

**SOUND RECORDINGS AND KAREL ŠTREKELJ:
THE INITIATOR OF A NEW APPROACH TO FOLK SONG
RESEARCH IN SLOVENIA***

Drago Kunej¹

**Senior Research Associate, Institute of Ethnomusicology, ZRC SAZU,
Ljubljana, Slovenia**

**ЗВУЧНИ СНИМЦИ И КАРЕЛ ШТРЕКЕЉ:
ИНИЦИЈАТОР НОВОГ ПРИСТУПА ИСТРАЖИВАЊУ
НАРОДНЕ ПЕСМЕ У СЛОВЕНИЈИ**

Драго Кунеј

**Виши научни сарадник, Институт за етномузикологију, ЗРЦ САЗУ,
Љубљана, Словенија**

Received: 31 August 2022
Accepted: 15 October 2022
Original scientific paper

ABSTRACT

The Slovenian philologist and folk song researcher Karel Štrekelj (1859–1812) was one of the first researchers in Slovenia to recognise the importance and usefulness of a new sound recording method. Based on a detailed study of archival documents and relevant literature, in this article I examine Štrekelj's contribution to folk music research using a new technical device and introducing a new method of sound documentation to field research. By placing his plans and efforts in a broader context of folk song research, one concludes that Štrekelj was more ambitious and forward-thinking than many other researchers at the time.

* The article was written within the framework of the research programme Research on Slovenian Folk Culture in Folklore Studies and Ethnology, No. P6-0111, funded by the Slovenian Research Agency.

¹ drago.kunej@zrc-sazu.si

KEYWORDS: phonograph, sound recordings, Karel Štrekelj, documenting folk music, field research.

АПСТРАКТ

Словеначки филолог и истраживач народних песама Карел Штрекељ (1859–1812) био је један од првих истраживача у Словенији који је препознао значај и корисност нових метода снимања звука. Заснована на детаљном проучавању различитих архивских докумената и релевантне литературе, ова студија има за циљ да испита Штрекељев допринос истраживању народне музике помоћу нових техничких уређаја и нове методе звучне документације теренског истраживања. Постављајући његове планове и циљеве у шири контекст истраживања народне песме, може се закључити да је био амбициознији и напреднији него многи истраживачи тога времена.

Кључне речи: фонограф, звучни снимци, Карел Штрекељ, документовање народне музике, теренско истраживање.

INTRODUCTION

The first sound collections and sound archives with ethnomusicological materials were created in the late 19th and early 20th centuries with a very explicit goal – to use the sound recording technology for scientific purposes and to create sound collections consisting of phonograms with folk music for the purposes of comparative studies in musicology, ethnology, linguistics, anthropology, aesthetics etc. The aim of archival sound collections was to collect, preserve and pass on the traditions – mostly the “pure” and “disappearing” ones – to younger generations. Archives were viewed as “storehouses of tradition” (Seeger 1986, 262), and their importance in ethnomusicology was compared to the importance of libraries in other scientific fields (Nettl 1964, 17). When the Folklore Institute (the present-day Institute of Ethnomusicology ZRC SAZU) was founded in 1934, its head, France Marolt (1891–1951), as well as his successors, aimed to “compile the most complete collection of Slovenian musical folklore” (Kumer 2000, 12). A very important part of this endeavour were sound recordings.

The Slovenian philologist and folk song researcher Karel Štrekelj (1859–1912) was the person who initiated the use of sound recording as part of fieldwork early on. Štrekelj was one of the first researchers in Slovenia to elevate the collection and publication of folk songs to a scientific level and he broke with the earlier romantic conception of folk tradition. He also planned extensive and systematic recordings of folk songs and aimed to create an archival sound collection of recordings on wax cylinders. He even went so far as to prepare instructions on how to use sound recordings for documentation and study of folk songs and the processing and archiving of

sound materials, even though Slovenia did not even own any recording devices at that time yet.

Although he never used a phonograph for research work himself, he was well aware of the importance and usefulness of this new method when it came to documenting folk songs, made possible by the invention of a sound recording and reproducing device. He was very well acquainted with the experiences of those (relatively rare) researchers and folk music collectors who had already used phonography as part of their work. According to Matija Murko (1861–1951), a researcher and Štrekelj's colleague, who later used phonographs in the field himself, Štrekelj relentlessly "pursued the study of folk songs all over the world [...] and was well aware of the successes Ms Lineva had achieved phonographing Russian folk songs as early as 1902" (Murko 1929, 43).

Karel Štrekelj's versatile and wide-ranging scientific and educational work in the field of linguistics, Slavic studies and ethnology is relatively well known to the community of experts and has been the topic of various discussions and several publications (Murko 1912; Muršič and Ramšak 1995; Kropelj 2001 etc.). His efforts and contribution to the acquisition of sound recording devices, as well as his influence on the introduction of a new approach to collecting and researching folk music, however, have for the most part been overlooked. This article focuses on Štrekelj's less known endeavours to acquire the first recording devices that would have allowed Slovenians to record folk songs in the field and adopt a new approach to folk music research. Based on a detailed study of archival documentation and relevant literature, I will examine Štrekelj's contribution to folk music research with the help of a new technical device and the introduction of a new sound documentation methodology into field research. By placing Štrekelj's plans and endeavours in a broader context of the folk song research conducted at the time, I aim to assess how ambitious, forward-thinking and concrete his ideas about the use of phonographs and recorded materials were during the early period of the use of sound recordings for folk song research.

THE BEGINNINGS OF SOUND DOCUMENTATION IN FOLK MUSIC RESEARCH IN EUROPE

Shortly after sound recording devices had appeared in the market, many researchers recognised their many advantages over manual transcription in the field. What they appreciated the most was the objectivity and precision of recordings, as well as the incredible ability to play the recordings back multiple times, facilitating more detailed musical notation. Some researchers also saw sound recordings as an opportunity to create a record of "untranscribable folk music" as well as of the music of non-European cultures, for which (Western) musical notation was hopelessly inappropriate. As Carl Stumpf, the founder of the Berlin Phonogramm-Archive, pointed out: "It was the phonograph that taught us about live music [...]. Without the help of the phonograph, we would have remained in a museum, where musical instruments are displayed in utter silence, full of questions and lack of comprehen-

sion” (Stumpf 1908, 67). Ludvik Kuba was another researcher who repeatedly drew attention to the improvement that the phonograph brought to documentation of folk music. According to a paper presented by Kuba at an international music congress in 1909, it was imperative to record “primitive” musical forms with a phonograph, as he believed that it was impossible to notate them “with our musical system” (Kuba 1909, 273).

Many prominent researchers later highlighted the great importance of sound documentation in the field of ethnomusicology and folklore. For instance, in 1937, Béla Bartók argued that the level of ethnomusicological development reached by then was to be attributed to Thomas A. Edison, who had been the first scientist to construct a sound recording and reproducing device in 1877, and thus presented a technical tool that was later used for folk music research in the field (Sárosi 1981). Jaap Kunst, who believed that ethnomusicology would have never become an independent scientific discipline, if it had not been for the invention of a sound recording and reproducing device, expressed a similar opinion a little later (Kunst 1955, 19).

With the advent of sound recordings, many researchers found an answer to one of the most important questions of folkloristic research at the time, i.e. how to document folk music in the field as precisely and accurately as possible. In a report from 1899, Ludvik Kuba provided a picturesque description of the difficulties researchers faced in transcribing the songs of *gusle* players: “There is a horse in front of us, running unrestrained, and our hearing and our hands are following it like a sluggish tortoise. [...] This can only be tackled with Edison’s phonograph” (Kuba 1899, 25). Evgenia E. Lineva believed that sound recordings in particular enabled her to carry out more precise studies of part-singing in Russian folk music. Filaret Kolessa, a Ukrainian researcher, was likewise convinced that phonographic recordings were the one thing that allowed him to unravel the rhythmic and melodic structure of Cossacks’ recitative singing; in fact, he believed that “it was impossible to document recitative singing in its variable form without a phonograph” (Kolessa 1909, 278).

In his comprehensive paper “The Phonograph at the Service of Ethnography”, Jiří Polívka (1906) pointed out that ethnographers and linguists had often discussed the necessity to preserve the peculiarities of folk music and dialect for posterity, which was an impossible feat even for the most precise transcriptions and notations. In addition, there is also quite a bit of subjectiveness in each written document; in fact, it takes a “machine” to record something in an accurate and objective way. Based on the experience of researchers who had already been using a phonograph for their work, he concluded that the new documentation method had become indispensable in ethnography, and urged for it to be used as often as possible. Later that same year, Franz Scheirl published a lengthy paper on the merits of phonography in folk music research titled “The Phonograph at the Service of Ethnography” (Scheirl 1906), in which he presented the main advantages of phonographic recordings. Moreover, he described in great detail how musical notation was able to preserve only those elements that could be written down, while all the individual, subjective characteristics of individual singers got lost, as opposed to phonographing, which preserves the latter as well.

Similar findings were made by Leoš Janáček, a Czech composer and folk music researcher, who reported that the phonograph had proven to be very useful for the

collection and research of folk songs. He mentioned that, thanks to recordings, he and his collaborators had been able to make “many corrections to the songs that had been written down by hand while listening to them” (Toncrová 1998: 143). From the very beginning of his folkloristic work, Janáček dealt with the issues of how to document folk songs in the best possible way. In fact, as a composer he was well aware of the gap between the actual folk music performances and the possibilities of musical notation (Procházková 1998, 114).

Today, we can largely agree with these researchers from the past on the significant advantages brought about by sound recording. Thanks to them, musical and linguistic performances were recorded objectively and accurately, with all the special features of a momentary performance; the recordings were preserved for future generations in an unchanged resonant form as sound, as opposed to a subjective transformation of what had been heard. However, although recordings contain much more information than a precise transcription or notation, audio recordings also have to be viewed as only one of the possible ways to document a performance, and one should also bear in mind their imperfect nature. In the past, these caveats were also highlighted by various researchers, some of whom thus objected to the use of sound recordings in folk music research.

KAREL ŠTREKELJ AND HIS AMBITIOUS SOUND RECORDING PLANS

Karel Štrekelj planned sound recordings of Slovenian folk songs as part of the activities carried out by the Committee for the Collection of Slovenian Folk Songs, which was part of a large Austro-Hungarian project titled *Folk Songs in Austria* (*Das Volkslied in Österreich*). The aim of this project was to collect the folk songs of all Austrian nations and publish them in printed form. Folk song collection took place under the auspices of the Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs, as it would have been impossible to carry out such an ambitious plan without state aid and financial support. In November 1904, the first consultation of prominent experts from various Austrian lands – one of whom was the Slovenian Karel Štrekelj – took place in Vienna. The Ministry set up a Vienna-based principal committee in charge of the entire collection campaign, which was chaired by Josef Pommer, an ardent collector of folk songs from the German Styria region. Shortly after, the Ministry started establishing regional (working) committees, which were headed by university professors whenever possible. On 4 May 1905, the Ministry appointed Karel Štrekelj as the chairman of the Slovenian committee, asking him to establish a Slovenian working committee.

As the chairman, initiator and driving force of the Slovenian committee, which was called the *Committee for the Collection of Slovenian Folk Songs* (hereinafter referred as the OSNP Committee), Štrekelj planned systematic and extensive sound recordings from the very beginning. Although the Slovenian committee was not officially established until late October 1905, Štrekelj had started doing the work related to the committee's establishment and preparation of its activities as early as the beginning of 1905. These activities also included plans for the purchase and use of phonographs for the purposes of the collection of songs in the field. According to

Štrekelj, phonographs would provide the best means of satisfying the basic principles of collecting and documenting the songs as part of this project (cf. Navodila in vprašanja 1906, 15) and the commonly emphasised need to record them faithfully – the songs were supposed to be collected in a “scientific way”, i.e. “the transcriptions and notations are to be absolutely perfect, as faithful and accurate as possible” (Murko 1929, 23). Moreover, the collected materials were supposed to be as diverse as possible, and collected from the “mouths of the nation” (Murko 1929, 23).

The archival documents include two letters sent by Karel Štrekelj to the future committee members at the time when the Slovenian committee was being set up, asking them to be part of it. Both letters are dated 27 May 1905, they have a very similar content and also include the first mention of the planned purchase of phonographs to be used for recording melodies. One of the two letters reads as follows: “We hope to be granted two phonographs by the ministry for the purposes of recording melodies. We could sometimes loan one to you and even send someone to teach you how to use it” ([Štrekelj] 1905a). This letter shows that Štrekelj had had a clear idea about collecting and sound recording folk songs even before the Slovenian committee was established.

Štrekelj extensively presented his views of the committee’s activities at its first meeting on 17 December 1905. The agenda that he prepared for it was very long ([Štrekelj] 1905b), listing fourteen items supplemented by numerous annexes. Item 5, Questionnaire and Guidelines for Recording the Material, was supplemented by Annex C, which contained a draft version of the later publication titled *Guidelines and Questions for Collecting and Transcribing Folk Songs, Folk Music, Folk Dances, and Related Customs* (Navodila in vprašanja 1906). In the section on recording melodies, the use of a phonograph was suggested for easier and more precise documenting of polyphonic songs (Anlage C2, n.d., 6). The manuscript in Annex C is in German and is practically identical to the *Guidelines and Questions* published in 1906 in Slovenian:

As it is very unlikely that sufficiently skilled transcribers could be found, it is highly appropriate to capture such polyphonic folk songs on a phonograph, especially where precious folk songs are sung one after another in very short intervals. Using phonograms for notation is easier than transcriptions of songs immediately after they have been sung (from the singer’s mouth) (Navodila in vprašanja 1906, 18).

More detailed information on the use of the phonograph can be found in Annex H, supplementing Item 12 on the agenda of the first meeting of the OSNP Committee including the budget and activities planned for 1906. The annex, titled *Praeliminare* (Preliminaries), contained the committee’s budget proposal for the rest of 1905 and for 1906. This annex was later also enclosed with the minutes of the meeting and sent to the ministry in Vienna. Item 7 in the budget proposal listed two phonographs and 400 cylinders at a total of 1,320 crowns (Anlage H, n.d., 1). The annex presents arguments for the expenditure, including extensive arguments for the purchase of the recording equipment. According to these, the Slovenian committee was in urgent need of at least two phonographs and a sufficient number of cylinders. It is clear that Štrekelj did not only estimate the costs; in fact, he based them on a concrete

quote. Details of the quote are given in Annex H, in which Štrekelj stated that the phonograph most suitable for purchase was the “American type offered by J. Lorenz from Chemnitz” (Anlage H, n.d., 2–3).

Even more ambitious plans for sound recordings can be seen from a manuscript, a draft estimate of the Slovenian committee’s expenditure for planned activities ([Štrekelj] n.d.). The document is written in Štrekelj’s handwriting and bears no date, although at some point it is clearly indicated that the (estimated) expenditure refers to 1905. In the draft, Štrekelj defined and evaluated individual activities in ten items, especially the preparation and publication of the *Guidelines and Questions* as well as the cost of fieldwork for song collection. All the costs are rounded off, and some even corrected, which is why it can be assumed they were merely a rough estimate of all the funds required. Item 9 includes as many as three phonographs and 3,000 cylinders. Compared to the expenditure stated in Annex H, the manuscript included the purchase of three instead of two phonographs and also the number of planned cylinders was significantly higher. This handwritten document is the only preserved testimony that mentions such ambitious plans for the purchase of phonographs and cylinders. Since it is not dated, it is difficult to determine when exactly it was created, for what purpose the cost estimates were made and how feasible the plans were. However, the document does prove that Štrekelj had planned some large-scale recording activities as part of the collection of folk songs from early on, but due to the high costs he most likely decided to cut them down somewhat in the official budget for 1906. Nevertheless, the ambitious phonographing plans are clearly evident from the 1906 budget, i.e. in his arguments in favour of the purchase of phonographs, Štrekelj stated that “at least” two phonographs needed to be procured for the committee.

The great enthusiasm with which Karel Štrekelj approached the activities related to the purchase of phonographs for folk song collection was greatly obstructed by the ministry in Vienna and its much smaller grant than the committee had needed and applied for. The ministry did praise the “enviable zeal” with which the committee set about work, however, it also urged the committee to conduct its activities in the most economical way possible, since the ministry’s funds were limited ([Štrekelj] 1906). Štrekelj, who firmly believed in the necessity of phonographing, kept asking for the funds to purchase phonographs and cylinders for several years, however, his persistence was to no avail. The ministry in Vienna clearly felt that recording folk songs with a phonograph was unnecessary, which can be seen from its letter of 22 June 1907 (Anonymous 1907a), calling upon the Slovenian committee to be highly economical with the approved funds and to discontinue all activities not absolutely necessary for the collection of folk songs. It explicitly mentioned the purchase of a phonograph as an example of unnecessary spending.

Despite his many years of remarkable persistence, Štrekelj failed to procure a recording device for the Slovenian committee. After 1910, Štrekelj, who was the main driving force behind the purchase of phonographs, started to fall ill. After a long and painful illness, he died on 7 July 1912. It was not until after his death, in 1914, that the Slovenian committee, with the help of the new chairman, Matija Murko, finally acquired a phonograph, which was used by Juro Adlešič to make recordings of folk songs in the Slovenian region of Bela Krajina.

ŠTREKELJ'S FORWARD-THINKING VIEWS ON SOUND DOCUMENTATION

Karel Štrekelj did not plan extensive sound recordings only for the sake of easier, faster and more accurate documentation of folk songs. Despite certain technical disadvantages of the phonographs that were in use at the time, he viewed sound recordings as faithful and objective records of folk music practices. For this reason he regarded phonography not merely as a technical tool for folk song collection in the field, but as a new methodological approach to documenting and studying folk songs.

He was well aware of the negative attitude towards the phonograph on the part of some collectors, resulting from the technical disadvantages of the device. He had to face such an attitude already during the first meeting of the Vienna-based principal committee in November 1904, where the possibilities and needs of sound recordings for folk song collection were discussed among other things. The chairman of the principal committee and head of the entire collection campaign, Josef Pommer, took an extremely negative stand on the use of sound recordings in folk song collection. Pommer's negative attitude remained unchanged for several years, in spite of all the arguments and evidence presented by those who had had positive experiences with a phonograph. This presented a major obstacle for the Slovenian committee, as well as committees in other regions, in trying to obtain a phonograph (cf. Deutsch and Hois 2004, 52–56).

This is probably why Štrekelj's arguments in favour of purchasing a phonograph focused on explaining that opposition to the use of phonographs in folk music was based on incorrect presumptions, which had been successfully proven wrong by the collectors of Russian folk songs Evgenia Lineva and Aleksander Grigorov. Moreover, Štrekelj argued that the phonograph was an objective device and could therefore be of great help in folk song collection, in spite of its technical limitations (Anlage H, n.d.).

In fact, Pommer defended the position that the phonograph, as an "unemotional device", could not replace a musically educated transcriber, who could also capture the "singers' feelings". Štrekelj repeatedly disputed this position, as evident from one of his letters:

The criticism about the device not being able to capture singers' feelings has also been expressed in relation to musical notation. However, isn't this so-called feeling the one thing that is most allusive and changeable about folk songs? Does a folk singer always sing a certain song with the same feeling? Won't the singer have unpleasant, bored feelings if the transcriber asks him to sing a song four, five or even more times? And how often does the transcriber bring their own feelings – or lack of it for that matter – into the song? When it comes to this, an objective device, no matter how serious its shortcomings, is a welcome aid that is not to be overlooked. Recordings of melodies include no feelings are practically non-existent (Anlage H, n.d., 2–3).

In the above quote, Štrekelj referred to the practice of documenting polyphonic folk songs that was very common at the time, i.e. singers were asked to sing the same song several times in a row, while the transcriber focused only on the notation of one segment of the performance during each repetition, e.g. the melody of one voice in polyphonic singing. The lyrics were often documented by means of dictation rather than singing. This often resulted in inaccurate transcriptions and deviations from the actual performance. One of the researchers who reported about such problems based on her own experience was Evgenia E. Lineva. She had frequently discovered errors and omissions in older transcriptions because the transcribers were unable to write down the lyrics accurately while the song was being sung, and so they transcribed it from dictation. This led to much imprecision because the performers were unable to accurately reproduce the lyrics without singing. Even greater difficulty arose when transcribing part-song melodies because the transcribers wrote down each voice in the song separately by having the singers repeat the same song. This led to errors because in each repetition the singers changed both the main and accompanying voices, which then no longer matched in the combined transcription. Only phonograph recordings made it possible to capture all of the voices at once and also properly transcribe them by playing back the song several times (Lineva 1909).

Štrekelj's decisive arguments for the purchase of phonographs reflected his strong belief about the usefulness and necessity of the use of sound recordings for folk song collection. Furthermore, he was certain that the Slovenian committee would soon obtain recording equipment because he also planned a detailed register of the collected material, including:

an inventory, including everything that was in the committee's possession, namely:
 a) hand-written collections, b) printed collections, c) phonographs and cylinders, d) publications etc. ([Štrekelj] 1907a).

Štrekelj elaborated on this in his letter to Matej Hubad in Ljubljana dated 9 January, 1907 ([Štrekelj] 1907b), in which he also proposed appointing an archivist that would be responsible for the committee's collection:

Each collection, song, and object should be numbered [...] Each cylinder should therefore be numbered as well; 35.40 (for example) identifies the 40th cylinder in the group registered with number 35. Without identification numbers, the transcription of cylinders will be impossible.

Members of the Slovenian committee were not as convinced about the indispensability of recording folk songs with a phonograph as their chairman Štrekelj, which can be deduced from the explanation as to why the amount of the funds for the purchase of a phonograph had been lowered, which was included in the minutes of a meeting held on 30 January 1907 (Anonymous 1907b):

The budget contains only a rough sum for a phonograph in the amount of 900 crowns; anyway, committee members believe that a sufficient number of qualified men can be

found to document songs directly, which is why the complex phonograph procedure would only be resorted to in exceptional cases and in remote areas.

Štrekelj obviously had the most forward-thinking ideas about the use of sound recording of all the members of the Slovenian committee. He was extremely serious about phonographic recordings, which is further proven by the fact that he viewed them as more than merely a tool for easier and more accurate notation of melodies at a later time. His explanation from Annex H includes the instruction to keep the recorded cylinders as evidence and reference to the notations (Anlage H, n.d., 3), which would allow later checking the exactness and accuracy of the transcription with the help of recordings. Due to the objectivity of phonographic recordings, which Štrekelj firmly believed in, such recordings can be used to check the subjectivity and imperfection of music notations despite their technical shortcomings. This suggests that the planned phonographs would serve to the Slovenian committee not only as a tool to be used by collectors with poor musical education, but also as a more complete, reliable and verifiable means of documenting folk songs. In fact, Štrekelj viewed archived sound recordings as a more complete scientific source than musical notation, which was a very forward-thinking belief for those times.

CONCLUSION

As part of the *Folk Songs in Austria* project, Štrekelj planned systematic and extensive sound recording sessions from the very beginning and also planned the related purchase of at least two recording devices and a large number of cylinders. From 1905 onwards, he repeatedly highlighted the pressing need for the use of phonographs, especially for easier and more precise documenting of polyphonic songs. Judging by the available data, the Slovenian committee headed by Štrekelj was one of the most forward-thinking committee in the folk song collection project in Austria-Hungary in terms of the systematicity and scope of the planned sound recordings. In addition, he paved the way for a new research methodology by viewing the phonograph as an objective device that faithfully records and serves as an excellent aid to western musical notation, and also by viewing the stored cylinders as evidence and reference to musical notation.

However, due to lack of understanding on the part of the principal committee in Vienna, his plans did not come to fruition until much later, after his death, when Juro Adlešič phonographed some folk songs on wax cylinders in the spring of 1914 in the Bela Krajina region of the present-day Slovenia. Despite a modest number of recordings of the singing from Bela Krajina, these recordings had a tremendous impact on the understanding of all the manuscript folk song materials, which had been collected as part of the OSNP Committee's collection campaign and had amounted to approximately 13,000 units (see Kunej 2008). In fact, these recordings have altered the view of folk songs after the very first listening. They raised doubts in the accuracy of the hitherto collected manuscript materials and suggested the need to review and evaluate particularly the performances of folk songs. Subsequent repeated analyses of these sound materials have led to a different understanding of

the traditional songs of Bela Krajina and presented the recordings in a new light; together with the documented metadata, the recordings became a new scientific source with an entirely new sound depiction of the performers and their singing styles. They confirmed the assumption that, in the past, polyphonic singing – similar to that in central Slovenia – was also widespread in this peripheral Slovenian region and thus refuted the stereotype of two-part singing and the exaggerated identification with the Uskoks tradition (cf. Kunej 2008). Moreover, the recordings also revealed that, as opposed to what was later assumed, the recorded materials were still very much alive among people at the time when they were recorded, since the songs were performed by young singers and not by “the last few remaining old women”, which was a commonly held belief. Similar findings were made through the analyses of the recordings from old gramophone records dating back to the pre-WWII period (cf. Kunej R. 2014).

It turned out that making these recordings was one of the committee’s last important activities, and without doubt also the first and only recording endeavour with a phonograph – the reason being World War II, which broke out soon afterwards and put an end to the committee’s work and the entire folk song collection campaign. Although a part of the collection of recorded cylinders was eventually destroyed and lost, the preserved sound materials now represents an exceptional ethnomusicological document of folk singing in Slovenia.

Štrekelj’s ambitious, systematic and extensive plans aimed at sound recordings of Slovenian folk music during the early beginnings of the use of the new technology and research approach were thus realised only to a very modest extent. Nevertheless, his initiative and determined efforts to purchase phonographs bore fruit. As the initiator and ardent supporter of the new research method, i.e. sound documentation in the field as part of the *Folk Songs in Austria* project, his ideas and efforts contributed to the fact that sound documentation started to be used by other committees involved in the Austrian project, and later came to be regarded as a very important folk music research method.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Anlage C2. n.d. *III Abschnitt, Weisungen für die möglichst genaue Niederschrift der Melodien*. Archives of the OSNP at the Institute of Ethnomusicology, Folder 1, Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts.
- Anlage H. n.d. *Praeliminare der slovenischen Arbeitsausschüssen für das Werk "Oesterreichisches Volkslieder" für den Rest des Jahres 1905 und für das Jahr 1906*, Archives of the OSNP at the Institute of Ethnomusicology, Folder 1, Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts.
- Anonymous. 1907a. [Letter of 22 June 1907]. Archives of the OSNP at the Institute of Ethnomusicology, Folder 3, Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts.
- Anonymous. 1907b. *Zapisnik o seji delovnega odbora za nabiranje slov. narodnih pesmi dne 30.1.1907*. Archives of the OSNP at the Institute of Ethnomusicology, Folder 3, Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts.
- Deutsch, Walter, and Eva Maria Hois, eds. 2004. *Das Volkslied in Österreich. Volkspoesie und Volksmusik der in Österreich lebenden Völker herausgegeben vom k.k. Ministerium für Kultus und Unterricht Wien 1918. Bearbeiteter und kommentierter Nachdruck des Jahres 1918 (= Corpus Musicae Popularis Austriacae, special volume)*. Wien: Böhlau.
- Kolessa, Filaret. 1909. "Über den melodischen und rhythmischen Aufbau der ukrainischen (kleinrussischen) rezitierung Gesänge, der sogenannten Kosakenlieder". In *III. Kongreß der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft. Wien, 25. bis 29. Mai 1909. Bericht*. Wien: Wiener Kongreßausschuß.
- Kroječ, Monika. 2001. *Karel Štrekelj: Iz vrelcev besedne ustvarjalnosti*. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC, ZRC SAZU.
- Kuba, Ludvik. 1899. "Narodna glazbena umjetnost u Dalmaciji". *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje južnih Slavena* 4: 1–33.
- Kuba, Ludvik. 1909. "Einiges über das istradalmatinisches Lied". In *III. Kongreß der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft. Wien, 25. bis 29. Mai 1909. Bericht*. Wien: Wiener Kongreßausschuß.
- Kumer, Zmaga. 2000. "Ustanovitev in razvoj do jeseni leta 1999". In *65 let Glasbenonarodopisnega inštituta ZRC SAZU: 1934–1999*, edited by Marko Teršeglav, 11–26. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC, ZRC SAZU.
- Kunej, Drago. 2008. *Fonograf je došel! Prvi zvočni zapisi slovenske ljudske glasbe*. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC, ZRC SAZU.
- Kunej, Rebeka. 2014. "Stare gramofonske plošče kot etnokoreološko gradivo". *Traditiones* 43 (2): 119–136. <https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2014430206>.
- Kunst, Jaap. 1955. *Ethno-musicology: a study of its nature, its problems, methods and representative personalities to which is added a bibliography*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Lineva, Evgenija E. 1909. "Über neue Methoden des Folklores in Russland". In *III. Kongreß der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft. Wien, 25. bis 29. Mai 1909. Bericht*. Wien: Wiener Kongreßausschuß.
- Murko, Matija. 1929. "Velika zbirka slovenskih narodnih pesmi z melodijami". *Etnolog* 3: 5–54.
- Muršič, Rajko, and Mojca Ramšak, eds. 1995. *Razvoj slovenske etnologije od Štreklja in Murka do sodobnih etnoloških prizadevanj: zbornik prispevkov s kongresa, Ljubljana, Cankarjev dom, 24.–27. oktober 1995*. Ljubljana: Slovensko etnološko društvo.
- Navodila in vprašanja za zbiranje in zapisovanje narodnih pesmi, narodne godbe, narodnih plesov in šeg, ki se nanašajo na to. 1906. Ljubljana: Zadružna tiskarnica.
- Nettl, Bruno. 1964. *Theory and method in ethnomusicology*. Glencoe: The Free Press.
- Polívka, Jiří. 1906. "Fonograf ve službě národopisu". In *Národopisný vestník Československý*, edited by Jiří Polívka, 167–174. Praha: Společnost Národopisného musea Československého.
- Procházková, Jarmila. 1998. "Theoretical Aspects of Janáček's Folkloristic Activities. Leoš Janáček and

- Moravien Folklore". In *The Oldest Recordings of Moravian and Slovak Folk Singing: on Folkloristic Activities of Leoš Janáček and his Collaborators*, edited by Jiří Plocek and Jaromír Nečas, 112–116. Brno: Gnosis, Institute of Ethnography and Folklore Studies of the Czech Academy of Sciences.
- Sárosi, Bálint. 1981. *Hungarian Folk Music collected by Belá Bartók Phonograph Cylinder*. Hungaroton LPX18069, gramophone record.
- Seeger, Anthony. 1986. "The Role of Sound Archives in Ethnomusicology Today". *Ethnomusicology* 30 (2): 261–276.
- Scheirl, Franz. 1906. "Der Phonograph im Dienste des Volksliedes". *Das deutsche Volkslied* 8: 85–89.
- Stumpf, Carl. 1908. "The Berlin Phonogrammarchiv". In *The Berlin Phonogramm-Archive 1900–2000. Collections of Traditional Music of the World*, edited by Artur Simon, 65–84. Berlin: VWB – Verlag für Wissenschaft und Bildung.
- [Štrekelj, Karel]. 1905a. [Letter of 27 May 1905]. Archives of the OSNP at the Institute of Ethnomusicology, Folder 1, Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts.
- [Štrekelj, Karel]. [1905b]. *Dnevni red za prvo sejo delovnega odbora slovenskega za publikacijo ministrstva za bogočastje in nauk "Avstrijske narodne pesmi"*. Archives of the OSNP at the Institute of Ethnomusicology, Folder 1, Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts.
- [Štrekelj, Karel]. 1906. [Letter of 5 March 1906]. Archives of the OSNP at the Institute of Ethnomusicology, Folder 11, Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts.
- [Štrekelj, Karel]. [1907a]. [Draft of a letter]. Archives of the OSNP at the Institute of Ethnomusicology, Folder 2, Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts (signature 58/29).
- [Štrekelj, Karel]. 1907b. [Letter of 9 January 1907]. Archives of the OSNP at the Institute of Ethnomusicology, Folder 3, Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts.
- [Štrekelj, Karel]. n.d. [A Draft Estimate of the Slovenian Committee's Expenditure for Planned Activities]. Archives of the OSNP at the Institute of Ethnomusicology, Folder 11, Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts.
- Toncrová, Marta. 1998. "Phonograph in folkloristic work of Leoš Janáček and his collaborators". In *The Oldest Recordings of Moravian and Slovak Folk Singing: on Folkloristic Activities of Leoš Janáček and his Collaborators*, edited by Jiří Plocek and Jaromír Nečas, 138–145. Brno: Gnosis, Institute of Ethnography and Folklore Studies of the Czech Academy of Sciences.

ДРАГО КУНЕЈ

Звучни снимци и Карел Штрекељ: иницијатор новог приступа истраживању народне песме у Словенији

(РЕЗИМЕ)

Словеначки филолог и истраживач народних песама Карел Штрекељ (1859–1812) био је један од првих истраживача у Словенији који је сакупљање и објављивање народних песама довео на научни ниво и тако раскинуо везе с пређашњом, романтичном концепцијом народне традиције. Иако сâм никада није користио фонограф при истраживању, био је свестан значаја и корисности овог новог метода документовања народних песама, који је омогућио проналазак уређаја за снимање и репродукцију звука.

Овај текст усредсређен је на његове мање познате подухвате да прибави прве направе за снимање које би Словенцима омогућиле да снимају народне песме на терену и усвоје нов приступ истраживању народне музике. Заснована на детаљном проучавању различитих архивских докумената и релевантне литературе, ова студија има за циљ да испита Штрекељев допринос истраживању народне музике помоћу нових техничких уређаја и нове методе звучне документације теренског истраживања. Постављајући Штрекељеве планове и циљеве у шири контекст истраживања народне песме, она покушава одговорити на питање колико су његове идеје о коришћењу фонографа и снимљених материјала биле амбициозне и напредне у раном периоду коришћења звучних снимака за истраживање народне песме.

Штрекељ је планирао систематичне и екстензивне сесије снимања звука од самог почетка пројекта *Народне њесме у Аусџирији*, а такође је планирао и куповину барем двају уређаја за снимање, као и велики број цилиндара. Од 1905. године наовамо изнова је указивао на горућу потребу за употребом фонографа, поготову када је реч о снимању вишегласних народних песама. Судећи по архивским документима, словеначки одбор који је Штрекељ предводио био је један од најнапреднијих одбора у оквиру пројекта прикупљања народних песама у Аустроугарској у погледу систематичности и опсега планираних снимања звука. Поред тога, Штрекељ је утврдио пут за нову истраживачку методологију посматрајући фонограф као објективни уређај који верно евидентира и служи као одличан додатак музичкој нотацији, и такође схватајући похрањене цилиндрице као доказ и референцу на музичку нотацију. Иако су његови планови реализовани у веома скромном обиму, његове идеје и труд су допринели чињеници да је звучна документација ушла у употребу и у осталим одборима аустријског пројекта, а касније је призната као врло важан метод истраживања народне музике.