

of common Bulgarian and Balkan hits. It becomes clear, then, that the repertoire cannot be defined along one line only, but rather along a web of lines crossing each other. The opposition of local vs. beyond-local crosses the oppositions of ethnic vs. trans-ethnic and old (traditional) vs. new (modern).

Even the players who stand lowest in the hierarchy of *zurnaci* skill – those who play predominantly to the people from their own neighbourhood – are also bearers of multi-ethnic repertoire. When asked what music he performs, a *zurnaci* from Belitsa says that his repertoire includes Bulgarian, Roma and Turkish music. When then asked why he plays Turkish music too, since his neighbourhood is populated by Bulgarian Gypsies, he replies: “They may be Bulgarian Gypsies but they want Turkish music. It’s modern” [I.H., p.64]. The great maestri from Kavrakirovo obligatorily include in their repertoire traditional music suitable for the various ethnoconfessional communities they play to (Bulgarian Christians, Bulgarian Muslims, Turks, Roma Christians and Roma Muslims). Needless to say then, the repertoire these musicians have mastered is multi-cultural (Bulgarian, Turkish and Roma folklore, ethnopop, soundtracks and world hits) as well as trans-border (music that is liked also in Greece and former Yugoslavia). This repertoire is acquired by clan inheritance, by the media and in contacts with musicians and audience from the neighbouring countries.

Repertoire and regulations

The *zurnaci* repertoire can be studied in the plane of regulated vs. non-regulated playing. Regulated here refers to any playing that is connected with concrete situations which form it and subject it to certain rules. Such regulations are traditional and new rituality, festive tables and dances, and playing in modern contexts (concert, studio, playing provoked by recorders and scholars). By non-regulated we mean any playing that the musicians do for themselves – without external rules and frames created by situation and audience.

The opposition of regulated vs. non-regulated is an interesting aspect of the relationship between performer and scholar recording him (folklorist, ethnomusicologist, anthropologist etc.). Usually the scholars goes to the *zurnacies* in order to record already chosen sphere of problems he or she is interested in: organologic aspects, certain repertoire etc. The music recorded is a function of such an approach: the performance is short and the recorder demands a definite melody to be played. This approach is useful for collecting and describing traditional ritual and dance repertoire. In our fieldwork, we tried another approach as well: an approach that, besides the description of traditional patterns, would be interested in interpretation of the live repertoire of today’s *zurnaci* music. The materials recorded when using the first (regulatory) approach can provide an idea of the old, traditional playing of old repertoire in “laboratory” conditions, i.e. isolated from normal environment and the influence of audience. Those performances recorded without regulations on the recorder’s part catch the state of *zurnaci* tradition in at the moment and can serve for interpretation of the modern repertoire, as well as of the live playing with its free, spontaneous unfolding of the musical thinking. While studying the repertoire, our basic task has been not to do a statistic description of it but to present it as a process and product of an open cultural system. Instead of making a herbarium out of it, we have tried to “catch” various webs of meaning, contexts and links. In such an approach it is impossible to escape questions about the figure of the musician and the pragmatic contexts of the music.