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I am sure that psaltes and scholars of Byzantine musicology will rush to acquire time machines once they are invented and built. Naturally, after that, the most visited time destination will be the last two Byzantine centuries – the 14th and 15th – when psaltic kalophony blossomed. On the other hand, a second, deeper, thought dictates that such time machines already exist; they are the musical manuscripts of the uninterrupted tradition of Byzantine and post-Byzantine psaltic art.

The present study will transfer us to the era of kalophony and take us back through the post-Byzantine centuries, using as a vehicle the manuscript tradition of the theotokion mathema Ἀνωθεν οἱ προφήται. Aiming to understand the concepts of eponymity, tradition and innovation as regards Byzantine compositions, in fact, I shall examine the adventures of the most widely-disseminated Byzantine mathēmatarian compositions, which survive even today in liturgical praxis.

Let me clarify first that I am referring to five different settings to music of an identical or similar poetic text, appearing during the 14th and 15th centuries, and recorded almost constantly in the musical manuscripts of the post-Byzantine period. They are two compositions by St Ioannēs Koukouzelēs – one in plagal second nenano and one in the grave mode1 – and three by Ioannēs Kladas; one in plagal second nenano, one in grave mode and a larger and more elaborate one in first or plagal fourth mode. The first four of these compositions are accessible through their transcription into the modern analytical Byzantine music notation, the so called

---

1 The greater part (pp. 399-534) of the doctoral dissertation of Vassiliki Goussi, Η τέχνη της προσωπογραφίας στη Βυζαντινή Μουσική: το πρόσωπο της Παναγίας (The Art of Portraying in Byzantine Chant: the Person of the Most Holy Virgin Mary), Thessaloniki 2015 [http://ikee.lib.auth.gr/record/278326], deals to the composition of Ioannes Koukouzelēs in grave mode. There is also a short study by the present writer on this specific composition to be published in the forthcoming volume Μαθηματάριον: Ερμηνευτική προσέγγιση και μουσικολογική σπουδή.
New Method. The latter has only been found in the original Round Middle Byzantine Notation.

The consensus of the musical manuscripts is that there are no more Byzantine compositions of Ἀνωθεν οἱ προφῆται except for the five mentioned above. Significantly, during the post-Byzantine period, four of these compositions (two in nenano and two in grave mode) are contained in almost every Mathēmatarion, while the composition by Kladas, adapted to the perissē Ριφεὶς Αδάμ, has been left behind and thrown into oblivion. In contrast, the composition by Koukouzelēs in the grave mode is probably the most disseminated and copied in numerous manuscripts from the 15th – 19th centuries.2

However, the very important codex Sinai 1262, copied by the last Byzantine protopsaltēs, Gregorios Bunes Alyates, from an older anthibolon by Moschianos3 complicates what is clearly indicated by the rest of the manuscript tradition. Between folios 172b and 176a of the Sinai manuscript, eight settings of the mathēma Ἀνωθεν οἱ προφῆται are contained, rather than five. Surprisingly, none of the three compositions of Kladas are included. Moreover, study of these compositions, contained in the codex Sinai 1262, demonstrates that six of them are different and not recorded elsewhere. These are three anonymous in plagal second nenano mode, one in the same mode by Koukouzelēs and another in the first mode by Ioannēs Glykys.

The following table shows the musical incipits of the compositions as well as the graphic layout of the poetic texts, the interpolations of kratēmata and the extent (i.e. the number of double lines written in the manuscript):

The compositions found in codex Sinai 1262

---

2 See the table and diagram at the end of this paper showing the dissemination per century of each of these compositions.
3 Concerning Moschianos see Gregorios Stathis, Η δεκαπεντασύλλαβος υμνογραφία ἐν τῇ βυζαντινῇ μελοποιίᾳ, Athens 1977, 105-106 and also Constantinos Karangounis, Η παράδοση καὶ ἐξήγηση τοῦ μέλους τῶν Χερουβικῶν τῆς βυζαντινῆς καὶ μεταβυζαντινῆς μελοποιίας, Athens 2003, 227-228.
The composition by Ioannēs Glykys is especially interesting. If we trust what Grēgorios Bunēs Alyatēs writes in codex Sinai 1262, then the prevailing impression that Ioannēs Koukouzelēs was the first composer of both the poetic text and the melody of Ἀνωθεν οἱ προφῆται is dissolved. What is very significant, in this case, is a fresco located in Ardenitsa Monastery in Lushnja, Albania, which is work of the Zografoi brothers, Athanasios and Konstantinos, from Korca, painted in 1744 and depicting the maistor saint holding a scroll with the text of Ἀνωθεν οἱ προφῆται on it.1 On the contrary, once again, the first inspiration and shaping of the composition belongs to Koukouzelēs’s teacher, Ioannēs Glykys. There is also an anonymous, extensive mathemata composition, which possibly could have been made by Koukouzelēs. The rest of them seem to be logoi or prologoi (ie kratēmata) rather than mathēmata. The following comparative table, showing the “prophetic” nouns and epithets for the Theotokos in the compositions of Glykys, Koukouzelēs and the anonymous one from Sinai 1262, may be considered to substantiate the hypothesis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glykys</th>
<th>Koukouzelēs</th>
<th>Anonymous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>στάμνον</td>
<td>στάμνον</td>
<td>στάμνον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ράβδον</td>
<td>ράβδον</td>
<td>ράβδον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πλάκα</td>
<td>πλάκα</td>
<td>πλάκα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τραπέζαν</td>
<td>τραπέζαν</td>
<td>τραπέζαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λυχνίαιαν</td>
<td>λυχνίαιαν</td>
<td>λυχνίαιαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κιβωτόν</td>
<td>κιβωτόν</td>
<td>κιβωτόν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γέφυρα</td>
<td>γέφυρα</td>
<td>γέφυρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κλίμακα</td>
<td>κλίμακα</td>
<td>κλίμακα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὄρος ἀλατόμητον</td>
<td>και σκινην</td>
<td>πυλήν αἰδιοδευτόν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χρυσοῦν θυμιατήριον</td>
<td>παλάτιον</td>
<td>παλάτιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θρόνον τοῦ βασιλέως</td>
<td>ὄρος ἀλατόμητον</td>
<td>ὄρος ἀλατόμητον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χρυσοῦν θυμιατήριον</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Seen through modern eyes and with the ideas of our era on copyright and the originality of a musical piece, it may be difficult to understand how the older melodic material, is not at

4 Unfortunately, the study of ecclesiastical heirlooms and monuments in Albania is still at an early stage and the relevant bibliography is hardly accessible. The existence of this fresco was suggested to me by Theodhor Peci, protopsaltes of the Orthodox Cathedral in Tirana, and I found further information about it on the following sites: http://www.shqiperia.com/arkeologjia/ardenica.php and https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ardenica_Monastery
all avoided by younger composers, within the context of Byzantine composition; rather they openly aim at transforming or rearranging it. Furthermore, it seems that the greatest virtue and the pride of a Byzantine composer is to follow the path of his teachers.

Even in Byzantine kalophony of the 14th and 15th centuries, when eponymity first appeared in Byzantine music, a musical work seems to be emancipated from its creator and it is likely to have many adventures over the course of time. Indeed, these adventures are declared often by manuscript music terminology itself and henceforth they create a new level of eponymy. In this light, I shall now examine the aforementioned five compositions of Koukouzelēs and Kladas, leaving apart that found in codex Sinai 1262.

**METATHESIS, REMAKING, ADAPTATION AND EMBELLISHMENT**

The remaking of an older composition, essentially the adaptation of the melodic material of an older *melos* to another poetic text, is not a rare phenomenon, especially during the 15th century. The *mathēma* Ἀνωθεν οἱ προφῆται by Ioannēs Kladas in the first or plagal fourth mode, which in several codices has been labeled "great", is the product of such a process of adaptation. Here is the inscription under which Kladas’s work is usually found in the musical manuscripts:

> Ἀπὸ τὸ μέλος τῶν περισσῶν, μέλος τό, εἰς τὸ Ῥιφεὶς Ἀδάμ, μετατεθὲν καὶ καλλωπισθὲν [πλατυνθὲν] ἐν τε χειρονομίαις καὶ μέλεσι καὶ σχήμασι καὶ ἰδιώμασι, παρὰ κυρ Ἰωάννου τοῦ λαμπαδαρίου, εἰς τὸ Ἀνωθεν οἱ προφῆται. Τὰ γὰρ ἐν ἐκείνῳ τερετίσματα καὶ τετενίσματα πᾶν ἐντέχνως καὶ εὖφυῶς εἰς τὰ τῶν ἑγκώμιων τῆς Θεοτόκου γράμματα, ὡς όρας. Ψάλλεται δὲ εἰς τὸ τέλος τῆς Ἀκολουθίας δίχορον, ὡς ὁρᾶς. Ψάλλεται δὲ ἐν τῇ Μεγάλῃ Ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἑορταῖς ἀπαραιτήτως καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ πόλει· ἦχος α΄ Ἀνωθεν οἱ προφῆται.

The melos of the perissē Ῥιφεὶς Ἀδάμ has been transposed (adapted) to this melos Ανωθεν οἱ προφῆται and has been embellished in *gestures* and *melodies* and *formulas* and *idioms* by Ioannēs Lampadarios [Kladas]. The *teretisms* and *nenanisms* of the original melos have been composed and adapted in an artistic and clever way to the words of the praise to the Theotokos, as you can see. It is to be chanted at the ending of the service by two choirs, not both together, but one by one. The original melos was composed by Andronikos.

Some very interesting information arises from the above indication:

a) First information: “Metathesis”, i.e., the adaptation of an existing *melos* to another poetic text is accompanied by a broader processing of the original *melos*. This processing is in other words the “embellishment” or/and the “extension” of the original melody and regards on:

- *Gestures* (i.e., adding or replacing the stereotypical melodic formulas, dictated by specific combination of vocal and speechless-gesture signs, the so-called theseis according to the definition of Manuel Chrysaphes).

- on *meloses* (ie the change of the melodic contour)

- on "*schemata"* - figures (ie ornamental movements of the voice required by specific signs) and

- on *idioms* (obviously of the mode, in other words the modal behaviour of the melos).

In addition, some other scribes describe this processing of the melody in less detail, referring to *parekvolai* /interpolation, *addition* and *embellishment* of the original melody. (It should be noted that the meaning of the previous terms can be easily found in the music theory treatises of the same period).

---

5  See codex Sinai 1313, f. 407r: “Ἀνωθεν τὸ μεγάλο ψάλλεται δὲ δίχορον, εἰς ἦχον α’.”


7  Čódex Koutloumousiou 456, 463r.

8  Konstantinou 86, f. 246r: “Τοῦ λαμπαδαρίου Ἰω. Κλαδᾶ καὶ νοήματα καὶ ποιήματα, παρεκβολαι καὶ προσθέσεις καὶ καλλιστήριοι. Τὸ παρὸν μέλος ἐν ἀπὸ τὰς περισσὰς τὰς γάρ ἐν τῷ Ῥιφεὶς Ἀδάμ τετενίσματα καὶ τετενίσματα ἐτεθέντες καὶ ἐποιήθησαν παρ’ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ Ἀνωθεν οἱ προφῆται, καθὼς όρας φάλλεται δὲ ἐν τῇ Μεγάλῃ Ἑκκλησίᾳ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἑορταῖς ἀπαραιτήτως καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ πόλει ἦχον α’ Ἀνωθεν οἱ προφῆται...”
Kladas, in general, often dares to embellish or adapt many compositions from the older repertory. The following inscriptions from codex SAL 48, which was written around 1430 by David Raidestēnos, are indicative:

267r: “Μετάφρασι τοῦ αὐτοῦ [Ἰωάννου Κλαδᾶ] ἀπὸ τὸ Σῶμα Χριστοῦ τοῦ [Ἰωάννου] Γλυκέος· [ἦχος] γ΄ Γενάσαθε…”

364r: “Ἔγκωμιον εἰς τὴν ἡγεμονίαν θεοτόκον μετατεθὲν καὶ αὐτὸ παρὰ τοῦ λαμπαδαρίου [Ἰωάννου Κλαδᾶ] ἀπὸ τὸ κράτημα τοῦ μαίστορος [Ἰωάννου Κουκουζέλη] τὸ λεγόμενον βιάλα καὶ ζαμάρα· [ἦχος πΑ. δ΄ Ην πάλαι προεκήρυξαν’].

368r: “Ἕτερον ἐγκώμιον καὶ αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν Θεοτόκον, μετατεθὲν ἀπὸ τὸ Ριφεὶς Ἀδάμ εἰς τὸ Ἄνωθεν οἱ προφῆται παρὰ τοῦ λαμπαδαρίου [Ἰωάννου Κλαδᾶ] δίχορον· [ἦχος α΄].

It seems, therefore, that Kladas had the necessary self-confidence and enjoyed the appreciation required to make such “embellishments”. However, not all similar efforts were favourably received. Although it is not directly relevant to my theme, the following inscription from codex Sinai 1234, written by Ioannēs Plousiadēnos in 1469, is very interesting:

f. 88r: “Mathēma to the same feast by maistor [Ioannēs Koukouzelēs], “deformed” by Manuel Argyros as somebody says”. (And on the lower margin): “Note: “deformed” is written so that everybody see the composer’s (Manuel Argyros) audacity in touching Koukouzelēs’s composition”.9

b) Secondly: Kladas adapted the words of the praise of the Theotokos to the melodies of the kratēmata (also teretisms and nenanisms) in an “artistic and clever way”. The specific reference to the melody adaptation of a kratēma shows that this is neither an obvious nor an easy process. The difference in treatment between kratēmata – especially teretisms – and the rest of the papadic melodies is obvious even to outsiders.

c) Thirdly: The original composition was composed by Andronikos, who is presented as a king in some other manuscripts. The absence of his name in the Athenian codex 2458 of the year 1336 and its appearance in the musical manuscripts from the mid 14th century onwards indicates that he is Andronikos III, who reigned between 1328 and 1341, and not his grandfather Andronikos II, already dead since 1332.

But in addition, in some other musical codices, Kampanis, who lived during the same period, is presented as the composer of the original composition.

Codex Iberon 1006, written by David Raidestēnos in 1431, gives more important information. Patriarch Matthaios ordered Ioannēs Kladas to adapt the words of the praise of the Theotokos to the old composition of the perissē Ριφεὶς Αδάμ.10 This means that the work of Kladas took place between years 1397 and 1410. It may be concluded in general that a simple monk as well as an emperor could deal with psaltic art – especially kalophony – during the Byzantine era and also that the ordering of musical works, particularly kalophonic compositions, was not a rare phenomenon.

“...ΚΑΤ’ ΊΧΝΟΣ ΕΠΕΤΑΙ../ “...FOLLOWS STEP BY STEP...”

Ioannēs Kladas set to music the mathēma Ανωθεν οί προφήται, using similar text, twice over, one in nenano mode and another in grave mode. Ioannēs Koukouzelēs almost a century before made the same modes choices for his own, very famous, compositions. Kladas certainly knew the compositions of Koukouzelēs, and thus the question arises: what gave Kladas the right to create his own compositions next to the older ones made by the greatest maistor Ioannēs Koukouzelēs?

Codex Konstamonitou 86, from the early 15th century, answers this question with the

9 “Ετέρον [μάθημα] εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν ἑορτήν, τοῦ μαΐστορος [Ἰωάννου Κουκουζέλη], ὡς τινες λέγουσι εἰκασκίνησι δὲ παρὰ Μανουήλ τοῦ Ἀργυροῦ, ἥχος β΄ Τῆς ἀύλου οὐσίας...”

“Σημείωση· πολλὰ οὖτος τολμηρὸς προσεγγίσαι, ἐνθα ὁ Κουκουζέλης συντέθεικε· ἵνα δὲ πάντες ὁρῶσι τὴν αὐθάδειαν αὐτοῦ, εἰκασκίνησι προσγεγραμμέναι”.

10 “Ἀυτὴ ἡ πεισμοθετήσσιν ἀπὸ τὸ Ριφεὶς Αδάμ εἰς τὸ Ἅνωθεν οἱ προφήται ὡς τοῦ καθηκόντος κυρίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ λαμπαδαρίου. Τούτῳ δὲ προσέταξεν αὐτὸν ποιῆσαι ὁ ἄγαμος πατριαρχὴς κύριος Ματθαίος. Ψάλλεται δὲ τούτῳ ἀτ’ αὐχής μέχρι τέλους· ὅπερ ὁ δεξιός χορὸς εἶπε τούτῳ καὶ ὁ ἀριστερὸς ἀποκρίνεται".
following indication: “The first composition is to be chanted by two choirs as one can see, but the latter is kalophonic and soloistic and is composed by Ioannēs Kladas who follows the older composers step by step. It is considered to be very good by its composer”.11 It is very interesting in this case that the scribe of the aforementioned codex conveys a statement by the composer, Ioannēs Kladas. This reminds us what Manuel Chrysaphēs wrote about the setting to music of the Oikoi of the Akathistos Hymn by Kladas, wherein “he follows the old masters step by step” and one may easily understand why he “is not only ashamed so to do, but rather took pride thereafter in not departing from the model provided by the efforts of the older composers”.12

However, it remains to be seen what constitutes this melopoetic imitation, by comparing Koukouzelēs’s compositions to those of Kladas:

First, one may see that the initial musical phrases in the compositions of Kladas are comparable with those of Koukouzelēs. It is obvious therefore that Ioannēs Kladas maintains the basic melopoetic ideas of Koukouzelēs but extends and varies them.

---
11 “Τοῦτο μὲν ἀπὸ χοροῦ καὶ δίχορον, ὡς ὁρᾷς, τοῦτο δὲ καλλιφωνικὸν μονο-φωνάρικον καὶ ίδιον τοῦ λαμπαδαρίου ποιήμα· κατ᾽ ἰχνεῖαν τοὺς ἀρχαίους διδασκάλους ἀκολουθοῦν πάνω καλὸν ὡς δοκεῖ τῷ ποιήσαντι [ήχος] βαρὺς ἄνθις ἄνθις οἱ προφητεύεται...”

12 Dimitri Conomos, The Treatise of Manuel Chrysaphes the Lampadarios, Wien 1985, 44-45: “Τῶν οίκων δὲ γε πρῶτος ποιητής ὁ Ἀνεώτης ὑπῆρξε καὶ δεύτερος ὁ Γλυκύς, τὸν Ἀνεώτην μιμούμενος· ἐπειτα τρίτος ὁ Ηθικὸς ὑπομιμεῖται, ὡς διδασκάλος ἐπόμενος τοὺς προειρημένους δυσύν· καὶ μετὰ πάντας αὐτούς ὁ χαριτώνυμος Κουκουζέλης, ὥς εἰ καὶ μέγας τῶν ἐν οἷς διδασκάλους ἰδιότητας ἔχει καὶ οὐδὲν τῶν προτερίους παρακινδύνουσα εὐκοπή· ἔπειτο δ’ οὖν ὁμοίας γλώσσης ἄνθις καὶ οὐδέν τοῦ εἰς τὰς ἐκείνους δοξασμένους καλὸν καὶ ἐσεμνύνετο καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ὡσπερ ἔργα καὶ κυκλωμένα δοξασμένα καλὸν, ὁ δὲ λαμπαδάριος Ἰωάννης τοῦτων ὑποτετούν εἴναι τὸν προτερόν τοῖς ἐν οἷς ἠσχύνετο, εἰ μὴ καὶ μὲν εἰς τὸν ἀνθρώπον ἀνομοιοθετεῖται, μὴ δὲ καινοτομεῖν τι παρὰ τὰ καθαρὰ. δοξασμένα δοξασμένα εἴχειν αὐτοῖς.”
KOUKOUZELÊS'S NENANO

KLADAS'S NENANO
b. He also acts similarly at the endings of the compositions, where he is interested in reminding the listener of the corresponding compositions by Koukouzelēs, but he also, very carefully, creates his own slightly wider melodic lines.

**The endings of the compositions in nenano mode**

---

**The endings of the compositions in grave mode**

---

It is characteristic, moreover, that Kladas uses phrases of poetic text identical to the corresponding compositions of Koukouzelēs at the beginnings and at the endings of his own compositions:

Pl. 4 mode beginning: Άνωθεν οἱ προφῆται σὲ προκατήγγειλαν, κόρη
ending: Σὲ προκατήγγειλαν, κόρη

Grave mode beginning: Άνωθεν οἱ προφῆται σὲ προκατήγγειλαν, κόρη
ending: [Σὲ προκατήγγειλαν] Άνωθεν οἱ προφῆται.
c. The beginnings and the endings of Kladas’s compositions demonstrate his overall melopoetic method. Kladas presents two wider, and in some ways more complete, compositions than Koukouzelēs. This can be clearly seen in the elaboration of the poetic text. Kladas uses as a basis the poetic text of the corresponding mathēmata of Koukouzelēs and after he has already set to music all the names of the Theotokos then he displays them completed with the appropriate adjective, also adding more prophetic designations for the Theotokos, known from the Akathistos Hymn and other relevant hymnographic poems. The following table shows the names and epithets of the Theotokos in the mathēmata of Koukouzelēs in comparison with those of Kladas. All the differences are indicated with bold letters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grave Mode</th>
<th>Nenano Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Koukouzelēs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Kladas</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στάμνον,</td>
<td>στάμνον,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ράβδον,</td>
<td>ράβδον,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πλάκα,</td>
<td>πλάκα,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κιβωτόν,</td>
<td>κιβωτόν,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λυχνίαν,</td>
<td>λυχνιάν,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τράπεζαν,</td>
<td>τράπεζαν,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ ρός ἀλατόμητον,</td>
<td>ὁ ρός κατάσκιον,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄλατομητον, σκηνή,</td>
<td>πύλην ἀδιόδευτον,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χρυσοῦν</td>
<td>κεκλεισμένη,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θυματήριον,</td>
<td>παλάτιον,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σκηνή,</td>
<td>θρόνον τοῦ βασιλέως,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πύλην ἀδιόδευτον,</td>
<td>στάμνον μάννα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πάλατον,</td>
<td>φέρουσαν,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κλίμακα,</td>
<td>πόκον δροσοφόρον,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θρόνον τοῦ βασιλέως</td>
<td>νεφέλη κούφην,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλέως</td>
<td>γέφυραν,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καθέδραν τοῦ μεγάλου</td>
<td>κλίμακα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλέως</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And of course, the main parts of Kladas’s compositions are newly created and obviously different from those by Koukouzelēs:
All the foregoing demonstrates that kalophony is more than an “Ars Nova”. It must be regarded as a great but peaceful revolution against the traditional character and the anonymity of the psaltic art. The composers of the 14th century asked and took “the portion of the property that fell to them”, which is translated into their new creations. But they did not journey “to a far country” as the prodigal son of the Gospel did.13 Instead, they cultured the fertile fatherland, in a less adventurous way perhaps than in the parable.

“...ΚΑΘῸΣ ΓΡΑΦΕΤΑΙ ΚΑῚ ΨΑΛΛΕΤΑΙ....” / “...AS IT IS WRITTEN AND CHANTED”

Of course, the notational transmission of a Byzantine kalophonic composition appears in different versions according to the period of notation. However, sometimes one may see variations in notated versions of the same composition during the same notational period. And obviously, these variations must be reflected in different styles of chanting.

This fact calls to mind the cases of Cretan composers of the 16th-17th centuries, who were accustomed to transmitting classical Byzantine compositions in their own notational versions and, consequently, their own fashion. The inscription relating to the mathēma Ἀνωθέν οἱ προφήται by Koukouzelēs in grave mode, from the Cretan codex Mayer 12053, held at the Sydney Jones Library of Liverpool University, written by Gerasimos Yalinas in year 1662, is eloquent testimony: (f. 283v) “One other theotokion, a poem by the maistor Ioannēs Koukouzeles as [it is written and chanted] by Demetrios Tamias; grave mode, Ἀνωθέν οἱ προφήται”.14

This provides a very good opportunity to study the general phenomenon of the notational recasting of Byzantine compositions by the Cretan composers, but unfortunately space does not permit this here.15 Moreover, it is clear that the subject will be illuminated sufficiently by the contribution of Dimitris Balageorgos to the present collection of essays.16

“...ΚΑΤ’ ΕΞΗΓΗΣΙΝ....” / “...IN EXĒGĒSIS....” (TRANSCRIPTION)

It is remarkable that the composition of Koukouzelēs in grave mode is regarded as the most disseminated and essentially the only one of the total five compositions of the mathēma Ἀνωθέν οἱ προφήται to have survived in the contemporary psaltic repertory. And furthermore, it should be noted that this particular composition is contained in all almost the Papadikes and Anthologies and of course in the Mathēmataria until the 19th century, and has been printed in numerous musical editions since then.

In the context of its extraordinarily rich manuscript tradition, Koukouzelēs’s composition remained notated in its original Round Middle Byzantine Notation until the middle of the 18th century. A few insignificant notational variations in some cases and the removal of the first repeated phrase Ἀνωθέν οἱ προφήται σὲ προκατήγγειλαν κόρη - παλιν- can be observed in some manuscripts.17

14 “Ἡτέρον θεοτοκίον, ποίημα Ιωάννου Κουκουζέλη καὶ μαΐστορος, καθὼς [γράφεται καὶ ψάλλεται παρὰ] Δημητρίου Ταμίων ηχος βαρύς, Ἀνωθέν οἱ προφήται”.

15 See also in Emmanuēl Giannopoulos' dissertation, Η ἄνθηση τῆς Ψαλτικῆς Τέχνης στὴν Κρήτη, Athens 2004, 416-435 the relevant unit in the fourth capital of the second part, entitled: “2. Παλαιὰ μέλη, καθὼς γράφονται καὶ ψάλλονται παρὰ τῶν Κρητῶν”.

16 “From the Cretan chanting tradition of the 16th - 17th centuries: A radical and original musical setting of the Great Doxology”, see pages XXX

17 See the relevant table in Constantinos Psachos, Η Παρασημαντικὴ τῆς Βυζαντινῆς Μουσικῆς, Athens 1978, 244, where four different notational versions of the initial phrase Ἀνωθέν οἱ προφήται σὲ προκατήγγειλαν are presented.
Later on, the composition is found written in the transitional exegematic notation by the two Peters, the master Peloponnesian († 1778) and his student Vyzantios (†1778). In addition, a certain Savvas19 – otherwise unknown – appears as the transcribe of the composition in codex Xeropotamou 385, f. 206r, writing it down in the pre-New Method transitional exegematic notation. Also, Antonios Lampadarios20 provides his own exegetic work, found in the acquisitions of Konstantinos Psachos’s library.21

Here is a table based on the older one compiled by Konstantinos Psachos and presenting the various notational versions of the phrase Ανωθεν οἱ προφῆται.

---

18 Autograph codex Esphigmenou 93, written in 1789, 126-132. See also Manolēs Chatzigiakoumēs, Χειρόγραφα Ἐκκλησιαστικῆς Μουσικῆς 1453-1820, op.cit., 110 and Konstantinos Psachos, op.cit., 83.


20 Konstantinos Psachos, op.cit., 243.

21 BKΨ folder 3/ leaf. 62, f. 1v.
Finally, the composition was transcribed into the notational system of the New Method by both teacher-exégētes, Grēgorios Protopsaltēs (†1821) and Chourmouzios Chartophylax (†1840). The protographs of these exégēseis can be found in the Anthology, codex EBE-MΠT 706, f. 370r, and in the envelope E of Gregorios’s Archive in Psachos’s library, f. 111v, respectively. The exégēsis of Gregorios, however, is the most widespread and well known through its printed publication, in the third volume of Mousikē Pandektē,22 (pp. 5-14) as well as in the first volume of Tameion Anthologias,23 where it is recorded with some small notational variations. It should be said that the later edition is intentionally mentioned here first because it is faithfully copied from the autograph of Grēgorios. The exégēsis printed in the earlier Tameion Anthologias is undoubtedly also Gregorios’s work, but nevertheless some notational differences exist, probably on account of the intervention of the editor, Chourmouzios.

Mousikē Pandektē

---

22 Πανδέκτη τῆς ιερᾶς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ύμνῳδίας τοῦ ὅλου ἐνιαυτοῦ, ἐκδοθεῖσα ὑπὸ Ιωάννου Λαμπαδαρίου καὶ Στεφάνου Α΄ Δομεστίκου τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας, τόμος 3, περιέχον τὰ μέγιστα μαθήματα τῆς τε Παπαδικῆς καὶ τοῦ Μαθηματαρίου, ἐν Κωνσταντινούπολε έκδοσιά τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας [1851].

23 Ταμεῖον Ανθολογίας, περιέχουσα τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ἑναυσίαν ἐν ἕκαστον ἐσπερινοῦ, ὀρθοῦ, λειτουργίας, Μεγάλης Τεσσαρακοστῆς καὶ τῆς λαμπροφόρου Ἀναστάσεως, μετὰ τισιν καλλοφωνικῶν (sic) εἰρήμων ἐν τῷ τέλει, κατ’ ἐκλογὴν τῶν εἰμιλεστέρων καὶ ἐφορδιαστέρων μουσικῶν θεᾶς τῶν ἑνδοξοτέρων διδασκάλων παλαιῶν τε καὶ νεόν, ἐξηγηθεῖσα ἐν τῇ τοῦ νῦν συνταγματικῆς ἐκδοσῆς, ἐπιστασίᾳ τοῦ Ιωάννου Λαμπαδαρίου, ἐκ τῆς τυπογραφίας Κάστρου εἰς Γαλατᾶν, αὐτ. 1824.
It should be made clear that exēgēsis is not a simple process of transcription from one notational system to another. It is, rather, an internal process occurring in the framework of the same, united and indivisible, notation. And this is the reason why it largely involves the interpretive expression of the exegetes, each clearly differing from the other. And this is the reason why in codex Xeropotamou 385 one can find the exēgēsis of Savvas a few folios after the exēgēsis of Peter Peloponnēsios on the same composition. In the same vein it can be understood also why Peter Vyzantios demonstrates a new exēgēsis instead of that of his teacher, Peter Peloponnēsios,
satisfying the request of his own students. Furthermore, it can be understood why the “thinner exégesis” of Chourmouzios is found beside the already analytical exégésis in the New Method of Grégorios Protopsaltès in codex Docheiariou 1240.  

In any case, the study of the different exégæseis reveals that differentiation between them constitutes the result: (a) of different musical orthography, (b) of different interpretations of the original notation, (c) of the lower or higher definition of the musical meaning.

“...ΣΥΝΤΜΉΘῈΝ...” / “ABRIDGED”

This wonderful composition by Koukouzelēs, from the distant Byzantine Palaiologan period has never so far stopped being chanted, and never ceased to be included in music manuscripts and printed music publications, and has never stopped being taught in music schools. However, in the case of the requirement of the modern era for shortening the time of worship, some teachers took care to transmit this composition in an abridged version. Konstantinos Protopsaltès, Nikolaos Protopsaltès of Smyrna and Markos Vasileiou made the most memorable abridgement of the mathēma. However, the abridgement of Konstantinos Protopsaltès is regarded as the most widely used.

The operation of Konstantinos essentially consists in cutting all repetitions extant in the composition of Koukouzelēs, and in the severance of the first kratēma. Konstantinos, however, distances himself from the composition of Koukouzelēs in the remaining kratēma, which is found at the end of the composition. He recreates it in an absolutely free way such that this part is regarded as an “epibolê” rather than an “abridgement”. Nikolaos Protopsaltès of Smyrna presents, in turn, his own melopoetic proposal regarding the kratēma and the ending of the mathēma. Instead, the abbreviation of the Markos Vassileiou, shows throughout great commitment to the original melody of Koukouzelēs. Note that the abridgement of Konstantinos Protopsaltès was adapted by Nektarios Prodromitēs in Romanian.
Others have also dealt with the abridgement of this specific composition of Koukouzelēs – Stephanos Xeropotamēnos,31 Ioasaf Dionysiαtēs,32 Grigentios Zografitēs33 and two more anonymous authors, according to information from Matthaios Vatopaidinos34 – but their works never enjoyed any great dissemination. It is worth mentioning, however, that the abridgements of Stephanos and Ioasaf were originally written in the notation system used before the New Method. Ioasaf, in fact, transcribed his own work into the New Method later.

**EPILOGUE**

When found in the area of the psaltic performance and especially the worship praxis, the time machine that has been used in our previous stroll through the era of kalophony is transformed into a vehicle that can carry us to the existing utopia of the psaltic art. In other words, it carries us into the Psaltic Eden. In the middle of this paradise, there is a huge tree, which is soaked with the sweat of the older and newer composers and art-masters and it is full of the fruits of their works. The new branches and shoots of this tree are not always identical to the older ones, but nevertheless they are consubstantial with them. Blessed are those who contribute to increasing and renewal of this tree of tradition and tasting its fruits. And conversely, expelled from Paradise, those who plant other trees and taste alien fruits without having authority.

---

32 See codex Dionysiou 645, ms of Ioasaf Dionysiαtēs, p. 17: “Τὸ παρὸν θεοτοκίον, ἤτοι Ἀνωθεν οἱ προφηταὶ, συνετμήθη εἰς τὸ παλαιὸν μὲν, ἔτραπαν δὲ εἰς τὴν Νέαν Μέθοδον τῆς Μουσικῆς, ἵνα ψάλληται καὶ ὡς μάθημα, καὶ μάλιστα εἰς τὴν τράπεζαν, ὅταν πανήγυρις ὑπάρχῃ ἡ ἡχος βαρύς Ἀνωθεν οἱ προφηταὶ”.
33 Codex Hagiou Pavlou 217, 1.
34 See codex Gregoriou 18, ms Matthaios Vatopaidinos from the year 1843.
- p. 601: “[... ] Ἱωάννου τοῦ Κουκουζέλη ἡ ἡχος βαρύς Ζω Ἀνωθεν οἱ προφηταὶ...”
- p. 617: “Εἰτερον τοῦ αὐτοῦ, ἔστρεψε ὅταν ἐνδύεται ὁ ἀρχιερεύς, έσυντομηθη δὲ παρὰ τοίχους ἡχος βαρύς Ζω Ἀνωθεν οἱ προφηταὶ...”.
- p. 627: “Εἰτερον τοῦ αὐτοῦ, ἐνδυομένου ἀρχιερείας, έσυντομηθη δὲ παρὰ τοίχους ἅλλου ἡχος βαρύς Ζω Ἀνωθεν οἱ προφηταὶ...”.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cent.</th>
<th>Koukoneles' Grave mode</th>
<th>Koukoneles' nema no mode</th>
<th>Kladas' Grave mode</th>
<th>Kladas' nema no mode</th>
<th>Kladas' first (or pl. 4th) mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14th</td>
<td>Sinai 1262 (1437)<em>/Iv. 1066</em>/ED Cl. 14/EBE 2406 (1453)/EBE 2604 (1463)/</td>
<td>Sinai 1262 (1437)*</td>
<td>Iv. 1006*/Konst. 86/</td>
<td>Iv. 1006/</td>
<td>Iv. 1006, Iv. 1120 (1458)<em>/Ar. 527, SAL 48 (1430)</em>/Met. 164*/Varl. 208*/Varl. 211*/Ath. 904*/Ath. 2401*/Ath. 2406 (1453)/Kron 86*/Var. 1550*/Kod. 456*/Var. 1497*/Var. 1530*/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>Iv. 1123*/Iv. 1238*/Iv. 1274*/Ps. 70*/Met. 246*/Xer. 263*/Xer. 269*/Doch. 315*/</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pant. 1046</td>
<td>Doch. 315*/</td>
<td>Sinai 1313*/Iv. 1144*/Doeh. 315*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th</td>
<td>Sinai 1283*/HS. 624*/Iv. 543 (1650)<em>/Iv. 1007 (1605)</em>/Iv. 1023*/Iv. 1096*/Iv. 1151*/Iv. 1176*/Iv. 1178*/Iv. 1191*/Iv. 1197*/Iv. 1198*/Iv. 1221*/Iv. 1224*/Iv. 1228*/Iv. 1229*/Iv. 1232*/Iv. 1234*/Iv. 1237*/Iv. 1238*/Mayar 12055*/Ps. 98*/Met. 310*/Met. 229*/Xer. 271*/Xer. 328*/Doeh. 337*/Lauros E6 (1620)*Merl. 2 (1658)<em>EBE 2980 (1667)</em>/Anam. 6 (1689)*EBE 947 (1680)*Tax. 2 (1682)<em>EBE 909 (1692)</em></td>
<td>Sinai 1283*/Iv. 1187<em>JC 33 (1653)</em></td>
<td>Sinai 1283*/Iv. 1096<em>JC 33 (1653)</em></td>
<td>Sinai 1283*</td>
<td>Iv. 1004*/Iv. 1096*/Doeh. 357*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th</td>
<td>Sinai 1266*/Sinai 1270*/Sinai 1288*/Sinai 1299 (1715)<em>Sinai 1419</em>/Sinai 1424*/Sinai 1429*/Sinai 1446*/Sinai 1448*/Sinai 1454*/Sinai 1458*/HS 308***/HS 347**/HS 550*/HS 560*/HS 574*/HS 577*/HS 590*/HS 594*/HS 604***/HS 614*/HS 616*/HS 626*/HS 632*/HS 634*/Iv. 1019*/Iv. 1026*/Iv. 1038*/Iv. 1091*/Iv. 1093***/Iv. 1118 (1746)<em>Iv. 1129</em>/Iv. 1134*/Iv. 1147*/Iv. 1148*/Iv. 1195 (1725)<em>Iv. 1262</em>/Iv. 1273*/Iv. 1285*/Hschl. III 695*/C. Gr. 25*/Ps. 45*/Ps. 59*/Ps. 73***/Ps. 71*/Ps. 99*/Ps. 12*/Ps. 60 (1716)<em>Ps. 11</em>/Ps. 44*/t. 11***/Met. 60*/Met. 92 (1772)<em>Met. 101</em>/Met. 416*/Met. 244*/Stef. 23*/Stef. 52 (1743)<em>Stef. 55 (1733)<em>Stef. 59 (1730)<em>Stef. 127</em>/Xer. 267</em>/Xer. 276</em>/Xer. 380*/Xer. 305*/Xer. 312*/Xer. 320 (1741)<em>Xer. 321</em>/Xer. 323 (1708)<em>Xer. 330 (1781)<em>Xer. 364</em>/Xer. 365</em>/Xer. 366*/Xer. 368*/Xer. 370 (1738)<em>Xer. 373</em>/Xer. 380 (1759)<em>Xer. 382</em>/Xer. 385****/Xer. 413 (1839)<em>/Doeh. 338</em>/Doeh. 358*/Doeh. 359*/Doeh. 372*/Doeh. 1240*/Xen. 150 (1763)<em>Xen. 172</em>/Pant. 501 (1734)<em>Pant. 985</em>/EBE 2222 (1786)*EBE 2220 (1745)*EBE-MPT 733 (1745)*EBE 823 (1747)*EBE 2446 (1770)*EBE 2218 (1782)*EBE-MPT 810 (1789)*EBE 926 (1792)*EBE-MPT 623 (1792)<em>EBE 2215 (1794)<em>Esph. 93 (1789)</em></em></td>
<td>Sinai 1266*/Sinai 1299 (1715)<em>HS 550</em>/HS 560*/Met. 416*/Stef. 23*/Stef. 52 (1743)<em>Stef. 127</em>/Paul. 128*/</td>
<td>Sinai 1299 (1715)<em>HS 550</em>/HS 560*/Met. 416*/Stef. 52 (1743)<em>Stef. 127</em>/Paul. 128*/</td>
<td>Sinai 1299 (1715)<em>HS 550</em>/HS 560*/Met. 416*/Stef. 52 (1743)<em>Stef. 127</em>/Paul. 128*/</td>
<td>Iv. 1289*/Ps. 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th</td>
<td>Sinai 1441*/Sinai 313*/HS 348*/HS 398*/HS 556***/HS 571***/HS 575*/HS 580***/HS 602*/Iv. 1011***/Iv. 1124 (1815)<strong>/Iv. 1126 (1810)</strong>/Iv. 1080 (1820)<strong>/Iv. 1096 (1829)<em>Iv. 1598</em>/Gr. L.4/#/Ps. 134*/Ps. 84 (1809)<em>Ps. 145</em>/Ps. 160*/Ps. 154*/Ps. 1, 2, 5B</strong>*/Ps. 4, 6, 7, 62*****/Ps. 6 (1817)<em>Xer. 288</em>/Xer. 361***/Xer. 369 (1802)<em>Doeh. 341 (1823)**/Doeh. 354</em>/Greg. 18 (1843)<strong>/Dion. 645</strong>*/Paul 26 (1800*)<em>Paul 217</em>/Paul 432*/Merl. 7 (1805)<em>EBE 1869 (1821)</em>/Anam. 3 (1811)*EBE 2417 (1818)*<em>EBE-MPT 743 (1808)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>