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Considerable research has been carried out during the last hundred years in the field of East Slavonic liturgical music. Most authors, however, have limited their activities to the study of the chants of the Russian Orthodox Church. Relatively little attention has been paid so far to the Byelorussian and Ukrainian liturgical heritage. Seen in the perspective of the Russian musical tradition, Byelorussia and the Ukraine were merely intermediate zones, through which West European influences penetrated to reach Russia in the 17th and 18th centuries. Musicologists and musical historians such as D. Razumovskij, S. Smolenskij, V. Metallov, A. Preobraženskij, N. Findejzen and J. Gardner gave some consideration in their works to the ecclesiastical music of what they generally referred to as Jugozapadnaja Ruš (south-western Ruš), but they dealt with it only insofar as it played a relevant role in the development of Church chants in Russia. They displayed little interest in following the evolution of any distinctive and coherent musical tradition in Byelorussia or the Ukraine.¹

This was perhaps a not unnatural tendency. The culture of the Western borderlands of the Russian Empire had, from relatively early times, displayed many elements which were alien to the Russian traditions, and which rendered it unattractive, and even suspect, to the Byzantine purists of the Panslavist movement. Compared to the elegant, well-mannered chants of the Russian Synodal cycle which had appeared in 1772, the freer, more elaborate melodies of the ‘Jugozapadnyj’ or ‘zapadno-russkij’ Irmologia seemed overdecorative and baroque. Moreover, their liturgical purity was questionable, since they had evolved in lands subject to the Catholic Grand Dukes of Lithuania, and had been used in the Greek-Catholic or Uniate Church, an institution viewed with the utmost suspicion and resentment by the Russian Orthodox establishment.²

In the field of Ukrainian Church music, valuable work was done in the 19th century by authors such as J. de Castro and D. Malas’kin, who published and commented on the liturgical chants of Galicia and the Kievo-Pečerskaja Lavra.³ Later musicologists such as F. Steško, B. Kudryk and E. Spikula did much to promote an interest in the Ukrainian musical heritage.

On the other hand, the Byelorussian tradition remained shrouded in obscurity, with the exception of one or two comments of considerable value in the works of Razumovskij and Preobraženskij.⁴ The first
serious attempt to break into this new field was made by Archpriest I. Voznesenskij, who in the last decade of the 19th century published an extensive study of the chants of the ‘Graeco-Russian’ Church in six parts. The second part of his work entitled *Osmoglasnyje rospevy trech poslednich vekov pravoslavnoj russkoj cerkvi* deals with the non-Russian chants — *Kievskij rospev*, *Bolgarskij rospev* and *Gre‐
českij rospev* — which were received into the Russian tradition in the 17th century. All three of these cycles penetrated into Russia to some extent through Byelorussia, and as such they are relevant also to the history of Byelorussian Church music. In the third part of his work, however, Voznesenskij touches more directly on the subject of ecclesiastical chants in Byelorussia and the Ukraine under the heading *Cerkovnoje penije jugozapadnoj Russi po Irmologam 17 i 18
vekov* (Moscow, 1898).

Although Voznesenskij seems to have had access to a good number of Byelorussian and Ukrainian *Irmologia*, his findings are often erratic, and his conclusions occasionally verge on the naive. Nevertheless his study is a good *point de départ*, and a useful guide to the student of Byelorussian Church music.

Apart from one or two excellent monographs by A. Preobraženskij which deal indirectly with Byelorussian ecclesiastical traditions, little else was done in the field during the first part of the present century, largely as a result of the lack of interest which Soviet musicologists have tended to show in the subject. In 1927, in the Ukrainian journal *Muzyka*, there appeared a valuable study on the Supraśl *Irmologion*, one of the most interesting collections of Byelorussian Church chants compiled by the monk Bohdan Anisimovič of Pinsk in 1601. Although this collection, which was first mentioned by Preobraženskij in 1910, is a basic work in the evolution of Byelorussian music in general, its existence is still passed over in silence in modern works on the subject.

Mikoła Kulikovič (1892-1968), a composer who in his later years displayed a great interest in the liturgical music of Byelorussia, did make an attempt to provide an outline, but he was severely handicapped through lack of sources at his disposal.

Few old manuscript chant books dating from before the mid-19th century are now to be found in Byelorussian churches, and fewer still have found their way to the West. When the Byelorussian Uniate Church was suppressed in most of Byelorussia in 1839, and in Podlasia in 1874, numerous monastery and church libraries were removed to archives inside Russia. Further collections were taken from the Western provinces during the 1914-1918 war, and much of what remained was destroyed during the Second World War.

The task of tracking down these collections is a daunting one. Important deposits of Byelorussian musical manuscripts are however to be found in Vilna, Kiev, Warsaw, Leningrad, Cracow and Moscow, and most of these have been adequately catalogued. It is in these collections in the first place that the student must search for sources. It is not always easy to identify the origin of a chant book, since the
catalogues almost invariably refer to a manuscript as being: *Irmologij notnyj zapadno-russkij*, or, even more vaguely, *Složenije hirmov cerkovnych*, *Śpiewnik Ruski*, and *Pieśni Cerkiewne*. Similarly, where a place of origin is entered in the catalogue, it is not always certain whether the collection was actually compiled there, or whether it was merely found in that locality. Considerable caution must therefore be exercised in examining a manuscript before identifying it as an example of Byelorussian Church music. Some chant books may however be ascribed to a specifically Byelorussian source by reason partly of the copyist’s own notes and comments, partly through marginal notes added in a later hand, and partly by the intrinsic characteristics of the chants and texts themselves. For example, there can be little doubt that an Irmologion bearing the inscription: ‘Сей Ірмолой церкви Жіровіцкой’ was in fact compiled in the monastery of Жyrovicy.\(^{11}\) On the other hand, a note to the effect that ‘Ten Irmolog dany ode mnie do cerkwi Swietyego Bazylego u mieście Wilni na zawsze ma byc przy cerkwi przy chorze dnia czwartego mjesionca oktobra roku 1734, Daniel Antoniy Swiszczewski’\(^ {12}\) is of little assistance in determining a collection’s place of origin.\(^{12}\) At the most it may assist in following its vagaries over the years, and possibly in establishing what chants were currently sung in a given area, but little else besides. Thus it is that one not infrequently finds Kievan or Galician chant books turning up in the monastery libraries of Vilna and Supraśl, even as *Irmologija* noted ‘belorusskij spisok’ or ‘belorusskaja skoropis’, are to be found in Galicia and the Transcarpathian Ukraine.\(^ {13}\)

There are in the libraries of Leningrad, Moscow, Kiev and Vilna a large number of *Irmologija* described simply as ‘Zapadno-russkij’. This qualification is not so imprecise, when it is remembered that it is distinguished from ‘Jugozapadno-russkij’. The latter term is used to describe manuscripts which originate essentially from the Ukraine, whereas the former, although it may cover collections from Volhynia, and even Galicia, is more often used in relation to Byelorussian works. In the absence of any other indication of the origin of a given manuscript, it is possible sometimes to identify a chant book as Byelorussian by comparing the chants themselves with those of other collections which are of ascertainable origin. This is by no means an entirely satisfactory method, since certain chants are common to both Byelorussian and Ukrainian traditions, whereas others may be restricted to a narrowly defined locality.\(^ {14}\)

Similarities exist also between the form of notation used in the earlier *Irmologija*, and these are no small assistance in identifying works of Byelorussian origin, though considerable circumspection is called for, and all the other relevant indices must be considered before coming to any firm conclusion.

It is possible to rely to some extent upon the texts of the chants themselves. Prior to the reforms introduced into Russia in 1652 by the Patriarch of Moscow, Nikon, Byelorussians, Ukrainians and Russians made use of a version of the Old Slavonic text known as the
Iosifskij tekst, though naturally variants existed from region to region. After the so-called Nikonite reforms, which were never accepted in Byelorussia and the Ukraiše until the suppression of the Union in 1839, no confusion is likely. To provide but one example, the hymn to the Theotokos in the Byzantine liturgy of St. Basil the Great begins with the words ‘О Тоб радуется обрадованная вся тварь’. In the Nikonite or Russian Synodal version this became ‘О Теб радуется благодатная всякая тварь’. These variants are legion, and are helpful in determining the age and origin of a manuscript, particularly in the case of documents more than 150 years old.

Occasionally one finds in certain Zapadno-russkij collections variants in the Old Slavonic text which indicate that the manuscript was written by a Byelorussian hand. These ‘variants’ are rather in the nature of copyist’s ‘slips’, and occur when the writer lapses into Byelorussian or sometimes even Polish idiomata. Isolated instances of the influence on the Old Slavonic texts of specifically Byelorussian features such as akańnie and cekańnie occur from time to time: thus irmoloj becomes ermoloj, and even more strikingly jarmoloj; dohmat changes to dahmat and so on. Conversely one finds svety for svjaty, and človek for čelovek.

In contrasting the musical content of the Synodal cycle of Russian Church chants with that of the so-called Zapadno-russkij (mainly Byelorussian) cycle, Voznesenskij expressed the view that the number and variety of the chants in the Russian chant book exceeded those in the Byelorussian and Ukrainian Irmologia. Whereas it had been found necessary to make special collections of chants from the Obichod, Irmologion, Osmoglasnik and Mineia, no such need had arisen in Byelorussia and the Ukraine, where all these chants were included in a single collection, the Irmologion. There is some truth in this assessment, although in practice Byelorussian Irmologia were often very extensive and comprised a surprising abundance of liturgical chants. Moreover, Byelorussian and Ukrainian church choirs from the 17th century onwards were much given to singing anthems in four-part harmony, whether in Slavonic, Latin or Polish, paraliturgical hymns (kantyčki), and motets with organ accompaniment. It was natural that this style of church-singing should to some extent inhibit the development of chants based on strictly liturgical texts and modes.

Among the earlier Byelorussian collections of Church chants it is the Supraśl Irmologion of 1601 which has attracted the most attention, and which is undoubtedly one of the most interesting. The philologist Karskij took note of it as a valuable source of Middle Byelorussian texts, whereas Preobraženskij stressed its importance in the evolution of East Slav church notation from the znamenny or neumatic to the linear staff system. Since then, a limited number of articles and monographs have appeared on the subject of the Supraśl Irmologion, although none have examined its form and contents in any great detail.
From many points of view the Supraśl collection is of outstanding interest.\textsuperscript{22} It was written in the West Byelorussian monastery of the Annunciation, one of the most important spiritual and cultural centres of the nation.\textsuperscript{23} The Irmologion comprises some 700 folios, and is written in a single hand in cursive script. According to the inscription on the title page, it was compiled by a monk of Supraśl, Bohdan Anisimovič, who was a native of Pinsk, in the South Byelorussian palatinate of Brest. The author was more than a mere copyist, and his work was a conscientious attempt to record not only the ancient \textit{znamenny} chants as then used in Byelorussia, but also a variety of other local, and even foreign chants which had been received into the choral repertoire of his monastery. In recording these, he added short instructions on when such and such a hymn was to be sung, as well as notes on the origin of a given chant, or the circumstances in which it was noted down: ‘Цари городскій, глася третей преположен от патриаршей нарукъый..... в раку [1583] сён и зъло красный’, or ‘Сие поем на литуріи велик Василя Задостойникъ напълу мирскаго’.\textsuperscript{24}

Copyists of Irmologia were not usually so engagingly garrulous. Among the various chants he records, prominence of place is given to the chants of his own monastery (‘И сей поем на внощномъ напълу супрасльскому. Сш стих поется . . . напълу МС, Сеже есть напълу монастыря супрасльскому’),\textsuperscript{25} the chants of Mir (Мирски напіл, на проводие Мирском), the Greek chant (Грецески роспиеv, Hrecki напіл), and the demestvenny chants.\textsuperscript{26}

The notation of the Irmologion is of the greatest importance, since it represents the earliest known example of the Western staff notation being used in connexion with East Slavonic liturgical texts. If the exceptionally fine red monochrome miniatures and polychrome decorative blocks in the Supraśl collection were also executed by Anisimovič himself, this talented monk must been a man of many parts.\textsuperscript{27}

Structurally the Supraśl Irmologion, and indeed other early Byelorussian manuscript Irmologia in the linear notation lack the coherence and order of later printed versions from L’vov (1700) and Moscow (1772). In the former, texts proper to the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom such as a Cherubik or a Potirion Sotiriou (both in the Greek language) are intercalated as it were, with little sense of order or convenience, between the Vesper doxology ‘Благослови душе моя господа’ (f. 192) and the Dogmatiki (f. 198) which belong to the service of the all-night Vigil. In the same way another Cherubik in the Supraśl chant (f. 223) follows a hymn to the Theotokos from the canon of the Liturgy of St. Basil the Great ‘О тебе радуется’, and precedes a Kinonik or communion hymn ‘В памят вечную’. On the other hand all the podobny of the Supraśl Irmologion, as in other Byelorussian Irmologia of the early 17th century, are grouped together in a separate section under the common heading of ‘podobn’ or ‘podobniki’,\textsuperscript{28} whereas in later Ukrainian and Russian works, the
podobny chants are not so grouped, but are classified separately with
the stichiry of their respective echoi (hlasy) or tone.

The podobny of the Supraśl Irmologion form a separate unit of
particular interest in that their preservation is attributed by Bohdan
Anisimovič to another copyist 'I.T.'. Indeed, the copyist's note preced­ing
the first podoben of the first tone specifies: ‘Напълоу монастыря
супрасльского праведно вноуование I. Т.’

Who this original compiler was is not known, and Anisimovič failed
to record his full name. He must have been a monk, or at least a pious
layman, who was fully familiar with the customs, usages and chants
of the Monastery of Supraśl. The date of his death is also unknown,
but it is possible that he was no longer living at the time Anisimovič
was writing, and that the latter made use of ‘I. T.’ 's manuscript
material. It may be that he was one of the monks who perished in the
great plague of 1572, which reduced the number of clerks regular at
the Monastery of the Annunciation from 32 to 12.

The grouping of the podobny into a separate section of the Irmolo­
gion was, as has been said, a common feature of early Byelorussian
hymnody in the 16th century. Instances of such a grouping of the
podobny are to be found in chant books both in the znamenny, and in
the later linear notation. Useful comparisons may be drawn with Irmologia which are approximately contemporary, in particular an
Irmologion in the znamenny notation dating from the mid-16th
century, now in the Biblioteka Narodowa, Warsaw, and a later version
with linear notation closely resembling that of the Supraśl Irmolo­
gion, and dating from the first quarter of the 17th century, which is
to be found in the Czartoryski Museum in Cracow. Both these
manuscripts have been identified as Byelorussian, and provide valu­
able means of comparison both from a textual and from a melodic
point of view.

The podobny are a system of liturgical chants adapted to one of
the minor poetic forms of Byzantine hymnography known as the
stichira. Stichiry were monostrophic hymns which followed the
reading of a versicle or stich, generally taken from the psalms, during
the Vespers service of the Byzantine Church. These stichiry were
sung in accordance with the traditional eight tones (oktoechos,
‘октоїх’, ‘восьмагласые’) which, in the Eastern Slav world was based,
on the ancient Greek modes, or on the mediaeval scale system,
but on the oriental pattern (maqqam) principle, systematised by St.
John Damascene in the 8th century. Each of the eight tones or hlasy
is made up of a number of these patterns or papieŭki, the sum total
of which gives to the tone its distinctive musical character.

In the East Slav usage, the tones applied to the various stichiry
were by no means uniform. The stichira ‘Господи воззвах к Тебе’,
the text of which is sung to each of the eight tones, generally has a
relatively straightforward, unadorned chant. Other stichiry, such as
the dahmaty, siedialny and the podobny, were more solemn in cha­
racter, and called for richer, more ornamented chants.

Any stichiry which had their own individual melodies in one or
other of the eight tones is described as being ‘samopiesno’.

Where, however, a text had been set to an existing melody, it was necessary to indicate in the osmahlasnik or oktoechos, the appropriate pattern or podoben to which the stichira was to be sung. For example, in the stichira na stichovnie for Saturday morning in the 2nd tone, the stichira ‘Стремление смертное’ is given as being sung to the podoben ‘Егда от древа’. Again the stichiry krestny ‘На кресте я волею нас ради’ for Wednesday morning in the 6th tone are noted to be sung to the podoben ‘Все отложше’.

The number of podobny found in the Byelorussian Irmologia of the 16th and early 17th centuries appears to vary considerably, and although some hymns such as ‘Небесным чином радование’ (1st tone), ‘Третий день воскресел еси’ (6th tone) and ‘О преславное чудо’ (8th tone) are relatively commonplace, others such as ‘Кто ти спаси ризу раздра’ (2nd tone) and ‘Кими похвалными вънцы’ (8th tone) are infrequently encountered. BN Aks. 2954 has twenty-three podobny in the 8 tones, including several of the more uncommon texts such as ‘Кими похвалными вънцы’ ‘Теряще мучения крьпок’ and ‘Иже во едеме рай’. Cz. 2055. I. has twenty-one podobny, and the Suprašl Irmologion has the relatively low number of sixteen. This compares with a total of twenty-six podobny in the L’vov Irmologion of 1700, fifteen in the Prostopenije of the Carpatho-Ukrainians published in 1955, and 13 in the Russian ‘Obichod Valaamskogo monastryja’ of 1909. Although by comparison with other collections the number of podobny in the Suprašl Irmologion is modest, the most common texts are included, and provide a comparatively comprehensive body of chant patterns.
| Tone  | Slavonic Colophon | Greek Colophon | Slavonic Colophon |
|-------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|
|仁     | Радуися живоносны крести Преподобен отече | Радуися живоносны крести Преподобен отече | Радуися живоносны крести Преподобен отече |
| 5th   | Все уроование Неначаема жития Треты день воскресел | Все уроование Треты день воскресел Ангелески предо идуте | Ангелески предо идуте Треты день воскресел Все уроование Неначаема жития |
| 6th   | Некому возвращаеми | Некому возвращаеми | Некому возвращаеми |
| 7th   | О преславленное чудо Что вы наречемо святии | О преславленное чудо Что вас наречемо святии | О преславленное чудо Что вас наречемо святии |
| 8th   | Господи аще насузды | Мученицы твои господи | Мученицы господи |
|       | Иже во едеме рай | | |

The text of the *podobny* chants of the Supraśl *Irmologion* is essentially the Old Church Slavonic version commonly known as the *Iosifskij* or ‘unreformed’ text. This version prevailed throughout the East Slavonic lands until 1668, when the ecclesiastical authorities of the Russian Empire, at the instigation of Tsar Alexej Michajlovič and the Patriarch of Moscow, Нікон, adopted the textual reforms proposed by the Mezenec Commission. These reforms were designed to bring the usages of the Russian Orthodox Church into closer line with those of the Greek Church, from which they had diverged somewhat in the course of the Middle Ages. Since the greater part of the metropolitan see of Kiev, which had jurisdiction over all Byelorussia and the Ukraine, lay within the dominions of the Polish Lithuanian Commonwealth, it owed no obedience to Moscow, and neither the Orthodox nor the Greek Catholic Churches of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania adopted the so-called ‘Nikonite’ reforms. The *Iosifskij* text continued to be used by the Byelorussian Orthodox Church until the annexation of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania by Russia at the end of the 18th century, and by the Greek Catholic Church until its suppression in 1839. This accounts for the divergences, sometimes marked, between the texts of 17th and 18th century Byelorussian and Russian *Irmologia*.

**Supraśl Version**

4th Tone: Яко добля во мученицео страстотерпче Георгіе сошедшея десне похвалимо яко соверши теченіе і въру соблюд еси и прият от бога венеці своекъ побыды етож моли ото тлі і въд избавітесь въро теоріци невичественную память твою.

**Moscow Synodal Version**

4th Tone: Яко добла въ мученицѣ страстотерпче Георгіе сошедшея десне восхвалимъ тя яко теченіе совершилъ веру соблюди еси и прият от бога побѣды твоей въецы етоже моли от тлі и въд избавлився въро совершия невичествию память твою.
An interesting feature of the Supraśl podobny texts, and indeed of the whole Irmologion is the persistence of the former tendency to assimilate the half-vowels ‘ь’ and ‘ъ’ to the letters ‘е’ and ‘о’ respectively. Even where these half-vowels are not actually written into the text as full vowels, it is evident from the melody itself that these ‘soft’ and ‘hard’ signs ‘ь’ and ‘ъ’ were to be given the value of full vowels, and extensive vocalisations were often sung to them. This practice known as chomonija, was widespread throughout the East Slavonic world until the beginning of the 17th century, when it began to disappear. It is clearly discernible in the podobny texts of BN Aks. 2954, which would seem to date from the mid-16th century, and is found to a lesser degree in the texts of the Supraśl Irmologion of 1601. In Cz. 2055. I., which is of somewhat later date, probably the first quarter of the 17th century, instances of chomonija are rarer still.

So it is that one finds in the Supraśl podobny the forms ‘ото языко’ instead of ‘отъ языкъ’; ‘мученихомо’ instead of ‘мученихомъ’; ‘человъколюбче’ for ‘человьколюбче’; ‘о душахо нашихо’ for ‘о душахъ нашихъ’ (though this latter form also is used, indicating a transitional period in which the practice was falling into disuse), and ‘бывоше’ instead of ‘бывше’. The more distorted forms of ‘денесе’ for ‘днесь’, ‘конецъ’, for ‘концы’, and ‘внутре’ for ‘внутре’ found in BN Aks. 2954, are seldom if ever encountered in the Supraśl texts.

On the other hand the texts of the Supraśl Irmologion, including the podobny texts, display certain features which suggest a certain influence of the Byelorussian vernacular on the original Church Slavonic language. These features are relatively few in number, and do not appear in the podobny with any kind of consistency. They may be ascribed rather to unconscious slips by the copyist, than to the existence of a specifically Byelorussian version of the old Slavonic texts. Hence one occasionally finds the characteristic forms of ‘Тобе’ and ‘Тебе’ instead of ‘Тебъ’, ‘ражаешься’ instead of ‘ражаетесь’, ‘свято’ for ‘свето’ and ‘светая’ for ‘святая’. The hypothesis of copyists’ slips is plausible when it is remembered first that the compiler was a native of Pinsk who inserted several notes in the Irmologion in the Middle Byelorussian language.

The melodies of the Supraśl podobny present considerably more individuality and interest than the texts which, after all, remain reasonably close to the Church Slavonic originals.

Certain collections of podobny from East Slavonic sources, particularly from North Russia and from the Carpatho-Ukraine, divide the melody of each podoben into a given number of sequences or kolena. In the case of the Carpatho-Ukrainian Prostopenije, which is a collection of recent date, these sequences are identified by dividing the melody into a number of bars. Whether this has any significance beyond a matter of convenience is not clear. The North Russian Valaam Obichod on the other hand, is clear and specific in defining the number of sequences or kolena comprised in each podoben. The number may vary from six kolena as in the podoben of the 1st tone.
'Небесных чинов', to twelve in the *podoben* of the 6th tone 'Совъть превъчны'. Other *podobny* such as that of the 5th tone 'Радуйся живоносны кресте' are described as having no determined number of *kolena* ('определеннаго числа колѣнь не имѣть').  

No such detailed division of the *podobny* melodies into a given number of *kolena* is discernible in the Supraśl *Irmologion*, BN Aks 2954 or Cz. 2055. I, and with the possible exeption of the somewhat anomalous Supraśl *podoben* of the 6th tone 'Ангелския предо идуге', no use is made of bar lines. It is true that certain melodic patterns or *папириуки* are to be found in the Supraśl *podobny*, and that these may recur within the same *stichira*, or in another *stichira* of the same tone. The essence of the Valaam *kolena* is that they are non-recurring, so no useful analogy can be drawn with the Supraśl chants on this feature.

The notation of the Supraśl *Irmologion* is based essentially on a system of linear or staff notation which appears to have come to Byelorussia from the West during the latter half of the 16th century. This may be deduced from the fact that the inventory made in Supraśl at the order of the Archimandrite Sergius Kimbar in 1551, reveals the existence in the monastery library of four *Irmologia*, all written in the neumatic or *znamenny* notation. No mention is made of any books of chants recorded in any other kind of notation. BN Aks. 2954, which is thought to date from the mid-16th century, is an instance of the prevalence of the *znamenny* notation at this time. Fifty years later Bohdan Anisimovič was making use of the linear system in compiling the Supraśl *Irmologion* at that same monastery, and even transcribing *znamenny* melodies. Since there are no earlier recorded *Irmologia* in which staff notation is to be found, its acceptance must have taken place at some time between 1551 and 1601. This probably came about as a result of the religious upheavals of the time, when large numbers of Orthodox laymen and even clergy, embraced the fashionable religious movements of the Reformation, and later of the counter-Reformation. Reconversions to Orthodoxy were by no means rare, and they doubtless brought in their train a measure of Calvinist and Catholic influences. A Calvinist Catechism was published in Niašviž in 1562, containing a number of canticles or *kantyčki* recorded in linear staff notation, and this, according to Voznesenskij, may well have been the origin of the notation used in the Supraśl *Irmologion*.** This suggestion is certainly plausible, when a comparison is made between the form of certain notes as used in the Niašviž Catechism — particularly the breves, semibreves and minims — and the corresponding notes of the Supraśl collection. The similarity is clear, even though the clean-cut quadrate notation of the former work has been somewhat debased in Anisimovič's cursive hand.

The value of the notes used in the Supraśl *podobny* became more or less standardised throughout Byelorussia and the Ukraine in the mid-17th century, and was adopted in Russia at the close of the century, though in a somewhat modified form.
The Supraśl Irmologion comprises the following notes:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{takt or breve} & : \quad \text{\begin{symbol}{takt or breve}}\end{symbol} \\
\text{polutakt or semibreve} & : \quad \text{\begin{symbol}{polutakt or semibreve}}\end{symbol} \\
\text{crotchet or quaver} & : \quad \text{\begin{symbol}{crotchet or quaver}}\end{symbol}
\end{align*} \]

The breve, as used in the Supraśl Irmologion appears quite frequently, which leads one to believe that in singing, it must in effect have had the value of a semibreve. The most commonly used notes are the polutakt (semibreve) and the četverty (minim). The polučetverty (crotchet) is used infrequently, and the pol-polučetverty (quaver) appears very rarely indeed. The breve is only found in the earlier manuscripts, such as Cz. 2055. I: by the mid-17th century its form, and probably also its relative value, had evolved, and it was being used only as a final breve to mark the ending of a canticle. In this latter form it appeared in the Žyrvicy Irmologion of 1661, and most of the later versions. On the other hand the pol-polučetverty (quaver) came into wider use at about this time, and it may be that the old symbol for the semibreve thereupon became the standard symbol for the breve.

The notation of the Supraśl Irmologion, as well as of Cz. 2055. I, was written in cursive script. Later Irmologia are recorded in a clearer quadrature form of notation which shows plainly the influence of printing.

The system of key signature used in the monastery of Supraśl followed standard Western norms. A staff of five lines is used throughout the Irmologion, the key signature being given by means of a Ć or alto clef placed on one of the four lower lines of the stave. The precise position of the C clef on the stave varies from stichira to stichira, depending on the demands of the melody of any given podoben, but out of a total of sixteen podobny chants in the eight tones, ten have the C clef on the third or middle stave, and five have the key signature on the fourth line from the bottom. One podoben ‘Ангелеския предо идуге’ begins with the C clef on the middle line, but the position of the clef changes to lower or first line at the words ‘приими целование’.

Modulation of a note by flattening, is a common enough feature of the Supraśl system of notation, and is indicated by the usual be-mol (♭) symbol used in Western Europe. Sharps are extremely rare but not unknown. Almost invariably the be-mol symbol when used, appears on the stave, immediately after the clef, and its use before a note in the middle of a chant is seldom, if ever, encountered. In most cases the be-mol is placed on the fourth line from the bottom, where
the C clef is placed on the first line. Where the C clef is placed on the third or middle line, the be-mol falls between the second and third lines, and if the clef is placed on the fourth line from the bottom, the be-mol falls between the fourth and third lines.

In the podobny chants, all the melodies except the anomalous 'Ангелеския предо идуте' of the 6th tone, are so noted so that the seventh note ascending from the dominant, i.e. the subdominant is flattened. It follows that fifteen out of the sixteen podobny chants are in fact in the key of F, although the position of the clef varies between the bottom and the fourth line.

Although the podoben 'Ангелеския предо идуте' is here described as anomalous in that the melody changes key twice within a relatively short span, in the Supraśl Irmologion taken as a whole, as well as in other Byelorussian Irmologia of later date, this is not an unusual feature, though the effect these modulations produce is a little strange.

The character and melodic content of the Supraśl podobny chants does not differ substantially from those of the other chants described by Anisimović as originating from the monastery of the Annunciation. Even a summary study shows that the melodies are generally broad and noble in feeling, and are infused with a dignity one would naturally associate with the interpretation and embellishment of liturgical texts. They are broadly speaking diatonic, having no chromatic intervals, apart from a few exceptions in those melodies which change key once or several times. The rhythm of the chant is that of free prose, in which the length of a musical phrase or sequence is determined by the length of the text. Although the podobny in Byelorussian Irmologia of later date contain the repetition of certain words or syllables, the Supraśl podobny are free of any such textual adulteration, and the melody is smooth, flowing and legato. Intervals of fourths and fifths are not uncommon, though these usually occur between sequences or phrases, rather than within a musical pattern or papieũka. Occasionally one encounters intervals of sixths (cf. podoben of the 6th tone 'Ангелеския предо идуте') and even intervals of sevenths, though such instances are exceptional (cf. podoben of the 4th tone 'Даль еси знамение' at the words 'єси начало').

The range of the melodies of the podobny is variable, extending from chants comprised entirely within an interval of a fourth (cf. podoben of the 1st tone 'Небесныхъ чинов радование') to those within an interval of an octave (cf. podoben of the 4th tone 'Званыи совыше'), and even of a range from A below middle C to C' (cf. podoben of the 6th tone 'Ангелеския предо идуте').

Although several of the podobny chants are written to be sung to the same tone, (e.g. the podobny of the 2nd tone 'Доме ефратово' and 'Егда ото древа'), they not infrequently diverge to such an extent as to present few or no features at all in common. There are however certain podobny of the same tone in which for example, the final sequences are related, and identical papieũki recur. A study of these chants will reveal to what extent they are interrelated.
1st Tone

There are two podobny of the first tone in the Supraśl Irmologion: 'Небесныхъ чинов' and 'Прехвалнии мученицы'. Both are in the same key (C clef on the fourth line from the bottom, with a be-mol between the middle and fourth lines, i. e. the key of F), and share a relatively narrow melodic range. The melody of 'Небесныхъ чинов' extends from G to D', and that of 'Прехвалнии мученицы' from A to E'. Between the two podobny there are but two recurring papieũki, notably on the words 'крепкая помощьнице' and 'древа животнаго' and on the final sequences 'богородице возложихомъ' and 'и велию милость'. Within the podoben 'Небесныхъ чинов' there are two recurring papieũki: the phrase sung to the words 'Небесныхъ чинов радовате' is repeated at 'спаси нас во ти прибегающая'. Similarly the papieũka sung to 'и на земли человека' also recurs on the words 'яко на тя уповаяше'.

The podoben 'Прехвалнии мученицы' shows less symmetry of structure than the first. The papieũka sung to the words 'потаила есте' recurs one half tone lower to the words 'слаждаетеся' and 'душамъ нашимъ'.

2nd Tone

The podoby of the 2nd tone 'Доме ефратово' and 'Егда ото древа' do not have a final papieũka in common. 'Доме ефратово' shows considerable richness of melody and rhythm. The range is from D to B-flat, and there are no recurring papieũki. 'Егда ото древа' on the other hand is a considerably lengthier chant, of more even melody and with less rhythmic variety. As in 'Доме ефратово' the melodic range extends from D to B-flat. One lengthy papieũka recurs frequently to the words 'Аримафеи сонято весяческимо жизне, христе обвито и любовию под визящеся' and 'пречистое облобызати обаче сумнася боязнию'. Another recurring papieũka is sung to the words 'из мирною плащаницею тя, сердце мои уста тъло' and 'вопіяще ти слава'.

3rd Tone

There is only one podoben of the 3rd Tone 'Велия креста твоего' in the Supraśl Irmologion. It is melodically rich and contains no repetition of any papieũka. The melodic range extends from D to C'

4th Tone

There are three podobny of the 4th tone, and they are remarkable in that they are quite evidently closely interrelated. Similar papieũki recur in 'Яко добла во мученище', 'Дал еси знамение' and 'Званый совыше'. Thus the papieũka to the words 'венец своея победы' in the first podoben recurs in the second 'Дал еси знамение' at the words 'темныя и власти'. Similarly the final sequence of the first podoben to the words 'всечестную память твою' is repeated in the second to
the words 'и спасти душам нашим' and in the third to the text 'просветити душа наша'. Again the \textit{papieiki} to the words 'соблюд еси' and 'похвалимо' in the first podoben, are repeated to the words 'его же моли' and 'облистай' respectively in the third. In the same way the \textit{papieika} to the words 'верою творящимо' and 'бъд избавитися' in the first podoben recur to the words 'смотрение славимо' and 'древнее блаженство' respectively in the second.

There are however, no repetitions of \textit{papieiki} within the first two podobny of the 4th tone, though within the third podoben the \textit{papieika} to the word 'плотести' recurs also to the text 'являя'. The melodic range in the first podoben of the tone 'яко добла во мученищеко' is narrow, extending over an interval of one fourth, ranging from D to G. In 'Дал еси знаменіе' it extends a full octave from C to C', and in 'Званы совыше' from E to E'.

5th Tone

There is only one podoben of the 5th tone, 'Радуися живоносный кресте'. The range of the melody extends from D to B-Flat, and contains a proportion of recitative on one note. There are recurring \textit{papieuki} to the texts 'Радуися живоносный кресте', 'церковное погражденіе' and 'воистинну украшеніе'. The \textit{papieika} to the words 'непобедимое оружіе' recurs at 'имже тля разорися' and 'пристанище спасению'. The \textit{papieika} to the word 'крепителю' recurs later to the text 'смертная держава'.

6th Tone

In the 6th tone there are four podobny to the text, 'Все упование', 'Третыи день воскресл еси', 'Неначаемая жития ради' and 'Ангелеския предо идуте'. They are distinguished melodically by the recurrence of relatively wide intervals of a fifth in the flow of the chant. In the podoben 'Все упование' the range of the melody extends from D to C'; in 'Третыи день воскресл; from F to C'; in 'Не начаемая жития' from C to C', and in 'Ангелеския предо идуте' from A below C to C'.

The final \textit{papieiki} of the podobny 'Все упование' and 'Третыи день' are related, but the endings of 'Неначаемая жития' and 'Ангелеския предо идуте' are dissimilar. As the podobny of the 6th tone are melodically rich and varied, there are few recurring \textit{papieuki} between the chants of this tone.

The podoben 'Все упование' has internally recurring \textit{papieiki} at the words 'исцеление' and 'во всем послушиви', at 'собы светя сокрыла есте' and 'евангелски не стажаста', and at 'неприяста тужеже' and 'бывоше Христови'. There are recurring \textit{papieiki} in the podoben 'Третыи день' at 'esi Христе из гроба' and 'славит род человеческий'.

The podoben 'Неначаемая жития ради' has a \textit{papieika} which is repeated at the words 'и увздомая права ради'. The \textit{papieika} to the text 'Не отоверзи мене блуденицу рождеися ото дьвы' is repeated
to the text 'не презри слезо моихо радости ангеломо'; the second half of this papieńka appears initially to the words 'ко тобъ вопиюще'. A shortish papieņka also recurs to the words 'но приими мя' and 'каюшуся'.

The podoben 'Ангелеския предо идуте' however, has a recurring papieņka, to the texts 'радосте богородице', 'людие речемо' and 'благословенно рождества'.

7th Tone

The 7th tone has only one podoben: 'Нектому возбраняеми'. This chant has a relatively narrow range, extending from G to C'. It has a recurring papieņka to the words 'возбраняеми есмы' and 'упование имуще'. Together with the podoben of the 2nd tone 'Доме ефратово' it is the shortest of the podobny.

8th Tone

The chants of the podobny of the 8th tone have a wide melodic range. 'О преславеное чудо' extends from D to C', and 'Что вы наречемо' ranges from F to D'. Since the endings of the two chants are entirely dissimilar, and as there are no recurring papieñki, it is difficult to trace any discernible kinship between the two podobny. 'О преславеное чудо' has no internally recurring papieņki. It contains a number of extended recitative passages, which mark it out as one of the melodically poorer podobny. 'Что вы наречемо', on the other hand, has one recurring papieņka at the words 'херувим ли яко на вас, серафимы ли яко выку' and 'молите о спасении душе'.

It is perhaps a little premature to speculate at this stage on the origins of the Supraśl chant as a whole, and of the podobny chants of the Supraśl Irmologion in particular. Voznesenskij has expressed the general view that what he called the jugo-zapadnyje chants, as well as those of Russia proper, were derived initially from the palaeo-Slavonic znamenny or stolpovoje chant. Even as the Muscovite cantors in the 16th and 17th centuries added to the old chant to embellish it and create new variations, so also did the Byelorussian and Ukrainian masters alter the chant by introducing ornamentation, abbreviations, and fresh melodic variations which were in keeping with local tastes. This theory is certainly plausible, but it does not appear to take into account the fact that there was in existence in Byelorussian Irmologia at the end of the 16th century, a considerable corpus of znamenny chants. These are akin to the znamenny chants of Moscow, though the differences which do exist are probably attributable to variations in national or regional tastes, as Voznesenskij suggested. Either there were two variations of the znamenny chant in Byelorussia — one more closely related to the Russian version, and one more remote, namely the 'south-western' chant, — or else there existed in Byelorussia, in addition to the local variant of the znamenny chants, several other bodies of chants derived from other sources. Until more information is made available, the question must remain an open one.
There did however exist, even in the early 17th century in Byelorussia, a considerable number of 'local' chants — Mirski, Słucki, Vilenski, Smalenski, and Żyrovicki napievi. It is hardly surprising, therefore, to find the independently-minded monks of Supraśl pressing claims to have chants and liturgical customs of their own. It should be borne in mind, when examining these claims, that at the time when Bohdan Anisimovič and his colleague I. T. were compiling their collections of Supraśl chants, the monastery had existed as a properly constituted community for less than one hundred years. It is also known that the monks who restored the monastery in 1504, came from Kiev. Naturally one is led to surmise that the Supraśl chants may well have been adaptations or variants of existing Kievan chants. It is likely that the Supraśl singers, anxious to establish their own traditions in the field of Church music, as well as in liturgical usage, consciously varied and embellished the chants they had brought with them and so in a few decades, created an indigenous Supraślński napień. Voznesenskij advanced the view that all the 'south-western' Irmologia had derived from a common source, and the evidence seems to point in this direction, at least insofar as the podobny chants of the Supraśl Irmologion are concerned. Such chants would in any event, by their relatively restricted use, evolve far less, and absorb fewer local vernacular influences than hymns of the Liturgy such as Cherubiki and the chants of the Canon, which were in almost daily use.

Nevertheless, a comparison between the Supraśl podobny, and those of the L’vov Irmologion of 1700, for example, shows that, despite certain undeniable similarities in several of the chants, wide divergencies are very frequently encountered. Where similarities in the respective chants occur, they usually come at the beginning of a podoben. Then, after one or two papieńki which are either similar or related, the chants diverge considerably, and present few or no common features. On the other hand, several podobny chants of the Supraśl Irmologion have no parallels at all in the L’vov version.

Closer similarities are, however, discernible in the Supraśl podobny chants with the podobniki of other Irmologia of Byelorussian origin. Thus the chants of Cz. 2055. I. stand considerably closer to the Supraśl version than do those of the L’vov Irmologion of 1700. There are fewer divergencies from the common norm, though naturally such divergencies do occur between the two earlier versions.

It would, therefore, seem that the podobny chants of the Supraśl Irmologion fit into the general pattern of Byelorussian and Ukrainian liturgical music. As in the field of folk-song and paraliturgical chants, there was throughout the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries a continuing interaction between the two musical traditions, and Ukrainian Church chants were a common feature of later Byelorussian Irmologia, even as Byelorussian choirbooks and cantors were to be encountered in the Ukraine. It is interesting to note, for example, in the Żyrovicy Irmologion of 1661, two chants for the post-Communion doxology 'Да испольняться уста наша', one entitled 'Бълорусское' and the other
as ‘Украинское’. Much more remains to be done, however, before the complete picture becomes apparent, and any significant conclusions can be drawn.

In transcribing the Supraśl podobny chants, an attempt has been made to present the melodies in a readily accessible form, whilst maintaining them at a reasonable pitch. The melodies have been transposed by altering the key-signature from A to G, whilst leaving the notes in their original position on the stave. Where necessary the appropriate modulations have been made by introducing sharps and flats.

For practical reasons, as well as on the grounds given above, the takt has been given the value of a semibreve.
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THE PODOBNY TEXTS OF THE SUPRAŚL IRMOLOGION (compared with other podobny texts of Byelorussian origin)

BN Aks. 2954

Supraśl Irm.

Cz. 2055. I.

1st Tone

1st Tone

2nd Tone

2nd Tone

THE JOURNAL OF BYELORUSSIAN STUDIES
Велия креста твоего господи сила водрузи бо ся на мвьестве и дртлествуете во мире и показа ото рыбаре апостолы и ото языко мученики и молятесь о доушахо нашихо.

3rd Tone
Велия креста твоего господи сила водрузи бо ся на мвьестве и дртлествуете во мире и показа ото рыбаре апостолы и ото языко мученики и молятесь о доушахо нашихо.

4th Tone
Яко добля во мученице-хострастотерче георгие сошедше денеесе восхва-лимо яко соверши течение и ввру соблюю еси и преко ото бога ввнеше своея побдь егоже моли тлъ и бдъ избавится вв-рою творящимо всечс-тную памят вво.

Дал еси знамение бов-щимся тебе господи крест твои всечсныи имже облицо еси начало темныя власти и возвал ны еси на древненое блаженство тмъ-же ти челове-ко-волноблое смотрение славимь исоусе всесиленне и спаси доушам нашим.

Дал еси знамение бовшым-ся тебе господи крест твои всечснныи имже облицо еси начало темныя и влас-ти из вел ны есина древ-нее блаженство темже ти челове-ко-волноблое смотрение славимь исоусе всесиленне и спаси доушам нашим.

Званны совыше а не ото человеко егда земная тма омрачи очи плотести и не-врстнемо обличная смотрение тогдаже небесныя сввто облиства смышлениеме сввто зрака благов-рье являя глаголомъ раз-зоума тмъ разоумь и из-ведашаго изо тмы свято христа бога нашего егоже моли спаси просветить доуша наша.

Званны совыше а не ото человеко егда земная тма омрачи очи плотести и не-врстнемо обличная смотрение тогдаже небесныя сввто облиства смышлениеме сввто зрака благов-рье являя глаголомъ раз-зоума тмъ разоумь и из-ведашаго изо тмы свято христа бога нашего егоже моли спаси просветить доуша наша.

5th Tone
Радоуися животоноси кресте благовърния непобдимое оружие двери рай-скя врнымъ крепителю церковное оражение имъ-же клятвъ разорися и проклации восприятъ и попра-ся смертная держава и вознесеномо от земля к небеснымъ оружие непоб-димое вьсомъ сопротив-ничие слава мученикъ преводимо яко воистин-нуо оукрашение пристанище спасен[o] пода миромъ тобою велию милость.

Радоуися животоноси кресте благовърния непобдимое оружие двери рай-скя врнымъ крепителю церковное оражение имъ-же тля разорися и проклации восприятъ и попра-ся смертная держава и вознесеномо от земля к небеснымъ оружие непобдимое вьсомъ сопротив-ничие слава мученикъ преводимо яко воистин-нуо оукрашение пристанище спасен[o] пода миромъ тобою велию милость.
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6th Tone

Весе оупование на небесех положиша сокровище некрадомо себя святая сокрыла есть туне прияста тунеже и дадите больящимо исцеление злата и сребра евангелиски не стяжаста человъколюбъко и скотъь благословіе подаете да во всем послушали быvoie христови содерзнение моліться о душах наших.

Третий день воскресл еси христе из гроба яко же есть писано совоскреси праотеца нашего тя славите род человъческий и поете твое воскресение.

Неначаемая жития ради и оуведомаема нрава ради мироносяще прииде ко теб вопиющи не отоверзи мене блуденицу рождеися ото дъвы не презери слезо михо радости аггеломо но приими мя каюшуся еяже не оторину согрешешоу ти господи веля ради твоея милости.

Аггелеская предо идуте силы иже во вифлееме уготовайте ясно слово бо ражаетеся премудрость приходите приими целование церкви на радость богородицы людие речъе благословень родися бого наше слава тебе.

7th Tone

Нектому возвращаеми есмы древа животенного оупование имоуше крестъ твои господи слава тобъ.

Ангелеская предо идуте силы же во вифлееме уготовайте ясно слово бо ражаетеся премудрость приходите приими целование церкви на радость богородицы людие речъе благословень родися бого наше слава тебе.

8th Tone

О преславное чюдо животворя садо кресте пресвяты на высотоу воздвижем вместо от вечности на землю приходятъ всис Zoom ся житнато и змеи прогоняють веси дъмно окоже дарава име нехристе спаси доуша наша яко милосердъ.

О преславное чюдо животворя садо кресте пресвяты на высотоу воздвижем вместо от вечности на землю приходятъ всис Zoom ся житнато и змеи прогоняють веси дъмно окоже дарава име нехристе спаси доуша наша яко милосердъ.
Что вы нареклием святин
херувими яко на вас по-
чило есте христосо серафи-
ми и яко непрестанною
прослависте его агелы тел-
а бо отовратится сильы
ли дъете бо чудеся многа
ваша имена и больша даро-
вания молите спасться
doушам нашим.
Что вы нареклием святин
херувым ли яко на вас по-
чило есте христосо сера-
фьым ли яко выку просла-
висте его ангулы тьлы бо
отовратится сильы ль дъ-
ствуете бо чудеся много
ваша имена и больша даро-
вания молите о спасении
dуше наших.
Что вас нареклием святин
хировими яко на вас по-
чило есте христосо сера-
фьым ли яко непрестанною
прослависте его ангулы тьлы
бо отовратитесь сильы ль дъ-
ети бо чудеся многа
ваша имена и больша даро-
вания молите спасться
doушам нашим.

THE PODOBNY CHANTS OF THE SUPRAŚL IRMOLOGION

Глас 1

A)

Ne-besnykh’chinoR da-va-nie i na zemli cheloveka

B)

Pravehval’nyi mu-chenyi vos ni zemlya pota-ila estе

no ne-boo pri-ta-tovy iOTO ver-zo-sa-sa вам ra-i-skiy

dve-ri i vnutrьb’vo-ше аре-va животна-го наслажда-

tes’ Hrista molite daro-ti du-shamь na-

oshimь

mir i ve-li-ju mi-lostь

THE PODOBNY TEXT AND CHANTS OF SUPRAŚL
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Глас 2
А)

До-ме-е-фра-то-во и гра-дь свя-
тыи проро-ко-мо слава у-кра-си до-
мо во нем-же бо-жес-тв е-н у-же-те-
ся

Б)

Ег-да о-то дре-ва та мертва А-ри-ма-фе-и со-ня-
то ве-сячес-кимо жиз-не из мирно-ю плыва-
ни-це-ю Тя хри-сте об-ви-то и лю-бо-ви-ю под-
ви-зя-ше-ся сер-де-це мо- и у-ста-тъ-ло тво-
е пречи-сто-е о-бла-бы-зати о-ба-че сум-на-ся бо-
яз-ни-ю раду-я-ся во-пя-я-ще-ти слав-
ва че-ло-въ- ко-лю-бе-че тво-е-му смо-трени-
ю

Глас 3

Ве-ли-я кре-ста тво-е-го господи си-
sала во дру-
Версия А

Яко доша в му́чени́цы-го страстоте́рпче гео́р-
гие сошеле́ся де́не́се похва́ли́мо яко
соверши́ тече́ние́ и ве́ру сооблю́е э́си и прия́т от Бого́ ве́нече́ сво́е́́ я по́бды́ е́го-же
мо́ли о́то́ тля́ и́ бд избави́тися ве́рою́ творя́шпи
мо всечестну́ю па́мять́ Тво́ю́

Версия Б

Дал э́си знаме́ніе бо́я́ющимся Тебе́ Госпо́ди крество
tво́й честны́ и́ им же о́бличи́ло э́си нача-

Гласс 4

ет бо́ся на мстье́ и де́вству́ете во́ ми́ре
и по́каза́ о́то ри́барев А́посто́лы и о́то я́зы́
ко му́чени́ки и мола́тес́я о ду́ша́хо
на́ши́ хо
Глас 5

Главы и властей из велы выси на древне...
блаженство темже ти человеколюбное смотрение... славимо Иисус все силы и спасти душам нашим...

Званны и сильше а не о том человеке гег...

dad земная тьма омрачил очи плотности и неврости...

светование тогда же небесными светами облестая Смышление нам свету мрака благоверие явля глаголо мо разумма тем разумь из вен дошаго из тьмы свято Христа Бога нашеего его же моли спасти и просвети ти душа на...
Глас 6

A)

Все упо - ва - ни - е на небесах по - ло - жи - сте сокро - ви - ще не - крало - мо со - бь све - та - я со - кры - ла е - сте туне прия - ста тунеже и да - ди - те бо - ля - ши - мо
и - счеление златы и сре-бра евангел - ски не ста -

ожа - ста челове - ком - же и скотом благо - ды - я -

ні - я по - да - е - те да во всем по - слу - ши - ли бы -

ше Хри - сто - ви со - дер - зно - ве - ни - е - мне молят - ся

о душах на - ших

Тре - ты день воскресел еси Хри - сте из гро - ба яко же есть пли -

са - но со - воскрес - си пра - от - ца на - ше - го тым - же тя

славит род челове - че - скїи и по - ет тво - е воскресе -

ни - ем

Г)

Не - нача - е - ма - я жи - ти - я ра - ди и ув - до ма -

я нрава ра - ди миро - но - сящи прииде ко То - бь во - ли -

ю - ще не - о - то - вер - зи ме - не блю - де - ни - цу
ПОДОБНЫЕ ТЕКСТЫ И ПРИЗЫ СУПРАШЛЯ

Глас 7

Не-кто-му воз-браня-е-ми ес-мы дре-ва жи-во-те-на-го
Глас 8

А)

О пресвятые чудо животворящего слава Тоби.

Б)

Что вы на перечислили ангелы тела в другие силы ли
дѣйствуйте бо чудеса многа ваша имена и больших дарования молите о спасении душе на ших