes influenced other composers, one of whom was Franz Liszt in his Eb Major and A Major piano concertos. Completed in 1849 and revised in 1855, Liszt’s Eb Major piano concerto exemplifies thematic transformation of the interrelated themes in all four movements. The thoroughgoing application of Liszt’s method of continual thematic transformation results in the formal connection of each movement. By 1853, Liszt expanded this principle to his Sonata in B minor. The four themes are developed in one extended movement with subdivisions corresponding to the sections of Sonata-Allegro principle.

Having been educated at the St. Petersburg Conservatory, Jurjāns was fully acquainted with these new developments in the concerto form and embraced them with his Concerto elegiaco. As with Mendelssohn’s Violin Concerto and Liszt’s piano concertos, Jurjāns presents the soloist and the orchestra as equals in the sharing of themes, as well as fusing the overall form into one large movement.

According to Professor Torgāns, Concerto elegiaco is best classified as Sonata-Allegro principle with Episode (Fig. 7), replacing a formal development section.

In contrast to his other symphonic works, Jurjāns incorporates only one folk reference,

---


which functions as the central element of the piece. Theme II is a ternary structure with the folk song *Why Do You Cry, What is Wrong* [*Ko tu raudi, kas tev kaite*] projected onto both a sections. The importance of the folk song is its correlation to the themes of the concerto. All of the themes are motivically related to the folk song. This would suggest that Jurjäns obtained his folk reference first, was influenced by its melody, and composed the other themes to match it. Specifically, the motivic pattern of theme II (Ex. 33) is found elsewhere in the introduction (Ex. 30), theme I (Ex. 31), bridge (Ex. 32), closing, the c and d sections of new theme in the episode (Ex. 34 and 35), and the codetta.

Jurjäns also stresses standard key relationships between the first and second themes. The introduction and exposition mostly emphasize the key of E minor, while the second theme moves to the relative major, G Major. For the recapitulation, theme I and II remain in E minor until the final statement of the second theme, in the parallel key of E Major. An arresting harmonic feature of the concerto is located in the episode.

Jurjäns relies on a tonally distant Neapolitan relationship between the tonic key and the key of the episode, which stresses F Major. The episode, itself, is Jurjäns' loose interpretation of ritornello principle, as well as his synthesis of the nocturne and barcarole genres. Furthermore, he introduces a new theme composed of two alternating sections.

Jurjäns’ turbulent and brooding introduction is reminiscent of Verdi’s opening storm scene in *Otello* (1887). The introduction opens with elements of the first theme interpolated between the powerful repeated notes of the French horns. In the measures prior to the soloist’s entrance, the flutes and violins play the descending fifth intervals.
followed by a descending second (Ex. 29). This intervallic pattern will manifest itself later as the incipit of theme I.

Example 29. *Concerto elegiaco*, Introduction, elements of theme I in mm. 1-9 of the piano reduction.
Figure 7. Sonata-Allegro Principle with Episode from *Concerto elegiaco*, Op. 11  
(for Violoncello in E minor).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intro. Maestoso (mm. 1-34)</th>
<th>Exposition Allegro agitato (mm. 35-197)</th>
<th>Episode Andante (mm. 198-287)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>I</strong> (35-65) Bridge Theme (66-128)</td>
<td><strong>R₁</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soloist takes part.</td>
<td>Soloist and orchestra as equals.</td>
<td><strong>(c²) (198)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements of theme I.</td>
<td>Echoes of theme I.</td>
<td><strong>(d) (205)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivic pattern of theme II.</td>
<td>Motivic pattern of theme II.</td>
<td><strong>(d) (214)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>em</td>
<td>GM instability GM</td>
<td><strong>C A♭</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EM</strong></td>
<td>FM instab. D♭M instab.</td>
<td><strong>AM instab. FM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FM</strong></td>
<td><strong>FM instab. FM over C ped.</strong></td>
<td><strong>FM</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Episode, con't. Andante (mm. 198-287)</th>
<th>Retransition Allegro Agitato (mm. 288-300)</th>
<th>Recapitulation (mm. 301-431)</th>
<th>Codetta (432-46)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(S₁)</td>
<td><strong>R₃</strong> <strong>S₁</strong> (301-30) Bridge Theme (331-74)</td>
<td><strong>II (a b a¹) Closing Theme (375-99) Full Cad.</strong></td>
<td>Motivic pattern of II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c³) (263) <strong>S₁</strong> (300) Bridge Theme (270) (276)</td>
<td>(d) (400) <strong>(401-17) (417-31)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(248)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM instab. D♭M instab.</td>
<td><strong>FM instab. FM over C ped.</strong></td>
<td><strong>FM</strong></td>
<td><strong>EM</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After the dramatic entrance of the cello, much like Otello’s entrance in Verdi’s opening storm scene, Jurjans presents the second element of theme I. This four-note figure from the antecedent phrase of the theme is in diminution (Ex. 30).

Example 30. Concerto elegiaco, Introduction, motivic pattern of theme II in mm. 11-12 of the piano reduction.

In addition to the orchestral soundscape, the vocal nature of the cello line elicits darker emotions through a quasi-recitative with vehement orchestral interjections suggesting rage and remorse. The sudden shift to a dulcet, contrasting passage in mm. 20-22 comes as somewhat of a surprise.

The close of the introduction on the cello’s rising, cadenza-like passage over a Neapolitan chord, again reminiscent of Verdi in his resolution of Otello and Desdemona’s beautiful Un bacio duet at the end of Act I, serves an important function. The tonal resonance of the F Major Neapolitan chord not only prepares the listener for the remote key area of F Major in the episode, but also alludes to what would at first seem to be a more uplifting exposition. The effect is deceptive. Both the cello and orchestra move to an Allegro agitato in E minor.
In the exposition, the presentation of theme I is shared by members of the orchestra and the soloist. The rest of the orchestra accompanies with agitated repetitive notes. Theme I, however, is not in keeping with traditional thematic concepts. Instead of a rhythmic, stable theme, Jurjäns writes one of expressive lyricism and plaintive urgency (Ex. 31). The first theme eventually leads the listener to a playful dialect between the soloist and the winds (mm. 45-48 and 57-60).

Example 31. *Concerto elegiaco*, Exposition, theme I in mm. 35-48 of the piano reduction.

After a condensed restatement of theme I, the cello and the orchestra subside with the cello’s descending line into the dark, brooding dramaticism of the introductory material (mm. 63-67). This small section acts as a transition to the bridge theme.
The bridge is more rhythmically assertive than theme I. In the agitated style of the orchestra, the cello displays a technical and virtuosic quality through ascending and descending eighth-note repeated patterns, double stops, and sixteenth-note arpeggios (Ex. 32). Although the lyricism of theme I alternates between the winds and the strings with echoes of theme I in the flutes, it is the harmonic instability as well as the driving force of the cello’s unceasing rhythmic line that propels the bridge towards Jurjans’ eventual goal, *Why Do You Cry, What Is Wrong* as theme II.

Example 32. *Concerto elegiaco*, Exposition, bridge theme in mm. 66-82 of the piano reduction.
An interesting harmonic feature of the instability prior to the second key area is how Jurjâns travels from E minor to the tonally distant key of B♭ minor. The contrast of the two remote key areas, E minor and B♭ minor, is particularly striking due to their tritone relationship.

As the bridge progresses in the key of B♭ minor, Jurjâns introduces another deceptive element, an A♭ pedal point preparation for D♭ Major. He never modulates to D♭ Major, but instead increases the tension by denying the listener the desired resolution. The A♭ pedal continues until the cello line descends into the orchestral material of the introduction and the elements of theme I. The introductory material and the last statement of the bridge theme act as a secondary dominant preparation for the second key area of G Major. Jurjâns finally resolves to the Dominant, D Major, on the intimations of theme II in the flute (mm. 124–28). Reminiscent of incidental music, the forshadowing of the second theme prepares the listener for the cello’s entrance on theme II (Ex. 33).

Example 33. *Concerto elegiaco*, Exposition, theme II in mm. 128–138 of the piano reduction.
Jurjāns chose the folk song *Why Do You Cry, What Is Wrong* for the second theme of *Concerto elegiaco* (Ex. 33). As Jurjāns did not include this particular folk song in his *Materials of Latvian Folk Music*, only the orchestral setting is excerpted for the purposes of discussion. He instead quoted the folk song from an unknown source.

*Why Do You Cry* is a young wife’s angry rebuttal to her husband, who neither loves, nor cherishes her anymore. Text of *Why Do You Cry* follows.

Text of *Why Do You Cry, What Is Wrong* [*Ko tu raudi, kas tev kaite*].

---

*Ko tu raudi, kas tev kaite,*

*mana jauna līgaviņa?*

*Vai, vai, jauna līgaviņ’,*

*Vai, vai, jauna līgaviņ’.*

*Vai tev trūka sāls un maizes,*

*Vai es mīli nedzīvoju?*

*Vai, vai, jauna līgaviņ’.*

*Sāls un maizes gān neatrāka,*

*Mīlu vārdu vien pietrūka,*

*Vai, vai, mīlu vārdu trūk’.*

*Ja tev tīka, dzīv’ ar mani,*

*Ja netīka, šķiramiesi,*

*Ja netīka, šķiramies’.*

*Šķir pušami gultas arēbes,*

*Lauz laulātus gredzenītqus*

*Deviņiemi gabaliem.*

---

Why do you cry, what’s wrong,
My young bride?
Oh, oh, my young wife,
Oh, oh, my young wife.

Do you lack salt and bread,
Do I not live for you, Dear?
Oh, oh, my young wife.

Indeed, I do not lack salt and bread.
I lack words of love from you, (my husband),
Oh, oh, I lack words of love.

If you desire, live with me,
If you do not, let us separate,
If you do not, let us separate.

Tear up the nuptial bed clothing,
Break the wedding ring into
Nine parts.

---

1 Zējs Viļols, *Divsimt latviešu tautas dziesmas* [Two Hundred Latvian Folk Songs], vol. 1, arranged for piano or voice and piano, 2 vols. (Rīga: Liesma, 1970), 65.
Theme II is characterized by sorrow and bitter longing despite its key of G Major (Ex. 33). The timbre of the cello is well suited to express the unrequited love of the rejected wife.

As was evidenced in the thematic construction of both the *Symphonic Allegro* and the *Song Festival March*, theme II consists of a smaller *aba* structure with *Why Do You Cry* projected onto both *a* sections. The *b* section in B♭ Major, or the III related key of G Major, is of Jurjāns' own devising and offers little variance to the previous *a* section. In fact, due to an initial quotation from the consequent phrase of *Why Do You Cry*, *b* of theme II falsely appears to be a continuation of the actual folk song. In reality, the *b* section is the means by which Jurjāns presents the first of the soloist's two cadenzas.

The statement of *a₁* is more joyous and uplifting than *a*. For Jurjāns, it is as if the young wife has finally let go of her pain to accept a future without her beloved. The upper woodwinds play a merry eighth-note accompaniment with the restatement of *Why Do You Cry*.

---

*Author's translation.*
Cry in the cello. Along with the *poco accelerando*, the effect is that of little, morning birds singing to the rejected bride.

Like the *Symphonic Allegro*, Jurjāns again forgoes a turning point within theme II. He moves immediately to the closing theme of the exposition (mm.169-188). Initially in G Major, the closing theme is a tonally unstable section, which Jurjāns’ uses to create constant motion towards what would ordinarily be the development section. In addition to the harmonic instability of the closing theme, Jurjāns also incorporates a repeated, descending triplet pattern to also give the close a forward, driving momentum.

Finally, a brief turning point with echoes of the introductory motive occurs. The introductory motive is now spread throughout the winds, while the closing theme dominates the cello. The result is a feeling of increased urgency. Modulating to the next key area, Jurjāns sequences on each repetition of the descending fifth and descending second intervals of the first theme emphasized in the introduction. The sequences finally cadence on an ambiguous G°7 chord. The significance of this cadence is that it allows Jurjāns to take the subsequent episode into any key. He prepares for a key far removed from G Major. The eventual resolution is deceptive. He simply travels to F Major.

Ironically, Jurjāns does not develop themes I or II in the episode. He instead introduces a slow, continuously rising theme consisting of two alternating sections, \(c\) and \(d\). This new theme is even more lyrical and serene than either theme of the exposition, which may point to a possible explanation as to why Jurjāns interpolated an episode instead of a formalized development section. Within the exposition, the first and
second themes are usually derived so that there is a distinct contrast between them.

In general, theme I is more rhythmic and active than the second, lyrical theme.

The exposition of *Concerto elegiaco* offers no such contrasting of themes. The only element differentiating themes I and II is the key. Furthermore, the lyrical content of both themes becomes a moot consideration since neither theme displays a surpassing lyricism strong enough to conclude the exposition or to treat developmentally. In other words, the episodic theme presents the real thematic contrast of the entire movement due to the change in character. The episode is a synthesis of the nocturne and barcarole genres, in that the lyricism of the theme is of the same nature as those found in nocturnes, typically for solo piano. Vascillating between 6/8 and 9/8 meters, the undulating orchestral accompaniment patterns of the episode evoke the wave-like motions of a barcarole. For added emphasis, Jurjäns also places the episode in the key of F Major, the tonally distant key foreshadowed by the closing Neapolitan chord of the introduction.

Although the orchestra and the soloist share in the presentation of the episodic material, Jurjäns employs a loose interpretation of the traditional ritornello principle usually found in the first movements of Baroque and Classical concertos.

The first ritornello ($R_1$) is characterized by the incipit of $c$. Jurjäns emphasizes the upper woodwinds and strings. Alternating and imitating the incipit over the course of the opening measures, he creates tension and anticipation to contrast the subdued cello entrance ($S_1$) with the full statement of $c$ over the gently undulating accompaniment of the previous ritornello (Ex. 34).
Example 34. *Concerto elegiaco*, Episode, *c* section of new theme constructed from the motivic pattern of theme II in mm. 205-213 of the piano reduction.

Jurjāns introduces the *d* section in the cello, rather than returning to the intrusive ritornello, to continue the sweetly flowing theme with its representation of heart-rendered emotions and longing. From the ascending line of the *c* section, Jurjāns creates an impression similar to the idea of Wagnerian transfiguration, a melody which slowly unfolds, rising upward as if to express the beauty beyond a corporeal existence. Therefore, although the *d* section is the descending balance to the *c* section, it still retains all of the surpassing sweetness of its counterpart.

The cello immediately engages the bassoon in a repeated exchange of the opening motive of *d*. Both pass the motive from one to the other until the cello ascends to newer
heights and greater anticipation over the ever present undulating accompaniment of the orchestra (Ex. 35).

Example 35. *Concerto elegiaco*, Episode, *d* section of new theme constructed from the motivic pattern of theme II in mm. 214-228 of the piano reduction.
As the last strains of the cello fade, the ritornello (R₂) begins c' (m. 228). The statement of c' is characterized by harmonic instability and upward sequential modulations before finally settling in the key of A Major. Jurjāns differentiates the soloist’s next entrance. Instead of remaining in the same key as the ritornello, as was the case with c, he modulates back to the key of F Major for c' of the cello. Furthermore, he imbues the continuously rising line of the cello with a new spirit, one in which the flute appears to be dancing around the cello theme with a playfully ornamented accompaniment.

The statement of d' (m. 248) is characterized by harmonic instability and a dialogue on the incipit of d' between the ornamented flute, French horn, and cello. Anticipation builds when the bassoon enters in the sequential ascent. As the ensemble reaches the limits of its upper registers, Jurjāns begins his modulation back to F Major for the third ritornello beginning with the cascading clarinet line and the statement of c''.

Jurjāns treats the incipit of c in the third ritornello (R₃, m. 263) in the same manner as the first ritornello, but the orchestration of each statement is now fuller as the motive is alternated between the strings and the brass. In addition, harmonic instability continues in R₃. What remains harmonically constant in R₃ is the C pedal point in the bass trombone, as the entire orchestra brings the episode to its eventual climax on the motive from c (m. 267). Repetition of the motive quickly subsides into the gently undulating orchestral accompaniment in F Major, the final resolution of the C pedal point and harmonic instability, enabling the cello to begin its last statement of c'' and d'' (m. 270).
In the last statement of $c^{11}$, the $c$ section fragments so that the incipit is imitated between the cello, violins, and bassoon. Jurjāns reserves the statement of $d^{11}$ for the final presentation of $a'$ and the motive from the $c$ section. As the cello sustains $a'$ over the F Major chord in the orchestra, Jurjāns completes the idea of transfiguration and can now draw the episode to its sublime close. For emphasis, he includes a fermata rest and a double bar at the end of the episode.

In the retransition (mm. 288-300), Jurjāns reverts to the Allegro agitato of the exposition through the repeated notes of the French horns, which become the prevailing motive of this section. He also incorporates syncopation and additive instrumentation. Harmonically, Jurjāns introduces a $B^b$ as the enharmonic spelling of $A^\#$, which acts as part of an Augmented 6th chord preparation for the key of E minor, the key of the recapitulation.

In general, the presentation of thematic material in the recapitulation is treated in the same manner as the exposition. Jurjāns simply employs a fuller orchestral texture. Other than orchestration, the main difference between the exposition and the recapitulation is Jurjāns’ statement of the theme II, Why Do You Cry, What Is Wrong. Jurjāns places Why Do You Cry, which remains in E minor, in full canon between the cello and upper woodwinds (mm. 375-399). According to Professor Torgāns, the profound alteration occurs in the statement of Why Do You Cry as $a'$ of the smaller $aba'$ structure. Jurjāns modulates to E Major. The key of E Major, as well as the accompanying upper woodwinds, enables Jurjāns to give Why Do You Cry the same uplifting quality it had in
the exposition. Torgāns was also careful to point out that the key of E Major is not as effective as the G Major tonality of the exposition. The concerto remains in E Major, concluding with a flash of technical brilliance in the virtuostic codetta.
CHAPTER VI

THE LIBERATION OF THE LATVIAN PEOPLE, OP. 12
(Latvju tautas brīvaišana, Op. 12)

Along with Jāzeps Viņols' Liigo [Rejoice, 1889], Liberation of the Latvian People, Op. 12, laid the foundations for programmatic symphonic repertoire. Written for the Freedom Festival in the Kurzeme region of Latvia in 1891, Jurjāns' symphonic poem is the delineation of the Latvians' oppression under the feudal yoke of the German nobility and the confirmation of their freedom with Alexander II's Reform Bill of 1861, thirty years prior to writing of Liberation of the Latvian People. Of the symphonic works discussed, it is the richest in folk references.

Historically, predecessors of the symphonic poem include the descriptive overtures of Beethoven with the Coriolan (1807), Berlioz with King Lear (1831), Mendelssohn with the Hebrides (1829-32), and Wagner with A Faust Overture (1840, rev. 1855). Franz Liszt, however, was the first to coin the term "symphonic poem" for a performance of his Tasso in 1854. He later applied it to all of his works in the genre and redesignated his earlier overtures as symphonic poems as well. Some of Liszt's most famous symphonic poems include Mazeppa (1847), Prometheus (1850), Hamlet (1858) and

---


2 Ibid.

3 Ibid.

Smetana’s work is a cycle of six symphonic poems based on subjects from his native Czechoslovakia. They are individually titled Vyšehrad (a legendary castle and the citadel of Prague), The Moldau [Vltava], Šárka (an Amazon-like Bohemian maiden in Czech legend), From Bohemia’s Woods and Fields [Z Ėeských luňů a hájů], Tábor (an ancient city), Blaník (a mountain near Prague where legendary heroes await their country’s plea for help). Several years later, Jurjāns composed Liberation of the Latvian People (1891) at a time when the symphonic poem was nearing its peak.

The genre reached its culmination with Richard Strauss’ Till Eulenspiegels lustige Streiche [Till Eulenspiegel’s Merry Pranks, 1895] and Also sprach Zarathustra [Thus Spake Zarathustra, 1896]. Strauss called both works tone poems as he preferred the term to symphonic poem.

Liberation of the Latvian People consists of two large sections (Fig. 8). As with the Song Festival March, Jurjāns projects five folk songs onto the form of each section, as well as reserving the coda for a similar setting of God, Bless Latvia. The first section is a long introduction depicting the suffering of the Latvian people through the use of

---

4Grout and Palisca, op. cit., 713.

5Locke, op. cit., 477.

6Ibid.

7Ibid.
Figure 8. Form of *The Liberation of the Latvian People*, Op. 12
* [Latvju tautas brīvaišana, Op. 12].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section I</th>
<th>Adagio</th>
<th>Meno mosso</th>
<th>Andante religioso</th>
<th>Andante molto maestoso</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>(mm. 1-35)</td>
<td>(mm. 36-136)</td>
<td>(mm. 136-149)</td>
<td>(mm. 150-170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 1st phrase of <em>Go, Sun, Soon to God</em> [Ej saulne, drīz pie dieva]</td>
<td>Full theme from <em>Go, Sun, Soon to God</em>, Development through fragmentation and imitation. Small climax on augmented folk song.</td>
<td>Forshadowing of the recurring trumpet fanfare that serves as transition.</td>
<td>Canonu entrances. Fragmentation and imitation.</td>
<td>Recurring trumpet fanfare as transition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dm</td>
<td>dm</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>DM over an A pedal</td>
<td>DM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Section II | Alla marcia triofonie |
| A | B | C | A |
| (mm. 175-204) | (mm. 205-231) | (mm. 243-266) | (mm. 267-300) |
| March based on *Shepherds Drive, Cattle Low* [Gani dzima govis māva] | Lyrical section based on *Oh Visitor, Oh Neighbor* [Ai ciemīgi, Ai kaimīgi] | Based on 2 liģo songs. |  |

Statements:
1 2
DM

Statements:
1 2 3
AM CM AM DM

Līgo songs:
1st 2nd 1st
gm BbM gm DM

Coda
(mm. 301-319)
Latvian national anthem, *God, Bless Latvia* aligned with the Russian national anthem, *God, Save the Tsar.*

DM
Go, Sun, Soon to God [Ej, saulīte, drīz pie dieva]. The second is a five-part Rondo (ABACA) with coda (Fig. 8).

Go, Sun, Soon to God is classified as a darba dziesma, or work song. As its classification implies, the serfs sang these songs while at their labor, as well as going to and coming from work. More than any other type of folk song, the darba dziesmas [work songs] are the most saturated with social protests and remonstrations of the German nobility. As a result, the majority of the darba dziesmas [work songs] are believed to have originated during the heaviest era of feudalism, between the years 1700 and 1800.

The text of Go, Sun, Soon to God is a typical example of the grief and sorrow found in the darba dziesmas. Text of Go, Sun, Soon to God follows.

Text of Go, Sun, Soon to God [Ej, saulīte, drīz pie dieva].

Ej, saulīte, drīz pie dieva,
Dod man svētku vakariņ’!
Bargi kungi darbu dev’,
Nedod svēta vakariņ’;

Go, sun, soon to God,
Give me a blessed evening!
The harsh masters have given me work,
(Our masters) don’t give blessed evenings.

Melna čūska mīlts mala
Vidā jārā uz akmin’;
Tos bīhs ēsti tiem kungiem,
Kas pēc saules strādināj’.

The black serpent grinds (rotten) flour
In the middle of the sea on a rock;
It will be eaten by those lords
Who make us work after the sun sets.

Teci, teci, kumelīņi,
Nu ar līku pavadiņ’;
Slīki gadi, bargi kung’,
Nedrīkst kēdes kalidināt.

Run, run steed,
With your poor bridle of bast:
Bad years, harsh masters,
They do not allow (us) to forge good chains of iron.⁸

Although critics received *Liberation of the Latvian People* with mixed reviews, Jurjāns’ treatment of *Go, Sun, Soon to God* was lauded for its “heartfelt” sentiments and depiction of the people’s suffering under the yolk of feudalism.

The introduction of *Liberation of the Latvian People* opens on the first phrase of *Go, Sun, Soon to God* in the upper woodwinds. In contrast to the original folk song (Ex. 36), Jurjāns augments the theme to intensify the expression of misery incipient in the text.

Example 36. Original folk melody of *Go, Sun, Soon to God* [Ej, saulīte, drīz pie dieva].

Fragments of the augmented theme characterize the introduction until the unaltered statement of *Go, Sun, Soon to God* (mm. 36-46) in the first oboe and viola.

Immediately after the full presentation of the theme, Jurjāns develops *Go, Sun, Soon to God*...
God through fragmentation and imitation. The climax of the peasants' suffering is delineated once more through augmentation of the first phrase of the folk song in the bassoons, trumpets, trombones, cello and bass (mm. 86-108).

The climax is short-lived, returning to thematic fragmentation and imitation in m. 109. The final canonic statement of Go, Sun, Soon to God is preceded by thematic fragmentation and the forshadowing of a recurring trumpet fanfare in the *Meno mosso* of m. 136. Moving from the initial *Adagio* to *Andante religioso*, fragmentation continues in the woodwinds, while Go, Sun is treated canonically in the strings.

The final measures of the first section (mm. 171-174) serve as the transition to the march of the A section of the Rondo. The introduction closes on a repeated triplet pattern throughout the entire orchestra before resolving to the recurrent trumpet fanfare of the transition. The fanfare precedes every occurrence of the march.

The second section of *Liberation of the Latvian People* is a five-part Rondo (ABACA) with coda. Jurjāns' use of several lively folk songs in the second section characterizes his view of the liberated peasants as a newly emerged nation united in their inner strength, vitality, and optimism.\(^\text{11}\) The first of the spirited folk songs is *Shepherds Drive, Cattle Low* [*Gani dzina, govis māva*], which serves as the main theme of the A section. His use of *Shepherds Drive, Cattle Low*, however, is still considered to be the weakest section of the work, especially in his treatment of the folk song as a

\(^{11}\) Grāvilis, *Jurjānu Andrejs* [*Andrejs Jurjāns*], 124.
recurring march within the Rondo form. According to Dārziņš in his 1906 article for Zalktis, *Shepherds Drive, Cattle Low* completely overshadows the B section.

*Shepherds Drive, Cattle Low* is a *ganu dziesma*, or shepherds’ song.

Since shepherding was generally reserved for boys ages seven through fifteen, *ganu dziesmas* [shepherds’ songs] are lighter in content and emotion than other types of work songs. The text of *Shepherds Drive, Cattle Low* follows.

Text of *Shepherds Drive, Cattle Low* [*Gani dzina, govis māva*].

12

---

12 Vītolīņš, *op. cit.*, 177.
For Liberation of the Latvian People, Jurjāns set *Shepherds Drive, Cattle Low* (Ex. 37) as a triumphant march (mm. 175-204). Although the original folk song is six measures long, Jurjāns only uses the first four measures, omitting the repeat of the refrain. The theme is stated twice in the A section. In both statements, the theme is located in the first violin with ornamentation occurring in the piccolo and flute. Both statements are followed by their thematic fragmentation.

Example 37. Original folk melody of *Shepherds Drive, Cattle Low* [Gani dzīna, govīs māva].

1. Ģanī dzīna, govīs māva, la-la-la, la-la-la, la-la-la, la-la-la,
2. Es tecēju vārtu vērī. 5. Valkā pati, ganu meīta,
3. Man atnesa ganu meīte 6. Savu ziedu vainadzīnu,
4. Zaju ziedu vainadzīnu 7. Man pašuva līgviņa
8. Zaļajāmi zīlītnē.
The B section of the Rondo is based on another folk song more sostenuto than the setting of Shepherds Drive, Cattle Low. For the B section, Jurjans orchestrated Oh Visitor, Oh Neighbor [Ai ciemiği, ai kaimiği], a folk song with a double entendre. On the surface, Oh Visitor, Oh Neighbor appears to be the lamentation of a young girl who has been deceived by her lover. A symbolic interpretation, however, is more appropriate for the programmatic aspect of Liberation of the Latvian People. Viewed in the context of the serfs' emancipation, the artful visitors of the lament would be the Baltic German nobility, whereas the deceived maiden would represent the enserfed peasant population. Text of Oh Visitor, Oh Neighbor follows.

Text of Oh Visitor, Oh Neighbor [Ai ciemiği, ai kaimiği].

Ai ciemiği, ai kaimiği,
Kam tu augi tik ražens.
Ne man dienu darbiņš tika,
Ne man nakti miedziņi nāc'.

Vai atmini to vietigu,
Kur mēs kopī runģījām.
Tu soliņi mani ņemti,
Pirkī zelta greizentīņš'.

Ne nopirki, neapņēmi,
Šķēlīmjam šķēlīmja valodiņš'.
Puisēnami pieci prāti,
Trejdeviņas valodiņš'.

Oh visitor, oh neighbor,
For whom you grow so successfully.
Neither a day’s work arrives for me,
Nor a night’s sleep comes to me.

Oh, remember that place,
Where we talked together.
You promised to take me,
To buy a gold ring.

You did not buy (a ring), you did not take (me),
An imp has an imp’s speech,
Such a boy has five (separate) minds,
He can speak about nothing all the time (in 3 x 9 ways).

He is able to deceive girls,
No matter what the circumstance.
He is able to deceive girls,
No matter what the circumstance.¹⁶

Oh Visitor, Oh Neighbor is stated three times. Throughout all the statements of Oh Visitor, Oh Neighbor, there is an indelible impression of simplicity and grace in the mostly stepwise motion of the melody and the constant ebb and flow of the woodwinds and strings (Ex. 38). Jurjāns did not include this folk song in his Materials of Latvian Folk Music. This folk song was quoted identically from another source. As a result, only the orchestral setting is excerpted.

Example 38. Liberation of the Latvian People, theme of B section in mm. 205-212 of the violin part.

According to his critics, Jurjāns achieves redemption in the C section of Liberation of the Latvian People. His setting of the two contrasting īgo [rejoice] melodies in the

¹⁶Author’s translation.
last episode of the Rondo have been acclaimed as examples of his best compositional technique in regards to his symphonic repertoire. The first līgo song occurs in the violins (Ex. 39). Marked marcato, this līgo melody is a scalar passage accompanied by cymbals.\(^\text{17}\)


The second līgo melody (mm. 248-253), a bright, charming miniature of separated steps and leaps accompanied by the triangle, soon follows in the upper woodwinds.

Both themes are repeated in their entirety before the return of the first līgo to close the C section of the Rondo. Jurjāns expands this last statement of the first līgo to include the theme not only in the violins, but also in the clarinets and French horns. The trumpet fanfare again announces the return of the march on *Shepherds Drive, Cattle Low*.

For the coda, Jurjāns creates a climax similar to the one found in the *Latvian National Song Festival March*, op. 1. Unfortunately, these measures of the *Liberation of

\(^{17}\)Professor Torgāns' assistance in pinpointing the līgo melodies was invaluable. Līgo songs are large in number and without titles. To locate a specific melody within any one collection is nearly impossible for one not familiar with Latvian folk songs.
the Latvian People (mm. 301-315) are usually deleted in performance. Although God, Bless Latvia is clearly the theme of the coda and is orchestrated in the same manner as Latvian National Song Festival March, it is not the only theme of the coda. While the entire orchestra plays God, Bless Latvia, Jurjāns has combined it with the Russian national anthem, God, Save the Tsar, in the low strings.

The controversy over whether or not to include the Russian national anthem is a political one involving Latvia’s status as a former satellite nation of the Soviet Union. During Communist rule, Edmunds Goldsteins (b. 1927) removed the measures for a recording session. Since Latvia’s independence in 1991, there is a continued reluctance to perform the two anthems simultaneously. As a result, these sixteen measures are rarely performed.

One wonders the reason as to why Jurjāns used both anthems at all. A possible explanation resides in the political climate of 1891. Thirty years had passed since tsarist intervention emancipated the Latvians from their German oppressors. The peasants initially felt indebted to Russia for their freedom. Jurjāns’ incorporation of the Russian national anthem may have been politically motivated in that he was acknowledging Russia’s role in the serfs’ liberation.
CRITICAL RESPONSE

If a history of Latvian symphonic music is ever written, the first page belongs to Andrejs Jurjāns.¹
(Enīls Dārziņš — 1875-1910 — Latvian composer and critic)

In general, the words of Enīls Dārzinš summarize how the Latvian people came to regard Andrejs Jurjāns' symphonic works. Throughout his career, Jurjāns was fortunate enough to receive not only the public's respect and esteem, but also that of his colleagues. Furthermore, the process of his lionization began shortly after his debut as a composer of Latvian art music. Prior to Jurjāns, Latvians lacked a true national hero, musical or otherwise. Latvians lauded Jurjāns' accomplishments as one of the first conservatory-trained Latvian musicians. They identified with their native folk tunes in his symphonic works, and hailed him for his collection of Latvian folk songs. In short, Jurjāns was a perfect candidate for canonization and national identification. As a result, perjorative remarks about his compositions were not easily tolerated. According to Professor Torgāns, no one dared to mention Jurjāns' shortcomings as a composer, for he was considered to be the patriarch of Latvian music. Criticism was limited to only the positive aspects of Jurjāns and his music with such epithets as:

¹Grāvītis, Jurjānu Andrejs [Andrejs Jurjāns], 118.
We certainly do not know in which art Jurjāns earns more admiration. We so want to state that the Latvian people would be proud of her son to whom they have awarded this happy hour. It (*Symphonic Allegro*) is a work before which we stand deferential, overcome by the artist’s power. Its instrumentation is magnificent, brilliant, ideal, and heartfelt.²

(A unidentified critic for the *Baltic Herald* [*Baltijas Vēstnesis*] on August 26, 1883 at the premiere of the *Symphonic Allegro* during a concert not only in honor of Jurjāns, but conducted by him.)³

The *Song Festival March* gives an idea about the folk way of life and marks several of Jurjāns’ artistic qualities - bright, sunny optimism expressed in a simple heartfelt melody, association with the folk song’s rhythm, and unpretentious harmonies.

Jāzeps Viīols⁴

They (the *Latvian Dances*) are mischievous, rich in contrast, and sonorous. Although the instrumentation is simple, (the dances) are a reflection of the original mood (of the folk sources).

Jāzeps Viīols⁵

Locating criticism about Jurjāns’ music was a difficult task. Professor Torgāns warned me about the dearth of information regarding true musical criticism. Reception history in Latvia is a relatively new field, and as such, articles on musical criticism and

²Ludvigs Kārklīšs, *Simfoniskā mūzikā Latvijā* [*Symphonic Music in Latvia*] (Rīga: Liesma, 1990), 27. As the original source could not be located, this secondary source is cited with the author’s translation.

³A. Grīgulis, “*Baltijas Vēstnesis*” (*“Baltic Herald”*), *Latvijas PSR mazā enciklopedija* [*The Latvian Socialist Republic Small Encyclopedia*], vol. 1 of 3 vols., ed. V. Samsons (Rīga: Zinātne, 1967), 176. The *Baltic Herald* was a bourgeois reactionary newspaper that fought against Russian control from 1896-1906. It was shut down and fined for “misinformation.” Subscribers changed to the *Voice* [*Balss*]. As the original sources for the following articles and their descriptions could not be located, this secondary encyclopedic source and Kārklīšs’ book on Latvian symphonic music is cited.

⁴Kārklīšs, *op. cit.*, 26. Author’s translation.

⁵Ibid., 28. Author’s translation.
reception would be hard to find. He advised me to begin my search with several bibliographic sources that covered an enormous range of topics, one of which was music. The first source was Ādolfs Gintars’ Directory of Reviews and Critiques [Recenziju un kritiku rādītājs], located in the Department of Bibliographic Information [Bibliogrāfisko uzzīju nodaļa] of the Latvian National Library. This particular source covers the 1700s until 1936. During the years of 1915 to 1918, the publication was not in print due to the first World War. After having thoroughly examined Gintars’ bibliographic source from 1875 until 1936, I was disheartened by my findings. My search was restricted to a few articles that fell short of an understanding as to how Jurjāns’ music was perceived. Instead, these commentaries simply discussed the composer’s biographical information and which of his works were performed at a given concert. I decided to investigate further in order to conduct the most thorough search possible. Torgāns again suggested another library for further research. His direction led me to the Brass Library [Misiņa bibliotēka] in the Latvian Academic Library [Latvijas Akadēmiskā bibliotēka].

Upon receiving clearance, I was able to peruse several sources. Another gap in time occurred, however, between the publication of Gintars’ compilation and the second bibliographic source, the Chronicle of Journal and Newspaper Articles [Zurnālu un Avēžu Rakstu Chronika]. From 1937 to 1943 all publication of bibliographic material ceased as

---

6 Although bibliographic information on Gintars’ Directory is unavailable, all volumes of the compilation are located in the Department of Bibliographic Information [Bibliogrāfisko uzzīju nodaļa] of the Latvian National Library [Latvijas Nacionālā bibliotēka] at No. 14 Barona iela, Rīga.

a result of the second World War. Between 1944 and 1957, the Chronicle failed to record a single article on the reception of Jurjans’ music.

By 1958, the Chronicle was renamed the Chronicle of the Latvian Socialist Republic Press [Latvijas PSR Preses Hronika]. This resource documented bibliographic information through 1995, at which time all pertinent materials were entered into a computer database. Several articles surfaced in both sources; all were uninformative in regard to criticism or reception of Jurjans. As with the earlier writings, these essays also give biographical information and concert programs. Additionally, many of the articles reiterate the same remarks about Jurjans’ role as patriarch and native son, as well as his contributions to Latvia’s music. Consequently, it became necessary to focus on reliable sources of secondary information for criticism and reception.

A single critic, Emils Dārziņš, went against the grain of the collective national consciousness and suffered the consequences of his actions. Although Dārziņš acknowledged Jurjans’ place in Latvian music history, he believed that even the patriarch’s music had room for improvement. With Symphonic Allegro, Dārziņš believed Jurjans’ orchestration demonstrated his early talent as a composer even though he also stated that it was ultimately conventional and academic. With the Song Festival March, he perceived Jurjans’ use of the folk motive to be superfluous, making the march Jurjans’ weakest

---

symphonic work. In *At Once, Right Away*, he considered Jurjāns’ thematic development excessive. Finally in *Liberation of the Latvian People*, Dārziņš thought Jurjāns’ setting of *Shepherds Drive, Cattle Low* as a march overshadowed the forthcoming second theme.

Dārziņš’ opinions, though respectful and professional, angered Pāvuls Jurjāns, Andrejs’ youngest brother. Pāvuls began a campaign to ruin Dārziņš’ career and reputation. He despised Dārziņš for his innate talent as a composer. While Pāvuls was himself trained at the St. Petersburg Conservatory, Dārziņš never completed his training with Rimsky-Korsakov at the same school. In essence, Dārziņš dropped out, but his natural ability was much greater than Pāvuls’, despite the latter’s years of study and practice. Dārziņš’ compositions were judged to be some of the best of his generation. Nevertheless, as a critic, Pāvuls constantly berated Dārziņš for failing to complete his conservatory education. The peak of Pāvuls’ attacks occurred in 1908 when he leveled his most serious accusation of all. Since Dārziņš had noted the weaknesses in Jurjāns’ symphonic works, Pāvuls retaliated by writing a scathing critique of Dārziņš’ symphonic poem, *The Lonely Pines* [*Vientuļo priedī*].[^9] Under the initials “E.P.” in the *Newspaper of Rīga* [*Rīgas Avīze*], a reactionary political and literary source from 1902-1915 that advocated national ideals, Pāvuls accused Dārziņš of plagiarizing Sibelius’ *Swan of Tuonela*.[^10]

---

[^9]: Kārkliņš, op. cit., 44.

Dārziņš was severely wounded.\(^{11}\) He turned for assistance to Glazunov, whom he viewed as an irrefutable authority. Glazunov obliged, sending an editorial to *Art* [*Māksla*], a quarterly illustrated journal for artists, actors, and musicians.\(^{12}\) The editorial, written on April 19, 1908, was instead published three days later in the *Herald of the Fatherland* [Dzimtenes Vēstnesis], a bourgeois reactionary newspaper (1907-1917) that gained widespread popularity with its advocacy of Latvian independence.\(^{13}\) Glazunov stated that after carefully playing through *The Lonely Pines* and the *Swan of Tuonela*, he could find no similarities whatsoever.

Undaunted, Pāvuls sent Dārziņš' score to Sibelius, whose reply was also published in the *Herald of the Fatherland* on May 6, 1908. Sibelius was brief and to the point in his opinion of Dārziņš' work and Glazunov's defense.

> It is clearly evident that Mr. Dārziņš composed *The Lonely Pines* under the influence of my *Swan of Tuonela*. Musicians who declare the contrary are aesthetically uncultivated people. Because Mr. Dārziņš is a complete amateur, the word "plagiarist" would be a bit harsh. I find, however, that you [Pāvuls] must protest strongly against any offense of ill-repute. You, as a responsible critic, wrote exactly as you should have.\(^{14}\)

\(^{11}\)Kārklīķs, *op. cit.*, 44.


\(^{14}\)Kārklīķs, *op. cit.*, 44. Author's translation.
Dārziņš could not withstand the attacks. The composer became severely depressed and destroyed most of his compositions, attempting to erase his name from Latvian music history.\textsuperscript{15} His only surviving symphonic works are the \textit{Melancholy Waltz} [\textit{Melankoliskais valsis}] and fragments of a piano score to his opera, \textit{Rosy Days} [\textit{Rožainas dienas}].\textsuperscript{16} His depression eventually led to his demise, which is still shrouded in mystery.

At the time of his death, Dārziņš' state of mind was questionable, since he never fully recovered from Pāvuls' bitter tirade against him. Dārziņš stepped in front of a speeding train. Controversy arose as to whether his death was accidental or suicidal. As a result, Pāvuls was linked with Dārziņš' gruesome fate for the rest of his own days and became the town pariah. One of his contemporaries, Emīls Melngailis (1874-1954), even went so far as to address him as the “Murderer of Dārziņš.”\textsuperscript{17}

Whether or not plagiarism played a role in Dārziņš’ work is suspect. Even Sibelius acknowledged the difference between writing under the influence of another’s work and true plagiarism. The question of outright theft of another’s work, however, is a symptom of an even larger dilemma in present-day Latvia. Until recently, there were no copyright laws. Plagiarism, especially during the 1950s through the early 1980s, was rampant. In fact, several of the historical and biographical works studied appropriated much more than the occasional sentence. Entire paragraphs were deliberately presented as the

\textsuperscript{15}Ibid.


\textsuperscript{17}Conclusion of Pāvuls vs. Dārziņš as related by Oļģerts Grāvīls in his Latvian Music History class.
authors' own thoughts or opinions. Consequently, some of what was documented about Jurjāns may be specious, since it was simply passed down the proverbial grapevine without further citation or investigation. I was presented with deciphering what was the truth and what was more likely to be hearsay.

One conclusion is certain. The canonization of Andrejs Jurjāns was achieved with suppression of any negative comments about his work and contributions. As a result, he became a symbol of national identity and pride, though a more realistic perspective of Jurjāns materializes when placing his accomplishments within a cosmopolitan framework of composers from the surrounding areas.

There are many composers whose achievements in one way or another are similar to Jurjāns'. In Hungary, Ferenc Erkel (1810-1893) was a composer and conductor who founded Hungarian national opera, writing nine operas based on his native history. Jurjāns' contributions to Latvian art music were also akin to the efforts of Bedřich Smetana (1824-1884) and Antonín Dvořák (1841-1904) in Bohemian art music. In contrast to Jurjāns, Smetana and Dvořák were internationally recognized. Aside from this difference, other similarities appear.

Like Jurjāns, Smetana was an émigré composer when his country was under the control of outside influences. After returning from Sweden in 1862, he founded Bohemian national music. According to Leon Plantinga, "His personal idiom comprised of diverse elements, some of them imitative of Bohemian folk styles, came to be accepted as uniquely
representative of his nation’s musical culture.”18 Dvořák was also viewed as a representative of nationalism, but an even more striking coincidence is the place of his Cello Concerto in B minor, Op. 104 (1896) in his oeuvre. Both Jurjāns’ concerto and Dvořák’s not only possess irregular forms, but are considered their crowning achievements.

Unsurprisingly, the achievements and musical style of Russian composers are also in keeping with those of Jurjāns. Although Mikhail Ivanovich Glinka (1804-1857) and Alexander Sergeyevich Dargomīzhsky (1813-1869) laid the foundations for Russian national music with their retention of the folk idiom, it is Pyotr Il’yich Tchaikovsky (1840-1893) with whom Jurjāns bears a greater resemblance in terms of musical style. Trained at the St. Petersburg Conservatory, both composers were profoundly affected by their music education and Glinka’s traditional harmonies. When incorporating their native folk songs, the harmonizations also remained conventional.

The contributions of Norwegian composers, however, stand out as the most similar to Jurjāns’ achievements. Art music in Norway had the same genesis as the art music in Latvia, that is, it remained at mostly an amateur level until the nineteenth century. For Norway, the impetus for change was what Plantinga has identified as “patriotic sentiment,” resulting from Sweden’s annexation of Norway in 1814.19 In comparison, Jurjāns elevated Latvian art music during a time of tsarist control and local German


19Plantinga, op. cit., 393.
oppression. Although residing in the Ukraine, Jurjāns continually sought to make Latvian folk songs an integral part of his music and established the foundations of ethnomusicology.

Like Jurjāns, Johan Svendsen (1840-1911) spent most of his life outside of his native country, initially leaving Norway to train at the Leipzig Conservatory. Due to his orchestral adaptations of folk songs, Norwegians regarded Svendsen as a representative of their national movement, though an even larger symbol of national identity is exemplified in Svendsen's contemporary, Edvard Grieg (1843-1907). Also trained at the Leipzig Conservatory, Grieg was influenced by Norwegian folk songs and later cultivated them. For Grieg, however, symphonies were not a medium for the incorporation of his folk songs. Like Jurjāns, he lacked the confidence to compose a symphony and considered his one completed attempt a failure. Consequently, Jurjāns' place in Western music history is with the composers of peripheral countries seeking to confirm their authentic origins and national identification with the use of residual strands of folk extraction. To compare his skills as a composer to the monumental composers of this era such as Wagner or Verdi would be inappropriate.

One question, however, still remains. In focusing on Andrejs Jurjāns' large-scale symphonic works, what tentative conclusions can be made? Jurjāns varied the means by which he incorporated his folk material. Although he avoided using folk songs in his first work, the *Symphonic Allegro*, Jurjāns experimented with a thematic construction that he

---

would later employ in his future symphonic works. The second theme of the Allegro is a smaller ternary structure, which could conceivably allow for the projection of a folk song onto its form. Furthermore, Jurjāns adds a motivic element that unifies the entire work.

Perhaps as a result of his experience with the Symphonic Allegro, Jurjāns decided that it was important to use folk songs in his compositions, for in the same year, he composed the Song Festival March. Instead of simply quoting the folk song, Rīga Resounds, he treated it motivically, making it an integral part of the aba'1 structure of the A section. Presenting two separate motives of Rīga Resounds individually, Jurjāns brings them together along with the final phrase of the folk song for the climax of the A section. In conjunction with this motivic treatment of folk material, he also quotes a līgo melody in the B section. In the coda, he quotes a song not of folk extraction, but of obvious patriotic connotations as is implied by its title, God, Bless Latvia, the present-day Latvian national anthem.

Each movement of the Latvian Dances also combines different techniques for the presentation of folk materials. Hullabaloo contains two folk songs that are motivically related and projected onto a smaller aba'1 form with insertions of Jurjāns'own original ideas in the b sections of the themes. For At Once, Right Away, Jurjāns separated the two phrases of the folk song into two full-fledged, seemingly unrelated themes that become integral to the form of the movement as they alternate in double variation. He discloses the relationship between the themes in the coda by revealing the folk song in its entirety. Dance of the Paupers quotes two folk references, one in the ternary form of the A section
and one in the B section. The last dance of the suite, _Aēkops_, strictly follows the five strains that comprise the original melody and returns to the first two strains as the Da Capo.

The fourth work discussed, _Concerto elegiaco_, has only one folk song, which is also projected onto the a sections of the second theme’s smaller ternary structure, with the b section devoted to Jurjāns’ own composition. In this work, a motivic pattern of the folk reference becomes central to the rhythmic and thematic unification of the entire movement.

Finally in _Liberation of the Latvian People_, Jurjāns’ principal method of folk extraction is quotation. After the eventual quotation of a folk song in the introduction, Jurjāns affixes four other folk songs onto the ABACA of the Rondo form. In the A section, he set _Shepherds Drive, Cattle Low_ as a recurring march, while _Oh Visitor, Oh Neighbor_ is the B section, and two _līgo_ melodies comprise the C section. For the coda, Jurjāns again quotes _God, Bless Latvia_, this time in conjunction with _God, Save the Tsar_. Thus, Jurjāns incorporates his folk material either motivically as an integral part of his work or by quotation.

A few tentative conclusions can also be drawn about stylistic features from this survey of Jurjāns’ large-scale symphonic works. In general, Jurjāns develops his principal motives and themes through fragmentation, imitation, and augmentation. The climaxes of these works usually entail the full disclosure of a folk song, the quotation of the present-day Latvian national anthem, or the augmentation of a theme in the full orchestra with
emphasis on the brass instruments. Despite his mostly conventional harmonizations, Jurjāns maintains the mood or spirit of each folk reference through distinct instrumentation and retention of characteristic features of each folk element.

Today, Latvian scholars view Jurjāns as a gifted and motivated individual who established the foundations of Latvian art music and folk song preservation. Although critics presently concede to Dārziņš' comments about Jurjāns' weaknesses as a composer, these weaknesses were generally overlooked during his lifetime. As a result, Jurjāns was elevated to a national symbol of Latvian identity in an era when collective national consciousness meant a justification of one's authentic origins. The Latvian public needed a voice with which to express themselves as a nation. They chose Jurjāns, whose retentions of their folk songs enabled them to identify with their roots and to overcome years of spiritual oppression.
APPENDIX

JURJĀNS' COMPOSITIONAL OUTPUT
Symphonic Works

1880 *Symphonic Allegro* [Simfonisks Allegro]  
(in F minor, first movement of an unfinished symphony)  
*Latvian National Song Festival March*, Op. 1  
[Latvju vispārējo dziesmu svēku maršs, Op. 1]

1883- *Latvian Dances*, Op. 3 [Latvju dejas, Op. 3]

1984  
1. *Hullabaloo* [Jandāls] (April 1, 1883)  
2. *At Once, Right Away* [Tūdaliņ, tagadiņ]  
3. *Dance of the Paupers* [Nabagu deja]  
4. *Ažikops* (June 11, 1894)

1888 August 23 - Musical Introduction to Ādolfs Alunāns’ play, “Kas tie tādi”

1891 *Liberation of the Latvian People*, Op. 12  
[Latvju tautas brīvlašana, Op. 12] (symphonic poem)

1894 *Festival March* [Svēku maršs]  
(Dedicated to the Russian Imperial Music Society’s Conservatory of Khar’kov - 25th anniversary.)

1907 August 7 - *Funeral March* [Sēru maršs]  
(In Memory of Jānis Sietiņsons, the first in Latvia in this genre)  
*Trimpus maršs*  
*Benefit Overture for Orchestra* [Benefic-uvertira orķestrim]  
(dedicated to Ādolfs Alunāns)  
*Introduction and March* [Ievadījums un maršs]  
(for Kurzeme’s Freedom Festival)  
*Blow, Wind* [Pūl, vejiņš]  
(Latvian boatman’s song for orchestra)  
*Berceuse* (for string orchestra)

Solo Instrument with Orchestral Arrangement

1889 *Concerto elegiaco* for Violoncello in E minor, Op. 11  
(dedicated to Alfred von Glehn)  
*Blow, Wind* [Pūl, vejiņš]  
(Latvian boatman’s song, orchestral arrangement for French horn and orchestra)

---

1'Grāvitis, Jurjāns Andrejs [Andrejs Jurjāns], 157-64. Source for the entirety of Jurjāns' compositional output.
**Vocal/Instrumental Works**

1880  *Belshezzar’s Feast* [Belzacara dzăres]
*(Based on *Belshezzar’s Feast* by Heinrich Heine for choir, soloist and piano/orchestra. Unfinished score.)*

1886  *To the Fatherland* [Tēvijai]
*(for choir and soprano with orchestra)*

1887  *Sacred Cantata* [Garīga kantate] *(in 5 movements)*
   1. *Praise be to the Lord* [Pateiciet tam kungam] *(mixed choir)*
   2. *If the Lord does not build the house* [Ja tas kungs neuztäsa namu] *(bass solo)*
   3. *Prayer* [Lūgšana] *(men’s choir)*
   4. *The Lord, God - Cebaots* [Tas kungs dievs-Cebaots] *(men’s choir)*
   5. *Arise* [Mostieties] *(with stabules and kokles for mixed choir)*

*Already the Moon Shines* [Jau mēness starus laista, Op. 4]
*(based on a text by H. Heine, in collaboration with J. Skujenieks)* for mixed choir with soprano solo

1893  *Rejoice, Revel* [Liģojiet, liksmojiet]
*(composed for the Fourth National Song Festival in Jelgava in honor of Kurzeme’s centennial anniversary of its membership into Russia and its liberation from the German nobility.)*

**Works for Chamber Ensemble**

*Ballade* [Balade] for Violin and Orchestra *(dedicated to Alberts Pestelis)*, also for Violoncello and Piano or French horn and Clarinet with Piano

*Berceuse* for Violin, Viola, Violoncello and Piano *(arranged from the 1907 string ensemble version)*

*Funeral March* [Sēru maršš] for Violin, Violoncello and piano *(arranged from the 1907 orchestral version)*

**Solo Songs**

In his collection of *Daiya*:

1877  *Svešatne* *(text by Davis Kažoks)*
   *Kā bij man tevim sacī* *(Ādams Ārgals)*
   *Asaras* *(Andrejs Stērste)*
Other Solo Songs:
1877  *Mirt jaunam, mirt vecam* (folk song text)
       *Die Quelle*
1880  *Šūplā dziesmiņa* (after folk song motives)
1881  *Egle*
       *Die Jahre kommen und gehen*
       *Jel nevācā* (from Pushkin’s text)
       *Jelē pasmaida* (text by Janis Pavārs)
1884  *Put, vējti, Op. 2*
       *Kā zagsus* (text by Rūdolfs Blaumanis)
1916  *Jel lūdž*

Folk Song Arrangements for Solo Voice

In his collection, *Latvian Folk Songs [Latviešu tautas dziesmas]*, vol. I:
1884  *Es uzkāpu kalnā*
       *Aši aši zīle dzied* (2 melodies)
       *Dzērū, dzēru krodiņā*
       *Es karāi aiziedams*

In his collection, *Latvian Folk Songs [Latviešu tautas dziesmas]*, vol. II:
1885  *Ko mēs, meitas, darīsim*
1910  *Sēj, brāliņi, kaņepētes*
       *Tas bij vīris, tam bij vara*

In his collection, *Latvian Folk Songs [Latviešu tautas dziesmas]*, vols. III and IV:
1910  *Es bij vīris, man bij vara*
       *Pusrītēņa saule ieca*
       *Lustīgām man dzīvot*
       *Par ko manim īkas kājas*
       *Aun meitiņa, baltas kājas*
       *Koši dzied zelta zile*
       *Saulē ‘tecēj’ tecēdama*
       *Sen dzirdēju, nu redzēju*
       *Ozošī, zemzarāti*
       *Balti balti ievas ziedi*
       *Jo tai ievas blati ziedi*
       *Sēju lielu rožu lauku*
       *Nāc pie manis, tautu meita*
       *Kur, māsiņas, braukājati*
       *Ko tu raudi, kas tev kaite*
Arrangements for A cappella Choir

Mixed Choir
In his collection, Daiqa:
1877 Ozolde, liepas meitas (text by Auseklis)
        Ziedoja vakara (text by Andrejs Stērste)
        Jūras meita (text by Krīšjānis Barons)

Other Arrangements:
1889 Cik pasaula jauka (text by H. Heine)
        Tēvijas dziesma (text by Auseklis)
1904 Skani, koko, skani skani (for the 25th anniversary celebration of the Latvian Song Society of Rīga.)
1909 Nevis slinkojot un pūstot (text by Juris Alunāns)
1913 Uz augšu (text by Janis Poruks) - In memory of the Jurjāns' friend.
1915 Tēvija (text by E. Zeibots)
        Aust diena bāla, tumša (text by J. Sanders)
        Aust jauna dienīga (text by J. Sanders)
        Kamēr vēl Latvija...
        Lakšīgala, lakšīgala
        Tēvijas vakars (for the Latvian Congregational Choir of Khar'kov)

Men's Choir
1876 Svētku dziesma (for the opening festival of the Latvian Benefit Society in the Rīga suburb of St. Petersburg)

In his collection, Daiqa:
1877 Dievozolu tījotne (text by Auseklis)
        Naks dziesma (text by Andrejs Stērste)
        Vakara (text by M. Kaudzīte)
1888 Lūk, roze zied (text by Ansis Līvenāls)

Other Arrangements:
1900 "Iemet, papiņ" - dzīru dziesma (text by Juris Graudiņš)
1903 Jel pacel balsi un dziedi (text by Janis Poruks)
1904 Ilgošanās (text by Andrievs Niedra)
Sveiks (for E. Stange - Jurāns’ text)
Kas īstens latvietis (text by J. Pumpurs)
Nevis slinkojot un pūstot (text by Juris Alunāns)
Līgaviņa ka rozīte (text by Ansis Līventāls)
Latvija (by Ausklis)
Dzintarzemis
Dziesmu svētku himna
Latvji, brāji (text rearranged by R. Bebris)

Arrangements for Men’s Choir
Tu esi it kā puķe (by Robert Schumann)

For Choir and Piano
Slava (text by A. Jurāns, dedicated to the wife of B. Sietūns)

Folk Songs for Mixed Choir

With Piano Reduction
In the collection, Latviju tautas dziesma, Book I:

1884 Pūt, vējini
Aiz tiem kalnu kalniem
Visu dienu bites dzinu

In the collection, Latviju tautas dziesma, Book II:

1885 Čuši, mana līgaviņa
Jūra krāca, jūra šqāca
Jūriņš prasa smalku ūklu
Lempam bija pieci dēli

All of the above without piano, see Jurāna kopotas dziesmas, pub. 1938.

A cappella

1879 Ej, saulīte, drīz pie dieva
1884 Kur tu skrīesi, vanadziqī?
Es karāi aiziedams
1889 Aiz upūtes es uzaugu
1890 Tautu meita, melnacīte
1893 Gatavs biju karavārs
Lecu, lecu dārziqā
1906 Dzērājpūsis bēdājās
Dziedā māku, dancot māku
Ozolīti, zemzarīti
Sēši mazi bandinieki
1909 Stādiju ieviņu  
Tautiešam roku devu
1914 Rindām auga ozoliģi
1915 Kur gāji, puisīti
1921 Aiz azara augstī koīni
Avīkstes upenes yudīgs apjēma
Azars teiruma molā
Borinetas dzīsmē
1921 Es holenu meišī lyudzu
Es uzaugu pi māmeņas
Es sovai māmeņai
Kū tos kūkles gauži skan
Kyukōj', zolta dzaguzeite
Malni muni kumeleņi
Man māmeņa bortin būre
Nikam nava taida dzeive
Pa kam var pazeit
Peldeja laiveņa
Picu broļu mosa beju
Pi īskneites stovādamo
Precej moni precineki
Puiskins dorza naapora
Sveša mote mani sauce
Švagera meiteņa
Trejs jaunas mosas
Toli dzeīvoj muna mīlā
Toli gonus vadeidama
Vysu dīnu bites dzymu
Zynu zymu tāva sātu

Folk Songs for Men’s Choir

With Piano

In his collection, Latvian Folk Songs [Latviešu tautas dziesmas], vol. 1:
1884 Apsegloju melnu kuili
Tā vaj’dzēja, tas notika
Liela pulka ģeņģu jāja
In his collection, *Latvian Folk Songs* [*Latviešu tautas dziesmas*], vol. II:

1885  
*Dievs, dod mušu īevu zemei*
*Pieci gadi kalpiņš biju*
*Tumsa nakte, zaļa zale*
*Šītā, zēni, mums dzīvoti*

**A cappella**

In his collection, *Latvian Folk Songs* [*Latviešu tautas dziesmas*], vol. I:

1884  
*Put, vējiņi*
*Dzērū, dzērū krodiņā*
*Bandinieka rudzi auga*

Other Works:

1889  
*Ai, zaļā lidacīņa*
1894  
*Svilpūdama sniedze skrēja*
1904  
*Es piedzēris kā vilciņš*
*Upe nesa ozolīgu*
*Plata upe, šaura laipa (2 melodies)*
*Lai ēd vilki visas kazas (2 melodies)*
*Div' balodi pali dzēra*
*Aiz kalniņa linus sēju*
*Ai tu, manu grūdu mušu*

1921  
*Es uzaugu pi māmeņas*
*Pa kam var pazeti*
*Pīcu broļu mosa beju*
*Seši jauni banderīki*

**Folk Songs for School Choir**

*Song Collection for Latvian Schools, 1890*
*[Dziesmu krājums latviešu tautas skolam]*

*Ai zaļā lidacīņa*
*Aiz upeš es uzaugu*
*Asti, asti zile dzied*
*Dar' man, lēvis, pastālīgas*
*Dievs, dod mušu īevu zemei*
*Dzeltens manis kumeliņš*
*E, kur stalti karavīri*
*Es uzgāju ganīdamis (also titled “Pieci gadi kalpiņš biju”)*
*Es uzkapu kalnā*
*Gavīju dziesma*
*Godu dziesma*
Guli, guli, gamumeita
Jūriņš prasa smalku tiklu
Karavīri bedūjās
Kas kaitēja nedzīvoti
Kas tie tādi, kas dziedāja
Krauklīts seņ ozolū
Kupla, kupla liepa auga
Kur tu jāsi, baileliņķ
Kur tu skriesi, vanadziņš
Līgo dziesmas (7)
Maziņš biju, neredzēju
Padziedi, putniņķ
Saulit' tecēj' tecēdama
Šūpula dziesminas (2)
Tēvam bija pieci dēli
Tēvis, tēvis, dar' man laivu (also titled “Pū, vējiņš”)
Teci, teci, kumeliņi
Vilciņš zaķi aicināja
Visu dienu bites dzinu

Play Songs (with Directions):
Aizskrēja vanadziņš, aizdināja
Kas dārzā, kas dārzā
Kumeliņi, kumeliņi
Lapsas aste
Nekul mani, māmuliņa
Nu es biju bagāts viris
Zvejnieks mani aicināja

Sacred Choral Works for Mixed Choir

1877  Mirt jaunam, mirt vecam
1879  Māle, rimstiet
Mūsu tēvs debešīs (“The Lord’s Prayer”, Matthew 6: 9-14)
Jel lūdz (arranged from a solo work by Pāvuls Jurjāns)
Several other choral arrangements
For Piano

Sonata in F minor (lost)
Saulī' tecēj' tecēdama - transcription for piano (in Austrums, No. 10, 1896)
Sudmalīgas - Latvian Folk Dance (in Druva, VI, 1912)

Unfinished Works

Kočubejs cietumā (from Pushkin’s poem, Poltava) for two soloists and orchestra
Latviešu švēti, operetta in two acts
Vanems Imanta (based on the book by Merkel, a German writer residing in
Latvia, depicting the feudal era of Latvia), opera written in collaboration
with Andrejs Sterste.
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