
THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON BYZANTINE AND EASTERN LITURGICAL MUSIC

The First International Congress of Byzantine and Eastern Liturgical Music (May 6-11, 1968) was held in the Abbey of Grottaferrata, near Rome. The organizer of the Congress was father Bartolomeo di Salvo, who gained general appraisal for his organizing ability, indefatigable activity and courtesy. The sessions were attended by about one hundred specialists, who represented a large number of European countries, the U.S.A. and Lebanon. The program of the Congress, besides the communications and discussions, included four very interesting concerts of Armenian, Italobyzantine and Ukranian chants and folksongs, as well as two visits to historical monuments and picturesque sites of Rome and its suburbs. The meetings were held in the library of the Abbey. The languages used were English, French, German and Italian, and each one of them was directly translated into each one of the others by a special team of interpreters. The absence from the Congress of certain leading authorities of Byzantine music and especially that of Egon Wellesz and Milos Velimirović was deeply felt by everyone.

The communications, which will be published in the Proceedings of the Congress, dealt with four main topics: a) Byzantine hymnography either in connection with music, or as an independent art; b) Byzantine music, ancient and modern; c) the ramifications of Byzantine music in Jugoslavia, Hungary, Rumania and Syria; d) other independent Eastern liturgical music traditions such as Jewish, Coptic and Glagolitic chants.

Five papers were devoted to the first topic, Byzantine hymnography. — Professor Tomadakis (Greece) talked about the prose rhythm of Byzantine hymnography, which he distinguished from the quantitative rhythm of the ancient Greeks, showed that the copyists of hymnographic manuscripts were well aware of the fact that the texts they wrote were based on music, and concluded that the editors of such manuscripts should respect their characteristic metrical patterns and not alter them in order to bring them into agreement with their own metrical theories. — Professor Strunk (USA), was going to talk about the "Asmatikon" of the metropolitan library of Kastoria, but eventually discussed the subject of the common origin of certain outstanding hymnographical forms of the Eastern and Western Churches. — Professor Folieri (Italy) started her talk by giving an outline of the life of the hymnographer of the 11th century John Mauropus, and later examined the form, content, language and syntactical peculiarity of his poems, underlined their esthetic value, and read excerpts from his Canon to Jesus. — Father Hannick (Belgium)

talked about the Canons of the *Parakletike* in the Greek, Georgian and Slavonic codices of Mount Sinai. — Father Bernhard (Austria) developed the subject of the disparition of the second ode of the Canon.

More than half the communications were devoted to the main subject of the Congress, Byzantine chant.— The communication of Mr. Huglo (France) treated the subject of the Byzantine influences on Western church music in the days of Charlemagne. According to Mr. Huglo, several Byzantine melodies were sung in the West in the beginning of the 9th century, either with their texts in their original form, or translated into Latin. He mentioned also that during the same period the Western court and church dignitaries adopted the intonation formulae of the Byzantine modes and several Byzantine musical terms; they also introduced for the salutation of Charlemagne similar acclamations to those used by the Byzantines for the salutation of their own Emperors. On the other hand, in a second brief communication, Mr. Huglo reported the disparition of a *Papadike* of the 17th century which came from Mt. Athos and belonged to a French family from Nantes, and pointed out that it should be rediscovered in order to be included in the projected publication of *Papadikai* which is being prepared by the *Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae*. — Mr. Raasted (Denmark) analysed the contents of the earliest extant Heirmologia and arrived at the conclusion that they consist of an original block of Akolouthiai, a transitional block, and a third block that combines early and later Canons. — Father Bartolomeo di Salvo (Italy) read two papers. In the first one he explained the meaning of the term “cheironomia,” while in the the second he explored the possibility of the existence of polyphony in medieval Byzantine music. — Mr. Karas (Greece) supported the view that from the very beginning of its existence, Byzantine music utilized the genera (diatonic, chromatic, enharmonic), species or “chroai,” and intervals of ancient Greek music, and pointed out that modern performers and transcribers of Byzantine chant should take this important fact into serious consideration. — Mr. Stathis (Greece) drew attention to three important but little known manuscripts of the monastery of St. Catherine on Mt Sinai, namely nos 1764, 1477 and 1550. The first is a collection of *Papadikai*, the second contains works by the 17th century composers Balasios and Chrysaphes the Younger transcribed into Western staff notation in the early 18th century, and the third examines the question *τι ἐστὶν χειρονομία*. He spoke also about the provenance of the above and the other musical manuscripts of the collection and said that he has drafted a catalogue of composers who flourished since the Middle Ages in St. Catherine. The catalogue, he added, makes a distinction between composers who went to the monastery from Crete, and composers who went

there from other places. In conclusion, he said that the musical tradition of St. Catherine agrees with that of the Patriarchates of Jerusalem and Constantinople. — Mrs. Rozemond (England) to begin with gave interesting details on the sojourn of Nathanael Conopios¹ in England (1639-1647), and later attempted to identify him with Nathanael, bishop of Nicaea, whose name appears in Byzantine musical manuscripts of the 17th century. It is quite likely, she said, that these two people are indeed but one and the same person, though this cannot yet be proved with absolute certainty, due to the lack of precise information. — The reverend Maximos, bishop of Laodicea, spoke about the musical schools, societies and printing-houses which were founded by or with the approval of the Oecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople in the 19th century. The speaker also referred to the countless steps which the Patriarchate took during that period to conserve and disseminate Byzantine music, and to provide moral and financial support to the artists who sang it. He also underlined the live interest which Patriarch Cyril VII and the bishop of Ephesos Dionysios took in the work of the three reformers of Byzantine notation Chrysanthos of Madytos, Gregory Levitis and Chourmouzios Char-tophylax. — Mr. Bentas (USA) analysed, theoretically and practically, the concept of *system* as understood by Chrysanthos, the reformer of Byzantine musical notation in the early 19th century. The term "System," he said, is borrowed from classical Greek musical theory, but its use by Chrysanthos does not seem to have any connection with the survival of ancient Greek melodic formulae in Byzantine music. — Mr. Tzelas (Greece) spoke about the Byzantine counterpart of "musica ficta," the so-called *ἐλλειψις*, and sang some characteristic Neo-Byzantine melodies to illustrate the manner in which they are affected by it. — The present writer observed that the "Legetos"—an offshoot of Mode IV—employs besides the Phrygian mode (tonic *e*) and the Lydian (tonic *f*). This, I said, can be clearly seen both in coral and solo-antiphonal performances of the mode. The bimodal character of the Legetos, I added, has so far escaped the attention of the theorists, some, however, consider it as a counterpart of the Turkish mode "Segiah," which is a variant of the Lydian mode. The Lydian form of the Legetos, I concluded, may be as old as the Phrygian, which came into being in the 15th century, though it may owe its existence to the tendency of certain 17th century precentors to imitate the characteristics of the Segiah. My conclusions were based on recordings, of the "Archives Musicales de Folklore" of Madame Merlier, and of the reverend Iakobos, bishop of Derkoi. — Mrs. Engberg (Denmark) said that

1. Conopios was a church dignitary, a composer and a close friend of Cyril Lucaris.

the Byzantine Old Testament Lectionaries, on the basis of their calendar system, seem all to derive from a Constantinopolitan prototype. — Mr. Ioannides (Cyprus) attempted to reconstruct the melody of a passage of an 11th century Evangeliarion from Cyprus containing ephphonic notation, on the basis of cantillations of the same passage by modern Greek, Armenian and Roman Catholic precentors, and Hoeg's and Wellesz's writings on ephphonic notation. — Mrs. Schiodt demonstrated the possibility of utilizing computers for examining certain problems which would be hard or would require too much time to be solved with the usual, simple methods. For instance, she said that the computer can separate the heterogeneous elements which are concealed beneath an apparently homogeneous group of melodies and accelerate the process of codification of melodic formulae. — Mr. Lazarov (Bulgaria) said that the notational mistakes and other lacunae of musical manuscripts could be corrected with the aid of mathematics, and supported the view that the signs of Byzantine and other related notations are graphic representations of their intervallic value. — Professor Marzi (Italy) pointed out that the Byzantine liturgy, with its dramatic articulation, the esoteric nature of its text, and the avocative character of its music is certainly indebted to the religious ceremonies of the pagans. — Mr. Savvas' (USA) paper was entitled "Byzantine Music, in the light of Orthodox worship and hymnography."

We come now to the papers devoted to the ramifications of Byzantine music in the Balkans and the Middle-East. — Mr. Stefanović (Jugoslavia) spoke about the early Slavonic daily *Menaia* and *Sticheraria* manuscripts from the 11th and 12th centuries, their characteristics, and their relationship with the corresponding Byzantine manuscripts. Of special interest, he said, are the original Slavonic hymns of these manuscripts. The talk ended with a presentation of slides illustrating the notational correspondences of the formulae of an hymn written in Coislin, Middle Byzantine and Russian notation. — Mrs Djurić-Klajn (Jugoslavia), talked about the manuscripts of Serbian church music in Byzantine notation and the composers mentioned therein. The music of these manuscripts, she said, is decidedly Byzantine; here and there, however, it has been modified according to the demands of the Serbian language. — Father Berki (Hungary) spoke about the music of the Greek Orthodox church of Budapest. Up to 1947, he said, the church used unsatisfactory translations and musical settings of the Byzantine hymns. Since then, however, the situation has improved by the introduction of superior translations, and melodies corresponding to those sung nowadays in the Greek churches. He mentioned as well that an anthology of Greek church music will be published soon in Budapest for the use of the Hungarian Greek Orthodox community. — Mr.

Ciobanu (Rumania) dealt with the subject of the relations between Rumanian church music and Byzantine music. Musical manuscripts, he said, which are kept in Rumanian libraries as well as the contemporary Rumanian oral tradition confirm that the church music in use from the Middle Ages in Rumania has not only its roots in Byzantine music, but has followed also step by step its evolution. It must be mentioned, however, he concluded, that in many parts of Rumania the influence of the Serbian and the local folk music is just as strong as the Byzantine influence. — Father Haddad (Lebanon) discussed the question of the church music of the Melchites. The subjugation of the Melchites by the Arabs, he said, brought about the gradual disappearance of Byzantine music from the Melchitic churches and the emergence, in its place, of a new local tradition. The Melchites started again to have relations with the Oecumenical Patriarchate in the 17th century. This had an immediate effect on their church music, which gradually became indistinguishable from Neo-Byzantine chant. Traces of their own church music are preserved in certain manuscripts of the 14th century. Students of Melchitic chant should aim at deciphering it and reintroducing it into the Melchitic worship.

The scholars who read papers on topics not directly related to Byzantine music and hymnography were Mrs. Borsai, Messrs Zganec, Levi, and Piatelli, and Father Moneta-Caglio. — Mrs. Borsai (Hungary) talked about Coptic chant on the basis of the recordings that she made in Egypt in 1966-7 for the musical department of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and Letters. This music, she said, is now being transcribed and studied in Hungary by herself and other experts. A tape containing examples of Coptic music was played at the end of the lecture. — Mr. Zganec (Jugoslavia) talked about the various types of the so-called Glagolitic chant, i.e. the music of the Roman Catholics that live in the N.W. shores of Jugoslavia and chant in the old Slavonic or Glagolitic language. — Mr Zganec pointed out that Glagolitic chant, which originated in the days of St. Cyril and St. Methodius, is, in its present form, in the last stage of its development, and contains Ambrosian, Gregorian, old Slavonic, Byzantine, Illyric and Serbian elements, as well as elements from Western art music. The talk, as the previous one, ended with the playing of a tape with characteristic examples of recordings made by the speaker. — Mr. Levi (Italy) pointed out that the Hebrew ecphonetic notation was more of a guide to the correct reading of the Pentateuch than a musical notation. He also said that the many conflicting traditions of chanting the Pentateuch which have come down to us from the Middle Ages, do not enable us to draw conclusions as to how it was originally sung. — Mr. Piatelli presented a program of traditional melodies of the Synagogue of Rome, sung by the cantor

of the Synagoge. — Finally, Father Moneta-Caglio (Italy) talked about the origin of the Gregorian “Jubilus.”

In the Congress of Grottaferrata, a wide circle of specialists in Byzantine and Eastern liturgical music met for the first time and discussed some of their problems, solved some of their differences and layed the foundations for closer cooperation. Hence, we would be justified in characterizing the Congress as the most important event in the history of Byzantine and Eastern liturgical music studies since the Conference of Höeg, Tillyard and Wellesz in Copenhagen in 1931 which gave birth to the *Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae*. We hope that the second meeting of the Congress in Athens in 1971 will be equally successful.

Athens

M. PH. DRAGOUMIS

CROCE AND RUSSIAN THOUGHT

Benedetto Croce confessed with “mortification” in 1917, at the time of Lenin’s triumphant return to Petrograd from prolonged exile, that he had not read a single of Lenin’s books or pamphlets. With his typical sarcasm Croce proclaimed his ignorance of Lenin whom he ironically called a “new Plato” and a “contemporary European philosopher and [his] illustrious colleague” completely unknown to him. Admittedly Croce was amazed at the tremendous welcome Lenin received in Petrograd and the widespread publicity accorded him in the Italian press, and he immediately sought to obtain Lenin’s *Materialism and Empirico-Criticism*, *Critical Notes on a Reactionary Philosophy*, but without success.

However, he did obtain two books that dealt with Russian philosophy: Thomas Masaryk’s *Russia and Europe*, which he read in the German edition, *Zur Russischen Geschichts-und Religionsphilosophie* (1913), and Paul Miliukov’s, *Le mouvement intellectuel russe* (Paris, 1918). At once Croce perused the volumes with his well-known passion for things unknown.

Croce’s knowledge of Russian intellectual life was not only superficial but prejudiced as well. He was firmly convinced, for instance, that the “mental level” of the Russian people was rather low. Though he believed that every people “whether is large or small” has a “science or a culture,” Russia was the exception that confirmed the rule. Russia, was Croce’s conviction, could not have any original philosophy but merely a certain level of “intelligentsia,” which was quite a different matter.