

## Samohlasen Tone 4 in the Carpatho-Rusyn Prostopînije

The omission by oversight from Bokšaj's *Церковное Простопѣніе въ Мукачевской греко-Католической Епархіи установленое* (1906) of the model samohlasen of Tone 4 would appear unfortunate at first glance. However, the practical disadvantage cannot have amounted to much; a quest for a Rusyn who could not sing this melody, according to the tradition of his or her parish, from memory, would have been fruitless. And in fact the version sung in the cathedral of Užhorod by the cantor of those days and Bokšaj's tradition-bearer, Iosyf Malynyč, was published; only not with the Slavonic text. The chant book was issued also in a Hungarian-language edition, in which this sticheron is printed in its expected place.

Bokšaj's was the only collection of Carpatho-Rusyn chant to attain widespread recognition, and when it became hard to obtain several collections based on it were published. In each of these the lacuna was filled independently, without reference to the Hungarian Bokšaj or to any other Bokšaj spin-off.

The earliest of these offshoots was compiled by Theodore Racyn (Ratsin, Ratsyn), a cantor in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, who in 1925 brought out an expanded edition, adding a number of melodies, notably for the Triodion, from the Irmologion of Ľvôv (thus bearing witness to high standards in observing proper melodies in North America during the period between the two World Wars. Racyn composed the text on the typewriter, put in the notes by hand, and published the expanded Bokšaj himself.

After the Second World War, Slavonic was still the predominant language of services, but knowledge of the Cyrillic alphabet was in decline and increasingly the Latin alphabet was used instead, with Slovak-based orthography. Neither Bokšaj's nor Racyn's edition was easily found, so Andrew Sokol compiled two books of material extracted from Bokšaj, with the text converted to Latin letters: Plain Chant, containing the ordinary of the three liturgies and several other services along with some paraliturgical hymns, was published in 1945, and Basic Chant, containing the eight tones and the ordinaries of Vespers and Mattins, in 1955.

Finally, in postwar Slovakia the Cyrillic alphabet was increasingly superseded by the Latin, here in connection with a government-supported Slovakization of the Rusyn populace. A thoroughly reëdited version of Bokšaj was prepared by Štefan Papp, Romanized, reorganized, and with a number of editorial changes (some of them unfortunate).

Each of these three derivatives of the original Slavonic edition of Bokšaj supplied the missing samohlasen in its own way.

In addition to Bokšaj, there is one other major collection of Prostopînije, that of Ioakim Choma (Khoma), containing the chant of the St Nicholas monastery at Mukačevo. Unlike Bokšaj, this collection is intended to be a supplement to the Irmologion of Ľvôv. It is quite independent of Bokšaj, and of course contains the stichera samohlasnyja, which are sung a bit different in former Kingdom of Hungary (the Irmologion, of course, provides them as sung in Galicia). Choma's collection, printed from hand-drawn stencils on the shapirograph, was published in 1930, but never attained wide circulation, and indeed was probably intended for use only in monasteries. The most recent collection known to me is a booklet prepared by Imrich Marinčák and published in Prešov in 1997. It contains melodies in the Prešov style for the ordinary of the Liturgy, and an abridged osmohlasnik including the samohlasen melodies.

As a result, we have a half-dozen different versions of the samohlasen melodies in print, twice as many as we would have had if the original Slavonic Bokšaj had not omit-

ted it. The cloud has a silver lining. An outstanding contemporary connoisseur of Prostopînije, Fr Stephan Meholick, has expressed regrets that Bokšaj did not include variants of the melodies, as Stevan Mokranjac did in his Serbian *Osmoglasnik* of 1922. One can only agree. In this case, we can supply some variants from the books surveyed above.

To appreciate the variation they exhibit, first to analyze the melody into its constituent phrases. These are the psalm verse preceding the sticheron and five phrases of the sticheron itself, a unique opening phrase, three phrases that repeat in order as needed, and a unique concluding phrase. I shall designate the melody for the preceding verse as V, the unique opening phrase as A, the iterative phrases as B, C, and D, and the concluding phrase as Z. Next let us construct a table to exhibit two chief characteristics of each phrase: the reciting note and the phrase final. Let us identify these both by solfege syllables and by the numerical code devised by the Hungarian musicologists, in which the final of the melody is 1, the next degree above it is 2, and so on; and let us place a colon between them. (Since this melody does not enter the plagal range, we need not here consider the lower octave, designated by Roman numerals.) Let us enter the several sources in chronological order. Note that Slavonic Bokšaj does give the melody for V, and this is reproduced in the three collections based on Bokšaj (although Papp then transcribes the sticheron a third below and has to change the key).

	V	A	B	C	D	Z
Bokšaj	4 (mi): 1 (ti)	1 (ti): 4 (mi)	3(re): 4 (mi)	4 (mi): 2 (do)	4 (mi): 3 (re)	2 (do): 1 (ti)
Racyn	4 (mi): 1 (ti)	1 (ti): 4 (mi)	3 (re): 4 (mi)	4 (mi): 2 (do)	4 (mi): 3 (re)	4 (mi): 1 (ti)
Choma	2 (do): 1 (ti)	1 (ti): 4 (mi)	3 (re): 4 (mi)	4 (mi): 2 (do)	4 (mi): 3 (re)	2 (do): 1 (ti)
Sokol	4 (mi): 1 (ti)	1 (ti): 4 (mi)	3 (re): 4 (mi)	4 (mi): 2 (do)	2 (do): 3 (re)	2 (do): 1 (ti)
Papp	4 (mi): 1 (ti)	2 (do): 4 (mi)	3 (re): 4 (mi)	4 (mi): 2 (do)	4 (mi): 3 (re)	2 (do): 1 (ti)
Marinčák	4 (mi): 1 (ti)	1 (ti): 4 (mi)	3 (re): 4 (mi)	4 (mi): 2 (do)	2 (do): 3 (re)?*	2 (do): 1 (ti)

\*In Marinčák, the last visible note of phrase D is indeed *re*, but it is an eighth-note (quaver) when all other phrases end in quarter-notes (crotchets), and both the flag of the note and the last letter of the underlying syllable of the text are cut off at the end of the line, suggesting that in fact there was a further note, or more likely two of them (in such figures, eighth-notes usually come in pairs and the final should be a quarter-note); the real final was therefore lost because of a printing error. However, no other version has a three- or even two-note figure in this position, so we simply do not know how to reconstruct the staff at this point and can draw no firm conclusions.

Run your eye down a column, and the exceptions to the consensus become obvious: phrase V in Choma, A in Papp, D in Sokol and Marinčák, Z in Racyn. These are not, of course, the only differences; Racyn, for example, often includes in a phrase an initial me-

lodic movement (intonation), while Sokol eschews them. But differences in the features exhibited in the table are probably the most structurally significant. What is their significance? They are clues to the history of the melody. However, to make use of them in this capacity, we would have to set them in a wider comparative context, including the Galician chant, the samohlasen melodies that appear (rarely) in the old irmologia, the Kievan Chant of Russian tradition, and ultimately also the Lesser Znamenny Chant of Russian tradition. I venture to predict that such a comparison would not only give us some account of the history of the melody, but would also suggest that these melodies have a much longer history than is generally believed nowadays.

One more little point to observe: while the rest all give for the model text *Životvor-jáščemu tvojemú krestú* six phrases (ABCDBZ), Choma divides it into seven (ABCDBCZ); he ends a phrase on *voschod*. None of the others does this, and they all agree with one another in phrase division.

