

coincidences avec les époques historiques connues, « le milieu et le troisième quart du XIX^e siècle », « la fin du XIX^e siècle », « le début du XX^e », la période de « l'entre-deux-guerres », la période « contemporaine » (1944–1979), cependant les éléments déterminants pour son adoption résident — comme nous l'avons déjà montré — dans l'évolution même de l'art de l'acteur, dans les mutations qui lui sont propres. Aussi bien l'auteur poursuit-il l'accumulation des nouveaux éléments qui amènent le changement d'équilibre et l'affirmation de nouvelles tendances stylistiques. Si jusqu'à la première guerre mondiale le développement est considéré comme unitaire, la période de l'entre-deux-guerres, apporte des diversifications se rattachant à la variété des courants littéraires, à la formidable explosion de l'art dans sa totalité. Parmi les plus intéressantes des tendances de l'époque se font jour à présent celles du théâtre d'avant-garde, analysées avec pertinence dans le sous-chapitre « Le théâtre d'avant-garde, une forme de protestation contre le théâtre ancien » (p. 201–208), où l'auteur expose les réticences existantes vis-à-vis des modalités expressionnistes, les tentatives de renouveler les moyens d'expression, dues plutôt à des metteurs en scène et insuffisamment adoptées par les acteurs, demeurés fidèles au théâtre psychologique.

L'auteur conclut en traçant les directions multiples et plurisémiotiques de l'art de l'interprétation actuel où les diversifications sont considérablement plus accentuées de nos jours, quand « l'art de l'acteur roumain accède < ... > à un langage nouveau, conditionné par la conception de la mise en scène, par la vision complexe sur l'œuvre dramatique, par le fait que l'acteur ne devait pas se limiter à une simple motivation psychologique d'un caractère dramatique < ... >. Les nouveaux espaces de jeu offerts à l'acteur, le changement des rapports acteur-public et la modification des moyens de communication avec le spectateur, la pénétration dans l'univers intérieur, substantiel de l'œuvre dramatique, en tant qu'*œuvre ouverte*, du personnage en tant que *personnage ouvert*, également, auront raison des inhibitions et des automatismes dans le jeu de l'acteur » (p. 255).

Actorul și vîrstele teatrului românesc est un ouvrage de référence pour tout ceux

qui désirent connaître le caractère spécifique et original de l'art scénique roumain, mais surtout pour ceux qui veulent pénétrer dans les arcanes de la création des acteurs, entendant par là que les confusions ne sont plus possibles entre l'art du théâtre et la littérature dramatique, puisque nous avons à faire, comme l'a dit un siècle plus tôt, le grand Caragiale, à deux arts différents, l'acteur étant à la fois *instrument* et *instrumentiste*, à la différence du poète qui, lui, est uniquement compositeur.

Ileana Berlogea

GHEORGHE CIOBANU, *Studii de etnomuzicologie și bizantinologie* (Studies in Ethnomusicology and Byzantinology), Bucharest, The Musical Publishing House, Vol. I, 1974, 444 p. Vol. II, 1979, 380 p.

The two volumes of *Studies in Ethnomusicology and Byzantinology* due to Gheorghe Ciobanu, are a first-rate analytical and documentary contribution to the study of several problems, which, in spite of their being really “of first importance”, are still nevertheless known by a few people still. The studies comprised in the two volumes have been conceived in and issued during a period of more than 30 years, i.e. they represent the author's lifelong efforts devoted to the specific problems raised by the Romanian folk music, by the Romanian music of Byzantine type, and by the beginnings of the Romanian music of Western type. Gheorghe Ciobanu dwells chiefly on the music reality, as it is offered by the extant documents — out of these several being quite novel — ; these documents are indeed at the core of all his “interpretations” and new points of view in a matter or another; his analyses, which are quite relevant in most instances, follow the example set by his great “mentor” and teacher, the late prof. George Breazu, founder, alongside of Constantin Brăiloiu, of today modern Romanian ethnomusicology.

The problems dealt with in the first volume are grouped around three main “tonal centres”, so to say : the origins of the Romanian folk music, and of its main structures; the real situation of Dimi-

the Cantemir's music inheritance within the framework both of European and of South-East-European music; the works due to the representatives of the Music School of Putna Monastery and, in this respect, the quite conspicuous Romanian character of their music, although it belongs to the Byzantine general music type, and the echoes throughout the various ages, of that same music. The titles of the studies are: *The Origins of the Romanian Folk Music*, *The Structure Relations between Verse and Tune within the Romanian Folk Song*, *National and Universal Aspects within the Old Romanian Folk Music*, *Old Musical Elements Extant within the Romanian and the Bulgarian Folk Music*, *The Connexions among the South-East-European Peoples as Shown within their Folk Music*, *The Folk Music and the Migration of Peoples*, *The Historical Criterion and the Study of the Folk Music Modes*, *The Chromatic Modes as Used in the Folk Romanian Music*, *The So-Called "Gipsy Scale"*, *The Town Folk Music*, *"Mugur, mugurel"* ("Bud, Little Bud"), *A Song in Anton Pann's Tune Collection*, *A Song by Dimitrie Cantemir in Anton Pann's Tune Collection*, *Novel Romanian Songs Coming from the Beginning of the 19th Century*, *Barbu Lăutarul (Barbu The <Arch-> Fiddler)*, *The Circulation of Tamboura within the Romanian Principalities in the Middle Ages*, *The Way the Romanian Folk Music has been Collected and Published*, *The Putna Music School*, *The Byzantine Musical Culture on Romania's Territory up to the 18th Century*, *The Romanian Psaltic MSS from the 18th Century*, *The Romanian Psaltic Music in the 17th—18th Centuries*, *The Origins of the Palm Sunday Kanon as Compiled by Dascălul Șarban (Șarban the Psalm-Reader)*, *Anton Pann and the "Romanization" of the Psaltic Chants*, *The Romanian Psaltic Music*, *A Four-Part "Kyrie Eleison" in Byzantine Notation Coming from the Beginning of the 18th Century*, *The Byzantine Music*.

The first of these studies deal with the origin of the Romanian folk music and of its elements of Dacian and Roman descent. Their greatest merit consists in their dwelling precisely on the extant documents, not on the abstract-sentimental desiderata; the author's perfectly justified conclusion in this respect reads: "The Romanian folk music on the one hand is

Dacian through its inherited musical basis and specific sensibility, whereas on the other is Latin, as well as the Romanian language itself, through its structural organization of the melody and rhythm and through the preference it clearly shows for certain intervals" (p. 12). This is the angle from which the author investigates the relations between the structure of the folk verse lines and the tunes they use. By means of a quite impressive set of musical quotations, the author shows the essential differences that occur between the system of the Romanian Folk song verse and those of the neighbour peoples, owing to the fact that "the structure of the melodic lines follows most closely the structure of the verse lines", whereas this latter structure "comes directly from the language itself, as its constituents are entirely built on the grammatical and phonetical rules of that same language" (p. 27). Therefore it is precisely the language that brings about two out of the most important aspects "of the national salient features of the folk music: a) the structure organization of the melody and rhythm; b) the singers' preference for certain musical intervals" (p. 35). As concerns the relations between the Romanian folk music and the Bulgarian one, the author shows both the resemblances and the essential differences between them; there were no mutual influences, but the taking over and the continuation in both of them of several elements coming from the Thracian substratum, interwoven later with other common elements coming either from the Byzantine music or from the Oriental one, brought by the Turks. As for the striking resemblances between various tunes belonging to peoples severed by lots of miles, the author shows that they are due to a great migration of peoples (proved and known as such by the historians); these migratory peoples have left as a "legacy" to the peoples that assimilated them several aspects of their folk culture including, too, their songs that have thus entered the cultural substratum of the respective peoples.

A specific problem, dealt with at length by the author is that of the folk musical modes, as there still persist even today a lot of various opinions and unsolved yet puzzles concerning them. The facts brought forward by Gheorghe Ciobanu show

most clearly that both the scales and the music built up out of the chromatic modes cannot be thought of as being exclusively Oriental; in fact there are three various strata of chromatic folk modes — a first one inherited from our ancestors, a second, probably coming from the Byzantine music and a third, which is indeed of Oriental descent. In the same respect, one must be aware that the so-called “gipsy scale” (which is a chromatic mode too) is really a “makam hissar”, widespread throughout all the Orient (and which has come to us through the tunes sung and played at the princes’ and the boyards’ courts) and not a true “gipsy scale” extant as such.

As concerns the town folk music, Gheorghe Ciobanu tries to make it get its true place within the general context of our folk musik taken in its whole as such. He uses a lot of documentary facts again, in order to fix up its main salient features — several of these documents being folk songs and dances collected by the author himself. In this respect a special analysis is devoted to the famous revolutionary song, *Mugur, mugurel* (“Bud, Little Bud”) composed by Ilarion, Bishop of Argeş, chief counsellor of Tudor Vladimirescu, leader of the 1821 Revolution; the song has undergone indeed a most stupendous evolution and spreading, being sung in the 1848 Revolution and written down in the collections of Anton Pann and D. Vulpian, arranged by George Dima, and then sung again both by the peasants during their famous 1907 uprising against the boyards and the revolutionary workers underground communist fighters. Another song, *Cînd eram mai tinerică* (When I was younger), coming from the town stock enjoyed a most interesting circulation, as it can be found not only in the collections of Anton Pann, I. A. Wachmann, D. Vulpian, but is “alive” even today, as the author has recently collected a variant of it from a fiddler-informant from the village of Clejani — thus this tune has been circulating for a period exceeding even 100 years.

The second section of Volume I deals with Dimitrie Cantemir’s activity as a composer. The well-known reigning Prince of Moldavia was also famous all over the world for his outstanding merits as a historian, writer, forerunner of ethnography and thinker. Gheorghe Ciobanu shows

that one cannot think about his musical compositions as belonging solely to the Turkish music, as Dimitrie Cantemir’s tunes show indeed most clear affinities with our fiddlers’ music, as well. This way, it is but quite natural that some of his tunes have been found in circulation on the Romanian Principalities’ territory — such being the case of the melody *Vai ce ceas, ce zi, ce jale* (What a sad hour, what a sad day, what a woe !) from Anton Pann’s collection, thought of by him to be a variant of a Greek tune (as Cantemir’s melody has got, indeed a Greek text, too, *Ti megali simfora*), to which one might add *The Dervishes’ Air*, another tune due to Cantemir, and which had aroused even W. A. Mozart’s interest who used it in one of his works.

Other studies in the first volume deal with the circulation of other such folk tunes and motifs since the beginning of the 19th century onwards and with the life and deeds of the greatest representative of the folk Romanian fiddlers, Barbu Lăutarul (Barbu The <Arch-> Fiddler), according to the documents concerning the fiddlers since the earliest periods until today; in this respect, Gheorghe Ciobanu identifies and analyses several folk and popular songs and dances having once belonged to the repertoire of this most renowned fiddler.

A text in organology, dealing with the tamboura in our country is followed by a basic one, concerning the ways of collecting, commenting and harmonizing folk music in various periods. Gheorghe Ciobanu’s appreciations on them vary according to the merits or shortcomings in these collections and theoretical premises; this way, his appreciations are not mere reviews, but careful analyses. For instance, Anton Pann should be credited with the merit of having published “in full” the folk tunes and their texts, in spite of his undesirable alterations and interventions; Theodor T. Burada opens new ways to investigation, showing himself as a true forerunner of today ethnomusicology; Gavril Musicescu brings forth new ideas concerning the social and collective aspects of folk music, the necessity of writing monographs depicting folk music, divided on provinces and dialects, and the necessity of using modal chords and harmony when transcribing the folk tunes for two or more-part settings (here we must add

that Musicescu had in this respect a most worthy predecessor, Carol Miculi, Chopin's pupil); Dimitrie Vulpian's collection is matchless as concerns the richness of the gathered materials and the documentary interest it presents even to today's researcher, but, on the other hand, the notations in it are full of all kinds of serious shortcomings, e.g. in most instances, the folk rhythm is "simply mutilated" so that the respective tunes (with the exception of dances) can no longer be played; in general, the old collectors have not so much "collected", but "selected" the folk tunes, altering them, marking and directing their preference towards a genre or another, without indicating clearly the true origins of the tunes, either folk or popular ones.

The last section of Volume I is devoted to the Romanian music of Byzantine type. Gheorghe Ciobanu analyses it under various angles, and presents it, too, from a general point of view — a most necessary thing to do, as other people, very conversant with it such as I. D. Petrescu or Grigore Panțiru, have nevertheless confined themselves solely to the problems raised by the notation and the echoi.

Gheorghe Ciobanu shows the unjust and too rash character of the formerly made appreciation, that since our old Prince's chancellors used Slavonic as their official language, it would go without saying that our old music ought to have been Slavonic, too. This wrong assertion led to gross confusions and errors, which, unhappily, do still persist even today. These are due either to insufficient musical documentation and information or to preconceptions. Several investigations, out of which a great part have been carried on by the author himself, have lately allowed the author to discover that there existed on Romania's territory several real "Music Schools", where people practised a music which though of Byzantine type, had nevertheless got a lot of specific salient features of its own, which could not be found in the neighbour peoples' music, where the same Byzantine type was differently taken over. The most important of these "Music Schools" (as it was proved chiefly by Gheorghe Ciobanu, but also by other researches — George Breazul, for instance although he had not at hand the capital documents, i.e. the extant MSS, long believed to be only

seven, but whose number recently came to nine by the investigations of J. Raasted and D. Conomos,¹⁾ is that from the Putna Monastery. Some researchers from abroad, such as Raina Palikarova-Verdeil have claimed these MSS as mere reproductions due to Bulgarian psaltae having taken refuge to Moldavia. It has been possible to assert them their right place only after the minute and sustained investigations of Radu Pava, Gheorghe Ciobanu, Anne E. Pennington (Great Britain) as they proved, beyond any doubt, that these MSS are, by no means, mere reproductions or at the most creations by some Bulgarian psaltae, fled to Moldavia, but on the contrary, they really stand as musical works of Byzantine type, due to several Romanian composers, of the period of Prince Stephen the Great and of his immediate successors; these composers had created a specific style of their own, in Byzantine music, and had turned the Putna Monastery into a centre where a lot of people from the neighbour countries came to learn psaltic music. Among them one might quote, above all, Evstatie the Protopsaltes, and then Paisie, Antim, Agathon, Agalian, Stephen, Longin, Josaphat, Anthony the Protopsaltes. Further proofs to that effect are furnished by the mentions in the Russian books devoted to church music, where their creations are most clearly termed *raspev putnevskii* (Putna chants). The author deals then with the length and duration of this Romanian music of Byzantine type, until the 18th century; here he insists, most rightly, upon the merits as a composer of Filothei, the former chancellor of Prince Mircea the Old, and the creator of a new species of psaltic monodic anthems-hymns, the *Pripele*. Then the author either turns back to the Putna Music School or goes on dealing with the printings of psaltic music, with the Bucharest Music School extant during the reign of Prince Constantin Brâncoveanu which had, in its turn, produced another great Romanian composer of Byzantine music, Filothei sin Agăi Jipei (Filothei, Son of Agha Jipa, "agha" meaning "police prefect"), followed in the former half of the 18th century, by Ioan sin (son of) Duma Radului Brașoveanu, by Dascălul Șărbăn Protopsaltul (Șărbăn the Psalm-reader & Protopsaltes), and, finally, with the last important Music School

preceding the 1814 reform of psaltic mussic, viz. The Neamț Monastery Music School, whose greatest representative was Iosif Monahul (Joseph the Monk). As concerns the Romanian psaltic MSS, coming from the 18th century, Gheorghe Ciobanu analyses seven of them, as they comprise valuable works due to the very gifted Romanian composers, mentioned above. Using always the data furnished by the documents, the author makes several important specifications in this respect, showing that, in spite of its becoming the official language in the Romanian princes' chancelleries during the Middle Ages, Slavonic never played the same leading role in the Romanian church chants; in fact our psaltae sang far more in Greek than in Slavonic, to say nothing of the fact that the Putna music was wholly of Byzantine type, whereas the intervals chiefly used (the major 2nd, the minor 3rd and the perfect 4th) were but those preferred by the Romanian folk music, too, i.e. their so frequent use was due, beyond any doubt, to the influence of the psaltae's mother tongue, the Romanian language. A somewhat slower process was that of the "Romanization" of the chants, i.e. of their adaptation to the Romanian words. Gheorghe Ciobanu rejects most rightly some researchers' taking over *tale quale* of the erroneous opinion of Bishop Melchizedek, concerning the would-be "Bulgarian" character of some of the ancient Byzantine-Romanian chants; he analyses in this connexion the *Palm Sunday Kanon* attributed to Dascălul Șărbăni. Having the documents at hand the author makes here a most important specification: no Romanian psaltae have ever sung a "Bulgarian" chant, as they have always indeed sung Byzantine ones instead or some creations of their own of Byzantine type; only the *language* they used in some instances was the Palaeoslavonic (or the Mediobulgarian). As concerns the "Romanization" of the chants, i.e. their full adaptation to the prosodic requirements of our language, after the first attempts in this respect due to Filothei sin Agăi Jipei and to Ioan sin Radului Duma Brașoveanu, a special mention deserves the decisive contribution brought by the two pupils of Peter of Ephesus that have imposed the 1814 reform of the psaltic music on Romania's territory, namely Macarie Ieromonahul (Macarie the Hiero-

Monk) and Anton Pann, followed by Dimitrie Sucevanul. They have "remade" and adapted the Greek melodic line to that effect. Moreover, Anton Pann "has translated and composed again all the chants that were to be sung in the lecterns — a tremendous achievement never attempted at either before or after by anybody" (p. 320), called by him an effort "to Romanize" the chants; it was he who had given the chants their form still used today in Romania, as he had ensured indeed, owing to his advanced aesthetical views, "a close connection between the text and the melody" (p. 322), by simplifying several excessive ornaments and chromaticisms. Gheorghe Ciobanu shows then that our church tradition is above all, *Latin* (as it is proved by the terms used until today, which are most of Latin origin), although our chancellery and church official language was for a while the Slavonic (which has left, too, several terms still in use); however, while adopting Slavonic as their official language, the Romanians sang only "the Byzantine chants, in their Greek original language, or sometimes in Slavonic" (p. 331), without borrowing in this respect would-be "Slavonic chants". An ample analysis of all the changes and modifications of the Byzantine chants done by the Romanians comes afterwards to back these considerations in history. As concerns Transylvania, Gheorghe Ciobanu shows again by means of an ample analysis, that there existed some differences between the way of singing the chants there and that used in the other two Romanian Principalities, such differences occurring with some new aspects in the Banat, too (these were due, for Transylvania, to the Union with Rome in 1701, and for the Banat, to its subordination to the Karlovać Serbian archbishopric). A unique musical document, a quite "novel" one, is that four-part *Kyrie Eleison* in Byzantine notation, dating from the beginning of the 18th century, discovered and transcribed by Gheorghe Ciobanu. Here again the author considers solely the documents, rejecting justly the would-be "hypotheses" built by some people, about the choral church singing, without any documentary support! Finally, before closing Volume I, the author analyses the Byzantine music in its historical development, showing its relations with the ancient Hebrew music, with the

Gregorian-Catholic and the ancient Greek one, as far as we know them today, and — last not least — with the folk one; he presents then the genres, the notation, the melodic formulae, the echoi, the styles, the modifications that occurred in the course of time, the music for ceremonials, the connection with the folk music.

The same criteria have been retained in Volume II. It comprises the following studies: *The Romanian Folk Music, The Structure of the Romanian Folk Versification System; its Connections with the Latin Versification, Stratifications Extant in the Romanian Folk Music, On the Factors Facilitating the Evolution of the Folk Music, The Relationship between the Rhythm of the Dances and that of the "Colinde" (Carols), The "Colinde" and the Church Music, George Breazu's Contribution to the Development of the Romanian Ethnomusicology, The Contribution of the Ethnomusicology to the Correction of several Errors of Musicology Proper, Constantin Brăiloiu's Contribution to the Widening of the Tonal System Concept, The History of the Modes-Classification, The Antiquity of the Chromatic Genre within the Byzantine Music, The New-Style Song in the Folk Creation, Revolutionary and Patriotic Songs of the 1848 Year, Peasant and Town Folk Musical Creations Connected with the Independence War, B. Romberg's "Caprice" and the Moldavian Song "Mititica" (Little Wench), Byzantine Music and "Cîntece de lume" (Secular Love Songs), in Psaltic Notation Comprised in MSS, coming from Oltenia, The Musical MSS in Byzantine Notation Extant Today in Romania, The Study of Byzantine Music in Romania, Contemporary Problems and Concerns in the Romanian Musical Palaeography, The Relations between Text and Melody in the Romanian Psaltic Music, The Relations between the Romanian Liturgical Music and the Byzantine Music, The "Pripele" by Filothei Monahul, The Putna MSS and Some Problems of the Romanian Mediaeval Culture, The Putna Musical MSS and the Problem of the Romanian-Bulgarian Musical Relations During the Middle Ages, The MSS by Evstatie the Protopsaltes from Putna (1511).* By presenting the folk creations connected with an occasion or with none at all, the tonal system of the folk music, the rhythm of the folk pieces, the folk musical instruments, the most important folk musical genres, the unity

of the folk music due to that of the language it uses, the author dwells upon the great antiquity and continuity of our folk music, literature and customs which form together an image of the antiquity and continuity of our people's life on this territory. The structure of the Romanian folk versification system, based on accentuation is totally different from those of the neighbour peoples; for instance those of the Serbians and of the Bulgarians are based on the number of syllables and of inner caesuras, those of the Russians and of the Ukrainians use a system of accentuation fully different from the Romanian one, whereas that of the Hungarians is a quite specific one, based again on the number of syllables and of inner caesuras. Moreover, whereas our people use verse lines consisting of 8(7) or 6(5) syllables solely, the Russians and the Ukrainians use verse lines of 5—14 syllables, the Bulgarians and the Serbians have got verse lines of 4—16 syllables and the Hungarians use, in their turn, verse lines of 5—25 syllables. The Romanian versification is again different from those of the other Romanic peoples, but is very close, however, to that of Low Latin, based on the trochaic rhythm: the metrics of Low Latin and that of folk Romanian verse lines is quite the same, with very few and unimportant differences. After this, Gheorghe Ciobanu deals at length with the stratifications that have occurred in the course of time within the musical folk genres. As concerns the factors facilitating the evolution of the folk music from the "old" to the "modern" style and afterwards to its "new" one, Gheorghe Ciobanu deals with its "contact with the music of other peoples", with its "contact with the cultivated music", with "the interpenetration among various regional styles", with "the variation" and with "the contamination" (p. 27), and analyses them at length afterwards, as they determine indeed the new tendencies which assert themselves more and more conspicuously at first in the "modern-style" songs and then in the "new-style" ones. As concerns the "colinde" (carols), the author deals at first with the frequently occurring most close resemblances between the "colinde de urat" ("congratulation carols" — they are the oldest ones, dating from the pre-Christian era) and the ritual dances connected with a certain date; these close

resemblances are often quite surprising, leading even to identities as concerns their rhythm; the author's minute analysis of them and of the "so neatly conspicuous" metric-rhythmic formulae they imply, proves that there existed once a very remote common origin of both these genres, based on "a most ancient and unitary rhythmic background". The author then deals with the relations (so complex, indeed) between the "colinde" (carols) and the ancient Byzantine music and shows that closer resemblances can be detected between the carols and the Gregorian music or again between the carols and the ancient Byzantine music, whereas such resemblances cannot be found at all between the carols and the new psaltic music, resulting from the 1814 reform. The carols, both in their melodies and texts have got, as far as their oldest stratum is implied, ancestral, pre-Christian elements, i.e. modes, compass and formulae, both melodic and metric-rhythmic, related to those in the oldest Gregorian and Byzantine chants, as those latter ones did but continue a series of such elements, inherited from Antiquity, and whose origins could be found in the remotest folk songs once extant as such.

The study dealing with George Breazul's activity is perhaps the deepest and richest, analytically speaking, of all those that have ever been devoted to him and to his activity. Gheorghe Ciobanu deals at length with George Breazul's outstanding merits both as a musicologist and as an ethnomusicologist, as a creator of the first Phonogram Archives in Romania — other such Archives being created at a year's distance by Constantin Brăiloiu —, as a founder of a true "science of the Romanian music" (p. 120) and of "a modern Romanian musical pedagogy, grounded on the folk music", as a most careful and profound investigator of the sociological aspects of the folk music and of the influences and borrowings in it, as a most careful student in "the specific salient features of folk music" (p. 122) and in the comparative method, in the clearing up of the first-rate importance of the problems raised by the urging need of a most profound investigation of the "folk melodic formulae" (p. 123); the author shows here, too, George Breazul's affording the utmost care, in the deepest way possible, to the problems raised by the folk modes,

to the necessary elucidation of the Thracian origins of several aspects visible in various basic elements of the Romanian folk music, and, last not least, to the necessity of gathering as many "data, mentions, documents and monuments as possible, concerning the folk music" (p. 126).

Following the high standards set up by George Breazul and Constantin Brăiloiu, Gheorghe Ciobanu deals then with several errors still maintained in the today musicology; he shows these are due to several causes, such as the taking over, without due checking, of earlier made asseverations, the exclusive character of tonal-musical education, the neglect-disregard of the folk music by some people, the lack of adequate documentation, the lack of a broad historical outlook. These errors can be amended only by means of data offered by ethnomusicology, as these show that there are also folk modes that ignore the tonal succession by fifths, being built instead on fourths, on thirds and even on micro-intervals, that the modes said to have come from the Antiquity can also be met with, in the folk music of peoples that have never been into contact with the ancient Greeks and Romans, that the folk singers have never learnt singing in church, but on the contrary, it is the clergy that have learnt singing from them, that several chromatic modes are most ancient, that the pentatonic scales exist, quite independently, in the folk music of a lot of various peoples, that the folk polyphony has got a lot of specific salient features of its own, which put entirely out of question its alleged descent from the classics' counterpoint. As concerns Constantin Brăiloiu, Gheorghe Ciobanu shows his outstanding merits in imposing what the great Romanian ethnomusicologist has justly called "*la nécessité de l'élargissement du concept de système tonal*" by including in it, too, the rich folk modal scales. However, one should have preferred a more consistently drawn analysis in this respect, in order to better point out the first-rate contribution of the great Romanian ethnomusicologist in this matter. As Gheorghe Ciobanu is himself a well-known specialist in modes, he then deals at length with the ancient musical scales, either folk or cultivated, with the mediaeval ones, i.e. the Byzantine proper, the psaltic and the Gregorian ones and with the folk ones, detecting most accu-

rately the resemblances, but also the differences among them; he deals, too, with the classification of the modes (rejecting some unilateral previous views in this matter) and shows they must be thoroughly considered either in the cultivated or in the folk musical practice, owing to their great importance and to the fact that the latter practice has given birth to the former.

As for the folk music itself, Gheorghe Ciobanu begins by showing that the "new folk songs" are not, in fact, "entirely new creations, that have sprung together with the new texts, but ~~ones~~ tunes that have been sung previously too, and have been taken over as such" (p. 171), with some alterations, of course, — but these are quite unimportant; this holds good both for the new peasant songs and for the workers' ones. The new songs appear in various ways, i.e. either by a tune passing from a dialect into another or by means of borrowings — from neighbour peoples — and influences — as those depicted in Vol. I concerning the evolution from the "old-style songs" to the "modern-style" and then to the "new-style" ones. Although the melodies are in most instances old, they are nevertheless "transformed" in all possible ways, so that finally they are really "renewed" in several of their elements and "compartments". Further proofs in this respect are provided by the author's minute analysis of the main "revolutionary and patriotic songs" sung during the 1848 revolution, and, later on, of the folk songs connected with the 1877 Independence War (here we must add that this great historic event has had, among other things, also a lot of musical consequences, so that the year 1877 might be most justly termed "A Crucial Moment in the Evolution of the Romanian Patriotic Song" — this being indeed the title of a paper by us, dealing with it). Gheorghe Ciobanu dwells upon the very few true folk songs and dances, either of rural or urban origin, that have been written down and preserved, in various collections, out of the big output due to the 1877 patriotic enthusiasm. As for the old Moldavian song *Mititica* (Little Wench) and the alleged use of it by B. Romberg in his *Caprice for Violoncello and Piano*, Gheorghe Ciobanu having already minutely analysed the extant data, George Breazul's considerations about it, as

well as the score itself, shows most limpidly, by comparing and confronting B. Romberg's work and five variants of the song, extant either in printed form or in MSS, that this composer and virtuoso, although he might have played some *ad-hoc* improvisations on this theme in a concert, however, he has not included at all this song in his *Caprice*, but has built it around other three Romanian tunes, out of which one has made itself conspicuous later on as a patriotic song, under the title *Ștefan înaintea Cetății Neamțului* (Prince Stephen the Great in front of the Neamț Fortress). The last article in this series is a real "alarm signal" concerning the disappearance without traces of several old MSS, comprising both psaltic music and "cîntece de lume" (secular love songs), some of them being even holographs of Anton Pann's, widely described and analysed by the author, who also gives the transcriptions of some songs in them that could have been restored.

As in Vol. I, the last division of this second volume comprises studies in Byzantinology. Gheorghe Ciobanu draws our attention to several most precious MSS comprising Romanian music of Byzantine type, in Byzantine notation, unfortunately neglected until today, by the experts in the field. These MSS have got, in most instances, Greek texts: the Slavonic lines in them are but few, even in the MSS coming from the 15th century, a fact showing that there is indeed a real need for a certain revaluation of the alleged "exclusive role" attributed to Slavonic by some historians, concerning its aspects as an official and culture language in the Romanian Principalities during the Middle Ages. According to the evidence provided by the MSS coming from the 15th — 16th centuries, the people sang then in church "far more Greek texts than Slavonic ones" (p. 245), a most important fact, if one also takes into account the existence of the three, already mentioned, great "Music Schools". The first musicologists that have really carried on a true scientific work in this respect have been I. D. Petrescu, G. Breazul, I. D. Chirescu, G. Galinescu, Gr. Panțiru, S. Barbu-Bucur and Gheorghe Ciobanu himself. The turning to good account of the legacy left to us by our old composers of Byzantine type has become quite "urgent" of late,

owing to the demonstration of the existence of the Putna Music School, to the rejection of the groundless allegations concerning the would-be "Bulgarian" character of this School and of its music, to the presentation of several once renowned mediaeval Romanian composers, whose music was of Byzantine type, to the demonstration of the musical-cultural unity of the Romanians during the Middle Ages, to the clearing up of a lot of problems raised up by the form and style aspects used in the Byzantine music, and finally to the presentation of the oldest Romanian choral monument, that four-part *Kyrie Eleison* from the 18th century; in this respect several MSS have been catalogued, carded, recorded on photocopies and microfilms, although there are still, according to the author's asseverations, some other 1,000 such MSS that have not been yet investigated as such, to say nothing about those that have been carried abroad. Unfortunately musical palaeography is known only to few people even today, as it is not studied at all in the Conservatoires, so that there is a great want for experts in musical palaeography and mediaeval matters, not to say anything about the danger of losing all the ties with the today knowledge and skill in deciphering, transcriptions and analyses, which some older scientists still possess; the Romanian music of Byzantine type deserves indeed a far better fate, owing to its great richness and variety due to the specific salient features imposed on it by our great composers of psaltic music from the Middle Ages. As concerns the relations between text and melody within our music of Byzantine type, the author is searching for the reflection of the specific musicalness of our language into the melody, as well as the concordance between the text and the melody. These influences are visible chiefly in the Byzantine music that has been spread orally in the villages and has thus been greatly influenced by several specific salient features of our folk music so that the connection between music and the liturgical text is rather "loose" in it. Although less evident, these features can nevertheless be detected, in the printed or manuscript Romanian music of Byzantine type, too. Gheorghe Ciobanu's division of the chants with Romanian texts runs : a) translations with the tune maintained in

full as such; b) adaptations of melodies to the specific salient features of our language; c) creations proper, on Romanian texts. The author dwells chiefly on the third group of chants, analyzing at length the contributions in this respect due to Macarie Ieromonahul (Macarie the Hiero-Monk) and chiefly to Anton Pann, who have ensured a far closer and tighter connection between their texts and tunes. As concerns the relations between the Byzantine music proper and the Romanian music of Byzantine type, the author shows again that our church music has been sung both in Slavonic and in Greek, but chiefly in the latter, not in the former language; this fact became more and more obvious since the 15th century onwards. He rejects again the groundless efforts of some people at turning Evstatie and the other great Putna composers either into "Bulgarians" or into mere transcribers of "Bulgarian chants" (!!) as some researchers from abroad ventured to affirm. Gheorghe Ciobanu analyses minutely the Romanian specific or even the Romanian-dialectal salient features, present as such within the music of Byzantine type used or created on our country's territory. A problem already dealt with in the previous volume is considered now from a different angle in a most imposing study; the author has in view further analytical elements concerning the *Pripele* due to Filothei Monahul (Filothei the Monk) from the Cozia monastery, the first Romanian composer ever known and acknowledged as such by the Russian historian and scientist Yatsimirski, and afterwards by the Romanian scholars P. P. Panaiteescu and S. Teodor (= Tit Sime-drea); the author rejects the groundless asseveration of the later historian R. Constantinescu, who ventured in ascribing the *Pripele* to the Byzantine patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos, solely on the basis of a "preconceived" deduction and ignoring completely the essential fact the *Pripele* are not to be found at all among the Constantinople "received chants" proper, being sung only by the Romanians and by some neighbour peoples (Russians and Serbians), who use them, however, in forms greatly altered from the Romanian ones. Gheorghe Ciobanu rejects, too, the confusion made even by such renowned scientists as P. P. Panaiteescu, E. Piscu-pescu and N. Cartojan and by some musi-

cologists that have taken it over from them, between the *Pripele* and the *Polyeleos*, owing to their lack of suitable musical information. Gheorghe Ciobanu gives then several transcribed examples of *Pripele* and *Polyeleos*, showing, besides, that they are sung on different occasions and that there exist rather considerable differences between their melodies and texts; the documents show most limpidly that the *Pripele* have been maintained in a form very close to the original solely in Romania, i.e. in the mother country of their author, Filothei Monahul, whereas the Slavonic peoples (Russians, Serbians) that had taken them over submitted them to great alterations and changes. Gheorghe Ciobanu then dwells again on the merits of the Putna School of Music, in order to convey the reader a most limpid image of them, and points out chiefly to the great achievements of Evstatie the Protopsaltes as a composer. He rejects the allegations due to Stojan Petrov and Christo Kodov, who have developed some other previous such allegations due to Raina Palikarova-Verdeil, concerning the would-be existence of a so-called old "Slavonic Church Service" different from the Byzantine one, where only the texts would have been Byzantine rendered into Slavonic; according to the above-quoted authors, the former Greek melodies of chants had been, soi-disant, submitted to an intense process of "Bulgarisation" both by means of accentuation and simplification and through the influence of the Bulgarian folk music; these authors think that Evstatie and his followers have been either mere "transcribers" of some older Bulgarian MSS, or have been "Bulgarians" themselves, thus "cultivating" this "Bulgarian" church music as refugees from the Turks' invasion, as according to their "opinion", there was only "a cultural void" then in the Romanian Principalities during the 15th – 17th centuries (!!). Gheorghe Ciobanu rejects utterly these "opinions", as completely groundless, as they are not supported even by the documents handled by S. Petrov and Ch. Kodov: the documents put forward by the two Bulgarian researchers show, on the contrary, that there have never existed such "Bulgarian church chants", different from the Byzantine proper ones, as not only most of the texts in them are Greek, but also the melodies are all be-

longing to the Byzantine type; in his turn, Evstatie could not have been "a mere transcriber", as a lot of places in those MSS do indeed bear the mention most limpidly expressed, that the respective chants are "*tvorenia*" (creations) of Evstatie himself; moreover, Raina Palikarova-Verdeil herself shows that the most ancient "Bulgarian" chants, are in fact but Byzantine melodies with Greek texts! In his zeal to "prove" his point of view, S. Petrov has allowed himself even to distort the text of a letter due to Prince Alexandru Lăpușneanu of Moldavia, by changing completely a whole sentence in it! In fact the Putna MSS have got 89.77% Greek texts and only 10.23% Slavonic ones! A quite similar situation, even more unfavourable to the percentage of Slavonic texts can be found in the Russian church music MSS! Even the Catholic *Masses* have maintained until today a lot of important divisions with Greek texts alone (such as *Kyrie Eleison* and so on). The church singing in Greek has been very widespread in the Romanian Principalities, too. Therefore Gheorghe Ciobanu's conclusion in the matter runs that the Putna MSS comprise music of Byzantine type, due to several Romanian composers, such as Evstatie, Josaphat, Kyr Georgie or Dometian Vlahu (Dometian the Romanian). The author adds then new facts refuting the "opinions" of the above-mentioned authors; thus, he shows that the influence of the folk music on the church chants is a real fact, but it asks for a very long lapse (for instance, it has become conspicuous in the Russian church music only four centuries later) — therefore one cannot accept the allegation that "in less than a century" the so-called "Bulgarian" church music had already become quite different from the Byzantine one. However, the two Bulgarian researchers seem to ignore utterly the contrary opinions in this matter expressed by M. M. Velimirović, C. Höeg or R. Palikarova-Verdeil herself, or misinterpret them, comparing solely the texts, although "the heart of the matter" would have lain precisely into a confrontation of the melodies! On the other hand, the two authors contradict each other as concerns the notation. Gheorghe Ciobanu shows then their lack of information concerning the Romanian countries, where the Christian faith was adopted even in the late period of the Roman rule

a proof in this respect is provided by the essential terms still extant in Romanian, which are of ancient Latin origin), where Greek has been continuously used in church — and so have done the Bulgarians, too, with it! —, and where the variant of the Slavonic language used in the Princes' chancelleries was not a mere Mediobulgarian but comprised also a lot of elements of Serbian and Ukrainian origin, grouped together with several Romanian words and grammatical forms, as the Romanians did not merely adopt "the Bulgarian culture" as such, but have worked out a synthesis in this respect. The author shows that there are no "Bulgarian" musical MSS, extant as such, that "there is no basis" that can support the alleged existence of a so-called "Bulgarian" church music, different from the Byzantine one; in fact the Byzantine music had already been imposed to the Proto-Romanians' church singing by a tradition of more than six centuries that had elapsed until Slavonic was adopted, or even of more than a millenium, if one takes into account the years when the Bulgarian kingdoms were conquered by the Turks, not to mention that the Bulgarians themselves adopted this same Byzantine church music tradition. To this, the author adds the undeniable fact that the clear-cut Byzantine type of church chants is another proof that the old Romanian music was Byzantine and not "Bulgarian"; the author's final (and decisive) argument in this respect is that the two Bulgarian researchers have declared the Putna chants to be "Bulgarian" not only on account of their lack of adequate information, but also owing to the fact that "neither of them is an expert in Byzantinology" and this accounts for their making no confrontations among the various melodies, although this ought to have been their main concern! The last study is devoted to the personality and to the creative activity of Evstatie the Protopsaltes from Putna. After an introduction, comprising again the previously drawn conclusions of the author, he rejects, on the basis of documents, an allegation of some historians, concerning "three linguistic stages" that have occurred, so-disant, in our church music (a "Latin" one, from the 4th to the 10th century, a "Slavonic" one, from the 10th to the 14th century, and a third one, at first "Slavonic", from the 14th to the 17th century,

then "Greek" from the 17th to the 19th century and finally "Romanian" from the 19th century onwards). Gheorghe Ciobanu shows most convincingly that our people had sung, at first, both in Latin and in Greek, and then both in Slavonic and in Greek (the Russians, for instance, were to go on with this bilingual singing even until the 17th century, whereas the Serbians have maintained until today several chants with Greek texts). The "three-stage" system, mentioned above, can be applied to the official chancellery language, but it is not suitable at all for the church language, as the documents refute it most limpidly. The author rejects again the alleged "Bulgarian" character assigned by some people to the Putna chants, but refutes, at the same time, the overrating of its merits — he shows thus that the Putna musicians have never invented a new neumatic system of notation, as some people have ventured to assert, although their *raspev putnevskii* has been adopted by the Russian church music, too. Gheorghe Ciobanu gives then a detailed description of Evstatie's MS, nowadays split into two fragments, one in Moscow and the other in Leningrad, investigated first by E. Kalužniacki and A. I. Yatsimirski, then presented in a partial way by Raina Palikarova-Verdeil, S. Petrov and Ch. Kodov, and finally in an objective manner by Radu Pava, Gheorghe Ciobanu (both from Romania), Dimitri Stefanović (Yugoslavia) and Anne E. Pennington (Great Britain), this researcher having succeeded even in reconstituting Evstatie's original MS. Her reconstitution of the MS is presented at length by the author, with one slight correction. As concerns Evstatie's Romanian origin, this can be easily inferred, not only from the specific form of his name, but also from the way he uses the Romanian definite article with various nouns. The author shows that the notation, although considered by Raina Palikarova-Verdeil as "medio-Byzantine", is in fact "neo-Byzantine". Gheorghe Ciobanu's conclusions in this respect run that Evstatie's MS "is until now the oldest known musical MS, written by a Romanian for Romanians"; it comprises no less than 49 works by Evstatie himself, although their real number can be still greater; it is unique, owing to Evstatie's specific writing in cipher; it is a proof of the Romanians' cultural level about 1500 (Evstatie finished

compiling it in 1511); it shows, owing to the various works by Greek psaltae included in it, our very close connections with Constantinople and Mount Athos; it stands as a proof for the bilingual Greek-Slavonic character of our church chants, with the predomination of the former language; it proves finally Evstatie's being both a Romanian and a very cultivated person. Thus the MS is most precious indeed, not only for the students in Slavonic and Greek, but also for musicologists. However, above all, it must be turned to good account by the representatives of the Romanian culture, as it is indeed their true legacy, as Gheorghe Ciobanu says most rightly.

This presentation of ours has aimed at presenting the great richness and variety of the *Studies in Ethnomusicology and Byzantinology* by prof. Gheorghe Ciobanu. The two volumes are indeed a capital reference work in today musicology, ethno-

musicology and Byzantinology. Therefore it would be highly advisable that a synthesis of the author's researches and analyses should appear, too, in a language of wide circulation, owing to their great significance. The author's exemplar scrupulousness in using the documents, the excellent analyses and impressive endeavour to solve the most difficult and arduous problems are of the utmost merit. One should not forget here too his efforts that all the legacies left to the Romanian musical culture should be signalled and turned to good account. The illustrations and the musical examples are also excellent both in quantity and in quality. Therefore one can rightly asseverate that these two volumes of *Studies in Ethnomusicology and Byzantinology* represent a most remarkable achievement, both for their author, and for the Musical Publishing House in Bucharest.

Constantin Stihl-Boos

¹ After these volumes have been sent to the print, their author has informed us that besides the seven Putna MSS he mentions and analyses in his book, there have been found out two more, by the experts in Byzantinology J. Raasted and D. Conomos, these two other

Putna MSS being presented at length by Anne E. Pennington in her study *Music in Sixteenth-Century Moldavia. New Evidence in Oxford Slavonic Papers, New Series*, vol. XI, 1978, p. 64–83. Thus, the total number of Putna MSS, amounts now to nine.

Notes

ZENO VANCEA, *Creația muzicală românească, sec. XIX – XX*, II^e volume, Bucarest, Ed. muzicală, 1978, 403 p.

Tout système de division du temps historique par périodes, quel que soit le modèle adopté — depuis la division biblique en usage aux commencement de l'historiographie musicale jusqu'à la triade romantique, tombée dans la banalité — reste une construction abstraite appelée à soumettre à des critères ordonnateurs une réalité fluide, continue, qui échappe à toute segmentation; il ne représente donc qu'une pure convention. La formule proposée par Zeno Vancea dans les deux volumes de son ouvrage *Creația muzicală românească în sec. XIX – XX* se réclame de Alfred Lorenz (voir *L'Introduction* au I^{er} volume, p. 9). En fait, l'auteur n'adopte de Lorenz que l'idée de la division par générations, sans adhérer à l'essence de sa théorie sur l'évolution de la musique en cycles historiques dérivant de l'alternance du principe

mélodique avec celui harmonique; c'est seulement à l'intérieur de ce moule — le cycle — que Lorenz opère par le système de la « chaîne généalogique ». La suite chronologique (rigoureusement observée) des micromonographies dédiées aux créateurs nés entre 1900 et 1925 à pour but de montrer comment se dessine le portrait d'une génération. Ce cadre peut apparaître simplificateur à l'historien qui aspire à surprendre le phénomène musical dans toute la complexité de ses connexions intérieures, dans le réseau de déterminations, d'influences, dans la pluralité de ses rapports multidimensionnels. Mais il offre un critère sûr, qui ne laisse pas de place aux doutes, le systématisation en fonction de l'année de la naissance étant, au bout du compte, un simple schéma à l'instar de tout autre.

Le deuxième volume continue, par conséquent, l'œuvre commencée, en présentant la création des compositeurs nés entre 1900 et 1925. Le respect rigoureux de la chrono-