THE PROBLEM OF APPLICABILITY OF “THE FINNISH METHOD” IN THE MELOPOETIC ANALYSIS OF SERBIAN FOLK SONGS

The first decades of the twentieth century were the time of important methodological advancements in the development of comparative musicology, which was quite young at the time. Carl Stumpf opened new horizons in music ethnography,1 Otto Abraham and Erich M. von Hornbostel suggested the principles of transcription of exotic melodies,2 which are even nowadays valid to a great extent,3 and Finnish musicologists Ilmari Krohn and Armas Otto Väisänen conceived the methodology of transcription, analysis and lexicography of collected folk melodies,4 an increasing number of which posed the necessity of rough factographic treatment as a precondition for the future analytical comparative activities.

Beside other parameters which had to be inserted into sections of a separate melologic sheet for each melody (scale-type, ambit, rhythm, cadences...), “the Finnish method” provided even for melopoetic structure of the sung stanza as an indispensable part of the “identity” of each folk song. Logical, practical and simple, the Finnish method was accepted wholeheartedly by great authorities of music folklore studies, so that it had soon found its place even among Bela Bartók’s studies. His work on the transcription of about a hundred Serbian and Croatian folk songs, and his studies of the morphology of our vocal heritage based on his own recordings and on some 3500 transcriptions by other authors, represent the first applica-

---

1 C. Stumpf, Tonsystem und Musik der Siamesen, Beiträge zur Akustik und Musikwissenschaft, III, 1901, 69-152.
tion of somewhat adapted principles of this method in the analysis of our musical folkloric material. The results of that voluminous work, which occupied Bartók in America, during the last years of his life, were published for the first time in New York in 1951, posthumously. Yet, the study *Serbo-Croatian Folk Songs* was not of crucial importance for the adoption of the Finnish method by Yugoslav ethnomusicologists. The credit for its adoption belongs to Vinko Žganec, who made this methodology more familiar to our ethnomusicological public by his review in *Muzičke novine* from 1948. Ever since, with various additions and adaptations to the peculiarities of the matter, the Finnish method is the elementary basis of all ethnomusicological works in the broad Yugoslav area.

We find the first results of the application of the Finnish method in Serbia in the publications of Miodrag Vasiljević, from 1953 on, which is one of the reasons why this scientist deserves the place of the first “real” Serbian ethnomusicologist. Until then Mokranjac’s analytical procedure was valid. Kosta Manojlović, the life-time follower of his great teacher, applied Mokranjac’s method of analysis also in his last works, which were published posthumously in the early 1950s. Except for Mokranjac’s original procedure, which was governed strictly by melody, there had also been other attempts of formal analysis before the adoption of the Finnish method. Milojko Milojević, who paid special attention to “the micro structure” – the motive work and the construction of melody out of smaller musical phrases, had a partly similar approach from the position of classical science of musical forms. Ludvik Kuba viewed the form of melodic stanza mostly from the aspect of the organization of its textual basis. Franjo Kuhač relied upon the analogy between the

---


principles of melodic formation and some stylistic figures of diction known to our folk poetry (anaphora, epiphora, anadyplosis...). In the same way, now Alexandar Linin still deals with the problems of form in Macedonia.

Krohn's and Väisänen's reflections brought a great novelty into the analysis of the formal aspect of folk songs. That is to say, contrary to the classical science of musical forms which regards the form through the prism of melodic and harmonic movements in the composition, the Finnish method starts from the textual basis of the sung song and it takes one sung line (melodic line) as the "measure" of the form, and only after that does it pay attention to the degree of the melodic semblance among the melodic lines that make one sung stanza (melodic stanza). Indeed, nothing could seem more logical and natural to the makers of this method and to all their followers, since in the majority of West European folklore traditions the melodic stanza is mostly based upon the simple lining up of a certain number of lines which usually make one poetic stanza as well. However, in some other musical and folklore areas, at the time far less known to the pioneers of the comparative musicology, the textual basis of the melody is not simplified in this manner; which makes the attempt of formal analysis using the principle by which one melodic line determines the boundaries of one melodic section much more difficult.

That is exactly the case with the vocal tradition of the South Slavic nations. This characteristic was often stressed by Ludvík Kuba, the one of the best experts in Slavic musical folklore at the time, connecting it with the absence of poetic stanzas, typical for South Slavic folk songs:

"... let us remember that the songs of the South Slavs - very much like the songs of the East Slavs - do not consist of stanzas in most cases, but as a rule they make an incoherent line of equal lines. The one who collects the text hears it represented in that way and prints it in all collections as such... Such a record is exact in narrated songs, sung accompanied by gusle or some other instrument; but the vast majority of the other songs enlarge their text while being sung. The text of one line becomes too short for the melody in which it is given; thus, it has to be enlarged artificially so that it can get more syllables to meet the demands of the melody. The simple line acquires thus the outward form of a stanza, but its content of ideas is not enriched in the least." 

Beside simply expanding the textual basis, which is accomplished by using versatile ways of repeating parts of the line (half-lines, particles, their parts), Kuba

---

13 F. Kuhac, Figure u jezičnim izrekama i u glazbenim stankama, Osobine narodne glazbe, naročito hrvatske, Zagreb, Dionička tiskara, 1909, 252–338. (see also: S. Radinović, Pristupi Kube, Mokranjca i Kuhaca u analizi melopoetskih oblika – njihova aktuelnost u našoj analitičko-formalnoj problematiči, the work from the symposium held on the occasion of XXV "The Days of Mokranjac" in Negotin 1990 – in handwriting).


15 L. Kuba, Cesty za slovanskou písní..., 331.
also noticed almost all the other possibilities, recorded up to now, of text use during the structuring of the sung stanza in our vocal tradition: implanting additions (i.e. refrains) varying in length into the beginning, the middle and/or the end of the melodic stanza; the phenomenon of overlapping in the text (i.e. “the incomplete chain”); overlapping in the text and in the melody; omissions of the last syllable in the line (i.e. apocope); interruption of the melody which may also occur in the middle of a word (i.e. the phenomenon of an unexpected melodic caesura which does not coincide with the textual caesura). All the stated possibilities, which we shall include in a syntagm “work with text”, Kuba explained by the presence of the double mechanism functioning on the plane of the outer relationship between the text and the melody, that is by the simultaneous interaction of the two opposed forces – the one helps the melodic stanza to be formed and to be made complete by the artificial enlargement of the line which is usually shorter then the melody (repetitions, refrains); the other contributes to the completion of the whole song, connecting and maintaining the cohesion of its fragmentary structure which was created by the influence of the former force (“the chain”, apocope, melodic caesura, also refrains, to some extent).

Noticing and investigating some of the mentioned aspects of work with text, Bartók, too, thought this feature to be one of the most striking features of the vocal traditions of the Serbians, Croatians and Bulgarians, and he also considered its very origin to be resulting from the absence of stanzas in poetic text. However, Bartók’s interpretation differs very much from Kuba’s. He believed that there is a connection between the stanza structure of text and the prevailing isometry of the melodic segments in Hungarian, in the greater part of Rumanian, in the oldest layer of Slovakian and Turkish folklore, which is confronted with typical absence of stanzas, followed

---

17 Under the term of overlapping in the text and in the melody, Kuba means specific treatment of the sung text, in which each melodic stanza ends by the singing of the first syllable of the following one; the singer continues every next melodic stanza from the same place, i.e. first he finishes singing this “chipped” melodic stanza, and then, by the same principle, he “bites” the next one. – L. Kuba, Album černohorské…, 120.
18 In our ethnomusicological literature this phenomenon is usually wrongly termed catalectic line (see Rečnik književnih termina, Beograd, Nolit, 1986, by the terms apokopa and katalektican stih).
20 Speaking of specific morphological characteristics of the South Slavic melodic stanza, or “work with text”, the majority of authors mean only various forms of repetition and refrains. Further in this text the mentioned syntagma will refer to the other mentioned possibilities as well.
21 L. Kuba, Cesty za slovanskou písní..., 330.
by a strong tendency to heterometry\textsuperscript{23} in the vocal forms of the Serbians, Croats, and Bulgarians:

"Isometric structures are overwhelmingly common in the Hungarian folk melodies, in both the so-called "Old" and the "New" styles... The same is true regarding Rumanian folk melodies, except the so-called \textit{Colinde} (winter-solstice songs) – and some melody structures of the Banat area adjoining the Serbo-Croatian territory to the north. The apparently oldest part of the Slovak melodies and the Turkish melodies have the same trend. The Serbo-Croatian melodies, however, lean toward heterometric forms; as a matter of fact, the structures most characteristic for Serbo-Croatian folk melodies are heterometric. This trait, among others, draws a sharp line between the autochthonous melody classes of the Hungarians, Romansians and Turks on the one hand and the Serbo-Croats on the other. And it is this trait which is in the innermost connection with a most peculiar treatment of the text lines – the splitting of the isometric text lines in order to make them applicable to heterometric melody stanzas. A similar phenomenon has not yet been observed elsewhere, or only sporadically, as far as I know, except in the Bulgarian material which has many traits in common with the Serbo-Croatian."\textsuperscript{24}

Kuba’s and Bartók’s assumption of the possible causes of this specific treatment of the sung text has not lost its relevance in the present, nor have there been plenty of new interpretations,\textsuperscript{25} but their geographic limits require a smaller correction and supplementation which can be made, at least roughly, on the basis of some data from recent literature. Namely, not all the South Slavic nations have the melodic stanza constructed in this way in the same measure, and also its existence is not strictly limited only to the south Slavic area. It is undoubtedly typical for Serbians, Croats,\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{23} In isometric vocal forms melodic segments of one melodic stanza rest upon an equal number of syllables, and in heterometric forms they rest upon a different number. – ibid, 28.

\textsuperscript{24} Ibid, 37.

\textsuperscript{25} V. Žganec thought this phenomenon to be a consequence of the degeneration of Croatian folk singing, which can be seen from the sentence: "This patching of the lines shows in which way the old beautiful folk songs are decaying." – V. Žganec, \textit{Hrvatske pučke popijevke iz Zeline i okolice}, Biblioteka kulturna baština Zeline i okolice, knj. 1, Zelina, SIZ kulture i informiranja, 1979, 34. D. Golemović presents a contrary opinion. Referring to the absence of work with text in the oldest layer of the Serbian vocal heritage, i.e. in most of the cases of ritual and customary songs, he sees in such a structuring of melodic stanza precisely the development of folk singing which occurred side by side with the development of younger genre categories (for instance, love lyricism). – D. O. Golemović, Srpsko narodno pevanje u razvojnom procesu: od obredne do ljubavne lirike, \textit{Folklor u Vojvodini}, Novi Sad, 1995, sv. 9, 136; by the same author, "Rad" sa tekstom u pesmi: razvoj ili degradacija narodnog pevanja? (in handwriting). S. Radinović has a different attitude towards the age of this phenomenon. She finds some special aspects of work with text ("the chain") in the oldest ritual songs of south-east Serbia and defines their undoubtedly magical meaning. – S. Radinović, \textit{Elementi makrostrukture}..., 450–455.

\textsuperscript{26} The specific structure of the Croatian sung stanza was stressed by F. Kuhac even in the beginning of the century: "There are no such stanzas, made by expanding one single verse by repetition or
Macedonians and Bulgarians, while it is found much less frequently in Slovenia, mostly in the areas where the Serbian and Croatian cultural influence was present, as is the case with Bela Krajina, Prekmurje and Štajerska. This phenomenon is not observed only in South Slavic nations, but also in the traditions of the Czechs, Poles and Russians, which corresponds with Cvjetko Rihtman’s remarks about its presence among the Slavic nations.

Leaving aside for now the reflections on the reasons for specific work with text, as well as the dilemmas concerning the South Slavic and the generally Slavic origin of the given phenomenon, we are left with two irrefutable facts: first, work with text is an undoubtedly characteristic and recognizable feature of Serbian musical folklore; second, precisely such a treatment of the sung text creates great difficulties and confusion in the attempt to consistently apply the principles of the Finnish method in the melopoetic analysis of Serbian vocal forms.

The basic question put to an analyst of such a form would be: what parts of the melopoetic whole should be considered as separate melodic segments in the examples in which the melodic stanza does not rely fully on the continuous succession of melodic lines – that is, how to apply the basic principle of the Finnish method in which one melodic line determines the limits of one melodic segment in an analysis of such melodic stanzas?

The first kind of difficulty in analysis is the widely popular enlargement of the textual basis:

- by repeating parts of the line (half-lines, particles, their parts);
- by inserting refrains of various length at various places in the melodic stanza;
- by connecting the neighboring melodic stanza, using one of the forms of “the incomplete chain”.

All these acts naturally enlarge the form, sometimes to a great scale, and in many different ways. However, until the whole line is exposed in its normal or

additions, in any other nation like in the Croatian nation... it is obvious, then, that such a stanza form belongs to the Croatian poetical and musical features. In the songs of Germans, Hungarians and Italians, truth to say, sometimes some parts of the lines in the stanza are repeated, in order to expand the stanza, but never or very scarcely do they make a whole stanza out of only one verse, expanding that verse.” — F. Kuhac, op. cit, 334–335.


28 F. Ugljaša, Melopoetski oblici nastali na principu ponavljanja članaka stih... u muzičkim tradicijama naroda Jugoslavije i drugih slovenskih naroda, Zbornik radova XXVII kongresa SUV (Banja Vrućica, 1980), Sarajevo, UFBiH, 1982, 485-495; I. Zemciovski, op. cit.

29 C. Rihtman, Narodna muzička tradicija Žepe, Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja u Sarajevu, Sarajevo, 1964, 242. R. Petrović mentions incidentally that the same phenomenon is found in the Greek matter as well. — R. Petrović, Morfološke strukture srpskih narodnih pesama, Zbornik radova o Stevanu Mokranjcu, SANU – Odeljenje likovne i muzičke umetnosti, Beograd, 1971, 217. These are only rough implications, because definite geographic frames and true dimensions of the presence of the work with text in other nations can be provided only by thorough knowledge of their traditions.

The Problem of Applicability of "The Finnish Method"... 

inverted order of half-lines (particles), or until the refrain which suits the existing line with respect to the length (i.e. to the number of syllables) appears, one cannot speak of a new melodic line (i.e. a new melodic segment) as of a new constitute form unit, and at the same time be faithful to the Finnish method.

A few examples based on our most popular line, the epic ten-syllable line (X:4,6), which has a caesura after the fourth syllable and two half-lines of different length (a₁=4 syllables, a₂=6 syllables), will serve as an illustration.

In the poetic basis of the example No. 1 (see the supplement) both half-lines are repeated, which can be expressed by the scheme:

\[
A \quad a_1 \quad a_1 \quad a_2 \quad a_2 \\
4, \ 4, \ 6, \ 6
\]

If we should abide by the principles of the Finnish method strictly and if we took a whole sung line as a basis of one melodic segment, then this form should be understood as an enlarged one-part piece (A), independently of the very melodic structure and regardless of the fact that the poetic basis contains two whole lines in a certain "crossed" order of half-lines: a₁a₁a₂a₂.  

The same goes for various other possibilities of half-line repetition as well, which, regardless of the melodic profile of the actual examples, can represent only different aspects of an enlarged one-part piece – if one does not abandon the basic principles of form analysis according to the Finnish method:

\[
a_1 \ a_2 \ a_2; \quad a_1 \ a_1 \ a_2; \quad a_1 \ a_2 \ a_1; \quad a_1 \ a_1 \ a_2 \ a_1; \\
4, \ 6, \ 6 \quad 4, \ 4, \ 6 \quad 4, \ 6, \ 4 \quad 4, \ 4, \ 6, \ 4
\]

etc.  

A similar expansion of the textual basis is created also by various refrains which are, by the number of syllables, shorter than the poetic line of the song in which they appear. Thus, the following example (No. 2) should be understood as an expanded two-part piece:

31 The "ten-syllable line was, by its permanently established structure, the most convenient for such creative virtuosity and its organization in melodic stanzas offers the largest number of exquisite combinations." – R. Petrović, op. cit, 210.


33 As an illustration of the mentioned morphological phenomenon here the textual basis of only several enlarged one-part forms, based upon the epic ten-syllable line, is shown. The same principle of shaping creates even more complex structures (an enlarged two-part piece, a three-part piece...); the difference is only of a quantitative nature. Also, there are very versatile examples based upon other sorts of lines, especially on the asymmetrical and the symmetrical eight-syllable line (VIII:3,2,3; VIII:4,4).
though the usual musical analysis would see it as four melodic segments, with the following order of the sung text:

\[
\begin{array}{cc}
a_1 & r_1 \\ a_2 & a_2 \\
4 & 6 \end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{cc}
a_1 & r_2 \\ a_2 & a_2 \\
4 & 6 \end{array}
\]

In the example No. 3 the refrain seems to take the role of the first half-line, omitted in the repetition, which, together with the melodic content imposes the idea of a two-part piece:

\[
\begin{array}{cc}
a_1 & a_2 \\
4 & 6 \\
r & a_2 \\
(5) & 6 \end{array}
\]

However, this "refrain supplement" and repeated second half-line are only an outer enlargements of the text basis though; so this melodic stanza also, with the consistent application of the Finnish method, has to be seen as a one-part piece, very much enlarged:

\[
\begin{array}{cc}
A \\
a_1 & a_2 \\
4, & 6 \\
r & a_2 \\
(5) & 6 \end{array}
\]

A greater whole, melodically completed and quite independent, sometimes rests on an ordinary exclamatory refrain (example No. 4). Musical logic would recognize a three-part piece in this form, with the following structure of the sung text:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
r & a_1 & a_2 \\
(1) & 4, & 6 \\
b_1 & b_2 & \\
4, & 6 \end{array}
\]

Yet, the consistent application of the Finnish method principle obliges us to understand it as a two-part piece:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & B \\
r & a_1 & a_2 \\
(1) & 4, & 6 \\
b_1 & b_2 & \\
4, & 6 \end{array}
\]

34 D. O. Golemović, Dvodelnost u našem narodnom pevanju..., 7.
The expansion of the textual basis (therefore, of the form as well) occurs also when both kinds of the incomplete chain appear. In the example No. 5, among melodic stanzas, there is “incomplete chain connection with regression”. That means that each following melodic stanza begins with the partial repetition of the line with which the previous one ended, i.e. with partial regression to the line which is a link in the mentioned connection. In accordance to the principles of the Finnish method, the form of this example has to be designated as a one-part piece:

\[
\begin{align*}
A \\
... & a_2 \ b_1 \ b_2 \ r \\
... & 6 \ 4 \ 6 \ (1)
\end{align*}
\]

though melodic movement denotes a two-part structure:

\[
\begin{align*}
... & a_2 \ b_1 \ b_2 \ r \\
... & 6 \ 4 \ 6 \ (1)
\end{align*}
\]

The other difficulties in analyzing arise in the examples which contain a melodic caesura in the middle of the melodic line – usually in between the half-lines, or particles (that is, in the place of the poetic caesura), but also within them, and even within one single syllable.\(^3\) Such a melodic caesura can also be considered as one of the procedures of work with text, since the ultimate result, the division of the textual basis, is accomplished by means of musical expression (break). The phenomenon of the melodic caesura disturbs the expected matching of the melodic and textual component of the melodic line and apparently complicates the form, “grinding” it into more pieces than the number of melodic lines that it actually has (in that way the one-part example No. 7 even gains the appearance of a three-part piece, for it contains two melodic caesuras).

Among the recorded examples there are also many examples in which repetitions, refrains, the incomplete chain and melodic caesura are combined in various ways (No. 9, 11 and 12), which additionally complicates the task of formal analysis.

The described morphological phenomenon, that is, work with text, exists in a large number of Serbian vocal forms – according to our rough estimation it is contained in some 30% of the collected melodies.\(^4\) All the researchers of Serbian folk

---

\(^3\) The frequent appearance of such a melodic caesura in many ritual and customary Russian and South Slavic songs for fertility, lead I. Zemcovski to the assumption of its Slavic origin and initial function of blurring the real boundaries among melodic stanzas, by which the magic of “continuous spellbound moving”, inherent precisely to the fertility rituals, is realized. – I. Zemcovski, op. cit, 66. B. Bartók also supposed that this melodic caesura is of Old Slavic origin, and that it mostly disappeared in the course of time, except from Yugoslav and Bulgarian territory. – B. Bartók, Morphology..., 76.

\(^4\) For this occasion five collections of folk melodies from various parts of Serbia were considered and the following percentages were calculated, of the examples which are, due to the work with text, difficult to analyze by the use of the Finnish method: M. A. Vasiljević, Narodne melodije leskovačkog
singing – B. Bartók to begin with, then M. Vasiljević, D. Dević, R. Petrović and the representatives of the younger generation of Serbian ethnomusicologists – had to seek a way to realize the form analysis according to the adopted Finnish method, which is, however, created on the basis of far more simple rules of melopoetic shaping, current in the musical traditions of the majority of the West European nations. Attempting to find a sort of compromise solution for a number of problematic cases, all the mentioned investigators return more or less to the baselines of the classical musical formal analysis in their procedures of adapting the Finnish method; they begin to shift the stress of the fulcrum from the textual basis to the melodic profile. Unfortunately, up to now not one of the offered solutions provided satisfactory results, for the following reasons. First, each author bore in mind only the segment of Serbian vocal heritage which he had been working on at the time, i.e. which had been collected by a specific date, so it happened that he did not include in his scope all the aspects of the manifestation of a certain phenomenon. Second, all these procedures are a mixture of two criteria – textual and melodic – which by no means rests upon firmly conceived and logically closed system, but upon the loose foundations of a too flexible subjective estimation. The incompatibility of formal solutions by different investigators appears as the ultimate consequence of the above mentioned, and very often inconsistency in the works of one and the same author appears as well (sometimes even in one and the same work!), because, as a rule, it comes across different solutions of the exact or very similar formal structure.

The attempt to illustrate all these facts and to penetrate the “code of thoughts” of each of the mentioned authors could occupy many pages of a large study. For this occasion several explicit examples will suffice.
The next type of the enlarged one-part structure, based on the epic ten-syllable line, contains the repetition of the first half-line:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
  a_1 & a_1 & a_2 \\
  4 & 4 & 6 \\
\end{array}
\]

Bartók decided to treat this form as a two-part piece in which neither melodic segment rests upon the whole line: 39

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
  a_1 & a_1 & a_2 \\
  4 & 4 & 6 \\
\end{array}
\]

M. Vasiljević holds to this solution. R. Petrović and D. Dević rely more upon the melodic profile of the concrete examples. So, according to R. Petrović, this form does not have the firmness and clarity of a two-part form, but sometimes looks like an incomplete two-part piece, while in some other cases it even leans toward a three-part piece. For D. Dević, such an order of half-lines is sometimes the basis of one, and sometimes even of two melodic segments, as Bartók says. D. Golemović sees the same structure as an enlarged one-part piece. 40

In the following example, which represents one of our most popular structures, based on the epic ten-syllable line as well, the other, longer half-line is repeated, which also makes a specific enlarged one-part piece of a kind:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
  a_1 & a_2 & a_2 \\
  4 & 6 & 6 \\
\end{array}
\]

To Bartók, even this is a two-part piece, but now the first melodic segment rests upon the whole line, and the other rests upon the repeated half-line:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
  a_1 & a_2 & a_2 \\
  4 & 6 & 6 \\
\end{array}
\]

R. Petrović is of the same opinion as in the previous example; that opinion is completely in accordance with the different formal solutions of this structure, the solutions which we find in M. Vasiljević, too. D. Dević and D. Golemović identify it as

39 "The other question concerns what shall be regarded as one text line when parts of the text lines are repeated, for example, when the ten-syllable line appears in a fourteen-syllable form as the result of a repeat of its first four syllables? We shall regard these fourteen syllables as two lines (8, 6,), the first of them formed by the repeated first four syllables of the original dekasyllabic line, and the second by the remaining fifth to tenth syllables." – B. Bartók, Morphology..., 31–32.

40 M. A. Vasiljević, Narodne melodie iz Sandžaka..., 51; R. Petrović, op. cit, 211; D. Dević, Narodna muzika Dragačevo..., 20–22; D. O. Golemović, Dvodelnost u našem narodnom pevanju..., 7.
a two-part piece (like Bartók), only they stress in some of their works that it is a matter of a transitive form between a one-part piece and a two-part piece.\textsuperscript{41}

Countless similar discrepancies occur also with the other sorts of lines, as well as with the appearance of shorter refrains which are either treated as separate melodic segments, or which are added to a repeated part of the line with which it is denoted as a melodic line, or thought to be a constituent part of the existing melodic line.

The melodic caesura was also the ground for various formal solutions. Bartók, who called it \textit{interruption}, believed that it had a specific decorative and expressive function in the melody\textsuperscript{42} and never considered it to be the end of the melodic segment. In other words, in Bartók's analyses, the caesura is always a phenomenon occurring \textit{within} the melodic line and it is never identified with its ending, which is contrary to musical logic, but it is in complete accord with the Finnish method, according to which the end of the melodic segment is the same thing as the end of the sung line. Modern investigators have the same attitude towards the melodic caesura. However, in M. Vasiljević an inconsistency concerning that issue can be noticed: he sometimes acts like Bartók, and sometimes quite the contrary, i.e. respecting only the laws of melodic formation (compare Vasiljević's analyses in the examples No. 6, 10 and 11).

A correct understanding of the type of lines is a special problem, too, since that is a factor upon which adequate interpretation of the form depends a great deal. Bartók allowed himself the freedom to divide a thirteen-syllable line and a fourteen-syllable line into two shorter lines: the thirteen-syllable line (XIII:4,4,5) was a combination of an eight-syllable line and a five-syllable line to him (VIII:4,4; V), and the fourteen-syllable line (XIV:4,4,6) a combination of an eight-syllable line and a six-syllable line (VIII:4,4; VI).\textsuperscript{43} It is not difficult to conclude that, for that reason, many examples, which would otherwise be placed in Bartók's tabulations among isometric, became artificially heterometric, and that the form of melodic stanzas founded upon these lines became twice as large (thus, for example, some two-part pieces became four-part pieces artificially).

Similar confusion occurs when the Finnish method is to be applied in an analysis of the forms based upon symmetrically longer lines, the ten-syllable line X:5,5 and twelve-syllable line XII:6,6, which in certain cases are really hard to distinguish from the doubly short five-syllable and the six-syllable line. The very presence of these lines often questions the accuracy of specific formal solutions in almost all existing works.

\textsuperscript{42}B. Bartók, Morphology..., 74.
\textsuperscript{43}Ibid, 31.
Beside the mentioned discrepancies, in the works of the ethnomusicologists occupied with Serbian vocal tradition there is a different usage of numerical and letter symbols from those suggested by the makers of the Finnish method; also, there are various modifications of the existing marks and the introduction of their own marks. Thus, for example, M. Vasiljević uses small Latin letters for melodic segments which do not have a whole sung line in its basis (example No. 11). D. Dević introduces marks $A', A'', A'''...$, to mark melodic lines with minor melodic alterations with respect to the segment $A$, and he does not use the current symbol $A_v$, which, according to the Finnish method, serves the same purpose. This way D. Dević accomplishes somewhat more accurate marking and avoids the superfluous use of the symbol $B$. Instead of the mentioned ones, D. Golemović uses marks $A_1, A_2, A_3...$, which, however, countermands the originally suggested symbols for the sequenced segments (since the makers of the Finnish method prescribed, for instance, mark $A_3$ for marking the melodic segment which sequences segment $A$ by one third lower). Out of the need for marking different sorts and degrees of the mentioned contrast as accurately as possible, D. Golemović, according to the same principle, also introduces symbols $A_{wv}, A_{vv}, A_{v1}, A_{v2}$ etc., which are generally accepted in Serbian ethnomusicology nowadays. Yet, though much more accurate and suitable for the Serbian vocal tradition than those previously provided for by the Finnish method, even these marks require additional work, since they do not cover all the registered aspects of melodic contrasting.

Finally, here one should mention the differences in the very concept of the form which are perceived between Bartók’s and all the other approaches. According to Bartók the size of the form is defined by the number of different melodic segments, and not by the very number of melodic segments involved in the construction of one melodic stanza. Thus, for instance, a structure composed from two melodically and rhythmically completely identical segments, which we mark as a two-part piece of the AA type, is a one-part form to Bartók.

** * * *

From all that has been said it is clear that such a state of affairs are a grave problem in Serbian ethnomusicology nowadays, which completely shatters the illusion that by adopting the Finnish method half a century ago, definite methodological solutions for the analysis of the form of Serbian vocal forms at last had been

---

44 M. A. Vasiljević, Narodne melodije iz Sandžaka..., XV.
45 D. Dević, Etnomuzikologija..., 225–277.
48 B. Bartók, Source Melodies: Part One, YUGOSLAV FOLK MUSIC, Vol. 3, State University of New York Press, 1978, 1-15. This way of understanding the formal structure is similar to the one which is valid for the instrumental melodies in our ethnomusicology. – ibid, 30–31.
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found. The inconsistency of the authors in their own works and the incompatibility of the results of different authors degrade melopoetic analysis to the level of superfluous and absurd formalism, which cannot serve for drawing valid conclusions on a comparative basis. Maybe here, too, lies the reason why in some of our recent studies the usual melopoetic analysis gives way to highly generalized descriptions.

The overall view to the problem in this article unmistakably directs us towards searching for the ways to overcome it eventually, by introducing a well-conceived, universally applicable methodological basis, suitable for the Serbian tradition. Therefore, we will try to explain in this article a possible solution which meets these criteria yet stays within the boundaries of the Finnish method.

In a large number of Serbian vocal forms there is no absolute accord of the melodic and textual components, so the first thing to do is to distinguish clearly the terms melodic line and melodic segment, because they cannot be synonyms in our case. The examples from the previous pages illustrate clearly enough the fact that, from the point of view of a strictly musical criterion, one melodic segment does not always rest upon one sung line (melodic line), but that it can have in its basis other parts of the sung text (refrain, half-line, a half-line twice exposed, half-line + refrain, etc.), as well. The same goes for numerous examples of the other kind, which were not the subject of our consideration since they do not contain work with text. Even in such forms, based upon the continuous lining up of sung lines, it happens very often that the musical whole, i.e. one melodic segment, is shorter, longer or simply incompatible with one sung line. The melodic line and melodic segment are, therefore, the wholes which, in our tradition, can be in concord but not necessarily, and which are inter-linked and framed into each other in many different ways, which is particularly evident where there is work with text. For all those reasons, the undefined mixture of a textual and melodic criterion which is the sole reality in our melopoetic analysis, must be replaced by a firm starting point – textual or melodic.

If we should begin with melody, that would actually mean giving up the Finnish method and returning to the classical musical formal analysis, for which the role of the text in structuring the form in most of the cases has no importance whatsoever. The other possibility, which means remaining within the boundaries of the Finnish method, is to begin with the text, i.e. with the sung line (melodic line) and, using the melodic line, to define the parts and the whole “outer form” of the melodic stanza. However, in the consequent appliance of the textual criterion, the current principles of the Serbian vocal tradition often confront us with the inevitability of neglecting the melodic shaping (due to the mentioned discrepancies between the melodic segments and melodic lines), as well as with the need to clearly define certain terms, above all the term and the boundaries of the sung line in the examples where there is work with text. In this sense we suggest here the following terms:

– basic melodic line for an integral melodic line exposed in normal or inverted order of half-lines, or particles, with no repetitions and shorter refrains; this term would also refer to the refrain which suits the existing line with respect to the length (i.e. to the number of syllables) in a certain song;
- **enlarged melodic line** which refers to the whole basic melodic line and all the applied textual enlargements until the appearance of the next basic melodic line;
- **enlarged melodic stanza** for each melodic stanza which contains at least one enlarged melodic line.

Depending on the sort of work with text it contains, the enlarged melodic line would be marked in one of the following ways:

- \( A(rp) \) = enlarged melodic line which contains the repetition of a part of a line
- \( A(rf) \) = enlarged melodic line containing a refrain
- \( A(ic) \) = enlarged melodic line containing an incomplete chain

If more forms of work with text should appear in an enlarged melodic line, the suggested marks could be combined: \( A(rp,rf); A(rp,ic); A(rf,ic) \) and \( A(rp,rf,ic) \).

The presence of the melodic caesura, which does not enlarge the basic melodic line but, on the contrary, it divides it and thus apparently makes the whole form more complex, should be marked with a mark in front of the letter symbol for the melodic line: \( (cs)A \). In case of need this symbol could be combined with the previous one, and yet it could remain separate and independent, for instance \( (cs)A(rp) \). The place of the caesura itself could be marked with an apostrophe, put in the proper place above the symbols which refer to the parts of the sung text.

With such a conception of the form and application of these marks, the “outer form” of our examples should be expressed in the following way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>example No. 1</th>
<th>example No. 2</th>
<th>example No. 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(cs)A(rp)</td>
<td>A(rf)</td>
<td>A(rp,rf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( a_1 ) a_1 a_2 a_2 \</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 4, 6, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>example No. 4</th>
<th>example No. 5</th>
<th>example No. 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(cs)A(rf)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A(rf,ic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \hat{r} a_1 a_2 ) b_1 b_2 \</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) 4, 6, 4, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>example No. 7</th>
<th>example No. 8</th>
<th>example No. 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(cs)A(rf)</td>
<td>(cs)A(rp)</td>
<td>(cs)A(rp,ic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \hat{r} a_1 \hat{a}_2 ) a_1 a_2 a_1 \</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) 4, 6, 4, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The suggested starting line for formal analysis has several important advantages. First, it enables us to remain within the boundaries of the Finnish method; second, it provides a clear and universally applicable criterion, and therefore standardization of our melopoetic analysis; third, due to additional symbols it enables us to recognize and denote immediately the characteristics of melopoetic structure in which there is work with text; and fourth, it provides for principles whose use makes it possible to see the “outer form” of melodic stanza, which is mostly dependent on the structure of the sung text itself.

In such an approach melodic shaping itself is not a primary parameter defining form any more. However, though this way is left aside to a large extent, it is not completely neglected, because the capital letters referring to the melodic lines still show the degree of their melodic contrasting. Besides, not much consideration has been given to the laws of the melodic “micro plan” in our country any way, and the boundaries of the “macro structure” defined by the suggested analysis could certainly be a firm starting point for future work concerning this problem.
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Example No. 2

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Si- noć Me - ho, Bje - lo Po - lje, bje - lo,} \\
\text{iz No - vo - ga do - de;}
\end{align*}
\]

Example No. 3

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{!! Po - le - ti - lo ja - to go - lu - bo - va,} \\
oj. la - ne, la - ne, ja - to go - lu - bo - va!
\end{align*}
\]

Example No. 4

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Parlando rubato} \\
\text{Ej!} \\
\text{Skolje ba - ba vra - ta za - pi - nja-la} \\
\text{da ne i - de star - če po me - ja - na}
\end{align*}
\]
Oj, devojko, milje moje,
je li Mica sama kod ojvaca, i!
Nije sama, ubila je tama, i!

Došo dragi pa je zagovara, i!
(sing like II melostrophe)
Sanja Radinović: The Problem of Applicability of “The Finnish Method”...

Example No. 6

\[ \text{\( \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} \))}\]

\[ \text{\( A(10) \)} \]

\[ \text{\( h-v-a-t-a-j-t-e \text{ se } u \text{ ko-lo, de-voj-ke,} \)} \]

\[ \text{\( A(10 + 1) \)} \]

\[ \text{\( h-v-a-t-a-j-t-e \text{ se } u \text{ ko-lo, de-voj-ke,} \)} \]

Example No. 7

Rubato

\[ \text{\( A_j, \text{ deno si-no ...o-noj} \)} \]

\[ \text{\( n-a \text{ ko-nak bi-ja-smo} \)} \]
Example No. 8

=S = cca 76

Siv sokole, i, sivo perje

tvoje, siv sokole, i,

Example No. 9

= = cca 90

Mujo do ga po megdanu voda

po megdanu voda, prekrio ga

Mujo doga po mejdanu voda,
Pokrio ga zelenom dolamom,
S obe strane do zelene trave,
Gledala ga Ajka sa cardaka,

Gledala ga pa mu govorila:
'Bolan Mujo, opasi se pasom,
Da ti ruža kroz pas ne propadne,
Da ti Ajka drugom ne zapadne.'
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Example No. 10

\[ \text{vi-diš, di-ko, tu ze-le-nu} \]

\[ \text{tra-vu, vi-diš, di-ko,} \]

\[ \text{tu ze-le-nu tra-vu?} \]

Example No. 11

\[ \text{Aij bej-tu-ra-ne, aman, bog tu-bi} \]

\[ \text{gr-a-a-ne,} \]

\[ \text{aman bog tu-bi-(jo)} \]

\[ \text{gr-a-a-ne.} \]
Parlando rubato

$\frac{~}{~} = 50$

Svi janja-ni, zla-to mo-je,

svi janja-ni, o, ja-nje mo-je,

svi janja-ni do-bre ko-nje ja-še,

oj, vo-zi me, la-do, lju-bi me,

An-do, do-bre ko-nje ja-še.
Music examples have been used from the following publications:


3: D. Dević, Narodna muzika Dragačeva (oblici i razvoj), Beograd, FMU, 1986, example No. 132;

4: S. Radinović, Muzička i orska tradicija sela Velikog i Malog Krčimira u Gornjem Zaplanju (diplomski rad), Beograd, FMU, 1987, example No. 25;

5: D. O. Golemović, Muzička tradicija Takova (diplomski rad), Beograd, FMU, 1978, example No. 44;

6, 10 and 11: M. A. Vasiljević, Narodne melodije iz Sandžaka, SAN, Posebna izdanja knj. CCV, Muzikološki institut knj. 5, Beograd, Naučna knjiga, 1953, examples No. 18, 102b and 50;


12: Unpublished material from the Phonoarchives of the Faculty of Music in Belgrade, recorded in the village of Obrovac near Bačka Palanka (without the archives’ signature for the time being); transcribed by Sanja Radinović.

SUMMARY

The author begins the paper with a short history of the use of “the Finnish method” in the analysis of Serbian vocal forms, applied for the first time in the works of B. Bartók and M. Vasiljević. A debate on the impossibility of carrying out the adequate form analysis of a large number of Serbian folk songs (about 30%) by the use of this method follows, supported with examples illustrating the problem. After a critical survey of the inconsistencies in the application of the Finnish method and its various subjective “adaptations” in the analyses of our ethnomusicologists, the author suggests her own modification, based upon a clear, consistent and universally applicable criterion, thus offering a solution for the absolutely necessary standardisation of the melopoetic analysis of Serbian folk songs.

(Translated by Milan Živković)