

## The Diatonic Scale in Greek Orthodox Church Music

Most musicologists assume that medieval Byzantine chant, i.e. the Greek Orthodox sacred music before the fall of Constantinople in 1453, was purely diatonic and made use of Pythagorean tuning. But what happened afterwards, when Greece came under Ottoman rule? After 1453 Greek Orthodox music gradually changed. The same poetical texts remained in use, but the music underwent the influence of Turkish music and was affected by its ‘oriental’ tonality.

The following factors may have played a role. Late Byzantine chant was composed in a highly melismatic and ornate style and had consequently developed a notation so complicated (with c. 60 signs!) that soon after 1453 it became unmanageable. Consequently oral tradition and improvisation grew in importance, with all the uncertainties inherent thereto. Further, Constantinople, where the patriarch was seated, dependent from and in close connection with the Ottoman rulers, gained an ever growing significance for the Greek Orthodox people. The musical tradition of the “Great Church”, the church of the patriarchate, became dominant. Thus cultural exchange certainly led to the occurrence of the ‘oriental’ tonality in the compositions of leading 18th century composers in the Ottoman capital. The most important of these is the great composer Petros Lampadarios (ca. 1730-1777), who improved the notation system and undertook the task to compose the music of church offices in a plain style. His output constitutes the main body of Greek Orthodox music today. In 1814, Chrysanthos of Madytos developed a new system of notation, which is still in use in Greece. Through transcription to this system, the music of Lampadarios, his contemporaries and his successors are preserved till the present day.

In an excursus in the second edition of *A History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography*, Oxford, 1961, Egon Wellesz also gives his opinion that a “transformation of the old Byzantine tonality took place under Turkish influence” (p. 366). He undoubtedly has in mind that, beside the diatonic tonality, modern Greek Orthodox chant makes use also of a ‘chromatic’ tonality. However, as is shown to be probable below, the diatonic tonality of modern Greek chant was originally an ‘oriental’ tonality as well. This can be made clear by consulting the famous book of Chrysanthos of Madytos, *Μέγα Θεωρητικὸν τῆς Μουσικῆς*, Trieste, 1832.

The following provides a preliminary understanding. In 1881 a musical committee, which met in Constantinople, defined a system of interval measuring which divided the octave into 72 interval units called ‘moria’, sg. ‘morion’. A musical interval can then be given in two ways: 1) as a ratio of the frequencies of the tones of that interval, and 2) as a number that indicates how many moria that interval contains. For a perfect fifth, then, the ratio of the frequencies of the tones is  $3/2$ , and a perfect fifth contains 42.12 moria<sup>1</sup>. Now the frequency ratio of the tones of an interval is the reverse of the ratio of the lengths of the sounding parts of a string giving that interval. So, in order to get a tone a perfect fifth higher than the tone produced by the whole string, the vibrating part of the string must be made  $2/3$  of the whole string length, since the ratio of the pitches of the high tone and low tone of a perfect fifth is  $3/2$ .

In his ‘diatonic’ scale, Pa[d] Bou[e] Ga[f] Di[g] Ke[a] Zo[b] Ne[c] Pa[d], Chrysanthos distinguishes three kinds of tones: the major tones Ga-Di[f-g], Di-Ke[g-a] and Ne-Pa[c-d], the

minor tones Pa-Bou[d-e] and Ke-Zo[a-b] and the ‘minimum’ tones Bou-Ga[e-f] and Zo-Ne[b-c] (§ 54).

Chrysanthos precisely determines (in § 63) where to place the frets on a pandouris (a great bass cistre with a Di[G]-, a Ga[F]- and a Pa[D]-string, tuned in the diatonic scale). He then correctly concludes (in § 65) that each ratio of the sounding part of a string to the whole length of the string for each different tone is:

1	8/9	22/27	3/4	2/3	11/18	9/16	1/2
Di	Ke	Zo	Ne	Pa	Bou	Ga	Di

Thus the ratio of the frequency of each tone to the frequency of the fundamental tone is:

1	9/8	27/22	4/3	3/2	18/11	16/9	2
G	a	b	c	d	e	f	g

And the ratio of the frequencies of the tones of each successive interval is:

9/8	12/11	88/81	9/8	12/11	88/81	9/8	
G	a	b	c	d	e	f	g

Then the number of moria of each tone is:

0	12.23	21.27	29.88	42.12	51.16	59.77	72
G	a	b	c	d	e	f	g

And the number of moria in each successive interval is:

12.23	9.04	8.61	12.23	9.04	8.61	12.23	
G	a	b	c	d	e	f	g

These numbers correspond approximately to:

12	9	9	12	9	9	12	
G	a	b	c	d	e	f	g

Or, to give them in tones:

1	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	1	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	1	
G	a	b	c	d	e	f	g

This scale is not at all diatonic like in modern Byzantine music, but purely Arabic or Turkish, where its three-quarter tone is characteristic. The tetrachords c-d-e-f and g-a-b-c equal the Rast tetrachord whose intervals are  $1 \frac{3}{4} \frac{3}{4}$ , and the tetrachords d-e-f-g and a-b-c-d equal the Bayati tetrachord whose intervals are  $\frac{3}{4} \frac{3}{4} 1$ , two of the most common sounds in Arabic music. This corresponds with Chrysanthos’ remark, “our diatonic genus is different from that of the Ancient Greeks and the Europeans” (§ 217 note 1).

The ‘chromatic’ scales, still in use in modern Byzantine music, with their characteristic one-and-a-half tone are also purely Arabic or Turkish. There we have to do with the Hijaz

tetrachord,  $\frac{1}{2} 1\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$ , also one of the most common sounds in Arabic music. It appears then that Byzantine music had become completely orientalized in its scales.

Unfortunately Chrysanthos gives the wrong numbers for the tones of the ‘diatonic’ genus (§ 63 note 2). He repeatedly mentions that the major tone, the minor tone and the ‘minimal’ tone have the ratio 12, 9, 7 with respect to each other. Clearly Chrysanthos did not have any notion of logarithms. In fact, if the major tone is given the number 12, the ratio is 12, 8.86, 8.44<sup>2</sup>.

Considering the nonsensical numbers 12, 9 and 7 for the tones of the diatonic genus, one must also mistrust the numbers Chrysanthos gives for the ‘enharmonic’ and ‘chromatic’ genera. For these he doesn’t give the placing of the frets and the shortening of the strings, such as for his diatonic genus. The numbers Chrysanthos gives for the chromatic genus are a clear example of error:

	7		12		7		12		7		12		7	
D		E		F		G		a		b		c		d

Here E-F and b-c, which have to be augmented tones, have the same number of interval units as the major tone in his ‘diatonic’ genus. Moreover, the octave here has 64 interval units instead of 68 in the other cases. These numbers were later corrected by others<sup>3</sup>:

	7		14		7		12		7		14		7	
D		E		F		G		a		b		c		d

Chrysanthos’ numbers 12, 9 and 7 for the tones in the ‘diatonic’ genus remained unaltered till 1881. At that time the aforementioned musical committee defined the diatonic scale – later called the **soft diatonic scale**<sup>4</sup> – anew, giving the major tone 12 moria, the minor tone 10 moria, and the minimum tone 8 moria. This scale has some resemblance with the western diatonic scale in just intonation, where the two different major seconds and the minor second have the frequency ratios 9/8, 10/9 and 16/15. In terms of moria: 12.23, 10.94 and 6.70. If just intonation was intended, it would have been better to assign the major tone 12, the minor tone 11 and the minimum tone 7 moria. For a pure major third of 23.18 moria, an approximate major third 12 + 10 = 22 is too small, but the major third 12 + 11 = 23 is close to perfect.

Moreover an ‘enharmonic’ scale was also defined – later called **hard diatonic scale**<sup>4</sup> – with 12 moria for the whole tones and 6 moria for the semitones. This scale is in fact identical with the western diatonic scale in equal temperament. This scale approaches the Pythagorean scale, where all major seconds have the vibration ratio 9/8 and the minor second the frequency ratio 256/243, in moria 12.23 and 5.41.

In my opinion the difference between the soft diatonic and hard diatonic genera is purely theoretical. In monophonic vocal music the pitches are not so stable as in other genres of music. They may vary from purely **Pythagorean tuning** (hard diatonic?) to more or less **just intonation** (soft diatonic?), according with the intended musical expression of the text or in relation with a existing drone on the base tone. Hearing Greek cantors singing provides affirmation of this hypothesis.

Contrary to the expectation of many Greeks, the tonalities used in modern Greek Orthodox church music have no direct equivalence to the tonality that was used in the older Byzantine





W. Christ / M. Paranikas, *Anthologia Graeca Carminum Christianorum*, Lipsiae, 1871.

Ἰωάννης Δ. Μαργαζιώτης, *Θεωρητικὸν Βυζαντινῆς Ἐκκλησιαστικῆς Μουσικῆς*, Αθῆναι, 1958.

Egon Wellesz, *A History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography*, Oxford, second edition 1961.

Σίμων Καράς, *Μέθοδος τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Μουσικῆς Θεωρητικόν*, Αθῆναι, 1982.

Ioannis Arvanitis, ‘On Chrysanthos’ Diatonic Scale (Part One)’, 2005. See Google: “On Chrysanthos’ Diatonic Scale (Part One)”.

*With thanks to Kevin Rooney, who helped me in clarifying this paper*