CHAPTER 6

THE FINAL PERIOD IN THE CYCLE: EVALUATING THE WORKS OF GREEK- ORTHODOX MUSIC THEORISTS OF THE 19th CENTURY OTTOMAN MUSIC SCENE AS A CULTURAL MEDIA FOR CONSTRUCTING OR PRESERVING NATIONAL IDENTITY

Nevin ŞAHİN¹, Cenk GÜRAY²

¹Hacettepe University, Ankara State Conservatory, Ankara, Turkey
e-mail: nevin.sahin@hacettepe.edu.tr

²Hacettepe University, Ankara State Conservatory, Ankara, Turkey
e-mail: cenk.guray@gmail.com

DOI: 10.26650/B/AA09.2021.007.06

ABSTRACT

This chapter compares music-related treatises of Greek-Orthodox theorists to elucidate the effects of the dominant 19th century nationalist ideologies on music theory. The shift in the Greek-Orthodox community in the Ottoman Empire from ethno-religious identification to a national identity paralleled the political developments of the era. Subsequently, this transferal played a role in shaping a Greek national music within the Ottoman Empire, utilizing ecclesiastical and folk music traditions. The influence of these developments on music theory was, however, directed toward geographical and transcultural connections rather than toward efforts to establish a national music theory congruent with the music traditions in question. The chapter examines the ideas generated by 19th-century Greek-Orthodox music theorists Apostolos Konstas, Konstantinos Protopsaltis, and Panagiotis Kiltzanidis against the work of their 18th-century counterparts, Panagiotis Chalatzoglou and Kyrillos Marmarinos. It especially scrutinizes connections to the multicultural work of Tanburî Küçük Artin and contemplates the influence of the 18th century theorist Dimitrie Cantemir. These analyses reveal the emergence of a line of Greek-Orthodox theory that also nourished the theoretical conventions of Ottoman music, distinguishing the Istanbul musical tradition from Arabic and Persian music practices. The study also ascertains the transculturality of forming a music theory influenced by Turkish-Muslim, Greek-Orthodox, Armenian, and other multicultural perspectives.

Keywords: Music theory, Greek-Orthodox music theory, Ottoman music theory, 18th and 19th century music manuscripts, music and nationalism

In the 19th century, the Ottoman Empire faced a transformation in political and cultural domains which mainly revolved around the agenda of nationalism. The terminology “millet,” which is the most direct marker of developments related to nationalism, hence entered the literature in the 19th century under the influence of constitutional reforms in 1839 and 1856 (Anagnostopulu, 2011, pp. 2-5). While empowering the Roman Patriarchate¹ over all Orthodox minorities within the empire, the reforms on the other hand secularized its status, and thus played a role in the transformation from ethno-religious minorities towards national identities (ibid. 5-8). In terms of ethno-religious identification, Greeks were dominant among minorities in the Ottoman Empire not only demographically but also culturally. The publishing tradition dating back to the 16th century provided linguistic dominance to Greeks in that Turkish and Armenian texts would be written with the Greek alphabet, and Bulgarian communities would adapt the Greek identity for its hierarchical advantages, which rested both on the power of the patriarchate and that of the publishing tradition. (Clogg, 1982, pp. 188-189). Moving from ethno-religious identification to national identity, the Greek-Orthodox community also sought a way of identification through music. Against the backdrop of the efforts of Turkish-Muslim musicians to develop a national music by categorizing non-Turkish and non-Muslim traditional elements into “Ottoman music,” the Greek-Orthodox community embraced the ecclesiastical music and folk songs to form their own national music (Erol, 2015, p. 150).

Was this trend of nationalization followed in the domain of music theory during the 19th century as well? The traditional music theory of Anatolia based on the “theory of cycles” had already experienced radical changes after the 17th century, especially under the influence of the treatise of Dimitrie Cantemir (Popescu-Judet, 1999; Tura, 2001). Departing from the relationship between music theory and nature, the theory moved towards interpreting makam structures as melodic contours between specific fret intonations. Despite the change, the theoretical works of the 18th and 19th centuries kept reflecting the multicultural heritage of Istanbul. This article delves into the function of music theory as a means of constructing or preserving national identity and analyzes the contributions of Greek-Orthodox theorists to makam theory. The works of Apostolos Konstas (1800-1820), Konstantinos Protopsaltis

1 From the 4th century onwards, the Eastern Orthodox Church of Byzantium was organized into Patriarchates, the one located in the capital city of the Eastern Roman Empire being hierarchically superior as unifying all Orthodox churches (primus inter pares-first among equals) and central to the empire (Οικουμενι-οικουμένη, “household” of the empire), hence being named the Ecumenical Patriarchate (Οικουμενικόν Πατριαρχεῖον Κωνσταντινουπόλεως). The status of the Roman Orthodox Patriarchate did not change after the conquest of Istanbul by Sultan Mehmed II, although it was relocated several times to different churches within the city. Since the 16th century, the patriarchate has been located in Phanar, hence being named as The Roman Patriarchate of Phanar (Fener Rum Patrikhanesi) in Turkish. See Ortaylı, 2018 for further details.

(1843), and Panagiotis Kiltzanidis (1881)² are taken into account in terms of the “expressed” similarities and “indicated” differences between Ottoman music culture and Greek-Orthodox music tradition referring both to the “strong” relation between these two music cultures and to the “newly” emerging “dilemma” between the Ottoman and Greek-Orthodox identities due to nationalism, which was a dominant force of the era.

The Chronological and Theoretical Interaction of Greek-Orthodox Music Theorists

Makam structures can be traced back nearly 5000 years to Ancient Mesopotamian music culture and have been the musical material of Asia Minor, used throughout the Ancient Greek, Roman, Byzantine, and Ottoman Empires and the Turkish Republic as well as the surrounding Muslim and Jewish cultures. This historical connection between different cultures, especially the interaction between Turkish-Muslim and Greek-Orthodox music traditions, made its way into comparative theoretical approaches in the 18th century. Panagiotis Chalatzoglou pioneered the comparative studies in his treatise which compared the Byzantine echoi and “Persian” makams (Popescu-Judet, & Sirli, 2000). The path opened by his treatise in the early 18th century was followed by his student Kyrillos Marmarinos and the 19th century witnessed a blossom of comparative theoretical works. The chronological and theoretical connections of three of those works by Apostolos Konstas, Konstantinos Protopsaltis, and Panagiotis Kiltzanidis, which were analyzed within the scope of this article, are provided below with summary information on their treatises and example comparisons of their fret identifications with one another and with preceding multicultural works by Dimitrie Cantemir and Tanburî Küçük Artin (Popescu-Judet, 2002).

Apostolos Konstas (1770?-1840) was a significant contributor to the musical life of the Greek-Orthodox community in the early 19th century. As a student of significant church musicians of the era (Pappas, 2007, pp. 10-11), Konstas made his name as an important transcriber of music treatises and a tanbur player (Pappas & Beşiroğlu, 2007, p. 36). Experiencing the context that led to the reform in Byzantine neume notation in 1814, Konstas made an effort to identify the problems of the Old Method³ (ibid. 36) as well as

2 There are other Greek-Orthodox contributors in this century like Ioannis Zografos from Geyve (Kılıçarslan, 2013), and Stefanos Mihail (İhsanoğlu, 2003, p. 146). Cem Behar (1994, p. 46) claims that Ioannis Zografos's work “Mousikon Apanthisma-Mecmua-yı Makamat” is a copy of his Turkish-Muslim contemporary Haşim Bey Mecmuası, and Miltiadis Pappas (1997, p. 4) claims that Konstantinos Protopsaltis's work (written by Stefanos Mihail under the supervision of Konstantinos according to İhsanoğlu) is a copy of 18th century theoretician Kyrillos Marmarinos's work.

3 Thomas Apostolopoulos (2002) did an extensive research on Konstas's contribution to Byzantine music theory with reference to his comparative approach on “technical elements of European and Arabic-Persian music.”

providing theoretical definitions and explanations about “external music” in his treatise named *Technology* (Τεχνολογία του Απόστολου Κόνστα Χίου). When doing so, he clearly benefitted from the treatise of Cantemir although he did not openly say so in his manuscript. He mostly agreed with Cantemir in the 17-fret pitch scale and he borrowed the term “babet-babet” from Cantemir’s “bab” with the same meaning, “section” (ibid. 40). One slight difference found in Konstas is that unlike Cantemir, he included another fret between Yegah and Aşiran, which he named Pest Bayati in the ascending scale and Pest Hisar or Sorizen in the descending scale (ibid. 40). Although Pappas and Beşiroğlu claim that Konstas was the first theoretician to use the fret name Sorizen (ibid. 39), Popescu-Judet (2010) makes it clear that Tanburî Küçük Artin actually used this terminology in his treatise, which was another 18th century comparative work covering Indian music as well. It can be inferred from the usage of the fret Sorizen that Konstas might have also been influenced by Artin’s work. Despite the fact that Chalatzoglou built his comparative theory upon Cantemir’s treatise and that Konstas was influenced by his treatise, it is striking that Konstas differed from Chalatzoglou in the makam equivalents of plagal echoi⁴ (ibid. 38). This was Konstas’s error according to Pappas since his successor Kiltzanidis disagreed with Konstas while aligning with their predecessor Kyrillos in the authentic echoi; however, Kyrillos and Kiltzanidis did not agree about plagal echoi either. This can be interpreted in terms of a progressive interaction and interpretation of makams and echoi throughout the 18th and 19th centuries, which enabled theoreticians to correlate different makams and echoi in the course of history.

A later work is that by Panagiotis Kiltzanidis (1810?-1896), who was also trained as a church musician and developed expertise in makam music, with contributions to both ecclesiastical music and “external music” (Pappas, 1997, pp. 5-6). In his book, Kiltzanidis declared that he benefitted from Cantemir’s treatise on “external music” and Hafid Efendi’s “Galatat-ı Meşhure-yi Osmaniyye” (ibid. 14). In addition to these sources, Kiltzanidis also benefitted from Konstas (Pappas, 2007, p. 57). In the Greek edition of Konstas, a fret between Çargah and Neva named “Seba” (referring to Saba in an orthographically different way) was described, and Uzzal was the only fret between these two main frets in a later edition in Karamanli (a variety of Turkish written in Greek alphabet). However, both frets were located in between Çargah and Neva in Kiltzanidis (Pappas & Beşiroğlu, 2007, p. 40). The striking difference was that Cantemir gave Saba as a half step above Çargah and Uzzal as a half step below Neva while Kiltzanidis claimed the exact opposite (Pappas, 1997, p. 148). This simple

4 Similar to Western modal theory, Byzantine music theory was also built upon eight modes (Οκτώηχος-oktōēchos). The first four modes are named as authentic echoi and the lower four modes are named as plagal echoi. See Jeffery, 2001 for further details.

difference concerning the frets between Çargah and Neva shows that neither treatise copied Cantemir, nor one another, directly. Furthermore, one significant contribution of Kiltzanidis was that he defined a new makam, Gümüş Gerdan, which does not appear in any other theoretical work (ibid. 182).

Between Konstas and Kiltzanidis came Konstantinos Protopsaltis's work *Ermineia Tis Exoterikis Mousikis* (Ερμηνεία Της Εξωτερικῆς Μουσικῆς-Explanation of External Music), which was published by the Roman Patriarchate (Feyzi, 2016, p. 204). The use of the same pitch system used in preceding treatises and of the tanbur as the main instrument for showing the frets, showed that Cantemir's influence was dominant in Ermineia. Having the *edvar*⁵ structure with explanations of the pitch system, *usûls* and their performance, makams and their melodic progressions, the book fulfilled its aim to teach "external music" to Greek-Orthodox church musicians by providing a *kâr-ı natık* in makam Rast in the end (ibid. 212). This piece covering 52 makams weakens the claim that it was a direct copy of Kyrillos although the way the two theorists analyzed makams is the same.

The term "external music" was used unanimously in 19th century theory sources and whether or not this expression was a marker of national identity, the predominant agenda of the era, is an aspect that should be investigated. Since Byzantine notation was mostly used in churches for transcribing ecclesiastical music, another term was necessary for labelling secular music. Thus, this externality primarily referred to the secular aspect of the music at issue (Pappas, 2007, pp. 7-8). Unlike Chalatzoglou's naming makam music as Persian and Kyrillos as Arabo-Persian, the "external music" terminology does not carry direct connotations of ethnicity or nationality. Nevertheless, the term encompassed Turkishness and Muslimness attributed to makam music contrary to the Byzantine identity attributed to ecclesiastical music. Kiltzanidis also distinguished between Arabo-Persian music and "external music" when he acknowledged Cantemir's and Chrysanthos's works⁶ on music theory (Pappas, 1997, pp. 14-15), which can be interpreted as his connotation of the geographical connection between Byzantine music and Ottoman music. Besides, there are claims that the Greek-Orthodox community embraced

5 The early Ottoman music manuscripts described the relationship between structures comprising makam and *usûl* in cyclic illustrations, which were named *devr*, *edvar* being the plural form. Later on, the term was used to refer to music manuscripts even though the cyclic connection was gradually abandoned. See Güray 2017 for further details.

6 Kiltzanidis referred to the 1832-treatise *Θεωρητικόν μέγα της μουσικῆς* (Great Theory of Music) by Chrysanthos of Madytos (d. 1843), who was among the "Three Teachers" establishing the New Method for Byzantine neumatic notation. See Romanou, 1990 for further details.

“external music” in an effort to “maintain their cultural identity against the rise of Western music⁷ and staff notation” by theorizing makam music (Feyzi, 2016, p. 204).

The effect of Orthodox Church in the transmission of makam theory

Before the influence of the Greek-Orthodox theorists on makam theory in the 18th and 19th Centuries, four main themes were prominent as characteristics dominating the theoretical approach of the period:

- There was a very clear distinction from the mathematics-based school of Ancient Mesopotamia and Ancient Greece, following the way of a predominantly verbal (oral) theory. Therefore, because of the possible variations within the oral transmission, makam structures could change from source to source both in organization and the sound material utilized.
- The revolutionary influence of Sultan Selim III had a transformative effect both on music theory and practice. This era of change initiated transformations “within the tradition.”
- At the beginning of the 18th century, two important attempts at developing musical notations were put forward by Cantemir and Albert Bobowski. These two studies are special in the way that they represent two of the oldest score archives of the “Eastern” world.
- The deviation of the theory line from its historical implementation, after the loss of the the ancient cosmos-music-human connections, had started in the 15th century and accelerated throughout the 18th century.⁸ (Güray & Aydın, 2009)

Greek-Orthodox theorists developed a unique line of theory that interacted significantly with those of other Ottoman theorists of the period. However, the former differed in the way they included the characteristics of Greek-Orthodox church music in the theory. Their influence on makam theory through Byzantine music theory can be summarized as follows:

7 Merih Erol identifies a similar concern against the invasion of values attributed to Western music and staff notation in Ali Rifat (Çağatay)’s late 19th century ideas where he states intermingling “our” music with Western music will destroy the musical heritage of the ancestors, which parallels the nationalist discourse adapted as well by Greek-Orthodox musicians and teachers during that time (2014, pp. 364-5).

8 Hızır Ağa can be claimed to have authored the last treatise maintaining the cosmos-music-human relation in the 18th century while there are references to cosmological connections in Artin’s work related also to Indian mythology. Both treatises differ in makam understanding from those of the 15th century. Nâyî Osman Dede in his early 18th century work, criticizes several “new” theorists for losing connection with the old theory tradition. Besides, Sultan Selim’s effect, observed especially in the treatise he commissioned to Nâsır Abdülbâkî Dede, triggered innovative approaches to theory and Cantemir’s transformative model became even more dominant. For further information on the interrelationship between theoretical approaches of the period, see Güray, 2017, pp. 101-115.

- Byzantine music theory formed the background of all the works by Greek-Orthodox theorists of the period. These writers regarded Byzantine music theory as a strong part of their musical and cultural identity.
- They implied the effect of Byzantine theory on the construction of Ottoman music theory.
- They also indicated the differentiation of Ottoman music theory from Byzantine theory, and the effects of Arabic and Persian musical styles.

When the theoretical understandings of Greek-Orthodox theorists and Turkish-Muslim theorists are compared, it can be understood that neither limited themselves to their local theoretical understandings, but they rather benefitted from one another's contribution to makam theory (Şahin, Güray & Aydın, 2018, p. 123). Figure 1 shows the relationship between makam theorists of the 18th and 19th centuries, suggesting that rather than nationalism, transnationalism and transculturality shaped the comparative understanding of makam theory and Byzantine music theory throughout the 18th and 19th centuries.

Figure 1. Interactions between the theorists of the period in light of Güray, 2017, p. 108

When these interactions are evaluated in tandem with the socio-cultural and political atmosphere of the period, a specific line of theory within the Greek-Orthodox church can be identified. The effects of this theory line on the formation of a Greek national identity along with compositional practices can be summarized as in Table 1. One significant difference, in the 19th century, from the theory line of the 18th century among Greek-Orthodox theorists can be identified as the distinction between “external music” and Arabo-Persian music. The usage

of the term “external music” to refer to the Turkish makam tradition was not meant to exclude Turkishness from Greek-Orthodox music theory. Therefore, it would not be wrong to interpret this development as an effort to locate Greek national identity not only theoretically but also as geographically distant from Arabic and Persian identities while utilizing Ottoman identity for the establishment of a Greek national identity. This process was also significantly different from the theoretical approach among their Turkish-Muslim counterparts in the early 20th century, who would seek a purely national understanding of music theory by eliminating all non-Turkish elements including Greek, Byzantine, Armenian, Arabic, and Persian interactions (Arel, 1969).

Table 1. The socio-cultural and practical characteristics of the Makam Theory Approach within the Greek Orthodox Church	
Makam Theory within the Greek-Orthodox Church	
Practical Side	Socio-cultural Side
Developed through a complex combination of sources, carrying strong traces of church tradition, but extensively interacting, in practice, within the Ottoman makam tradition.	A strong media of presenting and preserving Greek-Orthodox identity while forming strong bonds with Byzantine music theory.
A strong source of Ottoman music culture reflecting the rich compositional heritage of Greek-Orthodox composers.	Strengthened identity by differentiating Greek-Orthodox musical culture from Ottoman musical culture, based on the latter’s strong interconnection with Arabic and Persian musical cultures.
No great difference between the performances and works of Greek-Orthodox and Turkish-Muslim composers are found, but the differentiation starts in theory.	This is not a paradox as music theory transmits not only musical choices, but also the social cross-sections informing musical presentation. In this case, the transformations in the Greek-Orthodox community with regard to social changes in history and the development of an Ottoman-free base to represent their national identity.

Conclusion

The findings of the comparative analysis of 19th century Greek-Orthodox sources of makam music theory reveal three important conclusions. Firstly, a peculiar theoretical line in makam music nurtured by the Greek-Orthodox church can be identified, with a historical basis in the Ancient Greek and Byzantine roots of makam theory. Secondly, this theoretical line did not become straight and monolithic by segregating the influences of the surrounding Turkish, Arabic and Persian cultural traditions. While the 18th century theoretical approach among Greek-Orthodox scholars went in that direction, the 19th century scholars adapted the term “external music” to indicate secular music as distinct from the ecclesiastical music of

the church tradition rooted in the Byzantine period, and to indicate “the makam theory” of Ottoman Istanbul while also distinguishing it from Arabic and Persian makam traditions, which can be regarded as a further elaboration of theoretical interaction on a geographical basis. Lastly, the close connection of 19th century music theory works by Greek-Orthodox scholars with Cantemir’s 18th century treatise from a cultural outsider’s point of view, Artin’s 18th century treatise from a multicultural point of view, and Hafid Efendi’s early 19th century treatise from a Turkish-Muslim point of view, signals the importance of transculturality in understanding the multicultural heritage of the Ottoman Empire. The cultural interaction embedded in 19th century music theory reveals that the nationalism dominant in the period did not solely develop from a “Greco-centric” stance but was rather a multi-faceted process identifying cultural and traditional loci and defining itself interactively, when considered from the perspective of music theory. Further study in the field might reveal even more intricate connections between Greek national identity and surrounding identifications in the 19th century.

References

- Anagnostopulu, A. (2011). *Tanzimat ve Rum Milletinin Kurumsal Çerçevesi* [Tanzimat and the Institutional Framework of the Rum Millet]. In Pinelopi Stathis, ed. *19. Yüzyıl İstanbul’unda Gayrimüslimler* [Non-Muslims in the 19th Century Istanbul] (pp. 1-38). İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları..
- Apostolopoulos, T. K. (2002). *Apostolos Konstantos of Chios and his Contribution to the Theory of Music* (*O Apostolos Kωνσταντoς O Χίος Και Η Συμβολή Του Στη Θεωρία Τησ Μουσικής Τεχνης*). Athens: Stathēs.
- Arel, H. S. (1969). Türk Musikisi Kimindir [Whom Does Turkish Music Belong To]. *İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi*.
- Behar, C. (1994). Türk Musikisinin Tarihi Kaynaklarından Karamanlıca Yayınlar [Karamanli Publications from Historical Sources of Turkish Music], *Müteferrika*, 2: 39.
- Clogg, R. (1982). The Greek Millet in the Ottoman Empire. In Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis (Eds.). *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society* (vol. 1, pp. 185-207). New York and London: Holmes and Meier Publishers..
- Erol, M. (2014). Musicological Debates between Greeks and Turks in the Late Ottoman Empire: Dialogue and the Creation of the ‘Other.’ In Suraiya Faroqhi & Arzu Öztürkmen (Eds.), *Celebration, Entertainment and Theatre in the Ottoman World* (pp. 359-376). London, New York, Calcutta: Seagull Books..
- Erol, M. (2015). *Greek Orthodox Music in Ottoman Istanbul: Nation and Community in the Era of Reform*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Feyzi, A. (2016). XIX. Yüzyıl Bizans Müziği Kuramsal Yapı İfadesinde Geleneksel Türk Müziği Etkileri [Effects of Traditional Turkish Music on the Expression of Theoretical Structure in 19th Century Byzantine Music], *Zeitschrift für die Welt der Türken*, 8 (2): 199-215.
- Güray, C. (2017 [2012]). *Bin Yılın Mirası: Makamı Var Eden Döngü: Edvar Geleneği* [Heritage of a Thousand Years: The Cycle Creating Makam: Edvar Tradition]. İstanbul: Pan Yayıncılık.
- Güray, C. & Aydın, A. F. (2009). The Heritage of Byzantine in the Memory of Ottoman: Greek Orthodox Theorists and Their Effect in the Transmission of the Makam Theory. *Paper presented at the 2nd International Conference of Byzantine Music and Hymnology*, Athens.

- İhsanoğlu, E., ed. (2003). *Osmanlı Musîkî Literatürü Tarihi* [History of Ottoman Music Literature]. *Istanbul, Turkey: IRCICA*.
- Jeffery, P. (2001). Oktōēchos, *Groove Music Online*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.article.50097>. [Accessed 18 August 2020]
- Kılıçarslan, M. (2013). Karamanlî Bir Musîkî Mecmuası: Mecmua-yı Makamat [A Music Treatise in Karamanli: Mecmua-yı Makamat], *International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 8 (1): 373-400.
- Ortaylı, İ. (2018). *Osmanlı Barışı* [Ottoman Peace]. 10th ed. *Istanbul: Timaş Yayınları*.
- Pappas, M. (1997). *Kiltzanidis'in Kitabı* [Kiltzanidis's Book]. (Master's Thesis, Istanbul Technical University). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- Pappas, M. (2007). *Apostolos Konstas'ın Nazariyat Kitabı* [Apostolos Konstas's Theory Book]. (Doctoral Dissertation, Istanbul Technical University). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- Pappas, M. & Beşiroğlu, Ş. Ş. (2007). Apostolos Konstas'ın Nazariyat Kitabı'na İlişkin Bir İnceleme [An Analysis of Apostolos Konstas's Theory Book], *İTÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 4 (2): 33-42.
- Popescu-Judet, E. (1999). *Prince Dimitrie Cantemir: Theorist and Composer of Turkish Music*. Istanbul: Pan Yayıncılık.
- Popescu-Judet, E. (2002). *Tanburî Küçük Artin: A Musical Treatise of the Eighteenth Century*. Istanbul: Pan Yayıncılık.
- Popescu-Judet, E. (2010). *A Summary Catalogue of the Turkish Makams*. Istanbul, Turkey : Pan Yayıncılık.
- Popescu-Judet, E. & Sirli, A. A. (2000). *Sources of 18th Century Music: Panayiotis Chalatzoglou and Kyrillos Marmarinos' Comparative Treatises on Secular Music*. Istanbul, Turkey: Pan Yayıncılık.
- Romanou, K. (1990). A New Approach to the Work of Chrysanthos of Madytos: The New Method of Musical Notation in Greek Church and the Μέγα Θεωρητικόν της Μουσικῆς. In Wellesz, E. ed. *Studies in Eastern Chant*, vol. 5. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Pp. 1-13.
- Şahin, N., Güray, C. & Aydın, A. F. (2018). Cross-Cultural Influences in Makam Theory: The Case of Greek Orthodox Theorists in the Ottoman Empire, *Musicologist*, 2 (2),115-126.
- Tura, Y., ed. (2001). *Kitābu 'İlmi'l-Musîkî 'alā vechi'l-Hurūfāt: Mûsikîyi Harflerle Tesbî ve İcrâ İlminin Kitabı* [Book of Establishing Music through Letters and the Science of Performance]. 1. Cilt Edvâr (Tıpkıbasım-Çeviriyazı-Çeviri-Notlar). *Istanbul, Turkey: Yapı Kredi Yayınları*.