



City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Lingas, A. (2013). From Earth to Heaven: The Changing Musical Soundscape of Byzantine Liturgy. In: Experiencing Byzantium: Papers from the 44th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Newcastle and Durham, April 2011. (pp. 311-358). Abingdon, UK: Ashgate Publishing. ISBN 978-1-4724-1229-4

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

Permanent repository link: <https://city-ref-test.eprints-hosting.org/id/eprint/16596/>

Copyright and Reuse: Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to [City Research Online policy](#).

FROM EARTH TO HEAVEN: THE CHANGING MUSICAL SOUNDSCAPE OF BYZANTINE LITURGY¹ *Alexander Lingas, City University London and EHRC, University of Oxford*

I. Introduction

The sound of human voices raised in song—in other words, that of people performing what most modern listeners grounded in Western culture would recognise as forms of unaccompanied (*a cappella*) music²—was integral to public worship in Byzantium. Celebrations in cathedrals, parochial churches and coenobitic monasteries of the eucharistic Divine Liturgy and the major daily offices of morning and evening prayer—that is, Orthros and Vespers—featured, at least in theory, nearly continuous singing.³ This was performed in alternation between groups of singers arranged into ecclesiastical and musical hierarchies, whose precise configuration in a particular place and time was governed by such variables as the liturgical occasion, the rite being served—for example monastic or cathedral, of Constantinople or Jerusalem—and the financial and human resources that were locally available.

The full range of singers heard in Byzantine churches encompassed ordained soloists (including the higher clergy of deacons, priests and bishops), permanently resident choirs (in cathedrals generally consisting of ordained choristers who were members of the lower clergy, but functionally comparable to modern English lay clerks), various secondary ensembles (choirs of children, deaconesses and monastics), and entire congregations.⁴ At the top of this hierarchy were bishops and priests, who intoned blessings, the concluding doxologies of presidential prayers, and in some instances the prayers themselves.⁵ Deacons chanted litanies, the Gospel, and such commands as 'Let us attend' ('Πρόσχωμεν', effectively 'Pay attention!') and 'Stand upright' ('Ὁρθοί').⁶ Among the lower clergy, solo cantors (for whom the generic term was ψάλται, that is 'psalmists') chanted melodically florid settings of hymns and psalm verses and whilst readers (ἀναγνώσται) cantillated Old Testament lessons. When not singing

as soloists, these *psaltai* and *anagnostai* also served as members of choirs that performed choral versions of hymns and psalms. The doxologies, litanies and psalms of the higher clergy and professional singers were punctuated regularly with responses and refrains that were mostly brief and easily memorable. This facilitated their performance by larger and less skilled, bodies of singers that, in some times and places, the entire liturgical assembly (ὁ λαός). Musical continuity in major public services was interrupted only occasionally for the reading of catechetical material (saints' lives, homilies and other patristic texts) and, in some versions of the Palestinian Divine Office, the non-festal recitation of the Psalter.⁷

Given the almost seamless musicality of public worship in Byzantium, it is curious how rarely modern scholarly writing has taken account of its 'soundscape'. Taking this term in the broad sense given to it by its inventor, Canadian composer R. Murray Schafer, the soundscape of Byzantine worship would have been its 'acoustic ecology', encompassing every intentional and circumstantial aspect of its sonic environment.⁸ As a matter of course it would have included all the variable and invariable elements of vocal performance in particular times and places: the acoustics of individual churches, the texts and musical forms contained in the psalmodic and hymnodic repertoires of a given rite, and the number of available singers together with their levels of musical knowledge and skill. Furthermore, it would have embraced sonic elements that were incidental or otherwise not under the direct control of those responsible for planning and celebrating services: the ambient noise generated by crowds and nature as heard both inside churches and, during stational processions, in courtyards, monastic compounds and on city streets.⁹

In recent years it has also become common to employ the term 'soundscape' in a narrower way to denote primarily those aspects of an acoustic ecology that are the result of conscious human efforts at what Schafer calls 'acoustic design':

From the arts, particularly music, we will learn how man creates ideal soundscapes for that other life, the life of the imagination and psychic reflection. From these studies we will begin to lay the foundations of a new discipline—acoustic design.¹⁰

Studies of these sorts of soundscapes in ethnomusicology, for example, typically proceed from the identification of the components of acoustic design—the performers, their instruments (if any), their music, and the context for its performance—to investigate how musical performance simultaneously shapes and reflects the belief systems of those who produce and consume it within a particular cultural setting.¹¹

Despite major gaps in the documentary record and the complete absence of sound recordings from the Middle Ages, it is still possible for us to draw meaningful conclusions about the soundscapes of Byzantine worship from those elements of its acoustic design that may be at least partially recovered. Where medieval churches survive, their acoustics may be measured and even duplicated electronically as is currently being done, for example, by the Icons of Sound project at Stanford University.¹² The sonic outlines of individual services may be traced from the study of liturgical manuscripts by determining the order in which individuals or vocal groups chanted their appointed texts from particular locations in the sacred topography of an ecclesiastical complex or city. In some cases it is possible to enrich the texture of these data with visual depictions of liturgical singers.¹³ Further testimony regarding the sonic landscape of Byzantine liturgy may be gleaned from scattered references to chanting in hymns, homilies and hagiography.¹⁴

Yet perhaps the most neglected resources for the understanding the soundscape of worship in Byzantium are the very ones that were consciously created as literary tools of acoustic design: the hundreds of liturgical manuscripts containing forms of Byzantine musical notation that survive from the ninth century onwards.¹⁵ Essentially two types of notation were used in middle and late Byzantium: a system of so-called 'ekphonic' signs

(neumes) employed by readers for the cantillation of scriptural pericopes that is found in lectionaries, and families of 'melodic' neumes recording the hymns and psalms chanted by soloists and choirs. Originally both types of notations were adiastematic: incapable of encoding with precision a sequence of melodic intervals, they relayed information about the performance of musical figures that still had to be learned by ear.

Whereas Byzantine lectionary notation remained melodically ambiguous until it fell out use in the fourteenth century, the intervallically imprecise 'Chartres' and 'Coislin' systems of melodic notation gave way during the later twelfth century to a fully diastematic 'Middle Byzantine' or 'Round' notation.¹⁶ Although it left some aspects of performance practice—in particular, rhythmic subdivision of the basic beat, chromaticism, ornamentation, vocal timbre and the realisation of ornaments—largely within the realm of oral tradition, Middle Byzantine notation proved to be a powerful tool and remained in use until the early nineteenth century, when it was transformed into the so-called 'New Method' of neumatic notation employed in modern churches. During the Middle Ages, Byzantine melodic neumes facilitated the consolidation and dissemination of more or less standardised repertoires of hymns and melodically florid psalms. From the thirteenth century onwards, cantors cultivating distinctly personal styles of composition also employed it to create new chants of unprecedented length and complexity.¹⁷

Knowledge of Byzantine neumatic notations thus potentially enables a scholar to recover information about musical design in Byzantine liturgy, the amount and quality of which will depend on both the availability of notated sources and the extent to which the form of notation used depended on oral tradition for its realisation. In this regard, the sonic implications of ekphonic notation have proven particularly resistant to analysis, although in recent studies Sandra Martani has shown that it is still possible to draw meaningful

conclusions about the musical rendering of text from Byzantine lectionaries.¹⁸ Manuscripts with Middle Byzantine Notation, on the other hand, offer comparatively full melodic profiles of their chants that may serve as a basis for study or, more controversially, transcription and modern performance.¹⁹ Congruities between Middle Byzantine notation and its forbears have also enabled modern scholars to use it as a tool for deciphering, at least in part, melodies recorded in some earlier non-diastematic 'Palaeo-Byzantine' notations.²⁰

Hitherto most scholarly discussions of medieval Byzantine melodies have, in harmony with the disciplinary norms of musicology during the latter half of the twentieth century, been examinations of their musical form and style analysing such elements as their vocal range, modality, quantities of notes per syllable, and use of stereotypical melodic formulas.²¹ Yet much of this same information may serve reflection on sonic or performative aspects of chants, revealing ways in which their musical design may have contributed to the contours of worship as experienced in Byzantium. Jørgen Raasted showed how this might be done on a small scale in a series of pioneering examinations of text-music relationships.²² Somewhat more broadly based are investigations by Moran and Schiødt of the musical roles played by eunuchs in Byzantine liturgy,²³ or the historical treatment of the eucharistic anaphora by Giannopoulos.²⁴ Only a few studies, however, have begun to exploit the significant advances made over the last few decades in our knowledge of medieval Byzantine chant in order to address in detail questions of musical design at the levels of whole services or even entire rites.²⁵

Building on the work of Raasted and his successors, in the remainder of this study I will consider some ways in which acoustic design contributed to the soundscapes of worship in the liturgical rites of Constantinople and Palestine. In particular, I will look at how particular musical forms and styles were applied in these regional traditions to their

respective versions of the Christian cycle of daily prayer, what is known in Greek as the 'Ἀκολουθία τοῦ νυχθημέρου' and to Western scholars as the 'Divine Office' or 'Liturgy of the Hours'. Although differing in detail, the Divine Offices of the imperial capital and the Holy City shared with other urban rites of the Late Antique Mediterranean a common basis in the antiphonal and responsorial chanting of biblical psalms and canticles.²⁶ From the times of their emergence the psalmodic cores of each rite began to be elaborated in ways that were in part adaptations to local circumstances, as well as markers of shifts in liturgical or artistic sensibilities. Since a comprehensive historical treatment of music in these services could easily fill several volumes, I will limit myself my discussion of each rite to a survey of their most conspicuous features and a brief examination of the evening office of vespers as it was celebrated on feast days.

II. The 'Sung' Office of the Great Church

Distinctive features of the liturgical soundscape of Late Antique Constantinople stemmed from its topography, the ecclesiastical architecture of its major churches, and the lavish musical establishments that were attached to them. The urban landscape became especially important during the archiepiscopacy of St John Chrysostom, when Orthodox and Arians processed through the streets of the city in competing processions, their participants singing psalms with refrains advancing their theological positions.²⁷ These processions, as Baldovin has shown, left indelible marks on Constantinopolitan worship by forming the basis for an elaborate stational liturgy uniting the city's major churches and public sites into a single sacred topography.²⁸ In addition, stational elements came to be incorporated into all the services of the rite of Great Church of Hagia Sophia even on days when worshippers did not venture beyond the confines of their own church complex. These elements are best known from the ceremonial entrances of the three Constantinopolitan eucharistic liturgies celebrated in the modern Byzantine rite, namely the Divine Liturgies attributed to St Basil and St John Chrysostom, and the Lenten Divine Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts. Processions were also integral to the major morning and evening services of the Divine Office of Hagia Sophia, a cycle of daily prayer originally known as 'ὁ ἐκκλησιαστικός' but cited by late Byzantine authors as the 'ᾠσματικὴ ἀκολουθία' or 'Sung Office'.²⁹ Imperial patronage aided the erection of churches designed to accommodate the movements of clergy and congregants in the evolving local rite, a process that climaxed with the Justinianic cathedral of Hagia Sophia.³⁰

The architecture of Hagia Sophia today serves as a tangible monument to the apogee of what Taft has called the 'Imperial Phase' of Constantinopolitan liturgy, but some sense of its equally magnificent sonic scale may also be discerned from textual sources. Of the 525

clergy assigned by Herakleios in the year 612 AD to Hagia Sophia and its three dependent churches, the majority—a number that included at a minimum the 80 priests, 150 deacons, 160 readers, and 25 cantors on the list of personnel—exercised a liturgical ministry that potentially involved singing.³¹ The cantors constituted an elite vocal ensemble from which would emerge soloists, some (or in certain periods and places perhaps even a majority) of whom were high-voiced eunuchs.³² As a group they were divided into a pair of semi-choruses that alternated weekly in their precedence and were often directed by deacons.³³ The cantors also provided leadership for the larger corps of readers, who followed their division into two groups and system of weekly alternation. Readers, although confirmed in their ministry with same prayer employed in the ordination (χειροθεσία) of cantors, nevertheless occupied a lower place in the musical hierarchy, performing simpler choral chants and leading the congregations in the singing of refrains.³⁴ Choirs of monks, nuns, and orphan children added further sonic diversity to worship in the great urban churches of Byzantium. Communities of monks (ἀσκητήρια) stationed permanently near Hagia Sophia regularly assisted the secular clergy of the Great Church with the task of maintaining a full roster of services at the cathedral, whereas other vocal ensembles seem to have appeared occasionally to enhance the splendour of major solemnities.³⁵

To fill out our outline of the soundscape of Constantinopolitan cathedral liturgy we must now consider the music actually sung in its services. Nearly all of the surviving manuscripts containing texts sung in the rite of Hagia Sophia postdate the traumas of Iconoclasm, whilst those featuring diastematic Middle Byzantine notation are later still.³⁶ Indeed, the only musically notated sources for the ordinary two-week cycle of psalmody sung at the vespers and matins in the 'Sung Office' are a pair of sources from late Byzantine Thessalonica: Athens EBE 2062 (late fourteenth century) and Athens EBE 2061 (first quarter

of the fifteenth century).³⁷ Products of the twilight of Byzantium, these manuscripts were copied at a time when the Sung Office was regularly served only in Thessalonica, it having been relegated elsewhere only to occasional festal use.³⁸ Despite all of this, many of the musical settings in these Thessalonian manuscripts faithfully preserve archaic patterns of call and response that had been established a millennium ago to facilitate congregational participation in Late Antiquity. Some of these antiphonal forms explicitly require the participation of a cathedral's full range of singing personnel: celebrants, deacons, elite choirs together with their soloists, and choirs of readers that at times either lead or stand in for the congregation. Musically elaborate responsorial chants such as *prokeimena*, settings for which are preserved with Middle Byzantine notation in manuscripts of the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries, generally employ only one or two classes of participants, namely solo *psaltai* and choristers.³⁹ Additional musical was provided texture by changes of mode, vocal register or timbre, and variations in the rate of interchange between spatially separated singers, from vigorous in litanies and ferial antiphons from the Constantinopolitan Psalter to glacial in melismatic responsorial chants.

Progression through the weekly and yearly liturgical cycles for the rite of the Great Church reveals additional layers of acoustic design that invested each gathering for worship with a unique aural topography marked by peaks and valleys of vocal range, sonic density, musical complexity, and changes of acoustical environment. Rubrics record variations in the identity and number and number of singers (including the participation of guest ensembles of orphans or monastics), as well as in their patterns of deployment to locations both inside and outside of churches. Each one of these alterations to the means of musical production, which included the propagation of sound in particular acoustical environments, in some way reshaped the soundscape of worship.

Despite regularly noting the assignment of chants to a particular mode of the Octoechos, only rarely do rubrics for services of the Great Church contain qualitative or technical musical terms, so it is primarily notated chantbooks that enable us to discern how changes of musical style related to the daily, weekly and seasonal rhythms of Byzantine cathedral worship. Where custom endowed a psalmodic text of the Sung Office with multiple melodies, their relative solemnity may fruitfully be charted along a spectrum marking the relative prominence of their text or music. Placing these melodies at their appropriate points between the spectrum's extremes of unmodulated speech and wordless singing, we find that festal chants tend to be both longer and musically more varied in melodic contour than their ferial counterparts. The same procedure may be applied cumulatively to the musical content of entire services, leading one to the complementary conclusion that festal services were generally invested with greater musical sophistication.

How this worked in practice may be seen from the outline of the festal asmatic vespers in Table I. This service differed structurally from its ferial weekday counterpart mainly in its omission of the additional variable antiphons that were customarily sung between the first and final antiphons of its opening section, and in the inclusion of chanted readings from the Old Testament at its end. For their celebration both the festal and ferial versions of Constantinopolitan cathedral vespers required the participation of representatives of the higher clergy, a double-choir of cantors led by soloists, and complementary choirs of readers. Whereas the Prokeimenon was assigned only to the most accomplished singers of the elite choir of *psaltai*, Table II shows how the invariable opening antiphon of the service incorporated the singing of all available singers present. Although soloists and higher began and ended the antiphon, the bulk of its biblical text was delivered by the choirs employing a stereotyped melodic formula ('psalm-tone'), each iteration of which was punctuated by a brief

refrain. In performance this hierarchically ordered alternation of singers and melodic styles would have yielded a soundscape characterised by sonic, musical and spatial variety.

Fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Byzantine manuscripts with music for festal cathedral vespers reveal that on commemorations of the Mother of God and other saints—a level of solemnity they designate with the generic rubric 'εἰς ἐπισήμους ἑορτάς' ('for notable feasts')—the psalmodic antiphons sung during the first half of the service were sung in syllabic or mildly decorated melodic styles.⁴⁰ Diverging only slightly from the stylistic norms of their ferial counterparts in the weekday offices of the Constantinopolitan cathedral rite, these antiphons feature choral melodies that remain generally sober and utilitarian (characteristically, solo passages are of greater melodic interest). Versions of cathedral vespers for solemnities of Christ in the same sources, on the other hand, tend to endow their antiphons with chants that are musically more substantial, melodically distinctive and challenging for their singers to perform. This difference in musical style may be glimpsed in Example 1, which contrasts three settings from late Byzantine manuscripts of the choral refrain for Psalm 85, the invariable opening psalm of asmatic vespers: a) a stunningly unimaginative version in Mode Plagal 2 for the feasts of saints; b) a melody in Mode 1 for Easter; and c) a setting in Mode Plagal IV ascribed variously to the Exaltation of the Holy Cross (14 September) and ordinary Saturdays, the latter of which have a paschal theme due to their position on the eve of the Sunday commemoration of the Resurrection of Christ.

The tendency within the Constantinopolitan cathedral rite to manifest heightened solemnity of great feasts with more elaborate music is perhaps expressed most strikingly in notated settings of the asmatic 'kneeling' vespers of Pentecost (*gonyklesia*) that are transmitted in South Italian manuscripts of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.⁴¹ Copied for use in Stoudite monasteries of *Magna Graecia* that extraordinarily celebrated vespers

according to rite of the Great Church each Pentecost, these settings represent the most technically sophisticated vocal traditions cultivated at the Great Church of Hagia Sophia prior to 1204.⁴² Their music for Psalm 18 ('The heavens declare the glory of God'), the final variable antiphon (*Teleutaion antiphonon*) of Pentecost vespers, is particularly remarkable for its florid melodic style, monumental scale, and hybrid formal construction. An outline of the musical setting in an appendix to the Psaltikon Florence Ashburnhamensis 64, a manuscript copied at the monastery of Grottaferrata near Rome in the year 1289, is shown in Table III.⁴³

In this festal *Teleutaion* the standard format for Constantinopolitan antiphonal psalmody serves as a framework for a cycle of modified repetitions of a sequence of three Alleluias—each of which has been extended through the interpolation of additional syllables, a stylistic trait characteristic of melismatic choral chants in the repertories of the Great Church—that is heard without interruption only once as the conclusion to the first solo intonation. This threefold Alleluia is constructed in three distinct musical segments, the third (D) of which is divided into two parts (a & b) that together are roughly equal in length to the first two segments combined (B & C). When sung in sequence (BCD(ab)), the Alleluias become execute a gradual ascent in vocal register (tessitura) to a cadence a sixth above their starting pitch. When the antiphon resumes after the diaconal litany, its second intonation is elided both musically and textually into the *stichologia* of the psalm, where the components of the triple Alleluia appear separately with minor melodic variations as refrains to successive verses. Psalm verses following the second solo intonation begin with a traditional choral psalm-tone, but substitute the next florid Alleluia in the sequence for customary simple choral refrain. At the end of every third refrain the music reaches a sonic and registral climax, after which the melodic ascent begins anew with further melodic variations.

Before moving on to Palestinian traditions, it is worth pausing here briefly to consider how listeners whose musical and temporal expectations had been shaped by the daily psalmody of the Constantinopolitan cathedral rite might have perceived this extraordinary antiphon for Pentecost vespers, which lasts nearly 35 minutes on a recent recording by Cappella Romana.⁴⁴ On ferial occasions, as we have noted above, antiphons sung during the opening section of Sung vespers (and, incidentally, Sung orthros as well) consisted mainly of a highly repetitive *stichologia* in which the choirs alternated in rendering verses syllabically to a simple musical formula that led always to the same (and usually brief) refrain. Congregants familiar with the asmatic antiphonal psalmody who attended Pentecost vespers would have had their stylistic expectations initially satisfied when they heard a soloist begin the Teleutaion's first intonation at the usual point in the diaconal litany, but might well have experienced some disorientation as the music continued to unfold and ascend in tessitura over the approximately six minutes required for its performance.

Yet it was only once listeners were well into the antiphon's *stichologia* that they would have begun to apprehend its unusually expansive sonic and temporal proportions. Although each psalm verse after the second intonation was rendered musically with a traditional syllabic psalm-tone, it was dwarfed in scale by the Alleluia appended to it. The normal function of a *stichologia*—that of efficiently conveying the bulk of a psalmic text in a musically repetitive (and therefore, arguably, affectively unobtrusive) manner—was not so much ignored as overshadowed by the goal of offering extravagant praise to God. This purpose would, of course, have been inherent to any antiphon that featured 'alleluia' as a refrain due to the literal meaning of the word, but here in the Teleutaion it was being pursued through primarily musical means. One sign of this was the way in which 'alleluia' was brought to the edge of intelligibility with ecstatic melismata and the intercalation of so-called

'asmatic' letters. Another was the presence in the antiphon of elements of musical design that operated independently of its psalmic text: the unusual formal construction of the first solo intonation, its division into a cycle of three Alleluias during the *stichologia*, the repeated slow ascent in tessitura, and the melodic variations which distinguished each cycle of Alleluias as being in some way unique.

Byzantine liturgical commentaries unfortunately do not explicitly deal with matters of musical form and style, but it seems reasonable to assume that the reactions of listeners to this Pentecost antiphon patristic would have been shaped by what Metropolitan Kallistos Ware calls the 'dominant "model"' of liturgical interpretation in Byzantium: an anagogical vision in which earthly worship is seen as an icon of heaven through which human beings participate in the perpetual angelic ministry of praise.⁴⁵ Bearing this in mind, it is not hard for one to see the elaborate music of the Teleutaion as an attempt to depict in sound the notion that 'The heavens are telling the glory of God' with music that is more angelic than human in form and scale. Reflections of the interpenetration of heavenly and earthly worship in this antiphon may be discerned not only in such obvious features as the periodic suspension of normal speech, but also in its combination of cyclical and teleological formal devices. The three Alleluias ascend melodically to a particular goal, the achievement of which brings about a repetition of their sequence accompanied by melodic variations. A limit is placed on their potentially endless repetition by the text of Psalm 18, the doxology of which is interwoven with the final modified recapitulation of the refrains.

III. The Palestinian Divine Office in Middle and Late Byzantium

The catechetical homilies of St Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386) and the diary of the Spanish pilgrim Egeria show that by the end of the fourth century A.D. the Holy City of Jerusalem

had developed its own distinct system of public worship.⁴⁶ At its centre was the great cathedral of the Anastasis constructed by Constantine I, which served as hub for a stationary liturgy that recalled events in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus through the performance of prayers, readings and psalmody at sites associated with those events. Monasticism flowered during the same era both in Jerusalem itself and in the Palestinian deserts that surrounded it, with the Great Lavra of St Sabas soon emerging as the preeminent extramural community.⁴⁷ Whereas some ascetics cultivated musically austere forms of prayer and worship, others embraced to varying degrees the popular and melodious psalmodic practices of the cathedral. The monks and nuns (*monazontes* and *parthenae*) that Egeria witnessed chanting at the Anastasis were forerunners of the *Spoudaioi*, a resident community of monastics that, like the *asketeria* of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, contributed to the cycles of cathedral liturgy.⁴⁸

Despite the upheavals and losses of imperial control brought about by the Persian and Arab conquests of the seventh century, Jerusalem retained and further developed its own system of cathedral worship throughout the first millennium and in so doing profoundly influenced other liturgical traditions, including those of Constantinople, Rome, Armenia and Georgia.⁴⁹ While a detailed account of the dissemination of Hagiopolite liturgical forms is beyond the scope of this study, it is worth noting two musical innovations that profoundly altered the soundscape of Byzantine worship.

Like the Great Church of Hagia Sophia, the cathedral of the Anastasis possessed a Divine Office rooted in biblical psalmody. The scriptural core of Hagiopolite worship was expressed in the Palestinian Psalter (which differed from that of Hagia Sophia in its shorter verses and division not into antiphons, but *kathismata* and *doxai*), the fixed psalms and canticles of the Book of the Hours (Horologion), and seasonally appropriate psalmodic chants attached to the

temporal cycles of its lectionaries.⁵⁰ Whereas, as we have already seen, the Sung Office of Constantinople continued to provide its worshippers with a fairly strict diet of biblical psalmody, the musical repertories of Jerusalem were transformed at an early stage by a movement to adorn its psalms and canticles with ever-increasing quantities of newly composed hymns that served not only as vehicles of praise, supplication and thanksgiving, but also of scriptural exegesis and catechism. The development of hymnody moved in parallel with the adoption in Jerusalem of a system of eight musical modes (the Octoechos), the first signs of which Frøyshov discerns in the fifth (or perhaps even as early as the later fourth) century.⁵¹ The Octoechos provided Palestinian churches with a shared vocabulary of scales and melodic formulas to be exploited by cantors and composers, as well as a principle of liturgical organisation manifested most prominently in the establishment of an eight-week cycle of Sundays on which one of the modes would predominate.⁵² An initial synthesis of these developments is preserved in the 'Ancient Iadgari', a Georgian translation of a lost sixth-century Greek hymnal that includes a modally ordered group of eight sets of Sunday hymns celebrating the resurrection of Christ.⁵³

Christian efforts to regroup following the Persian sack of Jerusalem in 614 brought Palestinian cathedral and monastic traditions into even closer alignment, adding new momentum to the process of musically and textually enriching Palestinian liturgy. The outstanding early figure in this second wave of liturgical creativity was Patriarch Sophronios (d. 638), a bishop with monastic formation whose contributions to Hagiopolite worship include homilies, prayers and hymns with original melodies (*idiomela*).⁵⁴ Among the latter are chants for the services of Great Friday, Christmas, and Theophany that are still used today in the Byzantine rite (albeit with newer melodies).

Sophronios proved to be the first of many of eponymous 'melodists' (poet-composers) associated with the church of Jerusalem, the list of which includes Andrew of Crete (d. 720), John of Damascus (d. 749), and Kosmas of Maïouma (d. 787). Their hymns were incorporated during the eighth century into a revised hymnal for the Holy City that in the original Greek bore the generic title 'Tropologion', the crowning glory of which were the complex strophic poems known today as kanons.⁵⁵ For insertion between the verses of the canticles or 'odes' of Palestinian morning prayer (up to the full set of nine might be appointed on a given day), the Ancient Iadgari had only provided heterogeneous collections of thematically appropriate hymns comparable to those still used in the modern Byzantine rite for Lauds and the Lamplighting Psalms.⁵⁶ With the advent of the kanon, however, a single author assumed the task of writing and perhaps composing music for a single multi-section poem in which each ode was supplied with a set of hymns ('troparia') that were metrically and melodically identical to a model stanza ('heirmos'). The heirmoi could be either originally composed for that kanon (as was usual on great feasts), or borrowed from the extant repertory of model tunes. Listeners to the performance of a kanon would have been oblivious to acrostics formed by the initial letters of its troparia, but they would have discerned as marks of unity the development of a single topic in its text and the use of a single mode—and, according to Arvanitis, duple metre⁵⁷—in its music. At the same time, they would have been conscious of the variety created by the sequence of biblical canticles, the efforts of the poet to echo the scriptural language of each ode's host canticle, the use of multiple tunes, and shifts between pitch and stress accent as heirmoi were applied to successive troparia.⁵⁸

The cumulative effect of these developments in hymnody was a reordering of the liturgical soundscape in the cathedral rite of Jerusalem, as well as in those nearby monasteries where melodious chanting was viewed with favour.⁵⁹ Originally, as witnessed by Egeria, the

antiphonal psalms and canticles of Hagiopolite worship had resembled those found in the Sung Office of Constantinople, consisting mainly of their scriptural texts with the addition of a small number of refrains. With the emergence of the repertories compiled in the Tropologion, biblical psalmody in the festal offices of Palestine was demoted textually and musically to a supporting role of providing a framework for ever-increasing quantities of through-composed or strophic proper hymnody. The consistency and familiarity afforded to worshippers by the chanting of important fixed scriptural elements of morning and evening worship—the nine canticles and Lauds (Psalms 148–50) at orthros, and the Lamplighting Psalms (Psalms 140, 141, 129 and 116) at vespers⁶⁰—was increasingly replaced by variability and novelty, characteristics that Stoudite monasticism later extended systematically to ferial offices.

Patriarch Germanos I of Constantinople (reigned 715–30) not only aligned himself with Chalcedonian Christians of the Holy Land by sharing their opposition to Monothelitism and Iconoclasm, but he also composed hymns that appear in the Jerusalem Tropologion.⁶¹ Palestinian hymnody became a permanent feature of the Constantinopolitan liturgical scene after 799, when Abbot Theodore of Sakkoudion in Bithynia moved his community to the monastery of St John of Stoudios and began celebrating in its church the monastic Divine Office of St Sabas.⁶² Like Germanos before him, St Theodore the Stoudite (as he later became known) was a prominent iconophile and his embrace of the hymns of the Tropologion was motivated in part by his admiration for their doctrinal orthodoxy.

Yet Theodore and his monks did not rest after transplanting the Sabaitic Divine Office to Stoudios, but used its Horologion and Tropologion as the basis for a creative synthesis incorporating elements of the rite of Hagia Sophia and vast quantities of new hymnody.⁶³ From the Great Church they borrowed the office prayers of its Euchology, the readings and

responsorial psalmody of its lectionaries, the florid solo and choral chants of its elite choirs, and the paraliturgical cycles of kontakia sung at its vigils. To varying degrees they also adopted cathedral traditions of melodious antiphonal psalmody, most completely in some Stoudite monasteries on Pentecost when the Kneeling Vespers (*Gonyklesia*) was, as we noted above, celebrated according to the rite of Hagia Sophia.⁶⁴

Having thus enriched their worship with music from the Sung Office, Stoudite monks then made seminal contributions to a multi-generational project to fill out the repertoires of the Tropologion, especially its provision for lesser feasts and ferial days.⁶⁵ Although St Theodore the Stoudite is credited with the creation of the antiphons of the Octoechos, he and his successors mainly wrote in existing Palestinian genres.⁶⁶ When the task of filling the liturgical cycles with hymnody was essentially complete by the twelfth century, the time fifteen volumes of proper hymnody employed in the modern Byzantine rite had come into existence—the *Parakletike* or Great Octoechos, the twelve volumes of *Menaia* (one for each calendar month), and for the movable Penitential and Paschal seasons, the *Triodion* and the *Pentecostarion*. Containing a total of over 60,000 hymns in their published forms, these collections consist mainly of contrafacta sung to a circumscribed body of model melodies that were transmitted either by ear or, in the case of kanons, with the aid of an *Heirmologion*, a musically notated reference book of model stanzas (*heirmoi*).⁶⁷ The *Sticherarion*, another notated chantbook, was a vehicle for disseminating stichera and other office hymns with unique melodies (*idiomela*).⁶⁸ The proportion of *idiomela* to *prosomoia* appointed to be sung was generally a function of liturgical significance, with the most important occasions featuring the highest percentage of through-composed stichera and weekdays without a major commemoration the lowest.

In adapting for monastic use hymnody from the developed urban rite of Jerusalem, the Stoudites extended certain principles of liturgical design to their logical conclusions. Thanks to the proliferation of proper hymns, Hagiopolite services came to be marked by musical variety, textual particularity, and exegetical loquacity. As the Stoudites continued to augment the repertoires of hymnody attached to the Horologion, a form of *reductio ad absurdum* was eventually reached when every day of the year came to possess multiple sets of proper hymns and psalms. The need to choose from among this surfeit of material stimulated the creation of liturgical Typika, separate books of rubrics that governed the selection of proper chants and readings by establishing relative priorities among their liturgical cycles.⁶⁹

The influence of the Sung Office was evident in the way that some Stoudite houses sought to make their offices musically seamless by chanting almost everything.⁷⁰ It was customary in some places, for example, for the entire community to sing at the beginning of every orthros its fixed set of Six Psalms (the Hexapsalmos: Psalms 3, 37, 62, 87, 102, and 142).⁷¹ Stoudite monasteries also imitated the Rite of the Great Church in their arrangement, albeit on a much reduced scale, of their designated singers into semi-choirs around a central ambo. These choirs were assisted in their renditions of hymns by a canonarch, an official whose role was to prompt them audibly from a scroll or book with their next line of text, a practice similar to 'lining out' in some Protestant traditions of hymnody.⁷² Respites from the steady patter of texts rendered in syllabic or neumatic styles were occasionally provided by interludes consisting of either catechetical readings or melismatic chants, both solo and choral, borrowed mainly from the rite of Hagia Sophia: kontakia, hypakoai, prokeimena, Alleluiaria and the great responsories of Christmas and Theophany.⁷³

The turn toward more rigorous forms of monasticism evident in some Byzantine founders' typika (*ktetorika typika*) of the later eleventh century was accompanied in liturgical

documents by what Taft has identified to be 'a large infiltration of second-generation Sabaïtic material into the monasteries of Constantinople'.⁷⁴ Two trends shaping the soundscape of worship may be observed in this new layer of Sabaïtic material: a tendency to substitute solo recitation for choral singing in renditions non-festal psalmody, and the revival of the Palestinian all-night vigil (*agrypnia*) on the Saturday nights and the eves of major feasts.⁷⁵ A few of the reform *ktetorika typika* also revive suspicions about the dangers or efficacy for monastics of chanting, especially when practised in its more musically elaborate forms, that previously we saw articulated by Sinaïte and Palestinian ascetics of the sixth to eighth centuries.⁷⁶

A closer look at the sources reveals that late Byzantine monks celebrating a reformed 'Neo-Sabaïtic' rite managed both to share certain presuppositions about the need for performing psalmody with compunction, and to display significant diversity in thought and practice regarding their liturgical soundscapes. One end of the ideological spectrum was represented by the great hesychast St Gregory of Sinai (ca. 1265–1346) viewed melodious chanting as something, along with discursive language, that spiritually mature ascetics should ultimately transcend.⁷⁷ Yet before we are seduced by the etymology of hesychasm (= 'quietude') into assuming that the soundscapes of Neo-Sabaïtic offices were uniformly less varied or musical than their Stoudite counterparts, it is necessary to consider what was actually being sung at Athonite all-night vigils.

Thanks to musical developments advanced by the cantor, composer, theoretician and Athonite monk St John Koukouzeles (c. 1280–c. 1341), the restored *agrypnia* became in late Byzantium a showcase for sonic variety.⁷⁸ As codified in the rubrics of the *Diataxis of Divine Service* attributed to the Athonite abbot and later Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos (ca. 1300–1379), the Neo-Sabaïtic all-night vigil was largely an amalgamation of the festal versions of

Palestinian vespers and matins.⁷⁹ It rested on a musical foundation of the received repertoires of anonymous psalmody and Stoudite hymnody as newly edited by Koukouzeles.⁸⁰

Overlaying these revised traditional chants were new musical works composed as their alternates or supplements. Usually bearing the names of their composers, some are distinctly personal re-workings of earlier material, whilst others employ original melodies that in some cases also set new texts. Many are lengthy compositions cast in a virtuosic 'kalophonic' ('beautiful sounding') idiom marked variously by textual repetition or troping, melismatic passages, and vocalizations on nonsense syllables ('teretismata').⁸¹

Mature kalophonic works first appear in significant quantities integrated with traditional material in a new chantbook attributed to the editorship of Koukouzeles entitled the 'Akolouthiai' or 'Orders of Service', the earliest surviving copy of which is Athens EBE 2458, dated '1336'.⁸² Subsequent generations of late and post-Byzantine composers further enriched the repertoires of Koukouzelian chant, leading not only to the compilation of expanded versions of the Akolouthiai, but also the appearance of specialised collections devoted to particular genres of kalophonic chant: the Kalophonic Sticherarion (Mathematarion), the Oikoimatarion, and the Kratematarion.⁸³

The use of particular musical styles and genres in Stoudite and Neo-Sabaïtic versions of festal vespers is compared in Table IV, from which it can be seen that both traditions shared a common core of psalms and hymns generally set in closely related musical idioms.⁸⁴ Most chants in the Stoudite office were rendered in syllabic or neumatic styles in which the text remained clearly audible. Monotony over the course of the service was avoided by periodic changes of musical mode and melodic idiom from the simple, syllabic and repetitive patterns of psalm-tones to through-composed idiomela. Additional variety was provided by frequent alternations between the semi-choruses, their soloists, and—in responses to litanies and

ecphoneseis not indicated in Table IV—the higher clergy. Stoudite vespers reached a peak of sonic and visual interest with the interwoven hymnody and psalmody of the Lamplighting psalms, the singing of which was followed by the hymn Φῶς ἱλαρόν and the ritual entrance of the higher clergy into the sanctuary. Sonic interest was sustained after the entrance when a soloist ascended the ambo to lead the solemn chanting of what was probably the most elaborate music used in most Stoudite celebrations of festal vespers: a melismatic prokeimenon borrowed from the repertoires of the Sung Office of Hagia Sophia.

A substantial portion of the music for vespers contained in notated manuscripts of the Paleologan period consists of more or less lightly retouched versions of hymns from Stoudite collections and psalms rendered according to traditional melodic formulas. On feast days, however, the sonic contours and temporal dimensions of the service's opening psalmody could be radically altered by the performance of new compositions intended as festal alternatives to traditional psalm-tones. Drawing on thirteenth-century precedents for through-composed melismatic psalmody in the Sung Office, their composers transformed the concluding section of Psalm 103—the *Anoixantaria*, thus named because it commences with verse 28b, 'Ἀνοίξαντός σου τὴν χεῖρα'—and Stasis One of the First Kathisma of the Psalter (=Psalms 1–3) into sprawling and stylistically heterogeneous suites of traditional and innovative music.⁸⁵ Their traditional elements consist of anonymous verse settings that are sometimes labelled 'old' or supplied with such titles indicating geographic provenance as *Hagiosophitikon* or *Thessalonikaion*. Most verses, however, are attributed individually to Koukouzeles, his contemporary Xenos Korones and other late Byzantine composers. All settings begin with a traditional psalm-tone that soon dissolves into original and often virtuosic music.

Eponymous composers of *Anoixantaria* generally augmented the psalm's original refrain 'Δόξα σοι ὁ Θεός' ('Glory to you, O God') with *Triadika*, tropes in honour of the Holy Trinity.

Those ascribed to Koukouzeles in MS Sinai 1257 are:

- V. 29b – Ἀντανελεῖς τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐκλείψουσι. Δόξα σοι Πάτερ, δόξα σοι Υἱε, δόξα σοι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, δόξα σοι. (f. 169r; 'You will take away their spirit, and they will perish. Glory to you, O Father, glory to you, O Son, glory to you, O Holy Spirit. Glory to you!')
- V. 31a – Ἦτω ἡ δόξα Κυρίου εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Δόξα σοι ἅγιε· δόξα σοι Κύριε· δόξα σοι, βασιλεῦ οὐράνιε. Δόξα σοι, δόξα σοι ὁ Θεός. (f. 169v; 'May the glory of the Lord endure to the ages. Glory to you, Lord, glory to you, heavenly King, glory to you, glory to you, O God!')
- V.35a – Ἐκλείπειν ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. Δόξα σοι Τριάς ἄναρχε· δόξα σοι ὁ Θεός. (f. 169r; 'O that sinners might perish from the earth. Glory to you, Trinity without beginning, glory to you [O] God!')⁸⁶

Composers limited themselves to the biblical text and its traditional refrain 'Alleluia' in their music for the psalms of Stasis One, the verses of which they set in what were essentially two musical styles. The first is a semi-florid melodic idiom comparable to that of the *Anoixantaria* that they applied to verses of all three psalms. Their 'Alleluia' refrains, like those of the older Pentecost *Teleutaion*, are variously lengthened through melismata, textual repetitions—audibly prompted in some cases by the sung commands 'Λέγε!' ('Say!') or 'Πάλιν!' ('Again!')—and the insertion of small groups of extra syllables. A setting attributed to Koukouzeles on folio 15r of the Akolouthiai Athens 2458, for example, renders the word 'Ἀλληλούϊα' as 'ἄλλη- ἄλληλούϊα· ἀναλληλούϊα· ἀναχαχα ἄλληληναλληλούϊα'.⁸⁷

Marked by the application techniques of musical and textual extension on a grand scale to produce longer examples of *kalophonia*, the second style was employed by Koukouzeles and his colleagues in Stasis One only when composing settings of selected verses from Psalm 2. These vast compositions, which functioned as *ad libitum* substitutes for ordinary semi-florid

settings of the same psalmic text, would in some sense have stood outside the normal liturgical order as constituted in both unnotated service books and the minds of congregants. This is in part due to their sheer length. With the performance of each kalophonic composition lasting, if one assumes a similar tempo, approximately six to seven times as long as even the most expansive semi-florid verse, even a single substitution would have altered significantly the temporal flow of worship established during the singing of Psalm 1. The composers of kalophonic settings for Psalm 2 also extended or violated traditional techniques for setting texts to music that continued to prevail elsewhere in the service in order to create vast structures governed to a large extent by the formal logic of their music.⁸⁸ Not only did they regularly dissolve words into teretismata, but they also manipulated the psalmic text in startling ways. Williams has identified their use of the following techniques:

1. Repetition of syllables
2. Repetition of words and phrases
3. Inversion of words
4. Juxtaposition of successive lines (in their regular or inverted order)
5. Interpolation of fragments from different lines⁸⁹

Koukouzeles and other late Byzantine composers employed essentially the same techniques of musical construction and textual alteration in their kalophonic stichera, some of which they based on traditional chants from the Sticherarion whilst others set new texts, including a significant number in fifteen-syllable verse.⁹⁰ Those based on traditional chants often divide the hymn into two or more sections, giving the choirmaster freedom to make partial or total kalophonic substitutions. Here, for example, is the complete text of a sticheron in honour of St Katherine sung at the vespers on the eve of 25 November after the Trinitarian Doxology of the Lamplighting psalms:

Χαρμονικῶς τὴ πανηγύρει, τῆς θεοσόφου Μάρτυρος Αἰκατερίνης, συνδράμωμεν ὃ φιλομάρτυρες, καὶ ταύτην τοῖς ἐπαίνοις, ὡς ἄνθεσι καταστέψωμεν, Χαίροις βοῶντες αὐτῇ, ἢ τῶν φληνάφων Ῥητόρων, τὴν θραυστομίαν ἐλέγξασα, ὡς ἀπαιδευσίας ἀνάπλεων, καὶ

τούτους πρὸς πίστιν θείαν χειραγωγήσασα, * Χαίροις ἡ τὸ σῶμα πολυπλόκοις βασάνοις ἐκδοῦσα, δι' ἀγάπην τοῦ Ποιητοῦ σου, καὶ μὴ καταβληθεῖσα, ὥς ἄκμων ἀνάλωτος, Χαίροις ἡ ταῖς ἄνω μοναῖς, ἀντάξια τῶν πόνων εἰσοικισθεῖσα, καὶ δόξης αἰωνίου κατατρυφήσασα, ἧς ἐφιέμενοι οἱ ὕμνωδοί σου, τῆς ἐλπίδος μὴ ἐκπέσοιμεν.

Lovers of martyrs, let us joyfully run together for the festival of the Martyr Katherine, wise in God, and let us garland her with praises as with flowers, as we shout, 'Hail, you that confounded the insolence of the chattering Rhetors, as infected with stupidity, and led by the hand to divine faith. * Hail, you that surrendered your body to countless torments through love of your Maker, and like an unassailable anvil you were not cast down. Hail, you that dwell in the dwelling places on high, worthy of your pains, and enjoy eternal glory. Would that we, who long for it and sing your praise, might not fail in our hope.

A kalophonic setting of this hymn composed by the fifteenth-century theorist and scribe Manuel Chrysaphes, who served as Lampadarios in the chapel of the last two Paleologan emperors, divides its text into two 'feet' at the point marked above by an asterisk. Here is the text as set by Chrysaphes in the second 'foot':

Δεύτερος πούς· Ποίημα κυροῦ Μανουὴλ μαῖστορος τοῦ Χρυσάφη · Ἦχος πλ. β'
Χαίροις, χαίροις ἡ τὸ σῶμα πολυπλόκοις, πολυπλόκοις βασάνοις ἐκδοῦσα, δι' ἀγάπην τοῦ Ποιητοῦ σου, καὶ μὴ καταβληθεῖσα, ὥς ἄκμων ἀνάλωτος, Χαίροις ἡ ταῖς ἄνω, ἡ ταῖς ἄνω μοναῖς, ἀντάξια τῶν πόνων εἰσοικισθεῖσα, καὶ δόξης αἰωνίου κατατρυφήσασα· Λέγε· ἧς ἐφιέμενοι· Πάλιν· ἧς ἐφιέμενοι οἱ ὕμνωδοί σου, τῆς ἐλπίδος μὴ ἐκπέσοιμεν· μὴ ἐκπέσοιμεν τῆς ἐλπίδος·
τοτοτοτοτοτοτο...[τερέτισμα]...τοεανε· τῆς ἐλπίδος μὴ ἐκπέσοιμεν.⁹¹

Second foot, by Manuel Chrysaphes the Lampadarios: Mode Plagal 2

Hail, hail you that surrendered your body to countless, countless torments through love of your Maker, and like an unassailable anvil you were not cast down. Hail, you that dwell in the dwelling places on high, worthy of your pains, and enjoy eternal glory. Would that we, who long for it and sing your praise, may not fail in our hope; may not fail in our hope: tototototo...[teretism]...toeane: may not fail in our hope.

Here the textual alterations made to the original hymn are relatively minor: Chrysaphes chooses to repeat only selected words or phrases, doing so always with a clear sense of musical and rhetorical purpose that only becomes fully evident during a performance of this approximately eight-minute work.⁹² Each repetition brings with it a sense of increasing

emotional intensity that builds gradually until reaching a climax with the teretisms that emerge out of the reiterated prayer that we 'may not fail in our hope'.

More radical manipulations of texts are found in kalophonic stichera labelled *anagrammatismos* or *anapodismos*. Composed as optional codas to hymns in traditional styles, these musical anagrams recapitulate the texts and, in some cases, elements of the melodies of the sticheron to which they may be attached. How this worked in practice may be seen from Table V, which presents the texts of two versions of a hymn for the Blessing of the Waters on Theophany (6 January): 1) the original sticheron for the occasion by Sophronios of Jerusalem; and 2) the *anagrammatismos* written some seven centuries later by Koukouzeles to be performed at its conclusion.⁹³ The latter begins by proceeding backwards through the text of Sophronios, making it also an *anapodismos*. The remainder of its text features several repetitions as its music follows a trajectory similar to that of the Chrysaphes setting discussed above. In this case, however, the teretismata are followed not only by a return of the text, but also the recapitulation of the final phrase of its traditional setting.

IV. Conclusion

We have seen how the nearly constant performance song in Byzantine traditions of urban and monastic worship formed soundscapes consisting of a number of elements. Fundamental to the aural qualities of any given service or rite were its singing personnel, whose identity, training, and number determined its sonic palette of vocal timbre, register and volume. The cathedral rites of late Antiquity possessed rich and varied vocal resources: soloists chosen from among the higher and lower clergy chanted in alternation with men, eunuchs, children and women who sang either together as congregations or were deployed in ensembles of various sizes and competencies. At the opposite end of the spectrum of sonic variety were the dwellings of ascetics living alone or in small sketes, whose inhabitants were repeatedly discouraged by spiritual authorities from partaking in the sorts of singing cultivated in cathedrals. Falling somewhere in between were parochial churches, about which we know very little, and coenobitic monasteries, about which we know a great deal.

Foundational and liturgical Typika reveal that the musical establishments of monastic communities waxed and waned according to their economic resources, contemporary spiritual trends, and the liturgical preferences of their founders or administrators.⁹⁴ The performance of Stoudite worship in strict accordance with liturgical rubrics would have required the presence of musical personnel roughly equivalent in skill and organisation to the ensemble of specialist cantors at the Great Church, whose lectionaries and collections of florid solo and choral psalmody the Stoudites had borrowed. A Neo-Sabaïtic vigil celebrated according to the *Diataxis* attributed to Philotheos Kokkinos required a musical foundation resembling that of a Stoudite house, consisting of a priest, a deacon, a canonarch, two readers, and a pair of choirs led by soloists.⁹⁵ Noticeably missing in both monastic traditions, however, were the opportunities for sonic contrast afforded by the multiplicity of choirs that were

permanent or seasonal fixtures of a cathedral soundscape, although one might catch echoes of Hagia Sophia's large ensemble of readers in the chanting of psalms by an entire Stoudite community.

If singers provided the range of colours available for acoustic design in Byzantine worship, the sonic contours and temporal dimensions of individual services were determined largely by their texts, rubrics and music. The Constantinopolitan Sung Office remained throughout its long history textually and musically conservative at heart, with the melodically chanted portions of its services of vespers and orthros consisting almost exclusively of antiphonal and responsorial biblical psalmody.⁹⁶ Sonic variety within these archaic psalmodic forms was created chiefly through carefully the coordinated alternation of multiple soloists and groups of singers, each of which was allotted music suited to their vocal gifts and hierarchical rank. Aural contrast between units of psalmody relied in part on differences of modal assignment, textual form, choice of vocal personnel, and prevailing melodic idiom. Melodic styles could be distinguished from one another by a host of means, including extensions or contractions of ambitus, changes to the prevalence of conjunct or disjunct intervals, and modifications to the relative prominence of text or music. In some instances, especially important or solemn points within individual services or liturgical cycles of the Great Church were marked by the singing of chants that were, as is the case with the Pentecost *Teleutaion*, extraordinary in their vocal demands, musical form, and length.

The cathedral rite of the Anastasis in Jerusalem initially shared patterns of musical organisation with its Constantinopolitan counterpart that were, for urban churches throughout the Roman world, the common legacy of the Late Antique 'psalmodic movement': a hierarchically arranged multiplicity of musical ministries, the singing of biblical texts with congregational participation facilitated through the addition of refrains, and the involvement

of urban monastics.⁹⁷ In the Holy City and its surrounding monasteries, however, this inheritance underwent profound musical and textual development marked by the introduction of the Octoechos and the gradual replacement of fixed refrains with successive layers of extra-scriptural hymnody. Modal variety and textual variability having already become well established in the urban and monastic rites of Palestine, at the turn of the ninth century St Theodore the Stoudite initiated the further musical enrichment of the Sabaïte Divine Office at his monastery in Constantinople by fusing to it elaborate chants from the Great Church and continuing with renewed vigour the process of filling out its liturgical cycles of hymnody. As the Palestinian morning and evening offices with were approaching total saturation with kanons, stichera, and other hymns, important new currents emerged in Byzantine worship and chant: the consolidation of Neo-Sabaïtic liturgy, the perfection of Middle Byzantine Notation, and the rise of *kalophonia*. On the basis of these developments, Koukouzeles and his colleagues renewed the soundscape of Paleologan worship by reworking established repertoires and, more importantly, creating new ones of unprecedented melodic and formal complexity. Their suites of eponymous compositions for the festal psalms of the All-Night Vigil created new centres of musical gravity within the Neo-Sabaïtic Divine Office, whilst their vast repertoires of optional kalophonic substitutes and codas for traditional chants introduced significant contingencies to late Byzantine liturgy. Each kalophonic hymn was invested with latent potential to suspend and restructure the customary musical, textual and temporal orders of worship, but this would only be actualised when a choirmaster, ecclesiarch or celebrant authorised its performance.

There were, of course, other variable factors that helped to shape the sonic landscape in particular times and places. The urban rites of Constantinople and Jerusalem, as we briefly noted above, were closely wedded to their respective native physical environments through

the medium of stational liturgy. That of Jerusalem was closely integrated with the Holy City's network of shrines commemorating events in the life of Christ and his followers, whilst worship in the capital acquired distinctive characteristics in tandem with the development of its own sacred topography and church architecture.

Transposition of either rite to a new environment inevitably altered the soundscape of worship, affecting it perhaps through the use of other singers or by being situated within the acoustics of a different church. Compromises of various sorts were also inescapable, particularly when local resources failed to match those required for the celebration of a rite in its native environment. In the case of the Stoudites, their transplantation of usages from Palestine and Constantinople to their urban monastery proved to be a fruitful synthesis, eventually yielding offices richly adorned hymnody and cathedral psalmody that were performed in churches that were physically and, with their iconographic programmes, visually matched to their celebration.⁹⁸ Other such adaptations accompanied the consolidation of Neo-Sabaïtic liturgy, including the building of monastic churches without an ambo, which had been the traditional location of the singers in Hagia Sophia and in earlier Stoudite worship. Thus displaced from their former central location, the two choirs normally stood apart in Neo-Sabaïtic services, facing each other across the nave from new positions along opposing walls.⁹⁹

There would, of course, have been other sorts of discrepancies between the ideal presentation of Byzantine worship in service books and its sonic realisations. Temporary ones would have arisen from such vagaries of life as singers who fell ill and were therefore either absent or vocally impaired on a particular day. Although we know very little about Byzantine parochial worship prior to the influx of Palestinian hymnody, it is probably safe to assume that in smaller churches the elaborate antiphonal and responsorial formats of Late Antique

cathedral psalmody would have been adapted to local resources, perhaps even to the lowest common musical denominator of syllabic call-and-response led by a single cantor (as occurs today in some village or mission churches celebrating the modern Byzantine rite). Along the same lines, it was probably no more likely in the Middle Ages than it is today that every church performing Stoudite or Neo-Sabaïtic vespers or orthros possessed the full complement of musically trained personnel presupposed by their rubrics and notated chantbooks. We find confirmation of this from Symeon of Thessalonica who, in the preface to a defence of the Sung Office, observed somewhat sarcastically that one advantage the Palestinian Divine Office possessed over that of Hagia Sophia was that it could be performed by a single person:

In the monasteries here, and in almost all of the churches, the order followed is that of the Jerusalem Typikon of Saint Sabas. For this can be performed by one person, having been compiled by monks, and is often celebrated without chants [χωρὶς ᾠμάτων] in the cenobitic monasteries.¹⁰⁰

Given what we have already learned about the music of a Neo-Sabaïtic All-Night Vigil, these remarks should not read as being universally applicable to the soundscape of late Byzantine monastic liturgy. The absence of chanting, however, does correspond well to what we know of ascetic devotions. Gregory of Sinai, for example, advises:

When you stand and psalmodize by yourself, recite the Trisagion and then pray in your soul or your intellect, making your intellect pay attention to your heart; and recite two or three psalms and a few penitential troparia but without chanting them [ἄνευ μέλους]: as St John Klimakos confirms, people at this stage of spiritual development do not chant.¹⁰¹

Since the devotional performance of hymns, psalms and even entire offices with little or no singing was also facilitated in Byzantium, as Parpulov has shown, by the production of Psalters and Horologia for private use, we should not assume that chants were always rendered melodically, let alone in strict accord with their notated exemplars.¹⁰² On the other hand, there would have been little point in devoting so much effort toward the documentation

of worship if their texts, rubrics and chants found in Byzantine liturgical manuscripts were not performed with diligence in at least some Byzantine churches.

The potential for the existence of significant gaps between acoustic design and actual practice that we have just identified can perhaps be most profitably viewed as another variable for the student of Byzantine liturgical soundscapes to consider alongside the significant changes over time we have already noted in musical forms and styles, vocal resources, and physical settings for worship. Due in part to the wide geographic and chronological span of this information, in this study we have been able to engage only in passing with the question of how particular soundscapes might have been perceived as promoting or manifesting particular theologies. To do so more fully, we would need first to consider the interpretive frameworks that shaped the experiences of participants in Byzantine worship, which ranged from the notion, inherited from Ancient Greek philosophy and science, that music possesses important ethical and cosmic properties to theological traditions of interpreting earthly worship anagogically as a living icon of the perpetual heavenly liturgy served by angels.¹⁰³

I have argued elsewhere that the proliferation of Palestinian hymnody and kalophonia are, for their respective eras, developments that reflected contemporary theological understandings, best known to modern readers from writings on icons, of how the material world might serve as an agent of theophany.¹⁰⁴ The vast repertoires of Hagiopolite and Stoudite hymns did this by rendering God and his saints incarnate in exegetical songs sung by human voices, the texts of which supplemented or replaced Old Testament psalmody in which events relating to Christ's new dispensation could be evoked only indirectly through typology. The transformations of the usual temporal, musical and textual orders of Byzantine

liturgy effected by kalophonia, on the other hand, offered a musical analogue both to hesychast theology's vigorous reassertion of divine immanence and to the tendency in late Byzantine iconography to collapse the boundaries between human and angelic worship, most strikingly when singers transcended human speech in the performance of teretismata.¹⁰⁵ Despite employing different musical and textual means, the soundscapes of Stoudite and Neo-Sabaïtic liturgy shared a common goal of leading worshippers from earth to heaven.

¹ The completion of this article was made possible thanks to the gracious support of the Stavros Niarchos Foundation (for a year of research leave), the Seeger Center for Hellenic Studies of Princeton University (for a visiting research fellowship). The original lecture-demonstration on which this study is based was delivered with the musical aid of Spyridon Antonopoulos. All English translations of service texts, most of which have been published previously in liner notes to CD recordings by Cappella Romana, are by Archimandrite Ephrem Lash.

² Since, as Bohlman has observed, approaches to the description of musical activity may be rooted in distinctive ontologies of music, we should note that the Byzantines spoke and wrote about singing in church in ways that differ subtly from those customary today. Unlike Muslims, who traditionally have excluded the recitation of the Koran (*qirā'ah*) from their definitions of music (*mūsīqā/mūsīqī*), Byzantine authors were not averse to describing Christian liturgical singing as 'μουσική'. Indeed, *mousike* (literally something pertaining to the Muses) is but one a host of terms and phrases derived from pagan Greek Antiquity found in Byzantine literature, including treatises of music theory in which the theoretical

terminology Ancient Greek music was resumed, as well as homilies and hymns, where such terms were often deployed for rhetorical effect. Nevertheless, one finds in Byzantine service rubrics and monastic literature a distinct technical vocabulary for ecclesiastical chanting that serves both to distinguish it from other forms of music making and to indicate its continuity with might also be non-musical activities. Examples of such multivalent terms are the nouns psalmody (ψαλμοδία), ecphonesis (ἐκφώνησις), and reading (ἀνάγνωσις), as well as the verb to say (λέγειν). On the varieties of musical ontologies, see P. V. Bohlman, *World Music: A Very Short Introduction*, Very Short Introductions 65 (Oxford and New York, 2002), pp. 5-9; and P. V. Bohlman, 'Ontologies of Music', in N. Cook and M. Everist (eds.), *Rethinking Music* (Oxford and New York, 1999), pp. 17–34. An overview of Byzantine musical terminology is R. Schlötterer, 'Der kirchenmusikalische Terminologie der griechischen Kirchenväter' (Ph.D. diss., Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, 1953).

³ The amount of singing performed in minor daily offices or occasional services varied considerably according to the context. The lesser daily and seasonal offices of the rite of the Great Church of Hagia Sophia were musically similar to its major services in being sung throughout—hence, perhaps, the origin of the popular name of the Constantinopolitan cathedral rite in later Byzantium: the 'Sung Office' (ῥωματικὴ ἀκολουθία). The lesser hours of the Palestinian monastic rite of St Sabas, on the other hand, were constructed in such a way as to permit their celebration without little or no singing and, if so desired, in private (a practice actually mandated on some occasions by rubrics in monastic service books). The Office of Preparation for Holy Communion and other services of devotion or supplication that were not, strictly speaking, part of the daily cycle of offices could likewise be celebrated in private or in common with or without singing. For an overview of the minor hours of the

Byzantine Divine Office, see C. Lutzka, *Die Kleinen Horen des byzantinischen Stundengebetes und ihre geschichtliche Entwicklung*, 2nd ed., Forum orthodoxe Theologie 7 (Berlin, 2010) The relative importance of music within the Constantinopolitan and Neo-Sabaïtic liturgical traditions is examined in A. Lingas, 'How Musical was the "Sung Office"? Some Observations on the Ethos of the Byzantine Cathedral Rite', in I. Moody and M. Takala-Rozszenko (eds.), *The Traditions of Orthodox Music. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Orthodox Church Music, University of Joensuu, Finland 13–19 June 2005* (Joensuu, 2007), pp. 217–34.

⁴ For a comprehensive inventory of the musical forces employed in the churches of Byzantium, see now E. C. Spyraou, *Οἱ χοροὶ ψαλτῶν κατὰ τὴν Βυζαντινὴ παράδοση*, Institute of Byzantine Musicology Studies 14 (Athens, 2008). A compact but older survey is 'The Byzantine Choir', Chapter Three in N. K. Moran, *Singers in Late Byzantine and Slavonic painting*, *Byzantina Neerlandica* 9 (Leiden, Netherlands, 1986), 14–50.

⁵ 'Presidential' refers here to prayers usually cast in the first person plural that were recited on behalf of the entire assembly by a presiding priest or bishop. Originally these were performed aloud, but by the sixth century many of them were recited either silently or softly (μυστικῶς) in a voice audible, if at all, only to nearby concelebrating clergy. Celebrants, however, have continued until modern times to sing the concluding doxologies of many presidential prayers. Labelled 'exclamations' (ἐκφωνήσεις) already in the earliest surviving Euchology (Prayerbook) for the Constantinopolitan rite of the Great Church of Hagia Sophia (the late eighth-century MS Barberini gr. 336), these serve musically as cues for other singers, signalling when they should chant their 'Amen' and begin the next item in the liturgical sequence. From the perspective of an ordinary congregant, the reduction of the audible

portion of what were often lengthy prayers to brief sung *ecphoneiseis* could have only enhanced musical continuity in Byzantine services. The fading of most Byzantine prayers into inaudibility is documented in R. F. Taft, S.J., 'Was the Eucharistic Anaphora Recited Secretly or Aloud? The Ancient Tradition and What Became of It', in R. R. Ervine (ed.), *Worship Traditions in Armenia and the Neighboring Christian East: An International Symposium in Honor of the 40th Anniversary of St. Nersess Armenian Seminary* (Crestwood, NY and New Rochelle, NY, 2006), pp. 15–57. The Barberini Euchology has been published with commentary and Italian translation as S. Parenti and E. Velkovska, eds., *L'Eucologio Barberini Gr. 336*, 2nd ed., Bibliotheca "Ephemerides liturgicae" Subsidia 80 (Roma, 2000).

⁶ In the absence of a deacon, a priest would sing most of these items himself.

⁷ Differences in the musical performance of the psalter in the traditions of Constantinople and Palestine are discussed in O. Strunk, 'The Byzantine Office at Hagia Sophia', *Essays on Music in the Byzantine World* (New York, 1977), pp. 130–31; and A. Lingas, 'Festal Cathedral Vespers in Late Byzantium', *OCP* 63 (1997), pp. 445–47.

⁸ *The Soundscape: Our Sonic Environment and the Tuning of the World* (Rochester, Vermont, 1994); originally published as *The Tuning of the World* (Toronto, 1977).

⁹ Bissera Pentcheva, without actually using the word 'soundscape', engages with its importance for Byzantine worship in her discussion of the Hagia Sophia as an 'icon of sound: a space filled with human breath and the perfume of burning incense experienced as reverberating divine *pneuma* in the glitter of the golden cupola and semidomes' (see B. V. Pentcheva, *The Sensual Icon: Space, Ritual, and the Senses in Byzantium* (University Park, 2010), pp. 45–56). The importance of the sense of smell for the study of Byzantine religious practice was anticipated by S. A. Harvey, *Scenting Salvation: Ancient Christianity and the*

Olfactory Imagination, The Joan Palevsky Imprint in Classical Literature 42 (Berkeley, 2006).

Recent studies by Robert Taft approaching the study of Byzantine liturgy 'From the Bottom Up' are replete with details about the sounds generated by (often unruly) congregations. For an overview, see *Through their Own Eyes: Liturgy as the Byzantines Saw It* (Berkeley, CA, 2006), pp. 4–16 and 29–120.

¹⁰ Schafer, *The Soundscape*, p. 4.

¹¹ For example, K. K. Shelemay, *Soundscapes: Exploring Music in a Changing World* (New York and London, 2006).

¹² <http://iconsofsound.stanford.edu>.

¹³ For numerous examples of this approach, see Moran, *Singers*.

¹⁴ The hymns of Saint Romanos the Melodist, for example, have been shown to contain valuable information about the original contexts for their performance at popular vigils in Late Antique Constantinople: J. Grosdidier de Matons, 'Liturgie et Hymnographie: Kontakion et Canon', *DOP* 34/35 (1980), pp. 37–42. Numerous intentional and incidental aspects of Byzantine liturgical soundscapes are addressed in Taft, *Through their Own Eyes*.

¹⁵ The earliest manuscripts containing forms of notation recognised by modern scholars as 'Byzantine' were copied within a few decades of the earliest musically notated documents of Latin plainchant. In both cases, the appearance of musical notation is separated by over six hundred years from our single example of a Christian hymn with ancient Greek musical notation, the papyrus Oxyrhynchus 1786, the alphabetic notation of which is unrelated either to Byzantine or Latin neumes. The significance of a few, mostly fragmentary, sources from the seventh to ninth centuries containing what appear to be non- or 'proto'-Byzantine musical notations is unclear and, at all events, most singers learning to chant presumably relied

exclusively on oral means of transmission. On the possible use of musical notation in Byzantium prior to the ninth century, see I. Papathanasiou and N. Boukas, 'Byzantine Notation in the Eighth–Tenth Centuries: On Oral and Written Transmission of Early Byzantine Chant', *CIMAGL* 73 (2002), pp. 3–12; and E. Gertsman, *Пропавшие столетия византийской музыки / The Lost Centuries of Byzantine Music*, trans. S. Buko (St Petersburg, 2001). The Oxyrhynchus hymn is given an exhaustive treatment in C. H. Cosgrove, *An Ancient Christian Hymn with Musical Notation: Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 1786 : Text and Commentary*, Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum = Studies and Texts in Antiquity and Christianity 65 (Tübingen, 2011).

¹⁶ On lectionary notation, see S. G. Engberg, 'Greek Ekphonic Notation. The Classical and the Pre-Classical Systems', in C. Troelsgård and G. Wolfram (eds.), *Palaeobyzantine Notations II: Acta of the Congress held at Hernen Castle, The Netherlands, in October 1996* (Hernen, 1999), pp. 33–55. A compact survey of early Byzantine melodic notations is C. Floros, *Introduction to Early Medieval Notation (with an illustrated chapter on cheironomy by Neil K. Moran)*, Enlarged 2nd ed., trans. N. K. Moran, Detroit Monographs in Musicology 45 (Warren, Mich., 2005). The Middle Byzantine system of notation and the major issues surrounding its transcription are treated comprehensively in C. Troelsgård, *Byzantine Neumes: A New Introduction to the Middle Byzantine Musical Notation*, Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae Subsidia 9 (Copenhagen, 2010).

¹⁷ The consequences of the shift to diastematic notation in Byzantium are discussed in K. Levy, 'Le "Tournant Décisif" dans l'histoire de la musique Byzantine 1071-1261', *XV^e Congrès International d'études byzantines, Vol. 1* (Athens, 1979), pp. 473–80. Regarding the continuing importance of oral tradition and the degree to which notated sources served as

repositories of 'paradigmatic' renderings of melodies, see C. Troelsgård, 'Musical Notation and Oral Transmission of Byzantine Chant', *Classica et Mediaevalia* 50 (1999), pp. 249–57.

¹⁸ S. Martani, 'Words and Music in the Greek Gospel Lectionaries', in N.-M. Wanek (ed.), *Psaltike: Neue Studien zur Byzantinischen Musik. Festschrift für Gerda Wolfram*, Praesens Byzantinistik (Vienna, 2011), pp. 219–31; S. G. Engberg, 'Ekphonic Chant — The Oral Tradition and the Manuscripts', *JÖB* 32/7 (1982), pp. 41–47. Two studies that also take into account the witness of received oral traditions of cantillation in the Byzantine rite are A. T. Vourles, *Ὁ τρόπος ἀναγνώσεως-ἐκφωνήσεως τῶν ἀγιογραφικῶν ἀναγνωσμάτων* (Athens, 2004); and A. E. Alygizakes, 'Ἡ ἐκφωνητικὴ ψαλτικὴ πράξις· τὰ "χῶμα" καὶ τὰ "ἐκφώνως" ἀναγνώσματα', in G. T. Stathis (ed.), *Θεωρία καὶ Πράξις τῆς Ψαλτικῆς Τέχνης. Πρακτικὰ Ἀ' Πανελληνίου Συνεδρίου Ψαλτικῆς Τέχνης (Ἀθήνα, 3-5 Νοεμβρίου 2000)* (Athens, 2001), pp. 89–140.

¹⁹ The fullness of these melodic profiles has been debated extensively over the last century. Some scholars and practitioners of received traditions of Byzantine singing have argued on the basis of post-Byzantine sources that Middle Byzantine notation was fundamentally stenographic in its use, with written groups of signs serving as a form of shorthand for often lengthy melodic formulas learned by ear. Most other scholars, however, have concluded that medieval neumations of chants were essentially self-sufficient with regard to their melodic shape and length, an interpretation that will be followed in this present study. About these controversies over the interpretation and transcription of medieval Byzantine chant, see Troelsgård, *Byzantine Neumes*, pp. 35–40; and A. Lingas, 'Performance Practice and the Politics of Transcribing Byzantine Chant', *Acta Musicae Byzantinae* 6 (2003), pp. 56–76.

²⁰ Floros, *Introduction to Early Medieval Notation*, pp. 17–71.

²¹ Recent examples of such approaches are Σ. Σ. Ἀντωνίου, *Μορφολογία τῆς Βυζαντινῆς Μουσικῆς Ἐκκλησιαστικῆς Μουσικῆς* (Thessalonica, 2008); and most of the contributions to G. Stathis, ed., *Θεωρία καὶ Πράξις τῆς Ψαλτικῆς Τέχνης: Τὰ γένη καὶ τὰ εἶδη τῆς Βυζαντινῆς Μελοποιᾶς. Πρακτικὰ Β' Διεθνοῦς Συνεδρίου Μουσικολογικοῦ καὶ Ψαλτικοῦ: Ἀθήνα, 15–19 Ὀκτωβρίου 2003* (Athens, 2006). On the tendency toward formalism in musicology during the twentieth century, see J. Kerman, *Contemplating Music: Challenges to Musicology* (Cambridge, Mass., 1985).

²² J. Raasted, 'Some Reflections on Byzantine Musical Style', in M. M. Velimirović (ed.), *Studies in Eastern Chant, Vol. 1* (Oxford, 1966), pp. 57–6; idem, 'Byzantine Liturgical Music and its Meaning for the Byzantine Worshipper', in R. C. Morris (ed.), *Church and People in Byzantium* (Birmingham, 1986), pp. 49–57; idem, 'Compositional Devices in Byzantine Chant', *CIMAGL* 59 (1989), pp. 247–70; and idem, 'Length and Festivity. On some prolongation techniques in Byzantine Chant', in E. L. Lillie and N. H. Petersen (eds.), *Liturgy and the Arts in the Middle Ages: Studies in Honour of C. Clifford Flanigan* (Copenhagen, 1996), pp. 75–84. A brief but systematic discussion of musical style in the major genres of medieval Byzantine chant is Troelsgård, *Byzantine Neumes*, pp. 76–90.

²³ Especially N. Moran, 'Byzantine Castrati', *Plain-song and Medieval Music* 11 (2002), pp. 99–112; and N. Schiødt, 'From Byzantium to Italy. Castrato Singers from the 4th to the 20th Centuries', in N.-M. Wanek (ed.), *Psaltike: Neue Studien zur Byzantinischen Musik. Festschrift für Gerda Wolfram*, Praesens Byzantinistik (Vienna, 2011), pp. 301–11. These studies and other studies of Byzantine eunuch cantors should now be read in the light of the cautionary remarks of C. Troelsgård, 'When Did the Practice of Eunuch Singers in Byzantine

Chant Begin? Some Notes on the Interpretations of the Early Sources', in N.-M. Wanek (ed.) *ibid.*, Praesens Byzantinistik (Vienna, 2011), pp. 345–50

²⁴ E. S. Giannopoulos, 'Οἱ ὕμνοι τῆς Ἀγίας Ἀναφοῶς. Ἀναδρομὴ στὸ παρελθὸν καὶ σκέψεις γιὰ τὴν ψαλμωδία με ἀφορμὴ τὰ λεγόμενα "λειτουργικά"', *Ἡ ψαλτική τέχνη. Λόγος καὶ μέλος στὴ λατρεία τῆς ὀρθόδοξης ἐκκλησίας* (Thessalonica, 2004), pp. 49–63.

²⁵ One the Divine Liturgy, for example, see G. Stathis, 'Ἡ ψαλτικὴ ἔκφραση τοῦ Μυστηρίου τῆς Θείας Εὐχαριστίας', *Τὸ Μυστήριον τῆς Θείας Εὐχαριστίας· Πρακτικὰ Γ' Πανελληνίου Λειτουργικοῦ Συμποσίου* (Athens, 2004), pp. 253–75. Extended comparative discussions of musical form and liturgical function in Byzantine cathedral and monastic rites are to be found in D. K. Balageorgos, *Ἡ ψαλτικὴ παράδοση τοῦ Βυζαντινοῦ Κοσμικοῦ Τυπικοῦ*, Institute of Byzantine Musicology, Studies 6 (Athens, 2001); and Spyrakou, *Οἱ χοροὶ ψαλτῶν*. See also my 'Sunday Matins in the Byzantine Cathedral Rite: Music and Liturgy' (Ph.D. diss., University of British Columbia, 1996), an updated and expanded version of which is forthcoming from Ashgate.

²⁶ An overview of the basic types of Late Antique psalmody and their fate in Byzantine Christianity is R. F. Taft, S.J., 'Christian Liturgical Psalmody: Origins, Development, Decomposition, Collapse', in H. W. Attridge and M. E. Fassler (eds.), *Psalms in Community: Jewish and Christian Textual, Liturgical, and Artistic Traditions*, Society of Biblical Literature symposium series (Atlanta, 2003), pp. 7–32. On the spread of psalmody from desert ascetics to urban congregations, see J. McKinnon, 'Desert Monasticism and the Later Fourth-Century Psalmic Movement', *Music & Letters* 75 (1994), pp. 505–21.

²⁷ The descriptions of these events by the church historians Socrates and Sozomen are provided in English translation with commentary in J. W. McKinnon, ed., *Music in Early*

Christian Literature, Cambridge Readings in the Literature of Music (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 101–02 (#218) and 104 (#223).

²⁸ J. F. Baldovin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship: The Origins, Development, and Meaning of Stational Liturgy*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 228 (Rome, 1987), 167–226.

²⁹ S. Parenti, 'The Cathedral Rite of Constantinople: Evolution of a Local Tradition', *OCP* 77 (2011), pp. 451–54.

³⁰ The classic treatment is T. F. Mathews, *The Early Churches of Constantinople: Architecture and Liturgy* (University Park, 1971). For preliminary remarks on experiencing chant in the acoustics of Hagia Sophia, see Pentcheva, *The Sensual Icon*, pp. 52–55.

Technical details regarding the acoustic properties of the monument are addressed in C. A. Weitze, J. H. Rindel, C. L. Christensen and A. C. Gade, 'The Acoustical History of Hagia Sophia Revived through Computer Simulation', *ODEON Room Acoustics Software* <http://www.odeon.dk/pdf/ForumAcousticum2002.pdf> (accessed 24 July 2010).

³¹ Novella I in J. Konidaris, 'Die Novellen des Kaisers Herakleios', in D. Simon (ed.), *Fontes Minores V*, *Forschungen zur byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte* 8 (Frankfurt am Main, 1982), pp. 62–72 and 94–100. Taft has argued that the singing 'myrrhbearers' observed by the Russian pilgrim during his visit to Hagia Sophia in 1200 AD were in fact the deaconesses, which would add them to their number (40 according to Herakleios) to its musical personnel. Furthermore, based in part on the late (fifteenth-century) witness of Symeon of Thessalonica to Constantinopolitan cathedral liturgy (*Περὶ χειροτονιῶν*, PG 155, cols. 365–69), Spyraoui has concluded that the subdeacons, whose number was set at 170 by Herakleios, acted musically as readers when they were not performing their unique duties as assistants to the

celebrants. See R. F. Taft, 'Women at Church in Byzantium: Where, When-And Why?', *DOP* 52 (1998), pp. 67–68; and Spyraoui, *Oí χοροὶ ψαλτῶν*, pp. 165–66.

³² The twelfth-century canonist Balsamon reports that eunuchs dominated the ranks of soloists in his day, but the degree to which this was generally true in Byzantium during the centuries that preceded 1204 (after the Fourth Crusade references to eunuch singers become extremely rare) is far from certain. Maximalist and minimalist assessments of the prevalence of *castrati* are, respectively, Moran, 'Byzantine Castrati'; and Troelsgård, 'When Did the Practice of Eunuch Singers'.

³³ It is known from his vita that the great sixth-century Constantinopolitan poet-composer Romanos the Melodist was a deacon. Only in the past few years, however, have scholars revealed the extent to which deacons played important musical roles in Late Antique worship, especially in the rites of Old and New Rome. See Spyraoui, *Oí χοροὶ ψαλτῶν*, pp. 203–11; and 'Deacons as Readers and Psalmists in the Fourth and Fifth Centuries', Chapter 7 in C. Page, *The Christian West and Its Singers: The First Thousand Years* (New Haven and London, 2010), pp. 155–71.

³⁴ Spyraoui, *Oí χοροὶ ψαλτῶν*, pp. 117–24; and Moran, *Singers*, pp. 15–16.

³⁵ Spyraoui, *Oí χοροὶ ψαλτῶν*, pp. 178–203. Regarding the musical training and liturgical contributions of children at the Orphanotropheion said to have been founded by St Zotikos in the late fourth- or early fifth-century Constantinople, see T. S. Miller, *The Orphans of Byzantium: Child Welfare in the Christian Empire* (Washington, D.C., 2003), pp. 209–46. Musical parallels between Old and New Rome are explored in Page, *The Christian West and Its Singers*, pp. 243–59.

³⁶ The earliest surviving service book for the rite of the Great Church is the eighth-century Euchologion MS Barberini 336 cited above (Parenti and Velkovska, eds., *L'Eucologio Barberini Gr. 336*). Extant sources for musical practice in the Constantinopolitan cathedral rite are surveyed in my 'Sunday Matins', pp. 48–61.

³⁷ The texts of the cycles of cathedral psalmody in Athens 2061 and Athens 2062 have been edited in K. I. Georgiou, 'Η εβδομαδιαία ἀντιφωνική κατανομή τῶν ψαλμῶν καὶ τῶν ᾠδῶν εἰς τὰς Ἀσματικὰς Ἀκολουθίας ἐσπερινοῦ καὶ ὁρθρου. Ἑλληνικοὶ Μουσικοὶ Κώδικες 2061–2062 Ἐθνικῆς Βιβλιοθήκης Ἀθηνῶν' (Ph.D. diss., Pontifical Oriental Institute, 1976).

Overviews of their music are Strunk, 'The Byzantine Office', pp. 112–50; and Balageorgos, *Ἡ ψαλτική παράδοση*, pp. 292–335. For additional details about the contents and dating of these manuscripts, see Lingas, 'Sunday Matins', pp. 211–16; and Balageorgos, *Ἡ ψαλτική παράδοση*, pp. 187–93 .

³⁸ Symeon, Archbishop of Thessalonica from 1416 or 1417 until his death in 1429, reports that his Thessalonian cathedral of Hagia Sophia was the last church to maintain daily celebration of Sung Office, its performance elsewhere having been limited to the performance of asmatic vespers in the Great Church of Constantinople on the eves of three feasts: the Exaltation of the Holy Cross (14 September), St John Chrysostom (13 November), and the Dormition of the Mother of God (*De sacra precatone*, PG 155, cols. 553–36; English translation in Symeon of Thessalonike, *Treatise on Prayer: An Explanation of the Services Conducted in the Orthodox Church*, trans. H. L. N. Simmons, The Archbishop Iakovos Library of Ecclesiastical and Historical Sources 9 (Brookline, Mass., 1984), pp. 21–22). Yet the transmission of asmatic festal vespers in late Byzantine musical manuscripts indicates, as I have shown elsewhere ('Festal Cathedral Vespers', pp. 428–48), that this

service was more widely performed in Palaeologan Byzantium both on feasts and Saturday evenings.

³⁹ The complete repertory of melodies from twelfth- and thirteenth-century manuscripts has been edited in G. Hintze, *Das byzantinische Prokeimena-Repertoire Untersuchungen und kritische Edition*, Hamburger Beiträge zur Musikwissenschaft 9 (Hamburg, 1973). See also S. Harris, 'The Byzantine Prokeimena', *Plainsong and Medieval Music* 3 (1994), pp. 133–47.

⁴⁰ I analyse these settings in 'Festal Cathedral Vespers', pp. 421–59.

⁴¹ Overview of these musical settings are D. Conomos, 'Music for the Evening Office on Whitsunday', *Actes de XV^e Congrès International d'Études Byzantines* (Athens, 1979), pp. 453–69; and S. Harris, 'The Byzantine Office of the Genuflexion', *Music and Letters* 77 (1996), pp. 333–47.

⁴² These traditions are preserved in three musical collections—the Asmatikon, the Psaltikon, and the Asma—that survive mainly in South Italian copies. The Asmatikon contains the elaborate choral chants performed in the rite of the Great Church by elite choirs of cantors, whilst the music for their soloists is included in the Psaltikon. The Asma is a collection of florid chants that are stylistic forerunners of the kalophonic repertoires of Paleologan Byzantium. For an overview of these collections, see A. Doneda, 'I manoscritti liturgico-musicali bizantini: Tipologie e organizzazione', in Á. Escobar (ed.), *El palimpsesto grecolatino como fenómeno librario y textual*, Colección Actas. Filología (Zaragoza, 2006), pp. 103–10; as well as the detailed inventories in P. B. Di Salvo, 'Gli asmata nella musica bizantina', *BollGrott* XIII, XIV (1959–60), pp. 45–50, 127–45 [XIII] and 45–78 [XIV]; idem, 'Asmatikon', *BollGrott* XVI (1962), pp. 135–58; and C. Thodberg, *Der byzantinische*

Alleluiarionzyklus: Studien im kurzen Psaltikonstil, Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae

Subsidia (Copenhagen, 1966), pp. 9–31.

⁴³ Fols. 2594–264v. This manuscript has been published in facsimile as C. Høeg, ed., *Contacarium Ashburnhamense: Codex Bibl. Laurentianae Ashburnhamensis 64 phototypice depictus*, Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae 4 (Copenhagen, 1956). Conomos offers a slightly different analysis of this chant in 'Whitsunday', pp. 459–69.

⁴⁴ Cappella Romana, *Byzantium in Rome: Medieval Byzantine Chant from Grottaferrata*, dir. Ioannis Arvanitis (Cappella Romana 403-2CD, 2007). Although the manuscript offers the option of repeating music to achieve a complete rendition of the psalm in the *stichologia*, the recording that features only the six notated verses provided with musical notation. Ioannis Arvanitis edited the music for modern performance without recourse to the traditions of 'long exegesis' employed by Greek cantors during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, which would have produced a musical work at least quadruple in length.

⁴⁵ Bishop [now Metropolitan] Kallistos of Diokleia, 'The Meaning of the Divine Liturgy for the Byzantine Worshipper', in R. Morris (ed.), *Church and People in Byzantium, Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies: Twentieth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Manchester, 1986* (Birmingham, 1986), pp. 8–11. General introductions to the origins and importance of anagogical vision within Byzantine liturgy are J. A. McGuckin, *Standing in God's Holy Fire: The Byzantine Tradition*, Traditions of Christian Spirituality Series (London, 2001), pp. 23–32 and 131–49; and R. F. Taft, S.J., 'The Liturgy of the Great Church: An Initial Synthesis of Structure and Interpretation on the Eve of Iconoclasm', *DOP* 34-35 (1980-81), pp. 59–62.

⁴⁶ Compact surveys of the sources and forms of early Hagiopolite liturgy are J. F. Baldovin, *Liturgy in Ancient Jerusalem*, Alcuin/GROW liturgical study 9 (Bramcote, Nottingham, 1989); and S. Verhelst, 'The Liturgy of Jerusalem in the Byzantine Period', in O. Limor and G. G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Christians and Christianity in the Holy Land: From the Origins to the Latin Kingdoms* (Turnhout, 2006), pp. 421–62. See also the explanatory essays and commentary in J. Wilkinson, *Egeria's Travels*, 3rd ed. (Warminster, 1999).

⁴⁷ On these monasteries, see Y. Hirschfeld, 'The Monasteries of Palestine in the Byzantine Period', in O. Limor and G. G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Christians and Christianity in the Holy Land: From the Origins to the Latin Kingdoms*, Cultural Encounters in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages 5 (Turnhout, 2006), pp. 401–19.

⁴⁸ Their establishment is briefly described by J. Patrich, *Sabas, Leader of Palestinian Monasticism: A Comparative Study in Eastern Monasticism, Fourth to Seventh Centuries*, Dumbarton Oaks Studies 32 (Washington, D.C., 1995), p. 5. On their contribution to cathedral psalmody in the centuries after Egeria, see J.-M. Garrigues, 'Les caractéristiques du monachisme basilical (Ve–VIIIe siècle)', in J.-M. Garrigues and J. Legrez (eds.), *Moines dans l'assemblée des fidèles à l'époque des Pères, IVe–VIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1992), pp. 166–68.

⁴⁹ Armenians and Georgians adopted the urban rite of Jerusalem with only fairly minor structural modifications, leading to the survival in their languages of Palestinian liturgical sources representing stages of development for which evidence in the original Greek is fragmentary or non-existent. It is from the Georgian sources in particular that the nature and extent of influence of Hagiopolite worship on the worship and liturgical worship of the Late Antique and early medieval Latin West are now being revealed. Key studies of these patterns of influence include C. Renoux, 'De Jérusalem en Arménie. L'héritage liturgique de l'Église

arménienne', in T. Hummel, K. Hintlian and U. Carmesund (eds.), *Patterns of the Past, Prospects for the Future: The Christian Heritage in the Holy Land* (London, 1999), pp. 114–23; S. S. R. Frøyshov, 'The Georgian Witness to the Jerusalem Liturgy: New Sources and Studies', in B. Groen, S. Hawkes-Teeple and S. Alexopoulos (eds.), *Inquiries into Eastern Christian Worship: Selected papers of the Second International Congress of the Society of Oriental Liturgies, Rome, 17-21 September 2008*, Eastern Christian Studies 12 (Leuven, 2012), pp. 227–67; and P. Jeffery, 'Rome and Jerusalem: From Oral Tradition to Written Repertory in Two Ancient Liturgical Centers', in G. M. Boone (ed.), *Essays on Medieval Music: in Honor of David G. Hughes* (Cambridge, Mass., 1995), pp. 207–47.

⁵⁰ See G. R. Parpulov, 'Toward a History of Byzantine Psalters' (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 2004), pp. 11–12 [on the Palestinian Psalter]; and Frøyshov, 'The Georgian Witness', pp. 244–56 [Horologia and lectionaries].

⁵¹ Frøyshov, 'The Early Development of the Liturgical Eight-Mode System in Jerusalem', *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 51 (2007), pp. 139–78.

⁵² Regarding the musical aspects of the early Octoechos and the dissemination of the eight-mode system to Syriac, Latin, Byzantine and Slavic traditions of chant, see P. Jeffery, 'The Earliest Oktōēchoi: The Role of Jerusalem and Palestine in the Beginnings of Modal Ordering', in P. Jeffery (ed.), *The Study of Medieval Chant: Paths and Bridges, East and West — In Honor of Kenneth Levy* (Woodbridge, 2001), pp. 147–209. Jeffery's discussion of the emergence of the Octoechos in Hagiopolite liturgy should be read in the light of Frøyshov, 'The Early Development', pp. 164–69.

⁵³ French translation and commentary in C. Renoux, *Les hymnes de la Résurrection: I.*

Hymnographie liturgique géorgienne — Introduction, traduction et annotation des textes du Sinai 18, Sources Liturgiques 3 (Paris, 2000).

⁵⁴ A summary of his life and works is C. v. Schönborn, *Sophrone de Jérusalem: Vie monastique et confession dogmatique*, Théologie historique 20 (Paris, 1972), pp. 53–117.

Regarding the conflicting attributions for the Royal Hours of Great Friday, see S. Janeras, *Le Vendredi-Saint dans la tradition liturgique byzantine: Structure et histoire de ses offices*, Studia Anselmiana 19; Analecta Liturgica 13 (Roma, 1988), pp. 250–59.

⁵⁵ The surviving Georgian sources of the Tropologion (the 'New Iadgari') and the fragmentary counterparts of their Greek originals discovered amongst the New Finds of Sinai are surveyed in Frøyshov, 'The Georgian Witness', pp. 237–40; and R. Krivko, 'Синайско-славянские гимнографические параллели', *Вестник Православного Свято-Тихоновского гуманитарного университета. Серия 3: Филология* 1 (2008), pp. 56–102. Krivko (pp. 73–74) observes that the appellation κανών was originally a Palestinian synonym for 'service' (ἁκολουθία), which explains why both terms are attached to the hymnographic genre in early sources.

⁵⁶ The nine canticles (odes) of Palestinian orthros are: 1) Exodus 15:1–19; 2) Deuteronomy 32:1–43; 3) 1 Kings (=1 Samuel) 2:1–10; 4) Habbakuk 3:1–19; 5) Isaiah 26:9–20; 6) Jonah 2:3–10; 7) Daniel 3:26–56; 8) Daniel 3:57–88; and 9) Luke 1:46–55, 68–79. Eventually the Second Ode was fell from use on non-penitential occasions (about which, see L. Bernhard, 'Der Ausfall der 2. Ode im byzantinischen Neuenodenkanon', in T. Michels and A. Rohrer (eds.), *Heuresis. Festschrift für Andreas Rohrer, 25 Jahre Erzbischof V. Salzburg* (Salzburg, 1969), pp. 91–101; and R. Krivko, 'К истории второй песни

гимнографического канона: утраты и интерполяции', in D. Christians, D. Stern and V. S. Tomelleri (eds.), *Bibel, Liturgie und Frömmigkeit in der Slavia Byzantina. Festgabe für Hans Rothe zum 80. Geburtstag*, Studies on Language and Culture in Central and Eastern Europe 3 (Munich, 2009), pp. 229–42. For an example of a heterogeneous collection of anonymous hymns intended for use with the full Palestinian sequence of Nine Odes, see the texts for Palm Sunday translated by Renoux from the Ancient Iadgari: C. Renoux, *L'hymnaire de Saint-Sabas (Ve-VIIIe siècle): Le manuscrit géorgien H 2123. I. Du Samedi de Lazare à la Pentecôte*, *Patrologia Orientalis* 50, Fascicule 3, No. 224 (Turnhout, 2008), pp. 298–312.

⁵⁷ I. Arvanitis, 'The Rhythmical and Metrical Structure of the Byzantine Heirmoi and Stichera as a Means to and as a Result of a New Rhythmical Interpretation of the Byzantine Chant', *Acta Musicae Byzantinae* 6 (2003), pp. 14–29; and, in much greater detail, idem, 'Ο ρυθμός τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν μελῶν μέσα ἀπὸ τὴ παλαιογραφικὴ ἔρευνα καὶ τὴν ἐξήγηση τῆς παλαιᾶς σημειογραφίας—Ἡ μετρικὴ καὶ ρυθμικὴ δομὴ τῶν παλαιῶν στιχηρῶν καὶ εἰρμῶν' (Ph.D. diss., Ionian University, 2010). Several decades before Jan van Biezen had reached a similar conclusion about the use of duple rhythms in kanons in his study *The Middle Byzantine Kanon-notation of Manuscript H* (Bilthoven, 1968).

⁵⁸ For a theological analysis of three kanons (those for Easter, Transfiguration and the Dormition of the Mother of God) by John of Damascus, see A. Louth, *St. John Damascene: Tradition and Originality in Byzantine Theology*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford and New York, 2002), pp. 258–82. This rhythmical and metrical issues arising from the application of medieval heirmoi to their troparia are analysed in Arvanitis, 'Ο ρυθμός τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν μελῶν', pp. 277–328.

⁵⁹ As famously portrayed in *Narration of the Abbots John and Sophronios*, some Middle Eastern ascetics of the sixth to eighth centuries resisted the importation of musical repertoires and practices from cathedral liturgy, arguing that they were worldly and generally inappropriate to monastic life. For the text of the *Narration* and analyses of its liturgical content and relationship to other witnesses of resistance to the musical enrichment of monastic liturgy, see A. Longo, 'Il testo integrale della "Narrazione degli abati Giovanni e Sofronio" attraverso le Ἑρμηνεῖαι di Nicone', *RSBN* N.S. 2–3 (1965–66), pp. 223–67; B. M. Лурье, 'Повествование отцов Иоанна и Софрония' (BHG 1438w) как литургический источник', *VV* 54 (1993), pp. 62–74; and S. Frøyskov, 'La réticence à l'hymnographie chez des anachorètes de l'Égypte et du Sinaï du 5e au 8e siècles', in J. Claire, A. M. Triacca and A. Pistoia (eds.), *L'hymnographie: Conférences Saint-Serge, XLVIe Semaine d'études liturgiques, Paris, 29 juin-2 juillet 1999*, *Bibliotheca Ephemerides Liturgicae Subsidia* 105 (Rome, 2000), pp. 229–45.

⁶⁰ Regarding the use of these items as core elements of public evening and morning worship in Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages, G. W. Woolfenden, *Daily Liturgical Prayer: Origins and Theology* (Aldershot, 2004), pp. 280–91.

⁶¹ On the life and works of Germanos, see L. Lamza, *Patriarch Germanos I. von Konstantinopel (715-730): Versuch einer endgültigen chronologischen Fixierung des Lebens und Wirkens des Patriarchen mit dem griechisch-deutschen Text der Vita Germani am Schluss der Arbeit*, *Das östliche Christentum* n.F. 27 (Würzburg, 1975). The contributions of Germanos to the Tropologion as reflected in copies of the Georgian Iadgari are discussed in Jeffery, 'The Earliest Oktōēchoi', pp. 198–202.

⁶² T. Pott, *Byzantine Liturgical Reform: A Study of Liturgical Change in the Byzantine Tradition*, Orthodox Liturgy Series Book 2 (Crestwood, N.Y., 2010), pp. 118–42.

⁶³ On the musical aspects of the Stoudite reform, see Lingas, 'Sunday Matins', pp. 145–49.

⁶⁴ Pott, *Byzantine Liturgical Reform*, pp. 132–33. The celebration of Pentecost Vespers in the Stoudite communities of Southern Italy is addressed in Spyrakou, *Oí χοροὶ ψαλτῶν*, p. 227; M. Arranz, S.J., 'L'office de l'Asmatikos Hesperinos («vêpres chantées») de l'ancien Euchologe byzantin, IIe Partie: La psalmodie', *OCP* 44 (1978), pp. 412–15; Conomos, 'Whitsunday', pp. 457–69; and Harris, 'Office of the Genuflexion', pp. 333–47.

⁶⁵ The contents of the so-called 'Typikon of the Anastasis'—Jerusalem Hagios Stauros 43, a Greek manuscript dated '1122' but containing Holy Week and Eastertide services celebrated in the cathedral rite of Jerusalem prior to the year 1009—suggest that efforts to expand the repertoires of Palestinian hymnody were initially not limited to Stoudite monasticism, but involved more complicated patterns of artistic production and exchange. Evidence for this may be seen the inclusion of Stoudite hymns in Hagiopolite services, variations between the two regional traditions in the liturgical assignment of certain shared texts, and the relative superabundance of hymns for some occasions in the *Typikon of the Anastasis*. Hagios Stauros 43 provides, for example, not only idiomela but also a set of three prosomoia for Lauds on Great Friday for a total of ten stichera. See 'Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις Ἐκκλησίας. Διάταξις τῶν ἱερῶν ἀκολουθιῶν τῆς μεγάλης ἐβδομάδος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, κατὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐκκλησίας ἔθος, ἥτοι τὸ ἐν τῷ ναῷ τῆς Ἀναστάσεως', in A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus (ed.), *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας ἢ Συλλογὴ Ἀνεκδότων καὶ σπανίων ἐλληνικῶν συγγραφῶν περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἑρῶν ὀρθοδόξων ἐκκλησιῶν καὶ μάλιστα τῆς τῶν Παλαιστίνων* (St Petersburg, 1894), pp. 141–44.

⁶⁶ Strunk, 'The Antiphons', pp. 165–90. The prolific Joseph the Hymnographer is an example of a poet who seems to have written only contrafacta, with all 466 of hymns attributed to him by Tomadakes relying on existing melodies. See E. I. Tomadakes, *Ἰωσήφ ὁ Ὑμνογράφος: Βίος καὶ ἔργον*, Ἀθηνᾶ σύγγραμμα περιοδικὸν τῆς ἐν Ἀθῆναις Ἐπιστημονικῆς Ἑταιρείας. Σειρὰ διατριβῶν καὶ μελετημάτων 11 (Athens, 1971).

⁶⁷ The number of proper hymns in the liturgical books in the modern Byzantine rite is from K. Levy and C. Troelsgård, 'Byzantine Chant', in S. Sadie and J. Tyrell (eds.), *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (London, 2001), p. 743. Model melodies for hymns other than kanons are 'automela', with their contrafacta called 'prosomoia'. A small number of manuscripts include notated versions of automela, about which see C. Troelsgård, 'The Repertories of Model Melodies (Automela) in Byzantine Musical Manuscripts', *CIMAGL* 71 (2000), pp. 3–27.

⁶⁸ C. Troelsgård, 'What Kind of Chant Books Were the Byzantine Sticheraria?', in L. Dobszay (ed.), *Cantus planus: Papers read at the 9th meeting, Esztergom & Visegrád, Hungary, 1998* (Budapest, 2001), pp. 563–74.

⁶⁹ E. Velkovska, 'Byzantine Liturgical Books', in A. J. Chupungco (ed.), *Introduction to the Liturgy*, Handbook for Liturgical Studies Vol. 1, trans. E. Hagman, (Collegeville, MN, 1997), p. 232.

⁷⁰ M. Arranz, 'Les grands étapes de la Liturgie Byzantine: Palestine-Byzance-Russie. Essai d'aperçu historique', *Liturgie de l'église particulière et liturgie de l'église universelle*, Bibliotheca Ephemerides Liturgicae, Subsidia 7 (Rome, 1976), p. 64. Rubrics directing the melodious chanting of festal psalmody occur frequently in the Typikon of the Stoudite monastery of San Salvatore in Messina: idem, *Le Typicon du monastère du Saint-Sauveur à*

Messine: Codex Messinensis gr. 115, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 185 (Rome, 1969), pp. xxxvi, 186, 328 and 85.

⁷¹ Spyrou, *Oi choroi psaltōn*, p. 227.

⁷² Eadem, *Oi choroi psaltōn*, p. 462–66; Troelsgård, 'What Kind of Chant Books', pp. 565–70; and, on the similar Protestant practice, 'Lining out', in *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/16709> (accessed September 21, 2012)

⁷³ Their melodies were transmitted with musical notation in the Psaltikon and Asmatikon. Interestingly, kontakia (and possibly hypakoai as well) were originally syllabic chants that had been transformed through musical elaboration—a medieval counterpart to 'long' exegesis?—into occasions for musical contemplation. Some idea of the differences between the syllabic and melismatic styles may be gained by listening to the two versions of the kontakion for St Bartholomew of Grottaferrata included on Cappella Romana, *Byzantium in Rome: Medieval Byzantine Chant from Grottaferrata*, I. Arvanitis and A. Lingas, dir. (Cappella Romana CR404-2CD, 2007). The ordinary version sung to a melody from MS St Petersburg gr. 674 (fol. 14r) takes only 2:34 to perform, whilst the florid setting from the Psaltikon Ashburnhamensis 64 lasts 9:40. If the even longer oikos for St Bartholomew that follows the kontakion in Ashburnhamensis had been performed at the same tempo, the liturgical unit of Kontakion and Oikos would have provided a musical interlude of approximately 23 minutes between Odes 6 and 7 of the kanon.

⁷⁴ R. F. Taft, S.J., 'Mount Athos: A Late Chapter in the History of the Byzantine Rite', *DOP* 42 (1988), p. 190. On the reforms advanced by these *ktetorika typika*, see 'Early Reform Monasteries of the Eleventh Century', Chapter Four in J. P. Thomas, A. C. Hero and G.

Constable, eds., *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents: A Complete Translation of the Surviving Founders' Typika and Testaments*, Dumbarton Oaks Studies 35 (Washington, D.C., 2000), pp. 441–53.

⁷⁵ Taft, 'Mount Athos', pp. 187–92.

⁷⁶ Spyrahou, *Oi χοροὶ ψαλτῶν*, pp. 212–1; R. T. Dubowchik, 'Singing with the Angels: Foundation Documents as Evidence for Musical Life in Monasteries of the Byzantine Empire', *DOP* 56 (2002), pp. 289–90.

⁷⁷ Gregory of Sinai, 'Different Ways of Psalmody', trans. in G. E. H. Palmer, P. Sherrard and K. Ware, *The Philokalia: The Complete Text compiled by St Nikodimos of the Holy Mountain and St Makarios of Corinth* (London and Boston, 1995), pp. 266–74; discussed in A. Lingas, 'Hesychasm and Psalmody', in A. Bryer and M. Cunningham (eds.), *Mount Athos and Byzantine Monasticism: Papers from the Twenty-eighth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Birmingham, March 1994*, Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies 4 (Aldershot, 1996), p. 158.

⁷⁸ On Koukouzeles and his musical innovations for the Byzantine Divine Office, see E. V. Williams, 'John Koukouzeles' Reform of Byzantine Chanting for Great Vespers in the Fourteenth Century' (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1968); and idem, 'A Byzantine *Ars Nova*: The 14th-Century Reforms of John Koukouzeles in the Chanting of Great Vespers', in H. Birnbaum and S. Vryonis, Jr. (eds.), *Aspects of the Balkans: Continuity and Change: Contributions to the International Balkan Conference held at UCLA, October 23–28, 1969*, Slavistic Printings and Reprintings (The Hague and Paris, 1972), pp. 211–29; and Lingas, 'Hesychasm', pp. 159–68.

⁷⁹ 'Διάταξις τῆς ἱεροδιακονίας', PG 154, cols 745–66; and Taft, 'Mount Athos', pp. 191–92.

⁸⁰ Discussions of Stoudite collections of hymnody edited by Koukouzeles are S. S. Antoniou, 'La tradition de l'Heirmologion de Jean Koukouzeles', *Byz* 74 (2004), pp. 9–16; and J. Raasted, 'Koukouzeles' Revision of the Sticherarion and Sinai gr. 1230', in J. Szendrei and D. Hiley (eds.), *Laborare fratres in unum: Festschrift László Dobszay zum 60. Geburtstag*, Spolia Berolinensia: Berliner Beiträge zur Mediävistik (Hildesheim, 1995), pp. 261–77.

⁸¹ The emergence of these techniques in 'proto-kalophonic' repertories of the earlier thirteenth century is discussed in C. Troelsgård, 'Thirteenth-century Byzantine Melismatic Chant and the Development of the Kalophonic Style', in G. Wolfram (ed.), *Palaeobyzantine Notations III: Acta of the Congress held at Hernen Castle, The Netherlands, in March 2001* (Leuven, 2004), pp. 67–90.

⁸² This manuscript is described in G. T. Stathis, 'Η ἁσματική διαφοροποίηση ὅπως καταγράφεται στὸν κώδικα EBE 2458 τοῦ ἔτους 1336', *Χριστιανική Θεσσαλονίκη: Παλαιολογεῖος ἐποχή. Πατριαρχικὸν Ἰδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελετῶν, Ἱερὰ Μονὴ Βλατάδων*, 29-31 Οκτωβρίου 1987 (Thessalonica, 1989), pp. 167–241. For a brief general treatment of the contents of Akolouthiai manuscripts, see Doneda, 'I manoscritti ', pp. 108–10.

⁸³ The emergence of these books is discussed by C. Adsuaara, 'Textual and Musical Analysis of the Deuteros Kalophonic Stichera for September' (Ph.D. diss., Universidad Complutense, 1998), pp. 127–43.

⁸⁴ The extent to which continuity of musical style in a repertory or genre may be securely documented varies widely according to the availability of notated sources. Continuities of musical style in stichera and prokeimena may be verified by comparing their neumations in manuscripts copied before and after the beginning of the fourteenth century. On the prokeimena, see Hintze, *Das byzantinische Prokeimena-Repertoire* ; and Harris, 'Prokeimena',

pp. 133–47; and C. Troelsgård, 'The Prokeimena in the Byzantine Rite: Performance and Tradition', in L. s. Dobszay (ed.), *International Musicological Society Study Group Cantus Planus: Papers Read at the 6th Meeting Eger, Hungary 1993* (Budapest, 1995), pp. 65–77.

Since the Invitatorium 'Come, let us worship' ('Δεῦτε, προσκυνήσωμεν') and the music for many psalms first appear with notation in fourteenth-century manuscripts, the reconstruction of their performance in earlier periods must rely on a combination of these notated sources (mainly Akolouthiai manuscripts such as Athens EBE 2458) and Middle Byzantine rubrics. The earliest notated settings of the Invitatorium and Psalm 103, however, appear as appendices to copies of the Koukouzelian Heirmologion in MS Sinai 1256 (dated '1309') and MS Sinai 1257 ('1332'). See Williams, 'John Koukouzeles' Reform', pp. 109–42; and M. Velimirović, 'The Prooemiac Psalm of Byzantine Vespers', in L. Berman (ed.), *Words and Music, the Scholar's View: A medley of problems and solutions compiled in honor of A. Tillman Merritt* (Cambridge, Mass., 1972), pp. 317–37. Music for the Lamplighting Psalms is surveyed in A. Jung, 'The Settings of the Evening and Morning Psalms According to the Manuscript Sinai 1255', *CIMAGL* 47 (1984), pp. 3–63 [Sinai 1255 is mainly a Kalophonic Mathematarion, but also includes traditional settings of the eight-mode cycle of Sunday stichera with their psalm verses]; and S. Kujumdzieva, 'The Kekragaria in the Sources from the 14th to the Beginning of the 19th Century, Eger 1993, ' in L. s. Dobszay (ed.), *International Musicological Society Study Group Cantus Planus: Papers Read at the 6th Meeting Eger, Hungary 1993* (Budapest, 1995), pp. 449–63. On the late Byzantine neumations of simple forms of psalmody and their relationship to earlier oral traditions, see Strunk, 'The Antiphons', pp. 170–74; and S. Harris, 'Byzantine Psalmody: An Interim Report', in L. Dobszay (ed.), *Cantus Planus: Papers read at the 7th meeting, Sopron, Hungary, 1995*

(Budapest, 1998), pp. 273–81; and C. Troelsgård, 'Simple Psalmody in Byzantine Chant', in L. Dobszay (ed.), *Cantus Planus: Papers read at the 12th meeting of the IMS Study Group, Lillafüred/Hungary, 2004. Aug. 23-28* (Budapest, 2006), pp. 83–92.

Ironically, the melody of what is probably the most ancient extra-scriptural hymn of the Palestinian evening office, 'Joyful Light' ('Φῶς ἱλαρόν'), sometimes entitled the 'Thanksgiving at the Lighting of the Lamps' ('Επιλύχνιος εὐχαριστία'), is not transmitted by any source from the Middle Ages, evidently having been so well known as to have rendered its written transmission superfluous. The simple melody that finally does appear with notation in seventeenth-century manuscripts would not have been out of place in the sound world of medieval Byzantine psalmody, being limited in its vocal range and constructed from the repetition of a few short motives. Modern chantbooks transmit a melismatic version of this melody labelled 'Μέλος ἀρχαίον' that has been transcribed into the Chrysanthine 'New Method' of Byzantine notation through the application of *exegesis*. See Williams, 'John Koukouzeles' Reform', pp. 403–11.

⁸⁵ The precedents include the Pentecost *Teleutaion* discussed above and stylistically similar collections of melismatic verses for the first antiphon of the Sung Office of orthros transmitted in South Italian manuscripts. I discuss the settings for Constantinopolitan cathedral orthros and their relationship to the Trinitarian tropes of the Koukouzelian *Anoixantaria* in 'The First Antiphon of Byzantine Cathedral Rite Matins: From Popular Psalmody to Kalophonia', in L. Dobszay (ed.), *Cantus Planus: Papers Read at the 9th Meeting, Esztergom and Visegrád, Hungary, 1998* (Budapest, 2001), pp. 479–500.

⁸⁶ In the 'Musical Supplement' appended to 'John Koukouzeles' Reform', Williams offers staff-notation transcriptions of all of the semi-florid verses for Psalm 103 and the First Stasis

attributed to Koukouzeles, as well as of a pair of highly kalophonic compositions for Psalm 2. A mensural transcription by Ioannis Arvanitis of the anonymous traditional verses and five Koukouzelean *Anoixantaria* of Psalm 103 has been recorded on the CD *Voices of Byzantium – Medieval Byzantine Chant from Mt Sinai*, Cappella Romana, dir. Alexander Lingas (Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2012).

⁸⁷ Transcribed as 'Koukouzeles melody 5' in Williams, 'Musical Supplement' to idem, 'John Koukouzeles' Reform', 9.

⁸⁸ E. V. Williams, 'The Treatment of Text in the Kalophonic Chanting of Psalm 2', in M. M. Velimirović (ed.), *Studies in Eastern Chant 2* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 173–93.

⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 180.

⁹⁰ The repertories of kalophonic stichera are surveyed in G. T. Stathis, *Οἱ ἀναγραμματισμοὶ καὶ τὰ μαθήματα τῆς βυζαντινῆς μουσικῆς* (Athens, 1979); and idem, *Ἡ δεκαπεντασύλλαβος ὕμνογραφία ἐν τῇ Βυζαντινῇ μελοποιᾷ* (Athens, 1977).

⁹¹ MS Sinai 1234, folios 125r–125v.

⁹² As edited by Ioannis Arvanitis, this Second Foot lasts for eight minutes and twenty-four seconds in a performance Cappella Romana on *Voices of Byzantium*.

⁹³ Both versions—the traditional hymn from the Sticheraion MS Ambrosianus 139 A sup. (14th c.) and the *anagrammatismos* from the Kalophonic Sticheraion MS Sinai 1234 (an autograph of John Plousiadenos, dated '1469')—have been recorded on Cappella Romana, *Epiphany: Medieval Byzantine Chant*, I. Arvanitis, dir. (Gothic G 49237, 2004).

⁹⁴ Dubowchik, 'Singing with the Angels', pp. 278–96.

⁹⁵ PG 154, cols 745–66.

⁹⁶ Arranz ('Les grandes étapes', 45) has observed that the Divine Offices of Constantinople and Palestine, despite copious borrowing from each other, were ultimately irreducible. For examples of such borrowings in the rite of the Great Church, see Parenti, 'The Cathedral Rite', pp. 454–66; and A. Lingas, 'Late Byzantine Cathedral Liturgy and the *Service of the Furnace*', in R. S. Nelson and S. E. J. Gerstel (eds.), *Approaching the Holy Mountain: Art and Liturgy at St Catherine's Monastery in the Sinai* (Turnhout, 2011), pp. 183–230.

⁹⁷ About which, see McKinnon, 'Desert Monasticism', pp. 505–21.

⁹⁸ Taft ('The Liturgy of the Great Church', pp. 67–74) has identified a 'Middle Byzantine Synthesis' embracing iconography, church architecture and post-Iconoclast liturgical piety. I address the theological links between this 'Middle Byzantine Synthesis' and Stoudite hymnody in 'Sunday Matins', pp. 151–54.

⁹⁹ Spyraoui, *Oi χοροὶ ψαλτῶν*, pp. 432–43.

¹⁰⁰ Symeon of Thessalonike, *Treatise on Prayer*, p. 22 (= PG 155, col. 556). I examine the claims that Symeon makes in his comparison of the two rites in Lingas, 'How Musical was the "Sung Office"?', pp. 217–34.

¹⁰¹ Palmer, Sherrard and Ware, *The Philokalia*, p. 267.

¹⁰² G. R. Parpulov, 'Psalms and Personal Piety in Byzantium', in P. Magdalino and R. S. Nelson (eds.), *The Old Testament in Byzantium*, Dumbarton Oaks Byzantine Symposia and Colloquia (Washington, D.C., 2010), pp. 81–93.

¹⁰³ Starting points for considering these frameworks are: A. T. Vourles, *Ἡ ἱερὰ ψαλμωδία ὡς μέσον ἀγωγῆς (Ἡθικομονασικολογικὴ μελέτη)* (Athens, 1995); idem, *Δογματικοθητικαὶ ὁψεις τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου ψαλμωδίας* (Athens, 1994); E. Ferguson, 'Toward a Patristic Theology of Music', *Studia Patristica* 24 (1993), pp. 266–83; E. A. Moutsopoulos, 'Modal "Ethos" in Byzantine

Music. Ethical Tradition and Aesthetical Problematic', *JÖB* 32 (1982), pp. 3–6; C. Stapert, *A New Song for an Old World: Musical Thought in the Early church* (Grand Rapids, Mich. and Cambridge, 2007), pp. 42–59, 105–08 and 203–09; and J. Begbie, *Resounding Truth: Christian Wisdom in the World of Music* (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2007), pp. 77–95.

¹⁰⁴ Lingas, 'Hesychasm', pp. 167–68; and idem, 'Sunday Matins', pp. 137–54.

¹⁰⁵ The connection between teretismata and angelic praise is finally made explicit in a post-Byzantine treatise by the Cretan Hieromonk Gerasimos Vlachos. The theological and pastoral history of kratemata is summarised in G. Anastasiou, *Tà κρατήματα στην ψαλτική τέχνη*, Institute of Byzantine Musicology Studies 12 (Athens, 2005), pp. 98–119.