

THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE SERVANTS OF PSALTIC ART TO THE FORMATION OF THE TYPIKON CURRENTLY IN USE

Assistant Professor Ph.D. DIMITRIOS K. BALAGEORGOS
National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

Dimitrios K. BALAGEORGOS (b. 1966), professor, Byzantinologist, performer and conductor, studied Theology and Musicology in Athens, where he also earned his Ph.D. degree with a thesis on *The Psaltic Tradition of the Akolouthiai According to the Byzantine Secular Typikon* (published in Athens, in 2011). Currently he is Associate Professor at the Department of Musical Studies of the University of Athens. He has delivered lectures and seminars on History, Morphology and Palaeography of Byzantine Music in Athens, Tirana, Thyateira and London. He published more than 40 studies (monographs, articles, encyclopaedic entries, communications at scientific



congresses, essays) related to various (theoretical, historical, morphological, etc.) topics of Byzantine Musicology, in various collective volumes and in scholarly journals. He has participated in congresses on Byzantine Music, both in Greece and abroad. In 2004, he founded in his native city an artistic society named *Trikkis Melodoi*, directed by himself, aiming at the systematic cultivation and promotion of the Psaltic Art by participating in cultural and musical events, publishing musical CDs etc. Dimitrios Balageorgos deals with the scientific study and research into Byzantine music in all its theoretical, practical, historical and aesthetic aspects, in the broader cultural area of Orthodox Christianity. Equally important is his participation in the program of cataloguing the manuscript codices of Byzantine music preserved on Mount Sinai. He is an active member of various scientific associations: the Institute of Byzantine Musicology / Athens, The International Society for Orthodox Church Music / Joensuu, the American Society of Byzantine Music and Hymnology / Pittsburgh.

ABSTRACT

This paper is an attempt to follow the course of the Typikon based on the information furnished by the long and uninterrupted psaltic tradition and by the musical manuscripts. The author aims to answer questions such as how this Typikon was preserved to the present day, when and by whom the recording of the typical rules of the Patriarchal Temple commenced, what was the part and the contribution of the Protopsalts and other officials of

the Patriarchal Temple in shaping and formulating the precepts of the Typikon. The paper highlights valuable and trustworthy testimonies made by musical masters, scholars and researchers of Psaltic Art, who report in their texts many important facts linked to the evolution of this art in the patriarchal milieu and offer us remarkable notes on the contribution of the chanters to the establishing of the precepts of the Typikon.

Keywords: typical rules, Patriarchal Temple, musical manuscripts, Papadiki, psaltic tradition

Introduction

Ecclesiastical cult is regulated by a multitude of liturgical instructions and rules, which are exposed in the book called Typikon. The Typikon offers to those involved in church ritual the diagram or structure of the cult, thus ensuring the correct performance of services and the avoidance of any subjective interference. Since the 4th century, when the cult forms were crystallized, up to the present day, the form of the Typikon is not a fixed and rigid one; it has been subject to remodeling, with extension of some elements and elimination of others, always adapting itself to the needs of each time and place and to the situation of the churchgoers. Thus, as centuries went by, the two major traditions of liturgical Typikon (the Typikon of Constantinople, or cathedral Typikon, and the Typikon of Jerusalem, or monastic Typikon), in combination with other local traditions (Alexandria, Antioch, Sinai etc.) produced the initial form of a unified Typikon, as a result of the convergence of the rules included in the two main Typika, a convergence achieved in the Monastery of Stoudios in Constantinople. In the 15th century, marked by dramatic upheavals in the various aspects of Byzantine civilization, the synthesis of the forms and rules of the two Typika was completed and the Typical of the Orthodox Church as it is currently in use was finally standardized. Essentially, the monastic Typikon prevailed over the cathedral one and was diffused throughout the Orthodox world to such an extent that name changes occurred: the monastic Typikon of St Sabbas was renamed to Typikon of the Great Church of Christ. The local variations of this Typikon produced the Typika of Mount Athos, of the Slavic churches, of Patmos etc. It constituted the basis of the new Typikon of Constantinople that appeared in the 19th century under its two known versions by Constantine Byzantios

and George Violakis respectively, both Protopsalts in the Patriarchal Temple at Fanar [34, pp. 11-12].

In the present communication we will try to follow the course of this Typikon and to answer questions such as how this Typikon was preserved to the present day, when and by whom the recording of the typical rules of the Patriarchal Temple commenced, what was the part and the contribution of the Protopsalts and other officials of the Patriarchal Temple in shaping and formulating the precepts of the Typikon. Our inquiry into these issues, and into others that might arise in the process, will not be based on the liturgical sources and on the typical tradition, but on the long and uninterrupted psaltic tradition and on the data furnished by the musical manuscripts. By studying and preserving the content of musical codexes, not only we garner multiple evidence of particular interest for Byzantine Musicology, but we also bring to the light important data as far as the Typikon is concerned. These data allow us to recreate the splendid and magnificent cultic life of our Church in its two forms (cathedral and monastic) and to reconstruct the typical precepts for the various services, since they reveal the different additions or eliminations during the previous processes of synthesis. In parallel, there are valuable and trustworthy testimonies by musical masters, scholars and researchers of Psaltic Art, who report in their texts many important facts linked to the evolution of this art in the patriarchal *milieu* and offer us remarkable notes on the contribution of the chanters to the establishing of the precepts of the Typikon.

Typical precepts in musical manuscript books

Around the middle of the 14th century, a new type of manuscript musical book appeared, the so-called *Akolouthiai* or *Papadike*, containing the fixed chants sung at the day and night services. These are settings, in various styles and by different melodists, of verses from the Psalter of David. This book, which completed the written psaltic tradition of that time, was imposed and broadly diffused during the subsequent centuries, with various additions and eliminations of compositions. Many of these codices are interesting from a typical point of view (and this happens for the first time as far as musical books are concerned) because in several of

their entries, apart from the exclusively psaltic information they contain, they also give specific instructions to the chanters and the priests on what they must sing and on the details of the ritual of the various services; these instructions are in some cases more complete than those of the *Typika* themselves¹. It would not be exaggerated to affirm that almost all the musical books of the Papadic type compiled in the 14th and 15th centuries are enriched, in various degrees, with typical instructions². A telling example is the case of codex Koutloumousiou 457 (Mount Athos, second half of 14th century) that contains an extremely important Papadike with many typical entries, which, if gathered together, could constitute a concise *Typikon* with all precepts necessary for what is chanted and performed at Vespers, Matins and Divine Liturgy. Some of these manuscripts, apart from the chanting procedures of Constantinople, transmit as well the corresponding tradition of Thessaloniki, preserving at that some extremely accurate typical rules, formulated in complete and detailed manner³. The widespread occurrence of typical instructions in the musical manuscripts of that time was a consequence of the prevailing instability as far as the establishment of a standardized typical form was concerned; the procedures to that effect were still undergoing, and thus there was not a unified *Typikon* which would guide the chanters toward the correct performance of divine services. The disorder and confusion that would very probably result from such a lack was precisely what the codicographers of these books aimed at preventing from happening, by solving chanting issues and by ensuring the correct and regular performance of the services by means of clearly explained instructions. The codicographers, who were excellent musicians themselves, act as very competent *Typikon* compilers: they know very well both typical traditions, the cathedral and the monastic one, and try to convey information on what must be chanted and on the correct performance of services according to both traditions. This is precisely the course of action adopted by Symeon of

¹ Cf. the inscriptions that accompany the music of Great Doxology preserved in codd. Koutloumousiou 457, fol. 104b-105a, Hag. Triados Meteoron 78, fol. 53, NLG 2062, fol. 36a, 50b-51b etc.

² Cf. codd. Koutloumousiou 399, 456 and 457; Philotheou 122; Iberon 973, 984 and 985; Konstamonitou 86; Sinaiticus 1293 and 1312; Metamorphoseos Meteoron 192; Barlaam 210; Hag. Triados Meteoron 78; NLG 2401, 2406, 2444, 2454, 2456 and 2458.

³ Sinaiticus 1312, fol. 28a; Koutloumousiou 457, fol. 332a; Lavras Α 165, fol. 274a; Lavras E 173, fol. 247a; Lavras E 148, fol. 325a; NLG 899, fol. 192b; NLG 2401, fol. 242a.

Thessaloniki, versed in church music, compiler of Typika and liturgical commentator, when he compiled the Typikon of Haghia Sophia of Thessaloniki (contained in codex NLG 2047), having before his eyes the musical codex NLG 2062 which he consulted for matters of psaltic terminology and other useful information.⁴ This procedure is confirmed by the great master of Psaltic Art, Gregorios Bounis Alyates, who, urged by a similar disposition, transmitted, apart from his own musical codices, a Typikon to be used in parish churches, the codex Docheiarion 395, garnering typical data from the Typikon of St Sabbas as well as from other typical sources⁵. The servants of Psaltic Art are distinguished not only for their deep musical knowledge, but also for their typical one, which is obvious in almost all the Papadikai of that period, that in many cases compensate for the absence of Typika proper.

The diffusion of typical instructions in musical books continues in later Papadikai or Anthologies, either as a byproduct of exact copying from one manuscript to the other, or, in most cases, as a result of the codicographers' will to preserve and transmit the original typical tradition. To confirm this view I could cite a great number of musical codices, complete with the names of their copyists; I will, however, mention just two important musicians, priest and oekonomos Antonios (late 17th – early 18th century) and deacon-monk and Protopsalt Theodosios of Smyrna (mid-18th century). In their autographs, respectively the codex Iberon 968 and the codex Hagiou Paulou 146, these two men act as compilers of Typika, as they record in all detail and clarity the typical precepts of the Holy Week services [5, pp. 548-666] and of the forgotten akolouthia of cathedral Vespers [3, pp. 363-372] respectively. We therefore conclude that during a vast period of time – more than four centuries – musical manuscripts were used as substitutes for the Typika, allowing, by means of their instructions, the chanting choirs of monasterial and parish churches to correctly perform the difficult parts of the services.

⁴ For more details on this topic, see our article *Οι ἐκ τοῦ Τυπικοῦ τῆς ἁγ. Σοφίας Θεσσαλονίκης (χφ. ΕΒΕ 2047) ἀπορρέουσες ψαλτικές μαρτυρίες*, [The psaltic testimonies deriving from the Typikon of Hagia Sophia of Thessaloniki (ms. NLG 2047)], pp. 25-26, to be published in the forthcoming volume in honor and memory of the late professor Ioannis Fountoulis by the Department of Theology of the "Aristotle" University of Thessaloniki.

⁵ The codex bears the title *Τυπικὸν ἀκριβὲς τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας ἀπὸ τοῦ τυπικοῦ τοῦ ἁγίου Σάββα καὶ ἐτέρων ἀθροισθὲν διαφόρων ἔχον καὶ τὰ κεφάλαια τοῦ μοναχοῦ κύρ Μάρκου, ἐν οἷς ἕκαστον αὐτῶν ζητεῖται χωρὶς· μεθ' ἐτέρων τινῶν ἀναγκαίων σημειώσεων* (Docheiariou 3069.395, fol. 1a).

The contribution of Jacob the Protopsalt to the evolution of the Typikon

During the 18th century the Patriarchate of Constantinople began to take initiatives in relation to the ways and means by which Orthodox ritual was being performed. In this frame, a systematic care was taken as far as the correction of liturgical books [36, pp. 60-76] was concerned. This endeavor included the analytical simplification of musical notation [37, p. 70], a tendency towards fast chanting in all kinds of melopoeia with a view to shortening the liturgical time, and a standardization of the Patriarchal order in service performing. The leading part in all these initiatives was played by the Protopsalts of the Patriarchal Temple as well as by other members of the chanting choirs, all of them devoted to the typical and psaltic tradition and to the liturgical life of the Church. Patriarch Cyril V urged Protopsalt John Trapezountios to use the simplified notation system in his musical compositions. Music teachers and protopsalts John and Daniel established the fast psaltic tradition when Patriarch Gregory V undertook to correct the errors “which riddled the ecclesiastical books because of the printers’ negligence” [32, p. XXXVI], he charged Protopsalt Jacob with carrying out this task⁶. Thus Jacob, an excellent grammarian (according to Chrysanthos [32, p. XXXVI]) and an erudite Protopsalt of the Great Church (according to Nikephoros Kantouniaris, archdeacon at the Patriarchate of Antioch⁷), undertook the task to gather the typical rules and the instructions of the patriarchal psaltic tradition. He was the first Protopsalt who kept notes with a view to proceeding to the compilation of a Typikon, since he became aware of the need to record the typical precepts according to which the holy services in the venerable Patriarchal Temple were performed. Later Protopsalt Constantine Byzantios, who was the first to record the patriarchal order of service performing, alluded to the role of Jacob when he admitted that he fulfilled his own task relying on the notes of the “former Protopsalts”⁸, and therefore to those kept by Jacob.

⁶ M. I. Gedeon [35, p. 66]. According to a testimony of priest Kyriakos Philoxenous, garnered by M. Gedeon, Jacob devoted himself for many years to the epuration of the Pentecostarion, and this was the only one that he ever corrected.

⁷ Xeropotamou 318, fol. 140a ff. Cf. Gr. Th. Stathis, [39, p. 148].

⁸ From the title of the first edition of the Typikon of Protopsalt Constantine (1838).

Realizing the typical anomalies and discrepancies in performing the various services at many parish churches of his time, Jacob tried to compile a typical notebook containing the precepts for the services of the whole year according to the order that prevailed in the Patriarchal Temple where he had served for years⁹. We can easily imagine Jacob, since the early years of his chanting service at the Temple, holding in his hands a tiny booklet and noting at any occasion typical instructions, psaltic rules and various remarks, writing in lines or completing in the margins which choir chanted which troparion, what time commenced the services, what happened in the cases when major feasts coincided with Sundays and moveable feasts with fixed ones, what order had to be followed when the Patriarch himself led the choir, when the various troparia were chanted in fast manner and when in the slow one, which troparia could be omitted, which passages from the Gospels were read, and many other elements from the patriarchal liturgical order as far as divine services were concerned. And we can imagine him, year after year, enriching his notebook by adding further details that arose from the “reading” and the “use” of the Typikon each year. His aim was probably to systemize all these instructions and publish a Typikon for homogenizing the performance of services in all Greek-speaking churches, a project never completed, perhaps because of his death.

Behind this endeavor one can discern the efforts of Jacob in favor of typical conformity, his interest for the codification and the diffusion of the existing order and also maybe a patriarchal incentive for the recording of the ritual pattern of the Patriarchal Temple which had already evolved in comparison to the older Typika. Furthermore, one can discern the part of the Protopsalt of the Patriarchal Temple as the supervisor of liturgical order and responsible for the strict application of the rules as far as the performance of services was concerned. This is corroborated by the letter of Patriarch Neophytos VII, written in 1791, when Jacob was Protopsalt, according to which the protopsalt received a special salary “ἕνεκεν τῆς χοροστασίας αὐτοῦ, ψάλλοντας ἐν τῷ καθ’ ἡμᾶς πανσέπτῳ πατριαρχικῷ ναῷ τοὺς τεταγμένους καιροὺς τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἀκολουθιῶν καὶ συνελεύσεων, κατ’ ἔτος πεντακόσια τεσσαράκοντα γρόσια, ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἑξήκοντα διὰ τὴν φροντίδα καὶ ἐπιστάσιαν τοῦ Τυπικοῦ” [36, pp. 59-65].

⁹ In the year 1764, Jacob is referred to as First Domestikos. See Christos Patrinelis [38, p. 156].

We now can plausibly affirm that the unknown to us notes of Jacob, a product of his office as supervisor of the Patriarchal Temple, constitute the early source for the historical evolution of the Typikon currently in use and that his contribution to the establishment of the current typical order was of paramount importance.

The typical proposition of Apostolos Konstas

Contemporary research dealing with the evolution and history of the Typikon has not paid enough attention to an interesting typical guide to the order of services, which also contains some scathing comments by Apostolos Konstas, an eminent music teacher younger than Jacob, on the prevailing liturgical disorder and the people responsible for it. The most plausible cause for the ignorance of this text of Apostolos is, in our opinion, the fact that it was incorporated in a musical manuscript and that, between the typical precepts, musical texts were interpolated, rendering its identification harder. These typical notes of Apostolos Konstas are preserved in the Athenian codex NLG 1869, written in January 1821, just before the outbreak of the Greek Independence Revolution. The inscription at the beginning of the book reveals the twofold nature of its content: “Ἀνθολογία σὺν Θεῷ ἁγίῳ περιέχουσα τὴν τάξιν τοῦ τυπικοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀναγκαίων μαθημάτων, τοῦ ὁρθοῦ τε καὶ λειτουργίας...” [20, fol. 1a], whereas five more inscriptions outline the content of the corresponding unities, where typical rules prevail¹⁰. The fundamental problem, which functioned as an incentive for recording the order of the various services, seems to be the once again the typical discrepancies between the services performed at the churches in the time of Apostolos, an issue that was already observed in the time of Jacob and which remained unresolved precisely because the latter’s notes were not published: “διὰ τοῦτο δὲν ὁμοφωνοῦν πᾶσαι αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῆς πόλεως εἰς μίαν τάξιν· διὰ τὴν πολύτροπον καὶ ὑπερήφανον γνώμην τῶν

¹⁰ NLG 1869, fol. 2a: Ἀρχὴ σὺν Θεῷ ἁγίῳ τῆς τάξεως τοῦ μεσονυκτικοῦ τῆς Κυριακῆς, κατὰ τὸ σύνθηρες τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλῃς Ἐκκλησίας – fol. 4a: Ἀρχὴ σὺν Θεῷ ἁγίῳ τῆς τάξεως τοῦ ὁρθοῦ ὅταν εἶναι Κυριακὴ – fol. 24b: Ἀρχὴ σὺν Θεῷ ἁγίῳ τῆς τάξεως τοῦ ὁρθοῦ εἰς δεσποτικὰς καὶ θεομητορικὰς ἑορτὰς – fol. 28b: Περί τῆς τάξεως τοῦ ὁρθοῦ εἰς τὰς ἑορτὰς τῶν ἁγίων – fol. 33a: Ἀρχὴ σὺν Θεῷ ἁγίῳ τῆς τάξεως τῆς θείας καὶ ἱερᾶς λειτουργίας τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου.

προεστῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν· διὰ τὴν νὰ δείχνουν ἐπὶ τῆς κρυφῆς ὑπερηφανίας καὶ κενοδοξίας αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν λαόν, τὸ ὅτι εἶναι διδάσκαλοι προκομμένοι καὶ ἄξιοι καὶ πρακτικώτατοι τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας¹¹· ὅμως, σοφία καὶ μάθησις εἶναι νὰ φυλάγεται ἡ τάξις τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας ἀπείρακτος καὶ ἀπαρασάλευτος ὡς καθὼς τὴν ἐσύνθεσαν ἐκεῖνοι οἱ τοῦ Θεοῦ φανεροὶ ὑπηρέται, οἱ μὲ ἔργων ἄγιοι οὐχὶ μὲ λόγον μόνον· ἐκτὸς τούτου πάλιν; αὕτη ἡ πολύτροπος ἀκολουθία, ποιεῖ τοὺς χριστιανοὺς ὁ καρπὸς αὐτῆς νὰ μένουν ἀπαίδευτοι εἰς τὴν τάξιν τῆς ἀκολουθίας, καὶ νὰ ἐρημούνται αἱ ἐκκλησίαι ἀπὸ στολισμὸν τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἀνθρώπων· εἰ δὲ καὶ εἶχον πάντες μίαν γνώμην, ἦττον πολλὰ εὐκολώτερον νὰ μανθάνει ὁ καθεὶς χριστιανὸς τὴν τάξιν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας· καὶ οὕτως εὐκολοτέρῳ τῷ τρόπῳ ἐπρόκοπτον οἱ χριστιανοὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ἀκολουθίαν· διὰ τοῦτο πρέπει νὰ γένει ἓνα νέον τυπικὸν ἀπὸ τὴν μεγάλην ἐκκλησίαν καὶ νὰ τὸ βάνουν εἰς τύπον, καὶ νὰ τὸ ἔχει ὁ καθεὶς ἐκκλησιαστικὸς εἰς κάθε χώραν καὶ τόπον καὶ ἐκκλησίαν, νὰ ἡξεύρη τὸ πῶς ἔχει νὰ γένει ἡ κάθε ἀκολουθία· ὡς τὸ ἔκαμεν ὁ ἀληθινὸς ἅγιος προεστῶς Σάββας, ὁποῦ ὁ ἴδιος παντοκράτορ Θεὸς τὸν ἐτίμησε καὶ τὸν ἐδόξασε καὶ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐν τῇ γῆ· καὶ οὕτω νὰ διορθωθεῖ καὶ νὰ εὐκολύνει ἡ τάξις τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας” [20, fol. 25b-26b]. This extensive critical text of Apostolos clearly shows that the issue of typical uniformity at the parish churches of Constantinople, and by extension of the rest of the Orthodox world, remained unsolved in his time as well, because of the renewal, modification and adaptation of the monastic Typikon of St Sabbas to the actual needs of the parishes and the subsequent typical confusion. Apostolos, a very active man, was deeply concerned by this issue; however, his activities outside the patriarchal fold, his exclusion from the exegetic team and his rivalry with the teachers of the New Method did not allow him to devote himself to the compilation of a Typikon, despite the fact that this eminent Greek codicographer possessed

¹¹ This is the main problem and at the same time the incentive for the compiling of the Typikon by Protopsalt Constantine, who addresses the issue in a more elegant way in the preface of the first edition: “Μ’ ὅλα ταῦτα, διάφοροι συμπῶσεις ἐορτῶν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ, μὴ περιεχόμεναι καὶ εἰς ταύτας τὰς Ἐορμηνείας...ἀπογεννώσι πάλιν τὴν αὐτὴν ἀνωμαλίαν, ἐναντίως τοῦ ὀφειλομένου Ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ διακόσμου καὶ τοσαύτην μάλιστα ἀτοπίαν εἶναι δυνατὸν νὰ βλέπη τις εἰς τὸ πρᾶγμα, ὥστε ἄλλην ἁσματικὴν Ἀκολουθίαν, κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν Ἐορτήν, νὰ ψάλλῃ ἢ μία Ἐκκλησία, καὶ ἄλλην ἢ ἄλλη, πολλάκις καὶ εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν πόλιν· καὶ οὕτω δὲν ὑπάρχει ἡ ὀφειλομένη συμφωνία τῶν ἀκολουθιῶν εἰς τὰς Ἐκκλησίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ”.

the knowledge and the capacities required for such an endeavor. We must, nevertheless, admit that this "opposition" message of Apostolos – because of his identification with the conservative faction of the Patriarchs – strengthened the voices that required the compilation of a new Typikon by the Great Church and that his scathing tones operated as a leverage to the Patriarchate to revise and arrange the Typikon.

The Typika of Protopsalts Constantine Byzantios and George Violakis

The first person to systemize the patriarchal order regulating the performance of services was the Protopsalt of the Great Church, Constantine Byzantios. Relying on the notes of his predecessors, on patriarchal formulations and on his own experience, Constantine published his Typikon in 1838, with the firm intention to ensure typical uniformity among the churches, officialize the developments up to that time, correct the various errors and adapt the liturgical practice to the needs of his time. The precursor of this Typikon was a notebook – probably similar to the one previously kept by Jacob – where Constantine noted by his own hand typical precepts and instructions for the services of the whole year. This is the codex 178 preserved at the Konstantinos Psachos Library and includes notes written from 1806 to 1829¹². The exhaustion of the first edition and the errors and deficiencies observed as far as typical issues were concerned urged Constantine to proceed to a second edition of his Typikon, enriched with several orders and formulated in more accurate language. His Typikon met with a favorable reception and his contribution to the development of liturgical life is deemed epochal.

In the year 1880, as it is shown by the extant correspondence between Patriarch Joachim III and the compiler of Typika in the Pantokrator Monastery of Mount Athos [33, pp. 313-315], the Patriarchate reopened the issue of the Typikon, aiming at its revision, "ὅπως γένωνται ἐν αὐτῷ συμπληρώσεως οὐσιωδῶν τινῶν ἐλλείψεων καὶ ἄλλαι ἀπαιτούμεναι διαρρυθμίσεις πρὸς πληρεστέραν διευκρίνησιν

¹² The content of this codex is described by Presbyter Konstantinos Terzopoulos in his doctoral dissertation *Ὁ πρωτοψάλτης τῆς Μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας Κωνσταντίνος Βυζάντιος* [Constantine Byzantios, the Protopsalt of the Great Church of Christ], Byzantine Musicology Foundation, Studies 9, Athens 2004, pp. 256-270.

διατυπώσεών τινων αὐτοῦ” [33, pp. 313]. The result of the subsequent procedures was the publishing of the Typikon by George Violakis, in 1888. This Typikon has survived up to the present day and constitutes the official Typikon of almost all the Greek-speaking churches¹³.

Epilogue

The task of the care and supervision of the Typikon has always been assigned to individuals with sufficient musical erudition, a long chanting experience, a deep knowledge of the older Typika and a firm attachment to the patriarchal liturgical tradition. These requirements were mostly met by the most eminent chanting servants, i.e. the Protopsalts, but also by other chanters versed in issues of protocolary, ritual and liturgical order. The Church has always surrounded with confidence these persons, who learned Psaltic Art from their childhood and were instructed into respecting patriarchal order. These persons, animated by profound respect for tradition, without adding or omitting anything by their own initiative, proceeded to the revision and arrangement of the Typikon “πρὸς εὐταξίαν καὶ λαμπρότητα...τῶν ναῶν καὶ κοινὴν ὠφέλειαν τοῦ ἡμετέρου γένους, καὶ παραμυθίαν καὶ ἀνάπαυσιν τῶν μουσικολογιωτάτων ψαλτῶν” [36, pp. 59-65].

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Manuscript sources

- [1] Varlaam 210;
- [2] Docheiariou 3069.395
- [3] Hag. Pavlou 146
- [4] Hag. Triados Meteoron 78
- [5] Iberon 968
- [6] Iberon 973

¹³ I chose to refer only briefly to these compilations of Typika, by Protopsalt Constantine and George Violakis respectively, because there are two dissertations that deal extensively with the typical contribution and the work of the two aforementioned Protopsalts. The first one is the work by Presbyter K. Terzopoulos, mentioned above (note 12) and the second one is the unpublished study by Dionysios Bilalis Anatolikiotis: *Γεώργιος Βιολάκης ὁ πρωτοψάλτης, ὁ μουσικολόγος, ὁ τυπικολόγος (1820-1911)* [George Violakis: the Protopsalt, the musicologist, the typicologist (1820-1911)], Athens 2011.

- [7] Iberon 984
- [8] Iberon and 985
- [9] Lavras A 165,
- [10] Lavras 173
- [11] Lavras E 148
- [12] Metamorphoseos Meteoron 192
- [13] Konstamonitou 86
- [14] Koutloumousiou 457
- [15] Koutloumousiou 399
- [16] Koutloumousiou 456
- [17] Koutloumousiou 457
- [18] Philotheou 122
- [19] National Library of Greece 899
- [20] National Library of Greece 1869
- [21] National Library of Greece 2401
- [22] National Library of Greece 2406
- [23] National Library of Greece 2444
- [24] National Library of Greece 2047
- [25] National Library of Greece 2454
- [26] National Library of Greece 2456
- [27] National Library of Greece 2458
- [28] National Library of Greece 2062
- [29] National Library of Greece
- [30] Sinaiticus 1293
- [31] Sinaiticus 1312

B. Reference books

- [32] **CHRYSANTHOS** of Madytos, Archbishop, *Θεωρητικὸν Μέγα τῆς Μουσικῆς* [Great Theory of Music], Trieste, 1832
- [33] **DMITRIEVSKIJ, Aleksej**, *Opisanie liturgitseskich rukopisej III*, Typika, Saint Petersburg, 1917 (= Hildesheim 1965)
- [34] **FOUNTOULIS, Ioannis**, *Τελετουργικὰ θέματα* [Ritual Issues], Athens, 2002
- [35] **GEDEON, M. I.**, *Ἱστορία τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ πενήτων 1453-1913* [History of the poor servants of Christ 1453-1913], vol. II, Athens, 2010
- [36] **GEDEON, M. I.**, *Παιδεία καὶ πτωχεία παρ' ἡμῖν κατὰ τοὺς τελευταίους αἰῶνας* [Education and poverty in our land during the last centuries], Constantinople, 1893
- [37] **HADJIGIAKOU MIS, Manolis**, *Ἡ ἐκκλησιαστικὴ μουσικὴ τοῦ ἑλληνισμοῦ μετὰ τὴν ἄλωση (1453-1820)* [The ecclesiastical music of Hellenism after the fall of Constantinople (1453-1820)], Athens, 1999
- [38] **PATRINELIS, Christos**, *Protopsaltae, Lampadarioi, and Domestikoi of the Great Church during the Post-Byzantine Period (1453-1821)*, *Studies in Eastern Chant*, vol. III, London, 1976
- [39] **STATHIS, Gregorios, Th.** *Τὰ χειρόγραφα Βυζαντινῆς μουσικῆς - Ἅγιον Ὄρος* [The manuscripts of Byzantine Music – Mount Athos], vol. I, Athens, 1975