Costin Moisil

ROMANIAN VS. GREEK-TURKISH-PERSIAN-ARAB: IMAGINING NATIONAL TRAITS FOR ROMANIAN CHURCH CHANT

Abstract: Romanian cantors, clergymen and musicologists debated the problem of a national church chant from the late 19th century onwards. Amongst other things, they tried to define the specific traits of Romanian chant, to place these traits in opposition with Turkish and Oriental ones, and to show that traits of Romanian chant bore witness to a European and not an Oriental identity. This paper discusses various views on the traits of Romanian chant and the composing techniques of the "Romanianization" of Greek pieces, and points to the connections between these traits and national myths and symbols shared by Romanians.

Keywords: Byzantine chant, 19th century, Macarie the Hieromonk, Anton Pann.

This paper puts forward the most influential opinions about the characteristic traits of Romanian Orthodox church chant and traces the ways and circumstances in which these opinions changed during the 19th and 20th centuries. The sources of these opinions are various: scientific articles, volumes of music history, forewords, papers in periodicals, conferences, obituaries, memoirs. I confined my research to the territory of Wallachia and Moldavia – principalities that were under Ottoman suverainty for centuries up to 1878, and merged under the name Romania in 1862 – and I left aside the Orthodox church music of Transylvania and Banat – territories that were part of the Austrian Empire until 1918 – which had different histories and whose traits were less commented upon.

Sacred and secular. The problem of Romanian chant before the formation of Romania

Prior to the apparition of the Romanian national state (1862), the chant of the Romanians was not seen as having distinctive traits. The few written sources we know – forewords to books of chants, printed or in manuscript – show that Romanian chanters considered their chant as part of a tradition inspired by the Holy Spirit which started with anonymous melodists, continued with St. John of Damascus, St. John Koukouzelis, and eventually with the great Constantinopolitan chanters of the 18th and 19th centuries. Chant was the same at Constantinople, on the Holy Mountain of Athos, in the Danubian Principalities and other parts of the Eastern Christendom; as Macarie the Hieromonk († 1836) put it in the foreword of his *Heirmologion*: "One kind of chant was set to be chanted to God throughout the entire Church […]. Fathers from the Holy Mountain used to come and

chant in the holy churches in Constantinople, and there was a pleasant and received chant; Constantinopolitans used to go and chant in the holy churches of the Holy Mountain and there was a pleasant and received chant, and the same happened in other places and in our countries too".[1]

Macarie showed that the music and text of the hymns were inspired by the Holy Ghost and were preserved and transmitted down to his lifetime: "the Grace of God has preserved the chants of the Holy Church until now, and the same Grace will keep them unchanged forever". As chants were inspired by the Holy Spirit, they had to be transmitted further identically, and if someone intended to adapt a chant to a text translated in Romanian,[2] he had to be careful not to modify it (except for some inevitable changes on account of differences of length and accentuation between Greek and Romanian texts).[3] The same consideration for the faithful translation of Greek chants was also expressed by other chanters and hierarchs in the first half of the 19th century, such as Chesarie, bishop of Buzău, hierodeacon Nectarie Frimu, and Anton Pann.[4]

Macarie Ieromonahul was the first to make reference to the traits of Romanian chant, but without considering them as specific. They were mentioned in the context of tensions between Romanians and Greeks living in the Danubian Principalities,[5] in particular between native chanters and Greek followers of the Constantinopolitan tradition. Macarie pleaded for chanting in Romanian and eulogized Romanian cantors for their vocal capacities. At the same time, he criticized the mainstream of Constantinopolitan chant, which he considered to be strongly influenced by secular songs (including Turkish songs) and distanced from the traditional chant of the Holy Fathers. Nevertheless, Macarie was not against moderate borrowings

[1] Macarie Ieromonahul, *Irmologhion sau Catavasieru Musicesc*, [Vienna] 1823, vii–x. V. also A. Pann, *Bazul teoretic şi practic al muzicii bisericeşti sau Gramatica melodică*, Bucharest 1845, xxi–xxviii.

[2] The first evidence of chanting in Romanian dates from the mid-17th century, while the first manuscript with musical notation and chants in the Romanian language was written in 1713. Nevertheless, chanting in Romanian from scores spread in the Danubian Principalities as late as the first half of the 19th century, and Macarie the Hieromonk played a key role in this process.

[3] Macarie, *op. cit.*, vi–ix, xiv. N. M. Popescu, „Ştiri noi despre Macarie Ieromonahul, dascălul de cântări şi directorul tipografiei din mânăstirea Căldăruşani", *Biserica Orthodoxă Română* 39/8 (1915), 803.

[4] A. A. Buzera, *Cultura muzicală românească de tradiție bizantină din sec. al XIX-lea*, Craiova: Fundația Scrisul Românesc 1999, 314, 322–323. Pann, *Bazul*, *op. cit.*, xxxviii; idem, *Irmologhiŭ Catavasier în care se coprind Catavasiile Sărbătorilor Dumnezeeştĭ, Asemănândele Glasurilor şi Două-zecĭ şi una Doxologhiĭ*, Bucharest 1854, 1.

[5] At the beginning of the 19th century, the period that Macarie referred to, Greek Phanariotes occupied the chief positions in political, cultural, and clerical elites. The throne was occupied by Phanariotes up to 1821, the year of the insurrection led by Alexandros Ypsilantis.

from secular music, as, in his view, in chants by Petros Lampadarios Peloponnisios.[6]

The main feature that distinguished the Romanians' music from the new Constantinopolitan chant was the vocal style of the latter (*profora de Tsarigrad*). Greeks disdained Romanians because their chant lacked this style. On the contrary, for Macarie its lack was a positive quality because *profora de Tsarigrad* was nothing but Turkish style (*yfos turcesc*). Besides, its adepts were the same, mingling old chants with new secular pieces, including "those sung by Turks in coffee houses and their gatherings". The text suggests that the vocal style and the repertoire were inseparable – "new chants and *profora de Tsarigrad*, new chants and *yfos de Tsarigrad*" – and characteristic of the Greek-Turkish music criticized by Macarie. Lacking the Constantinopolitan style, Romanian chant was "sweet" and "natural", and Romanian chanters surpassed by far the Greek ones: chanting together, the best Greek master seemed like "the wild sound of an owl", while Romanians were like "beautiful sounding swallows".[7]

Therefore, the differences between the chant of the Romanians and the Greeks were of the moment, and had not originated from the supposed intrinsic qualities of the two peoples. Macarie did not hold that Romanian music was different from Greek music because the two nations were different, but that the Greeks – most of them – had in recent times departed from the true church chant.

After Macarie and before the middle of the 19th century, the only author who alluded to the traits of Romanian chant was Anton Pann (1796–1854): "I also cleansed the external figures that were very like Asiatic ones and hard for the listeners, and I brought them closer to the church melodies, following the way and the style of ancient people from the Holy Mountain and especially from the Homeland; because church music achieved its national character long ago, and only the Tsarigrad style has remained close to the Asiatic one".[8] The interpretation of this fragment is problematic. In my opinion, the most plausible possibility is that Pann's view on Romanian chant is similar to Macarie's: the chant of the Romanians was not essentially different from chant in Greek language, but from the chant in vogue in Constantinople, which abounded in external features (i.e. from secular music). Like Macarie, Pann was not basically against secular elements in church

[6] Macarie, *op. cit.*, viii, x. For the distinction between traditional Greek chant (including Petros Lampadarios' compositions) and the new Constantinopolitan style in Macarie's view, v. C. Moisil, "Despre românire în prefețele lui Macarie Ieromonahul şi Anton Pann", *Dimitrie Cunțan (1837–1910) şi cântarea bisericească din Ardeal* (ed. S. Dobre), Sibiu 2010, 142–146.

[7] Macarie, *op. cit.*, ix–xi.

[8] A. Pann, *op. cit.*, xxxviii.

music: he appreciated chanters with a knowledge of Persian music and admired Petros Lampadarios and Petros Vyzantios for the beauty of their *mathimata* in which external figures were used.[9]

Romanian vs. Constantinopolitan. Traits of Romanian chant in the 19th century Romania.

The first evidence of a change in the image of church music appeared shortly after the birth of the national state. For chanters as Ioanne Dem. Petrescu (1818–1903) and Bishop Melchisedek (1823–1892), who completed their education at a time when romantic nationalism was blossoming, and who took part in national movements such as the Revolution of 1848 or the Union of Danubian Principalities, Romanian chant expressed specific traits originating in the particular character of the Romanian nation. In the late 19th century, when national identity became more important than Orthodox identity for many inhabitants of Romania, chanters admitted the Constantinopolitan origin of their music, but showed more interest in the way in which this was adapted to the taste and genius of the Romanians and to their musical sense. They shared the view of Macarie the Hieromonk's that a series of characteristics ("sweetness", "clarity", etc.) distinguished Romanian chant from the modern Greek trend after Petros Lampadarios, but, unlike Macarie, they presumed a peculiar national character for chant in Romanian pri-or to Petros. The distinction between Romanian and Greek chant reflected, on the musical plane, the divergence between civilized and progressive Europe – of which Romanians wished to be part – and the decadent East, which was considered responsible for the backwardness of the Romanian nation.

For Ioanne Dem. Petrescu, the model for Romanian chant was to be found in the *oeuvres* of Macarie the Hieromonk. Petrescu saw differences of both a musical and a theological nature between Macarie's chants and those by Constantinople chanters. The latter "corrupted the sacred melodies and, by preferring profane [features], complied with Persian *manele*[10] and discarded the hymns' rhythm and accentuation".[11] On the contrary – "far from making the same mistakes as the Constantinopolitans" – Macarie paid attention to rhythm in both adapted chants and his own compositions: "Macarie does not lack precision and frisky variation. Both of them are accompanied by that natural and pleasant metre made by the accuracy of tones and

[9] *Op. cit.*, xxiii–xxv.
[10] At that time, the term *manele* (sg. *manea*) was used for a large category of vocal-instrumental lyrical songs of Oriental origin, probably linked to the Greek genre *amanes*.
[11] I. D. Petrescu, *Arta artelor sau Elemente de istoria musicei*, Bucharest 1872, 41.

the stress of the words intoned".[12] Even if the formulation is not particularly clear, the excerpt seems to refer to the concordance between grammatical and metrical stresses that could be found in Macarie's works. The *frisky variation* could be the presence of metrical feet that differ from the regular ones.[13]

Therefore, in the author's view, it was the rhythmical aspects that differentiated the chant of Macarie and of the Constantinopolitans. Like Macarie, Petrescu meant by Constantinopolitan chanters the successors of Petros Lampadarios who "had corrupted the Church's melodies with the *manele* or te-re-rems according to the Turkish taste".[14] Petrescu opposed them to the Athonites, who remained "faithful to the old system" and "successfully cultivated the art".[15]

Ioanne Dem. Petrescu also found aesthetic differences between Macarie's chants and those of the Greeks: "the simplicity, clarity and sweetness of his [i.e. Macarie's] compositions surpassed those of Greek chanters in the country".[16] In the compositions of Macarie one can see "the good taste and progress of art", whilst Greek chant "had not progressed at all" since the beginning of the 18th century.[17]

A similar view was exposed by Bishop Melchisedek in a survey of Romanian chant presented to the Holy Synod in 1881. In discussing the "cultured" variant of Romanian chant (the variant using musical notation), Melchisedek showed the differences between this and the Greek chant from which it originated. Romanian chant was characterized by "the sweetness and smoothness of the melody" and by "a sense of piety". Unlike contemporary Greek chant, it was immune to "Turkish traits", that is "figures foreign to church chant" which entered the chants under the influence of the Turkish song, starting with Petros Lampadarios. Melchisedek emphasized that the Greeks opposed the Romanians' attempts at having "a chant cleansed of the Greek Turkish traits".[18]

For the 19th century, Melchisedek distinguished two streams in church chant melody in Romanian language: the first one was Romanian and "was eventually resumed in the chants notated and edited by the immortal teacher Macarie", while the second was represented by Anton Pann,

[12] I. D. Petrescu, *Arta artelor sau Elemente de istoria musicei*, Bucharest 1872, 41.
[13] The context favours the interpretation of *the frisky variation* as a rhythmic feature. However, on page 28 Petrescu uses the phrase in connection with intervals, while on page 22 "variation of the melodies" seems to mean *modulation.*
[14] *Op. cit.*, 31.
[15] *Op. cit*., 30–32.
[16] *Op. cit*., 41.
[17] *Op. cit*., 32, 41.
[18] Episcop Melchisedek, "Memoriu pentru cântările bisericesci în România", *Biserica Ortodoxă Română* 6 (1882), 24–30.

who "when applying the melody to the chant[']s lyrics] greatly sacrificed the Romanian melody in favour of foreign [elements]". Melchisedek described Pann as "a great admirer of Greek chanters and their products" and insisted on his connections with Constantinopolitan chant. A number of Pann's chants were considered "mere translations from Greek", in contradistinction to Macarie's, for whom Melchisedek never used words with the same root as *translate*, but instead would say *transform*. As Melchisedek put it, besides Greek elements, one might also find in Pann's chants melodic "turns" from Bulgaria and Russia. By using those turns, Pann "deviated [his chants] from the taste of Romanian national melody".[19]

The first half of the 20th century: autochthonism and folklore

The image of the Romanian nation changed in the early 20th century. After the national state was consolidated and recognized as such by foreigners, Romanians felt less need to legitimize themselves as Europeans and compare themselves with neighbouring states. On the other hand, they became more interested in elements specific to themselves.[20] Consequently, interwar writings about Romanian chant attached less importance to comparison with the chants of others and invoked less the opposition between East and West, but laid emphasis on national traits instead for which they mainly looked to traditional folk music.

Ion Popescu-Pasărea (1871–1943), the most esteemed chanter in the first half of the 20th century, explained the presence of foreign elements in Romania's chant by means of borrowings, assignable to the implacable "law of progress".[21] The same law would also explain how chant came to be influ-enced by national folk music and, conversely, evolved slowly andnaturally towards the national Romanian musical spirit. Amongst other things, chants inappropriate to the Romanian genius – which used scales unknown in the Romanian musical folklore, e.g. of the second mode – were replaced by chants "according to the Romanian national genius", most of them composed "in the national melody of the first plagal mode" or "the melody of Romanian *doină*",[22] the *doină* being, in that epoch, the symbol of

[19] *Op. cit*., 32–35.
[20] On national ideology before and after 1900, v. L. Boia, *Istorie şi mit în conştiinţa românească*, Bucharest 1997, 49–55.
[21] I. Popescu Pasărea, "Evoluţia cântării psaltice în biserica română" [1], *Cultura* 29/3 (1940), 21–22.
[22] Idem, "Evoluţia cântării psaltice în biserica română" [3], *Cultura* 30/1–2 (1941), 6–7. Idem, "Rolul lui Anton Pann în muzica bisericească", *Cultura* 17/5–6 (1930), 6–8.

Romanian music.[23] In fact, the mode to which Popescu-Pasărea referred to seems to be related rather to the western harmonic minor than to the Romanian traditional modal system.

An approach to the national genius, opined Popescu-Pasărea, could be also seen in the adaptation of chants to Romanian texts. He distinguished the work of Macarie, who had faithfully adapted the Greek originals, from that of Pann, who "took the common people's road" and adapted the chants more freely: "he rounded off, chiselled, simplified and accommodated the chant according to Romanian singing and expressions". The principal merit of Pann was the *nationalization* of the chant. In the broad sense, nationalization designated the transformation of the chant by reference to popular Romanian tunes, but also to the nature, language, and habits of the people. In the narrower sense, nationalization referred to the adaptation of Greek chants by shortening "excessive lengths" in some papadic and sticheraric pieces, purging external figures similar to the Asian ones and bringing them back "to the closest church melody", in the manner and style of "ancient Wallachian chanters (*psalți Munteni*) and especially of the Homeland", as Popescu-Pasărea put it, invoking the passage by Pann previously mentioned.[24]

However, Pann's text was misinterpreted. Pann showed that he had shortened the chants for practical reasons, in order to avoid having them suddenly interrupted, as had happened to him during services; Popescu-Pasărea preferred to omit Pann's explanation and attributed this shortening to a hypothetical desire to bring the chant closer to the national spirit. Moreover, Popescu-Pasărea modified Pann's phrase *sfânt Munteni* (from the Holy Mountain, i.e. Athos) to *psalți Munteni* (chanters from Muntenia, i.e. eastern Wallachia, the region which includes Bucharest).[25] He thus placed Romanian chant in opposition not only to the new Constantinopolitan trend, as had been done in the previous century, but to all Greek chant.

The musicologist George Breazul (1887–1961) also placed Romanian and Greek chant in opposition, but approached them from a different perspective. For him, the "authentic Romanian" church chant – or at least, chant "with a Romanian imprint, if not entirely original Romanian" – was the chant in villages, which crystallized over time from the original Christianization of the people to the 19th century, at the same time and probably

[23] The *doina* (or *long song*) is a highly ornamented lyrical song in rubato rhythm, with elastic phrases and a partially improvised overall form.
[24] Idem, "Comemorarea lui Macarie şi Anton Pann. Intemeetori cântului bisericesc român", *Cultura* 17/1–2 (1930), 13–14. Idem, "Rolul", *op. cit.*, 6–8.
[25] The word *muntean* may be understood as highlander or as inhabitant of Muntenia.

under the influence of folk song.[26] Breazul deplored the fact that its place had been taken by Greek chant in the 19th century, which "took different influences from Asian music",[27] more precisely the influences of Turkish and Arabic styles, as he put it elsewhere.[28] According to Breazul, the adaptations by Macarie, Pann, Dimitrie Suceveanu and their contemporaries "affirm the indisputable authority of Greek chant, which they obey with servility".[29]

In addition, however, Breazul wrote about Romanian style in two obituaries, attributing it to the two deceased chanters. Ştefanache Popescu was mentioned as having a style with "a marked degree of Romanianism" and "full of that solemn piety evoked by all the Romanian manifestations of our glorious past",[30] and Popescu-Pasărea was praised for processing the compositions of Macarie, Pann şi Suceveanu "according to the musical nature of our people" and eliminating "excessive ornaments".[31]

The second half of the 20th century: old statements in new clothes

After Romania entered the zone of Soviet influence, church music became a subject to be avoided, for ideological reasons, in that atheism was part of communist doctrine. Nevertheless, from the 1970s onwards, the years of the rise of Ceauşescu's national communism, the regime encouraged research into the national character of church chant, a topic practically untouched in the first half of the communist period.[32] The central element in postwar writings about chant was the process of *Romanianization*; the meaning of the term evolved from the technical procedure of adapting chants to the Romanian text, to a process of adapting to Romanian feeling and thinking. Old nationalist themes such as, for example, the fight against Greek music, were revived and stereotypes regarding oriental music from the late 19th century were again brought into discussion.

Gheorghe Ciobanu (1909–1995), the most influential Romanian church musicologist of the epoch, considered that the Romanian traits of the church chant were determined by the musicality of the Romanian language, and mainly to a preference for particular intervals. A language, claimed

[26] G. Breazul, *Patrium Carmen. Contribuţii la studiul muzicii româneşti*, Craiova 1941, 574–575.
[27] Idem, *Pagini din istoria muzicii româneşti*, vol. II, Bucharest 1970, 25.
[28] *Ibid.*
[29] Elsewhere Breazul took a less strident tone, admitting "the elimination of Greek reminiscences" in chanters' adaptations. Cf. Idem, *Pagini*, *op. cit.*, 25.
[30] Idem, "Ştefan Popescu (Ştefanache)", *Cultura* 1/10 (1911), 209.
[31] Idem, *Pagini*, *op. cit.*, 30.
[32] For national communism in Romania, v. L. Boia, *op. cit.*, 69–82. For the study of church music in Romania during communism, v. F. Metz, "Muzica bisericească şi muzica sacră după 1945, în România", *Muzica*, new series 11/2/ 42 (2000), 120–138.

Ciobanu, is characterized by specific musical intervals and its speakers instinctively use them more often in singing, be it religious or secular. On the basis of his studies of folk music, Ciobanu affirmed that the major second, the minor third, and the perfect fourth were intervals specific to Romanian music (church music included), whilst Bulgarians frequently used the minor second and rarely the minor third; moreover, large skips were rarely used by Romanians, but frequently by Bulgarians (minor seventh) and Serbs (perfect fifth).[33]

Ciobanu deemed that influence of folk music was a necessary condition for the Romanian character of church chant. Following his teachers Popescu-Pasărea and Breazul, Ciobanu affirmed that Macarie did not take much after this Romanian folk character in his chants and that his music was Greek, which, in the 18th and early 19th centuries, was "much more strongly influenced by lyrical music, and chiefly by the Turkish-Persian-Arab music in fashion all over the Ottoman Empire". Among oriental influences Ciobanu counted melodic formulas, a particular ornamental manner and inflections from external pieces "of Greek-Turkish-Persian-Arab origin", and scales of Persian-Arab makams (moustaar, segah, atzem asiran etc.) which could be found in papadic chants. Though not explicitly, Ciobanu seemed to associate abundance of chromaticism in church chant with borrowing of Persian-Arab modes.[34]

The adaptations by Pann were considered the best (especially those of the heirmologic chants), including the question of the fitting of the melodic line with the musicality of the Romanian language. Pann was also mentioned for eliminating external figures – that is, the typical oriental ornamental manner and modulations – from papadic chants and those from the Doxastarion. Ciobanu affirmed that all these actions – to which added, in a paper for the general public, the shortening of long chants, the simplification of melismatic ones and the abandonment of *kratemata* – brought about the Romanianization of the chant.[35]

Ciobanu also mentioned a Romanian style of performance, which eliminated "nasalizations and continuous gurgles", components of the

[33] G. Ciobanu, *Studii de etnomuzicologie şi bizantinologie*, [vol. I], Editura Muzicală a Uniunii Compozitorilor, Bucharest 1974, 37, 299, 320; vol. III, 1992, 194–195. The comparison of Romanian pieces with their Greek correspondences refutes Ciobanu's hypothesis, v. C. Moisil, "Procesul de românire şi adaptarea la muzicalitatea limbii", in: *Simpozionul Naţional de Muzicologie "Preotul compozitor Gheorghe Şoima (1911–1985)". Sibiu, 4 decembrie 2010*, Sibiu 2010, 229–235.

[34] G. Ciobanu, *op. cit.*, vol. I, 283–284, 303, 339–341.

[35] *Op. cit*., vol. I, 318–322, 340; vol. III, 175–176.

Tsarigrad style. Both the composition and performance style came to take shape in the 18th century and crystallized in the 19th.[36]

The approach of Ciobanu – except for his theory about specific intervals – was shared by most of the contemporary musicologists in Romania. Some of them contributed with supplementary nuances and elaborations. Octavian Lazăr Cosma (b. 1933), the author of a series of volumes on the history of Romanian music, considered that chant in the 18th and early 19th centuries was characterized by a conflict between two tendencies: one of emphasizing the Romanian traits that were present in folk music, and the other of introducing on a large scale oriental (Turkish-Greek-Persian-Arab) influences of Muslim origin: chromatic modal structures, asymmetric rhythms, and "a real waste" of ornaments and melismas borrowed from secular music.[37]

According to Cosma, Romanianization was the chanter's major concern in the first half of the 19th century. He defined Romanianization as "the purification of chant melodies from abundant oriental influences […] and the generalization of chant in the Romanian language".[38] Oriental music had unsuitable elements for Romanian nature and sensitivity: "lascivious moods, unctuous laments, an excess of sentimentalism", though on the other hand "in reality, as part of the family of people in the sphere of Byzantine music, some oriental features characterize us, and their total removal would be an exaggeration".[39]

For Cosma, Macarie opposed Turkish influences in chant, but not Greek ones. When adapting chants, he took advantage in order to "cleanse the melodic profile overloaded by infinite melismas, vocalises, and ornaments, in order to obtain a melodic line that is *cantabile*, sober and adapted as much as possible to the sensitivity of the Romanian people".[40] Pann did not intend to discard Constantinopolitan chant either, but he made a better job of Romanianization than his predecessor. The characteristics that Cosma attributed to Pann's chant were similar to those atrributed to Macarie by writers in the 19th century: "the clarity, elegance and nobility of the musical discourse".[41]

[36] *Op. cit*., vol. I, 304, 338.
[37] O. L. Cosma, *Hronicul muzicii româneşti*, vol. I, Bucharest 1973, 379–381; vol. II, 1974, 68.
[38] *Op. cit*., vol. III, 1975, 9, 139.
[39] *Op. cit*., vol. I, 234; vol. IV, 1976, 182.
[40] *Op. cit*., vol. II, 10–11, 85–87; vol. III, 137–138.
[41] *Op. cit*., vol. III, 137–145.

Conclusions

The idea that Romanian chant had specific traits appeared under the influence of national ideology in the second half of the 19th century. National traits were described by means of reinterpreting affirmations made by chanters in the early 19th century, and underwent changes according to the political and ideological context of the time.

Some of the characteristic traits ascribed to Romanian chant belonged to the aesthetic field (simplicity, smoothness, piety etc.). Others were considered specifically Romanian because they were previously associated with Romanian folk music, such as specific intervals or scales. However, the most debated national traits were the absences of elements taken as typically oriental: the Constantinopolitan style, which was seen as Turkish; external figures – Asiatic, and later Greek-Turkish; rhythm – Persian; and, in the late 20th century, ornaments and scales taken as Greek-Turkish-Persian-Arab.

Many commentators considered that eliminating oriental traits when adapting Greek chant into Romanian led to the creation of a national chant, and judged the works of the main adapters according to the degree to which they had eliminated those traits. The hierarchy of the chanters was reversed after the First World War: in the 19th century, Macarie the Hieromonk was praised for cleansing the Turkish elements and Pann criticized for conserving external figures; while in the following century, the latter came to be appreciated for eliminating external figures and the former was considered as a keeper of Greek characteristics. More often than not, musicologists' assessments were based not on analyses of scores, but on the discourses of their forerunners.

LIST OF REFERENCES – ЛИСТА РЕФЕРЕНЦИ

Boia Lucian, *Istorie şi mit în conştiinţa românească*, Humanitas, Bucharest 1997.

Breazul M. [George], *Istoria muzicii romîneşti*, Tipografia şi litografia Învăţământului, Bucharest 1956.

Breazul M. [George], *Pagini din istoria muzicii româneşti*, vol. II, ed. G. Firca, Editura Muzicală a Uniunii Compozitorilor, Bucharest 1970.

Breazul M. [George], *Patrium Carmen. Contribuţii la studiul muzicii româneşti*, Scrisul Românesc, Craiova 1941.

Breazul M. [George], "Ştefan Popescu (Ştefanache)", *Cultura* 1/10 (1911), 207–210.

Buzera Alexie Al., *Cultura muzicală românească de tradiţie bizantină din sec. al XIX-lea*, Fundaţia Scrisul Românesc, Craiova 1999.

Ciobanu Gheorghe, *Studii de etnomuzicologie şi bizantinologie*, [vol. I], Editura Muzicală a Uniunii Compozitorilor, Bucharest 1974; vol. III, Editura Muzicală a Uniunii Compozitorilor şi Muzicologilor din România, Bucharest 1992.

Cosma Octavian Lazăr, *Hronicul muzicii româneşti*, vol. I, Editura Muzicală a Uniunii Compozitorilor, Bucharest 1973; vol. II, 1974; vol. III, 1975; vol. IV, 1976.

Macarie Ieromonahul, *Irmologhion sau Catavasieru Musicesc*, [Vienna] 1823.

Episcop Melchisedek, "Memoriu pentru cântările bisericesci în România", *Biserica Ortodoxă Română* 6 (1882), 11–47.

Metz Franz, "Muzica bisericească şi muzica sacră după 1945, în România", *Muzica*, new series, 11/2/42, (2000), 120–138.

Moisil Costin, "Despre românire în prefeţele lui Macarie Ieromonahul şi Anton Pann", in: *Dimitrie Cunţan (1837–1910) şi cântarea bisericească din Ardeal* (ed. S. Dobre), Editura Universităţii „Lucian Blaga", Sibiu 2010, 138–151.

Moisil Costin, "Procesul de românire şi adaptarea la muzicalitatea limbii", in: *Simpozionul Naţional de Muzicologie "Preotul compozitor Gheorghe Şoima (1911–1985)". Sibiu, 4 decembrie 2010*, ed. V. Grăjdian, Editura Universităţii "Lucian Blaga", Sibiu 2010, 229–235.

Pann Anton, *Bazul teoretic şi practic al muzicii bisericeşti sau Gramatica melodică*, Bucharest 1845.

Pann Anton, *Irmologhiŭ Catavasier în care se coprind Catavasiile Sărbătorilor Dumnezeeştĭ, Asemănândele Glasurilor şi Două-zecĭ şi una Doxologhiĭ*, Bucharest 1854.

Petrescu Ioanne Dem., *Arta artelor sau Elemente de istoria musicei*, Bucharest 1872.

Popescu Nic. M., "Ştiri noi despre Macarie Ieromonahul, dascălul de cântări şi directorul tipografiei din mânăstirea Căldăruşani", *Biserica Orthodoxă Română* 39/8 (1915), 788–805.

Popescu-Pasărea I., "Evoluţia cântării psaltice în biserica română" [1], *Cultura* 29/3 (1940), 21–23.

Popescu-Pasărea I., "Evoluţia cântării psaltice în biserica română" [3], *Cultura* 30/1–2 (1941), 6–7.

Popescu-Pasărea I., "Comemorarea lui Macarie şi Anton Pann. Intemeetori cântului bisericesc român", *Cultura* 17/1–2 (1930), 11–15.

Popescu-Pasărea I., "Rolul lui Anton Pann în muzica bisericească", *Cultura* 17/5–6(1930), 3–8.

Костин Моисил

РУМУНСКО И ГРЧКО-ТУРСКО-ПЕРСИЈСКО-АРАПСКО НАСЛЕЂЕ: ОСОБЕНОСТИ РУМУНСКОГ ЦРКВЕНОГ ПОЈАЊА
(Резиме)

У раду су представљена најутицајнија мишљења о карактеристичним цртама румунског православног појања и указано је на правац и услове у којима су се она мењала током XIX и XX века. Анализирани су написи осморице појаца, клирика и музиколога, по двојица за сваку половину поменутих столећа. Истраживање је ограничено на територију Влашке и Молдавије, а по страни је остала црквена музика Трансилваније и Баната која има различиту историју, због чега је тек спорадично у раду помињана.

Идеја о специфичном карактеру румунског појања појавила се под утицајем националне идеологије током друге половине XIX века. Националне особине описане су у реинтерпретацијама ставова појаца с почетка столећа, а доживеле су промене сходно политичком и идеолошком контексту епохе.

Неке од особених одлика приписаних румунској појачкој традицији припадају пољу естетике (једноставност, уједначеност, побожност итд.). Друге, пак, искључиво музичке природе, означене су као специфично румунске, будући да су присутне у румунском фолклору, пре свега у његовом лествичном устројству и необичним мелодијским интервалима. Међутим, међу националним елементима у вези са којима се највише дискутовало није било оних који су важили за „оријенталне“: тзв. константинопољски стил који је изједначаван са турским, азијатске и касније, грчко турске световне мелодије, персијски ритам и, у касним деценијама XX века, орнаменти и лествице чије је порекло, како се веровало, било грчко-турско-персијско-арапско.

Бројни аутори написа сматрали су да елиминисање оријенталних музичких елемената у прилагођавању грчких напева румунском језику води ка обликовању националног појачког стила. Према степену изоста-нка ових елемената процењивали су постојеће адаптације напева. Хијерархија појаца изменила се након Првог светског рата. У XIX столећу, јеромонах Макарије је цењен као онај који је румунско појање „очистио“ од турских елемената, док је Антон Пан критикован због очувања световних мелодија. У наредном веку је он, међутим, цењен

управо због елиминисања световног звука, док се за Макарија говорило да је у својим адаптацијама следио и сачувао грчке појачке карактеристике. Овакве и сличне процене музиколога заснивале су се превасходно на постојећим дискурсима о датој теми, а не на анализама самих адаптираних напева.

UDC 783.24/.25(=135.1)”18/19”
781.7(498)
DOI: 10.2298/MUZ1111119M

Anton Pann (1796–1854)