

# Zoltán Kodály and the Problems of the Critical Edition of Hungarian Folk Music

Katalin PAKSA

Institute for Musicology of Hungarian Academy of Sciences  
Budapest

The Xth volume of the *Collection of Hungarian Folk Music – Corpus Musicae Popularis Hungaricae* (CMPH) came out in 1997. Its title page (*Facsimile I*), similarly to the previous volumes, contains the remark: “Established<sup>1</sup> by Béla Bartók and Zoltán Kodály.” As the editor of the Xth volume, I feel it is high time to face the question: do we still have the right to refer to the founders, as Bartók died well before the appearance of the first volume, and Kodály died after the Vth? Some may argue that it is unjustifiable to “use” the renowned names of our great predecessors, while others may take it as a bona fide science historical tribute which has long lost its real relevance. It appears therefore imperative to evoke the circumstances that determined the genesis of the series, and to remind of the direct and indirect help we have received from the founders in the work of edition.

In a broad sense, the history of the CMPH probably began when Kodály and Bartók agreed, at the very beginning, to exchange a copy of their collections. They did not put their personal and individual collecting and scholarly activities ahead of everything, nor did they ascribe higher priority to the music of the areas where they collected – they wanted to map and understand the whole of Hungarian folk music.<sup>2</sup> They published a set of folksongs with piano accompaniment selected from the material of their first collections. In the preface to the score Kodály already outlined another form of edition – back in 1906! – which would be “governed by the principle of totality, irrespective of the lesser or greater value of the individual songs.”<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> “Edited” in volumes I–VI.

<sup>2</sup> With Bartók “Wir haben über eine lange Zeit unsere Funde zusammengelegt und nach Varianten geordnet. Diese Handschrift liegt heute in der Akademie. Wir haben auch versucht, ein System für diese immer umfangreichere Sammlung zu erarbeiten.” Kodály 1966a, 45.

<sup>3</sup> “Only such a collection can constitute the basis for any research into folksongs.” Bartók–Kodály 1906. Kodály 1964a, I. 9.

## COLLECTION OF HUNGARIAN FOLK MUSIC

ESTABLISHED

BY

BÉLA BARTÓK and ZOLTÁN KODÁLY

X

TYPES OF FOLKSONGS

5

Edited by

KATALIN PAKSA

Chief collaborator

IMRE OLSVAI

Munkatársak – Collaborators

DOMOKOS MÁRIA

RUDASNÉ BAJCSAY MÁRTA

SZALAY OLGA

BERECZKY JÁNOS

Lektorálta – Revised by

VARGYAS LAJOS

Fordította – Translated by

POKOLY JUDIT

Kottarajz – Music copying

KOVÁCS DONÁT

Megjelent a „Kulturális hagyományaink feltárása, nyilvántartása és kiadása”  
program, az „Országos Tudományos Kutatási Alap” és a „Nemzeti Kulturális Alap”  
támogatásával

Sponsored by the Programme “The Research Recording and Publishing  
of Cultural Heritage in Hungary”, the “Hungarian Scientific Research Fund” and the  
“National Cultural Fund”



ISBN 963 05 6449 1 (Összkiadás)

ISBN 963 50 6125 0 (X. kötet)

© Balassi Kiadó, Budapest 1997

Printed in Hungary

*Facsimile 1: Corpus Musicae Popularis Hungaricae vol. X, English–Hungarian title page*

Well versed in the literary sciences and works of history, Kodály was aware that certain scientific disciplines could not be cultivated without the critical edition of their sources. In an early period of his folk music research, before he wrote his important studies, he had already outlined the plan of a new comprehensive folksong collection vitally important for the relatively new branch of science, ethnomusicology, and submitted this proposal together with Bartók to the literary society in 1913.

Our plan is: to prepare a possibly complete, strictly critical and precise edition of the Hungarian folksongs and folk music, to edit a Hungarian ‘Corpus Musicae Popularis’ [...] Though we deem the collected material far from complete, yet it is urgent to publish the already available ones [...] so that a large mass of our folksongs should be circulating in the hand of the public in an authentic and accurate transcription [...] and allow the foreigners to have a chance to get acquainted with genuine Hungarian folk music ...<sup>4</sup>

Some two decades later the plan seemed to be taking shape. Bartók worked on this project (with a few of his colleagues<sup>5</sup>) between 1934 and 1940, upon the request of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. He completed the collection meant for publication and finalized it, but he was no longer able to get it ready for printing. His emigration and the world war foiled the publication.<sup>6</sup>

The first volume of the CMPH appeared in 1951 (*Facsimile 2*). As is known from Kodály’s posthumous papers, the double Latin and Hungarian title – “Corpus Musicae Popularis Hungaricae – A Magyar Népzene Tára” – was his idea.<sup>7</sup> Also, he insisted on showing Bartók’s name, for, quote he:

Although Béla Bartók cannot take part in the final elaboration of the material for printing, the overriding idea and an immense lot of detailed analysis have been contributed by him, so his name cannot naturally be missing.<sup>8</sup>

All the volumes published in Kodály’s lifetime begin with his preface or introduction: he wrote forewords to volumes I and V, and brief, untitled prefaces to volumes II, III and IV.<sup>9</sup> In the Foreword to Volume I, he dwelt in detail on the science historical precedents, citing the resolution of the Academy

<sup>4</sup> Bartók–Kodály 1913. In: Kodály 1964a, II. 49.

<sup>5</sup> Ilona Rácz (1897–1985): Bartók’s pupil, ethnomusicologist; György Kerényi (1902–86): Kodály’s pupil, ethnomusicologist and Sándor Veress (1907–92): composer, ethnomusicologist.

<sup>6</sup> Bartók’s work has only been published recently, vol. I in 1991 in Hungarian, in 1993 in English.

<sup>7</sup> Undated note. Kodály 1993, 302.

<sup>8</sup> Noted presumably between 1946 and 1951. Kodály 1993, 300. Volume I of CMPH pays tribute to the memory of Béla Bartók. (It pays homage to the entire lifework of Bartók, irrespective of the published twin-bar material which was not investigated by Bartók himself.)

<sup>9</sup> In English: Kodály 1974 pp. 40–63.

# A MAGYAR NÉPZENE TÁRA

A MAGYAR TUDOMÁNYOS AKADÉMIA MEGBÍZÁSÁBÓL

SZERKESZTETTE

BARTÓK BÉLA  
ÉS  
KODÁLY ZOLTÁN

I.

## GYERMEKJÁTÉKOK

SAJTÓ ALÁ RENDEZTE

KERÉNYI GYÖRGY DR.

BUDAPEST, 1951

*Facsimile 2: Corpus Musicae Popularis Hungaricae vol. I, Hungarian title page*



taken in 1833 to publish folksongs. He mentioned the 19th and 20th century interrelations between the Academy and folksong research in a wide variety of writings, wishing, as it were, “to pound it into the public mind”.

As early as in 1937 he indicated that

the edition of the complete collection of Hungarian folk tunes was decided by the H. Academy in 1934. Their preparation for printing is going on.<sup>10</sup>

The subsequent Hungarian and foreign-language editions of the study kept tabs on the recently published volumes.<sup>11</sup> He discussed the question in greater detail, among many other things in his study of *The Future of Folk Music Research* (1952),<sup>12</sup> in a manuscript (1953) published as *Folksong Edition and the Hungarian Academy of Sciences*,<sup>13</sup> and in his opening speech delivered at the Budapest conference of the IFMC in 1964.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Hungarian Folk Music. *A magyarság néprajza* [Ethnography of the Hungarians] IV, 12.

<sup>11</sup> Foreword to the third edition in 1952: “The time has not come yet to radically rework and enlarge it. It will be timely when the great collection of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences now in the making has been published, everyone has it in hand and each example can be referred to simply by a number. For the time being, only the first volume has come out, reference can be made to it.” Kodály 1989a, 295. Prefacing the German edition of *Hungarian Folk Music* in 1956: “Als wohlgeordnete Beispielsammlung und als Nachschlagewerk behält Bartóks Buch nach wie vor seinen Wert, während die allmählich druckreif werdende grosse Sammlung mit ihren nacheinander erscheinenden Bänden die dortige Skizze zu einem voll ausgeführten Gemälde zu gestalten bestimmt ist. Bisher erschienen drei Bände des “Magyar Népzene Tára” (Corpus musicae popularis hungaricae): I. Kinderlieder, II. Jahresfeste, III. Hochzeitslieder. Die Ungarische Akademie der Wissenschaften sorgt für eine ununterbrochene Ausgabenfolge.” Kodály 1956b, 9–10. The 4th edition of *A magyar népzene* reports of further two volumes in 1969. Kodály 1969a, III, 99.

<sup>12</sup> Referring to the cultural policy of the period: “... it is being reiterated today that we have to supersede folksongs. True, we have to, but first we have to reach the folksong ... This was comprehended by the Academy when in 1933, a hundred years after its first resolution, it decided anew to publish a scientific collection of folksongs. Implementation was delayed again – this time apocalyptically – by the rattling of arms. Béla Bartók took part in the preparations from 1934 till October 1940 when he left, but he did not live to see the first volume leave the press. After the forced break, it was the first concern of the Ministry of Religion and Public Education to resume the edition of the series. While the material and intellectual affairs of the Academy were being arranged, the Ministry allocated money for the musical engraving from September 1946 and later the editing work could begin. The Ministry of Public Education resumed the work and in November 1951 the first volume of the CMPH, Children’s Games, came out. In the meantime, the Academy of Sciences had to be reorganized, its financial affairs settled, so today there is no obstacle to fitting the scientific work in its schedule.” In: Kodály 1964a, II, 198.

<sup>13</sup> “More than one plans of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences outlined in the zeal of the Age of Reforms can only be realized in our days [ ... ] the publication of folksongs decided in 1833 was interrupted for lack of funds. What a great literary and political significance it would have had, had the one thousand tunes or so collected by then come out prior to 1848. The development of our music could have taken the right course half a century earlier ... On the other hand, it would have become obvious that the peasantry was not only physically the sustainer of the nation but its culture was also the faithful preserver of tradition ... A convincing proof is the Collection of Hungarian Folk Music, the second volume of which is to leave the press this month. Continuous work on the series is also ensured by the Academy via the permanent research team of its fellows, thus making sure that scientific researches, that the subject deserves, can at last be conducted ... ” Kodály 1989a, 390. Originally an untitled writing among the author’s posthumous papers, noted in Kodály’s hand: to the note-book Academy of Sciences.

<sup>14</sup> “... the Hungarian Academy of Sciences decided a hundred and thirty years ago to collect and publish the songs of the peasantry. The history of the century that has passed makes it clear why it was unable to act upon its decision earlier. It decided on the publication again in 1934 and Bartók began preparing it ... World War II was the new obstacle. The material had to be hidden in cellars, catacombs to save it from the bombs. The first volume could come out as late as 1951, with the next ones following as soon as the scientific apparatus and the printing press allowed.” Kodály 1989a, 400.

Kodály took great care to emphasize the commitment of the Academy not merely for the practical reason of creating and strengthening the institutional background of the series. It was of signal importance for him to bring to completion with the *Corpus Musicae Popularis Hungaricae* series a national initiative launched in the Age of Reforms. The repeated reference to the science historical precedents served the same goal, he also set in his artistic creation: to explore and consummate the forgotten and fragmentary values of the past – for the sake of the future. To quote from his writing *The Future of Folk Music Research*:

If we want to turn the people into a nation, we have to promote their music to the rank of a national treasure.<sup>15</sup>

Kodály's sentence rhymes with the words of Sándor Petőfi, the greatest Hungarian poet of the 19th century, who wrote to a fellow poet:

If the common people come to rule poetry, they will be close to ruling politics as well.<sup>16</sup>

Kodály attributed a nation-building role to Hungarian folk music, the profound investigation of which could not do without a survey of connections with the folk music of other nations. He recalled in his speech held on the 70th anniversary of the foundation of the Ethnographic Society:

Our original plan aimed at encompassing the music of all the peoples living here, showing their specific features preserved undisturbed and authentically under the aegis of *Pax Hungarica*. What a great venture it would have been [...] The title of our Corpus became then enlarged with a letter (from *Hungariae* into *Hungaricae*), restricting its contents to the Hungarians. Naturally enough, however, we always point out the interactive influences.<sup>17</sup>

For comparative work to go on, he was anxious to have the systematically arranged music publications of other countries.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Kodály 1952. In: Kodály 1964a, II. 199.

<sup>16</sup> First letter to János Arany, 4 Febr. 1847.

<sup>17</sup> Kodály 1959. In: Kodály 1964a, II. 214–215.

<sup>18</sup> He wrote: "... the time seemed close that every country would put the collection of their people on the table of the nations. It would have been a huge library with the Hungarian volume taking the pride of place. The war interrupted it all." *A zenei folklór fejlődése* [The development of music folklore]. Kodály 1923, II. 97. In 1952, he could already report of the development of folksong publication: "But not only in Hungary but in other countries as well a whole row of similar publications have appeared or are appearing, whose source value will allow for serious comparative work to begin." *A népzene kutatás jövője* [The future of folk music research]. Kodály 1952, II. 199.

In 1956: "Eine [...] Vorbedingung wäre, über systematisch geordnete Sammlungen von den in Betracht kommenden Völkern zu verfügen." Kodály 1956b, 10. "When more and more [...] surveys of distinct areas have appeared, [...] only then can the findings of comparative ethnomusicological research be recorded that exposed the essence of oral folk music tradition so far only vaguely." *Az összehasonlító népdalkutatás előfeltétele* [The precondition of comparative folksong research]. In: Kodály 1964a, II. 210.

Kodály defined the complete critical edition of folksongs as the precondition for research.<sup>19</sup> The magnitude of the task requires a peculiarly extensive and concerted activity; he contended that, to quote, “folk music research is such that it cannot be pursued by individuals alone.”<sup>20</sup> Thanks to his efforts, the team work of publishing folksongs took shape: in 1946 edition began with support from the Ministry of Culture, and in 1953 the Folk Music Research Group<sup>21</sup> was set up as part of the research network of the Academy. Thus, instead of pursuing scientific activity *in general*, the institutional form of ethnomusicology was created for the complete edition of folksongs, which Kodály expected to “generate vigorous development in a new branch of science”, as he put it.<sup>22</sup>

As a director,<sup>23</sup> he introduced a strict order of work, allocating and controlling the achievements of his colleagues. As a complete edition was planned, he let his staff carry out targeted collections to complete the material he and Bartók had systematized.<sup>24</sup> He also expected to receive tunes from collectors outside the Group: he himself corresponded for the acquisition of material just needed.<sup>25</sup> He knew that the findings of the immense field work he, Bartók and Béla Vikár had done in Transylvania needed completion as after World War I, when Transylvania was annexed to Romania, and it was no longer possible to continue research there.<sup>26</sup> “We need recent Transylvanian material for the volumes of the Collection of Hungarian Folk Music awaiting publication”, he wrote to Sabin Drăgoi in Bucharest in 1959 and asked his consent that János Jagamas be allowed to collect Hungarian folk

<sup>19</sup> Cf. e.g. Comments inspired by the lecture of Bence Szabolcsi *Népi és egyéni műalkotás a zenetörténetben* [Folk and individual creation in the history of music] (1953): “The time is not yet ripe to discuss the question in scientific terms. When the whole of folk music and a critical edition of art songs have been completed, we shall be able to settle down to it.” In: Kodály 1989a, 420.

<sup>20</sup> *A Nemzetközi Népzenei Tanács budapesti konferenciája után* [Statement after the Budapest conference of the International Folk Music Council]. Kodály 1964b, III. 401.

<sup>21</sup> Kodály insisted on the name ‘group’ although such places of research were usually tagged ‘institute’ (‘group’ designating a smaller unit). Vikár 1997, 113.

<sup>22</sup> *A zenei folklore fejlődése* [The Future of Folk Music Research] 1952. Kodály 1964a, II. 199.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. László Vikár: Kodály Zoltán, a Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Népzenekutató Csoportjának igazgatója [Zoltán Kodály, the director of the Folk Music Research Group of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences]. *Kodály emlékkönyv*, 1997. 113–117.

<sup>24</sup> “There was a radical increase in collecting trips, targeted collections to enrich the Corpus; they almost became compulsory all over the country.” Vikár 1997, 113.

<sup>25</sup> He expected to get urgently children’s songs from Lajos Schneider, followed by songs of customs (*Kodály Zoltán levelei* [Letters by Zoltán Kodály] 669, 678); he was to get Sámuel Almási’s 19th century song collection from József Pavo for his large folksong collection in the making (op. cit. 684); ethnographic photos from the Museum of Balassagyarmat for the volume of Calendar customs (op. cit. 710); wedding songs and laments from the Transylvanian ethnomusicologist János Jagamas (op. cit. 734, 986).

<sup>26</sup> “... the most valuable Hungarian area for collection became inaccessible”—he stated in 1923. *A zenei folklore fejlődése* [The development of music folklore]. In: Kodály 1964a, II. 97.

music.<sup>27</sup> But his idea to get a photocopy of the Hungarian material preserved in the Folklore Institute in Cluj-Napoca [Kolozsvár] was unsuccessful after several attempts as well.<sup>28</sup>

In this phase of work he deemed it unnecessary to publish folksongs under the names of individual collectors.<sup>29</sup> To quote:

Bartók's and my collections numbering several thousand items will only be published combined with the rest. This is meant to indicate that [the *Corpus Musicae Popularis Hungaricae*] is not the work of an individual but is brought to life by the collaboration of many.<sup>30</sup>

Collaboration also applied to the development of the scientific conception of publishing the material. He had been preoccupied with the question since the 1910s; it had undergone several modifications before it took a clear shape (with the constant expansion of the material to be published). A document of his ruminations can be read among his posthumous papers:<sup>31</sup>

There are many open questions: 1) What? 2) How? Every variant? Should the imperfect, [ ... ] defective transcriptions of old collections be printed again? The new transcriptions also include incorrectly notated, or sung pieces. Shall they be perpetuated? ... How? ... in the Bartók system [ ... ] in the order of cadences ... At any rate: it is good to have two different systematizations in the manuscripts.<sup>32</sup> We need a third one, arrangement by location.

In the same place he deliberated the problem of textual and melodic variants and handling "variants in other languages".<sup>33</sup>

And Kodály did not edit a volume "of his own"! When Bartók was working on his tune systematization for publication, he was carrying on a complementary task:<sup>34</sup> the elaboration of the historical material. (Why he

<sup>27</sup> With the tape recorder Kodály sent to Transylvania. *Kodály Zoltán levelei* [Letters by Zoltán Kodály] 973.

<sup>28</sup> In spite of the fact that the attempts were made on a reciprocal basis, under the aegis of the Hungarian–Romanian cultural agreement (in 1960, op. cit. 987), and the Hungarians sent the microfilm of all Bartók's Romanian transcriptions in exchange. "Without the material there, our systematizing work well under way will stymie" (in 1962, op. cit. 1048).

<sup>29</sup> But he encouraged the writing of village monographs within the frames of individual research (in the foreword to his study *A magyar népzene* [Hungarian Folk Music]; in the third edition, he could also report on the results. In: Kodály 1989a, 294, 296.

<sup>30</sup> Writing, e.g. to the widow of Lajos Schneider whom he informed of her late husband's song collection (in Kodály 1964, op. cit. 1159).

<sup>31</sup> Undated note on the back of a letter dated 1946. Kodály 1993, 294.

<sup>32</sup> I.e. Bartók's system based on rhythm, Kodály's based on cadences.

<sup>33</sup> "In all three cases, the question is: to put the text next to it, or in appendix at the end. One must give up the idea of including all texts, otherwise one would have to put down the same melody with a modified word or two for a hundred times. Presenting melody variants is easier, a page can carry 10–20 variants, with deviating remarks in the Notes. It's harder with text, and taking up more space. Question of variants in other languages, partly collected. Bibliographic references to be made about their publication. In notes, or appended."

<sup>34</sup> "Well, we studied different things enough, to change ideas without loss for each other, and added experiences of two are of more value than any individual." – he wrote to Bartók in late 1941. Bartók 1993, 18.

did not have Bartók's work published ten years later, when he had the opportunity to do so, is clarified by Sándor Kovács's study.<sup>35</sup>)

As the scholarly organizer and the theoretical guide, Kodály stood behind the volumes but left the actual work of publication to his pupils and colleagues: volumes I, II and IV to György Kerényi, volume III to Lajos Kiss, volume V to Lajos Kiss and Benjamin Rajeczky. Let me point out here a peculiar feature of the scholarly attitude and personality of Kodály which is hardly comprehensible at the turn of the 20–21st centuries. The closest analogy is perhaps the mentality of mediaeval artists that left the names of the cathedral designers, the carvers of statues, the painters of panel pictures in obscurity; their joint work served a single goal: the promotion of the glory of God. For Kodály, it was not the personal performance but the final outcome that counted<sup>36</sup> (*Photo 1*). It is revealing that he heralded the prospective appearance of the CMPH volumes as many times as he could, mentioning the title and volume number, but never the names of the editors. Nor is it indicated in the volumes themselves who was the contributor of a significant and distinctly outlined part.<sup>37</sup> Kodály's concern was the presentation of the "cathedral" – the "complete" system of folk music. This explains why he resigned from publishing his volume of laments in 1921,<sup>38</sup> although the musical engraving had already begun, and thus the material he collected in the 1910s was only published fifty years later, incorporated in the fifth volume of *Corpus Musicae Popularis Hungaricae*. When talking in a late television interview, he referred to the recently published fifth volume in connection with his "own" ethnomusicological endeavours, to wit:

... I began collectiong there [in the villages around Galánta]. At first on foot, with a backpack [ ... ] but this research spread out immensely. Let me skip various stages of development: it suffices to refer to the latest, fifth volume of the

<sup>35</sup> Bartók 1993, 13–33.

<sup>36</sup> The jobs of folk music collection, purchase of a collection, selecting and arranging tunes, transcription, were all discussed collectively at the meetings of the Folk Music Research Group. The records of the "plenaries" regularly kept from 1960 were made by the scientific secretary László Vikár and countersigned by Zoltán Kodály and the department heads: Benjamin Rajeczky, György Kerényi and Pál Járdányi.

<sup>37</sup> E.g. it was Pál Járdányi who arranged the twin-bar material of the first volume according to musical cores and he systematized the recitative tunes of free structure in a geographical order in volume V. It was again Járdányi who worked out the musical typology of the tunes in volume IV; here, his name is already indicated. Vargyas 1977, 404–406, 411–412.

<sup>38</sup> "In the turbulent days of 1920, I thought for a time, it would be better to publish forth with the material collected up to that date ... But I abandoned my plan. The collection would have been incomplete – because I was certain that custom existed in other areas of Hungary too; only time and opportunity for exploration were needed. Furthermore, the foreign literature available at that time proved to be so limited that it would not have provided an adequate basis for the proposed survey of world literature. A third reason for abandoning the project was that a phonograph-cylinder of two-minutes-duration could not give a true picture of the character of a lament ... As early as 1920 news had spread of a new invention that made recordings of 20 to 30 minutes possible." CMPH V, pp. 11–12.



Photo 1: Volume III of *Corpus Musicae Popularis Hungaricae* being made.

A moment of the team work in 1954:

Lajos Kiss, György Kerényi, Pál Járdányi, Zoltán Kodály. Photo by György Kerényi (Institute for Musicology of the HAS, collection of folk-music-related photos: 5761)

Collection of Hungarian Folk Music edited by a team of twenty folk music researchers and published by our Academy of Sciences.

Kodály's train of thoughts reveals a perfect union of individual and collective work.<sup>39</sup> He always spoke in plural about the *Corpus Musicae Popularis Hungaricae*. He said to Mária Nyéki Kőrösi, an associate of Phonotèque Nationale in 1965:

I presume you know our series of publication, which has arrived at its fifth volume. It contains the laments. There is a folk music research group at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, twenty researchers are working on the publication...<sup>40</sup>

In an interview with Lutz Besch he described the *Corpus Musicae Popularis Hungaricae* series in detail.<sup>41</sup> Kodály said in plural again:

Wir haben ein vollkommen neues System erarbeitet. Sehr viele der Lieder konnten wir nicht auf musikalischer Grundlage systematisieren. Sie sind musikalisch

<sup>39</sup> *Önarckép* [Self-portrait], 1965. Kodály 1965b, III. 584. An interview originally in German, edited by Hannes Reinhardt with the title *Kodály Zoltán, Ein Selbstportrait. Das Selbstportrait. Grosse Künstler und Denker unserer Zeit erzählen von ihrem Leben und ihrem Werk*. Christian Wegner Verlag. Hamburg, 1967. 133–146.

<sup>40</sup> *Párizsi beszélgetés* [Paris conversation], 1965. Kodály 1989a, 578–579.

<sup>41</sup> Kodály 1966a, 44–49.

zum Teil so verschieden voneinander, dass es nicht gut gewesen wäre, sie in das grosse Material einzufügen. Es hat sich als praktischer erwiesen, sie abzusondern.<sup>42</sup>

Kodály's words apply to the tunes associated with various occasions published in the first five volumes of CMPH: the tunes of children's games, calendar feasts, wedding, match-making, and laments, a considerable proportion of which have an unfixed structure, or which deviate from the main styles of Hungarian folk music, being of foreign or art music origin. The former attempts at systematization highlighted the strophic songs making up the greatest part of the stock of Hungarian folksongs. However, Kodály did not find them suitable for publication, though acknowledged them as an important scientific experience. Let me cite the above interview again:

Nach vielen Versuchen haben wir das beste Kriterium in der Melodielinie gefunden. Die Melodielinie ist entweder eine von Anfang bis Ende abwärts gehende Form (Descendent), oder ein tiefer Anfang, ein hoher Mittelteil und ein tiefes Ende, und so weiter ... [It is a system] nach welchem alle Varianten so ziemlich von selbst zusammentreffen und auch die Stilarten sich durch die Merkmale des Aufbaus zusammenfügen.<sup>43</sup>

That was the system which, decided upon by Kodály and approved by the Academy's Musical Commission, became the basis for the publication of the strophic tunes by musical types. Kodály died in the year after this series of interview. He left behind a well-organized research team,<sup>44</sup> a mature scientific concept of the prospective volumes of *Corpus Musicae Popularis Hungaricae*,<sup>45</sup> as well as a certain style and approach to work based on meticulous absorption, essence-directedness and the ambition to set research into a broader and more elevated context.

<sup>42</sup> "Vor allem die Kinderlieder, die ja eine ganz andere Struktur haben als die übrigen Volkslieder ... Und bei den Erwachsenenliedern muss man die an gewisse Gebräuche und rituelle Funktionen gebundenen Stücke absondern, weil sie auch musikalisch nicht zu den übrigen passen ... Der dritte Band enthält Hochzeitslieder. Auch die waren auszunehmen, weil sie sich von den anderen rituellen Liedern unterscheiden. Natürlich ist dieser Band etwas gemischt, da wir eine Menge Lieder hineingenommen haben, die die gleiche Struktur haben wie andere Volkslieder. Es werden also Stücke aus diesem Band anderswo wiedererscheinen ... Der vierte Band hat wiederum einen ganz spezifischen Charakter, der nicht in das System der gewöhnlichen Volkslieder passt. In Deutschland gibt es einige entfernte Verwandte davon, 'Paarungslieder' ... Der fünfte Band, die Totenklagen, ist wieder ein Kapitel für sich, das auch allein stehen muss, schon darum, weil diese Gesänge keine strophische Gliederung haben, sondern wie Prosa unendlich weitergehen ..." Eventually the melodious calls of market vendors, night-watchmen, beggars planned for the sixth volume were eventually left out. Kodály 1966a, 45–47.

<sup>43</sup> Kodály 1966a, 48, 47.

<sup>44</sup> At the first meeting after the Master's death, the Group members listened to a recording of Kodály's words – his testament, as it were – taped on 16 Dec. 1964: "I should like more and more, and better, warmth to emanate from here. I should like the Group to go on working in the future as if I were still here. For that's the only token of the survival of the Group." Plenary record 12. April 1967.

<sup>45</sup> At that time, Pál Járdányi was already engaged in working out a systematization of new criteria. "He did so upon Kodály's express request." Vikár 1997, 113.

\*

The *Types of Folksongs* were arranged into volumes in the physical absence of the Masteral already. We had to miss him in the phase of work that engaged his interest from the very beginning of his scientific career. The first five volumes of CMPH were namely a sort of necessary “detour”; the outcome of a wise, practical decision. Back in the early fifties, applying a purely musical system would have been tantamount to “western formalism”. It was a dangerous accusation at that time which did not spare Bartók’s music, either. The ethnographic function, the relationships with the life of the rural population were an acceptable criteria in the Stalinist phase of socialism. The songs connected with various occasions constitute only a small and less typical portion of Hungarian folk music.<sup>46</sup> (The fact that the Advent and Christmas songs, Nativity songs, Pentecost songs were published unmaimed in the volume *Corpus Musicae Popularis Hungaricae II, Calendar Customs* was certainly thanks to the authority of Kodály, for in the early fifties the texts of folksongs were censored and modified, replacing words like “God”, “church”, “altar”, “holy”, etc. with others.<sup>47</sup>)

The question arises to what extent did the volumes devoted to the occasional songs promote the cause of editing the folksongs types? I should like to stress that although the first five volumes of *Corpus Musicae Popularis Hungaricae* were basically arranged along an extra-musical criterion, the ethnographic functions of the tunes,<sup>48</sup> there are several references to their

<sup>46</sup> When describing the old style, Bartók was exclusively concerned with tunes not connected with any occasion, as “actual songs pure and simple, associated with no special occasions.” Bartók 1981, 12. He did not even collect the songs related to the ecclesiastic musical stock (though they were traditionally connected to the celebration of certain calendar days).

<sup>47</sup> Concerning songs of calendar days, let us cite a few excerpts from the supervisory report of Mrs Simon, deputy department head of the Institute for Public Education about Gy. Kerényi’s planned folksong publication entitled *Munka és az ünnep dalai* [Songs of work and holidays] in 1951: “The subsequent verses of the first song ‘New Year, that brings mirth [...]’ are explicitly religious, I recommend their re-writing ... Similarly to be treated are the following songs: ‘It’s one o’clock after midnight [...]’ and ‘On the day of the Magi [...]’ The latter could perhaps be omitted. In song 6: ‘Doctor Saint Gregory ...’ to be replaced by ‘Doctor Gregory the Great [...]’ at the end of the strophe ‘Let us go in God [...]’ to be replaced by ‘Let us go in time ...’ At the end of strophe 3 instead of ‘By God [...]’ ‘By knowledge’ [...] The beginning of song 2: instead of ‘God has brought [the day of purple Pentecost]’ ‘The time has brought ...’ The end of the last song: ‘The Father is to be praised on earth’ to be replaced by: ‘The fine summer is to be praised on earth.’ [...] Song 4: ‘The Angel from Heaven’ is, I think, most appropriately omitted, and the same should be deliberated about ‘Shepherd, shepherd’ [...] their publication being apolitical. I suggest the same in connection with the songs ‘The market of Heaven [...]’ and ‘In the mead of Heaven [...]’.”

<sup>48</sup> “In these [volumes] the principles of melody arrangement could not yet be acted upon, since the peculiarities of each volume’s material were considered and the frames of the folk custom taken as determinant (*Children’s games*: starting melody core; *Calendar days*: the order of the holiday and groups of motifs; *Wedding*: order of the ceremony; *Match-making songs*: order of the game – the latter three volumes with a catalogue of cadences and syllable patterns according to Kodály’s ideas –; *Laments*: grouping by compass within the geographical systematization).” Written upon Kodály’s recommendation, a subsequently interpolated passage in Pál Járdányi’s series of radio lectures entitled Hungarian folk music. In: Járdányi 1966, part II.



musical variation and interrelations, their analogies in history and in the music of other peoples.<sup>49</sup> What is more, wherever the material allowed it, the tune type served as an organizing principle in some volumes. These volumes can be taken as the methodological preparation for the subsequent volumes of types. Much experience had been gathered in handling various hand-written and recorded folk music sources. As for the transcription and treatment of the audio recordings, the predominantly strophic material in volumes II–IV also allowed the conclusion that one strophe should be given in notation, with only the deviations noted afterwards. This principle was generally observed, though not quite consistently. This can be carried out by a type of notation that ignores the tiniest details, taking into account only the variation above them.<sup>50</sup> (In these volumes on-the-spot transcription has a far larger share than in the volumes arranged by musical types, since sound recording only became general practice from the sixties and the problems of musical revision for publication arose only later.) For the sake of an unambiguous and unified rendering of the music in print, Kodály deemed it necessary to lay down the rules of ethnomusicological orthography. Commissioned by Kodály, Pál Járdányi prepared the “Law Book” in 1953–54<sup>51</sup> which has been in use, with minor modifications ever since.

The summaries in foreign languages attached to volumes III–IV and the complete English translation of volume V signposted the course to be taken in the entirely bilingual volumes of types.

Volume VI of CMPH – and at the same time volume 1 of the *Types of Folksongs* – was edited by Pál Járdányi, who masterminded the musical system applied,<sup>52</sup> and by Imre Olsvai, who had worked with Járdányi on the practical implementation of the system from as early as 1959. After Járdányi’s premature death,<sup>53</sup> Olsvai had to continue and complete the work alone. Volume VII was also edited by Olsvai, volume VIII by Lajos Vargyas,

<sup>49</sup> In the two volumes – containing structurally free material – these connections are summarized in separate chapters, in volume I “A comparison of our games with the games of other peoples” (NB: from an ethnographical, and not musical viewpoint), in volume V “Interrelationships” pp. 1118–22. Foreign and historical data are most often placed in the Notes, at times with music, usually referring to a single Hungarian tune or a small group of songs.

<sup>50</sup> “The transcriptions should usually be simple, the editor of each volume deciding which tunes should be transcribed in detail.” Cited from the plenary record of 3 May 1961. Vikár 1997, 115.

<sup>51</sup> Vikár 1992, 19.

<sup>52</sup> “Without him the CMPH is unimaginable, and if we deduced from what he had contributed to it, its scientific standards would sink considerably. He was almost exclusively intrigued by this job ...” Vargyas 1977, 414.

<sup>53</sup> Kodály’s high esteem and affection for Járdányi can be deduced from his obituary. But one can also make out the Master’s scale of values from it: “From every field of his activity the most humane man looks back upon us whose most ardent desire is to help others ... He was convinced: only those live who live for others. His sown field will not dry up. His colleagues [...] will go on with the work, thinking of his example.” Kodály 1989a, 465.

volumes IX–X by Mária Domokos and Katalin Paksa, who had been associates to both Olsvai and Vargyas in editing all the volumes of types. Thus the editing experience could be passed down from first hand.

Let us see now, how the volumes of types satisfied the requirements laid down by Kodály. First, I cite an excerpt from the *Paris conversation*.

Question: “When a tune has several variants, what is the criterion that can decide which is the most authentic form?”

Kodály’s reply: “No tune has a ‘single authentic form’. What defines a folksong precisely is that it is reborn in the singing of every individual, but this rebirth is never the same. There are always tiny alterations. At any rate, we have to differentiate the well adopted tune from the corrupted or fragmentary ones. All this notwithstanding, there is never a *single, unique authentic* form, but there are *several equivalent* forms.”

Question: “When they are published in a collected volume, what criteria of selection is applied?”

Kodály’s answer: “All variants are indicated ...”<sup>54</sup>

Let us start with Kodály’s last sentence. All variants can be indicated when “all” – that is, a sufficient number – have been collected. The enlargement of the folk music collection – which was the basis for the complete edition – went on as Kodály required. Though targeted collecting work for the *Corpus* decreased, an immensely growing set of tunes flowed in from different sources<sup>55</sup> – thanks to the rising dance research, among other things, and later to the dance-house movement: they provided a multitude of chiefly instrumental tunes from hardly explored areas. Though we still had no access to the material of the professional ethnomusicologists preserved in the Archive in Cluj-Napoca [Koložsvár],<sup>56</sup> we continuously received a large amount of recorded material from private collectors. These, in turn, outlined several new types during the work of transcription and systematization which were unknown at the time when Járdányi worked out his system. The possibility of tape-recording, and the new goals of collection: the registration of dance processes, the examination of the performing style and playing technique of

<sup>54</sup> 1965. Kodály 1989a, 579.

<sup>55</sup> Their elaboration provided lots of tunes for the volumes of types.

<sup>56</sup> By now, the excellent folksong publications of Transylvanian researchers published since then have acquainted us with some of their collections (cf. among others János Jagamas – József Faragó: *Romániai magyar népdalok* [Hungarian folksongs in Romania] 1974, István Almási: *Szilágysági magyar népzene* [Hungarian folk music in the Szilágyság region] 1979, János Jagamas: *Magyaró énekes népzeneje* [The vocal music of Magyaró] 1984, Ilona Szenik: *Erdélyi és moldvai magyar siratók, siratóparódiák és halottas énekek* [Hungarian laments, lament parodies and funeral songs from Transylvania and Moldavia] 1996). Yet even these published tunes could not be included in the *Corpus Musicae Popularis Hungaricae* main body, except in the form of references made in the notes, since they cannot be checked against the original sources, which is the precondition for a critical edition.

band leaders, the study of the temporal modification of the tunes, etc. – all entailed long and occasionally repeated recordings. The editors of *Corpus Musicae Popularis Hungaricae* were faced with a new difficulty deriving from the immensely enlarged stock.<sup>57</sup> Although the principle of making available “all” could not be relinquished, the editors had to yield to a sober sense of proportion, a great virtue of Kodály.

It became general to transcribe the tunes in medium detail and to include only a single strophe followed by the deviations.<sup>58</sup> The occasion on which a certain variant was collected had to be indicated. This complex presentation<sup>59</sup> contains all the variants and the manner of performance (see e.g. *Facsimile 3*). Several recordings of a many-strophe tune cause problems to the editors and the reader alike, but at the same time they afford a far more profound insight into the real life of folk music. The different materials of the volumes allowed for other methods of condensation at times. In volume VIII, for example, which contains types particularly rich in variants, the typology of lines was a helpful device, apart from the individual tunes (e.g. 68 of 201 variants of type LIII were published as main text, 128 by type of lines); and in volume X, “note types” were also created.<sup>60</sup>

A critical occupation with folksongs implies differentiating – to quote Kodály again – “the well adopted, corrupted and fragmentary” forms.<sup>61</sup> The differentiation is expressed by the notation of the main form and the scores relegated to the notes, as well as the elaborated sequence of scores at the end of each tune type – together with the awkward, eroded, truncated, contaminated variants, and those displaying the influence of art music or a strongly affected tone of popular songs. This is followed by the mere listing of the

<sup>57</sup> Even Kodály’s plans reckoned with an increasingly large material. In 1913 he wrote: “1000 songs should be gathered in one volume, if possible ... Hence the whole work would be arranged in five or six volumes ...” *Az új egyetemes népdalgyűjtemény tervezete* [Plan of the new comprehensive folksong collection]. Kodály 1964a, II. 52. In 1942: “Altogether, there are some three thousand main tunes and a multitude of variants, one having sometimes as many as fifty.” *A magyar zenei élet időszéri kérdéseiről* [About the timely questions of the Hungarian music life]. Kodály 1965b, III. 55. In 1943: “A material of some three thousand basic tunes and over ten thousand variants are being prepared for publication [at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences] under the supervision of Béla Bartók and Zoltán Kodály.” *Népzeneink* [Our folk music]. In: Kodály 1965b, III. 375. The Bartók-System closed in 1938 contains about 13,500 tunes, the Kodály-System closed in 1959 some 28,000 tunes. In 1961 *Magyar népdaltípusok I–II* [Hungarian Folksong Types I–II] (German edition in 1964), was prepared on the basis of 50–60,000 tunes as the condensation of the prospected 15–20 volumes of CMPH by the editor – Pál Járdányi. Járdányi 1961, 10. The collection arranged by types contains today some 170,000 transcribed (strophic) tunes. The so-far untranscribed material amounts to some 1500–2000 hours in duration.

<sup>58</sup> Such a transcription helps the interpretation of the musical phenomena by making the changing and unchanging parts visible and suggesting the extent and character of variation.

<sup>59</sup> The method was elaborated by Imre Olsvai and first applied in volume VI.

<sup>60</sup> The space-saving device served to separate the material of art music origin by contents.

<sup>61</sup> See footnote 54.

*Rubato* [♩ = cca 76]

1) — 2) 17) —  
1. s Ro-má-ni-ja ró-zsa vó-na,  
4) — 5) 6) 7) 8) 9) —  
3) — ( ) ( )  
Úgy-se sza-kí-ta-nék ró-la,  
10) — 11) 18) — 12)  
( ) ( )  
Ma-gyar-or-szág tö-vis vó-na,  
13) — 14) — 15) — 19) — 16)  
( ) ( )  
Úgy-és ró-zsát szédnek ró-la.

1a) 1b) 1c) 1d) 1e) 2) 3) 4) 5) 6) 7) 8)  
2.2)4. 2)2. 2)7. 3)11. 4)5. 5.2)4.7. 8. 2)1. 3.4.2)5. 3)11. 5.2)3. 4)10.  
3)9. 5. 3)11.4)7. 10.11. 3)9.11. 3)9.4)5. 4)6.11. 4)7. 4)5.10.  
4)7.

9a) 9b) 9c) 9d) 9e) 10a) 10c) 10d) 10e) 10f) 11)  
2.2)1. 3. 2)2. 3)11. 4)5. 6.III. 2)5.V. 3)9. 4)4.6.7.III.V. 4)11.V. 2)5.  
3)9. 10.11.III.

12) 13a) 13b) 13c) 14a) 14b) 14c) 15a) 15b) 16)+10b) sic  
5.IV.6.3)9. 5.VI.6.IV. 2)1-3. 2)5. 5.IV. 2)1.2.4.5.VI. 2)3.5.IV. 2)2.3.5. 4)6. 7.V.8.V.  
4)7.IV.VI. 2)7.VIII. 4)11.VI. 6.VI. 7.VI.VIII. 7.IV. 2)7.V.VII.  
11.IV. 4)6.7.10.11.

17) 18) 19)  
2.5.6.2)2-4. 2)1.5.7. 2)2.  
7.3)9-11. 5)5. 4)6.7.10.11.

3. s Hozd fél, Isten, azt a napot,  
Hogy süsse fél a harmatot,  
A harmatot a füvekről,  
A bánatot a szívemről!

4. s Én Istenem, adj egy napot,  
Hogy mulassam ki magamot,  
Én Istenem, adj egy napot,  
Hogy mulassam ki magamot!...

5. s Én Istenem, teremttétél,  
Egy víg napot nem rendeltél.  
Akkor mér is teremttétél,  
Ha jöngemét így megvertél.

## Facsimile 3

The text in English:

1. Even if Romania were a rose-bush,  
I wouldn't tear off a flower.  
Even if Hungary were just thorns,  
I would pick blossoms from it.
2. Lord Almighty, you have made me,  
But you ordered no merry day.  
Why did you make me then,  
If you punish me so hard?
3. Raise, Lord God, the sun  
That it may dry the dew.  
The dew from the grass-blades,  
The sorrow from my heart.
4. Lord Almighty, give me one day  
That I may have a good time once.  
Lord Almighty, give me one day  
That I may have a good time once.
5. Sorrow, sorrow, how heavy you are,  
How long you've been weighing down my heart.  
Why have you built a fort in my heart,  
Why have you built a fort in my heart?  
(Why didn't you build it on the mountain,  
On the top of a rocky cliff?)
6. Why didn't you build it on the mountain,  
On the top of a rocky cliff?  
Why did you build it in my heart,  
Why did you build it in my heart?
7. Many were my mother's warnings,  
Some I paid heed to, others I never did.  
Now I'd pay heed, but it's too late,  
For she's resting in the earth.  
I promise to strangers to pay heed,  
To the broom next to the door,  
To the broom next to the door,  
For it won't tell anybody.
8. My life's full of sorrow,  
Every minute's spent in grief.  
I'd raise up my mother,  
To unbosom myself to her,  
But there's no such doing,  
For she's been devoured by the earth.
9. My dear mother's rose tree  
Sprouted me as its finest branch,  
But a young man tore me off,  
He wilted me in his hat.
10. Love, love, just take care whom you love,  
For love makes everyone blind.  
It has made me blind, too,  
It has turned my joy to sorrow.
11. Little bird, what is the reason  
That you never walk on the ground?  
I would walk but I am afraid,  
Many envy me, I fear them.  
(Those who envy me are many and big,  
And I am only little.)

A "plaintive song" (Vol. X of *Corpus Musicae Popularis Hungaricae* 697) collected on four occasions with 11 strophes. The numbers above the staves indicate the place of variation. The melody strophe is followed by the variants in numeric order, divided by a double line. The number in italics shows the further occasions of collection – followed by the number of stanza indicated by a normal number.

The rest of the explanation can be found in the note attached to the tune, such as:

1st occasion 1968: stanzas 1–2, stanzas 5–6, tune of stanza 7 repeated twice from the middle, stanza 8 repeated from the middle.

2nd occasion 1969: stanzas 1–3, tune of stanza 5 repeated from the middle with further text, stanza 4, tune of stanza 7 repeated twice from the middle. Tonus finalis *a flat*.

3rd occasion 1969: stanza 9, stanza 10 repeated from middle, stanza 11. Tonus finalis *f*.

4th occasion 1972: stanzas 5–6, tune of stanza 11 repeated from middle with further words, tune of stanza 7 repeated twice from middle, stanza 10.

ethnographically seemingly apparent variants whose sources, however, cannot be checked on as neither sound recordings nor collectors' manuscripts are available.<sup>62</sup> The screening of variants performed by others than peasants and the "revival" data need no mentioning.

In the scholarly investigations of both Bartók and Kodály, the historical question of Hungarian folk music and its relations with the musics of the neighbouring peoples played an important role. Their viewpoints, achievements and results can be found in the first five volumes of *Corpus Musicae Popularis Hungaricae* applied to individual tunes or smaller tune groups. To treat the material from these angles became a compulsory aspect of the volumes of types, with overall validity. The Kodály-System still serves as the primary source for finding and elaborating variants in the music of our neighbours: the musical notation of other people's tunes borrowed from publications and his own notes put down on the base-sheets of the Hungarian tunes. It is peculiar that the base-sheets of the Bartók-System contain no such notes,<sup>63</sup> but the editors of the volumes can successfully search for relevant tunes in the material Bartók collected among neighbouring peoples. Similarly, the bulk of the 18th–19th-century historical occurrences of the tunes in question were borrowed from the Kodály-System. Kodály copied these base-sheet-like scores with a view to Bartók's *Complete Collection*.<sup>64</sup>

In this way the work of the two great predecessors has been incorporated in the volumes of *Corpus*, and the musical comparison, which they contributed to so substantially, has assumed far greater significance in the volumes of the types. While in volumes I–V the historical or foreign analogies were associated with a single Hungarian tune or a small group of tunes, in this instance the correspondence is between types.

It is worth listing the analogies of the music of linguistically related peoples included in Kodály's study entitled *Folk Music of Hungary* which belong to the material of the volumes of types. Kodály added a Cheremis and a Chuvash variant to the Nyitra tune "My hat is floating down the Tisza ..." noting that "The [...] type is widely spread both in Hungary and the East."<sup>65</sup> In volume VIII of CMPH 282 variants are recorded (type XLV) from almost the entire Hungarian language territory.<sup>66</sup> Kodály compared Cheremis and

<sup>62</sup> Mostly publications of folksong collections.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. Bartók 1993, p. 15, footnote 14.

<sup>64</sup> The editors naturally took into account the more recent findings of folk music researchers and musicologists, and also carried on researches into these subject-matters themselves.

<sup>65</sup> Kodály 1971, 32.

<sup>66</sup> Most of the variants are from the Great Plain.

Chuvash tunes with two variants of “The bridge over the wide water is narrow ...” from Csík county.<sup>67</sup> In volume IX 64 variants of the type are presented (type LXXXI). The Chuvash variant<sup>68</sup> of “In eighteen forty-six ...” is connected to ten Hungarian tunes – from Transylvania and Moldavia – in volume IX (type LXXV, – and it is noteworthy in this context that more recently discovered analogies also confirm the Chuvash relationship, including a tune collected by László Vikár, and a Cheremis analogy could also be presented.<sup>69</sup>) Still, the comparison remains lopsided because for want of publications presenting types, we do not know the role and importance of the given tunes in the folk music of these peoples; all we know is the place of the tune in the Hungarian context. The best example is the Cheremis analogy cited by Kodály in connection with the folksong “The peacock alighted ...”<sup>70</sup> which concerns 30 tunes in volume VI (type IX). The real significance of the comparison is even greater, since all the tune types in volumes VI and VII are interrelated, being manifestations of one and the same principle of melody construction in various syllabic patterns and rhythms.<sup>71</sup>

The 47 years that passed between the appearance of volumes I and X is a long time, spanning two generations. The editors of five volumes have already died. As for the historical-political background: work on volume I began shortly after World War II, volumes II–III were edited in the Stalinist era, volumes IV–V in the period of post-revolutionary (1956–) consolidation. So far, the protective umbrella of Kodály’s moral and professional authority has sheltered these ventures. After the publication of volume VI, ethnomusicology lost its institutional independence<sup>72</sup> and merged with the Institute for Musicology,<sup>73</sup> where work is still. For a cultural policy which rested upon

<sup>67</sup> Kodály 1971, 33–34.

<sup>68</sup> Kodály 1971, 46.

<sup>69</sup> *Corpus Musicae Popularis Hungaricae* IX. p. 1105.

<sup>70</sup> Kodály 1971, 26.

<sup>71</sup> “Some two thousand tunes of thirty-five melody types belong to this pentatonic layer of music built on a single musical idea.” Olsvai 1981, 59.

<sup>72</sup> Abolishing the independence of the Group was already decided in Kodály’s lifetime, but the Master’s authority prevented it. An excerpt from one of Kodály’s letters clearly reveals his arguments: “Our group can best exert its efforts in its retained independence. We have nothing in common with material folklore, or with the research of folk tales. We are far more in need of the help, on the one hand, of the Institute of Literary History, – expecting them to help with historical data of folk texts, and early literary analogies – and on the other hand, of musicologists, who could help retrace the roots of the tunes. Joint discussions with one or the other may be useful, but only when full independence is preserved. No one is considering the union of the Institutes of Linguistic Sciences and Literature, though their research fields are far more homogeneous ...” (Draft of a letter without address, 1961, the date is not in Kodály’s hand. *Kodály Zoltán levelei* [Letters by Zoltán Kodály] 1016.)

<sup>73</sup> The one-time director of the Institute for Musicology was Bence Szabolcsi. While he was alive, his human integrity, respecting Kodály’s personality and will, could delay the merger for a few years.

models prescribed by the Soviet Union, the Folk Music Research Group seemed all too national and dangerously independent of the ideology and power relations of the communist party.

With the merger, the prospects of *Corpus Musicae Popularis Hungaricae* changed. While the directors of the Folk Music Research Groups had been ethnomusicologists, specialists involved closely in the work of the Corpus,<sup>74</sup> now they were replaced by musicologists with a general qualification who had to take the relevant decisions about the forthcoming volumes. Though the series remained a “high-priority” task of the institute, it has lost its decisive role. Earlier, all research and collecting goals had been subordinated to the overall task publication, now the order was reversed, the tendency to publish individual studies took the upper hand and only a few colleagues took part in the editing work. Even so, the appearance of volumes VII–X is the outcome of concerted efforts incorporating the collecting, transcribing, systematizing and theoretical contributions of all the researchers active today. The scholars deem it an obligation to take part in the collective work of editing the folk music collection, but their number is far from proportionate with the task. In the *Paris conversation* of 1965, Kodály could report that “twenty colleagues are working on the publication and still doing collecting work.”<sup>75</sup> In 1997, the Department of Folk Music numbered a staff of half that number, in 2000 the department in charge of the edition has 7 associates. The folk music collection is no more available in the system elaborated by Járdányi for the volumes of *Corpus Musicae Popularis Hungaricae*, but in another system developed by style.<sup>76</sup> It is a great achievement of ethnomusicology that the publication of the series has been going on under changing circumstances, despite internal and external hindrances. The scholarly and moral greatness of Zoltán Kodály is the foundation on which these endeavours can rely.

<sup>74</sup> Zoltán Kodály, Benjamin Rajeczky, Lajos Vargyas.

<sup>75</sup> In: Kodály 1989a, 579. Also in 1965 Kodály addressed a letter to the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Department of Language and Literature, asking for a salary increase for the 23 associates in employment of the Folk Music Research Group (*Kodály Zoltán levelei* [Letters by Zoltán Kodály] 1198).

<sup>76</sup> The work of László Dobszay and Janka Szendrei. Cf. Dobszay–Szendrei 1992.



## References

- ALMÁSI, István 1979  
*Szilágysági magyar népzene* [Hungarian folk music from the Szilágyság region]. Kriterion Bukarest
- BARTÓK, Béla 1924  
*A magyar népdal* [The Hungarian folksong]. Rózsavölgyi és Társa Budapest. Cf. Bartók 1981, 1990
- BARTÓK, Béla 1981  
*The Hungarian Folk Song*. With annotations by Zoltán Kodály. Ed. Benjamin Suchoff. State University of New York Press Albany
- BARTÓK, Béla 1990  
*A magyar népdal* [The Hungarian folksong]. *Bartók Béla írásai*, 5. Ed. Dorrit Révész. Editio Musica Budapest
- BARTÓK, Béla 1991  
*Magyar Népdalok. Egyetemes Gyűjtemény* [Hungarian folksongs. Complete collection] I. A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia megbízásából 1934-től 1940-ig [Upon the request of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences 1934–40]. Eds. Sándor Kovács and Ferenc Sebő. Akadémiai Kiadó Budapest. Cf. BARTÓK 1993.
- BARTÓK, Béla 1993  
*Hungarian Folk Songs. Complete collection*. Eds. Sándor Kovács, Ferenc Sebő. Akadémiai Kiadó Budapest
- BARTÓK, Béla – KODÁLY, Zoltán 1906  
 Magyar népdalok. Előszó [Hungarian folksongs. Foreword] *Visszatekintés* [Retrospection] I. 9–10.
- BARTÓK, Béla – KODÁLY, Zoltán 1913  
 Az új egyetemes népdalgyűjtemény tervezete [Plan of the new comprehensive folksong collection]. *Visszatekintés* [Retrospection] II. 48–52.
- CMPH =  
*Corpus Musicae Popularis Hungaricae – A Magyar Népzene Tára – Collection of Hungarian Folk Music*. Edited/established by Béla Bartók and Zoltán Kodály. Budapest
- I. *Gyermekjátékok* [Childrens' games]. Ed. György Kerényi. 1951, Akadémiai Kiadó
- II. *Jeles napok* [Calendar customs]. Ed. György Kerényi. 1953, Akadémiai Kiadó
- III/AB *Lakodalom* [Wedding]. Ed. Lajos Kiss. 1955/56, Akadémiai Kiadó Budapest
- IV. *Párosítók* [Match-making songs]. Ed. György Kerényi. 1959, Akadémiai Kiadó
- V. *Síratók–Laments*. Ed. Lajos Kiss, Benjamin Rajeczky. 1966, Akadémiai Kiadó
- VI. *Népdaltípusok – Types of Folksongs 1*. Ed. Pál Járdányi, Imre Olsvai. 1973, Akadémiai Kiadó
- VII. *Népdaltípusok – Types of Folksongs 2*. Ed. Imre Olsvai. 1987, Akadémiai Kiadó
- VIII/AB *Népdaltípusok – Types of Folksongs 3*. Ed. Lajos Vargyas. 1992, Akadémiai Kiadó – Balassi Kiadó
- IX. *Népdaltípusok – Types of Folksongs 4*. Ed. Mária Domokos. 1995, Balassi Kiadó
- X. *Népdaltípusok – Types of Folksongs 5*. Ed. Katalin Paksa. 1997, Balassi Kiadó

- DOBSZAY, László – SZENDREI, Janka 1992  
*Catalogue of Hungarian Folksong Types – Arranged According to Styles*. Institute for Musicology of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences Budapest
- JAGAMAS, János 1984  
*Magyaró énekes népzeneje. Egy Felső-Maros menti falu magyar néphagyományaiából* [The vocal folk music of Magyaró. From the Hungarian folk traditions of a village along the Upper Maros river]. Kriterion Bukarest
- JAGAMAS, János – FARAGÓ, József 1974  
*Romániai magyar népdalok* [Hungarian folksongs in Romania]. Kriterion Bukarest
- JÁRDÁNYI, Pál 1961  
*Magyar népdaltípusok* [Types of Hungarian folksongs] I–II. Akadémiai Kiadó Budapest. Cf. JÁRDÁNYI 1964
- JÁRDÁNYI, Pál 1964  
*Ungarische Volksliedtypen* I–II. Akadémiai Kiadó Budapest
- JÁRDÁNYI, Pál 1966  
 Magyar népzene [Hungarian folk music]. *Járdányi Pál összegyűjtött írásai* [Collected Writings]. Ed. Melinda Berlász. MTA Zenetudományi Intézete Budapest 2000, 93–128
- Kodály emlékkönyv* [In memory of Kodály] Magyar zenetörténeti tanulmányok. 1997. Ed. Ferenc Bónis. Püski Kiadó Budapest
- KODÁLY, Zoltán 1906  
 see BARTÓK, Béla – KODÁLY, Zoltán
- KODÁLY, Zoltán 1913  
 see BARTÓK, Béla – KODÁLY, Zoltán
- KODÁLY, Zoltán 1923  
 A zenei folklore fejlődése [The development of music folklore]. *Visszatekintés* [Retrospection] II. 97–98
- KODÁLY, Zoltán 1937  
 A magyar népzene [Hungarian folkmusic]. *A magyarság néprajza* IV. 5–75. A 3. kiadástól (1952) példatárral, összeállította Vargyas Lajos [with a collection of examples from the 3rd edition, compiled by Lajos Vargyas]. Cf. KODÁLY 1956b, 1960, 1969a, 1971
- KODÁLY, Zoltán 1942  
 A magyar zenei élet időszerű kérdéseiről [On topical questions of the Hungarian music life]. *Visszatekintés* [Retrospection] III. 54–55
- KODÁLY, Zoltán 1943  
 Népzeneink [Our folk music]. *Visszatekintés* [Retrospection] III. 373–387
- KODÁLY, Zoltán 1952  
 A népzene kutatás jövője [The future of folk music research]. *Visszatekintés* [Retrospection] II. 198–200
- KODÁLY, Zoltán 1953a  
 A népdalkiadás és a Magyar Tudományos Akadémia [Folksong publication and the Hungarian Academy of Sciences]. *Visszatekintés* [Retrospection] III. 390
- KODÁLY, Zoltán 1953b  
 Népi és egyéni műalkotás a zenetörténetben. Hozzászólás Szabolcsi Bence előadásá-

- hoz [Folk and individual creation in the history of music. Comments inspired by the lecture of Bence Szabolcsi]. *Visszatekintés* [Retrospection] III. 420–421
- KODÁLY, Zoltán 1956a  
Az összehasonlító népdalkutatás előfeltétele [The precondition of comparative folk song research]. *Visszatekintés* [Retrospection] II. 210–211
- KODÁLY, Zoltán 1956b  
*Die ungarische Volksmusik*. Corvina Budapest. Cf. KODÁLY 1937
- KODÁLY, Zoltán 1959  
A Néprajzi Társaság fennállásának 70. évfordulóján [On the 70th anniversary of the foundation of the Ethnographic Society] *Visszatekintés* [Retrospection] II. 214–215
- KODÁLY, Zoltán 1960  
*Folk Music of Hungary*. Corvina Budapest. Cf. KODÁLY 1937
- KODÁLY, Zoltán 1964a  
*Visszatekintés* [Retrospection] I–II. Összegyűjtött írások, beszédek, nyilatkozatok [Collected speeches, writings, declarations]. Ed. Ferenc Bónis. Zeneműkiadó Budapest. <sup>2</sup>1975, <sup>3</sup>1982. Selection in English: KODÁLY 1974. See also KODÁLY 1989a
- KODÁLY, Zoltán 1964b  
Nemzetközi Népzenei Tanács budapesti konferenciáján. Elnöki megnyitó [The Budapest conference of the International Folk Music Council. Opening address by the president]. *Visszatekintés* [Retrospection] III. 400
- KODÁLY, Zoltán 1965a  
Párizsi beszélgetés [Paris conversation]. *Visszatekintés* [Retrospection] III. 576–579
- KODÁLY, Zoltán 1965b  
Önarckép [Self-portrait]. *Visszatekintés* [Retrospection] III. 584–589
- KODÁLY, Zoltán 1965c  
A Nemzetközi Népzenei Tanács budapesti konferenciája után. Nyilatkozat [After the Budapest conference of the International Folk Music Council. Statement] *Visszatekintés* [Retrospection] III. 401
- KODÁLY, Zoltán 1966a  
*Mein Weg zur Musik*. Fünf Gespräche mit Lutz Besch. Im Verlag der Arche in Zürich. Cf. KODÁLY 1969b
- KODÁLY, Zoltán 1966b  
Járdányi Pál halálára [Upon the death of Pál Járdányi]. *Visszatekintés* [Retrospection] III. 465
- KODÁLY, Zoltán 1969a  
*A magyar népzene* [Hungarian Folk Music] 4th edition. Zeneműkiadó Budapest. Cf. KODÁLY 1937
- KODÁLY, Zoltán 1969b  
*Utam a zenéhez*. Öt beszélgetés Lutz Besch-sel [My road to music. Five conversations with Lutz Besch] Zeneműkiadó Budapest. In *Visszatekintés* [Retrospection] III. 547–572. Cf. Kodály 1966a
- KODÁLY, Zoltán 1971  
*Folk Music of Hungary*. Enlarged edition revised by Lajos Vargyas. Corvina Budapest. Cf. KODÁLY 1937

- KODÁLY, Zoltán 1974  
*The Selected Writings of* —. Ed. Ferenc Bónis. Corvina Press Budapest
- KODÁLY, Zoltán 1989a  
*Visszatekintés III. Hátrahagyott írások, beszédek, nyilatkozatok* [Retrospection. Posthumous writings, speeches, declarations]. Ed. Ferenc Bónis. Zeneműkiadó Budapest.  
 Cf. KODÁLY 1964a
- KODÁLY Zoltán 1989b  
*Közélet, vallomások, zeneélet* [Publicity, confessions, music life]. Ed. Lajos Vargyas. Szépirodalmi Kiadó. Budapest
- KODÁLY Zoltán 1993  
*Magyar zene, magyar nyelv, magyar vers* [Hungarian music, Hungarian language, Hungarian verse]. Ed. Lajos Vargyas. Szépirodalmi kiadó Budapest
- Kodály Zoltán levelei* [Letters by Zoltán Kodály]. Ed. Dezső Legány. 1982, Budapest
- OLSAI, Imre 1978  
 Melodiensystematisierung der ungarischen Volksmusik bis 1975. *Studia Musicologica* (XX) 319–338
- OLSAI, Imre 1981  
 A magyar népzene egyik fő rétegének rokonnépi kapcsolatai [Analogies of one of the main layers of Hungarian folk music in the music of a linguistically related people]. In *Congressus Quartus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum*. Pars IV. 58–77
- SZENIK, Ilona 1996  
*Erdélyi és moldvai magyar siratók, siratóparódiák és halottas énekek* [Hungarian laments, lament parodies and funeral songs from Transylvania and Moldavia]. Kriterion Kolozsvár–Bukarest
- VARGYAS, Lajos 1961  
 Folk Music Research in Hungary. *Studia Musicologica* (I) 433–449
- VARGYAS, Lajos 1967  
 The Last Legacy: the Bartók–Kodály Corpus of Folk Music. *Hungarian Survey*. Vol. II, 114–123
- VARGYAS, Lajos 1977  
 Járdányi Pál, a népzene kutató [Pál Járdányi, the ethnomusicologist]. *Keleti hagyomány, nyugati kultúra*. Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó 1984, Budapest. 403–414
- VARGYAS, Lajos 1982  
 Kodály, a tudós és tudósnevelő [Kodály, the scholar and educator]. *Keleti hagyomány, nyugati kultúra*. Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó 1984, Budapest. 355–374
- VIKÁR, László 1992  
 Járdányi Pál “Törvénykönyv”-e [Pál Járdányi’s Law Book]. *Magyar Zene* (XXXIII) 1. 19–22
- VIKÁR, László 1997  
 Kodály Zoltán, a Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Népzene kutató Csoportjának igazgatója [Zoltán Kodály, the director of the Folk Music Research Group of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences]. *Kodály emlékkönyv* 113–117
- Visszatekintés* [Retrospection]  
 see KODÁLY, Zoltán 1966a, 1989a