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Abstract
The phenomenon of exegesis (ἐξήγησις) of Byzantine music and of transcribing the old musical settings into the New Method of analytical music notation since the beginning of the 19th century is one of the extremely disputed subjects amongst musicologists. A true “apple of discord”, perhaps the practice of translating or interpreting the Byzantine music semiographic system is the best example to describe the totally irreducible mentality which has characterized and is still characterizing part of the researchers in the field with regards to this point. The discussions started from the difficulties in understanding the stenographic and mnemo-technical features of this notation and from the fact that both the oral tradition and the written one accredit the idea that the motivic formulas (theses) in the old Byzantine music notation were semiographic units that focused on the melos or the real, truthful melody.

As it is well known, the construction system of the Byzantine melos and, implicitly, of the Sunday koinonikon, is one in which the basic unit is the thesis (the motivic formula) and the succession of theses. Thus, I chose to study the exegesis technique for the Sunday koinonikon in the 18th century on basis of the formulaic character of this music and its relation with the psalm text. This analysis method is known as regressive collations (ἀναδροµικός παραλληλισµός), i.e. starting from the received tradition and going back, step by step, until reaching the medieval sources.

The current study presents the conclusions regarding the translation (interpretation) technique in the New Semiography of the eleven most important formulas (theses) existent in the Sunday koinonika during the 18th century, beginning with the 42 Sunday creations of Daniel Protopsaltes (8 koinonika), Petros Lampadarios Peloponnesios (26 koinonika) and Petros Byzantios (8 koinonika), in the “interpretations” offered by the “fathers” of the New Semiography in the beginning of the 19th century: Gregorios Protopsaltes (1778–1821) and Chourmouzios Chartophylax (1770–1840).
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1. INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of exegesis (ἐξήγησις) of Byzantine music and of transcribing the old musical settings into the New Method of analytical music notation since the beginning of the 19th century is one of the extremely disputed subjects amongst musicologists. A true “apple of discord”, perhaps the practice of translating or interpreting the Byzantine music semiographic system is the best example to describe the totally irreducible mentality which has characterized and is still characterizing part of the researchers in the field with regards to this point.1

---

The discussions started from the difficulties in understanding the stenographic and memo-technical features of this notation and from the fact that both the oral tradition and the written one accredit the idea that the motivic formulas (theses) in the old Byzantine music notation were semiographic units that focused on the melos or the real, truthful melody.

For more than five centuries, the practice of exegesis was inscribed in the Byzantine music codices through two terms: ἐρμηνεία (interpretation) or ἔξηγησις (exegesis) and ἀνάλησις (writing/analytic transcription). It is worth mentioning that while the two terms (ἐρμηνεία and ἔξηγησις) have the same meaning, the term ἀνάλησις refers especially to the analytical transcriptions of the old music repertoires into the New Method.2

2 The terminology defining the last stage of the Byzantine music circulates with several denominations: New Method, New System, Method of the New System, New Way (of writing down the music), Analytical Method of Byzantine Music, Chrysantine Theory and Notation. For the Byzantine music notations before the Chrysantine Reform of 1814, the terminology is the following: Old Method, Old Way, Old System, Synoptic Manner of Writing of Byzantine Music, Old Method of the Synoptic (i.e. stenographic) Notation. See GR. TH. STATIES, “An Analysis of the Sticheron Τον ἀγιου κράφαντα by Germanos bishop of New Patras [The Old “Synoptic” and the New “Analytical” Method of Byzantine Notation]”, in: Studies in Eastern Chant 4 (1979), 180.


3 For an in depth analysis, see GHEORGHIŢĂ, “The kalophonic Idiom...”, IDEM, Chionicum diminutum..., 127–229. For the 17th century, see IDEM, Chionicum diminutum..., 230–253.

2 The definition of the term thesis can be studied in Manuel Chrisaphes the Lampadarios: On the Theory of the Art of Chanting and on Certain Erroneous Views That Some Hold About it (Edited from Mount Athos, Iviron Monastery MS 1120 [July, 1458]), Text, Translation and Commentary by D.E. CONOMOS, Corpus Scriptorum de Re Musica 2, Wien (1985), 41.

4 For an in depth analysis, see GHEORGHIŢĂ, “The kalophonic Idiom...”; IDEM, Chionicum diminutum..., 127–229. For the 17th century, see IDEM, Chionicum diminutum..., 230–253.

2. METHODOLOGY

The Sunday koinonikon (Αἰνειτε τῶν Κύριον ἐκ τῶν στρατόνων, ἀλληλούϊα, Praise the Lord from the heavens. Psalm 148.1) is one of the most important classes of compositions of the papadic idiom (melos). It is also the creation mostly represented in the manuscript tradition at the level of this category of chants.3

As it is well known, the construction system of the Byzantine melos and, implicitly, of the Sunday koinonikon, is one in which the basic unit is the thesis (the motivic formula) and the succession of theses.4

Thus, I chose to study the exegesis technique for the Sunday koinonikon in the 18th century on basis of the formulaic character of this music and its relation with the psalm text.5 This analysis method is known as...
regressive collations (ἀναδρομικός παραλληλισµός), i.e. starting from the received tradition and going back, step by step, until reaching the medieval sources.\(^6\)

The current study presents the conclusions regarding the translation (interpretation) technique in the “New Semigraphics” of the eleven most important formulas (theses) existent in the Sunday koinonika during the 18\(^{th}\) century, beginning with the 42 Sunday creations of Daniel Protospatelates (8 koinonika), Petros Lampadarios Peloponnosis (26 koinonika) and Petros Byzantios (8 koinonika), in the “interpretations” offered by the “fathers” of the New Semigraphics in the beginning of the 19\(^{th}\) century: Gregorios Protospatelates (1778–1821) and Chourouzios Chartophylax (1770–1840).

The manuscripts and the imprinted editions also used for the study were the following: Gr. MS 955 (Παπαδικὴ νέα, τόµος Β’, 18\(^{th}\) c. [end] – 19\(^{th}\) c. [beg.], ff. 97r – 129r, Library of the Romanian Academy in Bucharest); MS 735 (Ἀνθολογία ἐξηγήσεων, dated 1822, ff. 87r – 104v, EBE (ΜΠΤ) autograph Gregorios Protospatelates?); MS 1289 (Ἀνθολογία, ff. 311r – 351v, dated 1802, Monastery of Vatopedi – Mount Athos, autograph Mathaios Ephesios Vatopedinos); MS 1458 (Πανδέκτη, ff. 398r – 440v, 19\(^{th}\) c. [beg.], Monastery of Vatopedi – Mount Athos, autograph Apostolos Konstas Chios); Gr. MS 4920 (Ἀνθολογία, New Notation, 19\(^{th}\) c. [first half], ff. 96r – 146v, National Library in Bucharest); Ταµεῖον Ἀνθολογίας (Constantinople, 1824), Ταµεῖον Ἀνθολογίας (Constantinople, 1854).

3. ANALYSIS

3.1. CONCLUSIONS 1

The chapter Conclusions 1 presents the examples which have the value of a norm, i.e. of a rule. The standard formulas and not the exceptions were taken into account.

FORMULA I: THESIS WITH KYLISMA

The thesis including the great cheironomic sign of kylisma is one of the most representative formulas of the papadic melos during the 18\(^{th}\) century. Its presence is exclusively related to the melos of the first part (Αἰνεῖτε τὸν Κύριον ἐκ τῶν οὐφρανῶν), marking the final cadence segments of Αἰνεῖτε and the hemistichs (the first hemistich [Αἰνεῖτε τὸν Κύριον], the second hemistich [ἐκ τῶν οὐφρανῶν]). In this case, its musical profile acquires the characteristic features for each mode and the modal stage the cadence is building up. Most times, it functions on basis of the principle of pentachord transposition.

In the non-cadence context, the thesis with kylisma loses its melismatic effect. It is worth mentioning that Mode IV Plagal and Mode III (which takes over the scale from the Mode IV Plagal), have the modulator inflection (a short transition) towards the second mode inserted organically. In both cases the chromatic intention aims at the fifth step of the mode, towards the final part of the hemistichs.

From the typology of the thesis with kylisma, we only retain the cadence context:

1. apostrophoi syndesmoi (or any other descendant diastematic sign, sometimes without/with diple, klasma) supported on bareia – oxeia – dyo-kentemata – gorgon – petaste – apostrophos – elaphron with apoderma (Table 1: Formula I – 1);
2. apostrophos (or ison) with klasma (or without it) supported on bareia – aporrhoë – petaste – apostrophos – ison (elaphron) with apoderma (diple) (Table 1: Formula I – 2);
3. apostrophos with klasma supported on bareia – apostrophos – petaste – apostrophos – ison with diple (or apoderma) (Table 1: Formula I – 3);
4. ison (apostrophos or another diastematic sign) with/without klasma (sometimes with antikenoma) supported on bareia – apostrophos – ison supported on petaste – apostrophos – elaphron with apoderma (Table 1: Formula I – 4).

In all the four situations mentioned above, the kylisma is positioned under the neumatic combination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eh</th>
<th>1.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>$\frac{\chi}{\eta} \left( \frac{\chi}{\eta} \right) \left( \frac{\chi}{\eta} \right)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>$\frac{\chi}{\eta} \left( \frac{\chi}{\eta} \right) \left( \frac{\chi}{\eta} \right)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>$\left( \frac{\chi}{\eta} \right)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I pl.</td>
<td>$\frac{\chi}{\eta} \left( \frac{\chi}{\eta} \right) \left( \frac{\chi}{\eta} \right)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II pl.</td>
<td>$\left( \frac{\chi}{\eta} \right)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varys</td>
<td>$\left( \frac{\chi}{\eta} \right)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>$\left( \frac{\chi}{\eta} \right)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Formula I**

**Thesis cu Kylishma**

---

**ms. gr. 955 BARB, f. 119v (E)**

---

12
FORMULA II: THESIS WITH PARAKALESMA

The Parakalesma appears exclusively in part I of the Sunday koinonikon (mainly in hemistich 1 [Ἀπείτε τοῦ Κύριον]) and only in the modes I, III, I plagal and IV plagal. In most of the situations we encounter it, the formula is placed after a cadence of the following type: ως, sometimes in sequential construction, either at the beginning of the second hemistich, or at the beginning of τοῦ Κύριον (Table 2: Formula II).
FORMULA III: THESIS WITH PARAKLETIKE

In the examined chants, the *parakletike* is inserted in different neumatic groupings, equally in papadic and in heirmologic *melos* (part three – *kratema*), that is in the three sections of the piece. Being present in the whole Byzantine modal system, this cheironomic sign determines a melody which varies depending on the step the cadence is performed on and on its importance in the mode hierarchy, but also on the movement (tempo) of each one of the chant parts (papadic or heirmologic). Eventually, the instances in which the *parakletike* is inserted are the following:

1. In the combinations with the *thesis* consisting of apostrophos (supported or not on the *mikri bareia*), followed by oligon with diple, the *parakletike* forms the ample melodic construction that starts at the beginning of the koinonikon, a truly jubilatory structure very characteristic of the papadic idiom. In the corpus of the 42 koinonika the “opening” phrase is signalled in the modes II, III and I plagal (Table 3: Formula III – 1);

2. a) In the ison combination (or any other intervallic sign) – the dyo-kentemata, supported on petaste – apostrophos, the *parakletike* is inserted under them and it is present in all the modes, except in barys. This neumatic grouping is used as a formula preceding the final cadences of *Aiveite* or of the hemistiches. Out of the multitude of examples exclusively belonging to part I, and which are presented in the translation to the New Semiology in a unique version, Mode IV Plagal proposes a single situation in which the formula is inserted with the same *melos* and at the beginning of the *kratema* (the second part) (Table 3: Formula III – 2a);
   b) The combination *parakletike* – oxeia with kentema and tromikon followed by two apostrophoi is inscribed in the pattern of the same formula prefacing the final cadence of the hemistiches (Table 3: Formula III – 2b);

3. In the pelaston combination of two or three apostrophoi and the tromikon placed under the second apostrophos, the great *afonos* sign is positioned over the *thesis*. We can encounter the formula in all the eight modes, both in part II (*kratema*) – where the section’s beginning is preferred, mainly in sequential successions, but also inside it or at its end – as well as in the other two parts. It worth mentioning that its melody varies depending on its belonging to the papadic or heirmologic movement (Table 3: Formula III – 3).
FORMULA III
THEISIS CU FARA LITRI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ia</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>( \frac{\gamma}{\alpha} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>( \theta )</td>
<td>( \frac{\gamma}{\alpha} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>( \phi )</td>
<td>( \frac{\gamma}{\alpha} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>( \varphi )</td>
<td>( \frac{\gamma}{\alpha} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>( \frac{\gamma}{\alpha} )</th>
<th>( \frac{\gamma}{\alpha} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>( \theta )</td>
<td>( \frac{\gamma}{\alpha} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>( \phi )</td>
<td>( \frac{\gamma}{\alpha} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>( \varphi )</td>
<td>( \frac{\gamma}{\alpha} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>( \frac{\gamma}{\alpha} )</th>
<th>( \frac{\gamma}{\alpha} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>( \theta )</td>
<td>( \frac{\gamma}{\alpha} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>( \phi )</td>
<td>( \frac{\gamma}{\alpha} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>( \varphi )</td>
<td>( \frac{\gamma}{\alpha} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>( \frac{\gamma}{\alpha} )</th>
<th>( \frac{\gamma}{\alpha} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>( \theta )</td>
<td>( \frac{\gamma}{\alpha} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>( \phi )</td>
<td>( \frac{\gamma}{\alpha} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>( \varphi )</td>
<td>( \frac{\gamma}{\alpha} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FORMULA IV: THESIS WITH EPEGERMA

The formula is specific both to the text melody and to the kratema. The reduced number of instances where the epegerma is present as well as its equivocal translation to the New Method offered by the Three Teachers, do not allow us to formulate a definitive conclusion on the stenographic function of this thesis. Either the formula is inserted in the final cadence point of hemistich 2, or in part II, its melos is still ample, despite the idiom differences. This is probably due to the conclusive intention given by the two haplai present under the oligon or due to the insertion of the thesis in the beginning of second part. When it is inserted in the kratema, the formula provides the beginning of the section; when it is together with the thesis of the lygisma, it can build up the whole second section.

The Thesis with epegerma has the following neumatic profile: epegerma positioned under the thesis consisting of apostrophos (or any other diatematic sign) supported on bareia, with/without klasma, dyo-kentemata with/without gorgon, elaphron, homalon, oligon with apoderma (diple) (Table 4: Formula IV).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORMULA IV</th>
<th>THESIS WITH EPEGERMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eh</td>
<td>Partia I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vareos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FORMULA V

The formula V belongs exclusively to section I and is given in three combinations:

1. oligon with/without klasma – aporrhoe supported on small bareia ([mikri bareia] written in red) – oligon – apostrophos with/without apoderma (or diple). The thesis can be accompanied by heteron [parakalesma] written in red (Table 5: Formula V – 1);

2. oligon (or any other diatematic sign) with kratema – aporrhoe – oligon (oxeia) – apostrophos with/without apoderma (or diple). The thesis can be accompanied by heteron [parakalesma] written in red (Table 5: Formula V – 2);

3. the last combination is basically the „formula 1” presented in sequential succession. In the New Notation, the thesis forms a melodic unit, independent from the principle model-sequence of the Old Notation, but in which we find elements that are common to both formulas („1” and „2”) (Table 5: Formula V – 3).

7 The few examples, in which the melodic line is obviously diminished, belong to the third mode (inside the kratema – third mode, Daniel Protopsaltes) and first mode (Daniel Protopsaltes).

8 There is also one case in which the formula is inserted at the beginning of the kratema (Daniel Protopsaltes, Mode I Plagal).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORMULA V (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eh</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| I | \[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}, \frac{\xi}{\zeta}) \\
\delta & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\delta & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}, \frac{\xi}{\zeta}) \\
\eta & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\eta & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda})
\end{align*}
\]
| II | \[
\begin{align*}
\gamma & (\frac{\delta}{\eta}) \\
\gamma & (\frac{\delta}{\eta}) \\
\delta & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\eta & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\lambda & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\lambda & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda})
\end{align*}
\]
| III | \[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda})
\end{align*}
\]
| IV | \[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda})
\end{align*}
\]
| **I pl.** |
| \[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda})
\end{align*}
\]
| II pl. |
| \[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda})
\end{align*}
\]
| **Varys** |
| \[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda})
\end{align*}
\]
| **IV pl.** |
| \[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda})
\end{align*}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORMULA V (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eh</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| I | \[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\delta}{\eta} & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\delta & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\delta & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\eta & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\eta & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda})
\end{align*}
\]
| II | \[
\begin{align*}
\gamma & (\frac{\delta}{\eta}) \\
\gamma & (\frac{\delta}{\eta}) \\
\delta & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\eta & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\lambda & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}) \\
\lambda & (\frac{\gamma}{\lambda})
\end{align*}
\]
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The analysis of the Sunday koinonikon repertoire in the 18th century proves that the two formulas are exclusively part of the text melody. The most surprising conclusion is that, despite belonging to the papadic idiom and having all the arguments to develop ample melodic lines, the two formulas are totally ignored by the Three Teachers.

The theses in which the signs argosyntheton/gorgosyntheton are involved, are the following:
1. oligon – apostrophos – oligon – apostrophos with argosyntheton/gorgosyntheton (Table 6: Formula VI). Exceptionally, this formula can also be encountered in sequential context, and its melody can be recognised in both semiographies;
2. descendent fourth – oxeia with/without gorgon – elaphron with klasma – argosyntheton (Table 6: Formula VI).
FORMULA VII: THESIS WITH XERON – KLASMA

All the examples in which xeron-klasma is involved belong to part 19, more precisely to the second segment of the first hemistich. Composers from Constantinople prefer to insert this melodic figure either accompanied by the direct complement “τον” and the first syllable from “Κύριον” (“Κυ”), or on the vowel “υ”, which is marked at the end with the intercalated letter “χ”.

The thesis under which xeron-klasma is inserted is as follows: petastē with piasma – aporrhoē – oligon – apostrophos with tromikon – two consecutive apostrophoi, usually the last syndesmoi (or apostrophos with/without diple) (Table 7: Formula VII).

---

We mention that the only example in which the xeron-klasma is inserted in the second part, too (kratema), is offered to us by Daniel Protopsaltes (barys). The sequential context, the idiom and probably the red colour the xeron-klasma is written in, determines the loss of the stenographic dimension of the neuma.
FORMULA VIII
As it is characteristic of sections I and III, this formula is the articulating element, connecting the great melodic figures of the Sunday koinonikon. Preceded by oxeia (oligon) with tromikon (strepton) with/without gorgon, this thesis is mostly followed by oxeia (oligon) with klasma supported on baceia – plasma – apostrophos.

The formula can be found in all eight modes in the following typology that offers two possibilities:
1. ison with klasma – apostrophos – heteron (Table 8: Formula VIII – 1);
2. ison with klasma – aporrhoe – heteron (Table VIII: Formula 8 – 2).
**FORMULA IX: THESIS WITH PIASMA**

The cheironomic sign of the *piasma* is present in all eight modes according to the following typology:

1. oligon (oxeia/ison or any other interval sign) with klasma – apostrophos – heteron [red] – *piasma* (Table 9: Formula IX – 1);
2. oligon (oxeia/ison or any other interval sign) with klasma – two apostrophoi – heteron [red] – *piasma* (Table 9: Formula IX – 2);
3. apostrophos with klasma – apostrophos – elaphron and *piasma* placed under the *thesis* (Table 9: Formula IX – 3).

The first example precedes the cadence formula at the endings of the hemistiches; in combination with these, it builds up the most ample and complex melodic structure of the entire piece.

The second formula appears in the non-cadence context and has the role of connecting the two structures, like a “ligament”.

If the two *theseis* are especially characteristic of the text melody, the third formula is exclusively encountered in *kratema*, without stenographic value.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FORMULA IX</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>THESIS CU PIASMA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eh</strong></td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| I | (I) \[ \text{[Eq]} \]
|   | (II) \[ \text{[Eq]} \]
|   | (III) \[ \text{[Eq]} \]
| II | (IV) \[ \text{[Eq]} \]
|   | (I) \[ \text{[Eq]} \]
| I pl. | (II) \[ \text{[Eq]} \]
|   | (III) \[ \text{[Eq]} \]
| II pl. | (IV) \[ \text{[Eq]} \]
|   |   |
| **Eh** | 2. |
| I | (I) \[ \text{[Eq]} \]
| II | (II) \[ \text{[Eq]} \]
|   | (III) \[ \text{[Eq]} \]
|   | (IV) \[ \text{[Eq]} \]
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FORMULA X: THESIS WITH SYNAGMA

The fundamental characteristic of this formula is the fact that it belongs to part I, and more rarely, to part III of the Sunday koinonikon. It can be found mainly in the middle of the piece, either as cadence thesis of hemistich 1 (see third mode), or as incipit of hemistich 2 (see Mode I Plagal), or inserted towards the end of hemistich 1 (modes II, IV, IV plagal).

The thesis with synagma consists of oligon (or any other interval sign) – apostrophos with/without klasma – aporrhoē – apostrophos – oligon with apoderma/diple and synagma placed under the mentioned neumatic combination. The instances encountered are presented in Table 10: Formula X.
The last melodic figure studied in the Sunday koinonikon repertoire in the 18th century stays devoted to part I, being encountered only in modes III, I plagal, barys and IV plagal. The most important conclusion after studying the few examples in which psephiston – parakalesma is involved, especially in barys and IV plagal, shows that it is not a cheironomic sign which is determining in developing an ample melos, but – in our case – rather the cadence context. This last formula can be seen in Table 11: Formula XI.
3.2. CONCLUSIONS 2

Following the investigation of the construction mechanism of the Sunday koinonika repertoire in the 18th century, the conclusions regarding the constitutive elements of the monodic language are absolutely remarkable. The formula or the combination between the thesis and the cheironomic sign that dominates the thesis becomes the fundamental unit of constructing the Byzantine melos, and is able to concentrate whole phrases as well as to change the physiognomy depending on four parameters which are as follows:

1. The step of the infraoctavian (diphony, triphony, tetraphony, pentaphony) or octaviant mode structure:

This instance proves that the thesis is free to move, in most cases, inside a tetrachord or pentachord of the octoechal system. The transposition of the melodic fragment or formula is made either through lex trochos or by what the Byzantine call μετάθεσις or mutation/modulation. This is the reason why certain theses are common to more than one mode. Also some of these theses are characteristic to certain modes and others to other modes. Some of them have cadence character (see for example thesis with kylisma), others are characteristic for beginnings (thesis with parakletike), whereas others have the function of a ligament. Nevertheless, all of them depend on the step the cadence is reached on and on its function in the modal hierarchy of that particular mode. The above statement is strengthened by the fact that each stage of the tetrachord structure can potentially be the finalis for one of the eight basic modes.10

2. Belonging to one of the three genera: diatonic, chromatic or enharmonic:

This situation can be easily followed in the well-known cadence formula of kylisma, in which its melody is modified depending on the cheironomic sign in the diatonic or chromatic genre. The conclusions we get from the comparative study are also consolidated by the testimony of Chrysantos of Madytos: “Ὅταν τινὰς θέλη νὰ καταλάβῃ τὰ μέλη, τὰ ὑπόκειον, ἐγράφοντο διὰ τῶν εἰρήμενόν δεκαπέντε χαρακτήρων, καὶ διὰ τῶν κατηριθμημένων υποστάσεων, δύναται νὰ ἐπιτύχῃ τοῦτο διὰ τοῦ παραλληλισμοῦ. Ἐὰν φέρ’ εἰπεν θέλε νὰ γνωρίσῃ, ποιὸν μέλος ἔγραφε τὸ Κρατηµούπορφον, ἃς πάρῃ τὸ Κοινωνικὸν τοῦ Δανιῆλ, τὸ εἰς ἤτον πλάγιος τοῦ πρῶτου, γεγραµµένον μὲ τὴν παλαιὰν μέθοδον, καὶ γεγραµµένον μὲ τὴν νέαν, καὶ διὰ τοῦ παραλληλισµοῦ εὐκόλος τὸ εὐρίσκει”.11 Even if his example refers to the cheironomic sign which is characteristic of the Old Sticherarion, the paradigm is extremely relevant for the understanding of the liturgical language which is found in the definite melodies and other melodic types. This “vocabulary” can metamorphose not only from one melodic type to another (heirmologic – sticheraric – papadic), but also from a stylistic period to another, inside the same type (see the huge difference between “The Old Sticherarion” and “The New Sticherarion” in the 18th century).12

3. The idiom (or the melodic type – γένος µελοποιίας) in which the thesis appears: heirmologic, sticheraric or papadic:

As can be noticed in our study, there are certain theses for which the “interpretation” disappears when the formula is taken over from papadic to heirmologic repertory (e.g. the formula parakletike). As this phenomenon is constant, it indicates that each idiom has a set of characteristic formulas, which can be found only rarely in the other “melodic types”. This “vocabulary” can metamorphose not only from one melodic type to another (heirmologic – sticheraric – papadic), but also from a stylistic period to another, inside the same type (see the huge difference between “The Old Sticherarion” and “The New Sticherarion” in the 18th century)).

10 Χρ. οf ΜΑΔΥΤΟΣ, Θεωρητικὸν Μέγα τῆς Μουσικῆς, Triest (1832), §408: “Διότι, οἱ εἰρήμενοι χαρακτήρες, καὶ οἱ υποστάσεις, όταν ἀλλάξον τούςν, ἤθελλον καὶ τὴν δύναμιν οὖν, τὸ Παρακάλεσμα ἄλλο µὲν µέλος ἔγραφεν εἰς τὸ τόνο τοῦ πα’ ἄλλο δὲ ἐν τῷ τόνῳ τοῦ βο’ καὶ τὰ λοιπά.” For more examples, see Κ. ΠΗΛΟΧΕΝΟΣ, Λεξικόν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς έκκλησιαστικῆς µουσικῆς Α-Μ, Constantinople (1868), p. 44; and S. ΚΑΡΑΣ, Ἡ Βυζαντινὴ Μουσικὴ Σηµειογραφία, Athens (1933).
11 ΜΑΔΥΤΟΣ, Θεωρητικὸν Μέγα, §408.
12 ΜΑΔΥΤΟΣ, Θεωρητικὸν Μέγα, §408.
4. The colour of the cheironomic sign can be red or black:
One of the most important composers and theorists at the beginning of the 19th century, Apostolos Konstas Chios, states in his famous treaty that the great cheironomic signs “rule” and dominate the interval signs. They influence if some theses are simple or complex, longer or shorter from the melos point of view. Starting from the cheironomic sign of lygisma, Konstas Chios mentions that this sign has two interpretations: argon and gorgon/syntomon, depending on the colour red or black of the cheironomic sign.

In the papadic repertoire, the disappearance of an aphonos sign is indissolubly related to the colour, the tempo (papadic or heirmologic) but also to the presence of the formula in the cadence points.

---

13 About this musician and his treaty see Θ. ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, Ὅ Απόστολος Κόνστας ὁ Χίος καὶ ἡ Συμβολή του στὴν Θεωρία τῆς Μουσικῆς Τέχνης. Μουσικολογικὴ θεώρηση ἀπὸ ἑποχὴ ἱστορική, κωδικογραφική, μελοποιητικὴ καὶ θεωρητικὴ, Athens (2002).