

COMPOSITIONAL DEVICES IN BYZANTINE CHANT

It is a well-known fact that each genre of Byzantine chant makes use of a rather restricted number of musical motifs, formulas, and phrases which occur again and again, as centonizations or as variations of some basic models.¹ In the concluding chapter of "A History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography" (second edition, Oxford 1961), Wellesz considered this aspect of Byzantine music from the point of view of the audience, the congregation: "The special technique of musical composition, which consisted in connecting together certain groups of formulae and cadences, enabled the musicians to write a number of variations on a given theme. The advantage of this kind of technique is obvious. The congregation heard the well-known musical phrases in every new Sticheron, but arranged in a different way, and connected by new transitional passages. They must have taken pleasure in hearing musical phrases which were familiar but were linked together in an unexpected way, just as a modern audience takes pleasure in the recurrence of the themes in a movement of a symphony" (p. 361).

Now, Wellesz's interpretation strikes me somehow as being that of an outsider, a scholar of the 20th century who

This paper was first printed in *Musica Antiqua VII* (Bydgoszcz 1985), the acts of the 7th International Musicological Congress "Musica Antiqua Europae Orientalis"; the original print is not available through book-stores.

was a composer himself and had been formed by the concert-milieu of Vienna before the First World War. I am not so sure that the medieval mind worked in the same way. Maybe a Byzantine would rather compare the formulaic character of his Chant to the ways of icon painters: Songs and icons had to follow the traditional patterns, because they were realizations of perennial models - not unlike the Platonic Ideas. Ultimately, what was sung in church was echoes (ἀντηχήματα) of the singing of the angels, cf. the opening of the Cheroubikon: "We who mystically represent the Cherubim and sing the Trisagion to the lifegiving Trinity...". The tradition of Christian Chant began in Bethlehem, in the Holy Night when the Heavenly Hosts intoned their Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις θεῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνῃ ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία (Luke 2,14).

*

Committed to writing at different periods - at times fairly late² - the vast repertory of Psalms, Troparia, Kanones, Kontakia, Stichera etc. preserved elements of expression which must have once belonged to a milieu of orality. It is the aim of the present paper to consider some of these elements in terms of "compositional devices", looking at Byzantine music from the composer's point of view. Now, the very notion of "a composer" needs to be commented upon. In our Byzantine context, the composer is the person who decided how a given text was to be sung. We need this kind of vague definition to cover the range of singers, scribes, and "composers" in the narrow sense of the word. At one end of the line we find the creators of specific,

individual melodies (e.g. the Stichera Idiomela), at the other the Psaltes who followed the oral tradition of how to cantillate the various psalm texts in styles of different festivity, constantly having to adapt the psalmodic patterns to the demands of the text. And also the scribe who introduced changes of his own at the very copying process - affecting the melodic contours, the structure of the melody, or may-be its rhythmical patterns - can be viewed as a kind of composer.³ For our present concern, the important point is that all these types of persons made use of the same musical language, using the same "syntax" and "vocabulary" - viz. the inherited elements of musical expression. My actual interest lies here in the "syntax" rather than in the "vocabulary"; for I shall deal mainly with the way in which the melodic formulas are put together, and less with the formulas themselves.

*

Let us first have a look at the Psalmody. As pointed out by Strunk, the verses (στίχοι) of the Davidic Psalms are differently treated in "chanted" and "monastic" psalmody: In the "chanted" office, the Psalter "is arranged by whole verses which correspond roughly to the verses of the Authorized Version; for the monastic office it is (or was) arranged by short distinctions or half verses".⁴ This is not only true of the weekly singing of the entire Book of Psalms, but also of the Ordinary Psalms (e.g. Ps. 103 and 140 etc at the Hesperinos, and Ps. 148 etc at the Orthros). Each of these monastic short-verses is treated as a musi-

cal unit, with a line-opener and a cadential formula, and with a less clearly characterized middle section in between - expanded or reduced according to the demands of the text. Now, as already mentioned, Psalmody is one of the fields dominated by orality until fairly late. Consequently, what we find in the MSS does only give us a small idea of the possibilities for simple and ornamented cantillation. In Late- and Postbyzantine tradition we find a number of settings by named composers; the earlier, anonymous, settings are best viewed as "traditional" melodies, different realizations on a common base.

Exx. 1-3 illustrate both the monotony of Psalmody and its great flexibility in details. The six settings of *Ex. 3* demonstrate the tenacity of the tradition; for the last of these was composed as late as in the second half of the 18th century. At the end of *Ex. 1* I have quoted the rubric, reminding us that the monotonous cantillation goes on for many more verses than those which the scribe has chosen to take down - it continues, in fact, until verse 28b (Ἀν-οἴξαντός σου τὴν χεῖρα) where a more ornamented singing begins, including "refrains" at the end of each verse (δόξα σοι ὁ θεός).⁵ From our specific point of view the following details are to be noticed:

In *Ex. 2b*, the first two hemistichs of Ps. 103 are not exactly parallel, as they were in *Ex. 1*, but combined into one "couplet" of lines. This is brought about by means of the cadence of line 1^a, which is an "open" (or "leading-on") cadence where the final > demands an immediate

continuation on G. Besides, the two lines do not begin in the same way; for instead of the "normal" line-opener (see all lines in Ex.1), line 1^a here begins with the opening motif familiar from the modal Echema of Plagios Tetartos,

($\bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}-\bar{\alpha}-\bar{\gamma}\bar{\iota}-\bar{\epsilon}$).⁶
G a G G

In Ex.3, the inherited melodic structure with its stop before $\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\sigma\epsilon$ goes against the structure of the text. Here Balasios and Petros Byzantios introduce a "better" structuralization, with leading-on elements at $-\xi\alpha$ and prolongation of $\sigma\epsilon$.

*

As already mentioned, we have no medieval copies of the melodies for the Troparia used as Apolytikia at the end of the Hesperinos and as Kathismata with $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ near the beginning of the Orthros.⁷ At first one might be tempted to explain this deficiency along the lines suggested by Strunk's remark on the Sticherarion, which "tends to exclude all pieces thought to be too well known to require written transmission";⁸ for most of the Kathismata and Apolytikia are, in fact, Prosomoia to a few Apolytikia Automela. However, a glance at Ex.4 suggests quite a different explanation. For this melody seems to have been composed in a "stichic" style, related in its principles to Psalmody. Comparisons with other settings of texts which follow the same model - the Apolytikion $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\lambda\acute{\iota}\theta\omicron\upsilon$ $\sigma\omega\phi\alpha\gamma\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ - would be needed for us to establish the underlying model melody (or complex of musical formulas). At present, a reference to occurrences outside the

Greek area may serve as an illustration: In the Bolgar-skij Rospev we find the Automelon (Камени знаменанной) in a related musical pattern (though notated from C, i.e. a sixth lower than my example, and thus with implications as to the intervallic structure).⁹ See also the recordings of Hungarian Greek-Catholic chant which Theresia Kapronyi dealt with at the Congress for Byzantine Studies in Vienna.¹⁰ From an artistic point of view, the Greek melody of Ex.4 seems to be considerably more refined than the Bulgarian Troparion. For whereas the latter repeats its melodic line six times without any variation (except for its very ending which descends to the finalis, where the other lines end a third higher), the Greek Prosomoion uses variations of the cadential formula to underline the poetic structure of the text. The second section (introduced by $\delta\tau\iota$ in line 2) ends after line 4, where the main break of syntax is to be found - and this structure is neatly underlined by the cadences: (a) there is no full cadence after 2 and 3; (b) the verbum dicendi at the end of 5 is sung in a higher pitch, transposed a fourth upwards; (c) line 6 does not begin with the usual line-opener. I have not yet seen the Automelon in any Greek musical source, but do not expect its cadences to be placed in the same way; for in the Automelon the main syntactical break occurs after line 3.

In our present context we can use this simple melody to illustrate several compositional devices:

1. In line 1, the treatment of $\tau\acute{o} \xi\acute{o}\lambda\omicron\nu$ (with Diple

lengthening the final syllable) isolates the incipit of the Kathisma, as a kind of heading. This is a device which is frequently used at the beginning of hymns, or at the beginning of a section inside the hymn. A similar treatment of line-beginnings occurs in lines 2 and 4, with the effect of a caesura. It is to be noted that quite often (as is the case in our present example) these caesuras have nothing to do with the grammatical structure of the text; they are to be connected with the verse structure.

2. Another device to be understood in connection with the verse structure consists in the use of Apodermata at endings (of long and short verses, also at caesuras) where the structure of thought and syntax demands that the singing continues without any stop. By means of such "leading-on" elements, applied with great virtuosity, Byzantine composers (and scribes of musical manuscripts!) were able to underline the textual structure in a very sophisticated and refined way.

3. Due to its full cadence, line 1 is set apart as an independent announcement, a short statement of the liturgical occasion (the Finding of the Cross, Sept. 14).

4. It is to be observed, finally, that the monotonous way in which lines 1-4 begin, is dropped in lines 5 (the beginning of the "refrain" in the Automelon) and 6 (where the "refrain" of the Prosomoion sets in). No doubt, this is to be understood as a device to signalize that the melody is approaching its end.

I have included the "old" (17th century?) melody for the venerable Evening Hymn, the $\Phi\omega\varsigma$ ἱλαρόν, among my examples (Ex.5) in the firm belief that we have here a late realization of a really old, oral tradition. Also here the verses are treated as a monotonous variation of a fixed line-pattern, with a recurrent recitation motif (G FG a), with line endings which descend from a to E, and with some occurrences of a medial formula which reaches the b-natural. And again we see how the last line of the hymn gets a special shaping.

*

My next specimen, Ex.6, is typical for the style of Stichera Idiomela. In my ad hoc analysis the letters are meant to facilitate a closer study of the melodic structure. Each musical formula is divided into two parts, the first of which is normally an introductory motif. The combination of the two "ingredients" is not mechanical, but seems to depend upon the demands of the text and of the preceding musical formula. Thus, lines 7 and 18 start with the same motif (since both follow upon "formula E"), but they end with two different G-cadences (line 7 as e.g. line 20, line 18 as line 2) - probably because of the textual accents. From a compositional point of view this Sticheron excellently illustrates how the structure of the melody (i.e. the choice of musical formulas) underlines the structure of the text (both its structure of meaning and syntax and its verse-structure). The text is divided into four main sections, as follows:

I (1-5): St. Thecla's fidelity towards her Heavenly Bridegroom (*announcement of her particular claim to be a Saint of the Church*).

II (6-10): She became a follower of St. Paul's

III (11-16): and bravely suffered her martyrdom (*details, spelling out the statement of I, cf. $\gamma\alpha\sigma$ in line 6; II and III linked together with $\kappa\alpha\iota$ in 11*).

IV (17-22): With reference to III the assembled congregation asks for her constant intercession.

The full E-cadences are exclusively used at the ends of these sections (5,10,16,22), whereas G-cadences are used at the ends of long-verses within the sections (2,7,13, 18,20). For the minor stops within the long-verses (at the end of short-verses or at caesuras within the short-verses) various "leading-on" devices are used - the Kouphisma (6), the Apoderma (19), the Xeron-Klasma (9,11,12), and the Klasma (1,12) - or cadences on other pitches, especially on a (3,19,21) and D (14).

As a rule, text and music are organized in such a way that each unit consists of a shorter beginning and a longer ending: 4+5 is longer than 3, 9+10 than 8, 12+13 than 11, and 15+16 than 14. Especially elegant is the structure of Section III with its climax of length: Fire gets one short-verse (11), the wild beasts two (12-13), but for the seals no less than three short-verses are used (14-16); but at the same time the bipartite long-verse structure (11-13 and 14-16) is reflected in the melody, as can be seen from the small ornament on $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ (14).

At times there seems to be a conflict between the textual and the musical structure: The beginning of 2 (ἐν οὐρανῷ) textually belongs to 1, but is treated musically as an introduction to the G-cadence. And similarly τοῦ ἐπικλήρου in 4 from a textual point of view is to be connected with συμφῶνος in 3. In both cases the melody is composed in such a way that it follows the "shorter-longer" pattern already referred to. In an article on Kassia's Troparion¹¹ I mentioned several cases of enjambement; with these in mind, the ones just described may be added in favour of ascribing also the Thecla Sticheron to the famous female melode.¹² See also the musical enjambement in 9, where the element marked "f" clearly belongs to the preceding A²-formula, as in line 14.

*

At the latest congresses in Vienna and Bydgoszcz, Hrisanta Petrescu (now: Marin) has demonstrated a new method to decode "the mechanisms whereby the text generates the music".¹³ In her pilot texts (Κύριε ἐκέκραξα in Vienna 1981 and Αὐγούστου μοναρχήσαντος in Bydgoszcz 1982) the relations between the text and the melodic-rhythmical formulas were studied on different levels (semantic, syntactic, morphological, and formant-phonetic). These ideas were presented in a very technical manner, not particularly well suited for public discussions, and they still do not seem to have received the attention which their originality deserves. With a future discussion in mind I have chosen Kassia's Christmas Sticheron as my final example,

Ex.7, using the Vienna manuscript (cod. Dalasseni = MMB I) instead of Hrisanta Marin's source, Paris gr. 261. Thanks to the plates in J.-D. Petresco's "Les idiomèles et le canon de l'office de Noël" (Paris 1932) we can easily get an idea of the variations in the transmission of the melody: The tradition of Paris 261 has a marked predilection for frequent stops in the melodic flow, usually obtained by prolongation of the final note of the formulas; we see such prolongations (Diple or Double Apostrophos) at the end of formulas A (lines 1,3,5,7,9), D (2,5), and F (11). The Palæobyzantine tradition has several instances of leading-on elements not found in the Vienna copy; thus the transition from 6 to 7 is given as EF (E) / DG (or as EF+Kylisma / DG) - also in Paris 261 and Coislin 41 - and lines 7+8 (and 9+10) are connected by an Apoderma at the end of formula A' (also in Coislin 41).

Some years ago, in a letter to Hrisanta Marin 1982, I made an attempt to draw a coherent picture of the way in which the process of composition may have proceeded: "I think that we ought to begin with the beginning, i.e. by putting ourselves in Kassia's position just before she started to compose (i.e. to write text and melody for a new Christmas Sticheron). What did her planning comprise? At least the following:

1. The general idea (i.e. the juxtaposition of Augustus and the Incarnated Son).
2. The Echos (Deuteros chosen).
3. The structural pattern (aa,bb,cc...) of long-verses.

She can now, in principle, "compose" the first long-verse (text and music; but the musical flow may have come first to her mind - if that is how her mind works best!). Anyhow, she ends up with a couple of lines in the following rhythm: 1: x'x'x'x' x'x' 2: xxxx'xxx'xx'xx

This dictates all details of structure for lines 3+4 (rhythm, music, grammatical parallelism, and parallelism of thought).

She is now facing her next decision, about the shape of the following pair of long-verses. She decides to use roughly speaking the same melody (but with some rhythmic changes, cf. e.g. the difference between the second half of formula A in 1 and 5). The result is as follows: 5: xx'x'x'x x'xx x'xx'xx (to be repeated in line 6). Using now a somewhat different melodic material (but still well-known formulas) she makes 7+8: xx'xxx' x'xxx'xx (to be repeated in 9+10).

With verse 11 her genius makes itself felt. Textually speaking, we might hesitate between two interpretations of the genitives in 11: are they a prolepsis of the σοῦ in 12 (this is apparently the normal interpretation) or are they an addition to θεοότητος in 10 ("we have been signed with the name of your godliness, you our incarnated God")? The musical parallel between 11 and 10 suggests that the latter is the case; also the way in which the cadence comes in the middle of θεοότητός σου, alongside with the textual enjambement which puts σοῦ at the beginning of the next line (cf. my article on Kassia's Tropa-

tion in STUDIES IN EASTERN CHANT III, esp. pp.175-78).
 Finally, for the concluding line (the "refrain") she returns to the ending already used in the first long-verses; E-endings are required in this Echos, normally."

*

With these few examples I have tried to give an idea of one particular set of "compositional devices" which one can observe in any piece of Byzantine music, the way in which the music is made to reflect the verse structure of the text and its structure of thought. There is little new in my observations, the phenomena being obvious to any student of Byzantine Chant. But I have one good reason for having used the occasion of the present discussions - on the process of composition which moves "from idea to sound" - to remind the non-specialists about these phenomena. My point is that a careful analysis of the written tradition of Byzantine music will reveal a rich and complicated system of rules which originated in a period of exclusive orality. Of course, there is still a long way to go before we can begin to write a coherent "Composer's Handbook", of which only a few paragraphs have been touched in this paper. I would like, however, to draw a list of some of its other paragraphs, without going into any kind of details, just to demonstrate what kind of material I have in mind:

1. It is well-known that Byzantine church poetry often contains couplets of lines which are identical (or nearly so) from several points of view: same number of syllables,

same distribution of textual accents, same syntactical structure, and parallel lines of thought. This textual parallelism is at times reflected in the music, at times the composers have chosen to disregard it. Sometimes the device is only used for the first couple of long-verses, rarely it is carried on through the entire strophe. Ex.7 belongs to the latter group; for another example, see the Pentecost Sticheron Γλῶσσαί ποτε (p.62 in my "Intonation Formulas.. see note 14) with the following structure (text and music):
 $1+2 = 3+4$, $5 = 6$, $7(+8) = 9(+10)$.

2. A compositional device which we frequently meet in Stichera and in Heirmoi consists in a switch of modality, from the main mode of the piece to its parallel mode. In Stichera this switch oftentimes takes place at the beginning of the second main section of the strophe, or after the first couplet of long-verses. When a similar device is used in Heirmoi - which tend to be shorter and more "compressed" than Stichera - the switch takes place already after the first long-verse, may-be even earlier.¹⁴

3. The entire field of "exegesis", so ardently studied by Gr. Stathis, has problems of its own. Its rules - especially, perhaps, the mechanism of enlarging simpler musical formulas - would constitute several chapters in our Handbook!

4. Leaving the level of "Gross-Struktur", we observe innumerable bits of rules which govern the variation within a single melodic formula. The main constituents of these rules probably regard the details of text (e.g. number of

syllables, placing of textual accents) or the way in which a given melodic formula is "linked" into its musical context.

5. In Book V of the *Θεωρητικὸν Μέγα* (Trieste 1832), Chrysanthos has three chapters on composition: A' *Περὶ Μελοποιίας* (§§389-99), B' *Πῶς ἐμελίζοντο αἱ ψαλμοδαίαι* (§§400-08),¹⁵ Γ' *Τῶρινός Τρόπος τοῦ μελίζειν* (§§409-31). Especially the last of these chapters contains a wealth of practical remarks and observations which might come in as useful parallels to what ought to be treated in our medieval "Composer's Handbook".¹⁶ Bearing in mind the conservatism of the Greek tradition, we cannot exclude the possibility of a long history for such observations and attitudes. In my opinion they may legitimately be used as guides for our attempts to understand the mind of the Byzantine composers as well.

NOTES:

1. This point is well illustrated by the tables of Christian Thodberg, *Der byzantinische Alleluiarionzyklus*, Copenhagen 1966, pp.196-227 (= MMB Subsidia VIII) and George Amarqianakis, *An Analysis of Stichera in the Deuterios Modes, I-II*, Copenhagen 1977, pp.245-59 (= Cahiers de l'institut du moyen-âge grec et latin 22-23). An interesting study of a restricted material - the *Heirmoi* of the first authentic mode) is Hans Schmidt, *Zum formelhaften Aufbau byzantinischer Kanones*, Wiesbaden 1979. Due to a deplorable oversight I was not aware

of this book when I wrote the present paper. I now see that we have both chosen the same starting-point, though taken from different sources: I use Wellesz's second edition, 1961, and Schmidt quotes Stöhr 1952 (MGG); we both ought to have quoted instead the first occurrence, Wellesz's first edition from 1949, p. 286!

2. Oliver Strunk, *Essays on Music in the Byzantine World*, New York 1977, pp. 303 (on the *Sticherarion*), 307 (on *Psalmody*), 311 (on the *Ὠς ἱλαρόν* and the *Troparia/Apolytikia*).
3. In principle a *Koukouzeles* or a *Chrysaphes* would belong to this category in their revisions of the *Heirmologion* and the *Sticherarion*.
4. Strunk, *Essays*... p.130.
5. See Edw. W. Williams, *John Koukouzeles' Reform of Byzantine Chanting for Great Vespers in the Fourteenth Century*, Yale University 1968 (dissertation pp.109-142, esp. pp.120-22).
6. For echematic motifs as psalmodic line-openers, see Annette Jung, *The Settings of the Evening and Morning Psalms according to the Manuscript Sinai 1255*, CIMA GL 47, 1984, p.23.
7. Cf. above, note 2.
8. Strunk, *Essays*... p.303.
9. Bolgarskij *Rospev*, ed. Elena Tončeva & Stefan Kožuha-rov, Sofia 1971, pp.34-35.
10. Theresia Kapronyi, *First Tone-Troparion Melody-Type in Hungarian Greek-Catholic Chant*, *Jahrbuch der öster-*

- reichischen Byzantinistik 32/7, Wien 1982 (= XVI. Internationaler Byzantinistenkongress. Akten II/7), pp.119-28.
11. Jørgen Raasted, Voice and Verse in a Troparion of Kassia, *Studies in Eastern Chant III*, 1973, pp.175-76.
 12. The ascription is doubted in Ilse Rochow, *Studien zu der Person, den Werken und dem Nachleben der Dichterin Kassia*. *Berliner Byzantinische Arbeiten* 38, Berlin 1967, p.29.
 13. Hrisanta Petrescu, The Relation Text - Melodical and Rhythmical Formulas, an Element of Continuity in the Romanian Post-Medieval Church Music. <I>: *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 32/7, Wien 1982, pp.99-108. II: *Musica Antiqua VI, Acta Scientifica, Bydgoszcz* 1982, pp.549-64.
 14. Jørgen Raasted, Intonation Formulas and Modal Signatures in Byzantine Musical Manuscripts (MMB Subsidia VII, Copenhagen 1966), pp.89-94 (Stichera) and 99 (Heirmoi).
 15. For our current discussions about the phenomenon of "exegesis", the remark on πλατυσμός τῶν μελῶν (§407) and the examples quoted in §408 are interesting, as authoritative statements from the early 19th century.
 16. Later manuals of Neobyzantine chant, too, have something to say about the Melopoia. My favourite source, D.G. Panagiotopoulos's *θεωρία καὶ πράξεις τῆς Βυζαντινῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς μουσικῆς*, Athens 1947, has a good analysis of the four στάδια τῆς μελοποιίας pp.311-14.

Example 1: Psalm 103, 1^a-2^b (Sinai 1256, 209r)

1 ^a	Εὐ- G	λο- Gab b	γει- Gab b	η ab	ψυ- Gab b	χη a	μου a	του ab Ga F#	κυ- Gab c	ρλ- ba b a	ου G
1 ^b	Κυ- G	ρλ- ab b	ε- ab b	ο ab	θε- Ga	ος aba a	μου a	γα- ab a G F#	λνυ- Gab c	θης a b a	δρα G
1 ^c	Εξ- G	ο- G	μο- Gab b	λο- Gab b	κα a	με- a	γα- a	λο- ab G	κρε- a	πελ- a	αν a
2 ^a	Α- G	να- ab	βαλ- Gab b	λο- Gab b	με- c	βα ba	α a	ε- ab Ga F#	νε- Gab c	δου- ba b	σω G
2 ^b	Εκ- G	τελ- ab	νον- b	κα a	ὡς a	ως a	α a	λα- ab Ga F#	μα- Ga	ακ b aG	αG aG G

καὶ τὰ ἔξῃς τοῦ ψαλμοῦ εἰς τὸ μέλος αὐτὸν (sic)

Example 2: a) The first δευτε προσκυνησωμεν, b) The beginning of Ps.103 (Athens 2458,11r)

<p>a: $\lambda \delta \gamma$ $\delta \epsilon \upsilon \text{---} \tau \epsilon$ a G G</p>	<p>$\kappa \rho \sigma \sigma \text{---} \kappa \upsilon \text{---} \nu \eta \text{---} \sigma \omega \text{---} \mu \epsilon \nu$ G G ab ba a a</p>	<p>$\kappa \alpha \iota \text{---} \kappa \rho \sigma \sigma \text{---} \kappa \epsilon \text{---} \sigma \omega \text{---} \mu \epsilon \nu$ ab Gab cba ba a a</p>	<p>$\tau \omega \beta \alpha \text{---} \sigma \upsilon \text{---} \lambda \epsilon \iota$ a a a abG a</p>	<p>$\eta \text{---} \mu \omega \text{---} \nu \theta \epsilon \text{---} \omega$ ab Ga Gab cba b G a b</p>
<p>b: $\lambda \delta \gamma$ $\epsilon \upsilon \text{---} \lambda \omicron \text{---} \gamma \epsilon \iota$ a a G G</p>	<p>$\eta \text{---} \psi \upsilon \text{---} \chi \eta \text{---} \mu \omicron \upsilon$ G Gab ba a</p>	<p>$\theta \epsilon \text{---} \omicron \text{---} \sigma \text{---} \mu \omicron \upsilon$ ab Gab cba ba a</p>	<p>$\epsilon \text{---} \mu \epsilon \text{---} \gamma \alpha$ a a ab</p>	<p>$\lambda \upsilon \upsilon \text{---} \theta \eta \text{---} \varsigma \sigma \theta \omicron \text{---} \delta \rho \alpha$ a G Gab cba b G</p>

Example 5: Φῶς ἱλαρόν (Copenhagen, NKS 2747.2^o, 35v; 18th century)

1 $\overline{\phi\omega\varsigma} \overline{\iota\alpha\alpha\text{---}\rho\omicron\nu} \overline{\alpha\text{---}\gamma\iota\text{---}\alpha\varsigma} \overline{\delta\omicron\text{---}\xi\eta\varsigma} \overline{\alpha\text{---}\theta\alpha\text{---}\upsilon\alpha\text{---}\tau\omicron\upsilon} \overline{\kappa\alpha\text{---}\tau\omicron\delta\varsigma}$ 2 $\overline{\omicron\upsilon\text{---}\rho\alpha\text{---}\upsilon\iota\text{---}\omicron\upsilon} \overline{\alpha\text{---}\gamma\iota\text{---}\omicron\upsilon} \overline{\mu\alpha\text{---}\kappa\alpha\text{---}\rho\alpha\varsigma}$
 $\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline G & G & FG & a & G & G & FG & a & G & F & a & GF & G & F & E \\ \hline \end{array}$ A1 $\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline G & FG & a & G & F & a & GF & G & F & E \\ \hline \end{array}$ A2

3 $\overline{\iota\alpha\text{---}\eta\text{---}\omicron\omicron\tau\upsilon} \overline{\chi\omicron\iota\text{---}\sigma\tau\epsilon} \overline{\epsilon\lambda\text{---}\theta\omicron\nu\text{---}\tau\epsilon\varsigma} \overline{\epsilon\text{---}\iota\iota} \overline{\tau\eta\text{---}\nu} \overline{\eta\text{---}\lambda\text{---}\omicron\upsilon} \overline{\delta\upsilon\text{---}\sigma\iota\nu}$ 4 $\overline{\iota\text{---}\omicron\omicron\nu\text{---}\tau\epsilon\varsigma} \overline{\phi\omega\varsigma} \overline{\epsilon\text{---}\alpha\kappa\epsilon\text{---}\rho\iota\text{---}\upsilon\omicron\nu}$
 $\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline G & FG & a & G & b & G & G & G & FE & FG & a & GF & G & E \\ \hline \end{array}$ B1 $\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline G & FG & a & GF & G & E \\ \hline \end{array}$ A3 $\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline E & G & FG & a & GF & G & F & E \\ \hline \end{array}$ A2

5 $\overline{\upsilon\text{---}\mu\omicron\nu\text{---}\mu\epsilon\text{---}\nu} \overline{\kappa\alpha\text{---}\tau\epsilon\text{---}\rho\alpha} \overline{\upsilon\iota\text{---}\omicron\upsilon} \overline{\kappa\alpha\iota} \overline{\alpha\text{---}\gamma\iota\text{---}\omicron\upsilon} \overline{\kappa\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\text{---}\mu\alpha} \overline{\theta\epsilon\text{---}\omicron\upsilon}$
 $\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline EF & G & G & FE & FG & a & G & b & G & FG & a & GF & FE & E \\ \hline \end{array}$ B2 $\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline a & G & GF & FE & E \\ \hline \end{array}$ A1

6 $\overline{\alpha\text{---}\iota\text{---}\omicron\upsilon} \overline{\sigma\epsilon} \overline{\epsilon\nu} \overline{\kappa\alpha\text{---}\omicron\iota} \overline{\kappa\alpha\iota\text{---}\rho\omicron\iota\varsigma} \overline{\upsilon\text{---}\mu\epsilon\iota\text{---}\theta\alpha\iota} \overline{\phi\omega\text{---}\upsilon\alpha\iota\varsigma} \overline{\alpha\iota\text{---}\sigma\iota\text{---}\alpha\iota\varsigma}$
 $\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline G & FG & a & G & F & a & G & FG & a & G & b & G & a & GF & G & E \\ \hline \end{array}$ B2 $\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline F & a & GF & G & E \\ \hline \end{array}$ A3

7 $\overline{\upsilon\iota\text{---}\epsilon} \overline{\theta\epsilon\text{---}\omicron\upsilon} \overline{\zeta\omega\text{---}\eta\nu} \overline{\omicron} \overline{\delta\iota\text{---}\delta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma}$ 8 $\overline{\delta\omicron\text{---}\xi\alpha} \overline{\delta\omicron\text{---}\iota\text{---}\epsilon\iota} \overline{\epsilon\lambda\text{---}\epsilon\iota}$
 $\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline E & G & FG & a & G & a & b & G & a & GF & G \\ \hline \end{array}$ B3 $\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline F & a & G & b & G & G & a & GF & EF & a & GF & G & F & E & D & EF & GE & GF & G \\ \hline \end{array}$ B2 $\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline \delta\omicron\text{---}\xi\alpha & \delta\omicron\text{---}\iota\text{---}\epsilon\iota & \epsilon\lambda\text{---}\epsilon\iota \\ \hline \end{array}$ A4

Example 6: Sticheron for St. Thecla (Sinai 1230, 22v; cf MMB Transcripts I, 105 & CINAGL 23, 195)

NB For G-sharp and d-sharp, see Ex. 3

I ὡς ἡ νῦν-ῶν-ον ἐ-ῶν-α 2 ἐν αὐ-ῶν-οις χρί-ῶν-τον θε-ῶν-

a	b	c	d	e
b	a	bc	GF	E

A1

B				
ca	b	a	c	G

II 3 νῦν-ῶν-οις με-ῶν-ῶν-ον 4 τοῦ ἐ-ῶν-ου καὶ μὴ-ῶν-οις 5 θε-ῶν-οις

c1				
a	ba	G	ca	a

c2					
ba	G	a	bc	GF	EF

A2					
a	bc	a	ba	G	G

D1					
G	bc	a	G	F	E

III 6 ταῖς τῶν μὴ-ῶν-οις ἡ-ῶν-οις 7 ἐν-ῶν-οις μὴ πεί-ῶν-οις

d						
a	a	a	a	FG	G	G

e						
b	d	bc	a	ba	G	G

C2					
a	ba	G	G	G	G

IV 8 παύ-ῶν-ου ἡ-ῶν-οις 9 ἐν-ῶν-οις 10 τοῦ θε-ῶν-οις τῶν αὐ-ῶν-οις

c1						
a	b	a	bc	G	F	E

A2				
a	bc	G	F	E

f							
a	b	a	G	EF	G	F	E

D2						
a	G	a	G	F	E	E

V 11 καὶ τὸ μέν-ῶν-οις 12 τῶν θε-ῶν-οις τῶν αὐ-ῶν-οις

g							
a	b	a	bc	GF	G	F	E

h							
a	b	a	G	EF	G	F	E

B			
ca	b	a	G

VI 13 εἰς ἡ-ῶν-οις με-ῶν-οις

b							
d	G	a	a	ca	b	a	G

VII 14 ὡς ἐν-ῶν-οις 15 τῶν ἐν-ῶν-οις καὶ τοῦ θε-ῶν-οις

c3								
bc	ba	a	bc	GF	E	F	E	D

A2				
a	bc	G	F	E

f							
a	b	a	G	EF	G	F	E

h							
D	E	FG	a	EF	G	b	a

H							
a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b

D3								
a	a	b	ab	ba	a	G	FE	E

VIII 16 τῶν ἐν-ῶν-οις 17 ἐν-ῶν-οις

d/FE						
a	a	a	a	FG	GF	E

e							
b	d	cb	a	ca	b	a	G

B					
a	ca	b	a	G	G

IX 18 ἐν-ῶν-οις 19 ἐν-ῶν-οις

c4								
G	G	a	bc	b	a	ba	G	a

C1						
G	bc	b	a	ba	G	G

X 19 ὡς ἐν-ῶν-οις 20 ἐν-ῶν-οις

c4								
G	G	a	bc	b	a	ba	G	a

C1						
G	bc	b	a	ba	G	G

XI 21 ὡς ἐν-ῶν-οις 22 ἐν-ῶν-οις

c4								
G	G	a	bc	b	a	ba	G	a

C3						
G	bc	b	a	ba	G	a

A3									
a	c	G	E	G	bc	a	G	FE	E

D1									
a	c	G	E	G	bc	a	G	FE	E

Example 7: Christmas Sticheron (by Kassia; from D (=MMB I), fol. 94v)

NB For G-sharp
and d-sharp,
see Ex. 3

1	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline \text{ΛΥ-ΤΟΥ-ΣΤΟΥ ΜΩ-ΚΑ-ΤΗ-ΟΝ-ΤΟΣ} \\ \hline \text{G G a b b c a b a G a} \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline \text{Ε-ΠΙ ΤΗΣ ΤΗΣ} \\ \hline \text{a G EF G} \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline \text{2 Η ΠΟ-ΛΥ-ΑΙ-Α ΤΩΝ ΑΥ-ΘΟΥ-ΝΩΝ Ε-ΝΑΥ-ΟΑ-ΤΟ} \\ \hline \text{G G G a bc b a a b ab G a GFE E} \\ \hline \end{array}$
3	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline \text{3 ΜΑΙ ΟΟΥ ΕΥ-ΑΥ-ΘΟΥ-ΝΗ-ΟΝ-ΤΟΣ} \\ \hline \text{b G ab b c a b a G a} \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline \text{ΕΚ ΤΗΣ Α-ΤΥΧΗΣ} \\ \hline \text{a G EF G} \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline \text{4 Η ΠΟ-ΛΥ-ΑΙ-Α ΤΩΝ ΕΙ-ΘΩ-ΛΩΝ ΚΑ-ΤΗΟ-ΤΗ-ΤΑΙ} \\ \hline \text{G G G a bc b a a b ab G a GFE E} \\ \hline \end{array}$
5	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline \text{5 ΟΥ-ΠΟ ΜΙ-ΑΥ ΔΕ-ΟΝΟ-ΤΙ-ΑΥ} \\ \hline \text{b b G ab bc a ba G} \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline \text{ΕΥ-ΚΟ-ΟΜΙ-ΟΥ} \\ \hline \text{a bc bc a} \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline \text{6 ΑΙ ΠΟ-ΛΕΙΣ ΥΕ-ΥΕ-ΥΗ-ΝΗ-ΤΑΙ} \\ \hline \text{a b ab G a G FE E} \\ \hline \end{array}$
7	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline \text{7 Α-ΑΙ ΕΙΣ ΤΗ-ΑΥ ΔΕ-ΟΝΟ-ΤΙ-ΑΥ} \\ \hline \text{b b G ab bc a ba G} \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline \text{8 ΤΩ ΔΟΥ-ΜΑ-ΤΙ ΤΟΥ ΜΑΙ-ΟΑ-ΠΟΣ} \\ \hline \text{b d cb a ca b aG G} \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline \text{9 Α-ΑΙ ΕΙΣ ΤΗ-ΑΥ ΔΕ-ΟΝΟ-ΤΙ-ΑΥ} \\ \hline \text{G G b a b G ab b } \\ \hline \end{array}$
10	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline \text{10 ΟΥ-ΠΟ ΜΙ-ΑΥ ΔΕ-Ο-ΤΗ-ΤΟΣ} \\ \hline \text{b d cb a ca b aG G} \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline \text{11 ΟΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΕΥ-ΑΥ-ΘΟΥ-ΝΗ-ΟΝ-ΤΟΣ ΔΕ-ΟΥ Η-ΜΩΝ} \\ \hline \text{b b b b d cb a ca b aG G} \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline \text{12 ΜΕ-ΥΑ ΟΟΥ ΤΟ Ε-ΛΕ-ΟΣ ΚΥ-ΡΙ-ΟΥ ΔΟ-ΞΑ ΟΥΙ-} \\ \hline \text{bc b a a bc G EF G bc aG FE E} \\ \hline \end{array}$