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Abstract: The Hungarian language belongs to the Finno-Ugric linguistic family, but several pre-Conquest strata of Hungarian folk music are connected to Turkic groups. Intrigued by this phenomenon, Hungarian folk music researchers launched thorough comparative examinations. Investigations authenticated by fieldwork have also been ongoing to the present day, parallel to theoretical research. Initially, the main goal was to explore the eastern relations of Hungarian folk music, which gradually broadened into the areal research of the Volga-Kama-Belaya region. I further expanded this work to encompass the comparative investigation of Turkic-speaking groups living over the vast Eurasian territory. This paper provides a summary of the findings of this field research examining the folk music of Anatolian Turk, Azeri, Karachay, Kazakh, Turkmen, Uzbek and Kyrgyz people. I briefly describe the sources, the fieldwork, the methods of processing the collected material, and most interestingly, I summarize new findings. After providing an overview of traditional songs of several Turkic peoples, selected results are provided in three tables: 1) a grouping of Turkic folk-music repertoires; 2) Turkic parallels to Hungarian folk music styles; and 3) the current state of Turkic folk music research conducted by Hungarian scholars.
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Hungarian prehistory demonstrates a peculiar duality of language and music: the language belongs to the Finno-Ugric family, while several pre-Conquest strata of Hungarian folk music are connected to Turkic groups. Intrigued by this phenomenon, Hungarian researchers launched thorough comparative examinations relatively early. Zoltán Kodály initially identified Cheremis and Chuvash analogies.1 Bence Szabolcsi demonstrated broader international musical connections after
surveying a corpus of material. Lajos Vargyas undertook comprehensive historical investigation into the folk music of the Volga-Kama region. László Dobszay with Janka Szendrei, applying a novel approach to Hungarian folk music material, reviewed the international sources with respect to the lament and psalmodic styles, among other genres. Lastly, Katalin Paksa studied the eastern relations of Hungarian narrow-range tetra- and pentatonic tunes. (This outline mentions only the most significant scholars.)

In keeping with the integrity of Hungarian folk music research, investigations authenticated by fieldwork have been ongoing to this day, parallel with theoretical research. Most important are Béla Bartók’s Anatolian fieldwork, undertaken in 1936 (published, however, only in 1976); László Vikár’s and Gábor Bereczki’s areal field research in the territory limited by the Volga, Kama and Belaya in 1957–1978, and my own field research activity amongst several Turk ethnicities.

1. Zoltán KODÁLY, A magyar népzene (Budapest: Editio Musica, 1/1937; revised by Lajos VARGYAS: 3/1952; enlarged: 3/1982).
2. Bence SZABOLCSI, “Osztják hősdalok – magyar síratók melódiái,” Ethnographia 44/1–2 (1933), 71–75; id., “Népvándorlások a magyar népzeneben,” Ethnographia 45/3–4 (1934), 138–156; id., “Egyetemes művelődéstörténet és ötfokú hangsorok,” Ethnographia 47/4 (1936), 233–251; id., A magyar zenetörténet kézikönyve (Budapest: Magyar Körus, 1947); id., “Zenei tanulmányúton Kinában,” A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Nyelv- és Irodalomtudományi Osztályának Közleményei 8/1–4 (1956), 223–239.
3. Lajos VARGYAS, “Ugor réteg a magyar népzeneben,” in Zenetudományi tanulmányok, vol. 1: Kodály emlékkönyv, ed. by Bence SZABOLCSI and Dénes BARTHA (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1953), 611–657; id., “A magyar zene őstörténete,” Ethnographia 91/1 (1980), 1–34; 91/2 (1980), 192–236; id., A magyarság népzenéje (Budapest: Zeneműkiadó Vállalat, 1/1981; revised edition: Budapest: Planétás, 2002); id., “A magyar népdal,” in Magyar Népzajz, vol. 5: Népköltészet, ed. by Lajos VARGYAS (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1988), 414–565.
4. László DOBSZAY and Janka SZENDREI, “Szivárvány havasán: A magyar népzene régi rétegének harmadik stílus-csoportja,” in Népzene és zenetörténet, ed. by Lajos VARGYAS, vol. 3 (Budapest: Editio Musica, 1977), 5–101; eid., A magyar népdaltípusok katalógusa (Budapest: MTA Zenetudományi Intézet [hence: MTA ZTI], 1988); eid., The Catalogue of the Hungarian Folksong Types Arranged According to Styles (Budapest: MTA ZTI, 1992), vol. 1; László DOBSZAY, A siratóstílus dallamköre zenetörténetükben és népzenéinkben (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1993); id., “Az összehasonlító népzenetudomány tündöklése és lehanyatlása,” Magyar Zene 48/1 (February 2010), 7–19.
5. Katalin PAKSA, “Kis hangterjedelmű öt- és négyfokú dalaink keleti rokonsága,” Ethnographia 93/4 (1982), 527–553.
6. Béla BARTÓK, Turkish Folk Music from Asia Minor, ed. by Benjamin SUCHOFF, afterword by Reinhard KURT (Princeton etc.: Princeton University Press, 1976). See also A. Adnan SAYGUN, Béla Bartók’s Folk Music Research in Turkey, ed. by László VIKÁR (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1976), 7–181.
7. László VIKÁR and Gábor BERECZKI, Cheremiss Folksongs (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1971); eid., Chuvash Folksongs (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1979); eid., Votyak Folksongs (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1989); eid., Tatar Folksongs (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1999); László VIKÁR, “Népzenei kutatotúton Koreában és Kinában,” A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Nyelv- és Irodalomtudományi Osztályának Közleményei 13/1–4 (1958), 247–265; id., “Chinese Folksongs with Answers at the Interval of a Fifth,” Acta Ethnographica 7/3–4 (1958), 429–452; id., “Votyak Trichord Melodies,” Studia Musicologica 11/1–4 (1969), 461–469; id., A volga-kámai finnugorok és török népzenéjé (PhD Dissertation, Budapest: MTA ZTI, 1979); id., Volga – Káma – Bjęlaia vidéki finnugor és török népzenegyűjtés, 1958–1979 (Budapest: MTA ZTI, 1986); id., A volga-kámai finnugorok és török népek dallamai (Budapest: MTA ZTI, 1993); id., Magyar népzene és népzeneukutatás, a rokonnépek zenéje (typescript, Budapest: MTA ZTI, 1994); id., “Cseremisz egymágúsz,” A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Nyelv- és Irodalomtudományi Osztályának Közleményei 26/1–4 (1969), 375–385; id., “Mordvin sírató dallamok,” in Zenetudományi Dolgozatok 1980, ed. by Melinda BERLÁSZ and Mária DOMOKOS (Budapest: MTA ZTI, 1980), 159–173; id., “Régi rétegek a volga-kámai finnugor és török népek zenéjében,” in Zenetudományi Dolgozatok 1982, ed. by Melinda BERLÁSZ and Mária DOMOKOS (Budapest: MTA ZTI, 1982), 323–347.
Plate 1 The geographical scope of the research
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PLATE 2 The Phrygian “Midas monument” and mosque in Anatolia
(Photograph by the author)
since 1987 until the present. Initially, the main goal of this research series was to explore the eastern relations of Hungarian folk music, which gradually broadened into an examination of the multi-ethnic Volga–Kama–Belaya region. I further expanded into the comparative investigation of diverse Turkic-speaking groups living over the vast Eurasian territory. Simultaneously, the study of Hungarian prehistoric connections is ongoing.

Turkic folk music research is integral to the understanding of Eurasian culture; these ethnic groups have enduringly performed salient roles in Asia. Enriching this scope further is the fascinating diversity of these musics, as well as the fact that the connections between the music of Turkic groups differ fundamentally from their linguistic relations. In the course of this comprehensive project, part of the musical map of this vast area, stretching from China to Eastern Europe, has been charted (for a geographical survey, see Plate 1). Notably, no similarly extensive, analytical, comparative folk music research based on fieldwork has yet been undertaken in Asian territories. Further, different cultures and peoples have cross-influenced in the identified region. The case of Anatolia is a demonstrative example: as shown in Plate 2, Karachay people who migrated from the Caucasus Mountains in the twentieth century hold their feasts today in a place where the ancient Phrygian “Midas monument” and the mosque are found side by side.

8. János SIPOS, Török népzene, 2 vols (Budapest: MTA ZTI, 1994–1995) (= Műhelytanulmányok a magyar zenetörténethez, vols 14–15); id., Bartók Béla törökországi gyűjtése egy nagyobb anyag fényében (PhD Dissertation, Budapest: MTA ZTI Bartók Archívum, 1999); id., In the Wake of Bartók in Anatolia (Budapest: European Folklord Institute, 2000) (= Bibliotheca Traditionis Europaea, vol. 2); id., “Egy most felfedezett belső-mongói-stilus és magyar vonatkozásai,” Ethnographia 112/1–2 (2001), 1–80; id., Kazakh Folksongs from the Two Ends of the Steppe (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 2001); id., Bartók nyomában Anatoliában. Hasonló magyar és török dallamok (Budapest: Balassi Kiadó, 2002); id., “Vannak-e közös rétegek a karacsaj–balkár és a magyar népzeneben?,” in Orientalista Nap 2001, ed. by Ágnes BIRTA-LAN and Yamaji MASANORI (Budapest: MTA Orientalisztikai Bizottság / ELTE Orientalisztikai Intézet, 2002), 117–131; id., Azeri Folksongs: At the Fountain-Head of Music (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 2004); id., “A zene kezdetinek – azeri népzene,” in Zenetudományi Dolgozatok 2003. Tanulmányok az MTA Népzene-kutató Csoport megalakulásának 50. évfordulójára, ed. by Pál RICHTER and Mártia RUDASNE BAJCSAY (Budapest: MTA ZTI, 2003), vol. 2, 547–601; id., Comparative Analysis of Hungarian and Turkic Folk Music / Türk-Macarı Halk Müziğinin Karşılaştırmalı Araştırması (Ankara: TIKA / Ankarai Magyar Nagykövetség, 2005); id., Azerbaycan El Havaları – Musiqinin İlkin Qaynaqlarında (Bakı: Ebibol, Zeynalov ve oğulları, 2005 [2006]); id., “A Lament from Bartók’s Anatolian Collection and its Musical Background,” Studia Musicologica 48/1–2 (March 2007), 201–213; id., Azerbajdzsáni népzene – a zene forrásainál (Budapest: Európai Folklór Intézet, 2009); id., “A magyar népzene keleti kapcsolatainak nyomában. Beszámoló negyed évszázados keleti népzenesi kutatásainmról,” Kelet kutatásai (Spring 2011), 97–117; id., Kyrgyz Folksongs (Budapest: l’Harmattan, 2014); János SIPOS and Eva CSÁKI, The Psalms and Folk Songs of a Mystic Turkish Order (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 2009); János SIPOS and Mihály HOPPÁL, Shaman Songs (Budapest: International Society for Shamanistic Research, 2010); János SIPOS and Ufuk TAVKUL, A régi magyar népzene nyomában – A kaukázusi karacsajok népzénéje (Budapest: l’Harmattan Kiadó, 2012); ed., Karachay-Balkar Folksongs (Budapest: l’Harmattan Kiadó, 2015).
1. Summary of the Research Task

My long-term research goal is to categorize and compare, by musical criteria, the traditional songs of Turkic groups and other ethnicities living amongst and around them. I rarely refer to instrumental folk music, the repertoire of professional performers, or the most recent strata, and seldom or only occasionally discuss art music. The cultural, social and anthropological implications of music are only sporadically considered, too. I concentrate on traditional folk songs.

There are close connections between the languages of Turkic groups but their musical repertoires are fundamentally different. This is unsurprising because these peoples are, at least in part, Turkified, and through their substrata they are genetically and culturally related to several non-Turkic peoples. My research therefore has repercussions: Turkic-speaking peoples are connected by cultures, languages and histories, which are partly absorbed from other peoples, ascertaining the foundation for an even broader future comparative ethnomusicological research of Eurasian groups.

This paper provides a summary of the findings of my field research into the folk music of Anatolian Turk, Azeri, Karachay-Balkar (in Northern Caucasus and Turkey), south-western and Mongolian Kazakh, Turkmen, Uzbek and Kyrgyz people between 1987 and 2019. In other articles I have provided detailed accounts of the phases and results of this fieldwork, analysis of the findings, and comparative research.  

2. Description of the Tasks Performed, Methods of Processing, and Sources

a) Sources, fieldwork

Previously, systematized archives for the investigation of Azeri, Karachay-Balkar, Kyrgyz, Aday and Mongolian Kazakh, Turkmen and Sufi Islamic music did not exist, while the Anatolian and Kazakh collections were barely accessible. Contributing to this situation, the latter material was poorly annotated; basic genres were missing such as laments, lullabies, and religious folk tunes. These circumstances attest to the necessity of my fieldwork amongst several Turkic ethnic groups. Throughout the past three decades, I have dedicated a total of some 10 years in areas populated by Turkic groups, and collected and notated more than 10,000 tunes. I worked mostly in small villages and finished collecting amongst an ethnic group when the newly recorded tunes were already variants of former ones.

9. See among others SIPOS, “A magyar népzene keleti kapcsolatainak nyomában.”
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The resulting Turkic archive belongs to the major systematized and elaborated collections of Azeri, Kyrgyz, Karachay and Turkmen folk music found anywhere in the world. Concerning the degree of notation and analysis, the Anatolian and Kazakh collections are also important. This large amount of material allowed us to draw unique and reliable conclusions, and the endeavor as a whole has formed fundamental research.

The main groups of tunes I have collected since 1987 are the following: Turkish in Turkey (c. 4,000 tunes), Azeri (600), Caucasian and Turkish Karachay-Balkar (1,200), western and Mongolian Kazakh (600), Kyrgyz (1,300), Turkmen (500), Sufi Islamic communities (700) and North American Indian (700). My investigations also covered other non-Turkic peoples and religious communities in the region (1,400 tunes). The entirety of this collected material is summarized under “The archives” section of my website (www.zti.hu/sipos). The majority of collected tunes are videotaped, and a considerable part of the collection has been digitized; cataloguing and uploading materials is in process. I have notated the Anatolian, Azeri, Karachay, Kazakh, Kyrgyz and Turkmen tunes, and have presented large representative selections together with audio- and video-recordings in my books.

In addition to the works of Hungarian researchers and their successors in the Volga-Kama area, several articles and even a small number of books have appeared focusing on the folk music of some of the Turkic groups I have studied thoroughly (Anatolian, Kazakh). In many cases, however, there are only a selection of tunes (Azeri, Karachay, Kyrgyz) or even an absence of musical material (Turkmen). The vast majority of works by local and foreign folk music researchers refrain from classification, and accordingly make no attempt to examine sources comparatively. I briefly mention these in my discussion of respective groups. Some scholars who have made at least partial attempts to study materials comparatively: Robert Lach, Béla Bartók, Viktor M. Beliaev, Viktor S. Vinogradov and Kurt Reinhard.

10. VIKÁR, “Cseremisz egymagúság;” id., “Votiak Trichord Melodies;” id., A volga-kámai finnugorok (1979); id., “Régi rétegek;” id., Magyar népzene és népzenekutatás; VIKÁR and BERECZKI, Cheremiss Folksongs; eid., Chuvash Folksongs; eid., Votyak Folksongs; eid., Tatar Folksongs.
11. Robert LACH, Gesänge russischer Kriegsgefangener, vol. 1/1–4: Finnisch-ugrische Völker; vol. 2/1–3: Turkutatursche Völker; vol. 3/1–2: Kaukasusvölker (Wien etc.: Hölder–Pichler–Tempsky, 1925–1952).
12. BARTOK, Turkish Folk Music.
13. Viktor M. BELIAEV, Central Asian Music: Essays in the History of the Music of the Peoples of the USSR (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1975); id., Ocherki po istorii muzyki narodov SSSR (Moskva: Muzgiz, 1962); id., O muzikal'nom folklore i drevney pis'mennosti (Moskva: Sovetskij kompozitor, 1971).
14. Viktor S. VINOGRA DOV, Kirgizskaia narodnaja muzyka (Frunze: Kirgiz Gos. Izd., 1958).
15. Kurt REINHARD, “Types of Turkmenian Songs in Turkey,” Journal of the International Folk Music Council 9 (January 1957), 49–54.
b) Methods of Processing the Collected Folk-Song Material

Throughout my work, I have applied the methods of comparative folk-music research aligned with accomplished Hungarian traditions, which László Dobszay outlined in one of his important articles. I utilized the methods of ethnomusicology, adapted to the currently predominant, cultural-social anthropological trends, for smaller communities such as the Sufi Takhtajis and the Alevi/Bektashi people, as well as for in-depth research among the Aday and Mongolian Kazakh people. During fieldwork I conducted countless interviews with musicians, which await processing. I notated the tunes collected, classifying them in accordance with the methods of my predecessors’ applications to Turkic folk music. When comparing the material with Hungarian folk music, I primarily used a modified version of Dobszay and Szendrei’s conception of style (1992).

The symbols I employ as well as the principles of transposition and musical systematization are described in the introduction of my books (see note 8). Here I also clarify why I could not choose strictly unified principles when classifying the materials. It is sufficient to note here that the significantly different materials required different criteria of classification. For instance, the Azeri, Turkmen and Uzbek songs have short lines of a few neighboring tones, as opposed to broad-ranged four-lined pentatonic folk songs implying fifth-shifting. The main criteria for categorizing is firstly the melodic line, because other musical features (such as rhythmic scheme, syllable number, gamut, etc.) are less markedly characteristic of the tunes, and therefore grouping on a melodic basis can easily be presented in tabular form.

The resulting Turkic folk music collections of the Anatolian Turkish, Sufi Turkish Bektashi of Thrace, Azeri, Turkmen, Uzbek and Tadjik, Karachay-Balkar, Kazakh and Kyrgyz, rely on the material of my expeditions, as well as incorporating the Turkic groups in the region demarcated by the Volga, Kama and Belaya, which draw on the works of Vargyas and Vikár (listed in notes 3 and 7).

3. Summary of the New Scholarly Results

Reasons of space limit my remarks here to some of the observations and findings regarding the folk music of different Turkic peoples and their relations to Hungarian music; these are expounded in more detail in the discussion of the music of individual groups in my books (see note 8). Similarly significant to the systematic

16. DOBSZAY, “Összehasonlító népzenetudomány,” 7–18.
17. KODÁLY, A magyar népzene: Magyar népdaltípusok, ed. by Pál JÁRDÁNYI, 2 vols (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1961); Népies dalok, ed. by György KERÉNYI (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1961); VARGYAS, A magyarság népzenéje (2002); DOBSZAY and SZENDREI, “Szívárvány havasán;” and DOBSZAY, Siratóstílus.
18. DOBSZAY and SZENDREI, Hungarian Folksong Types.
collection of this extensive material are the analysis and classification of the musical repertoires, which provides a unique opportunity for a musical review of the studied segments of folk music. The musical classes can be studied in details in my books (see note 8). Based on publications and collections by other scholars, I have also reviewed the music of Turkic groups not previously analyzed in detail (such as the Siberian Turk, Gagauz, Karaim, Crimean and Dobrudjan Tatar, Uzbek, Tadjik, Uyghur and Yellow Uyghur groups) to which I make passing reference; their inclusion into comparative research will be the task of a subsequent stage of my research, or of a new generation of researchers.

There is little connection between the Turkic peoples’ linguistic and musical relations, probably owing to the different substratas. Compared to the highly complex forms of Anatolian folk music, the linguistically closely related Azeri people’s folk music has only a few musical forms, and these have hardly any connection with the simpler forms of Anatolian folk music. Similarly, compared to the simple narrow-range diatonic tunes of southwestern Aday Kazakhs, the music of Mongolian Kazakhs living several thousand miles away is dominated by pentatonic tunes of passionately undulating melody lines, although the language of the two groups is practically identical. Several complex Turkic folk-song repertoires contain contradictory musical strata of different origin (e.g. Anatolian Turkish, Karachay, Kazakh and Kyrgyz). Simultaneously, in the music of nearly every Turkic group, the rate of one or two-lined simple forms is significant, and some repertoires are wholly traceable to these simple forms (e.g. Azeri, Turkmen).

Anatolia’s particularly complex and varied folk music is obviously largely a reflection of the ethnically mixed Byzantine area’s occupation by the Turks. This is the most complex of all Turkic song stocks, taking a distinguished place in the list of the world’s folk musics in relation to diversity. The songs of the linguistically closely connected Azeri, Uzbek and Turkmen people are predominantly simple, narrow-ranged tunes, suggesting Iranian, and – in the Azeri case – partly also Caucasian, relations. The music of Karachay-Balkar and Noghay people living on the northern slopes of the Caucasus is far more complex than that of the Southern Caucasian groups, and it also differs in relation to strata. In the case of the former, there are several musical layers found among neighboring Caucasian groups which the Turkic groups presumably borrowed from them. Kyrgyz, and particularly Kazakh folk music is also complex, but it comprises different strata than the Anatolian music. The pentatonic strata of the equally diverse Uyghur and the simpler Yellow Uyghur folk music display elements of northern Turkic – Mongolian – Chinese music.

The zone of pentatonic Turkic music stretches from China through the Uyghurs, Mongolians, South Siberian Turkic groups, and the northern and eastern Kazakh areas, to the Chuvash, Tatar, Bashkir people in the Volga-Kama-Belaya area, and also characterizes most of the old (and some newer) strata of Hungarian folk music. Among the northern and eastern Turkic groups only the music of the Yakuts (Sakhas), living scattered over an enormous area to which they arrived rel-
atively late, is not pentatonic. However, the Turkic tunes using pentatonic (or partially pentatonic) scales take a great variety of forms, and the different pentatonic scales are not represented with equal weight in the repertoires of different peoples, aptly illustrated by the common and differing strata of, for example, the folk music of the Cheremis, Chuvash, Tatar, Bashkir and Mongol peoples. The pentatonic phenomena of Russian, Finno-Ugric and other peoples must be subject to a different research program. The Turkic ethnic groups living more southerly have predominantly diatonic folk music of narrow-ranged and simplistic melodies. Mainly in Anatolia and some central and southern Kazakh and partly Kyrgyz areas, complex, non-pentatonic tune forms are to be found. Similarly, the use of micro-tones is more prevalent in the southern Turkic areas (Anatolian Turkish, Azeri, Turkmen, Uzbek music), and is less dominant in the middle region of the territory (Karachay-Balkar, Kyrgyz, Kazakh areas), and is negligible in the area where pentatony is the norm. Within diatonic scales, the minor character scales are over-represented amongst the groups studied, while scales with the major third (mostly of major or Mixolydian character) are found among the Karachay-Balkar and Kyrgyz people in greater proportions.

Despite major differences amongst individual Turkic folk music repertoires, some common musical traits, and even musical strata, can be observed. In an article, I have compared the fifth-shifting tunes of Turkic groups residing around the Volga-Kama-Belaya and of other Turkic peoples, Hungarians and Mongolians. I also outlined the Turkic background of the Hungarian (and international) lament style, psalmic, descending pentatonic and fifth-shifting tunes, as well as children’s game songs. By means of an example, I mention the narrow-range simple-form Phrygian tune group of two short lines, which do not coalesce into a significant stratum in Hungarian folk music but are saliently important in Anatolian, and particularly in Azeri, Turkmen, Uzbek and Aday Kazakh folk music.

4. Grouping of Turkic Folk Music Repertoires, Hungarian Connections, and the State of Comparative Research

Before presenting the summary tables let me reiterate that the repertoires of Turkic folk music are often related to the music of the neighboring groups and peoples that they have integrated. In the south there are strong Iranian contacts (Azeri, Anatolian, Turkmen, Uzbek), in the north and east relations to the more broadly arched pentatonic music of the Mongols can be detected (Mongolian and eastern-northern Kazakhs, some Siberian Turks, Chuvash, Tatar, Bashkir), while

19. SIPOS, “Belső-mongóliai kvintváltó stílus.”
20. SIPOS, Török népzene, vol. 1; id., “Belső-mongóliai kvintváltó stílus;” id., “A zene kezdeteinél;” id., “Bartók’s Anatolian Collection.”
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in the Caucasus region, musical fusion with the Cherkes, Kabard, Alan and other Caucasian peoples is apparent (Karachay-Balkar, Nogay). The music of Turkey also mirrors the culture of absorbed and Turkified substrata to a great extent, whereas the music of Siberian Turkic groups is basically pentatonic, yet their music so fundamentally differs from the pentatonic forms of the Mongolia-Volga-Kama area that it requires further thorough comparative investigations. The motivic organization in the music of the Yakuts, who migrated to their current area later, also requires further study, as this music differs from the other Turkic repertoires and has forms that are similar to the motivic music of some Finno-Ugrian groups living in the Volga-Kama area.

Table 1 provides a grouping of the Turkic folk music stocks I have examined. Group 1 includes the Anatolian Turks with their highly complex and essentially diatonic music, showing only pentatonic traces. Group 2 includes the Azeris who are closely tied to Caucasian and Iranian traditions, and the Turkmens with strong Iranian musical influences. The folk songs of these people consist of very simple melodies moving on a trichord or a tetrachord. In Group 3 the Uzbeks, with strong ties to the Iranian Tadjiks, can be viewed as a separate entity, though their songs show some similarities to the simple melodic styles of the Azeris and Turkmens. Group 4 includes the Karachay, Nogay and Kumuk people. With their composite and convex melodic repertoire these musics, on the one hand, interact with the neighboring (non-Turkic) Kabard people, and on the other hand with some significant musical layers of the southern and western Kazakhs, Anatolian Turks and Kyrgyz residing far from them. Group 5 comprises the northern Turkic groups

Table 1 A grouping of Turkic folk music groups

| Group | People                                      |
|-------|---------------------------------------------|
| 1     | Anatolian Turk                              |
| 2     | Azeri (~Caucasus)                           |
|       | Turkmen (~Iranian)                          |
| 3     | Uzbek (~Tadjik)                             |
| 4     | Karachay                                    |
|       | Nogay                                       |
|       | Kumuk                                       |
| 5     | Chuvash                                     |
|       | Tatar                                       |
|       | Bashkir                                     |
|       | some Altay Turkic                          |
|       | Oirat                                       |
|       | Tuvan (~Mongol, Buryat)                     |
| 6     | Kazakh                                      |
| 7     | Kyrgyz                                      |
|       | Khakas                                      |
|       | several Altay tribes                        |
with dominantly pentatonic music: Chuvash, Tatar, Bashkir, some Altay Turk, Oirat and Tuvan people, with close relation to the pentatonic practice of Mongols and Buryats. Group 6 includes the Kazakhs living over a vast territory with their highly compound folk music displaying ties with the diatonic music of the south, and the pentatonic styles of the Turkic east. Group 7 includes the Kyrgyz, Khakas and several Altay tribes. Despite their common nomadic background, the music of groups 5 and 6 show remarkable differences.

*Table 2* illustrates that in the examined Turkic repertoire, certain old Hungarian folk music styles can also be traced. This is discussed in detail in different chapters of my books (see note 8) and in the books of László Vikár (note 7).

*Table 3* provides an overview of the state of Turkic folk music research currently conducted by Hungarian scholars. Partly due to the efforts of Hungarian

**Table 2** Turkic parallels of Hungarian folk music styles

| Hungarian Folk Music Form | Turkic Analogs |
|---------------------------|---------------|
| Short form of lament      | Anatolian Turk  |
|                           | Azeri and Kyrgyz |
|                           | *to a lesser extent:* |
|                           | Karachay-Balkar |
|                           | Turkmen |
|                           | Aday Kazakh |
|                           | Tuvan |
| pentatonic descending tunes, including fourth- and fifth-shifts | Chuvash |
|                           | Cheremis |
|                           | Tatar |
|                           | Mongol |
|                           | Uyghur |
|                           | Yellow Uyghur |
|                           | *to a lesser extent:* |
|                           | Karachay-Balkar |
| psalmody (psalm-like) tunes | Anatolian Turkish |
|                           | Aday Kazakh |
|                           | Karachay-Balkar |
|                           | Caucasian Avar |
| tunes built of twin-bar motifs rotating around the middle note of a trichord | Anatolian Turkish |
|                           | *to a lesser extent:* |
|                           | Karachay-Balkar |
|                           | Azeri dance tunes |
| regős (minstrel) tune     | Karachay-Balkar |
| returning (domed) structure | Karachay-Balkar |
|                           | Kyrgyz |
|                           | Anatolian Turkish |
|                           | Kazakh |
|                           | *(This form seems to be a newer development in Turkic music)* |
scholars, we have a relatively clear picture of Oghuz, Kipchak and Chuvash folk music. This is promising because considering their numeric rate, state-creating ability and the size of the area they populate, these ethnic groups comprise the bulk of the Turkic-speaking populace. The table indicates my collections in italicized bold type, Vikár’s and Bereczki’s collections in italics, and the groups whose music is currently omitted from comparative research are placed in parentheses.

Of course we know that the ethnogenesis of Turkic peoples has proven a complex process. Many of these peoples have multiple points of origin, with ethnic layer placed on top of ethnic layer. Although there are many ancestral elements shared commonly by a number of Turkic peoples (for example, the Kipchak elements found among the Uzbeks, Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, Karakalpaks, Nogays, Bashkirs etc.), the proportions of the common elements incorporated by each group

| Language Group | Location                  | People                                                                 |
|----------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1.1 Oghuz      | south-west                | **Turkish**<br>Azerbaijani<br>Turkmen<br>(Gagauz)                       |
| 1.2 Kipchak    | north-west                | **Kyrgyz**<br>Kazakh<br>Karachay-Balkar<br>Bashkir<br>Kazan Tatar<br>(Crimean Tatar)<br>(Karaim)<br>(Karakalpak)<br>(Nogay)<br>(Kumyk) |
| 1.3 Turkestani | east                      | **Uzbek**<br>(Yellow Uyghur)<br>(Modern Uyghur)<br>(Salar)             |
| 1.4 Siberian   | north                     | (Siberian Tatar)<br>(Altay)<br>(Shor)<br>(Chulim Tatar)<br>(Abakan Tatar)<br>(Khakas)<br>(Tuvin)<br>(Karagas or Tofa) |
| 1.5 Khalaj     |                           |                                                                        |
| 1.6 Yakut      | north                     | (Yakut)                                                               |
| 2. Bulgar–Turkic branch | Volga–Kama area       | **Chuvash**                                                           |
varies. Moreover, some of the shared elements (such as the Kipchak) were themselves hardly homogeneous. Additionally, many possessed or developed unique combinations of elements, which helped to distinguish one from the other. Furthermore, folk music research, as part of the social sciences, cannot propose finite, encompassing theories, and research into the music of Turkic ethnicities is far from complete. Not only are entire ethnic groups missing, but several tasks are still outstanding concerning the musical collections already studied.

Fieldwork must continue, and the relics of traditional tunes and the contemporary repertoire must be surveyed. It is important to create large, well-documented, accessible (online) digitized archives; to monographically elaborate upon the music of certain regions and ethnic groups; to carry out comparative analyses of the tune stock of Islamic folk religion, among many other tasks. It remains for future research to involve the folk music of Turkestani and Siberian Turkic groups, of smaller Khalaj and Yakut communities, and to continue the Kazakh and Anatolian research. Most of these tasks await local colleagues and international work teams such as the Music of the Turkic-Speaking World ICTM Study Group I founded.

Despite the many tasks ahead of us, I hope to proceed along the path signposted by our great predecessors. Our results in the collection and comparative analysis of the folk music of this enormous area have contributed to its better understanding. I also hope my investigations will be of help to the practitioners of comparative folk music research and ethnomusicologists adopting the methods of cultural anthropology alike, so that the foundations of an even broader comparative musical research of Eurasia, encompassing even more ethnic groups, shall be firmly established. Reviewing the folk music of the vast Eurasian territory may also provide data for the confirmation or, conversely, the modification or reconsideration of some assumptions relating to the prehistory of Hungarian folk music. Finally, classified, systematized folk music material may help music education, and a large folk music database provides the possibility to illustrate the musical culture of the peoples concerned.
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