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Abstract
The article considers the scholarly legacy of Volodymyr Hoshovsky in general, and more specifically his research into musical dialects. The scholar created his musical and dialectological method on the theoretical foundations of Filaret Kolessa, Bella Bartok, and other researchers of folk music from 1955. This study of musical dialects is based on the folk songs of Ukrainians in Transcarpathia.
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Like other areas of study, such as phonoarchival science, historiography of musical folklore, historical and comparative ethnomusicology, musical Slavic studies, typology, structural linguistics, ethno-psychology and experimental ethnomusicology, musical dialectology occupies a special place in folklore studies.

According to Volodymyr Hoshovsky, musical dialectology in Ukraine was founded by the famous Ukrainian folklorist Filaret Kolessa (Гошовський 1958, 70–74). In the 1920s, Kolessa pointed to the existence of Ukrainian musical dialects ‘which originated on Ukrainian territory and almost entirely overlap with the dialects of language’ (Колесса 1970). Although Hoshovsky considered Kolessa to be the first in this area of research, it should be mentioned that Stanislav Lyudkevych touched on this matter much earlier (1906) in the preface to the first volume of his ‘Galician-Rus’ Folk Melodies’. He did not use the phrase ‘musical dialect’, however. He wrote: ‘Eastern Galicia is the westernmost edge of the Ukrainian-Rus’ lands, and if viewed in geographical and ethnic terms, it is rather heterogeneous; besides, in the west and south it borders on foreign and quite different ethnic elements. Thus, it has provided a rich environment for the combination and overlapping of various local and external influences, and as a consequence, on its relatively small area of land, it exhibits (as in the language), both in minor details and on the basis of the melodies, notable ethnographic differences, apparently far more significant than Russian Ukraine’ (Людкевич 1973, 194). One of the reasons why Hoshovsky failed to mention Lyudkevych in this context could have been the fact that this work was unavailable. The scholar also did not mention B. Bartok, Y. Stenshevsky and Y. Yagamash, but in his next, much more in-depth, article ‘Musical Archaisms and their Dialectal Features in Transcarpathia’, he referred to the works of these folklorists.

Hoshovsky developed the musical and dialectological method from 1955. In fact, he applied it at the very dawn of his folklore studies, first on the grounds of the theoretical principles of Filaret Kolessa, and later of B. Bartok and other folk music researchers. In this area of research, he was greatly supported by Y. Dzendzelivsky, an eminent Ukrainian linguist, specialising in the history of the Ukrainian language, Ukrainian and Slavic dialectology, lexicology, lexicography and linguistic geography.

Hoshovsky began exploring the musical dialects of Transcarpathia in real-life conditions, and over the course of many years of practical experience, he amassed a wealth of profound theoretical, methodological and practical knowledge, having written down a large amount of folk songs. It was vital for him to indicate specific differences in musical dialects in the particular area, to find out explicit local features, and to define the direction in which to carry out the study of dialectical variants and methods to be used.
In his first academic publication ‘On the Issue of Musical Dialects of Transcarpathia’, Hoshovsky outlined the framework of the dialectological method he applied. Eventually, it was the Ukrainian folk song, *kolomyika*, that served as the basis for the discovery of dialectical differences, while other genres were not taken into account. The researcher states that the following steps are needed for musical dialectology to emerge as an established academic discipline: ‘1) to have a sufficient amount of song material from all regions; 2) to systematise the material; and 3) to explore the paradigm of musical thinking and musical language of the people’ (Гошовський 1958, 71).

Hoshovsky suggested that these issues should be dealt with by: 1) supplementing the existing fund of Transcarpathian folk songs with recordings made in all districts of the region; 2) systematising the material according to features peculiar to the specific territory and topics.

Disappointingly, the scholar did not specify what the ‘existing fund’ was, but he obviously meant ‘Folk Songs of Southern Subcarpathia’ by Kolessa (Uzhhorod, 1923), ‘Rus’ Folk Songs of Subcarpathian Rus’ by Kolessa (Prague, 1923), and ‘Folk Songs of the People of Subcarpathian Rus’ by D. Zadora, Y. Kostyo and P. Myloslavsky (Uzhgorod, 1944). However, he did mention the number of songs, ‘about 1,000’ (Гошовський 1958, 71), which were used as the basis for his research.

Comparing recordings of songs, Hoshovsky identified two main groups of musical dialects in Transcarpathia: 1) group ‘A’ consisted of the northern mountain dialects; 2) group ‘B’ the southern foothill dialects. It should be emphasised that the scholar outlined the dialects and later confirmed the findings of his research in the anthology-monograph ‘Ukrainian Songs of Transcarpathia’, including Maramoros and Uzhanskyi. A significant feature of the article ‘On the Issue of Musical Dialects of Transcarpathia’ by Hoshovsky is his observation of East-Slavic influences. It is likely that at that time he developed the idea for a comparative study of Ukrainian-Slovak interrelations in musical folklore.

The second time that Hoshovsky turned to this idea of studying musical dialects was in his work ‘Musical Archaisms and their Dialectical Features in Transcarpathia’, which was given as a report to the academic session at Uzhhorod State University in 1959. The researcher considerably extended the boundaries of the theme.

Firstly, it was not only Filaret Kolessa’s works that he based his work on, as was the case in his first article. The researcher also referred to works by B. Bartok, Y. Yagamesh and Y. Stenshevsky.

Secondly, by analogy with the language, he shows that a musical period can be subjected to analysis at three levels: syntactic, morphological and phonetic.
Thirdly, Hoshovsky emphasised the necessity to use an appropriate questionnaire to record songs. The term ‘questionnaire’ was first introduced in this work, which proves that the scholar considered it to be of paramount importance for the study of musical dialects. In his opinion, ‘it should contain, in addition to questions that are relevant only to songs of a certain genre [...] the melodies of the songs most widespread in the specified territory’ (Гошовський 1965, 13).

Fourthly, the researcher fundamentally developed some of the principles of dialectical research, which could be reduced to:

1) Systematising songs according to their typical features:
   a) songs of the same rhythmic structure (eg 5+5, 6+6, 4+4+6, etc);
   b) songs of the same melodic form (eg AABA, ABBA);
   c) songs of the same genre (ceremonial-wedding, shchedrivky [New Year songs], kolyadky [Christmas carols], lullabies, historical songs).

2) Identifying common features or variability, and detecting the absence of a particular musical phenomenon.

3) Mapping the acquired data.

Unlike the previous article, in which Hoshovsky based his research exclusively on the genre of kolomyika, in this article the scholar analysed musical dialects based on carols.

As he had amassed a sufficient amount of recorded musical and folk material, the scholar relied mostly on his own notes made in 31 villages, and records from 11 more villages published in the collections ‘Folk Songs of Southern Subcarpathia’ by Kolessa (Uzhhorod, 1923) and ‘Folk Songs of the People of Subcarpathian Rus’ by D. Zadora, Y. Kostyo and P. Myloslavsky (Uzhgorod, 1944). Thus, Hoshovsky had 49 melodies from 42 rural settlements in 12 districts of the region at his disposal. A comprehensive three-level analysis of the melodies revealed three types of carols in Transcarpathia:

1) Type A, which is a simple period with three phrases and a rhythmic structure of 5+5+4;

2) Type B, which is a complex period with two sentences and six phrases, its rhythmic structure being 2(5+5+3);

3) Type C, which is a complex period of type B with a second sentence extended by one phrase: 5+5+3 // 5+5+5+3.

If considered from the perspective of studying musical dialects, the analysed work by Hoshovsky has proven that carols, which are common in Transcarpathia, are also characterised by significant dialectical differences, despite their numerous common features. In essence, his idea concerning the study of musical dialects has facilitated the development of new analytical methods.
Hoshovsky’s work ‘Musical Archaisms and their Dialectical Features in Transcarpathia’ was published in 1964. It appeared as a separate part of the article ‘Folklore and Cybernetics’ (Гошовський 1964, 75–78), and some aspects reappeared and were expanded in his work ‘Methods and Prospects of Modern Musical Dialectology and Melogeography’. In 1965, his study ‘Musical Archaisms …’ was published in the USA in the journal Visti (News), with the support of Zinoviy Lys’ko (Гошовський 1965, 13–16).

A common axiom provides a basis for the method of musical and dialectological analysis: the conciseness of musical expression is determined by the couplet form of folk songs.

Another equally important issue of methodology appeared to be the systematisation of songs to make a comparative analysis according to the following principles: 1) songs of the same genre; 2) songs of the same metro-rhythmic structure; 3) songs of the same melodic form.

Applying the comparative method to the analysis of musical syntactic, morphological and phonetic aspects is the third principle of Hoshovsky’s methodology. Thanks to this principle, it becomes possible to distinguish common features, variability (‘dialect feature’), or the absence of a particular aspect or feature in the tune. The data collected defines the dialectical difference in the songs, and is transferred on to maps as conventional symbols. This method has provided a solid and broad basis for melogeography, for the development of musical dialectological and musical ethnic atlases. Hoshovsky touched on the subject of melogeography, as well as the study of musical dialects, in his article.

While focusing on his study of musical dialects, Hoshovsky still managed to follow closely the publication of folk music collections by other researchers. Having firm views on folklore, the scholar meticulously reviewed various publications, and he had reservations about all of them. Thus, in 1960, he published his thorough and fundamental critical review of Krechko’s collection ‘Transcarpathian Folk Songs’ (Гошовський 1960, 128–131).

The author entitled this review ‘The Disadvantages of one Collection’. However, the editors renamed it ‘A Collection of Transcarpathian Folk Songs’, thereby substantially changing Hoshovsky’s original emphasis. As a matter of fact, the reviewer criticised every aspect of the collection.

The preface received the most severe criticism. Hoshovsky called it superficial and controversial. In the original version of his review, the scholar pointed out that the collection was full of ‘anti-historical statements, the unscientific characterisation of songs, and confusing and contradictory conclusions’.

Hoshovsky also highlighted the fact that Krechko contradicted the historical truth when he failed to mention pre-Soviet publications, although he made
use of almost 60% of the songs from them. Also, Hoshovsky considered that Krechko had totally failed to specify the characteristic features of Ukrainian folk music. The scholar noted that ‘the list of different musicological terms is of no significance to the reader, but displays the incompetence of the author. Wouldn’t it have been better and more appropriate to look at the characteristics of Transcarpathian songs outlined by the academician Filaret Kolessa?’ One cannot but agree with Hoshovsky’s conclusions, as we go through the following analytical text by Krechko: ‘Next to the major and minor in songs, we often notice domineering Miksolidian, Dorian and Phrygian tonalities with a typical “Ukrainian” cadence ending. Vibrant melodies and frequent rhythm changes, along with intricate poetic lyrics, make the Ukrainian folk songs of Soviet Transcarpathia memorable and attractive, bearing a vivid national colouring’ (Гошовський 1960, 128). Hoshovsky devoted most of his review to an analysis of lyrics, providing numerous examples of where Krechko had frivolously edited them.

Hoshovsky drew attention to numerous mistakes and inaccuracies, which can be reduced to the following:

1) the lack of a meaningful preface;
2) the lack of a qualified characterisation of folk music;
3) the unsuccessful attempt to characterise the folk music of Transcarpathia;
4) the imperfect genre classification of songs;
5) the attempt to adapt specific words and expressions to the norms of Ukrainian literary language, which in most cases led to the distortion of content;
6) the fact of editing the melodies;
7) the incomplete certification of songs;
8) the absence of the required professional review.

It is no coincidence that we refer to this review, since through his criticism of Krechko’s collection ‘Transcarpathian Folk Songs’, Hoshovsky in fact declared his views of similar folklore activity, building, first and foremost, on the scholarly rationale.

A year before the publication of Krechko’s collection, the ethnomusicologist, who himself had been thinking about publishing a collection of Ukrainian songs from the Transcarpathian region, shared his thoughts with Sergey Aksyuk, the editor-in-chief of the periodical ‘Soviet Composer’:

‘Before publishing the collection, I would like to supplement it with songs from the unexplored areas, with photographs in order to describe better the geographical location of specific regions, and their ethnographic and anthropological peculiarities. This forthcoming collection could be provided with an introductory article, commentaries on the songs, and classified registers on the
subject, structure, rhythmic patterns and peculiarities of the songs’ (Гошовський 1958, 1).

The abovementioned review is worth comparing to the one in which Hoshovsky reviewed the collection by Karel Vetterl Lidové písně a tance z Valašskokloboucka (Гошовський 1961, 146–147). He emphasised significant features that are ‘characteristic of every serious scholarly publication’ (Гошовський 1961, 146), these being the accuracy of a recording of a melody and a text, the detailed scientific certification of the material, and the historical background. The reviewer also noted that the study had been carried out to a high scholarly standard. Hoshovsky considered that the true value of the collection lay in the comprehensive analysis of the musical culture, which was carried out thanks to the joint efforts of folklorists, historians, choreographers and dialectologists in this ethnographic area. He applied a similar framework in his publication ‘Ukrainian Songs of Transcarpathia’.

The ethnomusicologist further developed the theme of musical dialects in works such as ‘The Role of Melogeography in Complex Regional Explorations of the Carpathians’ and ‘The Sociological Aspect of Musical Ethnography’. He developed a methodology for analysing folk music which meets the basic requirements of dialectology as a science. A song, which equals a vocal period, is subjected to:

1. Syntactic analysis: the melodic form, the structure of the verse, the interaction of parts on an intonational level;
2. Morphological analysis: the analysis of musical phrases, their rhythms of melodic contours, metres, leaps and steps in the melody;
3. Phonetic analysis: the key systems of the period, tonal row, ambitus, melodic figuration.

The scholar believed that the compilation of an appropriate questionnaire is a necessary step in collecting and recording musical dialects. In addition to questions relating to certain song genres, it should also contain the lyrics of the first two verses, their content, and the tunes of the most common songs from the region. So, apparently, the structure of the questionnaire was considerably expanded, and the author also introduced several important points corresponding to his methods.

A similar technique was introduced by Hoshovsky for systematising his collection-anthology ‘Ukrainian Songs of Transcarpathia’, which was published in 1968. Musical dialects, as well as linguistic dialects, have developed over centuries as a result of historical, social economic and geographical conditions, as well as resulting from the interaction of various ethnic groups within the nation, and from the mutual influence of neighbouring peoples. Each dialectical feature
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has its own limit, or isogloss. Hoshovsky spent a number of years exploring the musical dialects of Transcarpathia in real-life conditions, and amassed much knowledge of the field. It was important for him to show the specific differences between musical dialects in a specific territory. The researcher determined which features were local, how dialect variants should be studied, and what methodology is applicable.

Hoshovsky’s study of musical dialects has been associated with comparative studies. The researcher applied the comparative method when he started his research into musical dialects. He proceeded from the theory that there is no such notion as only one folklore, be it Ukrainian or Hungarian, or any other, or only one Ukrainian language, except for literary.

Once again, Hoshovsky turned to this idea in his report ‘On the Issue of Certain Features of the Similarity of Slavic Musical Folklore’, which was written for the Eighth International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnographical Sciences, held in Moscow in 1963. Unfortunately, the text of the report received a negative review from S. Gritsa, and the final paragraph of her review concluded: ‘Due to the fact that the work is not an original study, and the principles of the analysis do not meet the requirements of Soviet folklore studies, the Ukr(ainian) Rep(ublican) Organising Committee for the preparation of the VIII International Congress of Ethnographers and Anthropologists of the Ukrainian SSR [...] do not consider it possible to recommend the report by V. L. Hoshovsky for announcement at congress meetings’ (Мушинка 2006, 27–28).

Hoshovsky developed an absolutely clear system of methods for studying musical dialects and shaping the academic discipline called musical dialectology on the basis of them. He was convinced that this research should start in a limited area, which he called a ‘folklore base’. He considered his ‘folklore base’ to be the region of Transcarpathia and the Carpathians; therefore, crucial scholarly experiments were carried out in the region. The theoretical and practical issues of musical dialectology and melogeography were tested by scientists in these areas. Hoshovsky believed the ethnogenetic research of the Carpathians, and possibly of any other territory, should rely directly on the development of melogeography, which he viewed as a self-contained independent discipline. As he defined it, ‘Melogeography is a two-tier empirical discipline, its method at the synchronic and descriptive level is inductive, and on the explanatory (theoretical) level, it is hypothetical and deductive. Due to this methodological approach, melogeography is increasingly becoming a complex academic system that can apply methods from the natural and exact sciences’ (Гошовский 1976, 124). In his article ‘Ethnogenetic Aspects of Melogeography’, he regards melogeography as ‘a discipline that studies authentic musical folklore from the perspective of
the distribution of integral objects or elements of them on a certain territory’ (Гошовський 1992, 318).

According to Hoshovsky, the methodology of melogeographical research includes the following:

– fieldwork, which means recording data conforming to a special questionnaire, which specifies song types, genres, tunes, poetic texts;

– classification of the musical material, carried out according to song types, first within the framework of the corresponding genre, then regardless of it;

– analysing the musical material at three levels: musical and syntactic, morphological and phonological;

– cartography of musical phenomena and elements, which involves transferring certain analysed musical data on to contour maps.

The object of melogeography, as chosen by Hoshovsky, is traditional ritual folk music (Christmas carols, Malanka carols, hayivky, ritual wedding songs [ladkannya], song dialogues and songs of kolomyika structure). In the context of melogeography, its study should follow the following steps: a) identifying the areas of distribution of song genres and types, and their dialectical differences; b) determining musical dialects and the limits of their distribution; c) creating musical and dialectological, typological, genre and musical-ethnic maps.

On accomplishing these tasks, Hoshovsky concluded that: a) among ritual songs only carols are commonly distributed throughout the Carpathians; b) other ritual and functionally regulated songs, as well as songs of kolomyika structure, form larger or smaller closed areas which do not coincide either with ethnic, linguistic and dialectical, or ethnographic areas; c) the configuration of song types on the map corresponds mostly to the areas of musical dialects; however, it coincides with the linguistic borders of dialects only to a certain extent; d) the distribution of certain types of ritual songs in the Carpathians and beyond (for example, in Moravia and the Balkans) indicates the migration paths of the Carpathian population, who carried the characteristic pattern of musical thinking; e) attention should be paid to ‘blank spots’ on the genre-based typological map, which testify to the lack of certain genres and types, which are spread in other places in the Carpathians and Ukraine among the linguistically and ethnographically homogeneous population.

The importance of this research cannot be underestimated, since it encourages the further use of methodological foundations and their wide application to the rest of Ukraine.

The methodology of the dialectological research was laid by Hoshovsky as the basis for his collection-anthology ‘Ukrainian Songs of Transcarpathia’ (Гошовський 1968), which was consistently implemented from the moment of re-
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recording the folk music (the choice of the region, village, informants, genres, their musical peculiarities) to its systematisation. Undoubtedly, this collection represents the comprehensive conclusion of Hoshovsky’s expeditionary and scholarly work in the period 1955 to 1965. The author trod a long and laborious path towards this monograph, which logically included a number of publications on the subject matter of the folk songs of Transcarpathia: ‘On the Issue of Musical Dialects of Transcarpathia’, ‘Some Peculiarities of the Historical Development of Ukrainian Folk Song in Transcarpathia’, and the review of Krechko’s collection ‘Transcarpathian Folk Songs’. The publication of the work turned out to be quite troublesome, since he experienced repressions from the Soviet regime.

Let us consider briefly the history of the publication. The collection was published in Moscow, as the Ukrainian publishers Muzychna Ukraina (Musical Ukraine) refused to publish Hoshovsky’s work, claiming that the scholarly concept of the collection was too formalised and complicated. Besides, the editor wanted to adapt folk songs which the author included in his collection, preserving all the dialectical peculiarities in accordance with the norms of the literary language, and another requirement was to remove the references. Hoshovsky disagreed strongly with this policy, as he applied his expert approach to the subject.

The scholar turned to the publishers Soviet Composer in Moscow, and the collection was published there in the original version. They kept all the references, and the lyrics were printed in the original language, with a translation into Russian.

The collection included 262 songs (selected from over 1,000 personal records), and a comprehensive introductory article dwelling on the ethnographic area studied, and explaining the broad social and historical background.

In his introduction, Hoshovsky proposed a division into thematic sections, specifically formulated the concept of the folk song and the aim of ethnomusicology, revealed the function of song in people’s lives, provided a detailed overview of the genres and types of songs in Transcarpathian folk music, and outlined the theoretical foundations for the study of musical dialects and the methods of musical and dialectological analysis, and the history of collecting and studying the Ukrainian folk songs of Transcarpathia.

The researcher selected traditional peasant songs that were most typical of a specific village or a studied musical dialect, which were known to most middle-aged and elderly native inhabitants.

It was in this collection that Hoshovsky published for the first time songs functionally and stylistically reflecting unique patterns of folk music culture. These are the kopanyovski songs and hoyekannya. Kopanyovski songs are known only in southeast Transcarpathia, in the valleys of the rivers Teresva and Ter-
eblya. These song-dialogues are usually sung by girls when taking a break from digging potatoes on their individual plots of land. *Hoyekannya* (*huyakannya* or *huyakannye*) were first recorded by Hoshovsky in 1963 and 1964, in villages next to the Uzhotsky Pass.

The folk song material in this collection is classified according to musical dialects (musical and ethnographic or musical and stylistic regions):

I. Songs of Hutsulshchyna;
II. Maramoros songs;
III. Songs of Eastern Verkhovyna;
IV. Songs of Western Verkhovyna;
V. Songs of the Uzhan-Turya valley;
VI. Uzhhorod songs;
VII. Songs of the Latorytsya valley;
VIII. Songs of the Borzhava valley.
IX. Migration songs, which make up an original song genre of Transcarpathian folklore.

Within each musical dialect, Hoshovsky systematised songs according to genres defined by the function of the song, and within the genre in accordance with the song types, and, further, according to the content. Thanks to this classification, songs can be considered in their natural environment, and connected to the spiritual life of the people and their artistic needs.

Wishing to facilitate the analysis of formal characteristics of musical folklore, and to assist the reader in navigating the content of the collection, the author also compiled an alphabetical index of songs, performers and villages, as well as the following special references: a) genres; b) song forms; c) rhythmic structures of the verses; d) key systems and tone rows.

The songs keep all the lexical and basic phonetic features of the local dialects, as well as bearing traces of the influence of the literary language. Almost all the songs are provided with notes and commentaries.

As is mentioned above, Hoshovsky’s collection ‘Ukrainian Songs of Transcarpathia’ marked a turning point in his dialectological studies of music. The path to it was professionally and systematically based on a number of publications, and was eventually summarised in this publication of songs classified according to musical dialects. The collection is the result of the scholar’s long-term expeditionary work in the area. The collection ‘Ukrainian Songs of Transcarpathia’ was an outstanding achievement, based on the author’s well-balanced theoretical and methodological principles. All in all, ‘Ukrainian Songs of Transcarpathia’ by Hoshovsky is no average collection. Taking into account the amount of material (field recordings made in the ethnographic area studied, the social and historical
background), the scope of scholarly consideration (classification, terminological innovations, methods of musical and dialectological analysis, notes, commentaries, analytical references), the publication is serious monographic research.

It should be acknowledged that Hoshovsky’s anthology and monograph ‘Ukrainian Songs of Transcarpathia’ was a remarkable phenomenon in the history of both Ukrainian and European ethnomusicology.

Thus, Volodymyr Hoshovsky’s musical and dialectological method, applied since 1955 to the musical culture of Transcarpathia, was successfully implemented in a number of publications, and completed in the anthology and monograph ‘Ukrainian Songs of Transcarpathia’.

Based on a comprehensive folk song database compiled in Transcarpathia, Hoshovsky highlighted the differences in local musical dialects, pointed out their distinctive local features, and established the directions which future research into dialectal variants should follow, as well as the methods to carry out the research most effectively. The scholar emphasised that in order to record songs, it is necessary to use carefully compiled questionnaires. He also developed some principles for dialectological research, which can be outlined by the following points:

1) Systematising songs according to their characteristic features:
   a) songs of the same rhythmic structure
   b) songs of the same melodic form
   c) songs of the same genre;
2) Identifying common features or variability of a musical phenomenon, and recording the absence of a musical phenomenon;
3) Mapping the data collected.

In our opinion, the significance of Hoshovsky’s methodological approach is in the possibility of its application to the comparative analysis of musical and syntactic (melodic form, structure of the verse, interaction of parts on the international level), morphological (analysis of musical phrases, rhythms of melodic contours, metres, leaps and steps in the melody), and phonetic (key systems of the period, tone row, ambitus, melodic figuration) levels. This method provides a solid and broad basis for the study of melogeography, and the compilation of musical dialectological and musical ethnic atlases.
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Summary

Like other areas of study, such as phonoarchival science, the historiography of musical folklore, historical and comparative ethnomusicology, musical Slavic studies, typology, structural linguistics, ethnopsychology and experimental ethnomusicology, musical dialectology occupies a significant place in folklore studies.

According to Hoshovskyi, musical dialectology in Ukraine was founded by the famous Ukrainian folklorist Filaret Kolessa. In the 1920s, Kolessa pointed to the existence of Ukrainian musical dialects which originated on Ukrainian territory and almost entirely correspond with language dialects. Although he considered Kolessa to be the first in this area of research, it should be mentioned
that Stanislav Lyudkevych touched on this matter much earlier, in the preface to the first volume of his ‘Galician-Rus’ Folk Melodies’. He did not use the phrase ‘musical dialect’. However, he wrote: ‘Eastern Galicia is the westernmost edge of the Ukrainian-Rus’ lands, and if viewed in geographical and ethnic terms, it is rather heterogeneous; besides, in the west and south it borders on foreign and quite different ethnic elements. Thus, it has provided a rich environment for the combination and overlapping of various local and external influences, and as a consequence, on its relatively small area of land, it exhibits (as in the language), both in minor details and on the basis of the melodies, notable ethnographic differences, apparently far more significant than Russian Ukraine.’ One of the reasons why Hoshovsky failed to mention Lyudkevych in this context could have been the fact that this work was unavailable. The scholar also did not mention B. Bartok, Y. Stenshevsky and Y. Yagamash, but in his next, much deeper article ‘Musical Archaisms and their Dialectical Features in Transcarpathia’, he did refer to the work of these folklorists.

Hoshovsky developed his musical and dialectological method from 1955. In fact, he applied it at the very dawn of his folklore studies, first on the basis of the theoretical principles of Filaret Kolessa, and later on those of B. Bartok and other folk music researchers. In this area of research, he was greatly supported by Y. Dzendzelivsky, an eminent Ukrainian linguist, specialising in the history of the Ukrainian language, Ukrainian and Slavic dialectology, lexicology, lexicography and linguistic geography.

Hoshovsky began exploring the musical dialects of Transcarpathia in real-life conditions, and over the course of many years of practical experience, he amassed a wealth of profound theoretical, methodological and practical knowledge, writing down a large number of folk songs. It was vital for Hoshovsky to indicate specific differences in musical dialects in the area, to identify explicit local features, and to define a direction in which to carry out the study of dialectical variants and the methods to be used.

In our opinion, the importance of Hoshovsky’s methodological approach is in the possibility of its application to the comparative analysis of various levels: musical and syntactic (melodic form, the structure of the verses, the interaction of the parts on an intonational level), morphological (the analysis of musical phrases, the rhythms of melodic contours, metres, leaps and steps in the melody), and phonetic (the key systems of the period, the tone row, ambitus, and melodic figuration). This method provides a solid and broad basis for the study of melogeography, and the compilation of dialectological and ethnic musical atlases.

Translated into English by Christina Ryabinets