



**“Κατά τους κάτω χρόνους” (During the latest times):
Some thoughts on the cultural context of
Greek chanting
during the 19th and the 20th centuries**

COSTIS DRYGIANAKIS*

Volos Academy for Theological Studies, Department of Psaltic Art and
Musicology
University of Thessaly, Department of History, Archaeology and Social
Anthropology
GREECE

Abstract: Although musicologists tend to overpronounce the continuity of Greek Church music (the so-called ‘Byzantine’) from the medieval times till our days, the 19th century is a period of radical changes. In a geographical area earlier dominated by imperia, the development of nationalism creates new perspectives as well as new problems, and this becomes very clear in the birth of autocephalous national Churches that break up the tradition of ecumenism. The procedures that end up to the formation of nations and national states in the region (like the effort for standardization of national languages and the development of what Benedict Anderson calls “print capitalism”) obviously trigger changes in the chanting art, which gets more systematic, homogenous and clearly entrenched inside national borders. The development of civil structures (like societies, organizations and educational institutions) suggests new patterns of musical activity, which gradually depart from the religious devotional life and later become dominant carriers of the Church music. These carriers create new channels for dissemination of the music and introduce new elements into the music aesthetics, a procedure that continues till today. The modern, West-European scientific historical and musicological approaches give rise to various questions about the present state of the chanting art and about the aesthetic qualities of chanting, at times guiding to reconstructive projects while in other cases developing theoretical documentations of the practices in use. Round the change of the century, recordings and the musical industry introduce even more new approaches, not only in methods of writing down the music but also in ways of perceiving it. The development of formal musical education and research in the next years brings to the surface even more issues. Given all these changes, one comes to the question: To which extend the contemporary performances of the Greek Church music resemble their older counterparts?

* olyaandcostis@gmail.com

Keywords: psaltiki, anthropology, chanting, modernity, nationalism, education, manuscript, society, choir.

1 Introduction

Some years ago I started exploring changes in the performing practices of the music of the Byzantine tradition¹, mainly through their traces in the relevant discography (Drygianakis, 2012), coming to the conclusion that the contemporary performing approach is mainly a product of the years after WWII. This refers mainly to the size of chanting choirs, their performing structure and the imperative presence of the *ison*. These changes didn't come out suddenly; in fact they are the fruit of several processes that can be traced clearly back to early 19th century. In the present article, I will try to explore some factors that led to these changes.

I will take for granted that features like the modal structures, the rhythmic formulations and the morphology haven't been essentially affected; I will also take for granted that the process of *exegesis* into the new analytical notation didn't introduce any gap in the tradition, though this has also been disputed (cf. Karagounis, 2011). I will concentrate on social changes that brought about new conceptions of the tradition in hand.

2 Changes of the 19th-20th centuries: Framework

The social changes resulted to changes of perception, which in turn have led to changes in organizational principles and, ultimately, in performance practices. First of all, even the term 'Byzantine' in itself, used for both the Eastern Roman Empire as well as for its church music (and it's still in use, centuries after the demolition of the Empire), is a relatively new term and it's invention was the result of the dialogue with West-European² historians. Many aspects of the practice of Byzantine chanting, which in general we take for granted today, are an outcome of the contact of its practitioners with Western Europe as I will try to make clear in the following text.

This contact with Western Europe, of course, didn't influence only music. The notion of the nations and of the national states came from Western Europe too; so, in the 19th century we see a number of national states emerging out of the Ottoman empire, the first one being Greece (cf. Anderson 2006, p. 72). This meant a somehow strange situation, for the new state left outside its borders a good part of Greek people, including the traditional educational and spiritual leadership. The Constantinople

¹ Which I will call shortly 'Byzantine music' in the text that follows.

² West European or just Western or just European. I use all three terms denoting exactly the same.

Patriarchate, e.g., was left outside (see also Papataxiarchis 2005, pp. 419-430).

Almost immediately, this situation gave birth to the Greek autocephalous church, creating a peculiar situation with two Churches for the Greek-speaking world; the new one based in Athens, the old one in Istanbul. While the two churches were in a relationship of full communion, supposed to show deep mutual respect, there were points of tension too and also points of different policies. No need to underline that, as the two churches belonged to different states, the overall context was totally different for them, driving them to different approaches on several topics; at times, chanting was clearly one of them. The Greek example was soon to be followed by other nations and churches, giving gradually the map of the contemporary Balkans, with sovereign national states and practically independent autocephalous churches, too. Obviously fascinated by the European interest on the ancient Greek culture and the spreading conceptions of the nation as an all-encompassing community, Greeks all over the region (both in the new independent Greek state and in the Ottoman Empire) embarked on the research for connections between the present and the ancient past. The nation, embedded in historic continuity, is a totally new notion of the times (cf. Papataxiarchis *ibid*, Herzfeld, 1982). The present (in the realms of language, literature, architecture, music etc) is not anymore perceived *per se*, but it is evaluated in relation to the distant glorious past. This fascination with the past is initially focused on the Antiquity (this kind of approach being stronger in Athens) but later it becomes associated with the Byzantine Empire as well (an approach obviously stronger in Istanbul that carried the Constantinople heritage). But in Istanbul, there were strong connections with the recent Ottoman past too, which has also been glorious, regardless of the decline of the last times, and much more alive.

I will leave aside the evolution of chanting in the other Balkan states, as it is studied by people much more specialized on the topic. I want to underline that the territory of the Patriarchate was practically trimmed to the limits of Greek-speaking populations, and even not all of them. While the autocephalous churches were in full communion with the Patriarchate, they enjoyed a lot of freedom as well, and this of course influenced the evolution of music. This was the case in Athens and the Greek Autocephalous church as well; Athens seems to have been apt to get independent not only administratively, but also musically. It's no surprise that even in the first half of the 20th century, in discography there are but little traces of Byzantine chanting from the territory of Greece. The majority comes from the Greeks of Istanbul and Izmir. Speaking of international relationships, Greece grew in its present size in the first decades of the 20th century; the expansion ended abruptly and bitterly with the Asia Minor Destruction of 1922, which caused

most of the Orthodox population of the then newborn Republic of Turkey to flee for Greece, as well as the majority of the Muslim population of Greece to leave for Turkey. The Patriarchate gradually lost a lot of its human resources, a situation that became even worse after the infamous September 1955 Istanbul Riots. The evolution of the relationships between the population of the Greek state and the Greek population of Ottoman Empire and, later, Republic of Turkey is a big issue which cannot be discussed here; it will be addressed only to the extent it concerns chanting. One should note anyway that the state of Greece, after the adventures of World War II and the Civil War that followed, found ways of development; the last decades of the 20th century was a period of economic progress, and as everywhere in the world, economic progress means coming closer to the Western concepts of development. This meant of course and a development in the realms of Byzantine chanting, or at least in many aspects of it.

But I would like to remind that the Ottoman Empire, as well as the contemporary Republic of Turkey, kept strong ties with Western Europe too, especially in music. Giuseppe Donizetti, Gaetano's older brother, was invited in Istanbul by Sultan Mahmud II in 1828; and so he went and lived there for almost 30 years, introducing West European music to the military bands and organizing lots of concerts and opera performances. In the last years of the Empire, Bela Bartok undertook a serious task of recordings of Turkish folk music *in situ*, and in the first years of the Republic, Paul Hindemith came to help the organization of the conservatory. But in spite of these, the once Ottoman land was an "Oriental" place for the European minds, in the way Edward Said (1978) puts it, and this passed of course in the Greek national narrative as well, where the Ottoman, the Turk or finally the Muslim was defined as a primordial enemy, stripped bare of all his positive aspects. Even the Orthodox refugees that flooded Greece after the Asia Minor destruction frequently faced hostility, as "Turkish-seeds". This approach got milder after the 1980's, but clearly didn't disappear; and beyond any doubt it influenced the way chanting was confronted by European and Greek cultural and educational institutions, as we will discuss in detail later.

3 Approaching the music: Was there a decline?

The Western musicologists initially approached Byzantine music with a lot of reservation, and this is not strange if we take into account the framework described above. They questioned the whole of the so-called Byzantine Empire as a legal heir of the Antiquity, Greek and Roman. Even if the Byzantine Empire was really a further stage of the Roman world, then there was a question about the Ottoman conquest. Weren't there changes in Byzantine music because of the Ottoman influence? The Greek side responded by pronouncing the similarities between the Ancient theoretical

works and the contemporary Byzantine practice; there is extensive bibliography on all these issues, so I am not willing to go further (just as an example, Papadopoulos 1890, pp. 1-50). But I would like to make a comment to this point: All this discourse took place inside the West-European framework of musicology, a scientific framework with concrete rules about reasoning and questioning. The Greeks tried and rather successfully faced the Western accusations into this very Western framework with the Western methods. But this meant also that many aspects of the framework, unthinkable of till that moment, gradually became a kind of common ground for the Greek side too. And thus they affected the musical practice too. One of the main concepts that appeared exactly in those times and as a result of the contact with Europe, was the concept of the decline. This was widely accepted not only by Europeans, but by Greek musicologists too. In fact, it was a common place not only among musicologists, but in general among Greek scholars, like Adamantios Koraes. Put simply, this concept goes as “there was a rise in the medieval times, but now we have almost nothing left; the Turkish occupation destroyed a lot, and there isn’t but just a spark left, which we have to revive”. Needless to say that Athens, the new capital, was generally friendly with this concept, as it gave the new capital a lot of space to re-invent its narratives. The idea grew stronger with the passing of time and it is still highly fashionable in the world of Byzantine musicologists³.

The new approaches are clearly set forth in the monumental book of Georgios I. Papadopoulos, published in 1890 (Papadopoulos 1890). In fact this book incorporates a quantity of older material too, so we can speak of changes that happened in the mid-19th century. Papadopoulos is most probably the first one to speak about this supposed decadence of Byzantine chanting; but if we compare his texts to the 50-years earlier book by Chrysanthos from Madyta (Chrysanthos 1832) where there is no such reference at all, we can conclude that there is no actual decadence, but a shifting of aesthetic perceptions. The evidence gets even stronger by the fact that in the first half of the 19th century there are still great musicians like Constantinos Vyzantios, Chourmouzios Chartofylax, Theodoros Phokaeus etc (for a brief history, see Hatziyakoumis 1980). Obviously Papadopoulos and the society of *literati* of Istanbul, having strong contacts with the West, started re-thinking on the actual situation of Byzantine chanting under the light of the recent West-European achievements. Lots of discussions of those times focused on the possibility of harmonization of Byzantine music, according to the Western model, and they left a very strong trace in the

³ It’s worth noting that we have only minute traces of the supposed medieval period of rise; on the contrary, the majority of Byzantine music that is available today dates from the supposedly dark Ottoman times.

bibliography (cf Filopoulos 1990). But even among those who opposed this idea (and Papadopoulos clearly was one of them 1890, pp. 499-538), the comparisons with the West brought questions to the surface. Couldn't Byzantine music be sung by a massive, big choir? Aren't the minute groups performing in contemporary churches a simple sing of poverty? (Papadopoulos 1890, p. 532) How was it done in the glorious times of the Byzantine Empire? The scientific European framework was suggesting new ways of approaching the tradition. Decline was defined mainly as lack of systematic education, as well as lack of massiveness and splendour.

The main means in confronting the lack of education (and the relative indifference of both the Patriarchate and the newly formatted Greek state) was the creation of associations. Papadopoulos himself participated in a number of such 'Associations of music lovers' (Σύλλογοι Μουσικοφίλων)⁴. His book, among other interesting topics, gives a rather detailed report on these efforts of the mid 19th century. The societies delivered lectures, lessons and concerts; some of them managed to run organized schools of chanting, though most of these efforts had a very short life. Anyway, it is important to observe that with this kind of activity, Byzantine music started departing from the Church and sought a new housing in a more secular environment. And we must bear in mind that Istanbul, the place where the main body of these innovations took shape, was yet the far biggest center of the Byzantine chanting tradition. Notwithstanding the fact that the Chanters of the times were personalities with vast knowledge and appeal (like Georgios Raidestinos II and Georgios Violakis), Papadopoulos' approach was rather clear. The situation in the churches was not what it should be, it needed improvement. This meant, ultimately, that the Church, as a keeper of the tradition, didn't meet anymore the contemporary demands. The situation called for organized education, which seemed like a kind of panacea for all the problems of chanting.

Was it really the case? Was there a decline? I suggest that not. The chanting art of the Ottoman, post-Byzantine centuries, probably was not as massive and splendid as the supposed chanting of the medieval times, but it was a highly elaborated and beautiful art music. It was somehow like a chamber variant; and, keeping the analogies with the West European tradition, chamber music is not minor or less significant to the symphonic genre. On the contrary, the small scale gave rise to details and ornaments that was difficult to come out in massive ensembles. But the quickly growing

⁴ Papadopoulos was a journalist and not a chanter; he held some honorary titles in the Patriarchate, but not any connected with music. A man of unexpectedly rich secular education, he was actively involved in the efforts to institutionalize the education of Byzantine music, as well as in the efforts to promote and rehabilitate this music in the new framework of the civil society.

proportions of the Western symphonic music and opera seem to have been a lure for the intellectuals of Istanbul, and made them start rethinking of the lost size of the ceremonies of the Byzantine ancestors.

The late 19th century obviously is the beginning of some such themes that become crucial in the evolution of Byzantine musicology thereafter. Papadopoulos complained that the well trained chanters were but few, anyway, there were some of them; some decades later, this conception of decline became formulated in a far more radical way. The old art was supposed to have been lost, and musicologists felt that their task was to restore it. This new conception seems to have come from Athens, which was always reluctant to accept that the Patriarchate kept good connections with the Antiquity; in fact the chanting of the Patriarchate was similarly considered degenerated, mainly as a result of Turkish oppression. A new task, the one of the restoration, was slowly surfacing, asking for the help of the new scientists, the musicologists. So from those times on, the musicological research concentrated not on describing what is actually happening in church chanting, but mainly on what *should be* happening. The distant ideal most frequently referred to some supposed past. Thus, gradually it became an underlying assumption of Byzantine musicology that the present is a fake, and the reality has to be sought in some barely surviving traditions, in some obscure manuscripts, in some remote locations. The qualities of music shifted; once having been judged related to mainly spiritual values, they started being judged by their faithfulness to the past which, I insist on this point, was largely supposed or even imagined in some cases. This became even clearer with the advent of discography, especially after World War II. In this post-war discography, in most cases the issue was not to record the musical performance as it actually happened, but rather to recreate it as it should be. This idea haunts most of Byzantine music on discs (mainly vinyl and CD's).

4 Associations of Music Lovers and the development of non-ceremonial choirs

The intellectuals of Istanbul had strong ties with Western Europe. One of the Associations of Music Lovers even had Richard Wagner as one of his honorary members. The lovers of music sought more proper places for the performance for Byzantine music, places where the music would be the main point of interest and not the supporter of the ceremonial acts. If it was not that obvious at that times, the decades that followed made it much clearer. The idea soon spread in Athens too, where societies and secular educational institutions started developing as well (Antonelis 1956, p. 21, Filopoulos 1990, p. 101). Byzantine music gradually started moving to the concert hall.

Societies at first sought to offer education, as it was pretty clear that the Church was not fulfilling this task. At the same time, they tried to assemble choirs. What kind of choirs? Initially the societies had no exclusively “Byzantine” orientation; the choirs were of the Western, polyphonic type, and they performed fragments from operas as well. (Papadopoulos 1890, pp. 407, 410) The concept of the so-called Byzantine choir must have sprung up rather later, most probably after the turn of the 20th century, as Papadopoulos doesn’t mention any such a concert; while on the contrary, he speaks of lectures on Byzantine music, followed by church ceremonies (Papadopoulos 1890, p. 404). In this point, we should consider the morphology of the chanting choirs of the church. These chanting choirs had (and still have) a clearly defined hierarchical form, with concrete roles assigned to the various participants, according to their level and age. Voudouris (1935) gives a detailed description of this function in the early 20th century; in its guiding lines, his description is still valid today. The chanting choir (I will use the Greek term *choròs* (χορός, plural *choroì*, χοροί) for the rest of the text) is considered to be strictly male, but it includes young boys as well; it performs divided in two halves, standing on the right and the left sides of the Royal Door. The special standing places (the *στασίδι*) clearly imply that the number of chanters is meant to be small. The right half is considered to be leading one, though there are concrete functions for the left as well. There is only one melodic line, but this doesn’t mean that all the members of the *choròs* sing exactly the same thing all the time; there are concrete roles like the *kanonarchos* or *isokratis*, though rarely there was notation about such details. One of the main issues that the organization of *choròs* had to face, was the long ceremonies in everyday basis; so the *choròs* covered these needs mainly with various sub-group of participants, the less experienced being in charge of the less official ceremonies (Voudouris 1935). Last not least, the heads of the two halves, are leading the chanting, not conducting it; their voices float over the choral singing, and in the most demanding parts they are frequently performing alone.

While this elaborated scheme is not always followed in detail, it’s still describing the basic function of most chanting *choroì* that follow the Byzantine tradition. Making the point clear, it is the way the majority of *choroì* perform in church worship. It can be observed even in cases that incorporate elements of polyphony. But rarely can it be found in discography or in concert performances.

As associations grew more and stronger, they started developing their own *choroì*. As these *choroì* were not intended for performing in worship, and rarely used to such a purpose, we will call them ‘non-ceremonial *choroì*’. Mainly they were intended for concerts and, later, recordings. Actually their structure is somewhere in-between the psaltic *choroì* and the West-European

choirs. From the psaltic side, they kept the monodic chanting (which they interpreted most of the times as homophonic), as well as the male only synthesis (though rarely including boys); from the West-European side, they kept the massiveness, the use of the conductor and the equality of the choristers. Features like the hierarchical structure of the church *choros* and the specific role of the chanting leader were left out. It is pretty uncertain when such non-ceremonial *choroi* started performing publicly; we find references about such performances in the first decades of the 20th century (Antonellis 1956, p. 25) and their first trace in discography only in the early 1950's. But suddenly, after 1960 their importance gets skyrocketed, as they start dominating the discographic medium. Their performing style gradually appears in the actual church ceremonies too. Most such non-ceremonial *choroi* included experienced chanters of several churches; the biggest formation of this kind having been the Choir of the Association of Chanters "Romanos the Melodist and Ioannis Koukouzelis" in Athens, which was (re)formed in 1943 (Antonellis 1956, p. 35) and kept active at least till the middle 1980's. What is interesting to point out here, is that even these non-ceremonial *choroi*, when perform in church, sometimes turn to the original church style, mainly because of the practical needs. These big formations, anyway, performed rather sparsely; this gives them a very different approach of that of the normal church *choròs*, where the repetitive performances call for a kind of economy. Somehow, it is like the 100m sprint compared to Marathon.

Concluding, we have to observe that unintentionally, just because of their cultural background, the *literati* of mid-19th century Istanbul started reforming the tradition, updating it according to the modern conceptions. They were renovators, not conservators, regardless of what they thought for themselves. In their effort for restoring an older tradition, they started introducing a new one, which bore the signs of their times. This process reminds a lot the restoration of ancient buildings: in any case, it cannot be totally faithful to the original. The people round the Patriarchate, which had been the most conscious guardian of the so-called tradition, became unexpectedly the bringers of the change. But possibly this was the case and in earlier centuries, as well.

5 The advent of musical typography and its results

The use of societies and associations to the aim of teaching, disseminating and improving Byzantine chanting had a profound effect to its evolution. But in fact, there was one more step that preceded them and made their activity possible. This was the establishment of typography for the notation of Byzantine music, in the 1820's.

As far as there was no typography for the Byzantine musical notation, and manuscripts were not easy to obtain or to reproduce, the actual source of knowledge for the pupil was the master. The relation between the master and the pupil was extremely crucial for the continuity of the chanting art through generations; as it was in most music all over the world for ages. The interpretation of the subtle ‘qualitative’ signs and similar details actually couldn’t be transmitted but orally. The transmission of the chanting art had also a defined space, and this was the church; the educational process used to take place in concrete churches almost exclusively. The church was acting as a kind of music school and the main tutorial space for the novices was the chanting stand itself, which in fact had a certain effect in the performing practice of Byzantine music and its aesthetics as well. This can still be observed even today; as we already described, the performance of the church choirs is structured in a way that it utilizes masters and disciples, and it combines performance and practicing too. This of course meant also the development of local schools of chanting each with its own subtle particularities, a beautiful kind of diversity. The master was not only a teacher, but actually a leader, frequently not only musical but also spiritual; the disciple was not only a student, but a constant assistant with growing responsibilities and possibly a successor.

The advent of typography obviously systematized the work of the teachers, helped to reduce arbitrariness and so on, but it meant also a kind of restriction. Typography was soon followed by Patriarchate instructions about the books that should be used in church, and this evidently must have led into increasing homogenization of chanting. Although educational chanting centers existed long ago in the flourishing cities and on Mount Athos, oral transmission as well as manuscript copying must have been allowing a lot more of personal intervention than the printed book, thus reinforcing the development of local styles. It introduced a serious amount of creativity too. With typography, this came up to an end⁵.

The effects of musical typography became even stronger as the secular associations started creating their non-ceremonial choirs. First of all, non-ceremonial choirs were not bound to concrete churches and had no permanent teachers, neither their performances were the result of a lifelong apprenticeship. Conductors might have been appointed on a long term basis, but this rarely meant an everyday relationship (and, even less, apprenticeship). The working framework of the non-ceremonial choirs was obviously more formal, especially as they constituted of already trained chanters. Then there was one even more important detail. The collaboration

⁵ A similar process about the development of national languages against local dialects is described in detail by Anderson (2006, pp. 70-72)

of chanters trained by different masters actually meant a restriction of chanting to what was a common ground; thus the various orally transmitted details were left off. Chanting was restricted to the printed text.

Here we have also to underline that in fact, as individual inquisition becomes more important than master's instruction, we have the transition from the mediaeval to modern world.

6 The new discipline of Musicology and the Western scholars

The constant contact (should one call it conversation?) with Western Europe brought more new concepts in Byzantine music. In Europe, during the 19th century there was a boom of printed sheet music; the printed sheet gradually became more and more authoritative and finally it came to be perceived as the music work itself (Hopkins 2000, pp. 95-96). In Byzantine music, the manuscript was considered rather a reminder, a helpful tool for the chanter, but the developments of musical typography made the concepts gradually shift too.

Of course it was not only the influence of the typography. Researchers involved with the musicology of the art of chanting (at that time, the term 'musicology' was practically non-existent) followed closely the example of their West-European colleagues. As the accuracy of the Byzantine musical notation was disputed by the Westerners, and as innovations of any kind were targeted by the local conservatives (sometimes justifiably, sometimes not), the efforts to be faithful to the written source increased. Gradually the written source became the main point of focus, with a significant development of musical paleography in the last decades (very evident in the work of Gregoris Stathis). On the other hand, approaches like the one of cultural anthropology never became fashionable, as in fact cultural anthropology only lately addressed issues of the so-called developed world (Herzfeld 1987, pp. 13-17). The study of the details of the actual church chanting practices, though suggested by Melpo Merlie in the 1930's (Merlie 1935, p. 16), was only a marginal work for the musicological community. Merlie was smart enough to observe that a lot of musicological research on Byzantine music, especially as it was practiced by most West-Europeans, was in the wrong path; her letters show a different perception, which was adopted by Greek musicologists only partially, till today. In fact, ethnographies of chanting (with collection of local data, recordings etc) still are practically non-existent.

7 An ethnographic approach: Chanting in the city and chanting in the village

All things said till now are essentially focused in the big cities, like Istanbul or Athens. Are they valid for the rest of the once Byzantine territory? In the mid-19th century, the percentage of people living in cities was no more

than 20% of the total population. Few cities were big enough to develop their own chanting traditions, like Istanbul or Izmir or Salonica. What was the case in smaller places, as well as in the suburbs? To which extent were the chanters of small towns able to read the musical notation? If we take into account that a significant percent of the population was still illiterate, how many could possibly have mastered the special skill of musical literacy? If they assimilated their tradition acoustically, how faithful could they have been to the written original? To which extent the works of, let's say, Petros Lampadariou Peloponnisios could have been disseminated to the some (possibly) 10.000.000 of Orthodox Christians of the Ottoman Empire of the early 19th century? How many chanters could perform them with acceptable accuracy?

Having put these questions from a musicological point of view, let's try to face them from some other points. Was it finally important to be faithful to the written source? Was it so overwhelmingly important to perform the intervals accurately? Did some bad intonation destroy the aesthetic aim of the composer? Evaggelia Spyrou, in her doctoral dissertation which is, most probably, the one and only such research till today, clearly claims that once the main qualitative criteria about chanting was the morals of the chanter (Spyrou 2008, p. 131), at least for many centuries. In the first half of 19th century, Chrysanthos (1832 p. 181-182) distinguishes the empirical in contrast to "scientific", as he terms it, chanting, but this seems to be a technical detail and not a matter of deeper essence.

This is not a discussion on moral content, but just a discussion on which forces formulate the aesthetics. Early Christian chanting seemingly was a kind of *arte povera*, or maybe a kind of minimalism, reduced to the most basic, essential elements. In the early 20th century, it appears to be an extremely elaborated art, with infinite discussions on mathematical relationships and connections to an ancient, non-Christian past. The spiritual aspects of music seem to have passed to a second plane. Church music followed, though unconsciously, the secularization of the whole society. The needs of the worship gradually were substituted by the needs of the concert.

8 As a conclusion

The 19th and 20th centuries were a period of tremendous changes in the social, economic and political level for the Greek territory. These changes reflect to the evolution of church music which, while retaining most of its structural features, has undergone a huge change in terms of performing practices and in the ways this music is perceived in its social context. There is strong evidence that, finally, the "new" Byzantine music, if one could term it, has a totally different feeling and spirituality than the "traditional" old one.

References

- Anderson Benedict (2006). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism, Revised Edition*. London: Verso.
- Antonellis Panagiotis (1956). *Βυζαντινή Εκκλησιαστική Μουσική* (Byzantine church music). Athens (n.p.).
- Chrysanthos (from Madyta) (1832). *Θεωρητικόν Μέγα της Μουσικής* (Great Theory of Music). republished Athens: Spanos, 1976.
- Drygianakis Costis (2012). “Ίσοκράτημα και εκτελεστικές πρακτικές στην εκκλησιαστική δισκογραφία” (Ison and performing practices in the discography of Greek church music), 5th International Musicological Conference of the Institute of Byzantine Musicology. Athens (to be published).
- Filopoulos Yiannis (1990). *Εισαγωγή στην Ελληνική πολυφωνική εκκλησιαστική μουσική* [Introduction to the Greek polyphonic church music]. Athens: Nefeli.
- Hatziyakoumis Manolis (1980). *Χειρόγραφα Εκκλησιαστικής Μουσικής 1453-1821* [Manuscripts of Church Music 1453-1821]. Athens: M.I.E.T.
- Herzfeld, Michael (1982): *Ours once more: Folklore, Ideology and the Making of Modern Greece*. New York: Pella.
- Herzfeld Michael (1987). *Anthropology through the looking glass: Critical ethnography in the margins of Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hopkins Pandora 2000. Ways of transmitting music. In Rice, Porter; Goertzen (eds), *The Garland Encyclopedia of World Music*, vol. 8: Europe. New York: Routledge.
- Karagounis Konstantinos Ch. (2011). Οι επιπτώσεις των κατά τον ΙΗ΄- ΙΘ΄ αιώνα σημειογραφικών και μελικών καινοτομιών [Incidents of the notational innovations of the 18th-19th centuries]. In Karagounis, K. (ed.), *Proceedings of the 1st Round of Musicological Lectures*. Volos: Volos Chanters Association.
- Papadopoulos, Georgios I. (1890). *Συμβολαί στην Ιστορία της παρ’ ημίν Εκκλησιαστικής Μουσικής* (Contributions to the history of our Ecclesiastical music). Republished Athens: Kouloura, 1977.
- Papataxiarchis Evthimios (2006). The regime of difference in greek society: Some research hypotheses. In E. Papataxiarchis (ed.), *Adventures of Alterity: The Production of Cultural Difference in Contemporary Greece* (pp. 407-469). Athens: Alexandria Publications.
- Said Edward (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage.
- Spyrakou Evaggelia (2008). *Οι Χοροί Ψαλτών κατά την Βυζαντινή παράδοση*, (Chanting choirs in the Byzantine tradition). Athens: IBM.
- Voudouris Aggelos (1935). Οι μουσικοί χοροί της Μεγάλης του Χριστού Εκκλησίας κατά τους κάτω χρόνους [The choirs of the Great Church of Christ in the latest times]. Istanbul (n.p.).