

# Koukouzeles' Sticherarion<sup>1</sup>

*Jørgen Raasted*

In 1469, when Ioannis Plousiadinus – in Venice – finished his beautiful copy of the Kalophonic Sticherarion Sinai 1234, he was well aware that the collection of Kalophonic Stichera ultimately went back to Koukouzeles, and that this earliest collection contained compositions and arrangements both by Koukouzeles himself and by others. The heading of the Sinai manuscript (Sinai 1234, 1r) speaks quite clearly about Koukouzeles' work as a redactor and a composer of Kalophonic Stichera:

Ἀρχὴ τῶν στιχηρῶν τοῦ ὅλου  
ἐνιαυτοῦ, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τῆς ἰνδίκτου...  
ποιήματα διαφόρων ποιητῶν·  
συνετέθεσαν οὖν σαφέστατα παρὰ  
τοῦ μάλιστα· καὶ ἐκαλλοπίσθη-  
σαν τὰ παλαιὰ μόνα, τὰ δὲ νέα  
ἀσάλευτα μένουσιν.

Koukouzeles composed numerous melodies in kalophonic style – long compositions taking up several manuscript pages in contrast to the rather few lines of, for instance, a Sticherion in the old, non-kalophonic tradition. Apart from acknowledging his rôle as a composer of a considerable part of the kalophonic repertory, scholarship has credited Koukouzeles with many activities in the transmission and development of Byzantine Chant. Let me mention, however briefly, some of the most important:

(a) He is supposed to be the one who organized the collection of the Ordinary Chants, the so-called ἀκολουθίαι – and, probably, the small beginners' book (the one often referred to as the “ἀρχὴ μέση τέλος”) with its concomitant propaedeutic material. This includes a list of ἠγήματα arranged according to

modes, with incipits (mostly of Stichera) fitting to the various Echemata-endings of each mode.

(b) Following the example of Ioannis Glykys he composed his famous Lehrgedicht, the Μέγα Ἴσον.

(c) He is connected with the growing use of the Great Ὑποστάσεις, the “red subsidiary signs”.

(d) Two colophons in Heirmologia from the early 14th century point towards some connection with Koukouzeles. The earlier – St Petersburg 121, from 1302 – describes itself as an ἔργον ἰωάννου παπαδοπούλου τοῦ ἐπιλεγομένου κουκουζέλη. The other manuscript (the Heirmologion Sinai 1256, from 1309) was written by Irini, daughter of Theodor Hagiopetritis – but it quotes, apparently, the colophon of its model: τέλος. δόξα τῷ θεῷ. ἀμήν. χεὶρ ἰωάννου παπαδοπούλου τοῦ κουκουζέλη. On the strength of these colophons and comparisons with other 14th-15th cent. Heirmologia, Oliver Strunk claimed that Koukouzeles made a revision of the Heirmologion<sup>2</sup>.

(e) My final point – the topic of this paper – deals with the Sticherarion. Are there any traces of a connection between Koukouzeles and the Sticherarion tradition since the end of the 13th or the beginning of the 14th century? The question was opened in the West by Strunk in a couple of papers from the 1960es<sup>3</sup>. In order to understand Strunk's reasoning, you must remember that some Stichera from the Oktoechos were so well known that their melodies were normally not written down in the earlier Sticheraria. It is thus not until the Kou-

kouzelian or Post-Koukouzelian period that we find melodies for the full set of Stichera Anastasima and the ordinary Dogmatikon for Saturday evening. Apparently, this feature is to be found only in the cyclically arranged Oktoechos, where all songs of a mode are grouped together. In earlier manuscripts, as you know, the normal procedure was to arrange the songs systematically, with sections comprising pieces for all eight modes for each genre (Alphabetika, Anabathmoi, Anatolika, or whatever). Now, it was in the cyclical Oktoechos of a few late Sticheraria that Strunk found a number of musical idioms which he knew from Koukouzeles' revision of the Heirmologion. To use Strunk's cautious wording: in some of these manuscripts there seemed to be "a significant relation of some kind" between the Stichera Anastasima and Dogmatika of the Oktoechos and the Heirmologion of Koukouzeles<sup>4</sup>. My present lecture follows these ideas which Strunk put forward a generation ago and extends their implications to the central repertory of the Sticherarion. I use the term of "a central repertory" to mark the distinction between these Stichera and the Anastasima and Dogmatika which Strunk dealt with and which he called "the marginal repertory."

The codex A 139 sup in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana in Milan is one of the manuscripts that contain the "marginal" repertory of the Oktoechos. In 1992 the MMB published a facsimile edition of the Ambrosianus<sup>5</sup>. Before I go on, I shall permit myself to quote the last few lines of my introduction to the facsimile edition:

*Did Koukouzeles ever establish a version of the complete Sticherarion? It is not unreasonable to think so; a Koukouzeles who revised the Heirmologion and initiated a collection of the Ordinary Chants – the 'Akolouthiai' – may as well have had his ideas about how to normalize the tradition of the Sticherarion. At present, however, we do not know for sure whether Koukouzeles produced his own version of the Sticherarion, nor have we any means to define in what respect the*

Example 1  
Oktoechos, Protos, endings in "marginal" repertory: Inventory

A1:	c	c	c	b	a	c	b	a
A2:	c	c	c	b	d	c	b	a
A2a:				b	d	c	b	a
A3:				a	b	c	b	a
A4:				a	ba	c	a	a
A4a:				bc	a	cb	a	a
A5:				a	ba	bc	a	a
A6:	c	c	c	bc	a	bc	a	a
A7:	c	c	c	b	a	bc	a	a
B1:			a	EF	D	F	D	D
B2:			a	EF	D	EF	D	D
C1:	a	GF	EF	G	a	EF	D	D
C2:	a	GF	EF	G	a	bc	a	a
D:	G	GF	Ga	a	GFE	F	E	D

*entire Ambrosianus A 139 sup might represent or reflect a Koukouzelian Sticherarion. If Koukouzeles ever revised the central parts of the Sticherarion, chances are that his interventions in the melodies of the central and stable repertory were far less conspicuous than in the marginal repertory on which Strunk focussed.*

Strunk's probings into the manuscript sources for the "marginal" repertory led him to "a tentative classification, based in some instances on comparisons of a few test pieces only"<sup>6</sup>. He divided his sources into the following four groups:

1. Allied to Ambrosianus gr. 733:  
Ivion 953  
Sinai 1471
2. Allied to the "Codex Peribleptus" [N]:

Example 2

Oktoechos, Protos, endings in “marginal” repertory: Distribution

MS:	A1	A2	A2a	A3	A4	A4a	A5	A6	A7	B1	B2	C1	C2	D
1471										x3	x2	x4		
953						Nr9				x2	x2	x4		
17							Nr8					Nr1	x3	
71							Nr8			Nr19		x5		x2
1228				Nr8				x3				Nr17	x4	
139		x2	Nr3	Nr8				Nr9						
1230		x2	Nr3	Nr8				-						
386	Nr9				Nr8				x7					
1493	x4				Nr8									
N	x8				Nr8									
386v	x4													
1493v								Nr1?	Nr2					
1228v								Nr17						

ΕΣΠΕΡΙΝΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΣΑΒΒΑΤΟΥ: **ἀναστάσιμα:** 1 Τὰς ἑσπερινὰς ἡμῶν εὐχὰς, 2 Κυκλώσατε λαοί, 3 Δεῦτε λαοί ὑμνήσωμεν. **θεοτοκίον δογματικόν:** 8 Τὴν παγκόσμιον δόξαν. **ἀπόστιχον:** 9 Τῷ πάθει σου χριστέ

ΟΡΘΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΚΥΡΙΑΚΗΣ: **ἀναστάσιμα:** 17 Ὑμνοῦμέν σου χριστέ, 18 Ὁ σταυρὸν ὑπομείνας, 19 Ὁ τὸν ἄδην σκυλεύσας, 20 Τὴν θεοπρεπῆ

Dionysiou 564 [386]

Vatopedi 1493

3. *Allied to Ambrosiana gr. 44*

[now: A 139 sup]:

Sinai 1230

4. *More or less independent:*

Naples II.C.17

Laura Γ.71

Sinai 1228

Of Strunk's four groups, Nos. 2 and 3 display, as I have already mentioned, “a significant relation of some kind” with the Koukouzelian Heirmologion.

Of these two groups, Group 3 (A 139 and Sinai 1230) is the one which Strunk found to be “most deeply involved – involved almost to the point of virtual identity”<sup>7</sup>.

My present lecture takes its starting point in Strunk's observations on the “marginal” repertory and extends their implications to the central repertory of the Sticheron. My main source material is the eleven manuscripts that Strunk mentioned; but I have supplied with some others that were easily accessible in the microfilm collection of the MMB. As you will understand, my material is certainly not complete – but I consider it to be sufficient for my present purpose.

I have gathered my documentation in four examples of musical variants, to demonstrate – at least in principle – what kind of material I dispose of in my hypothetical reconstruction of Koukouzeles' non-kalophonic Sticheron.

In order to get a more solid foundation I have – as a first step – collated the entire Protos section in the manuscripts used by

Strunk. To make our lives more easy, I have looked at the final cadences, only.

Let us first have a look at EXAMPLE 1, the inventory of the 14 different ways in which the Protos melodies end in the nine Sticheraria of the “marginal” repertory. The main distinctive grouping is between the endings which I have marked A1–A7 (ending high, on a) and the rest, mostly ending *low*, on D<sup>8</sup>.

EXAMPLE 2 shows the *distribution* of our 14 cadential formulas in 10 out of Strunk’s 11 manuscripts<sup>9</sup>. You see how nicely my diagram supports Strunk’s less explicit remarks: The *low* types (the endings that I call B C and D) – those to the right of my vertical double stroke – are *not* found in any of the manuscripts that belong to Strunk’s Groups 2 and 3, the ones where Koukouzeles’ supposed influence is most strongly marked. On the diagram you find the Koukouzelian candidates below the first horizontal stroke. You can immediately see, that these two groups of Strunk’s differ clearly from each other. Each of them has its own preferences: The first two manuscripts on my diagram (A 139 sup and Sinai 1230), i.e. Strunk’s Group 3, use 4 different endings. The other 3 (Strunk’s Group 2) use 2 others. The only exception to this picture is the ending A7; it occurs no less than 7 times in Dionysiou 386 – but as you see at the bottom of the diagram, four of these have as alternative readings the ending A1, the favourite ending in the other members of Group 2<sup>10</sup>.

To conclude this part of my exposé: My diagram certainly *does* confirm Strunk’s observations on the melodic tradition for the marginal repertory, especially as to his Groups 2 and 3 – those groups which Strunk found to come especially close to the ways of Koukouzeles’ Heirmologion.

The next logical step will be to have a look at the central repertory of the Oktoechos – the types of songs known as ἀνατολικά, ἀλφαβητικά, and ἀναβαθοί. The Protos section of the cycli-

cal Oktoechos comprises 24 such items. Again, I have collated only their endings. (See EXAMPLE 3).

This central repertory is transmitted in all Sticheraria that contain an Oktoechos, thus also in the numerous manuscripts of the older type where the melodies are arranged systematically, after *genre*. To get an idea of this older tradition I have collated the Vienna manuscript which was reproduced as vol. I of the MMB. This manuscript was written, in 1217 or 1221, by one Ioannis Dalassenos and is therefore normally referred to by the siglum “D”. I have included, also, the relevant data from two other manuscripts which from my earlier experience seem to be related to our “Koukouzelian” tradition, Athens 888 and the Copenhagen Sticherarion NkS 4960,4<sup>o</sup>.

Example 3 shows, beyond any doubt, that Strunk’s observations on the *marginal* Oktoechos are also valid when we turn to the *central* part of the repertory. We could not know that in advance – but we have now reasons to believe that Koukouzeles made his imprint on the *entire* Oktoechos.

We can also, at least tentatively, find a place for the “newcomer” Athens 888. In all 5 Sticheraria, it has the “Koukouzelian” readings – either together with the five other members of Strunk’s Groups 2 and 3, or joining the readings of Group 3.<sup>11</sup> Notice, however, that in No. 22 it sides with Strunk’s Group 2. It is thus, without any doubt, to be classified as a third member of Group 3, together with the Ambrosianus and Sinai 1230.

As for the Copenhagen Sticherarion (NkS 4960,4<sup>o</sup>), the picture is more unclear. I notice, however, that it *never* sides with Group 2 – whereas it shares some readings with Group 3.<sup>12</sup>

The first group in Strunk’s tentative classification<sup>13</sup> consisted of Sinai 1471 and Iviron 953. In Example 3, these two manuscripts normally follow the readings of Dalassenos (“D”).<sup>14</sup> Strunk’s Group 1 is thus closer to the old, non-Koukouze-

Example 3/1

Nos. 12, 13, 14a, 14c, 22 (slight deviations marked with parenthesis)

[**ἀλφαβητικά:** 12 Γυναῖκες θεοφόροι, 13 Ἴδου πεπλήρωται.  
**ἀναβαθμοί:** 14a Ἐν τῷ θλίβεσθαί με, 14c Ἄγιω πνεύματι τιμῆ καὶ δόξα.  
**ἀνατολικόν:** 22 Ὁδυρόμεναι μετὰ σπουδῆς.]

12:	1a	α̣	νε̣	στη̣	ο̣	κυ̣	ρι̣	ος̣										
		EF	abc	a		GF	Ga	FE	DE									
					(D)	1471	953	17	71	1228	4960	+	386v	1493v	Nv			
1b	α̣	νε̣	στη̣	ο̣	κυ̣	ρι̣	ος̣											
	a	a	G		cb	c	b	aG										
					(139)	(1230)	888	386	1493	N								

  

2a	ο̣	πα̣	ρε̣	χων̣	τω̣	κο̣	σμων̣	το̣	με̣	γα̣	ε̣	λε̣	ος̣
	C	D	EF	D	EF	a	GF	EF	G	a	EF	D	D
					(D)	953	17						
2b	ο̣	πα̣	ρε̣	χων̣	τω̣	κο̣	σμων̣	το̣	με̣	γα̣	ε̣	λε̣	ος̣
	C	D	EF	D	EF	G	G	G	G	a	EF	D	D
					71	1228	(4960)	+	386v	1493v	Nv		
2c	ο̣	πα̣	ρε̣	χων̣	τω̣	κο̣	σμων̣	το̣	με̣	γα̣	ε̣	λε̣	ος̣
	C	D	EF	D	EF	G	G	G	a	ba	cb	a	a
					1471								
2d	ο̣	πα̣	ρε̣	χων̣	τω̣	κο̣	σμων̣	το̣	με̣	γα̣	ε̣	λε̣	ος̣
	E	F	ab	a	G	a	GF	EF	G	a	EF	D	D
					139	1230	888	386	1493	N			

lian tradition than his Groups 2 and 3. As we shall see in a moment, the picture does not change when we leave the Oktoechos and turn to the rest of the Sticherarion. Before doing so, however, it might be useful to recapitulate the main result of what we have done until now.

Starting from Strunk's observations on a connection between Koukouzeles' Heirmologion and the marginal repertory of the Oktoechos, we corroborated his observations and extended them to cover also the central Oktoechos repertory. As I said, we could not know in advance what would come out of this investigation – but we have now found reasons to believe that Koukouzeles made his

imprint on the *entire* Oktoechos, not only on its marginal repertory. The inevitable question, of course, is now: What about the rest of the Sticherarion, the Menaia and the Triodion+Pentekostarion?

For the Menaion I have – at random – taken a Sticherion from the month of November (see EXAMPLE 4). Once more, we see the same grouping of the Koukouzelian manuscripts as before. Here, as in Example 3, Athens 888 is always connected with Ambrosianus 139 and Sinai 1230, i.e. with Group 3, the subgroup which in Strunk's eyes came closest to Koukouzeles' Heirmologion.

Also in this Example I have added a few more manuscripts to my material –

Example 3/2

13:											
1	καὶ	πρε	σβευ	ε	D	1471	953	17	71	4960	+ Nv
	EF	ab	a	G							
2	καὶ	πρε	σβευ	ε	1228 *	139	1230	888	386	1493	N
	a	bc	a	G							
14a:											
1a	οδυνων				D						
	a	GF									
1b	οδυνων				1471?	953					
	a	GF									
1c	οδυνων				17, 4960 *	139	1230	888			
	G	E									
1d	οδυνων				71	1228 *	386	1493	N	+ 17v	
	GFE										
2a	κυ	ρι	ε		D	1471	953				
	Ga	F	CD								
2b	κυ	ρι	ε		71	4960 *	139	1230?	888	386	1493 N + 17v
	FG	F	CD								
2c	κυ	ρι	ε		17	1228	+ (386v)	(1493v)			
	F	ED	CD								

(14a continues next page!)

again based on previous experience over the years. You find now, also, Athens 883, Paris 262, and Ottobonianus 380.

Of these, the *Ottobonianus 380* clearly belongs to Strunk's subgroup 1 (Sinai 1471 and Vatopedi 953). In the *Oktoechos*, this group was closer to the old, non-Koukouzelian tradition than subgroups 2 and 3. The same is true in the present *Sticherion* from the *Menaion* for November.

*Athens 883*: Already Tillyard was aware of the close relationship between Athens 883 and the codex *Neglectus*, the manuscript "N". Example 4 shows clearly that 883 is a member of Strunk's Group 2.<sup>15</sup>

NB One detail about Athens 883: Its *date*: In the catalogue – and hence in literature until now – this *Sticherion* is dated "12th century". Its evident connection with one of our "Koukouzelian" subgroups makes this early date absolutely impossible. It must be late 13th century, at the earliest, but probably 14th.! The mistake is understandable, however. For the text is written in an archaizing type of script, a *scrittura mimetica* – a term that I know from Giancarlo Prato.

Finally some words about the Paris manuscript *Ancien fonds grec 262*. When I first saw this manuscript – 30 years ago – I was struck by its peculiarities: The nota-

Example 3/3

3a					D	1471	17	(71)	1228	4960	*	139	1230?	888	
	σοι	κρα	ζω		D	FE	D	D							
	D														
3b						953	*	386	1493	N					
	σοι	κρα	ζω		D	F	D	D							
3c						(386v)		(1493v)		Nv?					
C	σοι	κρα	ζω		C	FE	D	D							
14c:															
1a						D	1471	953	(17)	71	1228				
	τη	τρι	α	δι		E	F	ab	a						
1b							386	1493	N						
	τη	τρι	α	δι		E	F	ab	a						
2							4960	*	139	1230	888				
	τη	τρι	α	δι		a	a	bc	a						
22:															
1						D	1471	953	17	71	*	888	386	1493	N
	δω	ρου	με	νος		EF	ab	a	G						
2							1228	*	139	1230	+ 17v				(not in 4960)
	δω	ρου	με	νος		a	bc	a	GF						

tion looked 13th or 14th century to me. But the writing was unnatural and old-fashioned, and the scribe often used iota subscriptum or even adscriptum. Furthermore, some mistakes in the copying of the text showed clearly that the scribe must have followed the lay-out of his model as closely as humanly possible, page by page – producing, as it were, a diplomatic replica of his model. Special difficulties were caused by the repetitions of vowels for melismatically sung ornaments. Here neumes and text fit so badly together that we may infer that the neumatic ductus of the model differed greatly from what we actually find in the Paris manuscript. Add to this that Paris 262 contains a number of textual variants written in its margins, quite against normal practice in Sticheraria.

30 years ago I made a hypothesis about the model: It was written in Round Notation – hence the vowel repetitions for the melismata – but the

old-fashioned way of text writing, so carefully imitated by the scribe, suggests that it must have been a very early Round Notation. My hypothesis, then, was that Paris 262 represented an attempt to save the tradition of a very old manuscript in Round Notation – a manuscript which maybe was considered to be of special importance. I did not ask, at the time, about the reason for this procedure. In short, I asked about the *quid*, but not about the *cui bono*.

It would be wonderful, of course, if I could now produce – as a white rabbit from a tophat – some indication that it was *Koukouzeles* who wanted – for his revision work – a copy of this “venerable Sticherarion of special importance”. Of course, I can *not*! Paris 262 is defective and does not any longer contain the Protopos section of its *Oktoechos*, so for the moment my bold and daring hypothesis rests *exclusively* on the variant distribution in line 7 of my Example 4, with manu-

Example 4

A Stricheron for the Anargyroi (November 1), transcribed from A 139 sup, 38v

1	Την	χα	ριν	των	ι	α	μα	των	2	εκ	θε	ου	ει	λη	φο	τες		
	D	a	a	a	a	G	a	EF		G	a	bc	a	G	bc	a		
3	αν	αρ	γυ	ρωσ	τα	πα	θη	4	των	ψυ	χων	και	των	σω	μα	των	η	μων
	D	D	EF	D	EF	a	G	G	a	bc	b	a	EF	a	G	bG	a	
5	θερ	μωσ	θε	ρα	πευ	ε	τε	6	παγ	κοσ	μι	οι	αν	αρ	γυ	ροι		
	a	bc	a	G	bc	a	G	a	GF	EF	G	a	EF	ED	D			
7	ο	θεν	δι'	υ	μων	χρι	στος	τοις	πι	στοις								
	D	a	a	Ga	a	EF	a	bc	a	b								
8	την	δε	δο	με	νην	ευ	ρω	στι	αν	χα	ρι	ζο	με	νοσ				
	G	a	b	c	b	a	G	a	a	a	bG	a	GF	F				
9	φω	στη	ρας	α	πλα	νεισ	υ	μας										
	EF	a	a	a	b	c	G	a										
10	αυ	τω	πρε	σβευ	σα	τε	11	σω	θη	ναι	τας	ψυ	χας	η	μων	:-		
	a	a	EF	a	G	G	a	GF	GF	EF	G	a	EF	EF	D	D		

  

4 και των σωμάτων	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} b a EF a G: \\ a GF EF a G: \end{array} \right.$	D (1471) 953 380 * 139 888 4960
		71 1228 * 386 1493 N 883 1230 262
4 ημων + 5 θερμωσ	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} bG a + a bc: \\ aF G + a bc: \\ aF G + G bc: \end{array} \right.$	1471 953 * 139 1230 888 4960 + Nv 262v
		D 380 71 1228 * 386 262 + 1493v 883v
		1493 N 883 + 386v
7 οθεν δι' ημων	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} D a a a a: \\ D a a Ga a: \\ bc a a Ga a: \end{array} \right.$	D 1471 953 380 71 1228 4960
		139 1230 888 386 1493 N 883 262
		386v 1493v Nv 883v
8 εβρωστιαν	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} a Ga a a: \\ a EF a a: \end{array} \right.$	(D) (1471) (953) 380 71 1228 * (139) 1230 888 (262) + 1493v Nv
		386 1493 N 883 4960
9 ημας	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} Petasthe on accented syllable: \\ Apoderma on accented syllable: \\ Kratema on accented syllable: \end{array} \right.$	D 1471 953 380 1228 * 139 1230 888 4960 262
		386 1493 N 883
		1493v 883v

script 262 siding with all seven members of our two “Koukouzelian” subgroups. It is a hypothesis, however, which deserves to be followed up.

The last step in my tedious investigation of musical variants is again inspired by one of Oliver Strunk’s observations. He pointed out that there was a stylistic tendency in the Koukouzelian readings

to use a higher register than the older tradition. We have already met this feature a number of times:

(a) In the endings of the *marginal* Protos Stichera – [Examples 1 and 2] – the MSS of subgroups 2 and 3 preferred *high* endings (on a), in contrast to the *low* endings (on D) found in the other MSS.

(b) In the material which I produced

from the *central* Oktoechos repertory [Example 3], there are several cases where one or both Koukouzelian groups prefer a high *bc a* for the lower *ab a* of the older tradition – or high *ab* instead of low *EF*. We thus find in No. 12 the words ὁ παρέχων sung in low position (C D EF D) in the old groups (readings 2a, 2b, 2c), but in high position (E F *ab a*) in the six Koukouzelians which constitute subgroups 2 and 3. In the same example [Ex.3, Nos. 14c and 22] we find E F *ab a* in the older tradition, against a *bc a* in subgroup 3.

A perusal of Tillyard's volume of Pentekostarion transcriptions confirms Strunk's notion about Koukouzeles' tendency to use a higher register than we find in the older tradition. Comparing Tillyard's data on all Protos Sticheraria of the Pentekostarion I found a number of cases where D had the low position, whereas a high position was preferred by the Koukouzelian manuscript N or another of the recent manuscripts used by Tillyard. Typical was the pair EF *ab a* versus a *bc a* – and a case of low ending (on D) versus high ending on a. But there were also a few cases which went the other way round – with an older form in high position and a low position in manuscripts of the Koukouzelian group.

The overall picture, however, is thus clear: There are indubitable traces of Koukouzeles in the entire Sticherarion, and these are most particularly to be seen in two groups of 14th century manuscripts:

- 1) Ambrosianus A 139 sup, Athens 888 and Sinai 1230;
- 2) Dionys. 386, Vatop. 1493, Athens 883, and the *codex Neglectus* (N).

So, it certainly looks as if there really was a Koukouzelian revision of the entire Sticherarion, parallel to that of the Heirmologion.

Equally clear, it seems, is the fact that nonKoukouzelian readings can be found even in the most "Koukouzelian" of these manuscripts – and, *vice versa*, that

Koukouzelian readings may be found also in manuscripts which do not belong to these two groups. This, however, by no means invalidates my construction. We would have no reason, in fact, to expect a clear and closed manuscript tradition where there must have been thousands of Sticheraria – many of them provided with musical variants. We can be sure that most musical manuscripts were manufactured by professional scribes, many of them singers who had their own tradition and might be influenced by it at any moment of the copying process. Of course, also the presence of musical variants in the models to be copied may be reflected in the copies, in unpredictable ways. As we have seen, such variants are one of the characteristic traits of Group 2.

I have now presented my case – a reasoning on variant distribution that I hope have convinced you that an extended search in the many Sticheraria copied after the end of the 13th century may enable us to isolate a number of direct or indirect witnesses to a Koukouzelian revision of the Sticherarion.

From the seven manuscripts which I have dealt with here, we have already formed a good idea of what features we can expect from a "Koukouzelian" Sticherarion:

I am sure, for instance, that the Oktoechos Part of Koukouzeles' Sticherarion was cyclically arranged and contained also the Anastasima and the ordinary Dogmatika, one for each mode.

There must also have been a collection of Sticheraria Dogmatika and of Stavrothotokia. It is as yet unsettled, which pieces these two collections contained.

Typical for most of the manuscripts of Groups 2 and 3 is their interest in *ascriptions*. Normally, each Sticherion will be provided with an indication of who wrote it (text? or melody? probably both!). The manuscripts, however, do not agree completely in their ascriptions. So, we can be sure that Koukouzeles' Sticherarion was provided with ascriptions, but we still do not know his choice in every case.

Similarly, the Koukouzelian Sticherarion must have been lavishly provided with musical variants. These interlinear variants seem to be predominantly found in manuscripts of Group 2, (Example 4). We still do not know exactly what tradition or traditions they represent.

Now, Strunk claimed that it was Group 3 (especially Sinai 1230) that came closest to the Koukouzelian habits which he – Strunk – had found in the Heirmologion. Now, if Group 3 represents the real Koukouzeles Sticherarion – what, then, shall we think about Group 2? I just mentioned its many musical variants. Is that also a Koukouzeles product – may be a kind of second edition? Or is it rather a local group, constituted on the basis of a Sticherarion of the Koukouzelian type? At present I cannot tell. I ask myself, however: Would it not have been really strange, if Koukouzeles felt compelled to stick ever after to his choices once he had completed a revised Sticherarion? Wouldn't we rather expect him to go over his product again and again – and during this constant process of revision to reintroduce older melodic turns which he had originally dropped? Or, still assuming that both groups are Koukouzeles, we may turn the chronology upside down and place Group 2 chronologically earlier than Group 3. In this case, we can choose between two solutions, depending on where we place the Heirmologion revision in terms of relative chronology – before or after his first revision of the Sticherarion.

There is no need to go on with these speculations now. I am sure that you have got the message and can follow my need for a clarification of the relationship between our two groups.

An important aspect of our complex – in a way the most interesting of them all – is the influence of the Koukouzelian revision on other branches of the Sticherarion tradition. Ever since the late 13th or the early 14th cent. – the unknown date of Koukouzeles' work on the Sticherarion – any copyist of a Sticherarion

might have wanted to include some – perhaps many – Koukouzelian features and turns into his product. As you see, the problem is interesting as well as enormously difficult to handle in an intelligent way.

After all these discussions about small and inconspicuous melodic variants, I am sure that you are sitting with a quite simple question on your lips: What about the music? I mean: The aim of our reconstructing the Koukouzelian version of the Sticherarion must ultimately be to understand its underlying principles. Now, when trying to “understand” the reasons behind his revision, I think that we ought to distinguish between two fields. One is the field of contents and repertory. This implies, for instance, the constitution of a full Oktoechos, including the Anastasima and the Ordinary Dogmatikon and Apostichon for each mode, and the arranging of the Oktoechos in eight cycles, one for each mode. Also, the inclusion of a collection of Stavrotheotokia, and – in all likelihood – also a remodelling of the series of Sticherarion Dogmatika.

Quite another field is the remodelling of melodies, the choice between the variants of tradition and the introduction of melodic turns and features hitherto more or less unknown. The latter question, of course, is simply to ask for – and if possible to define – a special Koukouzelian *idiom*. The former question deals, as it were, with his *aesthetic ideals*<sup>16</sup>. Are we able to reconstruct some components of his aesthetics? It is my firm belief that we shall some day be able to define the reason for his choice of reading in a tradition which was at the same time stable and unstable. Stable in outline and in many details which had been kept unchanged over centuries. But in many other details capriciously unstable and, in the eyes of Koukouzeles, obviously in need of some kind of “uniformification”.

The reconstruction of Koukouzeles' Sticherarion is more within reach than it was a year ago when we published the

facsimile–edition of the Ambrosianus. It must be much further advanced before we can even dream of answering some of the questions now raised.

*Additional note:* As mentioned below,

- |  |
|--|
| <p>+ Ἀθανάσιος τὴν μελουργὸν πυκτίδα<br/>         Ταύτην ἐμαῖς χερσὶ γέγραφα κοσμῖως<br/>         Ἐξ ἀντιγράφου πάνυ διωρθωμένου<br/>         ὄντος κάκκεινου τοῦ πάλαι κουκουζέλη:+</p> <p>+ Ἐξ ἀντιγράφου γέγραφα τὸ πυκτίον<br/>         Ἀθανάσιος τοῦ κουκουζέλη τόδε:–<br/>         Ἔτους ζωμθ’</p> |
|--|

In both of the alternative colophons Athanasios claims that he has copied ἐξ ἀντιγράφου τοῦ κουκουζέλη. So much is clear. In the first colophon, this model is said to be πάνυ διωρθωμένον. The implication of the last verse of this colophon is not clear to me. What exactly does τοῦ πάλαι κουκουζέλη mean? And what is implied by the word κάκκεινου? Anyhow, EBE 884 must represent Koukouzeles’ revision of the Sticheraion, his διώρθωσις.

Before I left Athens, I had a chance to inspect the manuscript. I was immensely curious to find out to which of my two groups it belonged – or whether it did not fit into the picture at all. The latter case would mean, of course, that my method had been wrong. The result was quite clear: At the 25 variant places that I had used above, the readings of EBE 884 fitted 100% to the readings of the second of my groups (Dionysiou 386, Vatopedi 1493, Athens 883, and the so-called *codex Neglectus*). So, finally, we have a means to study Koukouzeles’ revision directly, without having to rely on reconstructions and hypotheses.

I have not yet found time for a careful study of this new source. To get an idea of the connection between the two groups of Koukouzelian Stichera, I have compared the readings of EBE 884 and the Ambrosianus A 139 sup (facsimile:

note 1, Professor Stathis has drawn my attention to the manuscript Athens EBE 884. Its colophon (fol 390v) runs as follows:

MMB XI, 1992), but only for one melody (Τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς θηρεύματα, used on April 1). In Copenhagen we have collated almost one hundred versions of the standard Stichera for the month of April. We can therefore say with considerable certainty, that when the two Koukouzelian groups have the same reading, this is normally the reading of the majority of the tradition. When the two MSS disagree, it is mostly Athens 884 which has the old, traditional majority readings.

According to its colophon, the *Ambrosianus* was written in October 1341 (ζων’), and thus slightly later than the Athens MS which is dated ζωμθ’. It was written by two scribes: Leon Padiates wrote the text, and the Hieromonachos Athanasios wrote the lines of music (ὁ τόνος καὶ ἡ τοῦ μέλους κατάρτησις). As you see, the scribe of EBE 884 and the neumator of the *Ambrosianus* are homonyms. Is this the same Athanasios? Stathis was inclined to think so, I am more hesitant. The maximum distance between the two MSS is no more than one year: The Athens MS was written in 6849, the *Ambrosianus* in 6850. But in the older MS some neumes (e.g. the Kratema and the Hypsele) are written with forms which are a little more “modern” than those of the more recent one. This is why I hesitate to ascribe both products to the same Athanasios.

# Bibliography

Amargianakis, G. 1977

An Analysis of Stichera in the Deuterios Modes, Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen-âge Grec et Latin (CIMAGL) 22-23, Copenhagen.

Raasted, J. 1981

The interlinear variants in Byzantine musical manuscripts, Actes du congrès interna-

tional des études byzantines, Athènes 1976, Vol. II Art et archéologie, Athens.

Raasted, J. 1992

Ed. together with Lidia Perria, Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae XI. Sticherarium Ambrosianum, Pars Principalis & Pars Supplementoria. Haunia.

Strunk, O. 1977

Essays on music in the Byzantine world, ed. K. Levy, New York.

# Notes

## NOTE 1

In a discussion with Gregorios Stathis I learned – on the very evening before I was to read the present paper – about an Athens manuscript (EBE 884) which I must confess that I had overlooked, and which settles many of the questions raised in my communication. I have decided, however, to print my communication in the shape in which it was read. For details on Athens 884, see note at the end of this paper.

## NOTE 2

Strunk 1977 199–201.

## NOTE 3

Oliver Strunk, *Melody construction in Byzantine chant*, *Actes du XIIe congrès international d'études byzantines* (Belgrade 1963), 365–73; reprinted in Strunk 1977 191–201. Idem, P. Lorenzo Tardo and his *Ottoeco nei MSS. melurgici*. Some observations on the *Stichera Dogmatika*, originally published (in Italian) in the *Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata* 21, 1967, 21–34), reprinted in Strunk 1977 255–267.

## NOTE 4

Strunk 1977 197.

## NOTE 5

Raasted 1992.

## NOTE 6

Strunk 1977 196.

## NOTE 7

Strunk 1977 197.

## NOTE 8

The ending C2 begins like C1, but has the high ending – like the one called A5.

High and low endings might also be grouped after their treatment of the last three syllables:

To the high endings A1, A2, A3 correspond the low ending D.

To high A4 and A4a corresponds low B1

To high A5, A6, A7 (+ C2) we see the low parallels B2 and C1.

## NOTE 9

I have not a microfilm copy of Ambrosianus gr. 733.

## NOTE 10

The 139-group contains 4 or 5 stichera. Their endings are not used by the three MSS of the other group. – For No. 8 (the *Dogmatikon Tῆν παγκόσμιον δόξαν*), the c b a ending is used by the first group, the c a a by the second. – Dionysiou 386 has a predilection for the ending A7 – which ends with bc a. This ending is used in 7 out of 9 cases. For No. 8 he prefers the c a a ending (A4) – and only in No. 9 (the *Apostichon Tῶπάθει σου χριστέ*) do we meet ending A1 – which is the favourite of *Neglectus* and *Sinai* 1493. But notice, that the same ending – A1 – is given as alternative reading in 386, no less than 4 times.

## NOTE 11

No. 14a, readings 1c + 2b + 3a; No. 14c, reading 2.

## NOTE 12

Nos. 14a and 14c.

## NOTE 13

Example 1, subgroup 1.

## NOTE 14

The only exception is to be found at the end of No. 14a, where 1471 (as usually) join with D, whereas 953 reads as subgroup 2.

## NOTE 15

Like the other members of Group 2 it has many musical variants, written in red by the scribe. As I demonstrated at some length at

the 15th Byzantine Congress (Athens, 1976), a number of MSS contain such first-hand variants, belonging to the product as originally planned, see Raasted 1981 999–1004. At the time I offered a number of possible explanations of this feature, without venturing any final answer. It looks as if time is now ready to resume these speculations which I started more than 15 years ago.

## NOTE 16

One is his apparent predilection for changing the melodic field, from lower to higher. This may have been felt as a means to give more brilliance to the singing.

At times we find small changes which affect the musical accentuation of the text: Thus, in Example 4, the first of the *Anabathmoi* (No. 14a) ended in the older tradition – and in the three MSS of Group 3 – with a melody which corresponds to the accentuation *κύριέ σοι κράζω*. All four MSS of Group 2 have a melody which corresponds to *κύριε σοί κράζω*. The opposite is the case in another of the *Anabathmoi* (No. 15a). The old tradition stresses *ἵνα ὕμνω σε*, in the entire *Koukouzeles* tradition we have, more correctly, *ἵνα ὕμνω σε*. I am sure that there is much more of that kind, once you begin to look for it!

Without taking my observations down, I have also noticed many cases where line-ends are treated differently in the *Koukouzelian* and the non-*Koukouzelian* MSS. The main point is whether to rest at line ends or to connect with the following by means of some “leading-on” treatment of the last syllable of the line. This detail is perhaps most easily studied in Amargianakis’ edition of the *Deuterios Stichera* in *Sinai* 1230 (see Amargianakis 1977), one of the Group 3 MSS, that has very many red musical variants – first-hand, of course – that indicate alternative ways of connecting two lines.

