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Vinko Žganec's Collection of Croatian Folk Songs from Muce in 1924 shows important connections with Hungarian folk music, especially with its Old (pentatonic) style. In Žganec's later publications we can see the interaction between Croatian and Hungarian music styles as well as some common melody-types which have derived from other routes. The author expounds three groups of examples containing melody-types of Croatian-Hungarian folk music connections. The first group comprises examples of Croatian, Central-Slavic and Common-European influence in Hungarian folk music. The second shows intersections between and syntheses of Croatian and Hungarian musical elements and components. The third group points to the influence of Hungarian styles in Croatian folk music.

Béla Bartók's original plan in 1906, was to study on the spot every neighbouring people's folk music, along with Hungarian folk music, and finally to build the comparative ethnomusicology of the Eastern-Central European nations, on the basis of the collected material and its analysis. Unfortunately, the first world war and its aftermaths wrecked his plans, and he was unable completely to pass among all the peoples neighbouring the Hungarians. He was able to collect Slovak and Romanian folk music in large quantities, Ukrainian, Serbian, German and Gypsy folk music in a small degree; but Serbian and German music was studied by him only in Banat Region (east of the Tisza river). Thus, he failed to collect Croatian music at all.
In 1933 Bartók summed up his comparative studies of the folk music of the Hungarian and their neighbours, at first in radio lectures, later in publication, and these studies included extensive material of other collectors too (cca 20-25,000 melodies). Giving an account of the Yugoslav material of Vladimir R. Đorđević, Ludvik Kuba and Franjo S. Kuhač he had studied, he did not see any notable connection with Hungarian folk music, but Žganec’s publication: HRVATSKJE PUČKE POPJEVKVE IZ MEDIMURJA (1924) points to just such an important connection. According to Bartók, 389 melodies from Medimurje (Mura kôz) have Hungarian musical characteristics, i.e. 60% of the entire material. The inner division is even more interesting: 190 melodies have the character of the "Old (pentatonic) Style" of Hungarian folk music, 158 of the "New Style", and 41 melodies also have the so-called "dotted rhythm" with other stylistic character. Bartók’s main surprise and delight was the percentage of pentatonic Old Style: 30%.

In Žganec’s later collections (published between 1950-1964) we can see the interaction between Croatian and Hungarian music styles, as well as some common melody-types which have derived from archaic general-European, probably Roman or Byzantine, and other routes. I studied the following publications:

- Žganec: Medimurje u svojim pjesmama (1957) with 163 melodies;
- Žganec: Hrvatske narodne popijeve iz Koprivnice i okoline (1962) with cca 400 melodies;
- Žganec: Narodne popijeve Hrvatskog Zagorja (1950) with 752 melodies;

I also studied the collection HRVATSKJE NARODNE PIJESME KAJKAVSKJE (1950), but the bulk of its melodies is taken from the first Medimurje Collection. Altogether, with the first Medimurje Collection material, cca 2200 Croatian melodies collected resp. published by Žganec were studied and compared with Hungarian folk music material. According to Bartók’s opinion, which I share, the numerical data of musical connexion between the two peoples are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence of Croatian, Central-Slavic and general-European melody styles in Hungarian folk music</th>
<th>Influence of Hungarian melody styles in Croatian folk music</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEDIMURJE 1924</td>
<td>* 190 30% 158 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIMURJE 1957</td>
<td>* 38 23% 74 45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOPRIVNICA</td>
<td>48 12% 67 17% 30 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAGORJE</td>
<td>58 8% 18 2.5% 21 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADISČE</td>
<td>47 18% 8 3% 11 4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all: 153 11% 321 15% 294 13% |

* Unfortunately, I still have not studied it.
The Croatian influence appears mainly in the Transdanubian Dialect Area of Hungarian folk music, but there are a few characteristic Croatian (archaic Slavic) melodies found in the North-Western edge of Hungarian language territory, very near to the Slovak people, but absent among Transdanubian Hungarians.

Bartók had stated, in 1921 that there were four dialect areas in Hungarian folk music according to characteristic features of the Old Style; in the Forties-Fifties Pal Peter Domokos and Janos Jagamas supplemented Bartók's division with a fifth dialect area. According to them, these areas are the following:

I. Transdanubia (including the Hungarian national minority in Croatia, Slovenia and Austria);
II. Northern Area (including Hung. nat. min. of ČS and SU);
III. The Great Plain (inclu. Hung. nat. min. of Vojvodina and Western Romania);
IV. Transylvania
V. Moldavia (both of them meaning Hung. nat. minorities of RO).
(see the map)
Because of time limitations I cannot demonstrate all the examples, all melody-types of Croatian-Hungarian folk music connections. Still I shall try to present as many as is possible.

The first group of examples: Croatian, Slavonian (Central-Slav, common-European) influence in Hungarian folk music.

Hungarian dance-tune from Western Transdanubia. Hungarian dance-tune from Western Transdanubia (see enclosed music examples 1a and 1b), Croatian variants of this melody are: MEDUMURJE 134, ZAGORJE 745 (see music examples attached to this paper), very near relative tune is ZAGORJE 333.

Croatian variants of this melody are: MEDIMURJE 134, ZAGORJE 745.

Very near relative tune is: ZAGORJE 333.

The next lives in the North-Western area, near to the Slovak language-border (music example 2, Croatian variant of this melody is ZAGORJE 189).

The next dance-tune lives only in one Southern Transdanubian village. I haven't found any Croatian variant of it till now, but its stylistic character shows Croatian (or perhaps Serbian) features, I show two variants, because of the differing ending tone. The first variant was recorded by phonograph cylinder in 1936 (music example 3a).

The melody ending - the so-called "half-closing" RE instead of DO- is very characteristic in Croatian, Serbian etc. folk music. It comes from two-part performance, (demonstration on instrument, if it is available). Later collectors in the same village could record - on gramophone disk or by tape-recorder - variants ending only on DO (mus. ex. 3b).

Although no Croatian variant has appeared till now, it is my belief that this melody - type is of Croatian origin.

The Saint Blaise greeting song of Transdanubian Hungarians is definitely of Croatian origin (mus. ex. 4).

The Croatian variant of this is published in GRADIŠČE 252.

The second group of examples shows interactions and syntheses of Croatian and Hungarian musical elements and musical components.

There is a Transdanubian dance-melody with very characteristic rhythm, which has three branches of structure-types, or more correctly: subtypes (see the next page). Two subtypes agree with the general Old Style regularities, since both of them begin with an octave and their first section moves between the octave and fifth (mus. ex. 5/1, 5/2).

This was the "High" Subtype with the structure formula: A5 A5 A Av. The "Middle" Subtype has A5 A A A5 structure. But the third subtype - built from the same motifs - begins in the lower range, its first and third section moves between the fifth and the basic-tone, and the second section moves higher. Its structural formula is a little complicated: A B Av C, - but the "C" motif is a transposed variant of "B". May I introduce this subtype with two variants: first from Eastern Trans-Danubia (mus. ex. 5a), the second one from the Hungarian minority of Eastern Slavonia (mus. ex. 5b).
Subtypes:

**High**

**Middle**

**Deep**

I.: \( A^5 \)  \( A^5 \downarrow \)  \( A \)  \( A^6 \downarrow \)  
II.: \( A^5 \)  \( A \)  \( A \)  \( A^5 \downarrow \)  
III.: \( A \)  \( B \)  \( A \)  \( C \)  or  
\( A \)  \( B^x \)  \( A \)  \( B^x \)  

The melody structure of this "Deep" subtype is close to the "New Style" but without the most decisive element of that style, i.e. the identity of the first and fourth sections as in motif (musical content) and in height. Also the rhythm type deviates completely from that of the New Style tunes. The same structure and just the same rhythm appears in melodies from Hrvatsko Zagorje, represented by more variants. May I show two variants: ZAGORJE 70a II., 71a (mus. ex. 6/1). In the light of these tunes, we can see the synthesis between Croatian structure and Hungarian motifs.

Another interesting group of interaction has still more branches. All Hungarian variants move in minor-like scales, while the Croatian tunes move both in minor - and major-like scales, but the latter have ending on RE (i.e. "half-coding") similarity to all as well as all variants of North-Eastern Croatian ethnic groups living in Southern Hungary (Croatians of Lower Drava region, Bunjevatcze, Skokatsce etc.)

At first let us hear a Hungarian variant from Eastern Transdanubia: (mus. ex. 6a).

The second variant is a Croatian one from the left bank of the Drava, very near to the Eastern corner of Međimurje: (mus. ex. 6b).

Very close to this are two Croatian variants from the Valpovo district, collected by Stepan Stepanov: No 9634, 11074.

The third branch of this type-family has been developed by Hungarians in Southern Transdanubia, with new rhythmic feature in the second half of the melody: (mus. ex. 6c).

The fourth branch is a "Becarac" melody type of Croatians with the same rhythmic structure and with similar melody formula (with Coda-like additions) but in an other scale: (mus. ex. 6d).
The third group of examples show influence of Hungarian styles in Croatian folk music. Bartók revealed the melodic influence, but there is also a characteristic rhythmic formula of Transdanubian Hungarians which also appears among tunes from Medimurje and Zagorje. Originally, Bartók found the ending formula:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{\textsuperscript{0}} \text{\textsuperscript{1}} \text{\textsuperscript{2}} \text{\textsuperscript{3}} \text{\textsuperscript{4}} \text{\textsuperscript{5}} \text{\textsuperscript{6}} \text{\textsuperscript{7}} \text{\textsuperscript{8}} \\
\text{\textsuperscript{9}} \text{\textsuperscript{10}} \text{\textsuperscript{11}} \text{\textsuperscript{12}} \text{\textsuperscript{13}} \text{\textsuperscript{14}} \text{\textsuperscript{15}} \text{\textsuperscript{16}} \text{\textsuperscript{17}} \\
\end{array} \]

in Parlango and Rubato melodies with four-sectioned, eight-syllabled structure. Nowadays, this formula (and its variants) appear also in six-, ten- and twelve-syllabled melodies, as well as in a few Giusto-melodies! Some of their characteristic rhythmic endings are:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{\textsuperscript{1}} \text{\textsuperscript{2}} \text{\textsuperscript{3}} \\
\text{\textsuperscript{4}} \text{\textsuperscript{5}} \text{\textsuperscript{6}} \\
\end{array} \]

or

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{\textsuperscript{7}} \text{\textsuperscript{8}} \text{\textsuperscript{9}} \\
\text{\textsuperscript{10}} \text{\textsuperscript{11}} \text{\textsuperscript{12}} \\
\end{array} \]

or

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{\textsuperscript{13}} \text{\textsuperscript{14}} \text{\textsuperscript{15}} \\
\text{\textsuperscript{16}} \text{\textsuperscript{17}} \text{\textsuperscript{18}} \\
\end{array} \] (etc.)

In Žganec's two most extensive materials one can find 99 tune variants with clear or faded notation of this rhythm-closing in the next division:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllabic structure</th>
<th>6 (and 12)</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>In all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEDIMURJE 1924</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAGORJE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all 59 46 3 99

I should like to introduce 16 groups of examples to show the characteristic influence of Hungarian music styles in Croatian folk music. The same melody types are living and were collected both among the Croatian minority of Hungary among Croatian people of Medimurje, Zagorje, Podravina etc. How many tunes can I, may I, show to You?

Ethnomusicology, especially comparative research among neighboring peoples, is justifiably grateful to Vinko Žganec, who himself collected, analyzed and published as much as Lajos Kiss, Tibor Vujčić, Ernő Eperjessy and other collectors together in this field. Žganec's scientific work is a very valuable addition to Bartók's and Kodály's foundations, and Hungarian researchers hold him in the same respect.
Appendix

The rhythmic ending-formula

\[ \text{\{} \dot{\dddot{\text{}}}, \dot{\dddot{\text{}}} \text{\}} \]

or \[ \text{\{} \dot{\dddot{\text{}}}, \dddot{\text{}} \text{\}} \text{\} etc.} \]

appears in the next variants of Žganec’s collections from Medimurje and Zagorje:

*In 6 (or 12) syllabic structure:*


ZAGORJE: 92, 125, 126, 132, 140, 141d, 152a, 153, 493.

*In 8 syllabic structure:*


*In 10 syllabic structure:*

MEDIMURJE: 369.

ZAGORJE: 623, 624b.


(played by 5-piece peasant band: 1st and 2nd violins, viola, double-bass, cymbals).

1.a)

120 from Balog, Somogy County, 1922. Credby: Zoltán Kudaly.

an early use with wood, but not recorded. Further use see in CMFS Vol. 3.

1. Cveti, cveti šipek, jagoda.

Josip Horvat. Macincl.

Cviti cveši šipek jagoda, jagoda, ne daj me ne, majka,

Kaj bum vidla Janka Mihaleka

745

1. Debi veče, gospodar, Miro-je, miro-ljub lju-decm, Miro-je.
2. Sinek doh: želi mi, Miro-je, skrom prekrit o-vej aten, Miro-je.

(No tem pte-veš le-tu, Miro-je, Miro-jo ra sí-le aue-ka.)

46
2.

1. A kék 6-es az, az öögöm, 
2. Há értem az unga nem vagyok én oka.

Nagy a fekete föld Poszt-szon bő és gőm. 
Nem én az ő gyermék nem szerettem az-ka.

Vona, in Stanzas

3. Aki és az szeretem, 
Ez van az szeretem. 
Ha rátekintek is, 
Előkérd névetve, etc.

Further Vona, see in 

18a.

Szelava

1. 2. 3. 4.

Ne-fonc - bre-tec - ko-njo - čn

Zenye, ze-tra De - ri - ca

Én-vie-ke da - je. (Spod o - re-

Ho-ma, spod ze - le - no - od)

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

Von

Savle-ke da - je.
“Koszihala” (Maidens’ round dance) from Komád, Somogy County, 1996. Collected by Boldizsár Komári.

5.a) Sőrök a la-má-di jutót, Szétsz a ma-gyar katonát.

5.b) Csak hadd szédljék, csak hadd vigyék. Csak egymással el nem vigyék!

(Tran. v. - somewhat because of stage-fright) from Komád, Somogy County, 1996. Collected by Boldizsár Komári.

1. Sőrök a la-má-di jutót, Szétsz a ma-gyar katonát.
2. E-kidandók é-kidandók, Kátó-k sőn létten volna.

1. Csak hadd szédljék, csak hadd vigyék. Csak egymással el nem vigyék!
2. Nagy a bűkedés-be zin-garóv, Aa-so-bánum be-lizávov, etc.
Saint Blaise greeting from Roznai, Vas County. 1968. Coda by:
Árpád Széketi.

1. Ez a-kázzal Szent Lászlóval, eljutt tár a napja.
2. Gázla, gyorsan kelj fel mostan hozni ne-közöd jó bort,

Hozzunk ne-ta ta Altaja zs-tot-ja. 0-köl-öl a húszak,
A-ért vagy a kéznél, mindennel, mindeneket csak hozd. Nem, a nyárunk üres,

aszonyunk u-rá-uk, hogy húszádik ö-kazóval, ugyan ezt te-ni-ja.
A he-nünk is ihás, Ne szállíjad szellemeket, nekünk jól mágyarod.

Allargilo A ABCD,3-14 14-1015 Frakana (176)

252

Spó-men-te se a de-nis róga sou-ta-ga hí-ha-pa

Szolokosga re-da. Radat o-uj hí-zi i-no soj druži-ni.

ki van to-do blo-go-do-est va soem ve-jon zik-ki

O-modo dimum va-re elig-num laudas flormi dem-ni-ne!

lo-bus k¿pus au gi-lo-num.
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Haiduns' round dance from Károly, Baranya County, 1966.
Geogy: Géza Kis.

5/1

The "high" subtype

Eve. szu-ver. 0-va. Most á-rék a szil-ver.

Te-ket ve az al-ja, fülszé-length haj-vel-re.

(I love and courtival song) from László, Somogy County, between 1930-1939 (from our information), Geogy: Imre Olvasi.

5/2

The "middle" subtype

Itt is kö-zo lúmsa, él is kö-zo zénásia.

A legyene sít-tri-tíz-sa, nég-is in-sz-szamás.

Haiduns' round dance from Édesakadámy, Baranya County, 1960.
Geogy: Lejoe Keys.

5.a

2. Sérnok az a hajnal Ne-ké-ly tan-fa-ma, An stan-san

Te-ket ve az al-ja, fülszé-length haj-vel-re.

Hogy a saa-rez-célk Vá-ge na saa-vadna.
Mért nén vil-degsztál Mindan fa te-tejéa. etc.

5.b

A gána van az 0-l-ba. A gána-van-tó-ba.
A gána-van-tó-ba.

Hogy ha ne em- goszína Virágos kis kertbe.

"Bacidat" (Vernal round dance of the haiduns) from Szécsényi - László.
Dance tune with mocking words from Baranya, Zala County, 1951. Cădău: György Baráth, János Baráth and Béla Hoffer.

6.a)

(a) 1. Borász elő lugy a pörkát a, tószék, végje ki a
2. Huragaszzunk a bába, gazdák, jeljöjtek az

Lég szémét a holió, reform: Mégéj ürege, az csalézh a baj-és. Cseki, J

Mégéj, ném sárgá-ra. Ti ed léssz a vörösanyaga szána!

from Öztisza-Reventhalhely, Zala County, 1959. Cădău: Jánó

6.b)

(Groat, words)

Dance tune with love words from Sárpilló, Tolna County, 1954. Cădău: Jánó

6.a)

(played on the "torbanás")

an early var, with words see in BARTOK: No. 5251

"Mácsárás" from Lakke, Somogy County, 1971. Cădău: Jánó Baráth

6.a)

(Groat, words)

Abbreviations:

Cădău = collected by Folk. Magy. = 1956.