

CHARALAMPOS CHARALAMPOU- BYZANTINE MUSIC OPPONENT'S EVALUATION

Before proceeding to the analysis of his thesis, I would like to confess that I myself am a great admirer of Byzantine Music. I have studied it for a short time in Cyprus and I've also written an "undemanding" thesis about it. For this reason, I am convinced that Byzantine Music is a great treasure of the Greek and also the European musical culture. Its theoretical structure is very complex and difficult to comprehend and its history is often ambiguous. From the above mentioned concludes that the author had a very difficult task. If we take into consideration that the Czech as well as the Greek students of Charles University are not familiar with this kind of music, it becomes clear that such work is of great importance.

The here discussed essay, is divided into twelve (12) chapters, beginning with the definition of basic terms and historical data (Chapter 1), then an elementary teaching method is suggested with some exercises (chapter 2 and 3) and further on, dealing with more complex concepts and terms concerning the theory of Byzantine Music.

Concerning the methodology of this thesis, he uses a very coherent structure and the way in which he introduces the various issues makes it comprehensible. Also the use of English language is of a very high level.

Unfortunately there are quite a lot of mistakes concerning language and form that do not correspond to the generally high level of the work. For example, in page 6, a mistake in division of the text in paragraphs occurs. In page 9, last line, a Greek letter may be noticed accidentally in the middle of the sentence. In page 12, the 1st sentence of the 2nd paragraph seems illogical in association to the previous. In page 15, there is irrelevance between text and example. In page 17, the Greek word concerning notation is wrong. In page 18, the use of the expression "one voice up" seems inaccurate and in the same page the word *cheronomia* is written with a *b* in the place of *n*. In page 20, *Tree* is written instead of *Three*. In page 27, the word *rhythm* is divided by mistake into two lines, in the same page the explanation of the "Thesis" is incorrect (obviously by mistake). In page 58, the term *mode* is surprisingly and mistakenly replaced by the irrelevant word *sound*. In page 70, 1st line, the term *Diatonic* is mistakenly written in plural and finally, among other errors, in page 78, we find the text of page 79 and vice versa (!). In addition to such mistakes, the reader sadly finds more mistakes, concerning the clarification of theory. For instance, in page 16, the example illustrating the "Natural scale" has completely wrong intervals.

After the examination of this final thesis some questions arise that need to be answered. For instance, what is the function of the "scale" in B.M, and which is its connection to the term "genera", are they synonyms? Do the three "genera" have their equivalent in the theory of the "Western" music, (equal tuning, natural tuning etc)? An important part of theory of the B.M. is the "Micro intervals". In chapter 3, all the exercises are "translated" into "European" notation, isn't this a very serious mistake since the "micro intervals" are **completely** ignored? In page 16, two ways of teaching the "Natural scale" are mentioned (from "Nη" or from "Πα"). For this, I would like to hear the author's opinion.

After taking into consideration the above mentioned, I recommend that this Diploma work may be marked as **Very good**.

Prague, 18.5.2007