

NOUNE POGHOSYAN-ZELTSBURG

LEVON CHILINKIREAN AND HIS “UNKNOWN” *PATARAG*

Introduction

At the turn of the 20th century, one of the most important duties in Armenian music was assigned to the choirmasters acting in various churches. Their activity was especially significant in the Western Armenian communities, where religious music was going through changes, which shaped its forms and its development in the following decades. However, despite the rapid cultural development, many intellectuals feared that it was suffering from strong external influences and was at the brink of loss of the national identity.

One of these choirmasters, Levon Chilinkirean, played a considerable role particularly in the development of chant style in the Armenian communities of Constantinople and Jerusalem, being the choirmaster (*drapet*) and music director (*erazhshtapet*) of the Holy Trinity Church and St. James monastery respectively. He also created a “Three-Part Chant of the Holy Liturgy”. For decades, the score of this Liturgy was considered lost and it was unknown to the community of Armenian music specialists for a number of reasons, even though it was the first three-part choir performance of the Armenian Liturgy in Constantinople (1906)¹. Meanwhile, he has left a large collection of records both in Armenian and Western notation of which we find evidence in the Manuscripts collection of the St. James community. These are performed until this day, and his Songs of Sunrise Service (*Արևադարձի երգեր*) and the “Three-Part Chant of the Holy Liturgy” (*Եռաձայն երգեցողութիւն Սրբոյ Պատարագի*) were repeatedly published².

¹ M. Muradyan even mentions that there is no information about this Liturgy since, as he writes, “it was never printed”. See: **Մ. Հ. Մուրադյան**, *Ուրվագիծ արևմտահայ երաժշտության պատմության, Եր., ԳԱ հրատ.*, 1989 (**M. Muradyan**, *Outline of the Western-Armenian Music History*, Printing press of AAS, Yerevan, 1989), p. 63.

² *Եռաձայն երգեցողութիւն Ս. Պատարագի*, Զայնագրեց **Լեւոն Մ. Զիլինկիրեան**, Զմյուռնիա (Իզմիր), տպագր. Մամբլոս Մամուրյանի, 1898 թ. (in Armenian notation); **Լեւոն Մ. Զիլինկիրեան**, *Եռաձայն երգեցողութիւն Ս. Պատարագի*, Imprimerie G. Savigny, Paris (date unknown); *Եռաձայն երգեցողութիւն Ս. Պատարագի* (արական խումբի համար). դաշնաուրեց **Լ. Մ. Զիլինկիրեան**, Երուսաղէմ 1931 (in Western notation).

Aiming to identify Chilinkirean's creative activity and the esthetic and historical importance of his Liturgy in ethnomusicological perspective, and thus shed light on a little-known page of the history of Armenian music, I have tried to recreate the musician's artistic portrait. In the course of the study, a number of interesting challenges and methods to their solution arose, among which:

- to recover some details of Chilinkirean's life, comparing cultural-historical data from period sources,
- to reveal Chilinkirian's possible direct or indirect musical contacts with the creations of other choirmasters and composers of the time, and the consequences of such contacts,
- to explore the cultural and historical context of Chilinkirean's versions' appearance,
- to study the legacy left by Chilinkirean, focusing on the circumstances of the creation and printing of the Three-part Liturgy,
- to identify the cultural and historical significance of Chilinkirean's role in Armenian music and of his Liturgy in particular.

Levon Chilinkirian's life and activity are scarcely documented. Although his melodies are widely performed in churches of various Armenian communities, until this day there is not one systematic study devoted to his artistic life and musical heritage. The only sources providing any professional musicological reference to the subject are brief notes in A. Hisarlean's and M. Muradian's Armenian music histories³. To re-produce the details of the artist's biography and creative activity, one could use secondary sources such as publications in press periodicals of the musician's time, yearbooks, writings of his contemporaries, and letters. As primary sources, publications of Chilinkirian's "Patarag" and "Songs of Sunrise Service", as well as manuscript collections, provide the most valuable research materials.

This paper is the first attempt to systematically study Levon Chilinkirian's life and work. It discusses one of the least familiar musical versions of the Armenian Liturgy, with some aspects of its creation and performance history.

³ Ա. Հիսարլեան, *Պատմություն հայ ձայնագրությունների և նկարագրությունը երաժիշտ ազգայնոց 1768-1909*, Կ. Պոլիս 1914; Մ. Հ. Մուրադյան, *Ուրվագիծ արևմտահայ երաժշտության պատմության*. An invaluable source would be the collection of the yearbooks published at the beginning of the 20th century by the Armenian intellectual Teodik, which is considered the most reliable encyclopedia of the Armenian life of the time and unfortunately has become a bibliographic rarity; see Թեոդիկ, «Ամլնուն տարեցույցը», 1909-1928. Apparently, this was the main source used by the few authors who referred to Chilinkirian's biography.

Chilinkirian's life

Levon Chilinkirian was born on 25 December 1862⁴ in the Ortaköy district of Istanbul (traditionally called Constantinople by Armenians), to Srбуhi and Martiros Chilinkirean; he was orphaned at an early age. Chilinkirian received his early education in the Narekean, Roubenian and Ambrosean schools, after which he studied in the renowned Kedronakan high school. He was only nineteen when he started his activities as *dprapet* and music teacher; he taught in Pangalti, and later in Smyrna, where he stayed for about three years. Chilinkirian's musical activities were interrupted by a thirteen-year period of service in the Ounjian-Esayean steam-boat company. In the mid-1890s his name appeared again in the musical spheres. He married Elbis Abrahamian in 1895, and due to the security situation in the Ottoman Empire caused by the events of 1896 he moved to Russia, where he served at a certain music related position in Baku for a year. In 1897 he returned to Smyrna, acted as a music teacher, and in 1898 his three-part *Patarag* arrangement was printed in Armenian notation in the Mamurean printing house.

The next two stages of the musician's life are linked respectively with Constantinople and Jerusalem. He arrived to Constantinople after a short period of service in Atabazar, and stayed there until 1922. Here he served as choirmaster in the churches of Galata, Pera, Beşiktaş; his work in the Holy Trinity and St.Grikor Lusavorich churches is mentioned as especially successful. He also taught music and European notation in the notable Kedronakan High School.

In October of 1922 Chilinkirian moved to Jerusalem, to serve as the choirmaster, music director and music teacher in the St.James monastic community. He would stay in Jerusalem until his death in November 1932⁵. From these years of his activity, we have the *Patarag* and "Songs of Sunrise Service" published in facsimile in European notation, as well as a number of other religious music manuscript collections, both in European and Armenian notation⁶.

Although there is very little documentation about Levon Chilinkirean's life, and some stages of it are still unknown, it is discernible that his most productive years were spent in the most important centers of Armenian life, namely Smyrna, Constantinople, and Jerusalem. In

⁴ Old calendar; by the Gregorian calendar his birth date is 6 January 1863.

⁵ His service in Jerusalem was briefly interrupted when he travelled to Cyprus, supposedly, for family reasons.

⁶ See N. Bogharean, *Grand Catalogue of St. James manuscripts*, Jerusalem, 1968-91.

Smyrna, virtually immediately upon his arrival, he published his Liturgy. In Constantinople, already during the very first years of his service, on 14 September 1906, the Liturgy was performed by a three-part choir and with an organ accompaniment, and the performance was accompanied by Harutyun Sinanian⁷. In the period of his work in Jerusalem, he evidently endeavored to reform the entire religious chant of the local community. This is apparent from various notebooks and collections, part of which leave an impression of unfinished draft work, and another part, though complete, contains notes, amendments, corrections, and comments. In the preface to the edition of the *Patarag* of 1931 (Jerusalem), the author himself even states that the book that was prepared for use in Zharangavorats' Seminary, "... does not represent a complete work. When it will be possible to provide a patron's support, then we hope to publish our complete work normally and perfectly"⁸.

Introduction of Polyphony to Armenian Church Music

Attempts to convert the traditionally monophonic music of the Armenian Liturgy into polyphony were made by a number of musicians. The following paragraph mentions a few of the most important works in this context.

In 1873 in Ackerman, the Ukrainian playwright and musician M.L. Kropivnitsky presented his version of three-part chant of liturgical songs of the Armenians in Crimea. Pietro Bianchini's arrangement of the *Patarag* service was first published in 1876 and represented the liturgical service of the Mekhitarist brotherhood of St. Lazzaro, Venice. One of the pioneers of the Armenian polyphony Christophor Kara-Murza wrote a version of the Liturgy in 1886 and first performed it in the St. George church of Baku. The version of Amy Apkar, first published in 1897, represented the Armenian musical religious tradition of Nor Djughha (New Djulfa). One of the late 20th century versions is the composition of Khoren Mekhanajian. Traditionally, however, the most significant and artistically valuable versions are considered to be the three-part men's and four-part mixed choir arrangements by Makar Yekmalian, as well as the unmatched three-part men's choir arrangement made by Komitas.

⁷ Harutyun Sinanian – notable violinist, pianist, organist, conductor, representative of the famous musical family of Sinanians of Constantinople.

⁸ See preface to *Եռամասն երգեցողութիւն Ս. Պատարագի* (արական խումբի համար). դաշնամուրեց Լ. Մ. Զիլինկերեան, Երուսաղէմ 1931.

All the aforementioned attempts were made in a time of clashes between the old traditions and new tendencies in Armenian music. The New Armenian notation that was invented in the beginning of the 19th century made it possible to record and, to some extent, preserve the traditional melodies which were at the time under strong external influence. The new system, traditionally called the *Limonjian* system by the name of its creator, was quite widespread in the communities; it was taught at public schools and was used as a daily instruction tool by the *dprapets* or *tiratsus*, as the choirmasters were also called. The New Armenian notation stimulated the emergence and development of an entire trend in the musical circles in Eastern Armenia and in the Armenian communities in the Ottoman Empire. Among the ranks of the patriots of the new system who promoted the recording of the traditional religious as well as popular melodies were such names as Aristakes Hovhannisian, Gabriel Eranian, Hovhannes Myuhentesian, Nikoghayos Tashjean, Hambardzum Cherchian, and especially Eghia Tntesian. In the 1870s, by the order of Catholicos Gevorg IV and with his immediate participation, Nikoghayos Tashjian recorded all the songs of the Armenian *Zhamagirq* (Book of Hours), *Sharaknots* (Hymnal) and *Patarag* (Liturgy, or Mass); these collections were printed in Etchmiadzin and the melodies were proclaimed the standard of the entire Armenian chant. Along with Tashjian’s recordings, Eghia Tntesian was working on his recordings of the liturgical songs which, however, were not published until the 20th century. Despite these activities, particularly in the Armenian communities in Western Armenian provinces and even in Constantinople itself, the church authorities resisted the introduction of the tunes obligated by Etchmiadzin and continued to perform the service based on the local oral traditions.

It is well-known that in the Ottoman Empire, the Armenians played leading roles in the musical sphere, as well as in other areas of culture⁹. Being well familiar with the achievements of contemporary Western art music, Armenian musicians were trying to re-evaluate the pieces of religious music as musical artworks which would also be suitable for performance in concert halls. On the other hand, the church authorities were critical towards the attempts to raise church music to the concert stage,

⁹ On the activities of Armenian musicians in Western Armenia see **Մ. Հ. Մարտիրոսյան**, *Ուրվագիծ արևմտահայ երաժշտության պատմության*; in English: **L. Agbabian Hubbard**, “The Musical World of Armenians in Constantinople”, in: *Armenian Constantinople*, ed. by Hovannisian R.G. and Payaslian S., Mazda Publishers, Costa Mesa, 2010.

although they also endeavored to implement the Western compositional tools and techniques to refine the chant and canonize the musical component of the service. For example, for the purpose of professionalizing the music of the church, Makar Yekmalian was delegated to Saint Petersburg Conservatory to study musicology and composition, a result of which was his polyphonic arrangement of the Liturgy. Later, at the end of 19th century, Archimandrite (*Vardapet*) Komitas travelled to Berlin, with the purpose of studying the most advanced music techniques of the time.

Thus, at the end of the 19th century the discussions around Armenian religious music focused on the suggestion that it would either continue to develop in its current form based on chant of the orally passed tradition, or it should develop into a new quality: Armenian polyphonic music, following the route of the contemporary Western art music and using its advanced compositional tools and techniques, but also principles of the traditional chant. The masters of the New Armenian notation claimed that Armenian music, being based on the Oriental scales, cannot be recorded with the use of the Western notation. Limonjian's system was invented as a tool to record monophonic music, therefore it somehow also limited the introduction of the polyphony¹⁰. The arguments were heated to such an extent that some clerics rejected the melodic versions recorded by Tashjian in favor of the traditional melodies of their communities, and the adherents of the opposite view even denied the esthetic value of Armenian traditional music and suggested to replace the music of the religious repertoire with samples from Western music¹¹.

This was the cultural environment in which Levon Chilinkirian's *Patarag* was created.

Chilinkirian's Patarag: Cultural Environment of the Composition and its Reception

The history and the circumstances in which the *Patarag* appeared are very scarcely documented; however, this work is considered his most important achievement. As mentioned, it was first published by the Marmurian printing house, which was one of the most important institutions

¹⁰ In fact, use of the Western classical harmony in Armenian music is a challenging task since the Armenian scale is not an octave system as the Western is; this fact was recognized by the advocates of the traditional system.

¹¹ See **Ա. Հիսարլեան**, *Պատմութիւն հայ ձայնազրուիեան և նկարագրութիւնք երաժիշտ սգ-գայնոց 1768-1909*, Կ. Պոլիս, 1914 (**A. Hisarlian**, *History of Armenian notation and descriptions of the national musicians 1768 – 1909*, Constantinople (Istanbul) 1914).

not only in Smyrna, but in the whole landscape of the contemporary Armenian culture. It played an exceptional role in the promotion of Armenian printing in particular and of Armenian enlightenment in general; this printing house produced numerous Armenian books and periodicals as well as translations of World literature masterpieces. The publication of the *Patarag* printed in Armenian notation not only attests the leading role of Armenian Smyrna in affairs concerning music, but also the extraordinary level of advancement and distinct cultural identity of the Mamurians' institution. It is likely that this was a link in the chain of events that characterize the trend of the spread of the Armenian New musical notation in communities.

It could be said that Chilinkirian advocated the development of this trend. There is evidence that, when at a young age he decided to pursue the career of a musician, he studied with Nikoghos Tashjian who, at that time, was not only an acclaimed specialist in the New Armenian notation and a remarkable representative of the Constantinopolitan chant tradition, but also a recognized expert in Oriental music. Chilinkirian, except for one year spent as choirmaster in Baku, seems to have remained for all his creative life in the sphere of the Oriental chant tradition. In the Armenian convent of Jerusalem, several volumes of manuscript song collections are preserved that contain his records of Armenian notation.

Along with this, he also presented himself as a pupil of Tigran Chukhadjian, though it is hard to assume when and under what circumstances this apprenticeship took place. And yet Tigran Chukhadjian is considered one, if not the first, of the greatest Armenian composers equipped with the Western compositional techniques and skills. It should be mentioned that Chilinkirian's notebooks with European notated melodies have also survived; during his years of teaching both in Constantinople and Jerusalem, he also instructed European notation and Western music theory. The texture of his three-part arrangements of the *Patarag* shows that he had, after all, adopted the Western rules and styles of harmonization and choral composition.

The comparison of the two versions of the *Patarag* – the version written in Armenian notation (Smyrna, 1898) and the one published in the common Western notation (Jerusalem, 1931) – as well as the comparison of both mentioned texts with other arrangements of the Armenian Liturgy, allow us to draw conclusions regarding the choice of melodies, use of polyphonic styles, interpretation of the Armenian notation transcribed into Western, and especially polyphonic texture notated in Arme-

nian symbols; as mentioned, it was not common to use Limondjian's system for polyphonic writing. In the course of comparative analysis, the following observations were made:

In general, the melodies of the Smyrna (1898) version contain more melodic elaboration than those of the Jerusalem (1931) version; the use of embellishments is more generous in this version than in the version of 1931.

The melodies in the version of 1931 are notable for a more coherent and consistent interpretation of the modal component, while in the version of 1898 some discrepancies in the modal sphere can be found.

Polyphonic arrangement and harmonization in both versions are performed in entirely Western style.

The version of 1931 appears to be a composition of more mature and accomplished level than the one of 1898. In the latter, the parts are often voice-lead in parallel triads, overlapping of voices appears quite frequently, and the base part is more "fluid", which does not always appear compositionally justified.

Both the harmonization and the voice-leading in the version of 1931 are done in a more accomplished and mature manner, the parts are set in a more harmonious and natural way, though entirely in line with the rules of Western classical harmony.

The comparison of the versions leaves the impression that the melodies of Chilinkirian are the reflection of an oral tradition, on which, possibly, also M. Yekmalian based his three-part arrangement of the Liturgy¹².

Clearly, the ecclesiastical authorities gave great importance to Chilinkirian's arrangement of the *Patarag*. There is evidence that the three-part performance of the Liturgy in Constantinople in 1906 was approved and supported by Patriarch Maghakia Ormanian. As Babgen II, Catholicos of Cilicia said, "...many things he burnished and improved in our church chant"¹³. "Sion", the periodical of the St. James community of Jerusalem, wrote: "He had the competence, fervency and love, was proficient in the chant of Hymnal, equally in the art of European and Armenian music notation"¹⁴. Vahram Mankuni, the Chair of the Music Committee

¹² The detailed comparative analysis of the musical versions of the *Patarag* spans beyond the scope of this paper and will be presented in a separate work.

¹³ Translated by N. Poghosyan from: *Արևազայի երգերը երոստական ձայնագրովեանմբ, իսր. և քրտտ. Գ. ԱճԷՆԿԱՆ, Անթիլիաս, 1937* (Songs of Sunrise Service in Western notation, ed. and publ. G. Ajemian, Antelias 1937).

¹⁴ Translated by N. Poghosyan from: "Sion", Jerusalem, November 1932, p. 352.

of the Catholicosate of the time, appealed to Komitas with a request to provide his competent opinion on Chilinkirian’s arrangement of the Liturgy. Komitas, who at the beginning of the 1900s was already one of the best experts in Armenian popular and religious music, expressed his view on the work. He mentioned that the melodies are “harmonized in European, particularly, even more Russian style (according to Yekmalian)”¹⁵. Mankuni had asked Komitas to apply some amendments to the version sent to him, “without ever changing the tune of the melody” but Komitas, after providing a detailed analysis of the melodies and their origins, suggested: “If the three-part chant of the Liturgy is necessary, then the accordable manner of polyphonic singing is equally necessary. Therefore, I personally would suggest to implement M. Yekmalian’s four-part *Patarag*, without changing anything in the score, for on our musical ground until this day I don’t know any other, more worthy writing”¹⁶. He points out that the whole question of the introduction of polyphony to Armenian religious music is challenging and troublesome, “because one should first create an indigenously Armenian polyphonic style and spirit, and then only think on generalizing”¹⁷. This, along with other factors, allows us to make assumptions about how this version of *Patarag* fell out of the focus of the Armenian academic musicology.

As mentioned, the first version of Chilinkirian’s *Patarag* was published in the years when Komitas was taking the first steps of his musical career. In 1898 he was in Berlin, studying composition and musicology at the Kaiser Friedrich Wilhelm University and Richard Schmidt’s private Conservatory. In the same year, he published his review on the publication of Yekmalian’s *Patarag*. Afterwards, both artists were simultaneously active in Constantinople during several years.

¹⁵ Translated by N. Poghosyan from: **Կոմիտաս, նամակներ, 2-րդ լր. տպ., ԵՊՊ ՄՍՄ, ԳԱԹ ԲՐԱՍՄ, 2007 (Komitas, Letters, 2nd ed., Yerevan, Printing Press of Art and Literature Museum, 2007)** p. 135. However, Chilinkirian’s three-part is not as contiguous to Yekmalian’s version as Komitas claims. It even cannot be said with certainty that Chilinkirian was at all familiar with Yekmalian’s arrangements; otherwise the influence would be noticeable already in the version of Smyrna of 1898, which is not the case. Interestingly enough, Chilinkirian’s name is not mentioned in Komitas’s text. Is it possible that he did not know whose piece he reviewed? If so, it explains why even after his critique of the score he showed a favorable position towards Chilinkirian’s polyphonic composition.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 135.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 136.

Chilinkirian moved to Constantinople in 1905 or 1906, and Komitas arrived there in 1910. Komitas's remarkable choral concerts of popular and religious music, which took place in the Ottoman capital at the beginning of the 20th century, could not remain out of Chilinkirian's attention, as he was the choirmaster of some of the most important Armenian churches of Istanbul. This was around the time when the discussion around the introduction of polyphony to church music was near its culmination. Komitas wrote with regret that the three-part and four-part singing in Constantinople cannot be valuable "since there is no music conservatory in whole Turkey and 'the Constantinopolitan Armenian musicians have grown up in the [exclusively] Turkish circles'... The issue concerns not all the musicians but those people who sign as 'professional musicians' without having any elementary understanding of polyphony, and yet they shamelessly ostracize Chilinkirian's three-part Liturgy"¹⁸. Consequently, we can see that Komitas was familiar with Chilinkirian's arrangements, but was not among the opponents of their presence on the contemporary cultural scene.

The Musical and Historical Value of Chilinkirian's Patarag

What are the importance and the value of Levon Chilinkirian's *Patarag*? Can it at all be viewed side by side with works as exquisite as Yekmalian's and Komitas's, in the whole picture of Armenian worship music? Is there any practical or scientific need to draw such comparisons?

One thing is undoubted: his Liturgy arrangement has an exceptional historical value and merit. It is in the first place a practical arrangement written for instantaneous church performance and was not necessarily meant to represent a musical artwork, as the versions of Yekmalian and Komitas were. This work contains some melodic samples of Liturgy songs not found in other known versions. The study of this and other works by Chilinkirian might reveal valuable layers in the oral tradition of Western Armenian communities, and particularly, of Constantinople and Jerusalem, not to mention Smyrna, the musical tradition of which is barely known to music experts. In addition to other hymnological sources, these songs contribute to the study of the ways in which the musical traditions of different Armenian communities were connected. Along with other developments, this version also represents a significant stage in the advancement of polyphony in the Armenian compositional school; it marks one of the ways in which the traditionally monophonic chant

¹⁸ Translated by N. Poghosyan from: Մ. Հ. Մուրադյան, *Ուրվագիծ արևմտահայ երաժշտության պատմության* (M. Muradian, *Outline of Western Armenian Music History*), p. 241.

was converted into three- or four-part choral and instrumental texture, shaping the Armenian branch of professional musical art, and thus bringing it into accordance with the esthetics and forms of Western music¹⁹.

Conclusion

We have provided a brief review of the life and work of one of the important personalities on the scene of Armenian religious music. From what can be concluded out of scarce documentation, Levon Chilinkirian appeared to be a modest and agreeable person, a humble church musician, and for these reasons, may have escaped the spotlight of contemporary musicology. Nonetheless, he contributed a great deal to the history of Armenian musical culture in the beginning of the 20th century. His arrangement of the *Patarag* was one of the first attempts to not only record the musical component of the church service, but also to diversify and, through converting into polyphony, bring it to compliance with the demands of Western art music. It was the first polyphonic Liturgy in Armenian Constantinople and one of the links between the 19th and 20th centuries in Armenian religious music. As his contemporaries wrote about him, "Chilinkirian Levon was a master inspired by the sacred fire of Art, who put his talents and work in the service of the beautified chant of the Armenian Church"²⁰.

Selected Bibliography

Արևազալի երգերը երոսպական ձայնագրութեամբ, իւրբ. և հրատ. Գ. Աճէմեան, Անթիլիաս, 1937,

Եռաձայն երգեցողութիւն Ս. պատարագի: Չայնազրեց Լևոն Մ. Չիլինկիրեան, Զմյուռնիա (Իզմիր), տպագր. Մատթևոս Մամուրյանի, 1898,

Եռաձայն երգեցողութիւն Ս. Պատարագի (արական խումբի համար). դաշնամուրեց Լ. Մ. Չիլինկիրեան, Երուսաղէմ 1931 (in Western notation),

երգեցողութիւնք սրբոյ պատարագի Հայաստանեայց Առաքելական եկե-

¹⁹ Whether introduction of polyphony and other compositional devices typical for Western music was at all beneficial for Armenian church music is a problem that should be addressed by Armenian musicology separately. It is apparent that apart from the influences of Turkish or Persian music by which the contemporaries of Chilinkirian and Komitas were so worried, the tonal system of the European music and, later, insertion of Western vocal styles and manners affected Armenian music to such an extent that nowadays there are almost no church musicians found skilled in the system of the Armenian modes, and therefore the discussion about the current situation in Armenian church music is not over.

²⁰ *Արևազալի երգերը երոսպական ձայնագրութեամբ*, իւրբ. և հրատ. Գ. Աճէմեան, Անթիլիաս, 1937.

դեցույ, փոխադրեալ և ներդաշնակեալ յերիս և ի չորիս ձայնս ի ձեռն Մ. Եկմալեան, Լէյպցիգ-Վիեննա, 1896,

Թէոդիկ, *Տիպ ու տառ*, Կ. Պոլիս, տպագր. Վահրամ և Հրաչյա Տեր-Ներսեսյանի, 1912,

Կովիտաս, *Երկերի ժողովածու*, հ. 7 (Պատարագ), խմբ. Ռ. Աթայանի, Երևան, «Անահիտ», 1997,

Կովիտաս, *Նամակներ*, 2-րդ լր. տպ., Երևան, ԳԱԹ հրատ., 2007, էջ 132-136,

Հայ Սփյուռք հանրագիտարան, խմբ. Այվազյան Հ.Մ. և ուր., Երևան, Հայկ. հանրագիտարան հրատ., 2003,

Հարությունյան Մ., Բարսամյան Ա., *Հայ երաժշտության պատմություն*, Երևան, «Նոր դպրոց», 1996,

Հիսարլեան Ա., *Պատմություն հայ ձայնագրության և նկարագրությունք երաժիշտ ազգայնոց 1768-1909*, Կ. Պոլիս, 1914,

Մուրադյան Մ. Հ., *Ուրվագիծ արևմտահայ երաժշտության պատմության*, Երևան, ԳԱ հրատ., 1989 (էջ 241, 62-63),

«Սիոն» 1926-32,

Hovannisian R. and Payaslian S. (ed.), *Armenian Constantinople*, Mazda Publishers, Costa Mesa, 2010,

Hovannisian R. (ed.), *Armenian Smyrna/Izmir*, Mazda Publishers, Costa Mesa, 2012.

Նունե Պողոսյան-Ջեյքբուրգ Լևոն Զիլինկիրյանը և իր «անհայտ» Պատարագը

19-րդ դարավերջի և 20-րդ դարասկզբի հայ համայնքներում ստեղծագործող երաժիշտներից թերևս կարևորագույն դեր են խաղացել դպրապետները: Այդ դպրապետներից մեկը՝ Լևոն Զիլինկիրյանը, Կոնստանդնուպոլսի և Երուսաղեմի հայ հոգևոր համայնքների ժամերգության զարգացման և հետագա դոչատեման փուլերից մեկն է ձևավորել: Իբրև դպրապետ և երաժշտապետ, նա թողել է բավականին ծավալուն ժառանգություն հայկական և արևմտյան ձայնագրությամբ: Այդ մասին տեղեկանում ենք, մասնավորապես, Ս. Հակոբյանց միաբանության մատենագրարանում պահպանված ձեռագրերից: Դրա հետ մեկտեղ, նա ստեղծել է նաև «Եռաձայն երգեցողություն Ս. Պատարագի», որը մի շարք պատճառներով տասնամյակներ շարունակ համարվել է կորած և երաժշտագիտական հանրությանն անհայտ է մնացել:

Հոգվածն անդրադառնում է հայոց Պատարագի երաժշտության մի սակավածանոթ տարբերակի ստեղծման և կատարողական կյանքի պատմության մի քանի դրվագների, ինչպես նաև հայ երաժշտության կարևոր գործիչներից մեկի ստեղծագործական դիմանկարի վերստեղծմանը: