The Rosary and the Rose: Clergymen as Creators of Secular Poetry and Music in Early-modern Balkans

Introduction

It should be stressed from the outset that in Greek literature of the time, sacred music was clearly differentiated from secular, the latter called exoteriki or outside music, broadly meaning off-the-church. Yet, exoteriki (as opposed to esoteric) was a term that included all forms of non-Greek music, performed either in the mosque (illahti), the dervish ritual (sema) or at the Ottoman court. This can be explained by the fact that the
official genre of Greek music was the ecclesiastic one, since the Patriarchate of Istanbul (Constantinople) was the only administrative entity of the Greek people, who were subjects to the Ottoman sultan. The Ottomans had occupied the Byzantine Empire since the mid-15th century, and had organised the Greeks (as they did with the other peoples formerly inhabiting the Balkans) into ethnic-religious groups, called millets. The Greeks belonged to the Christian Orthodox millet (then called Rum millet, after the eastern Roman Empire), which included other peoples of the same profession (Romanians, Serbians, Bulgarians, etc.)\(^1\).

For reasons of consistency and clarity, the term “profane” is employed here to describe not only any non-Greek music (Ottoman, European etc.) but the non-Christian and non-liturgical repertoire of the time. This is important for the argument of this paper, since a good number of composers of those secular songs were clerics, not only of the lower ranks but of the highest echelons of the Greek Church. In the same spirit, the composers represented here all belong to the robed class, including deacons, priests, bishops and a patriarch! Although the church cantors were back then considered lower officers of the Church (in the sense that they contributed to the services and the general functioning of the church), they have been excluded here, despite the fact that they have also produced a sizeable amount of secular works. It is true that the repertoire of those two groups (the cantors and the clerics) is not differentiated in the collections of the time, but the identity (and importance) of each one of them is always noted and often stressed.

Traces of profane music can be detected from late Byzantium (13\(^{th}\)-15\(^{th}\) centuries) but in a very discrete way, and rarely drawing on non-Christian tradition. A case in point (and a possible exception) is a musical work by the great Byzantine cantor of the 14\(^{th}\) century, St Ioannis Koukouzelis, curiously called “Tatar” (Ταταρικόν). The work is in the form of kratema, that is, a nonsense-syllable text (such as te re re, ne ne na, etc.), used as a musical supplement to liturgical hymns (such as the Cherubic and the Communion hymn) to prolong the service or to fill in the time of mystical prayers by the priest(s). The “Tatar” appellation of Koukouzelis’ setting has been interpreted to denote the Mongols, who by the mid-13\(^{th}\) century had expanded their territory from China to Asia Minor\(^2\). Greek kratemata (pl.) reached their peak in the 14\(^{th}\) century (a period of great musical masters) and after a period of standstill following the fall of Istanbul to the Turks (1453) they were revived from the late-16\(^{th}\) century. It should be noted that it was usual for kratemata to bear extra-liturgical names, either of various instruments (trumpet, psaltery), aesthetic categories (very sweet, pleasant) or ethnic names (e.g. Bulgarian)\(^3\).

Yet, from the late-16\(^{th}\) century, a number of Greek clergymen, most of whom were associated with the Greek Patriarchate, became openly and intensely involved

---

in the production or study of secular music. The status and identity of these clergy-
men (monks, priests, bishops) meant that their involvement was known to the offi-
cial church and possibly approved. Furthermore, the continuity of this activity shows
that their involvement was not accidental and occasional, but formal, if not organised.
Yet, if secular music was often identified with non-Greek (usually Ottoman) music,
the question arises as to how the involvement of Greek clergymen in a non-Christian
cultural sphere was understood and explained. Entrance to mosques was not allowed
to non-Muslims, each *millet* having its own sanctuaries (churches for Christians, syna-
gogues for Jews, mosques for Muslims), and conversion was prohibited. Furthermore,
according to the Muslim law, if an “infidel” became Muslim, he/she was not allowed to
revert upon the penalty of death.

The answer points to both aspects of the conference theme (sacralisation of the
profane and profanation of the sacred) which are to be found in the Greek music
(practice) of the time. On the one hand, the ministerial status of the composers im-
plies an attempt to “exorcise” the secular music of the “infidels” (mainly Muslims); on
the other hand, the use of ecclesiastical notation for the transcription of secular songs
(some of which were of erotic character and written by non-Greeks) desacralized the
musical modes and signs that were thought to have been invented by saints and pious
men. The latter was emphasised by the addition, in the rubrics, of the equivalent Ottoman *makam* for every church mode (*echos*). Byzantine musical notation first appeared
in the 9th century, in the form of ecphonic signs that were originally employed as
markers of vocal inflexion (breath and stress) in gospels and other scriptural readings.
Their form is taken to imitate the gestures of choirmaster who outlined the musical
symbols (cheironomy), and sometimes even the gestures of Jesus himself while bless-
ing or preaching the crowds!

As for the eight musical modes, these were attributed to St John of Damascus (late-
8th to early-9th century) who was also the poet of a large number of hymns set to music
by subsequent composers. The division of the eight modes into four authentic and
four plagal was preserved throughout the Byzantine and Ottoman periods, and was
considered a central point of reference and distinction for Greek music\(^4\). The Greeks
boasted (and still do) that by having only eight modal entities could compete (and
cover) the hundreds of Persian or Arabic *makams* that the Ottomans inherited (and
multiplied). That was reinforced by the fact that each one of the modes was assigned a
special character and ethos associated with spiritual virtues. Thus, the Greek prelates
seem to have entered the secular space of non-Greek (Muslim or non-Orthodox) music
as “missionaries”, to spiritualise the pagan art, leaving at the same time the door (half-)
open to outside influences.

Why though? From the 17th century, a number of Greek musicians became engaged
with Ottoman music either as professional musicians in the court or the dervish cere-
monies or as composers of Ottoman music. They even used Turkish language for their
librettos, at a time when the official Greek Church established schools and a printing
press to promote Greek language to non-Greek speakers in the Balkans. Some Greek

---

composers of Ottoman music held (and still hold) a prominent position in the Ottoman pantheon of classical music, and were numbered among the founders of Ottoman music, such as Tamburi Angeli, teacher of Prince Dimitrie Cantemir, and Zaha-rya Hanende, a court singer. Other Greek musicians engaged in Ottoman music held high offices in the Greek Patriarchate, such as Petros of the Peloponnese, who was employed by the dervishes as tambur player, and was praised for his unique skill and open mind. In light of this information, the involvement of the Greek clergy in Ottoman music may be viewed as a way to control the activities of their flock and reassert their power on artistic matters.

Three stages can be discerned with regard to the Greek clergymen’s involvement in secular music: the first stage, starting from the late-16th and running through the 17th century, included a patriarch, priests and monks copying or imitating the Persian musical style that was then in vogue in Istanbul, after the conquest of Iran by the Ottomans; the second stage, in the 18th century, was characterised by a theoretical exploration of Ottoman music through the production of a treatise by a Greek bishop explaining the rules of Ottoman music for a Greek audience; the third stage, in the 19th century, consisted of a number of clergymen (bishops, priests, etc.) occupying themselves in creating original (musical and poetical) compositions gathered in musical anthologies. Thus, the clergymen’s involvement in secular music had at least three consequences: a) it allowed the infiltration of secular music into the religious one, thus giving birth to a new genre, b) it projected a profile of tolerance and openness on behalf of the Greek Church and its ministers, and c) enriched the repertoire of Ottoman and oriental music in general.

1. Profane music as allegory

The earliest evidence of the clergymen’s involvement in secular music comes from the late-16th century in the most impressive manner: the Greek patriarch Theophanes Karykes. He was an Athenian (albeit at a time Athens was a shadow of its ancient glory) from a well-off family, and had already served as protopsaltes or first cantor at the Greek Patriarchate of Istanbul before he was elected Metropolitan Bishop of Filipoupolis (modern-day Bulgaria) (1585), Metropolitan Bishop of Athens (1592) and finally Patriarch of Constantinople, where he remained for some months due to his untimely death (1597). Theophanes wrote a number of musical works, including some kratemata; one of the latter bears the curious title “Ismaelite” (Ἰσμαηλίτικον). Ismaelites (or Ismaelis) were Muslim people attested from the 8th century, who belonged to a sect

---

6 Leader of the right-hand choir that has the precedence in the church service. Karykes is the first reported protopsaltes of the Greek Patriarchate of Istanbul after the fall of the Byzantine capital to the Ottoman Turks (1455). See G. Anastasiou, The Kratemata in the Psaltic Art (Athens: Institute of Byzantine Musicology 12, 2005), 329–330, 402 (in Greek).
of the Shi‘ah, one of Islam’s major branches. They were thus called after Ismail, who was recognised as the seventh imam (spiritual successor) to Mohamed the Prophet by only a minority of the Shi‘ah. In the 9th century, Ismaelites founded a caliphate that became active until the 13th century, and was influential all over the Middle East9.

Yet, it is not certain that Theophanes had those Ismaelis in mind when he wrote his “Ismaelite” piece. This uncertainty is rooted in Byzantine literature that metaphorically refers to Egyptians (the enemies of Israelites) as Ishmaelites with reference to the Old Testament. The Egyptians were considered to be descendants of Ishmael, son of Abraham and his wife’s Egyptian maidservant, Hagar. Sarah, the wife, could not originally bear children to Abraham, and they agreed that he would sleep with Hagar; but, after Sarah gave birth, Ishmael, the child, was sent away, and later founded a nation (Gen. 16–17). It is also known that several Arab tribes claim descent from Ishmael10. In the dictionaries of Byzantine and post-Byzantine Greek language, Ismaelites are identified with either the Egyptians or the Arabs11. Besides, Byzantine hymnography contains negative allusions to the metaphorical Ismaelites, the best-known example being a hymn from the service of the Holy Cross (14 September), where the term “Ismaelites” is used as a generic name for the eternal enemy of Byzantium12. In light of that, Karykes’ kratema seems to re-evaluate the Ismaelis as non-enemies (at least in the context of music).

Theophanes’ precedent was soon followed by other composers, such as Arsenios Junior, a priest and monk of Vatopedi Monastery, Mount Athos, Greece, active in c. 1600. Arsenios wrote two kratemata, which he called “Syrinx or Miskal by the Ismaelites”13 and “Muslim” (μουσουλμάνικον)14 respectively. Syrinx and miskal represent the word “pan-pipe” in Greek and Arabic, respectively, and their association may refer to Arsenios’ borrowing from near-Eastern music. In another Greek anthology, the same kratema, along with Karykes’ one, is included in a series of “Naya, which derive from the Ismaelites”15. In Persian language, nay or ney (Gr. pl. Naya) is the word for the reed flute, one of the most important instruments of oriental music and the sacred instrument of the Mevlevi sect (whirling Dervishes). In the 18th century, nay was also mastered by Greek musicians including some cantors of the Patriarchate. Arsenios’ “Ismaelite” work, sometimes spelled out as “Miskal” (μουσχάλι), became popular, if we judge from its dissemination and imitation in 17th- and 18th-century collections of Byzantine chant.

12 This is the sanctification hymn “Δεύτε πιστοί, το ζωοποιόν ξύλον προσκυνήσωμεν. . .” (“Let us, faithful, worship the life-giving Tree…” composed by the Byzantine emperor Leo VI the Wise (866–912). The relevant passage goes: “...εν σοι οι πιστοτάτοι Βασιλείς ημών καυχώνται, ως τη ση δυνάμει, Ισμαιλίτην λαόν, κραταιώς υποτάττοντες…” (“...upon thee [i.e. the Holy Cross] our most pious Kings boast, because with thine power they can completely defeat the Ismaelite people…”.
13 “Σύριγξ, παρά δε των ισμαηλιτών μουσκάλι”. See M. Hadjigiakoumis, Μουσικά χειρόγραφα Τουρκοκρατίας (1453–1832) (Musical Manuscripts from the Turkish Occupation (1453–1832)) (Athens, 1975), 86, 269.
15 “Νάϊα άπερ εξεβλήθησαν δια ισμαιλίτων”. See Hadjigiakoumis 1980, pp. 85, 89. A “Miskal” kratema was written by Petros Bereketis (c. 1700) and has been released in LP (disc 1) by the Institute of Byzantine Musicology (1976).
Theophanes also composed a *kratema* which he named “Pestrefi” (πεστρέφι), a term corresponding to the most important instrumental form of Ottoman music (*peşrev*). His activity as a composer of profane works was catalytic given his double identity as patriarch and ex-*protopsaltes* of the Patriarchate. Right after his death and throughout the 17th century, a number of Greek clergymen are recorded as composers of secular *kratemata*. A group of them come from the islands of Lesbos and Chios, neighbouring with Asia Minor (Turkey), a fact explaining their borrowing of oriental elements. Among them, Seraphim of Mytilene, abbot of Great Lavra Monastery (the senior abode of Mount Athos), and the priests Michael of Chios and Clemens of Mytilene. The end of the 16th century was a period of decentralization and traditional reform for the Ottoman Empire, also described as the beginning of decline: population increase, economic disruptions, uprisings and revolts, war with Iran and other states. So, Theophanes, by setting his foot on the other side of the fence, might have wished to ascertain his role in the Ottoman context and show the Greeks’ importance as an ethnic/religious minority.

The next important stage of clerical involvement in profane music comes in the second half of the 17th century in the person of Balasios, a high-ranking priest in the Patriarchate of Istanbul. As a reward for his services in the Patriarchate, he was conferred the office of *Nomophylax*, or Guardian of Law, an honorific Byzantine title, by which he is known today. In the musical sphere, he is believed to have served as Assistant to Precentor or Chorister at the Patriarchate, and excelled himself as a composer of the Kalophonic or Beautiful-singing chant, a heavily ornamented repertoire, rooted in 14th-century Byzantium. Kalophonic chant was revived in the 17th century, but, under Ottoman rule, was vulnerable to influences from outside, because, although religious in character, “its use was not exclusively liturgical, but panegyric and festal, too.” Although a priest, Balasios was exposed to outside influences: he composed several pieces sung at dinner on the days of Great Feasts as well as *polychronia* or praises to Patriarchs and other prelates.

One of his secular works found in a mid-17th century chant collection by an anonymous hand, in Persian transliterated into Greek characters, is entitled “erotic *acem*” (Ατζέμικον ερωτικόν). The term *acem* was used by Cantemir (c. 1700) in his collection of notations to describe Persian tunes, which had become fashionable after the fall of Baghdad to the Ottomans (1638) and the influx of Persian musicians in Istanbul. In Ottoman literature, the term *acem* may also denote either a pitch (f), a mode (makam

---

17 All three clergymen composed *kratemata* called “naya”. See Anastasiou, 2006, pp. 163-164.
21 His *polychronion* has been recorded and released in *Polychronionos to the Ecumenical Patriarch by Balasios the priest* (CD production), The Greek Byzantine Choir 33 (1999).
22 Ms 941 (ff. 411-13), National Library, Athens, Greece.
Acem) characterised by cadences on this pitch\textsuperscript{24}. Here, the term should be understood as implying the Persian origin and not the mode, because the Byzantine mode-signature (Fourth plagal) in the heading marks an entirely different scale from that in the makam. The same piece, though without the praise, is transcribed in a later collection of the early-18\textsuperscript{th} century\textsuperscript{25}, having dropped the word acem from the heading. It should be noted that the first “Persian” kratema of the post-Byzantine period has been written at the close of the 16\textsuperscript{th} century by Gabriel, who is referred to either as monk or bishop of Ierissos (Greek Macedonia)\textsuperscript{26}.

A further “Erotic acem” is found in an anthology of Byzantine chant compiled by Kosmas of Macedonia, a monk at the Iviron Monastery, Mount Athos, in 1680\textsuperscript{27}. As in the previous case, the Persian identity of this piece is confirmed by a) the Byzantine mode-indication (First plagal) that is irrelevant to the makam and b) the Persian text in Greek transliteration. Kosmas (d. 1700) studied music with the same teacher as Balasios (Germanos of New Patras), and distinguished himself as a copier of chant collections, and a music teacher. In an autographed collection of religious compositions, dated 1668, he copied one of the stanzas of the Persian song as an independent piece\textsuperscript{28}. Another stanza of the same Persian song is included (also independently) in another collection of Byzantine chant of the late-17\textsuperscript{th} century, compiled in the same monastery\textsuperscript{29}. A kratema called “Acem” (ατζέμικον) was also composed by Panagiotes Hallaçoğlu, first cantor of the Greek Patriarchate at the beginning of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century, which has been discovered to copy an older Persian tune from Ottoman collections of notation\textsuperscript{30}.

Another one of Balasios’ works of this fashion set to a sacred text (of the Pentecost Feast) is described in a Byzantine chant anthology\textsuperscript{31} as belonging to an Ottoman mode, makam Ević. Ević was one of the most popular makams in the 17\textsuperscript{th} century: in an Ottoman collection dated of the 1680s, in particular, it is the second most frequent mode\textsuperscript{32}. Balasios’ little younger Cantemir, in his treatise (c. 1700), mentions Ević as one of his ten basic makams\textsuperscript{33}. However, in the first publication of Balasios’ work, a collection of Kalophonic chants\textsuperscript{34}, the Ottoman makam label was dropped, and remained so in following reproductions. The composition’s association with the makam must have created a feeling of inconvenience among the Greek musical circles of the Patriarchate, who appear to make an attempt to play down this fact by maintaining that “despite the use of the makam, he did not abandon the equivalent Byzantine mode altogether”\textsuperscript{35}.

\textsuperscript{25} Ms 2225 (f. 119v-120v), National Library, Athens, Greece.
\textsuperscript{26} Anastasiou, \textit{The Kratemata}, 351.
\textsuperscript{27} Hadjigiakoumis, \textit{Μουσικά χειρόγραφα Τουρκοκρατίας}, 85, 321.
\textsuperscript{28} Hadjigiakoumis, \textit{Χειρόγραφα Εκκλησιαστικής Μουσικής}, 1453–1820, 37–38.
\textsuperscript{29} Anastasiou, \textit{The Kratemata}, 358–359.
\textsuperscript{30} The original tune is found in O. Wright, \textit{Demetrius Cantemir: The Collection of Notations}, SOAS Musicology Series (London: Ashgate, 2000), 9–10. The discovery was made by this author and was published in J. Plemmenos, \textit{Το μουσικό πορτρέτο του Νεοελληνικού Διαφωτισμού} [The Music Portrait of modern-Greek Enlightenment] (Athens: Psifida, 2003), 11–14.
\textsuperscript{31} Ms 13 (f. 135v) dated 1805-15, Musical Folklore Archives, Centre of Asia Minor Studies, Athens.
\textsuperscript{33} E. Popescu-Judetz, \textit{Prince Dimitrie Cantemir: Theorist and Composer of Turkish Music} (Istanbul: Pan, 1999), 54–55.
\textsuperscript{34} P. Gregorios, \textit{Ειρμολόγιον Καλλοφωνικόν μελοποιηθέν παρά διαφόρων ποιητών παλαιών τε και νέων διδασκάλων} [Book of Kalophonic Chant by Various Composers, Ancient and Modern], ed. Theodoros of Phocaea (Istanbul, 1835), 141–42.
\textsuperscript{35} Chrysanthos of Madytos, \textit{Θεωρητικικά Μέτρα της Μουσικής} [Grand Treatise of Music] (Trieste, 1832), 122, 162.
2. Profane music as theory

In the first half of the 18th century, Kyrillos of Marmara, Archbishop of Tenos (the Aegean island), wrote a comprehensive study on Ottoman music theory. Kyrillos was well equipped to do so for, apart from being a composer of Byzantine chant, he was initiated into Ottoman music by his teacher Panagiotes Hallaçoğlu. The latter had served as protopsaltes or first cantor of the Greek Patriarchate of Istanbul, and had produced the first (more concise) Greek treatise on Ottoman music. He had also composed two Kalophonic works and a kratema; one of the former is admitted by Greek sources to employ an Ottoman makam (Acem). So, it is not surprising that his pupil, Kyrillos of Marmara, was also the transcriber of five Persian songs in a mid-18th century collection of Byzantine chant. The songs are in Persian language and Greek characters (ff. 323v-325v) and are followed by an indication on the form and mode: “Semai, and Sed-Huseyni in Turkish” (f. 323v); next to Ottoman mode name, he has placed its Byzantine equivalent.

Kyrillos’ treatise was written during the second term of Patriarch Paisios II, founder of a School of Chant in Istanbul. During the first term of the same Patriarch (1726-32), a treatise on Ottoman music, written by Hallaçoğlu and commissioned by the Greek nobleman Emmanuel Hypselantes, had been produced. It might be not a coincidence then that, in his second term, a new work on Ottoman music came into existence. With Hallaçoğlu being retired (1736), and Hypselantes executed by the Turks for treason (1738), new volunteers were needed. If the Greek-Ottoman music dialogue was thus far encouraged, this time it was to be “sanctified”. Kyrillos had served as abbot of Galinos and Chora, and, among other works, he had composed a series of Cherubic and Communion hymns; he had also cooperated with the then protopsaltes of the patriarchate, Daniel.

His treatise, written 1740-42, seems to be the outcome of his interest in Byzantine and Ottoman music. Humbly called The More Elementary Instruction on Profane Music, it is a thorough study of the modal system of Ottoman music, with emphasis on the melodic progression of the modes which is demonstrated with musical examples in Byzantine notation for every individual mode. This latter element

---

37 Chrysanthis, Θεωρητικόν Μέγα της Μουσικής, 120.
39 Το παρόν εστί ποίημα κυρ-Κυρίλλου πρώην Τήνου, το οποίο λέγεται σεμάι, τουρκιστί δε σε-χουσεινί, μέλος και λέξεις Περσών.
40 G. Papadopoulos, Συμβολαί εις την ιστορίαν της παρ’ ημίν εκκλησιαστικής μουσικής και οι από των αποστολικών χρόνων άχρι των ημερών ημών ακμάσαντες επιφανείς υμνογράφοι, μουσικοί και μουσικολόγοι [Contributions to the history of our ecclesiastical music, and the most important melodists, hymnographers, musicians and musicologists from the Apostolic times up to our days] (Athens, 1890), 303–304.
41 Although Codex 305 of the Historical and Ethnological Society, Athens, dated 1749, is considered his earliest autograph, there are serious reservations because of his signing “Archbishop of Tenos”, a post he left around 1742 (Hadjigiakoumis 1980, p. 94, fn. 219).
42 Στοιχειωδέστερα διδάσκαλιον περί της έξω μουσικής, Kyrillos’ treatise has been published (with an English translation and commentary) by Popescu-Judetz & Ababi Sirli 2000, pp. 49–124.
makes his work indispensable, since melodic progression in 18th-century treatises on
Ottoman music (e.g. Cantemir and Arutin) is only expressed verbally\textsuperscript{43}. The work is
written in the popular Byzantine style of \textit{erotapokrisis}, that is, a dialogue between
teacher and pupil. Kyrillos’ work was very popular amongst Greeks, and remained
the standard Greek work on Ottoman music until the end of the century. It was cop-
ied several times until the late 18th century\textsuperscript{44}, only to be superseded in the second half
of the 19th century.

Kyrillos approaches profane music with due seriousness, the same he shows for
sacred music, as can be seen from the fact that he places his treatise next to another
one of his on Byzantine chant. This attitude is apparent even from the introductory
paragraph, where he assures his reader that he has compared the Ottoman and Byzan-
tine systems “degree with degree, and phrase with phrase”, a phraseology taken from
Hallaçoğlu, who, in his introduction, compares “mode with makam, degree with de-
gree, phrase with phrase, and metres with metres”. Kyrillos’ introduction reveals his
close intimacy with Ottoman music and his acquaintance with Ottoman musicians,
most of whom must have been Muslim. At the same time, he seems to have immersed
himself in that profane music to the point that he is committed to discover its “most
correct” version (το ορθότερον), a term used in orthography (hence the word) as well
as in patristic writing\textsuperscript{45}: “After having spent a lot of time in consulting the specialists
of this profane music on many issues, I have found a big discrepancy between them.
Therefore, taking out what I thought the most correct, I translated [it] in our [Greek]
language”.

One of “the most correct” sources Kyrillos relied on has been identified with the
\textit{Handbook of Oriental Music} written in Turkish by the Armenian, Tamburi Arutin in the
1730s. Arutin was a courtly musician during the reign of Sultan Mahmud I (1730-56),
and was greatly influenced by Persian music which he studied in Baghdad\textsuperscript{46}. He also
invented a notational system using the Armenian alphabet. His treatise is divided into
two parts, the first dealing with the origin and history of music, and the second with the
modal and rhythmic theory of Ottoman music. A point of Kyrillos’ convergence with
Arutin concerns the “old” theory of the \textit{makams} association with the seven known
planets of the time. Kyrillos notes that “for the ancients, there are seven \{makams\}; for
the later and contemporary, however, twelve; because the ancient music teachers of the
Persians gave to the modes names according to the number of the seven planet-stars”.
The association of the octave with the planets is an ancient concept indeed, going back
to Pythagoras (6th century B.C.), but having survived until Kyrillos’ time, both in the
East and the West\textsuperscript{47}.

\textsuperscript{43} Feldman 1996, p. 268.
\textsuperscript{44} Other copies of the treatise: Ms Gr. 923, Library of the Romanian Academy, written in Istanbul in 1780; Ms 551, Breazul Library,
Bucharest; Ms 330, Xeropotamou Monastery, Mount Athos; Codex Petropolitanus 63, Russian Archeological Institute, Istanbul
(c.1800, pp. 21-40).
\textsuperscript{45} See, for example, the phrase «η των δογμάτων ορθότης εγκρίνει τας συνόδους» (the correctness of dogma approves the synods) by
\textsuperscript{46} An English translation of Arutin’s treatise has been published by Popescu-Judetz, E. (2002) \textit{Tanburî Küçük Artin: A Musical
Treatise of the Eighteenth Century}, Istanbul: Pan, pp. 82-83.
Yet, a question arises: what might have prompted Kyrillos to include this “ancient” theory in his treatise without hesitations either for its pagan origin or for his own responsibility towards the Christian flock? It should be noted that his teacher Hallaçoğlu did not make any mention to this or any other ancient theory. Besides, this theory had not been endorsed either by the official Orthodox Church, although it was tolerated, if we judge by its reference in some medieval Byzantine collections. An answer can be given by the interpretation of this association, offered by some late-antiquity authors, such as Aristides Quinctilianus (1st century AD). In his treatise *On Music*, Aristides notes that “for the better of the superior beings who have lived among men, the sounds draw near hearing and there was not even one such man without portions of the following good fortune. Just as it is difficult for us by nature to be *epoptae* of the almighty, while for those coming to the extreme of virtue and necessary science, it is possible even to observe without harm the presence of the divine figures, so also unworthy men most especially are absolutely incapable of hearing the sound of the universe by accident”.

So, it is the spiritual aspect of this theory that might have urged bishop Kyrillos to endorse it and include it in his musical treatise. At the turn of the century (1806), his spiritual brother Nicodemus the Hagiorite, a monk of Mount Athos and a prolific writer and editor of patristic studies, would reiterate this theory, though with some scepticism as to its authenticity. Nikodemos even includes a story according to which a monk who reached the peak of Mount Athos at midnight heard a harmony from the planets! It should be added that the word “epoptae” means those who had achieved the third and higher grade of initiation into the Mysteries. Although the Christian religion did not have mysteries in the ancient sense of the word, the term “epoptae” had been adopted by Christian ascetics from the 4th century and used in Patristic texts of

---


50 Νέα κλίμα ήτοι Ερμηνεία εις τους εβδομήκοντα πέντε Αναβαθμούς της Οκτωήχου, από διαφόρων εκκλησιαστικών συγγραφέων [New Ladder or Interpretation of the seventy five Anavathmi of the Eight Modes, by various ecclesiastical writers], Istanbul 1844.

3. Profane music as practice

If so far Greek clerics approached profane music as a marginal and theoretical activity, the turn of the century witnessed their involvement in a more systematic way. The most important collector cum creator of secular music in the first half of the 19th century was Nikephoros Kantouniarres, Archdeacon of the Patriarchate of Antioch. He was born on the Aegean island of Chios, but moved to Istanbul from early age to study music and letters in the Greek Patriarchate under the Precentor Iakovos of the Peloponnese (1790-1800). He spent some years in Damascus where he was ordained Archdeacon and composed some religious works before settling in Jassy (capital of the Moldavian province of Romania) where he established a school of chant and compiled his large anthologies. In the Moldavian capital, Nikephoros was attached to Golia Monastery where he was employed as cantor.

Yet, despite his activities and travels, he was able to save time for secular music, which he gathered in a large anthology of his, which he compiled between 1818 and 1820. This anthology (Ms 1428), bearing the archaic name “Melpomene” (the Muse of music and song), is now held in Vatopedi Monastery, Mount Athos, Greece, to which Golia Monastery belonged back then. The anthology gathers over three-hundred secular settings, mainly by previous Greek and Turkish composers (some already dead) as well as Nikephoros’ own settings. The Chiote Archdeacon was also the poet of eight of his settings, most of which are love-songs explicitly addressing a beloved person. Such is a piece emerged “at the warm request of his pupil Sofronios” (1428, p. 265), shaping the achrostic “Fotinitza” (a diminutive for the female name of Fotini), who is praised for her unique physical virtues and is compared to a “very bright planet”.

His other musical settings are based on the works of several Greek poets of the time, but the majority belongs to Athanasios Christopoulos (1772-1847), who lived the major part of his life in Bucharest as a judge, and was considered the major poet of his generation. Nikephoros set to music thirty-two of Christopoulos’ poems from his Lyric Poems (Istanbul 1811), categorised into seventeen Erotica (Love poems) and fifteen Bacchica (Bacchic poems), after Bacchus, the Greek god of wine. Although a son of a priest,
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53 A.P. Johnson, Ethnicity and Argument in Eusebius’ Praeparatio Evangelica (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 64.
55 Κατά θερμήν παράκλησιν του πολυποθήτου αυτού μαθητού κυρ-Σωφρονίου.
Christopoulos was hailed in his age as the new Anacreon, for his works are full of sensual images. In his verses there also appear ancient gods and goddesses, Muses and nymphs, heroes and heroines, who interact with the humans in an Arcadian (or utopian) context. Most of Christopoulos’ poems had been published in Greece and abroad, followed by numerous re-editions57.

Nikephoros also set to music three poems by Germanos (Herman), Bishop of Old Patras, the Peloponnese, who is registered as a national hero in modern Greek history, for he allegedly blessed the revolution of 1821, which broke out in Patras and led to a partial liberation of Greece (1830)58. Although of rural origin, Germanos (1771-1826) was known to the Patriarchal circles, since he was a nephew of Patriarch Gregorios V, by whom he was ordained Bishop in 1806. Nikephoros’ works must have been recorded in Istanbul, where Germans remained between 1815 and 1818 as a member of the Holy Synod of the Patriarchate. Germanos’ works are of erotic character, one shaping the acrostic “Katenko”, a diminutive for the Greek Christian name Aikaterina (Catherine). Katenko appears to have been a person of questionable morality, for, underneath this song, Nikephoros noted with contempt: “I dare not say what these verses stink of; as for the object they refer to, one has to chew broad-beans and spits on it” (1428, p. 16)59. No evidence of Nikephoros’ relation with the bishop survives, but in light of the above statement one may reasonably suspect that they would not have been very warm.

Another poem by Germanos (1428, p. 317) appears to employ a popular French strophic type, namely that of five-line stanza, which, though unknown to Byzantine or post-Byzantine poetry, is found almost identical in the light French poetry of the time. This stanza type is “constructed on two rimes which can be disposed in various ways, of which the most usual by far is a b a a b. The measure used is generally the line of seven and eight syllables”60. The 8-syllable poetic line is one of the most important in French language, the rest being the 10- and 12-syllable ones. In the 18th century, 8-syllable line was “much favoured by all the poets of that epoch both for lyrical pieces and for the ode, and more especially for all branches of lighter poetry”. The Greek song-text is one of light character too, the theme revolving around the lover’s complaints for the cruelty of his/her beloved. The (thematic and technical) proximity of the Greek work with its French prototypes can be gauged by a comparison with a work by the French poet J.-B. Rousseau (1671-1741), taken from his Oeuvres (Paris 1781, vol. I, p. 69):
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57 G. Theocharopoulos, Poesies lyriques de l’Anacreon moderne, Athanase Christopoulos ... avec la tradustion francaise en regard (Strasbourg: De l’Imprimerie de L. F. Le Roux, 1828).
58 For a brief account of Germanos’ activity, see C. A. Frazee, The Orthodox Church and independent Greece, 1821-1852 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 18–20.
59 Δεν λέγω τι βρωμούν οι στίχοι, μα δι’ τα υποκείμενα εις το οποίον ανήγεται ανάγκη να μασά τινάς κουκία και να το φτύνη.
Another love-song transcribed by Nikephoros was produced by Athanasios Kas-savetis of Cyprus, Bishop of Volos, Greece (Ms 1428, p. 145). Athanasios (1797-1821) was Nikephoros’ colleague in Istanbul, but managed to surpass him in church hierarchy due to his connections in the Patriarchate (he was a nephew of the Patriarch Gerasimos of Cyprus). However, he was popular among his flock, for he managed to connect the religious festivals with the rural ones in his diocese, and contributed a great deal to the preparation of the Greek Revolution. His work is an attack on Death who is called with the semi-archaic word Charon (Χάρος), and “steals” from life the most “precious, beautiful, marvellous and young” members. Yet, Athanasios’ verses contain some interesting innuendos as to the identity of the object of his praise (a young man?) and their (platonic?) relation61. This is pointed by Nikephoros’ own derogative comment on the author and his work, which he finds “cacophonous, out of tune and effeminate, and this Cypriot bishop’s mirror and image”!

Other settings were produced at the instigation of some pupils of his (either clergymen or cantors) in his School of Chant in Jassy. Such is the setting on a poem by Iakovos Rizos-Neroulos (1778-1849), a dramatist who was born in Istanbul, and served several Princes in Moldavia and Wallachia as high-rank officer62. Neroulos’ poem (1428, p. 259) was set to music by Nikephoros “after a pressing encouragement of both the poet [Iakovos] and the composer’s [Nikephoros’] pupil, Sofronios”63. The poem is of explicit erotic character: a girl is invited to lie down on the grass with the poet and leave herself to his caresses that are described in corporeal terminology (by the addition in
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61 Τα όντι Κυπριώτικον μέλος και τουίττου αρχηγός Κυπριώτας πόνημα και εύνοια: κακόφωνος, παράφωνος και εκτεθηλυσμένος.
63 Κατά παρακίνησιν βεβασμένην του αυτοῦ και τού μαθητοῦ του Σοφρονίου.
every line of the phrase “what a pleasure!” [τι ηδονή!]). Although the poem is not his own creation, Nikephoros' decision to provide a musical setting must be considered a daring and rather risky one. Sofronios seems to have been Nikephoros' beloved pupil since he is often referred to as such in another collection of Byzantine chant which he produced in Moldavia (1816)\(^{64}\).

Yet, his involvement in producing of and consuming secular music of this sort was totally forbidden by the official Church. In the official collection of ecclesiastical canons, first published less than two decades earlier (1800), the editor Nicodemus cites a number of canons prohibiting clergymen of all grades engage in all sort of entertainment upon depose from office. For example, Canon IV of Laodicea ordains that any bishop, priest or deacon “must not hold banquets by agreement or with contributions collected from a number of persons gathered together at the same time and place, whether they be in holy orders or clergymen or laymen”\(^ {65}\). That was based on an older assumption that “Christians cease holding banquets and balls (or dances) and games to the memory of or as feasts to martyrs and other saints, such as those customs which are peculiar to the Greeks [i.e. pagans] and due to their error and godlessness” (Canon LXIX of Carthage). Furthermore, the 7\(^{th}\) Ecumenical Council decreed that “neither ought Christians to eat and drink to the accompaniment of musical instruments and whorish and demonish songs”.

These prohibitions did not deter Archdeacon Nikephoros to write songs in explicit Ottoman fashion, such as a song described as a “kind of şarkı”, the most popular Ottoman form (1428, p. 222). The Greek lyrics were provided by Theodoros Negris (1790-1824), a polyglot Greek who lived in Wallachia, and was subsequently appointed chargé d’affaires to the Turkish Embassy in Paris\(^ {66}\). Nikephoros also records twelve Turkish, eight Arabic, four French, and an Italian song that seem to have become popular in the Greek community of Romania. Some of his Turkish songs come from the famous Turkish composer Ismail Dede Efendi (his contemporary), and were used in the ritual of the Mevlevi dervishes. Among his transcriptions, there is an ezan or a call to prayer “from the voice of a dervish of Damascus, where I received the monastic tonsure” (Ms 1428, p. 213). However, underneath the transcription, he added the following statement as if to apologise for this liberty: “Let him and his followers be anathema, unceasing worm, gnashing of teeth, and huge pit of nether gloom; as for me, may I ask for forgiveness for such a terrible impertinence and boldness”\(^ {67}\).

\(^{64}\) This is Ms 1429 (“Terpischore”), Vatopedi Monastery, Mount Athos, Greece.


\(^{67}\) Ανάθεμα δε έστω αυτώ, σκώληξ ακοίμητος, βρυγμός οδόντων και τάρταρος απέραντος μετά των οπαδών αυτού. Καμοί δε συγνώμη μεγάλη ένεκα τουσίτης απαιτίσει ανθαδείας και τόλμης.

Grški kleriki so se ukvarjali tudi s teoretskim opazovanjem „tuje“ glasbe, s čimer so ohranjali vodilno vlogo v grški skupnosti tudi pri umetniških vprašanjih. Tako je Ciril iz Marmare, škof na Tenosu, v sredini 18. st. spisal teoretsko razpravo, v kateri je grškim bralcem pojasnil pravila otomanske glasbe. Spis je bil pogosto prepisovan na širšem območju Balkana (predvsem v Turčiji in Romuniji). V drugi polovici istega stoletja so različni kantorji in duhovniki v Turčiji in Romuniji izdelali več antologij posvetne pesmi. Najbolj plodovit, a danes večinoma neznan kompilator tega časa je bil Nikfor Kantounieras z Iosa, arhidiakon Antiohijskega patriarhata, ki je uspel tudi pesmi dveh znanih prelatov: Germana, škofa iz Starega Patrasa in junaka grške revolucije leta 1821, ter Atanazija Kasavetisa s Cipra, škofa Volosa v Tesaliji. Kantounieras se je naselil v Romuniji, kjer je poučeval glasbo in zbiral na stotine pesmi grške in drugih etničnih skupnosti v velikih antologijah, notiranih v cerkveni notaciji. Njegovi odnosi z grškim patriarchom niso bili prav dobri, kar se odraža v njegovih zbirkah, ki mnogokrat opozarjajo na moralne slabosti njegovih sobratov. Članek, temeljč je na dosežek neznanem gradivu, ki ga je odkril avtor, odgovarja na vprašanja, kot so: Kaj je vodilo te duhovnike k ukvarjanju s posvetno poezijo oz. glasbo? Kako je občinstvo sprejemanje njihovo delovanje glede na etnična izhodišča? Kako se je odzvala uradna cerkev? Do kakšne mere je njihovo ukvarjanje z umetnostjo vplivalo na njihovo poklicno napredovanje (in delovanje) znotraj cerkvene hierarhije? Članek je razdeljen v tri odseke, ustrezo s temi pristopi pri ukvarjanju klerikov s posvetno glasbo (kot alegorija, teorija in praksa).

Prevod naslova, izvlečka in povzetka Aleš Nagode