

ungarischen Zitate, die sich manchmal auf eine halbe Seite erstrecken, ständig gestört, obwohl ihnen in Klammern auch die deutsche Übersetzung mitgegeben wird. Es wäre richtiger gewesen, in den Kapiteln des deutschsprachigen Buches auch vornherein die Zitate deutsch mitzuteilen und ihr ungarisches Original für Zwecke der Vergleichung oder Übersetzungen in andere Sprachen in den Anmerkungen mitzuteilen, sofern das den Anforderungen der Serie, wo dieses Buch erschienen ist, nicht widerspricht. Die kleinen Irrtümer im Buch sind nicht besonders hervorzuheben. (Solche sind z.B.: S. 21: Aufführungsjahr von Mendelssohns »Paulus« ist richtig: 1841; S. 28: das Konzert zum 80. Geburtstag: 7. Nov. 1890; S. 44: der »Gyászkar« [Trauerchor] stammt spätestens aus 1856 usw.) Dagegen müssen wir darauf aufmerksam machen, daß die Auszeichnung, die Erkel im Jahre der Krönung (1867) erhalten hat, — aus diesem Anlaß wurden sehr viele ausgezeichnet — mit der Oper »Dózsa György« schwerlich in Zusammenhang gebracht werden kann (S. 13), und, daß die auf S. 26 mitgeteilten Takte des Anfangs der Nationalhymne nur als erste Fassung gelten, die später sowohl Erkel, wie auch die Praxis modifiziert haben. Aus den einschlägigen Anmerkungen möchte ich Nr. 18 auf S. 191 dadurch ergänzen, daß die von Gárdonyi erwähnte instrumentale Vortragsweise, wo sich die oberste und die unterste Stimme in Oktavparallelen bewegen, auch für den Chorgesang der ungarischen reformierten Kollegien des 18—19. Jahrhunderts charakteristisch ist.

Das 2. Kapitel mit dem Titel »Ungarische Musik« mag der Verfasser unter anderem aus der Erwägung geschrieben haben, um aufgrund der bisherigen Literatur ein umfassendes Bild zu zeichnen über die drei miteinander fester oder loser zusammenhängenden Kunstgattungen, die Erkels Kunst mit

ungarischen Elementen nährten: über das im Sinne des vorigen Jahrhunderts verstandene »Volkslied«, über den Csárdás ferner über die Verbunkosmusik und ihre Vorgänger: über die ungarische Tanzmusik des 16—17. Jahrhunderts. Dadurch wollte er nicht bloß das bessere Verständnis der ungarischen Elemente in Erkels Lebenswerk befördern, sondern er wendete sich zu gleicher Zeit (s. S. 58) in der Form von Beweisen gegen Alfred Einsteins unhaltbare Ansicht (»Die Romantik in der Musik«, 1950, S. 80), wo dieser die Quellen, die die ungarische musikalische Romantik des vorigen Jahrhunderts belebten, simplifizierend, ironisch als Stilmischung und Zigeunermusik bezeichnete. Zur Glaubwürdigkeit des ungarischen musikalischen Hintergrunds bei Erkel, und zur historischen Bestätigung desselben, teilt Véber zahlreiche Notenführungen aus dem 16—18. Jahrhundert mit. Doch scheint es auf S. 84 nach dem oberen Notenbeispiel nicht begründet zu sein, den exponierten, weil zurückschreitenden erweiterten Sekundenschritt als fehlerhafte Notation zu qualifizieren, und was auf S. 60 mit falschem Rhythmus vorgeführte »bokázó«-Kadenz betrifft, wäre es richtiger gewesen die Aufmerksamkeit des Lesers eher auf die Kadenz auf S. 87 oder auf den 2. und 4. Takt der 2. Notenzeile auf S. 124 zu lenken.

Obwohl auch hinter dem 3. Kapitel sich die Wirkung eines früheren großzügigen Studiums: der Analyse der Erkel-Opern von János Maróthy (1954) merken läßt, teilt Véber doch hier und in der Schlußbetrachtung die meisten seiner selbständigen Feststellungen mit. Es war recht nützlich diese Schlußbetrachtung, um sie für weitere Kreise zugänglich zu machen, auch in anderen Sprachen mitzuteilen. Hingegen ist es schade, daß [während der ausländische Leser über die ungarischen Stilelemente der Erkel-Opern und über deren in der

ungarischen Musikgeschichte verlaufene Herausbildung informiert wird], der ausländische Leser über den gesamten dramaturgischen Aufbau der Opern keine genügende Übersicht gewinnt. Die Inhaltsangaben der Opern im Anhang können nur die Handlung interpretieren, nicht aber die Ordnung des musikalischen Aufbaus. Im gründlichen Literaturverzeichnis hätte der ausländische Leser auch die gleichzeitige deutsche Übersetzung der zahlreichen ungarischen Bücher und Studien gern gesehen, um sich mit ihrer Hilfe in den Themenkreisen orientieren zu können. Bedauerlicherweise ist das Namensverzeichnis lückenhaft.

In der Welt der Wissenschaft und der Kunst ist die zeitweise durchgeführte Synthese ebenso wichtig, wie die Progression. In Vébers Werk sind beide vorhanden. Gerade mit dieser Doppelseitigkeit bewies er seine Eignung sowohl zur überblickenden Summierung, wie auch zum individuellen Aperçu. Er ist imstande in einem großen, den Zielen von vielen dienenden Unternehmen ein gleichrangiger, vielleicht sogar vereinsamer Arbeitsgenosse zu sein.

Dezső LEGÁNY

László Vikár and Gábor Bereczki: *Chuvash Folksongs*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 1979. 579 pp., 54 photographs, 350 musical examples.

László Vikár and Gábor Bereczki, who have already published their Cheremis collection, now present selections of the Chuvash material they have collected. Collaboration between a folk musicologist and a linguist has again resulted in a highly significant work that furthers our knowledge of the traditions of peoples related to the Hungarians. Vikár's previously published studies have already pointed to

the most important lesson of their Chuvash field-work: that the quintal shift pentatonic style is not a tradition the Chuvash developed themselves, since it can be found only in a narrow belt along the Cheremis border, and that realization has already compelled a re-thinking of the 'ancient history' of Hungarian folk music. Now we have the material itself, which teaches us several important lessons in a number of other contexts as well.

Right from the first melodies we note with surprise from the detailed notations that our former ideas about there being two kinds of pentatonic music in the Volga—Kama region also need revision. For the pentatonic systems with or without semitone do not only exist side by side as separate styles but also alternate within a melody, at least in the predominantly tetratonic songs with a narrow compass that end on *sol* and in the 'basic pentatonic scale' developed further by an extra note. Thus the difference lies essentially in the variable intonation of the third. This phenomenon is also analysed in a separate study in the volume — Pál Sztanó's instrumental measurements — which also bear out that the variation of pitch of the 'neutral third' is much broader than that of the two neighbouring notes (the minor and major thirds). Interestingly, in the pieces with a greater compass, this dual character of the third gradually disappears, with semitone-less pentatonic scale becoming more and more exclusive.

The overwhelming majority of the musical material consists of melodies within a narrow compass, mainly *sol*-pentatonic melodies that start from below and sweep upwards, in some cases as high as the octave. The number of melodies descending from the octave is much smaller, and the melodies repeating down a fifth, which derive from the narrow north-western border

region, naturally represent a separate style. The tetratonic-pentatonic melodies moving in the low register show by their very nature very long *do-re-mi* motions. (Vikár gives as an example melody No. 199). In such songs it is easy to recognize the relationship with the *la*-tetratonic songs of the Zobor region (*Csak azt szánom-bánom* — "What I only repent" — e.g. No. 27). Side by side with these *la*-tetratonic songs the tetratonics known from the songs of the Gyimes and Moldavia region is also present (which may be summarized as *sol-la-do'-re'*).

On rhythm Vikár comes to the important conclusion that the overwhelming majority of the songs are in taut *giusto*, though within this the permanent alternation of various duple and odd-numbered beats is also characteristic. Only the Chuvash groups still living as a national minority among the Tartars also sing *parlando-rubato* songs, and this forms an insignificant minority of the whole material. At the same time the *giusto* melodies are also embellished with rich melismata which, together with the freely alternating bar types, gives an impression of unrestrictedness similar to that given by the *rubatos*.

From a formal point of view the volume offers a somewhat more organized picture than the one that has emerged from the earlier Chuvash collections, particularly Lach's material. Still, one and two-line songs, as well as three-line ones formed from two melodic lines with a repeat — the most elemental forms — prevail. And this elementary character is all the more strong as the contents of the various melodic lines is almost merely the variation of the elementary motifs that run up and down within a narrow range (e.g. No. 64); often the two 'different' melodic lines hardly deviate from one another (e.g. Nos 12–13).

Of the descending songs there is a specific type where the first three lines of the melody move in the upper registers, and then suddenly the fourth line virtually leaps down to the low basic note with a fourth or two subsequent fourths (Nos 314–315, 319, 340, 346, 348–349). This frequently occurs in songs ending at *re* (Nos 173, 176–178). Sometimes the lines or songs end with fourth (third) cadences with a dotted rhythm that are so characteristic of Hungarian melodies, too (Nos 173, 175, 268, 297, 316 and 340).

Vikár summarizes the musical qualities of the songs in a separate chapter, according to their stock of notes, form, melodic line and number of syllables, and also the deviations in musical dialects. He gives a summary useful to Hungarian research workers of the previous Chuvash collections and folksong publications; his survey of the Hungarian research work done on Chuvash folk music may also be of use to Chuvash experts and foreign research workers in general. He also summarizes the genres of Chuvash folksong, for the most part on the basis of Chuvash collections, since his own material offers relatively few examples of the genres that are connected with specific occasions. Such songs seem to be dying out, although it is possible there are more that collection work has yet to unearth. On the other hand, the examples featuring in his own collection do not indicate *musical* differences among the various genres. The specific texts relate to visiting relatives and include songs bewailing the singer's fate. (These latter ones are rough equivalents to Vogul-Ostyak 'fate song'.)

Vikár also describes the syllabic structure of the lines, which mostly have seven and eight syllables or combinations of the two. There are also peculiar 'lengthened' lines, such as frequently

occur in Hungarian songs, with their ten-syllable lines: *Piros alma ne gurulj, ne gurulj, Kisangyalom, ne busulj, ne busulj!* and similar ones.

Gábor Bereczki presents a stylistic and poetic description of the texts. This, and a look at the text translations, reveal that a characteristic of the lyrical songs is the use of two parallel pictures (one from nature and one from the life of man) which is also well known from Hungarian folk songs, and whose eastern relationships have been known ever since Gábor Lükő's comparative study. Bereczki points out that the text lines show a *quasi iso-syllabic* structure, that is, the strophe is made up of lines of by-and-large similar length, but with a greater or lesser fluctuation of syllables within the lines, e.g. 7–7–8–7. So they have reached approximately the stage of developing a restricted structure of line and strophe which Hungary had reached by the end of the 15th century. Another similarity with old Hungarian poetry is that they prefer to use stave-rhyme, and what end-rhymes there be, are rhyming suffixes at most.

Bereczki also provides necessary information on the Chuvash language and questions of the origin and history of the Chuvash.

After outlining the method and course of the collection work, Vikár describes the system applied in publishing the songs. He has transposed the songs to a common *do*, which we consider to be more appropriate in the pentatonic style than transposing to the common closing note (even though the songs ending with *do* and *re* have thus come much higher than those ending with *sol* and *la*; in the case of these latter, however, the transposition makes the stylistic inter-relationships much clearer). Still, there remains the question of whether it was correct also to apply the Bartókian numbering of I–VII and 1–8 to the common *do*. Ever since

Bartók I has always meant the closing note, since every melody is transposed to the common closing note. With Vikár I always means *la*, so that the closing note of the songs ending with *do* is  $b_3$ , that of the ones ending with *re* is 4, etc. Thus we always have to transpose both the cadence formulae and the compass markings as well. (On the other hand, those who become familiar with this system now can easily orient themselves on the basis of the given series of figures, if the same number always signifies the same note.)

The arrangement within the volume itself might perhaps have been more effective if it had been done not according to the number of lines or according to the cadences (and what is more, starting out from the principal cadence), but according to the compass; this would have enhanced the main similarities in style and type. In the present order the 'line of development' ranging from the primitive tetratonic songs to the descending or fifth-repeating songs with a broad compass, doubles back on itself several times.

Beyond what we have said in connection with the tetratonic songs, a closer Hungarian relationship can come into question only with one melodic type: Nos 289–290 are of the same structure as our song *Széles vizen keskeny palló* and its relatives; they are not such direct variants of them as those seen in Kodály's parallel, but they reveal the widespread of the melodic family or melodic structure.

Mention should also be made of a similarly distant relationship, which is also a kinship of melodic structure rather than of actual melody. Songs with a *so* base and a narrow range of notes including a variable third, may have a peculiar supplement of the minor sixth (e.g. Nos 65–70, 94–96, 113, 180 and 225), which resembles the Hungarian songs with an 'acoustic

scale', that also have an acoustic-Phrygian fluctuation. The similarity is enhanced by the fact that the vocal range of such songs ranges from the note under the closing note (or from the basic note) to the seventh, as in the most characteristic Hungarian songs (e.g. *Körtéfa* Pt 370, or *Meghalok, meghalok* Pt 473). Here too, there are no close melodic variants. (On the other hand, with us this melodic type occurs more frequently in the region where the *la*-tetratonic songs have also survived: in the Zóbor-region.)

All in all, the volume presents highly valuable material in a musical notation and phonetic text transcription of an exactness unequalled in Chuvash folk music notation. The musical order, rich indexes, and exact English and Hungarian translations that the volume contains make the material easy to handle in research work, the first steps in which have been taken by the authors themselves in their analytical studies. And even if the volume does not make the use of former collections superfluous, as they may also contain more archaic material, it well represents Chuvash folklore and provides a reliable survey of it. It is in all respects an accomplishment with which the two research workers have greatly furthered the knowledge of the folksong styles of the Volga-region, and which has brought us another step nearer to clarifying the problems in the prehistory of Hungarian music.

Lajos VARGYAS

*Whose Music? A Sociology of Musical Languages.* John Shepherd — Phil Virden — Graham Vulliamy — Trevor Wishart. London, 1977. Latimer, 297 pp.

"If it is art, it is not for all, and if it is for all, it is not art" (A. Schoenberg). "The blues is the truth" (Lightnin')

Hopkins). "Something's happening, and you don't know what it is, do you, Mr. Jones?" (Bob Dylan). These are the mottoes of the book written by a musician, two sociologists and a composer. Both the professional composition of the authors and the selection of the mottoes give rise to "great expectations" in the reader of a conception in which most problematic questions of a wide spectrum are promised to be answered, or at least, thrown a new light on; musical value and its social reception, folklore and political radicalism, more generally, the democratism of musical praxis in society.

As it has been stated by so many thinkers from the nineteenth century onwards, the source of all "evil" has been the advent of the industrial civilization. It developed a rational, deterministic approach in scientific thinking and applied it to all phenomena of reality. This epistemological method permeated not only the sphere of sciences but had become part of an all-embracing mental attitude affecting even the workings of senses. Shepherd introduces the category of "industrial world sense" as opposed to the "pre-literate" one, the latter characterizing primitive societies. All the differences in the sensation and the consciousness of the two types of societies are grasped in and originated from one important factor and it is the *media* through which information and social experience are obtained, stored up and distributed. In pre-literate societies the basically aural-oral channels of communication require from man an immediate response and a direct involvement in everyday reality. Conversely, with the advent of literate societies the possibilities of storing the information had enormously increased. Literacy put an emphasis on the *visual* at the expense of the *auditory*. The visually coded knowledge and ideologies of the succeeding legitima-

tions, however, made a more distanced and critically based attitude possible together with the emergence of a historical sense separate from myth.

The authors of this book distrust the concept of "progress" since it belongs to the vocabulary of industrial conceit. Thus, when analyzing the effects of literacy on the formation of a historical sense and of a critical dialectic approach to society Shepherd tends to underline the negative developments of this process. Literacy, especially printing, divorced from the immediate reality of face-to-face communication, much enhanced the gap between sign and meaning, and as such contributed to the dualities of form and content, subject and object, outer and inner reality, characteristic of the industrial world sense.

But what has all this to do with music? If this world sense indicates a rigid gap between content and form, message and media, *relata* (easily observed elements) and relationship, and, what is more, gives priority to the first members of the pairs, musical aesthetics must indeed be inadequate to its subject; in music relations are dominant over *relata*, and its subject and object can hardly bear a metaphysical separation if they can be discussed apart at all. Shepherd finds that current aesthetics is still unable to step beyond the duality of form and content. The "objective" approach regards music as an objective fact and adds nothing to finding out what musical experience is. The "psychological" approach, on the other hand, though able to describe the emotional experience, neglects music as fact, thus it cannot be related to its individual pieces.

The conclusion is that industrial world sense, having produced the above content-categories, is responsible for the current failure of aesthetics. Furthermore, the application of these categories

carries the immanent danger of apology because of reifying the values of the given social-intellectual structure. "Absolutist" aesthetics (as he calls it) fails to view music as a *creative* articulation of society and in so doing, its scope necessarily tends to be limited.

Shepherd's conception of music, including both the element of "revealing the dynamic structuring of social life" and that of creativity — having equally important roles — is definitely close to the Marxian interpretation of arts. (More concretely, to the theory of reflection set up by Lukács, who is, paradoxically enough, severely criticized later in the book.)

An ideal-typical concept like the industrial world sense covering a whole period roughly from the beginning of modern times up to our days and disregarding the differences of social structures, must necessarily neglect certain contradicting historic trends and phenomena; but if the most fundamental processes are correctly conceived, the theoretical construction set up may expose new relationships and may reveal new aspects for analysis. Here, however, this is not the case. Since the author concentrates only on the materialist-determinist line of thinking, not only are the influential dialectic-idealist and the irrational philosophical heritage of the nineteenth century put into brackets but so are significant twentieth century ideas and scientific schools having an epistemology radically different from the industrial thinking as interpreted here.

Therefore, the reader cannot be much surprised that Marxism is also conceived as a typical manifestation of industrial (i.e. mechanical and unidirectionally determinist) thinking. As an illustration, the Soviet-Russian cultural policy is subjected to an analysis. Shepherd's question is the following: what is the reason for the preference of the tradi-