

*Rev Dr Konstantinos Terzopoulos*

OBSERVATIONS ON THE EXEGEMATIC  
NOTATION THROUGH THE PRISM OF THE  
MS EXEGESIS OF THE PROTOPSALTES OF  
THE GREAT CHURCH, KONSTANTINOS  
BYZANTIOS: AN EXAMPLE\*

## I. KONSTANTINOS BYZANTIOS

### *A very short biography*

Konstantinos Byzantios was born in the year 1777, in the city of Constantinople, thus the name 'Byzantios'. His twenty year old mother was from Constantinople and his father was from the island of Chios, but he died before Konstantinos was born. So, as the story goes, Konstantinos was raised by his mother and 'each day he studied the sacred letters in the House of God and concerned himself with the ecclesiastical music'<sup>1</sup>. We know nothing else of Konstantinos' youth until he is assigned as Kanonarchos at the Metochion of Mount Sinai in Constantinople. He would eventually become second and first chanter in this historical church dedicated to St. John the Forerunner, a church frequented by many important

---

\* Gratitude is in order to the *Music and Letters* Trust for its award that made it possible for me to travel to Lillafüred, Hungary and deliver this paper.

<sup>1</sup> Th. Aristokleous, *Konstantiou A' tou apo Sinaiou: biographia kai syngraphai hai elassones* (Konstantinoupolei: ek tou typographeiou tes 'Proodou', 1866) 64.

members of the Phanariot society<sup>2</sup>. The young Konstantinos, however, heard his first lessons in Byzantine chant some time before the year 1800, studying under the important teacher Georgios the Cretan<sup>3</sup>. The list of students to this influential teacher reads like a who's who of early 19th century musicians and composers: Chourmouzios<sup>4</sup>, Antonios Lambadarios, Manuel Byzantios the protopsaltes<sup>5</sup>, Apostolos Konstas Chios<sup>6</sup>, Gregorios protopsaltes<sup>7</sup>, Petros Ephesios, Petros Hagiotaphites, Theodoros Phokaeus<sup>8</sup>, and many others.

---

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., 110; Chr. Boulake-Zese, *Hilarion Sinaites metropolitēs Tyrnoubou: he zoe kai to ergon autou* (Thessalonike 1983) 31; and M. Gedeon, *Aposeimeiomata Chronographou 1800-1913* (Athens 1932) 263-64.

<sup>3</sup> Aristokleous 1866; 64; G. Papadopoulou, *Symbolai eis ten historian tes mar' hemin ekklesiastikes mousikes* (Athens 1890) 317; Papadopoulou, *Historike episkopesis tes byzantines ekklesiastikes mousikes apo ton apostolikon chronon mechri ton kath' hemas (1-1900 m.Ch.)* (Athenai 1904) 107-8; K. A. Psachou, *He parasemantike tes byzantines mousikes* (Athenai 1917) 86, 100, 237-238; and Chrysanthos of Madyton, *Theoretikon mega tes mousikes syntachthen men para Chrysanthou archiepiskopou Dirrachiou toy ek Madyton* (Tergeste 1832; Athens 1977, reprint); xxxiv.

<sup>4</sup> Chourmouzios (Giamales) the Chartophylax, one of the three teachers of the New Method. Cf. Chrysanthou 1832; xlii; Aristokleous 1866; 62-63; and Papadopoulou 1890; 331-332.

<sup>5</sup> Ch. Patrinelis, 'Protopsaltae, Lampadarii, and Domestikoi of the Great Church during the post-Byzantine period: 1453-1821', *Studies In Eastern Chant* III (New York and Toronto: Oxford Univ. Press, 1973) 141-70.

<sup>6</sup> Gr. Stathe, *He exegesis tes palaias byzantines semeiografias* (Athenai 1978) 25-34.

<sup>7</sup> Patrinelis 1973; 157, 164.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 340-341.

Georgios the Cretan was a student of Meletios of Sinai<sup>9</sup> and Iakobos protopsaltes of the Great Church<sup>10</sup>. Part of the reason for Georgios' great influence on the overriding psaltic event of his time relates to the way he used the exegematic music notation. G. Papdopoulos relates the following: 'He surpassed in the analytical form of composition, writing the melodic lines using only the characters of quantity, without the hieroglyphic, great signs'<sup>11</sup>. Two of Georgios' students, Gregorios and Chourmouzios, would eventually become two of the Three Teachers of the New Method. Beyond this point, and the fact that many of his students would serve as chanters in the Great Church, Chrysanthos even emphasises Georgios' contribution to the evolution of the music notation in his *Theoritikon Mega tes Mousikes*, thus: 'The supervisors of the school [of the New Method] were planning to bring Georgios in order that he collaborate with the three men of the new method of music. Death, however, forestalled and deprived music-lovers of the good things expected from him'<sup>12</sup>. The important point to emphasise concerning Georgios the Cretan for our purposes here is the fact that he used a highly analytic form of notation.

After the death of Iakobos protopsaltes on 23 April 1800, Konstantinos Byzantios is called to serve as second domestikos of the Great Church. A few years later, after Petros Byzantios leaves his position as protopsaltes, sometime around 1805, Konstantinos will become first

---

<sup>9</sup> Papadopoulou 1890; 316-17.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Gr. Stathe, *Iakobos Protopsaltes ho Byzantios* (Athenai 1997) 317-34; Patrinelis 1973; 155; and Psachou 1917; 85.

<sup>11</sup> Papadopoulou 1904; 125-26, 190.

<sup>12</sup> Chrysanthou 1832; xxxiv-xxxv; Romanou 1974; 237.

domestikos and in the year 1808 he will begin his *semeiomatarion* or notebook<sup>13</sup>, from which he would publish the Typikon of the Great Church — *Typikon Ekklesiastikon tes Megales Ekklesias*. After the death of Manuel protopsaltes on 21 June 1819, Konstantinos will become the patriarchal lambadarios, chanting opposite of one of the three teachers, Gregorios protopsaltes. However, Gregorios' health would fail him in just two short years and Konstantinos becomes protopsaltes on Christmas Eve in the year of modern Hellas' independance, 1821. Konstantinos Byzantios will continue chanting in the Patriarchal Church of St George until the year 1855, when he goes to the Princess Isle of Chalke, ἐπ' ἀλλαγῆ ἀέρος (= for a change of air). However, he will retain the title of Protopsaltes until the year 1862, when he gives up his spirit on 30 June.

Of value here, beyond the fact of Konstantinos' studies under the important teacher Georgios the Cretan, is the point that Konstantinos will enter the service of the patriarchal church of St George, beginning as second domestikos. He ascends up the ranks of chanters, from second domestikos to first domestikos, lambadarios and, finally, protopsaltes. In all, his chanting experince in the patriarchal church would reach a total of fifty-five years; truly a lifetime!

#### *His psaltic acitivity*

Time restrictions do not allow for great detail in describing Konstantinos' psaltic activity, but a brief list of activities is useful for context, so as to bear witness to the importance of

---

<sup>13</sup> Exarchia, Athens, Greece: private collection of the late K. A. Psachos (BKΨ) MS 178. This is a nootebook begun by Konstantinos Byzantios in the year 1808.

Konstantinos' career as representative of the Patriarchal tradition. Being the last protopsaltes of the patriarchal church to chant and compose in the pre-New Method notation and in direct line of the previous chanters, his witness is not that of some 'chance' chanter, but is an excellent reflection of the oral and written tradition of the 18th century culminating in the psaltic activity of a primary patriarchal chanter whose presence would stretch through the first half of the 19th century, effecting developments that would occur in the second half of that century, affecting even the modern Hellenic psaltic tradition.

Of primary importance is the fact that Konstantinos, like his teacher, Manuel Byzantios the protopsaltes, did not accept the New Method of analytical notation of the Three Teachers. He continued to chant directly from the older manuscript codices and wrote using the exegetic notation. Even today, he is characterised as being a preserver of the Patriarchal ecclesiastical *hypchos* or style. His 55 years of chanting in the patriarchal church aside, Konstantinos is known to have been a copier of music codices. His musical activity includes *kallopismos*, *melopoeia*, *syntmesis*, *exegesis* and publication, spanning all the *genoi* and almost all the *eidoi* of melic composition. Witnesses to this activity can be observed in his publications:

- i. *Ανθολογία Στιχηραρίου*, 2 Vols., Constantinople, 1840 and 1841.
- ii. *Ταμειὸν Ἀνθολογίας*, 2 Vols., Constantinople, 1845 and 1846.
- iii. *Ἀναστασιματάριον ἀργὸν καὶ σύντομον*, Constantinople 1845.

Konstantinos' contribution to the printed tradition of the psaltic art is not limited, however, to his own publications, but also included his editorial influences on a number of other important works published at the Patriarchal Music Press.

The comparative study of Konstantinos' compositional work with composers who both preceded and followed him offers the opportunity to study the development of ecclesiastical melic composition, *melopœiā*, at the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th centuries. The careful study of the various compositional elements of the chant is essential. With regards to Konstantinos' compositional work, such elements include the traditional use of older and well established *theses*, or melic formulæ, the use of the also well established and accepted *genoi* (i.e. the heirmologic, sticheraric and papadic) and *eidoi* or categories of Byzantine composition (i.e. *pasapnoaria*, *kekragaria*, *polyeleloi*, *doxologiai*, etc.), along with a particular dexterity with regards to the use of *phthorai* and *parachorde* in the musical interpretation of the liturgical texts through a kind of musical imitation, or *mimesis*, of the poetic and textual images used in the hymns.

Among other things, we are able to observe the parallel use of the older Byzantine compositions along with the development and use of the newer, shorter, *syntomon* mele, as well as the selective use of the highly technical, virtuosic and embellished style applied to the newer melic compositions. Subsequently, this practice will play a major role in the evolution of the psaltic art up to the present.

Konstantinos also knew the secular music of his time, or *exoterike mousike*, as witnessed to in Stephanos domestikos' book published in 1843, *Ἐρμηνεία τῆς ἐξωτερικῆς μουσικῆς*, which was published with the 'official approval' of Konstantinos — it was the job of the

protopsaltes of the Great Church to oversee any music publications coming out of the patriarchal music press. In another publication, the *Μεθοδική Διδασκαλία* published by P. Kiltzanides<sup>14</sup>, there is an exegesis by Konstantinos that was transcribed into the New Method by Stephanos; it is the *Kiari* of the peizadé Giagkou Karatza and Giagkou Theologou.

After the school of the new method was discontinued in the year 1821, it would not be until the year 1866 when the fourth patriarchal school of music would be established. Konstantinos' stand against the New Method would not afford him the opportunity to teach in the official patriarchal music school. Nevertheless, information in both the manuscript and published psaltic tradition bears witness to many important chanters who were mentored by Konstantinos — names such as Ioannes Byzantios Neochorites and protopsaltes, Stephanos lambadarios, Georgios Rysios, Nicholas Stogianovits the lambadarios and Georgios Raidestenos II.

Konstantinos' importance with regards to the history and evolution of the order of divine service as practiced at the Great Church and the liturgical book known as the *Typikon* is of primary importance. The discovery of Konstantinos' *Semeiomatarion* in the K. A. Psachos private collection represents a substantial monument for the history of the development of the liturgical *typikon* as a genre and the practice of the divine service in the Great Church. This is an important event in as much as the published *Typikon Ekklesiastikon* written by Konstantinos (1st ed., Constantinople 1838 and 2nd ed., Constantinople 1842) is the main

---

<sup>14</sup> Constantinople 1881.

source for the order of service still used today in the Greek-speaking Orthodox church throughout the world. Moreover, translation into Slavo-Bulgarian by Neofit Rilski in 1853<sup>15</sup>, and a Romanian publication by another chanter, Anton Pann, in 1851 will also bring the publications into these areas, resulting in a uniformity of liturgical practice under the influence of the Great Church, the effects of which are still in force today. The 1888 *Typikon tes tou Christou megales Ekklesias* (Constantinople), revised by the patriarchal committees and edited by another protopsaltes of the Great Church, Georgios Biolakes, is in essence only a revised and enlarged version of the Konstantinos typika. Basic changes and developments to the ancient monastic, sabaitic typika, mainly adaptations for the worship life of the parish church community, were systematically codified for the first time by the hand of Konstantinos, together with the opinions and blessings of various patriarchs of Constantinople. This is indeed an important and large chapter of Konstantinos' life and work, but — not pertaining to today's topic — must be dealt with elsewhere.

Finally, Konstantinos was instrumental in the patriarchate's dealing with the appearances of various attempts at introducing alternative notational systems for ecclesiastical chant. We need only briefly mention them here:

- The Lesbian system of music notation,
- the alphabetic music system of the Bucharest school,
- the alphabetic music system of Paisios Xeropotamemos, and

---

<sup>15</sup> Cf. my forthcoming article in *Theologia* (Athens), 'Some Notes on the Slavic Translation of Konstantinos Byzantios' *Typikon Ekklesiastikon of the Great Church of Christ*'.

- the notational and musical innovations of Ioannes Chabiaras and hierodeacon Anthimos Nikolaïdes

Konstantinos Byzantios, then, as evidenced by all that was quickly mentioned above, can be understood as an important personality in the sphere of the Hellenic psaltic art. For the purposes of this paper, it is important to emphasise that Konstantinos is an especially important personality in the study of notational development in the sense that he firmly represents the culmination of the pre-New Method era.

## II. POINT OF REFERENCE: NOTATIONAL CLASSIFICATIONS

Prof. Oliver Strunk, in his important work, *Specimina notationum antiquiorum*<sup>16</sup>, states the following regarding the last phase of Byzantine notational development:

From about 1175 until the time of Chrysanthos, whose first publication appeared in 1821, the notation used in the transmission of Byzantine chant underwent no radical change.

In the same work he describes and compares a number of other classifications of what might be termed historical periods of notational development, referring specifically to J. B. Thibaut, E. Wellesz, L. Tardo, H. J. W. Tillyard, H. Reimann and A. Gastoué<sup>17</sup>. My purpose here is not to review or comment on their classifications, but only to present the most general groupings as a point of reference for what follows.

---

<sup>16</sup> Oliver Strunk, *Specimina notationum antiquiorum* (MMB Pars Suppletoria VII; Haunia: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1965) 1.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Strunk 1965.

On the most general terms, after the ekphonic notation of the 9th-14th centuries, three main divisions of Byzantine melodic chant notation are today the basic points of reference:

- I. Palæo or ancient Byzantine notation
- II. Middle Byzantine or so-called 'round' notation, and
- III. The New Method of ecclesiastical music, referred to in the west sometimes as the Chrysanthine notation and among Greek circles, more often as the method of the Three Teachers

Of course, things are not this simple. Within each of these historical periods, scholars working on specific mss will discover periods of development within each of these main periods. A number of criteria such as those mentioned in Gr. Th. Stathis' work, *Οι ἀναγραμματισμοὶ καὶ τὰ μαθήματα τῆς βυζαντινῆς μελοποιίας*<sup>18</sup>:

Byzantine Music notation, already in existence for over a thousand years, is divided into different periods of development. In order to reach the ascertainment of these periods of notational development – and correspondingly, those of Byzantine melopœia, composition – primary importance belongs to the notational signs and the hypostases, through which the melody is expressed. Specifically: a) the number and the chronological genesis or appearance of the symbols, b) their function or *energeia*, c) the falling into disuse or complete

---

<sup>18</sup> Gr. Th. Stathis, *Hoi anagrammatismoi kai ta mathemata tes byzantines melopoiias* (Athens: Institute of Byzantine Musicology, Meletai 3, 1979) 47-59. I have prepared an English translation of this entire work, which is forthcoming.

disappearance of certain signs, and d) the transcription, and, in older periods, conversion of signs and mele.

He continues, 'When one, or two, or three of these above criteria are met, it is possible to distinguish... chronological periods of development of Byzantine music notation'. Along this vein, many sub-periods of notational development, possible traces of other, lost Byzantine notations, are distinguished within each main period, the subject of much scholarship and research.

Other than the developmental evolution of the actual notational signs and their observed use in the extant music mss, the modern researcher must also take into account developments in the evolution of the divine services or rites of the Eastern Greek Orthodox Church, otherwise referred to as liturgical development. The Byzantine rite has a unique and involved history, which is anything but static. This, however, is another story in itself that will not concern us at any length here, but merits mention. These liturgical developments, closely linked with the use of specific types of hymns and how they came to be used in the divine services, or rather, possibly how their use changed over time can be seen a source of notational development. In short, new liturgical needs influence and are influenced by new hymnology or an adjusted usage of old hymnology.

Along this line of thought, Prof. Stathis puts forward another way of looking at the periods of notational development by suggesting the division into the four following periods:<sup>19</sup>

- I. Early Byzantine notation (AD 950-1175),
- II. Middle, fully developed Byzantine, Round, notation (AD 1177-1670),
- III. Transitional, exêgêmatic Byzantine notation (AD 1670-1814), and
- IV. New analytical notation, or simply, New Method (AD 1814 to present)

The main shift from the first, tripartite model mentioned at the beginning of this paper is in the addition of Stathis' third, transitional, exegematic notation. The differentiation with the middle notation offered in the short form is a) the number and the chronological genesis or appearance of the music notation signs, b) the stabilisation of their function, c) the falling into disuse or complete disappearance of certain signs, and d) the transcription or conversion of older signs and melodies in various mss throughout the world.<sup>20</sup>

The key word for Stathis' third notational period here is *ἐξηγήσεις*. The specific term is used for the first time in ms Mount Athos, Iveron 1250, written around the year 1670; it contains an exegesis of the Athenian nekrosêmon trisagion by Balasis the priest. Surely the transcription or conversion of older notations into newer forms or usages of what are basically the same notation is nothing new to the study of Byzantine chant; such mss exist

---

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 48.

<sup>20</sup> For Stathis' more detailed explanation cf. Ibid., 49 ff.

even for the ekphonetic to palæo Byzantine notations. However, its application to notational specimens beginning in the 17th century has proved to be a *sêmeion antilegomenon*.

The 'point of dispute' has to do with the fact that 'these "transcriptions" or "exegeses" have created the impression that no Byzantine notation before the 17th century presented melodic movement in all details, but rather that it served as a shorthand record of a performance'.<sup>21</sup> Theories regarding the so-called 'stenographic theory of Byzantine music', as Tillyard called it, either for or against, have also been the subject of a number of studies<sup>22</sup>. Some writers have attempted to make a distinction between the words '*metafrasis*' (translation) and '*exegesis*', since they are often used together in New Method publications, connecting the latter with a procedure 'of embellished performance or re-composition' of later Byzantine repertoires<sup>23</sup>. Without dispute, melodic embellishment, known as

---

<sup>21</sup> Kenneth Levy and Christian Troelsgård, 'Middle Byzantine notation', *Grove Music Online*, ed. L. Macy (Accessed: 16 August 2004), <<http://www.grovemusic.com>>.

<sup>22</sup> H. J. W. Tillyard, 'The Stenographic Theory of Byzantine Music', *Laudate* 2 (1924) 216-25 and 3 (1925) 28-32; 'The Modes in Byzantine Music', *Annual of the British School at Athens* xxii (1916-17, 1917-18) 147; and *Handbook of the Middle Byzantine Notation*, *Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae*, Subsidia 1 (Copenhagen 1935) especially p. 15.

<sup>23</sup> B. Schartau and Ch. Troelsgård, 'The translation of Byzantine chant into the "New Method": Joasaph Pantokratorinos', *Acta Musicologica* (=AcM) lxxix (1997, Facs. II, Juli-Dezember), 134-42. Cf. P. Jeffery, ed., *The Study of Medieval Chant: Paths and Bridges, East and West* (Cambridge: The Boydell Press, 2001), 159-229; H. Husmann, 'Interpretations und Ornamentatierung in der nachbyzantinischen Musik', *AcM* lii (1980), 101-5 and Kujumdzieva, S. 'Über die Zeichen Aphona während der spat- und

καλλωπισμός, is a term found in chant mss from Byzantine times, comparable to other related terms, such as ἐπιβολή and παρεκβολή. The problem is also related to the way various scholars understand and interpret the late Byzantine idea of the existence of several layers or levels to the middle and late Byzantine notations, as expressed in the treatise of Manuel Chrysaphes<sup>24</sup> and others; this understanding reveals itself with the terms παραλλαγή, μετροφωνία and μέλος<sup>25</sup>.

The scientific, careful, comparative study of the various exegeses, conversions or transcriptions from one notational form to another is a rich source of study and understanding of the evolution of both the notational system and melic composition or melopœia. Such sources are the few exegeses and syntmeses by the last protopsaltes of the Great Church to chant and write in the exegematic notation, Konstantinos Byzantios.

---

postbyzantinischen Periode', *Musikkulturgeschechte: Festschrift für Constantin Floros*, ed. P Petersen (Wiesbaden, 1990) 449-60.

<sup>24</sup> Manuel Chrysaphes, *The treatise of Manuel Chrysaphes the Lampadarios: On the theory of the art of chanting and on certain erroneous views that some hold about it*, Dimitri E. Conomos, text, translation, and commentary (Mount Athos, Iviron Monastery MS 1120 [July 1458]), Band II in the series the Monumenta Musicæ Byzantinæ's Corpus Scriptorum de re Musica (Wien 1985).

<sup>25</sup> Stathe, 'He byzantine mousike ste latreia kai sten episteme', *Byzantina* 4 (Thessalonike 1972) 392-438.

III. THE HISTORICAL BACKDROP: THE QUEST FOR AN ANALYTICAL  
MUSICAL NOTATION AND THE PSALTIC TRADITION AFTER PETROS  
LAMBADARIOS THE PELOPONNESE

A short historical review of the previous two centuries reveals the psaltic foundation from which Konstantinos Byzantios was affected and faced.

During the second half of the 18th c. the western music world begins what is called the Classical period with composers such as Hayden and Mozart in Venice, while the psaltic world of eastern Greek Orthodox church is at the door of a fourth notational stage, which has as its axis the search for an analytical chant notation.

The preceding century, the 17th, was another 'golden age' for the psaltic art. This period is related to what is termed the 'new kallopismos', the genesis of the new sticheraric melos and the development of the tradition of kalophonic melic composition, mainly of the sticheraric and heirmologic mele of the 17th c<sup>26</sup>. Especially important are the names Panagiotes Chrysaphes the new, Germanos Neon Patron and Balasis hierous. By the middle of the 18th c we find ourself in the period immediately after the protopsaltes Panagiotes Chalatzoglou. Petros Bereketes the Melodos is chanting at Hypsomatheia and protopsaltes of the Great Church is Ioannes Trapezountios.

*Ioannes Trapezountios the protopsaltes of the Great Church*

In the year 1727, Ioannes Trapezountios is appointed teacher of the First Patrairchal School of Ecclesiastical Music during the patriarchate of Paisios II from Nikomedeia. More

---

<sup>26</sup> Stathe 1979; 130 ff.

important for our short historical review is the following: according to Chrysanthos, this Ioannes,

was publicly saying that the difficulty of the teaching and transmission of psalmody, due to all the time it takes, ought to be removed from their creations and that a simpler, more methodical and elementary system of signs ought to be established, which would make it possible to write and transmit unaltered every kind of melody. (Ioannes became, obviously, an imitator of his teacher Panagiotes, as it seems that the characters of teachers are transmitted usually to their students.) So, in the year 1756, Ioannes was impelled by the philomousos Cyril, who was steering straight the helm of the patriarchate at the time, to compose *pasapnoaria*, *polyeleoi*, *doxologies*, *koinonika*, etc. He used a manner of writing which was different from the old, and closer to the *exegematic* way. Indeed, this became the source of the *exegematic* writing used by his student, Petros<sup>27</sup>.

To summarize, Ioannes Trapezountios, the then *protopsaltes* of the Great Church receives a charge or directive from Patriarch Cyril to make use of a more analytical music notation; the actual word used by Chrysanthos is '*exegematic*'. This is a starting point from which there was no return. Ioannes composes new hymns, but also condenses some of the older

---

<sup>27</sup> Chrysanthou Madyton, *Theorêtikon Mega tês Mousikês* (Tergestê 1832) xlviii-xlix; English translation from Katy Romanou, 'Great Theory of Music by Chrysanthos from Madytos: an annotated translation', MM thesis, School of Music, Indiana University (May 1974) 249. I have made some minor changes to better express the Greek terminology; specifically, I exchanged the word '*exegematic*' for Romanou's '*interpretive*'.

Byzantine compositions, no doubt the ones still in use. A prime example would be the leitourgika for the Div. Liturgy of St. Basil — the *Hagios, hagios, hagios* still chanted today.

*Some other important characteristics of the musical period*

Ioannes Trapezountios' successor, Daniel protopsaltes and his lambadarios, kyr Petros the Peloponnese, will further develop the exegetic music notation, which will express the aphonous or 'voiceless' signs, otherwise termed as hypostases in a more analytical fashion. All the hypostases, however, will not be abandoned. Some remain, but are simply written in a more analytical manner. This form of writing will, in turn, pass down to their students, Petros Byzantios the protopsaltes, Iakobos the protopsaltes, Georgios the Cretan, Manuel Byzantios the protopsaltes and Gregorios the protopsaltes. Another mousikodidaskalos of the 19th c, Apostolos Konstas of Chios will produce a large number of codices with his unique *theoriai*<sup>28</sup>. This form of writing, however, will be challenged when the three teachers, Gregorios the protopsaltes, Chourmouzos and Chrysanthos, will get Patriarchal backing for what they called 'The New Method of Ecclesiastical Music'.

One of the most important distinctions to keep in mind when dealing with this period of the exegetic notation is the genre of the new sticheraric melos, now often referred to as *syntomon*. The syntomon tradition of the heirmologic melos is codified by Petros Byzantios. Specifically, especially from the 18th c, a new, syntomon begins to influence the ecclesiastical chant. Up until then, the older sticheraric mele, rooted especially in the protopsaltes Manuel Chrysaphes and, later, Balasis the priest are still being copied and used in the

---

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Stathe 1978.

Anastasimataria, Sticheraria and Papadikai of the late 18th and early 19th c. This will be the impetus for Iakobos the protopsaltes to compose his famous *doxastarion* (1836), and other papadic compositions, which are clearly *syntmeseis* or abridgements of the older, late Byzantine tradition. From a more practical, notational aspect, Manuel Byzantios the protopsaltes would fulfill 'the measurement of time flowing in a melody, the definition of scales, neumes and the rest', according to Chrysanthos<sup>29</sup>.

During the time Iakobos was protopsaltes there would also arise a first attempt at a completely radical change of the ecclesiastical music notation by Agapios Palermios, first in the form of an adapted European pentagram and then in the form of an alphabetical notation. In short, a time full of change.

#### IV. NOTATIONAL OBSERVATIONS: AN EXAMPLE

As already stated above, Konstantinos Byzantios, like his teacher, Manuel Byzantios the protopsaltes, did not accept the New Method of analytical chant notation implemented by the three teachers, Gregorios protopsaltes, Chrysanthos Madytos, and Chourmouzios (1814-1821). Most works commenting on Konstantinos' notation would describe it as that of Petros Lambadarios the Peloponnesse. However, upon close study of Konstantinos' manuscripts and other manuscripts containing exegeses attributed to Konstantinos, it can easily be seen that there is a definite evolution in the notation from the time of Petros Lambadarios. In comparison with middle and late Byzantine notations with well over 45 signs, Konstantinos is seen using an analytical notation which is reduced to 33 (pl. 1).

---

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., liv and Romanou (1974) 254.

One important source for Konstantinos' exegeses is the Athonite MS, Hagios Panteleimonos (HP) 977, circa 1800-1805 (pl. 2). The indication on fol. 193r reveals that the exegesis of the compositions that follow were done by Konstantinos domestikos at the request of the monastery's *portari* (doorkeeper), a certain Joacheim.

As an example of comparative research between notational periods, HP 977 will be used in conjunction with four other MSS. The textual example is taken from the Baptismal Trisagion, *Ὅσοι εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸν ἐνεδώσαθε, ἀλληλούια*. This hymn, directly based on the Apostle Paul's phrase in his epistle to the Galatians (3. 27), is used instead of the trisagion hymn on days when baptisms traditionally occurred, feasts of the Master, especially Pascha, Pentecost, the Nativity of Christ (25 December), and the Epiphany (6 January) and is always chanted in mode I plagal. Like the normal trisagion hymn used in the Byzantine liturgy — Ἅγιος ὁ Θεός, ἅγιος ἰσχυρός, ἅγιος ἀθάνατος, ἐλέησόν ἡμᾶς — the *Ὅσοι εἰς Χριστὸν* is repeated at least three times, followed by the *Δόξα* and *Καὶ νῦν* with the second half of the troparion as refrain. After this follows the *Δύναμις*, which is a melismatic rendition of the hymn. It is the first few notational signs of this version of the troparion that today's example in comparative notational method will concentrate.

Six notational examples have been chosen that cross the Byzantine, Exegematic and New Method notation developmental periods:

- [i.] Athos, Iveron 1120, fols. , written in the year 1120 by Manuel Chrysaphes Doukas, the lambadarios of the royal clergy and maistor (pl. 3)

- [ii.] Athens, National Library of Greece (EBE) 947, fols. 78r-v, written in the 17th c by Panagiotes Chrysaphes the new, protopsaltes of the Great Church (pl. 4)
- [iii.] Athens, EBE 2175, fols. 320r-v, Papadike with mele of Balasios hierews, written in the mid-18th c (pl. 5)
- [iv.] Athens, EBE 2301, fols. Papadike, written in 1809 (pl. 6)
- [v.] Athos, HP 977, fols. 202v-203v, with exegeses by Konstantinos Byzantios, written between the years 1800 -1805, when he was domestikos of the Great Church – exegetic notation (pl. 2)
- [vi.] Athens, EBE-ΜΠΙΤ (*Μετόχιον του Παναγίου Τάφου, Κωνσταντινούπολις*) 704, fols. , written by and containing exegeses of one of the three teachers of the New Method, Chourmouzios in the year 1818 – new method notation (pl. 7)

Some preliminary, general observations are in order. Regarding the particular composition used in our example, Korones' synoptikon, and its relation to other compositions found in various Byzantine MSS, the topic has been studied and reviewed by D Conomos, in his *Byzantine Trisagia and Cherubika of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*<sup>30</sup>. Even the possibility of some Western chant parallels have been considered by K

---

<sup>30</sup> Dimitri E. Conomos, *Byzantine Trisagia and Cherubika of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (Thessaloniki: Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, 1974) 97-116.

Levy<sup>31</sup>. The main point that needs to be mentioned here is that although there are definite variations between the various Byzantine mele, there are also basic, common themes that can be identified. This is not the subject of this paper, but this is a basic principle of Byzantine *melopœia* or melic composition that happens to also have been cited in an important Byzantine theoretical treatise.

This theoretical treatise also happens to be written by one of the composers in our MS specimens, namely, Manuel Chrysaphes the maistor and lambadarios of the royal clergy's *On the Theory of the Psaltic Art and on certain erroneoos views that some hold about it*<sup>32</sup>.

The following quotation merits attention:

Thus even in the kalophonic stichera the composers of these do not depart from their original melodies but follow them accurately, step by step, and retain them. Therefore, they take over some melodies unchanged from tradition and from the music thus preserved (as it is recorded in the old Sticherarion), and they all follow the path unaltered throughout the entire composition. The second composer always follows his predecessor and his successor follows him and, to put it simply, everone retains the technique of the art.... Ioannes Koukouzeles, the maistor, does not alter the old stichera in his *anagrammatismoï*, but follows them step by step, although, like composers now, he was entirely able (indeed he was much more able) to create his own original chants which had nothing in common with

---

<sup>31</sup> Kenneth Levy, 'The Italian neophytes' chants', *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 23 (1970) 181-227. Reprinted in *The Garland Library of the History of Western Music 1: Medieval Music I: Monophony*, Ellen Rosand, ed. (New York: Garland, 1985).

<sup>32</sup> Chrysaphes 1985.

their prototype stichera.... In the *katanyktika* the composer imitate his predecessor who was successful in his art; and the same applies to the *kratemata* and to the *megalynaria*. And even in the Cherubim hymns, although their melodies are segmented, and would find on examining all the composers in detail that they were still using the same melodies and were in agreement with each other. Equally in Great Vespers they use the same rule and the same procedure; as well as in the *polyeleos* and the so-called antiphons, and also in the oikoi.... Ioannes the lambadarios, who came after these men and who was in no way inferior to his predecessors, wrote with his own hand these words, saying: "Akathistos composed by me, Ioannes Kladas, the lampadarios, imitating the old Akathistos as closely as possible". He was not ashamed to so write, but rather took pride thereafter in not departing from the model provided by the effort of older composers and in not making innovations in matters that they had once and for all decided. In making this sound decision, these were his thoughts; he spoke his thoughts and in speaking he did not lie, but he imitated the earlier composers who excelled in the science.<sup>33</sup>

Taking a closer look at the prepared examples we can observe a little of what Manuel Chrysaphes referred to in his treatise.

A few preliminary observations can be made. Examining the *Δύναμις* phrase in EBE 947 (pl. 4) and the second *Δύναμις* in EBE 2175 (pl. 5) it is easily noticed that the latter, carrying the indication that it is a composition of Balasis hierous, begins with the same *Δύναμις* as that found in the Chrysaphes the new MS! As Manuel Chrysaphes wrote, 'He was not

---

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., 111-121, 124-129, 134-142 and 151-161.

ashamed to so write<sup>34</sup>; not only is it a perfectly acceptable practice, but the *preferred* road to be followed. Comparing the two specimens with Iveron 1120 (pl. 3), a much shorter *Δύναμις* is noted. This same 'short' *Δύναμις* is actually an *Ἀμῆν* in numerous MS sources<sup>35</sup>, giving the impression of being a common melic line. D. Conomos, in his extensive comments on the various *Ὅσοι εἰς Χριστόν* settings<sup>36</sup> will conclude that there is widespread sharing of melodic material. Leaving the *Δύναμις*, it is time to look at the specific example prepared for the present paper.

All four of the pre-New Method MSS we shall inspect here begin with the identical incipit for the first word of the troparion proper, *Ὅσοι*. The signs are as follows: after the initial martyria for mode I plagal, the first combination or constellation of signs are [1i] an ison with [1ii] a klasma, [1iii] a piasma above and [1iv] parakalesma and [1v] apostrophos; five signs. In the provided specimens, the piasma and parakalesma are in red, except for Iveron 1120, where only the parakalesma is in red; comparisons with other Byzantine era MSS will bear witness to the same composition as having the piasma sometimes in black ink and at other times in red. For example, the Athens EBE MSS 2456, fol. 187r and 2837, fol. 147r will carry a black piasma, whereas Athens EBE MS 2406 has it in red ink. Other such minor variances in notation can often be observed, as in the primary example here.

---

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., 156.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Athens EBE MSS 2837, fol. 149v and 2406, fol. 222r.

<sup>36</sup> Conomos 1974; especially 104-16.

The second syllable of the first word, *-σοι*, contains at least five signs as follows: [2i] the bareia is followed by [2ii] an ison with [2iii] an apostrophos below, then [2iv] an oligon with [v] another apostrophos below. A number of MSS will add [2vi] a red gorgon above [2ii] the ison, as with EBE 947 and 2175 used here; other Byzantine MSS I have access to, also use the red gorgon (EBE 2456, fol. 187r, 2837, fol. 149r, and 2406, fol. 222v). EBE 2175 also adds [2vi] a red lygisma.

The second word of the troparion, *εἰς*, receives [3i] an ison with either [3ii] a dipole below or [3iii] klasma above.

Hence three *pneumata*, or 'spirit' signs in this small example are the piasma, parakalesma and gorgon.

And what exactly are these *pneuma* or 'spirit' signs? All three — the piasma, parakalesma and gorgon — are part of a set of signs known as the 'great signs' or signs of cheironomy and great hypostases. Although Byzantine iconographic images have left residue hints of some sort of musical cheironomy<sup>37</sup>, the technique is long lost. A recent protopsaltes of the Great Church, Petros Byzantios (protopsaltes from 1800 - c. 1805)<sup>38</sup> was recorded by Chrysanthos of Madyton as saying, 'If I knew there was to be found a master of Cheironomy even in America, with all my poverty I would go and learn from him all about it'<sup>39</sup>. What we do know, however, are two things: what the theories have to say regarding the power of

---

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Neil K. Moran, *Singers in late Byzantine and Slavonic painting* (Leiden 1986).

<sup>38</sup> Patrinelis 1973; 156.

<sup>39</sup> Chrysanthou 1832; liii-liv.

these signs and what has been received throughout the manuscript tradition via their exegeses. Addressing the first point, a few citations regarding the *piasma* and *parakalesma* are useful.

First the *parakalesma*. Although a voiceless [*aphonon*] sign, the *parakalesma* is characterised as belonging to a subgroup of signs known as *peritonoî*<sup>40</sup> or *hemiphones*. It is said to be interpreted cheironomically and is inherited from the Psaltikon, hence finding its way into the kalophonic settings<sup>41</sup>. Gabriel hieromonachos, connecting it to the *parakletike*, describes its energy thus, ‘the *parakletike* makes a supplication, as entreaty, as well as the *parakalesma*, which is not chanted with great [*sphodrou*] tone of voice, but brightly [*hilaros*]’<sup>42</sup>. The *Anonymous Questions and Answers* *theoria* offers a little more information: ‘In the same manner also the *parakalesma* is giving to those isons that are standing on top of it strength in the melos so that they appear fully “voiced” and the same applies to the

---

<sup>40</sup> *Die erotapokriseis des pseudo-Johannes Damaskenos zum kirchengesang*, G. Wolfram and Ch. Hannick, eds. in the *Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae* series ‘*Corpus Scriptorum de re Musica*’, vol. V (Wien 1997) 613-15.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. the late Byzantine *Anonymous Questions and Answers on the Interval Signs*, Bjarne Schartau, ed. in the *Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae* series ‘*Corpus Scriptorum de re Musica*’, vol. IV (Wien 1998) 833-35.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. the 15th c ‘*Peri ton en tei psaltikei semadion kai phonon kai tes touton etymologias*’ in *Gabriel hieromonachos: abhandlung über den Kirchengesang*, Ch. Hannick and G. Wolfram, eds. in the *Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae* series ‘*Corpus Scriptorum de re Musica*’, vol. I (Wien 1985) 308-15.

parakletike, i.e. it sort of sobs, making a slight rest, the melos in a way displaying prayer or a supplication, and due to the humility of the praying becomes like a hemiphone. And the maker's aim... was concerned with the cheironomy as well'<sup>43</sup>.

And the *piasma*. Also characterised as either a peritone<sup>44</sup> or hemiphone, the *piasma* is closely related to the *bareia* and the *Anonymous* openly calls it 'the two *bareiai*, i.e. the *piasma*'<sup>45</sup>. The doubling of signs in the Byzantine notations, as well as in the ekphonic notations, indicates a lengthening some type of lengthening. Hence, we have the examples of the two *oxeiai* becoming a *diple*, or the two *apostrophoi*. The *Hagiopolites* even calls the 'two slanting *Apostrophoi*' *Bareia*<sup>46</sup>. According to *Anonymous*, the *piasma* 'is interpreted cheironomically also in the voiceless signs, but with a voice, and without a voice it will not be found, as we have said in the case of the *bareia*, and the same goes for the *piasma*'.<sup>47</sup> And in another place, the *piasma* was 'made for two reasons: partly for the modifications of the cheironomy, partly in order to gather both, i.e. the ascending and the descending voices in combination'<sup>48</sup>.

Turning now to the melos, despite the minor notational differences between MSS, the basic melodic shape, or *metrophonia* of all three examples in the Middle Byzantine notation

---

<sup>43</sup> *Anonymous*; 242-55.

<sup>44</sup> *Erotapokriseis*; 613-15.

<sup>45</sup> *Anonymous*; 967-99.

<sup>46</sup> *Hagiopolites*; 18.35-38.

<sup>47</sup> *Anonymous*; 844-51.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 817-20.

are identical, following from the initial martyria of [*d*]: *e d d c d c d*. As an aside, it is worth mentioning that this type of detailed analysis of compositions of the same troparion is a wealth of information in discerning the contributions of individual composers. Since there is the concept of following one's compositional predecessor — very similar to the creative concept behind Orthodox Byzantine iconography — the points where a composition diverts from its predecessor's is a point of individual creativity or, perhaps, local tradition. That said, we can now move on to the next stage of notational development, the exegematic, in order to see exactly how the theories reviewed above came to be passed down through the psaltic manuscript tradition.

Placing HP 977 — Konstantinos Byzantios' exegesis of our composition — together with EBE 947, our representative of the Middle Byzantine notational tradition (pl. 8), it can be observed that in the metrophony the first two tones, *e d*, and essentially the last three, *d c [e] d*, are in agreement. Everything else in the middle, however, seems to disagree. The received psaltic interpretational tradition tells us that this difference is the difference between metrophonia or parallaxe and the final *melos*, the infamous musicological 'point of dispute' to which I have already referred.

Placing HP 977 with Chourmouzos' exegesis of the same composition in EBE-MIT 704 (pl.9), written about 13 years after HP 977, we can observe the full melos in the analytical New Method notation. The main observation to be made regarding both the exegematic and New Method exegeseis in this phrase is the retention of the parakalesma. The tzakisma, or klasma can be interpreted to have become the first bareia and the piasma effecting both the lengthening and gathering of the ascending and descending oligon and apostrophos (recall

*Hagiopolites* and *Anonymous*). The parakalesma effecting, as Gabriel hieromonachos points out, the supplication in a bright voice, hence, *Anonymous*' 'strengthening in the melos so that they appear fully "voiced"']. This results in the raising of the melos to *d*, *e* and *f* in order to come down on the ison with the attach of the large bareia.

## V. POSTSCRIPT

This method of comparative method is nothing new to the field of musicology, no less Byzantine musicology. Notational comparisons of music manuscripts are a rich source of information not only in understanding the changes between notational stages of development, but also within a single stage, as these comparisons can reveal the shared heritage of specific melic compositions, as well as personal, creative expressions in the form of kallopismoi.

Regarding the continuity of post-Byzantine exegeseis of Byzantine compositions, this is a rich and fertile field that is in need of systematic investigation. The Byzantine concept of kalloposmos on the foundation of an earlier melodic shape should not be confused with the process of improvisation<sup>49</sup>.

Konstantinos Byzantios is only one exegete in a long line. The corpus of psaltic MSS utilising some form of exegetic or exegematic notation has yet to be dealt with as a whole. They are an important key and bridge to better understand the Byzantine compositions. As

---

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Gr. Th. Stathis, 'Autoschediasmos: hyparchei ste Byzantine Mousike?', in the honorary tomos *...time pros ton didaskalon...: ekphrase agapes sto prosopo tou kathegetou Gregoriou Th. Stathe* (Athenai 2001) 682-87.

such, the corpus of exegesis, especially from the 17th century on, merits careful, scientific comparative study and must be examined with all the criteria available. Enough compositions from this notational period do not reflect the idea that post-Byzantine chant represents a 'weakening' of the Byzantine chant tradition, but rather they point to an organic and dynamic continuity.

The period of transitional exegetic notation proves to be a rich and approachable window through which the earlier developmental notational periods can be addressed, examined and compared, thus opening new and essential keys to a more comprehensive picture of this art form known as Byzantine Psaltic Art.

[frc@psalticnotes.com](mailto:frc@psalticnotes.com)

Presentation slides accessible at:

[http://www.psalticnotes.com/theoria/webCP2004/terzopoulos\\_CP2004.pdf](http://www.psalticnotes.com/theoria/webCP2004/terzopoulos_CP2004.pdf)