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ABSTRACT

The Byzantine musical notation and its right performance have been discussed already during the second half of the 15th century. Chrysanthos of Madytos refers to the says of Ioannes Trapezountios, who in the mid-18th century supported that the long musical teaching made it complicated and that it was indispensable to have a notational system easier and simpler. Some years after the death of Petros Peloponesios, at the end of the 18th century, Agapios Paliermos, after having spent several years in Europe where he was studying the Western music, presented two notational methods, the first one based on the staff notation and the second one alphabetical. However, the reactions against Agapios’ staff

* This text was initially a scientific paper to the International Medieval Congress of the Leeds University (2012).
system - mainly came from Iakovos protopsaltes - have not permitted its essential adoption. Iakovos protopsaltes has been the major obstacle to the application of his system. According to Chrysanthos of Madytos’ testimony two facts are referred as the impediments: a. Iakovos has never been persuaded that the Byzantine notation had to be changed and b. his ironical and satirical behavior towards Agapios, his person and his teaching method frustrated the creator of the new notational system. Agapios’ attempt does not have to be considered as a self-centered movement in order to discredit and eliminate the traditional Byzantine notational system and to impose his own method. His attempts on notational reform have not been fruitful because they have been really radical, while, on the contrary, the new analytical method, which has finally been chosen, was a bright system with several elements of the staff notation occurring beneath the Byzantine signs. Nevertheless, Agapios’ notational systems, clearly turned towards the Western notation and the Ancient Greek music, have been the beginning of sequence of analogous attempts of the 19th century, such as the notational system of Georgios Lesvios, the alphabetical systems of Bucharest and the one of Paisios of the Monastery of Xeropotamos, or the attempts to harmonize the Byzantine chant and, clearly, the whole „musical issue“ of the beginning of the 20th century.
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The Byzantine musical notation and its right performance were already discussed during the second half of the 15th century, according to the testimony of Manuel Chrysaphes. Indeed, he notes in the Preface of his treatise: „thus, the science of chanting does not consist only of *parallage* as some of the present generation imagine but includes many other methods […]. If someone were to say, ‘I have composed a melody which does not lack notes – not a single note is missing which ought to be there – and it is really correct and sound in its use of *parallage* so that nothing is absent nor any other element needed for perfection’, we must consider that such a person thinks and speaks wrongly and he has deviated from the correct principles of the science. […] For, if he were right, as in his ignorance he would probably claim to be, there would have been no need for Ioannes Glykys to have composed methods for the *theseis* in chanting and after him for the maistor Ioannes to have composed another method and the chanted signs, and after him for Korones to have composed the other two methods of the *kratemata* and the other for the *stichera“67. From this testimony,

67 D. Conomos (ed.), *The Treatise of Manuel Chrysaphes, the Lampadarios, Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae, Corpus Scriptorum de re Musica II*, Wien 1985, 38-41. See also, Chrysanthos of Madytos, *Θεωρητικὸν Μέγα τῆς Μουσικῆς*, Trieste 1832, XLVI, 69: „Επὶ τῶν χρόνων Μανουήλ τοῦ Χρυσάφου ἀνέφανησαν διδάσκαλοι τῆς Μουσικῆς, λέγοντες, ὅτι συνίσταται τὸ πᾶν τῆς Μουσικῆς εἰς τὴν
but also from the following teaching about the *theseis*, it can be testified that already during the period of action of Manuel Chrysaphes, the stenographic character of the notation and the long content of the musical formulas began to be obscure and the metrophonic dimension of the compositions began to be displayed by some who „held certain erroneous views about it”.

At the end of the 15th and the beginning of the 16th century, another composer, Akakios Chalkeopoulos from Crete appeared. His autograph manuscript, conserved in the National Library of Greece under the number 917, dated around 1500 according to the watermarks, contains an *Anastasimatarion*, several chants from *Sticherarion* and *Eirmologion*, a short Anthology and among others a particular treatise, which consists, probably, the first attempt of analysis – and perhaps transcription – of the Byzantine notation. The term „exegeses”, „theseis olographes” and „aproroes exegemenes” appeared in the treatise of Akakios Chalkeopoulos for the first time in the Byzantine musical terminology. Much more interesting, although obscure, is the following note on the f. 15r of his manuscript: „Because some of the teachers of the Music Science said about my shapes that when I will be dead the shapes will be preserved by my students, because they know and perform them; but when my students will be dead the shapes will be motionless and inactive, because nobody from the teachers knows how to perform them. So, now in my last years I changed my mind and I transformed the shapes in the text; and the text asks for the shape”.

---


70 ΕΒΕ 917, f. 15r: „Ἐπειδὴ τινὲς διδάσκαλοι τὸν (sic) τῆς μουσικῆς ἐπιστήμης διηγήσαντο περὶ τῶν σχήματος μου, ὅτι ἀπόντος καὶ μαθητῶν μου· ἀπόθανόν τε καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν μου, διαμένουσι τὰ σχήματα εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς μου· ὡς τὰ γνῶσκοντι καὶ ἀποθανόντων δὲ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν μου, διαμένουσι τὰ σχήματα αἰκίνητα καὶ ανενέχφητα. Διότι οὐδεὶς τῶν διδάσκαλον γνώσκει να τὰ ψάλει, Νῦν (sic) δὲ ἐμεταμελήθηκα ἐν τοῖς ὑστέροις μου καὶ ἐτέρω τὰ σχήματα εἰς τὸ κείμενον· καὶ τὸ κείμενον ἐρεθί τὸ σχῆμα. Καὶ ὅσως διδάσκαλος ἀναπτήσα (sic) καὶ
note means a kind of notational analysis, it remains obscure, especially relating to the terms „shapes” and „text”. The abovementioned testimony becomes more interesting – or challenging – if it is related to a following koinonikon composition and its title supposing a kind of arrangement: „the same koinonikon composition named voulgara, renamed Frankish by the composer of the shapes. It is organikon (instrumental) and its music is unified with the tenor; the first and great performer has to chant it alone without others, and he has to perform the part of the tenor also alone when it is appropriate, so, he has to leave the text and move to the tenor part, and again to leave the tenor part and go to the text; it is true that if someone can perform it without mistake he is a great performer”71.

This title at least implies a different musical education, as the term „Frankish” indicates, but also the instructions for the performance of the chant indicate a distinguished musical practice72. Apparently, these two testimonies have not been necessarily related to each other; nevertheless, if their significance is connected, Akakios probably could be considered as the first of a group of musical writers who suggest a more or less Western type of analysis of the notation, with a „transformation of the shapes”, i.e., the theseis, to „text”, i.e., in a form much more simple. This however is a matter that would require independent inquiry.

During the 16th century, another notational attempt followed, this time with a clear direction towards the western musical notation. Ieronymos Tragodistes, a Cypriot musician, whose action is dated between 1520 and 1560, after his staying in Italy and his learning period with the known teacher of music Gioseffo Zarlino73, has written in about 1556/7 a

βούλεται ψάλλειν τὸ κείμενον λέγει τὰ πάντα ἀσφαλῶς, ὡσπερ ψάλλεται καὶ τὸ ἐμὸν στιχεράριον· καὶ οὕτως διαλαμβάνεται”.

71 ΕΒΕ 917 f. 148v: „τὸ αὐτὸ κοινωνικὸν ἤ βουλγάρα μετόνομασθείσα φράγγικον παρὰ τοῦ ποιοῦντος τὰ σχήματα. Ἐστιν δὲ καὶ ὀργανικὸν καὶ ἔχει τὸ μέλος ἴδιον ἰδιόν ῒνωμένον (sic) μὲ τὸ τενόρε, να τὸ ψάλλη ὁ πρῶτος καὶ μέγας τεχνήτης (sic) μόνος τὸν δίχος συντροφία· καὶ μόνος τὸν νὰ κάμη καὶ τὸ τενώρε εἰς τὸν τόπον ὅπου τὸ ζητά (sic) ἢγουν νὰ ἀφήνη τὸ κείμενον καὶ νὰ κάμη τὸ τενώρε, καὶ πάλι (sic) ναφήτη (sic) τὸ τενώρε νάχχετε (sic) στὸ κείμενον· ἀλήθως ἔχει πάνυ τὴν ἀκρίβη (sic) ὅστις βρεθῇ τεχνήτης νὰ μπορέσῃ (sic) νὰ τὸ ψάλη δίχος (sic) σφάλµα”. Gr. Stathis, “Διπλοῦν μέλος’. Μια παρουσίαση τῶν περιπτώσεων ‘Λατινικῆς Μουσικῆς’ στὰ χειρόγραφα Βυζαντινῆς Μουσικῆς”, vol. Τιμή πρὸς τὸν διδάσκαλο, Athens 2000, pp. 665-666.

72 See also, E. Giannopoulos, Ἀνθήση 85-86.
theoretical treatise\textsuperscript{74}. The whole essay consists of an obvious effort to totally reform the notation, with adoption of the staff notation and perhaps also of western polyphony. Although older scientists have suggested that this treatise could help towards the understanding of the Byzantine notation and its supposed diatonic character, probably because of the assignment of the two notational systems, related evidence has not been produced\textsuperscript{75}. Ieronymos has chosen the Byzantine theoretical structure in order to be followed by the Byzantine specialists, to whom he wanted it to be addressed. However, this did not happen, surely because these specialists have not been ready for such a radical change and, also, because the treatise of Ieronymos has not been edited, as he wished according to the letter in the preface, in which the writer seems to dedicate his work to an anonymous Cardinal demanding financial support for his edition\textsuperscript{76}. In the same dedicative letter, one can distinguish the reasons that led Ieronymos to such a radical proposition. He clearly says that from his childhood he had followed the teaching of the older compositors and teachers, but he concluded that his contemporaries did not know the performance of the signs or the content of the theseis, although they used them, because of their negligence. They also lost happiness because of the same reason and the only way to re-find it is to chant to God. He also says that he was moved, apparently to invent another notational system, by pious thought and divine motivation. He finally proposes to apply another


\textsuperscript{75}Strunk, „A Cypriote“ 102; Panayiotakes, „Griechische Musiker“ 146. Gr. Th. Stathes, „Ἡ παλαιὰ βυζαντινὴ σημειογραφία καὶ τὸ πρόβλημα μεταγραφῆς τῆς εἰς τὸ πεντάγραμμον“, Βυζαντινά 7 (1975), 193-220; idem, Αναγραμματισμοὶ 56.

\textsuperscript{76}B. Schartau, Hieronymos, pp. 34-38. Agapetos, „Ἱερώνυμος” 291.
notation using almost all the old signs and some others that he has invented. It is clear that Ieronymos had to confront to the following problem: because of the stenographic character of the notation, the musicians of his time ignored the content of the musical formulas and even the right performance of the phonetic signs, which led to a wrong performance of the chants. Consequently, Akakios and Ieronymos, in two different areas under Venetian occupation, Crete and Cyprus, almost during the same period, have to face the same problem: the specific Byzantine stenographic notation has begun to be obscure and forgotten, a fact leading to the wrong music performance.

In the time in-between Ieronymos Tragodistes and Balases the priest, it seems that there are no other attempts at notational reform, either towards a simplification of the Byzantine notation or towards an adaptation of the Western system. Balases the priest and his followers, pointing toward the right performance of the chant through the appropriate use of the notation, tried to write in a more analytical way, or to transcribe some of the compositions. Chrysanthos of Madytos refers to the words of Ioannes Trapezontios, who in the mid-18th century supported that the long musical teaching made things complicated and that it was indispensable to have a notational system which was easier and simpler. Ioannes Trapezontios was the first compositor who used a

77 B. Schartau, Hieronymos, pp. 34-38: „Τούτους [τοις παλαιοίς διδασκάλοις] ἐγὼνε τοίνυν παιδώθεν κατ’ ἰχνος ἐπόμενος, τὴν οὐδὰν δὲ παρ’ ἡμῖν ἡσυχίῳς μονουκῆν ἐπιστήμην διὰ τῶν ἐνταῦθοι χαρακτήρων, τὰ τε κατ’ αὐτὴν ἐμπίπτοντα θεασάμενος ἀτοπο, μῆτοιγε διὰ τὴν τῶν προτέρων μὲν αὐτὴν ἀμέλειαν συστησάντων (καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ μὲν, ὡς προούθηκαν, σὺν ἀμα πάσι τοῖς ἄλλοις μαθήμασι, καὶ ταύτην καλῶς συστησάμενοι μεθοδικῶς συνετάζαντο), διὰ δὲ μᾶλλον τὴν τῶν καθ’ ἡμᾶς τε καὶ πρὸ μικροῦ τοῦ καθ’ ἡμᾶς τῶν χρόνον, ἀλλὰ ἄλλους γε χοιρισμένου αὐτῆς, μητ’ ὀλίγου τῆν φύσιν εἰδότων, μητ’ ὀλίγων’ ὡς χρωμένως τῶν τοῖς ἐπιλοίποις σημείων, καίτοι τούτοις αὐτοῖς ἀπάντων χρωμένων: [ἡν] ὃντας ὡς αὐτὺς σὺν ἀμα πάσι ἄλλοις μαθημασί τε καὶ εὐδαιμονίας ἀέλτως ἀπολωλέκειμεν (ἀμαρτάσεις ἡμῶν ταῖς ἡμετέραις), ἀν ἀπολολαυκότεν μέχρι πολλοῦ, ταῦτα ἀπολωλέκειμεν διαστείμην πάντων· καθελεξτεν τε νομίσας εἰναι καὶ τῶν ἀμα πάντων ἐπαχθεστάτων, καὶ εἰ μή ταύτην ἀνακτησώμεθα, ἵνα ὡς μὲ τὸ θείον (ὡς ἐρρέθη) δοξαλογῆσαι ἀκαταπαύστως, μηδὲ μᾶς δ’ ὡς ἀν εἰ τε ὄντων ἀλλαχείας, τῶν πη μὲν ὄντων, πη δὲ ὄντων, μᾶλλον δ’ οὐδ’ ὡς (ἐι θείον έπειν) ὄντων δοξής, θεία τινι δ’ ἐπινόια καὶ ζῆλο, πρὸς ταύτ’ ἀμφιθην, τοῦ κατὰ τὴν προσυστησάντων αὐτὴν ταύτην (ὡς εὔχαμι) τὴν ἐπιστήμην γνώμην, διαθύσωσθαι τα καὶ κατ’ εἰπεῖν ἀναλεύσασθαι, καὶ τούτων ἀπάντων ἐσχατον ἐκτεταμένον ταύτην, εἰ δυνατόν. […] Εξείργασται γὰρ μοι τὸν ώς οὕνες ἐχον· ἀν τοῦς πολυμαθεστόν ἡμετέρους πηρογῶν τα ἀμα καὶ διδασκάλων (οὔ πλείστην οὐδα πάσι τὴν χάμον) μωσικὴ ἐπηρόθῃ καὶ τοῖς σφόντοις τῶν πη μὲν πᾶσι σχεδόν χρωμένων σημείων (οὐ γὰρ μοι καλὸν ἔδωκεν εἴναι ὀλίγως τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς μετακινεῖν τοῦ Φεοδοῦ)· πλὴν ὀλίγων προστεθεμένων τινῶν, της τούτων διανοίας παραχωμένου συντεθεμένων".
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simpler version of the Byzantine notation, being the father of the exegeses, i.e. notational analysis. This analytical version of the notation was initially imitated and later developed by Petros Peloponnesios who “almost arrived to transform the musical signs from symbols to letters".

Some years after the death of Petros Peloponesios, at the end of the 18th century, Agapios Paliermos, after having spent several years in Europe – probably in Livorno of Italy – where he was studying the Western music in order to come back to “enlighten” the other Greeks, arrived in Constantinople and appeared to Patriarch Gregorios. He then exposed the disadvantages of the Byzantine notation, in all probability putting forward its stenographic character and the instruction’s complexity. Apparently, his notational method was based on the staff notation, however, as it was also noticed without the “deficiencies" of the Western notation. One could conclude that Agapios made a kind of adaptation of the western system to the Byzantine needs. Unfortunately, there is no copy of his first system or pieces transcribed, and the study of his system is not possible. The result of his presentation to the Patriarch was that the Patriarch was persuaded and he decided that Agapios’ notational system had to be taught, and that the chanters of the Patriarchate were obliged to learn and use it.

78 Chrysanthos of Madytos, Θεωρητικόν, XLVIII-XLI, 75: „έπρεπε να σηκωθή από τα ποιήματα των έκεινη η δια το πολυχρόνιον δυσκολία της διδάξεως και μεταδόσεως της Ψαλμωδίας […] και να συστήθη σύστημα χαρακτήρων απλούστερων, μεθοδικότερων και στοιχειώδεις, δι’ ου να είναι δυνατόν να γράφηται κάθε είδος μελωδίας, και να μεταδίδεται απαρασαλεύτως. Όθεν εν έτει αφ’ όντα υπό του φιλομούσου Κυρίλλου, τα της Πατριαρχείας τότε διατηρούμενα πολυέλεον, δοξολογίων και κοινωνικῶν κτλ., μετεχειρίσθη τρόπον τοῦ γράφειν, ὧν να τιμίηται ο μαθητής αὐτοῦ Πέτρος”.

79 Chrysanthos, Θεωρητικόν XLIX-L, 76-77: “σχεδόν έφθασεν εἰς τό να φέρῃ τοὺς μουσικοὺς χαρακτήρας απὸ συμβόλων εἰς γράμματα”.

80 Chrysanthos, Θεωρητικόν LI, 78, note α: „Οὕτως περιήλθε τὴν Εὐρώπην ἐπιταυτόν, διὰ να διδαχθή την μουσικὴν τῶν Εὐρωπαίων ἐντελῶς ἐπειτα να ἔλθει εἰς τὴν Ἐλλάδα, να ὁμογενεῖ τοὺς ὁμογενεῖς του κατὰ τοῦτο. Ὡθεν αἱ οὔ ἐνεδεναμωθῆ ἀρκετά εἰς τὴν εἰρημένην μουσικὴν, ἦλθε εἰς τὸ Άγιον Ὀρος ὁ τῆς σημείωσεν ἐπεὶ εἰς τὴν ἔκφρασην ἀποτυχὼς δὲ καὶ ἤλθε εἰς τὸν Ιερώνυμον 7ον […]”.

81 About the person and the life of Agapios Paliermos, see, Chrysanthos, Θεωρητικόν L-LII; Papadopoulos, Συμβολή 316 and note 1101; Gr. Stathis, «Εσωτερική Σημειογραφία και οι γενόμεναι μεταγραφαί της», in Διονυσίου Α. Ψαρινού, 183 Εκκλησιαστικοί Τίμοι εἰς Βυζαντινήν και Ευρωπαϊκήν Παρασημαντικήν, Ίδρυμα Βυζαντινής Μουσικολογίας, Αθήνα 2004, όμως; G. Plemmenos, Το μουσικό πορτρέτο του Νεοελληνικού Διαφωτισμού, Athens 2003, 69-102.
Firstly, the fact that the Patriarch accepted Agapios’ radical system is really impressive and could be explained by two factors: a. firstly, the complexity and difficulty of the Byzantine notation has been a fact accepted by the composers and, consequently, known by the Patriarch. As the known attempts at a notational analysis or simplification of the notation already began in the 17th century, we could suppose that the problem was evident at the end of the 18th century. b. Secondly, as the ideas and the concepts of the Enlightenment influenced the thought of the scholars, they believed that Greeks would reveal their national identity through a turn towards the Ancient Greek Culture and towards the West82. The same reason led a little later to the choice of the notational reform of the Three Teachers, known as New Method of Byzantine Notation, and to the rejection of the notational attempt of Apostolos Konstas, which has been more traditional and directly related to the old stenographic notation. One more time in this case a notational system with several Western elements, as the syllabic \textit{parallege}, covered under Byzantine signs was chosen83.

Agapios’ attempt on notational reform was the result of the analogous movements that had begun almost three centuries earlier and its reason was the complexity and the stenographic character of the Byzantine notation, to which many persons could not confront, and consequently they began to forget the right performance of the signs and the stenographic musical formulas.

However, the reactions against Agapios’ staff system – which mainly came from Iakovos protopsaltes – did not permit its essential adoption. Blamed by the failure of his method, but also his attempt on notational reform, Agapios left Constantinople and, probably, went to a European city in order to study Western music further. He had to work more on his system and perhaps invent another more appropriate one,


apparently persuaded that the failure has been caused by some weaknesses of his method. Until 1815, the year of his death in Bucharest, he went back to Constantinople twice, suggesting another notational system, this time based on the Greek alphabet, an attempt which was not successful.

Besides, it is impressive that Agapios’ alphabetical system, although not used in Constantinople, was supported in Europe and a Doxology written according to his notational system was printed in Vienna in 1813 by Leopold Ground’ Printing House. On the first page of the edition it is written: „Doxology in third mode composed by Agapios Paliermos from the island of Chios according to the newly invented Greek tones”. Respectively, the title of the composition is: „Doxology in third mode composed by Agapios Paliermos and characterized [written] according to the diagram of his own system”. It is evident that Agapios, after his initial turn towards the Western staff notation, tried a second turn towards the other center of interest of the Ideas of the Enlightenment, the Ancient Greek culture, and he invented a notational system based on the Greek alphabet. This is also testified by the phrase „Greek tones” used on the first page, but also by the use of the word „tropos” instead of the term „echos”. According to Agapios’ alphabetical system the composition is divided in meters. This composition starts with the letter M, probably used as a kind of key or the initial note; mainly the consonants of the Greek alphabet were used, replacing the phonetic signs of the Byzantine notation, other letters (usually the letter δ) in a smaller dimension is used probably indicating quality signs or generally a different expression, one, two or three lines underline some of the letters, probably as an indication of the time and the score is completed by points and commas. Agapios’ two notational systems resolve the two essential problems of the Byzantine notation: first, its stenographic character does not exist anymore and, second, the inability

84 Chrysanthos, Θεωρητικών Ι, note α.: „αποτυχών δέ, μετέβαλε τὸ σύστημα, καί ὅταν ἦλθε τὸ δεύτερον καὶ τὸ τρίτον εἰς Κωνσταντινούπολιν, μετεχειρίζετο τὸ Ἀλφάβιτον”.
85 See Gr. Stathis, „Εισαγωγή” φμδ’. A photo of the title page and the first page of a Doxology have been provided to me by the colleague and friend Achilleas Chaldeakes. I have to thank him also from here.
86 See the title page: „ΔΟΞΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΤΡΙΤΟΥ ΤΡΟΠΟΥ ΣΥΝΤΕΘΕΙΣΑ ΥΠΟ ΤΟΥ ΜΟΥΣΙΚΟΛΟΓΙΩΤΑΤΟΥ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ ΑΓΑΠΙΟΥ ΠΑΛΙΕΡΜΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΧΙΟΥ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟΥΣ ΥΠ’ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΝΕΩΣΤΕ ΕΠΙΝΟΗΘΕΝΤΑΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟΥΣ ΤΟΝΟΥΣ”. See also the title of the composition in the first page as following: “ΔΟΞΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΕΙΣ ΤΡΙΤΟΝ ΤΡΟΠΟΝ ΣΥΝΤΕΘΕΙΣΑ ΠΑΡΑ ΤΟΥ ΜΟΥΣΙΚΟΛΟΓΙΩΤΑΤΟΥ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ ΑΓΑΠΙΟΥ ΠΑΛΙΕΡΜΟΥ ΧΙΟΥ, ΚΑΙ ΧΑΡΑΚΤΗΡΙΖΕΙΣΑ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟ ΔΙΆΓΡΑΜΜΑ ΤΟΥ ΙΔΙΟΥ ΣΥΣΤΗΜΑΤΟΣ”. 
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of the phonetic signs to indicate the same pitch has been precluded, as each letter indicates a stable pitch.

As it is mentioned above, the person most against the adoption of Agapios Paliermos’ notational system was Iakovos Protopsaltes, one of the more conservative individuals of his time and a real guardian of the traditional Byzantine notational system and generally of chant. Iakovos Protopsaltes has been the major obstacle to the application of his system. According to Chrysanthos of Madytos’ testimony, two facts are mentioned as impediments: a. Iakovos was never persuaded that the Byzantine notation had to be changed and b. his ironical and satirical behavior towards Agapios, his personality and his teaching method, frustrated the creator of the new notational system. This last notice of Chrysanthos creates a number of questions firstly about Agapios’ teaching approach, which was inappropriate and perhaps middling, but mainly about his accent. We could only imagine the strength of Iakovos’ reactions, which arrived to barrier the application of the patriarchal decision and led to the departure of Agapios. It was really unfortunate for Agapios that his attempt on notational reform coincided with the period when the first chanter of the Patriarchate was Iakovos, who ”was keeping the tradition, following the traces of his teachers and he has not content with the innovations”. Thus, ”he strongly fought Agapios’ reforming attempt and his European notation”. In the general innovative atmosphere of the 18th century Iakovos was known as an extremely traditional personality. His very known composition, the Doxastarion, is composed with analytical, simple and sticheraric theseis, as it is usually noted in the title, in order to compose a shorter chant, using all the old sticheraric theseis and the new

87 About his person and his life see, Chrysanthos, Θεωρητικόν ΛΙ-ΛΙΙ; Papadopoulos, Συμβολαι 315-316; Gr. Th. Stathes, „Ιάκωβος πρωτοψάλτης ο Βυζάντιος (+23 Απριλίου 1800)“, Επιστημονική Επετηρίς του Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών, Τιμητικές Αφήρωμα εις Ευάγγελον Δ. Θεοδώρου, ΑΒ’ (1997), 317-334; Ch. G. Patrinelis, “Συμβολαι εις την ιστορίαν του Οικουμενικού Πατριαρχείου. Α’ Πρωτοψάλται, λαμπαδάριοι και δομέστικοι της Μεγάλης Εκκλησίας (1453-1821)”, Μνημοσύνη 2 (1968-69), 64-93; Chatzeyiakoumes, Χειρόγραφα 49 and 97 notes 269-272; idem, Μουσικά Χειρόγραφα Τουρκοκρατίας (1453-1832), Athens 1975, 299-302.
88 Chrysanthos, Θεωρητικόν ΛΙ, 78: „Διὰ τὸ ακατάπειστον ὅμως τοῦ Πρωτοψάλτου Ἰακώβου, καὶ διὰ τὰς εἰρωνείας του πρὸς τὴν προφορὰν καὶ τὸν τρόπον διδάξεως τοῦ Ἀγαπίου, δὲν ἐγινε καρπός“. 
89 Chrysanthos, Θεωρητικόν ΛΙ, 78: „Ο δὲ διάδοχος τοῦ Δανιήλ Ἰακώβος ο Πρωτοψάλτης, ἀκριβῶς φυλάττων τὰ παραδεδομένα, τοὺς ἱερεύς ἐμμόνως βαίνειν τῶν διδασκάλων του, δὲν ἐχαμεν τόσον εἰς νεωτερισμόν“. 
90 Papadopoulos, Συμβολαι 315-316 note 1101.
Iakovos’ persistence to the tradition is indicated from this notice but also from his whole compositional practice. It is also evident that he derives his material from older compositional models according to the ancient practice of the imitation of the older compositors. This impressive composer has been charged to point out the weaknesses of Agapios Paliermos’ notational system and the inappropriate use of the staff notation for the Byzantine music. Apparently, Iakovos persuaded Agapios that his system was unfavorable for the writing and the teaching of the Byzantine chant and that perhaps he himself did not have the necessary knowledge to assign the truth of the wise observations of Iakovos protopsaltes, who has been a man of education and musical experience, and he decided to go to Europe in order to learn more about the European music.\textsuperscript{91}

Agapios’ attempt does not have to be considered as a self-centered movement in order to discredit and eliminate the traditional Byzantine notational system and to impose his own method. Chrysanthos refers to the fact that Agapios initially appeared to the Patriarch asking to correct the existing notational system, explaining the reasons which led to this attempt, or to invent another new system, or to keep Agapios’ system and to transcribe all the Byzantine compositions according to it\textsuperscript{93}. In other words he proposed to correct all the „faults” of the Byzantine notation, but firstly to explain the reasons leading to that, in order to not consider the correction as an arbitrary movement. As a second resolution, he proposed the adoption of another notational system, either his own system or another. The fact that he proposed the adoption of another system and not necessary his own system points out that he was acting in order to conserve the musical tradition through an easier notational system. The same intention is indicated by the fact that he considered the transcription of the

\textsuperscript{91} See for instance the introductory note in the manuscript 52/200 (f. 1r) of K. A. Psachos Library, Doxastarion of Iakovos protopsaltes written by Anastasios Prikonessios round the end of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century: „Δοξαστικά τῶν δεσποτικῶν καὶ θεομητορικῶν ἑορτῶν καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐορταζόμενων ἄγιων καὶ τινὰ ιδιόμελα τοῦ Τριωδίου καὶ Πεντηκοσταρίου συντεθέντα κατὰ συντομώτερον τρόπον, ἐκ θέσεως στιχηρῶν τε καὶ εἰρμολογικῶν παρὰ τοῦ πρωτοψάλτου τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας κὺρ Ἰακώβου”.

\textsuperscript{92} Papadopoulos, Συμβολαί 316, note 1101.

\textsuperscript{93} Chrysanthos, Θεωρητικά Λι.: „[…] να διορθώσουμε τὸ Ἐκκλησιαστικόν σύστημα, δόντες τοὺς πρέποντας λόγους, ἢ νὰ ἐφεύρουμε ἄλλο νεώτερον, ἢ νὰ κρατήσουμε τὸ παρόν αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ἀγαπίου προσφερόμενον, καὶ κατ’ αὐτὸ νὰ μεταγράψουμε ὅλα τὰ ὅποια ἤξευρούσιν Ἐκκλησιαστικά μέλη”. 
whole Byzantine musical production to any other notational system, chosen in order to conserve the Byzantine musical tradition.

Agapios Paliermos' attempts on notational reform have not been fruitful because they have been really radical, while, on the contrary, the new analytical method, which was finally chosen, was a bright system with several elements of the staff notation occurring beneath the Byzantine signs. It has been a brilliant combination of the two notational systems, the staff and the Byzantine one. Nevertheless, Agapios' notational systems, clearly turned towards the Western notation and Ancient Greek music, have been the beginning of a sequence of similar attempts of the 19th century, such as the notational system of Georgios Lesvios, the alphabetical systems of Bucharest and the one of Paisios of the Monastery of Xeropotamos, or the attempts to harmonize the Byzantine chant and, clearly, the whole „musical issue” of the beginning of the 20th century
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