

Byzantine Chant, Authenticity, and Identity: Musicological Historiography through the Eyes of Folklore

RICHARD BARRETT

INTRODUCTION AND THESIS

The ecclesial music of the Greek Orthodox Church, referred to in Greek as ψαλμωδία and in English as “Byzantine chant,” is a sung art form that has been continuously practiced since its roots at least as far back as the fourth century.¹ It differs distinctly from Western musical conventions: the notation system bears no resemblance to modern staff notation, and the melodic system is based on scales employing tunings different from the well-tempered diatonic scale. Outside of Greece, the so-called received tradition² of the Byzantine repertoire is extensively employed in the Orthodox churches of Romania, Antioch, and even of parts of Russia. The historiography of Byzantine chant in countries where there is a strong concentration of Orthodox Christians tends to represent its musical development and current use as being unquestionably in continuity with its centuries of continuous practice. In Western countries, however, where there is at best a small minority of Orthodox Christians, discourse has employed what Alexander Lingas refers to as “a typically Orientalist³ narrative of decline.”⁴ Even so, Orthodox minorities have, paradoxically at times, also used the contours of Byzantine chant to support the worshiping community’s

own sense of internal authenticity.⁵ In fact, claims about the authenticity, or lack thereof, of current performance practice of the repertoire are tightly tied to concerns over identity, nationalism, and politics—scholarly, ecclesial, regional, and otherwise.

Properly analyzing a form of expressive culture which is a product of developments historical, political, musical, ecclesial, and cultural requires an interdisciplinary approach. There is ample precedent for studying the sacred music of non-Christian traditions as folklore and ethnic music;⁶ indeed, recent studies examine Christian musical traditions, past and present, East and West, this way.⁷ In this brief examination, I will use the lens of ethnomusicology to evaluate claims of authenticity.

BACKGROUND

Rev. John Finley and Alexander Lingas

In 2002, Rev. John Finley, a priest in the Antiochian Orthodox Archdiocese of North America (AOANA), made the following remarks at AOANA's annual conference on missions and evangelism:

There are forces at work ... that would prevent us from baptizing our nation with the whole tradition that has been handed down to us ... To a certain degree, our architecture, music and iconography remain in what might be called "cultural captivity." Authentic Church music is music that helps us to pray, to worship God, to enter the heavenly Holy of Holies. Authentic Church music is Orthodox Church music. But when we say the word "Orthodox," what do we mean? Do we mean Church music that finds its root and expression in certain geographical areas of the world? ... Is the Byzantine music that we sing today really Byzantine, i.e. from the Byzantine era of the 4th through the 15th Centuries? Are we not aware that the Church music of

the See of Constantinople was heavily influenced by the demands of the Turks after the fall of the empire in 1453 AD? Are we aware that the authentic music of the Byzantine Church lost its diatonic character and accepted enharmonic and chromatic intervals during this period of the Turkish yoke? Are we aware that the music of today's churches in the Byzantine tradition throughout the entire Mediterranean region of the world is the result of the codification of these oriental elements by Chrysanthus in the 19th Century and is scarcely 200 years old?⁸

Finley's presentation was popular enough and sufficiently stirring in its rhetoric to warrant inclusion in two print publications;⁹ certainly, he articulately expresses sincere concerns about the authenticity of the received Byzantine tradition, and his footnote suggests that he has done at least a modicum of homework: "The modern system [of Byzantine music] is radically different from the medieval system. Medieval Byzantine Chant is wholly diatonic. Oliver Strunk, *Essays on Music in the Byzantine World*, p. 16. It can be played with sufficient accuracy on a modern keyboard instrument. H. J. W. Tillyard, *Byzantine Music and Hymnography*, p. 44. ... The modern Chrysanthine system developed or was introduced in 1821. The whole fabric is not Greek at all, but Oriental, i.e., Arabo-Turkish. H. J. W. Tillyard, *Byzantine Music and Hymnography*, p. 63."¹⁰

Strunk and Tillyard, who along with Egon Wellesz were the Western scholars par excellence of Byzantine chant in the middle decades of the twentieth century,¹¹ provide scholarly legitimacy for Finley's attack on the received tradition as authentic, and Finley leaves it at that. Against this backdrop, Finley suggests how the received tradition may be made "Orthodox sacred music for prayer in America": "We should continue the work of transcribing Byzantine notation into modern western linear notation and adopt modern

western scale intervals. We need to simplify the melodies in connection with the texts ... [and we] should encourage the harmonization of the melodies.” According to Finley, since the received tradition is not truly authentic in the first place, changing it to make it at least sound more authentically American should be a nonissue.

In stark contrast to Finley is Alexander Lingas: “The extent of change in Byzantine music—especially with regard to rhythm, chromaticism and ornamentation, elements that were recorded with much less precision in pre-Chrysanthine notation—through the centuries remains in dispute, but it is now clear that the chanting heard in most parts of Greece, the Balkans and the Middle East is not an invention of [Chrysanthus], but part of a continuous tradition reaching back into the Middle Ages.”¹²

Lingas’s footnote cites different scholarship of more recent vintage: “This new consensus is reflected both in the title and individual essays of C. Troelsgård, ed., *Byzantine Chant: Tradition and Reform, Acts of a Meeting Held at the Danish Institute at Athens, 1993*.”¹³

Clearly, there is a disconnect here. How might the circumstances of this historiographical disagreement be illuminated?

Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae

We may trace the roots of the “Orientalist narrative of decline” and concerns about authenticity to the assumptions regarding performance practice made by the founders of *Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae* (MMB), the organization established in 1931 to coordinate Western musicological efforts related to Byzantine chant and to transcribe medieval ψαλμωδία manuscripts into Western staff notation. Wellesz openly admitted the assumption that “Byzantine music was diatonic before the Empire came under the overwhelming influence of Arabic, and, even more, of Turkish music.

Byzantine music cannot have sounded strange to Western ears.”¹⁴ Following this assumption, MMB notated every nuance into their musical scores in a highly prescriptive fashion—what Greek cantors and musicologists saw as an imposition of modern Western practice—and failed to take into account the unwritten conventions of the received tradition when analyzing medieval scores. Put simply, Western scholars assumed that if it was not on the page, it was not part of the practice.¹⁵

Aural expectations posed another problem. Lingas writes that “not only did the founders of MMB interpret their transcriptions in a literal manner without reference to the received conventions of Greek singing, but they left ample evidence of their preference for a particular modern Western approach to plainsong, namely that developed by the Benedictine monks of Solesmes to perform the recently restored repertory of Gregorian chant.”¹⁶ In fact, it appears that MMB explicitly expressed a preference, where possible, to model their transcriptions on Solesmes practice, which Tillyard refers to as “the best Gregorian tradition.”¹⁷

In short, the Western musicologists of MMB evaluated Byzantine manuscripts of ψαλμωδία based on the assumed supremacy of Western models, written and aural, largely removed culturally from the source of those manuscripts. To the extent that Lingas’s use of the term *Orientalism* is appropriate to describe the approach of Tillyard and others to their project, perhaps the term *subaltern* is a useful term to describe the status thus ascribed to the received tradition.

Simon Karas

Greek musicologists and cantors contemporary with Tillyard and Wellesz were sharply critical of their conclusions. In particular, Simon Karas, a twentieth-century Greek folklorist, musicologist, founder of the Society for the Dissemination of National Music, and teacher of ψαλμωδία,

not only put forth an extensive scholarly rebuttal of MMB's work¹⁸ but also formulated his own set of standards for evaluating the authenticity of the received tradition, one which both took into account Wellesz's critique of modern repertory as being too Eastern in character to be legitimate and rejected the applicability of Western models entirely. In Karas's view, the elements that Western scholars sought to eliminate from the received tradition as Arabo-Turkish corruptions were the very elements that made it authentic—microtones, modal structure, function, and the relationship to melodic material, the notation, and its liturgical context. In addition, Karas postulated an integral relationship between Greek liturgical and folk music, and that the general character of the music of the eastern Mediterranean world was fundamentally a product of Byzantine culture. To put it another way, to the extent that the received tradition of ψαλμωδία bears characteristics that sound Arabo-Turkish, those characteristics are in fact Greek in origin.¹⁹ For Karas, “Byzantine music is Greek music, and it is also an Eastern music with privileged links to ancient Greek music, which is the basis of all Eastern musics. Turkish secular music was based on Persian music, and subsequently on Byzantine music; it is thus subordinated to Byzantine music and doubly subordinated to Greek music.”²⁰

ANALYSIS

These very different discourses in the historiography of ψαλμωδία in the last several decades raise several issues. The “Orientalizing” of the Byzantine chant repertory, as noted, assumes the supremacy of Western scholarship and, ultimately, culture over that of scholars and singers who are native to the region and to the repertory, and assumes that there is a need “to rescue the music of the Greek Orthodox Church from the bearers of its living tradition.”²¹

A. Folklore and Nationalism

The “narrative of decline” insisted upon by Western scholars may also be understood as being related to nationalism, particularly if *ψαλμωδία* is viewed as a genre of, or at least inseparably related to, folksong, much as Karas theorized. As Regina Bendix writes, “specific bodies of folk literature ... [have been rendered] into icons of national identity ... [resulting in a] well-known entanglement of nationalism and folklore.”²² Bendix goes on to suggest that the “entanglement” of nationalism and folklore is “at best a backdrop to the search for authenticity,”²³ but at the same time acknowledges that a “very thin line separates the desire for individual authenticity and the calling to convince others of the correctness of a particular rendering or localization of the authentic. The most powerful and lasting example of this [problem in folklore] is the (ethno-) nationalist project. Textualized expressive culture such as songs and tales can, with the aid of the rhetoric of authenticity, be transformed from an experience of individual transcendence to a symbol of ... national unity.”²⁴

For our analysis of the historiography of *ψαλμωδία*, it is possible to read Tillyard and Wellesz as seeing the received tradition as the result of the negative impact of Ottoman nationalism on the *Ῥωμαῖοι*, the former Byzantines, and by implication the Greek nationalism that followed. By freeing a genre of sacred repertoire of such earthly concerns, to say nothing of the distastefully Eastern aesthetics that mar the repertoire as a result of said earthly concerns, the *ursprüngliche Reinheit*²⁵—the original purity—of Byzantine chant may be made available for the spiritual edification of those Westerners who have found its regional and temporal peculiarities too much to bear. Thus, the received tradition as actually practiced must be discounted in favor of the reconstructed authenticity as determined by Western scholars.

All in all, the problem remains one of Orientalism, in that the mysterious Eastern music must be sanitized for Western appreciation and consumption, but informed by nationalist concerns. This is in the end but another path up the same mountain; MMB's presumption of Western intellectual supremacy fills the gap left by Greek and Turkish nationalism, leading once again to the problem of the received tradition being treated as subaltern.

To be fair, such concerns are not entirely unfounded. It is difficult not to read Karas's formulations about the cultural supremacy of the Greeks in the eastern Mediterranean, and the resulting implications for what determines authenticity, as baldly nationalist. On the other hand, insofar as Karas is constructing a Byzantine musical identity for the entire region that is congruent with a Hellenic identity, itself at once "a national, cultural, philosophical, and religious identity,"²⁶ the matter is more complex than mere nationalism, and as a result it is more sensitive as well. To oversimplify, MMB appears to be arguing that the Greeks cannot legitimately identify with Byzantine culture because of their modern Hellenic identity, tainted as it is by Ottoman occupation and other foreign influences; Karas, on the other hand, insists that it is modern Hellenic identity that allows the Greeks to claim continuity with the Byzantine world, and points to areas of shared culture with the Arabs and Turks as evidence of this claim.

The matter is further complicated by the fact that even if the musical system and liturgical language may differ from region to region, the same texts are sung by all of the Eastern Orthodox churches, including those in Russia, Ukraine, Romania, Lebanon, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, Bulgaria, Serbia, Estonia, Finland, Macedonia, and so on. As well, the musical system of ψαλμωδία is utilized as the core liturgical repertoire in many of the Orthodox churches that lie outside of the Greek-speaking world. If this is a kind of folk repertoire, the membership of the folk must be determined by an-

other category than secular citizenship. Even if Karas is right that the music of the eastern Mediterranean is fundamentally Greek in origin—and evaluating such questions is well outside the scope of this brief study—its use and context range well beyond the modern boundaries of Greece and Turkey, whatever historical circumstances may have brought the repertoire to those places.

Folklore and the Dynamic of “Scholar versus Amateur”

Another dynamic that may help explain the divide over authenticity is that of “scholars versus amateurs.” Bendix describes the core of the problem as “folklore, [being] linked to . . . nationalism and questions of heritage and preservation, [appeals] to the specialist as well as to the broader public.” The result is a dichotomy between general interest and “authentic scholarship.”²⁷ This academic authenticity tends to be constructed according to somewhat subjective criteria: “‘Real’ scholars [work] from a comprehensive research program, building extensive, logically constructed storehouses of knowledge”;²⁸ “amateurs” do not. Authenticity is thus defined by “real” scholars.

The disconnect between Hillyard and company and Greek scholars such as Karas may be seen as a manifestation of this problem. MMB, representing “real scholarship,” may discount Karas’s arguments as being amateur; it is difficult not to detect this kind of condescension in Tillyard’s wholesale dismissal of characteristic features of the received tradition, such as ἰσοκράτημα, the drone held underneath the melody, on account of its supposedly not being witnessed to by the primary sources until the sixteenth century, or the nasal vocal production that “displeased many travelers in Greece in the nineteenth century.”²⁹ Karas’s own cultural position cannot provide him with sufficient distance from the subject of his research in order to have the standing of a “real” scholar and thus make any credible claims about authenticity.

Original Purity

We must also examine fundamental questions over just how to define authenticity. As we've already observed, a concern of the Western side is "original purity"; *purity*, as Bendix notes, along with *innocence* and *blessedness*, "are terms delineating a morally and religiously suffused authenticity. The scholar's task [is] to recover and restore such beauty."³⁰ The moral element cannot be understated; a quest for original purity leaves the unmistakable impression that what is presently practiced is sullied, defaced. In this regard, MMB's preference for the Gregorian repertoire as promulgated by Solesmes is ironic. As David Hiley points out, the Solesmes publications were not themselves any standard of original purity: "One should not ... overlook the fact that [the Solesmes repertory] was in effect a new creation. There was no unbroken line between the twentieth century and the Middle Ages, but a gap of centuries where different or at least revised melodies were sung, and no memory persisted of how medieval chant was performed. The aesthetic bases of Solesmes' performance style are rather to be sought in nineteenth-century France, the period of Viollet-le-Duc and the Gothic revival in church architecture, of César Franck's music and the Schola Cantorum of Paris."³¹

Judah Cohen, in a recent study of Jewish cantorial practice, introduces more complexity into the matter by examining institutions whose goal is to form contemporary musical practice by instructing new generations in a particular living musical tradition. Cohen argues that such institutions are "self-effacing entities that house flexible discourses of musical preservation and practice, and shape perceptions of musical authenticity even as they are often implicated in discourses of inauthenticity."³² He acknowledges the problem of a fundamental modern skepticism of institutions, a view of "the institution as a modern corruption of a purer tradi-

tion,” but finally concludes that “institutions ... may foster their own important processes of musical transmission.”³³ Cohen’s study cuts both ways; the Greek Orthodox Church and Karas’s Society for the Dissemination of National Music are certainly institutions that shape musical perceptions, but so is *Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae*. The musical, religious, scholarly, and national boundaries, to say nothing of issues of identity, negotiated between these institutions are dense and multilayered, as we have seen.

PRESENT-DAY DISCOURSES ON AUTHENTICITY

Early Music Scholarship and Performance Practice

To briefly examine the present-day situation in respect to discourses on the authenticity of ψαλμωδία, there are several points where the tone of the historiography has changed. Wellesz’s insistence that “Byzantine music cannot have sounded strange to Western ears,” and thus MMB’s construction of authenticity, has been turned on its head by the findings of early music scholars. Timothy J. McGee, in his investigation of medieval Western vocal technique, observes that “non-diatonic tones, indefinite and sliding pitches, and pulsing sounds mark the medieval vocal technique as decidedly different from that of later centuries.”³⁴ He concludes, “the basic vocal techniques and sound repertoires used in all of the Eastern traditions have much in common with the vocal sound in medieval Europe,”³⁵ and suggests that this sound represented an overall “Roman singing style.”³⁶ If McGee is correct, then Karas’s thesis of an eastern Mediterranean musical identity that is Byzantine, that is to say Roman,³⁷ would bear significant credibility, only it would cease to be limited to the eastern half of the Mediterranean world. Certainly such scholarship has impacted performance practice in the concert hall: for example, recordings of the so-called Old Roman repertory that analyze the manuscripts

with a “Roman singing style” as the rubrics have been made by Marcel Pérès’ Ensemble Organum, in collaboration with noted Greek cantor Lycourgos Angelopoulos, himself a student of Karas.

Ethnography in Estonia

Jeffers Engelhardt’s recent ethnography of musical practice at the Cathedral of St. Simeon and the Prophetess Hanna in Tallinn, Estonia, portrays Byzantine chant as a fundamental component of religious renewal for Orthodox Christians in a former Soviet country trying to establish a post-Soviet religious identity that is still Orthodox but not Russian.³⁸ Engelhardt writes, “Byzantine [chant] is a chronotope ... incorporating aspects of musical style, theology, and religious imagination that captures ... [the] more authentic qualities of their way of singing.”³⁹ Even if ψαλμωδία is not used exclusively in the practice of the cathedral, “Byzantine ways of singing bring them ‘to the source’ of the Christian tradition.”⁴⁰ For these Orthodox in Estonia, then, the authenticity of Byzantine chant, at least as an abstract concept, is not in doubt, and its presence authenticates their own local practice. Despite certain signifiers that tell the congregation the music is intended to be understood as Byzantine in character and thus authentic,⁴¹ however, it is unclear how authentic Karas would view their use of the repertoire to be. While it is monophonic, employs drone, and ostensibly uses the Byzantine modes, it is transcribed into Western notation,⁴² and Engelhardt does not clarify the question of whether the singers at the cathedral employ microtones.

CONCLUSION

To return briefly to Finley’s remarks, it is evident that his questions about the authenticity of liturgical music, which he views as being bound up with the historical circumstances

of a particular time and place, are honest, if likely principally informed by a culturally Western aural aesthetic and reinforced by outdated scholarship. The problem with his approach is that by apparently defining authenticity as that which is not limited, altered, or otherwise affected by history, he takes one repertoire that he perceives as inauthentic and proposes to replace it with another, defined and delimited by present-day concerns. Folklore may shed light on this problem as well; the Byzantine repertoire may well be the folksong library for a particular Christian folk *somewhere*, but Finley evidently agrees with the Very Reverend Alexander Schmemmann that, despite Orthodoxy's claims to catholicity, "its history was an Eastern history."⁴³ As a result, the cultural memory passed on by the Orthodox "folksong" is largely that of a different geographical and cultural reality and experience than Finley knows, and his religious identity as an Orthodox Christian is not sufficient for him to feel like a full participant in the communal memory of *Eastern* Orthodox Christians. "Orthodox music is not defined by its nationalistic [*sic*] culture,"⁴⁴ Finley insists, so the solution is to devalue the received tradition and replace it with another, equally nationalistic repertory. Paradoxical as this may seem, the bottom line is that however out-of-date Tillyard may be and whatever Karas, Lingas, and McGee may argue, the received tradition of ψαλμωδία does not mesh with Finley's American identity, and therefore is not authentic to his own experience.

In conclusion, Bendix suggests that this is the crux of the matter—that authenticity may be "at best a quality of experience" rather than something quantifiable by "real scholars."⁴⁵ The difficult question is, whose experience? And how might a person's answer be divorced from troubling questions of concrete historical circumstances? The answers are not simple, as we have seen. Lingas provides a possible solution in suggesting the benefit of "shedding inherited precon-

ceptions regarding the proper sound of Christian chant, the ideals for which have varied significantly according to place and time.”⁴⁶ However, it seems to this author that this is an incomplete answer. Perhaps the trouble is that there are two different problems, one that can be answered by musicology and history—what authenticity *meant*—and one that will need to be answered by ethnomusicology—what authenticity *means*. In that case, ethnographies such as Engelhardt’s can help bridge the gap. Documentation of the musical practice of active parishes that use ψαλμωδία as their core sung repertoire with a self-conscious effort to preserve authenticity through the received tradition, such as St. Irene in Athens, likely would bear much fruit in this regard. Certainly such work will provide more satisfying answers to how authenticity is represented in quality of lived experience than arguments over whether microtonal melismatic monophony is authentically Byzantine enough, whatever *authentic* actually means and whatever *Byzantine* actually means.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bendix, Regina. *In Search of Authenticity: The Formation of Folklore Studies*. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1997.
- Cohen, Judah M. “Music Institutions and the Transmission of Tradition.” *Ethnomusicology: The Journal of the Society for Ethnomusicology* 53, no. 2 (2009): 308–25.
- Engelhardt, Jeffers. “Right Singing in Estonian Orthodox Christianity: A Study of Music, Theology, and Religious Ideology.” *Ethnomusicology: The Journal of the Society for Ethnomusicology* 53, no. 1 (2009): 32–57.
- “Faith in Action: Very Rev. Alexander Schmemmann.” *Faith in Action*. National Broadcasting Company, 1965.
- Finley, John. “Authentic Church Music.” In *North American Conference on Missions and Evangelism, Antiochian*

Orthodox Archdiocese of North America: The Gospel in Song; Music, Missions and Evangelism (2002), www.antiochian.org/node/22682.

Hiley, David. *Gregorian Chant*. Cambridge Introductions to Music. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2009.

Jeffrey, Peter. *Re-Envisioning Past Musical Cultures: Ethnomusicology and the Study of Gregorian Chant*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1992.

Kaldellis, Anthony. *Hellenism in Byzantium: The Transformations of Greek Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition*. Edited by Susan E. Alcock, Jas Elsner, and Simon Goldhill. Greek Culture in the Roman World. 2007. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2009.

Kallimopoulou, Eleni. *Paradosiaká: Music, Meaning and Identity in Modern Greece*. Surrey: Ashgate, 2009.

Levy, Kenneth, and Christian Troelsgård. "Byzantine Chant." In *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, edited by Stanley Sadie and John Tyrell, 734–56. London: Macmillan, 2001.

Lingas, Alexander Leonidas. "Medieval Byzantine Chant and the Sound of Orthodoxy." In *Byzantine Orthodoxies: Papers from the Thirty-Sixth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Durham, 23–25 March 2003*, edited by Andrew Louth and Augustine Casiday. Publications for the Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.

———. "Performance Practice and the Politics of Transcribing Byzantine Chant." *Acta Musicae Byzantinae* 6 (2003): 56–76.

McGee, Timothy J. *The Sound of Medieval Song: Ornamentation and Vocal Style according to the Treatises*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.

Reed, Daniel B. *Dan Ge Performance: Masks and Music in Contemporary Côte D'ivoire*. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 2003.

- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. 1994. New York: Vintage, 2003.
- Tillyard, H. J. W. *Twenty Canons from the Trinity Hirmologium*. Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae Transcripta. Boston: Byzantine Institute, 1952.
- Wellesz, Egon. *A History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1961.
- . *Die Hymnen Des Sticherarium Für September*. Vol. 1. Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae Transcripta. Copenhagen: Levin and Munksgaard, 1936.

NOTES

¹ Kenneth Levy and Christian Troelsgård, “Byzantine Chant,” in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, ed. Stanley Sadie and John Tyrell (London: Macmillan, 2001), 734.

² Alexander Leonidas Lingas, “Medieval Byzantine Chant and the Sound of Orthodoxy,” in *Byzantine Orthodoxies: Papers from the Thirty-Sixth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Durham, 23–25 March 2003*, ed. Andrew Louth and Augustine Casiday, Publications for the Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 137.

³ “[From] the beginning of Western speculation about the Orient, the one thing the Orient could not do was represent itself” (Edward Said, *Orientalism* [1994; New York: Vintage, 2003], 283).

⁴ Lingas, “Medieval Byzantine Chant,” 136.

⁵ Jeffers Engelhardt, “Right Singing in Estonian Orthodox Christianity: A Study of Music, Theology, and Religious Ideology,” *Ethnomusicology: The Journal of the Society for Ethnomusicology* 53, no. 1 (2009): 46.

⁶ For example, Daniel B. Reed, *Dan Ge Performance: Masks and Music in Contemporary Côte D’Ivoire* (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 2003); and others.

⁷ See, for example, Engelhardt, “Right Singing in Estonian Orthodox Christianity”; Peter Jeffrey, *Re-Envisioning Past Musical Cultures: Ethnomusicology and the Study of Gregorian Chant* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1992); Eleni Kallimopoulou, *Paradosiaká: Music, Meaning and Identity in Modern Greece* (Surrey: Ashgate, 2009).

⁸ John Finley, “Authentic Church Music,” in *North American Conference on Missions and Evangelism, Antiochian Orthodox Archdiocese of*

North America: The Gospel in Song; Music, Missions and Evangelism (2002), accessed 2 May 2010, www.antiochian.org/node/22682.

⁹ Including *PSALM Notes*, the newsletter of the Pan-Orthodox Society for the Advancement of Liturgical Music, and *AGAIN* magazine, published by Conciliar Press.

¹⁰ Finley, "Authentic Church Music."

¹¹ See discussion in Lingas, "Medieval Byzantine Chant," 135–38, 46; Alexander Leonidas Lingas, "Performance Practice and the Politics of Transcribing Byzantine Chant," *Acta Musicae Byzantinae* 6 (2003).

¹² Lingas, "Medieval Byzantine Chant," 140.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 140n48.

¹⁴ Egon Wellesz, *A History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1961), 22.

¹⁵ Lingas, "Performance Practice," 56ff.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 70.

¹⁷ H. J. W. Tillyard, *Twenty Canons from the Trinity Hirmologium*, *Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae Transcripta* (Boston: Byzantine Institute, 1952), 6–7.

¹⁸ See discussion in Lingas, "Performance Practice," 66–69.

¹⁹ See discussion in Kallimopoulou, *Paradosiaká*, 35–46; and others.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 39–40.

²¹ Lingas, "Performance Practice," 73.

²² Regina Bendix, *In Search of Authenticity: The Formation of Folklore Studies* (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1997), 48–49.

²³ *Ibid.*, 49.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 20.

²⁵ Egon Wellesz, *Die Hymnen Des Sticherarium Für September*, vol. 1, *Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae Transcripta* (Copenhagen: Levin and Munksgaard, 1936).

²⁶ Anthony Kaldellis, *Hellenism in Byzantium: The Transformations of Greek Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition*, ed. Susan E. Alcock, Jas Elsner, and Simon Goldhill, *Greek Culture in the Roman World* (2007; New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2009), 394.

²⁷ Bendix, *In Search of Authenticity*, 99.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 100.

²⁹ Tillyard, *Twenty Canons*, 5.

³⁰ Bendix, *In Search of Authenticity*, 51–52.

³¹ David Hiley, *Gregorian Chant*, *Cambridge Introductions to Music* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2009), 216.

³² Judah M. Cohen, "Music Institutions and the Transmission of Tradition," *Ethnomusicology: The Journal of the Society for Ethnomusicology* 53, no. 2 (2009): 308.

³³ Ibid., 323.

³⁴ Timothy J. McGee, *The Sound of Medieval Song: Ornamentation and Vocal Style according to the Treatises* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 119.

³⁵ Ibid., 120.

³⁶ Ibid., 121–22.

³⁷ Consider that the Byzantines identified principally as Romans. See Kaldellis, *Hellenism in Byzantium*, 42–44ff.

³⁸ Engelhardt, “Right Singing in Estonian Orthodox Christianity.”

³⁹ Ibid., 46.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 40.

⁴¹ Ibid., 46.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ “Faith in Action: Very Rev. Alexander Schmemmann,” *Faith in Action*, National Broadcasting Company, 1965. Transcript available at www.schmemmann.org/byhim/easternorthodox.html (accessed 3 May 2010).

⁴⁴ Finley, “Authentic Church Music.”

⁴⁵ Bendix, *In Search of Authenticity*, 13.

⁴⁶ Lingas, “Medieval Byzantine Chant,” 149.