

Svetlana Kujumdžieva (Sofia, Bulgaria)

ON THE TRANSLATION OF THE BOOK ON EARLY MEDIEVAL NOTATION BY C. FLOROS WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON ITS IMPORTANCE FOR THE STUDY OF EARLY BULGARIAN ORTHODOX CHANT

Constantin Floros. *Introduction to Early Medieval Notation*. Revised, Translated, and with an Illustrated Chapter on Cheironomy by Neil K. Moran (=Detroit Monographs in Musicology/Studies in Music, № 45). Harmonie Park Press. Warren, Michigan, 2005. 195 p.

Constantin Floros, professor emeritus of musicology at the University of Hamburg, doctor honoris causa of Athens University (1999), member of the European Academy of Sciences and Arts (2002), who was quite recently awarded the golden honorary diploma from the University of Vienna (2005), is one of the most distinguished scholars in the field of medieval musicology. The publication of his three-volume book *Universale Neumenkunde* (1970) and its short version, the *Einführung in die Neumenkunde* (1980; enlarged 2d edition, 2000), was one of the turning points in the research on early medieval notations, and medieval chant, respectively. The books rank not only among the most often used scholarly literature in musicology, but they also became an important reference tool on the history, theory, and palaeography of neume studies. The English translation of the *Einführung* in its 2d enlarged edition is to be welcomed considering the spread of the English language and the increase of the interest in medieval chant traditions.

The importance of Floros's book lies in the fact that it opened new horizons in the field of medieval chant and launched new

research initiatives in general and in the field of early Bulgarian Orthodox chant in particular. First of all, the author relies on a rich material basis, representative of the three major early chant traditions that developed notational systems and are preserved in numerous musical (neumated) sources – Byzantine, Slavonic, and Latin. The approach to this material is quite innovative: the author insists on the thorough study of the neume repertoires based on an interdisciplinary and comparative methodology. Problems from the fields of history, theory and palaeography of music, liturgy, linguistics, theology, archeology and cultural anthropology are outlined clearly. The systematization and classification of the neumatic notations are based on a series of objective criteria. It is always the musical text and the historical evidence that validate research and conclusions. Floros showed that the connections between early Byzantine church music and the music of the Western church are much closer than was usually assumed. Thus new perspectives on the study of medieval music in East and West were opened.

The book is based primarily on research in the field of neumatic notations. The clas-

sification of the stages of Palaeobyzantine notation was recognized as the standard classification in 1992. The conception of the so-called great hypostases as fixing whole tonal formulas stenographically has also been widely accepted. With the intensive study of these signs and with the help of a combined methodology, Floros defends his deciphering of the Old Slavonic kondakarian notation, which was considered to be enigmatic for a long time.

Floros undertakes a comparative study of Byzantine, Slavonic, and Gregorian melodies, phrases, cadences, formulas, and figures, as well as a detailed comparison of the names, forms, and meanings of the corresponding early Byzantine and Latin neumes. The theory of neumes is considered not simply as a palaeographical discipline, but as a theory of musical figures. The object of this discipline is a written symbol and its musical meaning: the notational signs have both a graphic form and a musical meaning, a statement, that is proven time and again throughout the entire book. Considering medieval music theory, the author argues that the modal system of the Middle Ages originally consisted of 12 modes: four authentic, four plagal, and four additional medial modes, mentioned in some treatises. For the first time attention was paid to the medial modes and it could be shown that numerous chants belonged to these modes: the *mesos deuterios* and the *mesos tetartos*. The author also pointed out that each *echos* had its own final tone and main tones, its own cadences, *martyriai* (key witnesses), as well as one or several *echemata* (intonational formulas).

The neume notations are discussed in three major chapters, devoted to Byzantine, Slavonic, and Latin notation. The innovative aspects of the research will be outlined below.

The development of the *Byzantine* notations from the 10th to the 19th centuries is divided into four stages: 1) early or Palaeobyzantine notation – from the beginnings to the late 12th century; 2) middle Byzantine notation – from about 1150 to 1400; 3) late and post-Byzantine notation – from

1400 to about 1818; and 4) Chrysanthine notation – from 1818 to the present.

The focus of the book is on early notations. It is stressed that several notational systems existed side by side in the oldest period when two principal forms of expression coexisted in Byzantine church music: liturgical recitation and pure song. As a consequence there were two types of notation: the ekphonetic notation in the lectionaries for solemn recitation and chant notation.

The ekphonetic notation is considered to have developed out of the prosodic signs of the Alexandrian accent system: it is much closer to prosody than neumatic chant notation. The ekphonetic notation had in all 15 signs listed in three tables: MSS Leimon 38, Sinai 217, and Sinai 8 (in the latter the lectionary formulas are converted into Palaeobyzantine neumes). Floros defends J. B. Thibaut's view that the early Byzantine notations arose from ekphonetic semeiography¹. He compares ekphonetic and Palaeobyzantine notation and shows that they had no less than 13 signs in common.

Among his greatest achievements are the classification of early Palaeobyzantine notations and the characterization of the stages of development. Until 1970 almost nothing was known about the classes of Palaeobyzantine and Old Slavonic signs discussed in the book. Most of these signs were first studied onomasiologically, palaeographically, and semasiologically by Floros.

In the oldest sources two notational systems appear at almost the same time (10th century): the *Chartres* (after MS *Chartres* 1754) and the *Coislin* (after MS *Coislin* 220) notation. Both notations are adiaSTEMATIC and go back to a common original notation which has been lost. Both had a parallel development until the mid-11th century. Then the *Chartres* notation declined. The author separates the stages of the *Chartres* and *Coislin* notations by a series of criteria. The most

¹ Thibaut, J. B. *Monuments de la notation ekphonétique et hagiopolite de l'église grecque*. St. Petersburg, 1913 (reprint, Hildesheim, 1976).

important of them are: 1) the number of syllables remaining without neumes in the older manuscripts and the frequency with which the *oligon-episem* is used; 2) both of the notations use different signs for a repetition of the tone: *Chartres* uses the straight *ison*, *Coislin* – the *ison* with a hook; 3) though both notations have a considerable number of neumes in common, *Chartres* is rich in “great signs”, whereas the *Coislin* system is poor in this respect; 4) the number of letter neumes used in both systems differs; 5) the form and manner of writing the neumes; and 6) certain technical changes in the notation. Using criteria like these, the author determines four stages of *Chartres* and six stages of *Coislin*. The essence of their characteristics is the following.

Chartres I: Numerous syllables remain without neumes; the *Chartres ison* and *oligon* do not appear; the *kouphisma* and the combination of *apostrophos* and *duo kentemata* are unknown; *mega kratema* and *xeron klasma* are written as conjunctures; points function as signs for punctuation or repetitions of tones; most of the “great signs” are already present. The most important source is MS Lavra B.32.

Chartres II: Numerous syllables remain without neumes; the *Chartres ison* and *oligon* are introduced as innovations; the *kouphisma* is still unknown. The most representative sources here are Lavra Γ.12, Γ.72, and Γ.74.

Chartres III: The *kouphisma* is introduced as the third *hemitonon*; several letter neumes appear for the first time; certain neumes and combinations attain higher frequency of use; a new way of writing several signs is apparent. Representative of this stage is MS Lavra Γ.67.

Chartres IV: Almost all syllables are marked by signs; the *oligon-episem* is used almost excessively. The representative MSS are Vatopedi 1488 and Sinai 1219.

Coislin I: The stage has several features in common with *Chartres* I: numerous syllables remain without neumes; signs for the *ison* and *oligon* do not appear; the *kouphisma* and the combination of *apostrophos* and *duo kentemata* are unknown; *mega kratema* and *xeron klasma* are written as conjunctures;

points function as signs for punctuation and tonal repetitions; in contrast to *Chartres* letter neumes rarely appear and the many “great signs” of *Chartres* are unknown in the *Coislin* system right from the beginning. Patmos 55, Esphigmenou 54, and the *Coislin* fascicle of Lavra B.32 are the most representative sources for this stage.

Coislin II: The *ison* with a hook appears as a concluding neume of the notation. The representative texts for this stage are the eight *stichera* from the menaia from Carbone in MSS Cryptenses Δ.a.XII to Δ.a.XVII.

Coislin III: All syllables without neumes are provided with the *apostrophos* at this stage; the latter has a multiple meaning: it designates not only a descending movement, but also a repetition or an ascent. 27 *stichera* from the menaia from Carbone document this stage.

Coislin IV: The *oligon* is used for the first time; the *ison* is used exclusively as a sign for a tonal repetition; for the first time the *hypotaxis-praxis* is observed; also, the *kouphisma* is used for the first time; the *thematismos* is still written in a stenographic manner. All these characteristics are evident in the regular notation of the Calabrian menaia.

Coislin V–VI: The “analytical” manner of writing the *thematismos*; the diastematic boundaries of certain conjunctures and ligatures. The development in these two stages leads directly to the development of Middle Byzantine notation.

The best introduction to the oldest Byzantine and Slavonic systems of neumatic notation is provided by a study of the neume repertory according to its classification in Byzantine treatises. Two different typologies of neumes are discussed:

1) According to the *Hagiopolites* treatise, which is thought to transmit the repertory practiced in Jerusalem (the Holy City). The treatise goes back to the 12th century and is a reflection of the system in the later stages of *Coislin* (*Coislin* IV to VI). It encompasses almost none of the numerous signs of the *Chartres* notation. The repertory of the *Hagiopolites* comprises the chants of four different styles, which are represented in the four chant books used by the Byzantine church

at the time: the heirmologion, sticherarion, psaltikon, and asmatikon. Floros confirmed the statements of the theorists that the repertory of the *Hagiopolites* was sung in 10 modes.

2) The Middle and Late Byzantine classification: it reflects the relationships within Middle and Late Byzantine notations and groups the “great signs” together in one class. It is of great relevance for the study of *Chartres* notation. The Middle Byzantine notation, which developed out of *Coislin* during the 12th century, is diastematic (the signs have an exact interval value) and can be compared with the notation in the West.

The next step in the study is toward a systematic classification of the neume repertory. Floros encompasses the entire neume repertory and takes into consideration the historical development of Byzantine semeiography. The signs of the Paleobyzantine notational systems are divided into seven classes:

1) *Tonoi haploi* – basic or simple signs. Most of them are common to all Palaeobyzantine and Old Slavonic notations. With the exception of the *ison* and *oligon* these signs belong to the oldest neume repertory.

2) *Hemitona* (half tonoi) or *hemiphona* (half-voiced signs) – they indicate a semivoical manner of performance.

3) *Grammata* – letter neumes. These are abbreviations of certain Greek words with a musical meaning intended to improve the accuracy of the diastematic values or to define more clearly the rhythmic relationships.

4) *Tonoi synthetoi* – composite signs. They arise from the *tonoi haploi* through doubling or through various combinations. Some indicate a single long tone but most of them indicate differently-structured figures of two to six or even more tones and they, in turn, are grouped in 7 classes.

5) Ornamental neumes – for some of them remarkable parallels with Latin ornamental neumes are pointed out.

6) *Thetas* or *themata* – signs composed of an uncial theta and interval signs in several constellations. In the notation of the heirmologion and the sticherarion the *thetas* appear at the end of colons only but in the

notation of the asmatikon they can, in contrast, appear midway through a colon. The *thetas* indicate very graphically the stenographical principle of Palaeobyzantine semeiography. Starting from the *thetas* the continuous development of the purely analytical system developed can be followed.

7) *Martyriai* (witnesses) and *phorai* (signs for modulation).

In contrast to the above classes, the signs of the Middle Byzantine notation are divided into three classes according to numerous treatises from the 15th to the 17th centuries:

1) *Emphona* (voiced signs) for an upward and downward interval movement.

2) *Argiai* – rhythmic signs or signs for rest.

3) *Aphona* – the “great signs” or great hypostases. Modern research has interpreted most of the hypostases as signs for performance². Floros’s research proves the opposite, namely, that the *aphona* are in large part Palaeobyzantine signs which served as stenographic symbols for the indication of figures of two or more tones, and only later – as a result of the introduction of an “analytical” manner of writing down the melodies – were they broken up into individual signs. In this way these signs gradually forfeited their original meanings, and degenerated frequently into performance signs. In Middle Byzantine notation a few of these signs were retained as supports while others were found unnecessary and eliminated. Middle Byzantine notation of the 13th century exhibits relatively few hypostases. In the 14th century, in contrast, there are more hypostases and from the 15th century on hypostases appear very frequently and they form the most obvious characteristic of the notation.

The discussion of the *Slavonic* notations starts with the correct statement that the South Slavs (Bulgarians and Serbians) and the Eastern Slavs (Russians) took over the Byzantine liturgy as well as Greek litur-

² See for instance C o n o m o s, D. Byzantine Trisagia and Cheroubika of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries. Thessaloniki, 1974.

gical texts translated into Old Church Slavonic (Old Bulgarian) and the system of the eight modes when they were Christianized in the 9th and 10th centuries. A decisive question is whether the Slavs adapted Greek liturgical melodies together with Greek texts, a question which has remained controversial. Answers range from the opinion that the Byzantine melodic heritage was faithfully adapted to the theory of the transformation of these melodies by the Slavs, right up to the opinion that Old Russian Church music represents a new creation. The old Slavonic notations in Russian sources – *znamennaya* or *sematic* notation and *kondakarnaya* – were thought to be indecipherable. Floros considers these two notations as independent systems. He stresses that, although they draw on a wellspring of common signs, there are two fundamental differences between them with respect to both their neume repertoires and the arrangement of signs: in *sematic* notation all the signs are arranged in one single row; in kondakarian notation the “small signs” are written on the lower row with the “great signs” in a row above them. The *sematic* notation, which survived in many MSS, is considered similar to *Coislin* notation: it has a relatively poor stock of “great signs”; the kondakarian notation (known from the 11th to the 13th centuries according to quite a few MSS; it appears to have fallen out of use in the 14th century) is considered to be similar to *Chartres* notation: it has a large number of “great signs”.

One of the most important questions discussed in this chapter is about the adaptation of Church Slavonic texts to original Greek melodies. The author asks the question what methods were used to adapt the Old Church Slavonic texts to the original melodies. According to the study, four techniques may be distinguished: the *epenthesis*, *apheresis*, *dieresis*, and *syneresis*. These techniques are explained in the following way: the extra syllables were introduced into the translation in certain sections and were furnished as a rule with *stopica* (*epenthesis*); if the translation has fewer syllables than the original, the extra syllables of the originals were omitted (*apheresis*); some signs were

divided up in terms to fix the different number of syllables (*dieresis*); and some were combined to form one syllable (*syneresis*).

On the ground of a thorough study of the various notations (*Chartres*, *Coislin*, and Slavonic), the author suggests a key for deciphering the Slavonic notations. The graphics of the signs, their positions within neumatic contexts, and their functions within the various stages of the notations are investigated in a comparative manner. All the various signs of the notations as well as their combinations are systematically identified and classified. For the first time the meaning of the Palaeobyzantine and Slavonic signs (many of which indicate stereotypical tone figures) and sign combinations are explained. In terms of the *sematic* notation the author concludes that the Byzantine and Slavonic versions, except for minor variants, transmit the same melody.

In the section on the kondakarian notation the *Didactic Poem* (the *Teaching Song*) of the great medieval master John Koukouzeles, written around 1300, was included. The *Poem* is considered to be of high value for the study of all Byzantine notations. Research has established that it transmits not only regular figures and formulas of *Coislin* and Middle Byzantine notations, but also the figures of nearly all the hypostases of *Chartres* notation, and most particularly those hypostases, which were either inadequately described or just omitted in Byzantine treatises of later periods. Therefore the *Didactic Poem* of Koukouzeles proved to be probably the most important aid for Floros in deciphering the *Chartres* notation, and thus also the kondakarian notation. In this way it was possible to systematically register, classify, and name the kondakarian signs and to reconstruct their meanings. It is pointed out that many *Chartres* signs and many Late Byzantine great hypostases had the same meaning.

The results of the comparative investigation of the Byzantine and Slavonic notations are as follows: 1) the Slavs, and in particular the Russians, took over the melodies of the chants almost without changes when they were Christianized; 2) the occasional variations could be attributed to the coexistence

of different branches of tradition, firstly, and secondly to the method of adaptation; 3) the Old Slavonic kondakarian notation represents an archaic system of notation of Byzantine provenance; 4) the kondakarian signs are mostly identical semeiographically and semasiologically with *Chartres* signs; 5) the main distinction between kondakarian and *Chartres* notation is that *Chartres* does not systematically arrange the neumes in two rows and thus does not have the resulting rich possibilities of combining the great hypostases and the small signs.

In addition to this, Floros paid attention to two methods of transcription: parallel and applied *campo aperto* transcription. The method of parallel transcription is used when corresponding Middle Byzantine versions exist for the Paleobyzantine and Old Slavonic neumatic notations. The method of *campo aperto* is applied when Middle Byzantine (diastematic) parallel versions for the versions in Paleobyzantine or Old Slavonic notations do not exist and one has to depend on other aids like parallel passages with repeating series of neumes.

The method of transcription suggested by Floros is defended on the basis of a thorough study of the functions of signs in all their constellations along with the study of their intrinsic meaning.

In the same broad comparative way the author discusses the *Latin* neumes.

Considering the earliest surviving examples of neumes stemming from the German-Alemannic, French, Breton, and Palaeofrankish regions Floros concludes that notations already seem to be fully developed at the time of appearance of neumated sources. He assumes that if all the neumatic types derive from a common original notation, it would be evident that the period of the development of this notation must lie at least one or two centuries before the earliest documents. Discussing the musical treatises of Western authors like Alcuin, Aurelian, Pseudo-Huckbald, Berno, Hermann of Reichenau, as well the *Musica enhiriades*, the author pointed out an astonishing number of Greek terms for the designation of Gregorian modes (*protus, deuterus*, etc.), intonation for-

mulas, and the system of the *oktoechos*. On the basis of this it is argued that the Western theory of the modes was adopted from Byzantium.

The transcription of adiaستمatic neumatic chants for which parallel diastematic or "lined" versions are not known poses a particularly difficult task. Several facts are taken into consideration. They are outlined in the following statements. Gregorian chant consists of a large number of stereotypical repetitive melodic phrases, formulas, figures, and embellishments (the *cento* technique); each mode has its own characteristic formulas and figures; the singers knew these formulas and figures by heart; the interval values of many signs was recognizable from their position within a colon or within a series of neumes; many signs gave preference to certain immutable tone levels. Also, the names of the Latin neumes are analyzed onomasiologically. The study shows that the nomenclature originated in the first half of the 9th century at the latest. The terminology of the *tabula prolixior* must have been developed in the first half of the 11th century.

In terms of the classification of the Latin neumes, Floros stresses that the numerous modern systematic typologies differ sharply from each other. For an objective classification of the Latin neumatic repertory both historical and systematic aspects should be taken into consideration. In addition the results of the typology of the Palaeobyzantine signs should be taken into consideration as well. The author describes five classes of Latin neume signs, comparing them with their Palaeobyzantine counterparts: 1) *neumae simplices* (=tonoi haploi); 2) *neumae compositae* (=tonoi synthetoi); 3) ornamental neumes (=ornamental neumes); 4) *notae semivocales* (=hemiphona); and 5) *litterae significativae* (=grammata). The most important neumes of these five categories are discussed and the correspondences between Latin and Palaeobyzantine neumes are outlined. On the basis of the latter comparison, it is pointed out that Latin neumes and their Palaeobyzantine parallels are closely related semasiologically, which means that they fix the same tonal figures. With respect to this it is

stressed that most of the Palaeobyzantine *grammata* were completely unknown prior to 1970: for the first time they were described in Floros's research.

This chapter also poses the problem of the three families of neumes as defined by P. Ferretti in 1925³: "accent" neumes, "point" neumes, and "mixed" neumes, which are grouped on the basis of the German-Alemannic, Palaeofrankish, Breton, Aquitanian (South French), Lorraine (Metz), Central French, English, Spanish (Toledan, Mozarabic, and Catalan), and Italian regional notational scripts. Most of them indicate the same melody, but each reveals characteristic peculiarities. Concerning the theories about the relationship between the three families, Floros defends the opinion that the "accent neumes" are older and the "point neumes" and "mixed neumes" derive from them.

The problems of the topography of neumes and the characteristics of various regional notations are also posed in this chapter. The topography of neumes is considered as a separate discipline in the theory of neumes. According to the author its most important tasks are to clarify the historical and ecclesiastical prerequisites for the appearance of the various neumatic notations. The characteristics of various regional notations should be taken into consideration when one makes use of series criteria. The most important among these criteria are: the adiastrumatic character or diastematic arrangement of the neumes; the attribution of a notation to the family of "accent", "point", or "mixed" neumes; the direction of the writing; the shape and the repertory of the neumes. According to these criteria the characteristics of 14 families of neumes are shown: German-Alemannic (especially the St. Gall neumes), Palaeofrankish, Breton, Lorraine (Metz neumes), Aquitanian, Central French, English, Mozarabic (Visigothic), Toledan, Catalan,

³ Ferretti, P. Étude sur la notation Aquitaine d'après le gradual de Saint-Yrieix. – *Paléographie musicale*, 13, 1925, 54–211.

neumes from Novalesa, Bolognese, Nonantolan, and Beneventan neumes.

At the end the author poses the question of the origin of the neumes. Four theories concerning the origin of neumes are discussed: 1) neumes developed out of the tonic accents of ancient Greek⁴; 2) the neumes are traced back to the system of Alexandrian prosody⁵; 3) neumes derive from Hebraic scripts; and 4) neumes derive from Byzantine ekphonetic notation or the West adopted chant notation from Byzantium⁶. According to Floros's comparative investigations of the theory of neumes the last hypothesis is confirmed: the closest connections exist between Palaeobyzantine and Latin neumes.

In general, detailed onomasiological, semiographical, and semasiological comparisons between corresponding neumes lead the author to the following conclusions: 1) the classification worked out for Latin neumes corresponds extensively to the typology of Palaeobyzantine signs; 2) the terms used to designate Latin neumes and the significative letters are mostly borrowed words or loan translations from Middle Greek; only a few of the standard names can be said to be original Latin; the nomenclatures made up of borrowed words or loan translations from Middle Greek provide conclusive proof for the Byzantine origin of Latin chant notation; 3) the Latin "accent neumes" share the same repertory of basic neumes with Palaeobyzantine sources (especially with the signs of *Chartres* notation); also, most of the compound neumes can be shown to have Byzantine parallels; 4) the synonymous, or onomasiologically related and graphically identi-

⁴ Coussemaeker, C.-E.-H. de. *Histoire de l'harmonie au moyen âge*. Paris, 1852.

⁵ Jammers, E. *Studien zur Neumenschriften, Neumenhandschriften und neuemierter Musik*. – *Bibliothek und Wissenschaft*, 2, 1965, 85–161.

⁶ Riemann, H. *Studien zur Geschichte der Notenschrift*. Leipzig, 1878; Fleischer, O. *Neumenstudien*. Vol. 1. Leipzig, 1895; Thibaut, J. B. *Op. cit.*

cal, Palaeobyzantine and Latin neumes are often also semasiologically related or equivalent; and 5) the corresponding Palaeobyzantine and Latin *semata* often serve to indicate the same or similar figures, formulas, and phrases. The conclusion of the author is that Rome took over chant notation directly from Byzantium, albeit with certain changes.

The last chapter of the book is an investigation on *Cheironomy and Music Notation* by Neil K. Moran⁷. The chapter is directly connected to statements in the book and confirms that cheironomy was a very precise science, indicating specific intervals and musical figures. The author discusses the relationship between cheironomy and musical notation. He publishes 9 illustrations with singers from MSS and frescos from the 12th to the 16th centuries that offer some clues regarding this complicated problem. According to Moran, the illustrations suggest concrete evidence for the way in which music was notated. We all agree with his statement that reconstructing cheironomy is a very difficult task, especially as the practice seems to have disappeared in the Byzantine Church by the middle of the 17th century.

Considering the book *Introduction to Early Medieval Notation* as a whole, I would say, in conclusion, that the author, C. Floros, goes far beyond the title. The book is significant in that it gives an introduction not only to the theory of neumes but also to the history of monodic music of Byzantine, Slavonic, and Latin churches as a whole and the notations used by them: among the remarkable variety of the three basic medieval chant traditions numerous connections between the neumes are revealed.

The book is significant for Bulgarian cultural history in particular as well. The author argues that the early Slavonic books were translated from Greek into Old Bulgarian

and that this was the language that was the basis of the early Old Russian musical manuscripts. Also, for the first time the great importance of the *Didactic Poem* of Koukouzeles for Byzantine and Slavonic music is revealed. Floros's study on this *Poem* enriches our knowledge about the great medieval composer whose mother was Bulgarian, a fact proved on the basis of the *Vita* of Koukouzeles not only by Bulgarian scholars but also by the American musicologist E. Williams⁸. Furthermore, traces of South Slavonic (Bulgarian) archaisms can be found in the language of some of the kondakarian sources from the 11th to the 13th century. Of great importance for Bulgarian musicology are the four techniques of the adaptation of Old Slavonic texts to existing melodies outlined in the book. Finally, some of the studies on Bulgarian music by the Bulgarian musicologists R. Palikarova-Verdeil, E. Toncheva, and S. Kujumdžieva are cited with understanding of the problems of this particular music.

Floros's research clearly shows that it is not sufficient to collect the facts only, but equally important, to systematize and to explain them. The issues of the theory of neumes are discussed on the basis of extremely rich material from comprehensive samples of MSS, some of which are published for the first time. We should be very grateful to the publisher who allowed many complicated tables with neumes, musical examples, and facsimiles to be printed within the actual text. They will serve as an invaluable tool for comparative studies.

There is a lot we can gain from the insights of Floros's research. And we do: in almost every single publication on early medieval notation during the last 30 years scholars from different generations make use of his methodology, systematizations, and classifications (it is enough to take a look, for

⁷ N. Moran defended his Ph.D. in musicology at the University in Hamburg and is the author of numerous studies on European cultural history in Antiquity and the Middle Ages.

⁸ Williams, E. Koukouzeles' Reform of Byzantine Chanting for Great Vespers in the Fourteenth Century. Ph.D., Yale University, 1968.

instance, at the last two volumes on Palaeobyzantine notations published recently)⁹. Floros's research has provoked new studies, initiated new ideas, and fascinated various musicologists-medievalists to continue his work. This is probably the main achievement of the great scholar: it confirms that the foun-

dations he laid in the field of the theory of neumes are solid and reliable.

There is no doubt that the new English translation of the book, done by N. Moran with a deep knowledge of the problems discussed, will be read with great interest by a broad auditorium.

⁹ Palaeobyzantine Notations II. Ed. by C. Troelsgaard in collaboration with G. Wolfram. Hernen, 1999; Palaeobyzantine Notations III. Ed. by G. Wolfram. Leuven-Paris-Dudley, MA, 2004.