

**A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE ON THE ANALYSIS OF
DANCE STRUCTURE IN THE
INTERNATIONAL FOLK MUSIC COUNCIL (IFMC) /
INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TRADITIONAL MUSIC (ICTM)***

Anca Giurchescu

Preliminaries

The interest in dance structural analysis that emerged and developed in Europe, and especially in eastern Europe, at the middle of the 20th century was induced and stimulated by the International Folk Music Council (IFMC).¹ This was not because dance research did not exist before, but because in the framework of this organization the study of traditional dance (later termed Ethnochoreology) had a theoretical foundation and a wide international basis. Therefore, the history of the theory and method for dance structural analysis, as well as its foundation, development and application, is interwoven with the history of the ICTM Study Group on Ethnochoreology, as it is now known.²

Considered in a broad socio-political and cultural framework, dance research in general and particularly research focusing on folk dance structural makeup, developed pre-eminently in Eastern Europe, where traditional dance practice was still a living phenomenon in the mid-20th century. From an epistemological point of view, the European folkloristic perspective (that focuses on art products such as dance, music, poetry, and so on) finds its roots in the romantic efforts for national identity and the creation and consolidation of the nation states that emerged at the end of the 19th century. East European folklore and American socio-cultural anthropology have two fundamental differences: local versus universal and known (familiar culture) versus unknown (exotic culture). These two ideological orientations gave rise to two parallel scientific streams. In the domain of dance research they merged at the end of the century within the framework of the ICTM Study Group on Ethnochoreology.

In the Eastern European "socialist bloc," the State cultural management focused on the national character and the ancient roots of its traditional culture. Therefore, folklore research enjoyed institutional support. Conducting research as insiders of their own dance tradition, most researchers took into consideration a dance instance in contrast to anthropologists who, working in a foreign dance tradition, focused on a dance system as a whole. The aim was to collect, analyze and classify dances (considered artistic products) in order to discover characteristic traits that identify a national dance culture.

The necessary pre-conditions for developing a method for dance structural analysis were: (1) intensive field research activity that could produce a large stock of recorded (written and/or filmed) dance documents, and (2) the existence of a graphic notation system capable of capturing the transient performances.

At the end of the 1950s, a large corpus of dances had been collected in many countries, especially in Eastern Europe. Working in isolation, however, each country developed its own "national notation system" and a corresponding terminology, hindering cross-cultural information and communication between and among researchers.³ Roderyk Lange points out the limitations of the national systems: "Again, these systems are certainly helpful when used in a particular country and within a group of people who know that particular way of dancing"

[Lange 1980:10]. In contrast, the well established Kinetography Laban (1928) (and in a certain way the Benesh system 1956), based on universal principles, was institutionalized in Poland, Austria [Lange 1980:11] and Hungary (initially introduced by Lugossy Emma and Gönyey Lőrincz [Gönyey 1947], and adopted by a few specialists in England, Germany, former Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.⁴

Foundation of the Study Group on Folk Dance Terminology

It became evident that a unified dance terminology and a method for dance structure analysis were necessary to disclose the dance grammar, to verbalize it and to facilitate cross-cultural research [Hoerburger 1958:62; 1959:71-73]. These aims became reality in the institutional framework of the International Folk Music Council.

Before 1960 the IFMC journals contained many articles, abstracts and reviews on traditional dance with contributions of eminent scholars such as: Douglas Kennedy and Violet Alford (England), Felix Hoerburger (F.R. Germany), Richard Wolfram (Austria), Jean-Michel Guilcher (France), Gurit Kadman (Israel), Vera Proca-Ciortea (Romania), Olga Mladenović, Ljubica and Danica Janković (Yugoslavia), and Raina Katzarova (Bulgaria). In 1950, at the IFMC conference held in Bloomington, Indiana, USA, dance scholars from North America, such as Elisabeth Burchenal and Gertrude Kurath from the USA and Marius Barbeau from Canada, were active participants.

In 1957, at the tenth annual conference, the Executive Board of the IFMC took note of a resolution proposed by dance organizations from four Scandinavian countries, which requested the IFMC to pay more attention to dance issues and especially to "control" the way dance groups present "genuine tradition" on stage [IFMC 1957:12].

The Dance Commission and the IFMC Working Group on Dance Terminology

In 1960, at the thirteenth IFMC conference in Vienna (July 24-28), Felix Hoerburger proposed that a **Dance Commission** (governed by a set of regulations and led by a board), should be created. The Commission was "to appoint *ad hoc* working parties as occasion demands."⁵ The Dance Commission aimed for communication and exchange of scientific material, unification of dance terms and notation systems, and dissemination of bibliographic information.

In 1962, at the fifteenth IFMC Conference in Zlin (former Gottwaldov, Czechoslovakia), the inaugural meeting of the Folk Dance Commission took place with the following board: Felix Hoerburger (F.R. Germany) – chair, Roger Pinon (Belgium) – secretary, Douglas Kennedy (England) and Vera Proca-Ciortea (Romania) – members. This was a crucial moment: the dance researchers introduced dance as a domain of scientific inquiry in the context of the IFMC Conference. At the inaugural session, there were representatives of sixteen countries (Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Netherlands, Poland, Romania, United Kingdom, United States, Yugoslavia).⁶

Felix Hoerburger considered that inadequate and inaccessible bibliographies, and materials published in at least thirty European languages, hinder both dance research and communication between specialists. Consequently, he made the following proposals "for the work of the IFMC Dance Commission": a unified definition of the concept of Dance (including the term Folk Dance with its different categories), a survey of folk dance practice and research in different countries, unification of notation systems on the basis of Kinetography Laban, and dissemination of bibliographic information [Hoerburger 1962:161].

Based on the above, the Dance Commission suggested the following program:

1. A questionnaire that should illuminate the term "folkdance," the life of dance in contemporary society, and the situation of folkdance research in Europe.
2. Publication of a comprehensive dance bibliography (since 1962).
3. Organization of an international dance film archives.

4. The organization of a Working Group on Folk Dance Terminology (under the coordination of Prof. Vera Proca-Ciortea, Institute of Ethnography and Folklore, Bucharest, Romania) [IFMC 1962:23-27].

The following members were appointed for this initial working group (two researchers from each country): Martin György (Institute of Ethnography) and Pesovár Ernő (Institute of Musicology) Budapest, Hungary; Hannah Laudová (Institute of Folklore of the Academy) and Eva Kröschlová (Academy of Arts) Prague, Czechoslovakia; and Anca Giurchescu (Institute of Ethnography and Folklore) Bucharest, Romania.

The aims of this "working core" became the source of the long-term project on Dance Structure Analysis: (1) Unification of "dance terminology and creation of a scientific language" motivated by the redundant, imprecise, and vague dance terms in use. (2) Foundation of a common theory and method for dance structure analysis. [It should be stressed that from the very beginning Structural Analysis was meant only as a stage, and not a final goal, of dance studies that imply many other research perspectives.]

At the sixteenth annual conference of the IFMC, Vera Proca-Ciortea argued in her contribution, "Premises for a folk dance terminology," that "being a syncretic phenomenon, folk dance cannot be studied separately from folk music and poetry"; that dance may be seen as a "means of communicating our thoughts and feelings through movement"; and that researchers aim to create and develop instruments for dance analysis at the level of musicology and linguistics, thus setting up a new discipline, named choreology [IFMC 1963:22-23].⁷

In 1964 at the seventeenth IFMC conference in Budapest, thirty-nine dance people attended the session of the Folk Dance Committee (chaired by Felix Hoerburger), where questions of policy and organization were discussed⁸ and where Vera Proca-Ciortea presented a report of the Folk Dance Terminology Subgroup at a round table (chaired by Roger Pinon). On this occasion the name "Folk Dance Terminology Subgroup" became official and lasted until the beginning of the 1970s when it changed first to "Choreology" and later, in 1978, at the personal request of Vera Proca-Ciortea, to "Study Group on Ethnochoreology" (Vera Proca-Ciortea, 1996, personal letter to Lisbet Torp – chair of the ICTM Study Group on Ethnochoreology).

The makeup of the group and working methods

In 1965, the following new members of the Folk Dance Terminology Subgroup augmented the core: Dr. Kurt Petermann, founder of the Deutsches Tanzarchiv, Leipzig, and Rosemarie Ehm-Schultz, leader of the Staatliches Dorfansamble, Neustrelitz, both of GDR (East Germany); Milica Ilijin (Institute of Musicology, Beograd), Yugoslavia; Pesovár Ferenc (Székesfehérvár Museum), Hungary; Frances Bloland (University of California at Berkeley), the only western dance specialist that joined the group as an active observer. In 1972, at the Wiepersdorf (GDR) meeting, Grażyna Dąbrowska (Poland), and Anna Ilieva and Raina Katzarova (Bulgaria) became members of the Subgroup.

It should be mentioned that the group was exclusively eastern European, with membership by invitation only, a fact that gave it the character of a small and close gang of friends. In spite of its initially wide, international make up, the IFMC returned to the European format, due to the "cold war" syndrome [Reynolds 1987:3]. Indeed, later in 1996, in a personal letter addressed to Lisbet Torp, Vera Proca-Ciortea argues that the limitation of the working group to only researchers of the "Socialist" countries was motivated by the lack of information and communication with the Western World.⁹

The makeup of the group was justified by the theme of focus, by the capacities of the individual researchers, and by the fact that the common working language was German. In spite of different scholarly backgrounds, the group was welded together by the members' passion, enthusiasm and expertise, and by mutual respect and collegiality. Vera Proca described the Subgroup in the following terms:

In spite of our different scholarly backgrounds – some were researchers, others dance specialists (choreographers – dancers), all were very intelligent, well oriented from the theoretical and practical point of view, with great interest in folklore, with music training, good dancers and all spoke the German language, which was the common working language of the group. Thus we had good premises for a common understanding and for starting together on the way of creation of a new discipline: the Ethnochoreology [1996, letter to Lisbet Torp].

In a very short time the Subgroup became a well-balanced working team in permanent contact and exchange of ideas (in meetings or via letters). Considering the difficult conditions in the eastern countries (such as interdiction or tight control with traveling abroad and lack of funding) the group took advantage of all the offers that could bring its members together.¹⁰

With regard to the working method (in the same letter addressed to Lisbet Torp) Vera Proca-Ciortea writes the following: "Our theoretical and methodological competence was rooted in our own research experience, in the national scientific traditions and for sure in the dance reality of our countries." This particular situation made possible a permanent cross-cultural comparison and the use of practical examples for agreeing with or contradicting some of the researchers' statements.

The task of the Subgroup in this first stage was to create "A terminology of universal validity – a tool, so to speak, with which the scientist can unambiguously express himself – and give a scientific basis by the way it defines the terms which stand for the various dance units. In working towards such terminology, it is not the various languages which cause the main problem, but rather the choice of concepts which have comprehensive validity and carry an equally applicable sense in all languages" [IFMC Study Group 1975: 119]. It was also necessary to discover and define the movement units and the rules according to which they function to structure the dance Form.

For this purpose, the meetings of the Folk Dance Terminology Subgroup were focused on precise questions that were solved through theoretical argumentation and analysis of practical examples. Discussions were free, but very intensive, leading to a phrased final statement that should reach the consensus of a majority. Elaborated papers were seldom presented.¹¹

Forerunners' work on dance structure analysis

The teamwork of the IFMC Subgroup on Dance Terminology (implicitly on dance structure analysis) is rooted in the pre-eminent achievements of other dance scholars, and especially of the young generation of Hungarian folk dance researchers. Since the beginning of the 1960s they focused on dance structure analysis and classification based on the experience of extensive field research and influenced by both the morphological school of folkloristics, and in a less explicit way, by the Prague linguistic theories. The morphological and structural approach with particular emphasis on the smallest significant dance unit (the motif) stems from the characteristic traits of the Hungarian dance tradition (eastern European as well) based mainly on individual improvisation [Felföldi 1999:60]. In 1958, Szentpál Olga worked out a method for structural analysis of women's round dances establishing motif types based on recurrence of fundamental units, and in 1961 Martin György with Pesovár Ernő published "A structural analysis of the Hungarian folk dance (a methodological sketch)," which became a well-known and inspiring work primarily for the Study Group of the IFMC but also on a wide international scale (not the least for having been written in English) [Martin; Pesovár 1961]. The authors focus less on the formal structural units than on certain regularities that are significant for shaping the Form of the dance [Martin; Pesovár 1963].

It should be noted that most of the Study Group members were acquainted with the analytical perspective on dance and dance movements by having created their own dance notation system, or for transcribing dance movements in Laban or other notation systems.

Meetings of the Subgroup on Dance Terminology and some results

Between 1965 and 1969, the Folk Dance Terminology Subgroup had seven intensive and fruitful working sessions: 1965, January, in Geltow GDR (following the Composer Union invitation) where Kurt Petermann presented the *Syllabus für Volkstanzanalyse* [Syllabus for folk dance analysis] a first result of the collaborative work. In July 1965, at the Strážnice Festival (Czechoslovakia), the eight members of the Subgroup discussed the Syllabus (on the basis of a report presented by Vera Proca-Ciortea and Hannah Laudová). Anca Giurchescu and Kurt Petermann introduced to the group the concept of Dance Form Models.¹²

In 1965, September, in Celje (at the Congress of The Slovenian Folklorists Union) the Subgroup held one public session where Milica Ilijin discussed theoretical aspects and Vera Proca-Ciortea made a practical demonstration of the structural analysis method.

A preliminary Syllabus on folk dance analysis was issued in cyclostyled format with translation in four languages: English, French, German and Russian in a limited number of copies, edited by Kurt Petermann and meant to be tried on different dance traditions [IFMC 1966; Petermann 1965]. At the next meeting of the Subgroup, held in 1966, in Dojran (occasioned by the thirteenth Congress of the Macedonian Folklorist Union and organized by Milica Ilijin),



Vera Proca-Ciortea brought up for discussion the "Systematization of the Folk Dance Forms" and Eva Kröschlová presented "The linking and grouping of Folk Dance Forms." In conclusion, the participants decided to start writing (in a final form) on the dance structural units and on dance Form models. For the next planned meeting in 1968 Potsdam-Geltow (GDR), Anca Giurchescu and Kurt Petermann agreed to prepare a set of questions to be discussed and all participants planned to present structural analyses of their own material [Sulișteanu 1968:154].

At the meeting in September 1968, in Prizren (occasioned by the fourteenth congress of the Bosnia-Herzegovina Folklorist Union) the Subgroup on Terminology enlarged the sphere of interest to discuss improving communication between dance specialists, and starting collaborative projects on cross-cultural dance research [Giurchescu 1968:96]. The next meeting took place in August-September 1969 in Bucharest, on the occasion of the International Festival "Romania 69."¹³



1972 in Wiepersdorf: Grażyna Dąbrowska, Anna Ilieva, Ernő Pesovár

First results

In 1972, the ninth "Work session of the Study Group on the Terminology of Choreology" (new name) in Wiepersdorf (GDR), was considered to be a culmination of ten years of intensive work (which succeeded in explaining implicit, existent dance grammar). According to Vera Proca-Ciortea, the following results were achieved:

1. An international terminology for all the dance structural units from the smallest and indivisible unit to the dance as an integral form.
2. Dance structural units were discovered, defined and hierarchically organized, compositional rules and dance Form-models were discovered, and the structural relationship between dance and music illuminated.

The next project of the Study Group was the construction of "a universal system of classification for folk dances." The first task was the translation of the *Syllabus für Volkstananalyse* [the Syllabus for Dance Analysis] – already presented by Kurt Petermann in 1965 – in the nine languages of the group members: Bulgarian, Czech, English, French, German, Hungarian, Romanian, Russian, and Serbo-Croatian, to make possible its application in several local dance traditions. The necessity of gathering international bibliographic material on the system of dance classification was also mentioned as an important task [Proca-Ciortea 1972:45].

In 1975, "Foundation for the analysis of the structure and form of folk dance: a syllabus" (from 1972) was published in the *Yearbook of the IFMC 1974* (see IFMC Study Group for Folk Dance Terminology 1975:115-135).¹⁴ This article, presenting the method of Dance Form Analysis – in spite of its limitations (no relevant dance examples, and a few mistaken terms) – became an article for reference, and was frequently quoted.

Different perspectives on dance and dance analysis

At the beginning of the 1970s, dance studies were influenced by European and American structural linguistics, by theories of nonverbal communication, and later semiotics.

In 1973, the IFMC conference in Bayonne (France) was instrumental for a significant meeting between a representative of American cultural anthropology, Adrienne Kaeppler – who had already published her theory and method on structural analysis using linguistic analogies, and representatives of eastern European ethnochoreology, Vera Proca-Ciortea and Anca Giurchescu, members for the IFMC Study Group on Terminology of Choreology.

Kaeppler and Giurchescu, both working on dance structure analysis, in spite of different dance cultures and different approaches to dance were able to communicate on a common level and even used similar terms to designate basic dance units. While Adrienne Kaeppler worked at the level of dance "language," aiming to discover the dance system of the Tongan community (Kaeppler 1972), Giurchescu worked at the level of "parole," analyzing dance instances, comparing and reducing variants to abstract models for reaching the level of "language" (Giurchescu; Niculescu 1971). A confrontation between the western (American) dance anthropology and the choreological European approach was presented at a round table at the IFMC Conference in Regensburg (1975), where John Blacking (South Africa) and Susanne Youngerman (USA) initiated exciting, though controversial, debates, which revealed the lack of "cross-scientific" information between American and European dance researchers [Youngerman 1976].¹⁵

Starting a new project: classification

The IFMC "Study Group on Terminology of Choreology" considered that its goal: foundation of a theory and method for Dance Form Analysis had been fulfilled. This did not mean that unanimity was reached. Questions were still open, and after its application in practice by other scholars, new suggestions and changes were expected.

The next project of the Study Group was to set up a system for dance classification using the principles and methods of structural analysis for comparing and reducing variants to theoretical models (types, categories, and so on). Between 13 and 18 September, 1976, at the tenth working meeting of the Study Group in Zaborów, Poland – organized by Grażyna Dąbrowska – the main topic was "Problems of classification of European folk dances with special regards for group (chain and round dances) and solo dances." However, a final discussion on structural analysis demonstrated that our common struggle for the creation of an overall method for Dance Form Analysis still had "open ends," which could only be solved by its systematic application in practice.¹⁶



1976 Zaborów: Sunni Bloland, (man not identified), Anna Ilieva, Eva Kröschlová, Anca Giurchescu, György Martin

The proceedings of the meeting: *Analyse und Klassifikation von Volkstänzen* [Analysis and classification of folk dances], edited by Grażyna Dąbrowska and Kurt Petermann, included the full text of *Grundlagen der Struktur – und Formanalyse des Volkstanzes* [Foundation of the structure and Form analysis of the folk dance] in a revised version, followed by Eva Kröschlová's amendments to this last version. In the section dedicated to classification of chain and round dances, five papers were included. Kurt Petermann's theory on folk dance systematization and classification (*Systematische Ordnung und Klassifikations im Volkstanz*) rounded out this important publication (Dąbrowska; Petermann 1983).

"Pains of discontinuity"

The ICTM Study Group on Ethnochoreology (new name) under the pressure of other dance scholars' interest in the activity of this scientific body, was essentially forced to open the doors step-by-step. The ICTM Board strongly supported this trend, which emerged at the ICTM conference in Oslo, August 1979, where about seventeen scholars from six countries (most of them members of the Northern Association for Folk Dance Research) became members of the Study Group on Ethnochoreology.¹⁷

The eleventh meeting of the Study Group, organized in November 1979 in Neustrelitz (GDR) by Rosemarie Ehm-Schulz, was attended by thirteen scholars (including representatives of the Scandinavian countries). This meeting marked an important discontinuity in the Study Group tradition by proposing a new model for the future meetings. Dr. Erich Stockmann (president of ICTM and responsible of the Study Group's activities) suggested a broader coverage of subjects organized around a principal theme, a secondary one and papers dedicated to current research (a model that developed into the present-days Symposia).



1979 Neustrelitz : Kurt Petermann, Vera Proca-Ciortea, Erich Stockmann, Rosemarie Ehm-Schulz

Fifty dance scholars from twelve countries attended a 1980 conference organized in Stockholm, Sweden, by the Folk Dance Archives of the Swedish Dance Museum. Twenty-four papers addressed two topics: "Old couple dance forms of Europe" (formulated by the Nordic Association for Folk Dance Research) and "Classification of folk dances" (proposed by the "initial" Study Group), with Kurt Petermann presenting a "Three dimensional classificatory model."

The passage from a "brotherhood" of twelve members (until 1979) to a wide-open scientific forum (forty members in 1982), implying new aims and working methods, weakened the cohesion of the original Study Group. In an ICTM Bulletin report on the Study Group on Ethnochoreology (1982), Vera Proca-Ciortea presented the new situation in the following terms: "Until 1979, the Study Group counted only twelve members. In accordance with a recommendation of the Executive Board, the group has since enlarged and consists now of forty ethnochoreologists. An attempt was made to find specialists who were prepared, through their competence and orientation to contribute to the founding of a new discipline.... We would welcome closer contacts with ethnochoreologists in America and elsewhere, since, so far, only European specialists are active in the Study Group on Ethnochoreology" [Vera Proca-Ciortea 1982:23]. However, Vera Proca-Ciortea gradually lost contact with the Study Group due to other commitments in Romania, and to "natural exhaustion of having pushed the group along a quarter of century" [Reynolds 1987:5].¹⁸

The greatest loss for Ethnochoreology as a science and for the Study Group, was the untimely death (in 1983) of two of its key members: Martin György and Kurt Petermann.¹⁹ The group passed through a period of uncertainty.

Shortly before the ICTM Conference in Stockholm and Helsinki (1985) the leadership of the Study Group passed from Vera Proca-Ciortea (who, with outstanding energy and dedication kept together and animated the group since its creation) to Rosemarie Ehm-Schulz (GDR). Rosemarie's difficult task was to mediate the passage of the Study Group to another stage with a new profile: open membership, broad geographic range (in 1983 the Study Group had thirty-six members from fourteen countries) and a broad range of topics.

In May 1986, Rosemarie Ehm-Schulz organized a meeting of the Study Group in Neubrandenburg (GDR), with the participation of nine scholars from six countries. The papers, dedicated to current research, showed for the first time the diversity of themes existing in the Study Group.²⁰ At the end of the meeting it was decided that future activities should be organized by Rosemarie Ehm-Schulz as chair with two co-chairs Roderyk Lange (United Kingdom) and Lisbet Torp (Denmark).

Twenty-five Study Group members from thirteen countries attended in 1987 the twenty-ninth ICTM conference in Berlin, where they presented sixteen papers. This was the first time (after a long intermission) that dance researchers stepped forward on the ICTM stage as a visible scientific body.

Lisbet Torp in Copenhagen organized in 1988, the fifteenth symposium of the Study Group on Ethnochoreology. It was, in fact, the first manifestation of the Study Group with a new "ideology" and an open membership, which asked for changes in the way the group was run:

Lisbet Torp was elected Chairperson and the Study Group became formally structured with Rules of Order. A bi-annual newsletter came into existence in spring 1988, due to the initiative and editorship of William C. Reynolds. Since 1988, symposia of the Study Group were organized every second year in alternation with the ICTM world conferences (where the members of the Study Group on Ethnochoreology are active participants).²¹



1988 Study Group meeting in Copenhagen

Dance structural analysis in a new key

The symposium in Budapest began a revitalization of interest in structural analysis after an intermission of approximately ten years. For reprising the discussions on dance analysis there were some major motivations. One lies in the criticism of the Syllabus (in its form published in 1974 and improved in 1983) by a number of researchers that considered it inadequate for an analytical study of their own dance culture. Another critical point was the lack of examples for the way the method presented in theory was applied in practice. From this point of view, the re-evaluation of the Syllabus was a necessary requirement. Most important, however, proved to be the confrontation of the Syllabus with other methods for dance structural analysis based on different theoretical approaches and dance experiences.²² Now in the second stage of its existence, the activity of the Study Group reflects changes in its aim and makeup.

A round table dedicated to Structural Analysis (proposed by William C. Reynolds) was organized at the sixteenth symposium of the Study Group, Budapest 1990. Its main project was a comparison between several theoretical perspectives and methods for dance structural analysis in order to reveal their similarities and differences. The Syllabus of the "original Study Group" and the linguistic approach developed by Adrienne Kaeppler were the main terms of this comparison²³ [Reynolds 1989:3; 1990:6].



1990 Budapest: William Reynolds, Jan-Petter Blom, Adrienne Kaeppler, Elsie Dunin

With the increased membership of the Study Group and the different interests and points of view, Sub-Study Groups were organized at the sixteenth symposium in Budapest, as independent working groups between the symposia. The first Sub-Study Groups were the following: Structural Analysis (a continuation of the original Study Group on Dance Structural Analysis, organizer William C. Reynolds); Field Research Theory and Methods; Iconography; Revival; Visual Recording (not active).²⁴

The aim of the new Sub-Study Group on Structural Analysis was to widen the discussion on theories and methods of structural analysis, not only by comparing the two basic perspectives but also by acknowledging other approaches to this subject. For this purpose, the Sub-Study Group organized special meetings and meetings at the following symposia. The first working meeting was held in Istanbul 24-28 August 1993 (hosted by Arzu Öztürkmen). On this occasion, the group agreed that the fundamental difference between Kaeppler's and the ICTM Study Group's approaches to structural analysis is equivalent to the distinction introduced by Saussure between "langue" (level of system) and "parole" (level of performance). They also agreed on a definition of Motif: "A culturally grammatical sequence of movements," a "pragmatic tool in the hands of the researcher, combining both etic and emic perspectives." At the same meeting, Adrienne Kaeppler proposed, for the first time, to produce a joint document on the different methods and ideas on structural analysis to be presented at the forthcoming symposium in Poland, 1994.²⁵ Since the Istanbul meeting Adrienne Kaeppler took over the function of secretary/organizer of the Sub-Study Group.

The next meeting on Structural Analysis took place in Chania, Greece, 6-12 June, 1995 (Irene Loutzaki was the local organizer). The theme of the meeting was "From motif to genre." The main discussions focused on the concept of *genre*, and were prepared on the basis of a reading list provided by Arzu Öztürkmen.



1996 Třešť: Arzu Öztürkmen, Eva Kröschlová, Hannah Laudová, Andriy Nahachewsky, Catherine Foley

The theme of the Rhodes meeting (3-9 August 1997) was "Ethnochoreology versus Anthropology," placing dance structural analysis in a comparative frame. The issues were very broad, stretching from its final aim to the relation between "text" and "context," emic and etic, local terms and cross-culturally accepted terms, and so on. At this meeting the structure of the planned publication was discussed in more detail. The book was conceived to be comprised of an historical introduction (the history of the working group while showing the scientific

background), an updated presentation of the main theories and methods for structural analysis, to be followed by a rich sample of case studies, bibliography, index, glossary and illustrations. The final discussions on the content and format of the book entitled: "Dance structures: perspectives on the analysis of dance" to be edited by Adrienne Kaeppler were carried out at the twentieth symposium of the Study Group on Ethnochoreology, Istanbul, 1998.

This publication is the outcome of those discussions, rounding up almost half a century of efforts for analyzing, in the framework of cultural traditions, the grammar of the dance performance or of a movement system. It shows that a consensus has not been reached, either in theoretical perspectives or in methodological procedures. This situation is normal and even beneficial, as it opens the door for more inquiry and debates between and among scholars in the domain of dance structural analysis.



1997 meeting in Rhodes:

Maria Koutsouba, Mats Nilsson, Theresa Buckland, Anca Giurchescu, László Felföldi, Egil Bakka, Adrienne Kaeppler, Irene Loutzaki

Final comments

Since the Istanbul meeting, the Sub-Study Group on Dance Structural Analysis has met only sporadically. Coming to a close of its task, the group stopped focusing on themes strictly related to the theory and method of structural analysis. From this point of view, the future of the Sub-Study Group is uncertain. However, interest in movement structure has continued and may find related research themes, such as dance style or in more general terms aesthetics, the relationship between movement structure and social function, or between a dance system and other cultural systems that could make up new collaborative Sub-Study Groups in the framework of the ICTM Study Group on Ethnochoreology.

ENDNOTES

- * This article is a revised and amplified version of the paper presented at the 40th anniversary of the ICTM Study Group on Ethnochoreology at the 22nd Symposium held in Szeged, Hungary, in 2002 [Giurchescu 2006].
1. IFMC was founded in 1947 by delegates from 28 countries. At the first conference, President Ralph Vaughan Williams stated: "*While others are dealing with how people are to survive, this conference is discussing what to do with our lives. Music and dancing are fundamental art forms beyond political considerations.*" The aims of the IFMC were: (1) To assist in the preservation, dissemination and practice of the folk music of all countries. (2) To further comparative study of folk music. (3) To promote understanding and friendship between nations through common interest of folk music. Maud Karpeles, the Secretary of the IFMC, was a passionate folk dancer.
 2. For a thorough panorama of European dance research in the first half of the 20th century, see Roderyk Lange 1980:10-15.
 3. Some of the national notations were created by: V. Proca – Romania 1956; S. Lisicjan - Soviet Union 1940; S. Tóth – Bratislava, Czechoslovakia, 1952; St. Djoudjeff - 1945 and B. Tzonev - 1957, Bulgaria.
 4. At the international conference on notation in Dresden 1957, with participants from ten European countries and the USA, it was acknowledged that "any major and seriously intended research on dance has used Laban's notation" and "this was one of the first great achievements in international unification of the methods applied to dance research" [Baier-Fraenger 1977:64].
 5. Two other regulations (out of six) governing the Dance Commission are the following: "Its terms of reference shall be to make recommendations to the Executive Board on all matters relative to the study and practice of folk dance. It shall consist of representatives of folk dance organizations and institutions and individual experts appointed by the Executive Board in consultation with the national committee (when such exists) or the liaison officer in the country concerned, together with the secretary and treasurer as ex officio members" [IFMC 1960:19].
 6. Eight papers were presented on dance by new researchers, most from eastern Europe, such as: Martin György and Pesovár Ernő (Hungary), Raina Katzarova (Bulgaria), Hannah Laudová, Zdenka Jelinková (Czechoslovakia). A paper by Stefan Tóth was read by Kliment Ondreika, and two papers were presented by non-Europeans: Gurit Kadman (Israel) and Dora Lapson (USA). Vera Proca-Ciortea and Costea Constantin (Romania), Felix Hoerburger, Roger Pinon, and Richard Wolfram (Austria) also attended the conference [Reynolds, 1987:4]. At the inaugural session (July 17, Zoltan Kodály, President of the IFMC) three main fields were discussed: 1. Collection, 2. Research, 3. Practice.
 7. At the same conference the Executive Board considered that "the discussion of matters relating to the dance should be open to all members." Therefore the Dance Commission was replaced by a small Folk Dance Committee responsible to the Board [ICTM 1963:14].
 8. An interesting question raised by the Committee on this occasion was the way "Folk Dance can best be handled within the framework of the IFMC Conference: as plenary sessions or as sectional meetings?" This debate would last for a long time.
 9. "Indeed, the fact that the foundation of the Study Group occurred at a Congress that took place in a socialist country, necessitated that our group be made up of people from this very zone. This fact did not please the Executive Board. But we knew very little of the Western researchers and also we could only with difficulty come into contact with them. All was strongly kept under (control) censorship and especially the correspondence. I personally was not politically involved and was not under observation." (The letter written in German, October 1996, is in Lisbet Torp's possession. Translation into English by the author).
 10. For example IFMC/ICTM conferences, meetings of the National Committees, of the Association of Folklorists (Yugoslavia), the Union of Composers, and international folklore festivals, such as in Strážnice (Czechoslovakia) and Bucharest (Romania).
 11. I recall my colleagues each with his personality, temperament, and way of arguing. A warm feeling of friendship, understanding and respect dominated the passionate discussions which were always stimulating, never competitive.
 12. The meeting was attended by western scholars as well: Roger Pinon (Belgium), secretary of the IFMC Dance Committee, Lucile Armstrong (England), Frances Bloland (USA), Gurit Kadman (Israel), and Richard Wolfram (Austria).
 13. Between 1962 and 1967 the activities of the Subgroup on Terminology overpowered the Folk Dance Committee and the Executive Board of the IFMC decided to "discontinue" this Committee but to re-appoint the Group on Dance Terminology [IFMC 1967:12].
 14. William C. Reynolds, a student in Labanotation at the time, translated the article from German into English.

15. "Another contrast is that many European scholars, especially from Eastern Europe, have to cope with problems of applying the results of their work nationally, but most Third World scholars, who have similar problems, are influenced and trained by American universities, rather than in Europe" [Blacking 1975:22].
16. Especially Martin György, Eva Kröschlová, and Anca Giurcescu, who carried out discussions on strophe/stanza, dance suite/cycle, and the relationship between dance and music.
17. Norway: Egil Bakka, Jan-Petter Blom; England: Roderyk Lange; Sweden: Irene and Juno Sjoberg; Finland: Kari Bergholm, Pirkko Liisa Rausmaa; Iceland: Sigridur Valgeirsdottir; Denmark: Henning and Ida Urup, and a representative of Færøerne.
18. In the letter of 1996 to Lisbet Torp, Vera Proca-Ciortea expressed a kind of distrust for the enlargement of the group that happened in 1979, at the ICTM Conference in Oslo: "The Study Group grew from 12 to 47 members. I made the remark that it will be impossible for me to correspond regularly with so many people.... The enlargement of the Study Group brought no profit. When Rosemarie took over the leadership of the Study Group, I could see that she worked only with the 'old set'."
19. Martin's passion, creativity, seriousness, and openness to dialogue will remain as an inspiration for all newcomers in the field. He was a dancer, a thinker, and a wonderful person. Kurt Petermann had a sharp scientific mind, a great strength, and dedication in his work. He was modest and always supportive.
20. The following papers were presented: Lisbet Torp: "European chain and round dance: A comparative Study," Grażyna Dąbrowska: "Differenzierte Probleme der ethnochoreologischen Dokumentation in der Vergangenheit und Gegenwart" [Different problems of the ethnochoreological documentation in the past and present], Egil Bakka: "Augenblickliche Volkstanzforschung in Norwegen" [Current folk dance research in Norway], Roderyk Lange: "Trends der heutigen Volkstanzforschung" [Trends in current folk dance research], Anca Giurcescu: "Tanz Text und Kontext: Aspekte zur choreologischen und anthropologischen tanzforschung" [Dance text and context, choreological and anthropological perspectives in dance research], Owe Ronström: "The role of music and dance in the building of an ethnic community," William Reynolds: "Diskussionbeitrag aus seiner bisherigen Arbeit" [Themes for discussion stemming from his former work].
21. A listing of the Study Group for Ethnochoreology symposia (since 1988):
 - 1988 – 15th symposium. Copenhagen, Denmark (organizer Lisbet Torp)
Theme: "The dance event, a complex cultural phenomenon"
 - 1990 – 16th symposium. Budapest, Hungary (organizer Felföldi László)
Themes: "Dance transmission and diffusion," "Implement dances," "Reports on current research," "Round table: Dance structural analysis" (moderator William Reynolds)
 - 1992 – 17th symposium. Nafplion, Greece (organizer Irene Loutzaki)
Themes: "Dance in its socio-political aspects," "Dance and costume"

Lisbet Torp was re-elected as Chair in 1992, with Egil Bakka as Vice-Chair, and Anca Giurcescu Secretary

 - 1994 – 18th symposium, Skierniewice, Poland (organizer Grażyna Dąbrowska)
Themes: "Ritual and ritual dances in contemporary societies" (based on case studies), "Dance - music relationships"
 - 1996 – 19th symposium, Třešť, Czech Republic (organizer Daniela Stavělová)
Themes: "Children and traditional dancing," "Dance and style"

The 35th anniversary of the Study Group on Ethnochoreology was celebrated at the ICTM World Conference in Nitra, Slovakia, 1997.

 - 1998 – 20th symposium, Istanbul, Turkey (organizer Arzu Öztürkmen)
Themes: "Traditional dance and its historical sources" "Creative process in dance: improvisation and composition," Round table: "Local dance traditions and the interaction with the larger world: from local to global and back again" (moderator Colin Quigley).

Her term coming to an end, Lisbet Torp stepped down as Chair and Anca Giurcescu was elected Chair with Elsie Dunin, Vice-Chair, and Theresa Buckland Secretary. It is to Lisbet Torp's merit that the new-oriented Study Group reached a full maturity and stability during this most fruitful decade. Her engagement, scientific openness, creative initiatives, straight spirit of democracy and sense of humor helped to create a special atmosphere that became a marker of the Study Group on Ethnochoreology.

 - 2000 – 21st symposium, Korčula, Croatia (organizer Elsie Dunin)
Themes: "Sword dances and related calendrical dance events," "Revival: reconstruction, revitalization," Panel: "Ownership and appropriation of tradition in dance" (moderator, Georgiana Gore)

2002 – 22nd symposium, Szeged, Hungary (organizer Felföldi László)

The symposium was dedicated to the 40th anniversary of the Study Group.

Themes: "Re-apprising our past, moving into the future: research on dance and society," "Dancer as a cultural performer"

2004 – 23rd symposium, Monghidoro, Italy (organizer Placida Staro)

Themes: "Visible and invisible dance," "Crossing identity boundaries."

Theresa Buckland elected Vice-Chair with Tvrtko Zebec, Secretary

2006 – 24th symposium, Cluj-Napoca, Romania (organizer Kőnczei Csilla)

Themes: "From field to text: translations and representations," "Dance in space"

Her term coming to an end, Anca Giurcescu stepped down as Chair and László Felföldi was elected Chair with Theresa Buckland Vice-Chair and Tvrtko Zebec Secretary. Anca Giurcescu became the Honorary Chair of the Study Group.

22. Some of these approaches to dance/movement structural analysis were:

Adrienne Kaeppler, as presented in this publication, using analogies from structural linguistics for movement analysis that focus on structural components of a dance system (or any structured movement system), rather than on dance performances (or "instances" of the Syllabus).

The Norwegian ("Scandinavian") system of dance analysis created by Jan-Petter Blom in 1960, based upon vertical rhythmic-movement patterns (called *svikt*). The *svikt* analysis is a method for the characterization of different dance dialects and for the study of dance-music relationships. The study of *svikt* patterns was continued by Egil Bakka and applied in dance education (Bakka 1984, and see chapter four in this volume).

The "Hungarian" system although following in general terms the Study Group Syllabus, developed a more elaborated system (including the concepts of "support" and "motif stem") for classifying the dance significant units (motifs) (Martin; Pesovár 1963).

Lisbet Torp analyzed a wide body of European chain and round dances and described the structurally significant units and the principles of their composition. By defining the main structural features with a high degree of generality, she established a number of categories applicable to the systematization of European chain and round dances (Torp 1990; and see chapter five in this volume).

Judy Van Zile, a dance researcher and movement analyst whose work is grounded in the concepts and system of Labanotation (Van Zile 1984, and see chapter fifteen in this volume).

William C. Reynolds adapted structural analysis in the comparative study of dance variants for describing the mechanism of the process of improvisation (Reynolds 1989).

Other methods for dance structural analysis that parallel the original Syllabus use different terminology (for example Bucşan, Andrei 1971), or apply linguistic analogies as used by Adrienne Kaeppler, for example, to Greek dance traditions such as by Irene Loutzaki.

23. At the round table, moderated by William C. Reynolds, the participants were: Adrienne Kaeppler, Judy Van Zile, Hannah Laudová, Eva Kröschlová, Anca Giurcescu, Lisbet Torp, Egil Bakka, and László Felföldi.
24. During the last fifteen years, other Sub-Study Groups came into existence: 19th-century couple dances; Ritual complexes in comparative perspective; Dance, migration and diaspora; Dance-music relationships; and Visual recording.
25. Participants at the meeting: Egil Bakka, László Felföldi, Anca Giurcescu, Corina Iosif, Adrienne Kaeppler, Eva Kröschlová, Irene Loutzaki, Andriy Nahachewsky, Arzu Öztürkmen, and William C. Reynolds. A report by Andriy Nahachewsky on the Istanbul meeting presented the participants' new ideas and points of view on structural analysis based on case studies (Nahachewsky 1993).

REFERENCES CITED

BAIER-FRAENGER, Ingeborg

1977 "Dance notation and folk dance research: the Dresden congress 1957." Roderyk Lange (editor), *Dance studies* 2:64-75. Jersey, Channel Islands, United Kingdom: Centre for Dance Studies.

BAKKA, Egil

1984 "Folk dance research in Norway." Roderyk Lange (editor), *Dance studies* 5:22-47. Jersey, Channel Islands, United Kingdom: Centre for Dance Studies.

- BLACKING, John
1975 "Summary of the conference: a personal view of the 23rd IFMC conference." *Bulletin of the IFMC* 47 (October): 22-23.
- BUCȘAN, Andrei
1971 *Specificul dansulu popular românesc* [Characteristics of Romanian folk dance]. București: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România.
- DĄBROWSKA, Grażyna; PETERMANN, Kurt (editors)
1983 *Analyse und Klassifikation von Volkstänzen* [Folk dance analysis and classification]. Kraków: Polish Institute of Musicology.
- FELFÖLDI, László
1999 "Folk dance research in Hungary: relations among theory, fieldwork and the archive." Theresa J. Buckland (editor), *Dance in the field: theory, methods and issues in dance ethnography*: 55-70. London: Macmillan Press.
- GIURCHESCU, Anca
1968 "Congresul Uniunii Folcloriștilor Iugoslavi" [The Congress of the Union of the Yugoslav Folklorists], *Revista de Etnografie și Folclor* 13(1):95-96. București: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România.
2006 "History of the ICTM Study Group on Ethnochoreology." Elsie Ivancich Dunin, Anne von Bibra Wharton, László Felföldi (editors), *Dance and society: dancer as a cultural performer*: 252-263. The 22nd symposium of the ICTM Study Group on Ethnochoreology, Szeged, Hungary. Bibliotheca Traditionis Europae. Budapest: Académia Kiadó, European Folklore Institute.
- GIURCHESCU, Anca; NICULESCU, Radu
1971 Thèses sur la structure de la danse folklorique (research paper). (Presented at the *Seminar of audio-visual semiotics*, held in Urbino, Italy.)
- GÖNYEY, Sándor; LUGOSSY, Emma
1947 *Magyar népi táncok* [Hungarian folk dances]. Budapest: Budapest Székesfővárosi Irodasmi és Művészeti Intézet.
- HOERBURGER, Felix
1958 "Dance notation and folk dance research." *Journal of the IFMC* 10:62. Cambridge: International Folk Music Council.
1959 "Study of folk dance and the need for a uniform method of dance notation." *Journal of the IFMC* 11:71-73. Cambridge: International Folk Music Council.
1962 "Proposals for the work of the IFMC Dance Commission." *Journal of the IFMC* 14:161. Cambridge. Re-published 1987, William C. Reynolds (editor), *ICTM dance newsletter* 1(1):3.
- IFMC (INTERNATIONAL FOLK MUSIC COUNCIL)
1957 "Ninth meeting of the General Assembly in conjunction with the 10th annual conference at Copenhagen." *Bulletin of the IFMC* 12.
1960 "Formation of Folk Dance Commission." *Bulletin of the IFMC* 18:11, 19.
1962 "Report of the Folk Dance Commission." *Bulletin of the IFMC* 22:16; 23-27.
1963 "Report of the Folk Dance Commission." *Bulletin of the IFMC* 24:14; 22-23.
1966 "Subgroup on Dance Terminology." *Bulletin of the IFMC* 28.
1967 "Report of the Executive Board 1966-1967, Folk Dance Committee." *Bulletin of the IFMC* 29:12, 26.
- IFMC STUDY GROUP FOR FOLK DANCE TERMINOLOGY
1975 "Foundation for the analysis of the structure and form of folk dance: a syllabus." *Yearbook of the IFMC* (1974) 6:115-135. Ontario, Canada.
- KAEPLER, Adrienne L.
1972 "Method and theory in analysing dance structure with an analysis of Tongan Dance." *Ethnomusicology* 16(2): 173-217. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Society for Ethnomusicology. (See also chapter 3 in this 2007 volume.)
- LANGE, Roderyk
1980 "The development of anthropological dance research." Roderyk Lange (editor), *Dance studies* 4:1-36. Jersey, Channel Island, United Kingdom: Centre for Dance Studies.
- MARTIN, György; PESOVÁR, Ernő
1961 "A structural analysis of the Hungarian folk dance: a methodological sketch." *Acta ethnographica* 10:1-40. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

- 1963 "Determination of Motive types in dance folklore." *Acta ethnographica* 12(3-4): 295-331. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- NAHACHEWSKY, Andriy
1993 "Sub-Study Group on Structural Analysis. Colloquium in Istanbul, 24-28 August 1993." W.C. Reynolds (editor), *ICTM dance newsletter* 12:1-2. Egtved, Denmark: Study Group on Ethnochoreology.
- PETERMANN, Kurt (editor)
1965 *Syllabus der Volkstanzanalyse* [Syllabus of folk dance analysis]. The G.D.R. National Committee for Folk Music. Leipzig. (57 pages.)
- PROCA-CIORTEA, Vera
1972 "Report on the 9th work session of the Study Group on the Terminology of Choreology." *ICTM Bulletin* 41 (October): 44-45.
1982 "ICTM Study Group on Ethnochoreology." *Bulletin of the ICTM* 61(October): 22-23.
- REYNOLDS, C. William (editor)
1987 *ICTM dance newsletter for research in traditional dance* 1(1):3-5. Egtved, Denmark: Study Group on Ethnochoreology.
1989 *ICTM dance newsletter for research in traditional dance* 5:3. Egtved, Denmark: Study Group on Ethnochoreology.
1990 *ICTM dance newsletter for research in traditional dance* 6:1. Egtved, Denmark: Study Group on Ethnochoreology.
- REYNOLDS, William C.
1989 "Notation requirements for dance with improvised structure." *Proceedings of the 16th biennial conference of the International Council of Kinetography Laban*. Toronto, Canada.
- SULIȚEANU, Ghizela
1967 "Al XIII-lea Congres al Uniunii Folcloriștilor Iugoslavi (Savez Udruženija Folklorista Jugoslavije), Dojran, 15-18 September 1966." *Revista de Etnografie și Folclor* 12(2): 153-155. București: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România.
- SZENTPÁL, Olga
1958 "Versuch einer Formanalyse der ungarischen Volkstänze" [Attempt of a Form analysis of the Hungarian folk dances]. *Acta Ethnographica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 7(3-4):257-336. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- TORP, Lisbet
1990 *Chain and round dance patterns*. Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen, Museum Tusulanum Press. (Three volumes.)
- VAN ZILE, Judy
1984 "The potential of movement analysis as a research tool: a preliminary analysis." *Dance research journal* 16(1):3-26. New York: Congress on Research in Dance.
- YOUNGERMAN, Suzanne
1976 "Method and theory in dance research: an anthropological approach." *Yearbook of the IFMC* 7(1975):116-133. Ontario, Canada.