

STUDY OF BYZANTINE MUSIC IN THE WEST*

Although it is generally accepted as fact it is worth restating that all of Western European civilization and culture have their roots in the culture of the numerically small but highly talented Greek people of Antiquity, who, some 23 to 25 centuries ago established standards of civilized behavior and intellectual curiosity which have served as models ever since. We know very well that the Roman Empire did succeed in conquering the lands of the Greeks, but it was the Greek culture which in turn permeated the life of all the Romans. The history of the Greeks after the first contacts with Christianity is that of a rebirth, a renaissance, which found its material realization in the creation of the Byzantine Empire in which the Greek language and Greek ways were restored and pushed away the crust of Latin forms. One does not have to be a Herodotus to recount here the whole history of the Greeks except to remember that to the Greek Herodotus we do owe the existence of historical inquiry and historical writings. After many centuries the Byzantine Empire succumbed to new forces on the stage of history and at the same time the Fall of Constantinople in 1453 served as a new and strong reminder to the Western Europeans of their own indebtedness to things Greek. This event became one of the main stimulants in the renewed interest in the past, leading to one of the most fascinating periods of Western European history, that of the Renaissance of the 15th and 16th centuries. The changed geographical map of Europe as well as the territorial distance, temporarily beclouded the awareness of our debts to the Greeks, and as an extreme illustration of this change of attitude toward things Greek, one may mention the British historian Gibbon, who in his "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" expressed himself negatively about the Byzantine Empire. He went so far as to say that the history of the Byzantine Empire was nothing but a long decline. May I add only what a glorious decline to have lasted more than one thousand years! Gibbon's views were soon superseded by new events in the beginning of the nineteenth century when the wave of liberation movements was sweepingly changing the maps of Europe, decade after decade. Greece became free again and

* Paper read at the University of Thessaloniki, Theological Faculty, February 27, 1964.

gradually re-established itself as an independent country and as a dignified member of the European family of nations. I believe that the history of Greece, and for that matter of any other nation in this world, demonstrates that great truth, formulated so many centuries ago by Heraclitus, a Greek, *that everything changes - ΠΑΝΤΑ ΠΕΙ - and that nothing remains constant* in this material world.

When in the nineteenth century Europe became vitally interested in the fate of Greece and in its liberation from the Turks, gradually we could observe an ever growing interest in the history of Greeks, not only in the history of Antiquity but also in the history of Byzantium. This process may have taken a long time to become a regular subject of historical studies at all the Universities, both European and American, but it cannot be denied that throughout the last 100 years the number of scholars has been increasing constantly and that the range of subjects studied has reached a point where we are today familiar with almost all basic points not only of Byzantine history but of Byzantine civilization and culture as well.

While in this process it is natural that Greek scholars have carried and will continue to carry the responsibility of being the torchbearers, since after all it is their own history that is being studied, significant contributions to our knowledge of Byzantine culture have been achieved by scholars of other European nations. Quite often, joint enterprises of Greeks and other European scholars have produced important strides in this development. One after another, Byzantine literature, Byzantine theology and hymnography, Byzantine art and even Byzantine astrology and technical sciences, have become subjects for which one may encounter specialists, whether Greek or non-Greek is irrelevant, since their individual efforts have always contributed to our general store of knowledge about this period of the history of the Greeks.

It is thus only natural that the subject of music in the Byzantine Empire would attract the attention of scholars and become a legitimate field of scholarly investigation. As in all other historical disciplines, the rate of progress of studies depends on the availability and knowledge of sources, of those records in which this particular manifestation of the artistic talent of the Greeks was written down and thus preserved for posterity, for us, to study it and become familiar with an art which surrounded the daily life of an average inhabitant of Constantinople. In connection with this it must immediately be stated that whatever manuscript sources of Byzantine music still exist they contain only religious music, in other words the music sung at various religious services of Greek Christians and that for the duration of the Byzantine Empire, we have found no source yet which would contain another musical genre, such as folk music or music for dancing, although such music must

have existed. We do have literary references which tell us of the popularity of such types of music at various periods of Byzantine history. This circumstance that all our knowledge of music during the existence of the Byzantine Empire is in fact knowledge about liturgical music represents an important point. The Greeks did not change their religious allegiance and they maintained their Christian traditions throughout the period of Turkish occupation and continue to perform essentially unchanged religious services to the present day. This is then a very fortunate aspect which ought to help historians considerably in their inquiries about the past, since the *substance* of the religious services had remained the same. While I am not an expert in the history of liturgies, I believe that liturgiologists recognize only minor changes in the *form* of some services which originated in the changed circumstances of life under Turkish occupation and, in some cases, may be due to regional customs and traditions. It is then clear that Byzantine religious music had a very special place in the life of every Greek, since it was inseparably connected with one of the most deeply appreciated aspects of life, with his religion. Many religious songs and hymns were and are learned by a Greek in his youth and thus became and become a commonly known repertory which in many instances was and is transmitted by word of mouth in an oral tradition, which always flourishes especially strongly in semi-literate societies. In order to write down the growing repertory of ecclesiastical songs, the church singers created a peculiar system of musical notation which has no parallel in any Western European country. For Greeks who were literate, and of course for those who had shown an interest in learning this system of musical notation, it was not difficult to learn and to transmit it from generation to generation. The fact that this music was religious music and thus a part of the religious tradition among the Greeks, made it possible for this system of musical notation to be transmitted down to the present day. Yet in this transmission of *musical notation*, there was no question about the substance but of a *technique* used to write down something very elusive—the singing voice. Techniques as we know change sometimes and generally tend to become more precise and more efficient than they were in the past. As an example of the changes in technique we may mention the production of books in the last 500 years. At first each page of the text had to be printed separately by the movable type. After one page had been printed in a sufficient number of copies, the letters were reset and the new text for the next page was set and the next page was printed. As we all know, this system of printing has long ago been abandoned for more efficient systems of linotype and other processes which speed up the production and ensure greater precision and uniformity than it was possible to obtain in the early days of the printing press. By the same token, in the development

of the musical notation, there were at first only a few signs used to remind the singer to follow a melody which he had anyhow learned orally from his teacher and in this stage of development the musical notation served only as a mnemotechnical device and did not have that precision which we would normally expect from such a technique. In the course of time this system of writing underwent some changes which made it possible to write down the most complicated melodies with great precision, so that even people who do not have that music surrounding them all their lives, as the Greeks do, may, after becoming familiar with the notational system, learn how to sing even the most intricate songs of which they had no knowledge whatsoever earlier.

I feel that this is an important point to keep in mind for our discussion later.

The Western European scholars interested in things Greek came to realize at an early date the uniqueness of the Byzantine system of musical notation even if they did not know how to use it.

More than 250 years ago, the creator of the modern science of Greek paleography, a Frenchman by name of Montfaucon, in his epoch-making work entitled *Paleographia Graeca* (Paris, 1708), called the attention of the Western scholarly world to the existence of the peculiar Byzantine system of musical notation without being able to transcribe it into the Western type of notation. For decades there was no response to this challenge by Montfaucon. In the seventies of the 18th century, a rather well-known scholar who was to compile the first modern collection of medieval writings on music, Martin Gerbert, who was abbot of a monastery in Schwarzwald in Germany, claimed to have found the key for the reading of these musical signs and their transcription. Yet we have no written proof of this claim and do not know to what extent Gerbert was successful in this attempt. We do know, however, that in his work entitled *De Cantu et Musica Sacra* (1774) Gerbert published the first facsimiles of Byzantine musical notation from some manuscripts which had found their way into some Western European libraries. For readers of Gerbert's book these facsimiles remained an enigma without solution and they probably stared with amusement at these signs pondering how one ever could sing from that collection of lines and commas which had nothing in common with the then already perfected system of Western European musical notation on five lines which at that time acquired that precision which has remained essentially unchanged to our own days. At more or less the same time an Austrian amateur of sorts by the name of Sulzer dealt quite extensively with this problem, yet whatever results he obtained and which he published, remained outside the generally available knowledge on music of the Greeks so that we can safely say that in spite of the-

availability of some of the documents with Byzantine music, throughout the 18th century there was no understanding nor real knowledge in Western Europe about the music of the period of the Byzantine Empire.

Much more important historically was the treatise of Villoteau, a Frenchman who was one of the numerous scholars whom Napoleon had taken to Egypt to study the past of that country, and who was able to assemble quite a large body of information about Greek ecclesiastical music and practice among the Greeks of Egypt. For a large part of the 19th century Villoteau's information represented nearly the only source of knowledge as to the performance and repertory of the Greek Chant. Yet among the Greeks, very shortly after Villoteau's publication an important move had taken place. Chrysantos of Madytos had undertaken the significant task of "simplifying" the existing musical notation and the last important reform of the Byzantine musical notation had thus taken place. Thanks to the widespread use of printed books which contained type for each musical sign, the number of manuscripts copied diminished rapidly in the course of the 19th century and the books with the so-called "Chrysantine notation" started supplanting the use of old manuscripts and in this process the knowledge of some of the more complex notational signs became lost and gave way to the methodical system of Chrysantos which is in use even today among the chanters in Greek orthodox churches.

Yet Greeks speak Greek and are all brought up as devout members of an Eastern Orthodox Church. Western Europeans seldom speak Greek and if they learn it, it is the Erasmian version of the classical Greek. Furthermore the spirit of Eastern Orthodoxy was little understood or known by these scholars, among whom were Roman Catholics, Protestants of various denominations and only rarely an Eastern Orthodox, like the few Russians who pursued these studies at a later date. Thus we witness a rather strange and almost paradoxical situation, that Greeks were not so far away from Western Europe in an age of increased contacts and more frequent and speedier communications in the 19th c., yet nobody seemed to bother to find out from the Greeks how it is that they use musical books in their country and what they could possibly know about the musical notation in their own past. This is then why for so long a time the Westerners have been breaking their heads at trying to resolve the mystery of Byzantine musical notations. While throughout the 19th century significant successes were achieved in the study of the history of Byzantium, of Byzantine literature and especially in the field of hymnography, which is so closely allied to the use of music in the Greek Church, we may say that no success whatsoever was achieved in the field of learning about the music of Byzantium. This does not mean that no one ever tried to do something

about it. The famous paleographer Gardthausen as well as the students of hymnography Wilhelm Christ and M. Paranikas have each published the texts of some of the *papadike*, that handbook which contains the "psaltiki tehni" or the introductory treatise with basic information about the musical notation. In spite of their efforts it was due to Oskar Fleischer that we owe our first breakthrough in the West in the understanding of the meaning of signs for music in Byzantine Notation, when Fleischer published his results in 1903. At more or less the same time another Frenchman, the monk Jean-Baptiste Thibaut, devoted many studies to the problems of notation which were important for that time, yet remain only of historical interest today.

At the end of the nineteenth century we also witness a growing interest among Greeks themselves for the music of their past and in the works of G. Papadopoulos we have the first significant studies, of importance which were soon thereafter followed by the works of K. Psachos of whom we shall speak shortly again.

By the beginning of the twentieth century—some sixty years ago—there were at least six scholars in Western Europe, of different nationalities, who were interested in pursuing scholarly work in searching the history of Byzantine Music. These people were: the already mentioned Frenchman Thibaut, and Amédée Gastoué, the Italian Ugo Gaisser who studied the musical structure of the hirmoi, the German Hugo Riemann, one of the most prolific musical historians, who in his desire to cover the whole field of history of music could not leave the Byzantine music aside. Riemann, unfortunately, became obsessed with some of his own ideas about rhythm, and besides, misinterpreted some concepts of Byzantine notation so that his work, looked upon as a whole, represents a step backward rather than a step forward in the numerous attempts at understanding and solving the mysteries of Byzantine musical notation. In Russia worked a man of Greek origin, Constantine Papadopoulos-Kerameus, who published only a small number of works, but who understood very well what was at stake; and finally, the Englishman Tillyard whom we shall mention many times in our subsequent presentation.

What is it then that these scholars have found and what did they know about Byzantine music, some fifty years ago, at the time of the beginning of the First World War? These were the basic results:

It was recognized that Byzantine music can be studied and that there are a number of manuscripts available for this study as the primary sources. Most of these manuscripts became known through the courtesy of scholars interested either in the problems of Greek Paleography, or biblical scholars, who had been encountering musical manuscripts during their works in various libraries and some of the musical manuscripts became even partially

photographed at that time and thus available for studies. It was found that the *papadike* were a good starting point since they contained lists of musical signs, even if there were still some problems in understanding completely what certain technical terms meant. One especially vexing problem at that time was the meaning of the term "voiceless" signs (*a-fona*). Furthermore the problem of rhythm was not solved and it was unknown how the music should be transcribed, in equal or unequal notes. Also, it was anybody's guess at what pitch a song should start since the full meaning of the intonation signs, known as *martyriæ*, was not totally clear at that time either. Looking back at that period we can see the first groping uncertain steps. Yet with a definite purpose in mind: the reconstruction of the Byzantine Chant as it was sung during the days of the Byzantine Empire. Among many other reasons for this growing interest in the Byzantine Chant, one may mention the fact that this was also the period of very vigorous work toward the study of the Gregorian Chant in the West and it was felt that all bodies of Christian music should be studied with the same devotion toward restoring a view of the general lines of development of this important branch of the history of music.

By comparing available photographs of various manuscripts, written in various centuries, it had also become obvious that the Byzantine musical notation had undergone some slight changes and that it was not always the same. Manuscripts containing texts to be read solemnly contained signs which are known as "ekphonic" and which have no melodically great importance except for raising or lowering the voice of the reader. Yet for texts which were and still are sung in Greek Orthodox Church services, there were signs which differed in appearance, depending in which century the manuscript was written. The first important paleographical atlas of Byzantine musical notation, by J. - B. Thibaut, was published in 1913 in St. Petersburg and it was clear from it that the notation has to be studied in its historical development.

Before we proceed with this survey of scholarly work in Europe, let me mention at this point the work and theories of Psachos, who formulated his views in a book published in 1917 in Athens. As I understand it, the view of Psachos was that the singing of hymns in the Greek Church has remained essentially unchanged throughout the centuries. The consequence of this view is that it spreads the belief that the melodies which are currently in use in the religious services, theoretically at least, were always the same melodies and that if one were to take into his hands a musical manuscript from whatever century, and find the proper text, that the melody notated should sound the same as the melody of today. As it happens, this method can be applied easily to the books containing the Chrysantine notation, which, as it will be re-

called, spread so easily among the Greeks due to the printing of books with music. It should also be added that when Chrysantos undertook his reform he was dealing with the music of his own time and that which was written down in the period immediately preceding him, that is in the 18th century. Thus the method of Psachos may work quite successfully if applied to the printed books or manuscripts of about the last two centuries. However, if one attempts to apply the same rules for the meaning of musical signs as one knows them from Chrysantos' codification and takes into his hand, say, a manuscript from the thirteenth century, even though a great number of the musical signs will have a similar graphic appearance, one of the most important consequences will be that the music is not going to sound the same, but as if it were a completely different melody. If I understand things correctly, it appears that because of these discrepancies Psachos developed a theory of "steno-graphic" notation, implying in fact that regardless of what century is in question, the music of a given hymn was always the same, and if one looks at a manuscript and finds that it does not contain the melody as known from present day practices, then it must have been written down with a "steno-graphic system" which would only remind the singer of the proper turns of the melody which had been learned anyhow by heart and thus remained identical throughout the centuries. It is not my desire to discuss here technical details, but it appears to me that the principle from which Psachos started ignores that dictum we mentioned earlier, namely that EVERYTHING CHANGES — not only the notation but also that most elusive of all things, the art of music, especially if it has been transmitted for centuries by means of oral tradition. If one is willing to admit the fact, for which there is inscrutable proof in existing manuscripts, that the musical notation and principles of notation do undergo some changes, why is it that one cannot admit that melodies change as well? An argument frequently advanced in this sort of discussion brings up the point that since this was ecclesiastical music that was performed day after day, week after week and century after century, that it *must* have remained identical all the time. Yet just as in the case of the liturgy, as we had pointed out, the substance of the liturgy did not change and so the texts of the hymns have not changed. Yet the form of the liturgy had changed and still can be seen to have regional variants and by the same token the form of the delivery of the unchanged texts can and has changed acquiring different melodic shapes.

It has been suggested that Greek folk music was influenced by the ecclesiastical music and vice versa that folk music had penetrated into the Byzantine Chant which now, presumably, ought to contain a good many of the features encountered in the Greek folk music. I can only say, and with great regret, as

well, that I am not an expert on Greek folk music and that I am most eager to see and read studies about these relationships, yet I know of no such study now.

To sum up the points about the Psachos theory: it appears to me that the theory of Psachos (unquestionably attractive) has stifled the curiosity and inquiry into the historical development of the Byzantine Chant through the centuries. This, on the other hand, lead to the deep-seated conviction (and this is an *emotional* issue today) that the Chant of the present day is *the* "Byzantine" Chant. Very few people will allow a remote possibility that there may have been some slight changes in the form of the chant during the centuries separating the time of the existence of the Byzantine Empire before the Fall of Constantinople and the restored chant as it is practiced today. Although there is an apparently large number of Greeks around us who profess to study the Byzantine Chant, their main concern is to train singers for today and to teach them the very same melodies which they have learned from printed books which they then pass on to the next generation of singers.

Another and in some ways more important consequence of the works of Psachos was the rather sudden break of contacts with Western European scholars who had expressed a sincere interest in the history of Byzantine Music.

At precisely the same time when Psachos' book was published, an Austrian scholar, Egon Wellesz and the already mentioned Englishman Tillyard studying the available materials came more or less at the same time to similar basic conclusions which proved to be among the most important for the understanding of musical signs as used in the Middle Ages. By solving the problems of the voiceless signs and rhythm new perspectives for work were opened and from the 20's of this century onward, an ever larger number of musical pieces of the medieval repertory of chants of Byzantium became available for scholarly studies. It is to Wellesz especially that we owe the understanding of the basic principles of medieval Byzantine notation. As it turned out it was an ingenious and relatively *simple system with great economy*, which could be used to write down quite complex melodies and which represents one of the great achievements of the Greek genius. As one could have expected, bearing in mind the lesson that EVERYTHING CHANGES, the melodies in Wellesz' transcription do not always have great resemblance to those currently sung in Greek churches, but here, I believe, it is for the younger generation to pursue these studies and study the *evolution* of individual melodies from the shape in which they were recorded in the Middle Ages down through centuries and to observe what were the gradual changes that lead to the transformation of these melodies into those which are now being sung on Sundays and feasts.

The endeavors of Wellesz and Tillyard, who were shortly to be joined

by the great Danish classical philologist Castern Hoeg, led in the 30' s of this century to the establishment of a center for the study of Byzantine Music in Copenhagen, which publishes both facsimiles of MSS and studies and transcriptions in the series of publications under the name "Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae", and which has, since 1935, published more than 20 volumes of facsimiles, transcriptions and studies completely devoted to various problems of Byzantine Music of the Middle Ages. In addition to this center in Copenhagen, there is still another center of studies in Byzantine music in the Basilian monastery of Grottaferrata near Rome which, similarly to Greek monasteries on Mount Athos, prides itself that it has used Byzantine Chant throughout its existence of more than 900 years, yet where the music sounds differently if compared to the chant currently heard in Greece. This fact that there is a difference between these chants ought to lead to additional studies to find out the degree of the consistency of tradition against the innovations which could have crept into the musical practices in the course of centuries.

Looking back at the period between the two wars, it appears that the Western European scholars were able to overcome some of the difficulties in the studies about Byzantine Music. A key was found for the meaning of the martyriae so that it had become possible to start any hymn on its proper musical pitch. The meaning of the musical notation had been clarified to the point where it was possible to transcribe musical manuscripts from the end of the twelfth century onwards to the end of the Middle Ages going down into the period of late Byzantine musical notation, which by its complexity certainly surpasses anything that preceded it and where it becomes understandable that a reform such as that of Chrysantos must have become a necessity. With the solution of the problems of rhythm (some of which still require refinement and precision which is currently only tentative) and of the modes ("echoi") new insights have been gained into the musical practices and even into the methods of composition in the Middle Ages. We understand now that an "echos" was by no means a "scale" similar to the "scales" in use in the West, but rather a body of melodic formulae, some of which were interchangeable between the various modes. We have also come to realize that a musician-composer in the Middle Ages operated in a way similar to that of an icon-painter, who sometimes painted the very same subject-matter with an infinite number of variations. The same degree of subtlety and refinement one encounters in the now available transcriptions of medieval Byzantine music in which to the uninitiated ear it may seem that there is a great number of melodic repetitions. Yet these repetitions are in their substance just about the same as is the subject matter (icon of the Virgin, for instance) for an icon-painter, and

if put side by side, in the same way as one would notice differences between two icons, one can hear differences between two songs.

In the 1940's the ranks of these few scholars were enlarged by an American, Oliver Strunk, professor at Princeton University, who has especially deepened our understanding of the earlier stages of the development of Byzantine musical notation, going far beyond Tillyard's results, which had established that even in the so-called period of Early Byzantine notation one may distinguish at least three stages of gradual transition toward precision in musical notation.

One aspect of studies by Wellesz deserves especially great attention. Wellesz was the first to propound the theory of Byzantine elements in the Western Chant and he found that Greek melodies penetrated into Italy and were assimilated and accepted into the Gregorian Chant, especially in the regional traditions of Benevento and Ravenna. Stimulated by these results obtained by Wellesz, other Western scholars have pursued these points so that we know today of at least 45 Greek texts which had been literally translated and often sung in the Roman Church with the very same Greek melodies which we find in medieval Byzantine manuscripts. One of the indirect consequences of Wellesz' work is the new theory (not yet fully accepted but more and more studied by Western scholars) that one could actually distinguish two different layers in the history of the Gregorian Chant and that what we today call Gregorian is in fact only the form acquired in the course of the 13th century in Italy, while an older layer, the so called "Old Roman," may have preceded this Gregorian Chant in its spread through Europe.

Much of Wellesz' work of the last 15 years has been devoted to the study of the tradition and musical structure of the kontakia and especially of the Akathistos.

While for over 30 years Wellesz, Tillyard and Hoeg, who were later joined by Strunk, were just about the only scholars doing serious research work in Byzantine Music, since 1950 the number of scholars has increased rapidly and the range of problems under study is becoming ever larger and more comprehensive. Since it is accepted now in the West that medieval Byzantine musical notation may be read and transcribed into present day musical notation without great difficulties, and since it has been proven that Greek melodies had penetrated into the body of the Gregorian Chant, the current studies have started embracing certain aspects not yet fully explored by these pioneers. Among the problems particularly attracting attention is the problem of the relationship between music and text, and the relationship of the prosodic-textual and musical accent. This problem has received great attention in the comparative studies which are attempting to trace the spreading of the

Byzantine Chant into the Slavic lands where Greek texts were translated into the Church - Slavonic language and where one may encounter sometimes texts which retain the identical number of syllables per line of text and the identical disposition of stresses and length, which certainly is an amazing feature for a translation to achieve.

Another of the problems currently under study is the problem of musical forms used in the Byzantine Chant. It has been possible to ascertain, for instance, that in some of the hirmoi a musical form similar to the scheme A-BA or ABAB, ABAA, AABA, or AAB or ABB was used. Since some of these forms make their appearance at later stages of musical history it is now of paramount importance to try to establish whether some of the musical forms used in the West have their origins in some other practice or whether they too may be traced as one of the Byzantine elements and influences on Western European musical concepts.

In the study of the structure and melodies preserved in medieval hirmologia, it was found that even in the Middle Ages there existed at least two different musical traditions and it is important now to pursue this point in order to trace the later development of these melodies to find out which of the two traditions had prevailed. It is also necessary to clarify the point whether these differences are a consequence of chronological succession or whether they are a result of two regionally different melodic traditions.

In the area of the influence of the Byzantine Chant on the ecclesiastical music of neighbors, it has been incontestably substantiated that the Byzantine musical notation, not only graphically in its appearance but also with its principles of orthography had been transmitted to the Russians and that the oldest layer of Russian ecclesiastical music in the 10 - 13 centuries bore a very strong resemblance in its melodic outline to the Byzantine Chant of about the same period.

It has also been established that some of the misconceptions of the pioneers in the field of the study of Byzantine Music have to be revised and corrected. One such misconception, for instance, is the problem of the so-called "wrong martyriae". That is when in the middle of a song an intonation sign appears and implies the use of a different "echos" which seemed improbable to our predecessors in the study of this field. It is now becoming a growing conviction that the scribes who wrote musical manuscripts knew very well what they were writing down and that they were not so careless as to commit such gross mistakes and that the martyriae in question are truly correct indicating a temporary departure from one mode into another, enriching thus the melodic outlines of the songs of the ecclesiastical repertory with nuances and refinement seldom found in the contemporary music of the West.

I am very happy to say that some of these results have been obtained not only by Westerners, but also by at least three young Greeks who have adopted the Western research methods in this field. As for the other scholars working in this field, I already indicated that their number has grown so that we can find, e. g. in Yugoslavia 3 young scholars, in Italy 2 new scholarly names, in Germany two scholars particularly interested in the problems of theory of Byzantine music; after the death of Carsten Hoeg there are at least 4 young Danes who are following the example of their great teacher and study various problems in the field of Byzantine music; in England, besides Wellesz and Tillyard, there is at least one young Englishman who has started serious work in this field and in America there are three of us who have been studying this field for some time and we have at least three young students who are now working on their dissertations and are about to join our ranks. On the whole it may appear to be a small number of people, yet if one keeps in mind that only 30 years ago there were only 3 men devoting themselves to research work in Byzantine Music then the figure of more than 20 which I have just enumerated represents a tremendous growth. Our work is not necessarily of interest for Byzantinists only and the consequences of this work are slowly but surely being felt in the general study of history of music.

This is not to say that just about all things that are to be known about this field of studies have already been explored and there will be nothing left for generations to come. On the contrary, just as in any other type of study, the deepening of our knowledge about one aspect normally provokes inquiries which lead to further illumination of the same or related aspects of music. I hope that it will not be taken against me if I chose to present problems on which I am working to illustrate these final points which I would like to bring to your attention.

In my last published study I discussed the existence of the liturgical drama in Byzantium and Russia. It was truly by chance that I was fortunate to locate a number of sources containing a small liturgical drama which was performed in Constantinople and probably in Thessaloniki as well. The sources are quite explicit about the details of performance and there can be no longer any doubt about the fact that Byzantium too knew of mystery-plays which were performed within the church-walls in more or less the same fashion as in the West. While I have been able to assemble some material on a single drama, our curiosity is now being aroused to try to find additional sources and explore the possibility of a wider spread of such a practice. The fact that this play about the 3 children in the furnace penetrated into Russia and was performed there with great pomp and stage-effects, happens to be an additional proof of the very strong Byzantine influence on the eccle-

siastical practices of Russia during the existence of the Byzantine Empire and illustrated clearly the desire of Russia to become the spiritual heir of Byzantium after the Fall of Constantinople by maintaining certain traditions which had ceased to be performed in the now conquered city.

My current work is an attempt to prepare a preliminary catalogue of still existing medieval Byzantine musical MSS. The reason for this work is that so far, all our knowledge about Byzantine Music was based on the knowledge of a very small number of MSS and I think that the time has come for us to learn how many MSS of each type still exist. On the basis of such a census it may become possible to pursue specialized studies in the repertory of any period with a better knowledge as to what the percentage of used sources may be. Furthermore, some MSS contain valuable local usage and this is in itself sufficient reason to study this unity in variety and variety in the unity of this sublime art of music for liturgy. I have been able so far to discover the existence of a few bilingual MSS with both Greek and Slavic texts and what the consequences of this may be, it is still too early to predict, yet I hope that the very fact of existence of such MSS (hitherto unknown) again opens new possibilities for additional studies. We still do not have a comprehensive catalogue of composers of Byzantine Music and that is a task far too great for me to be able to cover during this single year of my work in Greece. Problems are innumerable and we only need new workers to join our ranks because no one of us has the monopoly on truth and the truth will become apparent only after many of us explore the various aspects of any given problem. What we need very much is for us non-Greeks to become aware of whatever work is being done in Greece and familiarize ourselves with these results. By the same token, *our* work in the West should become known to Greek scholars and after that, we can all jointly, together, helping one another continue our work, which exceeds by far the abilities of any single man to cover it alone, because, as we all know **ARS LONGA VITA BREVIS.**

Yale University

MILOS VELIMIROVIC