



Aspects of the Chrysantine reform and its implementation in our country (19th century)

ANDREI BEJAN*
Cernica Monastery
ROMANIA

Abstract: The present paper offers a synthetic approach to the personalities of the Chrysantine reform, Chrysant of Madyt, Gregorios the Protosaltis and Chourmouzos Chartofilakos; their contribution to the theoretical and practical areas were critical in the implementation of the Chrysantine reform in Greece. The present paper also presents information regarding the schools of chanting in the historical provinces of Moldavia and Walachia which also played an important part in the introduction of the new notation and of the chrysantine repertoire to the Orthodox Church of Romania. The final part of the paper offers a codicologic description of a manuscript in chrysantine notation, namely ms. 240 – *Chants for the Liturgy*, compiled by Monk Martinian from the Cernica Monastery. This important centre for the Romanization of the Orthodox music at Cernica near Bucharest flourished in the former half of the 19th century, under abbot Calinic, a supporter of the church theological and musical culture in the Romanian language.

Keywords: Chrysantine reform, the three teachers, psaltic music schools in the Romanian Principalities, Ms. 240 at the Museum of Cernica Monastery.

1 Introduction

Years 1814-1815 marked the official ending of the koukouzelian notation by setting the Patriarchal School in Constantinople, where Orthodox church music was to be taught, in a new system developed by three great musicians: *Chrysant of Madyt*, *Gregorios the Protosaltis* and *Chourmouzos Chartofilakos*. In reality, reform begun half a century before (Bucescu 2000, p. 39), through the great Greek protosaltis of the second half of the seventeenth century: Petros Peloponnesios, Jakobos the Protosaltis and Ioannis the Protosaltis, who, through the published theoretical and repertoire papers, had an important role in restoring the psaltic chant (Gheorghită 2008, p. 28). The implementation of the chrysantine notation was not done by itself;

* hieromonk, bucium_and@yahoo.com

it was seen as a necessity not only by the hymn composers, but by the church leaders of that time. In this regard, the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople, Cyril the Fifth, draws two texts (decisions) through which he acknowledges the establishment of the Music School from Constantinople, as well as the approval of the teaching of the *new system* to the pupils that were about to learn there (Stathis 2003, p. 8-9). This new notation would solve many problems that gathered in a long time, for more than four centuries, in terms of the execution and interpretation of the Byzantine music in the notation of St. John Koukouzelis. The development of the inaccuracy of the koukouzelian system emerges even since the seventeenth century (Tillyard 1923, p. 270), when a complication of the old notation system through ornaments, florals and rhythmic formulas, which were not executed and interpreted in a unitary manner by the psaltes (Bucescu 2000, p. 36) was noticed. A famous Greek teacher, A. Alighizakis, from the Faculty of Music of Thessaloniki, arguments very strongly the need to replace the old koukouzelian method with the chrysantine one, thus: “The exegetical attempts of the old writing, despite their effectiveness, proved to be hard to use. The whole writing system blamed not only the specialized musicians, but also the memorizing capacity. Whole volumes of musical material were gradually withrown by the use of the psaltic chants, while the knowledge of the significance of the musical symbols was already a fact of the past. And the few who knew the old system were not in a position to teach others their technique” (Yameos 2000, p. 120).

The introduction of the new musical reform has not been viewed in a positive manner by many hymn composers, composers and byzantinologists, who said that Byzantine music ended its existence at the same time with Chrisant and his collaborators, Gregorios and Chourmouzos. For instance, the best known international supporters of this idea were byzantinologists Egon Wellesz and the Romanian priest I. D Petrescu. Following in a certain manner the ideas of these two great byzantinologists, the Romanian researcher Titus Moisescu sees in the chrysantine reform a discontinuity of the Byzantine music, which was distorted because of the orientalismes (Moisescu 2003, p. 39) and by the introduction of the chromatismes, in the second half of the eighteenth century, infiltrating “step by step, in the Byzantine dyatonism, as numerous ornamentations, which were formally added to the chant, distorting and complicating, sometimes to excess, the simplicity and purity of the monody of the ancient Byzantine music” (Moisescu 2003, p. 45).

2 The specific characteristics of the chrysantine notation

These consist mainly in:

- the systematization of the eight modes in eight: four authentic modes (I, II, III and IV) and four plagal modal (V, VI, VII and VIII) (Tillyard 1918, p. 133), which are divided into three types: diatonic, chromatic and enharmonic (Barbu-Bucur 2002, p. 176);
- some signs of the old notation were dropped off: five diastematic signs (oxia, kouphisma, pelaston, dyo apostrophoi sindesmoi, kratemo-hyporrhon), four rhythmic signs (apoderma, kratema, dyo apostrophoi syndesmoi, kratemo-hyporrhon; the latter two having also a diastematic nature) (Moiescu 2003, p. 38);
- many cheironomic signs were eliminated, keeping only five of them in the chrysantine notation (varia, omalon, antikenoma, psifiston and eteron);
- the introduction of the ftorals, in number of twenty (eight diatonic, five chromatic, five enharmonic and two supporting ones: the iphes and the diesis); each flora determining the structure of the scale that it represents;
- from a rhythmic point of view new signs appear that clearly define times in musical compositions through the following signs: apli, dipli, tripli, gorgon, digorgon, trigorgon, argon and diargon;
- a touch of difficulty in the new system is highlighted by the cadences, with their formula, specific to each scale in part: perfect, imperfect and final cadences, which vary according to the three specific tactics: sticheraric, irmologic and papadic;
- of the 15 vocalic and phonetic diastematic neumes of the koukouzelian notation only ten were kept in the chrysantine notation: five raising signs (oligon, petasti, two chendimes, chendima, Ypsilanti) and four descendant signs (epistrophe, iporoi, elaphron, hamili) to which the echoe is added, that keeps the previous sound;
- clasma took over the functions of the tzachisma, apoderma, dyo apostrophoi sindesmoi, dipli and kratemo-hyporrhon;
- in the chrysantine notation, there are three types of tones: high tones, low tones and lower tones; also, decreased and increased intervals are used, together with micro-intervals, originating in Eastern modal structures.

From the point of view of researcher Titus Moiescu, the notation system of Chrysant was not simplified, but, on the contrary, got complicated by numerous elements of writing, from the desire to create a noting framework as accurate as possible (Moiescu 2003, p. 46-48).

Most definitely, objectively speaking, the introduction of the chrysantine notation entailed certain consequences, both positive and negative. Here are some of the positive ones (according to Iakovos Yameos):

- fixing the value and action of the musical symbols that were chosen from the old system, renouncing at many of the old signs;
- the annulment of the great hypostases¹ and the multitude of links between the phonic signs; the new system gave exactly the quantitative and qualitative value of the melody;
- the regulation of the counting and division of the time consumed by the musical notes through the special signs;
- precisely determining the intervals and musical scales, the type of the melody (genre) and of the action (use) of the alterations (ftorales) by appropriate signs;
- simplification: martyria, action and the extent of voices;
- the introduction of a node mode of variation of the chant by replacing the polysyllables: ananes, nana, aghia, neheanes, etc. with syllables: pa, vu, ga di, ke, zo, ni;
- the transcription from the old method into the new method of many of the old melodies.

The negative aspects of the reform, which are also invoked by the opponents of the chrysantine notation, are:

- alterations (ftorals) that abound, burdening the melody;
- the new chants and compositions, with the alternation of the different voices and with the use, from place to place of the alterations (ftorals), due to the influence of Turkish makamurs;
- the introduction of the three musical genres (diatonic, chromatic, enharmonic), which are not mentioned in the old music theory;
- the fixing of the temporal value of the phonic signs after the European models (Yameos 2010, p. 120-121).

3 The three teachers of the Chrysantine Reform

Under the guidance of the „Three Teachers”, the new system successfully imposed until 1821, mostly through the Patriarchal School of Constantinople, but also because of the connections the hymn composers from the entire Orthodoxy maintained with renowned teachers, protopsaltis and composers from the former capital of Byzantium. A change so important

¹ The great hypostases which were annulated are: antikenoma-kyllisma, argo-syntheton, ekstrepton, gorgo-syntheton, enarxis, eperghema, horevma, heteron-parakalesma, kratima, kyllisma, ligisma, psifisto-synagma, parakalesma, paraklitiki, psifisto-parakalesma, sisma, synagma, tromiko-synagma, tromiko-parakalesma, tromiko-homalon, tromiko-psifiston, thematismos esso, thes ke apothos, tromikon, thema haploun, ouranisma.

in Byzantine music could be achieved only by individuals with a vision and a high professional training, as were the three teachers and reformers, Chrysanthos of Madyt, Grigorie the Protopsaltis and Hurmuz Hartofilax. The complex activity supported by them consisted in teaching, composition and development of theoretical treatises designed to assist students and hymn composers in the secrets of *the new method* (Schartau, Troelsgard 1997, p. 134).

❖ *Chrysant of Madyt (1770 – 1843)*, whose real last name is Karamalles, was born in 1770 in the city of Madyt, from the eastern part of nowadays Turkey; more specifically, in the old Hellespont, now known as the Dardanelles Strait, which separates Asia from Europe and connects the north of the Aegean Sea with the south of the Marmara Sea. His hometown, which was known from ancient times to be a Greek city par excellence, has become almost entirely a city populated by Turks, after the Treaty of Lausanne of July 24, 1923, which provided for an exchange of population between Greeks and Turks following the Greco-Turkish war of 1922 (Papathomas 2011, p. 66). Moreover, currently, this former Greek town appears on the map of Turkey with the name of Eceabat. The renowned musician has certainly studied before 1805 church music at Constantinople with the renowned Petros Vyzantios, because starting this year, the latter was expelled to Kerson (in the southwest of the Crimean peninsula of today), being accused of bigamy. About Chrysant one knows that he was a connoisseur of Greek, Latin, French and Turkish, knowledge that gave him the opportunity to study a vast musical bibliography in these languages (Romanou 1973, p. XXIII). And besides church music, he was well acquainted with European and Arabic-Persian music, knowing how to play the flute and also the ney (Ploieșteanu 1902, p. 40). Before 1814, he was turned monk and exiled to his native country because of his promotion of new theoretical ideas and methods that he applied in teaching music, which were considered too innovative. However, he was not discouraged and continued his teaching activities after the new method in the locality of Madyt until he was noticed by the then Archbishop of Heracleea, an influential person from the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. Following his recommendations, Chrysant was recalled to Constantinople, where he founded a music school in the new system. For his outstanding merits in reforming the Byzantine music and his vast culture, he was ordained a bishop in the rank of metropolitan bishop of Prussia².

² The region named Prussia is situated nowadays in the territories of Russia, Germany, Poland and Lithuania and it was considered one of the strongest in Europe between eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The first of his most important works has the title *Εισαγωγή εἰς τὸ Θεωρητικόν καὶ πρακτικόν, τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς μουσικῆς* (*Introduction to the theory and practice of church music*), published in 1821 in Paris; in Romania it is known under the title *Mânelnic*, the term being picked up by the researchers in this domain starting with Nifon Ploieșteanu. His second fundamental work is *Θεωρητικόν μέγα τῆς μουσικῆς* (*The great theoretikon of church music*), printed in Trieste in 1832. Apart from these two volumes, only a few manuscripts are left, as all his other works, consisting of transcriptions into the new notation, were destroyed by a fire (Romanou 1973, p. XXIII-XXIV); this is the reason why Chrysant of Madyt is too little known as a composer, but instead as a teacher and theorist of the reform.

❖ **Chourmuzios Chartofilakos** (real name Chourmouzios Geamales) was born on the Chalke island in today's Greece, but his birth year remains unknown or at best uncertain to this day. He was also called "Chartofilakos" because of the position of archivist he held after 1814 at the Great Church of Constantinople (Romanou 1973, p. XXV). His basic knowledge in music came from the great protopsaltes Georgios of Crete and Iakovos the Protopsaltis, whose mastery he eventually exceeded (Corduban 2007 p. 217). His vast creation eventually filled approximately 70 volumes and consisted of the translation of the old repertory, from Saint John of Damascus to Manuel the Protopsaltis, into the new and simplified notation. He also wrote two theoretical works, as well as a volume that presents the features of the old and the new systems (Romanou 1973, p. XXV). Apart from these, Hurmuz re-edited Petros Peloponnesios *Anastasimatarion*, *Irmologion* and *Hymn Book*, as well as Iakovos the Protopsaltis two-volume *Doxology Book*. In 1824 he also printed the second edition of the anthology *Ταμείον Ἀνθολογία* (Ploieșteanu 1902, p. 41).

His activity as a composer, protopsaltis and tireless translator is crowned by that as a teacher at the Patriarchy School of Constantinople, where between 1815 and 1821 he taught the new method to his pupils. After a long mission in the service of music and church, Hurmuz Hartofilax died in 1840, on his natal island, Chalke.

❖ **Gregorios the Protopsaltis** or *The Levite*, was born in 1777 in Constantinople, and only lived for forty-five years. As a child, he studied church music with Abbott Jeremiah of Crete, who at the time was in charge of the Sinaitic monastery of Galata, and later perfected his skills with the famous protopsaltes Jacob the Protopsaltis, Petros Vyzantios and Georgios of Crete. It is known that he had a solid knowledge of Armenian language and music, even as a young man. Also, being originally from Constantinople, he had the opportunity to learn Turkish music and to become a good *pandouris* (tambourine) player (Romanou 1973, p. XXIV-XXV). With a solid music education, he adhered to the idea of reforming the old notation, working

strenuously together with the other two reformers in order to achieve this goal. His contribution to the adoption of the new system is important and consists in the explanation of the music symbols (Ploieșteanu 1902, p. 41), of scales and of musical alterations in his theoretikon, Ταμείον Ἀνθολογία. He also applied the new method in his numerous compositions, gathered in five volumes. Given his activity, he was appointed protopsaltis of the Great Church of Constantinople in 1819, a position that he got to hold for only three years, as he died in 1822.

It must be underlined that all three reformers had the same teachers. Thus, Petros Vyzantios taught all three, while Iakovos the Protopsaltis and George of Crete were the teachers of Gregorios the Protopsaltis and of Chourmouzios Chartofilakos. This proves that the idea of renewing and changing the old method was suggested to the three musicians quite early, while in school, as their teachers were themselves the proponents of change and of solving the crisis of the old notation which seemed to deepen from one generation of hymn composers to the next.

4 Chrysantine notation in Romanian schools and publications

Only two years after Chrysant of Madyt's reform was approved, in 1816, in Bucharest, a first school of church music was founded, and teaching the “new system”. The new method was brought to our country by the well-known Greek hymn writer Petros Ephesios (Buzerea 2003, p. 9). Other great names of Greek ecclesiastical music have contributed in the 19th century to training Romanians in the old and new systems: Athanassos of Rapsani, Agapie Paliermul, Dionysos Fotinos, Petros the Protopsaltis, Gregorios Vyzantios, Georgios Paraschiade, Dimitrios Teodorahis-Castrino, Toma Paraipan and Filip Paleologos (Buzerea 2003, p. 157).

Although in Romania the Chrysantine reform arrived via Greece, it was implemented and applied through the efforts of Romanian composers and teachers, the founders of modern Romanian church music, Macarie the Hieromonk, Anton Pann, Ghelasie Basarabeanu and Dimitrie Suceveanu. They continued the process of “românire”/”Romanization” (the use of the Romanian language in the psaltic chant) of the hymns, a process that had been started as early as the beginning of the 18th century by Filothei Sin Agăi Jipei, in his musical writings *Psaltichia rumănească / The Romanian Psaltic Anthology* (1713). The term “românire”/”Romanization” was defined and used for the first time in Romania by Anton Pann; by it he understood both the translation of liturgical texts and the adaptation of Greek melody to the Romanian text (Bucur 2005, p. 37). The action of localizing church hymns gave birth, in time, to a liturgical music that was specific to the Romanian space, its origins remaining the Byzantine music from the Greek space. In the beginning, the Greek melos was adopted in an almost identical manner,

without many changes (as is the case of Filothei), but later on, the Romanian composers starting with Macarie the Hieromonk, were increasingly concerned with the originality and the quality of the music there were translating (Bucescu 2007, p. 206). The most important feature that Romanian Byzantine music took on was the fact that it made the music work for the text, thus underlining the message transmitted by the prayer using the melodic line.

One of the factors that contributed to the successful implementation of the new notation in Romanian churches was the emergence of music printing presses, which had the necessary symbols used in the Chrysantine notation. Before 1820 – when Peter of Ephesus arrived in Walachia and founded such a printing press – no book was printed with the Byzantine notation. His Byzantine music books are the first such books to have been printed in the world. Petru Lampadarie's *Noul Anastasimatar (The New Anastasimatarion)* using the new method and the *Scurtul Doxastar (Brief Doxology Book)*, published in 1820 in Bucharest at the printing press belonging to Petros Ephesios, were an auspicious start, as this printing effort would mean a powerful encouragement given to Macarie the Hieromonk and to Anton Pann, who would print their music books according to the new system, completely localized.

A special role in the promotion of hymns written in the new notation was played by the establishment of church music schools in Walachia and Moldavia, where the writings of both Greek and Romanian composers were taught in a very thorough manner.

4.1 In *Walachia*, at the St. Nicholas Church (“Șelari”) in Bucharest, a Byzantine music school was founded, the first to teach the Chrysantine method. This was where Petros Ephesios taught numerous Romanian and foreign pupils, some of the most famous being Panaiot Enghiurliu, Macarie the Hieromonk and Anton Pann. The school was founded at the order of Prince Ioan Caragea, being subsidised by the national budget. In the beginning, study was difficult, due to the lack of schoolbooks, which were copied by hand at the time. This situation caused Petros Ephesios to decide to set up a music printing press, where to print music books using the new system. The Greek teacher from Șelari managed to do this with the help of a professional silversmith from Bucharest, Serafim Hristodor, and of another specialist, Grigore Razo. Thus came to be published the first hymn books in the world, at first sold only in Romania. The lack of funds would eventually lead to the bankruptcy of the press, and Petros Ephesios was forced to sell it to the Metropolitan Bishopric of Ungro-Walachia. This failure seriously hurt Petros Ephesios, who died in 1840. Unfortunately, there are no accurate records of the place where he was buried. It appears that he was buried at the

Cernica Monastery near Bucharest, near the walls of the old church, on the small island of St. Nicholas.

It must be stressed that Petros Ephesios had a prolific activity in Romania in the area of church music also due to the support lent by the Metropolitan Bishop of the time, Dionisie Lupu. The latter started his activity as the head of the Church in Walachia by initiating numerous reforms (Păcurariu 200, p. 358), one of them being the reformation of music. The first achievement in this latter area was the establishment, at his request and at that of several aristocrats, of the school of church music at the Șelari church, using state budget money. We can therefore say that what the Metropolitan Bishop Veniamin Costache did for the introduction of Chrysantine notation in Moldavia, was done in Walachia by the Metropolitan Bishop, Dionisie Lupu.

Another important musical institution in Bucharest was the *Metropolitan Central Seminary*, established in 1836, where Anton Pann used to teach. The Walachian capital definitely had other church music schools, funded by parish churches, the way it happened in Craiova, with the schools run by the churches of the Theotokos–Dudu, of Old Saint George, of Hagi – Enuș, of the Holy Apostles, of Mântuleasa (Buzerea, p. 12). It is also known that in 1858, the Metropolitan Bishop Nifon founded two church music schools in Bucharest, one in the Upper District, having as teachers Ștefan Popescu and Nae Mateescu, and one in the Lower District, with teachers such as Oprea Demetrescu and Zamfir Popescu (Buzerea, p. 205).

The Cozia School had been of some renown even before the Chrysantine reform, due to the personality of Filothei the Monk, former officer at the court of Mircea the Old and the author of the first local poetic and musical creations, called *Pripeale* or *Veliceanii* (Buzerea, p. 70). After Filothei came, in the 15th century, Daniel Domesticos, who later became a protopsaltis, and in the 17th and 18th centuries it was Arsenie the Hieromonk from Cozia that became known for his activity as a composer and teacher of Byzantine music. The latter had the appreciation of Macarie the Hieromonk, who judged him to be the equal of Șerban, the Protopsaltis of the Royal Court, and with Kalistos, the Protopsaltis of the Metropolitan Bishopric (Buzerea, p.70-71). The long tradition this school enjoyed became more established and developed in the first half of the 19th century, due to the efforts of the hymn composers who lived and worked here (Buzerea, p. 70). Of those who perfected their skills in the church music art, we shall mention here Gheorghe Gherontie – a copyist, composer and painter; Chesarie the Hierodeacon, who was a collaborator and friend of Anton Pann; First Bishop Secretary Varlaam Bărăncescu – a musician and poet, who lived in several monasteries around Walachia, retiring before his death to the Monastery of Ciolanu (Buzerea, p. 71-73). The school at the Cozia Monastery, together

with those at the monasteries of Hurezi, Bistrița, Dintr-un Lemn and at the Bishopric of Râmnic (Buzerea, p. 74), maintained and developed the Byzantine music in Chrysantine notation in this part of the country, thus proving the care and the concern the monks had for the introduction of Romanian singing in their monasteries and not only there.

The Râmnicu Vâlcea Seminary, founded in 1837, would become a strong centre, where composers and teachers of the new method would be active. The first music teacher at this school was Hristea Grigoriu, who worked between 1837 and 1846, being succeeded, for a brief period of time, by Chesarie the Hierodeacon (Buzerea, p. 218-220). Toma Paraipan, Nicolae Călinescu, Constantin Brăvimanu, Ioan Zmeu and Gheorghe I. Gibescu (Buzerea, p. 222-230) are the best-known teachers of church music that have taught at this seminary. Apart from this institution, the Râmnic Bishopric had another music school, in which the famous teacher Anton Pann used to teach, together with Toma Paraipan and with other well-known hymn composers, together having a great contribution to the shaping of the new generations of church singers, who were trained in the new notation and studying specific hymns.

The protopope schools in Oltenia, founded at the initiative of the Holy Hierarch Calinic, had the objective to train singers and church janitors (paraclisieri) for this bishopric (Buzerea, p. 35), so that each parish in his charge would have a well-trained staff in terms of church rituals and singing (Buzerea, p. 37). Hence the conclusion that most likely one of the very important subject-matters taught in these schools was church music in Chrysantine notation.

Craiova hosts one of the oldest Romanian schools of liturgical singing according to the new method. This school was founded in 1819, as a charge of the Theotokos-Dudu Church, being the third of its kind in the country, after those in Bucharest. Designed for the use of the young men in Craiova and the county of Dolj (Buzerea, p. 9-10), the school employed Dimitrie Teodorache-Castrino as a hymn-singing teacher; he was originally from Greece, and had been called from Bucharest especially for this post (Buzerea, p. 157). Several generations of young men studied church music in this school, but its capacity was not enough compared to the demand, and so, after 1830, several other schools opened in Craiova, as charges of some of the city churches (Buzerea, p. 12).

The church music school in Câmpulung Muscel was mentioned for the first time in a document in the 19th century, when Macarie the Hieromonk, from his position as an inspector of church music schools, send letters and recommendations to the church heads of the place, to protopopes and to his disciples, calling for the establishment of such schools in all the county capitals. At Câmpulung Muscel, Ion Constantin, a disciple of Macarie, was

the first to teach Chrisant's method to "children who have a good voice" (Isăroiu 2002, p. 235-236). After Ion Constantin, Pandele Nicolae came to this school in 1830 to teach, as well as to work as a protopsaltis of the largest church in town. After 1850, the music school of Câmpulung Muscel would have many teachers, one of them being Gheorghe Căciulă, also known for his activity as a composer. The year 1853 finds this particular teacher in the position of singer at the St. Nicholas church, which also had in its charge a church music school (Isăroiu, p. 237-239).

4.2 Moldavia was always the home of a rich and select culture in the area of music, due to the composers that were active in the region. One of the enlightened hierarchs who understood the pastoral and artistic value of liturgical music was the Metropolitan Bishop Veniamin Costache. Familiar with the latest innovations approved by the Constantinople Patriarchy, he also supported the introduction of the reform in Moldavia, by founding in Iași the second music school in our country, the Socola Seminary, where church music would be taught according to the new method. The arrival of Macarie the Hieromonk in Moldavia in 1824 and his collaboration with Metropolitan Veniamin influenced decisively the introduction of church singing in the Romanian language, using the new Chrysantine system. The Moldavian Metropolitan Bishop waged a genuine campaign for the dissemination of Macarie's church music books, which would afterwards be used and known in monasteries, in theological schools and in the important churches of Moldavian cities (Bucescu 2007, p. 205). Upon his arrival in Moldavia, Macarie the Hieromonk was sent to the Neamț Monastery, where he taught Byzantine music using the new system; the reason was that in our country monasteries had always been considered important culture centres – this was where traditional church singing, in Greek and Slavonic and eventually in Romanian, was studied first (Calamaz 1996, p. 46). In 1829, the Metropolitan Veniamin appointed Macarie as the abbot of the Bârnova Monastery; the latter spent only a short time there, returning (without the knowledge of the Metropolitan) to the Neamț Monastery, in 1831. His stay at this convent lasted until 1833, all the while Macarie working as a teacher and coordinator of the music school of the monastery (Calamaz 1996, p. 47). It was not an accident that Macarie chose this monastery to work as a teacher: at the time, the Neamț Monastery was recognized as an elite church music centre, where important musical personalities had been active (Iosif the Monk or Visarion the Confessor) (Bucescu 2007, p. 206-207).

The activity initiated by Macarie the Hieromonk and the metropolitan bishop Veniamin Costache will be successfully continued by metropolitan bishop Iosif Naniescu and Dimitrie Suceveanu, disciple of Gregorios Vyzantios, Georgios Paraskiados and Nicu Dimcea Vasile 1995, p. 11). In

Iasi, Dimitrie Suceveanu will conduct a complex musical activity, as professor of church music (between 1848-1890), of protopsaltis of the Metropolitan Cathedral, but also of composer. For this reason, he is considered one of the founders of the Romanian chrysantine music (Bucur 1992, p. IX).

4.3 Transylvania remains represented, in the field of the nineteenth century Byzantine music, by the School from Scheii Brasovului - Romanian cultural city, unwavering in troubled times for the Transylvanian Romanians. Here was first taught, in Transylvania, the chrysantine notation by renowned professors such as Anton Pann and Gheorghe Ucenescu. The interest for learning Psaltic music in this school and the prints of Macarie the Hieromonk, who have targeted the Romanians in Transylvania also, demonstrate that here, despite the influence of the Western music, the Byzantine Romanian chants were popular and have been adopted by hymn composers and their apprentices. The stay of Anton Pann in Braşov for several times: in 1821, 1828, 1851 (Catrina 1997, p. 117), has made possible the learning of the new system by the students here, among which Gheorghe Ucenescu was noticed, who later became a teacher at this school for a period of forty-three years (Țurcanu 1996, p. 54). A few years before he passed away, Gheorghe Ucenescu expresses his discontent and sadness in a document written in 1889, related to the fact that the Byzantine church music had no chance to survive in Brasov: "And it should be known that our ancient church had thoughts after the Greek psalm book art, but after my death, I believe that no one will sing after the oriental notes and will sing naturally, according to his judgement" (Țurcanu 1996, p. 59). These words of the Transylvanian Professor are more than a simple observation; over time, they have been found to be premonitory, in terms of the state of the Byzantine church music. Thus, at the end of the nineteenth century, neumatic psaltic music was gradually replaced by the one using a Western notation, through the use in the pew of the repertoire collections noted on music sheets by Dimitrie Cunțan.

4.4 Chrysantine notation in the Romanian manuscripts

Until the establishment of the first printing house with Chrysantine notation in our country (1820), the protopsalters and their apprentices became acquainted with Byzantine musical repertoires strictly through manuscripts which were prepared and circulated in music schools attached to churches and monasteries. Even after the emergence of the printing houses, writing and copying of manuscripts did not cease, especially in monastic centers, where they were used to perform ceremonies and learning songs. Currently, in the library funds from our country there are a number of manuscripts in

Byzantine and psaltic notation, but their cataloging work has not been completed, in order to accurately assess their number. The cataloging activity is important because through the codicological research of manuscripts valuable historiographical information, but also a rich treasury of psaltic songs of a priceless value for our cultural heritage, may emerge.

One of the monasteries in Walachia where singing in the new system in the Romanian language has been extensively promoted, even since the early decades of the nineteenth century, is the Cernica Monastery, near Bucharest. In support of this statement stands as proof the large number of manuscripts that come from this monastic and musical center, stored either in the the monastery's museum, either in the National Archives or at the Romanian Academy, but also in other monasteries in Bucharest and within the country. Most of them were written during the abbacy of the Saint Hierarch Calinic, the abbot of the Cernica Monastery and an important personality of the Romanian Orthodox Church in the nineteenth century, known for his innovative ideas of supporting the independence and national identity.

One of the valuable manuscripts in Chrysantine notation from the fund of the Cernica Monastery Museum is Ms. 240, of which a detailed description (for the used research framework, see Bucescu 2010) is presented below.

5 A case study. Ms. 240 at the Museum of Cernica Monastery

Collection Type: **Chants for the Liturgy** copied by Monk Martinian – 1849 (Cernica Monastery).

I. Summary box

<p>Chants for the Liturgy. Does not have a title sheet. Used languages: Romanian, Greek, Slavic. Alphabet: Cyrillic, Greek and Slavonic. Musical semiography: Chrysantine notation. Copyist: Monk Martinian – Cernica Monastery – 1849. Preliminaries: Not recorded in any specialty work so far.</p>

II. Description of the manuscript

The covers of the manuscript are made of cardboard, wrapped in black leather. On the book spine, we find printed at the top, in Romanian, with capital letters from the Latin alphabet, the title of the book: “Chants for the Liturgy”, as well as the name of the owner: “At. Iordănescu” (in the lower part of the book spine). The information concerning the owner is found at the end of the manuscript, at sheet 239^r, where the following note is written: ”These two books, namely the Vigil and the Liturgy, are given to me by professor Casian the Hierodeacon from the Cernica Monastery: And for remembrance I have written here. Athanasius Iordăchescu, cantor. 1908”. The book spine is decorated with three motifs that have printed in the middle

one cross-shaped flower of golden color. The first cover is decorated with a gilded cross in the middle, surrounded by a border, which has floral motifs in its interior. The same frame and floral motifs are found on the second cover, with the difference that instead of the Holy Cross a golden chalice is printed. The manuscript is in the Cernica Monastery Museum, with inventory no. 240. **Formate:** 11x17,5 cm; book spine: 4 cm. **The mirror** of the page: 10 x 16.5 cm, with 10 lines of neumes and 10 lines of text. Red ink was used for titles, initial letters, capital letters, testimonials, florals and musical keys and for the vocal neumes, etheron, varia, antichenome and the liturgical text black ink was used. Writing is neat, elaborate, handwritten with one hand. The original pagination is done by a copyist, per pages, from 1 to 469. The first four pages are not numbered. Recent **numbering** in pencil, on the sheets, from 1 to 239. **The state of the manuscript is relatively good**, except for some pages, where the tiles were erased because of the moist (s.187^v, s.192^r, s.197^r, s.198^r, s.200^v); the rest of the pages are well preserved. It has a flyleaf at the beginning and at the end. The date and name of the person who made the new numbering are written of the flyleaf at the end. (“February 20th, 2012 – Andrei Bejan”). Some partially detached pages, and page 11 separated from the body of the manuscript. Other sheets (s. 186^r, s.187^r, s.188^r, s.189^r, s.190^r, s.191^{r-v}, s.192^r, s.193^r, s.194^{r-v}, s.195^r, s.196^{r-v}, s.197^{r-v}, s.198^r, s.199^r, s.200^{r-v}) are corrected and rewritten, in what concerns the musical notes, the liturgical text or some titles. The sheet used for manuscript is yellowish, of good quality, without watermarks throughout the manuscript. The low wear degree of the manuscript indicates that it has not been extensively used in the pew. **Ornamentation:** rich, frontispieces with different colors, obtained with floral motifs (Imagine 1).



Imagine 1 Ms. 240, sheet 5^r

III. Date and localization

From s.1^r, we learn from the note of the calligrapher, that the manuscript was written in the Cernica Monastery in 1849, during the abbacy of St. Calinic, by Monk Martinian: “This anthology, the sequel of the Divine Liturgy was written in the time of Father Archimandrite Callinic, abbot of the Holy Monastery of Cernica. By monk Martinian, cantor, January 1849”.

IV. Liturgical music contents

f.1^r-f.2^v SCARĂ PENTRU CÂNTĂRILE CE SĂ AFLĂ ÎNTR-ACEASTĂ ANTOLOGHIE [SCALE FOR THE CHANTS FROM THIS ANTHOLOGY following is the listing of the liturgical music contents with the original pagination, made by the copyist, our note].

<i>Binecuvintează</i>	1
<i>Laudă suflute al mieu pre Domnul</i>	13
<i>Dinamis românesc</i>	21
<i>Dinamis grecesc</i>	24
<i>Alilulia după apostol</i>	28
<i>Începutul heruvicelor</i>	
<i>Heruvicele săptămânii</i>	32
<i>Heruvicele mari diortosite</i>	86
<i>Heruvicele mari de Anton Pann</i>	133
<i>Începutul acsioanelor</i>	
<i>Acsioanele săptămânii</i>	166
<i>Acsioanele praznicelor</i>	194
<i>Începutul chinonicelor</i>	
<i>Chinonicele săptămânii</i>	249
<i>Chinonicele de duminică</i>	
<i>Glas α</i>	282
<i>Glas ε</i>	289
<i>Glas η</i>	296
<i>Chinonicele praznicelor</i>	
<i>La Nașterea Domnului</i>	304
<i>La Botezul Domnului</i>	319
<i>La Bunavestire</i>	328
<i>La Învierea Domnului</i>	329
<i>La Înălțarea Domnului</i>	338
<i>La Pogorârea Duhului Sfânt</i>	344
<i>La Schimbarea la Față</i>	350
<i>La înălțarea Sfintei Cruci</i>	358
<i>Cântările marelui post</i>	
<i>Liturgia sfântului Vasilie cel mare</i>	366
<i>Heruvicu[l] la presfeștenie</i>	387
<i>Heruvicu[l] din joi[a] ce[a] mare</i>	392

<i>Acsion într-acea zi.....</i>	397
<i>Heruvicul din sâmbăta cea mare.....</i>	405
<i>Acsion întra cea zi.....</i>	413
<i>Chinonic într-a cea zi.....</i>	421
<i>Începutul irmoaselor</i>	
<i>Vai, mie, înegritule suflete.....</i>	429
<i>În cuptorul cel vâlvâietor.....</i>	439
<i>Plâng și mă tânguiesc.....</i>	445
<i>Laudă la arhiereu.....</i>	459
<i>Acsion nou ce am uitat ca să-l scriu la locul lui și l-am pus aici la sfârșitul cărții pentru înlesnire.....</i>	460
<i>Slobozește-ne la acatist.....</i>	464
f. 3 ^r filă nescrisă (albă)	
f.3 ^v -f.4 ^v [cântare în limba slavonă cu caractere chirilice] <i>Anghel vopiiășe (Îngerul a strigat)</i> [Axionul Învierii rusec, glas al III-lea];	
f.5 ^f -f.11 ^r ÎNCEPUTUL CÂNTĂRILOR SFINTEI LITURGHII ACEASTA ESTE BINECUVINTEAZĂ FACEREA PĂRINTELUI[I] VARLAAM IEROD[IACONUL] GLAS VIII λ δ Ni ∞ [Psalmul 102], <i>Amin.</i>	
<i>Binecuvintează suflete al meu...;</i>	
f.11 ^r -f.14 ^v [Psalmul 145 așezat pe note muzicale, fără indicație de glas deoarece paginile 13-14 lipsesc, cântarea este incompletă, n.n.];	
f.15 ^f -f.16 ^v Cântarea cea întreit sfântă facerea lui Grigorisie Morai[tul]	
<i>Sfinte Dumnezeule... Glas</i> $\overline{\Delta}$ $\overline{\Delta}$ $\overline{\Delta}$;	
f.16 ^v -f.18 ^r Aceasta este dinamic grecesc Glas $\overline{\Delta}$ $\overline{\Delta}$ $\overline{\Delta}$;	
f.18 ^v -f.20 ^r Aliluia care să cântă după Apostol Glas I $\overline{\Delta}$ $\overline{\Delta}$ $\overline{\Delta}$;	
f.20 ^v -f.47 ^r HERUVICELE CARE SĂ CÂNTĂ PESTE SĂPTĂMÂNĂ FACEREA D.D. PETRU LAMPADARIE ȘI GRIGORIE PRO[TO]PSALTUL ȘI RUMÂNITE DE RĂPOSATUL MACARIE IEROMONAHUL.	
f.20 ^v -f.23 ^v Glas I $\overline{\Delta}$ $\overline{\Delta}$ $\overline{\Delta}$ Pa <i>Cari pre heruvimi;</i>	
f.23 ^v -f.27 ^r Facerea lui Kir Grigorie Protopsalt Glas II $\overline{\Delta}$ $\overline{\Delta}$ $\overline{\Delta}$, <i>Cari pre heruvimi;</i>	
f.27 ^r -f.30 ^v Facerea aceluiași Grigorie Glas $\overline{\Delta}$ $\overline{\Delta}$ $\overline{\Delta}$ Ga, <i>Cari pre heruvimi;</i>	

f.31^r-f.34^r Aceasta este facerea lui kir Petru Lampad[arul] Glas IV $\overset{\text{J}}{\text{A}}$ Di [Aghia din Di], *Cari pre heruvimi*;

f.34^r-f.38^r A lui Petru Glas V q Pa, *Cari pre heruvimi*;

f.38^r-f.41^r Facerea lui Kir Grigorie Prot(o)psalt Glas VI $\overset{\infty}{\pi}$ α , *Cari pre heruvimi*;

f.41^r-f.44^v Facerea lui Kir Petru Lampadarie Glas VII Z Zo, *Care pre heruvimi*;

f.44^v-f.47^r Facerea aceluiași Kir Grigorie Protopsalt Glas VIII $\overset{\lambda}{\pi}$ A Ni, *Care pre heruvimi*;

f.47^v-f.80^v Alte heruvice mari facerea fericitului întru pomenire d.d. dascălul Petru Efesie și rumânite de răposatul părintele nostru Macarie Ieromonahul; f.47^v-f.51^r Glas I $\overset{\text{J}}{\text{q}}$ Pa *Care pre heruvimi*; f.51^v-f.55^r Glas II $\overset{\infty}{\Delta}$ t *Care pre heruvimi*; f.55^v-f.59^v Glas r Ga, *Care pre heruvimi*; f.59^v-f.63^v Glas IV $\overset{\text{J}}{\text{A}}$ Di [glas IV Aghia din Di]; f.63^v-f.68^v Glas V q Pa, *Care pre heruvimi*; f.68^v-f.72^v Glas VI $\overset{\infty}{\pi}$ α , *Care pre heruvimi*; f.72^v-f.76^v Glas VII Z Zo; f.76^v-f.80^v Glas VIII $\overset{\lambda}{\pi}$ A Ni, *Care pre heruvimi*;

f.81^r-f.85^r [Pe lângă heruvicele lui Petru Efesiul, copistul a mai adăugat un heruvic pe larg ce aparține lui Anton Pann]. Aici am adăugat un heruvic facerea d[omnului] Anton Pann profes[or]. Glas I $\overset{\text{J}}{\text{q}}$ Π α , *Care pre heruvimi*;

f.85^v-f.101^v AXIOANE RUMÂNEȘTI CE SĂ CÂNTĂ PESTE SĂPTĂMÂNĂ; f.85^v-f.87^v Glas I $\overset{\text{J}}{\text{q}}$ Π α , *Cuvine- se cu adevărat*; f.87^v-f.89^v Glas II $\overset{\infty}{\Delta}$ t *Cuvine- se cu adevărat*; f.89^v-f.91^v Glas r Ga, *Cuvine- se cu adevărat* [Acest Axion este a lui Macarie Ieromonahul]; f.91^v-f.93^r Glas IV Leghetos v Vu, *Cuvine-se cu adevărat*; f.93^r-f.95^r Glas V q Pa, *Cuvine- se cu adevărat*; f.95^v-f.97^r Glas VI $\overset{\infty}{\pi}$ α , *Cuvine- se cu adevărat*; f.97^r-f.99^r Glas Glas VII Z Zo, *Cuvine- se cu adevărat*; f.99^r-f.101^v Glas VIII $\overset{\lambda}{\pi}$ A Ni, *Cuvine- se cu adevărat*;

f.101^v-f.128^v ACESTEA SÂNT IRMOASE CARE SĂ CÂNTĂ ÎN
LOC DE AXION LA PRAZNICELE ÎMPĂRĂTEȘTI ȘI ALE
NĂSCĂTOARE[I] DE DUMNEZEU

f.101^v-f.103^r [*Axion la Nașterea Domnului*] Acesta este la Nașterea
Domnului nostru Ii[sus] H[ristos] Glas I $\overset{J}{\dot{\eta}}$ Πα, *Mărește sufletul meu...*;

f.103^r-f.105^r Alt irmos [la Nașterea Domnului] Glas I $\overset{J}{\dot{\eta}}$ Πα; f.105^r-f.106^v La

Botezul Domnului nostru Ii[sus] H[ristos] Glas II $\overset{\infty}{\pi} \alpha$, *Mărește suflete al*

mieu...; f.107^r-f.108^v Alt irmos [la Botezul Domnului] Glas II $\overset{\infty}{\pi} \alpha$ *Mărește*

suflete al meu...; f.108^v-f.110^v La Întâmpinarea Domnului nostru Ii[sus]
H[ristos] Glas III Ga ca de la Ni, *Născătoare de Dumnezeu...*; f.111^r La Buna

Vestire a Maicii Domnului Glas IV Leghetos λ Vu, *Binevestește*

pământule...; f.111^v-f.113^v La Intrarea în Biserică [a Maicii Domnului] Glas

IV Leghetos λ Vu, *Îngerii intrarea...*; f.113^v-f.115^r La sâmbăta Sfântului

Lazăr Glas VIII Ni, *Să cinstim popoarelor...*; f.115^r-f.116^v (*Idem*) La

Duminica Stâlpărilor Glas IV Leghetos λ Vu, *Dumnezeu este Domnul...*;

f.116^v-f.119^r La Învierea Domnului Nostru Ii[sus] H[ristos], Glas I Πα,

Îngerul a strigat...; f.119^r-f.120^v La Înjumătățirea Praznicului Glas VIII Ni,

Strein lucru este maicilor fecioria...; f.120^v-f.122^r La Înălțarea Domnului

Nostru Ii[Sus] H[ristos] Glas V $\dot{\eta}$ Pa (*Mărește sufletul meu pre Hristos*

dătătorul de viață...); f.122^r-f.123^v La Pogorârea Sfântului Duh. Glas IV

Leghetos λ Vu, *Bucură-te împărăteasă Maică...*; f.123^v-f.125^r La

Dumnezeiasca Schimbare la Față Glas Leghetos λ Vu, *Mărește sufletul meu*

pre Domnul...; f.125^r-f.127^r La Adormirea Prea Sfintei Născătoarei de

Dumnezeu Glas I $\overset{J}{\dot{\eta}}$ Πα, *Neamurile toate...*; f.127^r-f.128^v La Înălțarea Sfintei

Cruci Glas VIII $\overset{\lambda}{\pi}$ δ Ni, *Rai de taină ești...*

f.129^r-f.145^r KINONICELE SĂPTĂMÂNII RUMÂNEȘTI FACEREA

LUI KIR PETRU LAMPADARIE; f.129^r-f.131^v Glas I Πα Luni, *Cel ce faci*

pre îngerii Tăi...; f.132^r-f.134^r Acesta este kinonicu de marți Glas VII Zo,

Întru pomenire...; f.134^v-f.137^r Acesta este kinonicu de miercuri glas IV Di

Paharul mântuirii...; f.137^r-f.140^r Acesta este kinonicu de joi Glas VIII Ni,

În tot pământul au ieșit...; f.140^r-f.142^v Acesta este kinonicu de vineri glas V

Πα, *Mântuire ai lucrat...*; f.142^v-f.145^f Acesta este kinonicu de sâmbătă glas V Πα, *Fericîți sânt cei pre care...*;

f.145^v-f.156 Acestea sînt kinonice care să cântă duminica scrise dintrale lu(i) D. D. Anton Pann profesoru[1]; f.145^v-f.149^f [chinonic duminical] Glas I Πα *Lăudați pre Domnul*; f.149^f-f.152^v Glas V Πα; f.152^v-f.156^v Glas VIII Ni;

f.156^v-f.161^f ALTE KINONICE CE SĂ CÂNTĂ LA PRAZNICELE ÎMPĂRĂTEȘTI. Acesta este la Nașterea Domnului Dumnezeului și Mântuitorului nostru Ii[sus] H[ristos]. Facerea lui Kir Daniil Pr[oto]psalt. Glas I Πα *Izbăvire au trimis Domnul...*; f.161^f-f.164^f La Botezul Domnului nostru Ii[sus] H[ristos]. Facerea lui Kir Daniil întâiul cântăreț. Glas I Πα *Arătatu-s-au darul lui Dumnezeu...*; f.164^v-f.167^v La Buna Vestire a Maicii Domnului. Facerea lui Kir Daniil întâiul cântăreț glas I Πα Ke, *Ales-au Domnul Sionul...*; f.168^f-f.173^v La Sfânta și Luminata zi a Învierii Domnului Dumnezeu și Mântuitorului Nostru Ii[sus] H[ristos] Glas (I) Πα *Trupul lui Hristos...*; f.173^v-f.176^v La Înălțarea Domnului nostru Ii[sus] H[ristos]. Facerea Lui Kir Daniil Întâiul Cântăreț. Glas IV Di, *Suitu-S-au Dumnezeu...*; f.176^v-f.179^v La Pogorârea Sfântului Duh. Facerea lui Daniil Întâiul Cântăreț Glas I Πα, *Duhul Tău Cel Sfânt...*; f.176^v-f.183^v La Sfânta și Dumnezeiasca Schimbare la față a Domnului Nostru Ii[sus] H[ristos]. A lui Daniil. Glas (VII) Zo; f.183^v-f.187^v La Înălțarea Sfintei și de viață făcătoarei Cruci. Facerea lui Kir Lampadarie. Glas V Πα, *Însemnatu-sau preste noi...*;

f.187^v-f.192^f RÂNDUIALA CÂNTĂRILOR LA SFÂNTA LITURGHIE A MARELUI VASILIE CE SĂ CÂNTĂ ÎN POSTUL CEL MARE RUMÂNITE ȘI LA ALTE PRAZNICE ÎMPĂRĂTEȘTI PESTE AN. GLAS (II) Di [Răspunsurile mari de la Liturgia Sfântului Vasile] *Cu vrednicie și cu dreptate...*;

f.192^f-f.197^v (A)ceasta să cântă î(n) loc de axion GLAS VIII Ni, *De Tine se bucură*;

f.197^f-f.198^v Aceasta să cântă după axion [condacul] Sfântului Vasilie cel Mare, *Pre arătătorul celor cerești...*;

f.198^f-f.200^v [titlul este indescifrabil, datorită uzurii foii] Glas I Πα, *Acum puterile cerești*;

f.200^v-f.203^f Acesta este heruvicul care să cântă în joia ce(a) mare Glas VI Πα, *Cinei Tale...*;

f.203^f-f.207^f Aceasta să cântă și kinonic întru astă zi iar acest(a) de joi este axion întru astă zi. Glas VI $\overset{\epsilon}{\pi} \alpha$, *Din ospățul Stăpânului...*;

f.207^f-f.211^f Acesta este heruvicu care să cântă în sfânta și marea sâmbătă de Kir Iacov Ierocântăreț glas (VI) Πα, *Să tacă tot trupul omenesc...*;

f.211^f-f.215^f Acesta este axion într-acea zi Glas VI $\pi \alpha$ *Nu te tânguî...;*
 f.215^f-f.218^v Acesta este kinonic într-acea zi de Grigorie Criteanul Glas V $\Pi \alpha$ *Sculatu-s-au ca din somn Domnul;*
 f.219^f-f.224^f Aicea s-au scris câteva irmoase din cele mai frumoase. Acesta este facerea părintelui Macarie. Glas VIII $\lambda \grave{\alpha}$ *Ni, Vai mie înnegritule suflete...;*
 f.224^f-f.227^f Alt irmos facerea lui Kir Petru Berechet. Glas (I) $\Pi \alpha$, *În cuptorul cel vâlvâietoru...;*
 f.227^f-f.231^f Alt irmos facerea lui Kir Marin (...Câșleței?) Glas VIII *Ni, Plâng și mă tânguiesc...;*
 f.231^f-f.234^f Alt irmos ce să cântă la arhieru. Glas VII *Zo, Pre Stâpânul...;*
 f.234^f-f.234^v Glas II *Di, Întru mulți ani...;*
 f.234^v-f.236^v Acest axion fiindcă s-au uitat să se puie la locul lui și așa s-au pus aici la sfârșitul cărții pentru înlesnire. Glas V $\Pi \alpha$, *Vrednică ești...;*
 f.236^v-f.239^f Acesta se cântă în toate sâmbetele la acatist. Glas VIII $\lambda \grave{\alpha}$ $\grave{\alpha}$ *Ni, Slobozește-ne pre noi....*



Imagine 2 Ms. 240, f. 1^v, title sheet

V. List of recorded authors

Varlaam the Hierodeacon, Gheorghios of Kritos, Petros Lampadarios, Gregorios the Protopsaltis, Macarie the Hieromonk, Anton Pann, Daniil Protopsaltis, Petros Bereketis, Marin (...Câșleței? at 227 sheet).

VI. Complementary elements

At sheet 239^f a writing made by the owner is found: "These two books, namely the Vigil and the Liturgy, are given to me by professor Casian the Hierodeacon from Cernica Monastery. And for remembrance I have written here. Athanasius Iordachescu, cantor. 1908". Also, on the front sheet at the end information about numbering are noted in pencil: "The new numbering was done by brother Andrei Bejan, a dweller of Cernica monastery, on 20 february 2012". Some chants were added later, in pencil, by psalm singers who sang from this manuscript.

6 Conclusions

The three teachers, Chrysant of Madyt, Gregorios Protopsaltis and Chourmouzios Chartofilakos had a decisive theoretical and practical activity in the implementation of the Chrysanthine reform in Greece. In our country, the reform was initiated and implemented by Petros Ephesios, Macarie the Hieromonk, Anton Pann, Gelasios the Bessarabian and Dimitrie Suceveanu, famous Byzantine teachers and composers, considered the founders of modern Romanian psaltic music. Also, an important role in the implementation of the new notation and chrysantine repertoire in the Romanian Orthodox Church had the schools of psaltic music of Moldova and Walachia. These institutions formed many generations of psaltes and teachers who copied numerous musical manuscripts in chrysantine notation, kept today in monastery or university library funds. An example of modern notation manuscript, unreported until now, is Ms. 240, Chants of the Liturgy from Cernica Monastery, important centre for the Romanization of the Orthodox music at Cernica near Bucharest. This monastic center flourished during Calinic abbot, a true supporter supporter of the church theological and musical culture in the Romanian language.

References

- Alighizakis A. (1978). *Fundamente ale muzicii bisericesti*. Tesalonic: Ed. Pournara.
- Barbu-Bucur Sebastian (1992). Cuvânt înainte. In *Idiomelar. Partea întâia – care cuprinde cântările sărbătorilor din lunile Septembrie-Decembrie*. Sinaia: Ed. Mănăstirii Sinaia.
- Barbu-Bucur Sebastian (2002). Aspecte fundamentale ale tradiției muzicii românești de tip bizantin: serviciile, muzica de cult și ehurile muzicii

bizantine. In *Byzantion Romanicon*, vol. VI. Iași: Universitatea de Arte „George Enescu”.

Barbu-Bucur Sebastian (2005). Muzica Bizantină în veșmânt românesc – interviu. In *Muzică Bizantină – Sebastian Barbu-Bucur*. București: Editura Semne.

Catrina Constantin (1997). Despre câteva repere privind învățământul muzical de tradiție bizantină din Șcheii Brașovului – secolele XVIII-XIX. In *Byzantion Romanicon*, vol. III. Iași: Universitatea de Arte „George Enescu”.

Bucescu Florin (2000). Pregătirea reformei hrisantice. Înnoiri muzicale în creația precursorilor reformei. In *Acta Musicae Byzantinae*, vol. II. Iași: Centrul de Studii Bizantine din Iași.

Bucescu Florin (2007). Rolul Mitropolitului Veniamin și al Ieromonahului Macarie în afirmarea creației psaltice românești în Moldova. In *Byzantion Romanicon*, vol. VII. Iași: Editura Artes.

Bucescu Florin, coord. (2010). *Catalogul manuscriselor de muzică sacră din Moldova – sec. XI-XX*, vol. I. Iași: Editura Artes.

Buzerea Alexie (2003). Școala de psaltichie de la biserica Maica Domnului – Dudu din Craiova la începutul secolului al XIX-lea și Sistema Nouă. In *Coordonate ale culturii muzicale din Oltenia – Muzica de tradiție bizantină*. Craiova: Reduta Publishing.

Buzerea Alexie (2003). Oprea Demetrescu. In *Coordonate ale culturii muzicale din Oltenia – Muzica de tradiție bizantină*. Craiova: Reduta Publishing.

Buzerea Alexie (2003). Vetre de cultură muzicală: Școala de la Cozia. In *Coordonate ale culturii muzicale din Oltenia – Muzica de tradiție bizantină*. Craiova: Reduta Publishing.

Buzerea Alexie (2003). Profesori și compozitori de muzică psaltică la Seminarul de la Râmnicu Vâlcea. In *Coordonate ale culturii muzicale din Oltenia – Muzica de tradiție bizantină*. Craiova: Reduta Publishing.

Buzerea Alexie (2003). Școlile Protopopești din Oltenia. In *Coordonate ale culturii muzicale din Oltenia – Muzica de tradiție bizantină*. Craiova: Reduta Publishing.

Buzerea Alexie (2003). Trei psalți greci la Craiova. In *Coordonate ale culturii muzicale din Oltenia – Muzica de tradiție bizantină*. Craiova: Reduta Publishing.

Calamaz Carmen (1996). Legăturile Ieromonahului Macarie cu viața muzicală a Moldovei. In *Byzantion Romanicon*, vol. II. Iași: Universitatea de Arte „George Enescu”.

Corduban Mihaela Lidia (2007). Înnoiri importante apărute în muzica Bisericii Ortodoxe în prima jumătate a secolului al XIX-lea. In *Byzantion Romanicon*, vol. VII. Iași: Editura Artes.

- Gheorghiu Nicolae (2007). *Muzica Bizantină – Scurtă introducere*. In *Byzantion Romanicon*, vol. VII. Iași: Editura Artes.
- Isăroiu Ion (2002). Câmpulung Muscel – străveche vatră de cultură muzicală a Țării Românești (sec. XVII – XVIII). In *Byzantion Romanicon*, vol. VI. Iași: Universitatea de Arte „George Enescu”.
- Moisescu Titus (2003). Sisteme de notație neumatică în vechea muzică bizantină. In *Cântarea monodică bizantină pe teritoriul României – Prolegomene Bizantine II – Variante stilistice și de formă în muzica bizantină*. București: Editura Muzicală.
- Papathomas Grigorios D. Istoria Bisericii din Grecia în secolul XX. In *Biserica Ortodoxă din Europa de Est în secolul XX*, trad. de Liliana Donose Samuelsson. București: Ed. Humanitas.
- Ploieșteanu Nifon N. (1902). *Carte de Musică Bisericească pe psaltichie și pe note liniare, pentru trei voci*. București: Tipografia Joseph Göbl („Gutenberg”) a Cărților Bisericești și Carol Göbl.
- Păcurariu Mircea (2006). *Istoria Bisericii Ortodoxe Române*, vol. II, ediția a III-a. Iași: Editura Trinitas.
- Romanou Katy G. (1973). Introduction. *Chrisanthos of Madytos Great Theory of Music*, translated by Katy G. Romanou. Indiana University.
- Stathis Gregorios (2003). Les „Protographa” de la transcription dans la notation de la nouvelle methode, VI. In *Acta Musicae Byzantinae*, vol. VI. Iași: Centrul de studii Bizantine din Iași.
- Tillyard H. J. W. (1923). Byzantine Music. In *Music & Letters*, vol. 4, nr. 3. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tillyard H. J. W. (1916/1917-1917/1918). The Modes in Byzantine Music. In *The Annual of the British School at Athens*, vol. 22. Athens: British School at Athens.
- Schartau Bjarne and Troelsgard Christian (1997). The translation of Byzantine Chants into the “New Method”: Joasaph Pantokratorinos – Composer and Scribe of Musical Manuscripts. In *Musicologica*, vol. 69. International Musicological Society.
- Țurcanu Nicolae (1996). Gheorghe Ucenescu – Dascăl de muzică de tradiție bizantină. In *Byzantion*, vol. II. Iași: Academia de Arte „George Enescu”.
- Vasile Vasile (1995). Protopsaltul Dimitrie Suceveanu (1816–1898). In *Byzantion Romanicon*, vol. I. Iași: Academia de Arte „George Enescu”.
- Yameos Iacob (2010). *Principalele aspecte ale istoriei muzicii bisericești*, trad. de Ierom. Luca Mirea. Alba – Iulia: Ed. Reîntregirea.