THE UKRAINIAN KOBZA AND BANDURA IN ORGANOLOGISTS’ WORKS OF THE SECOND HALF XX – EARLY XXI CENTURIES
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INTRODUCTION

Bandurais considered in organology to be the most debatable instrument of the traditional music culture of the Ukrainians. The issues of its origins are being actively discussed in modern scientific discourse. The representatives of traditional Slavic organology, Mykola Lysenko, Aleksandr Famintsyn, and Hnat Khotkevych, made significant contributions to its study, and found that kobza and bandura were two different instruments. These scientists have shown that there were two types of bandura in the Ukrainian traditional instruments: with *prystrunki* (short melodic strings) and without. H. Khotkevych refuted the Famintsyn’s hypothesis about the Western European origin of the bandura and the eastern, Asian origin of kobza. He made an assumption about autochthonous origin of the bandura, without confirming it with scientific arguments, which, ultimately, corresponded to the general state of organology development in 1920s in the territory of the USSR.

The author attempts in her article to analyze kobza and bandura functioning in the works of Ukrainian and Russian organologists of the second half of 20th and the beginning of 21 centuries – A. Humeniuk, K. Vertkov, M. Khai, M. Prokopenko, L. Cherkaskyi, V. Kushpet, as well as individual bandura players.

*Kobza or bandura in Andrii Humeniuk’s concept.*

The famous Ukrainian organologist A. Humeniuk examines kobza (or bandura) in his monograph “Ukrainian Folk Musical Instruments” (1967), assigning them to the strings on which the sound was produced by a pinch\(^1\).

The author, in the historical reference on these instruments origin, development and existence, treats kobza and bandura as a single instrument (in the traditions of Ukrainian traditional organology). The organologist, when giving an assessment of the two controversial theories of these instruments origin – the migratory theory by A. Famintsyn and the autochthonous theory by H. Khotkevych – indicates the bias and one-sidedness of each of them, since “the first <...> did not take into account the folk’s creative initiative

---

(! – I. Z.), conditioned by its life and artistic needs, preferring adoption, and the other one did not recognize the adoption at all. Instead, the researcher does not propose his own concept for this type of instrumentation genesis and ways of development, being captured by the Soviet theory of society class stratification and class-based “struggle of the Ukrainian people for social and national liberation”.

Humeniuk, sharing A. Famintsyn’s opinion about bandura as a lute type instrument with a gusli-like phonation, was the first of the Ukrainian organologists to pay attention to A. Famintsyn’s prophetic assumption that “the Cossack rhapsodes-singers, while creating a new required instrument, adopted general lute structure (body with a fingerboard) and placed basses on the fingerboard. In addition, they transferred gusli strings on the body and called them prystrunky (short strings). Thus, kobza or bandura combined elements of the eastern lute and Slavic gusli”. A. Humeniuk also agrees with A. Famintsyn that idea of prystrunky evolved under the influence of the image of Russian (?) – I. Z.) gusli. When answering to the question: “why this new instrument was called kobza, and later bandura?” the author gives an unambiguous answer: “The Slavic peoples and neighboring non-Slavic ethnic groups called the stringed musical instruments of various type as kobza”. That is why the Ukrainians “traditionally called the new instrument they created a kobza”.

The researcher believes that kobza became an autochthonous musical instrument that the peoples of Ukraine generally mastered only in the late XVI – early XVII centuries, in connection with which the kobza players “began searching for a new name” (?) – I. Z.). It was at this time that “attention was paid to the names of existing same-type (apparently lute-like – I. Z.) instruments of other peoples”. Since kobza was not only similar to a lute, but also built on its basis, “there was no great difference between the kobza and bandura’s structures” (italic type added – I. Z.), in connection with which “kobza was also called bandura”. According to the author, this instrument still bears a double name.

---

According to A. Humeniuk, bandura in those days, when it was called kobza, could not be three-stringed, with a narrow long fingerboard – an instrument with a plucked phonation. Kobza, like gusli, has always been a plucked instrument. In addition, neither in structure nor in number of strings could it in the XV – XVI centuries be more primitive than the lute-like instrument depicted on the medieval fresco in the Cathedral of St. Sophia “Musicians” (XI c.): “What was the need for Ukrainians to create a new instrument, more primitive than existing ones?” – the author asks rhetorically. It is worth noting that the history of organology knows many cases when not only highly developed, extremely sophisticated instruments, but also huge layers of instrumental culture (together with the spiritual and material ones) died with the change of socio-historical formations. Possibly, a two- and three-stringed kobza (with a long neck) could have been adopted from the nomadic peoples of the Steppe later within the period of the Kyiv state decline (after 1240 – until the victory over the Golden Horde in the Battle of Kulikow (1380) and subsequent formation of Grand Duchy of Poland and Lithuania (1407) The ancient kobza could have had a specific ethnocharacteristic detail – prystrunky absent in simultaneously existing lute-like instruments of other European peoples. Therefore, according to Humeniuk, “when it comes to the Ukrainian kobza of ancient times one should refer to an instrument with prystrunky <...> more sophisticated than gusli” (? – I. Z.) The latter, according to the organologist, became the basis for the creation of a more sophisticated kobza or bandura (? – I. Z.), which ousted them from the musical life of Ukraine.

A. Humeniuk rightly associates the modern development of the instrument (bandura) with the name of H. Khotkevych, a professional bandura player of the new type, who for the first time introduced structural changes in the traditional instrument in the 1920s and 1930s, such as: asymmetric displacement of the neck relative to the body, increasing the number of strings and prystrunky, partial pitch chromatization using the moving levers and string supports). The variety of string tuning (Lydian – by O. Veresai, P. Bratytsia, H. Honcharenko, Phrygian – bandura described by A. Rubets, and Dorian – bandura by M. Kravchenko and A. Gepuba) in ancient bandura depended on many factors: regional traditions, the nature and range of the performer’s voice, type of repertoire, aesthetic sound, personal tastes and preferences of kobza players. Depending on the content of the genre, nature of

---

work the strings have been retuned several times, so when searching for new acoustic indicators of the instrument and increasing the number of prystrunki, it became necessary to create an instrument with a chromatized scale (O. Korniyevskyi, I. Skliar, V. Tuzychenko, V. Herasymenko). The use of the instrument under new conditions (in particular, in the ensemble performance) raised a question of creating bandura family (V. Tuzychenko, I. Skliar) for professional and amateur chapels of bandura players.

Thus, in the development of Ukrainian string-plucked instruments of the kobza tradition, A. Humeniuk stands on the positions of the vulgar-evolutionist theory inherent in the Soviet period of development of the Ukrainian organological science, simplifying the emergence and development of each subsequent instrument based on the previous one through its displacement from the musical and historical practice by other (gusli – kobza – bandura – modern academic bandura). The author’s lack of understanding of the instruments historical evolution is evidenced by at least an explanation of impossibility of existence in the Ukrainians of a long-necked three-stringed kobza (long neck lute) on the basis of existence of a five-stringed plucked lute-like instrument on the medieval Ukrainian fresco (the Cathedral of St. Sophia, XI century)\(^9\), which belongs to the type of short-neck lute (with rearpins). The long neck lute itself could have appeared on anti-Ukrainian lands long before the formation of the Kievan Rus (according to Ibn Fadlan). Thus,

1. A. Humeniuk was the first Ukrainian organologists to draw attention to A. Famintsyn’s idea of bandura origin from the Russian gusli (without specifying, in fact, what type exactly and why Russian, not medieval East Slavic, narrower – ancient Ukrainian), as evidenced by prystrunki location on the instrument body. (Given the fact that A. Famintsyn considered prystrunki as “purely Ukrainian invention”!).

2. According to A. Humeniuk, the plucked mode of play on kobza-bandura, as on gusli, correlates this lute-like chordophone with the latter, while the researcher rejects completely the possibility of plucked phonation, the existence of which was undoubtedly indicated by M. Lysenko and A. Famintsyn.

3. In substantiating the affinity of bandura with gusli as an instrument that combines elements of the eastern lute and Slavic gusli, the researcher does not consider it necessary to specify the type of instrument itself, which, when changing the method of holding and a manner of play, can no longer be interpreted solely as struck string lute type chordophone.

\(^9\) 1970s studies showed that on the original image from St. Sophia’s fresco (XI c.), the lute instrument had three strings.
**Kobza and bandura in Konstantin Vertkov’s concept.**

K. Vertkov studied the issue of the Ukrainian struck string instruments origin of kobza tradition in contemporary Russian organology. His exploration of “Regarding issue the Ukrainian Kobza” (1972) became a major contribution to the study of Ukrainian struck string instruments. The scientist focused his attention not only on the critical review of written sources, but also on a detailed analysis of the instruments from Ukrainian iconography of XVII – XIX centuries, in particular, from the Ukrainian folk paintings “The Cossak Mamay” with the image of a kobza.

The author, noting the synonymy of using terms “kobza”, “bandura” and “lyre”, often referred to as kobza in common terms, critically approaches the widely quoted in “Dictionary” by B. Linde of the statement “kobza <...> with three strings”, indicating that the specified number of strings could only refer to the organistrum. Following A. Humeniuk, the author is inclined to believe that the inaccurate reading of B. Linde’s text by later authors has led to the fact that the oldest Ukrainian kobzawas considered to be a three-stringed (L. Golembiovskyi, A. Sovinskyi, A. Famintsyn, H. Khotkevych). The identification in the national vocabulary of the words “kobzar” and “lirnyk” is associated with the use of the term “kobza” with a completely different type of instrument – “<...> lyre, which can be explained not as much by the peculiarities of the individual design of these instruments, but their typical function they performed in the Ukrainian (Cossack and Rural) environment as rhapsody instruments, as well as common repertoire.” The author explains thus the synonymity of using the names of three instruments – kobza, bandura and lyre.

According to K. Vertkov, the Ukrainian iconographic monuments of the XVII – XIX centuries – folk paintings “The Cossak Mamay” are of decisive importance in addressing the issue of the Ukrainian kobza origin. As mentioned above, H. Hotkevych was the first one who used the iconography of kobza images depicted in the “Mamays”in organological analysis, who unfortunately could use a rather limited number of images (6), with only one type of instrument, which prevented him from making broader generalizations.

The researcher, when studying instruments from paintings, first published in the study of P. Biletsky’s “The Cossak Mamay”– Ukrainian folk painting”
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observed the presence in the plots of paintings of two different types of plucked chordophones – with long and short necks (according to K. Vertkov – tambourine and lute-like)\(^{13}\).

The instruments of the first group have a hemispherical or oval body, a long narrow neck and a straight head, slightly bent back or turned volute-forward. We find this form, analyzed by H. Khotkevych, more often. The longneck kobzas on the paintings are reproduced both with frets and without\(^{14}\) (perhaps, they were not always depicted by folk painters, because, according to ancient traditions, frets were imposed for some ancient instruments – I. Z.). Kobzas are depicted on the paintings of the XVII – XVIII centuries with 3–4 frets.

The instruments of the second type have a pear-shaped body, a short neck and a head, bent back at right angle (as lute). Kobzas of this type depicted at the “Mamays” of the end of the XVII – XVIII centuries. They are not preserved in the Ukrainian traditional instruments of the XIX century; although still exist in the Romanian and Moldovan ones (in the ensemble tradition of \(\text{lăutari}\)).

In longneck kobza with frets, depicted in paintings of the XVII – XVIII centuries, each string (together with the thumbstring) had a range in the volume of quint or sixth. However, one painting dated the beginning of the XIX century, shows the cossack playing kobza with ten frets, the lower four of which are located under the first (thumbstring), that is, used to play the melody in head tone. Based on this observation, K. Vertkov concludes on a much broader fret-line volume and expressive capabilities of the ten-fret instruments of the XIX century testifying to the high development of performance technique\(^{15}\).

Both types of instruments (long and short necks) are depicted predominantly with the same number of strings (four single or double-choral). They are combined by the same playing style (position of Cossack musician’s hands) and the manner of holding the instruments. A detailed analysis of the play mode (with all five fingers with active function of the little finger) gave the scientist grounds to conclude on the highly developed play technique on both kobza types\(^{16}\).

\(^{13}\) Vertkov K. (1973 a) К вопросу об украинской кобзь. Проблемы музыкального фольклора народов СССР / Сборник статей. Москвa: Музыка, p. 279.

\(^{14}\) H. Hotkevych failed to observe this.


The rhapsodic instrument development of the Ukrainian kobza-professional tradition, according to K. Vertkov, gradually “led to the formation of a new kind of kobza, which combined two different instruments – a tambourine-like (long neck – I. Z.) the neck of which lost the function of the fingerboard with frets, and the cittern-like that gave rise to “prystrunki” <...>”17. With regard to this new version, the author, following Famintsyn, saw the unification of functions of the East Slavic gusli of helmet-like type (with no strings shortening during play) and the Ukrainian kobza18. In the author’s opinion, the likelihood of the interaction between gusli and kobza is more likely given that both instruments were used simultaneously in the national center of kobza art – the Zaporozhian Sich19. The author considers the helmet-shaped East Slavic gusli as the gusli with horizontal holding mode.

The image of such a hybrid instrument with prystrunki was first presented by Ukrainian historian O. Rihelman (1785); it is captured on the Ukrainian folk paintings of the 1830s. The instrument depicted in the painting by O. Rigelman is a typical short neck lute (kobza). It has an oval body, a wide (with no frets) neck and a steeply bent back head. The instrument depicted in the painting “The Cossack Mamay” of the 1830s is a typical long neck modal lute (with four short melodic strings on the sounding board). The first instrument illustrates the kobza player of the XVIII century, the second one (as can be seen from the inscription under painting “Hey, my bandura”) reproduces the bandura player, which indicates the synonymity of using the terms “kobza” and “bandura” in the first decades of the XIX century.

According to K. Vertkov (and O. Famintsyn), the ancient bandura had no prystrunki, as confirmed by German authors (Berchholtz, Stelin, and Bellerman). They all described the bandura (i.e. the European lute of the Baroque – bandora – I. Z.) in the same way. Hence, K. Vertkov concludes that there were no prystrunki on the ancient banduras; they are an attribute of kobza exclusively.

According to K. Vertkov, the short neck kobza disappeared in Ukraine due to “uncompetitiveness” with a longneck one, which had the ability to add short (melodic) strings – prystrunki. If the short neck kobza covered a wide Eastern European area (the territory of modern Ukraine, Poland, Moldova, Romania), then the long neck kobza was widespread in Ukraine only. In the course of historical development (approximately from the end of the

19 It is still unknown what form and method of holding gusli had in the Zaporozhian Sich.
XVIII century), due to the growth of the accompanying function, *this type of kobza replaced an “urban” bandura* (? – I. Z.).

K. Vertkov associates the appearance of kobza in the Ukrainians with the era of modern Ukrainian nation formation (XIV–XV centuries), when a *duma* genre emerged, inextricably associated with kobza. According to the organologist, Ibn-Fadlan’s testimony (X century) on the existence of instruments in the Eastern Slavs similar to the “yidan” (Arabic al-ud – I. Z.) cannot be considered as the original prototype for the Ukrainian kobza, at least because the term “kobza” was not used in the written sources of the Ancient Rus.

Therefore, in K. Vertkov’s concept of bandura origin, the following points should be emphasized:

1. Studying the instruments from the Ukrainian folk paintings “The Cossack Mamay”, the organologist for the first time identified two types of Ukrainian neckstruck string chordophones: lute- and tambourine-like kobza (according to the Hornbostel–Sachs systematics – short- and longneck lute-like instruments)\(^{20}\).

2. The author considers the terminological way of establishing the similarity of instruments used by A. Famintsyn and H. Khotkevych to be extremely dangerous, since it leads to typological (and genetic) polysemy and leads organologists on the wrong track.

3. The organologist does not correlate the formation of a new type of hybrid instruments – kobza with *prystrunki* – with bandura formation. In his opinion, *the ancient bandura had no prystrunki*.

4. The organologist attributes bandura origin to the phenomenon of adding *prystrunki* to long neck lutes, since short neck instruments in Ukraine, in his opinion, due to “uncompetitiveness” disappeared eventually from use and could not become a prototype for kobza with additional string carrier – a body.

5. Developing the idea of A. Famintsyn and A. Humeniuk about bandura hybridization on the basis of two instruments (according to A. Famintsyn and A. Humeniuk – bandura and gusli, in K. Vertkov’s concept – long neck kobza and helmet-like gusli), the organologist unfortunately fails to develop it further. According to K. Vertkov, Russian gusli were of three types: wing-like – in the form of wings, helmet-like or psalter-like (“helmet-like” – in the form of an equilateral triangle) and rectangular or table-like (“table-like” – footed, by clavichord type), a historically later variety\(^{21}\). So, Vertkov’s

---

\(^{20}\) In our work, we use the terminology of C. Sachs – E. Hornbostel.

systematization is based on the instrument shape\textsuperscript{22}. At the same time, the players held the helmet-like and wing-like gusli on their knees during performance\textsuperscript{23}, i.e., horizontally. The organologist does not mention any other possible means of holding these; so, apparently, the vertical way of holding was unknown to him.

Supporting Famintsyn’s hypothesis of bandura hybridization with gusli, K. Vertkov, unfortunately, does not solve the issue of how the manner of playing the instrument could change; he does not say anything about changing the way it is held. After all, the horizontal way of holding traditional Russian helmet-like gusli could not be applied to the bandura, which the performers never held horizontally contrary to the torban and lyre, but always perpendicularly with a certain inclination or pressing against the chest.

\textit{Kobza and bandura in Mykhailo Khai’s concept.}

M. Khai puts forward rather original theory of bandura and kobza evolution as instruments of the kobza-gusli tradition in his monograph “Musical and Instrumental Culture of the Ukrainians (Folklore Tradition)”, 2007 (2\textsuperscript{nd} ed. 2011). The researcher, developing basic idea of traditional (Russian and Ukrainian) organology regarding bandura inheritance of the gusli mode of play (Famintsyn, Khotkevych, Humeniuk, and Vertkov) and analyzing gusli types given in M. Lysenko’s work, identifies three well-known types of these instruments widespread in the Slavic world: 1) the oldest wing-like, 2) helmet-like (gusli-psalter), and 3) table- or clavier-like (according to K. Vertkov). At the same time, M. Khai notes that the first type (recorded by K. Vertkov almost 65 years later on Russian material) in M. Lysenko’s classification is absent. This is not surprising, since in the times of M. Lysenko medieval wing-like gusli were an unknown instrument known only from Czech written sources (the so-called Bohemian wing): Russian archaeologists discovered this type of gusli during the excavations of Ancient Novgorod in the middle of the XX century. In Ukraine, since the late Middle Ages, other types of vertically held gusli have displaced it. Concerning bandura origin, the researcher puts forward an interesting hypothesis, according to which the wing-like gusli “… in form and structure were closest to the historically inevitable transition of a cittern-like instrument – gusli – into a lute-like bandura”\textsuperscript{24}.

Offering his own classification of Ukrainian traditional chordophones, the author first characterizes gusli as a plucked neck-free instrument (next to bandura (?! – I. Z.) and subsequently – as a plucked percussion instrument (!? – I. Z.) together with cymbals 25. The researcher tries to supplement generally accepted in Russian organology classification of gusli by three main types (K. Vertkov) with the fourth one – few strings (? – I. Z.) or the so-called archeological gusli, “called so as opposed to “ethnographic”, with more strings”26. At the same time, the organologist notes that the researchers-bandura players (V. Yemets) assign these gusli to the “instruments of a gudok type” (? – I. Z.), that is, a violin-type bowed chordophone (!), but with a vertical holding mode (that is, eastern one – I. Z.). Here, the author refers to the picture No. 18 in the attachments to his monograph (page. 516), which should illustrate the Russian medieval gudok – ancient Slavic violin, which was held vertically during play. However, the above mentioned picture shows the Naddniprianski cymbals, not gudok (gudok is shown on another picture – No. 23 on page 518)27.

The author classifies kobza as an instrument of kobza-lute family28. Bandura, in his opinion, “is genetically derived from a zither-gusli-like… type29. In his studies of the 1990s the author, developing the ideas of H. Khotkevych and S. Hrytsa, proposes a hypothesis of the historical and staged development of the Ukrainian epic instruments – gusli, bandura, and kobza (as a refutation of the existing version of bandura origin from kobza), that is, the transformation of “diatonic and pentatonic” (? – Ugro-Finnish – I. Z.) gusli into bandura with diatonic structure”30. The author considers kobza as a type of synthesized (? – I. Z.) instrument (with fingerboard and prystrunki) – “Ukrainian analogue of the Eastern kobuz and European lute transformed under Ukrainian setting into the form and structure of popular in this setting bandura”31.

27 Review of the mentioned works by V. Yemets and G. Tkachenko did not confirm the author’s appeal.
28 There is no such family according to the E. Hornbostel – C. Sachs systematics or the Russian modern systematic.
29 Apparently, the author refers to the zither-like type of chordophones (according to C. Sachs).
In our opinion, M. Khay’s hypothesis of the staged-chronological development of the Ukrainian struck string instruments applied to the “transformation <...> of zither-like gusli into a lute-like bandura”\textsuperscript{32} requires some correction, since bandura with short melodic strings it adopted from the vertically held gusli was formed as a traditional instrument of the Ukrainians at a time when the medieval and baroque vertical gusli-psalter, at least since the second half of the XVIII century, started disappearing from use. Nevertheless, the “genetic memory” of the people has been preserved about the method of holding the instrument and the method of play, which are the most stable features in the national instruments evolution...

Also the quasi-quotatation from M. Khai’s monograph on the archeological (few strings) gusli appurtenance “to a separate category of “instruments of gudok type” (? – I. Z.)”\textsuperscript{33} [6, p. 107], one must think that it belongs to the author himself, while in the researcher’s reference to the work by V. Yemets “Kobza and Kobza Players” (1923) this opinion is missing. Developing his concept, M. Khai notes that only wing-like gusli relate to the development of struck string instruments of the epic East Slavic tradition, which “in the North Slavic (i.e. modern Russian – I. Z.)... lands, having lost <....> their ethno-organologic (? – I. Z.) traits, acquired the features of the newest ones (balalaika)”\textsuperscript{34}. In Ukraine, according to the author, the wing-like gusli most likely “transformed into an instrument of bandura-duma epic tradition (into bandura wing-likeshape)” (? – italic type added – I. Z.)\textsuperscript{35}. In this case, the interpretation is unclear of bandura evolution line from kobza, which contradicts the classification of bandura by the author as a hybrid type instrument. Let us recall that the wing-like gusli have two varieties – with an opening in the widest part, that is, lyre-like\textsuperscript{36} [18], and without it. Gusli without opening could not have influenced the radical transformation thereof into another type of chordophone (lute-like) either by the mode of holding (horizontally on the knees) or phonation method.


The author, insisting on the appurtenance of hypothesis on natural transformation of the epic-gusli tradition instrument into dumy-bandura tradition (not dumy-kobza – I. Z.) by G. Tkachenko (although the latter never spoke of change in the external shape of the lute-like bandura, stating only the change to the helmet-like gusli holding method)\textsuperscript{37}, invokes the well-known conclusions of S. Hrytsa and A. Ivanytskyi about historical inheritance of the ancient Ukrainian epic-gusli and kobza-duma traditions\textsuperscript{38}. Based on Khotkevych’s a priori view of the autochthonous origin of most traditional Ukrainian instruments, the researcher does not support the generally accepted in organology idea of “kobza bandura” evolution and adheres to his own concept, “more substantial” (! – I. Z.) than previous versions, <...>, since [it] is “imposed” logically not only on the evolutionary-ergological series of instruments structure involved in the transformation”\textsuperscript{39}. According to the researcher, the diatonic bandura of the category of simple (neck-free) chordophones (? – I. Z.)\textsuperscript{40} is closer in classification of Hornbostel–Sachs systematics to gusli (index 321.32. -5)\textsuperscript{41} than kobza, which the author considers as “an instrument of the complex aerophones category (???? –I. Z.)\textsuperscript{42}. It follows from the further exposition that “the folk (old-world) bandura is a struck string lute instrument of wing-like (? – I. Z.) shape formed as a result of zither-like ancient Ukrainian gusli transformation, acquiring under the influence of the European (? – I. Z.) tradition lute-like shape\textsuperscript{43}. The definition given by the author denies the previous one; furthermore, it is unclear how a single instrument (traditional bandura) can simultaneously combine the shape of two instruments at the same time – a wing-like gusli (i.e., an instrument of a wingshape) and a lute (neck chordophone)? The researcher, apparently, is not fully aware of the typical differences between wing- and helmet-like gusli, as picture No. 19, page 495 of the monograph “Musical and Instrumental Culture of the Ukrainians”, shows different in shape and type gusli: 1) helmet-like, that is of triangular shape (upper


\textsuperscript{40} Bandura never belonged to simple neck-free chordophones, the instrument always had a fingerboard.

\textsuperscript{41} Hornbostel–Sachs systematic does not list gusli as an instrument.

\textsuperscript{42} Obviously, this is an unfortunate lapsus of the author, as kobza, according to Hornbostel-Sachs system, is classified as complex chordophones.

instrument) and 2) wing-like gusli with opening, that is, lyre-like (two lower instruments). The latter are reconstructed by G. Pavlychenko Novgorod five-(XI century) and nine-stringed (XIII century) medieval gusli. The author, for unknown reasons, combines them into one type – wing-like gusli, as evidenced by the inscription under picture on page 495. Thus, M. Khai’s concept is currently the most controversial of all existing ones and needs further refinement.

**Kobza and bandura in M. Prokopenko’s concept.**

Mykola Prokopenko, the researcher and bandura player, referring to C. Sachs, derives bandura origin and name from the Sumerian neck instrument “pan tur” (III millennium BC), translated as a “small bow”\(^44\). (As we know, C Sachs has never spoken in his works about the link between *pan tur* and *bandura*.) The author notes that the name of the Arab-Persian tanbur arose from the accidental rearrangement of the letters in the words “*pan tur*”, and not vice versa, as A. Famintsyn thought. Hence, the incorrect conclusion that “<...> bandura is not a tambourine-like instrument, but, on the contrary, a tanbur is a bandura-like (? – I. Z.)”\(^45\). Acknowledging the existence in many peoples of the Caucasus and Transcaucasus (the Georgians, the Abkhazians, the Adzharians, the Ossetians) of neck instruments called *panduri* and *fandur* (which C. Sachs regards as adopted by these peoples from the Sumerians\(^46\)), and analysing the political situation of the Kievan Rus in the XIII – XVI centuries (? – I. Z.), M. Prokopenko makes a conclusion about Ukrainian bandura succession with its ancient “ancestor” *pan tur*, which came to Ukraine through centuries – old contacts with the Caucasian peoples. The author gives information about numerous long-lasting wars, settlements of the Circassians, the Ossetians, the Abkhazian and the Georgians in Ukrainian lands in the first decades of the XIV century. According to M. Prokopenko, both the name and the prototype of the original bandura became known in Ukraine only in the XIV century\(^47\).

Prokopenko’s concept is incorrect, since it is proved (V. Abaiev) that the word “bandura”, along with the Scythian ethnic group, found way into to the south of Ukraine and the Caucasus from the depths of Asia Minor at the dawn of our day. Abaiev dates the appearance of *pan tur* (*fandir*) in the Caucasus to the Scythian-Sarmatian age, and associates the pervasion of bandura lexical


item into the Caucasus with the Scythian colonization of this region\textsuperscript{48}. Therefore, in Ukraine, the ethnonym bandura (panjtor) could not pervadefrom the Caucasus, but existed since the time of Scythian culture domination in the Ukrainian territory.

**Kobza and bandura in L. Cherkaskyi’s concept.**

Leonid Cherkaskyi in the study “Ukrainian Folk Musical Instruments” analysing traditional organological works, tends to the idea of classic organologists about the oriental origin of kobza and its name. Supporting the hypothesis of the Ukrainian kobza eastern origin under the influence of contacts with the Turkic-speaking world\textsuperscript{49}, the author does not reject the autochthonous hypothesis of H. Khotkevych, noting, however, that there is no evidence to support it.

L. Cherkaskyi considers it reasonable to distinguish between two stages in the instrument development – the old one, which provided for the presence of two or three gut strings (from the XV to the first half of the XVIII century), when, according to Khotkevych, kobza was a “common” instrument and the newest (autochthonous) one – from the second half of the XVIII century\textsuperscript{50}, which provided for the presence of prystrunki, without motivating the lower chronological limit of the newest instrument appearance in the Ukrainian territory.

It is significant that the author classifies the modern-day kobza (with prystrunki) as a lute-like instrument with two string carriers – a fingerboard and a sounding board (or rather the body – I. Z.). This observation prompted the organologist to interpret the newest kobza as a zither of a lute-like shape with the preservation of two modes of play (according to E. Hornbostel – C. Sachs systematics its index is 321.(3+1) 32–5)\textsuperscript{51}. The author believes that the authentic modalkobza disappeared in the early XIX century.

The author, while studying bandura, agrees with M. Prokopenko on its genesis and origin of the name, but states: “Preferring precisely this“Caucasian” version of the primary bandura origin in Ukraine, we consider it necessary to emphasize that these “common” instruments against the background of Ukrainian musical culture, its well-established struck string (gusli) instrumentation, and the epic tradition characteristic of the Ukrainians,


have undergone changes, resulting in their own Ukrainian national instruments ...”\textsuperscript{52}.

Like the development of kobza, L. Cherkaskyi also distinguishes two stages in the bandura evolution: 1) from its appearance in Ukraine to the second half of the XVIII century, and 2) from the second half of XVIII century to date. The author refers to the first stage of development the existence of instrument without \textit{prystrunki}, with lute-like mode of phonation (the so-called primary bandura); during the second stage, the autochthonous Ukrainian bandura is being established as “an instrument which organically combines the features of the lute-like and gusli-like instruments”\textsuperscript{53}. The organologist sees the differences between kobza and bandura in increased number of strings (from 3 to 4 in kobza to 8 in bandura), as well as in some features of their shape: “kobza had a longer and thinner handle, smaller body”\textsuperscript{54}. The author described other structural differences between kobza and bandura in the article “On the issue of identifying kobza and bandura”\textsuperscript{55}, where he emphasizes different ways of phonation: “gusle-like” (digital – I. Z.) on bandura and lute-like – on kobza\textsuperscript{56}.

From L. Cherkaskyi’s concept analysis it follows that the author assigns both kobza with \textit{prystrunki} and bandura to the type of hybrid instruments, seeing the differences between these lute-like in shape instruments only in the size of the body, neck parameters and unequal number of strings, without taking into account the differences in the modes of playing and holding instruments.

\textbf{Kobza and bandura in Volodymyr Kushpet’s concept.}

Volodymyr Kushpet, critically reviewing, like other contemporary authors, the provisions of classic studies on the origin of bandura (in particular, from kobza), in the monograph “Mendicancy: traveling singers-musicians in Ukraine” (2007) pays special attention to the specific ways of kobza and bandura phonation, in particular, on the instrument of O. Veresai. The manner

of kobza player’s phonation with strings being pressed to the fingerboard (neck) of the instrument, first characterized by M. Lysenko and H. Khotkevych, indicates that it was a kobza (without frets-nuts), although in parallel the kobza player used another method of phonation. Considering the method of playing using Veresai’s instrument, which had 6 long and 6 short strings, V. Kushpet tends to the opinion of the Kyiv guitarist Y. Pukhalskyi (author of “Bandura play teaching method”, 1978) that the fingerboard strings of the Veresai’s instrument may well perform a full-fledged independent function. Comparison of the performance capabilities of the fingerboard strings with prystrunki limited capacities leads the author to a conclusion on the specificity of Veresai’s style of play, which combined the playing technique on both instruments – kobza and bandura. The author believes that it is much more convenient to play the Veresai instrument by pressing strings to the fingerboard like on lute-like instruments (lute and guitar), and it is almost impossible to play in the harp-like manner, as on multi-string bandura. Reconstructing the repertoire of O. Veresai using an exact copy of the kobza player’s instrument, made by the craftsman M. Budnyk, the author recreated a way of playing in the 1980s, which convinced him of the existence of an independent lute-like instrument – kobza. According to Kushpet, kobza had few prystrunki (from two to seven) and, unlike bandura, they performed the function of extending the range of the instrument when playing in one position. However, in our opinion, kobza with prystrunki (including the Veresai’s instrument) should be attributed to transitional type instruments – hybrid instruments, as L. Cherkaskyi does.

Following S. Ludkevych, the researcher considers bandura as a harp-like multi-stringed instrument, justifying his assumption by the fact that the harp similarity is a commonly accepted definition of struck string instruments family, phonation on which occurs without pressing outstrings when changing their pitch. The increased number of prystrunki on kobza, according to Kushpet, led to the emergence of a new instrument that had a completely

---

57 V. Kushpet uses less successful term “sound removal” (remove – eliminate, not produce sound).
different way of playing –harp-like and “took over the already known in the bourgeois noble environment name of kobza – bandura”\textsuperscript{63}.

Without denying author the expediency of clear and justified delineation of both instruments – kobza and bandura, let us pay attention to the validity of interpreting the latter as an instrument with a harp-likemanner of playing. It is known that phonation using the ancient harps of small size was performed with both hands (except for some medieval instruments, played with one hand while holding them with other one). However, the one-handed way of playing is peculiar to the medieval psalter tradition only –psalters (gusli) of vertical hold, on which the sound was produced not by clanging, but by pinching open strings. Obviously, here we must talk about bandura inheritance not ofharp-like, but psalter-like mode of playing, since the harp-likemode of play on modern framed harps provides for free bilateral access of both hands of the performer to the open strings, and, in addition, quite different sounding board arrangement relative to the strings. The psalter-likemode of playing, with the parallel arrangement of the sounding board body relative to the strings, involves \textit{unilateral access of the performer to the strings} (like with bandura).

Concerning the definition of the type of instrument itself, it should be noted that V. Kushpet does not raise this issue in his monograph: it is obvious that the author attributes both kobza and bandura to the lute-like instruments, with different modes of play. The harp-like (more properly, the psalter-like – I. Z.) mode of playing bandura does not give grounds to interpret it as a harp-like instrument, because harps in the international Hornbostel – Sachs systematics constitute a separate kind of chordophones.

In addition to organologists, the issue of kobza and bandura origin was raised by many Ukrainian and foreign bandura and kobza players, bandura craftsmen and bandura researchers –VasylYemets’ in the work “Kobza and Kobza players” (1923), Zinoviy Shtokalko in “The Kobza Textbook” (1992), Georgii Tkachenko in the textbook “Fundamentals of Playing Folk Bandura”,\textsuperscript{64} [13], Mykola Budnyk in his textbook (both in manuscript versions), Kost’Cheremskyi, Andriy Horniatkevych, Viktor Mishalov in the work “Kobza Bandura. The history of multi-stringed Ukrainian national folk instruments”\textsuperscript{65}. In agreement with the thesis of the prominent bandura player Khotkevych regarding the autochthonous origin of kobza and bandura, who

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
first formulated it in the “Bandura PlayTextbook” (Lviv, 1907), the bandura players note that even today the issue of kobza and bandura origin remains open. Based on the facts known in organology, none of the works of the mentioned authors provides enough evidence to shed light on the genesis and origin of this traditional instrument of the Ukrainian culture. Thus, despite the great literature of the subject, the banduragenesis, like the term itself, has not until recently remained an unsolved issue.

CONCLUSIONS
Thus, the works of the Ukrainian and Russian organologists of the second half of 20th – early 21st centuries advanced individual issues on studying the nature of the instrument. Following classic organologists (M. Lysenko, H. Khotkevych), most researchers deduce bandura from the neck chordophones. K. Verkov, the follower of A. Famintsyn, believes that bandura formed as a result of changes in the appearance of gusli, without specifying their type. G. Tkachenko associates the bandura origin with helmet-like (triangular) gusli of vertical holding method. M. Budnyk supports his idea. M. Prokopenko believes that the instrument was brought from the Caucasus and associates it with neck chordophones. L. Cherkaskyi complements the “Caucasian version” of the author with the influence of the medieval struck string instruments of the Slavs. V. Kushpet calls bandura a harp-like instrument. All the theories analysed have shortcomings and do not definitively address the issue of the instrument genesis and typology. In fact, the genesis of bandura and its typological affiliation remains today an open question. In my opinion, bandura preserved the vertical holding and playing mode from the ancient Ukrainian triangular psalters – by pinching strings with a quill, rather than pressing them against the fingerboard, like on a lute-like neck instruments. Therefore, it should be considered a hybrid instrument – a combination of the shape of a short-neck lute and a zither-like instrument with a vertical holding mode. Its index according to E. von Hornbostel – C. Saks systematics should combine the features of zither with a sounding board body played with the use of quill (index 314.122-6) and kobza – neck box-type lutes (index 321.32.), that is, to be the next one – 314.122 – 6 + 321.32

66 G. Tkachenko’s ideas on the nature of each instrument, which “requires only one single mode of play...” are particularly valuable for our study, according to which the bandura player attributes “O. Rubets’s instrument” to the transitional type of lute-like shape, separating Veresai’s kobza from it, on which the kobza player combined two different modes of play.

SUMMARY

The article analyzes the organological concepts of the Ukrainian and Russian organologists of the second half of 20th – early 21st centuries, in terms of the origin of Ukrainian folk instrument – bandura, and its historical links with kobza. So far, kobza and bandura are considered to be the most debatable instruments in studying the folk music culture of the Ukrainians. The representatives of Ukrainian traditional organology found that kobza and bandura were different instruments, attributed to different types of neck chordophones, with different genesis. Some representatives of the modern Ukrainian Organology School (A. Humeniuk) sometimes ignore this idea.

The interpretation considered of kobza and bandura in the concepts by A. Humeniuk, K. Vertkov, M. Khai, M. Prokopenko, O. Kushpet, and opinions are briefly characterized of the bandura players – V. Yemets’, G. Tkachenko, V. Mishalov. It has been shown that researchers do not agree on the genesis and typology of the instruments. Most of them deduce bandura from the neck chordophones, some of them incorrectly determine the phonation method.

In our opinion, the Ukrainian bandura belongs to the hybrid instruments, as it inherited the shape of the body from the short neck lute-like instruments, and play mode, flat body and vertical holding method – from the zither-like instruments. Its index according to Hornbostel–Sachs systematics is 314.122 – 6 + 321.32.
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