



THE UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND
AUSTRALIA

Russian Sacred Music of the Late Nineteenth Century: Differences and Similarities of the Moscow and St. Petersburg Schools in Theory and Practice in an Age of Reform.

Nataliia Kornetova

BEd, Voronezh State Pedagogical University

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at

The University of Queensland in 2017

School of Music

Abstract

The history of music in the Russian Orthodox Church is a long and complex one that evolved alongside the cultural, political, and social developments of the church since the Christianisation of ancient Rus¹ in the tenth century. Similar to many aspects of Russian cultural life, church music underwent a development that is now seen not only in the context of changes within the country, but also through foreign influences since the seventeenth century. Following the strongly Western flavour of the work of D. S. Bortnyansky, as composer and church-music authority of the eighteenth century, and the censorship of N. I. Bakhmetev of church music during the 1860s and 70s, possibilities emerged, in a climate of debate, for the revitalisation and reform of Russian church music.

During the mid to later stages of the nineteenth century, church music was also affected by the intellectual climate in which the pros and cons of integration with Western culture were hotly debated. In particular, the reformist agenda settled on composers, inspired by the thinking of S. V. Smolensky, centred in Moscow. From this arose competing ideologies (paralleled in many rivalries between the two capitals) amongst composers grouped, on the one hand, in Moscow (such as S. V. Smolensky, A. D. Kastal'sky, S. I. Taneyev, M. M. Ippolitov-Ivanov, A. T. Grechaninov, and P. G. Chesnokov) and, on the other, St. Petersburg (such as P. I. Tchaikovsky, N. A. Rimsky-Korsakov, and A. A. Arkhangel'sky).

As in any process around reform, the debate about church music at the end of the nineteenth century reveals differences in doctrine and practice. The current thesis contends, through an examination of selected representative works of Russian church music from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (prior to 1917), that the theory-practice gap was more significant than is usually recognised, and, moreover, has this phenomenon is not as well understood as it deserved to be.

Early chapters review the current state of knowledge in the field (chapter 1) and develop a context for understanding the motivations and actions of the reformists (chapter 2), as well as documenting and discussing the specific nature of and problems inherent in the reforms (chapter 3). In chapter 4, a range of representative works of composers from both the Moscow and St. Petersburg schools of late-nineteenth-century Russian sacred music are examined from a range of parameters (textual, textural, intervallic, and compositional) showing that claims about differences are overstated. The conclusion provides a synthesis of the contextual and critical chapters and

¹ This term refers to a federation of East Slavics tribes. Its territory stretched from Baltic Sea to Black Sea and covered territories of current Eastern Europe that includes Belarus, Moldova, Poland, Romania, Slovakia Russia, and Ukraine.

provides explanations for the discrepancy in theory and practice based on a range of causes, from the purely pragmatic to the ideological and the political.

Declaration by author

This thesis is composed of my original work, and contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference has been made in the text. I have clearly stated the contribution by others to jointly-authored works that I have included in my thesis.

I have clearly stated the contribution of others to my thesis as a whole, including statistical assistance, survey design, data analysis, significant technical procedures, professional editorial advice, and any other original research work used or reported in my thesis. The content of my thesis is the result of work I have carried out since the commencement of my research higher degree candidature and does not include a substantial part of work that has been submitted to qualify for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution. I have clearly stated which parts of my thesis, if any, have been submitted to qualify for another award.

I acknowledge that an electronic copy of my thesis must be lodged with the University Library and, subject to the policy and procedures of The University of Queensland, the thesis be made available for research and study in accordance with the Copyright Act 1968 unless a period of embargo has been approved by the Dean of the Graduate School.

I acknowledge that copyright of all material contained in my thesis resides with the copyright holder(s) of that material. Where appropriate I have obtained copyright permission from the copyright holder to reproduce material in this thesis.

Publications during candidature

No publications.

Publications included in this thesis

No publications included.

Contributions by others to the thesis

No contributions by others.

Statement of parts of the thesis submitted to qualify for the award of another degree

None.

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to thank the staff and librarians of the University of Queensland Architecture and Music Library for providing prompt advice on books and periodical literature. I thank Sarah Evans from Research Information Services for continuous assistance with finding books in libraries overseas.

I also thank staff members of the School of Music. I would also like to express appreciation to the School of Music's Research and RHD Administrative Officer, Elizabeth Farrington, for her assistance and support throughout my PhD course.

I would like to express sincere appreciation and thanks to my principal advisor, Dr. Simon Perry, for his tremendous mentoring and encouragement in progress with my research. I express my gratitude to Dr. Perry for insightful comments and advice that helped to widen my research from various perspectives. I would like to thank my associate advisor Dr. Denis Collins for valuable comments, especially on the Russian contrapuntalist S. I. Taneyev.

I am grateful to our friend, Lynne Anderson, for her support along the way. Last but not least, I would like to thank my dear husband for supporting me emotionally throughout writing of this thesis and in my life in general.

Keywords

church music, Russian Orthodox, history and criticism, analysis

Australian and New Zealand Standard Research Classifications (ANZSRC)

ANZSRC code: 190409 Musicology and Ethnomusicology, 100%

Fields of Research (FoR) Classification

FoR code: 1904 Performing Arts and Creative Writing, 100%

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Declaration by author	iv
Publications during candidature	v
Contributions by others to the thesis	vi
Acknowledgements	vii
Keywords	viii
List of Tables	xi
List of Musical Examples	xii
List of Abbreviations	xiv
Note on Translation and Transliteration	1
Introduction	3
Chapter 1—Review of Literature	11
1.1. Russian sacred music: history and historiography	11
1.2. Changes in research directions after 1917	20
1.3. Research of Russian sacred music in the post-Soviet era	26
1.4. Research of Russian sacred music in Western scholarly literature	30
Chapter 2—Preconditions for Reform of Russian Sacred Music in the Later Nineteenth Century	34
2.1. Cultural and political context: The relationship of church and state	34
2.2. Historical overview of Russian church music and nineteenth-century historiographical awareness	38
2.3. Nineteenth-century views on Russian sacred music and the reform agenda	57
Chapter 3—Late-Nineteenth-Century Russian Sacred Music, Composers, and Reforms	62
3.1. Late-nineteenth-century composers of sacred music in the reformist context	62
3.2. Smolensky, Kastal'sky, Taneyev, and Grechaninov	67
3.3. Purported differences between the two Russian schools of sacred music: Evaluating the objectives and claims of the reformist composers	77
Chapter 4—Critical Discussion of Selected Repertoire of the Moscow and St. Petersburg Schools	86
4.1. Critical discussion of selected repertoire of the Moscow school	91
4.1.1. Text setting	94

4.1.2. Intervallic content	98
4.1.3. Use of 7th chords and other dissonances	100
4.1.4. Functional progressions	107
4.1.5. Stability and completeness of musical phrases in the selected compositions of Moscow composers	109
4.1.6. Texture and sonority	117
4.2. Critical discussion of selected repertoire of the St. Petersburg school	122
4.2.1. Text setting	123
4.2.2. Intervallic content	127
4.2.3. Use of 7th chords and other dissonances	130
4.2.4. Stability and completeness of musical phrases in the selected compositions of St. Petersburg composers	133
4.2.5. Texture and sonority	136
4.3. Summary of findings	139
Conclusion	145
Bibliography	156
1. Music	156
2. Literature	159

List of Tables

Table 2.1.	Revised periodisation of Russian sacred music development	41
Table 3.1.	Well-known composers of secular music and less well-known sacred music	63
Table 3.2.	Selection from the group of lesser-known composers of sacred music	65
Table 3.3.	Summary of the objectives and features of the Moscow and St. Petersburg schools	84
Table 4.1.	Summary information for selected pieces of <i>Bozhestvennaya Liturgiya</i>	89
Table 4.2.	Summary information for selected pieces of <i>Vsenoshchnoye Bdeniye</i>	90
Table 4.3.	Summary of comparative analysis of stylistic features relevant to the reformist agenda in the repertoire of the Moscow school	92
Table 4.4.	Yavorsky's categorisation of stable and unstable progressions	112
Table 4.5.	The overall ranges of the settings of <i>Kheruvimskaya pesn'</i>	118
Table 4.6.	The overall ranges of the St. Petersburg compositions	138
Table 4.7.	Summary of the musical features practically implemented in the sacred compositions of the two schools: Moscow and St. Petersburg	139

List of Musical Examples

Ex. 4.1.	Chesnokov, “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda,” mm. 1–3	95
Ex. 4.2.	Kastal'sky, <i>Kheruvimskaya pesn', znamenniy raspev</i> , mm. 71–77 (excerpt of contrapuntal <i>Alliluiya</i> part)	97
Ex. 4.3.	Grechaninov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn',” mm. 79–90 (<i>Alliluiya</i> part)	97
Ex. 4.4.	Ippolitov-Ivanov, “Simvol veri’,” mm. 1–3	100
Ex. 4.5.	Smolensky, “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda” (the concluding strophe)	102
Ex. 4.6.	Grechaninov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn',” mm. 15–17	103
Ex. 4.7.	Chesnokov, “Veruyu,” mm. 51–56	103
Ex. 4.8.	Kastal'sky, <i>Veruyu</i> , no. 3, mm. 65–70	104
Ex. 4.9.	Smolensky, “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda” (the beginning theme)	105
Ex. 4.10.	Grechaninov, “Simvol veri’,” mm. 52–61	106
Ex. 4.11.	Chesnokov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn',” mm. 1–2	107
Ex. 4.12.	Kastal'sky, <i>Sofroniyevskaya Kheruvimskaya pesn'</i> , mm. 1–11	108
Ex. 4.13.	Chesnokov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn',” mm. 8–11	108
Ex. 4.14.	Symmetrical phrases constructed by stable (“+”) and unstable (“-”) moments	110
Ex. 4.15.	Grechaninov, “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda,” mm. 9–16 (unconnected modulation, reduced version)	113
Ex. 4.16.	Grechaninov, “Simvol veri’,” mm. 1–11 (first phrase cadence, reduced version)	114
Ex. 4.17.	Grechaninov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn',” mm. 7–8 (“subdominant” and “dominant” progression, reduced version)	115
Ex. 4.18.	Chesnokov, “Veruyu,” mm. 97–99	116
Ex. 4.19.	Ippolitov-Ivanov, “Simvol veri’,” mm. 20–23 (the second strophe, reduced version)	116
Ex. 4.20.	Kastal'sky, <i>Veruyu</i> , no. 3, mm. 65–70	117
Ex. 4.21.	Grechaninov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn',” mm. 22–24	119
Ex. 4.22.	Chesnokov, “Veruyu,” mm. 9–11 (strophe with soloist)	121

Ex. 4.23.	Rimsky-Korsakov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn’,” no. 5, mm. 1–4	124
Ex. 4.24.	Rimsky-Korsakov, “Tebe Boga khvalim,” mm. 16–19	124
Ex. 4.25.	Tchaikovsky, “Otche nash,” mm. 34–37	125
Ex. 4.26.	Tchaikovsky, “Otche nash,” mm. 47–52	126
Ex. 4.27.	Rimsky-Korsakov, “Dostoyno yest’,” mm. 14–18	126
Ex. 4.28.	Rimsky-Korsakov, “Tebe Boga khvalim” (unmeasured part, after m. 51)	128
Ex. 4.29.	Rimsky-Korsakov, “Tebe Boga khvalim,” mm. 40–43	128
Ex. 4.30.	Rimsky-Korsakov, “Dostoyno yest’,” mm. 1–7	128
Ex. 4.31.	Tchaikovsky, “Kheruvimskaya pesn’,” no. 3, mm. 57–61	129
Ex. 4.32.	Arkhangel'sky, “Veruyu” (the beginning strophe)	130
Ex. 4.33.	Arkhangel'sky, “Milost' mira,” mm. 25–26 and 32–33	131
Ex. 4.34.	Rimsky-Korsakov, “Tebe Boga khvalim,” mm. 35–39	132
Ex. 4.35.	Tchaikovsky, “Dostoyno yest’,” mm. 8–12	132
Ex. 4.36.	Rimsky-Korsakov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn’,” no. 6, mm. 6–8	134
Ex. 4.37.	Tchaikovsky, “Kheruvimskaya pesn’,” no. 3, mm. 5–9	135
Ex. 4.38.	Tchaikovsky, “Otche nash,” mm. 28–33	136

List of Abbreviations

OLTP	<i>Obshchestvo Lyubiteley Tserkovnogo Peniya</i> [The Society for the Friends of Church Singing]
Rdmdm	<i>Russkaya dukhovnaya muzika v dokumentakh i materialakh</i> [Russian Sacred Music in Documents and Materials]
RMS	<i>Russkoye muzikal'noye obshchestvo</i> [Russian Musical Society]

Note on Translation and Transliteration

All translations from Russian into English throughout the text are my own, except where indicated otherwise. For transliteration from the Cyrillic alphabet to the Roman, I have adopted the system developed for use in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 2nd ed. (now used in *Grove Music Online*). This system adapts a number of languages using Cyrillic script; the table below provides equivalences that are relevant to Russian.

Cyrillic	Roman	Cyrillic	Roman	Cyrillic	Roman
а	a	к	k	х	kh
б	b	л	l	ц	ts
в	v	м	m	ч	ch
г	g	н	n	ш	sh
д	d	о	o	щ	shch
е	e/ye	п	p	ъ	"
ё	yo	р	r	ы	ı
ж	zh	с	s	ь	'
з	z	т	t	э	è
и	i	у	u	ю	yu
й	y	ф	f	я	ya

The following variations apply to this table: (1) Cyrillic “e” is rendered “ye” after the “soft” (ь) and “hard” (Ъ) signs, after vowels, and as the initial letter of a word, otherwise “e” is used; (2) the common Russian form of surname with the masculine nominative adjectival “ий” is transliterated “y” rather than “iy”.

Some commonly used names in English writing are retained in their more familiar, rather than literally transliterated, versions, for instance: “Araja,” “Jurgenson,” “Tchaikovsky,” and “Rachmaninoff.” This does not apply where these names appear in direct quotations or titles, or where they are given as rendered in the original source. Names of Russian cities are provided according to Chicago style. The city of St. Petersburg changed its name several times during the twentieth century, becoming Petrograd during the period 1914–1924, then Leningrad until 1992, whereupon its name reverted to St. Petersburg. Its original name is generally used throughout the text of this thesis with an exception for bibliographical information, which is maintained in its original form.

For texts using the pre-Reform (1918) spelling, I have rendered these in the modern spelling where they appear in transliteration for purposes of consistency and in line with the majority of modern practice. References, however, to Church Slavonic (such as titles of musical works that may be given in Church Slavonic rather than in Russian) retain the Church-Slavonic spellings, which may align to pre-reform spelling.

Most dates in the text are given simply according to year; in cases where specific dates are mentioned, they are given according to “New Style” Gregorian calendar, unless indicated otherwise by the abbreviation “O. S.” (“Old Style”). As a general rule, the practice adopted with regard to terms in Russian that are quite specific to the topic at hand has been to provide the Russian term in transliteration followed by translation in parentheses. While this provides generally good readability, in some sections, especially with frequent repetition of more technical terms, the opposite practice has been adopted, as it lends itself to more fluid reading in those passages.

Introduction

This thesis considers Russian sacred music of the late nineteenth century, a time of significant appeal for reform in this music. Put simply, there are significant inconsistencies between the theoretical requirements of the reformist program and the extent and nature of its practical implementation. Intimately connected to the reform program is the much-vaunted difference between Russia's two main "schools" of sacred music—those of Moscow and St. Petersburg. The reform agenda called for a restoration of the Old-Russian¹ singing heritage and this movement took on a Moscow-based, nationalist cast, which was symptomatic of larger cultural movements of the time. This resulted in inevitable comparisons arising between the two schools, given the Imperial capital's association with Western cultural importation and pastiche. Through a consideration in the following pages of the extent to which and reasons why such differences might have been overstated, a much messier picture of the situation regarding all aspects of the reform movement is revealed. It emerges that, within the framework of calls for reform aligned with a nationalist cultural agenda, there are a number of contradictions and complications far more nuanced than has hitherto been understood. Disentangling these contradictions and complications helps to answer key questions about the situation of Russian church music during this reform period, and also prompts a consideration of problems and lacunae in the current discourse on this topic.

In order to address the issues described above, a number of preliminary considerations are required. For instance: what were the historical and historiographical factors that encouraged and shaped the reformist ambitions? What led to the evident discrepancies between the aspirations, their practical implementation, and therefore, the incompleteness of the reforms? How are these discrepancies best explained in light of the nature of the reform program and its interactions with other contextual factors? Is it reasonable to differentiate between two schools of sacred music in Russia at the end of the nineteenth century?

To address these issues, the work presented here examines political, ideological, and practical circumstances surrounding the reforms in late-nineteenth-century Russian church music. It evaluates the differences and similarities, both asserted and evidenced in the repertoire, of the two schools of sacred music and places these in the context of the reformist ideals of the period. The ensuing discussion underlines the complexities of these ideals and interrogates the relational difficulties between them and their practical implementation. In so doing, it picks up themes in

¹ Usually, this refers to Russian pre-Nikonian sacred chants.

recent scholarship² and considers how features of foreign culture in late-nineteenth-century Russian sacred music came to be assimilated, working toward the broader project of deconstructing nationalist mythology around “pure Russianness”—in this case specifically in Russian sacred music of the late nineteenth century.

In following this agenda, this thesis aims to fill gaps in current knowledge of music and musical life in the Russian church tradition. These gaps lie in a number of areas. Until comparatively recently, musicological studies that considered Russian sacred music of the period in the decades before the Revolution of 1917 show various limitations and preconceptions. To an extent these were already embedded in the cultural aspects of the reform agenda already outlined above, especially in light of promotions of the Moscow school as a national leader in the application of the reformist ideals. Much of the scholarly literature also makes, as is shown in chapter 3, relatively clear-cut distinctions between the two schools of sacred music according to differences in their compositional approach and stylistic features, evidently ignoring or avoiding some of the obvious similarities between and differences within these schools (as is demonstrated in chapter 4). What such studies have not fully investigated yet in the area of Russian sacred music in the late nineteenth century is the degree of Westernisation of the repertoire and the inner conflicts (whether theoretical or ideological) that led to the inconsistencies outlined above.

In the twentieth century, limitations in research were determined by political and cultural restraints inside the country, while outside the country, scholars could only find censored and limited access to research materials. Therefore, the work of a number of scholars who have studied Russian folk culture, Old-church music, and secular music demonstrates a selective approach, favouring secular and folk genres as a general rule over the sacred traditions, especially those of the late nineteenth century. This includes the work of scholars as diverse as B. V. Asaf'yev, Malcolm Hamrick Brown, Margarita Mazo, I. I. Zemtsovsky, N. F. Findeizen, O. A. Pashina, Vadim Prokhorov, É. S. Smirnova, L. A. Rapatskaya, and others. The work of the final author on this list³ serves as a useful example of a contemporary textbook, which synthesises standard existing Russian scholarly views. Additionally, the scattered disciplinary and chronological range of these authors is itself testimony to the rather *ad hoc* treatment this topic has received in comparison to other areas.

² Marina Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism: From Glinka to Stalin* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007); Marina Ritzarev, *Eighteenth-Century Russian Music* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006); Richard Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically: Historical and Hermeneutical Essays* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997); V. I. Mart'nov, *Istoriya bogoslužebnogo peniya: Uchebnoye posobiye* [History of Liturgical Singing: Schoolbook] (Moscow: RIO Federal'nikh arkhivov; Russkiye ogni, 1994); *Russkaya dukhovnaya muzika v dokumentakh i materialakh* [Russian Sacred Music in Documents and Materials. Abbr: Rdmdm], 7 vols. (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turī, 2002–2010).

³ L. A. Rapatskaya, *Istoriya russkoy muziki: Ot drevney Rusi do serebryannogo veka* [The History of Russian Music: From Old Russia to the Silver Age] (Moscow: Gumanitarniy izdatel'skiy tsentr VLADOS, 2001).

Objective scholarly activity faced significant impediments during the twentieth century, which led to something of an “information vacuum.” Consequently, these limitations stimulated a growth of partially complete research—deliberate or inadvertent—and led to the ossification of accepted views and facts that needed and, to a significant extent still need, a broad and systematic revision. As recently as 2006, Marina Ritzarev asserted that studies of Russian musical culture “generally lacked a broad approach” and found that the interdependence of genres and earlier traditions had not been classified.⁴ The generations of Western scholars who studied Russian music, such as Christopher de Bellaigue and Rosa Newmarch, Michel-Dimitri Calvocoressi and Montagu Montagu-Nathan, Gerald Abraham, up to scholars of the present, such as Richard Taruskin and Marina Frolova-Walker, have worked mainly on secular music. Taruskin and Frolova-Walker also discuss at length an array of influences on Russian music that resulted in a splicing of foreign and Russian idioms. This evidence of “foreignness” in Russian secular music served as a stimulus for consideration in the present work of similar issues in sacred music traditions.

The approaches adopted in this thesis include: historiographically informed study of scholarly literature; contextualisation of the impact of reformist thinkers and composers around the reforms; critical and comparative consideration of the sacred music with a comprehensive summary according to the proposed reformist frame. Consequently, settings of a number of composers are examined in detail, and a selection of musical features is considered in the light of the reforms. The sacred compositions of the selected composers are grouped according to the school under which they are usually categorised. The discussion is conducted through investigation of various categories such as textual and textural presentation, intervallic content, use and treatment of dissonance, stability and completeness of musical phrases, as well as specific compositional devices that are used in the music, and how these qualities may or may not correlate to theoretical ideals. This qualitative examination problematises the alleged differences and similarities between schools, questions simple notions of “Russianness” in the music, and broadens knowledge on the sacred music in both major centres.

The thesis is divided into four chapters. The first provides a review of literature and musicological activity on the broad topic area since the eighteenth century. It considers extant literature on the topic, both Russian and Western (largely Anglophone) and examines aspects of the intellectual development of knowledge in the field. The chapter takes into account various preconceptions and biases that have arisen over more than a century of complex political and cultural change. In the twentieth century, a somewhat unilateral approach to the study of Russian music was typical for both Russian and Western scholars. The domination of the secular and folk

⁴ Ritzarev, *Eighteenth-Century Russian Music*, 8.

genres over sacred music in scholarly literature of the twentieth century was grounded on the approach that had been taken due to the proletarian policies and anti-clerical campaigns of the Soviet government, launched from the 1920s onwards. Following the events after the Revolution of 1917—ideological purges, persecutions, and exiles—the country acquired a new doctrine: “irreligious proletarian collectivism.”⁵ The dictates of this campaign directed authors, artists, musicians, and intellectuals away from the works and thinking of the Tsarist era. The research into church music was framed according to these dictates, which resulted in biased scholarly preferences.

The consequent refocusing of the research in the twentieth century was due to compliance with secular themes in art, which led to the neglect of church music and favouring of secular genres and proletarian themes for scholarly activity. Under these conditions, the works of the nationalist composers, especially those who used Russian folklore idioms in various ways, were generously promoted, supported and, therefore, studied. During the period from the 1920s to 1980s those genres that were based on secular topics were generally deemed ideologically the most appropriate to examine. Opera as a genre, according to the Soviet doctrines, came to be understood as a national musical tradition. Moreover, Soviet ideologists maintained that the genre of Russian opera developed without Western influence and the Stalinist ideological machine continued the presentation of opera as nationalistic genre that had escaped Western stimulus.⁶ This gave an acceptable basis for discussions within the bounds of Soviet ideology,⁷ while almost no sacred music or scholarly consideration of sacred repertoire was produced owing to the greater difficulty, presumably, of subsuming the subject matter under the necessary ideological framework.

This situation has begun to change significantly in the recent past, especially since 1990s, when the climate of freedom gained pace. The relative independence of the print sector along with an increased accessibility of archival materials began only after 1991. Ten years later, dissertations on theological subjects began to appear. Now, as library sources and bibliographical works (such as the *Pravoslavnaya Éntsiklopediya* [Orthodox Encyclopaedia]⁸ and I. Ye. Lozovaya et al.⁹) have become available for study, the lacunae in Russian church music are starting to be removed.

⁵ A. N. Yakovlev, *Sumerki* [Twilight], 2nd ed., enl. (Moscow: Materik, 2005), 195–200.

⁶ Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 76.

⁷ Ritzarev, *Eighteenth-Century Russian Music*, 4–5.

⁸ *Pravoslavnaya Éntsiklopediya* [Orthodox Encyclopaedia], 45 vols., ed. Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia. Tserkovno-nauchnĭy tsentr Pravoslavnaya Éntsiklopediya, 2000–. <http://www.pravenc.ru/vol.dop.html>. *Pravoslavnaya Éntsiklopediya* is an on-going series that currently consists of forty-five volumes with thirty-nine volumes available online; it continues to be updated. The first volume was published in 2000. The *Pravoslavnaya Éntsiklopediya* is an extensive work that covers a wide range of scholarly articles and bibliographical information on

Chapter 2 provides a necessary overview of the development of church music in Russia until the period under consideration. The study of Russian sacred-music traditions is no less significant than the study of Russian secular or folk music, as it is a “litmus test” for cultural interactions. While the examination of the origins of Russian sacred music is not the cornerstone of this research, it assists in understanding of Russian sacred music as a purported exemplar of national identity. Before the appearance of professional secular music in eighteenth-century Russia, folk song and church music formed the dominant realms of the nation’s musical self-expression. These realms developed and survived over hundreds of years, and they doubtless did so in close relationship with each other.¹⁰ The vast territories and varied nationalities of the expanding Russian Empire also contributed to such development, bringing in a great variety of external and internal influences and fusions. The fact that a folk song could exist in numerous variations was widely accepted, as recognised by the researcher and folklorist V. P. Prokunin (1848–1910).¹¹ The same characteristics could be found in sacred music, and variable settings of church chants were a commonplace in most sacred genres.¹²

The scholarly focus on the national features of Russian music obscured the existing controversy between the theoretical ideas expressed by the scholars of the late-nineteenth century reformist agenda, and the sacred music of the same period. Therefore, chapter 2 also considers the historical, cultural, and theological preconditions for the reformists’ activity at the end of the nineteenth century. The contextualisation of the reform movements facilitates the understanding of emergent inconsistencies between ideals and practices. Differences between dogma and reality have been a feature of many spheres of human life and activity throughout history, often leading to conflict and varying degrees of coercion. In the realm of the arts and organised religion, aesthetic proclivities and tastes have often unavoidably sparked conflict with prevailing theological concerns in many different domains over centuries. These conflicts were often stimulated by differing, or even polar, understandings of theological principles (different interpretations of biblical texts being

sacred music of both Russian and foreign denominations. The publication is a comprehensive source of sacred nomenclature.

⁹ I. Ye. Lozovaya et al., *Russkoye tserkovnoye peniye XI–XX vv.: Issledovaniya, publikatsii 1917–1999. Bibliograficheskiy ukazatel’* [Russian Church Chant of the Eleventh–Twentieth Centuries: Studies and Publications 1917–1999. Bibliographical Index], vol. 2 (Moscow University Press, 2001).

¹⁰ Rapatskaya, *Istoriya russkoy muziki*, 9, 12.

¹¹ I. A. Istomin, *Melodiko-garmonicheskoye stroeniye russkoy narodnoy pesni* [Melodic-Harmonic Structure of Russian Folk Song] (Moscow: Sovetskiy Kompozitor, 1985), 19.

¹² Vladimir Morosan, ed., *One Thousand Years of Russian Church Music: 988–1988* (Washington, D.C.: Musica Russica, 1991), xxviii; also see N. P. Strakhova, *Russkaya kul’tura 10–17 vekov* [Russian Culture of the Tenth–Seventeenth Centuries] (Volgograd: VolGu, 2001), 147.

among them), in which prominent individuals played significant roles—these matters are also discussed in the chapter 2. Such conflicts were not exclusive to Russia. For instance, the doctrine of Congregational thinkers opposed any higher interference in the congregation's proclivities¹³; Martin Luther believed in atonement of sin by faith alone and questioned the practice of granting indulgences.¹⁴ The reforms of Russian Orthodoxy¹⁵ that occurred in the seventeenth century and encompassed, for example, the reconsideration of the rituals and church practice (the introduction of the three-finger sign of the cross instead of two-, the direction of the procession, etc.) were symptomatic of an increasingly politicised Orthodox Church and, consequently, led to a major schism. Events such as these that had a prescriptive character inevitably caused friction between ideologically driven impulses and a more conservative reality, and this often meant retention (sometimes overt, sometimes covert) of the old practices with a slower adoption of new practices, and often a corruption of the two.

Chapter 3 outlines various theoretical views of prominent composers and thinkers of the reformist period and contextualises the activity of composers in the reformist era. While it studies scholarly opinion on the reform principles, it also summarises perceived differences between the two Russian schools of sacred music—Moscow and St. Petersburg—in the second half of the nineteenth century. Factors around the study of Russian music alluded to above diverted scholarly attention from a number of composers of sacred music, whose activity increased in the later nineteenth century. Therefore, this chapter also attends to the composers of sacred music whose compositions were subsequently obscured. Authoritative opinions of the sympathisers of the nineteenth-century reforms suggested various strategies in realisation of the reformers' aspirations—from textual and textural uniformity to compositional methods. However, the broadness and inconsistency of the prescriptions in reality resulted in the multitude of features that contradict the reformist agenda. These issues are considered in the chapter 4 as well as being discussed in the conclusion.

The investigation of Western influences on Russian sacred music in the late nineteenth century is necessary, bearing in mind that such features are confirmed in secular music of the same period. Therefore, chapter 4 focuses on a detailed discussion of sacred compositions of Moscow and

¹³ Nicholas Temperley, "Congregational Church, Music of the," *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed June 24, 2017, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/subscriber/article/grove/music/48105>.

¹⁴ Robin A. Leaver, "Luther, Martin," *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed June 24, 2017, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/subscriber/article/grove/music/17219>.

¹⁵ I. A. Gardner, *Bogoslužebnoye peniye russkoy pravoslavnoy tserkvi* [Church Singing in Russian Orthodox Church] (Jordanville, N.Y.: Holy Trinity Monastery, 1982), 2: 36–37.

St. Petersburg schools. The composers of the Moscow school considered in the first section of this chapter are S. V. Smolensky (1848–1909), A. D. Kastal'sky (1856–1926), S. I. Taneyev (1856–1915), M. M. Ippolitov-Ivanov (1859–1935), A. T. Grechaninov (1864–1956), and P. G. Chesnokov (1877–1944). Their sacred compositions are studied in light of the practical implementation of the reformist views that were claimed to differentiate Muscovite sacred repertoire from that of St. Petersburg. This section also considers the extent to which composers managed to apply the stylistic changes required by the reform agenda in their sacred compositions. The second section of this chapter, retaining categories discussed in the first section, investigates representative sacred compositions of St. Petersburg composers such as P. I. Tchaikovsky (1840–1893), N. A. Rimsky-Korsakov (1844–1908), and A. A. Arkhangel'sky (1846–1924). The two sections facilitate the understanding of differences and similarities between the two Russian schools of sacred music, and these are summarised in the final section of chapter 4.

Russian sacred music has witnessed numerous conflicts of musical realisation, aesthetics and doctrines. In particular, there has been a significant number of examples of conflict arising from the injection of certain secular music elements into church-music styles or practices in Russia. As examples, we might include the introduction of five-line, Western staff notation and polyphony into Russian sacred music around the time of the Nikonian reforms in the mid-seventeenth century. The history of music discloses many attempts by composers of sacred music to legitimise the use of familiar secular musical elements in compositions for church. This is clearly seen in Russian sacred music of the nineteenth century, when the composers had to navigate between the aspirations of the reformists and the tastes of the church-going public.¹⁶

The conclusion, therefore, provides an assessment of what motivated the developments and findings described in the thesis. It suggests possible reasons for the incompleteness of nineteenth-century reforms, as shown in the various inconsistencies in theory, practice, and ideology shown throughout the earlier chapters. The conclusion discusses confrontations and compromises between artistic expression, politics, and religious ideology and it reveals that idealistic, nationalist aspirations, inconsistency of reformatory recommendations, and disconnectedness of the reform agenda from everyday church-music practice contributed to the incompleteness of the reforms. It finds that the reformatory process was more akin to an ideological program that tacitly acknowledged assimilated Western features that became associated with true Russianness. The discussion of the possible reasons behind the inconsistency that are identified in this thesis helps to investigate whether the “purification” of Russian sacred music at the end of the nineteenth century was achieved (or even possible). The consideration of the sacred music of Moscow and St.

¹⁶ Outside Russia, the most famous example of this is probably the efforts of reconciliation of the doctrinal demands for textual clarity with aesthetic preferences for elaborate polyphony in the music of Palestrina.

Petersburg composers in the terms of the reformist agenda contributes to the understanding of the broader situation around these two schools and the wider claims about “Russianness.”

Chapter 1

Review of Literature

1.1. Russian sacred music: history and historiography

Sacred music has played a focal role in formation of national identity in Russia since the adoption of Christianity. While there have been many significant milestones in the development of Russian sacred music practice, systematic research into Russian sacred music did not arise in Russia until the turn of the nineteenth century. Since the 1800s, Russian sacred music became a frequent subject of research and formed the focus for much critical discussion amongst musicologists, composers and critics. This chapter provides an overview of the development of Russian research in church music and considers the evolution of various points of view on the topic. It offers an account of the many challenges that this field of study has faced over many decades, including the militant secularisation of the Soviet period. It also considers Western scholarly contributions to the research in this field.

One of the first major figures to contribute to the historiography of Russian sacred music was the Kievan Metropolitan Yevgeny (1767–1837). A historian, bibliographer, and archaeologist, Yevgeny (Ye. A. Bolkhovitinov prior to accepting the metropolitanate) wrote numerous works on liturgical aspects of the Russian sacred service and several on sacred music in particular. With the availability of the *Pravoslavnaya Éntsiklopediya*¹ it is now possible to acknowledge the whole range of Yevgeny's works both published and unpublished.² His major contributions to research focused on church history and studies of regional developments. He did not write extensively on musical aspects of the Orthodox liturgy; nonetheless, Yevgeny's archival research and discussion of Old-Russian sacred singing³ remains of interest to the researcher of the sacred music. According to I. A. Gardner, Yevgeny was the first figure in the historiography of the Russian church to acknowledge the importance of the history of Russian sacred music as a subject of study.⁴

¹ See intro., n. 8.

² *Pravoslavnaya Éntsiklopediya*, 17: 63–68.

³ Ye. A. Bolkhovitinov, *Istoricheskoye rassuzhdeniye voobshche o drevnem khristianskom bogoslužebnom penii i osobenno o penii Rossiyskoy tserkvi* [Historic General Discourse on Old Christian Liturgical Singing and in Particular on the Singing of Russian Church] (St. Peterburg, 1804).

⁴ I. A. Gardner, *Bogoslužebnoye peniye russkoy pravoslavnoy tserkvi* [Church Singing in Russian Orthodox Church] (Jordanville, N.Y.: Holy Trinity Monastery, 1978), 1: 36.

V. I. Martīnov claims that, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, Yevgeny was the first to affirm an inappropriateness of the concerto style in Russian sacred music.⁵

While Alfred J. Swan stated that the intensive research of Russian history could be dated to the end of the nineteenth century,⁶ it is evident that the impetus to the specific study of Russian sacred music introduced by Yevgeny led to a systematic approach a generation later in the extensive work of Archpriest D. V. Razumovsky (1818–1889). He was the first substantial historian in the field of church music, an initiator of studies of Russian sacred music history, and the first professor of Russian sacred music at the Moscow Conservatory.⁷ Razumovsky's *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii. Opit istoriko-tekhnicheskogo izlozheniya* [Church Singing in Russia. Experiment in Historical-Technical Exposition]⁸ represents the first thorough study of Russian sacred music, including investigations of Greek modal influences on Russian sacred music as well as the study of church modes. S. S. Skrebkov, a musicologist of the twentieth century, emphasised the significance of Razumovsky's findings on the eight modes and his understanding of the melodic relationship between and within *glasi* [patterns in modes],⁹ which proved, according to Skrebkov, the “narrowness of the melodic component” in the *znamenniy raspev* [sign-notated system of monophonic melody].¹⁰ Vladimir Morosan affirms that Razumovsky's *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii* was the first of its kind in the history of Russian sacred music.¹¹ Razumovsky's work stands as a summation of the understanding at that time of the fundamentals of Russian sacred music, including technical-melodic characteristics of early Christian chants, their structure, and the evolutionary

⁵ Martīnov, *Istoriya bogosluzhebnoy peniya*, 101 (see intro., n. 2).

⁶ Alfred J. Swan, “Harmonization of the Old Russian chants,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 2, no. 2 (1949): 83.

⁷ M. V. Brazhnikov, “Pevcheskiye rukopisi sobraniya D. V. Razumovskogo i V. F. Odoyevskogo” [Compilations of Singing Manuscripts of D. V. Razumovsky and V. F. Odoyevsky], in *Sobraniya D. V. Razumovskogo i V. F. Odoyevskogo. Arkhiv D. V. Razumovskogo* [Collections of Manuscripts of D. V. Razumovsky and V. F. Odoyevsky. Archive of D. V. Razumovsky], ed. I. M. Kudryavtsev (Moscow: Biblioteki imeni V. I. Lenina, 1960), 6.

⁸ D. V. Razumovsky, *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii. Opit istoriko-tekhnicheskogo izlozheniya* [Church Singing in Russia. Experiment in Historical-Technical Exposition], 3 parts (Moscow: Tipografiya T. Ris, 1867–1869). This book was reprinted in the same years as its original publication. The reprinted version is incomplete and does not include pages of the third part. The reprint also differs by 19–30 pages. Citations in the thesis refer to the complete version.

⁹ The theory that *glasi* are based on combinations of *popevki* [singing patterns] originates with V. M. Metallov in 1900; see Marina Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 284, 297 (see intro., n. 2). Traditionally, in Russian sacred music the notion of *glasi* refer to a set of melodic figures rather than a traditional system of modes. Although Metallov weakened the theory of *glas*, pro-nationalist composers took this a step further and related *popevki* exclusively to folk traditions; see Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 284.

¹⁰ S. S. Skrebkov, *Russkaya khorovaya muzika XVII–nachala XVIII veka. Ocherki*. [Russian Choral Music of the Seventeenth–Beginning of the Eighteenth Century] (Moscow: Muzika, 1969), 18–19.

¹¹ Vladimir Morosan, “Folk and Chant Elements in Musorgsky's Choral Writing,” in *Musorgsky in Memoriam 1881–1981*, ed. Malcolm Hamrick Brown (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1982), 117.

stages of Russian sacred music. The work also provides a prescription for the harmonisation of sacred chant and related difficulties. Yu. K. Arnol'd (1811–1898), whose own work is discussed below, claimed that it was Razumovsky who first properly described the difficult and elusive notion of the *glasī*.¹² And, although Razumovsky devoted a significant portion of his work to the pre-reform era, he also drew attention to the problems that occurred in reform-era harmonisations of Russian sacred chants.

The establishment of this new field of research generated an increasing number of studies by various public figures. For example, N. D. Gorchakov (1788–1848), a Russian poet and translator, wrote a book on Russian vocal music¹³ and an article on part-singing,¹⁴ in which he outlined the historical development of singing in Russia and summarised complications that arose in relation to part-singing practices. V. M. Undol'sky (1816–1864) was a Russian specialist in literature, bibliographical studies, a researcher of manuscripts, and publicist. His work¹⁵ provides an explicit study of the history of Russian sacred music notation from Christianisation to 1700 (a date that marks the end of sign-notation in the mainstream practice of the church).¹⁶

V. F. Odoyevsky (1803–1869), famous for his scholarly contributions on the topic of Russian music¹⁷ and pro-nationalist activity, also played a crucial role in development of *Russkoye muzikal'noye obshchestvo* [Russian Musical Society, henceforth RMS]¹⁸ and the new Conservatory in Moscow. Being a supporter of national aspirations in music, he acted as a liaison between the Moscow department of the *RMS* and its patroness, the Grand Duchess Yelena Pavlovna

¹² Yu. K. Arnol'd, *Garmonizatsiya drevnerusskogo tserkovnogo peniya po ellinskoy i vizantiyskoy teorii i akkusticheskomu analizu* [Harmonisation of Old-Russian Church Singing Using Hellenic and Byzantine Theory and Acoustic Analysis] (Moscow: Razumovsky, 1886), 8.

¹³ N. D. Gorchakov, *Opit vokal'noy i pevcheskoy muziki v Rossii, Ot drevnikh vremyon do nineshnego usovershenstvovaniya sego iskusstva; s lyubopitnimi zamechaniyami ob otlichnikh avtorakh i regentakh vokal'noy muziki, i s dvumya gravirovannimi figurami starinnikh pevcheskikh not* [History of Vocal and Singing Music in Russia, From Ancient Times to the Current Improvement of this Art; With Interesting Comments on Excellent Authors and Conductors of Vocal Music, and with Two Etched Figures of Old Singing Notes] (Moscow: Reshetnikov, 1808).

¹⁴ N. D. Gorchakov, "Ob ustavnom i partesnom tserkovnom penii v Rossii" [On Statutory and Part-Singing in Russia], *Moskvityanin* V, no. 9 (1841): 191–207.

¹⁵ V. M. Undol'sky, *Zamechaniya dlya istorii tserkovnogo penii v Rossii* [Comments on History of Church Singing in Russia] (Moscow: Universitetskaya tipografiya, 1846).

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 18.

¹⁷ Alfred J. Swan, *Russian Music and Its Sources in Chant and Folk-Songs* (London: John Baker, 1973), 73–74.

¹⁸ The *RMS* first appeared in the 1850s and from 1869 became the Imperial Russian Musical Society.

(1807–1873).¹⁹ In his well-established and long-lived literary salon, Odoyevsky assembled some of the most productive minds in various fields, including musical figures from M. I. Glinka (1804–1857) to Tchaikovsky, which enabled much discussion on Russian music. Morosan states that the pro-nationalistic ideas of Odoyevsky and Razumovsky influenced Glinka’s aspiration to travel to Berlin to study counterpoint, in order to acquire the skills necessary to the improvement of Russian music.²⁰ (There is some irony in this in light of later attitudes amongst certain nationalist figures in regards to the establishment of the Conservatory in the 1860s.)

Odoyevsky’s advocacy for national musicians and his dislike of Italian opera resulted in a strong criticism of foreign musicians who visited Russia.²¹ Razumovsky greatly valued Odoyevsky’s study of Russian chants and his advocacy for the purification of Russian sacred music through the revision of extant harmonisations of church chants.²² Being driven by such imperatives, Odoyevsky’s solution to the problem was the use of the four main statute books,²³ which he believed contained genuine exemplars of Russian sacred chants.²⁴ Odoyevsky’s review and acknowledgement of N. M. Potulov’s (1810–1873) sacred compositions reflected his own personal understanding of what constituted proper sacred harmonisations. These were to be simply harmonised Synodal chants, without vocal ornament, extremes of tessitura or distorted pronunciation of the liturgical text.²⁵

In 1842, on the advice of Odoyevsky, Arnol’d—whose long career embraced music theory, criticism, composition, and pedagogy—commenced his own studies towards the establishment of a

¹⁹ M. P. Rakhmanova, ed., *Knyaz' Vladimir Odoyevsky. Dnevnik, Perepiska, Materiali (k 200-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya)* [Prince Vladimir Odoyevsky. Diary, Correspondence, Materials (on the 200th Anniversary of His Birth)] (Moscow: Deko-VS, 2005), 6–7.

²⁰ Morosan, *One Thousand Years*, xxxviii (see intro., n. 12).

²¹ Rakhmanova, *Knyaz' Vladimir Odoyevsky*, 62–63.

²² D. V. Razumovsky, “Muzikal’naya deyatel’nost’ knyazya V. F. Odoyevskogo” [The Musical Activity of Prince V. F. Odoyevsky], 1869, repr. in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmyslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918], vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, ed. M. P. Rakhmanova, comps. A. A. Naumov, M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul’turi, 2002), 47–48.

²³ These four main statute books were published in 1770–1772 and became popular due to being monodic and approachable for even an amateur choir. For more information on the four books, see Carolyn C. Dunlop, *Russian Court Chapel Choir: 1796–1917*, vol. 1 of Music Archive Publications F, ed. Richard Bonyngé (Rutledge, 2000), 63.

²⁴ Knyaz’ V. F. O. (V. F. Odoyevsky), *K voprosu o drevne-russkom pesnopenii: poyasneniye* [On the Question of Old-Russian Chant: Explanations] (Moscow: Bakhmetev, 1864), 5.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 19–23.

thorough theory of Old-Russian church music and folk singing.²⁶ His activities found the support of colleagues such as Razumovsky and A. V. Preobrazhensky.²⁷ Arnol'd acknowledged the significance of Razumovsky's *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii* and Undol'sky's *Zamechaniya* as foundational to his own research.²⁸ Arnol'd's first treatise²⁹ was a significant contribution to a formation of Russian sacred-music theory. In this work, he studied important fundamentals of Russian sacred and folk music, such as the scales that he classified as original (major and minor) and derivative (semi-major and semi-minor). In his theoretical work, Arnol'd studied Old-Russian sacred music through his understanding and application of the theory of ancient Greek sacred modes. Additionally, he worked on a systematic account of sacred modes, which he matched with the *glasī*.³⁰ In his treatise, Arnol'd intended, to some extent, to validate his own melodic arrangements of sacred chants, which were based on harmonic combinations related to the four scales.³¹ While Arnol'd's theory, as the author himself claimed, was possibly the first of its kind as far as its systematic analysis of Russian church music was concerned,³² his book also offered practical advice on the harmonisation of chants.³³

Arnol'd's next book³⁴ provided further detailed background information on Russian sacred music and a critical appraisal of the scholarly literature of the author's own time. In contrast to the nineteenth-century critics who negatively evaluated D. S. Bortnyansky's sacred compositions, Arnol'd pointed to the lyricism and simplicity in Bortnyansky's choral music, while also pointing to its resemblance of Neapolitan choral style.³⁵ In this work, Arnol'd reiterated and broadened, to a considerable extent, the theoretical aspects of Byzantine choral traditions that he first discussed in detail in his earlier *Teoriya*. In *Garmonizatsiya* he provided practical recommendations on

²⁶ Yu. K. Arnol'd, *Teoriya drevne-russkogo tserkovnogo i narodnogo peniya na osnovanii avtenteskikh traktatov i akusticheskogo analiza*, [Theory of Old-Russian Church Singing on the Basis of Authentic Treatises and Acoustic Analysis], 1st ed. (Moscow: Pravoslavnoye Obozreniye, 1880), ix.

²⁷ *Pravoslavnaya Éntsiklopediya*, 3: 378–79.

²⁸ Arnol'd, *Teoriya*, 10.

²⁹ For the full reference on Arnol'd, *Teoriya*, see n. 26 above.

³⁰ *Pravoslavnaya Éntsiklopediya*, 3: 378–79.

³¹ Arnol'd, *Teoriya*, xii.

³² *Ibid.*, viii.

³³ *Ibid.*, 147–64.

³⁴ For the full reference on Arnol'd, *Garmonizatsiya*, see n. 12 above.

³⁵ Arnol'd, *Garmonizatsiya*, 5.

harmonisation of sign-notated scales that included the author's validation of chords, intervals, and sound combinations appropriate for sacred music.³⁶

Following Arnol'd, the next substantial step in development of the scholarship of Russian sacred music is associated with Smolensky, a musicologist, composer, conductor, educator, and director of the *Moskovskoye Sinodal'noye uchilishche* [Moscow Synodal College] and *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella* [Court Singing Chapel] (based in St. Petersburg) from 1901 to 1903. Smolensky's *Vospominaniya* [Memoirs]³⁷ provide a first-hand insight into the competing reputations of these two organisations, which collectively were the major trendsetters in the performance of sacred music in this period. Smolensky's edition of the *Azbuka znamennogo peniya startsa Aleksandra Mezentsa 1668 goda* [Alphabet of Sign-Notated Singing of an Elder Aleksandr Mezenets of 1668]³⁸ with his own comments and explanations greatly facilitated the study of the notation of the *znamennoye peniye* [sign-notated singing]. The book provided a square-note notation that depicted the melodic formulae of the *znamennoye peniye*, which helped to broaden access to this repertory for practitioners and theorists alike. Smolensky also provided tables in which he clarified the use of various signs with their corresponding pitch, a move that, according to its author, would contribute substantially to research into the organisation of the *glasi*.³⁹ Smolensky's influence on the development of an entire field of Russian sacred music was so immense that it would occupy a whole chapter to consider his contributions in detail. While an examination of Smolensky's work is not the primary purpose of the thesis, the discussion in later chapters necessarily returns to this topic, in particular reference to his recommendations for improving the harmonisation of Russian sacred chants.

Another important contributor to this field in roughly the same generation as Smolensky was the Archpriest V. M. Metallov (1862–1926), a historian, researcher of Russian Orthodox church singing, a pedagogue in the *Moskovskoye Sinodal'noye uchilishche* and, subsequently, a professor in the Moscow Conservatory. Metallov's *Bogoslužebnoye peniye russkoy tserkvi v period domongol'skiy* [Liturgical Singing of the Russian Church in Pre-Mongolian Period]⁴⁰ provides a

³⁶ Ibid., 32–34, 228–40.

³⁷ M. P. Rakhmanova, ed., *Stepan Vasil'yevich Smolensky. Vospominaniya: Kazan', Moskva, Peterburg* [Stepan Vasil'yevich Smolensky. Memoirs: Kazan', Moscow, St. Petersburg], vol. 4 of *Rdmdm*, com. N. I. Kabanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002), 59–424.

³⁸ S. V. Smolensky, *Azbuka znamennogo peniya startsa Aleksandra Mezentsa 1668 goda* [Hornbook of Sign-Notated Singing of an Elder Aleksandr Mezenets of 1668] (Kazan': Tipografiya Imperatorskogo Universiteta, 1888).

³⁹ Ibid., 53.

⁴⁰ V. M. Metallov, *Bogoslužebnoye peniye russkoy tserkvi* [Liturgical Singing of the Russian Church], vol. 26 of *Zapiski Imperatorskogo Moskovskogo Arkheologicheskogo Instituta im. Imperatora Nikolaya II* [Memoirs of The Emperor Nicholas II Imperial Moscow Archaeological Institute], ed. A. I. Uspensky (Moscow: Snegiryova, 1912).

valuable study of ancient singing traditions in the pre-Mongolian period as well as a study of manuscripts in which Metallov attempted to account for the first appearances of Russian music notation. Metallov's work is referred to several times throughout the thesis, specifically in relation to developmental periods of Russian sacred music and the historical and theoretical premises concerning its harmonisations.

The consideration of theoretical and practical bases for the development of Russian sacred music was one of the central themes of numerous scholarly books of the nineteenth century. The Archpriest M. A. Lisitsin (1872–1918)⁴¹ stands out amongst his contemporaries in offering a review of an extensive list of Russian sacred compositions in his *Obzor dukhovno-muzikal'noy literatury* [Review of Spiritual and Musical Literature].⁴² In this work, Lisitsin made recommendations on the suitability of sacred music for various settings, and these are referred to throughout this thesis. Lisitsin's work is important for this study as it reviews the sacred compositions of the period under consideration (the second half of the nineteenth century). Additionally, Lisitsin's book was published under the imprimatur of the *Svyateyshiy Sinod* [The Holy Synod] in 1902, meaning that the *Sinod* approved the use, both in church and church schools, of the sacred compositions referred to and discussed therein, which facilitated proliferation of the repertoire. Lisitsin's opinion on particular sacred compositions is taken into consideration in later discussions in this thesis concerning reform-era requirements for sacred music compositions.

A. V. Preobrazhensky (1870–1929), a contemporary of Lisitsin, was a researcher of Russian Orthodox church music who worked in the *Moskovskoye Sinodal'noye uchilishche* and, after 1917, was a professor in the Petrograd Conservatory. His *Kul'tovaya muzika v Rossii* [Cult Music in Russia],⁴³ while consisting of the by now customary overview of the main developmental stages of Russian sacred music, also provided a new understanding of the *glasī*. Preobrazhensky claimed that the *glasī* came originally to Russia from Greece as modes, with authentic and plagal couplings, but subsequently changed as they developed in Old-Russian sacred music. According to Preobrazhensky, these modes transformed over time into frequently used melodic patterns, and lost their original theoretical basis.⁴⁴

⁴¹ Ye. G. Artyomova “Prot. M. A. Lisitsin—ideolog Novogo napravleniya dukhovnoy muziki” [Archpriest M. A. Lisitsin—Ideologist of the New Direction in Sacred Music], *Vestnik PSTGU* 1, no. 13 (2014): 137.

⁴² M. A. Lisitsin, *Obzor dukhovno-muzikal'noy literatury* [Review of Spiritual and Musical Literature], 2nd ed. (St. Petersburg: Stolichnaya tipografiya Gorokhovaya, 1902).

⁴³ A. V. Preobrazhensky, *Kul'tovaya muzika v Rossii* [Cult Music in Russia], ed. B. V. Asaf'yev (Leningrad: Academiya, 1924).

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 25–26.

N. F. Findeizen (1868–1928) is well known as a pioneering musicologist and historian of Russian music. Both Abraham and Larisa Georgievna Danko have described his contribution to the scholarship of Russian music as fundamental and groundbreaking for all subsequent work in the field.⁴⁵ While a very useful and comprehensive source of information, Findeizen's two volumes on Russian music from Antiquity to 1800, unfortunately, do not cover the concluding years of the nineteenth century.⁴⁶

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, the intensification of scholarly activity in the field of Russian sacred music that was mostly led by pro-nationalist scholars had largely crystallised into one focused on Old-Russian notations and sacred chants. Simultaneously, a new area of research emerged in relation to the study of the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella* in St. Petersburg and its governors. Major topics of interest here included the influence of Bortnyansky (1751–1825) in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries (both as a composer and official censor), the harmonisations of F. P. L'vov (1766–1836) and his son A. F. L'vov (1798–1870), and the role of N. I. Bakhmetev (1807–1891), whose governance of this institution lasted for 22 years—a period usually regarded as one of stagnation in the development of Russian church music.

Despite the activities outlined above, extant research on Russian sacred music remains incomplete; in particular, an examination of the practical implementation of various doctrines supported by composers and other significant musical figures has not been given much consideration. Also, there is a significant amount of literature on the topic that consists of subjective descriptions rather than objective analyses, as discussed in sections 1.2 and 1.3 of this chapter. A consideration of the lacunae in the extant research is important for understanding much of the subjectivity that pervaded musicological literature in the first half of the twentieth century.

In Russia in the late nineteenth century the highly influential critic V. V. Stasov (1824–1906) wrote a great many essays and accounts of music in the nineteenth century, which gained widespread recognition.⁴⁷ Stasov, being a propagandist of *Moguchaya kuchka* [The Mighty Handful], promoted the idea of aesthetic unanimity within the circle⁴⁸—a concept which has been

⁴⁵ Gerald Abraham and Larisa Georgievna Danko, "Findeyzen, Nikolay Fyodorovich," *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed June 3, 2017, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/subscriber/article/grove/music/09663>.

⁴⁶ Nikolai Findeizen, *From Antiquity to the Beginning of the Eighteenth Century*, vol. 1 of *History of Music in Russia from Antiquity to 1800*, ed. Miloš Velimirović and Claudia R. Jensen, trans. Samuel William Pring (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008); Nikolai Findeizen, *The Eighteenth Century*, vol. 2 of *History of Music in Russia from Antiquity to 1800*, ed. Miloš Velimirović and Claudia R. Jensen, trans. Samuel William Pring (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008).

⁴⁷ Rapatskaya, *Istoriya russkoy muziki*, 5 (see intro., n. 3).

⁴⁸ Robert C. Ridenour, *Nationalism, Modernism, and Personal Rivalry in Nineteenth-Century Russian Music* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: UMI Research Press, 1987), 75, 113–14.

widely challenged in recent decades. Stasov tended to write negatively about those members who were outside the group, on the basis of their professional training in the St. Petersburg Conservatory (which Stasov opposed).⁴⁹ This enmity towards formal musical education permeated his critical writings. Stasov's aspiration to see a critic as a mediator of the people's needs and a promoter of the popular ideas of the community brought him to a point at which he argued about the problems of professional art and music education, accusing professionalism of breeding pedantry and detachment from life.

Stasov was equally opinionated on the topic of sacred music, which he characterised as one that deceived the people by virtue of its mystical and religious basis. To a significant extent, Stasov's attitude can be attributed to his atheism, which seems to have penetrated his critical writings on church music and impacted composers in his circle, including M. A. Balakirev (1836–1910).⁵⁰ Stasov, as is well known, promoted a “realistic” art that reflected the life of the people. In the 1850s, years when strong nationalistic and populist trends that had begun already in the post Napoleonic period gained rapidly increased momentum in Russian culture, Stasov's ideological writings were widely accepted amongst certain groups of the intelligentsia. Due to his persistence and overbearing style, his writings undoubtedly dominated the critical scene in the second half of the nineteenth century—and it is not infrequently claimed, unduly so.⁵¹

The research of the twentieth-century Russian musical culture into the last decades of the nineteenth century reveals areas that have not been studied thoroughly yet. In particular, church music after Bakhmetev, its liturgical and aesthetic properties in the light of the reformist program of the late nineteenth-century has not received a complete consideration in studies after 1917 and, to an extent, before that date. The work of both Western and Russian scholars was affected by an increasingly secular historiographical orientation that emerged inside Russia in the later years of the nineteenth century and subsequently further developed and took root throughout the twentieth century. Russian researchers and critics such as Asaf'yev, V. Ya. Propp, Smirnova, Zemtsovsky, and Marina Riĭsareva,⁵² in most cases, placed significantly greater emphasis on the study of secular music with correspondingly less acknowledgement of sacred music.

A musicologist and historian, whose work stands out amongst his colleagues by virtue of its thoroughness in the investigation of Russian sacred music, was Gardner (1898–1984), an Orthodox priest who eventually settled in Germany. His comprehensive two-volume treatise *Bogosluzhebnoye*

⁴⁹ Rapatskaya, *Istoriya russkoy muziki*, 161–62.

⁵⁰ Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 174; see also Swan, *Russian Music*, 84.

⁵¹ Rapatskaya, *Istoriya russkoy muziki*, 5.

⁵² As a transliteration, her name appears as Riĭsareva, elsewhere Ritzarev as given in her books.

peniye russkoy pravoslavnoy tserkvi [Church Singing in Russian Orthodox Church] explores an extensive period of the evolution of Russian sacred music from Christianisation to the *katastrofa* [catastrophe], as the author describes the time after the Revolution 1917.⁵³ These volumes provide meticulous consideration of central components of Russian sacred music, such as systems of notation and a study of aspects of liturgical service. Gardner not only gave a substantial historical analysis of developmental stages of religious music but also identified the main scholars who continued the study of church music at the end of nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth.⁵⁴ Miloš Velimirović claims that Gardner was one of a few scholars who studied Russian church music in depth.⁵⁵ The *Pravoslavnaya Éntsiklopediya* lists him as an heir of the pre-revolutionary research traditions in Russian church music established by Razumovsky and Metallov, and one who exclusively and comprehensively studied Russian sacred music in the mid-twentieth century (roughly, from 1920 to 1970).⁵⁶ Gardner stands out, in fact, as a seminal figure in the research of Russian church music, one whose influence cannot be ignored and to whom this thesis returns a number of times.

1.2. Changes in research directions after 1917

The years after 1917 inevitably saw new priorities arise in Russia in academic research into musical culture, including church music. Sacred music as a topic for scholarly attention came close to prohibition after the Revolution of 1917.⁵⁷ In 1918, both the *Moskovskoye Sinodal'noye uchilishche* and the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella* were united into a Choral Academy.⁵⁸

⁵³ Gardner, *Bogoslužebnoye peniye*, 2: 586–91 (see intro., n. 15).

⁵⁴ Gardner, *Bogoslužebnoye peniye*, 1: 21.

⁵⁵ According to Miloš Velimirović, Gardner, whom he describes as a “Russian-German musicologist,” had been exposed to church music since childhood, and became an expert in Russian church chant, analysing it both stylistically and historically. After the Revolution of 1917, Gardner left Russia for Belgrade, where he completed theological studies in Belgrade University in 1928. After becoming a monk, for the following fifteen years or so Gardner served in Jerusalem, Vienna, and Potsdam. In 1944 he returned to the laity, took a position of a choral conductor, and subsequently settled in Germany, where in 1965 he defended his doctorate with a thesis on Russian chant and the difficulties of its notation. He went on to complete an extensive list of studies on Russian church music. For more information, see Miloš Velimirović, “Gardner, Johann von,” *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed June 3, 2017, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/subscriber/article/grove/music/10665>.

⁵⁶ *Pravoslavnaya Éntsiklopediya*, 10: 416–18.

⁵⁷ T. A. Zaytseva, *Sokrovishcha Rossii: dukhovnaya muzika M. A. Balakireva. Issledovatel'skiye ocherki* [Treasures of Russia: Sacred Music of M. A. Balakirev. Research Essays] (Moscow: Muzika, 2013), 10.

⁵⁸ Marina Frolova-Walker and Jonathan Walker, *Music and Soviet Power, 1917–1932* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell, 2012), 7.

Ideological restrictions on researchers' activities—at first somewhat implicit, but pressed with increasing rigour as the 1920s turned over to the 1930s—narrowed the acceptable range of academic topics. Musicological studies in early Soviet period increasingly took on a sociological frame of reference and were increasingly concerned with the musical preferences of the working class.⁵⁹

Post-revolutionary Russia faced several problems, such as widespread socio-economic decline, illiteracy, and the political repression of opponents of the regime. Imprudent discussions could often result in extreme penalties⁶⁰; as T. V. Bukina⁶¹ states, in autumn 1922 almost two hundred opposition-minded scholars were deported, and a newly arisen generation loyal to the government took their vacant places.⁶² In light of these circumstances, progress in the area of research into Russian church music was difficult. In many cases, crucial figures simply left the country: Gardner was evacuated to Turkey in 1920 (as a part of *Belaya émigratsiya* [White Immigration])⁶³; Grechaninov, an important composer of sacred music, emigrated in 1925.⁶⁴ At home, numerous scholars faced local prosecution. Bukina states that, in the 1920s, most of the musicological research literature, which she does not enumerate, except some of Asaf'yev's works, fell not only into oblivion but became a rarity because of interrupted publishing activity.⁶⁵

The survival of artists and musicians in the 1920s and 30s required them to endure significant compromises. Whilst choral activities were not abandoned, composers of sacred music were reoriented to facilitate a production of proletarian singing collections and harmonisations of proletarian songs.⁶⁶ From the 1920s, new subjects such as bibliographical studies and systematic cataloguing of works gained popularity at the expense of certain pre-existing efforts, including

⁵⁹ T. V. Bukina, *Muzikal'naya nauka v Rossii 1920–2000kh godov: (ocherki kul'turnoy istorii). Monografiya* [Musical Science in Russia of 1920–2000: (Essays on Cultural History). Monograph] (St. Petersburg: Russkaya khristianskaya gumanitarnaya akademiya, 2010), 54.

⁶⁰ Swan, *Russian Music*, 198.

⁶¹ The work of Bukina *Muzikal'naya nauka v Rossii 1920–2000kh godov* is an important source of critical research of Soviet era musicological activities. The book considers socio-economical, cultural, and political conditions for formation of musicology and musical science in Russia. The author rightfully devotes a whole chapter to Asaf'yev and his research. While her work provides thorough historical information, it does not discuss extensively the problems that researchers of sacred music faced during this period. Nonetheless, it remains a useful work for understanding how the discipline evolved during this period.

⁶² Bukina, *Muzikal'naya nauka*, 15–16.

⁶³ *Pravoslavnaya Éntsiklopediya*, 10: 416–18.

⁶⁴ Frolova-Walker and Jonathan Walker, *Music and Soviet Power*, 355.

⁶⁵ Bukina, *Muzikal'naya nauka*, 12.

⁶⁶ Frolova-Walker and Jonathan Walker, *Music and Soviet Power*, 24 and 168.

research into sacred music.⁶⁷ From 1930s, the Union of Soviet composers became the central musical organisation in the Soviet Union and promoted the ideological aims of the Party amongst musicians. It controlled all aspects of musical activity in Soviet Russia and fought against the perceived (or claimed) negative and socially destructive influences of Western “bourgeois” music.⁶⁸

Despite the adversity experienced by many researchers in 1930s and the Soviet period more broadly, the study of topics around the church was not completely interrupted.⁶⁹ The hostility towards church studies did not exclusively obstruct the activity of Russian musicologists such as M. V. Brazhnikov (1902–1973), and V. M. Belyayev (1888–1968), who studied Russian sacred music extensively; however, they did not focus on the area and timeframe relevant to the present study. Brazhnikov studied folk music, and his works are mostly dedicated to the research of traditions such as Afghani, Turkmenian, and Persian music. In the 1940s he turned his attention to the Old-Russian church-singing traditions including *znamennoye peniye*, *znamennaya notatsiya*, and other forms of sign-notation. Belyayev made extensive studies of the musical folklore of Russia, Asia, and Europe. While he focused primarily on the study of folk music, his work on Russian chants remains relevant to current studies of Old-Russian sacred music and sign-notated chants particularly.

A distinguishing characteristic of Belyayev’s musicological works was his deciphering of sign-notated chants, which undoubtedly contributed to the analysis of the Old-Russian musical heritage. His *Drevnerusskaya muzikal'naya pis'mennost'* [Old-Russian Musical Notation] is one of several important pieces of research in this field.⁷⁰ The *Pravoslavnaya Éntsiklopediya* presents a list of his major works on Russian sacred music of the early centuries.⁷¹ While impossible to prove, it is conceivable that the relative lack of ideological scrutiny endured by studies such as these relates both to the fact that the topics concerned the ancient past and also, that the ethnomusicological character of the work sat more easily with the sociological emphases of the period.

Notwithstanding the oppressive circumstances, one musicologist of the Soviet period, T. N. Livanova (1909–1986), did pursue the study of Western-European music and interrelation of church and secular music in her thesis submitted in 1935. This research was probably made possible under the decree *Ob uluchshenii bīta uchyonikh* [Upon the Improvement of Scientific Life] implemented

⁶⁷ Bukina, *Muzikal'naya nauka*, 41.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 67 and 69.

⁶⁹ Swan, *Russian Music*, 194.

⁷⁰ V. M. Belyayev, *Drevnerusskaya muzikal'naya pis'mennost'* [Old-Russian Musical Notation], ed. S. V. Aksiuk (Moscow: Sovetskiy kompozitor, 1962).

⁷¹ *Pravoslavnaya Éntsiklopediya*, 4: 589–90.

in 1919 and repealed at the beginning of 1930s.⁷² Bukina notes that, despite some critics' appreciation of this work, *Sovetskaya muzika* [Soviet Music], the official organ of the Union of Soviet composers, severely criticised Livanova's research and, further, claims that this compelled her to reconsider her scientific points of view.⁷³ Livanova was accused of disrespect toward Russian folklore as a tool for formation of the national music and, subsequently, was forced to admit that she overestimated the degree of Western influence on Russian music and underestimated the role of Russian national musical originality.⁷⁴

Livanova's own enforced reappraisal of her work is evidenced in her *Ocherki i materialī po istorii russkoy muzikal'noy kul'turi* [Essay and Materials on History of Russian Musical Culture]⁷⁵ which was published in 1938. The years 1937–1938 (co-incident with the Great Terror) were amongst the darkest in the history of the Soviet Union. Under these conditions, as Simo Mikkonen points out, publication of academic work was subject to extreme control.⁷⁶ The necessary conformity is evident in the Livanova's book; while it purports to study sacred music, the findings would seem to have been circumscribed by an enforced ideological agenda. Livanova evaluated the Russian musical heritage of the period from seventeenth to the beginning of the nineteenth centuries through a comparison of theoretical and socio-historical aspects of Russian and Western traditions of music in general and sacred music in particular. As a product of its time, the book abounds with ideas on the superiority of the motherland and its musical culture.⁷⁷ It identifies for example, "problems" such as a destructive and oppressive impact of church music on the evolution of Russian secular music.⁷⁸ Despite a politically conditioned one-sidedness and its ideologically grounded conclusions, Livanova's book still contains useful discussions on the fundamentals of sacred music, such as its styles and historical development.

⁷² The Decree allowed the scientific elite to freely travel abroad as well as to use interlibrary resources of foreign countries. For more information on the subject, see Bukina, *Muzikal'naya nauka*, 38.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 76 and 77.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 77.

⁷⁵ T. N. Livanova, *Ocherki i materialī po istorii russkoy muzikal'noy kul'turi* [Essay and Materials on History of Russian Musical Culture], 1st ed., ed. A. Ostretsov (Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1938).

⁷⁶ See Simo Mikkonen, *Music and Power in the Soviet 1930s: A History of Composers' Bureaucracy* (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 2009). Mikkonen's book is a fairly recent study on the topic that would not potentially receive a scholarly consideration. The discussions on the activity of a musical elite and the Union of Soviet composers have received a profound examination in this book.

⁷⁷ Livanova, *Ocherki i materialī*, 20.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 42.

Concerning the prejudiced treatment of certain musicological topics, Soviet musical literature exemplifies numerous cases of avoidance of church-music subjects. Due to the militancy of Soviet secularisation, the neglect of scholarly activity towards sacred-music composers—or *kul'toviy* [cult] music, as it came to be called after the Revolution—penetrated deeply into the scholarship of Russian music in the twentieth century. In the Soviet era, the choice of musicological themes was subjected to state policy, which, since the Revolution, propagated working-class supremacy while the government laid high expectations on science as a transmitter of an accomplished victory of the working class.⁷⁹

While B. V. Asaf'yev (1884–1949) did not make major contributions to the study of sacred music, any discussion of the development of musicological discourse in the Soviet Union cannot fail to mention him and his impact. He was a seminal figure in Soviet musicology, who lived and worked in the first half of twentieth century, and played a crucial role in the promotion of musicological research in Soviet Russia.⁸⁰ Asaf'yev's work showed an increasingly critical partiality during the 1920s and, especially, 1930s,⁸¹ which almost certainly reflects the necessity of conformity in the given conditions. Vocal genres and opera particularly were amongst those that had a potentiality to influence the working public and shape an obedient, loyal “Soviet listener.”⁸² Asaf'yev's suggestion on the connection of folklore and opera⁸³ empowered the latter with ideologically appropriate qualities and defined it as approachable to the public. While his work attempted to bolster the significance of secular art music in the life of the people, it tended to downplay the value of sacred music in this same domain. In Asaf'yev's *O khorovom iskusstve* [On the Choral Art], for instance, the author mentioned Bakhmetev and L'vov as composers of *kul'toviy* (“cultish”) compositions and persistently avoided any precise reference to words such as “sacred” or “church.”⁸⁴ Asaf'yev made no mention of the church compositions of Rimsky-Korsakov.⁸⁵ He placed Grechaninov among the composers of *a capella* choruses, without revealing his indisputably

⁷⁹ Bukina, *Muzikal'naya nauka*, 14.

⁸⁰ Asaf'yev's career and influence is well documented in Boris Schwarz, *Music and Musical Life in Soviet Russia*, enl. ed. 1917–1981 (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1983).

⁸¹ A significant number of Asaf'yev's texts were written under the pen name Igor' Glebov. All citations are given according to how the consulted source names the author (i.e. Asaf'yev or Glebov), but all references to the person throughout this text are given as Asaf'yev.

⁸² Schwarz, *Music and Musical Life*, 27–28.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 20–21.

⁸⁴ B. V. Asaf'yev, *O khorovom iskusstve* [On the Choral Art], ed. B. A. Kats, comp. A. B. Pavlova-Arbenina (Leningradskoye otdeleniye: Muzika, 1980), 18, 21, 24.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 21.

numerous sacred compositions.⁸⁶ He allocated just a few sentences to another composer of sacred music, Arkhangel'sky, although he did praise this composer for the unprecedented popularisation of choral (though not specifically church) music.⁸⁷ The same is true with regard to his discussion of Taneyev's compositions.⁸⁸ Asaf'yev only briefly discussed some of the *kul'toviy* compositions of Taneyev without acknowledging their importance. Characterising Kastal'sky's work, Asaf'yev again described the *kul'toviy* musical art as limited, although he found room to praise Kastal'sky's choral music for its pure sonority, irrespective of its liturgical content.⁸⁹ This kind of approach has been described more recently by Bukina as "*mimikriya*" [mimicry]⁹⁰; it was designed to secure a scholar's survival in this rigid era of authoritarian censorship, which lasted at least until Khrushchev's "Thaw" in the mid-1950s, if not beyond.

Although the period beginning in the middle of the 1950s brought some relative freedoms to various fields of research, the emergence of greater scrutiny of scholarly activity by the State (through the actions of the KGB and its predecessors) was also a feature of this period. The control was total and even included control over admission to a thesis defence.⁹¹ In spite of the ongoing censorship and ideological controls, the 1960s and 1970s signified a gathering momentum of scholarly activity. In the 1970s a promotion of national traditions through arts, crafts, folklore, music, and musicological subjects gained pace.⁹² While this was true for secular genres of popular activity, religious aspects remained under oppression. Boris Schwarz states that in the 1960s in the Moscow Institute of Art History, merely one monograph out of eighteen works was dedicated to church music. This was a study by Brazhnikov, written in the 1970s.⁹³ It represents a significant work on sacred music, but covers only the period from the fifteenth to eighteenth centuries, without considering the church music of the later nineteenth century. Other works conducted in the institute were generally focused on secular composers, music of the working class, or folk songs.⁹⁴ Martinov

⁸⁶ Ibid., 23.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 22.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 26.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 26.

⁹⁰ Bukina, *Muzikal'naya nauka*, 75–80.

⁹¹ Ibid., 88.

⁹² Ibid., 96 and 110.

⁹³ M. V. Brazhnikov, *Drevnerusskaya teoriya muziki po rukopisnim materialam 15–18 veka* [Old-Russian Theory of Music, Based on Manuscripts of the Fifteenth–Eighteenth Centuries] (Leningrad, 1972).

⁹⁴ Schwarz, *Music and Musical Life*, 37–75.

claims, for instance, that church attendance in the years of stagnation from 1964 to 1987 would still lead to administrative punishment and the church knew little of the “Thaw”; Khrushchev promised to eliminate the last priest by 1980.⁹⁵

1.3. Research of Russian sacred music in the post-Soviet era

In the 1990s, the climate of freedom in the post-Soviet context⁹⁶ contributed to an upsurge of scholarly research; despite the liberation of musicological activity, this was still not, as Bukina has pointed out, a predominant area of research if one compares it to other fields such as sociology, cultural studies, critical reviews of history or literature.⁹⁷

Despite the newfound freedoms, cases of neglect could still be found in academic literature, especially material that was issued in new editions. This applies, for example, to Smirnova’s widely used historical text, which characterised Bortnyansky as a choral composer, without any further elaboration, and an opera composer.⁹⁸ A. A. Alyab'yev (1787–1851), who wrote more than thirty liturgical compositions in the 1840s, has still not received an appropriate study and none of his sacred compositions have been discussed in scholarly literature until recent times; only since 2002 have Alyab'yev’s sacred compositions begun to be published.⁹⁹ Smirnova’s interpretation of the story of Alyab'yev’s exile fails to mention certain historical facts, such the reason for his exile being related to penance and service of his sentence in monastery.¹⁰⁰ Even though Smirnova’s *Russkaya muzikal'naya literatura* [Russian Musical Literature] is a standard textbook, it is a demonstrative example of a continuing influence of Soviet-era thinking in post-Soviet music historiography—republishing without revising. The book was first issued according to state standards in 1962 and has been republished many times since then. The most recent edition that I consulted appeared in 2002, with facts, as noted above, that show continued lacunae in this area.

⁹⁵ Martīnov, *Istoriya bogoslužhebnogo peniya*, 215.

⁹⁶ Frolova-Walker and Jonathan Walker, *Music and Soviet Power*, 2.

⁹⁷ Bukina, *Muzikal'naya nauka*, 113.

⁹⁸ É. S. Smirnova, *Russkaya muzikal'naya literatura* [Russian Musical Literature], ed. T. V. Popova (Moscow: Muzika, 2002), 6.

⁹⁹ Ye. D. Kutsenko, “Ispolnitel'skaya sud'ba dukhovno-muzikal'nikh sochineniy Alyab'yeva v XIX veke” [The Performance Fate of the Sacred Musical Compositions of Alyab'yev in the Nineteenth Century], *Vestnik*, no. 1, Moscow: RAM im. Gnessinikh (2011): 5.

¹⁰⁰ G. N. Timofeyev, *A. A. Alyab'yev: Ocherk zhizni i tvorchestva* [A. A. Alyab'yev: Sketch on Life and Oeuvre] (Moscow: Jurgenson, 1912), 17–19.

The study of Old-Russian singing occupied a primary place in the research of many scholars from the end of twentieth century and into the beginning of this one. G. A. Pozhidayeva's *Pevcheskiye traditsii drevney Rusi: Ocherki teorii i stilya* [Singing Traditions of Old Rus': Essays of Theory and Style] provides a thorough discussion of *znamennoye* singing and its variations, which the author categorises as syllabic, syllabic-melismatic, and melismatic.¹⁰¹ N. V. Zabolotnaya's work has concentrated on the *partesniy kontsert* [part-singing concerto] of twentieth-century composers, as well as sacred singing books of the eleventh to the fourteenth century. Her work in this area is also supported by the contributions of N. B. Zakhar'ina, Yu. V. Artamonova and Ye. V. Pletnyova.¹⁰² While these important publications cover a wide range of several centuries, they do not take in the period under examination in this thesis.

The research activity of the last several decades shows a great range of study into Russian sacred music that has uncovered some of the more obscure areas of choral music and its composers. Mart'inov's *Istoriya bogoslužhebnogo peniya* [History of Liturgical Singing]¹⁰³ was commissioned by the Russian Orthodox Church and was intended primarily as a resource for religious schools; nonetheless, it affords potential insights into problems addressed in this thesis. The author treats Russian sacred music through an understanding of correlated aspects of Western and Eastern sacred singing. Mart'inov argues that while staff notation along with *partesnoye peniye* [part-singing] provides mainly physical characteristics of a sound such as pitch, value, tonic–dominant functional characteristics, these two (notation and *partesnoye peniye*) could be suitable to portray corporeal and secular themes but not sacred music.¹⁰⁴ Mart'inov clarifies the significance of musical terms such as *igra* [playing] and *peniye* [singing], their evolution and how these two terms were differentiated in Russian sacred music.¹⁰⁵ His study of the practical and theoretical fundamentals of Russian sacred music is significant for understanding of the arguments around “theatricality” in Russian sacred music. Mart'inov's discussion of historical developmental periods of Russian sacred music largely reflects those stages outlined by Gardner (the stages of sacred music development are considered in the chapter 2). What differs in Mart'inov's research, however, is that he broadens the

¹⁰¹ For more information see G. A. Pozhidayeva, *Pevcheskiye traditsii drevney Rusi: Ocherki teorii i stilya* [Singing Traditions of Old Rus': Essays of Theory and Style] (Moscow: Znack, 2007).

¹⁰² *Pravoslavnaya Éntsiklopediya*, 19: 438–39.

¹⁰³ For the full reference on Mart'inov, *Istoriya bogoslužhebnogo peniya*, see intro., n.2.

¹⁰⁴ Mart'inov, *Istoriya bogoslužhebnogo peniya*, 182–83.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 94–97.

timeframe of those developmental periods of Russian sacred music.¹⁰⁶ Martīnov's argument concerning the embodiment of theatricality entailed in the participation of Tsar and Patriarch¹⁰⁷ in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is noteworthy, and informs debates around “theatrical” sounds in Russian sacred music at the end of the nineteenth century.

Since 2000, several scholars, including M. P. Rakhmanova, A. A. Naumov, and S. G. Zvereva, with support and funding of the *Rossiyskiy gumanitarniy nauchniy fond* [Russian Humanitarian Scientific Fund], edited the seven-volume *Russkaya dukhovnaya muzika v dokumentakh i materialakh* [Russian Sacred Music in Documents and Materials].¹⁰⁸ This work covers many aspects of Russian sacred music and includes documents, correspondence, and critical articles on composers of sacred music and their contemporaries. T. A. Zaytseva justifiably describes these volumes as “a most valuable” contribution to the research of Russian sacred music¹⁰⁹; the volumes represent both a detailed collection of established facts and provide new insights and accessibility to previously unpublished material, forming an invaluable point of reference for all scholars in the area of Russian sacred music. These volumes, as a concentration of primary resources, are an essential source of information to this study; for instance, volumes 2 and 4 present a comprehensive range of materials and archival documents concerning the *Sinodal'noye uchilishche* and its choral activities, while volume 3 deals with critical writings of figures relevant to the history of church music, and volume 5 concentrates on Kastal'sky's correspondence and provides understanding of his activities by both his contemporaries and scholars of the twentieth century.

N. S. Gulyanitskaya's *Poétika muzikal'noy kompozitsii: Teoreticheskiye aspekti russkoy dukhovnoy muziki XX veka* [Poetics of Musical Composition. Theoretical Aspects of Russian Sacred Music in the Twentieth Century]¹¹⁰ analyses an extensive range of sacred compositions, focusing on works composed during a period from the last decades of the nineteenth to the concluding years of the twentieth century. The book covers a wide range of musical aspects of Russian sacred music and considers diversity of genres—short and long sacred chant forms, the liturgical cycle and concertos—through the understanding of musical-poetic expressions such as the structure of

¹⁰⁶ For example, a preliminary period that, according to Martīnov, continued until the thirteenth century; see Martīnov, *Istoriya bogoslužhebnogo peniya*, 104.

¹⁰⁷ *Idib.*, 108.

¹⁰⁸ Referred to by the abbreviation *Rdmdm* throughout this work.

¹⁰⁹ Zaytseva, *Sokrovishcha Rossii*, 7.

¹¹⁰ N. S. Gulyanitskaya, *Poétika muzikal'noy kompozitsii: Teoreticheskiye aspekti russkoy dukhovnoy muziki XX veka* [Poetics of Musical Composition. Theoretical Aspects of Russian Sacred Music in the Twentieth Century] (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002).

liturgical texts and the semantic and functional roles of a sacred composition within the service.¹¹¹ In comparison to Gardner, who classified various kinds of sacred chants, Gulyanitskaya also differentiates structural qualities, such as a chant with a refrain *Alliluiya* [Alleluia], for instance, in *Blazhen muzh* [Blessed is the Man],¹¹² and narrative forms without refrain such as *antifon* [Antiphon].¹¹³ The obvious acknowledgement of Gardner's expertise in sacred music and an adoption of his classification can be seen in Gulyanitskaya's categorisation of chant forms. While the book presents a plentiful scholarly analysis of sacred settings, it does not discuss the relation of nineteenth-century reformist claims and their execution in the compositions to be considered later in this thesis.

In 1999, N. Yu. Plotnikova published all the sacred compositions of Taneyev for the first time in *Taneyev S. I. Dukhovnaya muzika* [Taneyev S. I. Sacred Music].¹¹⁴ Plotnikova noted that the manuscripts of Taneyev's sacred compositions were located only recently in the Tchaikovsky House-Museum in Klin and the reproductions of Taneyev's sacred polyphonic compositions that are found in her book represent his arrangements of sacred monodic chants.¹¹⁵ These materials provide for a full evaluation of the composer's contribution to Russian sacred music. Taneyev's documents, correspondence, and materials make possible an outline of the composer's areas of musical interest and concerns for the development of Russian music.¹¹⁶

Zaytseva's *Sokrovishcha Rossii: Dukhovnaya muzika M. A. Balakireva. Issledovatel'skiye ocherki* [Treasures of Russia: Sacred Music of M. A. Balakirev. Research Essays] treats a less well-covered aspect of Balakirev's compositional career.¹¹⁷ Her essays consider Balakirev's importance in the formation of new directions in sacred music 1870s and, therefore, also address the relatively one-sided emphasis on his secular compositions that had applied to the study of Balakirev's music. The book examines Balakirev's sacred music and the formation of a religious direction in his work in detail. The book sheds new light on the spiritual dimension of Balakirev's artistic personality and

¹¹¹ Ibid., 121, 129–30.

¹¹² Ibid., 131.

¹¹³ Ibid., 138.

¹¹⁴ N. Yu. Plotnikova, comp., *Taneyev S. I. Dukhovnaya muzika* [Taneyev S. I. Sacred Music] (Moscow: Moskovskaya konservatoriya, 1999).

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 2, 3.

¹¹⁶ V. A. Zhdanov, ed. and com., *P. I. Tchaikovsky, S. I. Taneyev: Pis'ma* [P. I. Tchaikovsky, S. I. Taneyev: Letters] (1874–1893; repr. Moscow: Goskul'tprosvetizdat, 1951); L. Z. Korabel'nikova, ed., *S. Taneyev: Dnevnik, 1894–1909* [S. Taneyev: Diaries, 1894–1909], 3 vols. (Moscow: Muzika, 1981, 1982, and 1985).

¹¹⁷ For the full reference on Zaytseva, *Sokrovishcha Rossii*, see n. 57 above.

work. The composer emerges in these pages as a devout person for whom presence in the church was an absolute need, and who desired to write sacred music.¹¹⁸ Indeed, he turns out to be person of extremes, according to Zaytseva, joining the church of the Old Believers. In the 1870s—a time of hardship for the composer following his withdrawal from public musical activity in St. Petersburg—Balakirev’s passionate nature found asylum in Old Belief.¹¹⁹

1.4. Research of Russian sacred music in Western scholarly literature

The influence of central musical figures on the development of the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella* and administration of the affairs of its school are well covered by Carolyn C. Dunlop’s *Russian Court Chapel Choir, 1796–1917*. The author acknowledges the difficulties of research of Russian sacred music in the twentieth century owing to conditions discussed above,¹²⁰ and, in this work, Dunlop meticulously examines the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella* and various facets of its activity in order to address these lacunae. This includes the investigation of published statute singing compilations, study of the involvement of governing figures, development of instrumental and conducting programmes, as well as the administrative business of the school. The book covers an extended period of the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella*’s life from 1796 until the Revolution of 1917. Dunlop states that the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella* had a great influence and played a crucial role in musical education and remained so even when the similar program was implemented in the *Sinodal'noye uchilishche*,¹²¹ which most likely contributed to the rivalry that arose between the two schools of sacred music and served as one of the reasons for subsequent hostile criticism of the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella*’s harmonisations.

A tendency to prioritise Old-Russian sacred music, folklore, and secular music innovations of the nineteenth century are well-established preoccupations of Western scholarly literature on Russia’s musical heritage. Roughly contemporaneous with Gardner’s work, are Swan’s *Russian Music and Its Sources in Chant and Folk-Songs* and Nicholas Brill’s *History of Russian Church Music, 988–1917*.¹²² Both work cover briefly (necessarily so, given their scope) Russian sacred music traditions from the establishment of sign-notated chants to the quest for a national identity in

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 32.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 43.

¹²⁰ Dunlop, *Russian Court Chapel Choir*, 125.

¹²¹ Ibid., 125.

¹²² For the full reference on Swan, *Russian Music*, see n. 17 above; Nicholas Peter Brill, *History of Russian Church Music, 988–1917* (Bloomington, Ill.: Brill, 1980, 2nd edition in 1982). Page references are to the 1982 edition.

the nineteenth-century Russian sacred music. The latter subject receives a relatively conventional consideration in these books, while the composers of the period under examination do not receive a substantive study. Brill's work covers Russian sacred music from the period of the *znamennoye peniye* and includes transcriptions of *znamyona*. While relevant to a broader context, it does not embrace topics directly related to the present study.

Swan's *Russian Music and Its Sources in Chant and Folk-Songs* does provide a concise analysis of Russian music, including sacred materials, although its contribution in this field is overshadowed by Gardner's *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*.¹²³ In contrast to Gardner, Swan asserts the subversive impact of sacred reforms on *znamenniy* [sign-notated] chant in the seventeenth century (the author alludes to the Nikonian reforms that were implemented at this time).¹²⁴ The book evaluates interrelationships of the central composers of the nineteenth century and offers historical analysis; however, it omits a detailed study of the sacred music of the same composers under examination. Swan adumbrated the development of Russian music, including sacred music, at the beginning of the twentieth century, highlighting the decade before the First World War as a rebirth of musical movements in Russia.¹²⁵ The purpose of this chapter is not to debate this progression; a broader discussion on Russian sacred music, its evolution, its epochs, and periods, is provided in the subsequent chapter of the thesis.

Vladimir Morosan contributed significantly to the research of Russian sacred music outside Russia. The history of Russian sacred music from the early years to the early twentieth century liturgical practice was well researched in his books *One Thousand Years of Russian Church Music: 988–1988* and *Choral Performance in Pre-Revolutionary Russia*, offering a historical overview of the development of Russian church music and consideration of some prominent church-music composers such as Bortnyansky, Kastal'sky, and Chesnokov.¹²⁶ Despite the fact that this book covers such an extensive developmental period of Russian sacred music, it does not consider the questions on how thoroughly later nineteenth-century composers adapted their sacred music to reformist ideas.

Western scholars who studied the Russian musical culture of the nineteenth century frequently highlighted the compositions of the *Moguchaya kuchka*, their predecessors, and followers, strengthening the accepted notion of Russian national style. Richard Taruskin has said

¹²³ For the full reference on Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, see intro., n. 15 and n. 4 above.

¹²⁴ Swan, *Russian Music*, 33.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 156.

¹²⁶ For the full reference on Morosan, *One Thousand Years*, see intro., n. 12; also see Vladimir Morosan, *Choral Performance in Pre-revolutionary Russia*, 2nd ed. (UMI Research Press, 1986; Musica Russica, 1994).

much about this strain of Western scholarship on Russian music. He notes the strong influence of Vladimir Stasov on early Western scholars such as Bellaigue (1858–1930, France) and Rosa Newmarch (1857–1940, England). Bellaigue and Newmarch’s successors—Michel-Dimitri Calvocoressi (1877–1944, England and France) and Montagu Montagu-Nathan (1877–1958, England)—continued this line of thought. The scholars of secular Russian music Gerald Abraham (1904–1988) and Gerald Seaman (b. 1934), the inheritors of the tradition of Calvocoressi and Montagu-Nathan, contributed further to the durability of Stasov’s secular, realist and nationalist proclivities.¹²⁷ For instance, in *A History of Russian Music* (1918), Montagu-Nathan provided his English readers with what are now considered relatively well-trodden facts about Russian composers; however, within almost a hundred of pages dedicated to Rimsky-Korsakov, none of his sacred compositions are discussed. Just a few pages are devoted by Montagu-Nathan to Taneyev, without any mention of his sacred compositions.

Taruskin discusses the implications of Stasov’s influence on the persistence of a one-sided understanding of Russian music; however, Taruskin himself classifies A. F. L’vov (a composer, conductor, and a director of the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella*) as a composer of operas and concertos. Taruskin states L’vov “is remembered only for *Bozhe, Tsarya khrani*” [God, Save the Tsar]—the Russian National Anthem from 1833 to 1917.¹²⁸ He hardly mentions L’vov’s sacred settings, whereas L’vov, in addition to his own sacred music, also made rearrangements of the Old-Russian Orthodox *znamenniy raspev* sacred chants to be sung during the entire year; his edition was distributed throughout churches in Russia 1846–1849.¹²⁹ Abraham’s book *On Russian Music*, written in 1939, mostly considers secular compositions, and mostly those of the *Moguchaya kuchka*. The sacred compositions of Rimsky-Korsakov are not mentioned there, although they had been composed by 1885. In *The music of Tchaikovsky*, edited by Abraham, only six pages out of almost 250 are devoted to Tchaikovsky’s liturgical compositions. Even in a source such as *Grove Music Online*, there is not much information about Russian composers of sacred music. One quite detailed article is devoted to Bortnyansky, whereas to other composers such as Smolensky, Arkhangel'sky, Allemanov, and Kastal'sky, just one paragraph, if any, is allocated.¹³⁰

¹²⁷ Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*, xiv (see intro., n. 2).

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, xiii.

¹²⁹ Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 271.

¹³⁰ Marika Kuzma, “Bortnyans'ky, Dmytro Stepanovych,” *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed November 27, 2016, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/subscriber/article/grove/music/03638>; also see Miloš Velimirović et al., “Russian and Slavonic church music,” *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed November 27, 2016, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/subscriber/article/grove/music/43458>.

Marina Frolova-Walker, by contrast and while not specialising in church music, devotes a number of pages to consideration of some aspects of this topic in her *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin*. She emphasises, for instance, the importance of Rimsky-Korsakov's sacred settings for the development of church music. She also agrees that church music was not a favoured subject for scholars, especially in the wake of Stasov's anti-clerical attitude and his powerful influence on Russian composers.¹³¹ In *Music and Soviet Power, 1917–1932*,¹³² while focusing on various socio-political aspects that shaped Russian secular art after the Revolution, she studies the period from 1917 to 1932 in general as well as discussing some of the adversities faced by church composers.

Unquestionably, all the above-mentioned musical figures and researchers contributed to the development of Russian sacred music of the nineteenth century either by research in the field or by recommendations and practical advice on sacred music. This thesis examines how these recommendations of the leading music figures and their mentorship were reflected in chosen sacred compositions of the nineteenth century. The practical implementation of the composers' advice in the sacred music is also considered through the study of imposed expectations. Consequently, this discussion facilitates an understanding of how the aspirations of the nineteenth century were met in the music and to what extent the music of St. Petersburg and Moscow schools of sacred music was different.

Having reviewed the lacunae in both Russian and Western literature the ensuing chapters move to a consideration of certain themes emerging from these gaps. An overall consideration of historical epochs of Russian sacred music takes place in chapter 2, which also provides a context for the discussion of later nineteenth-century reform movements in Russian sacred music that form the main focus of this thesis.

¹³¹ Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 174, 277.

¹³² For the full reference on Frolova-Walker and Jonathan Walker, *Music and Soviet Power*, see n. 58 above.

Chapter 2

Preconditions for Reform of Russian Sacred Music in the Later Nineteenth Century

2.1. Cultural and political context: The relationship of church and state

This chapter combines a concise overview of the development of Russian church music and an assessment of nineteenth-century understandings of that history. It considers the historical, theological, and musical precursors for the reforms in sacred music that were argued for and, to varying extents, actually took place in the second half of the century. Over the course of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Russia went through numerous stages of development and expansion, including regular political changes. The overall tendency of this period was the geographical expansion of Russia eastwards, and the cultural turning of Russia to the West. Obviously the church, as indeed any other institution, was not immune to the Westernisation that affected, for example, its musical component. Hence, the additional focus of this chapter is an assessment of the political and cultural atmosphere around the church.

Although a periodisation of the developmental stages of Russian sacred music is not a priority for this thesis, the evolution of Russian sacred music needs to be outlined briefly in order to provide the reader with necessary contextual information on the subject. Therefore, the second section of this chapter outlines the key developmental stages of Russian sacred music that facilitates both a historic overview and a critique of historiographical discussions on the topic, which increased in the last decades of the nineteenth century. Embarking on such a review of the facts also enables us to consider the historiography of Russian church music during this period, particularly in the thinking of crucial actors in the reform movement of the later nineteenth century. The views of Undol'sky, Odoyevsky, Razumovsky, Arnol'd, Metallov, and others, on the development of sacred music are considered as they pertain to key viewpoints about the need for reform.

In Russia, as doubtless in other domains in Christendom, the revision of ecclesiastic and stylistic elements in sacred music frequently appear to have emerged as a consequence of problems related to a weakened position, or even crisis, for the church socially and/or politically. Such problems were frequently manifested in a loss of authority and decrease in church attendance. The first signs of an increase in tension between Russian ecclesiastic and secular domains in Russia, which developed into open antagonism at the end of the nineteenth century, were seen at the beginning of the eighteenth century. In Russia, since the late 1720s, secularisation of some aspects of church practice gained pace, which, at the same time, coincided with an increasing subordination

of the church to the state.¹ An example of this can be seen in the demands of the latter that the former become its “eyes and ears” in the dioceses.²

G. V. Florovsky (1893–1979)³ identified the Petrine period (1696–1725) as a point of intensified pressure on the independence of the church and its increasing subordination to the state. According to Florovsky, Peter the Great intended to govern the church according to Western practices.⁴ These moves had the effect of generating a distrust of the church amongst its followers, people who had already experienced the consequences of living in what was effectively a police state. In the eighteenth century, increasing unrest can be seen in various aspects of social organisation. For example, V. O. Klyuchevsky (1841–1911) and Florovsky both pointed out that the further entrenchment of serfdom and resulting popular rebellions (most notably the Pugachyov uprising) reflected social discontent across classes.⁵ Additionally, spiritual needs, which were increasingly less well met by the modernised Orthodox Church, led to a rise in the search for alternatives in movements such as Freemasonry.⁶ Morosan claims that it was around this period that Russian sacred music lost the leading position it had previously commanded, for the next couple of centuries.⁷

In the climate of paranoia that prevailed amongst Russia’s rulers in the eighteenth century, the church was required to preach obedience and subservience to officialdom.⁸ The clergy were forced to obey official dictates that sometimes resulted in inappropriate, even sacrilegious, practices. For example, clergy were required to wear images of the Empress Anna Ioannovna

¹ Richard Taruskin, *On Russian Music* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), 156.

² Ritzarev, *Eighteenth-Century Russian Music*, 345–46 (see intro., n. 2).

³ G. V. Florovsky was a Russian-born priest, theologian, and historian. In 1920 he immigrated to Prague. In 1926 he moved to Paris, became deacon and then priest, and published *Puti russkogo bogosloviya* [Paths of Russian Theology]. Some twenty years later he moved to America; he died in 1979, in Princeton.

⁴ G. V. Florovsky, *Puti russkogo bogosloviya. Istoriya russkogo bogosloviya, i yego stanovleniye* [Paths of Russian Theology, History of Russian Theology and Its Formation], 2nd ed., part 1 (1983; repr. USA: Holy Trinity Orthodox School, 2003), 1: 60, 62. Page references are to the 2003 edition.

⁵ V. O. Klyuchevsky, *Lektsii po russkoy istorii professora Moskovskogo Universiteta V. O. Klyuchevskogo* [Lectures on Russian History by Professor of Moscow University V. O. Klyuchevskogo], as the manuscript (St. Petersburg, 1902), 3: 155, 226.

⁶ Florovsky, *Puti russkogo bogosloviya*, 81–83.

⁷ Morosan, “Folk and Chant Elements,” 114 (see chap. 1, n. 11).

⁸ The Emperor Pavel I (1754–1801) believed, or at least this was the official explanation, that the causes of rebellion and mutiny lay in a lack of homily in churches; see N. M. Nikol'sky, *Istoriya russkoy tserkvi* [A History of the Russian Church], 3rd ed., ed. N. S. Gordiyenko (Moscow: Politizdat, 1985), 224; Ritzarev, *Eighteenth-Century Russian Music*, 346 (see intro., n. 2); also see L. V. Milov, ed., *Istoriya Rossii s drevneyshikh vremyon do nachala XXI veka* [History of Russia from Ancient Times to the Beginning of the Twenty-First Century] (Moscow: EKSMO, 2006), 77.

(1693–1740) in décolleté as a part of their vestments, while Catherine II (1729–1796) was portrayed as the Virgin on a fresco of the Mogilev Cathedral.⁹ In the second half of the eighteenth century, disengagement with the official church was met with punitive measures such as the imposition of fines for non-attendance.¹⁰

The period following the War of 1812 is usually identified as the beginning of a revitalisation of Russian national self-esteem and prestige.¹¹ It affected all aspects of cultural life and challenged a transition from Western to Russian styles in music and art, the establishment of critical studies of art along with organisations of diverse assemblies, societies, and circles, devoted to a revitalised national culture. Also, as Swan observes, this period witnessed an increase in influence of the two major cities Moscow and St. Petersburg.¹² Florovsky claimed that at the beginning of the nineteenth century the government of Aleksandr I (r. 1801–1825) sought to portray itself overtly as a religious one.¹³ It determined to resolve the situation with the Old Believers not through force but through a process of ecclesiastical dialogue. To achieve this, the church was given increased financial support.¹⁴ As Florovsky has noted, the Russian government's attempts to boost the religious spirit amongst the people has to be seen in the context of emerging nationalism and as an effort to regain religious supremacy for the Orthodox Church.¹⁵

The 1820s, however, could be characterised as having a lack of clear direction in state purposes and definitions on the path to be followed by the church, which had also to serve as a deterrent action for any revolutionary activity. In this decade, for instance, Aleksandr I changed the policy of acceptance of freedom of faith to one of rejection and prohibition of Christian societies and lodges that had become associated with revolutionary ideas.¹⁶ This uncertainty of direction could also be seen inside the church, for example, in the attempts in the 1820s to translate the Bible from Church Slavonic to Russian. Although this initiative found some supporters, in general it faced rejection by ultra conservatives for whom any translation of the Bible was perceived as

⁹ Ritzarev, *Eighteenth-Century Russian Music*, 346.

¹⁰ Klyuchevsky, *Leksii po russkoy istorii*, 198.

¹¹ Rapatskaya, *Istoriya russkoy muziki*, 61, 62 (see intro., n. 3).

¹² Swan, *Russian Music*, 156 (see chap. 1, n. 17).

¹³ Florovsky, *Puti russkogo bogosloviya*, 95.

¹⁴ S. M. Solov'yov, *Uchebnaya kniga russkoy istorii* [Educational Book of Russian History], 1st ed. (Moscow: Soldatenkov and Shepkin, 1859), 564.

¹⁵ Florovsky, *Puti russkogo bogosloviya*, 95–97.

¹⁶ Milov, *Istoriya Rossii*, 434–35.

heresy.¹⁷ Hence we can see a lack of unanimity occurred in both ruling domains—in the government and the church. This also reflects, no doubt, a wider tension emerging between conservatives and liberals in general.

While the pro-nationalistic views gained momentum in the first half of the nineteenth century, there was a corresponding development of pro-Western thinking. The well-known movements of Slavophiles (1840s) and Westernisers (1840s–1850s) represent the most conspicuous of the major philosophical battles that took place among the nineteenth-century intelligentsia. The Slavophile belief in Orthodoxy as the unifying and redemptive moment for the entire nation undoubtedly stimulated nationalistic discussions in the circles of the proponents of the church. I. V. Kireyevsky (1806–1856), a prominent Slavophile, perceived Orthodoxy as the one true and authentic religion.¹⁸ The Russian philosopher P. Ya. Chaadayev (1794–1856) also supported Orthodox Christianity. He claimed in his *Filosoficheskiye pis'ma* [Philosophical Letters], however, that the period in which he was writing (the 1820s and 30s) witnessed a stagnation of the development of religion, and Russia in general.¹⁹ While acknowledging the benefits of foreign influence, which in his words was the geographical connection of Russia to East and West, he expressed deep concerns for lack of and, foremost, disinclination toward, progress.²⁰

The Great Emancipation of 1861 further increased artistic interest in the common folk (the peasantry) and their way of life. In literature, for instance, this focus is seen in the work of V. I. Dal' (1802–1872), I. S. Turgenev (1818–1883), N. S. Leskov (1831–1895), and the early works of L. N. Tolstoy (1828–1910). Some of these works were very much adjusted to the readers' level and resorted increasingly to colloquialism, as noted by Klyuchevsky.²¹ Undoubtedly this kind of adjustment was evident also in Russian sacred music of the last decades of the nineteenth century as composers increasingly resorted to idioms and styles that reflected common associations with folk art.

In the middle of the nineteenth century, the state of religion and the public attitude to the church underwent further challenges with the growth of atheism and scepticism amongst certain parts of the intelligentsia.²² In Russia of the nineteenth century, and especially in the later decades,

¹⁷ Florovsky, *Puti russkogo bogosloviya*, 112–17.

¹⁸ I. V. Kireyevsky, *Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy* [Complete Collected Works] (Moscow: Koshelev, 1861), 1: 13.

¹⁹ P. Ya. Chaadayev, *Filosoficheskiye pis'ma* [Philosophical Letters], ed. Vl. N. Ivanovsky (Kazan': Gran', 1906), 11–13.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 11–12.

²¹ Klyuchevsky, *Leksii po russkoy istorii*, 498.

²² Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 292 (see intro., n. 2).

the church continued to experience a great decrease in attendance. The intellectual elites favoured libertarianism and freethinking, which obviously discouraged religious participation; the working classes in the cities were also abandoning the church during this period.²³

A demoralising atmosphere inside the church, especially amongst clergy, also affected the overall public distrust of the church: inappropriate lifestyles and immorality among the clerical class turned churchgoers against the church. Smolensky's experience in the Assumption Cathedral in the Moscow Kremlin gives some indication of the state of affairs.²⁴ Smolensky, who was accustomed to the sedate and moderate style of clerical life in Kazan', was profoundly shocked to encounter discourtesy, alcohol abuse, smoking and indecent talk among the Muscovite clergy. Additionally, the composer expressed his dismay at witnessing the materialism of clergymen who would boast extravagantly about luxury possessions or extravagant celebrations.²⁵ N. P. Dolgushin, a Russian church choir conductor of the late nineteenth century, saw the main impediment to reform in church music as lying in the clergy itself.²⁶ He condemned what he saw as a poor situation in church life, characterising it as one of humiliations and quarrels, in which there was little appreciation amongst the clergy for conductors and choirs. He cites cases in which clergy reacted negatively when the choir extended the time needed to complete the service.²⁷ Undoubtedly, such attitudes antagonised members of the congregation, whose relations with the church were already strained.

2.2. Historical overview of Russian church music and nineteenth-century historiographical awareness

In order to reach a broad understanding of the rationale for reforms that arose in the nineteenth century, it is important to outline the various metamorphoses that occurred in Russian church music over the course of its history. Although the pre- and post-reform years have been

²³ Nikol'sky, *Istoriya russkoy tserkvi*, 425–26.

²⁴ Smolensky gives many examples of the immoral behaviour of clergy in Assumption Cathedral in Kremlin. For more information on this subject, see Rakhmanova, *Stepan Vasil'yevich Smolensky*, 242–43 (see chap. 1, n. 37).

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 242.

²⁶ N. P. Dolgushin, "Tormozi tserkovnogo peniya" [Impediment of Church Singing], 1907, repr. in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmyslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918], vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, ed. M. P. Rakhmanova, comps. A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002), 626.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 631. The adjustment of church service was not a new practice, for example, shortening of it was evident in the middle of the sixteenth century; see p. 45, 47.

studied in scholarly literature,²⁸ it is necessary for the reader of any serious study of Russian church music to be aware of core elements of Russian Orthodox sacred singing, such as the evolution of *znamennoye peniye* [sign-notated singing], *partesnoye peniye*,²⁹ and the *obikhodnoye peniye* [the basic everyday chants]. Therefore, this section provides a synopsis of developments that occurred in Russian sacred music. Also, it looks into critical understandings of this process by musical figures and critics that prompted the reformatory agenda at the end of the nineteenth century.

Musical figures and scholars of the nineteenth century, such as Razumovsky, Smolensky, Metallov, and Florovsky, distinguished between several developmental periods of Russian sacred music. Razumovsky claimed that a development of melodic church singing in Russia could be divided into two categories: unnotated (*znamennoye*) and notated.³⁰ Metallov broadly categorised the era from the twelfth to sixteenth centuries as a one of monodic church music and that from the middle of the seventeenth century (from Nikon's time) as one of harmonic music.³¹ Florovsky assessed the two-century period from the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries as one in which there was a preparatory turn to Western traditions.³² Gardner, as a researcher in the twentieth century, was obviously aware of these attempts at periodisation, which he studied and revised into a more detailed system. His approach is adopted in this study as it is, despite its age, still the most complete. Gardner, presumably following Metallov, identified two paramount epochs, each of which he subdivided into four periods.³³ His first epoch was mostly characterised by monophonic singing, divided into periods comprising: 1) an initial period—from the tenth to eleventh centuries; 2) the development of the *znamennoye peniye*—eleventh to fourteenth centuries; 3) the period of “monk-educators,”³⁴ and the proliferation of monasticism, and monasteries, monastic types of service and singing³⁵—fourteenth to sixteenth centuries; and 4) pre-Nikonian rudiments of

²⁸ See study by Metallov, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye russkoy tserkvi* (see chap. 1, n. 40); V. M. Metallov, *Ocherk istorii pravoslavnogo tserkovnogo peniya v Rossii* [Essays of History of Orthodox Church Singing in Russia] (Saratov: Tipografiya gubernskogo zemstva, 1893); Morosan, *One Thousand Years* (see intro., n. 12); Nikol'sky, *Istoriya russkoy tserkvi*; Findeizen, *From Antiquity* (see chap. 1, n. 46); and Ritzarev, *Eighteenth-Century Russian Music*.

²⁹ For translation, see chap. 1: 27.

³⁰ Razumovsky, *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii*, 95 (see chap. 1, n. 8).

³¹ Metallov, *Ocherk istorii*, 57, 61.

³² Florovsky, *Puti russkogo bogosloviya*, 11, 13–22.

³³ Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 1: 25 (see chap. 1, n. 4).

³⁴ *Monashestvuyushchiye* [literally “livers of monastic life”] or *monakhi-uchitelya* [“monk-educators”]. Generally, both these terms are used to describe the same class of person; however, I have retained “monk-educators” because it clearly reflects the missionary role they performed.

³⁵ Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 1: 377.

polyphonic singing and first experiments with Western staff notation, as well as the emergence of the *partesnoye peniye*—sixteenth to mid seventeenth centuries.³⁶

The second epoch began, according to Gardner, in the middle of the seventeenth century and continued even after the Revolution of 1917. The periods of this epoch are: 1) the development of *partesnoye peniye*, patriarch Nikon's reforms, and the *partesniy kontsert*³⁷—mid-seventeenth century until eighteenth century; 2) the period of Italian influence—eighteenth to mid-nineteenth centuries; 3) the *Peterburgskiy* [St. Petersburg]³⁸ period from the mid-nineteenth to the beginning of the twentieth century; 4) the *Moskovskiy* [Muscovite]³⁹ period, from the beginning of the twentieth century until the Revolution.⁴⁰

Over the course of research for this thesis it has become clear that several corrections to the aforementioned timeframe have to be made. Regarding the first epoch, it is worth considering the first two periods as one. This era is not the main area of study and regarding it as a single span takes Metallov's and Gardner's own claims that there were no liturgical singing records until the eleventh century into account.⁴¹ Therefore, the preliminary period—the period of monophony that preceded staff notation—began in the tenth century and lasted until the fourteenth century. This includes the first two periods according to Gardner's timeframe.

In the second epoch some alterations regarding the last two periods are also required. The Italian influence in Russian music began from the time the Italian composers Baldassare Galuppi and Giuseppe Sarti arrived to serve the Imperial Court⁴²; therefore the second period could be considered to have started in the 1730s, lasting until the 1830s. The *Peterburgskiy* period started around the 1830s, but finishes earlier than Gardner suggests, because the beginning of the following period coincides with the loss of the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella*'s censorship in 1878 (to be discussed further below), which should be understood as a turning point. Consequently, the last

At that time the first rudiments of an early schools sacred singing were established in central cities like *Velikiy Novgorod* and Moscow; see Findeizen, *From Antiquity*, 107.

³⁶ Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 1: 23–26.

³⁷ For translation, see chap. 1: 27.

³⁸ Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 1: 25.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 25.

⁴⁰ The period after the Revolution might constitute the fifth period; nevertheless, this should be considered as a separate complex period of sacred music inside Russia and in emigré communities outside Russia; see Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 2: 461 (see intro., n. 15).

⁴¹ Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 1: 24.

⁴² Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 267.

period (*Moskovskiy*) may be thought of as having started in the 1880s. Gardner states that sacred music did not develop after the Revolution, either in émigré communities or inside the USSR; therefore, the fourth period is considered to have finished with the Revolution in 1917. Sacred music composed after 1917 either in Russia or abroad would have to belong to a fifth category, beyond the scope of this research. In this thesis the revised periodisation, which is based on Gardner's findings, is shown in table 2.1.

Table 2.1. Revised periodisation of Russian sacred music development.

Epoch	Period
1	1) Preliminary period: from tenth century to fourteenth century;
	2) Period of “monk-educators”: from fourteenth to sixteenth centuries;
	3) Pre-Nikonian period: from sixteenth to mid-seventeenth centuries.
2	1) Period of <i>partesnoye peniye</i> : from mid-seventeenth century to eighteenth century;
	2) Italian period: from the 1730s to the 1830s;
	3) <i>Peterburgskiy</i> period: from around the 1830s to the 1878;
	4) <i>Moskovskiy</i> period: from the 1880s to the Revolution in 1917.

The essence of Christian Orthodox religion as well as church singing is traditionally seen to lie in characteristics of grace, edification and temperance.⁴³ These have been widely conceived as the distinctive foundations of traditional Russian Orthodox church singing, which differentiated it from the music of pagan cultures.⁴⁴ Another distinguishing feature between Christian (Orthodox) and pagan musical culture was the prohibition of musical instruments in the former.⁴⁵ Russian Orthodox singing is, and always has been, entirely *a cappella*; even the organ is not, and never was, accepted by the Orthodox Church. Only the human voice is assigned a legitimate musical capacity

⁴³ O. A. Pashina et al., *Narodnoye muzikal'noye tvorchestvo* [Folk Musical Art], chief ed. O. A. Pashina (St. Petersburg: Kompozitor, 2005), 36.

⁴⁴ For more information, see Pashina, *Narodnoye muzikal'noye tvorchestvo*, 35–36.

⁴⁵ The church regarded folklore musical dances and instruments as diabolic and had to be eliminated from the use. For more details on the subject, see Rapatskaya, *Istoriya russkoy muziki*, 13–17.

for sacred purposes.⁴⁶ According to the Assembly of 1274, only approved and devoted people were qualified to read in a *naraspev* [chanting voice] and to sing sacred chants.

The preliminary stage in development of Russian church music involved the introduction of singing material that was unfamiliar to the populace and its consequent, slow adaptation to national needs. The Russian Orthodox church-singing traditions derived from those of the Byzantine Empire. This derivation involved an adaptation of both melodic elements and language.⁴⁷ The latter eventually merged with the Slavic language and developed into Church Slavonic. In recent scholarship, N. P. Strakhova characterises this phenomenon as a process of “domestication,” through the interaction of native languages and the influence of folk-singing traditions with the inheritance from Byzantium.⁴⁸ According to Arnol’d, writing in 1880, Russian Orthodox chant theory resembled ancient Greek music theory.⁴⁹ Metallov similarly stated that the Russian Orthodox Church received an entirely established and complete system of church singing that was taught by Greeks.⁵⁰ His belief in Greek influence on Russian church singing and notation, as Metallov admitted, contradicted Smolensky’s national perception that both components were an utterly Russian invention.⁵¹ While the adaptation encompassed almost the whole array of church singing, some remnants of the Greek language and Greek sacred musical forms were retained in sacred books, even to the present day. These are the *stikhira* [stanza], *kondak* [kondakion], *tropar’* [troparion],⁵² *prokimen* [prokeimenon], and *irmos* [irmos].⁵³

⁴⁶ Rapatskaya, *Istoriya russkoy muziki*, 12.

⁴⁷ Gorchakov, *Opit*, 2–6 (see chap. 1, n. 13).

⁴⁸ Strakhova, *Russkaya kul'tura 10–17 vekov*, 147 (see intro., n. 12).

⁴⁹ Arnol’d, *Teoriya*, 4 (see chap. 1, n. 26).

⁵⁰ Metallov, *Ocherk istorii*, 33–35.

⁵¹ Metallov, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye russkoy tserkvi*, viii.

⁵² *Tropar’* derives from Byzantine troparion, and is a poetic addition to psalms, canticles and doxologies; see Christian Troelsgård, “Troparion,” *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed June 14, 2017, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/subscriber/article/grove/music/28455>. *Tropar’* serves as a summation of the canticles of a particular day; see Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 1: 92. *Stikhira* is a hymn that was sung between verses of psalms. *Irmos*, from the Greek verb “to tie,” provides a musical link between biblical readings and a theme that is developed in *tropar’*; see Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 1: 94. *Prokimen* is usually taken from psalms and sung before reading the Gospel; see Christian Troelsgård, “Prokeimenon,” *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed June 14, 2017, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/subscriber/article/grove/music/40455>; Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 1: 104. These hymns consist of eight to twelve strophes and relate to a sacred feast.

⁵³ Strakhova, *Russkaya kul'tura 10–17 vekov*, 157; Rapatskaya, *Istoriya russkoy muziki*, 29.

Razumovsky held that early Orthodox Christians built their singing practice on the Greek theory of church singing and its eight modes.⁵⁴ Despite not being able to provide substantial evidence, he also asserted that early Russian church singing has received the Greek practice in its entirety. It can be suggested that this form incorporated many of the same Greek principles of rhythmic verse organisation along with technical organisation and “hook-writing” that took the form of *znamennoye peniye* in Rus'.⁵⁵ Undol'sky asserted that by the twelfth century proficiency in *znamennoye peniye* had improved and Russian singers were able to apply the *znamya* [sign] to various sacred singing chants.⁵⁶ Even though the *znamennoye peniye* was a written (graphic) form of singing notation, the melodic sequence of the pitch and intervals were allegedly memorised rather than read.⁵⁷ *Znamennoye peniye* functioned by “summarising” a musical pattern and depicting it as a *znamya*.⁵⁸ Gardner states that the beginning pitch of the sign pattern was also relatively imprecise and depended on the vocal range of the singer.⁵⁹

After the time of Mongolian domination, during the first epoch of the second period, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the influence of Moscow as a political and cultural centre increased significantly.⁶⁰ These centuries also witnessed a substantial growth of the influence of ecclesiastical activities. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the first attempts to consolidate the *znamenniy* [sign-notated] melodies into a more specific form of notation were undertaken. The translation of *znamyona* [signs] was embarked upon firstly in monastic books and then spread out across all dioceses.⁶¹ Monks and clergy began to perform educational roles as part of this process.⁶² The clergy were advised to establish parish schools for reading and singing throughout all

⁵⁴ Razumovsky, *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii*, 19.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 58–59; also see Findeizen, *From Antiquity*, 59, 60, 69.

⁵⁶ Undol'sky, *Zamechaniya*, 3 (see chap. 1, n. 15).

⁵⁷ For example, the sign *krizh* [cross] would usually be put at the end of a chant and meant that the last note had to be sustained. The signs were accompanied by recommendation such as “*strelku svetluyu–poderzhat' i povernut' vverkh dvazhdi*” [light arrow—to hold and turn upwards twice]; see Strakhova, *Russkaya kul'tura 10–17 vekov*, 148. Brill states that *znamenniy* notation possessed no reference to intervallic characteristics while served as a visual stimulus for singers who memorised the related melodic patterns; see Brill, *History of Russian Church Music*, 19 (see chap. 1, n. 122). Morosan claims that *znamennoye peniye* could vary from “syllabic to melismatic.” For more information, see Morosan, “Folk and Chant Elements,” 114.

⁵⁸ Razumovsky, *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii*, 23, 24; Rapatskaya, *Istoriya russkoy muziki*, 25.

⁵⁹ Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 1: 140.

⁶⁰ Razumovsky characterised the church music from the Christianisation to 1860s as consisting of two periods: unnotated and notated singing; see Razumovsky, *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii*, 95.

⁶¹ Ibid., 73, 74; Metallov, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye russkoy tserkvi*, 262.

⁶² Razumovsky, *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii*, 65–66.

dioceses.⁶³ These monk-educators were widely experienced in singing and reading *znamyona*. They originated from the city of *Veliky Novgorod* [Novgorod the Great]—a major ecclesiastical centre at this time.⁶⁴ Having dozens of pupils, they spread the traditions of singing the *znamyona* throughout the country. The most talented educators and their pupils moved to Moscow, eventually, bringing the highest standards of church singing to the city. These developments facilitated the education, proliferation and distribution of church singers qualified in *znamyona*.⁶⁵

In the sixteenth century (third period), significant church reforms commenced. It was during this period that varied chant settings of sacred texts became legitimised and named according to their place of origin.⁶⁶ The advent of the new hymns resulted in the acceptance of local variations of settings of the *znamennoye peniye* by various cities' choirs. Towards the end of the sixteenth century the most prominent variations in the chant tradition were the Ukrainian settings with a (clearly stated) major–minor tonal system which was later seen, for example by Preobrazhensky, as an appealing factor in the Ukrainian-Polish *kant* [canticle].⁶⁷ Additionally, Bulgarian and Greek variations emerged—the Russian adaptations of the Greek church singing⁶⁸—and their variations: *Novgorodian* (from Novgorod the Great), *Vologodsky* (from Vologda), *Kirilobelozyorsky* (from Kirilobelozyorsk), *Valaamsky* (from Valaam Island), etc. Perhaps most significantly, these new local variations—Ukrainian, Bulgarian, and Greek—introduced staff notation, rudiments of major and minor modes and repetitions of musical lines, rather than *popevochnoye* singing (i.e. singing based on *popevki* [singing patterns]).⁶⁹

While the distribution of church singing might be seen as a positive development, the number of pupils and singers was unable to satisfy the church's growing need for trained singers. By the end of the sixteenth century, *znamennoye peniye* in its notated form was flourishing widely throughout Russia.⁷⁰ However, this proliferation had its drawbacks. The increased quantity of

⁶³ Ibid., 68.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 69.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 69; Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 1: 447.

⁶⁶ Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 1: 463; Strakhova, *Russkaya kul'tura 10–17 vekov*, 152.

⁶⁷ For more information on the subject, see Preobrazhensky, *Kul'tovaya muzika v Rossii*, 48–50 (see chap. 1, n. 43).

⁶⁸ P. A. Bezsonov, *Pravoslavnoye obozreniye* [Orthodox Review] (Moscow: Katkov, 1864), 28.

⁶⁹ Smolensky explained the *popevki* as melodies based on succession of singing models; see S. V. Smolensky, *O blizhayshikh prakticheskikh zadachakh i nauchnikh raziskaniyakh v oblasti russkoy tserkovno-pevcheskoy arkheologii. Pamyatniki drevney pis'mennosti i iskusstva* [The Important Practical Targets and Scientific Studies in the Field of Russian Church-Singing Archeology. Monuments of Ancient Literature and Art] (St. Petersburg: Skorokhodov, 1904), 43; Rapatskaya, *Istoriya russkoy muziki*, 44; Ritzarev, *Eighteenth-Century Russian Music*, 25–26.

⁷⁰ Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 1: 151–54.

znamyona [signs], which were unfamiliar to some singers, inevitably caused confusion.⁷¹ Despite the fact that church copyists had a theological education, they made numerous mistakes in deciphering the Old-Slavonic language. The limited literacy of the singers and their aspiration to achieve smooth performances of *znamenniye* chants that would fit the liturgical text led to the appearance of an excessive number of additional syllables in the sacred texts.⁷² Moreover, according to Razumovsky and Findeizen, by the middle of the sixteenth century, the Russian liturgy had undergone drastic changes, particularly in the shortening of the service. This was achieved by simultaneous performance of different parts of the service, a practice known as *mnogoglasiye* [many-voices]. The practice of *mnogoglasiye* prompted further transformations of the church service, whose ultimate effect was to reduce the singing component and replace it with reading.⁷³

In the sixteenth century, church-choral activity increased. The choir of the *Gosudarevi pevchiye d'yaki* [Sovereign Singing Deacons], which later became the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella* [Court Singing Chapel], gained fame not only in Moscow but also in those provinces visited by the Tsar whose entourage included this singing group. A second role of the *Gosudarevi pevchiye d'yaki* was to preserve what was regarded as genuine Russian Old-church singing. In the same century, the *Patriarshiye pevchiye d'yaki* [Patriarchal Singing Deacons], later known as the *Sinodal'niy khor* [Synodal Choir], was also established.⁷⁴ It is quite possible that in the formation of these two groups during the sixteenth century we might recognise the beginnings of the two “schools” of sacred music in Russia. The difference between these two choirs lay in their dependant status; the former had state dependence, whereas the latter depended on the Patriarchy. As Razumovsky stated, Russian Patriarchs had always had a personal choir that was assigned a leading role during sacred services.⁷⁵ Preobrazhensky asserted that the *Sinodal'niy khor* had a strong tradition of using Old-Russian chants.⁷⁶ From this time, the differences between the two choirs, which implied the different choice of singing styles and sacred repertoire, took root and broadened.

⁷¹ Findeizen, *From Antiquity*, 108.

⁷² Metallov, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye russkoy tserkvi*, 262.

⁷³ *Mnogoglasiye* [many-voices] should be distinguished from *mnogogolosiye* [multivoices]; the first term has no harmonic connotation whereas the second term literally means polyphony. The essence of *mnogoglasiye* was in singing parts of liturgical service not consecutively but simultaneously; see Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 1: 446, 452; Razumovsky, *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii*, 67–68.

⁷⁴ For more information on these two choirs, see D. V. Razumovsky, *Patriarshiye pevchiye d'yaki i podd'yaki i gosudarevi pevchiye d'yaki* [Patriarchal Singing Deacons and sub-Deacons, and the Sovereign Singing Deacons] (St. Petersburg: Findeizen, 1895).

⁷⁵ Razumovsky, *Patriarshiye pevchiye d'yaki*, 19–23, 46; also see Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 1: 469.

⁷⁶ Preobrazhensky, *Kul'tovaya muzika v Rossii*, 117.

Toward the middle of the seventeenth century the diversity of the singing practices alluded to above coalesced into two main types of singing: the *pridvorniy* [courtly] type of singing adorned festive church services, whereas the *prostoy* [plain] was sung on a daily basis.⁷⁷ This coexisted with the continuing presence of *znamenniy* singing that was also represented in two types: *bol'shoy* [great] and *maliy* [small].⁷⁸ According to Morosan, the first of these two types closely resembled Byzantine chant singing. The *prostoy* type of chant, eventually, became commonplace.⁷⁹

The second epoch's first period is associated with the major ecclesiastical reforms of the seventeenth century. In the 1650s, the correction of liturgical books began. The process was supervised and led by the monk Aleksandr Mezenets (c.1600s–1667) who finally compiled the *Alfabet* (of *znamennoye peniye*) that was a century later revised and edited by Smolensky.⁸⁰ From 1652 to 1659, Tsar Aleksey Mikhaylovich (1645–1676) in collaboration with the Moscow Patriarch, Nikon (1605–1681), a devotee of everything modern, especially polyphonic music, continued and expanded the reforms started in the sixteenth century. The reforms introduced by Nikon had a major impact on all aspects of church life, and led to the schism in the middle of the seventeenth century. Florovsky characterised Nikon as Graecophile with a preference for the grandeur and splendour found in the Greek church service; his preferences were reflected in the reforms of sacred rituals, as Florovsky called them, and the negation of all Old-church practices.⁸¹ This marked the beginning of a revolutionary new era in Russian sacred music.⁸²

In the wider context of the reforms, Nikon oversaw the reform of *znamenniy* notation.⁸³ Under Nikon, this process began with the reform of sacred books⁸⁴ and proceeded with

⁷⁷ In some sources, different names for these two singing styles can be found—*prostoy* (*ustavnoy*) [statute] and *pridvorniy* (*neustavnoy*) [non-statute]. The statute chants were those that were approved by the Synod and aligned with church service. Non-statute chants were not aligned with ecclesiastical norms; see Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 1: 133–34. Odoyevsky described *prostoy* singing as monodic and built on diatonic scale; see V. F. Odoyevsky, *Mneniye knyazya V. F. Odoyevskogo po voprosam, vzbuzhdyonnim ministrom narodnogo prosveshcheniya po delu o tserkovnom penii* [Opinion of Prince V. F. Odoyevsky on the Question Raised by the Minister of Public Education About the Matter of the Church Singing] (St. Petersburg, 1866), 1.

⁷⁸ Metallov, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye russkoy tserkvi*, 270, 271–73.

⁷⁹ Morosan, *One Thousand Years*, xlv–xlvi.

⁸⁰ Brill, *History of Russian Church Music*, 42–43.

⁸¹ For more information on the subject, see Florovsky, *Puti russkogo bogosloviya*, 47–48.

⁸² Morosan, *One Thousand Years*, xxix–xxx; Rapatskaya, *Istoriya russkoy muziki*, 40.

⁸³ Rapatskaya, *Istoriya russkoy muziki*, 42, 46.

⁸⁴ The books possessed numerous, as they were perceived, cases of divergence of liturgical text and, as a consequence, musical element alteration. For more information on the subject, see Razumovsky, *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii*, 75–79; Findeizen, *From Antiquity*, 68.

ecclesiastical reforms in general that touched various aspects of church life such as the structure of the service, ritual aspects,⁸⁵ and the introduction of choral multi-voiced singing.⁸⁶ The essence of the reforms was dictated by his perception of Orthodox church ideals. This included, on the one hand, unification of Russian liturgical traditions with Greek church practice, on the other hand, he patronised the development of polyphonic singing in Russia.⁸⁷ Nikon's singing reforms encompassed an elimination of what was understood to be distorted elements in the Orthodox religious service such as the practice of many-voices (*mnogoglasie*); it also included an introduction of square notation written in C-clef on the third line of a stave.⁸⁸

The first harmonisations of church chants constituted occasional parallel 3rds and 5ths with an adjusted bass line; according to Gardner, it introduced a basic triadic concept of harmony.⁸⁹ The accommodation of the *znamennoye peniye* to the practice of *partesnoye* pushed the musical component of the chant away from its strophic organisation. The non-metrical individuality of Slavonic sacred strophes did not agree with the rhythmic structures of measured notation.⁹⁰ Gardner claimed that the requirements of the new system of *partesnoye peniye*⁹¹ were met by arbitrarily shortening individual syllables of musical lines from the old melodies. The main melodic line was now sung by the tenor rather than the descant.⁹² From 1668 polyphonic singing was officially permitted, and, indeed, encouraged⁹³ and *partesnoye peniye* found the full support of Tsar Aleksey.⁹⁴ One of the key thinkers on Russian sacred music of the mid-nineteenth century, Odoevsky looked back on this time critically, and decried not only the emergence of polyphonic

⁸⁵ Rapatskaya, *Istoriya russkoy muziki*, 42.

⁸⁶ Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 2: 46.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 36.

⁸⁸ Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 2: 36; also see Razumovsky, *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii*, 81, 84–86.

⁸⁹ Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 2: 62.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 74, 76; Strakhova, *Russkaya kul'tura 10–17 vekov*, 160.

⁹¹ Russian *partesnoye peniye* had a four-voice chordal structure. Typically, the main melodic line for *partesnoye peniye* was usually borrowed from *znamenniy* chant and was placed in tenor part; the bass part played a role of accompaniment, the descant sang in 3rds or 6ths above the tenor, and the alto further supplemented the harmony; see Rapatskaya, *Istoriya russkoy muziki*, 48.

⁹² Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 2: 74, 77.

⁹³ Rapatskaya, *Istoriya russkoy muziki*, 46.

⁹⁴ Metallov, *Ocherk istorii*, 61; Razumovsky, *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii*, 209–10.

harmonisations but also Western styles of singing, which he defined as the tendency to adorn *prostoy* chants with features of theatricality such as dotted rhythms and grace notes.⁹⁵

In the second half of the seventeenth century the *partesnoye peniye* thrived. Eventually, it developed into the *partesniy kontsert*. This genre of singing could commonly consist of between three and twelve vocal parts, and even, on rare occasions, extend to as many as forty-eight.⁹⁶ The harmonic style of the *partesniye* sacred compositions abounded in consonant intervals and chords as understood in the theory of the time. This style soon overshadowed the old, monophonic *znamenniy* system completely; moreover, due to the persecution of the Old Believers and the association of monophonic singing with them,⁹⁷ the older style was no longer politically in favour.

Although the proliferation of the *partesnoye peniye* was supported at the state level,⁹⁸ Razumovsky stated that the establishment of the polyphonic singing in Russia was also possible due to Russians' receptiveness to the foreign choral style—the same style that the nineteenth-century critics condemned for implanting dance-like and theatrical sounds into church music. Metallov's point of view on the distribution of such music was that a lack of practical guidance and written differentiation between appropriate Orthodox church singing and inappropriate Westernised harmonisations facilitated the acceptance of polyphonic-harmonic singing and the proliferation of *partesnoye peniye*.⁹⁹ At the turn of the eighteenth century, as Razumovsky held, an overseas music education became available for some selected students from church schools. At the same time a complete establishment of staff notation in Russia was complete. Martīnov claims that by the beginning of the eighteenth century, all church-singing books were put in staff notation.¹⁰⁰ These contributed to the distribution of manuscripts with notated chants, which were used in church services throughout Russia.¹⁰¹

⁹⁵ Odoyevsky, *Mneniye knyazy*, 9–11.

⁹⁶ Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 2: 82.

⁹⁷ Despite the association with schismatics, some composers yet attempted to preserve the purity of old *znamenniy* settings. In 1830, Turchaninov made an attempt to rearrange the old Orthodox chants. These arrangements were composed in Western style, reflecting still the European outlook at the beginning of the nineteenth century; it is understood that his settings of Old-church chants were less modified than others versions. Metallov, for example, names Turchaninov as the most reputable church composer of his time; see Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 269–71.

⁹⁸ Razumovsky, *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii*, 209.

⁹⁹ Metallov, *Ocherk istorii*, 59–60.

¹⁰⁰ Martīnov, *Istoriya bogosluzhebnogo peniya*, 136 (see intro., n. 2).

¹⁰¹ The publishing of church scores began in 1766 from the enthusiastic attempts of a worker in the printing house S. I. Bīshkovsky. The printing of selected chants took two years from 1770–1772; see Razumovsky, *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii*, 88–90; *Knyaz' V. F. O., K voprosu*, 8 (see chap. 1, n. 24).

At the beginning of the eighteenth century, due to abolition of the Patriarchate and establishment of *Svyateyshiy Sinod*,¹⁰² the *Patriarshiye pevchiye d'yaki* was renamed *Sinodal'niy khor*. The *Gosudarevī pevchiye d'yaki* became known as *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella* and was relocated to the new capital, St. Petersburg. The next stage in the development of two separate singing schools (Moscow and St. Petersburg) can be traced to this juncture.

The prominence of the *partesnoye peniye*, as an initial form of polyphonic singing, finished with the death of Peter I in 1725 and with the influx of foreign (particularly Italian) musicians, which began the second, so-called, Italian period of Russian church music.¹⁰³ In the 1730s, the Empress Anna appointed the Italian musician Francesco Araja (1709–c. 1770) to direct an opera troupe in Russia.¹⁰⁴ Odoevsky necessarily reflected positively on the influence of Catherine II (1729, r. 1762–1796) on the development of musical arts in Russia. He also acknowledged the importance of musical education that Russian composers acquired abroad in the eighteenth century; however, he agreed with the Metropolitan Yevgeny, who was less appreciative of the *kontsertnaya simfoniya* [concerto-symphony] and placed it in the category of Italianate sacred compositions.¹⁰⁵ Razumovsky stated, in similar view, that the participation of the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella*'s singers in the theatre choral activity accelerated the proliferation of Italian musical traditions in the sacred sphere.¹⁰⁶ He explained that, in 1742, due to a shortage of singers for staging the opera *Miloserdniye Tita* [La Clemenza di Tito] in St. Petersburg, the choristers of the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella* were engaged in the staging, because in this period they were regularly employed in Italian operas.¹⁰⁷ Razumovsky claimed that in the church music sphere of the eighteenth century the Italian kapellmeisters focused on a genre new for Russians—the *partesniy kontsert*.¹⁰⁸ The proliferation of the foreign musical traditions in the church music was greatly

¹⁰² For translation, see chap. 1: 17.

¹⁰³ Rapatskaya, *Istoriya russkoy muziki*, 57, 58.

¹⁰⁴ Metallov, *Ocherk istorii*, 63; also see Rapatskaya, *Istoriya russkoy muziki*, 69.

¹⁰⁵ Knyaz' V. F. O., *K voprosu*, 8–10.

¹⁰⁶ Razumovsky, *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii*, 225; also see H. A. Laroche, “O nineshнем sostoyanii tserkovnoy muziki v Rossii” [On the Current State of Church Music in Russia], 1869, repr. in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmishlenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918], vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, ed. M. P. Rakhmanova, comps. A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002), 152.

¹⁰⁷ Razumovsky, *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii*, 225. (The libretto for *La Clemenza di Tito* was written by Pietro Metastasio in 1734; it was first set, by Antonio Caldara in the same year, although it is not clear if this was the music performed in St. Petersburg in 1742 or not.)

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 226.

condemned by musical figures of the nineteenth century who strove to eliminate traces of the Italianate style from sacred compositions.

The priority of music over text was to become a distinguishing feature of church music in the eighteenth century. The foreign influence on Russian sacred music could also be associated with religious *kant* that appeared during the eighteenth century.¹⁰⁹ *Kant* was a genre that became very appealing to the public who, according to Swan, were tired of austerity and keen on joyful music.¹¹⁰ Preobrazhensky stated that *kant* was an influential mediator between Western musical form and Russian church singing.¹¹¹ The *kant* found its followers in both domains outside the church premises and inside the church. Traditionally, the *kant* was three-voiced and in strophic form, with frequently repeated text phrases or individual words.¹¹² Both genres, *partesnoye peniye* and *kant*, came to Russia from western and south-western Ukraine (regions historically exposed to Western influences) and bore features of Polish Catholic choral music.¹¹³

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, Gorchakov claimed that, because Russian composers had acquired such proficiency in the *partesniy* style, these settings could now be deemed “inherently national” rather than derivative of Western styles.¹¹⁴ The popularity of polyphonic Russian compositions of the turn of the nineteenth century (or *partesniy* as Razumovsky anachronistically referred to them), increased and, as a result, brought about a multitude of compositional mistakes in this type of music. This was because the complex texture of this music, requiring formal choral training for its performance, led choir conductors to simplify the compositions arbitrarily so as to suit the skills of their choirs. Razumovsky argued that this in turn led to the appearance of polyphonic compositions with inappropriate features; for instance, those with freely created text or the rendition of the *Kheruvimskaya pesn'* [Cherubic Song] in a joyful, rather than solemn, character.¹¹⁵ Gorchakov held that a composer of sacred music had to pay attention to a content of the liturgical text because “church music should please the soul and heart

¹⁰⁹ Asaf'ev states that *kant* existed before Petrine epoch and should not be associated with Western motet; see Asaf'ev, *O khorovom iskusstve*, 39 (see chap. 1, n. 84); also see Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 2: 111; and Rapatskaya, *Istoriya russkoy muziki*, 90.

¹¹⁰ Swan, *Russian Music*, 50.

¹¹¹ Preobrazhensky, *Kul'tovaya muzika v Rossii*, 48.

¹¹² Rapatskaya, *Istoriya russkoy muziki*, 57.

¹¹³ Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 2: 22, 67; also see Taruskin, *On Russian Music*, 59.

¹¹⁴ Gorchakov, *Opit*, ii.

¹¹⁵ Razumovsky, *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii*, 230–31.

but not the ears.”¹¹⁶ In 1816, in order to eliminate these mistakes, the state imposed an obligation to sing only notated polyphonic sacred compositions in church, which caused a significant step away from the Old *obikhodniy* [statutory] chants and also, as Razumovsky noted, caused a proliferation of the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella*’s sacred music.¹¹⁷

It was from this time that the censorship of the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella* directorate, under Bortnyansky and his adherents, emerged.¹¹⁸ Under this censorship, the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella* maintained the sole right to approve or prohibit every setting composed for church purposes.¹¹⁹ This further broadened the difference between the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella*’s sacred compositions and the Synodal publications. Statute sacred settings,¹²⁰ under this censorship, were overshadowed and supplanted by sacred compositions in an Italian style following Bortnyansky and M. S. Berezovsky (1745–1777).¹²¹ Preobrazhensky described the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella* at the beginning of the nineteenth century as a “nursery” of the Italian style.¹²² Odoevsky characterised the sacred music of Bortnyansky’s period as a combination of prayerful and theatrical (or even dance) music.¹²³ Arnol’d, addressing the issue of true national sacred music, asserted that in Bortnyansky’s time it was impossible to expect the existence of genuine Russian sacred music; any such thought could only be regarded as an absurdity.¹²⁴

The period of the Italianate sacred compositions ensued in a chain of events that was extremely significant for the forthcoming reform movement. In the 1830s, the activity of the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella* further increased through publication of harmonised chants of the Liturgy and a compilation of the *prostoy pridvorniy* chants—both printed in round notation, rather than in square notes.¹²⁵ Razumovsky claimed that after Bortnyansky’s time the influence on

¹¹⁶ Gorchakov, *Opit*, 28.

¹¹⁷ Razumovsky, *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii*, 238–39.

¹¹⁸ Metallov claimed that it was since this time that harmonic singing was established in Russia; see Metallov, *Ocherk istorii*, 72.

¹¹⁹ Laroche, “O nineshнем sostoyanii tserkovnoy muziki,” 151.

¹²⁰ See chap. 2, n. 77.

¹²¹ Laroche, “O nineshнем sostoyanii tserkovnoy muziki,” 152.

¹²² Preobrazhensky, *Kul'tovaya muzika v Rossii*, 87.

¹²³ Odoevsky, *Mneniye knyazya*, 8–9.

¹²⁴ Arnol’d, *Garmonizatsiya*, 5–6 (see chap. 1, n. 12).

¹²⁵ Razumovsky, *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii*, 246–47.

partesnoye peniye was concentrated in the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella*, whose sacred harmonisations were regarded by its contemporaries as an exemplar.

Preobrazhensky claimed that most of the churches in this time disobeyed the statute laws and failed in their ethical obligations in the choice of choral compositions.¹²⁶ Attempts to regulate church repertoire and therefore reduce the number of Italianate sacred compositions (concertos) still in use were seen in the 1830s. Razumovsky claimed that this resulted in an almost complete prohibition on performing large-scale polyphonic compositions (sacred concertos) during church services (except for wedding services or celebrations outside the church). This step caused the reduction in the number of such compositions.¹²⁷ This constraint obviously shifted the artistic focus away from writing larger, elaborate works to creating smaller-scale church compositions, found in the works of sacred-music composers since the 1830s.

Scholarly discussion on Old-Russian sacred chants that appeared in periodical literature in the 1840s prompted further interest in this aspect of the Russian musical heritage. According to Odoyevsky, historical findings made it possible to distinguish the notion of Old-sacred chants from music of Bortnyansky's era, which was previously regarded as part of the same tradition.¹²⁸ In the period when censorship of church compositions increased, Odoyevsky's concerns focused predominantly on the criteria for proscriptions. For instance, he suggested that censorship should be applied to only those sacred compositions that were to be included for church use; whereas, composers' work outside of that category should remain free. He considered the eparchial directorate to be a censoring body that should also advise on appropriate church repertoire, whereas musical artistic values of this repertoire could be evaluated by the public response to it.¹²⁹

The quest to find "proper" ways to harmonise Russian sacred chants encouraged amateur composers to take part in harmonisation of Old-church melodies from the beginning of the 1840s. Being driven by personal musical preferences, these composers offered various solutions.¹³⁰ Undoubtedly, this eagerness increased cases of musical mistakes and deviation from liturgical standards. As a result of this proliferation, in the 1840s the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella* attempted to eliminate variations of harmonised sacred chants and to increase the standardisation and accessibility of this repertoire. In order to familiarise the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella*'s

¹²⁶ Preobrazhensky, *Kul'tovaya muzika v Rossii*, 117.

¹²⁷ Razumovsky, *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii*, 239–40.

¹²⁸ Knyaz' V. F. O., *K voprosu*, 13–14.

¹²⁹ Odoyevsky, *Mneniye knyazya*, 12.

¹³⁰ Razumovsky, *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii*, 250.

directorates with various forms of harmonisation, the *kapella* collected copies of the three- and four-voice choral settings that were in circulation throughout all dioceses.¹³¹ The subsequent attempt to purify the sacred repertoire encompassed a whole collection of the sung church settings, which had to be printed in traditional round notation¹³² for a four-voice choir. This compilation was published in 1847.¹³³ These settings stimulated the further demands for preservation of the Old-sacred chants in future harmonisations; therefore, in 1848 diocesan commissions were organised in major cities of the country.¹³⁴ As a consequence, in 1848 the *Svyateyskiy Sinod* criticised the compositions published by the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella*, characterising them as being beyond acceptable church criteria, given that these new arrangements were adjusted to Italian stylistic parameters.¹³⁵ This move threatened the monopoly of the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella* and increased the tension between the two musical centres.

During the nineteenth century, a well-known rivalry between the two centres arose in relation to professional musical developments and understanding of national ideas. This tendency could be seen in both secular and sacred music. In secular music, the rivalry was seen, for instance, in the foundation of the nationalistic Balakirev circle (later known under Stasov's sobriquet, *Moguchaya kuchka*) and the populist Free Music School, as opposition to the state sponsored conservatories established under the Western-European model favoured by Anton Rubinstein and his adherents.¹³⁶ In sacred music nationalism, as composers perceived it, generally concentrated on using particular editions of sacred settings of Old chants.

In the nineteenth century the following organisations had obtained the governing roles in musical life: from the very beginning of the nineteenth century the *Filarmonicheskoye obshchestvo* [Philharmonic Society] appeared, followed by the *Russkoye muzikal'noye obshchestvo* [RMS¹³⁷; from 1869 Imperial Russian Musical Society], the Russian Choral Society in Moscow in 1872, and

¹³¹ Ibid., 250.

¹³² The printing of notated chants started in Russia in the eighteenth century but included square notation rather than traditional round notation that was introduced around five decades later. For more information on the subject, see Strakhova, *Russkaya kul'tura 10–17 vekov*, 163.

¹³³ Razumovsky, *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii*, 249.

¹³⁴ Ibid., 251.

¹³⁵ D. V. Razumovsky, “Tserkovno-russkoye peniye (fragmenti)” [Russian Church Singing (Fragments)], 1871, repr. in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmyslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918], vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, ed. M. P. Rakhmanova, comps. A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002), 122.

¹³⁶ Rapatskaya, *Istoriya russkoy muziki*, 161, 162, and 168.

¹³⁷ For translation, see chap. 1: 13.

the less well known but, for this work, vitally important, organisation—*Obshchestvo lyubiteley tserkovnogo peniya* [The Society for the Friends of Church Singing], henceforth referred to as *OLTP*. This latter was established in the 1870s and officially registered in 1880.¹³⁸ Although the status of Russian church music declined somewhat in an increasingly secularised nineteenth-century culture, an interest in the ancient church melodies dramatically increased as a corollary of the cultural movements associated with Nationalism. Almost all composers of the nineteenth century took part in a “purification” of church music through recourse to the Old-Russian church chants and composing settings based on those chants, in so far as they had access to them.¹³⁹

During the second half of the nineteenth century, the urge towards a restoration of Old-church melodic patterns increased. Dissatisfaction with the censorship of the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella* rose and reached climax in the 1870s. The actual fall of the *kapella*'s censorship occurred in 1878, the year in which Jurgenson's printing house won a victory over the *kapella*'s governance (under Bakhmetev) in a civil court action over rights to the publishing of Tchaikovsky's Liturgy of John Chrysostom.¹⁴⁰ The hopes placed on the directorate of the St. Petersburg *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella*, which in practical terms boiled down to the governance of Bakhmetev during 1860s and 70s and implied a revitalisation of the church-singing sector, had not so far been met. During these years, the image of the *kapella* as a guardian of genuine sacred singing traditions had soured. Odoyevsky criticised certain sacred compositions produced by the *kapella*'s musicians for containing chromaticism, sustained or syncopated notes, and wide intervals that were impossible to perform by amateur church choirs.¹⁴¹

¹³⁸ L. K. Shabalina, “Stolichniye i provintsial'niye muzikal'niye obshchestva 19–nachala 20 veka v Rossii” [Capital and Provincial Musical Societies of the Nineteenth and the Beginning of the Twentieth Centuries], *Izvestiya Ural'skogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta* 59, no. 16 (2008): 269–79; also see M. P. Rakhmanova, Vstupitel'naya stat'ya [Introductory Article] to “Obshchestvo lyubiteley tserkovnogo peniya” [The Society for the Friends of Church Singing], in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmishlenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918], vol. 3 of Rdmdm, ed. M. P. Rakhmanova, comps. A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002), 190. Note that *lyubitel'* might translate literally as “lover,” but also as “admirer,” “liker,” or “fan.” “Friend” while not a proper close translation, is in this context more idiomatic, as a “society of friends of” is a more familiar colloquialism in English.

¹³⁹ Morosan, *One Thousand Years*, xxxix–xl.

¹⁴⁰ Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 266; M. P. Rakhmanova, Vstupitel'naya stat'ya [Introductory Article] to “Liturgiya Petra Il'icha Tchaikovskogo” [The Liturgy of P. I. Tchaikovsky], in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmishlenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918], vol. 3 of Rdmdm, ed. M. P. Rakhmanova, comps. A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002), 159; also see N. I. Teterina, “Bortnyansky, Tchaikovsky & Jurgenson,” *Iskusstvo muziki: teoriya i istoriya*, no. 7 (2013): 7.

¹⁴¹ Odoyevsky, *Mneniye knyazya*, 3; also see Preobrazhensky, *Kul'tovaya muzika v Rossii*, 101.

At the beginning of the fourth period, in the 1880s, Tsar Aleksandr III (r. 1881–1894) directed that reforms of traditional church singing should take place.¹⁴² The other musical authority, the *Sinodal'noye uchilishche i khor* [Synodal College and Choir] in Moscow—was now seen by the governing *Sinod* as more suitable for achieving these goals. Frolova-Walker claims that the scholarly activity of Smolensky caused a shift of the school of sacred compositions from St. Petersburg to Moscow.¹⁴³ In St. Petersburg, Bakhmetev insisted on high quality scores released by the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella* alumni. In contrast, the Moscow composers argued for the superiority of their sacred settings.¹⁴⁴ Additionally, Smolensky led and encouraged Muscovite composers to experiment with harmonisations of church chants. Both the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella* censor and Archbishop Moskovskiy and Kolomenskiy Filaret adopted the church compositions of Smolensky. Smolensky was a propagandist of nationalist ideas in sacred music, ideas that were reflected in sacred works of Kastal'sky, Chesnokov, and others.¹⁴⁵ These experiments were supported by K. P. Pobedonostsev (1827–1907)—*ober-prokuror* [chief-prosecutor] of the *Svyateyshiy Sinod* from 1880 to 1905.¹⁴⁶ The further history of the two schools of church singing contains some informational lacunae, presumably due to the emphasis on the historical study of secular music.

In addition to the factors described above, there were two additional aspects to the rivalry between St. Petersburg and Moscow: a competitiveness based, on the one hand, on quality of choral singing and, on the other, repertoire composed.¹⁴⁷ Naturally, these are not exclusive factors. In these circumstances composers competed for the potential to have their work presented by a professional and prestigious choir. Not only did composers compete with each other, but choirs also shared rivalries. In Moscow, where skilled church choirs were much appreciated, from the 1850s onward there were at least nineteen professional choirs and about twenty-six amateur choirs with at least six privately sponsored church choirs (*Khor knyazya Obolenskogo* [the Choir of Prince Obolensky],

¹⁴² S. G. Zvereva, Vstupitel'naya stat'ya [Introductory Article] to “Arkhivniye dokumenti” [Archival Documents], in *Sinodal'niy khor i uchilishche tserkovnogo peniya: issledovaniya, dokumenti, periodika* [Synodal Choir and the College of Church Singing: Research, Documents, Periodicals], vol. 2 of Rdmdm, eds. S. G. Zvereva, A. A. Naumov, M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002), 261.

¹⁴³ Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 280.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 281.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 266.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 292.

¹⁴⁷ Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 2: 361.

Khor meshchanina Solov'yova [the Choir of the Merchant¹⁴⁸ Solov'yov], *Khor artista Seleznyova* [the Choir of the Artist Seleznyov], *Khor meshchanina Sokolova* [the Choir of the Petty-Bourgeois Sokolov], *Khor artista Bobovskogo* [the Choir of the Artist Bobovskogo], *Khor kuptsa Yerokhova* [the Choir of the Merchant Yerokhov]).¹⁴⁹ Towards the end of the nineteenth century, Moscow concerts of sacred music became a regular form of public entertainment.¹⁵⁰

In the last decades of the nineteenth century, the church as an institution underwent a significant decline. Smolensky, for example, found the *Moskovskoye Sinodal'noye uchilishche*¹⁵¹ in a dishearteningly dilapidated condition. Notwithstanding the improvements Smolensky himself made in this institution during his governance (1889–1901), the fact that the composer witnessed the declining process in the *uchilishche* shows something of the overall tendency in sacred music, and church life more generally, in Moscow. Talking about both the *Sinodal'niy khor* and the institutional body, Smolensky stated that at the end of the nineteenth century the level of theoretical knowledge of *Sinodal'niy* choristers was very low, as was their discipline,¹⁵² and that, therefore, maintaining a satisfactory level of choral performance in the *Uspensky sobor* [Assumption Cathedral] in the Kremlin would present a significant challenge for its director.

In 1882 the Archpriest A. N. Ivanov (from Tula), who was amongst the supporters of the reforms in Russian sacred music, identified a declining process in Russian sacred music of the nineteenth century in a memorandum published in the *Kiyevskiye yeparkhial'niye vedomosti* [Kievan Diocesan Gazette]. Ivanov described the overall dispiriting state of singing in remote churches and affirmed that, upon becoming acolytes, the former archiepiscopal choristers would often show little interest in the *obikhodnoye peniye*, finding them boring and less entertaining than the *partesnoye peniye* that seem to have flourished in archiepiscopal choirs. He also mentioned that an important aim for Russian sacred music was to gain an emotional response from the congregation.¹⁵³ As a consequence, Ivanov admitted that the *obikhodnoye peniye* came under threat

¹⁴⁸ Translating these titles into English is necessarily awkward. The choirs bore names and titles of their sponsors and owners.

¹⁴⁹ Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 2: 355.

¹⁵⁰ Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 281.

¹⁵¹ For translation, see chap. 1: 16.

¹⁵² S. V. Smolensky, “Moskva. Sinodal'niy khor i uchilishche tserkovnogo peniya” [Moscow. Synodal Choir and College of Church Singing], n. d., repr. in *Stepan Vasil'yevich Smolensky. Vospominaniya: Kazan', Moskva, Peterburg* [Stepan Vasil'yevich Smolensky. Memoirs: Kazan', Moscow, St. Petersburg], vol. 4 of Rdmmdm, ed. M. P. Rakhmanova, com. N. I. Kabanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turī, 2002), 232–34.

¹⁵³ A. N. Ivanov, “Popītki k vosstanovleniyu drevnetserkovnogo peniya” [Attempts at Restoration of Old-Church Singing], 1884, repr. in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmīslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918], vol. 3 of Rdmmdm, ed. M. P.

of disappearance. He saw further cause for the relegation of *obikhodnoye peniye* in the dissemination of Italianate Russian sacred music and reciprocal public appreciation of these settings.¹⁵⁴ This claim dates from the 1880s, which is another example of the actual state of sacred music in contrast to the more pervasive picture of national-oriented Russian sacred music in the late nineteenth century.¹⁵⁵

2.3. Nineteenth-century views on Russian sacred music and the reform agenda

Analytical understandings of Russian church music in its historical development first reached a critical mass in the nineteenth century in the thinking of a number of intellectuals, including those referred to in the pages above. As well as the aesthetic concerns of the reformers, there was an explicitly political dimension behind the movement as well in that reforms were called for by Pobedonostsev. The ensuing discussions involved the identification of appropriate features for a reformed Orthodox sacred music. As the amount of scholarly activity and number of attempts to understand the history of Russian church music gathered momentum, these understandings fed into the calls for reform that arose in relation to the issues of emerging nationalism discussed above. Describing the chant harmonisations created earlier in the nineteenth century, specifically those of P. I. Turchaninov (1779–1856) and A. L'vov, Smolensky wrote that these unsuccessful attempts exposed a need to reassess and rethink the methods of harmonisation.¹⁵⁶

A significant inhibiting factor in attempts to reform Russian church music in the later nineteenth century was a paucity of scholarly material. In the 1860s, Odoyevsky noted the scarcity of academic research on Russian sacred music theory¹⁵⁷ while Findeizen, similarly, found that all of the research materials that appeared in the nineteenth century failed to present a complete picture, serving at best as an impulse to a further research.¹⁵⁸ In the 1870s, he expressed frustration that G.

Rakhmanova, comps. A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002), 376–77, 381.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., 381.

¹⁵⁵ See Preobrazhensky, *Kul'tovaya muzika v Rossii*, 110.

¹⁵⁶ S. V. Smolensky, “Obzor Istoricheskikh kontsertov Sinodal'nogo uchilishcha tserkovnogo peniya v 1895 godu” [Review of Historical Concerts of Synodal College of Church Singing in 1895], 1895, repr. in *Sinodal'nyy khor i uchilishche tserkovnogo peniya: issledovaniya, dokumenti, periodika* [Synodal Choir and the College of Church Singing: Research, Documents, Periodicals], vol. 2 of *Rdmdm*, eds. S. G. Zvereva, A. A. Naumov, M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002), 212–13.

¹⁵⁷ Knyaz' V. F. O., *K voprosu*, 11.

¹⁵⁸ Razumovsky, *Patriarshiye pevchiye d'yaki*, 8.

Lomakin's (1812–1885) work on Russian sacred music and its findings on suitable harmonisations of the chants had not yet been published. Similarly, Razumovsky's important work on *znamennoye peniye* had still had not received adequate coverage.¹⁵⁹

Thinkers of the nineteenth century favoured uncluttered harmonisations of sacred chants and the use of simple harmonies, homophonic textures, vocal parts without extremes, and clearly enunciated liturgical text. Odoyevsky, for instance, praised Potulov's sacred harmonisations for precisely these qualities.¹⁶⁰ For Odoyevsky, Russian sacred music simply did not have certain features of secular music (he refers specifically to pauses, appoggiatura, and trills).¹⁶¹ Smolensky found that although Potulov's harmonisations of Old-sacred chants were frequently included in the repertoire of the *Sinodal'noye uchilishche*, they did not find a positive critical response because their simplicity was not appreciated.¹⁶²

National character in nineteenth-century Russian music was often achieved by the incorporation of traditional musical idioms. Zaytseva states that Balakirev established a tradition of the use of *znamenniy raspev* in the search for national colour in his instrumental music, a practice later taken up by Tchaikovsky, Rimsky-Korsakov, and S. V. Rachmaninoff (1873–1943).¹⁶³ Although this refers to secular music, a similar approach can be found in sacred music, in which traditional singing idioms were used to emphasise a sense of "Russianness." For some commentators, these tendencies did not always yield positive results. Arnol'd, for instance, distinguished a group of composers, whom he did not name, whose attempts at "Russianising" their music were contrived, resulting in "cacophonic" settings merely to satisfy their desire to create an authentic Russian sacred music.¹⁶⁴

Razumovsky, analysing Old-church singing of the seventeenth century, concluded that fast notes, such as semiquavers and smaller values, should not be accepted in contemporary church music as they imparted feelings of liveliness to music that he believed should be appropriately austere. He also stated that alterations of diatonic scales, except for the lowered $\hat{7}$, should not be used in the church signing.¹⁶⁵ Assessing the impact of the previous epoch, he also claimed that

¹⁵⁹ Knyaz' V. F. O., *K voprosu*, 16–17.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., 19–22.

¹⁶¹ Odoyevsky, *Mneniye knyazya*, 2.

¹⁶² Smolensky, "Obzor Istoricheskikh kontsertov," 213.

¹⁶³ Zaytseva, *Sokrovishcha Rossii*, 36 (see chap. 1, n. 57).

¹⁶⁴ Arnol'd, *Garmonizatsiya*, 9.

¹⁶⁵ Razumovsky, *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii*, 86.

towards the end of the eighteenth century there was an increase in the composition of sacred settings based on a liturgical text, in which the latter was usually drastically altered.¹⁶⁶ In contrast to his contemporaries, Razumovsky acknowledged *partesnoye peniye* as an impetus for a church singer to familiarise himself with various vocal parts and to develop choral skills crucial for a church conductor.¹⁶⁷ The opinion on homophonic *partesnoye peniye* expressed by musical figures during the last decades of the nineteenth century, as Razumovsky's position implies, was not in fact unanimously positive or negative. For example, Potulov appreciated the harmonic qualities of *partesnoye peniye*.¹⁶⁸ Razumovsky, while agreeing on the unsuitability of the polyphonic sacred concertos of the Italians for Russian church services, distinguished, as did his colleague Arnol'd, certain positive features (such as the conformity of elaborated music to liturgical text) in the so-called Italianate sacred compositions of Russian composers Berezovsky, A. L. Vedel' (1767–1808), and Bortnyansky.¹⁶⁹ Odoyevsky, however, criticised Bortnyansky for the use of dancing rhythms in his sacred compositions.¹⁷⁰ Metallov assessed Italianate sacred compositions as having no aesthetic or religious value; however, he had to acknowledge their widespread adoption around the country.¹⁷¹

Towards the end of the nineteenth century a perception of the musical qualities of church music changed towards more liberal opinions. Smolensky, describing his travel to Athos in the 1900s, regretfully admitted that those natural intervals (for the human voice) and poetic rhymed texts, used in Greek Orthodox compositions, were not yet utilised in Russian sacred music. He also explained that, being raised on tempered scales, contemporary Russian musicians did not accept natural sounds and actually gravitated towards dissonances such as 7th and 9th chords.¹⁷² The composer expressed his dissatisfaction with a general lack of knowledge of Russian chants amongst church-music composers, who failed to appreciate their organisation, free rhythms and forms.¹⁷³

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., 231.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., 217.

¹⁶⁸ N. M. Potulov, *Rukovodstvo k prakticheskomu izucheniyu drevnego bogoslužhebnogo peniya pravoslavnoy Rossiyskoy tserkvi* [The Guidance to Practical Study of Singing of Russian Orthodox Church], 4th ed. (without changes) (Moscow: Sinodal'naya tipografiya, 1888), 104.

¹⁶⁹ Razumovsky, *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii*, 228.

¹⁷⁰ Knyaz' V. F. O., *K voprosu*, 15.

¹⁷¹ Metallov, *Ocherk istorii*, 65–66.

¹⁷² S. V. Smolensky, *Iz dorozhnikh vpechatleniy* [From Road Impressions] (St. Petersburg: Tipografiya glavnogo upravleniya udelov, 1906), 26–27.

¹⁷³ Smolensky, *O blizhayshikh prakticheskikh zadachakh*, 4–5.

Metallov, analysing the sacred compositions of St. Petersburg-based composers Glinka and Potulov stated that these two composers harmonised the chants diatonically, obviously in accordance with the composers' perception of authentic church music, and in conscious opposition to Turchaninov's chromatic harmonisations.¹⁷⁴ Metallov's understanding, however, of musical operations in sacred music went beyond simple harmonisation. He stated that, although Potulov's harmonisations kept the chant melody intact and had features of austere edification, the fact that they did not have elaborate harmony was a drawback. He claimed that composers of sacred music contemporaneous with him attempted to eliminate this drawback by improving harmonies through inclusion of various 7th chords, cadences, and more developed principal melodies.¹⁷⁵ Still, however, the priority of text over the musical component—the correspondence of melodic rhythm to a text, the non-repetitiveness of strophes, and use of voices within their natural range—continued to be seen as indispensable to good harmonisation. For instance, Metallov praised M. A. Vinogradov's (1809–1888)¹⁷⁶ sacred compositions for their incorporation of precisely these features.¹⁷⁷

Preobrazhensky claimed that the new era of sacred chant harmonisation and composition started at the end of the nineteenth century; the features of this music could be seen in the compositions of Rimsky-Korsakov and Kastal'sky.¹⁷⁸ While Preobrazhensky pointed to imitative openings, chromaticism and 7th chords in Rimsky-Korsakov's harmonisations and stated these features were not new for the music, he also claimed that Rimsky-Korsakov's sacred harmonisations of 1885 laid a beginning of a “great union” of Russian sacred chants and traditions of national schools.¹⁷⁹

The aspirations for innovations and reforms in sacred music were probably also encouraged by reformatory movements in Western music history. The Caecilian movement that started in Germany in the nineteenth century called for reforms in Catholic music. The proponents of the reform sought inspiration in Palestrina's music and *style antico*.¹⁸⁰ The crucial requirements of the Caecilian reformists were grounded on Roman chapel music rather than on an expressive sacred

¹⁷⁴ Metallov, *Ocherk istorii*, 87.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 89.

¹⁷⁶ Razumovsky criticised the same Vinogradov for imitations of Italianate music; see Razumovsky, *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii*, 231.

¹⁷⁷ Metallov, *Ocherk istorii*, 91.

¹⁷⁸ Preobrazhensky, *Kul'tovaya muzika v Rossii*, 115.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 110.

¹⁸⁰ James Garratt, *Palestrina and the German Romantic Imagination: Interpreting Historicism in Nineteenth-Century Music* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 133–35.

music of the eighteenth century. Some of the requirements included avoidance of musical theatrical features such as word-painting, abundance of modulations and chromaticism.¹⁸¹ In the light of Russian reforms of the nineteenth century, we might identify analogous musical aspirations—Glinka, Potulov, and later, Taneyev all studied Palestrina’s sacred compositions. The objectives to achieve clear sacred harmonisations eventually crystallised in the Russian reformist agenda of the later nineteenth century. The requirements of this agenda stipulated the avoidance of “sumptuous” sounds in Russian sacred music, which, it was believed, would be achieved through the use of simultaneous singing of liturgical texts (without alteration), simple harmonies, and eschewing of Western musical characteristics such as appoggiature and dissonances.

The next chapter turns to the reformist composers’ opinions on the revitalisation of Russian church music and the ways to realise such an agenda. It also looks into contextualisation of the reformist movement and its aspirations as advanced by various intellectuals.

¹⁸¹ Siegfried Gmeinwieser, “Cecilian Movement,” *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed May 14, 2016, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/subscriber/article/grove/music/05245>.

Chapter 3

Late-Nineteenth-Century Russian Sacred Music, Composers, and Reforms

It is important for the purposes of this thesis to outline the activity of the most significant composers of church music in the context of the nineteenth-century reforms. This chapter, therefore, provides a more detailed background around the two Russian schools of sacred music in the second half of the nineteenth century. During this time, almost all well-known Russian composers turned to composing sacred music, applying recently gained knowledge in this area. Taking into account the composers' input, it is necessary to outline their activity in the context of the reformist movement. It is also important to study various expert views on the reformist agenda and summarise the supposed differences between the two schools of Russian sacred music.

3.1. Late-nineteenth-century composers of sacred music in the reformist context

The manifestation of nationalistic musical attitudes (which had already started a few decades earlier in secular music) increased in sacred music from the middle of the nineteenth century and gained momentum from the 1870s. As a consequence of the abolition of the censorship of the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella* in 1878,¹ an increasing number of composers started to write sacred music. From 1870 to 1917, dozens of Russian composers, apart from those who composed secular music, created more than fifty large-scale liturgical compositions and over a thousand individual settings of sacred chants. Lisitsin's *Obzor dukhovno-muzikal'noy literatury* clearly demonstrates that in the early 1900s over a hundred Russian composers of church music can be identified.² The *Svyateyshiy Sinod*,³ the governing body of the Russian Orthodox Church, approved their compositions for use and recommended many of them to church-choir conductors. However, in musicological literature, many of these works have received significantly less consideration than Russian secular music of the same period.

The cohort of composers who turned to composing sacred compositions in the second half of the nineteenth century and particularly during the period from 1870 to 1917 can be divided into two categories: (1) well-known composers of secular music whose sacred compositions remain (with perhaps a couple of noteworthy exceptions) more obscure; and (2) a group of lesser-known

¹ See chap. 2: 54; for translation, see chap. 1: 16.

² Lisitsin, *Obzor dukhovno-muzikal'noy literatury* (see chap. 1, n. 42).

³ For translation, see chap. 1: 17.

composers of almost entirely unknown (outside of Russia) sacred compositions. For the reader's convenience, these two groups are summarised, although far from exhaustively, in the two tables below.

Table 3.1. Well-known composers of secular music and less well-known sacred music.

Composer	Compositions
M. I. Glinka (1804–1857)	Composed his first settings of the sacred texts in 1840s. <i>Kheruvimskaya pesn'</i> [Cherubic Song] including the part <i>Yako da Tsarya</i> [That We May Receive the King of All] (1837); <i>Velikaya ekteniya</i> [The Great Litany] (n.d.); <i>Da ispravitsya molitva moya</i> [Let My Prayer] (c. 1856).
P. I. Tchaikovsky (1840–1893)	Two settings of the central church services; <i>Liturgiya Svyatogo Ioanna Zlatousta</i> [Liturgy of the St. John Chrysostom] (1878); <i>Vsenoshchnoye Bdeniye</i> [All-Night Vigil] (1882); Spiritual choral compositions: the settings to <i>Angel vopiyashe</i> [The Angel Cried] (1887); <i>Priidite poklonimsya</i> [Come, Let Us Worship] (1878); <i>Sviatij Bozhe</i> [Holy God] (1878); Three settings of <i>Kheruvimskaya pesn'</i> (1884); <i>Tebe poyem</i> [We Praise You] (1885); <i>Dostoyno yest'</i> [It is Truly Fitting] (1885); <i>Otche nash</i> [Our Father] (1885); <i>Blazheni yazhe izbral</i> [Blessed that I Have Chosen] (1885); <i>Da ispravitsya molitva moya</i> (1885); and <i>Nine sili nebesniya</i> [Now the Powers of Heaven] (1885).
N. A. Rimsky-Korsakov (1844–1908)	Settings from <i>Liturgiya Svyatogo Ioanna Zlatousta</i> such as <i>Otche nash</i> (1883) and several settings of <i>Kheruvimskaya pesn'</i> (1884).
M. A. Balakirev (1836–1910)	Settings of sacred compositions such as <i>Kheruvimskaya pesn'</i> (c. 1880–1890); <i>Da molchit vsyakaya plot</i> [Be Silent My Flesh] (c. 1880–1890); <i>Svishe prorotsi</i> [The Prophets From Above] (c. 1880–1890); <i>Da vozraduyetsya dusha moya</i> [But My Soul Will Rejoice] (c. 1880–1890); and <i>So sviatimi upokoy</i> [With the Saints Repose] (c. 1880–1890).
A. K. Glazunov (1864–1936)	Settings of the <i>Paskhal'niye pesnopeniya</i> [Easter Hymns] (1935).
M. M. Ippolitov-Ivanov (1859–1935)	Settings from <i>Liturgiya Svyatogo Ioanna Zlatousta</i> such as <i>Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda</i> [Bless the Lord, O My Soul] (1903); <i>Kheruvimskaya pesn'</i> (1903); and <i>Simvol veri</i> [The Creed] (1903).

None of the composers listed in table 3.1 held any ecclesiastic post; however, they had a strong interest in national music, to which sacred music, obviously, belonged. Tchaikovsky, for example, edited and prepared for publication the entire collection of sacred compositions of Bortnyansky, which further solidified the latter's legacy in sacred music. The fifteen settings by Rimsky-Korsakov that were published during his lifetime received positive critical reviews; in Lisitsin's *Obzor dukhovno-muzikal'noy literaturi*,⁴ for instance, they are highly recommended for choir conductors.⁵ Zaytseva states that Balakirev's influence on the formation of the St. Petersburg school of sacred compositions could be seen not just in his own work, but in his encouragement of others, notably his encouragement of Tchaikovsky to compose sacred music.⁶ His own collection of sacred compositions and arrangements, published in 1900, played a pivotal role in the formation of a new direction for the St. Petersburg school around that time.⁷ While Gardner considered Balakirev's musical material to be relatively insignificant in the realm of Russian sacred compositions, he recognised Balakirev's influence as a censor of church compositions. Balakirev also encouraged Rimsky-Korsakov to work in the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella* and to create harmonisations of sacred chants.⁸ Swan claimed that the union of these two composers brought about the first results in the application of national musical features to harmonisations of Russian sacred chants, even if these still also bore characteristics of Western music.⁹

The other group of works embraces the lesser-known composers, whose compositions are virtually unknown in the West (see table 3.2).

⁴ For translation, see chap. 1, n. 42.

⁵ Lisitsin, *Obzor dukhovno-muzikal'noy literaturi*, 268–71.

⁶ Zaytseva, *Sokrovishcha Rossii*, 13 (see chap. 1, n. 57).

⁷ *Ibid.*, 66.

⁸ Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 2: 434–35 (see intro., n. 15).

⁹ Swan, "Harmonization," 83–84 (see chap. 1, n. 6).

Table 3.2. Selection from the group of lesser-known composers of sacred music.

Composer	Sacred compositions
A. A. Alyab'yev (1787–1851)	Three settings of <i>Liturgiya Svyatogo Ioanna Zlatousta</i> (1827–1832).
G. Ya. Lomakin (1812–1885)	Ten settings of <i>Kheruvimskaya pesn'</i> (1884); <i>Liturgiya Svyatogo Ioanna Zlatousta</i> (1884); and <i>Vsenoshchnoye Bdeniye</i> (1884).
A. A. Arkhangel'sky (1846–1924)	Settings for <i>Vsenoshchnoye Bdeniye</i> (1892); <i>Liturgiya Svyatogo Ioanna Zlatousta</i> (1886); and eight settings of the <i>Kheruvimskaya pesn'</i> (1894).
S. V. Smolensky (1848–1909)	Arrangements of various chants of <i>Vsenoshchnoye Bdeniye</i> , <i>Liturgiya</i> , <i>Panikhida</i> [Dirge], and <i>Moleben</i> [Prayer] for male choir (1893).
Ye. S. Azeyev (1851–1918)	Settings of <i>Priidite Poklonimsya</i> (1884); <i>Kheruvimskaya pesn'</i> (1884); <i>Dushe moya</i> [Oh, My Soul] (1884); <i>Gospodi, spasi blagochestiviya</i> (1884); and <i>Svyatyy Bozhe</i> (1884).
A. D. Kastal'sky (1856–1926)	Settings for <i>Liturgiya Svyatogo Ioanna Zlatousta</i> (1905); <i>Vsenoshchnoye Bdeniye</i> (1912); and several settings of <i>Kheruvimskaya pesn'</i> (1897).
S. I. Taneyev ¹⁰ (1856–1915)	Settings for <i>Vsenoshchnoye Bdeniye</i> such as <i>Blagoslovi</i> , <i>dushe moya</i> , <i>Gospoda</i> (c. 1879); <i>Gospodi, vozzvakh</i> [Lord, I Have Cried] (incomplete) (c. 1891); <i>Svete tikhyy</i> [Gladsome Light] (n.d.); <i>Khvalite imya Gospodne</i> [Praise the Name of the Lord] (1883); <i>Preblagoslovenna, yesi Bogoroditse Devo</i> [Hymn to the Mother of God] (1890); and <i>Vzbrannoy voyevode</i> [To Thee, Victorious Leader] (n.d.).
A. T. Grechaninov (1864–1956)	Settings for <i>Liturgiya Svyatogo Ioanna Zlatousta</i> and <i>Vsenoshchnoye Bdeniye</i> (1897–1932).
D. V. Allemanov (1867–1928)	Around a hundred settings of spiritual compositions (1892–1910).
P. G. Chesnokov (1877–1944)	Settings for <i>Liturgiya Svyatogo Ioanna Zlatousta</i> and <i>Vsenoshchnoye Bdeniye</i> (1895–1917).

¹⁰ Taneyev somewhat defies easy categorisation by the current criterion (well or less well known), because although his theoretical views are known to the Western scholars, his sacred compositions appear to be less studied.

In this group, only five composers—Allemanov, Chesnokov, Arkhangel'sky, Smolensky, and Kastal'sky—were somehow related to the church, either through family professional involvement or study in the *Sinodal'noye uchilishche*.¹¹ Alyab'yev, who is not technically of the period under consideration here, is best known as a composer of romances, such as *Solovey* [The Nightingale], but he also composed more than thirty settings of sacred chants. Almost none of his sacred works have been published until the very recent past (2002).¹² Lomakin, who is perhaps best known to non-Russians as a collaborator with Balakirev in the St. Petersburg Free Music School in the 1860s, composed fifty settings of sacred chants. Aleksandr Arkhangel'sky wrote more than one hundred settings and around fifty small spiritual compositions. Taneyev studied folk and church music. Although, his sacred settings might best be understood as exercises in the application of counterpoint to Russian sacred chants, these compositions may have been intended to demonstrate the admissibility of contrapuntal techniques in sacred music. Therefore, it is important to study the works of this influential composer and theorist in the domain of Russian polyphony, even though Taneyev finished only six numbers of the *Vsenoshchnoye Bdeniye*.¹³ As Plotnikova informs us, in the twentieth century, Taneyev's sacred compositions fell into a period of near oblivion until rediscovery by V. V. Protopopov in the 1960s.¹⁴ Protopopov subsequently transcribed the existing manuscripts of Taneyev's sacred works for publication.¹⁵ Chesnokov wrote settings of various sacred texts, which comprise repertoire of both secular and sacred choirs. Azeyev was a composer who, in collaboration with other teachers of the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella* and under the guidance of Rimsky-Korsakov, worked on the compilation of the book *Peniye pri Vsenoshchnom Bdenii drevnikh raspevov* [Singing of the Old Chants During the All-Night Vigil]. Additionally, he prepared Rimsky-Korsakov's settings of sacred compositions for publication.

In the present study, I focus mainly on the central figures of the two schools of church-music composition in Moscow and St. Petersburg and their position in relation to the reformist agenda. The reasons for this selection as well as criteria for musical analysis, as becomes apparent from the ensuing discussion in this chapter, are based on the specifics of the debates about sacred music which took place during the period in question. The composers Smolensky, Kastal'sky, Taneyev, Ippolitov-Ivanov, Grechaninov, and Chesnokov are generally regarded as adherents to the

¹¹ For translation, see chap. 1: 16.

¹² See chapter 1: 26.

¹³ Plotnikova, *Taneyev S. I.*, 4 (see chap. 1, n. 114).

¹⁴ The exact date is not available; however, this likely occurred in the 1960s. Protopopov, who rediscovered Taneyev's sacred music, was appointed professor at the Moscow Conservatory in 1961.

¹⁵ Plotnikova, *Taneyev S. I.*, 6.

Moscow school. Guided by Smolensky, this school was regarded at the end of the nineteenth century as one that embodied a “renaissance” of Old-church singing traditions.¹⁶ Gardner classified these Moscow composers as “progressive,” noting that their sacred settings were drastically different, both stylistically and technically, from those of the St. Petersburg school.¹⁷ He also claimed that the musical activities in the *Sinodal'noye uchilishche* in Moscow revealed a “genuine Russian choral style of sacred compositions that was utterly free from foreign influence.”¹⁸

The composers selected in this study that represent St. Petersburg school are Arkhangel'sky, Rimsky-Korsakov, and Tchaikovsky. Gardner's statement regarding the Moscow school of sacred music of the late nineteenth century suggests that features of music found in the work of the St. Petersburg sacred school were not inherent in that of the Moscow school.

3.2. Smolensky, Kastal'sky, Taneyev, and Grechaninov

In this chapter, the discussions of the composers selected for consideration, especially those who were recognised as authorities, such as Smolensky, Kastal'sky, Taneyev, and Grechaninov, are taken into consideration as guidance for the analysis in chapter 4. Smolensky's relationship with church music started during his university years and developed into an interest in Russian church-music history, including the music of the Old Believers.¹⁹ In 1889, he headed the department of church-music history in the Moscow Conservatory as well as the directorate of the *Sinodal'noye uchilishche*. His opinion, therefore, on sacred music of his time was highly influential in both sacred and secular domains. As discussed in the previous chapter, some of the tasks that were identified in the reformist camp involved the improvement of harmonisations of sacred chant and the employment of experts in sacred music who could oversee its restoration. The *ober-prokuror* of the *Svyateyshiy Sinod*, Pobedonostsev,²⁰ who served from 1880 to 1905, articulated the key points of the restoration strategy. Amongst them were: (1) re-establishment of the Old-church chants in their original form; (2) refinement of arrangements of the chants; (3) the engagement of experts on ancient sacred music; (4) the publication of affordable compilations of sacred chants; and (5) the

¹⁶ Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 280 (see intro., n. 2).

¹⁷ Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 2: 463, 488.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 412.

¹⁹ Miloš Velimirović, “Smolensky, Stepan Vasil'yevich,” *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed December 4, 2016, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/subscriber/article/grove/music/26029>.

²⁰ See chap. 2: 55.

professional public performance of sacred chants.²¹ Gardner states that Pobedonostsev articulated these aims to the director of the *Sinodal'noye uchilishche* who was, at that time, Smolensky. Additionally, Pobedonostsev made it clear that he required the composers of the *Sinodal'noye uchilishche* to differentiate themselves from those of the (St. Petersburg) *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella*, both in style and repertoire.²²

Findeizen characterises Smolensky as highly organised in this role and able to engage the most talented composers of sacred music to serve these tasks.²³ He tried to boost the interest of composers, including Kastal'sky, in the harmonisation of sacred chants and stimulated their activity by endorsing their compositions.²⁴ For instance, in 1899, the *Sinodal'niy khor*,²⁵ under Smolensky's control, was engaged in the consecration of a Russian Cathedral in Vienna, during which event Kastal'sky's sacred compositions were introduced to a Viennese audience. Such action attests to the level of support Smolensky provided to those composers of sacred music whom he favoured.²⁶

Smolensky had a somewhat inconsistent opinion on sacred repertoire of the nineteenth century. While he strongly supported innovations in sacred music at the turn of the twentieth century, he also advocated the respectful treatment of Old-church chants, under which he implied the use of harmonies that would not distort the chant (i.e. retaining intervals considered “natural” for the voice, which he so admired in Greek Orthodox singing).²⁷ On the one hand he agreed with the inadmissibility of “Western” musical elements,²⁸ as he understood them, into Russian sacred music (such as *sladkaya* [sweet] polyphony²⁹ along with virtuosity and sentimentality); on the

²¹ Zvereva, *Vstupitel'naya stat'ya to "Arkhivniye dokumenti,"* 261 (see chap. 2, n. 142).

²² Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 2: 412.

²³ N. F. Findeizen, “Stepan Vasil'yevich Smolensky. Biograficheskiy ocherk” [Stepan Vasil'yevich Smolensky. Biographical Sketch], 1910, repr. in *Stepan Vasil'yevich Smolensky. Vospominaniya* [Stepan Vasil'yevich Smolensky. Memoirs], vol. 4 of *Rdmdm*, ed. M. P. Rakhmanova, comp. N. I. Kabanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002), 616–17.

²⁴ N. I. Kompaneysky, “A. D. Kastal'sky. Po povodu 4-go vīpuska yego dukhovno-muzikal'nikh sochineniy” [A. D. Kastal'sky. Concerning the Fourth Issue of His Sacred-Musical Compositions], 1904, repr. in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, materiali, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence], vol. 5 of *Rdmdm*, ed. and comp. S. G. Zvereva (Moscow: Znakh, 2006), 259; also see Findeizen, “Stepan Vasil'yevich Smolensky,” 617.

²⁵ For translation, see chap. 2: 45.

²⁶ Kompaneysky, “A. D. Kastal'sky,” 255–56.

²⁷ Findeizen, “Stepan Vasil'yevich Smolensky,” 616, 618; also see Smolensky, *Iz dorozhnikh vpechatleniy*, 26–27 (see chap. 2, n. 172).

²⁸ Smolensky, *O blizhayshikh prakticheskikh zadachakh*, 12 (see chap. 2, n. 69).

²⁹ In this Smolensky obviously replicates the attitude of opponents of Bortnyansky, who, due to the Italianism of his music, was nicknamed by Glinka as “*Sakhar-Medovich*”; see A. T. Grechaninov, *Moya muzikal'naya zhizn'* [My

other, he valued certain attempts at sacred harmonisation that had been made before his time—harmonisations that evidently bore Western musical characteristics. Smolensky, for instance, characterised some of the twelve-voice sacred compositions of V. P. Titov (c. 1650–c. 1715), a master of *partesniy* style,³⁰ as ingenious compositions with “refined vocal and modulating effects.”³¹ It seems the acceptance of multi-voice compositions was a conscious choice in favour of the settings that were, while rather sonorous, still composed in “Russian style” (here Smolensky referred to incorporation of folk-style “undervoices,” or *podgoloski*), instead of inappropriate sacred compositions with vigorous rhythms and “sweet” melodic lines.

A shift from what was a clear opposition to advanced sacred compositions, usually with Western elements, to acceptance of some great masterpieces with purported national features was evident toward the end of the nineteenth century. An initiative of the *Sinodal'noye uchilishche* to hold *Istoricheskiye kontserti* [Historical Concerts]³² found support from Smolensky, who reviewed them. These concerts were introduced to the general public in 1895 and represented a musically expressed history of Russian sacred music over a two-century period from the end of the seventeenth century to the end of the nineteenth.³³ Smolensky believed in the power of these concerts to introduce the public to, and familiarise them with, new church compositions as well as reintroducing old chants. The overall effect of this activity would be, in his view, to lessen the influence of Italianate tastes in church music. He also believed that, despite the attachment of Russians to harmonic singing, the concerts could provide a platform for presentation of *znamenniy* chant to public.³⁴ In 1900, Smolensky clearly agreed with the critics’ positive review of Tchaikovsky’s elaborate sacred compositions, which were characterised as “attuned to prayer and suitable to use during a church service.”³⁵ These diverse attitudes exemplify not only a lack of rigour about and “rules” for the treatment of sacred music but also reveal composers’ preferences

Musical Life] (Paris: 1936), 63. Frolova-Walker translates this nickname as “Mr MacSugar-Treacle”; see Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 268.

³⁰ For translation, see chap. 1: 27.

³¹ Smolensky, “Obzor Istoricheskikh kontsertov,” 202 (see chap. 2, n. 156).

³² *Ibid.*, 197–218.

³³ *Ibid.*, 197.

³⁴ S. V. Smolensky, “Ob ozdorovlenii program dukhovnikh kontsertov v Moskve” [On a Recovery of Program of Sacred Concerts in Moscow], 1900, repr. in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmyslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918], vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, ed. M. P. Rakhmanova, comps. A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002), 466–68.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 465.

for sonorous and sentimental sounds over plain compositions, despite the prescriptions of church authorities.

Kastal'sky was an influential composer in the nineteenth century, whose connection with church music started in his early years. His father was a well-known archpriest in Moscow whose church services the future composer attended.³⁶ Although, as the composer admitted, he did not express a passion for music in particular, later in life he became known as “a founder of the new direction in music.”³⁷ Therefore, his views are also taken into account here, in particular owing to his influence and activity. In the *Sinodal'noye uchilishche*, Kastal'sky worked as a teacher from 1887, a conductor of the *Sinodal'niy khor* (1907–1910), a director (1910–1918), and then, after the reorganisation of the *Sinodal'noye uchilishche* into the *Narodnaya khorovaya akademiya* [People's Choral Academy], he remained as its governor until 1923.

Critics and publicists of Kastal'sky's time, such as I. V. Lipayev (1865–1942), identified Kastal'sky as a progressive thinker in Russian sacred music. Lipayev characterised Kastal'sky's sacred compositions as “penetrated with the sense of incorporeality and asceticism.”³⁸ In a musical sense this might suggest a renunciation of extravagant sonorities and dynamics in line with a notion of *dukhovnost'* [spirituality]. Lipayev admired Kastal'sky's music for not being related to the major-minor system,³⁹ he valued Kastal'sky's harmonisations of church chants and stated that his sacred compositions were comprehensible to the public due to the use of “folk-like” harmonies, although he did not clarify exactly what he meant by this.⁴⁰ N. I. Kompaneysky's (1848–1910) impression of Kastal'sky's music reveals another side of the latter's sacred music. Kompaneysky, in his discussion of Kastal'sky's Christmas *troparion*,⁴¹ described it as a *pevcheskaya simfoniya* [singing symphony] in the Russian sacred style, which implies a more complex and elaborate work rather

³⁶ A. D. Kastal'sky, “O moyey muzikal'noy kar'yere i moi misli o tserkovnoy muzike” [About My Musical Career and My Thoughts on Sacred Music], 1915, repr. in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, materialī, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence], vol. 5 of Rdmmdm, ed. and comp. S. G. Zvereva (Moscow: Znak, 2006), 49.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 49–51.

³⁸ I. V. Lipayev, “Sinodal'noye uchilishche, i yego idealistī, khor. Kastal'sky” [Synodal College, Its Idealists, chor. Kastal'sky], 1898, repr. in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, materialī, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence], vol. 5 of Rdmmdm, ed. and comp. S. G. Zvereva (Moscow: Znak, 2006), 239.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 239.

⁴⁰ M. A. Lisitsin, “Tserkov' i muzika. (Po povodu novikh techeniy v muzikal'nom iskusstve. Fragment)” [Church and Music. On Contemporary Tendencies in Musical Art. A Fragment], 1902, repr. in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, materialī, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence], vol. 5 of Rdmmdm, ed. and comp. S. G. Zvereva (Moscow: Znak, 2006), 246–47.

⁴¹ For more information, see chap. 2, n. 52.

than simpler, austere qualities alluded to in Lipayev's comments. According to Kompaneysky, the signs of *narodnost'* [folk-like quality], as he understood them, in Kastal'sky's sacred compositions lay in combinations of elaborate melodic phrases with melismas, variations, and imitations.⁴² Such observations of Kastal'sky's sacred music signpost a particular position that started to form among musicologists and composers towards the end of the nineteenth century: the justification of complex musical operations (harmonies and textures) on the basis of nationalistic ideas, which is discussed further below.

At the turn of the nineteenth century, composers and other musical figures began to call Kastal'sky the “Russian Vasnetsov in music,” after the Russian artist V. M. Vasnetsov (1848–1926), one of the original members of the *peredvizhniki* group (known in the West as the “Wanderers” or “Itinerants”), whose work is associated with strong nationalist and folk themes.⁴³ Igor Glebov [aka B. V. Asaf'yev] compared Kastal'sky's nationalistic style to Musorgsky's compositions.⁴⁴ S. A. Shumsky (1892–1976), an alumnus of the *Sinodal'noye uchilishche* and an expert on Russian sacred music, credited Kastal'sky with a profound understanding of true Russian sacred musical characteristics,⁴⁵ even while noting Kastal'sky's occasional use of expressive rhythmic elements such as duplets, triplets, and quadruplets.⁴⁶ Claims made by Kastal'sky himself emphasised the nationalist character of his musical activity, although the composer did not always follow these claims in his compositions or harmonisations of sacred chants. Kastal'sky urged composers to use simple harmonies. He advised composers to “idealise Old-church chants” as he understood them,

⁴² N. I. Kompaneysky, “Sovremennoye demestvo” [Contemporary Demestvo], 1902, repr. in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, materiali, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence], vol. 5 of Rdmdm, ed. and comp. S. G. Zvereva (Moscow: Znack, 2006), 248, 249.

⁴³ M. P. Rakhmanova, Vstupitel'naya stat'ya [Introductory Article] to “Rubezh vekov. Polemika o tserkovnom penii v gazete Moskovskoye Vedomosti 1899–1903” [Turn of the Century. Polemic on Church Singing in the Gazette Muscovite Vedomosti 1899–1903], in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmyslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918], vol. 3 of Rdmdm, ed. M. P. Rakhmanova, comps. A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002), 416.

⁴⁴ Igor' Glebov [aka Asaf'yev B. V.], “Sovremennoye russkoye muzikoznaniye i yego istoricheskiye zadachi” [Contemporary Russian Musicology and Its Historical Tasks], 1905, repr. in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, materiali, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence], vol. 5 of Rdmdm, ed. and comp. S. G. Zvereva (Moscow: Znack, 2006), 299.

⁴⁵ S. A. Shumsky, “Moskovskoye Sinodal'noye uchilishche i vrozhdeniye natsional'noy dukhovnoy muziki (Materiali dlya razrabotka temi)” [Moscow Synodal College and Resurgence of National Sacred Music (Materials for Development of the Theme)], n.d., repr. in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, materiali, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence], vol. 5 of Rdmdm, ed. and comp. S. G. Zvereva (Moscow: Znack, 2006), 437.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 427, 433.

which implied the implementation of “purely native” harmonies and musical formulae “familiar to the Russian ear.”⁴⁷

During his years in the *Sinodal'noye uchilishche*, Kastal'sky was a member of a committee that reviewed and censored sacred compositions in Moscow for the *Sinodal'niy khor*.⁴⁸ Preobrazhensky distinguished the *chor* for preservation of Old-Russian church-singing traditions.⁴⁹ In contrast, other choirs in Moscow were much less concerned with the preservation and reforms of sacred repertoire and the use of “*chistiye i neporochniye melodii*” [clear and chaste melodies].⁵⁰ This means that the *chor* can be presumed to have played a primary role in preservation of sacred chants, or, at least, that it was understood to have done so; and therefore, it can be contended that all the claims that were made by the composers who wrote for it would be reflected in their sacred music.

In general, Kastal'sky received a great deal of support from both inside and outside Moscow. The *Svyateyskiy Sinod* expressed satisfaction with Kastal'sky's sacred settings and gave him the green light to propagate his compositions. Furthermore, in 1902, the *Svyateyskiy Sinod* approved the issue of a manual on sacred compositions compiled by the priest Lisitsin, including Kastal'sky's sacred compositions. The support that Kastal'sky received from Smolensky's directorate⁵¹ 1889–1901 along with the *Sinodal'niy khor*, which had capability to fulfill the composer's musical expectations, encouraged him to concentrate his creative efforts on sacred compositions for the *Sinodal'niy khor*.⁵² Frolova-Walker notes in particular that his connection to the *Sinodal'niy khor* allowed Kastal'sky to embody a variety of musical and dynamic elements suitable for this particular, and highly accomplished, ensemble.⁵³

⁴⁷ Kastal'sky, “O moyey muzikal'noy kar'yere,” 60.

⁴⁸ Kompaneysky, “A. D. Kastal'sky,” 256.

⁴⁹ Preobrazhensky, *Kul'tovaya muzika v Rossii*, 117 (see chap. 1, n. 43).

⁵⁰ A. P. Grigorov, “K voprosu o tserkovnom penii” [On the Question of Church Singing], 1900, repr. in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmyslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918], vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, ed. M. P. Rakhmanova, comps. A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002), 428.

⁵¹ Smolensky had an ambivalent attitude to Kastal'sky's music. As can be seen from Kompaneysky's documentation, Smolensky mentioned the very “ordinary” skills of Kastal'sky as a composer, favouring Chesnokov's sacred compositions. At the same time, Smolensky tried to encourage the interest of Kastal'sky in sacred composition; see S. G. Zvereva, *Vstupitel'naya stat'ya* [Introductory Article] to “A. D. Kastal'sky i S. V. Smolensky” [A. D. Kastal'sky and S. V. Smolensky], in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, material'i, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence], vol. 5 of *Rdmdm*, ed. and comp. S. G. Zvereva (Moscow: Znak, 2006), 573–75.

⁵² Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 286; Kompaneysky, “A. D. Kastal'sky,” 255.

⁵³ Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 286.

Trying to push the limits of sacred choral harmonisation, Kastal'sky reinstated harmonisations with more than four voices. In his personal correspondence, Kastal'sky argued against standard four-voice harmonisations of sacred chants, which he felt compromised the chants.⁵⁴ On the one hand, the composer associated four-voice harmonisation with Western singing culture and he greatly condemned the dominance of the sacred church settings harmonised in Western styles. On the other hand, from Kastal'sky's point of view, the standard four-voice harmonisation would limit a composer's range of choral techniques. Kastal'sky saw benefits in thick-textured sacred compositions. As the composer admitted in his writing, he frequently received positive feedback from various members of congregations, even Old Believers.⁵⁵ He also claimed that because his sacred compositions frequently left a good impression on congregations he was encouraged to write more compositions that were sonorous. Kastal'sky emphasised the correlation between churchgoers' musical tastes and the choice of singing repertoire and seems to have believed that the expressive potential in harmonisations for more than four voices would make his compositions more attractive to the public. These attitudes show inconsistency in the reformatory program of the Muscovite composers; while supporting the simple, folk-like nature of two- or three-voice sacred settings, composers also justified the use of thick, multi-voiced sonorities that would meet expressive requirements. These facts draw attention to the actual correlation of the composed music to a particular choir and its abilities as well as fulfilment of public expectations.⁵⁶

Grechaninov also participated in discussions dedicated to correctness or incorrectness of sacred harmonisations at the turn of the century. In 1900 he wrote an article entitled *Neskol'ko slov o dukhe tserkovnikh pesnopeniy* [A Few Words on the Essence of Church Chants]. In this, Grechaninov identified the main criterion for a good sacred harmonisation as being the relevance of the music to the liturgical text (which could vary from austere to festive in character).⁵⁷ He tried to clarify the actual standards of sacred harmonisations, whereas other colleagues of his were focused more on emotional aspects of sacred compositions.⁵⁸ Grechaninov gave explanations as to which

⁵⁴ Kastal'sky, "O moyey muzikal'noy kar'yere," 55.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 56.

⁵⁶ The question is whether his compositions were actually sung in churches and particularly in the Kremlin's church. The answer is given by the composer himself, who stated that Smolensky was not keen on including Kastal'sky's sacred settings into the church practice; Kastal'sky, "O moyey muzikal'noy kar'yere," 52.

⁵⁷ Grechaninov, *Moya muzikal'naya zhizn'*, 63; also see A. T. Grechaninov, "Neskol'ko slov o dukhe tserkovnikh pesnopeniy" [A Few Words on the Essence of Church Chants], 1900, repr. in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmyslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918], vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, ed. M. P. Rakhmanova, comps. A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002), 431.

⁵⁸ Grechaninov, "Neskol'ko slov," 430.

text should be put into a specific harmony or tempo and why.⁵⁹ For instance, he suggested that harmonies should suit liturgical text meanings,⁶⁰ pointing out a common discrepancy when major modes or vigorous rhythms were applied to a solemn text.⁶¹ Grechaninov also concluded that once the music reflected the content of a liturgical text, it naturally became free of “*iziskanniye, chuvstvenniye ili sentimental'niye*” [subtle, sensual or sentimental] sounds or chromaticism, which he equated with sensuality and extravagance and, therefore, believed to be inappropriate.⁶²

Grechaninov's justification of counterpoint reflects an inconsistency in his attitude to “Western” elements. For example, he supported the use of counterpoint where it would not disturb the meaning of the sacred text.⁶³ The composer also believed that the most suitable part for using the contrapuntal elements might be the *Alliluiya* in *Kheruvimskaya pesn'*.⁶⁴ Among the common musical mistakes Grechaninov mentioned is one that was introduced by Bortnyansky and which continued to be found in settings of the *Kheruvimskaya pesn'*. The composer stated that, while the second part of the song is habitually sung *allegro*, this *allegro* tempo is irrelevant to the second part of the *Kheruvimskaya pesn'*. The tempo is also often exaggerated by thick textures and dense “*voinstvennikh*” [warlike, aggressive] chords that contradict the whole meaning of the *Kheruvimskaya pesn'* and the sacred composition as a whole.⁶⁵ It might seem that Grechaninov's arguments about the inappropriateness of tempo in certain sections of sacred works combined with his advocacy of counterpoint betray a level of ideological inconsistency in regard to Western influences. If this is the case, he is far from alone.

Similar inconsistency can be identified in statements of Taneyev. A prominent figure of this time, Taneyev, received a very thorough musical education. At the age of ten, in 1866, he was enrolled in the Moscow Conservatory and spent almost ten years there. Among Taneyev's teachers were Tchaikovsky (harmony and orchestration), N. G. Rubinstein (1835–1881) (piano), and

⁵⁹ Grechaninov distinguished liturgical text by its character: “*sozertsatel'niy, torzhestvenniy, tainstvenniy, mrachniy, strogiy*” [contemplative, ceremonial, mysterious, somber, rigid]. He insisted that composers had to bear in mind the character of liturgical text while working on sacred compositions; see Grechaninov, “Neskol'ko slov,” 431; also see *Ibid.*, 432.

⁶⁰ Gardner categorised Russian sacred chants into six main categories: 1) “dogmatic character; 2) historical narrative character; 3) didactic character; 4) contemplative character; 5) explanatory character; and 6) doxological and prayerful hymns”; see Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye penie*, 1: 65–69 (see chap. 1, n. 4).

⁶¹ Grechaninov, “Neskol'ko slov,” 431.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 432; also see Grechaninov, *Moya muzikal'naya zhizn'*, 63–64.

⁶³ In the Church-Slavonic language, an unnecessarily long note can change even the meaning of a phrase; therefore, it is important that composers use appropriate notes values suitable for syllables and Church-Slavonic accents.

⁶⁴ Grechaninov, “Neskol'ko slov,” 432.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 431–32.

Razumovsky, who taught the history of church singing.⁶⁶ L. Z. Korabel'nikova notes that Razumovsky's lectures on the history of church music played a very important role in formation of Taneyev's musical views.⁶⁷ He turned to writing sacred settings in the 1870s, attempting to discover appropriate harmonic and polyphonic textures for Russian sacred music. In order to practise invertible counterpoint, Taneyev composed around thirty small fugues in the various church modes.⁶⁸

In the 1880s, Taneyev worked in the Moscow Conservatory as a professor, developed "Russian counterpoint," and also was a member of the censoring committee *Nablyudatel'niy sovet* [Supervisory Board].⁶⁹ His pedagogical influence as a teacher of counterpoint and form was prominent, and he taught significant composers such as Rachmaninoff and A. N. Skryabin (1871–1915) in the class on musical forms; Grechaninov also studied counterpoint in Taneyev's class, Kastal'sky learned music theory with him.⁷⁰ The fact that Taneyev was the teacher and mentor of Grechaninov and Kastal'sky in the class of composition means that he had a direct influence on these composers' musical styles. Smolensky, who was Taneyev's close friend, was inspired by "the new composers who appeared to be creative in counterpoint, and who could also understand and appreciate sacred musical ideas."⁷¹ Amongst the "new composers" Smolensky had in mind, foremost among them was, undoubtedly, Taneyev himself.

Taneyev supported attempts to reconstitute Old-Russian singing traditions. In 1881, the same year in which Tchaikovsky began his arrangements of the *Obikhod* [The Annual Cycle of

⁶⁶ Lectures on Russian church music were read in the Conservatory until 1926; see L. Z. Korabel'nikova, *S. I. Taneyev v Moskovskoy konservatorii* [S. I. Taneyev in the Moscow Conservatory] (Moscow: Muzika, 1974), 10, 35, and 36.

⁶⁷ Korabel'nikova, *S. I. Taneyev v Moskovskoy konservatorii*, 35–36.

⁶⁸ Plotnikova, *Taneyev S. I.*, 3. Taneyev uses the overall term "movable" counterpoint for techniques that include invertible counterpoint. The theory of movable counterpoint was set out in S. I. Taneyev, *Podvizhnoy kontrapunkt strogogo pis'ma* [Movable Counterpoint in the Strict Style] (Moscow: Jurgenson, 1909). Taneyev introduced the concepts of *prostoy* [simple] and *slozhniy* [complex] movable counterpoint of several kinds, including vertically-shifting counterpoint; horizontally-shifting counterpoint; and double-shifting counterpoint as well as their invertible forms; see N. Yu. Plotnikova, "Trudi S. I. Taneyeva po teorii kontrapunkta" [S. I. Taneyev's Writing on the Theory of Counterpoint], *Istoriya muziki: teoriya i istoriya*, no. 6 Moscow: Gosudarstvenniy Institut Iskusstvoznaniya (2012): 10, 11.

Taneyev uses the word *slozhniy* to distinguish various derivatives of contrapuntal combinations of voices but not the complexity of its combination; see Taneyev, *Podvizhnoy kontrapunkt strogogo pis'ma*, 7. This work was Taneyev's most significant contribution to Russian music theory; since then, counterpoint became an independent study in Russian musicology; see Plotnikova, "Trudy S. I. Taneyeva," 5.

⁶⁹ Zvereva, Vstupitel'naya stat'ya to "Arkhivniye dokumenti," 263.

⁷⁰ V. A. Kiselyov, T. N. Livanova, and V. V. Protopopov, eds., *Taneyev S. I.: Materiali i dokumenti* [Materials and Documents] (Moscow: Akademiya Nauk SSSR, 1952), 320; Korabel'nikova, *S. Taneyev: Dnevnik*, 3: 179 (see chap. 1, n. 116); and also see Kastal'sky, "O moyey muzikal'noy kar'yere," 49–50.

⁷¹ Korabel'nikova, *S. I. Taneyev v Moskovskoy konservatorii*, 37.

Sacred Chants], Taneyev outlined the main goals for Russian composers who composed or harmonised chants for church services.⁷² Taneyev believed in the benefits of utilising Western counterpoint in sacred music and prescribed for composers the practice of counterpoint in their harmonisations of monodic Russian sacred chants.⁷³ This kind of exercise would help to develop essential music-writing skills and establish a school of church composers in Russia. Eventually, trained in this way, composers would be able to create their own original sacred settings that were pursuant to church statutes and not resorting to the Old unison church chants. It should be noted that in supporting *strogoye pis'mo* [strict counterpoint] Taneyev continued to implement the views of H. A. Laroche (1845–1904). The latter, like Taneyev, drew attention to the importance of studying subjects such as “strict counterpoint, free counterpoint and harmony.”⁷⁴ Both acknowledged the applicability of counterpoint to Russian church music.⁷⁵ Plotnikova states that, despite the Western-oriented basis of Taneyev’s theoretical views, he regarded the Old-church chants with great reverence. In his arrangements of monodic sacred chants the tunes were rarely changed.⁷⁶

Another compelling reason for the implementation of counterpoint in vocal music, as Taneyev perceived it, was the possibility to expand the range of unifying components by using melodic and textual imitations but avoiding dependence on the major-minor system.⁷⁷ Taking into consideration Kastal'sky's correspondence, it is clear that Taneyev exercised this principle widely in

⁷² Plotnikova, *Taneyev S. I.*, 5.

⁷³ In his book *Podvizhnoy kontrapunkt strogogo pis'ma* Taneyev clarified the benefits of counterpoint in strict style in which tonal chords relationship and dependence on harmony is absent. As Taneyev stated in his treatise, the chords used in counterpoint do not swirl around one tonic chord but correlate according to diatonic scale; see Taneyev, *Podvizhnoy kontrapunkt strogogo pis'ma*, 188; also see S. I. Taneyev, “Letter to P. I. Tchaikovsky,” 10 Aug., 1881, repr. in *P. I. Tchaikovsky, S. I. Taneyev: Pis'ma* [P. I. Tchaikovsky, S. I. Taneyev: Letters], ed. V. A. Zhdanov (1874–1893; repr. Moscow: Goskul'tprosvetizdat, 1951), 74–75.

N. D. Kashkin (1866–1918, Russian critic and professor at the Moscow Conservatory) in his article “*Misli o russkoy muzike*” [Thoughts on Russian Music] also supported application of counterpoint to Russian sacred chants; see M. P. Rakhmanova, *Kommentarii* [Commentary] to “*Zhelatel'no li i vozmozhno li dal'neysheye sushchestvovaniye Obshchestva lyubiteley tserkovnogo peniya?*” [Discussion on the Question of Whether Desirable and Viable the Further Existence of the Society for the Friends of Church Singing?] by P. D. Samarin, in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmyslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918], vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, ed. by M. P. Rakhmanova, comps. A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002), 318.

⁷⁴ Ellon D. Carpenter, “Russian Music Theory: A Conspectus,” in *Russian Theoretical Thought in Music*, ed. Gordon D. McQuere (Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press, 1983), 15.

⁷⁵ H. A. Laroche, “O sovremennikh nuzhdakh tserkovnoy muziki v Rossii” [On Current Needs of Church Music in Russia], 1900, repr. in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmyslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918], vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, ed. M. P. Rakhmanova, comps. A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002), 455.

⁷⁶ Plotnikova, *Taneyev S. I.*, 5.

⁷⁷ Taneyev, *Podvizhnoy kontrapunkt strogogo pis'ma*, 5, 6.

his sacred compositions.⁷⁸ Taneyev spent only a few years on the composition of sacred choral music; in 1889 he was assigned to lead the *Sinodal'niy khor*, and Smolensky asked him to make arrangements of old chants for the *Sinodal'niy khor*.⁷⁹ Smolensky appreciated Taneyev's attempts to "elucidate our folk art"—as he described the church musical heritage.⁸⁰

Being a member of the committee of the *OLTP*, Taneyev censored compositions submitted for revision.⁸¹ His reviews of the compositions contain another example of inconsistency in the approach to Western musical elements, a tendency which we also find in Smolensky and Grechaninov's statements. Taneyev's attitude to plain harmonisations of statute chants submitted by contestants was rigid. Harmonisations, which consisted of parallel 3rds, 6ths or excessive use of 7th chords would not meet with his approval.⁸² Taneyev condemned attempts by Russian musicians who harmonised Russian sacred music using Western methods.⁸³ He even claimed that, in general, genuine Russian music, especially harmony, had not yet appeared; instead, what existed was a mix of "raw material" with "foreign forms."⁸⁴

3.3. Purported differences between the two Russian schools of sacred music: Evaluating the objectives and claims of the reformist composers

Debates over the Moscow and St. Petersburg schools of sacred composition occupied the minds of various commentators for decades. In the nineteenth century, writers discussed stylistic features of the repertoire, the implementation of various techniques, and the degree of correspondence of the repertoire to the demands of religious traditions in Russia. At the turn of the twentieth century, a dispute regarding the criteria for determining the spirituality of religious compositions arose, and the veracity of Russian sacred singing styles was questioned by all of

⁷⁸ Kastal'sky, "O moyey muzikal'noy kar'yere," 51.

⁷⁹ Plotnikova, *Taneyev S. I.*, 7.

⁸⁰ Korabel'nikova, *S. I. Taneyev v Moskovskoy konservatorii*, 37.

⁸¹ S. I. Taneyev, "Otziv o sochineniyakh, predstavlenikh na premiyu OLTP v 1885 godu" [Review of Compositions Submitted for a Prize of the *OLTP* in 1885], 1885, repr. in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmyslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918], vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, ed. M. P. Rakhmanova, comps. A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002), 224.

⁸² Taneyev characterised the method of harmonisation, which involved "doubling" of the main melody by imperfect consonances, as "mechanical." This conclusion can be drawn from Taneyev's commentary on sacred compositions submitted to the *OLTP* in 1885. For more information, see Taneyev, "Otziv o sochineniyakh," 221–22.

⁸³ S. I. Savenko, *Sergey Ivanovich Taneyev* [Sergey Ivanovich Taneyev] (Moscow: Muzika, 1984), 51–52.

⁸⁴ Qtd. in Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 227.

musical society in Moscow.⁸⁵ In 1902, Metallov listed several requirements that he considered should be met in sacred compositions. These included the reflection of national character, incorporation of diatonic scales and consonant intervals, avoidance of asynchronous singing of liturgical texts and a prohibition of chromaticism. Additionally, Metallov proposed a lessening of the restrictions on free settings (or concert music, as he called it) where he felt it should be permissible for composers to use various rhythms, counterpoint and a wide vocal range.⁸⁶ In 1909, the church-music theorist and composer A. V. Nikol'sky (1874–1943) also formulated criteria by which composers could be guided. The essential points of the criteria were the preservation of modality, the absence of manifest major-minor system, and the use of *glasī* in their unaltered form.⁸⁷ However, these recommendations bore a generally subjective character rather than a systematic or practical one.

A consideration of the literature shows that existing studies focus more on the main choirs of each city and their singing practices and traditions, rather than on the composers of church music and their styles and aesthetic orientation. While prominent commentators of the late nineteenth century, including the priests Lisitsīn and Metallov, and the musicologist and composer of sacred music Kompaneysky, tried to analyse the sacred compositions of composers from both schools, they usually narrowed their research down to the singing and aesthetic preferences of either the *Sinodal'niy khor* in Moscow or *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella* in St. Petersburg.⁸⁸ The repertoire of these choirs represented carefully selected sacred settings relevant to cathedrals in which the choirs sang. This repertoire is not, therefore, generally illustrative of the entire output of each school; a more comprehensive account and study of the wider output of each school of sacred composition is required. Before the investigation can be undertaken, however, the claims and arguments concerning the distinctiveness of the two schools need to be examined.

⁸⁵ N. A. Davīdova, “Problema stilya v Russkom tserkovnom penii rubezha 19–20 vekov (1880–1916)” [The Problem of Russian Church-Singing Style at the Turn of the Nineteenth–Twentieth Centuries (1880–1916)], *Izvestiya Rossiyskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta imeni A. I. Gertsena* 63 (2008): 69.

⁸⁶ V. M. Metallov, “O sovremennom sostoyanii i nuzhdakh tserkovnogo peniya” [On Contemporary State and Needs of Church Singing], *Moskovskiye vedomosti*, no. 348–52 (1902), repr. in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmīslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918], vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, ed. M. P. Rakhmanova, comps. A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turī, 2002), 494–95.

⁸⁷ Davīdova, “Problema stilya,” 70.

⁸⁸ M. A. Lisitsīn, “O novom napravlenii v russkoy dukhovnoy muzike” [On a New Trend in Russian Sacred Music], 1909, repr. in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmīslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918], vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, ed. M. P. Rakhmanova, comps. A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turī, 2002), 558.

The period from the 1880s to 1918 is traditionally classified as one in which the dominant church style was perceived to be Muscovite, according to the location of its activities and emphasis on reviving national traits.⁸⁹ This common description pertains to various scholars, from Razumovsky, Preobrazhensky, and Gardner to Frolova-Walker, who refers to Moscow composers such as Smolensky, Kastal'sky, and Chesnokov as “nationalist thinkers.”⁹⁰ The Moscow composers’ writings and their correspondence reveal the nationalistic tendencies of their beliefs. For example, Smolensky and Grechaninov both stated that “Western” musical elements—chromaticism and “sweet” polyphony—were inappropriate for Russian sacred music due to their purported sentimental properties.⁹¹ Gardner characterised sacred music of the Moscow school as free of continuous four-voice textures, with a preference for using two- or three-voice textures, but also alternating between unison and what he described as “full multi-voice texture.”⁹² The use of musical techniques identified with the music of the *Moguchaya kuchka*,⁹³ such as *podgoloski*, pedal notes, and modulations, where the ambit of modulation is not constrained to any particular key relation, was also understood to strengthen the national flavour of church music.⁹⁴ One may, indeed, easily become confused in trying to understand the main streams of church music of this period by considering assertions made by the aforementioned composers and their colleagues.

In the stream of nationalistic ideas, some composers, as noted earlier in the chapter, among them Smolensky, supported the use of two- or three-voice harmonisations, considering these to be closer to traditional folk-music textures.⁹⁵ The advice to use three-voice harmonisations was made in conscious opposition to the use of four-voice textures, which the pro-nationalists believed to be a stylistic marker of Western musical influences.⁹⁶ In suggesting the use of two- or three-voice

⁸⁹ M. P. Rakhmanova, Vstupitel'naya stat'ya [Introductory Article] to *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmishlenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918], vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, ed. M. P. Rakhmanova, comps. A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002), 13.

⁹⁰ Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 266.

⁹¹ Smolensky, *O blizhayshikh prakticheskikh zadachakh*, 12; Grechaninov, *Moya muzikal'naya zhizn'*, 63.

⁹² Gardner does not clarify what he understands by this term; see Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 2: 500.

⁹³ For translation, see chap. 1: 18.

⁹⁴ Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 291.

⁹⁵ S. V. Smolensky, “O Russkom tserkovnom penii: v otvet g-nu Missalleidesu, protopsaltu tserkvi Svyatoy Fotinii v Smirne” [On Russian Church Singing: in Respond to Mr. Missalleides—a Lead Chorist of the Church of St. Fotinii in Smirna], 1893, repr. in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmishlenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918], vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, ed. M. P. Rakhmanova, comps. A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002), 369.

⁹⁶ Smolensky, “O Russkom tserkovnom penii,” 370.

harmonisations, Smolensky was possibly influenced by a stir of pro-national activity that brought some extremely assertive, sometimes dubious, statements to the surface. Kastal'sky aligned with the trend and stated, for example, that Russian church singing had been present in the second or third century.⁹⁷ Another assertion suggested that the so-called *troyestrochnoye peniye* [three-voice singing] existed in the seventh century, prior to any Western influence in Russia.⁹⁸ While these ideas seem odd in the context of a pre-Christian Russia, such suggestions give some evidence of a sense of the context in which composers propagated national ideas to serve the political agenda.⁹⁹ As an example of the search for “Russianness,” Preobrazhensky pointed to the existence of specific musical terms (*stroki* [lines], *niz* [bottom], *put'* [path], *verkh* [top]) that were used to describe counterpoint.¹⁰⁰ These terms had a descriptive meaning rather than a theoretical nature and were intended to emphasise the Russian nature of the music. Preobrazhensky also mentioned Smolensky's attempts to distinguish *kazanskoye znamya* [Kazan' sign-notation] as a “particularly Russian contrapuntal style.”¹⁰¹

The lack of a systematic approach was also evident in the presentation of the fundamental church-music notions such as *dukhovnost'* and *narodnost'*. Specific musical techniques such as might render these qualities apparent in sacred music were not explicitly articulated or prescribed. Also, an uncertainty of how these qualities might be gauged in sacred compositions gave critics an opportunity to speculate on the presence of these elements in church music. *Narodnost'* in sacred music was more or less understood in musical stylistic terms as referring, even if only vaguely, to nationalist styles associated with the *Moguchaya kuchka*. *Dukhovnost'*, on the contrary, was limited in its application to liturgical texts and a *cappella* performance. It neither considered innate qualities of music nor had a definitional sense in terms of musical style. In the 1880s Tchaikovsky admitted that Russian sacred music still needed a clear set of rules for harmonisation.¹⁰² Later, in 1909, in the journal *Khorovoye i regentskoye delo* [Choral and Conducting Matters], Nikol'sky

⁹⁷ Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 281.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 137.

⁹⁹ The Director General of *Svyateyshiy Sinod* Pobedonostsev had ultra-national views. That is why any national-like claims and ideas in sacred music were supported by high rank people. For more information, see Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 292. Pobedonostsev's attempts to support national ideas was a sort of counterargument to atheism and scepticism of the 1860s. At the end of the nineteenth century composers had to support the state policy that reflected Slavophile direction; see Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 292.

¹⁰⁰ Preobrazhensky, *Kul'tovaya muzika v Rossii*, 41.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 40.

¹⁰² Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 278.

wrote an article on this subject saying that there was no clear definition for *dukhovnost'*¹⁰³ and how it might be realised in music.¹⁰⁴

Further attempts to characterise the Moscow and St. Petersburg schools of sacred music were made in the twentieth century by Gardner and more recent researchers, Lozovaya and Ye. Yu. Shevchuk, who gave an insight into distinguishing features of the two schools.¹⁰⁵ Findeizen wrote two very detailed volumes on Russian music, but did not consider the years after 1800. His biographical essay on Smolensky outlines the main achievements of this composer, but it does not contain any detailed analysis or criticism of his sacred music. Metallov, Gardner, Lozovaya and Shevchuk all have outlined the distinguishing Western-influenced features of the St. Petersburg school as essentially the following: (1) homophonic style, (2) *svobodnoye obrashcheniye dissonansov* [free use of discords], (3) use of parallel 3rds and 6ths, (4) use of the dominant 7th chord and its inversions.¹⁰⁶

If one takes into consideration Tchaikovsky's assertion that in his sacred harmonisations of *Vsenoshchnoye Bdeniye* he carefully avoided chromaticism, dissonances and 7th chords (unless they were used as passing chords) then it becomes evident that these features were commonplace in nineteenth-century sacred music, and particularly in St. Petersburg.¹⁰⁷ Additional characterisation of the St. Petersburg school can be drawn from Gardner's criticism of the sacred compositions of Bakhmetev, who was the governor of the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella* for about twenty years, from 1861 to 1883. Amongst those aspects of Bakhmetev's work that attracted Gardner's criticism were: use of dissonances, unprepared modulations, repetition of words within a strophe, and asynchronous singing of words.¹⁰⁸ According to Gardner's comparative observations of the time after Bakhmetev's period of oversight, in the later years of the nineteenth century, by which time

¹⁰³. In the course of the thesis I have found that the term *dukhovnost'* was frequently used by reformatory composers and critics of Russian sacred music.

¹⁰⁴. A. V. Nikol'sky, "O 'tserkovnosti' dukhovno-muzikal'nikh sochineniy: Zametka" [On the 'Churchliness' of Sacred Musical Compositions: A Note], 1909, repr. in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmyslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918], vol. 3 of Rdmdm, ed. M. P. Rakhmanova, comps. A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002), 563.

¹⁰⁵. I. Ye. Lozovaya and Ye. Yu. Shevchuk, *Tserkovnoye peniye* [Church Singing] (St. Petersburg: Neva, 2005).

¹⁰⁶. Metallov, *Ocherk istorii*, 98–99 (see chap. 2, n. 28); Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 2: 372; also see Lozovaya and Shevchuk, *Tserkovnoye peniye*, 13.

¹⁰⁷. P. I. Tchaikovsky, "Predisloviye k pervomu izdaniyu Vsenoshchnogo Bdeniya" [Preface to the First Edition of All-Night Vigil], 1882, repr. in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmyslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918], vol. 3 of Rdmdm, ed. M. P. Rakhmanova, comps. A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002), 187.

¹⁰⁸. Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 2: 351–52, 424.

Arkhangel'sky had gained recognition as a scholar and composer, little had changed from Bakhmetev's period of dominance over St. Petersburg's sacred music.¹⁰⁹ The essence of those few changes which had occurred lay, according to Gardner, in: (1) implementation of strict four-voice settings; (2) support of the principal melodic line by parallel 6ths or 3rds, (3) homophonic harmonisation of each step of principal melodic lines, (4) wide melodic leaps up to a 6th.¹¹⁰ A. A. Filat'yev (1937–1971), with whom Gardner concurs, also referred to a sombre prayerfulness or “lachrymose sentimentalism-romanticism” in sacred music of St. Petersburg composers. Gardner affirms, that at the end of the nineteenth century, sacred music composers focused on conveying their personal feelings rather than the liturgical text. This ultimately caused a substitution of concepts, in which sentimentalism in sacred music came to be associated with prayerfulness.¹¹¹

According to Gardner, Lozovaya, Shevchuk, and Frolova-Walker, who all at different times identified similar principles in the Moscow school of sacred music, the staple tasks for this school were the maintenance of Old-church chants and the exploration of new approaches to their harmonisation.¹¹² Preobrazhensky briefly, and vaguely, characterised this initiative as “having the free choice of musical means and the possibility to compose new compositions.”¹¹³ The essence of these new harmonisations lay in: (1) linear development of principal melodic lines; (2) use of plagal relations; (3) use of 5ths, unisons, and a parallel flow of perfect consonances.¹¹⁴ Lozovaya states that these rules were initially articulated by Kastal'sky and used in his sacred compositions. Eventually, they came to be considered as those qualities that determined the main stylistic features of the Moscow school of sacred compositions. M. I. Panayotova also states that parallel 5ths were one of the notable features of the revival period.¹¹⁵ Lindsay N. Norden states that the composers of the Moscow school excelled in implementation of “national” character in their harmonisations.¹¹⁶

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 471.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 471.

¹¹¹ Ibid., 450–51.

¹¹² Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 2: 411, 488; Lozovaya and Shevchuk, *Tserkovnoye peniye*, 14; and Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 291.

¹¹³ Preobrazhensky, *Kul'tovaya muzika v Rossii*, 115.

¹¹⁴ Lozovaya and Shevchuk, *Tserkovnoye peniye*, 14.

¹¹⁵ Miroslava Ivanova Panayotova, “In search of ‘Russianness’: Russian National Idioms in Aleksandr Glazunov’s Sonata no. 1 for piano, op. 74” (PhD thesis, The University of Arizona, 2012), 38.

¹¹⁶ Lindsay N. Norden, “A Brief Study of the Russian Liturgy and Its Music,” *Musical Quarterly* 5 (1919): 428.

Additionally, taking into account Kastal'sky's own commentary,¹¹⁷ it may be deduced that the features of the Moscow school were the harmonisations of the Old chants and composed settings with incorporation of new timbres and choral colours. Therefore, vocally expanded harmonisations that went beyond standard four-voice textures also represented the Moscow school of sacred music.¹¹⁸ For a summary of the purported features of the two schools refer to table 3.3 below.

¹¹⁷ A. D. Kastal'sky, "Khoroviye kraski" [Choral Colours], autograph, repr. in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, materiali, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence], vol. 5 of Rdmdm, ed. and comp. S. G. Zvereva (Moscow: Znak, 2006), 218–24.

¹¹⁸ S. G. Zvereva, Vstupitel'naya stat'ya [Introductory Article] to "Pomestniy Sobor Russkoy Pravoslavnoy tserkvi 1917–1918 godov. Materiali o tserkovnom penii" [Local Council of the Russian Orthodox Church 1917–1918. Materials on Church Singing], in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmyslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918], vol. 3 of Rdmdm, ed. M. P. Rakhmanova, comps. A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002), 695; also see Kastal'sky, "O moyey muzikal'noy kar'yere," 55.

Table 3.3. Summary of the objectives and features of the Moscow and St. Petersburg schools.

Moscow school objectives and features:	St. Petersburg school features:
Exemplify a “renaissance” of Old-church singing traditions ¹¹⁹ ;	Use of homophonic style
Engagement of progressive composers for writing sacred music;	Use of four-voice textures;
To differentiate, stylistically and technically, from their rival school ¹²⁰ ;	Use of wide melodic leaps;
To represent “genuine Russian choral style of sacred compositions that was utterly free from foreign influence” ¹²¹ ;	Sentimentalism-romanticism;
Apply a new approach to harmonisations;	Free use of discords;
Avoid sentimentalism and sensuality in sacred music;	Use of unprepared modulations;
Use of simultaneous singing of the liturgical text;	Asynchronism in the singing of liturgical text;
Use of unisons;	Repetition of liturgical words;
Use of parallel perfect consonances such as 5ths; avoid parallel imperfect consonances;	Use of parallel 3rds and 6ths;
Use of plagal relations.	Use of the dominant 7th chord and its inversions. ¹²²

While many of the claims made by and about the Muscovite composers would suggest that their orientation was nationalistic and based on folk traditions of Russian music, stylistic analysis of their sacred works discloses a significant degree of inconsistency between the styles and techniques used in this repertoire and many of the claims made about it. It is a characteristic of the history of Russian sacred music that its composers often soberly discussed and criticised flaws and

¹¹⁹ Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 280.

¹²⁰ Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 2: 463, 488.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 412.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 372; also see Lozovaya and Shevchuk, *Tserkovnoye peniye*, 13.

weaknesses of sacred harmonisations, but proved unable or unwilling to step beyond the common harmonisations they themselves criticised.¹²³ The evidence of and reasons for such inconsistencies concern the remainder of this thesis; the circumstances behind them turn out to be highly mixed, involving a combination of theoretical, practical, and even trivial matters. In the next chapter, the precise degree to which the adherents of the reformist agenda for late nineteenth-century sacred music in Russia practised what they preached is considered, as are the underlying causes for such discrepancies as may emerge.

¹²³ P. M. Vorotnikov, “Zametki po povodu rassuzhdeniy o garmonizatsii tserkovno-russkoy melodii” [Notes on the Discussion About Russian Church Melody], 1871, repr. in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmyslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918], vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, ed. M. P. Rakhmanova, comps. A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul’turi, 2002), 140.

Chapter 4

Critical Discussion of Selected Repertoire of the Moscow and St. Petersburg Schools

This chapter considers the extent to which claims made about the repertoire under consideration, by both its composers and significant commentators, are evidenced in the music of the two schools. In particular, it focuses on the reform agenda set forth in the Moscow school and considers the degree of the differences supposedly opened up between this school and the St. Petersburg one. The chapter consists of two sections—the first concerns the sacred music of the Moscow school and the second that of St. Petersburg. The assertions made by the composers themselves and musicologists—from Smolensky to Metallov—at the end of the nineteenth century prompted six categories for the discussion of the chosen sacred repertoire in this chapter. These musical figures debated the use of appropriate intervals and undisturbed liturgical text, and they also speculated on the issue of inappropriate “sensuality” and “extravagance,” which was connected to dissonance, chromaticism, and elaborated harmonies. The manifestation of the major-minor system in church music was another one of the points discussed among the reformists.¹ Therefore, taking into consideration these debates, the following discussion considers: (1) text setting; (2) intervallic content; (3) use of 7th chords and other dissonances; (4) functional progressions; (5) stability and completeness of musical phrases; (6) texture and sonority.

The discussion focuses on various settings of the *Bozhestvennaya Liturgiya* [Divine Liturgy]² and *Vsenoshchnoye Bdeniye* [All-Night Vigil], both of which constitute core elements of the Russian Orthodox service. The choral numbers of the *Bozhestvennaya Liturgiya* selected for discussion are as follows:

¹ See chap. 3: 70, 76, and 78.

² For readers' convenience, some translations (especially those that relate to the church service) are reiterated in this chapter.

- *Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda* [Bless the Lord, O My Soul], in settings by Chesnokov,³ Grechaninov,⁴ and Ippolitov-Ivanov⁵;
- *Kheruvimskaya pesn'* [Cherubic Song],⁶ in settings by Chesnokov,⁷ Grechaninov,⁸ Ippolitov-Ivanov,⁹ and Kastal'sky¹⁰;
- *Simvol veri* or *Veruyu* [The Creed],¹¹ in settings by Chesnokov,¹² Grechaninov,¹³ Ippolitov-Ivanov,¹⁴ and Kastal'sky.¹⁵

³ P. G. Chesnokov, “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda” [Bless the Lord, O My Soul], in *Liturgiya Sv. Ioanna Zlatousta. Dlya malogo smeshannogo khora* [The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. For Small Mixed Choir], op. 42 (Moscow: Jurgenson, 1914), 2–3.

⁴ A. T. Grechaninov, “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda” [Bless the Lord, O My Soul], in *Liturgiya Sv. Ioanna Zlatousta* [The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom], op. 13, no. 2 (Moscow: Jurgenson, 1898), 6–7.

⁵ M. M. Ippolitov-Ivanov, “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda” [Bless the Lord, O My Soul], in *Liturgiya Sv. Ioanna Zlatousta dlya chetiryokhgosnogo smeshannogo khora* [The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom for Four-Voice Choir], op. 37, no. 2. (Moscow: Jurgenson, 1903), 6–8.

⁶ While this chant can have different titles, such as: *Kheruvimskaya pesn'* [Cherubic Song], *Kheruvimskaya* [Cherubic], or *Izhe kheruvimi* [As the Cherubim], in the thesis it is generally referred to as Cherubic Song.

⁷ P. G. Chesnokov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn'” [Cherubic Song], in *Liturgiya Sv. Ioanna Zlatousta. Dlya malogo smeshannogo khora* [The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. For Small Mixed Choir], op. 42, no. 4 (Moscow: Jurgenson, 1914), 15–17.

⁸ A. T. Grechaninov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn'” [Cherubic Song], in *Liturgiya Sv. Ioanna Zlatousta* [The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom], op. 13, no. 6 (Moscow: Jurgenson, 1898), 20–24.

⁹ M. M. Ippolitov-Ivanov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn'” [Cherubic Song], in *Liturgiya Sv. Ioanna Zlatousta dlya chetiryokhgosnogo smeshannogo khora* [The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom for Four-Voice Choir], op. 37, no. 10 (Moscow: Jurgenson, 1903), 24–28.

¹⁰ A. D. Kastal'sky, *Kheruvimskaya pesn', znamenniy raspev* [Cherubic Song, Znamenniy Chant] (Moscow: Grosse, c. 1897), 2–7;
A. D. Kastal'sky, *Sofroniyevskaya Kheruvimskaya pesn' po napevu Glinskoy pustini* [Sophroniyevskaya Cherubic Song, Based on Domestic Tune of the Glinskaya Hermitage] (Moscow: Grosse, c. 1898), 3–6.

¹¹ This chant can have different titles, such as: *Simvol veri* [Symbol of Faith] or *Veruyu* [I Believe]; in the thesis it is generally referred to as The Creed.

¹² P. G. Chesnokov, “Veruyu” [The Creed]. In *Liturgiya Sv. Ioanna Zlatousta. Dlya malogo smeshannogo khora* [The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. For Small Mixed Choir], op. 42, no. 5 (Moscow: Jurgenson, 1914), 19–24.

¹³ A. T. Grechaninov, “Simvol veri” [The Creed], in *Liturgiya Sv. Ioanna Zlatousta* [The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom], op. 13, no. 8b (Moscow: Jurgenson, 1898), 32–38.

¹⁴ M. M. Ippolitov-Ivanov, “Simvol veri” [The Creed], in *Liturgiya Sv. Ioanna Zlatousta dlya chetiryokhgosnogo smeshannogo khora* [The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom for Four-Voice Choir], op. 37, no. 12 (Moscow: Jurgenson, 1903), 30–36.

¹⁵ A. D. Kastal'sky, *Veruyu* [The Creed], no. 1 (1898, repr. Moscow: Rossiyskoye muzikal'noye izdatel'stvo, 1992), 2–5;
A. D. Kastal'sky, *Veruyu* [The Creed], *dlya smeshannogo khora bez soprovozhdeniya* [for mixed choir without accompaniment], no. 3 (Moscow: Jurgenson, n. d.), 2–5.

The numbers of the *Vsenoshchnoye Bdeniye* considered are:

- *Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda*, in settings by Smolensky¹⁶ and Taneyev¹⁷;
- *Gospodi, vozzvakh* [Lord, I Have Cried], in a setting by Taneyev¹⁸;
- *Svete tikhiy* [Gladsome Light], in a setting by Taneyev¹⁹; and
- *Khvalite imya Gospodne* [Praise the Name of the Lord], in a setting by Smolensky.²⁰

Tables 4.1 and 4.2, below, are given in order to provide the reader with some general information on the chosen numbers from these services, including a description of the usual character and context of each item within the service as a whole.²¹

¹⁶ S. V. Smolensky, “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda” [Bless the Lord, O My Soul], in *Glavneyshiye pesnopeniya Bozhestvennoy Liturgii, Molebnogo peniya, Panikhidi i Vsenoshchnogo Bdeniya: Pesnopeniya Vsenoshchnogo Bdeniya* [The Main Chants of Divine Liturgy, Prayer Singing, Dirge, and All-Night Vigil: The Chants of All-Night Vigil], 3rd ed, annex to journal “Tserkovniye vedomosti” (St. Petersburg: Yablonsky, 1893), 1–2.

¹⁷ S. I. Taneyev, “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda” [Bless the Lord, O My Soul], c. 1879, repr. in *Taneyev S. I. Dukhovnaya muzika* [Taneyev S. I. Sacred Music], comp. N. Yu. Plotnikova (Moscow: Moskovskaya konservatoriya, 1999), 9–12.

¹⁸ S. I. Taneyev, “Gospodi, vozzvakh” [Lord, I Have Cried], glas 1 [in mode 1], c. 1891, repr. in *Taneyev S. I. Dukhovnaya muzika* [Taneyev S. I. Sacred Music], comp. N. Yu. Plotnikova (Moscow: Moskovskaya konservatoriya, 1999), 20–21.

¹⁹ S. I. Taneyev, “Svete tikhiy” [Gladsome Light], n. d., repr. in *Taneyev S. I. Dukhovnaya muzika* [Taneyev S. I. Sacred Music], comp. N. Yu. Plotnikova (Moscow: Moskovskaya konservatoriya, 1999), 24–30.

²⁰ S. V. Smolensky, “Khvalite imya Gospodne, drevnego raspeva” [Praise the Name of the Lord, of the Old Domestic Tune], in *Dukhovno-muzikal'niye sochineniya i perelozheniya S. V. Smolenskogo* [The sacred-musical harmonisations of S. V. Smolensky] (St. Petersburg: Énergiya, 1905), 17–20.

²¹ Galina Maximova, “Russian Orthodox Music in Australia: the Translation of a Tradition” (M. Mus. thesis, Australian Catholic University), 1999, 9–18, <http://researchbank.acu.edu.au/theses/20>; also see Vladimir Morosan, ed., *Johann von Gardner. Russian Church Singing: Orthodox Worship and Hymnography*, vol. 1 (St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1980).

Table 4.1. Summary information for selected pieces of *Bozhestvennaya Liturgiya*.²²

Title	Description
<i>Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda</i> [Bless the Lord, O My Soul]	This <i>antifon</i> ²³ of Psalm no. 102 is sung at the very beginning of the Liturgy of Catechumens. The <i>antifon</i> has an edifying role that motivates prayer. In the chosen settings, it is composed for a mixed choir.
<i>Khvali dushe moya, Gospoda</i> [Praise the Lord, My Soul]	<i>Khvali dushe moya, Gospoda</i> is the second <i>antifon</i> of the Liturgy. It proclaims church dogma concerning the Lord and the Holy Trinity. In the chosen settings, it is composed for a mixed choir.
<i>Kheruvimskaya pesn'</i> [Cherubic Song]	<i>Kheruvimskaya pesn'</i> opens up the Liturgy of the Faithful. Its role is to awaken prayerful feelings, while the priest carries the Eucharist from the table of oblations to the altar. In the chosen settings, it is composed for a mixed choir.
<i>Simvol veri</i> [The Creed]	<i>Simvol veri</i> is sung before <i>Milost' mira</i> . It performs a narrative role as it is a short presentation of the fundamentals of Christian faith. In the chosen settings, it is composed for a mixed choir.
<i>Milost' mira</i> [The Mercy of Peace]	<i>Milost' mira</i> is sung immediately after <i>Simvol veri</i> . It is one of the central numbers of Eucharistic prayers. Strophes of <i>Milost' mira</i> alternate with Eucharistic prayers read by the priest at the altar. In the chosen settings, it is composed for a mixed choir.
<i>Dostoyno yest'</i> [It is Truly Fitting]	<i>Dostoyno yest'</i> is always sung immediately after <i>Milost' mira</i> . It praises the Mother of God. In the chosen settings, it is composed for a mixed choir.
<i>Otche nash</i> [Our Father]	<i>Otche nash</i> is sung after <i>Milost' mira</i> . In the chosen settings, it is composed for a mixed choir.
<i>Tebe Boga khvalim</i> [We Praise Thee, Oh Lord]	<i>Tebe Boga khvalim</i> is sung during the first week of Lent, for the Liturgy at the end of the thanksgiving prayer. The piece praises the Lord. In the chosen settings, it is composed for a mixed choir.

²² The table includes pieces of both schools that are selected for the discussion.

²³ *Antifon* refers to the singing of psalms and hymns by two choirs in turn. Psalms are usually called *antifon* [antiphon] as they should be sung by two choirs in an antiphonal manner. For more information, see Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 1: 102–03 (see chap. 1, n. 4).

Table 4.2. Summary information for selected pieces of *Vsenoshchnoye Bdeniye*.

Title	Description
<i>Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda</i> ²⁴ [Bless the Lord, O My Soul]	The <i>antifon</i> of Psalm no. 103 is a prayer of praise to God for the beauty and grandeur of the universe. It is sung at the beginning of the great Vespers. In the chosen setting, it is composed for a mixed choir.
<i>Gospodi, vozzvakh</i> [Lord, I Have Cried]	Psalm no. 140 is sung in the Vespers. In this prayer man asks for the Lord's mercy and for the forgiveness of sins. May be set to any of the eight <i>glasi</i> ²⁵ according to the date in the liturgical calendar. In the chosen setting, it is set to <i>glas</i> 1.
<i>Svete tikhiy</i> [Gladsome Light]	This hymn to the Lord is also sung during Vespers. Its melodic structure has several common variants (the <i>znamenniy</i> [sign-notated] chant, the Kievan tune, the Greek tune, or the <i>Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella</i> 's tune) as well as completely free compositions independent of pre-existing chant. In the analysis here, the setting represents a harmonisation of a <i>znamenniy</i> chant for a five-voice mixed choir.
<i>Khvalite imya Gospodne</i> [Praise the Name of the Lord]	The <i>antifon</i> of Psalm no.135 is sung at Matins. This piece performs an edifying role, providing instruction on the righteous path. In the chosen setting, it is composed for a mixed choir.

There are several good reasons for choosing these particular numbers for discussion. They are all prominent and mandatory parts of the Russian Orthodox service. All of these numbers are part of the *neizmenyayemiyе pesnopeniya* [unchangeable chants],²⁶ with fixed liturgical texts, whose words and meaning were well known. Given these considerations, numerous composers adopted these texts for composing sacred settings, which means that they offer the best means of comparison. In short, these chosen compositions provide a wide and representative basis for comparison.

A significant structural feature of all these sacred settings is the organisation of the text—and, therefore, the music—around “strophes,” by which I refer to the verse lines of liturgical text

²⁴ The psalms 102 and 103 have a similar first strophe that is used as their title; however, the liturgical text of these two psalms differs.

²⁵ For translation, see chap. 1: 12.

²⁶ *Neizmenyayemiyе pesnopeniya* are a group of chants, in which liturgical text does not change and does not relate to a particular Holy feast or *glas*. Such chants are a pivotal part of any sacred service; see N. A. Potyomkina, “Stilevoye raznoobraziye neizmenyayemikh pesnopeniy sovremennogo tserkovnogo obikhoda” [Stylistic Diversity of Unchangeable Chants of Contemporary Church Cycle], *Vestnik*, no. 2, Moscow: RAM im. Gnessinikh (2008): 2. These chants could be likened, roughly, to the “Ordinary” of the Roman Catholic rite (as opposed to the “Offices”).

that determine the musical phrase and the structure of the song. While some strophes consist of simply a word, e.g. *Alliluiya* [Alleluia] (as in the *Kheruvimskaya pesn'*), they still represent melodically finished units that can be considered as a formal element.²⁷

4.1. Critical discussion of selected repertoire of the Moscow school

Before turning to a detailed examination of the repertoire, it is worth considering the tabular summary provided below (table 4.3).

²⁷ The strophe is a line-phrase that is, at the same time, a musical phrase; for example, in sticheron, there can be eight-to-twelve line-phrases or strophes; see Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 1: 89.

Table 4.3. Summary of comparative analysis of stylistic features relevant to the reformist agenda in the repertoire of the Moscow school.

	Asyn-chronous singing of text/ words	Altered text (repeated or omitted)	Homo-phonic texture	Tempo change/ <i>allegro</i> in 2nd part of <i>Kher. Pesn'</i>	7th chords or its inver-sions	Other texture, contrapuntal <i>Alliluiya</i> part in <i>Kher. Pesn'</i>	Use of parallel perfect consonances (including in <i>ekfonetika</i> ²⁸)
Kastal'sky							
<i>Veruyu</i> no.3	18.9%	18.3%	53%	5 times	9.8%	47%	56.4%
<i>Kher. pesn'</i> (<i>Sofron.</i>)	nil	21.4%	38.5%	2 times	20%	61.5%	15.7%
<i>Kher. pesn'</i> (<i>znam</i>)	9%	46.7%	28.6%	8 times	31.1%	71.4%	42.8%
Grechaninov							
<i>Blagoslovi</i> op.13, no.2	nil	50%	100%	4 times	17.2%	nil	65.5%
<i>Simvol veri</i> op.13, no.8b	4.4%	nil	99.2%	17 times	27.4%	0.8%	76.1%
<i>Kher. pesn'</i> op.13, no.6	21.1%	21.6%	87.7%	14 times	18.8%	12.3%	44.4%
Ippolitov-Ivanov							
<i>Blagoslovi</i> op.37, no.2	nil	30%	100	2 time	34.3%	nil	87.5%
<i>Simvol veri</i> op.37, no.12	11.5%	16.6%	92.3%	1 time	33.3%	7.7%	79.4%
<i>Kher. pesn'</i> op.37, no. 10	6.7%	45.9%	99.9%	2 times	39.1%	0.1%	54%
Chesnokov							
<i>Blagoslovi</i> op.42	37.5%	31.2%	68.7%	0 time	50%	37.5%	62.5%
<i>Veruyu</i> op. 42, no. 5	20.7%	13%	85%	6 times	39.6%	15%	61.3%
<i>Kher. pesn'</i> op.42, no. 4	30.1%	20.7%	56.6%	2 times	43.3%	43.4%	41.5%
Smolensky							
<i>Blagoslovi</i>	nil	90%	80%	0 times	9.2%	20%	30%
<i>Khvalite drevniy raspev</i>	nil	40%	90%	0 times	8.1%	10%	70%
Taneyev							
<i>Gospodi, vozvakh, glas 1</i>	nil	nil	80%	0 times	2.5%	20%	68.7%
<i>Svete tikhiy</i>	81%	34.4%	nil	0 times	nil	100%	16.6%
<i>Blagoslovi</i>	nil	70%	38.5%	0 times	7.8%	61.5%	19.7%

²⁸ *Ekfonetika* is a type of singing-like reading in a constant pitch with possible change of the pitch at the beginning and especially at the end of a phrase. This should be differentiated from *psalmodiya* [psalmody], which is church reading in a constant pitch with possible change of the pitch only at the end of the singing; see Gardner, *Bogoslužebnoye peniye*, 1: 77.

The table shows the seven main claims that were discussed by various composers and critics of Russian sacred music during the period under discussion (see chap. 3). The first five features were, as discussed above, meant to be avoided in the compositions of the Moscow school; the final two, contrapuntal *Alliluiya* parts and parallel perfect consonances,²⁹ were, on the other hand, meant to be present. The computation of the parallel perfect intervals was based on the counting of all measures with the intervals (including those in the cases of *ekfonetika*) and calculating the percentage out of the total number of measures in a composition. The same method was used for calculation of 7th chords. The calculation of asynchronism was based on counting all measures with the asynchronous singing against the total number of measures. This type of computation is not intended to prove the discrepancy between theory and practice but to serve as an initial stimulus for debate. The main objective of table 4.3 is to show a broad statistical overview of the extent to which the composers managed to enact the stylistic changes mandated by the reform. Also it investigates whether the specific requirements discussed in the previous chapter are reflected in their music. Obviously the table does not cover all aspects of the sacred repertoire, nor is it comprehensive. It is provided primarily to serve as a point of departure for the discussion to follow.

From an overall perspective the table shows no strong correlation between stylistic prescriptions and the music composed. For example, asynchronous singing of the words, along with alterations of religious texts can be found quite often in the Moscow composers' settings, despite this approach not being recommended in theory. Table 4.3 suggests that homophonic textures were also relatively popular amongst composers of Moscow school, despite this being seen as a "pro-Western" trait of the St. Petersburg composers. The table also helps to show that the percentage of parallel consonances used in the settings is typically higher in those with homophonic textures, which on its own provides a contradiction to the claims that homophonic textures were to be avoided.

The matter of tempo change for the sections of the *Kheruvimskaya pesn'* is also shown in the table, as this was a specific phenomenon found in the critical discussions of this repertoire (see chap. 3: 72). The *Kheruvimskaya pesn'* produced numerous debates among the composers who identified, for example, the inappropriateness of an *allegro* tempo, due to its "aggressiveness."³⁰ The tempo changes could also, potentially, affect the perception of the entire liturgical text and music, leading to a quality of "sensuality." With this in mind, we now look in detail at the sacred settings of Moscow composers, examining these categories one-by-one.

²⁹ The scholars of the twentieth century attributed the parallel perfect consonances to the sacred compositions of the Moscow school; see chap. 3: 82.

³⁰ See chap. 3: 74.

4.1.1. Text setting

As discussed in the previous chapter, the proper representation of liturgical texts in sacred settings was one of the issues discussed amongst the adherents of the reform process in sacred music.³¹ Liturgical text was, in the reformist discussion around sacred music, to be sung simultaneously by all vocal parts and repetitions of strophes or separate words was to be avoided.³² Failure to meet these standards was one of the main points of criticism directed by reformers towards the sacred music sung in the *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella*.³³

In the sacred compositions of the Moscow school analysed here, cases of inconsistency between claims and their practical application (as regards treatment of the text) can be found quite frequently. One rather obvious consideration, which perhaps was not fully reflected in discussions of the advised reforms, was that certain of the required stylistic characteristics could be understood to be in conflict. For instance, the use of counterpoint and the maintenance of synchronicity in the text setting would seem to imply at least partial level of incompatibility. Passages of counterpoint do not necessarily entail asynchronous text setting, but they do seem imply it as a natural consequence. For this reason, examples of textual asynchrony related to contrapuntal textures can be found in quite a few compositions of the Moscow school.³⁴ For example, in Chesnokov's "Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda" the contrapuntal opening results in asynchronism³⁵ (see Ex. 4.1).

³¹ See chap. 3.

³² Smolensky attributed the repetition of the words to secular music; see Smolensky, *O blizhayshikh prakticheskikh*, 30 (see chap. 2, n. 69).

³³ For translation, see chap. 1: 16.

³⁴ Kastal'sky, *Veruyu*, no. 1, mm. 10–11 and 3, mm. 23–26; Grechaninov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," mm. 1–3 and 18–20; Ippolitov-Ivanov, "Simvol veri"; Chesnokov, "Veruyu"; Smolensky, "Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda."

³⁵ Chesnokov, "Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda," mm. 1–10.



Ex. 4.1. Chesnokov, “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda,” mm. 1–3.

Chesnokov’s setting is also an example of alteration of the liturgical text. It represents only two opening strophes of the psalm (no. 102) and a concluding strophe, instead of the original twenty-five strophes.³⁶ In Taneyev’s “Svete tikhii” one requirement of the reformists, to preserve the flow of the original *znamennii* chant is met,³⁷ but the alteration of the text is clearly a consequence of the use of contrapuntal elements (moveable counterpoint and canonic imitation)³⁸ and *podgoloski* [subsidiary voices or under voices], as these would be described by the folklorists. While homophonic texture, on the other hand, more naturally provides for simultaneity of the words,³⁹ it may defeat the reformist purpose by associations with the ideas of Western style evoked, supposedly, in the St. Petersburg school. This also demonstrates a contradiction between the objectives and the results.

The integrity of the liturgical text is also distorted by omission of words in the vocal parts,⁴⁰ their repetition,⁴¹ or by use of triplets and duplets (on which basis Shumsky criticised Kastal'sky’s sacred compositions).⁴² The use of triplets and duplets against regular durations in Kastal'sky’s

³⁶ The reduced version of a setting, that is, with fewer textual strophes present, can quite often be found in Russian sacred music; however, the proper way the setting should be sung is by applying the same tune to all strophes, which should ideally be included. However, in this case, the melodic line is written in such a way that it would not actually be possible to sing all the text to the music as written.

³⁷ See Synodal version to compare: I. Smirnov, “Svete tikhii” (*znamennii*) [Gladsome Light], in *Tserkovno-pevcheskiy sbornik* [The Church-Singing Collection], vol. 1 (St. Petersburg: Sinodal'naya tipografiya, 1898), 71–76.

³⁸ Taneyev, “Svete tikhii,” mm. 10–11 and 50–53.

³⁹ As it can be seen in Grechaninov, “Simvol veri,” mm. 16–18, 40–43; “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda,” mm. 9–11.

⁴⁰ See Chesnokov, “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda,” that is an example of employment of repetition and reduction of the text: the setting represents only two opening strophes of the psalm (no. 102) and a concluding strophe, instead of the original fifteen measures.

⁴¹ See Ippolitov-Ivanov’s “Kheruvimskaya pesn” and “Simvol veri” that reveal features of both asynchronous singing and multiple repetition of the text; also see Taneyev, “Svete tikhii,” in which repetition of the words between voices occur due to contrapuntal texture; and Chesnokov, “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda,” mm. 1–10.

⁴² Shumsky, “Moskovskoye Sinodal'noye uchilishche,” 427, 433 (see chap. 3, n. 45).

Veruyu no. 1⁴³ would seem to be at odds with the reformist style; however, this may reflect the composer's appreciation for various musical operations, which he articulated in his *Khorovīye kraski* [Choral Colours].⁴⁴ This polyrhythm might be understood as consistent with his recommendation to use short values against a melodic line.⁴⁵

A contrapuntal setting of the *Alliluiya* of the *Kheruvimskaya pesn'*, as advised by Grechaninov,⁴⁶ in general can be seen only in the settings of two composers of the Moscow school—those by Kastal'sky (see Ex. 4.2) and Chesnokov.⁴⁷ In contrast to Grechaninov's suggestions, the *Alliluiya* part of his own “Kheruvimskaya pesn',” strangely enough, represents a completely homophonic texture (see Ex. 4.3).⁴⁸ Even more paradoxically, from a reformist standpoint, contrapuntal elements are used throughout the rest of the setting, where the text is more elaborate, resulting in textual asynchronism.⁴⁹ Other composers use mostly homophonic textures or stylised *podgolosochnaya polifoniya*⁵⁰ and *podgoloski* in the *Alliluiya* part of the compositions analysed here.

⁴³ See Kastal'sky, *Veruyu*, no. 1, mm. 10–11.

⁴⁴ See chap. 3, n. 117.

⁴⁵ Kastal'sky, “Khorovīye kraski,” 219 (see chap. 3, n. 117).

⁴⁶ Grechaninov, “Neskol'ko slov,” 432 (see chap. 3, n. 57).

⁴⁷ Chesnokov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn',” excerpt of contrapuntal *Alliluiya* part, mm. 46–49.

⁴⁸ Similar situation can be seen in Ippolitov-Ivanov's *Alliluiya* part of “Kheruvimskaya pesn',” mm. 36–45 (see mm. 40–45).

⁴⁹ See Grechaninov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn',” mm. 1–3 and 57–62.

⁵⁰ *Podgolosochnaya polifoniya* is one of the common types of folk *mnogogolosiye* [multi-voice singing]. Bershadskaya gives the following description of this type of Russian folk *mnogogolosiye*: “multi-voice singing with different functions of every voice such as one is a leading voice and the others are ornamental accompaniment”; see T. S. Bershadskaya, *Osnovniye kompozitsionniye zakonomernosti mnogogolosiya russkoy narodnoy krest'yanskoy pesni* [Major Compositional Principles of Polyphony of Russian Folk Peasant Song] (Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoye muzikal'noye izdatel'stvo, 1961), 38.

Podgolosochnaya polifoniya is probably included in what Yavorsky referred to as *melodicheskaya konfiguratsiya* [melodic configuration], by which he meant voices that serve to accompany a main melodic line; see B. L. Yavorsky and S. N. Belyayeva-Ekzemplyarskaya, *Struktura melodii: Konstruktsiya melodicheskogo protsessa. Vospriyatiye melodicheskogo dvizheniya* [Structure of Melody: The Construction of Melodic Process. The Perception of Melodic Movement] (Moscow: Mospoligraf, 1929), 32.

The existence of various terms for the polyphony in Russian scholarly literature of the turn of the twentieth century that was already discussed in the previous chapter (see chap. 3: 80) could also be explained by an eagerness to create a specifically national musical/theoretical vocabulary that would be recognised by amateur and trained composers.

Ex. 4.2. Kastal'sky, *Kheruvimskaya pesn'*, *znamenniy raspev*, mm. 71–77 (excerpt of contrapuntal *Alliluiya* part).

Ex. 4.3. Grechaninov, “*Kheruvimskaya pesn'*,” mm. 79–90 (*Alliluiya* part).

The combinations of the homophonic, contrapuntal, and antiphonal⁵¹ textures in the sacred settings discussed here can be understood as an expressive element that differentiates textual strophes or parts of a composition.⁵² The incorporation of these different textures through three main parts of a composition, as in the setting of Ippolitov-Ivanov’s “*Simvol veri*,”⁵³ may also

⁵¹ The antiphonal singing is one of the five types of Russian church singing: 1) *antifonniy* [antiphonal]; 2) *ipifonniy* [epiphonal]; 3) *responsonniiy* [answer-respond]; 4) *kanonarkhom* [with leader]; 5) *gimnicheskiiy* [hymn]. The statute of church prescribes two choirs—on the left and right hand side of iconostasis. During the service some chants are sung as a dialog between two choirs; see Gardner, *Bogoslužebnoye penie*, 1: 82.

⁵² See Chesnokov, “*Kheruvimskaya pesn'*”; Kastal'sky, *Kheruvimskaya pesn'*, *znamenniy raspev*.

⁵³ See Ippolitov-Ivanov, “*Simvol veri*,” mm. 31–34; and also see his “*Kheruvimskaya pesn'*,” mm. 36–45 (see mm. 40–45) as an example of the use of homophonic and antiphonal textures.

suggest a type of ternary form that some musicologists attributed to Western influence.⁵⁴ One of the Western traditions that Gardner noted in Bortnyansky's music, sacred concertos, and *Kheruvimskaya pesn'* was what he termed *tryokhchastnaya forma* [three-part form]. This can be also found in the settings of Moscow-school composers.⁵⁵ Gardner stated that the essence of *tryokhchastnaya forma* as used by Bortnyansky comprised the use of two textures with fugal outer parts and a "choral" (by which it should probably be understood that he meant homophonic) middle part.⁵⁶ According to Gardner, such a form was a reflection of the prevailing Western traditions in the High Court in St. Petersburg. Taking into consideration Gardner's thoughts, the settings of Chesnokov and Ippolitov-Ivanov,⁵⁷ both of whom used two textures in their settings—homophonic and contrapuntal, might be understood as showing signs, in their formal design, of practices inherited, via Bortnyansky, from "Western" traditions.

In order to further clarify the situation with regard to use of "Western"⁵⁸ elements in Russian sacred music of the last decades of the nineteenth century, the next characteristics upon which the sacred settings are analysed include intervals, harmony, rhythm,⁵⁹ sonorities, and texture. Since various critics and researchers, as discussed in chapter 3, distinguished a genuine spirituality and "Russianness" in the sacred settings of Muscovite composers, in comparison to works of the St. Petersburg school, the study of the characteristics listed above facilitates the analysis of "spiritual" and "Russian" musical idioms.

4.1.2. Intervallic content

The attitude of Muscovite composers to the use of intervals, as they understood them, was not always unanimous. On the one hand composers aspired for, at least in theory, the use of parallel perfect consonances, even though such a move would violate standard voice-leading practices. On

⁵⁴ Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 2: 255–54 (see intro., n. 15).

⁵⁵ Ippolitov-Ivanov, "Simvol veri"; Ippolitov-Ivanov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'"; and Chesnokov, "Veruyu."

⁵⁶ Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 2: 255–54.

⁵⁷ Chesnokov, "Veruyu," see contrapuntal measures 29–32; and his "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," in which he utilised various techniques such as movable counterpoint and imitation with the polyphonic texture constituting about a half of the entire setting; for Ippolitov-Ivanov, see n. 53 above.

⁵⁸ Saying "Western" we should remember that we are talking about the musical elements of St. Petersburg's sacred music. In the personal correspondence of Muscovite composers, the term "Western" can be usually seen. Probably this term lent stronger emphasis to what elements had to be changed in the Moscow-based reforms.

⁵⁹ These three categories were identified for musical analysis by Jan LaRue; see Jan LaRue, *Guidelines for Style Analysis* (New York: Norton, 1970), 3–50.

the other hand some composers were not only willing to use imperfect consonances but also argued about the validity of dissonance. Taneyev, for instance, advised against the use of parallel imperfect consonances in Russian sacred compositions,⁶⁰ whereas Grechaninov was even willing to accept dissonances, an issue that generated frequent disputes among composers and clergy. It seems that for Grechaninov, the chief task of Russian sacred music was to reflect liturgical text and convey a proper message to the congregation, rather than being preoccupied with rigid theoretical forms, stylistic and musical elements, such as, for example, dissonances.⁶¹

It would be unfair to state that none of the recommendations was implemented. Parallel consonances were liberally used by Muscovite composers, which were noted by musicologists of the twentieth century as a distinguished feature of this school. A closer study of the use of perfect consonances reveals primarily the frequent use of these consonances in low voices and not in genuine parallel motion but in a chanting, or recitation manner known as *ekfonetika*, above which the high voices “move” in parallel imperfect consonances.⁶² Despite the fact that Taneyev advised against the use of parallel imperfect consonances in sacred compositions, his own settings show many examples of motion in parallel 3rds (or 10ths) and 6ths.⁶³ While Chesnokov used perfect consonances in parallel “motion,” as *ekfonetika*, or doubled at the octave in his “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda” and “Kheruvimskaya pesn’,”⁶⁴ settings of these chants by Grechaninov and Ippolitov-Ivanov show a constant use of imperfect consonances, 3rds (or 10ths) and 6ths.⁶⁵ The homophonic texture that is used to such an extent in these settings inevitably facilitated an abundance of imperfect consonances. In Ippolitov-Ivanov’s “Simvol veri,” the 5ths in *ekfonetika* are often combined with imperfect consonances and dissonances, which lessen the effect of the perfect consonances (see Ex. 4.4).

⁶⁰ Taneyev perceived this method as “mechanical” (see chap. 3: 77; and n. 82). The non-acceptance of imperfect consonances should be understood more as a historical fact rather than anything related to contemporary theory.

⁶¹ Grechaninov, “Neskol’ko slov,” 433.

⁶² See Taneyev, “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda,” mm. 1–6; Taneyev, “Gospodi, vozzvakh,” opening strophe; also see Chesnokov, “Veruyu,” mm. 1–4; Smolensky, “Khvalite imya Gospodne, drevnego raspeva,” motif A; and Smolensky, “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda,” motif A.

⁶³ See Taneyev, “Svete tikhii,” mm. 3–4, 18, 20, 33, 37, 39–40, and 50–53.

⁶⁴ Chesnokov, “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda,” mm. 1–3; and Chesnokov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn’,” mm. 28, 33–34.

⁶⁵ Grechaninov, “Simvol veri,” mm. 16–8 and 40–43; Grechaninov, “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda,” mm. 9–11; Grechaninov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn’,” mm. 22–25; Ippolitov-Ivanov, “Simvol veri,” mm. 1–3; and Ippolitov-Ivanov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn’,” mm. 58–61 and 65–67.

Въ - ру - ю во е - ди - на - го Бо - га От - ца, Ве - ед - ер - жи - те - ля, Твор -

Скоро.

Ex. 4.4. Ippolitov-Ivanov, “Simvol veri,” mm. 1–3.

In the sacred compositions of the Muscovite composers, the reformists’ recommendations to use parallel perfect consonances revealed, in practice, cases when these intervals were used in combination with parallel imperfect consonances and homophonic textures that were habitually associated with the sacred music traditions of St. Petersburg. Possibly, also, the use of homophonic textures was not only a voluntary intention on the part of the composer but also a measure dictated by a need to conform to the tastes of governing bureaucrats such as the chief-prosecutor Pobedonostsev or his colleagues in Moscow. Smolensky stated in his memoirs that the chief-prosecutor did not like the long melismatic *znamenniy* chant sung in the church, due to an extended length of a sung vowel that overpowers the text in these chants, and, therefore, he demanded that choirs avoid this kind of composition.⁶⁶ Consequently, by fulfilling one recommendation, composers compromised another. Such concessions, as well as disunity among the allies over the priorities and implementation of the reform agenda, become more evident over the course of the following discussion.

4.1.3. Use of 7th chords and other dissonances

The use of 7th chords and other dissonances also occupied the minds of critics who believed that such sounds were unacceptable in Russian sacred music. Scholars of the nineteenth century such as Odoyevsky and Kompaneysky argued extensively over various aspects of the application of dissonances in Russian sacred music.⁶⁷ In the 1870s Odoyevsky stated that the most appalling

⁶⁶ Smolensky, “Moskva. Sinodal’niy khor,” 307 (see chap. 2, n. 152).

⁶⁷ V. F. Odoyevsky, “Zametki o penii v prikhodskikh tserkvakh” [Notes on Singing in the Dioceses], 1864, repr. in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmishlenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the

feature of the Western influence on Russian sacred music, particularly in St. Petersburg, was the use of dominant 7th chords and unprepared modulations.⁶⁸ The use of *tyagoteniye* [leading notes] and their association with Western traditions (which were to be avoided) was also a point of discussion in the reform debates in the nineteenth century.⁶⁹

The presence of dissonant intervals, 7th chords and their inversions is evident in many of the sacred compositions of the Muscovite composers. While Smolensky and Taneyev used 7th chords less often,⁷⁰ Chesnokov, Grechaninov, Ippolitov-Ivanov, and Kastal'sky exploited a whole range of 7th chords in all inversions.⁷¹ Smolensky used dissonances and 7th chords the least, in comparison to his colleagues, and perhaps in keeping with the views concerning reform, which, after all, largely originated with him. Seventh chords, for example, are scarcely represented in his “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda.” The V⁷ chord in F major that is found in the beginning strophe recurs three times in the setting. While the notes that form tritone in this 7th chord can be understood as *perekhodyashchiye noti* [passing notes],⁷² the 2nd, which is used in the concluding strophe and held for two beats, should be considered as a stronger dissonance (Ex. 4.5).

Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918], vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, ed. M. P. Rakhmanova, comps. A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002), 62, 63.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 63.

⁶⁹ Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 136, 244–51, and 272 (see intro., n. 2).

⁷⁰ See Smolensky, “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda.” This setting has irregular measuring; therefore, to state all measures in which 7th chords are used is impossible; also see Taneyev, “Svete tikhii,” mm. 11–3, 36, and 40; Taneyev, “Gospodi, vozzvakh,” mm. 1, 6, and 9.

⁷¹ Chesnokov, “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda,” see mm: 3, 6, 7, 8, 10–13, and 15; Chesnokov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn',” see mm. 1, 3, 5, 9, 12, 14–17, 21, 23, 27, 31, 35, 37, 39, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, and 51; Chesnokov, “Veruyu,” see mm. 8, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 24–8, 38, 39, 40, 43, 45, 46, 52, 53, 54, 55, 62, 63, 64, 66, 68, 70, 75, 76, 77, 86, 87, 91, 92, 97–99, 102, 104, and 105; Grechaninov, “Simvol veri,” see mm. 5–8, 14, 20, 29, 30, 35, 43, 46, 52, 55, 58, 64, 67, 70, 72, 79, 80, 86, 87, 92, 95, 99, 100, 103, 106, 109, 112; Grechaninov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn',” see mm. 4, 7, 10, 15, 21, 23, 25, 26, 41, 44, 47, 48, 52, 54, 56, 59, 82; Ippolitov-Ivanov, “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda,” see mm. 4, 9, 13, 15, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 28, and 31; Ippolitov-Ivanov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn',” see mm. 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 17, 18, 20, 21, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 43, 44, 47–49, 52, 53, 54, 58, 59, 61, and 70; Ippolitov-Ivanov, “Simvol veri,” see mm. 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 14, 17, 20, 37, 38, 45, 46, 49, 52–54, 55, 58, 60–62, 65, 67, 72, and 77; Kastal'sky, *Veruyu*, no. 3, see mm. 13, 18, 35, 38, 40, 60, 61, 64, 65, 67, 69, 70, 75, 76, and 89; Kastal'sky, *Kheruvimskaya pesn', znamenniy raspev*, see mm. 1, 2, 18, 22, 24, 29, 35, 36, 40–43, 49, 50, 52, 53, 56, 57, 63, 68, 69, 73, and 76; Kastal'sky, *Sofroniyevskaya Kheruvimskaya pesn'*, see mm. 4, 11, 19, 21, 26, 34, 36, 41, 51, 53, 58, 65, 67, and 70.

⁷² Odoyevsky, “Zametki o penii,” 62, 63.



Ex. 4.5. Smolensky, “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda” (the concluding strophe).

Although some dissonances can be considered as *perekhodyashchiye noti* because of their short values, contextual factors such as tempo, rhythmical and metrical organisation of a composition contribute to different kinds of accentuation of dissonances. For example, in Ippolitov-Ivanov’s “Simvol verī,” 2nds are used freely as passing intervals and in *ekfonetika* (see Ex. 4.4, m. 3), in which the static harmonic nature tends to highlight the discords.⁷³ In Grechaninov’s “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda,” which is in tempo *tranquillo*, a 9th (in the m. 3) between bass and tenor in the incomplete G: V⁹ chord occupies a two-beat value, and therefore cannot be heard as a simple passing dissonance.⁷⁴ Grechaninov, as he admitted in personal writings,⁷⁵ evidently explored various musical elements in his sacred compositions, including 7th chords such as V⁷ and ii⁷ and their inversions which are, for example, extensively used in his “Kheruvimskaya pesn’.” The composer even employs a half diminished ii^{ø4/3} (see Ex. 4.6, m. 15), which, on the basis of observations made in all the settings chosen for the discussion, is a very unusual chord for Russian sacred music, and in this context it provides a comparatively rich sonority, and an affective setting of the word *tayno* [secret].

⁷³ See Ippolitov-Ivanov, “Simvol verī,” mm. 1–3.

⁷⁴ See Grechaninov, “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda,” mm. 1–8.

⁷⁵ Grechaninov, *Moya muzikal'naya zhizn'*, 93 (see chap. 3, n. 29).

Ex. 4.6. Grechaninov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn’,” mm. 15–17.

Chesnokov went further in application of dissonances. In his “Veruyu,” tritones, as part of augmented and diminished chords, are found in mm. 52–55 (Ex. 4.7).⁷⁶ His use of an appoggiatura, in the tenor part, draws attention to V^7 (m. 55). The composer even utilised a series of unresolved tritones, presumably to amplify the meaning of the liturgical text *i stradavsha i pogrebenna* [and suffered, and was entombed]. The combination of the very slow tempo ($\text{♩} = 40$) and the unresolved augmented 4ths lends the phrase a very intense, rich effect in which the dissonances, far from being eschewed, draw listener’s attention.

Ex. 4.7. Chesnokov, “Veruyu,” mm. 51–56.

The numerous cases of 7th chords and their inversions in the settings discussed here reveal another aspect faced by composers of sacred music—*tyagoteniye*, which appeared to be unavoidable. Although Kastal'sky made an attempt to avoid *tyagoteniye* in his setting of

⁷⁶ Also see Chesnokov, “Veruyu,” m. 99.

Sofroniyevskaya Kheruvimskaya by consistently lowering (or not raising) $\hat{7}$,⁷⁷ he did not avoid $\#7$ in his setting of *Veruyu*.⁷⁸ Kastal'sky, who used a number of 7th chords in different inversions rooted on $\hat{2}$, $\hat{5}$, and $\hat{7}$ in this setting, treated the E minor: $\text{vii}^{\circ 4/3}$ in m. 70 (Ex. 4.8) in a context of prolonging the *tyagoteniye* to E minor. He even put a fermata over this chord to ensure its duration. Examples such as this contradict the ideas of Lipayev who suggested that Kastal'sky's sacred music was not related to the major-minor system.⁷⁹ In m. 60, an augmented triad on the $\hat{3}$ suggests further evidence of the influence of the major-minor system.⁸⁰

Ex. 4.8. Kastal'sky, *Veruyu*, no. 3, mm. 65–70.

A “national campaign” against leading notes had originated in St. Petersburg⁸¹ several decades earlier than in Moscow. In order to bring national flavour to their compositions, members of the *Kuchka* and other nationalist composers based in the city had advocated elimination of the “leading note” from minor tonalities. Glinka was the first to proclaim the leading note to be “non-Russian.”⁸² Such objectives were overly idealistic due to the difficulty, or even outright infeasibility, to introduce them to audiences that had over almost two centuries been so thoroughly influenced by Western tonal and harmonic practice and the major/minor system. Given that these Western features became a widely accepted part of Russian secular and sacred music, the genuine elimination of *tyagoteniye* represented a challenge that would be almost impossible to implement in practice. The critics Odoyevsky and Kompaneysky suggested avoiding accidentals, such as *tyagoteniye* (leading notes and secondary leading notes), making exceptions to *perekhodyashchiye noti* [passing notes]. Despite the suggestions and for the reasons outlined above, leading notes and

⁷⁷ See Kastal'sky, *Sofroniyevskaya Kheruvimskaya pesn'*, mm. 1–2.

⁷⁸ See Kastal'sky, *Veruyu*, no. 3, mm. 55, 58.

⁷⁹ Lipayev, “Sinodal'noye uchilishche,” 239 (see chap. 3, n. 38).

⁸⁰ See Kastal'sky, *Veruyu*, no. 3, mm. 57–62.

⁸¹ In *Moguchaya kuchka* time St. Petersburg pertained its name.

⁸² Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 136, 272.

secondary leading notes are inevitably evident in the sacred settings of Moscow-school composers discussed here, even if reformist ideas about church music and ideals of nationalism required otherwise.

The presence of leading notes can be seen, for example, in Smolensky's "Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda," which begins with a V in D minor, requiring C \sharp , which is then followed by I in C at the end of the melisma, requiring cancellation of the leading note (the absence of a natural sign before C over the bass progression G–C is clearly a misprint) (see Ex. 4.9).

Ex. 4.9. Smolensky, "Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda" (the beginning theme).

Grechaninov in his "Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda" used $\sharp\hat{7}$ to establish briefly the tonality of A minor, which is followed by modulation back to E minor, with the phrase concluding in a half cadence (mm. 12–14).⁸³ In his "Simvol verī," the leading note to C \sharp minor (in $V^{4/3}$) shows another instance of this practice (mm. 26–27).⁸⁴ The use of $\sharp\hat{7}$ is also seen in m. 55, in which a modulation to A minor occurs (see Ex. 4.10).⁸⁵

⁸³ See Grechaninov, "Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda," mm. 9–16.

⁸⁴ See Grechaninov, "Simvol verī," mm. 26–27.

⁸⁵ Similar approach is seen in Ippolitov-Ivanov's "Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda," in which he even introduced the double sharp to accentuate V in G \sharp minor in m. 14.

#7

Ex. 4.10. Grechaninov, “Simvol veri,” mm. 52–61.

Chesnokov’s “Kheruvimskaya pesn’” shows not only #7 in A minor (mm. 10, 36)⁸⁶ but also seems to imitate a trademark of the *Moguchaya kuchka*—a stepwise chromatic motion over a pedal note.⁸⁷ The chromaticism that involves motions such as $\hat{5}-\#5-\hat{6}-\flat 6-\hat{5}$ over a sustained bass was an element nationalist composers frequently used as a marker of orientalism in their music.⁸⁸ Such a progression can be found in Chesnokov’s “Kheruvimskaya Pesn’,” in the descending $\hat{8}-\hat{7}-\#6-\flat 6-\hat{5}$ motion in the alto over the A pedal at the beginning of the first strophe (see Ex. 4.11). While this feature fits the type of nationalist marker described above, at the same time, its chromatic qualities would surely attract the criticism of a colleague such as Grechaninov that it created an inappropriate level of “sentimentality.”⁸⁹

⁸⁶ Chesnokov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn’,” mm.10, 36.

⁸⁷ Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 142.

⁸⁸ This feature was firstly distinguished by Gerald Abraham and then Richard Taruskin, which the latter called “the very morpheme of *nega*” [bliss]; see Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*, 176 (see intro., n. 2). Glinka resorted to $\#5-\flat 6$ in *Ruslan i Lyudmila* to imply a folk-like quality; see Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 145.

In secular music of Rimsky-Korsakov chromaticism $\hat{5}-\#5-\hat{6}-\hat{7}-\hat{8}$ takes place; moreover, he used this kind of chromatic motion as a marker of liturgical music in the chorus *Tsar' nash* in *The Maid of Pskov*; see *Ibid.*, 151. This chromaticism was often distinguished as “Kuchka Pattern”; see *Ibid.*, 141–42; however, Frolova-Walker argues that the pattern was no more than habitually used Italianism and an element that many members of the circle favoured; see *Ibid.*, 160.

⁸⁹ See chap. 3: 74.



Ex. 4.11. Chesnokov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn’,” mm. 1–2.

Despite the attempts of some Moscow-school composers to avoid dissonances, 7th chords, and leading notes, these features are clearly present in the settings discussed above. These may also serve as examples of Western influence on Russian composers in general that was firstly evident in the St. Petersburg composing school and eventually found followers in Moscow.

4.1.4. Functional progressions

The use of the Western “functional” model of tonic–subdominant–dominant (hereafter T–S–D) progressions was a feature of sacred music of St. Petersburg composers who were criticised by their Moscow contemporaries, such as Kastal'sky.⁹⁰ This composer emphasised the inappropriateness of the T–S–D pattern in Russian sacred music, complaining, for example, about its use in the everyday chanting during the Litany.⁹¹ He called this progression a “German cliché” and urged composers to avoid it.⁹² In 1917, Kastal'sky also claimed that the composers of sacred music, including Tchaikovsky and Taneyev, had exploited Western musical traditions too extensively. He disapproved of their attempts to achieve *sobornost'* [universal unification] and prayerfulness through the use of overly sophisticated sacred compositional styles.⁹³

All the settings of the Moscow-school composers analysed in the current discussion, however, show the use of T–S–D progressions.⁹⁴ In Kastal'sky's own *Sofroniyevskaya*

⁹⁰ As used in this section, these terms should not be confused with the quite different emphasis attached to them under Yavorsky's theories, which are discussed in the next section.

⁹¹ A. D. Kastal'sky, “Po povodu obnovleniya” [On Restoration], 1917, repr. in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, materiali, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence], vol. 5 of Rdmdm, ed. and comp. S. G. Zvereva (Moscow: Znak, 2006), 115; also see Norden, “A Brief Study,” 441 (see chap. 3, n. 116).

⁹² In this study we are moving from a discussion based on chordal roots to a discussion based more on function (Tonic–Subdominant–Dominant).

⁹³ Kastal'sky, “Po povodu obnovleniya,” 114.

⁹⁴ See Grechaninov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn',” mm. 1–6 and 81–7; Grechaninov, “Simvol veri',” mm. 6–7, 43–45, 62–65, and 110–13; Ippolitov-Ivanov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn',” see plagal sequences of the first strophe, mm. 7–11; Chesnokov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn',” mm. 8–11; Chesnokov, “Veruyu,” mm. 8–9 and 17–19; Chesnokov, “Blagoslovi

Kheruvimskaya pesn' the T–S–D progression is found over the course of the temporary tonicisation between the relative keys of A minor and C major (see Ex. 4.12). In this setting Kastal'sky expanded the use of the primary chords T–S–D and incorporated secondary chords such as ii^7 , which can be considered as an attempt to expand this “German cliché.”

A minor: S–D–T

Ex. 4.12. Kastal'sky, *Sofroniyevskaya Kheruvimskaya pesn'*, mm. 1–11.

The T–S–D progression can also be found in Chesnokov’s “*Kheruvimskaya pesn'*” from his *Liturgiya*, op. 42, where the subdominant is used in cadential progressions. For example, in measures 9–10 secondary chords such as A minor: vi^7 and $ii^{6/5}$ support subdominant function, a move which can be understood as an attempt to diversify the Western-related T–S–D progression (see Ex. 4.13).

A minor: vi^7 $ii^{6/5}$

Ex. 4.13. Chesnokov, “*Kheruvimskaya pesn'*,” mm. 8–11.

dushe moya, Gospoda,” mm. 3–4, 14–16; Smolensky, “*Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda*,” first and second strophe cadences; and Kastal'sky, *Sofroniyevskaya Kheruvimskaya pesn'*, mm. 8–9, 14–15, and 48–49.

The frequent use of T–S–D progressions in the sacred settings analysed in the thesis contradicts the claims of composers in Moscow that such progressions should, or in fact, could be avoided. According to Frolova-Walker’s study, audiences and congregations of the nineteenth century actually understood the frequently used the dominant-tonic progression as traditionally Russian.⁹⁵ This statement suggests that such a progression was universally used, and therefore cannot be selected as a distinguishing feature of a specific school. In the chosen compositions the application of T–S–D progression either with or without the subdominant is indisputably much more sophisticated due to incorporation of various chords.

4.1.5. Stability and completeness of musical phrases in the selected compositions of Moscow composers

In this section, I turn to a discussion of the claims of the Moscow-school composers in relation to “emotionality” in the sacred music. One of the requirements of the reform agenda was to eschew “emotional” appeals and sensual effects such as might distract the congregant from the solemn contemplation of the liturgy and the ritual. This concept of “emotionality” is a hard category to measure with much objectivity, and implies a range of psychological problems beyond the scope of this study; however, one possible means may be to consider the music in terms of stability and completeness at the phrase level, for reasons that follow shortly. In doing so, it was decided to employ a theory contemporaneous to the music itself, and which, though it is impossible to prove, may well have been recognised by some of the musicians under consideration—the theory⁹⁶ of auditory gravitation [*slukhovoye tyagoteniye*] by B. L. Yavorsky (1877–1942).⁹⁷ Yavorsky’s work includes the theory of modal rhythm [*ladoviy ritm*] and modal sonorities [*ladoviye sozvuchiya*]. According to this theory, the use of various combinations of sonorities can affect the sense of stability of musical phrases and, as a consequence, cause what Yavorsky described as “modal tension.” Certainly Yavorsky’s work is not without its critics, and it is accepted that some of its bases are controversial. Nonetheless, owing to the circumstantial proximity of the theory to the music at hand, it was deemed appropriate at least to venture some observations stemming from it, and not the least because Yavorsky stated that a naturally composed piece without tension (i.e.

⁹⁵ Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 291.

⁹⁶ Taneyev was a predecessor to and inspirer of Yavorsky’s theory of intonation; see Gordon Daniel McQuere, “The Elements of The Structure of Musical Speech” by S. V. Protopopov [microform]: A Translation and Commentary (PhD thesis, The University of Iowa, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 1978), 449.

⁹⁷ On the ensuing pages I provide transliteration in brackets so that the discussion is not encumbered; see note on translation and transliteration, p. 2.

which followed his laws of gravitation) would facilitate an undisturbed auditory attention⁹⁸; meanwhile, modal tension would intensify the emotional aspect of it.⁹⁹ Also, Yavorsky made an attempt to explain the psychology of musical processes and perception, which is another reason for using his theory in this context.

Yavorsky's theory of auditory gravitation discusses all aspects of music from formation of a sound, melodic intonation [*melodicheskaya intonatsiya*], and structural characteristics of a composition such as moment,¹⁰⁰ progression, modal sonority, symmetry of moments, and phrases [*moment, oborot, ladovoye sozvuchiye, simmetriya momentov*,¹⁰¹ *frazi*]. The symmetry (virtually a reflection) of moments builds symmetrical phrases of stable (“+”) or unstable (“-”) moments (see Ex. 4.14).¹⁰²



Ex. 4.14. Symmetrical phrases constructed by stable (“+”) and unstable (“-”) moments.¹⁰³

According to Yavorsky's theory, the stability [*ustoychivost'*] and completeness [*zakonchennost'*] of melodic units or phrases depends on the progressions of chords as well as the presence of unstable sonorities [*neustoychivoye sozvuchiye*] or auditory gravitation. These

⁹⁸ Yavorsky and Belyayeva-Ekzemplyarskaya, *Struktura melodii*, 10.

⁹⁹ L. A. Mazel', *Stroyeniye muzikal'nikh proizvedeniy: uchebnoye posobiye* [Structure of Musical Compositions: Schoolbook], 2nd ed., exp. (Moscow: Muzika, 1979), 71.

¹⁰⁰ S. V. Protopopov, *Elementi stroyeniya muzikal'noy rechi* [The Elements of Construction of Musical Speech], part 1, ed. B. L. Yavorsky (Moscow: Muzikal'niy Sektor, 1930), 70.

In Yavorsky's theory the notion of melodic intonation is connected to verbal expressions of words. Also, a melodic intonation “is the smallest unit of a musical structure”; hence, a musical structure consists of melodic intonations that are built on a moment—an element of a one-tone gravitation or a function. A “monopartite” moment is either a word with a single accent on the first syllable or one-function unit. Correspondingly, a “bipartite” moment is a word with an accent placed on the last syllable or a two-unit intonation. Slurs show duration of the intonation and a bar line borders bipartite intonations. Those intonations that occur within a measure would represent monopartite intonations; see McQuere, “Elements,” 170–74 and 487.

¹⁰¹ The language and terms that Yavorsky use bear a more figurative and mathematic connotations rather than academic meaning; see M. G. Aranovsky, “Teoreticheskaya kontseptsiya B. L. Yavorskogo” [The Theoretical Concept of B. L. Yavorskogo], *Iskusstvo muziki: teoriya i istoriya*, no. 6. (2012): 57, 58.

¹⁰² McQuere, “Elements,” 97.

¹⁰³ Two phrases that consist of dominant (D) moment and tonic (T) moment may construct stable phrase (marked “+”) or unstable phrase (marked “-”); see B. L. Yavorsky, *Uprazhneniya v obrazovanii ladovogo ritma* [Exercises in Creating of Modal Rhythm], part 1 (Moscow: Jurgenson, 1915), 22–24; Protopopov, *Elementi stroyeniya muzikal'noy rechi*, 70.

progressions were thoroughly studied by Yavorsky in the early 1900s and can be found in his work *Konstruktsiya melodicheskogo protsessa* [The Construction of the Melodic Process].¹⁰⁴ In Yavorsky's theory, one of the elements that affects the degree of stability and completeness of musical moments and phrases is the sonorousness of stable and unstable notes. To be able to judge the stability of phrases, using Yavorsky's theory, the reader should remember that a subdominant sonority in major mode, according to Yavorsky, is determined by presence of $\hat{6}$; dominant sonority is determined by presence of $\hat{7}$. Additionally, Yavorsky identifies a combined sonority [*soyedinyonnoye sozvuchiye*] that is determined by the presence of both $\hat{6}$ and $\hat{7}$. In the minor mode Yavorsky classifies the subdominant sonority by the presence of $\hat{7}$; the dominant sonority is determined by presence of $\hat{6}$; combined sonority is determined by both $\hat{7}$ and $\hat{6}$.¹⁰⁵ To illustrate this, for example, in reference to C major and A minor, in C major the subdominant would be defined by the presence of A, or $A\flat$, dominant by the presence of B; in A minor these would be G, $G\sharp$ and F.¹⁰⁶ In Yavorsky's system, the functions of S and D in major and minor modes are understood to be in a mirror reflection¹⁰⁷; hence, S sonorities are formed: in the major mode, descending from T; in the minor mode, ascending from T; whereas, D sonorities are formed: in the major mode ascending from T; in the minor mode, descending from T. This understanding of the two functions necessitates a reverse exchange between S and D in minor mode, i.e. in A minor the dominant is D minor, and the subdominant is E.¹⁰⁸ According to his theory there are three stable progressions [*ustoychiviy oborot*] and twelve unstable progressions [*neustoychiviy oborot*]. In a stable progression an unstable moment resolves in a stable moment¹⁰⁹ (see table 4.4, moments are separated by bar lines).

¹⁰⁴ Yavorsky and Belyayeva-Ekzemplyarskaya, *Struktura melodii* (for the full reference, see n. 50 above).

¹⁰⁵ Yavorsky, *Uprazhneniya*, 3, 4.

¹⁰⁶ McQuere, "Elements," 142, 148.

¹⁰⁷ Possibly, this reverse understanding of S and D in the minor mode is similar to, and possibly derived from, Hugo Riemann's theory of functions which attempted to account for the minor mode through reference to a spurious "undertone" series; see Hugo Riemann, *Harmony Simplified or the Theory of Tonal Functions of Chords*, ed. Augener (England: Augener, 1996), 141–42.

¹⁰⁸ McQuere, "Elements," 305.

¹⁰⁹ Yavorsky, *Uprazhneniya*, 10.

Table 4.4. Yavorsky's categorisation of stable and unstable progressions.¹¹⁰

Three stable progressions					
D T	“authentic” progression [<i>avtenticheskiy oborot</i>]				
S T	“plagal” progression [<i>plagal'niy oborot</i>]				
$\mathbb{D}_S^{111} T$	“full” progression [<i>polniy oborot</i>]				
Twelve unstable progressions					
progressions that break stability		progressions with two unstable moments		progressions with same modal function	
T D	“half-authentic” progression [<i>poluavtenticheskiy oborot</i>]	S D	“half progression” [<i>polovinniy oborot</i>]	S S	“subdominant” progression [<i>subdominantniy oborot</i>]
T S	“half-plagal” progression [<i>poluplagal'niy oborot</i>]	D S	“interrupted progression” [<i>prervanniy oborot</i>]	D D	“dominant” progression [<i>dominantniy oborot</i>]
$T \mathbb{D}_S$	“half-full” progression [<i>polupolniy oborot</i>]	$S \mathbb{D}_S$; $\mathbb{D}_S S$; $D \mathbb{D}_S$; $\mathbb{D}_S D$	“combined sonority” [<i>soyedinyonnoye sozvuchiye</i>]	$\mathbb{D}_S \mathbb{D}_S$	“combined” progression [<i>soyedinyonniy oborot</i>]

After considering the above-mentioned combinations and progressions, one may distinguish if a phrase or piece is complete or incomplete, at least as far as Yavorsky's theories account for these qualities.¹¹² As a complete phrase or piece Yavorsky classifies those phrases or melodies in which all unresolved unstable moments and sounds gain resolution. Under stable sounds, Yavorsky implies degrees belonging to a tonic triad. By unstable sounds, Yavorsky means gravitating (or, we might say, “active”) sounds [*tyagoteyushchiye zvuki*]. Correspondingly those phrases that retain unresolved sounds are designated as incomplete. Also, he distinguished relatively stable

¹¹⁰ Yavorsky and Belyayeva-Ekzemplyarskaya, *Struktura melodii*, 25; Yavorsky, *Uprazhneniya*, 10.

¹¹¹ This is not the original symbol used by Yavorsky as it is difficult to reproduce typographically. This symbol refers to *soyedinyonnoye sozvuchiye* that represents both subdominant and dominant, according to Yavorsky's theory.

¹¹² Yavorsky and Belyayeva-Ekzemplyarskaya, *Struktura melodii*, 25.

[*otnositel'no ustoychiviy*] phrases, in which unstable notes receive auditory gravitation [*iskhod svoego napravleniya*] but not resolution.¹¹³

Using Yavorsky's theory, which was in circulation by the early years of the twentieth century in Russia, is one way of considering, however imperfectly, whether the sacred compositions analysed here display qualities of "completeness" or "incompleteness." These concepts, remembering that Yavorsky's theory was also a theory about perception, are important for the analysis by linking the qualities to the effect of these pieces, or progressions within them. While Smolensky's "Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda" provides an example, applying Yavorsky's theory, of a stable and complete setting because both of its strophes conclude with an "authentic" progression of D|T in C major,¹¹⁴ Grechaninov's "Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda,"¹¹⁵ by contrast, in general, is unstable and incomplete. Such a conclusion is drawn from the studying of progression of the moments, in which not all the notes achieve resolution.¹¹⁶ For example, the third phrase is unstable and incomplete. The phrase finishes with an "interrupted" progression of D|S and unconnected modulation [*nesvyaznoye sopostavleniye*]¹¹⁷ in E minor that amplifies auditory tension and imbues the phrase with "emotional" intonations (Ex. 4.15).



E minor: D | S | S | S
(presence of $\hat{6}$) (presence of $\hat{7}$)

Ex. 4.15. Grechaninov, "Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda," mm. 9–16 (unconnected modulation, reduced version).

The strophic nature of some sacred settings, which implies division of musical phrases according to the text, such as in Grechaninov's "Simvol veri," suggests the presence of a cadence in

¹¹³ Ibid., 25.

¹¹⁴ See Ex. 4.5, Smolensky, "Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda," the concluding strophe; also see Taneyev, "Gospodi, vozzvakh," mm. 8–9.

¹¹⁵ Grechaninov, "Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda".

¹¹⁶ Yavorsky, *Uprazhneniya*, 10.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 41.

each phrase. Occasionally, in the sacred compositions examined here, instability of moments alternates with stability.¹¹⁸ For example, in the first two musical phrases of Grechaninov's "Simvol veri,"¹¹⁹ an unstable cadence as a "half" progression S|D in B major is counteracted by a stable "plagal" progression in F# minor (keeping in mind Yavorsky's peculiar understanding of chord functions in the minor mode, E is $\hat{7}$ and represents a "subdominant" progression, see Ex. 4.16). The instability of the whole strophe is emphasised by modulation or, in Yavorsky's terminology, by unconnected modulation.¹²⁰ As a consequence, the more such unstable elements are used in the strophe the greater emotionality it might express.

B: S | S | D | D | D |

E: D | T A: D | T F#minor: S | T

Ex. 4.16. Grechaninov, "Simvol veri," mm. 1–11 (first phrase cadence, reduced version).

According to my analysis of Russian sacred music, resolution of 7th chords or cadences can appear in the next musical phrase, so the cadences or resolutions become suspended. From a Western point of view, such cases are relatively common, whereas in Russian sacred music any suspended resolution would create tension and an unduly emotional dynamic that contravenes the principles of Muscovite reformers. Also, such suspended resolutions produce an unstable, incomplete progression that may deflect from the appropriate spirituality of a composition. In Grechaninov's "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," the suspended cadence can be found in measure 7 (see Ex. 4.17). This cadence is formed by a "half" progression, which, according to Yavorsky's theory, is an unstable progression that involves the "subdominant" and "dominant" progression and, in this case, is emphasised because it is prolonged by the *fermata*. The auditory tension gains resolution in the

¹¹⁸ See Chesnokov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'."

¹¹⁹ See Grechaninov, "Simvol veri," mm. 106–13, concluding strophe.

¹²⁰ Yavorsky, *Uprazhneniya*, 41.

following measure, which means that the phrase is incomplete. According to standard Western music theory, this cadence would be distinguished as a half cadence, having the progression of V-ii^{6/5}-V.



D min: S | D | S | T¹²¹

Ex. 4.17. Grechaninov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn’,” mm. 7–8 (“subdominant” and “dominant” progression, reduced version).

In Chesnokov’s “Veruyu,” for example, the unresolved auditory gravitation in an “interrupted” progression and unresolved G: D⁷ in the seventh strophe¹²² could be considered as pertinent to the meaning of the liturgical text. Grechaninov, who argued for the connectedness of music to liturgical text,¹²³ would doubtless endorse this congruity; however, the sustained melodic tension that finds resolution in the following measures might also signify an inappropriate “expressivity.” Unresolved tritones—an augmented 4th and a diminished 5th in the measure 99 (see Ex. 4.18)—facilitate the perception of incompleteness and instability of the ninth strophe, especially taking Yavorsky’s thoughts on unresolved tritones into consideration. Although, the tritones resolve in an ensuing measure, the musical phrase remains incomplete.¹²⁴

¹²¹ The reader should bear in mind that it is not a function but perception of sounds according to *slukhovoye tyagoteniye* [auditory gravitation with a need to resolve] and *ladovoye sozvuchiye* [modal combinations].

¹²² Chesnokov, “Veruyu,” mm. 66–68.

¹²³ Grechaninov, “Neskol’ko slov,” 430–32.

¹²⁴ Also see Chesnokov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn’,” m. 5. It has suspended resolution of the tritone F–B.

во ос-та-вле-ни-е грѣ-ховъ. Ча

G: D | D | D | D | D

Ex. 4.18. Chesnokov, “Veruyu,” mm. 97–99.

An increased emotional effect is demonstrated in the second strophe of Ippolitov-Ivanov’s “Simvol verī.”¹²⁵ It is an incomplete phrase that involves unstable progressions such as T|D and S|D¹²⁶ and has the unstable progression B minor: T|S as a cadence. The suspended resolution of the final chord also increases the emotional dynamic of the strophe (Ex. 4.19).

B minor: S | S | S | T | S | T | D | T | S | S | S | S

Ex. 4.19. Ippolitov-Ivanov, “Simvol verī,” mm. 20–23 (the second strophe, reduced version).

Further confirmation of the idea that the more incomplete and unstable phrases or strophes occur in a setting the more the sense of modal tension rises is found in Kastal'sky’s *Veruyu* no. 3. The commonly used sonority in its cadences is the unstable combined progression $\begin{matrix} D \\ S \end{matrix} | \begin{matrix} D \\ S \end{matrix}$ (see Ex. 4.20, mm. 67–70) or an “interrupted” progression followed by a “half” progression as in measures 77–79.

¹²⁵ Ippolitov-Ivanov, “Simvol verī,” mm. 7–23.

¹²⁶ Yavorsky, *Uprazhneniya*, 11.

E minor : D^\flat | D^\flat | D | D^\flat | T D^\flat | S | D^\flat

Ex. 4.20. Kastal'sky, *Veruyu*, no. 3, mm. 65–70.

The study of the chosen sacred compositions, applying Yavorsky's theory of auditory gravitation, often shows evidence of instability and incompleteness of the phrases. The compositions with such phrases, therefore, express an increased "modal tension" and emotionality that may not be considered appropriate to Russian church music, in the sense of the ideals distributed by the reformists.

4.1.6. Texture and sonority

While in the last decades of the nineteenth century Muscovite composers supported the restoration of Russian sacred music and strove, at least on paper, to eliminate a range of Western influences from sacred compositions, the overall execution of their compositions, as we have seen, did not fully reflect the stylistic elements required by this reformation. In the category of texture and sonority, the concerns of reformists reflected the idea that the music should serve the liturgical purpose for which it was written and that "excessive," elaborate theatricality and heavily sonorous effects should be avoided. The homophonic textures that are evident in most of the sacred compositions analysed in this chapter tended to involve rich and sonorous combinations of sounds.

In the sacred compositions, thick and sonorous sounds are usually achieved not only by *forte* or *fortissimo* dynamics but also by wide vocal range, closely spaced chords, octave doublings or by moving all voices to either high tessitura or low. Such moves usually create a rich sound that is difficult to correlate with the required solemnity or asceticism theoretically desired for sacred music.¹²⁷ In the settings of Moscow-school composers considered in this thesis, the tendency to introduce a wide vocal range with rich sonorities can be frequently observed.¹²⁸ For example, on

¹²⁷ It should be noted that the introduction of female voice in church singing by Arkhangel'sky in 1880 expanded choral abilities to create rich sonorities; see Gardner, *Bogoslužebnoye peniye*, 2: 448.

¹²⁸ See Chesnokov, "Blagoslovi dushe moyá, Gospoda" (the range is A–g"); Chesnokov, "Veruyu" (the range is

average, all of the settings of the *Kheruvimskaya pesn'* examined here have a wide vocal range of three octaves that occasionally may involve notes as low as the notes of the second octave (C–E)¹²⁹ or high notes of the fifth octave (f'–a'') (see table 4.5).

Table 4.5. The overall ranges of the settings of *Kheruvimskaya pesn'*.

A sacred setting	An overall range of a setting
Kastal'sky, <i>Sofroniyevskaya Kheruvimskaya pesn'</i>	G–e''
Kastal'sky, <i>Kheruvimskaya pesn', znamenniy raspev</i>	C–f''
Ippolitov-Ivanov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn',” op. 37, no. 10	D–a''
Grechaninov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn',” op. 13, no. 6	C–g''
Chesnokov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn',” op. 42, no. 4	E–g''

Kastal'sky, who believed in the benefits of using thick textures,¹³⁰ resorted to octaves when a greater density of chords was required.¹³¹ His *Kheruvimskaya pesn', znamenniy raspev* shows typical instances of a wide vocal range, octave doublings as well as closely spaced chords (see Ex. 4.2, above); a similar approach is used by his colleagues in Moscow—Grechaninov and Chesnokov.¹³²

The use of wide vocal range in the chosen sacred compositions is used as a method of musical expression. For example, Grechaninov's setting of *Kheruvimskaya pesn'* shows a consecutive move of the voices to lower tessitura in order to accentuate the meaning of the liturgical strophe *i zhivotvoryashchey Troitse, trisvyatuyu pesn' pripevayushche* [and who sing the thrice-holy hymn to the life-creating Trinity] (Ex. 4.21). The meaning of the word *tayno*, in the first strophe of

F–g''); Grechaninov, “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda” (the range is G–e''); Grechaninov, “Simvol veri” (the range is B,–g''); Ippolitov-Ivanov, “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda” (the range is E–e''); Ippolitov-Ivanov, “Simvol veri” (E–g''); Kastal'sky, *Veruyu*, no. 3 (the range is E–f''); Smolensky, “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda” (the range is G–g''); Taneyev, “Gospodi, vozzvakh” (the range is E–e''); and Taneyev, “Svete tikhiy” (the range is F–e'').

¹²⁹ These ranges refer to the Helmholtz system as adopted in *Grove Music Online*, where C is two octaves below middle C, c is one octave below, c' is middle C, and c'' is one octave above, etc.

¹³⁰ See chap. 3: 72–73.

¹³¹ See Kastal'sky, *Kheruvimskaya pesn', znamenniy raspev*, mm. 30–34.

¹³² See Grechaninov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn',” mm. 22–24; Chesnokov, “Veruyu,” mm. 81–88.

this setting, is emphasised by a highly unusual, half diminished chord in combination with *pianissimo* dynamic. Here, the exceptional harmonic colour is used almost as a form of “word-painting” (see Ex. 4.6).

The image shows a musical score for a four-part setting. It consists of four staves: two vocal staves (Soprano and Alto) and two piano accompaniment staves (Right and Left Hand). The music is in 2/4 time and B-flat major. The lyrics are in Russian: "три - свя - ту - ю пѣснь припѣ - ва - цѣ пѣснь три - свя - ту - ю пѣснь,". The score includes dynamic markings: *forte, ma non troppo* and *mf*. The piano part features a half-diminished chord in the right hand at the end of the phrase.

Ex. 4.21. Grechaninov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn’,” mm. 22–24.

The compositions examined in this study quite often demonstrate a discrepancy with regard to the claims to adhere to a sense of austere sonority. Most of the settings employ occasional divisions of vocal parts and some may reach as many as seven voices.¹³³ Such musical techniques correspond to the claims of the Moscow sacred school to incorporate distinctive vocal colours. For example, according to Kastal'sky, the use of the textures with greater than four voices was recommended¹³⁴ and, as discussed, the composer employed it greatly. In Kastal'sky's sacred compositions tension and emotionality was achieved by the use of sonorous chordal formulae as well as various combinations of tessitura and vocal range. The expressive formulae used in Kastal'sky's sacred compositions take us far away from the idealistic picture of humble, edifying chants and may serve equally to contradict the aspirations to create deeply spiritual and ascetic sacred compositions that were meant to be free from sensuality and emotional distractions. Although Chesnokov's “Kheruvimskaya pesn'” and Smolensky's “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda” have no division beyond four parts,¹³⁵ on their own the four-voice texture contradicts the advice of the latter who suggested the composers should avoid four-voice textures and use two- or three-voice textures,¹³⁶ as these were considered relatively close to folk traditions.

¹³³ See Ippolitov-Ivanov, “Simvol veri,” mm. 77–78; Kastal'sky, *Kheruvimskaya pesn', znamenniy raspev*, mm. 47–48.

¹³⁴ Kastal'sky, “O moyey muzikal'noy kar'yere,” 55 (see chap. 3, n. 36).

¹³⁵ See Exx. 4.11 and 4.5.

¹³⁶ Kastal'sky recommended in his workbook on choral colours the use of three-voice compositions for a village choir; see Kastal'sky, “Khoroviye kraski,” 220.

In the consideration of sacred compositions the reconciliation of Western and Russian musical elements can be identified through stylistic imitations of key liturgical elements such as imitation of bells or antiphonal singing¹³⁷ that served to bring a national folk flavour to sacred music.¹³⁸ For example, in Kastal'sky's *Kheruvimskaya pesn'*, *znamenniy raspev* the rhythm that is applied to C octaves in the tessitura of the *basso profundo* points to another choral technique Kastal'sky used in this setting—an imitation of tolling church bells (see Ex. 4.2),¹³⁹ which is used in order to enrich sonority and reconcile the Western-like contrapuntal texture with this Russian feature. However, as it can be seen, the musical elements used tended perhaps to make the music sound more secularised rather than authentically sacred. This statement certainly does not reflect the situation with Russian sacred compositions of the entire composing school in Moscow but demonstrates practices prevalent amongst reputable composers.

The inclusion of a soloist in Chesnokov's "Veruyu"¹⁴⁰ can be considered as another example of an attempt to bring Russianness to the setting. Singing with a soloist or *kanonarkh* [prompting singer, leader], who would be used in the case of a shortage of books, was common practice in monasteries.¹⁴¹ This is not the case in the setting of Chesnokov because the soloist sings a single word rather than a whole strophe; however, it can be considered as an element that was meant to unite Western musical elements with Russian church-singing traditions, in which Chesnokov resorts to a stylised reflection of the *kanonarkh* (see Ex. 4.22). This choral technique was mentioned in Kastal'sky's summary of choral colours, where he stated that the *kanonarkh*—included episodically either on tonic or dominant—and the cases of *ekfonetika* that we saw in the discussed compositions could help to achieve more "authentic" sounds.¹⁴²

As Ivanov states, two-voice compositions would not require special education, whereas three-voice compositions would require minimal understanding of musical theory; see Ivanov, "Popitki k vosstanovleniyu," 393 (see chap. 2, n. 153).

¹³⁷ See chap. 4, n. 23 and n. 51.

¹³⁸ Another feature that served to emphasise Russianness in sacred music was the use of stylistic imitations. Imitation of antiphonal singing in Kastal'sky, *Kheruvimskaya pesn'*, *znamenniy raspev*, serves as a core element that also emphasises spiritual flavour of the setting.

¹³⁹ Frolova-Walker attributes the imitation of tolling church bells in sacred music to Kastal'sky; see Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 291.

¹⁴⁰ Chesnokov, "Veruyu," mm. 9–10, 76–77, 88–89, 99–100, and 105–06.

¹⁴¹ Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 1: 84–85.

¹⁴² For more information on the subject, see Kastal'sky, "Khoroviye kraski," 218–19.

ТЕНОРЪ (одинъ).
 Въ - ру - ю...
 И во е - ди - на - го Гос - по - да І - и -

Ex. 4.22. Chesnokov, “Veruyu,” mm. 9–11 (strophe with soloist).

The “true Russianness” of sacred music was questioned in discussions which arose amongst composers and clerical conductors in late decades of the nineteenth century. Composers aspired to changes in Russian sacred music and believed that increased activity in numerous musical circles that became feasible after the reforms of the 1860s would facilitate its process.¹⁴³ What concerned the members of the circles and societies such as Odoyevsky, Razumovsky, and Potulov, were the Italianate musical traditions that had become deeply rooted in and flourished on Russian grounds.¹⁴⁴ These thinkers were concerned about specific stylistic features of Italianate music that were embodied in sacred compositions, such as rhythmic groups of short notes that they associated with secular music, excessive dynamics and changes of tempo such as retardations and accelerations.¹⁴⁵ Several decades later Smolensky, Kastal'sky, and Grechaninov accepted these concerns and added those that concerned them such as “Western” harmonies and the abundance of embellishments found in the Western styles, as they perceived them. As the discussion above reveals, however, it is not difficult to identify a significant gap between what was preached and what was practised.

¹⁴³ Rakhmanova, *Vstupitel'naya stat'ya to Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii*, 27, 28 (see chap. 3, n. 89); also see, V. F. Odoyevsky, “Obshchestvo drevnerusskogo iskusstva” [The Society of Old-Russian Art], 1865, repr. in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmıslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918], vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, ed. M. P. Rakhmanova, comps. A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002), 105.

¹⁴⁴ M. P. Rakhmanova, *Vstupitel'naya stat'ya* [Introductory Article] to “1860–1870ye” [1860s and 1870s], in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmıslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918], vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, ed. M. P. Rakhmanova, comps. A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002), 26.

¹⁴⁵ See chap. 2: 48, 58; and chap. 3: 73–74.

4.2. Critical discussion of selected repertoire of the St. Petersburg school

The claims of Muscovite composers and other musical figures with respect to the reform of Russian sacred music in the later nineteenth century placed much emphasis on the distinction of the Moscow school of sacred music from that of St. Petersburg. Considering the claims of those of a reformist cast who criticised the features of the St. Petersburg school, we would expect to find these features consistently present in the selected sacred compositions of this school. With this in mind, the present analysis is meant to facilitate a broader awareness of the extent of any such distinctions between these schools as well as helping to construct a wider picture of Russian sacred music in the last decades of the nineteenth century in both major centres.

In order to retain a level of consistency across the comparison between the music of the two schools, I have kept the same categorisation of features that served the discussion in the previous part of this chapter. The reader is, therefore, referred again to table 4.1 for general information on the selected numbers from the church service. The choral numbers of the *Bozhestvennaya Liturgiya* selected for the analysis are as follows:

- *Kheruvimskaya pesn'*, in settings by Arkhangel'sky,¹⁴⁶ Tchaikovsky,¹⁴⁷ and Rimsky-Korsakov¹⁴⁸;
- *Milost' mira*, in settings by Arkhangel'sky¹⁴⁹ and Rimsky-Korsakov¹⁵⁰;

¹⁴⁶ A. A. Arkhangel'sky, "Izhe kheruvimi" [Cherubic Song], in *Peniye Liturgii Svyatogo Ioanna Zlatousta v dukhe drevnikh napevov pravoslavnoy tserkvi. Dlya chetiryokhgholosnogo smeshannogo khora* [The Chant of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom in the Manner of the Old Tunes of the Orthodox Church. For Four-Voice Choir] (St. Petersburg: Shmidt, 1905), 8–10.

¹⁴⁷ P. I. Tchaikovsky, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'" [Cherubic Song]. *Devyat' dukhovno-muzikal'nikh sochineniy* [Nine Sacred Musical Compositions], no. 1, 1884, repr. in *Peter Tchaikovsky. The Complete Sacred Choral Works*, Monuments of Russian Sacred Music II, editor-in-chief Vladimir Morosan (Madison, Conn.: Musica Russica, 1996), 315–23;

P. I. Tchaikovsky, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'" [Cherubic Song]. *Devyat' dukhovno-muzikal'nikh sochineniy* [Nine Sacred Musical Compositions], no. 3, 1884, repr. in *Peter Tchaikovsky. The Complete Sacred Choral Works*, Monuments of Russian Sacred Music II, editor-in-chief Vladimir Morosan (Madison, Conn.: Musica Russica, 1996), 336–47.

¹⁴⁸ N. A. Rimsky-Korsakov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'" [Cherubic Song], no. 5. *Liturgiya Sv. Ioanna Zlatousta* [The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom], 1884, repr. in *Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov. The Complete Sacred Choral Works*, Monuments of Russian Sacred Music III, editor-in-chief Vladimir Morosan, intro. Marina Rakhmanova (Madison, Conn.: Musica Russica, 1999), 157–66;

N. A. Rimsky-Korsakov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'" [Cherubic Song], no. 6, n. d., repr. in *Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov. The Complete Sacred Choral Works*, Monuments of Russian Sacred Music III, editor-in-chief Vladimir Morosan, intro. Marina Rakhmanova (Madison, Conn.: Musica Russica, 1999), 167–75.

¹⁴⁹ A. A. Arkhangel'sky, "Milost' mira" [The Mercy of Peace], in *Peniye Liturgii Svyatogo Ioanna Zlatousta v dukhe drevnikh napevov pravoslavnoy tserkvi. Dlya chetiryokhgholosnogo smeshannogo khora* [The Chant of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom in the Manner of the Old Tunes of the Orthodox Church. For Four-Voice Choir] (St. Petersburg: Shmidt, 1905), 13–14.

- *Dostoyno yest'*, in settings by Tchaikovsky¹⁵¹ and Rimsky-Korsakov¹⁵²;
- *Simvol veri*, in settings by in settings by Arkhangel'sky¹⁵³ and Tchaikovsky¹⁵⁴;
- *Otche nash*, in settings by Tchaikovsky¹⁵⁵ and Rimsky-Korsakov¹⁵⁶;
- *Khvali dushe moya, Gospoda*, in a setting by Arkhangel'sky¹⁵⁷; and
- *Tebe Boga khvalim*, in a setting by Rimsky-Korsakov.¹⁵⁸

4.2.1. Text setting

As a general rule, in the settings of the St. Petersburg composers considered here, the words of liturgical texts are not altered considerably. The text is frequently repeated in settings of the *Kheruvimskaya pesn'*,¹⁵⁹ but this practice, as indicated in the analysis, was probably a common

¹⁵⁰ N. A. Rimsky-Korsakov, “Milost' mira” [The Mercy of Peace]. *Liturgiya Sv. Ioanna Zlatousta* [The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom], op. 22, no. 4, 1883, repr. in *Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov. The Complete Sacred Choral Works*, Monuments of Russian Sacred Music III, editor-in-chief Vladimir Morosan, intro. Marina Rakhmanova (Madison, Conn.: Musica Russica, 1999), 27–31.

¹⁵¹ P. I. Tchaikovsky, “Dostoyno yest'” [It is Truly Fitting]. *Devyat' dukhovno-muzikal'nikh sochineniy* [Nine Sacred Musical Compositions], no. 5, 1885, repr. in *Peter Tchaikovsky. The Complete Sacred Choral Works*, Monuments of Russian Sacred Music II, editor-in-chief Vladimir Morosan (Madison, Conn.: Musica Russica, 1996), 353–57.

¹⁵² N. A. Rimsky-Korsakov, “Dostoyno yest'” [It is Truly Fitting], no. 2, n. d., repr. in *Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov. The Complete Sacred Choral Works*, Monuments of Russian Sacred Music III, editor-in-chief Vladimir Morosan, intro. Marina Rakhmanova (Madison, Conn.: Musica Russica, 1999), 190–94.

¹⁵³ A. A. Arkhangel'sky, “Veruyu” [The Creed], in *Peniye Liturgii Svyatogo Ioanna Zlatousta v dukhe drevnikh napevov pravoslavnoy tserkvi. Dlya chetiryokhgholosnogo smeshannogo khora* [The Chant of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom in the Manner of the Old Tunes of the Orthodox Church. For Four-Voice Choir] (St. Petersburg: Shmidt, 1905), 10–12.

¹⁵⁴ P. I. Tchaikovsky, “Simvol veri” [The Creed]. *Liturgiya Sv. Ioanna Zlatousta* [The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom], op. 41, no. 8, 1878, repr. in *Peter Tchaikovsky. The Complete Sacred Choral Works*, Monuments of Russian Sacred Music II, editor-in-chief Vladimir Morosan (Madison, Conn.: Musica Russica, 1996), 47–56.

¹⁵⁵ P. I. Tchaikovsky, “Otche nash” [Our Father]. *Devyat' dukhovno-muzikal'nikh sochineniy* [Nine Sacred Musical Compositions], no. 6, 1885, repr. in *Peter Tchaikovsky. The Complete Sacred Choral Works*, Monuments of Russian Sacred Music II, editor-in-chief Vladimir Morosan (Madison, Conn.: Musica Russica, 1996), 358–65.

¹⁵⁶ N. A. Rimsky-Korsakov, “Otche nash” [Our Father]. *Liturgiya Sv. Ioanna Zlatousta* [The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom], op. 22, no. 7, 1883, repr. in *Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov. The Complete Sacred Choral Works*, Monuments of Russian Sacred Music III, editor-in-chief Vladimir Morosan, intro. Marina Rakhmanova (Madison, Conn.: Musica Russica, 1999), 40–43.

¹⁵⁷ A. A. Arkhangel'sky, “Khvali dushe moya, Gospoda” [Praise the Lord, My Soul], in *Peniye Liturgii Svyatogo Ioanna Zlatousta v dukhe drevnikh napevov pravoslavnoy tserkvi. Dlya chetiryokhgholosnogo smeshannogo khora* [The Chant of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom in the Manner of the Old Tunes of the Orthodox Church. For Four-Voice Choir] (St. Petersburg: Shmidt, 1905), 2.

¹⁵⁸ N. A. Rimsky-Korsakov, “Tebe Boga khvalim” [We Praise Thee, Oh Lord], *dvukhornoeye* [for double choir], 1885, repr. in *Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov. The Complete Sacred Choral Works*, Monuments of Russian Sacred Music III, editor-in-chief Vladimir Morosan, intro. Marina Rakhmanova (Madison, Conn.: Musica Russica, 1999), 99–139.

¹⁵⁹ See Rimsky-Korsakov, “Kheruvimskaya pesn',” no. 6; Arkhangel'sky, “Izhe kheruvimi.”

practice in both schools discussed here. In the compositions of the St. Petersburg school, as in those of Moscow, the asynchronous singing of the liturgical text is mostly evident in passages with contrapuntal textures,¹⁶⁰ as for example in Rimsky-Korsakov's "Kheruvimskaya pesn'" no. 5 (Ex. 4.23)¹⁶¹ and "Tebe Boga khvalim" (Ex. 4.24)¹⁶²—the latter being composed for two choirs singing in an antiphonal manner. This approach, as well as the contrapuntal relation of the voices, clearly results in asynchronism and word repetition (Ex. 4.24).

Ex. 4.23. Rimsky-Korsakov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," no. 5, mm. 1–4.

Ex. 4.24. Rimsky-Korsakov, "Tebe Boga khvalim," mm. 16–19.

¹⁶⁰ Rimsky-Korsakov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," no. 5; Rimsky-Korsakov, "Tebe Boga khvalim"; Tchaikovsky, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," no. 1; Tchaikovsky, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," no. 3.

¹⁶¹ Also see Rimsky-Korsakov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," no. 5, mm. 9–13, 19–23, 27–31, 37–41, 45–47, and 66–71.

¹⁶² Rimsky-Korsakov, "Tebe Boga khvalim." The settings has strophic middle and concluding part, therefore, these strophes do not receive a measure number; numbers of measures continue elsewhere: mm. 9–11, 15–22, 24–28, 59–61, 64–66, and 76–80.

The continuation of the supposedly “Western” tradition of composing sacred music in a type of “ternary form,”¹⁶³ which was introduced by Bortnyansky, is seen in Tchaikovsky’s “Otche nash.” In this composition, Tchaikovsky resorted to homophonic and contrapuntal textures,¹⁶⁴ including imitative counterpoint in the middle part of the setting, to distinguish parts of the composition (see Exx. 4.25 and 4.26).¹⁶⁵ Contrary to Tchaikovsky, Rimsky-Korsakov, in his homophonic “Dostoyno yest’,” imitated the ternary form by alternation of monophonic (solo) and homophonic textures to distinguish between the sections (see Ex. 4.27).¹⁶⁶ In both compositions the introduction of vocal parts in the middle section has an antiphonal quality.

34 Медленнее

Хлеб наш на-суш-ный да-ждь нам д-несь,
Хлеб наш на-суш-ный да-ждь нам д-несь,
Хлеб наш на-суш-ный да-ждь нам д-несь,
Хлеб наш на-суш-ный да-ждь нам д-несь,

Ex. 4.25. Tchaikovsky, “Otche nash,” mm. 34–37.

¹⁶³ Gardner, *Bogoshuzhebnoye peniye*, 2: 254–55.

¹⁶⁴ The practice, which has been already seen in the Muscovite compositions.

¹⁶⁵ Also see Tchaikovsky, “Otche nash,” mm. 22–42.

¹⁶⁶ In the outer strophes of Rimsky-Korsakov’s “Dostoyno yest’,” the composer used homophonic texture exclusively; see Rimsky-Korsakov, “Dostoyno yest’,” mm. 1–13 and 26–41.

нам дол-ги на-ша, я-ко же и мы ос-тав-ля-ем долж-ни-
 нам дол-ги на-ша, я-ко же и мы ос-тав-ля-ем долж-ни-
 нам дол-ги на-ша, я-ко же и мы ос-тав-ля-ем долж-ни-
 нам дол-ги на-ша, я-ко же и мы ос-тав-ля-ем долж-ни-

Ex. 4.26. Tchaikovsky, “Otche nash,” mm. 47–52.

прис-но бла-жен-ну-ю и пре-не-по-роч-ну-ю и Ма-терь

Ex. 4.27. Rimsky-Korsakov, “Dostoyno yest’,” mm. 14–18.

Arkhangel'sky's collection of settings for the Liturgy,¹⁶⁷ in general, provides us with mostly homophonic compositions, which naturally provides for synchronous singing.¹⁶⁸ While the most elaborated melismatic textures can be seen in the settings of *Kheruvimskaya pesn'* and *Milost' mira*, the simultaneous singing of the text is constantly maintained in these compositions.¹⁶⁹

The discussion of liturgical text in the settings of the St. Petersburg composers leads to the conclusion that repetition and asynchronous singing of the text is minimal in the selected compositions. On the contrary, the composers of the Moscow school used the liturgical text more freely, which resulted in many cases of asynchrony and repetition due to their use of a greater

¹⁶⁷ A. A. Arkhangel'sky, *Peniye Liturgii Svyatogo Ioanna Zlatousto v dukhe drevnikh napevov pravoslavnoy tserkvi. Dlya chetiryokhgolosnogo smeshannogo khora* [The Chant of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom in the Manner of the Old Tunes of the Orthodox Church. For Four-Voice Choir] (St. Petersburg: Shmidt, 1905).

The settings in the collection are composed to *neizmenyayemiye pesnopeniya* or text, which means that they do not belong to any particular *glas*; see n. 26 above.

¹⁶⁸ See Arkhangel'sky, “Khvali dushe moyā, Gospoda.”

¹⁶⁹ See Arkhangel'sky, “Izhe kheruvimī,” mm. 23–28, 41–46, 59–63, and 79–82; Arkhangel'sky, “Milost' mira,” mm. 28–29, 36–38, 64–66, and 101–07.

variety textures. The supporting evidence appears on the basis of all the compositions considered here in relation to the approach demonstrated in the both schools of sacred music.

Most of the selected composers resorted to *ekfonetika* to some extent, which is likely to be associated with an attempt to place emphasis on the words (as was seen in *Otche nash*, *Milost' mira*, *Veruyu*).¹⁷⁰ Although the use of homophonic textures was criticised by Muscovite composers, who attributed it to the St. Petersburg school, in these compositions it plays a crucial role in maintaining the synchronicity of the text. This shows once more the obvious problem of suggestions that combine the ideas of textual clarity and polyphonic writing, as discussed earlier in the chapter.

4.2.2. Intervallic content

The use of intervals both in parallel motion and *ekfonetika* is the next point of consideration. Scholars of the nineteenth and twentieth century attributed the Western-influenced 3rds and 6ths in parallel motion to the St. Petersburg school of sacred music.¹⁷¹ This section discusses the extent to which these scholarly claims are reflected in the selected repertoire. Overall, consonances in *ekfonetika* are found in most of the compositions of St. Petersburg school,¹⁷² with the 3rds and 6ths being almost the most used intervals in parallel motion.¹⁷³

In Rimsky-Korsakov's "Tebe Boga khvalim," parallelism in its clear form is used rather sparingly. For example, parallel 6ths are found occasionally and cannot be considered as a consistent feature.¹⁷⁴ The cases of *ekfonetika* (as chanting in 3rds, 5ths, 6ths, and 8ths) or homophony with the quality of *ekfonetika*, on the contrary, are seen throughout the composition (Exx. 4.28 and 4.29).¹⁷⁵ Doubling of the melodic lines in both choirs (as seen in the Ex. 4.29) is used as the means for increasing the overall sonority in this composition.

¹⁷⁰ Arkhangel'sky, "Veruyu"; Rimsky-Korsakov, "Otche nash"; and Rimsky-Korsakov, "Milost' mira."

¹⁷¹ See chap. 3: 81.

¹⁷² See Rimsky-Korsakov, "Tebe Boga khvalim"; Rimsky-Korsakov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," no. 5; Rimsky-Korsakov, "Otche nash"; Rimsky-Korsakov, "Milost' mira"; Arkhangel'sky, "Veruyu"; and Tchaikovsky, "Otche nash."

¹⁷³ Arkhangel'sky, "Milost' mira," mm. 10, 13, 19, 20–21, 23–24, 40, 44, 51–60, 63–65, 69–71, 76, 79–87, and 101–07; Arkhangel'sky, "Izhe kheruvimi," mm. 1–2, 5–6, 19–21, 26–27, 29–30, 33–34, 37–39, 44–45, 47–48, 51–52, 57, 62, 66–67, 70–71, 75–76, and 80; Tchaikovsky, "Dostoyno yest'," mm. 1–2, 14, 24–25, and 35–36; Tchaikovsky, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," no. 3, mm. 3–4, 6, 21–22, 24, 39–40, 42, 59–60, 63, and 67–69; Rimsky-Korsakov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," no. 5, mm. 12–13, 21, 30–31, and 48–49; Rimsky-Korsakov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," no. 6, mm. 5, 7, and 30–31.

¹⁷⁴ See Rimsky-Korsakov, "Tebe Boga khvalim," mm. 5, 50, 52, and 96. Similar situation is found in his setting of *Kheruvimskaya pesn'*, see Rimsky-Korsakov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," no. 5, parallel 3rds and 6ths in mm. 12–13, 21, 30–31, and 48–49.

¹⁷⁵ See Rimsky-Korsakov, "Tebe Boga khvalim," mm. 3, 30–31, 39–41, 45–46, 54–55, 72–75, and 83–84; also see the middle strophic part.

Ex. 4.28. Rimsky-Korsakov, “Tebe Boga khvalim” (unmeasured part, after m. 51).

Ex. 4.29. Rimsky-Korsakov, “Tebe Boga khvalim,” mm. 40–43.

In Rimsky-Korsakov’s “Dostoyno yest’,” parallelism is found more often than in almost any other sacred setting discussed in this section. For example, parallel motion in 3rds between first and second tenors over sustained pedals is used twice in the setting (see Ex. 4.30, mm. 3–6 and 35–39).

Ex. 4.30. Rimsky-Korsakov, “Dostoyno yest’,” mm. 1–7.

The use of parallel imperfect consonances, which was one of the targets of the reformist views,¹⁷⁶ is much evident in the compositions of Tchaikovsky. For example, his strophic “Kheruvimskaya pesn” no. 3, which contains both parallelism and *ekfonetika* (see Ex. 4.31),

¹⁷⁶ See chap. 3: 77.

entailed repetitions of the parallel imperfect consonances throughout the composition. In the setting of *Otche nash*, the composer frequently used *ekfonetika* in 4ths and 5ths¹⁷⁷; while in the measures with counterpoint the motion in parallel intervals is clearly less in evidence.¹⁷⁸

57 *ff*
 Я - ко да Ца- ря всех по- ды- мем, по- ды- мем, я - ко да Ца-
ff
 Я - ко да Ца- ря всех по- ды- мем, по- ды- мем, я - ко да Ца-
ff
 Я - ко да Ца- ря всех по- ды- мем, по- ды- мем, я - ко да Ца-
ff
 Я - ко да Ца- ря всех по- ды- мем, по- ды- мем, я - ко да Ца-

Ex. 4.31. Tchaikovsky, “Kheruvimskaya pesn’,” no. 3, mm. 57–61.

Arkhangel'sky's sacred compositions perhaps show the highest use of 3rds, 4ths, and 6ths as parallel intervals, or in *ekfonetika*. This happens, clearly, due to almost exclusive use of homophonic textures in his compositions.¹⁷⁹ The strophic form of Arkhangel'sky's compositions assumes that the melodic and, therefore, intervallic content recurs throughout these compositions.¹⁸⁰ For example, in his “Veruyu,” Arkhangel'sky incorporated very plain textures and *ekfonetika* that obviously allowed a focus to be on the text, which was one of the general requirements of Russian sacred music. The use of *ekfonetika* was probably dictated by the central role of the prayer in the Liturgy that required participation of the congregation in the singing (see Ex. 4.32).

¹⁷⁷ Tchaikovsky, “Otche nash,” mm. 1–6, 11–15, 46, 49–51, and 55–61.

¹⁷⁸ Tchaikovsky, “Otche nash,” mm. 34–45.

¹⁷⁹ See Arkhangel'sky, “Izhe kheruvimi”; Arkhangel'sky, “Milost' mira”; and Arkhangel'sky, “Veruyu.”

¹⁸⁰ See Arkhangel'sky, “Milost' mira,” mm. 9–16.



Ex. 4.32. Arkhangel'sky, "Veruyu" (the beginning strophe).

In general, due to the high use of homophonic textures in the sacred compositions considered here, the imperfect consonances are frequent features of the music, in which the measures with *ekfonetika* occasionally dominate. These findings confirm the assertions of the scholars and critics that the imperfect consonances in parallel motion were frequent features of the St. Petersburg school of sacred music. Nevertheless, the clear presence of both kinds of consonance, in parallel or as *ekfonetika*, in the sacred compositions of the Moscow school disproves the idea of twentieth-century scholars that these intervals were common only to the St. Petersburg school.¹⁸¹

4.2.3. Use of 7th chords and other dissonances

Musicologists of the twentieth century affirmed the frequent use of dissonances and various inversions of the 7th chord in the sacred compositions of the St. Petersburg school (see chap. 3: 81). In practice, the dissonances and 7th chords are used moderately in the compositions considered here.¹⁸² In Arkhangel'sky's "Milost' mira" the chord vii^o and the inversions of 7th chord such as V^{4/3} and vi^{o6/5} reoccur in this strophic setting. Although there are not many discordant harmonies in this composition, some dissonances such as the 9th or tritone receive longer than usual duration, which give these intervals a more prominent effect (Ex. 4.33).

¹⁸¹ See chap. 3: 81.

¹⁸² Arkhangel'sky, "Izhe kheruvimī," mm. 19, 37, 55, 74, and 78; Arkhangel'sky, "Milost' mira," mm. 17 and 47; Rimsky-Korsakov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," no. 5, mm. 4, 7–8, 22, 24, 40, 51, and 86; Rimsky-Korsakov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," no. 6, mm. 1–6, 16–17, 19–21, 23, 35, 37, 40, 45, 51, 55, 58, 63, 67, and 71; Rimsky-Korsakov, "Tebe Boga khvalim," mm. 4, 8, 15, 17, 37, 39, 42, 52, 70, 81, 83, 91, and 94.

the 9th (a–b')

A musical score snippet showing a 9th interval (a–b') in A minor. The score is written on a grand staff (treble and bass clefs). The melody is in the treble clef, and the bass line is in the bass clef. The lyrics are: "и Свя - то - му Ду - ху,". The interval is highlighted by a bracket above the notes.

A minor: parallel imperfect consonances moving against 5th pedal.

the aug. 4th (c'–f#')

A musical score snippet showing an augmented 4th interval (c'–f#') in A minor. The score is written on a grand staff (treble and bass clefs). The melody is in the treble clef, and the bass line is in the bass clef. The lyrics are: "сущ - ии". The interval is highlighted by a bracket above the notes.

A minor: i–vi^{6/5}

Ex. 4.33. Arkhangel'sky, "Milost' mira," mm. 25–26 and 32–33.

In Rimsky-Korsakov's "Kheruvimskaya pesn" no. 6 dissonances as a part of 7th chords are often found in modulatory measures.¹⁸³ The tendency to sustain dissonances by using longer values (in homophonic texture) is also seen in Rimsky-Korsakov's sacred compositions. In his "Dostoyno yest'," for example, the sustained 7th (b–a') is followed by 9th (c'–d''), which fall on strong beats in measure 5 (see Ex. 4.30); in measure 8, the 7th (d'–c'') is held for three beats that obviously cannot pass unnoticed.¹⁸⁴ In Rimsky-Korsakov's "Tebe Boga khvalim" dissonances are mostly used as passing notes in measures with modulations (as a part of 7th chord on $\hat{2}$ and $\hat{5}$), however, in measure 39, the 2nd (bb'–c'') and the diminished 5th (e'–bb') are clearly accented by longer rhythmic values (see Ex. 4.34).

¹⁸³ See Rimsky-Korsakov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn," no. 6, mm. 1–3, 9, 17 (the augmented 4th), and m. 16 (the diminished 5th). Due to the strophic form of the setting, these modulatory measures are repeated.

¹⁸⁴ See Rimsky-Korsakov, "Dostoyno yest'," mm. 5 and 8; also see other cases of the dissonances in mm. 29–31.

F : I⁶ V^{4/3}

Ex. 4.34. Rimsky-Korsakov, “Tebe Boga khvalim,” mm. 35–39.

Although Tchaikovsky characterised the use of dissonances in Russian sacred music of the late nineteenth century as excessive,¹⁸⁵ his “Dostoyno yest’” and “Kheruvimskaya pesn’” represent some of the more persistent examples in the use of 7th chords among those considered here. In his “Dostoyno yest’,” dissonances are used more often than in his “Kheruvimskaya pesn’” no. 3.¹⁸⁶ For example, in “Dostoyno yest’,” the augmented 4th (b^b–e”) in a diminished triad (in measure 8) and the 7th (f–e”) as a part of the 7th chord (in measure 12) contrast with imperfect consonances and homophony, which amplifies discordance of the phrase (see Ex. 4.35).¹⁸⁷

F : vii^{o6} V⁷ V^{4/3} V⁷ I^{6/5}

Ex. 4.35. Tchaikovsky, “Dostoyno yest’,” mm. 8–12.

¹⁸⁵ Tchaikovsky, “Predisloviye k pervomu izdaniyu,” 187 (see chap. 3, n. 107).

¹⁸⁶ Tchaikovsky, “Kheruvimskaya pesn’,” no. 3, mm. 4, 23, 40, 58–59, 62, 68, and 83.

¹⁸⁷ Also see Tchaikovsky, “Dostoyno yest’,” mm. 9–13, 15, 18, 32, 34, and 46.

Taking into consideration the examples above, which are typical, it can be concluded that Gardner's claims regarding the free use of dissonances¹⁸⁸ in the St. Petersburg sacred repertoire is not universally confirmed in the settings reviewed here. The use of 7th chords and their inversions cannot be characterised as excessive as was claimed by the scholars of the nineteenth and twentieth century. What is evident is that some compositions, such as Rimsky-Korsakov's "Milost' mira" and "Otche nash," or Arkhangel'sky's "Veruyu," do not have elaborate textures and, therefore, represent less sophisticated choices of chord combinations (occasionally narrowed to the primary chords)¹⁸⁹ than in the other selected sacred compositions of St. Petersburg composers. This greater simplicity also marks such pieces as different from the compositions of the Moscow composers, who incorporated more complicated harmonies and chord inversions in their music.

4.2.4. Stability and completeness of musical phrases in the selected compositions of St. Petersburg composers

Stability and completeness of phrases, as in section 4.1.5, is considered here applying Yavorsky's theory of auditory gravitation.¹⁹⁰ As discussed earlier, this theory is drawn on as a means of assessing of the level of stability and completeness and, presumably, emotive and sensual qualities in the chosen compositions and, by further extension, their suitability to strict liturgical functions—one of the requirements identified in the reformist agenda. For a review of the limitations of this theory and the justification for considering it, see 4.1.5 above.

As discussed earlier the sacred compositions of the Moscow school show a high level of instability and incompleteness of phrases, which was facilitated by often-suspended resolutions of auditory gravitation, that suggests, according to the theory, an increased "emotiveness" of the compositions. From an overall perspective, the selected sacred setting of the St. Petersburg composers show a tendency to articulate stable and complete phrases,¹⁹¹ which, while acknowledging the limitations of this analysis, as discussed above, supports the idea of the primary site of concentration being on the liturgical text rather than on purely musical components. For example, Arkhangel'sky's strophic "Izhe kheruvimī" and "Milost' mira" represent stable and complete compositions, in which strophes with progressions of both stable and unstable moments

¹⁸⁸ Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 2: 372.

¹⁸⁹ See Arkhangel'sky, "Veruyu."

¹⁹⁰ See chap. 4: 109.

¹⁹¹ Arkhangel'sky, "Milost' mira"; Arkhangel'sky, "Izhe kheruvimī"; Arkhangel'sky, "Veruyu"; Rimsky-Korsakov, "Tebe Boga khvalim"; Rimsky-Korsakov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," no. 5; Rimsky-Korsakov, "Otche nash."

achieve resolution in cadences.¹⁹² Arkhangel'sky's "Veruyu" represents only two progressions T|D and D|T that alternate throughout the setting.¹⁹³ This is an example of stability and completeness with phrases, which Yavorsky would categorise as symmetrical phrases.¹⁹⁴ Rimsky-Korsakov's "Dostoyno yest"¹⁹⁵ and the strophic "Kheruvimskaya pesn'" no. 5 also demonstrate stability and completeness of strophes. The "Kheruvimskaya pesn'" no. 5 shows a repeated strophe that consists of stable and complete phrases, which, according to Yavorsky's theory, finishes with stable "authentic"¹⁹⁶ progressions D|T.¹⁹⁷

The most developed composition, amongst those studied in these section, is Rimsky-Korsakov's "Kheruvimskaya pesn'" no. 6. The composition has an extensive modulatory plan and exhibits the quality of *peremenniy lad* [mutable mode]. The stability and completeness of the composition is achieved by resolution of all the notes with auditory gravitation and symmetry of the moments as seen in the Ex. 4.36.¹⁹⁸



B minor: S | T | S | T | T | S | T

Ex. 4.36. Rimsky-Korsakov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," no. 6, mm. 6–8.

Tchaikovsky's sacred compositions express a larger quantity of unstable progressions that stand out in emotional aspect and could be understood as detracting from the liturgical text. This point may also confirm Kastal'sky's criticism of Tchaikovsky for his supposedly extensive use of

¹⁹² See Arkhangel'sky, "Izhe kheruvimī," mm. 24–28; Arkhangel'sky, "Milost' mira," mm. 35–39.

¹⁹³ Arkhangel'sky, "Veruyu," opening strophe.

¹⁹⁴ See chap. 4: 110.

¹⁹⁵ Rimsky-Korsakov, "Dostoyno yest'," mm. 11–13 ("plagal" progression in cadence) and mm. 37–41 with "authentic" progression D|T as a cadence.

¹⁹⁶ See table 4.4.

¹⁹⁷ See Rimsky-Korsakov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," no. 5, mm. 16–18; also see mm. 86–90.

¹⁹⁸ Also see Rimsky-Korsakov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," no. 6, mm. 17–18, and 35–36.

Western musical features.¹⁹⁹ Despite the evidence of stable progressions in Tchaikovsky's sacred compositions, some strophes finish with unstable progressions in cadences that are classified under Yavorsky's theory as exhibiting instability.²⁰⁰ For example, the first part of Tchaikovsky's "Kheruvimskaya pesn'" no. 3 (before the text *yako da Tsarya*) has two unstable phrases in the main melodic strophe. The first phrase has unstable progressions and finishes with "half-plagal" progression T|S, which is designated as unstable progression (see Ex. 4.37). The second phrase has unstable S|D "half" progression as a cadence²⁰¹; therefore, having both unstable phrases, the whole strophe should be understood as unstable and incomplete.

A minor: S | T | T | T | T | S | S | T | S

Ex. 4.37. Tchaikovsky, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," no. 3, mm. 5–9.

The general rule in Tchaikovsky's compositions such as "Otche nash" and "Dostoyno yest'" is the use of unstable progressions in cadences, which counteract the stable moments within the phrases and bring unresolved auditory gravitation to the whole strophe. For example, while the very last phrase of the "Otche nash" is stable and complete, in general, this setting is unstable and incomplete. This happens due to an extensive use of unstable progressions—"subdominant" (S|S)²⁰²

¹⁹⁹. See chap. 4: 107.

²⁰⁰. See chap. 4: 110–12.

²⁰¹. See Tchaikovsky, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," no. 3, mm. 16–18; for more examples of unstable progressions ("half" progression, "dominant" progression, and "interrupted" progression), see this setting of *Kheruvimskaya pesn'*, mm. 58–60.

²⁰². See table 4.4.

and “half-plagal” (T|S)²⁰³—in which auditory gravitation does not find resolution. For example, as can be seen in the measure 33, the unstable sonority does not resolve into its gravitating tonic (see Ex. 4.38). A similar approach is seen in Tchaikovsky’s “Dostoyno yest’” where the instability of a strophe is emphasised by the use of unstable progressions, according to Yavorsky’s theory, with the same modal function such as the “subdominant” progression S|S in the cadence.²⁰⁴

28

на не-бе-си и на зем-ли.

на не-бе-си и на зем-ли.

не-бе-си и на зем-ли.

на не-бе-си и на зем-ли.

G: S | T A minor: D \flat | T | S | S | S

Ex. 4.38. Tchaikovsky, “Otche nash,” mm. 28–33.

The resolution of the auditory gravitations ultimately provides for the relatively high level of stability and completeness found in the compositions of the St. Petersburg school. Consequently, this could be interpreted to result in a reduced emotional dynamic, which allows us to suggest that, having such qualities, these compositions could be considered suitable for the liturgical function within the boundaries set out by the reformists. At the very least, the attempt to examine the works of both schools through a prism which is both contemporaneous and purported to enlighten the degree of modal tension and thus emotional temperature of the music shows the inherent difficulty of objectively measuring factors such as solemnity and *dukhovnost'*.

4.2.5. Texture and sonority

Although scholars of the nineteenth century did not critically discuss the overall development of the sacred compositions of the St. Petersburg school, it is deemed necessary to

²⁰³ See Tchaikovsky, “Otche nash,” mm. 1–6, 16–17, 24–25, 28–33, 49, 59–62, and 64–65.

²⁰⁴ See Tchaikovsky, “Dostoyno yest’,” mm. 14–17; also see mm. 18–23.

consider this category for an objective completion of the present study. The analysis conducted here shows that not all the claims made by Moscow composers and other musical figures could be consistently seen in the selected sacred repertoire.

The presentation of sacred settings of St. Petersburg's composers appears to be less elaborate than that of the Moscow school where wide vocal range and thick textures with closely spaced chords are evident. Odoyevsky would likely have accepted such compositions for their having an uncluttered texture, given his acknowledgement of the clear musical operations in Potulov's sacred works.²⁰⁵ Arkhangel'sky, Rimsky-Korsakov, and Tchaikovsky tended to use simple rhythmic combinations; only occasionally Tchaikovsky resorted to short-note figures with semiquavers.²⁰⁶

Tchaikovsky's "Otche nash" is more advanced in texture and in overall execution than the sacred compositions of his colleagues. In the "Otche nash," the use of triple time,²⁰⁷ the diversity of dynamics, and tempo changes bring this composition to a new level. While these musical components may supplement the liturgical text, they equally expand the emotional dynamic of the composition.

The composers whose sacred settings are considered in this section used various techniques to increase the sonorousness of their music, although perhaps less elaborately than their Moscow colleagues. Rimsky-Korsakov incorporated simultaneous singing of two choirs and a wide vocal range with the addition of the basso profundo, which added additional sonority to his "Tebe Boga khvalim." In his "Otche nash" and "Milost' mira," the composer used closely spaced chords throughout the settings to achieve a dense sound. In Tchaikovsky's "Kheruvimskaya pesn" no. 3 the fullness of the sound is acquired by divisions of vocal parts that provide a thick texture with as many as eight voices, in which the melodic line is doubled in parallel 3rds. The use of wide vocal range is seen in most of the compositions of the St. Petersburg school with the exception of those by Arkhangel'sky (see table 4.6), in which the composer used a somewhat narrower vocal diapason with an occasional A, which, in the case of vocal limitations of a given choir, could be easily substituted with a.

²⁰⁵ See chap. 2: 58.

²⁰⁶ See Tchaikovsky, "Dostoyno yest'," mm. 10–13, 26, and 35–36.

²⁰⁷ See Tchaikovsky, "Otche nash," mm. 34–45, 55, and 57.

Table 4.6. The overall ranges of the St. Petersburg compositions.

A sacred setting	An overall range of a setting
Tchaikovsky, "Dostoyno yest'," no. 5	G–g"
Tchaikovsky, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," no. 1	F–f"
Tchaikovsky, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," no. 3	G–g"
Tchaikovsky, "Otche nash," no. 6	F–g"
Rimsky-Korsakov, "Dostoyno yest'," no. 2	F–eb"
Rimsky-Korsakov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," no. 5	A–f"
Rimsky-Korsakov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," no. 6	F#–f#"
Rimsky-Korsakov, "Milost' mira," op. 22, no. 4	G–e"
Rimsky-Korsakov, "Otche nash," op. 22, no. 7	F–c'
Rimsky-Korsakov, "Tebe Boga khvalim"	B,–a"

The tradition of the occasional use of fast tempi in the second part of *Kheruvimskaya pesn'*, supposedly restricted to St. Petersburg practice, is evident in the sacred compositions of both schools.²⁰⁸ The settings of *Kheruvimskaya pesn'* discussed here show a continuation of Bortnyansky's tradition, still found to be in use decades after its inventor's time. Tempi such as *allegro* or *animato* are seen in the part *yako da Tsarya* of "Kheruvimskaya pesn'" composed by Rimsky-Korsakov and Tchaikovsky.²⁰⁹ In Rimsky-Korsakov's "Kheruvimskaya pesn'" no. 5, the change of texture from homophonic to contrapuntal is not only used to separate the two main parts, but also to provide contrast between them and introduce a new tempo—*skoro* [fast or *allegro*]—and meter change—from 4/4 to 3/4—which lends the second part a somewhat jovial character.²¹⁰ Commentators of the nineteenth century maintained that the entire *Kheruvimskaya pesn'* was to be

²⁰⁸ See Chesnokov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," mm. 37–53; Grechaninov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," mm. 51–90; and Ippolitov-Ivanov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," mm. 40–74.

²⁰⁹ Rimsky-Korsakov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," no. 5, mm. 58–90; Rimsky-Korsakov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," no. 6, mm. 55–72; Tchaikovsky, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," no. 1, mm. 53–78; and Tchaikovsky, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," no. 3, mm. 57–85.

²¹⁰ Rimsky-Korsakov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," no. 5, mm. 58–90.

sung at a consistent tempo²¹¹; therefore, these examples of the changing tempo were likely to be considered as a discrepancy from the one-tempo tradition.²¹²

4.3. Summary of findings

The discussion above makes clear a discrepancy between what the adherents of the reform called for, on the one hand, and the compositional implementation of their reform ideas, on the other. Despite the claims of the reformists who believed in the Russianness of the Moscow school and its uniqueness, this chapter finds, on the evidence of the selected compositions, many similarities between the two schools of sacred music, which is something left conspicuously unacknowledged in the polemics of the reformers. For example, both schools used homophonic textures (including *ekfonetika*) quite extensively, which facilitated the appearance of imperfect consonances and dissonances (whether as passing notes or rhythmically accented intervals). Having considered the representative works of both schools, this section summarises the findings and purported characteristics of the discussed schools (see table 4.7).

Table 4.7. Summary of the musical features practically implemented in the sacred compositions of the two schools: Moscow and St. Petersburg.

School of the sacred music	Asynchronous singing	Alteration of the liturgical text	Homophonic texture	Contrapuntal texture	Parallel imperfect consonances	Dissonances and 7th chords	Instability, emotiveness, and rich sounds
Moscow	more	more	less	more	equal	more	more
St. Petersburg	less	less	more	less	equal	less	less

In theory, composers who attempted to avoid the so-called Western musical characteristics such as homophonic textures would gain recognition amongst the reformist group. Kastal'sky, for example, in his review of Rachmaninoff's *Vsenoshchnoye Bdeniye*, placed high value on Rakhmaninov's methods of harmonisation of the Old-Slavonic chants. Kastal'sky praised Rakhmaninov's steps towards the elimination of *partesnost'* [part-singing], by which Kastal'sky

²¹¹. See chap. 3: 74.

²¹². Ibid.

referred to homophonic textures and vertical organisation of voices.²¹³ The vertically organised voices or homophony was typically associated with the traditions of *Pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella* and the St. Petersburg composers.

In practice, although the Moscow school strongly recommended the avoidance of homophonic textures in sacred compositions, this objective, as seen in the section 4.1, was not always achieved and such textures were found quite regularly in the selected sacred settings of the Muscovite composers. Also, the use of this texture would inevitably lead to the undesirable parallel imperfect consonances, which are also found in these compositions.

The relatively few “Western” features that Muscovite composers and critics attributed to sacred music of their colleagues in St. Petersburg are not predominant in the music considered in this thesis. The representation of the liturgical text was somewhat distorted in both schools. Although the asynchronous singing of the texts is found in many compositions under discussion, the sacred settings of Muscovite composers are found to abound with it. From the representative works considered here, the asynchronism is typically found in contrapuntal textures. Such textures were, on the one hand, advocated by Grechaninov and Taneyev, and, on the other hand, disrupted the synchronous singing of the text required under the reform agenda.

It cannot be claimed that the repetition of the liturgical phrases and words was particularly eschewed by either of these schools. Virtually all settings of the *Kheruvimskaya pesn'*, an illustrative and central chant of the Liturgy, show a great level of text repetition, whether it is half a strophe or a single word. This repetitiveness of the words in the analysed sacred settings can be understood as a more or less widely accepted feature, whether it agreed with the reformist agenda or not, and a compositional method widely used by both schools of sacred music.

The alteration of the liturgical text also suggests a continuation of the eighteenth-century tradition found in *kant*.²¹⁴ Smolensky, who studied the *kant* tradition, suggested that, for example, the *Kheruvimskaya pesn'*, commonly known in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, were musically and structurally based on the *kant* genre. The form and distribution of parts in *Kheruvimskaya pesn'* were also derived from the *kant*. The structural features of *kant*, such as textual repetitions and caesuras, took root in the *Kheruvimskaya pesn'*. Singers appropriated the

²¹³ A. D. Kastal'sky, “Vsenoshchnoye Bdeniye S. V. Rachmaninoff” [All-Night Vigil of S. V. Rachmaninoff], 1915, repr. in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, material'i, vospominaniya, perezpiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence], vol. 5 of Rdmdm, ed. and comp. S. G. Zvereva (Moscow: Znack, 2006), 108.

²¹⁴ For translation, see chap. 2: 44.

singing in 3rds, with one leading voice, which was also borrowed from *kant*²¹⁵ and incorporated it into the *Kheruvimskaya pesn'*.

The most obvious characteristic of the *kant* was the adjustment of the liturgical text to the melodic phrase.²¹⁶ The distinctively Western features of the *kant*, as composers and musical critics understood them, such as tonic–subdominant–dominant progressions, concise and complete phrases, affected the perception of the *kant* as an agreeable style of composition and helped to spread this genre throughout Russia. This also explains the frequent use of the tonic–subdominant–dominant progressions by both schools.

Despite Pobedonostsev's advice in which he urged Moscow composers to be different to their colleagues in St. Petersburg, various elements of the supposedly Western-influenced practices of the northern capital were adopted in the Moscow school. The shortening of psalm texts (by utilising fewer strophes) that is evident in Smolensky's "Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda," was first introduced in St. Petersburg²¹⁷ and, subsequently, adopted by the Moscow school (see Chesnokov's "Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda"). In the St. Petersburg tradition, the church services were shortened at the expense of the quantity of psalms and prayers, which consequently entailed a shortening of sacred settings. The evidence of such tradition in the Moscow sacred compositions opposes the habitual perception that the Moscow school of sacred music was more attentive to the primacy of the liturgical texts. Moreover, it suggests that some concepts of the St. Petersburg school had been cultivated for several decades in Moscow choral domain.

Clearly, Muscovite composers tried to fulfill the imposed expectations. They expanded a set of useful musical formulae that could potentially help them to display Russianness and bring Russian sacred music to further levels of development. The *podgolosochnaya polifoniya* was one of the folk-inspired elements that were used by the composers endeavouring to express Russianness in the sacred settings.²¹⁸ Although Chesnokov made an attempt to emphasise Russianness by referencing the traditional *antifonnoye peniye*²¹⁹ (that was commonplace in almost all city churches

²¹⁵ The researcher and scholar of the twenty first-century Colin Armstrong clarifies the connection of *kant* and sacred music in Russia. He states that the parallel flow of 3rds or 6ths (as inversions of 3rds) seen in sacred music was inherent from *kant* and were evident remnants of the preceding epoch of Western influence on Russian church music; see Colin Robert Armstrong, "West Meets East: Giuseppe Sarti's Influence on Russian Church Music. A Study of Western Influence and Surviving Russian Traits" (PhD thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2011), 32, 35.

²¹⁶ Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 2: 116.

²¹⁷ Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 2: 367–68.

²¹⁸ Kastal'sky, *Sofroniyevskaya Kheruvimskaya pesn'*; see also, Kastal'sky, *Kheruvimskaya Pesn'*, *znamenniy raspev*, mm. 16–22; Grechaninov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," mm. 1–6 and 57–61; Chesnokov, "Kheruvimskaya pesn'," mm. 3–5.

²¹⁹ For more information, see chap. 4, n. 23 and n. 51.

until 1917),²²⁰ his “Veruyu”²²¹ contains several peculiarities that characterise the composition as rather secular, and which, therefore, should be considered as a contradiction to the national reformist ideas of the Moscow school. The inclusion of an additional solo tenor voice in the outer parts of his setting amplifies the impression of a concerted, secularised composition.

In the Moscow school of sacred music, the attitude to intervallic content (as the composers understood it) was various. Taneyev was in favour of perfect consonances in sacred music, which can certainly be found in his sacred settings analysed for the present discussion, whereas Grechaninov, by contrast, was even enthusiastic about the use of dissonances if his main condition for inclusion could be met—namely the meaningful relation of the music to the sacred text and its meaning.²²² Despite the various opinions on intervallic content, both schools used consonances without restraint, especially the imperfect consonances in parallel motion and *ekfonetika*.

Razumovsky claimed that no dissonances and chromatic chords should be used in the sacred music.²²³ Despite the disapproval of commentators and composers such as Glinka and Odoyevsky,²²⁴ the presence of dissonances is evident in the compositions of Moscow composers. Kastal'sky, Grechaninov, Ippolitov-Ivanov and Chesnokov, exploited a whole range of 7th chords and their inversions.

Kastal'sky's quest for thick sounds and various techniques for achieving them is reflected in his treatise, *Khoroviye kraski*²²⁵; therefore, rich and flamboyant sounds that are found in his sacred settings should be considered as the practical implementation of his own recommendations. It is likely that the dissonances and 7th chords encountered in Kastal'sky's settings are symptomatic of his attempt to refine a set of musical formulae that, according to the composer's own views, could be used in Russian sacred music. Frolova-Walker notes that Kastal'sky's sacred compositions comprise dissonances and frequent use of the ii^{6/5}, which in the composer's time had become associated with Russianness.²²⁶ Whatever the reasons were, dissonances and 7th chords in all inversions are found in his and the other composers' sacred compositions.

²²⁰ Gardner, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye*, 1: 83.

²²¹ See Chesnokov, “Veruyu.”

²²² Grechaninov, “Neskol'ko slov,” 433.

²²³ Razumovsky, *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii*, 253 (see chap. 1, n. 8).

²²⁴ Preobrazhensky, *Kul'tovaya muzika v Rossii*, 101 (see chap. 1, n. 43).

²²⁵ For the full reference on Kastal'sky, “Khoroviye kraski,” see chap. 3, n. 117.

²²⁶ Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 286–87.

Taneyev's approach was much less reliant on Western tonal relationships, in comparison with the other Muscovite sacred settings. Taneyev used homophonic textures quite sparingly, which is to be understood as a positive aspect in the light of the reformist beliefs. Taneyev's harmonisations of *znamenniye* chants are well-balanced combinations of homophony and polyphony and tend away from simple tonal harmonisations. Parallel 3rds are less frequent in the harmonisations of Taneyev, which is another positive feature of his sacred harmonisations from the reformist point of view.

The so-called “excessive” use of 7th chords in St. Petersburg's sacred compositions is not confirmed in the selected repertoire. In this school, 7th chords are present in moderation, and in most cases they are part of either cadence or modulation.

As an example of a contradiction seen in the claims of the reformists to avoid sensuality in sacred music and the results achieved in sacred settings, it is useful to refer back to Kastal'sky's *Kheruvimskaya pesn', znamenniy raspev*. Despite the fact that Kastal'sky made several settings of the *Kheruvimskaya pesn'* during the pre-revolutionary years, from the composer's own point of view his *Kheruvimskaya pesn', znamenniy raspev* (1897) was the most estimable of his sacred compositions, wherein he managed to employ a great range of choral colours. Kastal'sky expressed satisfaction with what he had achieved in the application of new methods of harmonisation and new choral sounds in his *Kheruvimskaya pesn', znamenniy raspev*.²²⁷ This in itself does not contradict what Kastal'sky practised in his sacred compositions but it is at odds with the reformist agenda and with Kastal'sky's own exhortations to avoid “Italianisms” through the adoption of simple harmonies and avoidance of “vivid” ones.²²⁸

In general, Kastal'sky's sacred compositions are examples of a conscientious application of his own choral theories, such as the effect of two choirs achieved by gradual introduction of vocal parts, use of fermata, widely spaced intervals as suggesting a sense of “*tainstvennost'*” [mysteriousness], and various other combinations of voices, and so on.²²⁹ Being driven by a desire for rich sounds, Kastal'sky outlined the most valuable choral sonorities in his summary of *Khoroviye kraski*. According to Kastal'sky's workbook on choral colours, it can be deduced that rich sonorities and expressive vocal combinations could be achieved by, for example, putting voices in various groups: descants with bass voices, or alto and bass. Singing at *krayniye granitsi* [extreme

²²⁷ Swan, “Harmonisation,” 84 (see chap. 1, n. 6); also see Kastal'sky, “O moyey muzikal'noy kar'ere,” 52.

²²⁸ A. D. Kastal'sky, “Nasaditeli drevnego peniya” [Propagators of Old Singing], 1911, repr. in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, materialy, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence], vol. 5 of *Rdmdm*, ed. and comp. S. G. Zvereva (Moscow: Znak, 2006), 101.

²²⁹ Kastal'sky, “Khoroviye kraski,” 219, 220–22.

boundaries] was described by Kastal'sky as a valuable source of choral expressiveness.²³⁰ These features would seem to be at odds with the statements of Lipayev that Kastal'sky's sacred settings bore austere, spiritual features,²³¹ not to mention contradicting the Moscow school's intention to compose ascetic sacred music.

Although the tradition of using fast tempi in the second part of *Kheruvimskaya pesn'*, commencing with the words *yako da Tsarya vsekh podimem* was not prescribed in statute books, the discussion shows that it was a well-established convention in both schools of sacred compositions.

The use of ternary form, which was not discussed by the reformist composers but was found in the compositions of the both schools,²³² took a different approach to that which Gardner described.²³³ While in his explanation this ternary form represented polyphonic outer parts, in the analysed sacred compositions this was adjusted and had homophonic outer and contrapuntal middle parts. The use of the two textures as the basis for a ternary form is another example of the borrowed Western tradition that was evidently present in sacred music in Moscow.

Having considered the features that the composers and scholars of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries attributed to the two schools of sacred music, it is clear that the differences between these schools are less pronounced than is commonly held. These findings necessitate further discussion concerning the possible reasons for such inconsistencies of theory and practice.

²³⁰ Kastal'sky, "Khoroviye kraski," 218–23.

²³¹ Lipayev, "Sinodal'noye uchilishche," 239.

²³² See chap. 4: 97–98 and 125.

²³³ See chap. 4: 98.

Conclusion

The discussion in the previous chapter discloses a rather messy reality in terms of the differences and similarities between the Moscow and St. Petersburg schools. It is fairly clear that, overall, the range of textural, stylistic features and compositional methods that were believed to be pertinent to one school, were in reality found, to varying extents, in the compositions of both schools. This makes it impossible to draw a distinct line between these two schools. In fact, this study points to a more complex set of circumstances in the composition, style, and practice of late nineteenth-century Russian church music than the well-worn bi-polar encapsulations of Moscow and St. Petersburg are capable of explaining.

The first question that the discussion addresses is: are claims for the existence of two separate schools of sacred music composition in Russia at the end of the nineteenth century even viable in the first place, so far as the music itself is concerned? The evidence, based on the representative works examined, clearly demonstrates that the answer, to a considerable extent, is “no.” Despite the categorisation of Muscovite sacred compositions by reformist composers and critics as a purely national music, the musical material discloses a synthesis of Western and Russian musical idioms that were realised by formally trained composers in Moscow. The discussion of the musical compositions conducted in chapter 4 demonstrates that composers of sacred music utilised a whole set of musical elements that could be correlated with those of Western origin, were adopted by St. Petersburg composers, and were eventually borrowed by Muscovite composers. Therefore, the compositions of the composers studied here cannot be described as “purely” Russian and neither do they, in broad terms, meet the reformist agenda to its fullest extent. The evidence also does not confirm the purported differences between the two schools as the reformists described it. These basic findings lead to a broader consideration of the reasons for the inconsistency between theory and practice, necessitating further contextualisation of this phenomenon.

Given that in the last decades of the nineteenth century, the overall state policy—which simultaneously reflected and supported wider nationalistic cultural phenomenon—urged composers to boost national authenticity, it is important to understand why reformist aspirations were not fulfilled in the musical compositions of the time. There were several possible reasons for the incompleteness of the reforms in sacred music, which can be broadly categorised as theoretical, practical, and ideological. While these categories are not mutually exclusive and a certain overlapping is expected, they serve as a useful set of points to organise the discussion and are addressed in the following pages.

In theoretical terms, the reformist program was far from clear or succinct. It lacked prescriptive details and instead rested on a broad agenda that allowed, or perhaps required,

composers to decipher it according to their own understanding and skills. The *ober-prokuror* Pobedonostsev, who was Slavophile in his beliefs and radical in action, held, according to Frolova-Walker, ultra-nationalist and reactionary views in general and in relation to church singing in particular.¹ While Pobedonostsev formulated the key points of the reformist agenda in broad terms, which included improvement of the harmonisations of sacred chant, reestablishment of Old chants, and engagement of sacred music experts,² it is important to note the simple fact³ that he was not musically trained. Hence, his prescriptions were not technically specific and this allowed for a range of responses, some of them contradictory. This in turn, made room for considerable variance amongst individual responses to the reform program.

In the late nineteenth century, the openness of the reform agenda referred to above seems to have prompted much ambiguity and, even, disagreement on the “Russian” features of sacred music. Nineteenth-century scholars frequently promoted the textural simplicity of earlier sacred music, making much of its freedom from complex compositional methods.³ Composers, while agreeing to a large extent with this position in theory, in practice incorporated compositional methods that were inconsistent with the calls for a simpler approach under the reforms. For example, a commonly held concept amongst both composers and intellectuals in the area of church music was *dukhovnost'*.⁴ A degree of imprecision, however, in understanding how *dukhovnost'* was to be conveyed in sacred settings,⁵ led to several contradictions between theory (or doctrine) and practice. Regarding the matter of *dukhovnost'*, the vagueness of its definition meant that generally the best composers and reformers could recommend was to avoid “theatricality,” “sensuality,” and “sumptuous, luxurious” sounds [*pīshniye zvuki*]⁶ or, as Grechaninov advised, to avoid chromatic alterations, which evoked mannerism and sentimentalism.⁷ In practice, however, the problem of “theatricality” and “sumptuous, luxurious” sounds corrupting the solemnity deemed suitable to liturgical practice was far from being eradicated. On the contrary, the evidence⁸ shows that composers, even those in the reformist camp, frequently resorted to stylistic elements that had the opposite effect.

¹ Frolova-Walker translates the term *ober-prokuror* as “Director General”; see Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 292 (see intro., n. 2).

² See chap. 3: 67.

³ See chap. 2: 58.

⁴ For translation, see chap. 3: 70.

⁵ See chap. 3: 80.

⁶ Here, for the fluency of reading, I provide transliteration in brackets.

⁷ Grechaninov, “Neskol'ko slov,” 432 (see chap. 3, n. 57).

⁸ See chap. 4: 106, 117, and 142.

One of the possible reasons for the use of the descriptive rather than technical terminology was the requirement of the reformists to deal with the *Svyateyshiy Sinod*, whose members comprised bureaucrats (often not musically trained) who were perceived as guardians of religion. Before the Revolution, the Russian philosopher N. A. Berdyayev (1874–1948) criticised the *Svyateyshiy Sinod*, describing its members ironically as “princes of the church and agents of the Tsar.”⁹ It is quite possible that composers of the reformist period recognised the general preposterousness of the nationalist agenda in the sacred music; however, the degree of the state involvement in the field (through the *Sinod*) and dependence of those same composers on this regulatory body constrained them to a set of ideas that had to be politically appropriate at the time.

An example of this kind of adjustment of theoretical thought relates to discussions on the origins of *podgoloski* [undervoices].¹⁰ Frolova-Walker’s study of folk-song collections reveals inconsistencies and weak points in the theory of *podgoloski* that were, in nature, elements of hetero-polyphony. Frolova-Walker’s conclusion is that *podgoloski* were most likely fabricated as a “characteristic trait” in Russian folklore and adopted by secular composers.¹¹ Sacred-music composers were also aware of this “native” singing feature.¹² Kastal'sky, for instance, was one of those who not only believed in existence of *podgoloski* in Russian folk music but also strengthened its legend.¹³ Such examples support arguments for the artificiality of the proposed national doctrine. It also shows the extent to which the doctrine influenced the discussions around folk, secular, and sacred music.

The use of pastiche folk elements served to emphasise “Russianness” in the music of the late nineteenth century. In secular music, A. P. Borodin (1833–1887), for example, used a large range of folk-inspired elements—such as asynchronous singing, repetition of words, and melismas—which in part had Western origins and in part evoked the genre of the *protyazhnaya pesnya* [protracted song].¹⁴ It is reasonable to assume that contemporaries of Borodin who composed sacred music

⁹ N. A. Berdyayev, *Svobodnaya tserkov'* [Free Church] (Moscow: Moskovskaya prosvetitel'naya komissiya pri Vremennom komitete Gosudarstvennoy dumī, 1917), 19–20.

¹⁰ Frolova-Walker translates the term *podgoloski* as “the undervoices, which accompany the primary melody”; see Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 170.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 170, 237.

¹² See chap. 4: 95, 96, and 141.

¹³ Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 236–39.

¹⁴ The term is used in application to songs with elaborated melismas, subsidiary voices, free rhythm, linear polyphony, and repetition of the words; see Ritzarev, *Eighteenth-Century Russian Music*, 15–16 (see intro., n. 2); also see Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 170. Frolova-Walker translates *protyazhnaya pesnya* as “drawn-out song”; see Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 30.

would likely also have resorted to similar elements in order to amplify the sense of Russianness in their compositions. *Podgolosochnaya* polyphony (based on *podgoloski*) in the late nineteenth century was one of the imitative elements that helped to emphasise national flavour and evoke a certain folk-like quality in sacred music. Smolensky, for instance, distinguished certain values of Western musical traditions (“free counterpoint”¹⁵) that he characterised as methods applicable to sacred music based on their possibility to highlight *russkost'* [Russianness].¹⁶ This theoretical justification of the use of Western musical elements through their close association with *podgoloski* found its practical implementation in the sacred music of the nineteenth century. While the *podgolosochnaya polifoniya* could be partly attributed to Russian folk-music traditions, essentially, it was the result of nationalistic theorisation. The existence of such polyphony indicates an attempt to create pastiche of the *podgolosochnaya* texture by adoption of contrapuntal textures that were known to the composers through their exposure to Western musical styles or formal education. These circumstances made the adoption of polyphonic textures unavoidable. In reality, what the composers created was a uniquely Russian synthesis of various contrapuntal elements, but not some ideal “pure” Russian texture.

Another reason for the incomplete realisation of the reformist agenda was the disconnectedness of the reforms from the reality of everyday church-music practice and congregational expectations. Composers, being obviously driven by a desire for public appreciation of their work, had to adhere to stylistic parameters that would fulfil the expectations of churchgoers, and these parameters did not necessarily align with the more ideologically driven requirements of reformers. As a consequence, in much of the music actually written we see a wide range of expressive elements, whereas, in the discourse, composers made appropriate references to addressing the reformist agenda. It is quite likely that the less elaborate sacred compositions met with a less positive response amongst congregations and performers. Ironically, the chief architect of the reforms, Pobedonostsev, himself referred to an essential appreciation for the sensuous amongst his countrymen, noting “the Russian perceptiveness to the beauteousness of alien forms and structures.”¹⁷ V. F. Komarov, a researcher of Russian sacred music in 1890s, noted the dissatisfaction of churchgoers, whose musical tastes were nurtured in Western styles, with the

¹⁵ “Free counterpoint” is based on the singing of a melodic line that is harmonised in the other voices; see Smolensky, “O Russkom tserkovnom penii,” 368 (see chap. 3, n. 95).

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 368.

¹⁷ K. P. Pobedonostsev, *Moskovskiy sbornik* [Moscow Collection] (Moscow: Sinodal'naya Tipografiya, 1896), 212.

“*tusklaya i seraya*” [dull and gloomy] nature and texture of strict sacred compositions.¹⁸ It seems that vibrant musical styles attracted people more to the church than conservatively treated, ascetic, Old chants, which were mostly supported by an insignificant number of clergymen. These were issues that Smolensky raised frequently in his memoirs.¹⁹ Members of the clergy themselves even testified to the stubborn persistence of Italianate church music, many of them pointing out that congregations favoured compositions with Western harmonies.²⁰ Hence, in practice, even composers who were genuinely reform minded nonetheless faced a set of public preferences that were resistant to ideas concerning the “purification” of Russian sacred music.

In 1890, the problem of the use of Western musical elements in sacred music was identified by Laroche, who stated that it was still unclear how to redirect and re-educate the general public and composers, who continued to indulge the public with “Western” sounds instead of turning their attention to strict sacred compositions.²¹ Some features of sacred music, for example tonic–dominant progressions, had become conventional, rather than foreign (Italian, German), and widely accepted by both clergy and members of parish, as Frolova-Walker concluded.²² This statement probably shows that, although reformist composers understood the Western origin of the tonic–dominant harmonic relations, they had to continue using this progression given that it had become a well-recognised musical element. Another compositional device that was used in the sacred works of the late nineteenth century that numerous musical figures criticised but used in reality—singing in 3rds—was habitually perceived by the general public and clergy as a Russian musical idiom; hence, composers were actually compelled, to some extent, to use this element in order to fulfil the auditory expectations of a wider populace (in contrast to those of the clergy or various experts). Kastal'sky, for instance, recommended the choirs and students to practise parallel 3rds and 6ths as a skill that would help choristers in the every-day singing of sacred chants.²³ Such recommendations would be unnecessary if such parallelism was not common in sacred music in either harmonised

¹⁸ V. F. Komarov, “Sredstva k uluchsheniyu tserkovnogo peniya” [Resources for Church Singing Improvement], 1890, repr. in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmislennii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918], vol. 3 of Rdmdm, ed. M. P. Rakhmanova, comps. A. A. Naumov, M. P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002), 248.

¹⁹ Rakhmanova, *Stepan Vasil'yevich Smolensky*, 231–424 (see chap. 1, n. 37).

²⁰ Ivanov, “Popitki k vosstanovleniyu,” 381 (see chap. 2, n. 153).

²¹ Laroche, “O sovremennikh nuzhdakh,” 455–59 (see chap. 3, n. 75).

²² Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 291.

²³ A. D. Kastal'sky, “Metodika tserkovnogo i shkol'no-khorovogo peniya” [Methodology of Church and School-Choral Singing], 1918, repr. in *Alexandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, material'i, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence], vol. 5 of Rdmdm, ed. and comp. G. S. Zvereva (Moscow: Znak, 2006), 191, 195.

settings of chants or in composed liturgical pieces. This is echoed in the pseudo-folk style (or pastiche of folk style) in compositions of the *Moguchaya kuchka*, such as those by Rimsky-Korsakov, which would sometimes merely imitate, rather than quote, musical replicas of Russian folk songs.²⁴ The folk imitations that were used in music of the late nineteenth century helped to support the myth that Russia had authentic national music that was capable of uniting all strata of society, from peasant to Emperor.

There was also a mercantile aspect to the situation. Composing church music was not a purely philanthropic activity or simply a “sacred calling.” Composers, who were professionals in most cases, rather than simply musical clergymen, clearly had pecuniary interests in the composition of sacred music. Lisitsin’s *Obzor dukhovno-muzikal'noy literaturi* contains price information and his reviews of sacred music, accompanied by recommendations on the pieces for choir conductors.²⁵ To make his sacred compositions useful to a broad public, Grechaninov even provided a piano accompaniment for some liturgical chants; hence anyone, who might struggle to read the choral score, could still use these sacred compositions at home.²⁶ A successful composer could also obtain the privilege of receiving a Tsar’s pension, as did Grechaninov, who admitted that due to the success of his *Veruyu* he received the Tsar’s pension of two thousand roubles a year. This pension and the honoraria from his compositions allowed the composer to stop tutoring and live “a life of ease.”²⁷

While the divergence between theory and practice is evident in Russian sacred music, the next question to be considered is what drove the establishment of the putative Russianness in the sacred music of the nineteenth century. Historically, an appeal to patriotic themes and nationalist sentiments often arises in times of a threat (actual or perceived) to the integrity of the state and its institutions (which would certainly encompass the Orthodox Church in late nineteenth-century Russia). The gradual entrenchment of Western influences in Russia fuelled frictions at all levels of the populace. In the 1820s, a perception of the Orthodox Church as an agent of the government in the fight against revolutionary activities²⁸ became intertwined with a nationalist ideology and was transfigured into an open antagonism toward Western traditions in the last decades of the nineteenth century.

²⁴ Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 163.

²⁵ Lisitsin, *Obzor dukhovno-muzikal'noy literaturi* (see chap. 1, n. 42); see also Kastal'sky, *Kheruvimskaya pesn', znamenniy raspev* (see chap. 4, n. 10).

²⁶ Grechaninov, *Moya muzikal'naya zhizn'*, 95 (see chap. 3, n. 29).

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 89.

²⁸ Florovsky, *Puti russkogo bogosloviya*, 116 (see chap. 2, n. 4).

Slavophiles and national-minded activists (often idealists in nature) greatly contributed to the establishment of the church-music reform agenda. Fundamental research in Russian sacred music that was led by national-minded scholars such as Razumovsky and Odoyevsky started gaining pace from the middle of the nineteenth century.²⁹ This activity also facilitated the idealistic attempts to win back the supremacy of church music.³⁰ Odoyevsky upheld the four main statute books as an exemplar of pure Russian sacred chants. These books were monodic and approachable for even an amateur choir.³¹ Smolensky, who was sympathetic to the nationalist cause and a mediator of Pobedonostsev's reformist ideas and their practical implementation in the sacred music,³² supported attempts to strengthen the perception of Russian sacred music as having no foreign influence. Kastal'sky's somewhat incredible suggestion that Russian sacred singing began in the third century even before Rus' was baptised³³ serves as an example of a nationalistically driven statement that was aligned with the Slavophile agenda.

The centuries-old separation of Western and Eastern churches also played a crucial role in the opposition of Orthodox nationalists to the Western musical traditions. Acceptance of Western musical influences and the presence of Western musical features in Russian music could be perceived as undermining the foundation of the schism and an attempt to corrupt the Orthodox tradition. Pobedonostsev idealised the Russian Orthodox Church and expressed the view that it was the “*vsenarodnaya*” [all-people's] church in which everybody, from rich to poor, was equal. He also complained about the emergence of admirers of foreign ecclesiastical traditions, who “naively” marvelled at the energy seen in Anglican or German churches and condemned coarseness and stagnation of the Russian church.³⁴

As discussed in the chapter 2, at the end of the nineteenth century the authority of the church was weakened. Its demoralisation was clearly reflected in Russian arts of the 1860s, as seen in paintings such as Vasily Perov's (1834–1882) *The Village Easter Procession* (1861) and *Teatime in Mitishchi near Moscow* (1862).³⁵ The subservience of the church to the government and its

²⁹ See chap. 1: 13–16.

³⁰ See chap. 2: 51–52.

³¹ Dunlop, *Russian Court Chapel Choir*, 63 (see chap. 1, n. 23).

³² See chap. 3: 67–68.

³³ Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 281.

³⁴ Pobedonostsev, *Moskovskiy sbornik*, 208, 211–12, and 213.

³⁵ Both pictures show scenes of country life that expose hypocrisy and demoralisation of the clergy. *The Village Easter Procession* shows members of a congregation leaving a modest peasant's hut, while at the door leans a drunken priest who has just served Easter prayers for the inhabitants; another clergyman lies in a stupor beneath the steps.

unwillingness to acknowledge any beneficial aspects of the Western influences on Russian sacred music further strengthened nationalistic tendencies. The study of reformist aspirations and evidence in their sacred compositions (often with the features contradictory to the reforms) reveal an approach that was well established since Christianisation of Russia—adoption, nationalisation, and popularisation. For example, after Christianisation, the church faced the difficulty of eradicating pagan customs³⁶ and, therefore, resorted to an adoption of pagan traditions, deities, and rituals, with the consequent assignment to them of liturgical names, Christian qualities, and holidays. These resulted in cases where various features of paganism that had been rooted in folklore could be encountered in church services.³⁷ Certain characteristics of *Perun-Gromoverzhets* [Perun the Thunderer] merged with those of the Prophet Elijah; the pagan feast of *Ivan-Kupala* [Ivan the Bather] merged with the celebration of St. John the Baptist.³⁸ Similarly, in the late nineteenth century, reformists promoted church music, which evidently embraced Western musical features, as one with Russian national characteristics, which became popularised and favoured by the public. Eventually, with the assistance of scholars, the distribution of the myth of “Russianness” in sacred music increased.

It was idealistic, if not fanciful, to believe that “genuine” Russian sacred idioms could be re-introduced, or, even emulated in some theoretically “pure” form, after nearly two centuries, if not more, of external musical influences.³⁹ Similarly, it was idealistic to believe in the Russianness of sacred music while even the old *znamenniy*⁴⁰ chant tradition contained a multitude of influences. These monodic chants, losing their sign notation tradition, eventually, were written out in the form of Western notation and later harmonised according to Western music theory. As a result, instead of genuine purification of sacred music, what happened was assimilation of Western features that became accepted as Russian.⁴¹

The entire situation described above should not be seen as unique but rather as a part of series of the political and cultural events that affected Russian music throughout history. For

Teatime in Mitishchi near Moscow depicts a corpulent priest who, while enjoying his afternoon cup of tea, arrogantly disregards a beggar and a boy, who are pushed away by his maidservant.

³⁶ Metallov, *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye russkoy tserkvi*, 3–4, 9 (see chap. 1, n. 40); also see Florovsky, *Puti russkogo bogosloviya*, 7–9.

³⁷ Findeizen, *From Antiquity*, 19, 21 (see chap. 1, n. 46).

³⁸ Rapatskaya, *Istoriya russkoy muziki*, 14 (see intro., n. 3).

³⁹ Razumovsky, *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii*, 225 (see chap. 1, n. 8).

⁴⁰ See chap. 2: 43.

⁴¹ For instance, sentimentalism in sacred music became to be associated with prayerfulness; see chap. 3: 82.

example, the artificiality of the attempts to construct Russianness outlined above has ironic echoes in the pseudo-proletarian music of the 1920s. After the Revolution, proletarian composers, including Kastal'sky, were dedicated to the proletarian doctrine and mass production of proletarian marching songs.⁴² N. A. Roslavets (1881–1944)—a composer and a commissioner of Glavlit⁴³—in 1926 wrote an article on pseudo-proletarian music and how composers—the members of *Assotsiatsiya proletarskikh kompozitorov* [Association of Proletarian Composers], to which Kastal'sky also belonged, artificially created and in some cases simply adapted earlier used characteristics of sacred music to the new “proletarian” art.⁴⁴ Roslavets’s main complaint was about the contradiction of a musical form intended for a completely different original context now adapted to a proletarian text. He also argued against calling the songs proletarian based merely on the fact of a proletarian text with revolutionary ideas, but not on the musical qualities.⁴⁵ This correlates with the phenomenon of *dukhovnaya muzika* [sacred music] that is described as such based on its generic attributes as *a capella*-style music with liturgical text, without serious consideration of compositional characteristics and qualities.

Roslavets also claimed that the proletarian composers adjusted musical features of Western bourgeois music to Russian proletarian texts, which were also surely incompatible elements.⁴⁶ He stated, for instance, that Kastal'sky used features of sacred music such as chordal textures, diatonic and modal harmonies, and plagal cadences in his proletarian songs.⁴⁷ These statements were rejected by a member of the *Assotsiatsiya proletarskikh kompozitorov*, L. L. Kaltat (1900–1946), who, despite admitting a connection of Kastal'sky with pre-revolutionary “cultish” music, suggested that Kastal'sky had been forced to compose the so-called cultish music, which he had easily abandoned after the Revolution in 1917.⁴⁸ In spite of the absurdity and indoctrinating character of

⁴² N. A. Roslavets, “O psevdoproletarskoy muzike” [On Pseudo-Proletarian Music], 1926, repr. in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, materialy, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence], vol. 5 of Rdmdm, ed. and comp. G. S. Zvereva (Moscow: Znak, 2006), 311–15.

⁴³ *Glavlit* was *Glavnoye upravleniye po delam literatury i izdatel'stva* [General directorate for the affairs of literature and publishing], which censored all publishing materials and protected state interests in the press and media from 1922 to 1991.

⁴⁴ Roslavets, “O psevdoproletarskoy muzike,” 313.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 314–15.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 313.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 313.

⁴⁸ L. L. Kaltat, “O podlinno-burzhuzaznoy ideologii gr. Roslavtsa. Fragment” [On Genuine Bourgeois Ideology of citizen Roslavets. Fragment], 1927, repr. in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, materialy, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence], vol. 5 of Rdmdm, ed. and comp. G. S. Zvereva (Moscow: Znak, 2006), 318–19.

Kaltat's suggestions, it gives us an insight into how composers adjusted their musical priorities and personal beliefs to a state ideology, or at least claimed to do so.

Summarising all the steps that were taken to achieve a supposedly genuine Russian sacred music of the late nineteenth century it can be concluded that the professional school of Russian sacred music was yet at its developing stage. The speciousness of the recommended qualities and lack of concise compositional methods reveal several lacunae in the theoretical knowledge of sacred music. Despite all the proclaimed authentic features (free of foreign characteristics) and the aspirations to develop the "true" Russian sacred music, it is evident that the nineteenth-century "reformed" sacred music bore more Western-like elements than its proponents and composers would have preferred to admit.

The overall objective of this project was to demonstrate the lack of consistency between the claims for and about national reforms in late nineteenth-century Russian sacred music and their implementation and, further, to account as far as possible for the reasons behind the discrepancies between theory and practice. Further questions beyond the scope of this study are, therefore, opened up for future research. In particular, why is what can now only be described as the mythology of sacred-music reform in this era perpetuated in large measure in informed criticism and scholarship throughout much of the twentieth century? Whether the answer lies in the realm of politics, culture, or individual preference, these contextual characteristics may serve as a starting point for a future discussion on the reasons for the prolongation of this myth. Although the arguments on the perpetuation of the myth would lead to a whole new study of the historiography of twentieth-century sacred music scholarship, some speculation can be foreshadowed here. Scholarly activities of nationalist sympathisers, who continued working in the mainstream of the nationalist agenda, increased in the twentieth century, bolstered by the increasingly nationalist orientation of Soviet culture. Also, the restrictions imposed on scholarly resources facilitated the unilateral approach and understanding of Russian sacred music of the end of the nineteenth century as one dominated by Moscow. Possibly, the established cultural differences and representative characteristics of the two cities contributed to this approach. Individual aspects also framed the research; some researchers such as Gardner or Mart'nov, were likely restricted by their professional occupation; others, as Soviet-era musicologists, were subordinated to the indoctrinating machine.⁴⁹

The earlier nineteenth-century composer Alyab'yev's sacred compositions were not touched in this research; however, this could be a future area of research worth pursuing. His sacred music can be understood as subject to Western influence and forms and, thus, shows a connection to the one of the later sacred schools of music discussed in the thesis. A composer of the second half of

⁴⁹ See chap. 1.2 and 1: 27.

the nineteenth century A. K. Lyadov (1855–1914) and his music must similarly be placed in the category of composers whose sacred music has been neglected and, as a consequence, remains in need of further research. Also, further research may focus on the fifth period of the second epoch (according to Gardner's classifications⁵⁰)—the musical activity after the Revolution 1917 in Russia and outside Russia in emigré communities is also ripe for further research.

⁵⁰ See chap. 2: 39–40.

Bibliography

1. Music

- Arkhangel'sky, A. A. "Izhe kheruvimi" [Cherubic Song]. In *Peniye Liturgii Svyatogo Ioanna Zlatousta v dukhe drevnikh napevov pravoslavnoy tserkvi. Dlya chetiryokhgolosnogo smeshannogo khora* [The Chant of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom in the Manner of the Old Tunes of the Orthodox Church. For Four-Voice Choir]. St. Petersburg: Shmidt, 1905, 8–10.
- . "Khvali dushe moya, Gospoda" [Praise the Lord, My Soul]. In *Peniye Liturgii Svyatogo Ioanna Zlatousta v dukhe drevnikh napevov pravoslavnoy tserkvi. Dlya chetiryokhgolosnogo smeshannogo khora* [The Chant of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom in the Manner of the Old Tunes of the Orthodox Church. For Four-Voice Choir]. St. Petersburg: Shmidt, 1905, 2.
- . "Milost' mira" [The Mercy of Peace]. In *Peniye Liturgii Svyatogo Ioanna Zlatousta v dukhe drevnikh napevov pravoslavnoy tserkvi. Dlya chetiryokhgolosnogo smeshannogo khora* [The Chant of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom in the Manner of the Old Tunes of the Orthodox Church. For Four-Voice Choir]. St. Petersburg: Shmidt, 1905, 13–14.
- . *Peniye Liturgii Svyatogo Ioanna Zlatousta v dukhe drevnikh napevov pravoslavnoy tserkvi. Dlya chetiryokhgolosnogo smeshannogo khora* [The Chant of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom in the Manner of the Old Tunes of the Orthodox Church. For Four-Voice Choir]. St. Petersburg: Shmidt, 1905.
- . "Veruyu" [The Creed]. In *Peniye Liturgii Svyatogo Ioanna Zlatousta v dukhe drevnikh napevov pravoslavnoy tserkvi. Dlya chetiryokhgolosnogo smeshannogo khora* [The Chant of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom in the Manner of the Old Tunes of the Orthodox Church. For Four-Voice Choir]. St. Petersburg: Shmidt, 1905, 10–12.
- Chesnokov, P. G. "Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda" [Bless the Lord, O My Soul]. In *Liturgiya Sv. Ioanna Zlatousta. Dlya malogo smeshannogo khora* [The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. For Small Mixed Choir], op. 42. Moscow: Jurgenson, 1914, 2–3.
- . "Kheruvimskaya pesn" [Cherubic Song]. In *Liturgiya Sv. Ioanna Zlatousta. Dlya malogo smeshannogo khora* [The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. For Small Mixed Choir], op. 42, no. 4. Moscow: Jurgenson, 1914, 15–17.
- . "Veruyu" [The Creed]. In *Liturgiya Sv. Ioanna Zlatousta. Dlya malogo smeshannogo khora* [The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. For Small Mixed Choir], op. 42, no. 5. Moscow: Jurgenson, 1914, 19–24.
- Grechaninov, A. T. "Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda" [Bless the Lord, O My Soul]. In *Liturgiya Sv. Ioanna Zlatousta* [The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom], op. 13, no. 2. Moscow: Jurgenson, 1898, 6–7.
- . "Kheruvimskaya pesn" [Cherubic Song]. In *Liturgiya Sv. Ioanna Zlatousta* [The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom], op. 13, no. 6. Moscow: Jurgenson, 1898, 20–24.

- . “Simvol veri” [The Creed]. In *Liturgiya Sv. Ioanna Zlatousta* [The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom], op. 13, no. 8b. Moscow: Jurgenson, 1898, 32–38.
- Ippolitov-Ivanov, M. M. “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda” [Bless the Lord, O My Soul]. In *Liturgiya Sv. Ioanna Zlatousta dlya chetiryokhgosnogo smeshannogo khora* [The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom for Four-Voice Choir], op. 37, no. 2. Moscow: Jurgenson, 1903, 6–8.
- . “Kheruvimskaya pesn” [Cherubic Song]. In *Liturgiya Sv. Ioanna Zlatousta dlya chetiryokhgosnogo smeshannogo khora* [The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom for Four-Voice Choir], op. 37, no. 10. Moscow: Jurgenson, 1903, 24–28.
- . “Simvol veri” [The Creed]. In *Liturgiya Sv. Ioanna Zlatousta dlya chetiryokhgosnogo smeshannogo khora* [The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom for Four-Voice Choir], op. 37, no. 12. Moscow: Jurgenson, 1903, 30–36.
- Kastal'sky, A. D. *Kheruvimskaya pesn', znamenniy raspev* [Cherubic Song, Znamenniy Chant]. Moscow: Grosse, c. 1897, 2–7.
- . *Sofroniyevskaya Kheruvimskaya pesn' po napevu Glinskoy pustini* [Sophroniyevskaya Cherubic Song, Based on Domestic Tune of the Glinskaya Hermitage]. Moscow: Grosse, c. 1898, 3–6.
- . *Veruyu* [The Creed], no. 1. 1898. Reprint, Moscow: Rossiyskoye muzikal'noye izdatel'stvo, 1992, 2–5.
- . *Veruyu* [The Creed], *dlya smeshannogo khora bez soprovozhdeniya* [for mixed choir without accompaniment], no. 3. Moscow: Jurgenson, n. d., 2–5.
- Rimsky-Korsakov, N. A. “Dostoyno yest” [It is Truly Fitting], no. 2, n. d. Reprinted in *Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov. The Complete Sacred Choral Works*. Monuments of Russian Sacred Music III. Editor-in-chief Vladimir Morosan. Introduction by Marina Rakhmanova, 190–94. Madison, Conn.: Musica Russica, 1999.
- . “Kheruvimskaya pesn” [Cherubic Song], no. 5. *Liturgiya Sv. Ioanna Zlatousta* [The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom], 1884. Reprinted in *Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov. The Complete Sacred Choral Works*. Monuments of Russian Sacred Music III. Editor-in-chief Vladimir Morosan. Introduction by Marina Rakhmanova, 157–66. Madison, Conn.: Musica Russica, 1999.
- . “Kheruvimskaya pesn” [Cherubic Song], no. 6, n. d. Reprinted in *Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov. The Complete Sacred Choral Works*. Monuments of Russian Sacred Music III. Editor-in-chief Vladimir Morosan. Introduction by Marina Rakhmanova, 167–75. Madison, Conn.: Musica Russica, 1999.
- . “Milost' mira” [The Mercy of Peace]. *Liturgiya Sv. Ioanna Zlatousta* [The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom], op. 22, no. 4, 1883. Reprinted in *Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov. The Complete Sacred Choral Works*. Monuments of Russian Sacred Music III. Editor-in-chief Vladimir Morosan. Introduction by Marina Rakhmanova, 27–31. Madison, Conn.: Musica Russica, 1999.

- . “Otche nash” [Our Father]. *Liturgiya Sv. Ioanna Zlatousta* [The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom], op. 22, no. 7, 1883. Reprinted in *Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov. The Complete Sacred Choral Works*. Monuments of Russian Sacred Music III. Editor-in-chief Vladimir Morosan. Introduction by Marina Rakhmanova, 40–43. Madison, Conn.: Musica Russica, 1999.
- . “Tebe Boga khvalim” [We Praise Thee, Oh Lord], dvukhornoye [for double choir], 1885. Reprinted in *Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov. The Complete Sacred Choral Works*. Monuments of Russian Sacred Music III. Editor-in-chief Vladimir Morosan. Introduction by Marina Rakhmanova, 99–139. Madison, Conn.: Musica Russica, 1999.
- Smirnov, I. “Svete tikhii” (*znamennii*) [Gladsome Light]. In *Tserkovno-pevcheskiy sbornik* [The Church-Singing Collection]. Vol. 1. St. Petersburg: Sinodal'naya tipografiya, 1898, 71–76.
- Smolensky, S. V. “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda” [Bless the Lord, O My Soul]. In *Glavneyshiy pesnopeniya Bozhestvennoy Liturgii, Molebnogo peniya, Panikhidi i Vsenoshchnogo Bdeniya: Pesnopeniya Vsenoshchnogo Bdeniya* [The Main Chants of Divine Liturgy, Prayer Singing, Dirge, and All-Night Vigil: The Chants of All-Night Vigil]. 3rd ed. Annex to journal “Tserkovniye vedomosti.” St. Petersburg: Yablonsky, 1893, 1–2.
- . *Glavneyshiy pesnopeniya Bozhestvennoy Liturgii, Molebnogo peniya, Panikhidi i Vsenoshchnogo Bdeniya: Pesnopeniya Vsenoshchnogo Bdeniya* [The Main Chants of the Divine Liturgy, Prayer Chants, Dirge, and All-Night Vigil: The Chants of the All-Night Vigil]. 3rd ed. Annex to journal “Tserkovniye vedomosti.” St. Petersburg: Yablonsky, 1893.
- . “Khvalite imya Gospodne, drevnego raspeva” [Praise the Name of the Lord, of the Old Domestic Tune]. In *Dukhovno-muzikal'niye sochineniya i perelozheniya S. V. Smolenskogo* [The sacred-musical harmonisations of S. V. Smolensky]. St. Petersburg: Énergiya, 1905, 17–20.
- Taneyev, S. I. “Blagoslovi dushe moya, Gospoda” [Bless the Lord, O My Soul]. c. 1879. Reprinted in *Taneyev S. I. Dukhovnaya muzika* [Taneyev S. I. Sacred Music]. Compiled by N. Yu. Plotnikova. Moscow: Moskovskaya konservatoriya, 1999, 9–12.
- . “Gospodi, vozzvakh” [Lord, I Have Cried], glas 1 [in mode 1]. c. 1891. Reprinted in *Taneyev S. I. Dukhovnaya muzika* [Taneyev S. I. Sacred Music]. Compiled by N. Yu. Plotnikova. Moscow: Moskovskaya konservatoriya, 1999, 20–21.
- . “Svete tikhii” [Gladsome Light], n. d. Reprinted in *Taneyev S. I. Dukhovnaya muzika* [Taneyev S. I. Sacred Music]. Compiled by N. Yu. Plotnikova. Moscow: Moskovskaya konservatoriya, 1999, 24–30.
- Tchaikovsky, P. I. “Dostoyno yest” [It is Truly Fitting]. *Devyat' dukhovno-muzikal'nikh sochineniy* [Nine Sacred Musical Compositions], no. 5, 1885. Reprinted in *Peter Tchaikovsky. The Complete Sacred Choral Works*. Monuments of Russian Sacred Music II. Editor-in-chief Vladimir Morosan, 353–57. Madison, Conn.: Musica Russica, 1996.
- . “Kheruvimskaya pesn” [Cherubic Song]. *Devyat' dukhovno-muzikal'nikh sochineniy* [Nine Sacred Musical Compositions], no. 1, 1884. Reprinted in *Peter Tchaikovsky. The Complete Sacred Choral Works*. Monuments of Russian Sacred Music II. Editor-in-chief Vladimir Morosan, 315–23. Madison, Conn.: Musica Russica, 1996.

- . “Kheruvimskaya pesn” [Cherubic Song]. *Devyat' dukhovno-muzikal'nikh sochineniy* [Nine Sacred Musical Compositions], no. 3, 1884. Reprinted in *Peter Tchaikovsky. The Complete Sacred Choral Works*. Monuments of Russian Sacred Music II. Editor-in-chief Vladimir Morosan, 336–47. Madison, Conn.: Musica Russica, 1996.
- . “Otche nash” [Our Father]. *Devyat' dukhovno-muzikal'nikh sochineniy* [Nine Sacred Musical Compositions], no. 6, 1885. Reprinted in *Peter Tchaikovsky. The Complete Sacred Choral Works*. Monuments of Russian Sacred Music II. Editor-in-chief Vladimir Morosan, 358–65. Madison, Conn.: Musica Russica, 1996.
- . “Simvol veri” [The Creed]. *Liturgiya Sv. Ioanna Zlatousta* [The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom], op. 41, no. 8, 1878. Reprinted in *Peter Tchaikovsky. The Complete Sacred Choral Works*. Monuments of Russian Sacred Music II. Editor-in-chief Vladimir Morosan, 47–56. Madison, Conn.: Musica Russica, 1996.

Tserkovno-pevcheskiy sbornik [The Church-Singing Compilation]. St. Peterburg: Sinodal'naya tipografiya, 1898.

2. Literature

Abraham, Gerald. *On Russian Music*. London: Reeves, 1939.

———. *Slavonic and Romantic: Essays and Studies*. London: Faber & Faber, 1968.

Abraham, Gerald, ed. *The Music of Tchaikovsky*. Port Washington, N.Y: Kennikat Press, Inc. 1969.

Abraham Gerald, and Larisa Georgievna Danko. “Findeyzen, Nikolay Fyodorovich.” *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed June 3, 2017. <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/subscriber/article/grove/music/09663>.

Aleppsky, Pavel. *Puteshestviya Antiokhiyskogo Patriarkha Makariya v Rossiyu v polovine XVII veka. Ot Dnestra do Moskvī* [The Journey of Archbishop Makariy to Russia in the Middle of the Seventeenth Century. From Dnestr to Moscow]. Vol. 2. Translated by G. Murkos. Moscow: Universitetskaya, 1897.

Aranovsky, M. G. “Teoreticheskaya kontseptsiya B. L. Yavorskogo” [The Theoretical Concept of B. L. Yavorskogo]. *Iskusstvo muziki: teoriya i istoriya*, no. 6. (2012): 41–60.

Arkhangel'sky, A. A. “Vstupitel'naya stat'ya” [Preface]. In *Peniye tserkovnikh sluzhb vo dni Svyatogo Velikogo Posta, Svyatoy Paskhi i dvunadesyatikh prazdnikov. Sv. Vel. Post* [Singing of Church Services During the Days of Holy Lent, Holy Easter, and the Holy Days with a Fixed Date. Holy Great Lent]. 3rd ed. Saint-Petersburg, 1892.

Armstrong, Colin Robert. “West Meets East: Giuseppe Sarti’s Influence on Russian Church Music. A Study of Western Influence and Surviving Russian Traits.” PhD thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2011.

- Arnol'd, Yu. K. *Garmonizatsiya drevnerusskogo tserkovnogo peniya po éllinskoy i vizantiyskoy teorii i akkusticheskomu analizu* [Harmonisation of Old-Russian Church Singing Using Hellenic and Byzantine Theory and Acoustic Analysis]. Moscow: Razumovsky, 1886.
- . *Teoriya drevne-russkogo tserkovnogo i narodnogo peniya na osnovanii avtenticeskikh traktatov i akusticheskogo analiza* [Theory of Old-Russian Church and Folk Singing on the Basis of Authentic Treatise and Acoustic Analysis]. 1st ed. Moscow: Pravoslavnoye Obozreniye, 1880.
- Artyomova, Ye. G. “Prot. M. A. Lisitsin–ideolog Novogo napravleniya dukhovnoy muziki” [Archpriest M. A. Lisitsin–Ideologist of the New Direction in Sacred Music]. *Vestnik PSTGU* 1, no. 13 (2014): 136–48.
- Asaf'yev, B. V. *Izbranniye trudi* [Selected Works]. Vol. 5. Moscow: Akademiya nauk SSSR, 1957.
- . *O khorovom iskusstve* [On the Choral Art]. Edited by B. A. Kats. Compiled by A. B. Pavlova-Arbenina. Leningradskoye otdeleniye: Muzika, 1980.
- Bakulina, Ellen. “The Concept of Mutability in Russian Theory.” *Music Theory Online* 20, no. 3 (2014): paragraphs 1–22, accessed Dec. 11, 2015.
<http://www.mtosmt.org/issues/mto.14.20.3/mto.14.20.3.bakulina.php>.
- Bazhanov, N. D. *Taneyev* [Taneyev]. Vol. 10 of *Zhizn' zamechatel'nikh lyudey* [Life of Great People]. Moscow: Molodaya Gvardiya, 1971.
- Belyayev, V. M. *Drevnerusskaya muzikal'naya pis'mennost'* [Old-Russian Musical Notation]. Edited by S. V. Aksiuk. Moscow: Sovetskiy kompozitor, 1962.
- Berdyayev, N. A. *Svobodnaya tserkov'* [Free Church]. Moscow: Moskovskaya prosvetitel'naya komissiya pri Vremennom komitete Gosudarstvennoy dumī, 1917.
- Bershadskaya, T. S. *Osnovniye kompozitsionniye zakonomernosti mnogogolosiya russkoy narodnoy krest'yanskoy pesni* [Major Compositional Principles of Polyphony of Russian Folk Peasant Song]. Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoye muzikal'noye izdatel'stvo, 1961.
- Bezsonov, P. A. *Pravoslavnoye obozreniye* [Orthodox Review]. Moscow: Katkov, 1864.
- Bolkhovitinov, Ye. A. *Istoricheskoye rassuzhdeniye voobshche o drevnem khristianskom bogosluzhebnoy penii i osobenno o penii Rossiyskoy tserkvi* [Historic General Discourse on Old Christian Liturgical Singing and in Particular on the Singing of Russian Church]. St. Petersburg, 1804.
- Bova, Russell, ed. *Russia and Western Civilization: Cultural and Historical Encounters*. Armonk, N.Y.: M. E. Sharpe, 2003.
- Blyum, A. V. *Sovetskaya tsenzura v épokhu total'nogo terrora 1929–1953* [Soviet Censorship in the Epoch of Total Terror of 1929–1953]. St. Petersburg: Akademicheskii Proékt, 2000.
- Brazhnikov, M. V. *Drevnerusskaya teoriya muziki po rukopisnim materialam 15–18 veka* [Old-Russian Theory of Music, Based on Manuscripts of the Fifteenth–Eighteenth Centuries]. Leningrad, 1972.

- . “Pevcheskiye rukopisi sobraniy D. V. Razumovskogo i V. F. Odoyevskogo” [Compilations of Singing Manuscripts of D. V. Razumovsky and V. F. Odoyevsky]. In *Rukopisniye sobraniya D. V. Razumovskogo i V. F. Odoyevskogo. Arkhiv D. V. Razumovskogo* [Collections of Manuscripts of D. V. Razumovsky and V. F. Odoyevsky. Archive of D. V. Razumovsky]. Edited by I. M. Kudryavtsev, 6–22. Moscow: Biblioteka imeni V. I. Lenina, 1960.
- Brill, Nicholas Peter. *History of Russian Church Music, 988–1917*. 1980. 2nd ed. Bloomington, Ill.: Brill, 1982.
- Brown, Malcolm Hamrick, ed. *A Collection of Russian Folk Songs by Nikolai L'vov and Ivan Prach*. Vol. 13 of *Russian music studies*, 2nd ed. With introduction and appendixes by Margarita Mazo. United States: Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms, 1987.
- Brumfield, William C., and Miloš M. Velimirović. *Christianity and the Arts in Russia*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Bukina, T. V. *Muzikal'naya nauka v Rossii 1920–2000kh godov: (ocherki kul'turnoy istorii). Monografiya* [Musical Science in Russia of 1920–2000: (Essays on Cultural History). Monograph]. St. Petersburg: Russkaya khristianskaya gumanitarnaya akademiya, 2010.
- Camp, Philip Reuel. “A Historical and Contextual Examination of Alexandre Gretchaninoff's Second Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, Opus 29.” PhD thesis, Texas Tech University, 2002. ProQuest (3069130).
- Carpenter, Ellon D. “Russian Music Theory: A Conspectus.” In *Russian Theoretical Thought in Music*, edited by Gordon D. McQuere, 1–83. Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press, 1983.
- . “The Contributions of Taneev, Catoire, Conus, Garbuzov, Mazel, and Tiulin.” In *Russian Theoretical Thought in Music*, edited by Gordon D. McQuere, 253–379. Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press, 1983.
- Chaadayev, P. Ya. *Filosoficheskiye pis'ma* [Philosophical Letters]. Edited by Vl. N. Ivanovsky. Kazan': Gran', 1906.
- Davīdova, N. A. “Problema stilya v Russkom tserkovnom penii rubezha 19–20 vekov (1880–1916)” [The Problem of Russian Church-Singing Style at the Turn of the Nineteenth– Twentieth Centuries (1880–1916)]. *Izvestiya Rossiyskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta imeni A. I. Gertsena* 63 (2008): 68–70.
- De Kyustin, Astol'f. *Rossiya v 1839 godu* [Russia in 1839]. Translated by V. A. Mil'china. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo imeni Sabashnikovikh, 1996.
- Dolgushin, N. P. “Tormozī tserkovnogo peniya” [Impediment of Church Singing]. *Russkaya muzikal'naya gazeta*, no. 30/31 (1907): stlb. 668–74. Reprinted in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmīslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 626–31. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turī, 2002.

- Dubovsky, I. I., S. V. Yevseyev, I. V. Sposobin, and V. V. Sokolov. *Uchebnik garmonii* [Harmony Textbook]. Moscow: Muzika, 1999.
- Dunlop, Carolyn C. *Russian Court Chapel Choir: 1796–1917*. Vol. 1 of Music Archive Publications F. Edited by Richard Bonyngé. Rutledge, 2000.
- Findeizen, Nikolai. *From Antiquity to the Beginning of the Eighteenth Century*. Vol. 1 of History of Music in Russia from Antiquity to 1800. Edited and annotated by Miloš Velimirović and Claudia R. Jensen. Translated by Samuel William Pring. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008.
- . *The Eighteenth Century*. Vol. 2 of History of Music in Russia from Antiquity to 1800. Edited and annotated by Miloš Velimirović and Claudia R. Jensen. Translated by Samuel William Pring. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008.
- . “Stepan Vasil'yevich Smolensky. Biograficheskiy ocherk” [Stepan Vasil'yevich Smolensky. Biographical Sketch]. 1910. Reprinted in *Stepan Vasil'yevich Smolensky. Vospominaniya* [Stepan Vasil'yevich Smolensky. Memoirs]. Vol. 4 of Rdmdm, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by N. I. Kabanova, 604–26. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.
- Florovsky, G. V. *Puti russkogo bogosloviya, istoriya russkogo bogosloviya, i yego stanovleniye* [Paths of Russian Theology, History of Russian Theology and Its Formation]. 2nd ed. Part 1. Corrected and amended reprint of the 1983. USA: Holy Trinity Orthodox School, 2003.
- Frolova-Walker, Marina. *Russian Music and Nationalism: From Glinka to Stalin*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Frolova-Walker, Marina, and Jonathan Walker. *Music and Soviet Power, 1917-1932*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell, 2012.
- Gardner, I. A. *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye russkoy pravoslavnoy tserkvi* [Church Singing in Russian Orthodox Church]. Vol. 1. Jordanville, N. Y.: Holy Trinity Monastery, 1978.
- . *Bogosluzhebnoye peniye russkoy pravoslavnoy tserkvi* [Church Singing in Russian Orthodox Church]. Vol. 2. Jordanville, N. Y.: Holy Trinity Monastery, 1982.
- Garratt, James. *Palestrina and the German Romantic Imagination: Interpreting Historicism in Nineteenth-Century Music*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Glebov, Igor' [aka Asaf'yev B. V.]. “Kharakterniye osobennosti iskusstva Kastal'skogo” [Typical Features of Kastal'sky's artistry]. 1928. Reprinted in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, material'i, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence]. Vol. 5 of Rdmdm, edited and compiled by S. G. Zvereva, 366–68. Moscow: Znak, 2006.
- . “Sovremennoye russkoye muzikoznaniye i yego istoricheskiye zadachi” [Contemporary Russian Musicology and Its Historical Tasks]. *De Musica, Vremennik Razryada istorii i teorii muziki*. Leningrad: Gosudarstvenniy institut istorii iskusstv, 1905, 18–23. Reprinted in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, material'i, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence]. Vol. 5 of Rdmdm, edited and compiled by S. G. Zvereva, 295–300. Moscow: Znak, 2006.

- Gmeinwieser, Siegfried. "Cecilian Movement." *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed May 14, 2016.
<http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/subscriber/article/grove/music/05245>.
- Gorchakov, N. D. "Ob ustavnom i partesnom tserkovnom penii v Rossii" [On Statutory and Part-Singing in Russia]. *Moskvityanin* V, no. 9 (1841): 191–207.
- . *Opit vokal'noy i pevcheskoy muziki v Rossii, Ot drevnikh vremyon do nineshnego usovershenstvovaniya sego iskusstva; s lyubopitnimi zamechaniyami ob otlichnikh avtorakh i regentakh vokal'noy muziki, i s dvumya gravirovannimi figurami starinnikh pevcheskikh not* [History of Vocal and Singing Music in Russia, from Ancient Times to the Current Improvement of this Art; with Interesting Comments on Excellent Authors and Conductors of Vocal Music, and with Two Etched Figures of Old Singing Notes]. Moscow: Reshetnikov, 1808.
- Grechaninov, A. T. *Moya muzikal'naya zhizn'* [My Musical Life]. Paris, 1936.
- . "Neskol'ko slov o dukhe tserkovnikh pesnopeniy" [A Few Words on the Essence of Church Chants]. *Moskovskiye vedomosti*, no. 53 (1900). Reprinted in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmisenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 430–34. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.
- Grigorov, A. P. "K voprosu o tserkovnom penii" [On the Question of Church Singing]. *Moskovskiye vedomosti*, no. 34 (1900). Reprinted in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmisenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 428–29. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.
- Grove, Paul Richard II. "Sergei Ivanovich Taneev's Doctrine of the Canon: A Translation and Commentary." PhD thesis, The University of Arizona, 1999.
<http://hdl.handle.net/10150/283986>.
- Gulyanitskaya, N. S. *Poëtika muzikal'noy kompozitsii: Teoreticheskiye aspekti russkoy dukhovnoy muziki XX veka* [Poetics of Musical Composition: Theoretical Aspects of Russian Sacred Music in the Twentieth Century]. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.
- Istomin, I. A. *Melodico-garmonicheskoye stroyeniye russkoy narodnoy pesni* [Melodic-Harmonic Structure of Russian Folk Song]. Moscow: Sovetskiy Kompozitor, 1985.
- Ivanov, A. N. "Popitki k vosstanovleniyu drevnetserkovnogo peniya" [Attempts at Restoration of Old-Church Singing]. *Tul'skiye yeparkhial'niye vedomosti*, no. 10–18, 23 (1884). Reprinted in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmisenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 371–405. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.

- Kaltat, L. L. “O podlinno-burzhuznoy ideologii gr. Roslavtsa. Fragment” [On Genuine Bourgeois Ideology of citizen Roslavets. Fragment]. *Muzikal'noye obrazovaniye*, no. 3–4 (1927): 39–41. Reprinted in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, material'i, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence]. Vol. 5 of Rdmdm, edited and compiled by S. G. Zvereva, 318–19. Moscow: Znak, 2006.
- Kastal'sky, A. D. “Khoroviye kraski” [Choral Colours]. Autograph. GTSMMK, f. 12, no. 383. Reprinted in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, material'i, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence]. Vol. 5 of Rdmdm, edited and compiled by S. G. Zvereva, 218–23. Moscow: Znak, 2006.
- . “Metodika tserkovnogo i shkol'no-khorovogo peniya. Fragmenti” [Methodology of Church and School-Choral Singing. Fragments]. Autograph. 1918. GTSMMK, f. 12, no. 246: 116–20. Reprinted in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, material'i, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence]. Vol. 5 of Rdmdm, edited and compiled by S. G. Zvereva, 190–213. Moscow: Znak, 2006.
- . “Nasaditeli drevnego peniya” [Propagators of Old Singing]. 1911. Reprinted in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, material'i, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence]. Vol. 5 of Rdmdm, edited and compiled by S. G. Zvereva, 101–02. Moscow: Znak, 2006.
- . “O moyey muzikal'noy kar'yere i moi misli o tserkovnoy muzike” [About My Musical Career and My Thoughts on Sacred Music]. *Muzikal'niy sovremennik*, no. 2 (1915): 31–45. Reprinted in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, material'i, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence]. Vol. 5 of Rdmdm, edited and compiled by S. G. Zvereva, 49–61. Moscow: Znak, 2006.
- . “Po povodu obnovleniya” [On Restoration]. 1917. GTSMMK, f. 171, no. 91. Reprinted in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, material'i, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence]. Vol. 5 of Rdmdm, edited and compiled by S. G. Zvereva, 110–18. Moscow: Znak, 2006.
- . *Prakticheskoye rukovodstvo k v'irazitel'nomu peniyu stikhir pri pomoshchi razlichnikh garmonizatsiy* [Practical Guidance to Expressive Singing of Stanza Using Various Harmonisations]. Moscow: Jurgenson, 1909.
- . “Vsenoshchnoye Bdeniye S. V. Rachmaninoff” [All-Night Vigil of S. V. Rachmaninoff]. *Russkoye slovo*, no. 54 (1915). Reprinted in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, material'i, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence]. Vol. 5 of Rdmdm, edited and compiled by S. G. Zvereva, 108. Moscow: Znak, 2006.
- Kireyevsky, I. V. *Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy* [Complete Collected Works]. 2 vols. Moscow: Koshelev, 1861.
- Kiselyov, V. A., T. N. Livanova, and V. V. Protopopov, eds. *Taneyev S. I.: Material'i i dokumenti* [Materials and Documents]. Moscow: Akademiya Nauk SSSR, 1952.
- Klyuchevsky, V. O. *Lektsii po russkoy istorii professora Moskovskogo Universiteta V. O. Klyuchevskogo* [Lectures on Russian History by Professor of Moscow University V. O. Klyuchevskogo], as the manuscript. Vol. 3. St. Petersburg, 1902.

- Knyaz' V. F. O. (V. F. Odoyevsky). *K voprosu o drevne-russkom pesnopenii: poyasneniye* [On the Question of Old-Russian Chant: Explanations]. Moscow: Bakhmetev, 1864.
- Komarov, V. F. "Sredstva k uluchsheniyu tserkovnogo peniya" [Resources for Church Singing Improvement]. Appendix to *Pravoslavnoye obozreniye* (1890). Reprinted in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmishlenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of Rdmdm, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 232–82. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.
- Kompaneysky, N. I. "A. D. Kastal'sky. Po povodu 4-go vĭpuska yego dukhovno-muzikal'nikh sochineniy" [A. D. Kastal'sky. Concerning the Fourth Issue of His Sacred-Musical Compositions]. *RMG*, no. 13–14 and 17–18 (1904): stlb. 359–64 and 461–65. Reprinted in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, material'i, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence]. Vol. 5 of Rdmdm, edited and compiled by S. G. Zvereva, 254–58. Moscow: Znak, 2006.
- . "O stile tserkovnikh pesnopeniy" [On Style of Church Chants]. *RMG*, no. 37 and 38 (1901): stlb. 852–60 and 886–96. Reprinted in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmishlenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of Rdmdm, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 471–83. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.
- . "Sovremennoye demestvo" [Contemporary Demestvo]. *RMG*, no. 49 (1902): stlb 1227–1235. Reprinted in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, material'i, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence]. Vol. 5 of Rdmdm, edited and compiled by S. G. Zvereva, 248–52. Moscow: Znak, 2006.
- Korabel'nikova, L. Z., ed. *S. Taneyev: Dnevnik, 1894–1909* [S. Taneyev: Diaries, 1894–1909]. 3 vols. Moscow: Muzika, 1981, 1982, and 1985.
- . *S. I. Taneyev v Moskovskoy konservatorii* [S. I. Taneyev in the Moscow Conservatory]. Moscow: Muzika, 1974.
- Krilova, V. D. "Dukhovniy put' S. I. Taneyeva" [Spiritual Path of S. I. Taneyeva]. *Vestnik: Muzikal'noye iskusstvo khristianskogo mira* 5, no. 2 (3). Moscow: PSTGU (2008): 101–12.
- Kustovsky, Ye. S., and N. A. Potyomkina. *Posobiye po izucheniyu osmoglasiya sovremennoy moskovskoy traditsii* [Workbook for the Study of the Eight Modes in the Contemporary Muscovite Tradition]. 2nd ed. Revised and expanded. Moscow, 2006.
- Kutsenko, Ye. D. "Iсполнител'skaya sud'ba dukhovno-muzikal'nikh sochineniy Alyab'yeva v XIX veke" [The Performance Fate of the Sacred Musical Compositions of Alyab'yev in the Nineteenth Century]. *Vestnik*, no. 1. Moscow: RAM im. Gnessinikh (2011): 1–6.
- Kuzma, Marika. "Bortnyans'ky, Dmytro Stepanovych." *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed November 27, 2016.
<http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/subscriber/article/grove/music/03638>.

- Laroche, H. A. “O nīeshnem sostoyanii tserkovnoy muziki v Rossii” [On the Current State of Church Music in Russia]. *Sovremennaya letopis'*, no. 47 (1869). Reprinted in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmīlenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of Rdmdm, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 150–55. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.
- . “O sovremennīkh nuzhdakh tserkovnoy muziki v Rossii” [On Current Needs of Church Music in Russia]. *Moskovskiye vedomosti*, no. 76 (1900). Reprinted in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmīlenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of Rdmdm, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 453–59. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.
- LaRue, Jan. *Guidelines for Style Analysis*. New York: Norton, 1970.
- Leaver, Robin A. “Luther, Martin.” *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed June 24, 2017. <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/subscriber/article/grove/music/17219>.
- Lipayev, I. V. “Sinodal'noye uchilishche, i yego idealisti, khor. Kastal'sky” [Synodal College, Its Idealists, chor. Kastal'sky]. *RMG*, no. 4 (1898): 391–401. Reprinted in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, materialī, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence]. Vol. 5 of Rdmdm, edited and compiled by S. G. Zvereva, 239–41. Moscow: Znak, 2006.
- Lisitsīn, M. A. *Obzor dukhovno-muzikal'noy literaturī* [Review of Spiritual and Musical Literature]. 2nd ed. St. Petersburg: Stolichnaya tipografiya Gorokhovaya, 1902.
- . “O novom napravlenii v russkoy dukhovnoy muzike” [On a New Trend in Russian Sacred Music]. *Muzikal'nīy truzhenik*, no. 7–12/13 (1909). Reprinted in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmīlenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of Rdmdm, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 525–57. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.
- . “Tserkov' i muzika. (Po povodu novīkh techeniy v muzikal'nom iskusstve. Fragment)” [Church and Music. On Contemporary Tendencies in Musical Art. A Fragment]. Lisitsīn, M. svyashch. *Tserkov' i muzika. (Po povodu novīkh techeniy v muzikal'nom iskusstve)*. St. Petersburg, 1902, 8–14. Reprinted in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, materialī, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence]. Vol. 5 of Rdmdm, edited and compiled by S. G. Zvereva, 242–47. Moscow: Znak, 2006.
- Livanova, T. N. *Ocherki i materialī po istorii russkoy muzikal'noy kul'turī* [Essay and Materials on History of Russian Musical Culture]. 1st ed. Edited by A. Ostretsov. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1938.
- Lozovaya, I. Ye. *Actual'nīye problemī izucheniya tserkovno-pevcheskogo iskusstva* [Actual Problems of Study of Sacred-Singing Arts]. Nauchno-izdatel'skiy tsentr: Moskovskaya Konservatoriya, 2011.

- Lozovaya, I. Ye., N. G. Denisov, N. V. Gur'yeva, and O. O. Zhivayeva. *Russkoye tserkovnoye peniye XI–XX vv.: Issledovaniya, publikatsii 1917–1999. Bibliograficheskiy ukazatel'* [Russian Church Chant of the Eleventh–Twentieth Centuries: Studies and Publications 1917–1999. Bibliographical index]. Vol. 2. Moscow University Press, 2001.
- Lozovaya, I. Ye., and Ye. Yu. Shevchuk. *Tserkovnoye peniye* [Church Singing]. St. Petersburg: Neva, 2005.
- Martinov, V. I. *Istoriya bogoslužhebnogo peniya: Uchebnoye posobiye* [History of Liturgical Singing: Schoolbook]. Moscow: RIO Federal'nikh arkhivov; Russkiye ogni, 1994.
- Maximova, Galina. "Russian Orthodox Music in Australia: the Translation of a Tradition." M. Mus. thesis, Australian Catholic University, 1999. <http://researchbank.acu.edu.au/theses/20>.
- Mazel' L. A. *Stroyeniye muzikal'nikh proizvedeniy: uchebnoye posobiye* [Structure of Musical Compositions: Schoolbook]. 2nd ed. Expanded. Moscow: Muzika, 1979.
- McLeish, K., and V. McLeish, *Stravinsky*. London: William Heinemann, 1978.
- McQuere, Gordon Daniel. "The Elements of The Structure of Musical Speech" by S. V. Protopopov [microform]: A Translation and Commentary. PhD thesis, The University of Iowa, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. 1978.
- McQuere, Gordon Daniel, ed. "The Theories of Boleslav Yavorsky." In *Russian Theoretical Thought in Music*. Ser. 2. 109–65. Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press, 1983.
- Metallov, V. M. *Bogoslužhebnoye peniye russkoy tserkvi* [Liturgical Singing of the Russian Church.]. Vol. 26 of *Zapiski Imperatorskogo Moskovskogo Arkheologicheskogo Instituta im. Imperatora Nikolaya II* [Memoirs of the Emperor Nicholas II Imperial Moscow Archaeological Institute]. Edited by A. I. Uspensky. Moscow: Snegiryova, 1912.
- . *Ocherk istorii pravoslavnogo tserkovnogo peniya v Rossii* [Essays of History of Orthodox Church Singing in Russia]. Saratov: Tipografiya gubernskogo zemstva, 1893.
- . "O sovremennom sostoyanii i nuzhdakh tserkovnogo peniya" [On Contemporary State and Needs of Church Singing]. *Moskovskiye vedomosti*, no. 348–52 (1902). Reprinted in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmislennii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 489–96. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.
- Mikkonen, Simo. *Music and Power in the Soviet 1930s: A History of Composer's Bureaucracy*. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 2009.
- Milov, L. V., ed. *Istoriya Rossii s drevneyshikh vremyon do nachala XXI veka* [History of Russia from Ancient Times to the Beginning of the Twenty-First Century]. Moscow: EKSMO, 2006.
- Montagu-Nathan, Montagu. *A History of Russian Music: Being an Account of the Russian School of Composers, with a Survey of Their Lives and a Description of Their Works*. London: Reeves, 1918.

- Morosan, Vladimir. *Choral Performance in Pre-revolutionary Russia*. 2nd ed. UMI Research Press, 1986; Musica Russica, 1994.
- . “Folk and Chant Elements in Musorgsky’s Choral Writing.” In *Musorgsky in Memoriam 1881–1981*, edited by Malcolm Hamrick Brown. 95–133. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1982.
- Morosan, Vladimir, ed. *Johann von Gardner. Russian Church Singing: Orthodox Worship and Hymnography*. Vol. 1. St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1980.
- Morosan, Vladimir, ed. *One Thousand Years of Russian Church Music: 988–1988*. Washington, D.C.: Musica Russica, 1991.
- Morozov, A. I. *Krug tserkovnogo znamennogo peniya v shesti chastyakh* [The Annual Cycle of Sign-Notated Chants in Six Parts]. Part 4. St. Petersburg, 1884.
- Nevezhin, V. A. *Yesli zavtra voyna, yesli zavtra v pokhod — bud' segodnya k pokhodu gotov: Podgotovka k voyne i ideologicheskaya propaganda v 30s–40s godah* [If Tomorrow is War, if Tomorrow is the Campaign—Then Prepare for the Campaign Today: Preparation and Ideological Propaganda in the 30s and 40s]. Moscow: Yauza, EKSMO, 2007.
- Nikol'sky, A. V. “O ‘tserkovnosti’ dukhovno-muzikal'nikh sochineniy: Zametka” [On the ‘Churchliness’ of Sacred Musical Compositions: A Note]. *Khorovoye i regentskoye delo*, no. 3 (1909): 74–75. Reprinted in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmyslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 562–63. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.
- Nikol'sky, N. M. *Istoriya russkoy tserkvi* [A History of Russian Church]. 3rd ed. Edited by N. S. Gordiyenko. Moscow: Politizdat, 1985.
- Norden, Lindsay N. “A Brief Study of the Russian Liturgy and Its Music.” *Musical Quarterly* 5 (1919): 426–50.
- Obolonsky, A. V. *Na sluzhbe gosudarevoy: Byurokratiya v staroy i novoy Rossii* [In Public Service: Bureaucracy in Old and New Russia]. Ocherk. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo IGI, RAN, 1997.
- Odoyevsky, V. F. *Mneniye knyazya V. F. Odoyevskogo po voprosam, vzbuzhdyonnim ministrom narodnogo prosveshcheniya po delu o tserkovnom penii* [Opinion of Prince V. F. Odoyevsky on the Question Raised by the Minister of Public Education About the Matter of the Church Singing]. St. Petersburg, 1866.
- . “Obshchestvo drevnerusskogo iskusstva” [The Society of Old-Russian Art]. *Sovremennaya letopis'*, no. 1 (1865). Reprinted in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmyslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 102–07. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.

- . “Zametki o penii v prikhodskikh tserkvakh” [Notes on Singing in the Dioceses]. *Den'*, no. 4 (1864). Reprinted in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmislennii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 61–64. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.
- Ol'khov, K. A. *S. Taneyev. Izbranniye khori bez soprovozhdeniya* [Taneyev. Selected Chorals without Accompaniment]. 2nd ed. Leningrad: Muzika, 1972.
- Olkhovskiy, Yuri. *Vladimir Stasov and Russian National Culture*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: UMI Research Press, 1983.
- Panayotova, Miroslava Ivanova. “In search of ‘Russianness’: Russian National Idioms in Aleksandr Glazunov’s Sonata no. 1 for piano, op. 74.” PhD thesis, The University of Arizona, 2012.
- Pashina, O. A., Ye. Ye. Vasil'yeva, N. Yu. Danchenkova, Ye. A. Dorokhova, V. A. Lapin, and I. V. Matsiyevskiy, *Narodnoye muzikal'noye tvorchestvo* [Folk Musical Art]. Edited by O. A. Pashina. St. Petersburg: Kompozitor, 2005.
- Pipes, Richard. *Russia Under the Old Regime*. Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1974.
- Plotnikova, N. Yu., comp. *Taneyev S. I. Dukhovnaya muzika* [Taneyev S. I. Sacred Music]. Moskva: Moskovskaya konservatoriya, 1999.
- . “Trudi S. I. Taneyeva po teorii kontrapunkta” [S. I. Taneyev’s Writing on the Theory of Counterpoint]. *Istoriya muziki: teoriya i istoriya*, no. 6. Moscow: Gosudarstvenniy Institut Iskusstvoznaniya (2012): 5–39.
- Pobedonostsev, K. P. *Moskovskiy sbornik* [Moscow Collection]. Moscow: Sinodal'naya Tipografiya, 1896.
- Potulov, N. M. *Rukovodstvo k prakticheskomu izucheniyu drevnego bogosluzhebnoy peniya pravoslavnoy Rossiyskoy tserkvi* [The Guidance to Practical Study of Singing of Russian Orthodox Church]. 4th ed. (without changes). Moscow: Sinodal'naya tipografiya, 1888.
- Potyomkina, N. A. “Stilevoye raznoobraziye neizmenyayemikh pesnopeniy sovremennogo tserkovnogo obikhoda” [Stylistic Diversity of Unchangeable Chants of Contemporary Church Cycle]. *Vestnik*, no. 2. Moscow: RAM im. Gnnessinikh (2008): 21–30.
- Pozhidayeva, G. A. *Pevcheskiye traditsii drevney Rusi: Ocherki teorii i stilya* [Singing Traditions of Old Rus': Essays of Theory and Style]. Moscow: Znakh, 2007.
- Pravdin, A. M., ed. *Voronezhskkiye Yeparkhialniye Vedomosti* [Voronezh Diocesan Gazette]. Voronezh, 1866–1917.
- Pravoslavnaya Éntsiklopediya* [Orthodox Encyclopaedia]. Edited by Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia. 45 vols. *Pravoslavnaya Éntsiklopediya*. 2000–. Also available at <http://www.pravenc.ru/vol.dop.html>.
- Preobrazhenskiy, A. V. *Kul'tovaya muzika v Rossii* [Cult Music in Russia]. Edited by B. V. Asafyev. Leningrad: Academiya, 1924.

- Prokhorov, Vadim. *Russian Folk Songs: Musical Genres and History*. Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow Press, 2002.
- Propp, V. Ya. *Russkiye agrarniye prazdniki* [Russian Agricultural Feasts]. Edited by I. A. Migunova. St. Peterburg: Azbuka, 1995.
- Protopopov, S. V. *Elementi stroeniya muzikal'noy rechi* [The Elements of Construction of Musical Speech]. Part 1. Edited by B. L. Yavorsky. Moscow: Muzikal'niy Sektor. 1930.
- Rakhmanova, M. P. Kommentarii [Commentary] to “Zhelatel'no li i vozmozhno li dal'neysheye sushchestvovaniye Obshchestva lyubiteley tserkovnogo peniya?” [Discussion on the Question of Whether Desirable and Viable the Further Existence of the Society for the Friends of Church Singing?] by P. D. Samarín. In *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmyslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of Rdmdm, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 316–21. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.
- Rakhmanova, M. P., ed. *Knyaz' Vladimir Odoyevsky. Dnevnik, Perepiska, Materiali (k 200–letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya)* [Prince Vladimir Odoyevsky. Diary, Correspondence, Materials (on the 200th Anniversary of His Birth)]. Moscow: Deká–VS, 2005.
- Rakhmanova, M. P., ed. *Stepan Vasil'yevich Smolensky. Vospominaniya: Kazan', Moskva, Peterburg* [Stepan Vasil'yevich Smolensky. Memoirs: Kazan', Moscow, St. Petersburg]. Vol. 4 of Rdmdm. Compiled by N. I. Kabanova. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.
- . *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmyslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of Rdmdm. Compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.
- . Vstupitel'naya stat'ya [Introductory Article] to “Liturgiya Petra II'icha Tchaikovskogo.” [The Liturgy of P. I. Tchaikovsky]. In *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmyslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of Rdmdm, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 159–67. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.
- . Vstupitel'naya stat'ya [Introductory Article] to “Rubezh vekov. Polemika o tserkovnom penii v gazete Moskovskiye Vedomosti 1899–1903” [Turn of the Century. Polemic on Church Singing in the Gazette Muscovite Vedomosti 1899–1903]. In *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmyslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of Rdmdm, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 413–20. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.
- . Vstupitel'naya stat'ya [Introductory Article] to *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmyslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of Rdmdm, edited by M. P.

Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 13–22. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.

———. Vstupitel'naya stat'ya [Introductory Article] to “1860–1870ye” [1860s and 1870s]. In *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmishlenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of Rdmdm, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 25–45. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.

———. Vstupitel'naya stat'ya [Introductory Article] to “Obshchestvo lyubiteley tserkovnogo peniya” [The Society for the Friends of Church Singing]. In *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmishlenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of Rdmdm, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 190–212. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.

Rapatskaya, L. A. *Istoriya russkoy muziki: Ot drevney Rusi do serebryannogo veka* [The History of Russian Music: From Old Russia to the Silver Age]. Moscow: VLADOS, 2001.

Razumovsky, D. V. “Muzikal'naya deyatel'nost' knyazya V. F. Odoyevskogo” [The Musical Activity of Prince V. F. Odoyevsky]. *Trudi Pervogo Arkheologicheskogo s'ezda v Moskve* [Works of the First Archeological Congress in Moscow]. Vol. 1. Moscow, 1869, 436–38. Reprinted in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmishlenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of Rdmdm, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 46–49. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.

———. *Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii. Opit istoriko-tekhnicheskogo izlozheniya* [Church Singing in Russia. Experiment in Historical-Technical Exposition]. 3 parts. Moscow: Ris, 1867–1869.

———. “Tserkovno-russkoye peniye (fragmenti)” [Russian-Church Singing (Fragments)]. *Trudi Pervogo Arkheologicheskogo s'ezda v Moskve* [Works of the First Archeological Congress in Moscow]. Vol. 2. Moscow, 1871, 459–67. Reprinted in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmishlenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of Rdmdm, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 116–24. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.

———. *Patriarshiye pevchiye d'yaki i podd'yaki i gosudarevi pevchiye d'yaki* [Patriarchal Singing Deacons and sub-Deacons, and the Sovereign Singing Deacons]. St. Petersburg: Findeizen, 1895.

Redepenning, Dorothea. “Muzikal'niy gorod Peterburg. Misli o dialoge kul'tur” [Musical City St. Petersburg. Thoughts on Dialog of Cultures]. *Neprikosnovenniy zapas* [Untouchable Heritage]. Translated by S. Shakhmalova. no. 4(30) (2003), accessed February 23, 2013. <http://magazines.russ.ru/nz/2003/4/redep.html>.

Reid, Robert Addison. “Russian Sacred Choral Music and its Assimilation into and Impact on the American A Cappella Choir Movement.” D.M.A. thesis, The University of Texas at Austin, 1983.

- Ridenour, Robert. C. *Nationalism, Modernism, and Personal Rivalry in Nineteenth-Century Russian Music*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: UMI Research Press, 1987.
- Riemann, Hugo. *Harmony Simplified or the Theory of Tonal Functions of Chords*. Edited by Augener. England: Augener, 1996.
- Ritzarev, Marina. *Eighteenth-Century Russian Music*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.
- Roslavets, N. A. "O psevdoproletarskoy muzike" [On Pseudo-Proletarian Music]. *Na putyakh iskusstva. Sbornik statey* [On the Path of Arts. Collection of Articles]. Moscow, 1926, 180–92. In *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, material'i, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence]. Vol. 5 of Rdmdm, edited and compiled by S. G. Zvereva, 311–15. Moscow: Znak, 2006.
- Russkaya dukhovnaya muzika v dokumentakh i materialakh* [Russian Sacred Music in Documents and Materials]. 7 vols. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002–2010.
- Ritsareva, Marina. *Kompozitor Bortnyansky: zhizn' i tvorchestvo* [The Composer Brotnyansky: Life and Oeuvre]. Leningrad: Muzika, 1979.
- Samarin, P. D. "Zhelatel'no li i vozmozhno li dal'neysheye sushchestvovaniye Obshchestva lyubiteley tserkovnogo peniya?" [Discussion on the Question of Whether Desirable and Viable the Further Existence of the Society for the Friends of Church Singing?]. 1905. Reprinted in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmislenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of Rdmdm, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 293–316. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.
- Samarov, I. [aka Lipayev I. V.]. "Tserkovnoye peniye" [Church Singing]. *Russkiy listok*, no. 97–98 (1900). Reprinted in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmislenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of Rdmdm, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 460–63. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.
- Sakhaltuyeva O. Ye., and O. I. Sokolova. *N. A. Garbuzov–muzikant, issledovatel', pedagog* [N. A. Garbuzov–Musician, Researcher, Pedagogue]. Edited by Yu. N. Rags. Moscow: Muzika, 1980.
- Savenko, S. I. *Sergey Ivanovich Taneyev* [Sergey Ivanovich Taneyev]. Moscow: Muzika, 1984.
- Schwarz, Boris. *Music and Musical Life in Soviet Russia*. Enlarged ed. 1917–1981. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1983.
- Shabalina, L. K. "Stolichniye i provintsial'niye muzikal'niye obshchestva 19–nachala 20 veka v Rossii" [Capital and Provincial Musical Societies of the Nineteenth and the Beginning of the Twentieth Centuries]. *Izvestiya Ural'skogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta* 59, no. 16 (2008): 269–79.
- Shaw, J. Thomas. *The Transliteration of Modern Russian for English-Language Publications*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.

- Shumsky, S. A. “Moskovskoye Sinodal'noye uchilishche i vrozozhdeniye natsional'noy dukhovnoy muziki (Materiali dlya razrabotka temi)” [Moscow Synodal College and Resurgence of National Sacred Music (Materials for Development of the Theme)]. n.d. Reprinted in *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, materiali, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence]. Vol. 5 of Rdmdm, edited and compiled by S. G. Zvereva, 420–36. Moscow: Znak, 2006.
- Shteinpress, B. S. *Stranitsi iz zhizni A. A. Alyab'yeva* [The Pages of Aliab'iev's Life]. Moscow: Gosmuzizdat, 1956.
- Skrebkov, S. S. *Russkaya khorovaya muzika XVII– nachala XVIII veka. Ocherki* [Russian Choral Music of the Seventeenth–Beginning of the Eighteenth Centuries]. Moscow: Muzika, 1969.
- Smirnova, É. S. *Russkaya muzikal'naya literatura* [Russian Musical Literature]. Edited by T. V. Popova. Moscow: Muzika, 2002.
- Smolensky, S. V. *Azbuka znamennogo peniya startsa Aleksandra Mezentsa 1668 goda* [Hornbook of Sign-Notated Singing of an Elder Aleksandr Mezenets of 1668]. Kazan': Tipografiya Imperatorskago Universiteta, 1888.
- . *Iz dorozhnikh vpechatleniy* [From Road Impressions]. St. Petersburg: Tipografiya glavnogo upravleniya udelov, 1906.
- . “Moskva. Sinodal'niy khor i uchilishche tserkovnogo peniya” [Moscow. Synodal Choir and College of Church Singing]. n. d. Reprinted in *Stepan Vasil'yevich Smolensky. Vospominaniya* [Stepan Vasil'yevich Smolensky. Memoirs]. Vol. 4 of Rdmdm, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by N. I. Kabanova, 231–400. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.
- . “Obzor Istoricheskikh kontsertov Sinodal'nogo uchilishcha tserkovnogo peniya v 1895 godu” [Review of Historical Concerts of Synodal College of Church Singing in 1895]. 1895. Reprinted in *Sinodal'niy khor i uchilishche tserkovnogo peniya: issledovaniya, dokumenti, periodika* [Synodal Choir and the College of Church Singing: Research, Documents, Periodicals]. Vol. 2 of Rdmdm, edited by S. G. Zvereva, A. A. Naumov, and M. P. Rakhmanova, 197–214. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.
- . “Ob ozdorovlenii program dukhovnikh kontsertov v Moskve” [On a Recovery of Program of Sacred Concerts in Moscow]. *Moskovskiy vedomosti*, no. 306 (1900). Reprinted in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmishlenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of Rdmdm, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 464–70. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.
- . *O blizhayshikh prakticheskikh zadachakh i nauchnikh raziskaniyakh v oblasti russkoy tserkovno-pevcheskoy arkheologii. Pamyatniki drevney pis'mennosti i iskusstva* [The Important Practical Targets and Scientific Studies in the Field of Russian Church-Singing Archeology. Monuments of Ancient Writing and Art]. St. Petersburg: Skorokhodov, 1904.
- . “O Russkom tserkovnom penii: v otvet g-nu Missalleidesu, protopsaltu tserkvi Svyatoy Fotinii v Smirne” [On Russian Church Singing: in Respond to Mr. Missalleides—a Lead Chorist of the Church of St. Fotinii in Smirna]. *Tserkovniye vedomosti*, no. 9 (1893): 352–59. Reprinted in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmishlenii sovremennikov*

1861–1918 [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 361–69. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.

Solov'yov, S. M. *Uchebnaya kniga russkoy istorii* [Educational Book of Russian History]. 1st ed. Moscow: Soldatenkov and Shchepkin, 1859.

Strakhova, N. P. *Russkaya kultura 10–17 vekov* [Russian Culture of the Tenth–Seventeenth Centuries]. Volgograd: VolGu, 2001.

Swan, Alfred J. “Harmonization of the Old Russian Chants.” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 2, no. 2 (1949): 83–86.

———. *Russian Music and Its Sources in Chant and Folk-Songs*. London: John Baker, 1973.

Taneyev, S. I. “Letter to P. I. Tchaikovsky.” 10 August, 1881. Reprinted in *P. I. Tchaikovsky, S. I. Taneyev: Pis'ma* [P. I. Tchaikovsky, S. I. Taneyev: Letters]. Edited by V. A. Zhdanov, 73–76. 1874–1893. Reprint, Moscow: Goskul'tprosvetizdat, 1951.

———. “Otziv o sochineniyakh, predstavlenikh na premiyu OLTP v 1885 godu” [Review of Compositions Submitted for a Prize of the *OLTP* in 1885]. *Moskovskiye vedomosti* (1885). Reprinted in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmisenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 221–22. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.

———. *Podvizhnoy kontrapunkt strogogo pis'ma* [Movable Counterpoint in the Strict Style]. Moscow: Jurgenson, 1909.

Taneyev, S. V. *Iz proshlogo imperatorskikh teatrov 1825–1856* [From the Past of Imperial Theatres 1825–1856]. Moscow: Katkov, 1886.

Taruskin, Richard. *Defining Russia Musically: Historical and Hermeneutical Essays*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

———. *Musorgsky: Eight Essays and an Epilogue*, Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1993.

———. *On Russian Music*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009.

———. “Others: A Mythology and a Demurrer (By Way of Preface).” In *Defining Russia Musically: Historical and Hermeneutical Essays*, xi–xxxii. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Tchaikovsky, P. I. “Predisloviye k pervomu izdaniyu Vsenoshchnogo Bdeniya” [Preface to the First Edition of All-Night Vigil]. Naples, 1882. Reprinted in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmisenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 186–89. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.

- Temperley, Nicholas. "Congregational Church, Music of the." *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed June 24, 2017.
<http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/subscriber/article/grove/music/48105>.
- Teterina, N. I. "Bortnyansky, Tchaikovsky & Jurgenson." *Iskusstvo muziki: teoriya i istoriya*, no.7 (2013): 5–22.
- Timofeyev, G. N. *A. A. Alyab'yev: Ocherk zhizni i tvorchestva* [A. A. Alyab'yev: Sketch on Life and Oeuvre]. Moscow: Jurgenson, 1912.
- Troelsgård, Christian. "Prokeimenon." *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed June 14, 2017.
<http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/subscriber/article/grove/music/40455>.
- . "Troparion." *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed June 14, 2017.
<http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/subscriber/article/grove/music/28455>.
- Undol'sky, V. M. *Zamechaniya dlya istorii tserkovnogo peniya v Rossii* [Comments on History of Church Singing in Russia]. Moscow: Universitetskaya tipografiya, 1846.
- Vakhromeyev, V. A. *Uchebnik tserkovnogo peniya* [Textbook of Church Singing]. Vol. 1. Belorussia: Minsk, 2000.
- Velimirović, Miloš. "Gardner, Johann von." *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed July 7, 2017.
<http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/subscriber/article/grove/music/10665>.
- . "Smolensky, Stepan Vasil'yevich." *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed December 4, 2016.
<http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/subscriber/article/grove/music/26029>.
- Velimirović, Miloš, Leonora DeCarlo, Irene Lozovaya, and Gregory Myers. "Russian and Slavonic Church Music." *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed November 27, 2016.
<http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/subscriber/article/grove/music/43458>.
- Vorotnikov, P. M. "Zametki po povodu rassuzhdeniy o garmonizatsii tserkovno-russkoy melodii" [Notes on the Discussion About Russian Church Melody]. *Trudi Pervogo Arkheologicheskogo Obshchestva* [Works of the First Archeological Congress in Moscow]. Vol. 2. Moscow, 1871, 474–75. Reprinted in *Tserkovnoye peniye poreformennoy Rossii v osmyslenii sovremennikov 1861–1918* [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of *Rdmdm*, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 137–39. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.

- White, John David. *Comprehensive Musical Analysis*. USA: Scarecrow Press, 1994.
- Wilcox, Keith Dwayne. *Russian Sacred Choral and Folk Music: A Multicultural Text for High Schools and Colleges*. Kansas City: University of Missouri, 1998.
- Wolfram, Gerda. "Stichëron." *Grove Music Online*. *Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed July 7, 2017.
<http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/subscriber/article/grove/music/26753>.
- Yakovlev, A. N. *Sumerki* [Twilight]. 2nd ed. Enlarged. M: Izdatel'skaya firma Materik, 2005.
- Yavorsky, B. L., and S. N. Belyayeva-Ekzemplyarskaya. *Struktura melodii: Konstruktsiya melodicheskogo protsessa. Vospriyatiye melodicheskogo dvizheniya* [Structure of Melody: The Construction of Melodic Process. The Perception of Melodic Movement]. Moscow: Mospoligraf, 1929.
- Yavorsky, B. L. *Uprazhneniya v obrazovanii ladovogo ritma* [Exercises in Creating of Modal Rhythm]. Part 1. Moscow: Jurgenson, 1915.
- Yevseyev, S. V. *Narodniye i natsional'niye korni muzikal'nogo yazika S. I. Taneyeva* [The Popular and National Roots of Taneyev's Musical Language]. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoye muzikal'noye izdatel'stvo, 1963.
- Zaytseva, T. A. *Sokrovishcha Rossii: Dukhovnaya muzika M. A. Balakireva. Issledovatel'skiye ocherki* [Treasures of Russia: Sacred Music of M. A. Balakirev. Research Essays]. Moscow: Muzika, 2013.
- Zemtsovsky, I. I. *Russkaya protyazhnaya pesnya: opit issledovaniya* [Russian Protracted Song: Synopsis of Research]. Leningrad: Muzika, 1967.
- Zhdanov V. A., ed. and comp. *P. I. Tchaikovsky, S. I. Taneyev: Pis'ma* [P. I. Tchaikovsky, S. I. Taneyev: Letters]. 1874–1893. Reprint, Moscow: Goskul'tprosvetizdat, 1951.
- Zvereva, S. G., ed. *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, material'i, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence]. Vol. 5 of Rdmdm. Moscow: Znak, 2006.
- . Vstupitel'naya stat'ya [Introductory Article] to "A. D. Kastal'sky i S. V. Smolensky" [A. D. Kastal'sky and S. V. Smolensky]. In *Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Stat'i, material'i, vospominaniya, perepiska* [Aleksandr Kastal'sky: Articles, Materials, Memoirs, Correspondence]. Vol. 5 of Rdmdm, edited and compiled by S. G. Zvereva, 573–79. Moscow: Znak, 2006.
- . Vstupitel'naya stat'ya [Introductory Article] to "Arkhivniye dokumenti" [Archival Documents]. In *Sinodal'niy khor i uchilishche tserkovnogo peniya: issledovaniya, dokumenti, periodika* [Synodal Choir and the College of Church Singing: Research, Documents, Periodicals]. Vol. 2 of Rdmdm, edited by S. G. Zvereva, A. A. Naumov, and M. P. Rakhmanova, 261–87. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turi, 2002.
- . Vstupitel'naya stat'ya [Introductory Article] to "Pomestniy Sobor Russkoy Pravoslavnoy tserkvi 1917–1918 godov. Materiali o tserkovnom penii" [Local Council of the Russian Orthodox Church 1917–1918. Materials on Church Singing]. In *Tserkovnoye peniye*

poreformennoy Rossii v osmislenii sovremennikov 1861–1918 [Church Singing in Russia after the Reforms in the Understanding of Contemporaries 1861–1918]. Vol. 3 of Rdmdm, edited by M. P. Rakhmanova, compiled by A. A. Naumov and M. P. Rakhmanova, 675–706. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turī, 2002.

Zvereva, S. G., A. A. Naumov, and M. P. Rakhmanova, eds. *Sinodal'niy khor i uchilishche tserkovnogo peniya: issledovaniya, dokumenti, periodika* [Synodal Choir and the College of Church Singing: Research, Documents, Periodicals]. Vol. 2 of Rdmdm. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoy kul'turī, 2002.