

ARTICLES

Contemplating Music and the Boundaries of Identity: Attitudes and Opinions Regarding the Effect of Ottoman Turkish Contact on Bulgarian and Macedonian Folk Musics

Karen A. Peters

University of Wisconsin-Madison

“It is ... preposterous to look for an Ottoman legacy in
the Balkans. The Balkans are the Ottoman legacy.”

Maria Todorova [1996:46]

Introduction: Contemplating Musical Boundaries and National Borders

In the course of the fieldwork that I completed in Southwest Bulgaria prior to writing my dissertation [Peters 2002], I recorded a dozen representative events, primarily informal celebrations, all hosted or attended by the group of friends whose musical practice was my study's point of departure [Peters 2002: 208-10].(1) Informal group singing was a significant activity on such occasions, and I observed that approximately 80% of the songs sung in the course of these recorded events could be divided roughly equally into Bulgarian songs and Macedonian songs [Peters 2002: 208, 211-12].(2) In Bulgaria, “Macedonian” is generally understood as a regional designation referring to its southwest corner, which along with much of Northern Greece, a bit of Albania, and the entire Republic of Macedonia, forms geographic Macedonia (Figure 1). Furthermore, this designation is often understood in the same sense when applied beyond Bulgaria's national borders: as recently as 1999, an estimated 51% of the Bulgarian population still considered the Republic of Macedonia's Macedonian population to be ethnically Bulgarian [Stoyanova-Boneva, Nikolov, and Roudometof 2000: 239, citing survey statistics from Analytical Creative Group 1999]. In the Republic of Macedonia, however, where most of the Macedonian songs in question are also commonly sung, “Macedonian” is in no way considered to signify “Bulgarian,” but is rather an ethnonational designation in its own right. In other words, the proper ascription of Macedonian songs, and indeed of the Macedonians themselves, has at times been a bone of contention between the two countries, among others.(3)

Ascription of Macedonian songs as regional or national is not the only aspect of song repertoire that has been viewed differently by Bulgarians and Macedonians. Scholars and others in Bulgaria and the former Yugoslavia have at times held differing views regarding the relative significance and quality of their village and urban song. In the case of Bulgaria, village music and folklore were valorized and utilized in the construction of a unified national identity [see, e.g., Buchanan 1991, Rice 1994, and Silverman 1983 and 1989].(4) Thus one of the more remarkable things about the songs that I encountered during the course of my fieldwork was that, for the most part, they were not examples of the village folklore that was represented in the pre-1990s Bulgarian

literature to the near exclusion of everything else,(5) but rather of urban folk and popular songs. I later found that had I begun my research with Macedonian sources rather than Bulgarian, I would have been presented with a somewhat different point of view, as Macedonian scholars have long accepted their cosmopolitan, multi-ethnic urban music as being emblematic of Macedonian identity and therefore worthy of study and note.

In this article, then, I will present descriptions of, and attitudes expressed towards, Bulgarian and Macedonian village and urban song, as found in the writings of two representative music scholars, one Bulgarian and the other Macedonian. In so doing, I will foreground the differences in these opinions and attitudes as regards the presence of foreign musical features in these songs, with particular attention to those often considered to have been derived from Ottoman Turkish classical music. Finally, I will argue that these differences in attitude may be attributed at least in part to modern Bulgarian and Macedonian identity construction projects, which intensified with the attempted superimposition of mononational borders on the multicultural Balkans as the Ottoman Empire disintegrated in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In the Bulgarian case, it is noteworthy that certain of these attitudes and opinions continue to be held by particular segments of Bulgarian society as that country increases its attention to its image abroad in anticipation of membership in the European Union beginning in 2007.

The Historical Bulgarian Perspective: Village (Folk) and Urban Song

The Bulgarian urban song has had a relatively short road of development. Appearing around the middle of the [nineteenth] century, it did not succeed in expressing the important characteristics of the life of the people, of its feelings and mood. Its musical worthiness is far from that of the village folk song. A large part of the urban songs were born and died as ephemera, responding to the topical, the shocking, and the short-lived, scooped up many times from the filthy lower strata of the bourgeois-capitalist city. More valuable and meaningful are the revolutionary songs of the Bulgarian proletariat [Kaufman 1967:56].(6)

From the late nineteenth century until fairly recently, most Bulgarian folklorists and musicologists were almost exclusively concerned with their village folk music, which was considered to be purely Bulgarian and therefore an important factor in the project of identifying, describing, and defining modern Bulgarian identity as a whole. Bulgaria's multicultural urban music, on the other hand, was considered lacking in the "purity" attributed to village music and was not similarly valued. Nevertheless, between 1952 and 1966, the eminent Bulgarian scholar Nikolai Kaufman managed to take time from his engagement with the collection and study of Bulgarian village song to research and write a book about Bulgarian urban song. The book, *Bŭlgarski gradski pesni* (1968), consists of an extended essay followed by a collection of 580 songs and variants, most of them predating the end of the Second World War. Not surprisingly, a number of these songs can be considered Macedonian, a fact that has led Macedonian ethnomusicologist Ćorgi Ćorgiev – whose opinions will be examined presently – to accuse Kaufman of "mystification" [1986: 103].

In his book, Kaufman compiles a list of differences between Bulgarian urban and village song [1968: 13-14]; these are reproduced in Figure 2. Some items on the list speak to differences between the way of life

and worldview of urban and village populations that are reflected in the songs they create and the circumstances of their creation and performance, while other items deal with structural characteristics such as musical meter, scale or mode, and form. A curious aspect of these structural characteristics is the apparent absence of Turkish and Greek musical features – this, in spite of the fact that Kaufman elsewhere asserts that Bulgaria’s early urban songs “were largely a product” of the urban songs of these peoples [1980: 436]. Instead, the musical characteristics by which he distinguishes Bulgarian urban song from village song appear to be largely Western European: the predominant use of simple and compound musical meters; the use of major/minor tonality and functional harmony; melodies that utilize triadic movement; and symmetrical, quadratic phrase structures.(7)

In fact, Kaufman expressed great antipathy towards Turkish music, an antipathy in keeping with a general post-World War II Bulgarian government policy that culminated in the Todor Zhivkov regime’s attempt to forcibly assimilate the country’s Turkish minority in the 1980s [Silverman 1989:147-48]. Kaufman wrote that the musical culture of the Turks living in Ottoman Bulgarian towns was on a much lower level than that of the Bulgarians. He asserted that even at the time of his writing, Turks living in Bulgaria continued to sing primarily love songs whose subject matter he described as “thematically poor” (*bedni tematicchno*). While Kaufman did not dispute what was considered their generally high poetic quality, he nevertheless characterized these songs as “fundamentally erotic, often nourishing bad taste” (*v osnovata si e erotichna, podkhranvashta chesto loshite vkusove*), and hence inappropriate for the nineteenth century Bulgarian youth who sang them. He further portrayed the melody of Turkish song as “monotonous” (*ednoobrazna*) and “maudlin” (mawkish, syrupy) (*sladnikava*). In general, Kaufman maintained that the meter, ornamentation, and melodic material – based on Turkish modes (*makamlar*) employing augmented seconds in a manner different, he maintained, from that found in the native Bulgarian village folk song – were sufficiently foreign to require a song’s Bulgarization in order to gain acceptance among the Bulgarian populace [1968: 25-26, 71-73, and *passim*].(8)

While there is no doubt that the Bulgarian urban population was inclined to Bulgarize foreign borrowings to a greater or lesser extent – and not only in cases of adaptation of Turkish songs [Kaufman 1968: 10-11, 16, 26-27, and *passim*] – I suspect that Turkish music was not really so foreign to the Bulgarian urban populace of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as Kaufman represents. Recent writings on the subject of contemporary Bulgarian ethnopop music discuss that music’s antecedents not only in terms of older urban songs such as those found in Kaufman’s study, but also in terms of an instrumental practice called *chalga* (or *chalgiia*)(9) with a repertoire that Bulgarian musicologist Rozmari Stelova describes as “[having] an eclectic character and [reflecting] the intonational appearance of the Balkan town in the middle of the 19th century” [1999: 14].(10) Stelova goes on to quote Bulgarian musicologist Elizaveta Vŭlchinova’s description of *chalga* as encompassing:

popular Bulgarian folk songs, dances, and instrumental melodies; folk melodies and dances characteristic of the minorities, folklore forms of the neighboring Balkan peoples, European dances that were fashionable at that time such as the waltz, polka, and mazurka; and melodies of urban songs widely distributed [throughout Bulgaria] ... [1999: 14-15, quoting Vŭlchinova 1989:136].(11)

Hence, I suspect that less-Bulgarized Turkish or Turkish-style songs may have been consciously omitted from Kaufman's collection, along with other songs that may have been deemed ideologically inappropriate. Even if such editorial bowdlerizing was practiced, however, it apparently was not enough to "redeem" urban song in Kaufman's eyes: as expressed in his book, Kaufman's opinion is that Bulgarian urban song is on the whole poorer than Bulgarian village song, exhibiting as it does less musical and textual diversity, less amenability to flexible treatment, and ultimately less polish as a result of not undergoing continual communal re-creation. Whether or not Kaufman's opinion is accepted as stated – and indeed, there is good reason to suspect that he was not completely free to express his own opinion (12) – it reflects the dominant political ideology typical of that era, forming as it does part of his overall negative characterization of many of these songs as products of a "bourgeois-capitalist" urban environment, as in the quote that heads this section [cf. Dimov 1999: 53-54].

It should be noted, however, that denigration of urban music preceded the establishment of the (Socialist) People's Republic of Bulgaria in 1944. As I noted earlier, village music was privileged by late nineteenth century Bulgarian folklorists and other intellectuals as a pure expression, even an artifact, of Bulgarian identity, while urban music was described as "insipid" and "lowbrow." To some extent, this negative attitude towards urban music clearly had something to do with its foreign content, but budding Bulgarian nationalism may not have been solely to blame. In an effort to align itself with Western Europe, characterized as civilized and culturally superior, and to distance itself from its recent Ottoman past, Turkish and Romani musical characteristics were disparaged by Bulgarian intellectuals, who associated these manifestations of "oriental" [*orientalna*] culture with backwardness, with the primitive and the uncivilized [Dimov 1995: 11, Levy 1999 :66-67] – associations still made in certain Bulgarian circles to this day [Dimov 1999: 46, 53-56; Levy 1999: 66 and 2000: 69-72].

The Macedonian Perspective: "Older" and "Newer Urban" Folk Song

Here should be emphasized the boundless function and power of music as a medium for inter-regional communication that smashes all barriers and rises above antagonism and divisions between people. On this basis, Macedonians spontaneously absorbed the beautiful from the music of the Turks who were their enslavers [Ćorgiev 1992: 14].

In contrast to the situation described for Bulgaria, Macedonian ethnomusicologist Ćorgi Ćorgiev, rather than distinguishing strictly between village and urban song, makes a slightly different distinction, one between what he terms simply "the older" (*postarite*) songs – without distinguishing between village and urban – and "the newer urban" (*ponovite gradski, starogradski* (old town)) songs [Ćorgiev 1996: 277, 278]. In making this distinction, Ćorgiev notes that it is impossible to determine a particular point in time dividing "older" from "newer."(13) He also writes that it is not possible to determine what portion of the musical features in the newer urban vocal tradition are indigenous and what portion are foreign, a circumstance reflective of Macedonia's

geographic location at what he terms “the center of mutual cultural influences from east and west” [1996: 277] – a circumstance that is true of Bulgaria as well, and indeed, of the Balkans in general.

Although Ćorgiev did not draw up a formal list comparing the “older” and “newer urban” Macedonian folk songs as Kaufman did for Bulgarian village and urban song, such a list, extrapolated from a brief essay he wrote surveying Macedonian folk song [1996], can be found in Figure 3. Keeping in mind that Macedonian and Bulgarian musics overlap and are otherwise closely related, Ćorgiev’s accounting of the characteristics of the newer urban Macedonian song form a striking contrast to Kaufman’s list of Bulgarian urban song characteristics, as they include not only Western European musical features, but Macedonian and “oriental” features as well. Striking too are the differences between the two scholars’ assignment of certain structural features; the most salient of these are summarized in Figure 4. Particularly puzzling are their assessments of meter: Kaufman finds complex meter to be characteristic of Bulgarian village music but writes that it is rare in the urban music Ćorgiev, just the opposite, finds it the exception in the older folk music but quite common in the newer urban folk music. Complex (cf. London [2001: 284-86]) or “unevenly-divided” meter (e.g. *neravnodelni slozhni taktove* [Dzhudzhev 1980: 97]) is a feature so commonly associated with Bulgarian music that Béla Bartók referred to it at one time as “so-called Bulgarian” [1992 [1938]]; and it is just as firmly associated with Macedonian music.⁽¹⁴⁾ Yet while Bulgarian scholars such as Kaufman consider these meters indigenous, Macedonian scholars such as Ćorgiev consider their origin open to conjecture, with Asian (Turkish or Romani) origins a distinct possibility [see, e.g., Hadžimanov 1969]. Similarly, Ćorgiev considers the use of scales incorporating the interval of an augmented second to be a notable characteristic of the newer urban Macedonian song that is not present in the older folk song, but rather has its origin in the model system of Turkish classical music.⁽¹⁵⁾ Kaufman, on the other hand, does not consider such scales typical of Bulgarian urban song; furthermore, when scales or modes with augmented seconds are encountered in Bulgarian village music, Bulgarian scholars have generally considered them to be indigenous or else derived from sources other than Turkish classical music.⁽¹⁶⁾

Obviously, then, Ćorgiev did not consider the presence of Turkish features in Macedonian song to be problematic. Rather than impoverishing the music, rather than rendering it of little value in the project of identifying, defining, and describing Macedonian ethnonational identity, Ćorgiev wrote that these attributes add to the beauty and diversity of the newer urban songs, as can be seen in the quotation that heads this section. Thus, although he clearly values the older songs with their presumably archaic musical traits,⁽¹⁷⁾ Ćorgiev also values the newer songs, believing that they reflect progressive development through time; in fact, just the opposite of Kaufman for Bulgarian song, it is the newer urban song that Ćorgiev finds to be more melodically, textually, and structurally diverse, presumably a result of the hybridization that was officially denied to be a feature of Bulgarian music.

Conclusion

In this paper, I have presented, primarily through the writings of Nikolai Kaufman and Ćorgi Ćorgiev, the differing opinions and attitudes of Macedonian and Bulgarian scholars regarding foreign music – in particular Ottoman Turkish music – and the presence of its features in Macedonian and Bulgarian songs. It should be noted that what are often referred to as “oriental” musical characteristics, that is, Turkish and Romani characteristics, are also found in the urban musics of the other Balkan peoples, and thus a number of scholars have suggested that these features might well be considered pan-Balkan [cf. Pettan 1996: 35 and *passim*; Dimov 1995: 13, 14-15 and *passim*; Buchanan 1999]. Ćorgiev appears to agree, writing in a study of urban song in the eastern Macedonian towns of Radoviš and Strumica that the changes wrought on the music as a result of foreign contact were typical not only of the newer urban songs of those and other Macedonian towns, but also of

... the wider Balkans in the urban songs of the other southern Slavic peoples. In connection with this should be stressed in particular the extraordinarily developed inter-regional communications that enabled similar musical means of expression to be used in a much wider area than in the older practice ... [1986: 103].

The widespread presence throughout the Balkans of urban music with these features suggests that the alleged antipathy of the Bulgarian people in regards to Turkish music and music exhibiting Turkish features may well have been overstated (cf. Rice [2002] and the works by Dimov, Levy, and Statelova cited earlier). Yet perhaps as a result of the sociopolitical constraints of the time in which he produced the bulk of his work on Bulgarian urban song, Nikolai Kaufman represented himself as dismissive of much of that music, appearing to value only the village folk song presumed to be characteristic of pre-Ottoman Bulgaria, or urban songs of a patriotic or other ideologically-appropriate nature, and singled out Turkish music and musical features for special criticism. As I have pointed out, Kaufman’s stated negative opinion of popular forms of urban song with Turkish and Romani features situates him and others sharing this opinion in an ideological chain that links the beginnings of the modern Bulgarian identity construction project – a project that, among other things, sought to distance Bulgaria from its Ottoman past and place it firmly within the European realm – with certain contemporary Bulgarian educated elites who, once again focusing on the border between occident and orient and what they perceive as a “civilizational choice” (*tsivilizatsionnii izbor*) between the two, have bought into representations of the latter as backwards, primitive, and uncivilized.

Finally, Kaufman’s expressed antipathy towards music with Turkish features may also have been indicative of something that had nothing to do with the Ottoman Turks *per se*. He has more than once stated that the common origin of Macedonian and Bulgarian song, and hence of the Macedonian and Bulgarian people, must be sought in the older village music [Kaufman 1984: 62-63; 1989: 62]. Thus while Macedonians had as much reason as Bulgarians to resent their former Ottoman overlords, they nevertheless had an arguably more concrete and pressing concern: that of asserting an identity separate from the Bulgarian, a concern also noted by anthropologist Keith Brown in his recent study of modern Macedonian national identity [2003: 152 and *passim*]. Linguist Victor Friedman hints at a similar concern when he observes that, in codifying the modern Macedonian literary language,

... the position of Turkisms was an issue from the very beginning. There was one current of thought among some Macedonian intellectuals that maintained that Turkisms should be encouraged and preserved because they were characteristic of folk speech and also emphasized Macedonian's differentiation from the other Slavic languages [2003:16; my emphasis].

Although this is not the “current of thought” that eventually won out, the fact that it had its adherents lends support to my suspicion that Macedonian attitudes towards the Turkish and other foreign features in their music might to some extent be attributable to a desire on the part of Macedonia's educated elites to distinguish the Macedonians from the Bulgarians.(18) I would further suggest that being culturally and historically close to the Bulgarians, who had been permitted to establish their modern state somewhat earlier – 1878, as opposed to 1944(19) - and thus had a significant head start in the demarcation of their own modern ethnonational identity, it was logical that Macedonian intellectuals such as Ćorgiev would utilize the ongoing urban music tradition in the construction of a Macedonian identity, particularly since the analogous Bulgarian tradition had already been rejected by that nation's intelligentsia.

In concluding, then, I would like to point out that circumstances such as those that I have outlined here should serve to remind us that the putatively objective defining factors to which a given music is thought to conform may be subject to ideological manipulation – conscious or unconscious – and thus should not be taken at face value. Rather, they require on our part a careful scrutiny informed by extramusical factors.

NOTES

1 Field research for the period October 1995 through June 1996 was supported by an Individual Advanced Research Opportunities Grant from the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX) with funds provided by the National Endowment for the Humanities and the United States Department of State under the Title VIII program. None of these organizations is responsible for the views expressed herein.

An earlier version of this paper, derived from Chapter 6 of my dissertation [Peters 2002], was presented as part of the panel “Negotiating Identity across Borders: Ottoman Turkish Musical Legacies in the Balkans” at the 49th Annual Conference of the Society for Ethnomusicology, Tucson, Arizona, November 3-7, 2004. I would like to thank Margaret Beissinger for suggesting that I publish this paper, as well as her helpful comments on an earlier draft.

2 For purposes of my study, I defined as “Macedonian,” songs so represented by the people singing, recording, composing, writing about, or publishing them; and as “Bulgarian,” songs sung in that language or one of its dialects and not otherwise categorized as Macedonian. The reality, of course, is that the two categories overlap.

3 Particularly Greece and Serbia. Discussion of the so-called “Macedonian question” as it pertains to these peoples is nevertheless beyond the scope of this paper.

4 It should be noted that at least some of the Bulgarian scholars involved deny that such manipulation took place. The accounts of various people that I met during the course of my fieldwork regarding the government's control of music and musicians during the so-called "Communist" period, however, appear to corroborate the above-cited writings of Buchanan, Rice, and Silverman in this regard.

5 Since the "fall" of Bulgaria's totalitarian regime on November 10, 1989, this apparent paradox has been noted by Bulgarian scholars as well [e.g. Dimov 1995:4]. For a discussion of this and other changes in regard not only to folk music, but to folklore research in general, see Rice [1999]. The 1995 Dimov essay cited above is only one of many examples of a shift in scholarly focus to contemporary Bulgarian popular music forms, especially those with elements of various Balkan musics. For other Bulgarian examples of such studies, see Dimov [1999 and 2001]; Levy [1999, 2000, and 2002] (this last in English); and Statelova [1995, 1996, 1999, and 2003].

6 All translations from Bulgarian and Macedonian are my own.

7 Similar to poetry, "meter" in music refers to a regularly recurring pattern, but here of stressed and unstressed beats rather than syllables. Each repetition of such a pattern is referred to as a "measure" or "bar" (analogous to a "foot" of poetic meter). A musical "phrase" can be, and commonly is, made up of a specific number of such measures. In most Western European music prior to the twentieth century, measures most commonly contained 2, 3, or 4 beats of equal length that could be subdivided by two (in simple meter) or three (in compound meter). To this day, musical structures, especially in popular music, often consist of pairs of phrases of equal length, lengths of 4 and 8 measures being the most common.

"Tonality" refers to melodic structures based on major and minor scales – ascending or descending series of pitches, used throughout a section or entire piece of music, that bear specific hierarchical relationships to each other. "Harmony" refers to the simultaneous sounding of two or more of these pitches, while "functional" in this context references the harmonic exploitation of tonality's hierarchical relationships. Finally, a "triad" consists of three specific (usually non-contiguous) notes from a scale that are sounded either simultaneously (harmonically) or sequentially (melodically, hence "triadic movement").

8 In general, "modes" resemble scales in terms of consisting of a series of ascending or descending pitches with specific hierarchy, but incorporate additional features such as characteristic musical phrases, gestures, and ornamentation. Harmony, particularly functional harmony, is not generally a feature of modal systems.

"Augmented second" refers to a specific interval (distance) between two pitches. Commonly present in the pitch series that form part of the Turkish modal system, they are almost entirely absent from the analogous pitch series comprising Western European major and minor scales.

9 Macedonian musicologist Dragoslav Ortakov notes that in Macedonia, however, rather than foregrounding instrumental performance as was typical elsewhere in the Balkans, singing accompanied by instruments was the focus of the genre [1986: 82].

10 “Intonation” [*intonatsiia*], a term frequently used by Bulgarian music scholars, is a concept worked out by Soviet musicologist, theorist, and composer Boris Asaf’ev. A complex concept, musicologist Malcolm Brown has described it as follows:

So as to establish unequivocally its association with the phenomenal world, the concept of “intonazia” is defined in its primal sense as any phonic manifestation of life or reality, perceived and understood (directly or metaphorically) as a carrier of meaning. In other words, an “intonazia” in its simplest form is a real sound produced by something, be it creature or natural phenomenon ... with which meaning is associated or to which meaning is ascribed. Thus, a musical “intonazia” results when some “intonazia” from life experience is transmuted into a musical phrase; as such, it retains from the original intonational source that quality, property, or characteristic essence which expresses meaning and therefore possesses the power to quicken man’s emotions and touch his sensibilities [1974: 559; also see Krader 1990 and Zemtsovsky 1997: 189-92].

11 For more on this genre, more commonly known as *chalgiia*/*čalgija*, see Vŭlchinova [1989] and D. Kaufman [1990] (for Bulgaria) and Džimrevski 1985 (for Macedonia). In the English language, ethnomusicologist Sonia Tamar Seeman has written an M.A. thesis on Macedonian *čalgija* (1990) that is frequently cited. It is not commonly available, however, and I personally have never been granted access to it.

12 In fairness to Kaufman, he elsewhere defends the study of Bulgarian urban song and, by extension, at least a portion of the genre, by pointing out the (then current) ideological soundness of some of it and noting as well the Bulgarization of the presumably objectionable foreign material found within it [1968: 16]. Indeed, his continuing engagement with the study of Bulgarian urban song suggests that it is something that he does in fact value, and thus the statement above (and numerous similar statements made by other scholars) should likely be considered a reflection of the constraints under which he and his colleagues were working in Bulgaria during the so-called Communist period.

13 For a fuller discussion, see Ortakov [1982: 29-33, 39-24 and 1986: 79-88]. To summarize Ortakov, between the fifteenth and nineteenth centuries, Ottoman Turkish musical characteristics began to find their way into the older indigenous Macedonian folk music system that formed the basis of the newer folk style. With increased contacts with Western Europe and its music in the nineteenth century, a separate, newer urban folk style crystallized. It is not clear precisely how Ortakov’s historical outline might map onto Ćorgiev’s newer urban folk/older folk distinction: as Ćorgiev noted, it is impossible to determine a particular point in time dividing the newer from the older style. Also missing from Ortakov’s discussion is the role played by the Roma, who entered the Balkans at roughly the same time as the Ottoman Turks, and their music.

14 Such meters can be envisioned in two different but related ways: (1) as meters where the measure is divided into beats of equal length that are grouped in twos and threes (i.e. the measures are divided unevenly); and (2) – following from the groupings in (1) – as meters where the measure is divided (unevenly) into beats of two different lengths, the shorter of which is two-thirds the length of the longer.

15 For an example, cf. Ćorgiev [1996: 279], Dzhudzhev [1980: 329-30], and Signell [1977: 32, 35] regarding scales based on the Turkish *hicaz*, tetrachord (four pitch scale segment).

16 Many of the names of Turkish modes (*makamlar*), which are in turn applied to the Macedonian and Bulgarian scales that borrow their features (e.g. “*hidzhas*” [*hicaz*]) are found in the analogous Arab and Persian modal systems as well: until the sixteenth century, the Turkish modal system derived much of its theory from Arab scholars [Reinhard and Stokes 2001: 915]. Since Bulgarian and certain other Balkan scholars have rejected the notion that Ottoman Turkish musical features are present in their village folk musics, the relationships among these modal systems have permitted them to attempt to circumvent the Ottoman connection by comparing their folk musics with Arab, Persian, and other modal systems instead. The Turkish modal system, however, is not identical to any of these other systems [Pennanen 1995:99]; thus this matter requires further investigation.

17 The presence in some Bulgarian and Macedonian village songs of combinations of certain traits, often described by scholars as “restrictive” (narrow ambitus, one-part structures, and so forth), is generally assumed to be indicative of a song’s antiquity (see, e.g., Ćorgiev [1996: 278]). That some of these traits are common to the village musics of other Slavic peoples further suggests that they may be survivals of a common ancient Slavonic or proto-Slavonic style [Bartók 1978 [1951]: 54], or perhaps something even older [Czekanowska 1975: 251]. These traits are generally found in songs connected with calendrical and life-cycle rituals, as well as with specific types of work (e.g., harvest songs).

18 Seeming to further support this view, while I was a participant in the IREX/BAN Bulgarian Studies Seminar in Sofia in July of 1995, our primary instructor, a linguist, told me that she had once asked a Macedonian colleague why there were so many Turkish words in the Macedonian language, words that were not present in the Bulgarian. The answer she received was, “Because it makes my language more colorful,” an answer that seems to echo Ćorgiev’s positive evaluation of Macedonian urban folk songs as more diverse than their older, monoethnic counterparts. Our instructor implied, however, that the real reason for this use of Turkish words was that it was a way of distancing the Macedonian language from the Bulgarian, a suspicion that appears to be borne out by Friedman’s observation.

19 While both Bulgaria and geographic Macedonia were liberated from the Ottoman Empire by the Russians pursuant to the Treaty of San Stefano in March of 1878, geographic Macedonia was handed back to the Ottoman Empire by the European “Great Powers” in the Berlin Treaty three months later. Liberated again in 1912, geographic Macedonia was partitioned among Bulgaria, Serbia, and Greece. A Macedonian state did not come into its own until 1944, when the portion formerly awarded to Serbia was recognized as a constituent republic of the Yugoslav federation.

Figure 1
Geographic Macedonia in Southeastern Europe
 (after Poulton 1995: xvi)



Figure 2
Comparison of Bulgarian Urban¹ and Village Song Characteristics [N. Kaufman 1968: 13-14]

<u>Characteristic</u>	<u>Urban Song</u>	<u>Village Song</u>
1. Point of Origination	Towns and cities	Primarily villages
2. Author/Composer	Known in many cases	Most often unknown
3. Typical text structure	Lines rhymed, grouped into verses	Lines unrhymed, not grouped into verses
4. Typical vocabulary	Includes words from the literary language, foreign loan-words, and neologisms specific to the urban milieu	Includes local village words; neologisms not present
5. (Textual) Thematic material	As a rule, themes reflect urban life; relatively limited in comparison to village song; fewer motifs, poorer presentation and expressive means	Themes reflect village life
6. (Communal) re-creation, variation	Songs remain relatively unchanged (and therefore unpolished) through successive performances; fewer song variants	Songs polished by singers through successive performances; greater number of song variants
7. Non-complex meter	Simple triple and compound duple especially characteristic	Simple triple and compound duple not typical (except in Southwest Bulgaria)
8. Tempo rubato	Rarely encountered after c. 1878; when encountered, songs differ substantially from tempo rubato village songs in ornamentation and melodic line	Quite common
9. Ambitus	Wide (octave or more)	Narrow (fourth, fifth)

¹ Excluding some pre-liberation love and historical songs, as well as many later love songs that combine features of urban and village song. The latter songs, however, according to Kaufman's analysis [1968b: 78-79], largely fit the description of urban song presented here. Sixty such songs, a number of them Macedonian, are included in Kaufman's collection.

<u>Characteristic</u>	<u>Urban Song</u>	<u>Village Song</u>
10. Scale	Major and minor scales predominate, especially in later songs; leading tone used	More diversity of scalar material; subtonic used
11. Melody	Especially after c. 1878, movement following tonic and dominant triads (more rarely, subdominant) predominates	Triadic movement rare (except for use of tonic triad in certain Rhodope Mountain songs)
12. Functional harmony, final cadence	Songs are most often based on clearly outlined functional harmonies: tonic – (subdominant) – dominant; final cadence is nearly always dominant – tonic, often preceded by tonic 6/4	Functional harmony not characteristic; subdominant – tonic relationship typical of final cadence
13. Form	Most songs in 3/4 and 6/8 (esp. after c. 1878) employ a symmetrical, quadratic phrase structure (4+4, 2+2, etc.); asymmetrical phrase structure is rarely encountered	Phrase structure is often asymmetrical
14. Interpolations, refrains	Esp. after c. 1878, rarely encountered	(Repeated) insertion of single words or short phrases into a line of text typical of many village songs, as is insertion or addition of a refrain
15. Complex meter	Little metric diversity; 5/8 (2+3), 7/8 (3+2+2), 8/8 (3+2+3), 9/8 (2+2+2+3) encountered only rarely, most others of this type not at all	Characteristic: meters ranging from 5/8 to 17/8 in various groupings of 2 and 3 beats encountered
16. Anacrusis	Typical of a large number of urban songs, esp. those in 3/4 and 4/4 (more rarely, 2/4)	Not characteristic
17. Transmission	Often written	Oral

Figure 3
Comparison of Macedonian Newer Urban and Older (Primarily Village) Song Characteristics (Extrapolated from Ćorgiev [1996])

<u>Characteristic²</u>	<u>Newer Urban Song</u>	<u>Older Song</u>
Context	[Entertainment/educative-communicative implied by enumerated subject matter]	Work, ritual
Who sings (gender)	Sexes roughly equal, although males are dominant in the sense that they are freer to travel and have more chances for interaction through business and trade	Exclusively female, except for <i>koleda</i> (Christmas/winter solstice) songs, as well as diaphonic songs sung by men in the Tetovo-Gostivar district
Vocal performance practice	Single groups, sexes mixed; monophony or harmony in parallel thirds	Single groups or 2-3 antiphonal pairs, single sex; monophony and/or drone-based diaphony, depending on region; three-part singing in Aegean Macedonia only
Instrumental accompaniment	Usual	Not usual
Non-complex meter [7]	Present, but not to the extent found in the older songs	Simple duple and triple
Complex meter [15]	Common, ranging from 5/8 (2+3) to 20+/8; 7/8 (3+2+2) is the most common; some other common meters of this type are 8/8 (3+2+3), 9/8 (2+2+2+3 and 2+3+2+2), 11/8 (2+2+3+2+2), and 12/8 (3+2+3+2+2)	Rare enough to be considered a chance occurrence
Tempo rubato [8]	Present, but not to the extent found in the older songs	Characteristic (most common)

² Numbers in brackets correspond to a characteristic's number on the list in Figure 2.

<u>Characteristic</u>	<u>Newer, Urban Song</u>	<u>Older [Village] Song</u>
Ambitus [9]	May exceed an octave, permitting freer melodic movement and melodic contrast than in the older songs	Unusually limited: minor second to a perfect fifth
Scale [10]	More diverse than in the older songs; three most common are Phrygian, major, and scales with an augmented second, (<i>hidzhas</i> most common of this type); older scales continue to be used as well	Limited by ambitus, but still diverse; with or without semitone; most common is a tetrachord with a semitone between the second and third degrees (<i>e.g.</i> , FGABb, with G as the <i>finalis</i>), and with tonal centers on the <i>finalis</i> and the third above it; if anhemitonic, there is a single tonal center on the tonic
Form [13]	More diverse than in the older songs; two- and four part forms most common; more than four parts not uncommon	One or two parts (second part often a variant of the first); three and four part songs rare
Interpolations, refrains [14]	Large number of interpolations; refrains developed to the point of forming a separate (sometimes two-part) section in the overall form of a song	Only interpolation referenced in this context is the <i>glas</i> [= Bulgarian <i>izvikvane</i>], a type of stylized outcry usually found at beginnings and ends of lines, but also possible in the middle; refrains short, less developed
Word interruption	[Not present]	Present, w or w/o subsequent completion
Overall impression	Formally and melodically well-developed	Formally and melodically undeveloped; employs archaic elements, many of which were common to all Slavic people

Figure 4
Comparison of Kaufman and Ćorgiev

I. Comparison of Village/Older Songs

Characteristic	Kaufman (Bulgarian Village Song)	Ćorgiev ("Older" Macedonian Song)
Non-complex meter	Simple triple and compound duple not typical, except in Southwest Bulgaria	Simple duple and triple typical
Complex meter	Characteristic: meters ranging from 5/8 to 17/8 in various groupings of 2 and 3 beats encountered – <u>considered indigenous</u>	Rare enough to be considered a chance occurrence
Scale	More diversity of scalar material than in the urban songs; <u>to the extent present, scales with augmented seconds are considered indigenous</u>	Limited by ambitus, but still diverse
Overall impression	Musically and textually more diverse than urban song; more amenable to flexible treatment; more polished as a result of continual communal re-creation	Formally and melodically undeveloped; employs archaic elements, many of which are pan- or pre-Slavic

II. Comparison of Urban/Newer Songs

Characteristic	Kaufman (Bulgarian Urban Song)	Ćorgiev (Macedonian “Newer”/Urban Song)
Non-complex meter	Simple triple and compound duple especially characteristic	Not present to the extent found in the “older” songs
Complex meter	Little metric diversity; complex meter encountered only rarely	Characteristic: meters ranging from 5/8 to 20+/8 in various groupings of 2 and 3 beats encountered – <u>considered possibly of Turkish and/or Romani origin</u>
Scale	Major and minor scales predominate, especially in later songs	More diversity of scalar material than in the “older songs”; three most common are Phrygian, major, and scales with an augmented second, <u>which are considered to be of Turkish origin</u>
Overall impression	On the whole, poorer than village song	Formally and melodically well-developed

WORKS CITED

- Analytical Creative Group ACG Ltd 1999. "Nationwide Survey of the Bulgarian Population." Unpublished.
- Bartók, Béla 1978 [1951]. "Morphology of the Serbo-Croatian Vocal Folk Melodies." In Béla Bartók and Albert B. Lord, Yugoslav Folk Music, Volume One: Serbo-Croatian Folk Songs and Instrumental Pieces from the Milman Parry Collection, ed. Benjamin Suchoff with a foreword by George Herzog. (The New York Bartók Archive Studies in Musicology, Number 9). Albany: State University of New York Press, 21-244.
- _____ 1992 [1938]. "The So-called Bulgarian Rhythm." In Benjamin Suchoff (ed.), Béla Bartók Essays, reprint ed. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press 1992 (original ed, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976 (originally published as "Az úgynevezett bolgár ritmus." Énekszó 5/6: 537-41)), 40-49.
- Brown, Keith 2003. The Past in Question: Modern Macedonia and the Uncertainties of Nation. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Brown, Malcolm H 1974. "The Soviet Russian Concepts of "Intonazia" and "Musical Imagery." The Musical Quarterly 60: 557-67.
- Buchanan, Donna A. 1991. "The Bulgarian Folk Orchestra: Cultural Performance, Symbol, and the Construction of Identity in Socialist Bulgaria." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.
- _____ 1999. "Musical Axis Sofia---->Istanbul: Ottomanism, Orientalism, or Balkan Cosmopolitanism?" Paper given at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, April 23, 1999.
- Czekanowska, Anna 1975. "The Importance of Eastern Religions' Calendars for the Rhythm of Annual Folk Songs in Slavic Countries." Baessler-Archiv: Beiträge zur Völkerkunde 23 (1) (New Series): 239-55.
- Dimov, Ventsislav 1995. "Folkbumüt i popkarakteristikite mu (Kŭm sotsiokulturniia portret na sŭvremennata etnopopmuzika v Bŭlgariia)" [The *Folk* Boom and its Pop Characteristics: Towards a Sociocultural Portrait of Contemporary Ethnopol Music in Bulgaria]. Bŭlgarski folklor 21(6): 4-19.
- _____ 1999. "Vŭrhu niakoi ideologemni aspekti na bŭlgarskata etnopop muzika" [On Some Ideological Aspects of Bulgarian Ethnopol Music]. Bŭlgarsko muzikoznanie 23 (1): 45-58.
- _____ 2001. Etnopolbumüt. Sofia: Bŭlgarsko muzikoznanie (Izsledvaniia).
- Džimrevski, Borivoje 1985. Čalgiskata traditsija vo Makedonija/La Tradition de la musique tchalcuya en Macédoine. (Makedonsko narodno tvoreštvo: Orska i instrumentalna narodna traditsija, Institut za folklor "Marko Cepenkov" – Skopje, kniga 4). Skopje: Makedonska Kniga.
- Dzhudzhev, Stoian 1980. Bŭlgarska narodna muzika: Uchebnik za bŭlgarskata dŭrzhavna konservatoriia, tom pŭrvi [Bulgarian Folk Music: Textbook for the Bulgarian State Conservatory, first volume], 2nd ed. Sofia: Muzika.
- Friedman, Victor A. 2003. Turkish in Macedonia and Beyond: Studies in Contact, Typology and other Phenomena in the Balkans and the Caucasus. (Turcologica series, 32). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Ćorǵiev, Ćorǵi (M.) 1986. "Osvrt kon uslovite povrzani so razvojoj na gradskata vokalna narodna tradicija vo Radoviš i Strumica" [Overview of the Conditions Connected with the Development of the Urban Vocal

- Tradition of Radoviš and Strumica]. In Cvetanka Organdžieva and Tanas Vražinovski (eds), Zbornik od XXXI kongres na Sojuzot na združenijata na folkloristite na Jugoslavija, Radoviš 1984 [Collected Works from the 31st Congress of the Union of Folklorists' Associations of Yugoslavia, Radoviš, 1984], 99-106. Skopje: Sojuz na združenijata na folkloristite na Jugoslavija/Združenije na folkloristite na Makedonija, 99-106.
- _____ 1992. "Mužičkite karakteristiki na pesnite ot Razloško" [The Musical Characteristics of the Songs of the Razlog District]. In Lazo Karovski et al. (eds), Makedonski narodni umotvorbi od Razloško Pirinska Makedonija/Les Créations populaires macédoniennes de la région de Razlog en Macédoine de Pirine. Posebni izdanija, knj. 18. Skopje: Institut za folklor "Marko Cepenkov," 13-29.
- _____ 1996. "Mužičkite karakteristiki na narodnite pesni" [The Musical Characteristics of the Folk Songs]. In Krum Tomovski et al. (eds), Etnologija na Makedoncite/Ethnology of the Macedonians, Skopje: Makedonska akademija na naukite i umetnostite, 277-80.
- Hadžimanov, Vasil 1969. "Metroritmičkata sedmorka vo makedonskiot melos" [The Metrorhythmic Seven-Beat Measure in Macedonian Music]. Makedonski folklor 2 (3-4): 283-91.
- Kaufman, Dimitrina 1990. "Ot vŭzrazhdenskata chalgija kŭm sŭvremennite svatbarski orkestri" [From the *Chalgija* of the National Revival Period to the Contemporary Wedding Orchestras]. Bŭlgarski folklor 16 (3): 23-32.
- Kaufman, Nikolai 1967. "Bŭlgarska narodna muzika: Gradski pesni" [Bulgarian Folk Music: Urban/Town Songs]. In Petko Stainov et al. (eds), Entsiklopediia na bŭlgarskata muzikalna kultura [Encyclopedia of Bulgarian Musical Culture]. Sofia: Bŭlgarskata akademiia na naukite, 55-56.
- Kaufman, Nikolai 1968. Bŭlgarski gradski pesni [Bulgarian Urban/Town Songs]. Sofia: Bŭlgarskata akademiia na naukite.
- _____ 1980. "Bulgaria II: Folk Music." In Stanley Sadie (ed.), The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians. Vol. 3. London: Macmillan, 431-38.
- _____ 1984. "Za edinstvoto na pesniiia ni folklor" [Regarding the Unity of Our Song Folklore]. Bŭlgarska muzika 35 (9): 57-66.
- _____ 1989. "Pirinskiiat folklor i edinstvoto na bŭlgarskata narodna muzikalna kultura" [Pirin Folklore and the Unity of Bulgarian Folk Music Culture]. In Todor I. Zhivkov (ed.), Edinstvo na bŭlgarskata folklorna traditsiia [Unity of the Bulgarian Folklore Tradition]. Sofia: Bŭlgarskata akademiia na naukite, 35-62.
- Krader, Barbara 1990. "Recent Achievements in Soviet Ethnomusicology with Remarks on Russian Terminology." Yearbook for Traditional Music 22: 1-16.
- Levy, Claire (Kler Levi) 1999. "Replika po povod proiavite na popfolka" [A Remark Regarding *Popfolk* Expressions]. Bŭlgarsko muzikoznanie 23 (1): 66-70.
- _____ 2000. "Produtsirane na poslaniia v sŭvremennata "etniceska" muzika" [Producing Meanings in Contemporary "Ethnic" Music]. Bŭlgarsko muzikoznanie 24 (3): 69-89.

- _____ 2002. "Who is the "Other" in the Balkans? Local Ethnic Music as a *Different* Source of Identities in Bulgaria." In Richard Young (ed.), Music, Popular Culture, Identities. (Critical Studies 19). Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.
- London, Justin 2001. "Rhythm." In Stanley Sadie (ed.), The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians, 2nd ed. Vol. 21. London: Macmillan, 277-309.
- Ortakov, Dragoslav 1982. Muzičkata umetnost vo Makedonija [The Musical Art in Macedonia]. Skopje: Makedonska revija.
- _____ 1986. Ars nova macedonica: Osnovni estetički procesi vo makedonskata umetnost od XIX vek so poseben osvrt vrz muzikata. [Fundamental Aesthetic Processes in 19th Century Macedonian Art, with Particular Reference to Music]. Skopje: Makedonska kniga.
- Pennanen, Risto Pekka 1995. "Folk Music Research and the National in the Balkans." East European Meetings in Ethnomusicology 2: 94-104.
- Peters, Karen A. 2002. "Macedonian Folk Song in a Bulgarian Urban Context: Songs and Singing in Blagoevgrad, Southwest Bulgaria." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Pettan, Svanibor 1996. "Gypsies, Music, and Politics in the Balkans: A Case Study from Kosovo." The World of Music 38 (1): 33-61.
- Poulton, Hugh 1995. Who Are the Macedonians? Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Reinhard, Kurt and Martin Stokes 2001. "Turkey §IV: Art Music." In Stanley Sadie (ed.), The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians, 2nd ed., Vol. 21. London: Macmillan, 913-18.
- Rice, Timothy 1994. May it Fill Your Soul: Experiencing Bulgarian Music. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- _____ 1999. "The Revision of Bulgarian Folkloristics and Folk Music Research in the Post-Communist Period (1990-1996)." In Bruno B. Reuer (ed.), Musik im Umbruch: Kulturelle Identität und gesellschaftlicher Wandel in Südosteuropa/New Countries, Old Sounds? Cultural Identity and Social Change in Southeastern Europe: Beiträge des Internationalen Symposiums in Berlin (22.-27 April 1997). (Veröffentlichungen des Südostdeutschen Kulturwerks, Reihe B, Wissenschaftliche Arbeiten, Band 85). Munich: Verlag Südostdeutsches Kulturwerk, 187-202. .
- _____ 2002. "Bulgaria or Chalgaria: The Attenuation of Bulgarian Nationalism in a Mass-Mediated Popular Music." Yearbook for Traditional Music 34: 25-46.
- Seeman, Sonia Tamar 1990. "Continuity and Transformation in the Macedonian Genre of Čalgija: Past Perfect and Present Imperfective." M.A. thesis, University of Washington.
- Signell, Karl L. 1977. Makam: Modal Practice in Turkish Art Music. Seattle: Asian Music Publications.
- Silverman, Carol 1983. "The Politics of Folklore in Bulgaria." Anthropological Quarterly 56: 55-61.
- _____ 1989. "Reconstructing Folklore: Media and Cultural Policy in Eastern Europe." Communication 11 (2): 141-60.
- Statelova, Rozmari 1995. Prezhiviano v Bŭlgariia: Rok, pop, folk, 1990-1994 [Experienced in Bulgaria: Rock, Pop, Ethnopol, 1990-1994]. Sofia: Riva.

- _____ 1996. "Tsennostno-smislovi aspekti na populiarnata muzika v Bŭlgariia" [Aspects of the Value and Meaning of Popular Music in Bulgaria]. Bŭlgarsko muzikoznanie 20 (2): 64-91.
- _____ 1999. "Folkŭt: Kŭm sŭshtnostta na iavlenieto i negovoto definirane" [Bulgarian Ethnopolop: Towards the Nature of the Phenomenon and Its Definition]. Bŭlgarsko muzikoznanie 23 (1): 5-44.
- _____ 2003. Sedemte griakha na chalgata: Kŭm antropologiia na ethnopolopmuzikata [The Seven Sins of Chalga: Towards an Anthropology of Ethnopolop Music]. Sofia: Prosveta.
- Stoyanova-Boneva, Bonka, Stephan E. Nikolov and Victor Roudometof 2000. "In Search of 'Bigfoot': Competing Identities in Pirin Macedonia, Bulgaria." In Victor Roudometof (ed.), The Macedonian Question: Culture, Historiography, Politics. (East European Monographs 333). Boulder, Colorado: East European Monographs, 237-58.
- Todorova, Maria 1996. "The Ottoman Legacy in the Balkans." In L. Carl Brown (ed.), Imperial Legacy: The Ottoman Imprint on the Balkans and the Middle East. New York: Columbia University Press, 45-77. .
- Vŭlchinova, Elisaveta 1989. "Svirdzhii (chalgadzhhii) ot sredata na XIX vek: Mezhdinna forma mezhdu selskata i gradskata muzikalna kultura" [Instrumentalists (*Chalga* Musicians) from the Middle of the 19th Century: An Intermediate Form between Village and Urban Musical Culture]. Muzikalni khorizonti 12-13: 134-37.
- Zemtsovsky, Izaly 1997. "An Attempt at a Synthetic Paradigm." Ethnomusicology 41 (2): 185-205.