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I.

In the Christian religion, singing is such an integral part of a divine service that until recently the Eastern Rite was not familiar with the spoken liturgical service.

When speaking of church liturgical chant, we must speak of a) the development of the liturgical text and b) the development of the liturgical melodies. We shall begin first with the development of the liturgical text:

The first Christians conducted their divine services with the singing of psalms and spiritual hymns, including from the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. But in time the pious people began to compile spiritual hymns, and these hymns were sung at church services. As they began to collect with them similar but incorrect songs, the Synod of Laodicea (343 AD) issued the following rule: “It is not proper in temples to read songs that are uninspired, or books that are not specified by canon, but just the books of the Old and New Testament, as established by the canons.” (Canon 59) Spiritual songs introduced by the faithful but not sanctioned by the Church were called “songs that are uninspired and unsanctioned by canon”. The reason for this was that the faithful could bring in a song composed by a heretic and thus involuntarily introduce error with its contents. Thus the Church since its very beginning took care for the appropriate content of spiritual hymns. The names of the composers of the spiritual hymns of the first three centuries are unknown to us.

In the fourth century, Christianity became free, but likewise we do not fully know the names of the composers of spiritual hymns. As a singular case we can list St. Basil the Great (†379) and St. John Chrysostom (†407), as formulators of the already existing Divine Liturgy. In later centuries there is already a series of composers of spiritual hymns, as a consequence of whose work are the existing works: the Oktoikh, Mineon, Triodion, and other service books.

Likewise it is known that in the 5th century the Patriarch of Constantinople St. Anatolius (†458) composed many stichiry (although some researchers call this into question), – and St. Romanus the Melodist (Sweet Singer) (†556), who composed many Kondaks.

In the 6th century hymns were compiled by: St. Sabbas (†532), a monk who who lived at the Kidron Valley near Jerusalem, and who is honored as the first compiler of the Mineon. But he had obtained the bases of the Mineon (as orally transmitted) from St. Chariton (who lived in the time of [Emperor] Constantine the Great), St. Euthymius (†473) and St. Tektist (†467), his teachers, – and he systematized them and wrote them as an obligatory liturgical book for his monks.

In the 7th century the Patriarch of Jerusalem, St. Sophronius (†638), augmented the Mineon and composed the Triodion, – and St. Andrew, Archbishop of Crete (†720), composed a series of hymns, chiefly the Canon of Repentance.

In the 8th century, the Mineon was augmented and the Oktoikh composed by St. John of Damascus (†749) and St. Cosmas, monk at Jerusalem and later Bishop of Mayum (†781). Among others, St. Cosmas composed the Canon for the Descent of the Holy Spirit.
In the 9th century, two brothers composed many hymns and Canons: St. Theodore the Studite (†826), Archimandrite of his Monastery, and Joseph (†845), Bishop of Solun. Many ascribe to them also the enlargement of the Triodion. Many hymns were composed, augmenting the Mineon, by St. Theophan, Archbishop of Nicea (†845) and Joseph the Hymn-singer, a monk at Constantinople (†883).

With this ended the creation of liturgical texts, and they have remained unchanged until now.

[The writers of] all the above-mentioned collections of liturgical hymns, among whom is also counted St. John of Damascus, can not in the full sense of the word be referred to as authors of these hymns that are scribed to them. For, just as for example the dogmatic work of St. John of Damascus *De fide Orthodoxa* is a compilation of all that had been said before him about the faith by all the Fathers and Teachers of the Church, the same can be said about the liturgical texts. All the above-mentioned composers of liturgical texts, and St. John of Damascus, benefited greatly from the works of the earlier Fathers of the Church, and the Tropars, Kondaks, and other hymns found in use in the Church.

So much for the texts of our liturgical books.

*And how did the melody of liturgical hymns develop?*

Jesus Christ Himself provided the example of singing prayer, when after the Mystical Supper He and the Apostles “singing, went out to the Mount of Olives”. The Church from the very beginning has introduced chant to the divine services, with the conviction that the human voice is the most perfect instrument to glorify the Creator, and that in singing prayers, the Christian glorifies God with mind and heart together. The principles of the Old Testament also had influence here. In the Old Testament, a place where singing can not be heard is considered dead (Lamentations of Jeremiah, 5:14-15; Jeremiah 7:34 and 25:10). – The Christians sang their divine services in their upper rooms (the highest room in the lodgings, which in the time of Jesus Christ was considered by the Israelites to be for prayer), and in the catacombs. (A catacomb is an underground passage in which the first Christians during the times of persecution conducted their services and buried their dead.)

The melodies for the hymns of the first Christians were of Israelite origin, since the Israelites were the first bearers of Christianity. The first melodies were transferred from the Old Testament synagogue. This was monophonic recitation with an elevated voice at the end of each verse. All faithful sang together, responding to the priest. Later, as Christianity spread among the pagans, they fitted the New Testament prayers to their own native melodies. A similar thing is seen even now in mission territories, for example African liturgical melodies transferred from missionaries are decorated with their own native melodies.

After Constantine the Great proclaimed the freedom of Christianity in 312 AD, the Holy Fathers took care to regularize and perfect liturgical chant and melody, but could not achieve success since at that time there was not an established musical system with which all churches could be guided in common. And so in each separate church region, local melodies were used in divine services. – Already in the 8th century St. John of Damascus (†749) systematized and set the church liturgical chant at its proper height. After regularizing first the the exact text of the services, St. John of Damascus selected, out of the multitude of church chants of that time that
were used in different church regions, only those chants that were considered most suitable for universal church use. Basically, he re-worked and created the so-called “osmohlasnik” (book of eight tomes) [footnote 1], by which the Eastern Church chants even now.

Consequently, in the Eastern Church, in the eight tones are used the general liturgical chant according to [St. John of Damascus's theory, consisting of eight basic melodies for: Tropars, Kondaks, Prokimens, Stichiry, and Canons. Some tones for Prokimens, Stichiry, and Canons even have so-called “samopodobens” [independent melodies]. [St. John of Damascus's theory was sanctified for for the entire Eastern Church. Of course, St. John of Damascus used for his “official” liturgical chant the most widespread and most suitable Greek melodies for divine services.

So much for a brief item on the development of liturgical hymns of the Eastern Rite [footnote 2]

It is necessary to indicate how the first Christians took care for the beauty of church chant. I shall quote three saints.

St. Athanasius, whose memory we celebrate on April 12, said “May church chant be beneficent!”

And the Archbishop of Carthage, the Martyr St. Cyprian (†258), instructs, “And when I gather with my brethren and glorify together with the Divine Archpriest the divine sacrifice, we must keep in mind this comeliness and discipline: not to develop far and wide our prayer in a loud clamor, where the handsomeness which ought to be brought humbly to God becomes presented to God as clamorous verbosity, but God is the hearer not of the voice but of the heart. For it is not necessary to remind people in a shout of what they know in their thoughts.”

And St. John Chrysostom implored “Be accustomed to sing and you will notice the sweetness of speech. For those who sing will be filled with the Holy Spirit.”

II.

The Mukačevo Eparchy, adopting Eastern-Rite Christianity, accepted along with it Eastern liturgical chant. Greek chant, which is the basis of all chants of the Eastern Rite, became also the basis of our liturgical chant.

We have very little material on the history of church liturgical chant in the Mukačevo Eparchy: some chance notations, not conforming with the chant itself, or written casually on various occasions.

The lack of liturgical books for the faithful was the reason for the weak development of church liturgical chant in the eparchy. The churches had just the large books for the Mineon and Oktoikh and Triodion in one, rarely two, copies, which stayed on the kliros and from which the cantor sang. Especially just the cantor himself, since the people mostly did not know how to read. And the faithful, if they helped sing, then just those prayers that they had memorized. In 1750-1752, the Bishop of Mukačevo, Michail Olšavskij, visited every parish in the diocese, and the protocols of his visitations specify the church ritual books of each parish. From this we are convinced that our churches took care that they had the ritual books, but what difficulty they had with taking care of the books can be seen from the fact that the richer churches had the Mineon and Triodion, but here and there the church books were written by hand. [footnote 4] There were no printed books. On the old books we come across such notes as: “He who has ears, let him
hear; and he knows how to write, recopy this book.” But not just cantor's books; we also had handwritten Gospels, which include for example such as the one preserved until now in Koločava-Negrovec in the Maramoroš region. It was not just difficult to obtain church books, but they were also expensive. Thus, marginal notes on our church books [footnote 3] say that one church book cost the price of one cow. For example, for the Epistle book in Stričava, previously Bereznyj, a cow and 12 measures of cloth were given in 1654. – for the Festal Triodion in Dubovoje in the Maramoroš region 12 sheep were paid in 1743. And in vain was it written on the books purchased for this church: “Whoever would take away by any manner the holy things from the church in Benjatina, let him be accursed and condemned as anathema. Maranatha, unto the ages of ages, Amen.” as written on the Liturgikon in Benjatina, Sobrancy region, (written in 1724), but the curses did not help, and there were cases of private stealing of church books.

It is no wonder that with the lack of books, church chant could not develop properly. The faithful were usually just listeners in church. And this is the reason that the faithful mistakenly memorized some texts, not just in liturgical hymns, but also in the daily prayers. Their tradition comes down until now with such errors, since once memorized in error, they are sung in error in the churches until now.

* 

- - - - [page 184]

It is very curious to point out that the faithful mastered the melodies, and especially those who wished to become cantors. Not having liturgical texts, as well from the reason that it was hard to learn and memorize a liturgical text, the faithful assigned helpful secular texts which easily reminded them of the melody of the individual tones. These helpful texts became so distributed that they were written down under the name “Cantor's tones” in hand-written song books. There were many such texts, and each region had its own. For example, I will show the “Cantor's tones” from a hand-written song collection, the so-called, “Prjašev” one from the mid-18th century, that was found in Chust and published by [J.] A. Javorskij in his *Materialy po istorii staroj pesennoj literatury v Podkarpatskoj Rusi*; Materials on the ancient chant literature in Sub-Carpathian Rus’, p. 151.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tone 1.</th>
<th>Tone 2.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why am I not a lady of the house, why am I not a homeowner? For three days I did not have a hut, and did not carry out the trash, -- Get up, husband, don't lie there, Take out the trash!</td>
<td>Do you hear, Ivan, that your wife is singing? Take this rod, so that with it You can drive your wife into a tight corner!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tone 3.</th>
<th>Tone 4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am singing in the third tone, and I love my husband, but only sometimes. My beloved spouse, don't beat me too much, – I swore to this,</td>
<td>I am singing in the fourth tone, and give my wife some shame; It is true that wives know how to break and use superstitions, The priest blesses,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and I will hold to it. but the Devil makes impure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tone 5. (The text is improper, so I am not including it.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tone 6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tone 7.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tone 8.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But, as mentioned above, there are other versions of the “Cantor's tones”. I shall show several verses that I transcribed from an old man who had learned them in the military from worker-soldiers in the Bereznjana region in the Austro-Hungarian era.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tone 4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tone 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tone 6.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tone 8.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* But much care was taken to ensure correctness of the chant in our churches. This was seen from antiquity, as our churches ensured that they had notated Irmologions. The cantor-teacher Ivan Juhasevič was extolled for recopying Irmologions for churches.

Ivan Juhasevič was born 1741 in Šariš, probably in the village of Prikra. From the notes in his manuscripts it is shown that Juhasevič in 1760-70 studied in the Stavropigial College in L'vov and there, together with his cantor training, also studied with some priest the art of copying books. Then he taught at other parishes, finally at Nevickoje near Užgorod, where he died in 1814. – Juhasevič was not a common copier. As seen from his work, he was a master in this. He recopied many song books of spiritual hymns. But the Irmologions are important for us. A hand-written notated Irmologion of Juhasevič from 1795 is preserved (had been in the village of Nevickoje), an Irmologion from 1806, an Irmologion from 1809 (in the church in the village of Kamjonka in Spiš), and an Irmologion from 1811-12 (now in the library of Charles University in Prague under entry XVII, L 16). Dr. Ivan Pan'kevič found in 1946 one Irmologion by Juhasevič from 1778-79 in the library of the Monastery of the Redemptorists in Michalovcy.

Juhasevič had to write many Irmologions for churches. One notation on an Irmologion says that he had written 30 of them [footnote 5], – but on the Irmologion from 1811-12 the number 38 is written, from which one may surmise that by this Juhasevič indicated that this was
the 38th Irmologion he had recopied. Possibly there are other such Irmologions in our churches. On Juhasević's Irmologion from 1809 there is a note that this Irmologion had been copied for the Fol'vark parish (in Spiš) by Petro Kuzmjak, cantor of that same church.

This information already suffices to prove that sufficient care was taken in the Mukačevo Eparchy regarding accuracy of the chant. I add to this, that the cantors were principally cantor-teachers, who had graduated the Preparandia in Uzgorod, and if they were not a cantor-teacher, they had to pass the cantor's examination, which was always very strict. This strictness of the accurate signing was so employed that even olderpriests in our days were corrected by the cantors in singing, if he sang incorrectly, that he [priest] sing it all over again properly, or else he [cantor] sang it correctly himself.

As pertains to the artistic value of singing, this was the weak side of our liturgical chant. The Galician newspaper Zorja Galickaja [Galician Dawn] in 1854 contained an article of its Užgorod correspondent regarding our church singing, as I shall show: [in local Galician dialect]

“... with internal regret and sorrowful heart, I confess that in a number of our many Subcarpathian parishes, our faithful people knew nothing about artistic singing and do not have any concept of melodious singing, and they do not sing together a generous 'Lord have mercy', 'Grant this, o Lord', or 'To Thee, o Lord', but are distracted, not paying attention decently to the divine service; instead of singing and prayer they whisper their announcements, call out many times, and never even quiet down! The singer (honor and nobility to the deserving!) is left alone, like a leper; he himself occupies the entire kliros and buzzes exactly like a wasp, then rushes the words, then drags it out in an extremely measured manner, somehow coarse, foul and absolutely unacceptable, and on the side with a low voice; boredom more than inspiration and enjoyment rules; the sensitivity of the listeners is not prodded and, more than that, is made dull in them; the word is not expressed clearly: such as '...Podi pomiluj!' [instead of 'Hospodi pomiluj']; someone will speak nasally, patter-sing, and jump from the beginning to the very end, and so forth. 'More honorable than the Cherubim and more glorious ... ro-to-to-to ... we magnify' and many times will incite the pious faithful more than he serves to build them up ...” [footnote 6]

For the above reasons, celebration of services with just the cantor singing took place in the Eparchy for centuries.

In 1866 was the beginning of a great change. In that year, the pastor of the church in Velikaja Kopanja, Andrej Popovič (1809-1901), printed a Sbornik [Collection] for the faithful, named the Velikij Sbornik [Great Collection]. This was an excerpt from the Oktoich and Mineon and Triodion, of Matins and Vespers for all Sundays and holydays of the year. The Divine Liturgy was also included. This Sbornik, in slightly supplemented form, has been reprinted even until now for the faithful.

With his printings of the Sbornik, Andrej Popovič also served the cultural and religious elevation of our faithful, and chiefly for the distribution and mastery of the melodies by the faithful, and so that all the faithful could sing with enhanced beauty the divine services in the churches of the Eparchy. Ours is a singing people, and they learned to read from the Sbornik out of their love for singing; – as the Sbornik spread, so too did church singing. The beauty of the
common singing at divine services enraptured both faithful and clergy. The priest and [Carpatho-Russian] writer Aleksandr Mitrak (1837-1913), wrote thus about his impressions, hearing in church for the first time the singing not of just the cantor, but of the people: [original in Russian] “On my return trip from Maramoroš, I satisfied my long-time strong desire – to visit Velikaja Kopanja and see there the fruits of the unprecedented pastoral activity of the local priest, Father Andrej Popovič, who has dedicated his life to the education of his people. -- But I experienced the greatest satisfaction and joy in the church at Matins and Liturgy. I have never seen nor heard anything comparable in the Russian church. Behold this is truly the catholic, conciliar church, a living temple of the Living God, in which, with one mouth and one heart, the most pure and magnificent name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is glorified and praised. –

All the girls and boys came into the church with their Velikij Sbornik, which had been printed by the local priest and 150 copies purchased in his parish. The cantor just started the first word of a hymn, and the entire church picked it up and continued it beautifully, harmoniously and touchingly, for the entire Matins from beginning to end.” (Sv’it [Light], 1867, r. č 16).

And so, since 1866 thanks to the appearance of the Velikij Sbornik, all the faithful in the Mukačevo Eparchy participate in the liturgical hymns in the divine services.

Because before the very implementation of the chant there was in the Mukačevo Eparchy the institution of the custom of universal singing in churches, all sing without division of singers into voice parts, and this type of singing the Eparchy's tradition called “Prostopinije” – “plain chant”.

* 

The beauty and correctness of church liturgical hymns depend to a great degree on the editions of the Sborniks, their arrangement, inspection, script, and so forth. It was stated above how great was the significance of the first Sbornik for the faithful. After the first editions came a series of editions. I have at hand, besides the first one mentioned, 7 copies of various editions of the Sbornik: the Velikij Sbornik issued in 1887 by the Society of St. Basil the Great, edited by I.R., presumably Canon J. Roškovič. Then the 1906 Velikij Sbornik edited by Petr Gebej (later Bishop) and Cathedal cantor Iosif Malinič. This is very attractive, with clear letters and attractive printing. – The 1912 Srednyj Sbornik [Medium Collection] based on the above abridged arrangements by Fathers Andrej Karcub and Ivan Flenko; in 1913, a reprinting of the same Srednyj Sbornik in Hungarian script was unsuccessful, and likewise unsuccessful was a new edition of the Velikij Sbornik in Hungarian script. In 1910 this was reissued by Julij Feldešij. A Sbornik by Andrej Popovič, entitled Cerkovnyj Sbornik [Church Collection], although printed in large letters, was not progress but a step back. I recall two other Prjašev editions of the Sbornik under the name Chvalite Hospoda [Praise the Lord], written in Latin letters in 1937 and 1947. There may be other editions of Sborniks, but I did not research then.

Generally, the issuance of all these Sborniks undoubtedly meant the spread of chant, proof of which is the fact that the Sborniks were quickly sold out – but all the editions had one defect: they were arranged and printed in such a manner that they could not become the reason for elevating the beauty of church singing. Of all of them, the best edited was the Velikij Sbornik of 1887. I will speak of this later, – since it provides an indication that this should be the edition of the Sbornik that would be instrumental in elevating church singing.

In the front of the Sbornik are shown mottos from the Holy Scriptures with explanations
in the vernacular, as shown:

“Sing ye with understanding!” Psalm 46:8.

“In church it is better to say five words with understanding than ten thousand words senselessly…” ([1] Corinthians 14:14 [sic; s/b 14:19])

“O Lord! … grant us the grace or power of the Holy Spirit that we might be made worthy to sing to you…” (Priest’s Prayer 6 of Matins)

On two occasions, the executive committee of the Society of St. Basil the Great met regarding the publication of this Sbornik, as referred to in its Afterward, on January 31 and May 16, 1887, chaired by Canon Ivan Mondok, – and there made the decision in 9 points and 11 subpoints that were all directed toward elevating the beauty of church chant. Let us look at these points:

1. The motto calls us to singing with understanding, and the 9th subpoint explains that “in the interpretation of the Holy Fathers, (it is necessary to) ‘sing with understanding’ for the hearing and understanding of all!”, and point 3 resolves how to achieve this: “let there be denoted with asterisks the places where to pause”.

2. The 9th point repeats the other motto thus: “But because the chief thing is still that the holy Apostle of the nations said in 1 Corinthians 14, “I should rather wish to say say five words with understanding in church, than ten thousand without understanding.”

As stated, the executive committee of the Society of St. Basil the Great which was composed of the highest-ranking priests of the Eparchy, saw the problems in singing: singing rapidly, since our Matins and Vespers are exceedingly long, and the cantors rushed so that they could finish even in an hour and a half, wherein the singing was unintelligible and not suitable for prayer; further, the text of the singing was unintelligible, since there were no stopping points in the text or marks in places where the texts might be intelligibly expressed in the singing. The cantors in their singing paused wherever they wished, or wherever it turned out, so that the text of the singing became unintelligible. The editorial board of the above Sbornik attempted to set this straight, and in the Sbornik within some Irmoses and Podobens were placed asterisks where needed to pause the singing, so that the text would be “understandable”.

Taking care for this Sbornik and that the length not be an obstacle for “understanding the prayer”, and such that for example the Canon for Matins is considered as one indivisible prayer and that texts that are only to be read, not be mixed in between the separate hymns of the Canon (the Ikos, the 4th Sidalen, the Svitilen, the Kondak, etc.)

I will not discuss these questions here, since I deal with them in a separate article in more detail. I will just indicate that the 1887 Sbornik is better than the editions of all others that have been printed until the present. Unfortunately, with all the unavoidable needs it is necessary to remark upon the errors in the publication of the Sborniks, since without them we would never have achieved the beauty, worth, and understandability of the singing; and the priests on the committee of the Society of St. Basil the Great noticed them only after the Sbornik was printed. If only the Society had noticed the defects of church singing in our Eparchy before the printing of their Sbornik, – and had seen the Sbornik as their “Afterword” spoke of it, things would stand otherwise in the church chant of the Mukačevo Eparchy. There is the historical reality that our clergy saw the deficiencies and needs in singing, but the Society of St. Basil the Great dreamed about such a Sbornik, and in conclusion called for the following: “it would be desirable that if those ‘took up the key of understanding’ were to compile and publish such a publication as soon as possible.”

And what an irony! After these publications there came out, it seems, at least 10 more
editions of the *Sbornik*, all worse than the reference one, and not one brought the wise committee of the Society to life since the year 1887 – and so there was neither progress nor decline. This “historic” neglect of the good committee had a consequence not just in the current erroneous singing in the Mukačevo Eparchy – but also that J. Malinič – when singing the *Prostopinije* complied badly with the text, often “without understanding”. Canon Ivan Bokšaj transcribed the singing erroneously after him, and thus there appeared in the note transcription of our church melodies a whole series of prayer texts that are sung “without understanding”.

For the sake of completeness, I shall touch upon further points of this important decision of the Committee of the Society of St. Basil the Great. The first and second point is to mention the order of the section of the *Sbornik* and what was taken to be included in it – and then the orthographic notes shall be touched upon, such as: writing one-syllable words without accent, e.g. “se az jesm’” [Behold, I am] instead of “sé áz jesm’”; and “u” in place of “ou”:-- A long-term basis of the decision completely excluded the letter “ъ” [hard sign in Cyrillic] from the text. It is nice to know regarding the letter “ъ”, that “ъ” is not needed for the meaning of words. As Iosif Dobrjanskij (who is honored as the “Founder of Slavonic Philology”) discussed this at the beginning of this [19th] century, and compiled an entire grammar of the Church Slavonic language without “ъ”. Our Ugro-Russian writer Mikhail Lučkaj followed him in this, in his *Slavo-Ruthenica Grammatica* [Slavic-Russian Grammar] and *Cerkovnyja Besidy* [Church Conversations].

And so much space and time were lost with the useless “ъ”, that book printing was 5% more expensive, and “Lingua oneratur litteris et regulis non necessariis” [The language is burdened with unnecessary letters and rules] (Lučkaj). From day to day, books in all scholarly disciplines multiply, in which the “ъ” are no longer written at the ends of words.

III.

Instruction in church chant was by conducted by tradition. Usually priests' sons were cantors. Also, suitable people from among the faithful were trained for cantoring and then went for the cantor test. A cantor-teacher also taught chant in the cantor-training seminary in Užgorod. Only the richest churches had Irmologions, either manuscript or later printed ones from Galicia. Hence it is no wonder that uniformity of chants throughout the entire eparchy could not be maintained.

Bishop Julij Fircak noticed the deficiencies in liturgical chant and resolved to systematize the church chant – and by his efforts there appeared in 1906 the *Cerkovnoje Prostopinije* [Church Plain Chant], the first collection, in notes, of liturgical hymns sung in plain chant.

I shall provide the history of this *Prostopinije* in the words of Dr. Fedor Steško, who inquired of the author himself, Titular Canon Ivan Bokšaj, pastor in Chust, in 1936, and who provided the following in his article on the liturgical chant of Transcarpathia [footnote 7].

“The initiator of the systematization of church chant in Transcarpathia was Bishop of Mukačevo Dr. Julij Fircak [footnote 8], a man of high intelligence and broad vision. Wishing above to to bring the church life of his eparchy into good order, he turned his attention also to church singing. Taking advantage of the fact that in his administration of the diocese the choir director of the Užgorod cathedral was Ivan Bokšaj, a musically-educated man (past student of the Budapest Conservatory), which did not always occur in Transcarpathia, the Bishop entrusted him with gathering and transcribing the local melodies for the entire cycle divine services, so that from these transcriptions he could put together a complete book of liturgical chant, which would
be compulsory for all churches of the Mukačevo Eparchy. Bokšaj worked on this. He transcribed the chants from cantor Iosif Malinič of the Užgorod Cathedral, now deceased (†1910), a man who was not at all well educated in music (he did not know how to read notes and could not sing from notes), but a great master of the local chants and a self-educated good singer. From him Bokšaj transcribed (the transcription took rather long) a complete cycle of church chant with local melodies, from which he composed the Prostopinije.

* 

There arises the first question: Which vicinity of the Mukačevo Eparchy used that chant that J. Malinič sang, and which was transcribed by I. Bokšaj in the Prostopinije? Did Malinič know all chants of the Eparchy, let us say even distant Maramoroš? Did he sing some himself, from his own vicinity, or, knowing the others, did he select from them the most beautiful melodies – is it possible that he was acquainted with Galician cantors (for example in the military), learned a little from them and replaced his own chant with a unique new one? The evidence for this is very sparing. Malinič cantored in the Užgorod region, in the villages, and later in the cathedral church in Užgorod. Nothing more is known. And it is difficult to investigate anything. And so, the official liturgical chant of the Mukačevo Eparchy was the chant of the Užgorod region, which was “bestowed” upon the entire Eparchy, forgetting that the other more separate areas could have melodies more beautiful, more original, and more appropriate to the eastern and national spirit, either entire liturgical songs or sections of them.

As J. Malinič sang, so I. Bokšaj wrote, arranging chiefly only the tones that impressed his ear. Neither Malinič nor Bokšaj knew all church chants of the Mukačevo Eparchy and could not select from them the pure “gold”, the most beautiful melodies. It would be necessary to recognize all the special features of the chants of different regions of the Eparchy in order for it to be possible to say to what extent J. Malinič rendered the melodies accurately and which of his own features he added to them, as our cantors have usually done.

It is already not possible either to capture the pure chant of the Mukačevo Eparchy or a combination of these most beautiful melodies of entire songs or parts of them, from all regions of the Eparchy, and set down a unified chant. There are many reasons: since the publication of the Prostopinije, candidates for teaching, who were predominantly cantoring in churches, as well as seminarians, were taught exactly to the chant of the Prostopinije. Knowledge of the Prostopinije chant was required for all cantors in their cantorial duties. Hence the clergy, teaching staff, and cantors have for more than 60 years disseminated throughout the Mukačevo Eparchy the Prostopinije chant which they learned, and the local features of the the chants are slowly vanishing: old cantors who “preserved” the local melodies have died; finally, such work can not remain in the short term, and time all the more effaces the particularities in the melodies. We must consider the Prostopinije chant as the only and the official chant of the Mukačevo Eparchy.

* 

As concerns the most important deficiencies in the Prostopinije.

At many places in the Prostopinije, the musical marks for “pausing” are badly shown. It
depends on these marks whether the text is sung with understanding or without understanding, and just what to sing. Where J. Malinič understood the text well, there the marks were well positioned in the chant, and an easy text was well sung. But where the text was hard, not understood by him, there J. Malinič for that reason placed incorrectly the “pausing” marks; and this mainly in the Irmoses, so that the sense of the text was greatly changed. A pause in the middle of a sentence, or adding one or two words from the next sentence before a complete stop. J. Malinič sang the text incorrectly, and I. Bokšaj transcribed it incorrectly, since in general he did not look at the text but merely wrote down the melody. Examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where?</th>
<th>Was</th>
<th>Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canon Tone 4, Song 5</td>
<td>“v mir prišel jesi,* svit svjatij obraščaj* iz mračna nevidinija”</td>
<td>“v mir prišel jesi svit svjatij,* obraščaj iz mračna nevidinija”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stichira, Tone 6</td>
<td>“Pobidu imijaj Christe,* juže na ada na krest vozšel jesi,* da ...”</td>
<td>“Pobidu imijaj Christe,* juže na ada* na krest vozšel jesi,* da ...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon, Tone 7, Song 9</td>
<td>“selo Nevm'istimaho* Zizidjetla Tvojeho Tja veličajem ...”</td>
<td>“selo Nevm'istimaho Zizidjetla Tvojeho* Tja veličajem...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon, Tone 8, Song 5</td>
<td>“no obrati mj, i k svitu* zapovidej Tvojich* puti moja napravi ...”</td>
<td>“no obrati mj, i k svitu zapovidej Tvojich* puti moja napravi..”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Thursday</td>
<td>“Večeri Tvojeja tajnija* dnes’, Syne Božij...”</td>
<td>“Večeri Tvojeja tajnija dnes,* Syne Božij...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Monday, “Certoh Tvoj”</td>
<td>“prosviti odijanje duši mojeja* Svitodavče i spasi mja.”</td>
<td>“prosviti odijanje duši mojeja Svitodavče* i spasi mja.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paschal Canon, Song 4</td>
<td>“i paki iz hroba krasnoje* pravdi nam vozsija solnce”</td>
<td>“i paki iz hroba* krasnoje pravdi nam vozsija solnce”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paschal Canon, Song 7</td>
<td>“jedin blahosloven* otcev Boh I preproslavlennaho”</td>
<td>“jedin blahosloven otcev Boh* I preproslavlenn”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paschal Canon, Song 9</td>
<td>“jehože, v'irniji, utverždenije nadeždi* imušče, radujemsja”</td>
<td>“jehože, v'irniji*, utverždenije nadeždi imušče, radujemsja”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon for the Exaltation of the Cross, Song 3</td>
<td>“nyri procvite drevo* kresta, v deržavu i utverždenije”</td>
<td>“nyri procvite drevo kresta*, v deržavu i utverždenije”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Same, Song 9</td>
<td>“Sni'diju dreva, rodu* pribyvša smert'...”</td>
<td>“Sni'diju dreva*, rodu pribyvšaja smert' ...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon for the Protection, Song 9</td>
<td>“bezplotnych umov jestestvo, počitajuščije* svjaščennoje toržesto* Bohomatere”</td>
<td>“bezplotnych umov jestestvo*, počitajuščije svjaščennoje toržesto* Bohomatere”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon for the Nativity of Christ, Song 3</td>
<td>“i v posl'indnaja ot Di'ivy voploščennomu bez's'imeno, Christu Bohu vozopijem”</td>
<td>“i v posl'indnaja ot Di'ivy voploščennomu bez's'imeno*, Christu Bohu vozopijem”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon for the Meeting of the Lord, Song 9</td>
<td>“Otca beznacal'na, Syna* pervorodjaščasja Materiju* neiskusomužno veličajem”</td>
<td>“Otca beznacal'na,* Syna pervorodjaščasja Materiju neiskusomužno* veličajem”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon for the Prophet Elijah</td>
<td>“Uslyšach Hospodi* sluch Tvoj i ubojachsja”</td>
<td>“Uslyšach Hospodi sluch Tvoj* i ubojachsja”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panachida</td>
<td>“So duchi pravednymi* skončavšichsja, dušu raba ...”</td>
<td>“So duchi pravednymi skončavšichsja*, dušu raba ...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burial service</td>
<td>“Svjahty lik obrite istočnik žizni* i dver' rajskeju: da obrjašču i az put pokajanimj,*</td>
<td>“Svjahty lik obrite istočnik žizni* i dver' rajskeju*: da obrjašču i az put pokajanimj*,”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the Canon for the Dormition and other hymns, there are many errors, etc.

In the *Prostopinije*, there are too many differences in accent between text and music. As far as the text itself, in many places the text is erroneously given, or a word or a sentence is missing (for example, in “Da molčit”). The entire text is given to the text of the *Irmos*, which is not appropriate. (e.g. Circumcision, *Irmos* 6), and others.

The *Prostopinije* was supposed to be a selection of pure, original melodies of the *Mukachevo Eparchy*, but J. Malinič brought in foreign melodies (for example, the Cherubic Hymn number 17 in the *Prostopinije* book).

There are also in the *Prostopinije* unsuitable melodies that are not appropriate for church, such as the “Our Father” (the one in which with the words “Our Father” are repeated), and two Cherubic Hymns from the group of funeral hymns.

*Prostopinije* is therefore not without its defects, both in texts and melodies, but in the circumstances and times in which it appeared, there could not have been a better one.

We can just marvel at the colossal memory of J. Malinič – only someone who knows all the *Irmoses* of the *Prostopinije* can understand this. Nowadays even good cantors will not undertake to sing the *Irmoses* of some holydays without notes.

IV.

Another question: the origin of our church chant and its development. If this is the original Transcarpathian church chant and the creativity of the people in the course of a millennium on the basis of a primordial received system, – then how much was it under the influence of the church chants of neighboring peoples of the Eastern rite?

Generally delineating the nature of the church chant of the *Mukachevo Eparchy*, I shall mention a well-known researcher of Byzantine church chant, Professor E. Wellesz of the University of Vienna, who after looking through the *Cerkovnoje Prostopinije* [Church Plain Chant] wrote in his study [footnote 9] that the Transcarpathian church chant is spiritually related to Oriental church chant, proof of which the author would present.

This note of the esteemed Professor is spoken rather generally, and we must look into it in more detail. We can only provide an answer to this on the basis of deductions from the history of the *Mukachevo Eparchy*.

a) Transcarpathia, after receiving Christianity, accepted the Eastern Rite, and with it also the Eastern church chant. The foundation of our church chant is Greek chant, – brought by SS. Cyril and Methodius, – which is at the base of all chants of the Eastern Rite.

b) In the course of centuries, learning the church chant only as transmitted, the cantors and priests endowed with musicianship together with the faithful bestowed upon the foundational Greek chant Transcarpathian features, from which Transcarpathian church chant arose.

c) A positive influence on the church chant of the *Mukachevo Eparchy* was Galicia, with which Transcarpathia had religious and cultural ties. The influence of Galicia was of enormous extent, since the *Prjašev Eparchy* (which until 1818 was a part of the *Mukachevo Eparchy*) changed over time very much due to Galician church chant. “Other chants again recall the chants
of the Galician Church from the L'vov Irmologion, which after all is entirely natural if one keeps in mind the geographical closeness of Transcarpathia with Galicia, the ethnographic kinship of the population of both, and most important, the same religion and same rite of the population of Transcarpathia with the Galician Church.” [footnote 7] – But to Transcarpathia came in great number priests, monks, and cantors from Galicia and even from Volhynia. Let us name just a few families: Bačinskij, Pidhajeckij, Dudinskij, Il'nickij. In 1701, a cantor from the Trans-Dniester region was in Maramoroš, in Zolotarjevo. [footnote 10] – “This closeness certainly evoked living links in church matters between the clergy and population of Transcarpathia and Galicia, and this was able to lead to imbuing the practice of the Transcarpathian church with the Galician church chant.” [footnote 7] It is necessary here to note that, by order of Mukačevo Bishop Andrej Bačinskij (1773-1809), he sent our monks to study the rite at the Kievo-Pecherska Lavra, and Galician notated Irmologions were introduced in our churches. These Irmologions are found in almost all churches of the Mukačevo Eparchy, and before the appearance of the Prostopinije, church chant was taught at the cantor-teacher seminary in Užgorod, so that even these days it is possible to see as the old cantors sing the Irmoses not from the Prostopinije but from the Galician Irmologion. – Finally, Canon I. Bokšaj himself recognized that the singing by Malinić was verified, and corrected as needed, with the Galician Irmologion.

d) Our chant has nothing in common with Bulgarian chant, beyond the fact that they are both Eastern. I have in my hands the Bulgarian plain chant in notes, the newest edition [footnote 11], and have reviewed it thoroughly, – but did not find any similarity. It is the more remarkable that we have “samopodobens” [independent melodies] of the stichiry, the so-called “Bolharskije” [Bulgarian], which would tend to imply that these melodies were taken from Bulgarian chant. In fact, I could not obtain notated Bulgarian funeral text, and I can not provide an opinion as to what extent our “Bolharskije samopodobens”, which are used exclusively by us for funerals, are in fact Bulgarian.

e) According to the testimony of people who have studied theology in Serbia, the divine services of the priests of the Mukačevo Eparchy do not have any similarities with the Serbian (it is understood that does not count Bačka [Carpatho-Russian region of Serbia - Translator], which has priests of the Mukačevo Eparchy).

f) I can not give an opinion regarding Romanian chant, since I could not obtain a Romanian Irmologion. But if one undertook precise research, we can not contrast with ours the Romanian church chant of the Greek Catholic eparchies of Semigorod [Seven Cities area of northwest Romania] since these eparchies were historically part of the Mukačevo Eparchy, and so the church chant of the Semigorod Romanian eparchies is, if not identical to the Mukačevo Eparchy, at least close.

g) Dr. Steško notes that any chants of the Prostopinije, as well as in the Irmoses of the Canons (e.g., Tones 2, 4, 5 (in some places), and 7 (the majority)), recall the chants used in the Russian Church (Irmoses of the Greek “raspev [chant] “ in O. L’vov’s collection). – It is true that the melodies of the Irmoses in the Mukačevo Eparchy had to be from the very original, which I reveal with the precision indicated in history, with which divine services were conducted in the Mukačevo Eparchy. The admixtures of Greek “raspev” used in Russian churches in the Irmoses may be explained thus: a) it is more likely that the Greek “raspev” of the Irmoses was brought from the Russian church to the Mukačevo Eparchy by Konstantin Matezonskij [footnote 12], who was the first choir director of the cathedral church in Užgorod (1830). Since the Irmoses belong to the most difficult chants, the seminarians and cantors trained by Matezonskij mixed them with the chants of the Irmoses of the Mukačevo Eparchy and established the current form...
of Irmoses used, as annotated by Bokšaj.

h) So it is entirely possible that Bokšaj himself took somewhat from the Russian “raspev” and introduced it into the Irmoses of the Mukačevo Eparchy, since he himself recognized that he adjusted Malinič’s chant according to other Irmolajs. This could easily happen since Bokšaj, as choir director of the cathedral choir, had in his hands many different sets of sheet music from Ukrainian and Russian compositions of spiritual music; (the Užgorod cathedral choir sang the Divine Liturgy in the manner of the Ukrainian composer Dmitrij Bortnjanskij and other Ukrainian and Russian composers).

V.

One must present three occurrences from the history of the Mukačevo and Prjašev Eparchies which touch upon our church chant.

1. In 1916 a small booklet was published in Prjašev, 24 pages and 11 x 16 cm, entitled A szentmise (Liturgia) nepenekeibol. The notes were written by Kizak Janos [Ioann Kizak], a priest of the Prjašev Eparchy amd professor of the teaching seminary. The booklet was published with the approval of the Ordinariate. Dr. Seman Istvan [Stefan Seman] published the booklet. Instead of a preface there were explanations in which it was stated that by annotated publications of divine service texts in the Hungarian language, an opportunity has been given so that Greek Catholic students of the gimnazium in Prjašev could sing the Divine Liturgy in Hungarian. Further introductory explanations stated that the Hungarian language was inevitable in prayer and the Liturgy for spiritual growth and the needs of the Greek Catholic intelligentsia. This booklet contained the entire Liturgy in notes with Hungarian text and the songs in Hungarian for Božij Syn dnes'[God's Son today] – Nebo and zemlja [Heaven and earth] – Divnaja novina [Wondrous tidings] – O kto, kto Nikolaja ljubit [Who, oh who, loves St. Nicholas] – Christos V oskrese [Christ is Risen] – Anhel vopijaše [The Angel cried out] – Svitísja, svitisja [Shine, o shine]. The goal of this publication was Magyarization.

2. I read in the Dušpastyr’ [Shepherd of souls] publication of the Mukačevo Eparchy, Volume X, No. 11, for 1930, that there had appeared in print Prostopinije po predaniju inokov Čina sv. Vasilija Velikoho, oblasti Karpatorusskoj, na irmologijni noti spisav o. Joakim Choma, protoigumen ČSVV [Plain Chant according to the tradition of the monks of the Order of St. Basil the Great of the Carpatho-Russian region, with Irmologion notes written by Fr. Joakim Choma, Proto-Igumen of the ČSVV]. This book has 182 pages, format 4, price 120.0 crowns. This book was not distributed in the Eparchy and had no influence on the chant in the Eparchy.

3. In 1948 there appeared in Prjašev the Cerkovnoje Prostopinije [Church Plain Chant], in lithography, to republish Bokšj's Prostopinije. The printing was badly done: illogicality of arrangement, incorrect text, complete uncriticality regarding notes, so where text was missing in Bokšaj, it was missing here, etc.

4. We have learned from our work for printing that a republishing of Prostopinije in Fr. Andrew Sokol's edition has come out in the Pittsburgh Eparchy, with the addition of some spiritual paraliturgical hymns for the needs of the Eparchy.

* 

Finally, I shall provide the reasons for this edition:

1. This book has new local additions which are more suitable for such needs.
2. Some melodies are grouped differently, for better review (for example, all that pertains to the Liturgy is provided in the section entitled “Divine Liturgy”).

3. In many places, the Church Slavonic text has been corrected, and additionally in the first editions there were words, sentences and texts that were missing, while words, sentences and texts that were not suitable were removed. The Church Slavonic accents were fixed.

4. As pertains to notational melody adjustments, there were over 200 such note changes. Although the number is not large, yet the melodies as a result of these changes were modified just with respect to a small number of errors. Only what was unavoidable was changed, so as to avoid new difficulties. No melody was adjusted as such, but just several places in the melody were fixed. Where the text was adjusted, the melody remained primary.

5. Also texts with melodies that were lacking in Bokšaj’s Prostopinije were added, such as the Pričasten [Communion Hymn] “Chvalite Hospoda” [Praise the Lord], in the so-called Maramoroš melody, – The Cherubic Hymn, numbers 15 to 25, – the Great Fast hymn “Pod Tvoju Milošť [Unto thy protection] and the Stichira in Tone 4, “Životvoraščemu Tvojemu Krestu” [To Thy Life-creating Cross], – Prokimen No. 6 for Matins, – In the Lenten Triodion: the Canon “Otkudu načnu plakati” [From whence shall I begin to weep], – Another hymn of Matins of Jerusalem, – Newer divine services (in particular, “Various divine services” section) and so forth.

At the same time as the publication of this Irmologion, we are also publishing all chants of the Irmologion on gramophone records, wishing to this set on the road a stable uplifting of the level of our church chant.

---------------------

1. Likewise, the Gregorian Latin chant has 8 “tones”.
2. St. Gregory the Great (†604) established the church chant of the Latin rite, and this chant is called “Gregorian” for this reason. This chant is the standard chant of the Latin Church. It is monophonic. In addition to this there was also created a choral chant, called polyphony, accompanied by a musical instrument, namely an organ.
3. Dr. Ivan Pan’kevič, “Pokrajni zapiski na pidkarpats'kich cerkovnych knigach, č. II.” [Marginal notations in Sub-Carpathian church books, Part II], Naukovij Zbirnik t-va Prosvita [Scholarly Anthology of the Prosvita Society], Vol. XII (1936).
4. Dr. Vasilij Hadžega, “Dodatki do istorii rusinov i russkich cerkvej” [Notes toward a history of the Rusins and Russian churches], Naukovij Zbirnik t-va Prosvita, Užgorod.
7. Dr. F. Steško, article included, see No. 6.
8. He was Bishop from 1891 to 1912.
Osmoglasnik and Divine Liturgy. Translated from original to western notes by Petr Dinov, Sinoldalno knigoizdatel'stvo [Synod Publishing], Sofia, 1947.
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<td>Juhasevič's <em>Irmologion</em> from 1811-1812, page 16</td>
<td>Juhasevič's <em>Irmologion</em> from 1809, page 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juhasevič's <em>Irmologion</em> from 1811-1812, page 19</td>
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Summary in Slovak

Summary in English
NOTES RELATING TO CHURCH LITURGICAL CHANT

1. The cantor: Parishes are obligated to ensure that their churches have good cantors. Cantors: 
   a) must be of blameless Christian life and behavior, honorable people, and exemplary
      faithful; b) a cantor is obligated to love the church and its chant; c) the cantor is obligated to be
      in possession of a diploma, signifying that he has passed a test before the examination
      commission of the Ordinariate.

2. Requirements for cantor examinations: The candidate shall present to the Ordinariate:
   evidence from his parish regarding point 1), as well as confirmation that the candidate has sung
   for three years as a cantor at the kliros. – He shall be obligated to have a suitable voice. It does
   not appear to be a requirement that he have a voice of extraordinary beauty, but the requirement
   is that he have a voice that is appropriate for singing, and the hearing that is necessary for a
   singer. – To master the church chant as it is introduced in the *Irmologion* and “Duchovnjye
   p’isni” [Spiritual hymns]. At the test: he is to sing the Liturgy of St, Basil the Great, the Liturgy
   of the Presanctified Gifts, Irmoses from the *Irmologion*, and everything else from the *Sbornik*
   or other church books. – From the *Typikon* the following are inquired after: knowledge of all
   services and rites – church books – and know how to avail himself of the *Ustav*.

3. Church chant:
   Each church hymn is at the same time a prayer. Church singing is service to God. In singing,
   God is magnified, God is glorified, God is thanked, and God is beseeched, or in other words: in
   singing we pray. Our faithful love singing, and our rite is, for them, above everything. Strangers
   are delighted by the beauty of our chant. For this it is necessary to ensure that the singing be at a
   worthy level.
   a) Our rite prescribes two kliroses: right and left. If these are not present, it is necessary
      to introduce them.
   b) In church, it is required to sing at a pitch that is accessible for the faithful: not too high
      and not too loud, but a singing tone.
   c) It is compulsory to maintain the arrangement of melodies as provided. – It is not
      possible to sing melodies not introduced in the *Irmologion*. Each new melody must be evaluated
      by the Ordinariate.
   d) Reading the Epistle and the Readings must be done distinctly and correctly, so that
      those listening may understand the reading.
   e) The Creed “I believe” is to be read by one person, then from “And in one holy …”, all
      the faithful may sing. At Otpusts, all the faithful sing the entire Creed.
   f) The pre-Communion prayer “I believe, o Lord, and confess” is spoken by all the
      faithful with the priest.
   g) The course of divine services must be neither too fast nor too slow. Generally, this also
      pertains to the technique of singing: stichiry, sidalens, and jektenijas are sung in a measured but
      lively manner; tropars, kondaks, polijeles, veličanijes, canons, svitilens, and so forth are sung in
      a measured manner; – and hymns in processions, entrances, and so forth are sung in an
      protracted manner. – At a funeral one is not free to rush. – But only the particular moment on the
      holyday will sometimes indicate how one may sing.
   h) For catechists and parish priests, these rules signify that in all schools and in all
      classes, church singing should be a part of each hour of religion.
THE ORDER OF MELODIES AT THE DIVINE LITURGY

Before the Divine Liturgy: “Vošel jesi” [Thou hast entered], – and for variety another spiritual hymn from the hymn book Duchovňi pišňi; and for the Nativity of Christ, carols.

After the Divine Liturgy: spiritual hymns from the references hymn book.


The Cherubic Hymn: on Sunday in the manner as prescribed in the Irmologion. For some of them, the “Podobens” [pattern melodies] are introduced, so that it might be easier to remember the melody for these words. For holydays:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holiday</th>
<th>Č.</th>
<th>Melody</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Prophet Elijah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theophany</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Transfiguration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Hierarchs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dormition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of the Lord</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Beheading of St. John the Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annunciation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Nativity of the Most Holy Mother of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Sunday</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exaltation of the Cross (Lenten melody)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pascha, day I.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Protection of the Most Holy Mother of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pascha, day II.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Archangel Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pascha, day III.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Entrance into the Temple of the MPVM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Martyr George</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>St. Nicholas (melody “O kto, kto”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascension</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Immaculate Conception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descent of the Holy Spirit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nativity of Christ, I: “Božij Syn ...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descent of the Holy Spirit, day II.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nativity of Christ, II: “Divnaja novina ...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred Heart of Jesus</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Nativity of Christ, III: “Nova radost' ...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity of St. John the Baptist</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter and Paul</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Cherubic Hymn during the Great Fast is as specified in the Irmologion and well as numbers 11, 10, 17, and 18.

The “Our Father” on Sundays and holydays: as in the Irmologion, as well as replaced by the Podobens “Nebesnych činov”, “Raduijsja živonosnyj krests”, “Vsechválniji mučenicy”, “O preslavnoho čudese”, the Tropar “Razrušil jesi”, and using the melody of the samohlasnyje stichiry of all tones.

The “Our Father” at a Liturgy for the deceased: using the Podoben for Tone 2, “Jehda ot dreva”; the Bolharskij for Tone 1, “Kaja žitekskaia”, and the Bolharskij for Tone 8, “Plaču i rydaju”.

The “Our Father” during processions: under section 3 of the Podoben for the Bolharskij of Tone 4, “Hd'i jest' mirskoje”.