The Repertories of Model Melodies (Automela) in Byzantine Musical Manuscripts

Christian Troelsgård

Reading through any Byzantine liturgical order, one will quickly recognise the importance of contrafacta in the Byzantine rite; hardly any service is sung without the use of model melodies. Adaptation of a chant text (proshomoion) to a preexisting 'model melody' (automelon) has been a basic principle in the composition, performance, and transmission of Byzantine chant from its earliest phase and is perhaps a main reason for the enormous productivity in Byzantine hymnography.

The contrafactum technique of the Kanon singing is relatively well known as the classical Byzantine Heirmologion represents a collection of model melodies, heirmoi, required for the performance of troparia in this genre. But for three other quantitatively very important genres of troparia sung during the daily offices, model melodies have only in the last decades been recognised in medieval musical sources. These automela distribute into the following categories:

I) the kathismata automela, whether used as models for a kathisma proper (i.e. a poetic text sung at the end of a whole section of the Psalter in the continuous psalmody of the office), as troparion of the day (i.e. as a 'proper' troparion of the feast, sung at Vespers, Matins, and Divine Liturgy), or as apolytikion ('dismissal chant'). Some kontakia in syllabic style are used as automela in similar liturgical positions.

II) the stichera automela (a class of model melodies for stichera proshomoia to be inserted between the four, six or eight last verses of a Psalm and the Doxology in the performance of psalmody at the evening and morning offices. In this position the stichera proshomoia alternate with stichera idiomela for which notated melodies are present in the classical sticherarion.

---

1 Paper read at the international symposium Chant Byzantin, État des recherches at Fondation Rayaumont (France), december 1996.
III) the *exaposteilaria automela* (a class of model melodies used for *troparia* in the morning office, sung after the *Kanon*). During Lent, the *exaposteilaria* are substituted with *troparia photagogika*.

Contrary to earlier assumptions that the evidence for these groups of model melodies is very meagre or even nonexisting as regards the medieval period, I shall in this paper draw attention to a selection of available sources. Even if these chants have been identified in a relatively limited number of manuscripts far, it is to be expected that more sources will appear once we start to look for these repertories, especially in manuscripts from the Late- and Post-Byzantine periods. The *automela* are primarily written in the so-called 'Round' or 'Middle' Byzantine notation, occasionally in one of the Palaeobyzantine varieties, as is the case with the *exaposteilaria anastasima*. The repertories or cycles of *automela* in the three actual genres as found in a selection of manuscripts are indexed below in the Appendix. I think that a closer study of this material might contribute to the knowledge of the medieval Byzantine chant practice and performance, especially because the *automela* cycles appear in relatively few manuscripts. In such a 'marginal repertory' we do not encounter a broad and stable written tradition, as seen in the core of the classical *Sticherarion*, or in the earlier tradition of the *Heirmologion*. Instead, the various sources render the melodies quite differently, although often converging towards a common melodic ideal. In the case of melodic diversity, the various written versions might equal multiple performances, different local traditions or chronological developments. Sources with notated *automela* did probably not function as choir books and were most likely not used in the performance situation; rather they were reference books for singers and choirmasters or didactic manuals intended for training purposes only. Dealing with the *automela/proshomoia* singing, the role of the singer's memory, in all its different modes of functioning, his presupposed knowledge of the different styles and his ability to generate melodies according to the tradition are features that attract our attention, becomes important. There was, however, in certain periods or areas also pockets of written tradition involved in the transmission. For example the *kathismata* of the MSS Vatopediou 1493 and Dionysiou 570 are almost identical down to minute details of the notation, and it is reasonable to assume that also MS

---

4 The term 'marginal repertory' was coined by Oliver Strunk for the repertory of *stichera anastasima* only present in few and relatively late sources, cf. O. Strunk, *Melody Construction in Byzantine Chant* (orig. 1963), reprinted in *Essays* ...(see note above), 195
St. Petersburg 674 belonged to that tradition, though with a number of variant readings. This specific idiom of the Byzantine automelon/proshomoion singing could perhaps be labelled the 'automelon style'.

Also in the perspective of the later tradition and the continuity of Byzantine chant, the study of the medieval automela is of great interest. Comparison of versions of these model melodies over the centuries seems to confirm a considerable and lasting stability regarding the general outlines, as far it can be gathered from the few written sources available. In some pieces characteristic melodic movements appear to have been crystallized entities in the memory of the scribes and singers and have been preserved over a span of several centuries. However, we can also observe fluctuations, developments, and adjustments in the concepts of mode, melody, and style during the last period of the Byzantine Empire and the centuries to follow.

Previous research
To my knowledge, the study of these repertories began with Max Haas' transcriptions of kontakia from MS St. Petersburg 674, a manuscript which also Kenneth Levy⁵ had found interesting. In the 1970's Jørgen Raasted studied Haas' transcriptions and was captured by the peculiar collection of syllabic melodies for the kontakia. Raasted made some comparisons with the later tradition⁶ and devoted a couple of his last papers to the apolytikia. In 1991 Annette Jung⁷ wrote a study on the structure of the kathismata/apolytikia in a seventeenth-century manuscript.

In 1993, Irina Shkolnik made a new investigation in St. Petersburg 674 and reported that it contained also a cycle of stichera automela⁸, and later she has read

---


more papers on this finding and on *stichera automela* in more recent sources, especially noting the difference in style between the versions of St. Petersburg 674 of the manuscript Sinai gr. 1250 from the fifteenth century\textsuperscript{10}, and at the same time I studied the melodic variation in the *kathisma* and *expostiliaria automela*\textsuperscript{11}. The problem of *proshomoion/automelon* singing had however been attacked from another angle already some years before, namely through studies of the Lenten *proshomioia*\textsuperscript{12} in copies of the classical *Sticherarion* by Heinrich Husmann\textsuperscript{13} and Nicolas Schidlovsky\textsuperscript{14}, the latter of whom included parallels from the Old Slavic tradition.

The notated *automelon Tòì µαθηταίς συνέλθωμεν* for the *expostiliaria anastasima* was discovered by Constantin Floros in the Palaeobyzantine MS Ohrid 53\textsuperscript{15} (Coislin notation), it was musically analysed by Gerda Wolfram\textsuperscript{16} and recently taken up again in comparison with additional Palaeobyzantine sources and a number of sources in the Middle Byzantine notation\textsuperscript{17}. Among these is also the St. Petersburg gr. 674 which in addition to the above mentioned repertories includes a small cycle of *expostiliaria automela*. The *expostiliaria* have some features in


\textsuperscript{15} Cf. Konstantin Floros: *Universale Neumenkunde* I, Kassel 1970, 352


common with the *kathismata* and the *stichera automela*, as for example the frequent use of *tromiton* as a neume group on accented syllables and in the cadences, and the use of *epegerma-cadences* at the end of *lines*. In other respects, however, the *exaposteilaria* seem behave differently from the rest of the *automela* repertories.

**Terminology**

Before going into a more detailed examination of a few examples of model melodies, the technical terms involved in the discussion deserve to be clarified. According to current conventions, I use here *'automelon'* for a model melody, *'proshomoion'* for a *contrafactum*, i.e. a piece borrowing the melody from an *automelon*, and, finally, *'idiomelon'* for a unique melody, i.e. a chant having no *contrafacta* or *'proshomoia'*. But these terms were somewhat differently applied in the Middle Ages and have been used with various meanings also during the Postmedieval period\(^{18}\), as we can collect from the rubrics in the musical manuscripts (see Appendix). Often we meet *'idiomelon'* in the sense of model melody (i.e. corresponding to our *'automelon'*)\(^{19}\), and this was probably already from the twelfth century used in the same sense along with *'automelon'*. Also *'heirmos'\(^{20}\)* was used to designate a model melody outside the *Kanon* genre. In addition, the later Byzantine tradition the terms *'proshomoion'\(^{21}\)*, *'prologos'*, and *'protypon'* to denote the model melody. The *contrafacta* were traditionally just indicated by putting a "\(\pi \rho \delta \varsigma \tau \delta\)" (i.e. 'sung to the melody..."), before the text *incipit* of the model melody, written in full, abbreviated \(\), labelled *'proshomoion'* or *'homoion'* in the musical and liturgical manuscripts.

**The *automela* of first authentic mode**

After these introductory remarks I shall focus on some musical examples of *automela* belonging to *echos protos*. Example I shows the first item of the *kathismata* cycle,  
\(\text{Το ο ι ἔρου σφραγίσα δεντος}^\) and as a representative of a 'medieval' tradition (to which also the manuscripts St.Petersburg gr. 674 and Athos, Dionysiou 570 belong) I have chosen Vatopediou 1493 ("V"), a 'postmedieval' tradition is represented by Sinai 1259 ("S"), a Sofia MS, Kliment Ohridski cod. gr. 814 ("O") represents a late

---


\(^{19}\) See eg. St.P. 674, Vatoped. 1493, and Sinai gr. 1250

\(^{20}\) See rubric of of the *kathismata* in Dionys. 570

\(^{21}\) At least from 16th cent., See Athens 917
Example I, 1(3)

V: Vatopediou 1493 (14th c.)
S: Sinai 1259 (16th c.)
O: Kliment Ohridski (AD 1720), fol. 55r, Prosomoion Τοῦ σταυροῦ σου ξέλον
A: Αναστασιματάριον ἄργυν καὶ σύντομον, 16 (Athens 1972, ΖΩΗ)

Τοῦ λυ-θού σφρα-γι-σθε-ντος
υ-πο τῶν ἱ-ον-δαι-ων
καὶ στρα-τι-ω-τῶν φυ-λασ-σο-ντων τὸ ἀ-χρα-ντον σου σω-μα,
δο-ξα τη αναστασει σου χριστε
δο-ξα τη βασιλεια σου

δο-ξα τη οικονομια σου
μονε φιλανθρωπε.
Byzantine tradition and, finally, a present-day version written in the New Method notation, based on a 'translation' from the *Anastasimatarion* of Petros Peloponnnesios (ca. 1780), is shown.

Both the opening of the piece as well as its final cadence in line 6 seem to be fixed or 'crystallized' elements, especially in the three earliest versions, whereas the differences are greater in the inner phrases of the melody. The style is plain and includes a certain amount of recitation in all versions. Regarding the distribution of the recitation pitch and the interior cadences, i.e. melodic characteristics belonging to the concept of mode, we observe the greatest differences between the 'automelion style' and the traditional or 'classical' *Sticherarion* style. In the first mode, the latter displays a bifocal modality, centred around both D and a, whereas the *automela* are monofocal, using either D or a as tonal center. The ambitus of the majority of 'classical' stichera is C-d, whereas the stichera *automela* in 'high' position, i.e. from a cover the range from E-f. In the 'classic' sticherarion occasional recitation will fall on a or D, whereas the recitation note of the *automela* in the medieval manuscripts will be e (or F if notated in the 'low' register). It appears from these comparisons that the characteristics of first mode in the *automela* were slightly changed from the 13th-14th-century versions in comparison to the later ones. a (or D) is still a central pitch, but the 'old' recitation pitch on c (or F) with occasional accent inflections upwards to the high d (or G) often expressed with the neume *petasthe*, and c (or G) used for interior cadences has been altered. In all later versions, cadences on e/d has been pushed upwards to d/e (or G/a). This can be seen already in line 1a (-σθεν-τος), but also the cadence in line 3a is a clear example of this change of focus one step upwards (τρι-η-με-ρος σω-τηρ).

Example II shows the first *sticheron automelon* of the collection, Τῶν οὔρανίων ταγμάτων: As seen in Example 1, the tonal center is pushed upwards from c to d (or from F to G in the fifth transposition of the Sinai manuscript) from the fifteenth century onwards. We observe a frequent use of *tromikon*, almost the only great 'hypostasis' to appear in the *automela* versions from 13th-14th centuries. *Tromika* are seen in the classical *Sticherarion*, but not at this frequency. It is here very interesting to note the version by Akakios Chalkopoulos (16th c.), who is the first scribe explicitly to use the word ἕξηγησις in connection with notation and performance of Byzantine chant. He introduces in line 1 a slightly ornate cadence (with *tromikon*), where the others keep it syllabic, and in line 2 he happens to reintroduce a 'medieval' *tromikon* on the word γῆς, a version that he claims is "as they are sung in the ecclesiastic order by the best clerics, those who know the art of


Example II, 1(2)

V: Vatopediou 1493, fol. 185v (14th c.)
S: Sinai 1250, fol. 152v (15th c.)
A: Athens EBE 917 (16th c.), Akakios Chalkeopoulos
C: Copenhagen, IGLM 4,8 118r (ca. 1800), Petros Byzantios Protopsaltes
α-χραντε παρθενε σωσον η μας.
τους εις σε καταφευγντας.

οτι εν σοι τας ελπιδας μετα θεον.
θεοτοκε ανεθεμεθα.
music". But otherwise Akakios is not more musically 'talkative' in the notation than the tradition represented by Sinai gr. 1250, to which he seems to be closely related in respect to melodic movement. The Copenhagen manuscript, transcribed at the bottom, represents a version by Petros Byzantios (ca. 1800), which is also the version that formed the basis of the standard translation of the Heirmologion into the New Method by Chourmouzios Chartophylax (1835). This is the latest and most strictly syllabic of all versions, but the general outlines as to high and low beginnings seem to follow the older ones: line 3 has 'high' ending, line four is 'low', line 5 ends 'high', and line 6 repeats the 'low' full stop cadence already seen in line 1. Only in line 2 we see a disagreement in the overall melodic layout; Sinai and Akakios end 'high', whereas the other two versions, those at the greatest chronological distance, have a 'low' one. Despite such deviations, I think that melodic profiles might have played an important role in the memorizing and following also the performance and transmission of the automela/proshomoia. It is my impression that the coincidences in details are too many to have been created by a set of generative rules alone; certain characteristic melodic movements and the general layout as to 'high' and 'low' beginnings and cadences were probably remembered strictly, probably mnemonically linked with the text. In this way, the process of notating an automelon/proshomoion can be compared with the actual application of a proshomoion to a model melody in performance, given that no notated Vorlage was at hand.

The stichera automela and the 'classical' Sticherarion
How do our new sources relate, then, to the melodies of the Lenten proshomoia transmitted in the 'classical' Sticherarion? If we compare the 'pieces available in the two repertoires, the general picture is that they are complementary. The automela melodies corresponding to the notated proshomoia in the 'classical' Sticherarion are generally absent from the collections stichera automela, and vice versa. There is, however, a slight overlap, for example in the St. Petersburg manuscript, which has the richest of the automelon collections. In these cases the melodies in the automelon repertory follow those of the 'classical' Sticherarion, namely the stichera proshomoia of Lent or few pieces from other parts of the Sticherarion, which occasionally are used as model melodies. They are rendered in the well-known syllabo-neumatic style of the of the Menaia, Triodion, Pentekostarion and parts of the Oktoechos in the Sticherarion. In the remaining portion of the repertory, which consists of the most frequently applied model melodies and which is not included in the traditional

---

22 See Appendix, the rubric of Athens 917, fol. 22r.
Sticherarion, another musical style seems to prevail. The only musical touchpoint between the automela in the first mode and the classical Sticherarion appears to be the anastasima of the Oktoechos (in the pieces Τάς ἐσπερινάς εὐχάς, Κυκλώσατε λαοί, Δεῦτε λαοί ὑμνήσωμεν)\textsuperscript{23}. Only these few stichera have recitation on ε with pitch accent on δ, interior cadences on ε in first mode, and a syllabic cadence on ε β α, both at the end of sections and at the very end of the chants. Although the texts and modal ascriptions of these anastasima are very old, they only appear with notation in MSS only from the fourteenth century, possibly as a result of a revision of the entire Sticherarion\textsuperscript{24}. Following, they share with the automela a status as frequently used chants (the anastasima of the first mode were used every eighth Sunday through the year) and as transmitted without notation until around 1300. It seems that these conditions of transmission could have influenced the shaping of the melodies and it is, I think, too early to conclude which of the two styles is the most archaic. It is in this connection also worth noticing that the kathismata automela and the most frequently applied stichera of the automela cycles share the musical style.

One of the few instances, where a frequently used model melody is represented both in the automelon cycle and in the 'classical' Sticherarion is treated in Example III; it is the sticheron symtomon automelon Οἶκος τοῦ Ἐφραήμ for the forefeasts of Christmas in second mode\textsuperscript{25}. It appears twice in MS Vatopediou 1493, the first version is found in the standard repertory and the second in the repertory of automela. The version in the later MS Sinai gr. 1250 is related with the 'automelon version' of the Vatopediou manuscript, but for the major part these two versions follow - with slight variations - the classical Sticherarion, except for the phrases 4-5. Notice that the syllabic cadence over a descending fourth (or fifth) in the two 'automelon versions' resembles the type of cadence observed in the first mode automela, see e.g. Example II, line 6.

---

\textsuperscript{23} I. Shkolnik has presented a structural/metrical analysis of these three short pieces, "The Problem of ...", see above note 9.


\textsuperscript{25} During the last decade studied by Mariangela Cappelli Arata: *Some notes on Cyprian the Hymnographer*, Studies in Eastern Chant V, (New York 1990), 123-9 and Annette Jung: *Symtomon, a musical genre from around AD 800*, CIMAGL 66 (Copenhagen 1996), 25-34
Vatopediou 1493, fol. 84v (14th c.) (Standard repertory)

Vatopediou 1493, fol. 186r (14th c.) (Automela repertory)

Sinai 1250, fol. 152v (15th c.)

Οἶκος τοῦ Ἑφραθα ἡ πόλις ἡ ἀγία, τῶν προφητῶν ἡ δόξα

1 In S this syllable should probably be read δοριω̐, cf. Athens 917, fol. 33v.
The *exaposteilaria automela*

According to the tradition, the *exaposteilaria anastasima*, composed in political verses, was a work by Byzantine emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (913-959). Example IV shows the first couple of lines from the first item of the series. Here the melodic differences in contemporary versions are very striking, but the layout of the piece, the resting cadence notes, the position of *tromikon* groups and occasional melodic identity, especially in lines 3-4, nevertheless give the impression of various 'manifestations' or 'performances' of the same melodic skeleton in the three 13th-14th-century versions represented. But in the fourth one, the version from the 16th-century Sinai manuscript, not only the melody seems not to be related to the earlier ones, even the modal ascription has been changed from first to second mode. In this genre a greater amount of melodic diversity is seen, perhaps because the modal ascription of the *exaposteilaria* was normally absent from the liturgical books and the neumed versions appeared even less regularly than the cycles of *stichera* and *kathismata automela*. The conclusion on the transmission of this piece is that we encounter an instance of discontinuity between the medieval tradition and the later one, i.e. a break of tradition approximately contemporary with the adjustments of the modality observed between the 'old' versions and the Sinai MSS of the 15th-16th century in examples I-III.

The importance of the *automela* reperories

One the most interesting questions raised by this material is when and how this special 'automelon style', developed. Except for the *exaposteilaria anastasima*, it is documented in the musical manuscripts from the late thirteenth century or beginning of the fourteenth century onwards. Strunk had noticed that some *automela* figured as 'stichera apocrypha' in Palaeobyzantine sources and in his article "The Notation of the Chartres Fragment" he ventured a transcription of such a melody, 'Ο τοῦ παραδόξου θεόματος in first authentic mode. At that time Strunk did not know any Middle Byzantine version of the chant. Therefore he engaged into transcription of this *automelon* according to a private 'library of formulas', developed on the basis of several comparisons between the Palaeobyzantine and Round notation versions of first mode *stichera* in the standard repertory. Now that we have access to a Middle Byzantine version of the piece in the cycle of *stichera automela*, we have an opportunity of comparing Strunk's reconstruction with a version drawn directly from a Byzantine source (see Example V). Although a certain similarity between the two

26 *Essays...* 68-111.
Example IV, 1(1)

Pe: St. Petersburg 674 (13th - 14th c.)
I: Iviron 953 (13th-14th c.)
Pa: Patmos 473 (14th c.)
S: Sinai 1259 (16th c.)

Τοις μαθηταίσοις συνελθωμεν. εν ορει γαλιλαίας.

πιστει χριστον θεασασθαι. εχοντα εξουσιαν.
melodies is seen in the first line\textsuperscript{27}, there are many differences as well, and most of these appear to depend on the stylistic divergence between the 'classical' stichera and the stichera automela already described above. Certainly, this does not imply that Strunk's method did not work, but that we see two different musical styles applied to the same melody. What is strictly common to the two versions is the pattern of line repetitions, according to isossyllabia and homotonia, which are the basic principles in the automelon/prohomoion singing. This cannot justify any assumption of a descendence of the one from the other of these two versions, despite the apparent similarity in line 1. An alternative interpretation would be that a simpler, nonwritten style coexisted for a considerable period with the style of the notated 'classical' sticherarion. The written tradition of the stichera automela, the one similar to the stichera idiomela and reflected in the Palaeobyzantine version in MS Δ.γ.74, was abandoned and alone the 'oral' survived. This hypothesis might be supported by similar tendencies in the Heirmologia, where the Late- and Postmedieval tradition is characterised by multiple versions in parallel transmission\textsuperscript{28}.

The study of the marginal repertories of kathismata automela, stichera automela, and exapostellaria automela is still in its preliminary phase, but it is evident that this material offers a range of new possibilities to study the "hidden interplay of oral and written tradition", as Oliver Strunk described this complex scenario when he opened the discussion on the marginal repertories\textsuperscript{29}.

\textsuperscript{27} The movement G EF Ga a (or GF EF Ga a) with accent on Ga) is very common in first mode stichera and heirmoi of the standard repertories, whereas it is, except for this single occurrence, absent from the first mode pieces of the automela cycles.


\textsuperscript{29} O. Strunk, P. in p. Lorenzo Tardo and his "Ottoeco nei mss. melurgici" (orig. 1967), Essays....267.
A juxtaposition of O. Stunk's reconstruction of the automelon "Ω τοῦ παραδόξου θαυματος" on the basis of a.o. MS Athos, Laura. Γ.74 (above, see Strunk: *The notation of the Chartres Fragment*, Essays... 100-101) and my transcription from Athos, Vatopediou 1493 (below).
τὸν γα-βρι- ἡ κε- κιν- μέ- νοι τα- ξι- αρ- χον.

κε- χα- ρι- τω- μέ- νη χαί- ρε.

με- τὰ σοῦ ὁ κύ- ρι- ος.

ὁ πα- ρέ- γων τῷ κό- σμῳ δι- α σοῦ τὸ μέ- γα ε- λε- ος.
Appendix
The repertories of *automela* in Byzantine Musical Manuscripts.

I) KATHISMATA AUTOMELA

a) Kathismata/apolittika/troparia
Listed according to MS Athos, Vatopediou 1493 (14th c.), fol. 187r sqq.
Additionally, the contents of St. Petersburg, Public Library 674 (13th-14th c.), Athos Dionysiou 570 (15th c.), Sinai gr. 1250 (15th c.), Sinai gr. 1259 (15th-16th c.), Sofia, Kliment-Ohridski cod. gr. 814. (AD 1720) are given. Indentation shows that the piece is absent from Vatopediou 1493.

(Rubrics: Vatopediou 1493: *Ετερα στιχηρα καθισματα κατ’ήχον
Dionys. 570: Οι εἰρμοι τῶν καθισμάτων κατ’ήχον
Sinai 1250: *Αρχή σὸν θεῷ ἀγίῳ τῶν κατ’ήχον καθισμάτων

(fol. 187r)
α του λιθου σφραγισθεντος (674,9v) (570,126r) (1259,142r)
α του ταφου σου (674,9v) (570,126r) (1259,141v)
α χορος αγγελικος (814, 404v)
β ευσπλαγχνιας υπαρξοΰσα πηγη (674,10r) (570,126v)
β ο ευσχημων ιωσηφ απο του ξυλου (1259,142v)
γ χριστος εκ νεκρων εγηγερται (674,10r) (1259,143r)
γ την ωραιωτητα της παρθενιας σου (674,10r) (570,126v) (1259,143v)
γ θειας πιστεως ομολογιαν (674,10r) (570,126v)
δ αναβλεψαι του ταφου (674,10v) (1259,144v)

(187v)
δ ταχυ προκαταλαβε (674,10v) (570,127r) (1259,145v)
δ κατεπλαγη ιωσηφ (674,10v) (570,127r) (1250,8v) (1259,146r)
πλα τον συναναρχον λογον (674,11r) (570,127v) (1259,146v)
πλα τον σταυρον του κυριου (674,11r) (proshomoion of
tον συναναρχον λογον)
πλα λαμπει σημερον η μνημη των αθλοφορων (674,11r)
πλβ του ταφου ανεωγμενου (674,11r) (1259,146v)
πλβ αγγελικα δυναμεις επι το μνημα σου (1259,147r)
πλβ της ευσπλαγχνιας την πυλην (1259,147v)
πλβ σταυρε δαιμονων ελατωρ (1259,147v)
πλβ η απεγνωσμενη δια του βιον (1250,8v)
πλβ ελπις του κοσμου (674,11v)
πλβ μονον επαγη (814, 55v)
βαρ η ζωη εν τω ταφω (1259,148)
βαρ ο δι' εμε ανασχομενος (1259,148v)
βαρ πυρος φαινοτερον το ξυλον (1259,148v)
βαρ ως της ημων αναστασεως θησαυρισμα (674,11v)
πλδ ανεστης εκ νεκρων (674,11v) (570,127v) (1250,9r) (1259,149v)
πλδ το προσταξθεν (674,11v) (570,128r) (1250,9r)
πλδ την σοφιαν τον (και)λογον (674,12r) (570,128v)
πλδ αυλων ποιμενικων μελοδουντων (674,12r)
πλδ επι σοι χαιρει κεχαριτωμενη (674,12v) (570,128v) (1250,9v)
πλδ οι μαρτυρες σου κυριε επιλαθομενοι (1250,8r)

b) Kathismata/kontakia (prooimia)
Rubrics: 674 "Κοντάκια ιδιόμελα εἰς διαφόρους ἐορτὰς καὶ μνήμας", in 1493 and 570 each piece is designated "κοντάκιον" with indication of feast)
(187v)

β τα ανω ζητων (674,12v)
δ ιωακειμ και αννα (674,12v)
δ ο υψωθεις εν τω σταυρω (674,13r) (1259,145r)
β αγωνας εν αθλησι (674,13r)
πλδ της παρθενιας το (674,13r)
β τα μεγαλειας σου, παρθενε, τις διηγησεται (674,13r)
δ τοις των αιματων σου πειθροις (674,13v)
β οι την χαριν λαβοντες των ιαματων (674,13v)
β αρχιστρατηγοι θεου λειτουργοι (674,13v)
πλβ εκ των ουρανων εδεξω την θειαν χαριν (674,13v)
β χειρογραφον εικονα μη σεβασθεντες (674,13v)

γ η παρθενος σημερον (674,14r) (570,129r) (1259,144)
πλβ ο προ εσωφορου εκ πατρος (674,14r)

(188r)

δ επεφανης σημερον (674,14r) (570,129v) (1259,144v)
δ τηνωματικην σου παρουσιαν δεδοικως (674,14v)
α ο μπτραν παρθενικην αγιασαι τω τοκω σου (674,14v)
πλδ πιστιν χριστου ωσει θωρακα (674,14v)
πλδ τη υπερμαχω (674,15r) (570,129v)
πλβ πασαν στρατιαν του κοσμου καταλιποντες (674,14v)
β τους ασφαλεις και θεοφθουγους (674,15r)
β προφητα και προσφετα των μεγαλουργιων του θεου (674,15r)
πλα μιμητης υπαρχων του ελεημονος (674,15r)
πλβ πρωτος εσπαρης επι γης (674,15v)
βαρ επι του ορους (674,15v)
β την εν προσβειας (674,15v)
πλα η του προδρομου ενδοξος (674,15v)
πλδ μετα των άγιων (674,16r)
πλβ της σοφιας οδηγε (674,16r)
πλδ ο απεριγραπτος λογος (674,16r)
βαρ ουκετι φλογινη ρουμασα (674,16r)
πλβ τω θρονω εν ουρανω (674,16v)
πλδ τον δι' ημας σταυρωθηντα (674,16v)
β την αβυσσον ο κλεισας (674,16v)
πλδ ει και εν ταφω (674,17r) (570,130r)
πλδ τη φιλοπραγμονι δεξια (674,17r)
β το χαιρε ταις μυροφοροις (674,17r)
πλδ πιστει ελθουσα εν τω φρεατι (674,17r) (proshomoion for pιστιν χριστοι ωσει θωρακα)
πλβ την υπερ ημων πληρωσας οικονομιαν (674,17v)
πλδ οτε καταβας τας γλωσσας (674,17v)
πλδ ως απ'αρχας της φυσεως (674,17v)
α οταν ελθης ο θεος επι γης (674,18r)
β η παντων χαρα χριστος η αληθεια (674,18r) (proshomoion ?)

In addition, Sofia, Kliment Ochridski 814, AD 1720 (Cf. Annette Jung, CIMAGL 61 (1991), 49-77) includes a number of proshomoia for the following automela:

α τον ταφον σου δ κατεπλαγη ιωση
α του λιθου σφραγισθεντος δ ο υψωθεις εν τω σταυρω
α χορος αγγελικος δ ταξιν προκαταλαβε
γ την ωραιοτητα πλδ την σοφιαν και λογον
γ τον συναναρχον λογον πλδ το προσταχθεν

II) STICHERA AUTOMELA

Listed according to MS Athos, Vatopediou 1493, fol. 185v sqq.
Additional MSS St. Petersburg 674, Sinai 1250, and Athens 917 (AD 1520).
Rubrics: 1493, 674 and 1250: "Στιχηρά ἰδιόμελα κατ’ ἡχον".
917: "Ἀρχὴ τῶν προσομιών του πρώτου ἡχου. Ἡγουν τὰ αὐτόμελα. καθὼς ψάλλονται ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησιαστικῇ τάξει, παρὰ τῶν ἄριστων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν. τῶν ἑχοντα[?] καὶ τὴν τέχνην τῆς μουσικῆς."

(185ν)
α των οὐρανίων ταγμάτων (1250,152ν), (917,22ρ)
α πανευφημοὶ μαρτυρεῖς, Α-1, (1250,152ν), (917,22ν)
α ω του παραδοξοὶ θαυματος η πηγη (1250,152ν) (917,23ρ)

(186ρ)
β οτε εκ της ξυλου, Α-15, (1250,153ρ), (917,32ν)
β οικος του εφραθα (1250,153ρ) (917,33ν)

(187ρ)
β ποιοις ευφημων στεμμασιν (1250,153ρ) (917,33ρ)
β σταυρωθην εκραζον, Α-29, (674,1ρ)
β των πεπραγμένων μοι (μου) δευνων, Α-24, (674,1ρ)

(186ρ)
γ μεγαλη του σταυρου σου, Α-6 (1250,153ν), (917,41ν)
γ τω τυπω του σταυρου σου (674,1ρ)
γ σταυρωφανως μουσης, Α-14, (674,1ρ), (1250,153ν)
δ εδωκας σημειωσιν, Α-3, (674,1ν), (1250,154ρ), (917,55ρ)
δ ο εξ υψιστου κληθεις, Α-16, (674,1ν), (1250,154ν), (917,55ν)
δ ως γενναιον εν μαρτυσιν (674,1ν), (1250,1250,154ρ), (917,54ν)
δ ηθελον δακρυσιν εξαλειψαι (674,2ρ) (1250,155ρ), (917,56ρ)
δ οπλον απτητου (674,2ρ)
πλα οσιε πατερ θεοφορε (1250,155ν), (917,68ρ proshom. σαββα θεοφρο των αγγελων)
πλα χαιροις ασκετικων αληθως, Α-7, (674,2τ), (1250,155ν), (917,67ρ)

(186ν)
πλα των επιγειων απαντων (674,2ν)
πλα κυριε επι μουσεως, Α-20, (674,2ρ)
πλβ ολην αποθεμενοι, Α-2, (674,2ν), (1250,156ρ), (917,156ρ)
πλβ αι αγγελικαι προπορευεσθε δυναμεις (674,3ρ), (1250,156ν), (917,82ρ)
πλβ αρχαγγελικως ανυμνησμεν, Α-18, (674,3ρ)
πλβ μεταβολη των θλιβομενων (674,4τ)
πλβ συ ει ο θεος ημων ο εν σοφια (674,4τ)
πλβ πρεσβειαις της τεκουσης σε χριστε (674,4ν)
πλβ η απεγνωσμεν δια τον βιον (917,81τ)
πλβ εκ γαστρος ετεχθης, proshomoion for η απεγνωσμεν (1250,157τ)
πλβ τριημερος ανεστης (1250,156ν), (917,81τ)
καταφρονησάντες παντων των επι γης (674,3r), (1250,158r in marg.)

ουκετι κολυμβηθα (674,3r), (1250,158r)

ω του παραδεξου θαυματος το ζωηφορον (674,3v), (1250,157r),
(917,101v)

dευτε απαντες πιστοι (674,4v)

τι υμας καλεσωμεν, Α-4, (674,3v), (1250,157v), (917,100r)

οι μαρτυρες σου κυριε (674,3v), (917,100v)

κυριε ει και κριτηριω παρεστης, Α-8, (1250,157v), (917, 101v and 103v)

εν εδεμ παραδεισου ροτε, Α-19, (674,3v), (1250,158r)

αμετρητος υπαρχει, Α-13 (674,4r)

III) EXAPOSTEILARIA AUTOMELA

Listed according to St. Petersburg 674 (13th-14th c.). Indentation shows that the piece is not in 674.

Additional Manuscripts.: Palæobyzantine: Cyprus, Nicosia, Archeepiscopal Library, Mousikos 39 (11th c.); Ohrid 53 (12th c.). Middle Byzantine: Iviron 953 (13th-14th c.); Patmos 473 (14th c.), Sinai 1259 (16th c.).

Rubrics: 674: "Εξαποστειλαρια ιδιόμελα", Sinai 1259: "Αρχη σων θεω άγιω των κατ' Ἡχον έξαποστειλαρίων".

(18r)

τοις μαθηταις συνελθωμεν (πλα in some MSS, ηχ. β' from 16th c. onwards), (C39,136v), (O53,642), (1953,286r), (P473,91), (S1259, 153r ηχ. β'). Notated proshomaia for Τοις μαθηταις in C39 (fols. 136v-139v): Theotokion 1 Ο άνω δοξαζόμενος, Exapost. 2 Τον λίθον, Exapost. 3 Οτι χριστός, Exapost. 7 Οτε ήραν τὸν κύριον, Exapost. 8 Δόω αγγέλους, Exapost. 9 Συγκεκλισμένων δέσποτα, Exapost. 10 Τιβεριάδος θάλασσα, Exapost. 11 Μετὰ τὴν θείαν έγερθαι. Notated proshomaia for Τοις μαθηταις in 1953: Exapost. 6 Δεικνύων δτι άνθρωπος (288v), Exapost. 7 Οτε ήραν τὸν κύριον (289v).

(18v)

ο ουρανος τοις αστροις κατακομησας (1259,154r)

επεσκέπατο ημας (1259,156r ηχ. πλβ')

επεφανη ο σωτηρ (1259,156r)

εν πνευματι τω ιερω (1259,156v ηχ. γ')

(19r)

φως αναλλοιωτον λογε (1259,155r)
β  αποστολοι εκ περατων (1259,155r)
β  τον νυσφωνα σου βλεπω (1259,155v)
(19v)
α  γυναικες ακουτισθητε (1259,154r ἡχ. β’)
β  των μαθητων οροντων σε (1259,154v)
β  το παναγιον πνευμα
πλδ  σαρκι υπνωσας ως θνητος (1259,153ν)
β  σταυρω το φυλαξ (1259,155v)
β  ψυχη μου ψυχη μου αναστα (1259,157r)