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Abstract

It is a matter of record that while music in the West steadily incorporated polyphony from the ninth century onwards, sacred music in Russia remained largely monophonic until around mid–17th century, when Western–style polyphony (partesny) suddenly appeared and was incorporated. However, the extant literature does not provide any fully satisfactory explanation for the success of this sudden incursion of polyphony, after almost seven centuries of concerted monophony. Accordingly, in this thesis, I examined the period from 1650–1750 in detail, to clarify the factors either promoting, or inhibiting, the abrupt appearance of polyphony. I identified several powerful pre–existing inhibitors, which I conclude had collectively barred polyphony up to mid–17th century. These included religious opposition, geographical isolation, a lack of training facilities and of singers capable of part singing, and musical roadblocks in the traditional Russia monophonic canon. I proposed that the appearance of partesny was directly and temporally related to the softening and eventual disappearance of these inhibitors. In addition, numerous promoters of polyphony long operative in the West, that had previously been largely absent in Russia, emerged gradually as inhibitors waned.

I conclude that the array of inhibitors identified played a primary role in successfully holding polyphony at bay until mid–17th century, with an additional lack of promoters playing a secondary role. I further suggest that while the secular music that developed subsequently in the 18th and subsequent centuries could have incorporated polyphony independently of sacred music at several different historical time points, ingress of polyphony into Russian liturgical music may only have been practically possible in the period from 1650–1750. Failing that, it is plausible that Russia’s sacred music could have remained largely monophonic to the present day, as is the case for Greek sacred music.
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Up to the ninth century, Christian church music was generally sung monophonically (in unison), a cappella (unaccompanied), and by men only. Thereafter, in Western Europe, church music began to be harmonised and sung polyphonically (in parts), and eventually with addition of instrumental accompaniment (organs and later orchestras), and also women and boys. In contrast, Russia church singing remained steadfastly in unison, unaccompanied, and sung by men only. Then in the 17th century, Western–style part singing (termed partesny in Russia) suddenly and unexpectedly appeared and was incorporated into Russian music. This abrupt appearance of part singing, after many centuries of singing in unison, has never been fully explained, and this sudden shift was therefore the focus of this thesis. Three possible explanations were examined. The first was that the later appearance of part singing was a result of much slower cultural development in Russia than in the West. I concluded that this was insufficient as an explanation. A second possibility was that Western part singing grew out of some earlier experiments with Russian part singing that occurred in Novgorod during the 16th century. However, such Novgorod part singing was limited to a few larger cities, and soon died out. More importantly, early ‘indigenous’ part singing was clearly different from the Western version that appeared in Russia from mid–17th century. The third possibility was a change in the balance between factors encouraging the development of part singing (promoters) and factors slowing it down (inhibitors). Analysis showed a lack of promoters in Russia up to the 17th century, as compared with the West, where polyphony was already well developed. More importantly, I was able to define a tangle of potent inhibitors that had effectively blocked the entry of part singing over previous centuries. These inhibitors then suddenly softened and disappeared over the period studied (1650 – 1750), allowing Ukrainian and eventually European singers to bring Western part singing to Russia. Boys were then added to Russian church choirs (early 18th century). However, unlike in the West, Russian sacred music is still sung to this day without any musical instruments.

Although I was not able to visit Russia and Ukraine to view possibly relevant materials, due to a combination of the Covid Pandemic and then Russia’s invasion of Ukraine, this study clearly shows that the main factor surrounding the sudden changeover from unison to part singing was a series of powerful inhibitors specific to Russia. These all disappeared starting in mid–17th century, allowing polyphony to take hold in both sacred and secular music.
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Proem

‘To sing a sacred text is to pray’

Anon.

Sometimes when I glance at the titles of theses gathering dust in the bowels of a library, I find myself wondering ‘why’, or ‘seriously’, or worse ‘what’s the point’? Dissertations in unfamiliar fields may give rise to more pungent reactions, even active derision as in the controversial ‘Golden Fleece Awards’ of USA Senator William Proxmire.¹ On the other hand, the value proposition of the in–depth research involved in a dissertation is not always straightforward to quantitate or appreciate, and it is a brave soul that can confidently predict the many possible consequences of a body of somebody else’s work, however nugatory it may seem to be on first consideration. Above all, every thesis can be presumed to have its story, with a rationale born of the author’s passion. Why else would anyone devote years of their lives labouring on one? The latter has certainly been true for me.

I had the great advantage as a child of being marinated in music, mostly classical. My parents refused to have a TV in the house, and music played on the radio constantly. Music was also a big part of the schools I attended in the 1950s and 1960s. I played the French Horn in the band and orchestra, and sang regularly in several choirs.² Once I had built a crystal set, and later my own radio, I could listen ad lib to more music, and expand my musical horizons further. I was also blessed that in my lifetime, scratchy old 78s evolved – into LPs, tapes, CDs, and eventually the vast online musical bazaar of the Internet. I can now listen to whatever I wish, whenever I choose. The result is that I have enjoyed classical music all my life, both as a listener, and as an enthusiastic, if workaday amateur performer. It has always been what I do when I have a spare moment, or need a boost.

I first heard Russian sacred music when I was 7 or 8 years old. I was complying, reluctantly, with the instruction to go to bed, but became entranced by what came on the radio. My mother told me about Russian church choirs, and I drifted off to sleep with vivid images of women wearing head scarves, and bearded men, lit by candles and singing to God. Frustratingly, for many years during the Soviet era, I did not hear any more Russian sacred music on the radio, nor find any in the large collection of vinyl LP records at the local library. Then, in an amazing coincidence, I heard the same piece on the radio a decade later, and was able to identify it – Gretchaninov’s ‘Litany of Fervent Supplication.’ Later, in rapid succession, the Soviet Union collapsed, the first CDs of Russian sacred music appeared in the West, Western choirs started to tackle this genre, and my own choir sang selected pieces from Rachmaninov’s extraordinary ‘All Night Vigil’ (Vespers). I was hooked!

With the advent of the Internet, and more particularly of YouTube, a profusion of Russian sacred music recordings has appeared like magic and is now available freely in the West. That was when I first heard recordings of smaller ensembles and

¹. Severo, ‘William Proxmire’. These were public awards satirising the ‘squandering’ of public taxpayer money in research dismissed by Proxmire as ‘useless’ or ‘frivolous’.

². Formal musical education in UK schools has atrophied over the past few decades.
also of Old Believers (see Chapter 1). I realised that Russian liturgical music wasn’t always sung in the full, mixed voice polyphony of Gretchaninov and Rachmaninov that I had first heard, but could also be chanted by men only and in unison. I then learnt that Russian sacred music had remained largely monophonic up to the 17th century, and then suddenly incorporated part singing, long centuries after polyphony began to develop in the West. This apparent incongruity intrigued me, and I became obsessed with learning more. However, there were some real stumbling blocks. From a practical standpoint, as a medical doctor, researcher and educator, I simply had no time, and studies of Russian sacred music simply had to wait – ultimately until I retired. I also had no formal education in music, and so undertook courses in Music and Theory at the University of Edinburgh, and worked my way through ABRSM Theory Exams. I became an active participant in the International Society for Orthodox Church Music (ISOCM). I was warmly welcomed, made a couple of presentations, and began to build a network of musician and musicologist colleagues. Lacking familiarity with the basic musicology literature on Russian sacred music, I worked my way through the publications available in English. Another issue was that I had personal experience of Anglican, Presbyterianism and Catholic liturgies and worship, but was woefully ignorant on the specifics of Orthodoxy. Fortunately, I was able to take advantage of an Orthodox Pilgrimage visiting a series of Russian monasteries and churches, and was privileged to have some wide-ranging discussions with several Orthodox priests who generously made time for me.

Thus prepared – after a fashion – I felt sufficiently confident to start a blog. The great leap occurred when I resolved to undertake a research PhD. This allowed me access to all the courses required for BMus and Masters’ degrees, but there were now two new problems, namely accessing all the relevant sources in Russian, and becoming sufficiently proficient in Russian to read it. My Russian was strictly tourist book level, and required a major upgrade. The difficulty with access to relevant materials has been substantially more taxing, and is discussed in detail in the Introduction.
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Miscellaneous Notes

The ‘Old Style’ or ‘Julian’ calendar was introduced by Peter the Great. It remained in general use in Russia until 1918, and is still used by the Russian Orthodox Church today. Consequently, any dates given in days and months in this thesis are in Julian, or Old Style (OS). These dates lag behind the New Style (NS) dates of the Gregorian calendar adopted by the West – e.g., by 9 days in the 16th century, 10 days in the 17th century, and so on up to 13 days in the 20th century.

Capital letters are used for names, proper nouns, and for languages and nationalities, although the Russian language does not use capitals for the latter. This thesis includes numerous words from other languages, notably Russian but also some Ukrainian, Greek, Latin, Polish, German, and French words. For this reason, abbreviations are generally avoided. When potentially unfamiliar non-English words are first introduced, they appear in italics, followed by translation or explanation in brackets e.g., *mnogogolosiye* (many voices, i.e., polyphony).

Modern Cyrillic Letters, and Their Roman Transliterated Equivalents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cyrillic</th>
<th>Roman Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>А а</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Б б</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>В в</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Г г</td>
<td>g (Ukrainian h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Д д</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Е е</td>
<td>e/yei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ё ё</td>
<td>yo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ж ж</td>
<td>zh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>З з</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>И и</td>
<td>i (Ukrainian y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Й й</td>
<td>yi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>К к</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Л л</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>М м</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Н н</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>О о</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>П п</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Р р</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>С с</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Т т</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>У у</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ф ф</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Х х</td>
<td>kh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ц ц</td>
<td>ts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ч ч</td>
<td>ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ш ш</td>
<td>sh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Щ щ</td>
<td>shch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ь</td>
<td>strong (unpronounced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ыы</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ь</td>
<td>weak (unpronounced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Э э</td>
<td>eh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transliterations from Russian or Ukrainian generally follow the *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*,4 with minor modification – ы as 'y' and иї as 'y' in personal names (see footnote above). In the case of familiar names, where standard, Anglicised transliterations are in common usage, viz. Tchaikovsky, Rachmaninov, and Moscow, these are used rather than Chaikovskiy, Rakhmaninov, and Moskva. However, in the bibliography, transliteration follows the form of the citation. In addition, I have favoured 'Kyiv' and 'Kyivan' throughout, rather than 'Kiev' and 'Kievan'. Where names of composers have variant spellings, the language of the most relevant country is used. Thus, in the particular case of Ukrainian musicians who spent most of their lives in, and are known for their works in Russia, I generally use Russian versions of their names e.g., Dmitry Bortniansky rather than the Ukrainian form Dymytro Bortnians’ky.

Introduction

There's a thread you follow. It goes among things that change. But it doesn't change.
People wonder about what you are pursuing.
You have to explain about the thread.
But it is hard for others to see.
While you hold it you can't get lost.
Tragedies happen; people get hurt or die; and you suffer and get old.
Nothing you do can stop time's unfolding.
You don't ever let go of the thread.

William Stafford

Background

In the mid-17th century, the gulf between Western Europe and Russia was enormous, and nowhere more so than in their music. In the West, polyphony had been actively explored and developed, if not always reliably or immediately written down, since at least the ninth century.\(^5\) This appears to reflect the combined, enabling effect of several ‘promoters’. For example, although originally sung in unison by adult men, Western sacred music progressively incorporated women and child singers, as had long been the case in traditional folk music. The wide range of voice pitches led naturally to sacred singing at octaves, and other intuitive intervals e.g., at thirds. Another ‘promoter’ was the innate tendency of humans to experiment and compete vocally. The added beauty possible with harmonisation and the relative lack of serious inhibitors then meant that part singing evolved organically in the West. By the early 17th century, polyphony had been incorporated into religious music for more than half a millennium, and was driving development of a parallel thread of instrumental music. Instruments were also being combined with voice to create accompanied sacred music, and later orchestral secular choral music including opera. Stave notation that facilitated the clear setting out of music in parts on paper, and its printing, was another promoter, and in turn this began to drive musical literacy. Modern major: minor tonality was close to its modern form. Further, musicians were becoming professionalised and were increasingly paid to perform, in public venues outside church. A cadre of named composers was testing the bounds of vocal, and instrumental, polyphony, and opportunities were proliferating for experience and training in vocal technique and music theory, both in choirs and institutions of higher education. Polyphony had become the norm in both sacred and secular music, and both these musical threads were developing rapidly.

Russia’s musical life approaching mid-17th century was very different. Any Western musician venturing there would surely have been surprised, perhaps even shocked, to learn just how different (detailed in Chapter 1). Thus, liturgical music was still sung primarily from memory, rather than from written music as increasingly in the West. Notation was less well developed, and still depended on difficult-to-read idiographic neumes that were not print–friendly, and which had been largely abandoned in the West. Musical literacy was a rarity. Singing was pre–tonal, based on the Russian gamut, not much different from the Western gamut formalised by Arezzo and others

\(^5\) Erickson, ‘Musica enchiriadis, Scolica enchiriadis’ (see also Chapter 1, Music).
back in the 11th century. Singers were still viewed as artisans; many were priests and monks beholden to and closely controlled by the Church. Anonymity remained the norm, and Russia did not yet have any historical roster of named composers outside a handful of singing masters in 16th-century Novgorod. Sacred music was only performed in sacred spaces, and education in voice or music was rare outside a few major choirs of national importance. Instrumental accompaniment of sacred music was not permitted, and secular genres other than folk music were virtually nonexistent. As we shall see in Chapter 1, most of the promoters of polyphony evident in the West were simply absent in Russia in mid–17th century, and there were also several potent inhibitors of part singing. The result was that the canonical sacred music thread was still steadfastly monophonic, almost seven centuries after polyphony had begun in the West. These differences in liturgical singing would have been especially striking in a predominantly white Christian monarchy. However, our Western musician visitor might have been even more surprised at the abrupt, unexpected appearance in Russia of Western–style choral polyphony, or partesny (part singing), from around mid–17th century.6

This bald summary of musical differences between Russia and the West at mid–17th century, and the extraordinary blitzkrieg–like invasion of Western polyphony that followed in Russia, are acknowledged and recorded as a straightforward matter of fact in the musicological literature (see A Brief Historiography below). However, such accounts do not fully explain the extended previous dominion of monophony in Russia, nor adequately account for its sudden collapse from mid–17th century onwards, the twin questions that had engaged my own interest (see Proem). The few authors that do address these questions do so obliquely and without providing consistent answers. Many seem to intimate, without quite explicitly so stating, that the appearance of polyphony in Russia was simply delayed, due to an unusually long medieval period and cultural backwardness.7 Preobrazhensky opined that ‘by the beginning of the 17th century, the singing of Kyivan Rus (Russia) was fully saturated with the harmonic element, and all was prepared for transition to a polyphonic form.8 Another suggestion is that mid–17th–century partesny was derived from an earlier 16th–century form that appeared in Novgorod, although Morosan disputed this.9

These possible explanations seemed to me contradictory, superficial, and unsatisfactory. Further, my initial reading of the salient literature had strongly suggested a much more complex and nuanced interplay of factors, both facilitating and impeding the adoption of polyphony, that had not hitherto been dissected out and considered in detail. This thesis therefore focusses on the identification and characterisation of such putative factors – both promoters and inhibitors – in enabling the partesny that erupted in mid–17th century Russia, and the seismic shift away from monophony.

6. Gardner, Russian Church Singing, Vol. 2, 255 and 353, fn111. In the Russian literature, partesnoye peniye, partesny for short, is a standard term for Western–style part singing from this time period. I periodically use the expanded term ‘Western partesny’ to distinguish this form from earlier Russian polyphony (Chapter 1). N.B., in Russian, mnogogolosiye (many voices, polyphony) is used more frequently than polyfoniya (polyphony).
8. Preobrazhensky, Kul’tovaya muzyka v Rossii. [Culture of music in Russia], 143.
I should emphasise at the outset that while I am focussed on what was clearly a defining event in Russia’s subsequent music, and particularly the manner in which it happened, I am in no way suggesting that incorporation of polyphony was necessary, or even appropriate, for example to catch up with with the continuing development of polyphony in the West. Monophonic Russian liturgical chant in mid–17th century was highly–developed, with many different chant forms, and could boast an extraordinarily rich corpus of beautiful a cappella music. Moreover, there were, and still are, cogent liturgical arguments for holding to the simplicity and purity of chanting the liturgy in unison, in order to maximise support for and to illuminate the sacred texts being chanted. The complexities and ‘contrivances’ of polyphonic music have not infrequently been criticised as distracting from the primacy of the word of God, and of exalting liturgical music for its own effete, artistic sake. Two centuries before partesny arrived in Russia, a furious debate erupted within the Catholic Church in Europe, with serious attempts being made between 1480 and 1515 in multiple locations to prohibit and shut down the burgeoning use of polyphony in liturgical singing. The debate revolved around the question of whether part singing increased the magnificence of heavenly worship or amounted to nothing more than empty, earthly vanities (see also Chapter 4). My purpose in this thesis will be to dispassionately examine something profound that happened in Russian sacred music starting around mid–17th century – ergo the arrival of polyphony – while making no judgements as to its value.

Specific Research Questions
1. After almost seven centuries of steadfast monophony, what were the major promoters and inhibitors of polyphony in Russia approaching the mid–17th century, and how was this situation different from that in the West?
2. Was the adoption of Western partesny from mid–17th to mid–18th century primarily due to the appearance of promoters comparable to those in effect in the West, or the disappearance of long–standing local barriers in Russia?

The General Methodological Approach
My intended approach was to gather relevant historical and musicological analysis of the period from 1650 around the time of Western partesny’s first appearance, to 1750 when it had been accepted into Russia’s sacred music and was spreading across this vast country. This period from mid–17th to mid–18th century corresponds roughly to the Russian Baroque. However, I soon found that unlike in the West where a substantial body of records and scholarship extends back almost to the beginnings of polyphony in the ninth century, the amount of corresponding material detailing the arrival of part singing in Russia is much more limited. I discovered several obvious problems.

First and foremost, there is little or no expository commentary emanating from music scholars in mid–17th century, at the time that partesny appeared. Relevant accounts were generally written decades or centuries later, and likely incorporate views of events through ‘retroscopes’ and ill–defined, time–dependent filters. In part, this problem can reasonably be viewed as reflecting the turbulent sweep of Russian history. Throughout both Tsarist and in Soviet times, scholars of music have lived through unusually fractious and repressive political times. They have often been

subjected to harassment and pressure to work around or to project particular narratives in their scholarship, in order to ensure the freedom to pursue and publish their work, or even their personal wellbeing and survival. This difficulty is by no means unique, but it has been a recurring reality in Russia, and was especially true during the Soviet era when religion and sacred music were proscribed. The result is that relevant publications are often clustered in a relatively small number of historically ‘safer’ periods, when interference by the authorities in musical analysis and reportage was somewhat less prominent. In parallel, researchers and commentators have also faced restrictions in access to materials. For example, during the Soviet era, foreigners encountered major difficulties in visiting Russia and accessing materials. More recently, a combination of the Covid–19 pandemic, and the Russian invasion of Ukraine, have again closed off access to important documentary sources (see below). I am well aware that these realities may cause bias and misinterpretations, some of which may remain unrecognised in our reading today. Consequently, it is important at the outset to scrutinise more closely the materials available for study.

**A Brief Historiography of the Literature**

I first compiled a comprehensive listing of texts offering some combination of musical analysis and historical perspective, irrespective of the date of publication. I will refer to this body of work as musicological publications, even though the term Musicology as an academic discipline did not become formalised in Europe until mid–19th century, and shortly thereafter in Russia by Serov. Their historiography is considered here, and those actually accessible to me are then discussed individually below (The Materials Reviewed). Considering first the Russian literature, only a handful of texts date from the 17th century, the time at which Western partesny first came to Russian sacred music. Equally, from 1690 to 1860, there are just a few monographs. The first substantive body of musicological scholarship, comprised of a dozen or so publications, only appeared much later, during the pre–Revolutionary period that led up to the October Revolution (c.1860 – 1917). During the Soviet era (1917 – 1991), few musicological texts were published. The poor harvest of publications during this period is hardly surprising, given the barren soil then available for musicologists to till. Fairclough details the difficulties of accessing materials, avoiding ideological diktats, and of publishing religious musicological scholarship and commentary, as pervasive and protean. In contrast, during the post–Soviet era (1991 – present), there has been a relative explosion in publications. Extant musicological texts in other languages, primarily in English, reveal a not dissimilar pattern of historical distribution, with no publications during the Russian Baroque (c. 1650 – 1750) and succeeding century, a few during the pre–Revolutionary and Soviet epochs, and an abundance since the demise of the Soviet Union (The Materials Reviewed below).

I then examined some possible reasons for this uneven historical profile of musicological publications from 17th century to the present. One plausible explanation

---

13. Naumenko, *Textological Aspects of Musicology*, 65. This author discusses an article *Muzyka, muzykal’naya nauka, muzykal’naya pedagogika* [Music, musical science, musical pedagogy] from 1864, by the music critic and composer Alexander Serov; this publication was unavailable to me.
concerned the extent of geopolitical isolation of Russia, since troughs in publication occurred when Russia was cut off from the rest of the world and was inherently inward-looking – i.e., during the early 17th century, and in Soviet times. Conversely, there were clear peaks when Russia was more open to the West in pre-Revolutionary times and immediately after the end of the Soviet era. Intriguingly, my analysis of the transition from monophony to polyphony in mid–17th century indicated that geopolitical isolation was not just an impediment to publication, but also a prominent inhibitor of the incursion of polyphony (Chapter 1). Nevertheless, I stress that geopolitical isolation per se cannot adequately explain the limited harvest of musicological publications between 1680 and 1850. After all, this was a time when Russia became fully open to the outside world, and was recruiting immigrants of all stripes, with all deliberate speed (Chapters 2 and 3). In the field of music, native Russians began actively interacting with immigrant musicians from 'Southwestern' countries neighbouring Russia (viz Ukraine, Belarus, Poland and Lithuania), and from Europe. Moreover, much polyphonic sacred music was being created and performed. The upshot is that with geopolitical isolation at a palpably low level, this period between 1680 and 1860 should theoretically have yielded not a trough in publications, but a substantial peak.

To search further for an explanation for the seemingly missing publication peak between 1680 and 1860, I next considered the national literacy rate going into this period. Mironov puts this at just 4.5% in Russia, as compared with France (14–29%), Britain (31–47%), and the USA (33–65%). However, I stress that the literacy rate in Russia in 1889, midway through the dramatic pre–Revolutionary flowering of musicological publications, was still substantially lower than in the West (13–33% as compared with around 90%). More to the point, parish and monastic clergy, who were heavily involved in sacred singing and thus best placed to generate relevant musicological texts, were generally literate well before Western partsys arrived. Low literacy per se therefore does not explain the limited appearance of musicology publications before 1860, although it may have been one factor in the slower appearance of written music in Russia as compared with the West (Chapter 1).

I next focussed on the possibility that the Russian Church may have had a hand in regulating or limiting the number of publications. This is because, as noted above, many of the singers and others with musical knowledge and experience were monks and priests employed by, and beholden to the Russian Orthodox Church. In the early 17th century, the Church was a highly reactionary body that functioned as a theocracy

---

15 Findeizen, History of Music in, Vol. 1, 233–236 and 259–266. I use this 'Southwest' regional designation throughout to finesse the ticklish intricacies of shifting national boundaries and identities. In brief, Kyiv was the original capital of Rus, the precursor of Russia, and was razed by the Mongols. Ukraine was then occupied by Poland and Lithuania. In 1654, Ukraine underwent union in with Russia, was subsumed into the Russian Empire as Malorossiya (little Russia), and later into the Soviet Union, along with Poland, Belarus, and Lithuania. These countries have all since become independent. The current Russian invasion of Ukraine is supported by Belarus, and opposed by Poland & Lithuania. 'Ruthenia' is another designation used for the 'Southwest'.

16 Mironov, 'The Development of Literacy', 247; Houston, 'The Literacy Campaign in', 49–64.

17 Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 7–16. Morosan debates the relative roles of monks and clergy, and of the laity, in church singing prior to polyphony, and suggests that monks and priests were primarily responsible.

18 Mironov, 'The Development of Literacy', 231. This estimates the number at 100% literacy for parish priests, and around 70% for monastic priests at mid–17th century.
in all but name. Both Filaret, (Patriarch from 1619–1634, Chapter 1) and Nikon (Patriarch from 1652–1658, Chapter 2), articulated the supremacy of Church over State in stentorian and muscular fashion. Both expected to be addressed as Velikiyi Gosudar (Great Sovereign), even by the Tsar. The mighty Russian Church hierarchy was certainly not favourably disposed to any unsolicited musicological commentary about liturgical music, nor for that matter any deviation from traditional canonical music. Indeed, I will conclude that religious opposition to change in general was a powerful and longstanding inhibitor of the liturgical uptake of polyphony (Chapter 1). Consistent with this, the Church roundly denounced the highly popular, secular folk music practiced by Skomorokhi (jongleurs), which offended both in being polyphonic, and instrumented. These itinerant street musicians were hated, demonised and persecuted (see Chapter 1).

The Church also controlled the mechanisms for creation of enduring materials in music and scholarship, both in the production of manuscripts in monastic scriptoria and later in the first printing press in Russia, the Pechatnyi dvor (Moscow Print Yard) set up by Ivan IV (The Terrible) in 1553. In mid–17th century, it was controlled by the imperious Patriarch Nikon (Chapter 2). Even when Peter I (The Great) later abolished the powerful Patriarchate and created a dramatically–weakened Synod as just another office in his government (see Chapter 3), the Church continued to influence the output of Russia’s presses. The generally reactionary posture of the Russian Church outlined above indicates that this was a potentially important impediment to published scholarship.

I also considered the possibility that the poverty of musicological texts in Russia from 1680 to 1860 might have reflected limited opportunities for formal musical education, and a consequent lack of trained musical theorists. My reasoning was based on the fact that several European countries were by then implementing universal primary and secondary education initiatives, some of which followed an ancient trivium/ quadrivium syllabus model that explicitly included music. There was also a network of Latin schools in the West, such as the one attended by J.S. Bach, in which music played a substantive role in the curriculum (Chapter 3). Europe also included music education as part of higher education at a web of choral schools, universities, and some early conservatories (Chapter 1). Further, by early–17th century, the Southwest was well endowed with choir schools, ‘singing brotherhoods’, and universities offering choral training and education in music theory (Chapter 1). In contrast, musical education in Russia lagged at every level. Aside from instruction ‘on the job’ in the larger Russian church choirs (Chapter 1), the only didactic school for choral training established during the period of study (1650 – 1750) was actually set up in Hlukhiv (Glukhov in Russian), in Ukraine (see below and Chapter 3). Russia’s first universities in St. Petersbourg and Moscow did not open until 1724 and 1755.

---

19 Meyendorff, Russia, Ritual and Reform, 88–90. Direct comparison is infeasible, but by the 17th century, Western Churches were arguably less controlling, especially in the item of music sung.
21 Meyendorff, Russia Ritual and Reform, 106–107.
22 Bobrick, The Making of the, 129–134; Hosking, Russia People and Empire, 138–142. Despite the serious damage caused by Tsar Peter (Chapter 3), the Church succeeded in postponing publication of a complete Bible in Russian until 1876, a full decade after publication of Karl Marx’s ‘Das Kapital’ Note the comparable earlier opposition of the English Catholic Church to publishing the Bible in English.
23 Gardiner, Music in the Castle, 38–43.
respectively (Chapter 3). It is hard to escape the conclusion that musical scholarship amongst native Russians was underdeveloped in mid–17th century at the appearance of Western partesny, and remained so for some time thereafter. I conclude that this deficiency also constituted another substantive barrier to the incorporation of polyphony into Russia’s sacred music (Chapter 1).

Having examined some of the possible explanations for the missing peak of publications between 1680 and 1860, I next considered possible reasons for the wealth of publications in the pre–Revolutionary epoch from 1860–1917. The most immediately obvious factor is the appearance of a network of music conservatories in the larger cities of Russia during this period (see below). However, this begs the question of whence the large numbers of demonstrably skilled musicians came to staff these, especially given the lack of previous opportunities noted above for formal training of native Russians. The most plausible answer is the urgent and massive recruitment of trained non–Russian migrant polyphonists. The first wave of immigrant singers and musicians began in mid–17th century. This was constituted of singers from the Southwest, and especially from Ukraine and Belarus.  Such singers were predominantly Slavic and familiar with Orthodox tradition. They had already incorporated Western polyphony, and a square–note form of stave notation, into their liturgical music in the previous century (Chapter 2). A second wave of migrants starting in the first half of the 18th century consisted of trained, ex–patriate singers and other musicians arriving from Italy and other Western European countries. This was a direct result of the aggressive opening up of Russia to Europe by Peter I, which effectively dispensed with geopolitical isolation (Chapter 3). The third wave involved trebles. This followed the incorporation of boy voices early in the 18th century. Vocal training was outsourced to a boy’s choral school in Hlukhiv, the then administrative capital of the Ukrainian Hetmanate (Chapter 3). Alumni of this school included some of the most prominent of the next generation of Russian sacred music composers (see below).

One can imagine such musical migrants might have harboured doubts about a lengthy, difficult move to the ‘Wild East’, but job prospects may nonetheless have seemed good to the many Western musicians competing to scratch out a living in the crowded musical milieu of Europe. Notably, Ritzarev reports that in 1726, J.S. Bach wrote to Georg Erdmann, in the court of Tsarina Catherine I the widow of Peter I, to enquire about a position in the Russian court. Equally, Mozart apparently prevailed upon Count Razumovsky, then Russian Ambassador in Vienna, to treat with Prince Gregory Potemkin concerning a possible post in Russia. Obviously, neither Bach nor Mozart actually wound up in Russia, but it is tempting to speculate how these two extraordinary musicians might otherwise have changed the subsequent course of choral polyphony and Russian music more generally.

25 Harri, St. Petersburg Court Chant, 47–48; Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 39–42.  
26 A state ruled by a hetman (commander), perhaps a Slavic version of the German title hauptman.  
27 Ritzarev, Eighteenth–Century Russian Music, 1.  
28 Mooser, Annales de la musique [Annals of music], II: 466.
From the perspective of Russia, immigration of trained, experienced immigrants was evidently a convenient expedient to temporise the shortage of polyphonist native singers. Equally, it was probably an important factor in the pre–Revolutionary peak in musicological publications. On the other hand, Russia’s continued reliance on immigrant singers and other musicians through the 18th century had some unintended consequences. One was to enable continued postponement of provision for programmes and institutions of musical education within Russia (see above). Another was that while ex–pat Southwestern, Slavic singers could be expected to continue the process of embedding part singing that was appropriately Orthodox in form into Russia’s choral music (Chapter 1), European musicians were almost all Catholic or Protestant. Thus, while they helped to rectify the shortage of native Russian part singers, they were culturally, linguistically, liturgically and musically ignorant of Russian sacred music, and evinced little or no interest in performing or composing it. Their stock in trade was secular music, and especially Opera, which was then taking the world by storm and becoming de rigeur in Russia at court and in high society.  

This had direct consequences for the Tsar’s Choir, the leading liturgical ensemble in Russia (Chapter 1). While continuing to fulfil its traditional remit of singing the traditional Orthodox liturgy for the Royal family, albeit now polyphonically, this choir was now tasked in addition with performing secular music and opera, initially translated into Russian but eventually sung in the language of origin (Chapter 3). Such diversion into the new realm of secular works was hardly discouraged by the fact that successive Directors of the Tsar’s Choir throughout much of the 18th century before Bortniansky took the helm (see below), were immigrant European composers primarily of secular music. In addition, successive Tsars and Tsarinas, and especially Catherine II (the Great), increasingly demanded to hear this new secular music. Some accounts paint a picture of Russian sacred music taking a back seat to imported, instrumental, polyphonic music, and Italian opera. Morosan cites Metallov’s commentary ‘Upon the [operaic] stage, the technical aspects of the vocal art were developed, various subtleties of vocal performance were studied, practical methods of voice training were mastered….. accompanied by a loss of taste and attraction for the indigenous national style of singing that had been passed along from generation to generation’. This was hardly an ideal environment for serious musicological studies of Russian sacred music. In fact, migration of singers and musicians resulted not only in the further development of polyphonic liturgical singing, but also...

29 Harri, St. Petersburg Court Chant, 64–65; Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 59–62 and 66. Harri reports that only two Italian composers, Galuppi and Sarti, out of the many migrating to Russia, produced any ‘Russian’ liturgical music.
30 Dunlop, The Russian Court Chapel, 1–3. This was originally founded as the Gesodarev pevchye d’iaki (The sovereign’s singing clerks) in the late 15th or early 16th centuries (see also Chapter 1). Since then, it has been variously titled; Dunlop suggested the term Kapella.
31 Harri, St. Petersburg Court Chant, 64–65; Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 60–61.
32 Harri, St. Petersburg Court Chant, 64–65; Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 59–62. Ex–pat European musicians serving successively as Director were: Francesco Araja, Hermann Raupach, Vincenzo Manfredini, Josef Starzer, Baldassare Galuppi, Tomasso Traetta, Giovanni Paisiello, Carlo Canobbio, Giuseppe Sarti, Gennaro Astaritta, Domenico Cimarosa and Vincente Martin Y Soler.
33 Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 57–60.
34 Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 59, fn63. Metallov’s publication was not available to me.
but also the birthing of a new, separate thread of polyphonic secular music in Russia (Chapter 3).

As the 18th century progressed, a new group of Slavic ‘classical period’ composers appeared in Imperial Russia. Of the five best–known of these ‘Classical Period’ composers, four were born in Ukraine – Maksym Berezovsky and Dmitry Bortniansky in Hlukhiv, Stepan Davydov in Chernihiv (Russian Chernigov), and Artemy Vedel in Kyiv. The fifth, Stepan Degtyarev, was born a serf in Belgorod, a few miles from the Ukrainian border. His rise to national prominence as a composer of Russian sacred music is detailed by Ritzarev. These composers received basic choir training as boys, and professional training as adults with prominent European musicians. They wrote secular as well as sacred music. Bortniansky was particularly well regarded in his day, and was appointed Director of the Tsar’s Choir in 1796, the first Slavic composer to hold this post after its long monopolisation by European musicians (see above). Some later authors, including Tchaikovsky, were less complimentary about Bortniansky, and Preobrazhensky carped about his ‘Italianate sound’ (see below). This group of ‘classical period’ musicians is often regarded as the first generation of professional composers in Russia. However, belying their strong, formal education, none left any musicological texts, quite unlike many of their Western counterparts of this period. I speculate that this may have to do with continuing trepidation of musicians in Russia to indulge in any printed pronouncements about sacred music, as against the increasingly independent status of musicians in the West (Chapter 1).

The turn of the 19th century brought a dramatic increase in state oversight of the composition and performance of sacred music. This responsibility was assigned to Bortniansky as the Director of the Tsar’s Choir by the Emperor, Paul (reigned 1796–1801). Together with an edict from the Church Synod in 1797, and a later ukaz (edict) from Emperor Alexander I (reigned 1801–1825), administrative procedures were put in place to reverse ‘Italianate excesses’, and specifically to ban the liturgical usage of the florid vocal pieces that had been encouraged by Catherine the Great. Although with funding shortages, the Tsar’s Choir initially shrank in size, Bortniansky moulded it into an outstanding ensemble, jointly influenced by his strong Italian musical ‘apprenticeship’ and his traditional Orthodox faith. Meanwhile the hold of the State over Russian sacred music continued to grow. Another ukaz put Bortniansky in charge of directing the publication of approved books of ‘Court Chant’. These provided officially approved versions of liturgical music with the explicit aim of

35 Ritzarev, Eighteenth–Century Russian Music, 264–287. His owner, Count Nikolai Sheremetev, repeatedly promised Degtyarev his freedom, but never made good on his word. Degtyarev was forbidden to earn any independent income, and worked anonymously, or under pseudonyms.
36 Harri, St. Petersburg Court Chant, 65–67; Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 69.
37 Preobrazhensky, Kul’tovaya muzyka v Rossii [Culture of music in Russia], 72; Tchaikovsky, ‘Letter to Adolph Brodsky’, April 15/27, 1882. Tchaikovsky wrote ‘I am editing Bortniansky’s Complete Works …. Since the generous Pyotr Ivanovich is paying me magnificently for my editorial work, I shouldn’t be complaining, but Bortniansky’s works are so poor in content, there are so many of them, and so monotonous are they, that from time to time I sink into profound despair.’ Preobrazhensky later scoffed that Bortniansky was ‘the Prima Donna of the Italian Operatic Scene’.
38 Lester, Compositional Theory, 323–347. This is a list of the extraordinary number of publications by Western musical theorists and composers of the 17th and 18th centuries.
39 Harri, St. Petersburg Court Chant, 65–67; Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 69–73. Bortniansky was not able to completely escape taking on responsibility for concerts of Western music, and in 1824 the Tsar’s Choir gave the World Premiere of Beethoven’s Missa Solemnis in St. Petersburg.
standardising performance of the repertoire, some of which was still sung from memory, and often discrepantly. He was also empowered formally to supervise the education of all precentors (vocal coaches); after training, these then fanned out to churches across Russia.40

The most substantive edict appeared in 1816. It required that all new sacred music be submitted to the Director of the Tsar’s Choir for approval – in a word censorship by the State. This new power was not much used by Bortniansky. However, his successors as Director, Aleksei L’vov and Nikolai Bakhmetev, approved almost no new compositions, other than their own and those of a few other composers closely associated with the Tsar’s Choir.41 In this way, the function of the Tsar’s Choir had been expanded from provision of private liturgical singing for the Royal family, to include secular singing, formal choral training, and now direct administrative control (with the Tsar) of all church music across the entire Empire. Predictably, this actively chilled the publication both of new sacred compositions, and I surmise also of related musicological texts, further contributing to the missing publication peak prior to 1860. This is very different from the profusion of academic theorists and musicological publications emanating from the West at that point.42

Censorship of sacred music was eventually struck down in 1881, through legal action by the music publishers, Jurgenson, who took the Tsar’s Choir to court over their ban on the publication of Tchaikovsky’s setting of the Liturgy of St. John Chrystosom.43 More significantly, a web of institutions for formal instruction in music was now appearing, bringing opportunities for formal educational opportunities that had previously been lacking. The first institutions were the Russian Music Society (1859), and the St. Petersburg Conservatory (1862), both largely the work of Anton Rubinstein. His brother, Nikolai Rubinstein, provided leadership for the Moscow Conservatory, which opened shortly thereafter, in 1866. Similar conservatories followed in several other major Russian cities, and together with Russian universities built out a national network of institutions offering higher education in all aspects of music, and a key point – in native Russian rather than in the smorgasbord of European languages employed previously.

Equally, the musical life of Russia was enriched by much new composition, including opera, and frequent public concerts. A cadre of professional music critics appeared, although their focus was more on the secular music of Slavophil composers (see below).44 More importantly, Russia now boasted a stable of trained academics steeped in the new traditions of Musicology.45 A burst of musicological publications ensued, although I stress that these could obviously not offer a contemporaneous

40 Harri, St. Petersburg Court Chant, 70–71; Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 78–81. These were also called Demestvenniki in Russian.
41 Harri, St. Petersburg Court Chant, 67–73 and 83–85; Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 81–83
42 Lester, Compositional Theory, 323–347.
43 Harri, St. Petersburg Court Chant, 84–85; Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 88–91. St. John Chrystosom was Archbishop of Constantinople, and one of the fathers of the Greek Church. He was called Chrystosomos (Greek for Golden mouth) because of his oratorical gifts. He is known in the Russian Orthodox Church as St. John Zlatoust; is viewed as one of the three Holy Hierarchs (along with Basil the Great, and Gregory ‘the scholar’ of Nazianzus).
44 Campbell, Russians on Russian Music, xi–xviii.
45 Williams, Constructing Musicology, 1–2.
account of the Western partesny that had arrived two centuries earlier, and were shaded by their strong Germanic provenance. Also, unlike Russian secular music, this burst of musicological scholarship was apparently slow to reach the West. The Frenchman Arthur Pougin, writing in 1915, did mention the substantial musicological text of Dmitry Razumovsky (see below), but opined that 'in Russia there is nothing that could strictly be called a history of Russian music'.

The 19th century also witnessed a parallel movement in Russian music comprised of dyed-in-the-wool Slavophils. The father of these Romantic era musicians was Mikhail Glinka, whose ground-breaking opera, ‘My Life for the Tsar’, published in 1838, propelled him to fame. He was followed by the Kuchka (The Five, the Bunch, the Mighty Handful), the group of composers including Aleksandr Borodin, Tsezar Cui, Modest Mussorgsky, and Nikolai Rimsky–Korsakov, and led by Mily Balakirev. I note that despite their considerable musical achievements, the only one of this group to receive formal musical education was their natural leader, Balakirev. Campbell documents the appearance of a prominent and highly opinionated group of Slavophil music critics, including Herman Laroche, Prince Odoievsky Aleksandr Serov, and Vladimir Stasov, some of whom did receive musical training. Such Slavophils stridently emphasised the ideal of ‘Russian’ secular music, especially opera, and even criticised Tchaikovsky’s music as being insufficiently Russian. Disappointingly, they were disinterested in liturgical music, no matter how ‘Russian’, and they wrote no relevant musicological texts.

During the 20th century, World Wars I and II, civil war, uprisings, manufactured famines, political terror, and general chaos, resulted in the premature deaths of uncounted millions of Russians and other Slavic or Soviet citizens. Following the October Revolution in 1917, large numbers of musicians, and musical scholars left Russia. Few returned, and most rapidly subordinated any notion of musical scholarship to the need to make a living as composer, conductor, or performer. Meanwhile, those that remained in Russia faced a pervasive climate of fear, random denunciations, and liquidations. Often, particular groups in society were targeted. For example, consistent with Soviet proscription of religious observances, many thousands of priests, including those of higher rank up to the Patriarch, were imprisoned and/ or liquidated. Churches and monasteries in their thousands were

47. Garden, ‘The Five’.
50. Lowe, Savage Continent, 12–17; Snyder, Bloodlands, 415–417. World War II (the Great Patriotic War) alone saw the death of around 27 million Russians. Millions more died in the Gulags (1930–39), political famines such as the Holodomor in Ukraine (1932–33), Stalin’s Great Purge (1939–1941), in Eastern Poland and Europe during WW II (1941–45) and in the Soviet Union after WW II (1945–1991).
51. Notable émigré musicians included Aleksandr Glazunov, Aleksandr Gretchaninov, Nikolai Kedrov, Mikhail Konstantinov, Boris Ledkovsky, Sergei Prokofiev, Sergei Rachmaninov, Konstantin Shvedov and Igor Stravinsky. Many did not adjust to life outside Mother Russia, and few wrote any sacred music other than Gretchaninov. Rachmaninov became known primarily as a pianist.
52. Christensen, The Making of the, 145–165; Snyder, Bloodlands. 78–86; Fairclough, 'Don't sing it on', 71 fn7. At Butovo, one of Stalin’s numerous mass graves, more than 1,000 of the roughly 21,000 summarily liquidated were priests. Their number included Metropolitan Serafim of Petrograd (St. Petersburg), and a disproportionate number of other senior clerics, whose presumed crime
destroyed or re–purposed for secular activities.\textsuperscript{53} Any activities involving sacred music became hazardous. Scholars of sacred music faced constant difficulties in accessing materials for study, public ‘naming and shaming’, and State control of the presses.\textsuperscript{54} There was also government control of every aspect of existence, backed up with political imprisonment and executions. Musicians and musicologists that remained in the Soviet Union gravitated to pursuits other than sacred music. At a minimum, they became very careful about performing or sharing their opinions. Musicological publications that did appear in Russia during the Soviet era are a testament to the bravery and determination of the authors that somehow managed to wrangle them into print. However, given the manifest hazards of authorship, not to mention the growing time gap from the original appearance of polyphony, I have treated the coverage of topics and the conclusions drawn as potentially suspect (see Livanova below).

There were also inconsistencies in the Soviet approach to sacred music which at first glance seem surprising or confusing in the West. Fairclough argues that these choices are in fact oddly rational.\textsuperscript{55} For example, despite the Soviet ideological prohibition of religion, the venerable Tsar’s Choir, renamed the Leningrad State Academic Capella, pulled off a handful of performances of Tchaikovsky’s St. Chrystosom Liturgy and Rachmaninov’s All–night Vigil during the first decade after the October Revolution. Beyond the courage of their director, this probably reflected the practical issue that there was yet no new Soviet music to perform. Thereafter, following the ascent of Stalin to power, the amount of Russian sacred music performed declined dramatically. Even then, exceptions still occurred, for example in the case of well–known composers such as Bortniansky and Berezovsky. However, the text was generally replaced with non–religious content, in a fashion resembling the contrapuncta (new text for an existing melody) that had appeared regularly in Western music from the early Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{56} Then, during the political thaw of the mid–1960s, Russian sacred music was again heard in performance, and in 1965 Alexander Sveshnikov conducted the first recording of Rachmaninov’s All–night Vigil. This was never released in Russia, but the Melodiya record company did offer it in the West, ostensibly as an example of Soviet musical achievement.\textsuperscript{57}

Meanwhile, the Soviet approach to European, as distinct from Russian, sacred music was different. An oddly–assorted repertoire of large–scale Western choral works remained a staple of concert fare throughout the Soviet era, except during the Great Patriotic War (World War II) when Russia was fighting Germany and European Axis powers, and in the ‘high Stalin’ era that followed until c. 1953.\textsuperscript{58} The rationale for this discrepancy appears to have been that Western sacred music was often in Latin viz.

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{53} Fairclough, ‘We should not sing’, 1–2.
\textsuperscript{54} Fairclough, ‘Don’t sing it on’, 73–78; Fairclough, ‘We should not sing’, 8–9; Naumenko, \textit{Textological Aspects of Musicology}, 15–22.
\textsuperscript{55} Fairclough, ‘We should not sing’, 21–22.
\textsuperscript{57} Contrafacta often rendered bawdy songs into quasi–sacred form, disguising or changing language.
\textsuperscript{58} Galbraith, ‘Historical Performance Norms and’, 254–258; Moody, ‘Rachmaninov’s All Night Vigil’, 124–129.
\end{footnotesize}
requiem settings, or in other languages that Russians could not be expected to understand. Also, unlike the a cappella tradition of Russian church music, Western sacred music was instrumental, and therefore did not sound like ‘proper’ Russian sacred music. It appears that performance of Western sacred works was intended to illustrate the cultural inclusivity and enlightenment of the Soviets, and the virtuosity of their performers in monumental pieces. In essence, even though musical education remained robust throughout the Soviet era, earlier geopolitical isolation (see Chapter 1) rose phoenix–like from the ashes, and 17th–century religious opposition to sacred polyphony (Chapter 1) was recast as opposition to religion. These factors had a predictable effect in suppressing musicological research and publications on sacred music, even though the number of trained musicologists had not fallen substantially. In marked contrast, the demise of the Soviet Union in 1991 removed both geopolitical isolation and opposition to religion and religious writings, and also greatly facilitated travel and access to materials. Musicological research on liturgical music and publications took off like a rocket.

Thus far, I have focussed this explication of the historically patchy body of musicological literature in Russia on the variable numbers of ‘willing and able’ authors, and periodic religious or political restrictions on their scholarship. However, the turbulent history of Russia raises another possible explanation, relating to the very real difficulty of creating enduring materials, both manuscripts and printed publications. As far as we know, the only printing press in Russia up to the latter part of the 17th century was the Moscow Print Yard. It was then under the control of the Church, and largely reserved for publication of religious texts (Chapter 2). Even when more presses were brought into service under Peter I in the 18th century, much of their capacity was taken up with his particular priorities viz. books on mathematics, science, warfare, and a tidal wave of new decrees and laws (Chapter 3). This was followed by state censorship of the 19th century (see above), which greatly restricted publication of new sacred compositions, and by inference of related musicology texts. The 20th century then brought rigid Soviet control.

Compounding such difficulties in the creation of enduring materials is the likelihood that some considerable number of manuscripts and books may have been damaged or lost. Unknown quantities of manuscripts were destroyed in repeated conflicts during Russia’s long development as a country and empire. Churches and monasteries were often specifically targeted, because of the riches they contained. Another hazard reported in historical accounts was the appalling fires that occurred regularly in the densely packed towns and cities of Russia. Traditionally, buildings were constructed largely of wood, which was plentiful, rather than of stone. Houses often included highly flammable pitch and thatch roofs. Large sections of Moscow were repeatedly consumed by conflagrations throughout the 16th and 17th centuries. This was a major reason that at the beginning of the 18th century Peter the Great

59 Fairclough, ‘Don’t Sing it on’, 69–70.
60 Hosking, Russia and the Russians, 122–127; Hosking, Russia People and Empire, 55–56. For example, during Ivan IV’s Massacre of Novgorod in 1570, St. Sophia, the oldest Cathedral in Russia (dating from early 10th century) and all the many other numerous monasteries surrounding Novgorod, were looted and seriously damaged.
61 Massie, Peter the Great, 5–6.
pragmatically demanded that his new capital of St. Petersburg be fashioned of stone (Chapter 3).\textsuperscript{52}

Then followed more deliberate attempts to provide professional curation, with use of dedicated stone buildings and professionals with expertise in preservation.\textsuperscript{63} In fact, in Russia, organised curation seems to have started quite early, and even preceded comparable initiatives in some Western countries. For example, the library at the Moscow Print Yard built in 1625 was in stone. Similarly, the Tsar’s Choir library moved to a new stone building in St. Petersburg in the early 1700s, and after the long war with Sweden ended in 1724, Peter I and his successors built a substantial web of new governmental buildings and storage facilities there, similarly in stone (Chapter 3), and began the process of centralising the storage of relevant documents for curation purposes.\textsuperscript{54} Peter I was an inveterate collector, and issued an ukaz in 1722 that all ancient documents and books in churches and monasteries across the Empire be brought to Moscow, whence they were moved again to his private library in St. Petersburg.\textsuperscript{65} In the following century, the Tsar’s Choir, and Aleksei L’vov in particular, engineered initiatives to gather in masses of musical and other manuscripts to St. Petersburg. This included one edict from the Synod to all dioceses in the land to submit manuscripts.\textsuperscript{56}

While in some respects, this new focus on collecting of documents into large, curated repositories in a few major cities such as Moscow and St. Petersburg was a sensible step, it did have downsides. During the collection process, there were extraordinary hazards in the process of transporting a wealth of irreplaceable manuscripts and books, often in open wagons exposed to the elements, across the poorly policed vasts of Russia. Worse, centralisation of documents in Moscow and St. Petersburg later resulted in massive losses, the true scope of which will never be known. For example, at the time of Napoleon’s entry into Moscow in 1812, a massive fire damaged or destroyed much of the city and many of the documents stored there.\textsuperscript{67} In 1826, an episode of fire at the archive of the Tsar’s Choir in St. Petersburg destroyed the entire stock of earlier documents.\textsuperscript{68} Later, shortly after the October Revolution in 1917, Bolsheviks dragged innumerable ‘bourgeois’ manuscripts and books out of this archive, and gleefully torched them in the square outside in a scene reminiscent of the Bonfire of the Vanities. There are also strong indications of official lists of books that were banned by the Soviets, and which were to be burnt or otherwise destroyed.

\textsuperscript{52} Massie, \textit{Peter the Great}, 360–363.

\textsuperscript{53} Simmons, ‘History of Museums’, 1812–1819.

\textsuperscript{54} Hosking, \textit{Russia, People and Empire}, 88–90. e.g., National Academy of Sciences and Hermitage Museum in St. Petersburg, many buildings in the Moscow Kremlin, and universities in both cities.

\textsuperscript{55} Massie, \textit{Peter the Great}, 815. When Peter died shortly afterwards, much of the resulting collection was moved yet again, to the Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg.

\textsuperscript{56} Razumovsky, \textit{Tserkovnaye peniye v Rossii} [Church singing in Russia], 1: 250; Dunlop, \textit{The Russian Court Chapel}; 15–27; Harri. \textit{St. Petersburg Court Chant}, 77–82. Although the Synod specified that copies of manuscripts be sent, it is unclear if copies or actual originals were sent.

\textsuperscript{57} Dixon, Simon. \textit{The Modernisation of Russia}, 40. Hosking, \textit{Russia, People and Empire}, 251. It is uncertain if the Great Moscow Fire was arson by Napoleon’s troops, or deliberate scorched earth policy on the part of the Russians. Regardless, Moscow was largely razed.

\textsuperscript{58} Dunlop, \textit{The Russian Court Chapel}, 3, The fire occurred in the archive of the Ministry of the Imperial Court, which was curated at the Central State Historical Archive in St. Petersburg.
on sight. We can infer that these included books on forbidden religious topics.69 Between 1941–1943, Leningrad (St. Petersburg) was under siege by the Nazis for 872 days and was massively damaged by bombardment and incendiary bombing. It is not known how many books and manuscripts survived the destruction. In fact, ever since the pre–Revolutionary period, musicologists have made often heroic efforts to compile collections of musical manuscripts surviving from the previous centuries (see below). Nonetheless, we will likely never know what might have been lost.

This brief historiography indicates several possible explanations for the historically uneven profile of musicology publications, chief among which appear to be geopolitical isolation, religious opposition and limited opportunity for formal education. I note that these same issues will later be found to constitute a dense barrier to the entry of polyphony prior to mid–17th century (Chapter 1). The practical result is that contemporaneous musicological coverage of the early days of Western partesny is almost non–existent. Some of the interpretations and conclusions drawn in the available literature from later centuries must also be treated with scepticism, especially in the case of retroactive accounts appearing centuries later. Even where multiple accounts of key events are available, confident triangulation is not always possible, and this complicates attribution of motivation and causation. A further unanticipated problem was the difficulty I experienced in actually gaining access to parts of the extant body of materials discussed above (see below). Given this, it is important to consider in further detail the publications that I was actually able to source for studies of promoters and inhibitors of polyphony.

The Materials Reviewed

A handful of music theorists are known to have been active in Russia around the time when Western partesny arrived in mid–17th century, and a few influential manuscripts appeared. The first was a treatise entitled Skazanie o pometakh ezhe pishutsia v peni pod znamenem, [A treatise on additional signs written in chant over the neumes]. Although this is usually attributed to the Novgorodian monk, Ivan Shaidurov. there is some lack of agreement. Findeizen states that it was written by Shaidurov, but provides no further details. Conversely, Gardner suggests this work to be about Shaidurov.70 Unfortunately, I have been unable to access this treatise, but its thrust is clear. Neumatic notation had long given only indirect indications of pitch, relative to preceding and succeeding neumes. Shaidurov is credited with devising kinovarnye pomyety (red cinnabar pitch marks), to provide a clearer indication of pitch.71 He is also thought to have rationalised the Russian Gamut.72 In that this is similar to the earlier Western Gamut (Chapter 1), he was presumably familiar with the earlier Western conceptualisation of hexachords and choral music.73 However, very little is known of his life, outside the fact that he worked in Novgorod, a city geographically and culturally close to the West (see Chapter 1).

69 Raskolnikov, ‘Open Letter to Stalin’. ‘You have revived the medieval burning of books. I have seen with my own eyes the long lists, circulated to Soviet libraries, of books that are to be subjected to immediate and unconditional destruction’.
70 Findeizen, History of Music in, Vol. 1, 108–110; Gardner, Russian Church Singing, Vol. 2, 319–322. The precise date on which this manuscript appeared is unknown.
The second important treatise from this period was penned by Aleksandr Mezenets, a monk and prominent theoretician from Kyiv, and an early representative of the first wave of musicians migrating to Russia from the Southwest (see below and Chapter 1). He became an elder at the St. Savva monastery, and eventually a proof-reader at the Moscow Print Yard. Mezenets compiled a comprehensive azbuka (alphabet) of the enormous repertoire of neumes then in use in Russia. This was entitled Izveshenie o soglasneishikh pometyakh [A report on the most consonant markings]. Stepan Smolensky (see below) edited and published this some two centuries later. Mezenets was tipped by Tsar Aleksei to head a commission charged with reform of church music and chant books in 1655. However, work was interrupted by an epidemic of plague, and was not completed until around 1668. This commission also had to contend with the convulsive period of the raskol (schism) within the Russian Church, which irreversibly sundered the New Rite with its now polyphonic music, from the Old Rite and traditional monophonic chant. The many hold-out starover (Old Believers) have hewed adamantly to monophony to this day (see below and Chapter 2). Mezenets also produced a treatise in which he laid out a system of black priznaki (pitch marks) designed to show reference pitch, as an alternative to Shaidurov’s red pomyety. Black priznaki were intended to make the books of chant under revision easier to print than red pomyety, but in the end the revised chant books were never actually printed and were released in manuscript form (Chapter 2).

The third important text in the 17th century came from another influential theoretician, Nikolai Diletsky, who was a composer in his own right. Jensen gives a thorough account of Diletsky and his Musical Grammatika (see also Chapter 2). Although details of his life are scanty, he was another Ukrainian, born most probably in Kyiv. He later worked at the University of Vilnius in Lithuania. This trajectory gave him extensive exposure to Western musical trends, from both an Orthodox and a Catholic perspective. Although the bulk of his Grammatika may have been written originally in Polish, he subsequently moved to Russia and published three editions in Russian in 1677 (Smolensk), in 1679 and in 1681 (Moscow). Each had slightly different titles, and the latest one included a work by another theorist, Ioann Korenev, on the topic of polyphony. The initial part of Diletsky’s treatise covered music theory, and particularly the concept of overlapping hexachords (ut, re, mi, fa, sol, lya). This was followed by a discussion of kliuch (key) and sharps and flats, consistent with emerging Western major: minor tonality. He also covered stave notation, complete with descriptions of different clefs. The second part of this treatise focussed specifically on compositional techniques for Western polyphonic music (see Chapter 2). This was illustrated with examples, including his own 8–part setting of a Divine Liturgy, and works of some Polish composers. There was also a diagram showing his version of the musical hand originally proposed by Guido de Arezzo.

74 Parfentiev, ‘Autographic Church–Choral Collections’, 77–83. This summarises Mezenets’ works.
75 Smolensky, Azbuka znamennago peniya [Alphabet of znamenny singing].
76 Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 37–38. This source was not available to me.
77 Harri, St. Petersburg Court Chant, 48–49; Jensen, Musical Cultures in Seventeenth–Century, 38. This source was not available to me.
Diletsky's *Grammatika* made extensive use of Italian musical terms. This is not surprising since it could be viewed as an account of Italian polyphonic music of the period, as viewed through Polish Catholic and Slavic Orthodox musical eyes. One other intriguing aspect of the *Grammatika* was the description, apparently for the first time anywhere in the world literature, of the circle of fifths. It is noteworthy that Diletsky's work was the first major musicological publication in Russian providing comprehensive coverage of the fundamental relationship among the 12 pitches of the chromatic scale, their key signatures, and major and minor keys. On the other hand, I note that the first musicological texts in the West, by such notables as Boethius, Aurelian, Hucbald and the enchiriadis authors (Chapter 1, Music) all date to 800 or more years earlier.80

Significantly, these three authors were all active around the time that Western partesny arrived in Russia from mid–17th century. It is not clear if this association is purely casual, or possibly causal. Diletsky's treatise was seminal in that it was the first account in Russian of Western polyphonic choral music. It was also available to the substantial class of composers harmonising traditional, monophonic chant that became active in Moscow in the latter half of the 17th century (see Chapter 2).81 These three publications all deal with particular musical issues, which I will argue had previously functioned at some level as inhibitors of polyphony (Chapter 1). However, beyond that, they do not engage at all with how Western partesny found its way into Russia's liturgical music, and why so abruptly at that particular point in history.

Over the next two centuries, during the aforementioned period of 'missing' musicology publications from 1680–1860 (see above), some monographs are known to have been published,82 but the next serious musicological work on monophonic chant and partesny did not appear until two centuries later. This was when the chair of Liturgical Music at the new Moscow Conservatory was occupied in succession by Dmitry Razumovsky, Stepan Smolensky and Vasily Metallov. The latter two also had leadership roles at the Moscow Synodal Choir, which was by then beginning to eclipse the Tsar's Choir (Chapter 1).83 These three academically-trained musicologists wrote extensive accounts of Russian sacred music. It is important to note in passing that although Razumovsky and Metallov were both archpriests,84 and would presumably have viewed events at least in part through the conservative lens of the Orthodox Church, their writings do not seem to project such a perspective overtly. Antonin Preobrazhensky was another prominent musicologist active in the

---


81 Findeizen, *History of Music in*, Vol. 1, 233–236. Findeizen credits the large volume of polyphonic sacred music from late 17th–century Moscow to the beneficial effects of Diletsky's manual on composers such as Vasily Titov, Nikolai Bavykin, Fyodor Redrikov, and Mikhail Sifov (Chapter 2).

82 Harri, *St. Petersburg Court Chant*, 36–39; Morosan, *Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary*, 86–87. Authors included: Yevgeny Bolkhovitinov (1799); Fyodor L'vo (1834); Vukol Undol'sky (1846); Ivan Sakharov (1849); and Aleksei L'vo (1858). I have not been able to learn the content of these monographs.

83 Morosan, *Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary*, 100–117. The successor to the Patriarch's Choir after abolition of the Patriarchate (Chapter 3); it languished in the shadow of the Tsar's Choir in the 18th century.

84 In Orthodoxy, Archpriest (or Protopresbyter) is used for priests with supervisory duties over other priests, or in several parishes.
pre–Revolutionary period. He worked at the Moscow Synodal School, the Tsar’s Choir, and the St. Petersburg Conservatory, and penned an important historical overview. He also studied the origin of Russian chant from Byzantine liturgical music. Several other scholars, including Yury Arnol’d, Archpriest Mikhail Lisitsyn and Vladimir Undol’sky, also published musicological texts.

This pre–Revolutionary class of scholars collectively laid the foundations of formal Russian musicology. In addition they produced a large and important body of scholarship relevant to traditional Russian liturgical music, based to a considerable degree on analysis of primary source materials. However, I emphasise that their collective contribution to our understanding of promoters and inhibitors of partesny at mid–17th century is less than might be anticipated. This is perhaps unsurprising, given that their accounts were written some 200 years after the initial incursion of Western partesny. After all, they viewed events through a 19th–century filter. Ergo, Russia was no longer the isolated, medieval, agrarian theocracy of the mid–17th century. It had by now undergone extensive Westernisation; built a powerful military (including a navy); repulsed invasions by Poland, Sweden, and France; created a modern, industrial empire; and transformed itself into one of Europe’s great powers. Secondly, in the late 19th century, the Russian musical enterprise had embraced the Germanic approach to musical education and musicology, rather than the earlier more Italianate provenance of 17th–century partesny. Thirdly, academic music in 19th–century Russia was by then consumed with the extraordinary developments underway in the separate secular music thread.

So, in contrast to traditional Old Believers, and also to strident Russophiles, 19th–century German centric musicologists appear simply to have accepted the incorporation of Western polyphony into sacred music as a natural step in Russia’s overall musical development – a matter of course, and not worthy of much comment beyond the fact of its occurrence. Their accounts of the polyphonic upheaval that had erupted in mid–17th century reflect this perspective. Relevant narrative accounts are descriptive and rather superficial, rather than detailed and investigative, and there is little curiosity about, nor analysis of, the promoters and inhibitors involved. I imagine this was a very different reaction from that of the rather bewildered Russian unison singers and churchgoers who had first been confronted with Western partesny two centuries earlier.

Following the October Revolution in 1917, and proscription of religious observances, a deep freeze descended on liturgical music and related research. Those musicians and musicologists that did not flee the country grew very careful in what they said and wrote. Some, like Pavel Chesnokov, simply stopped composing sacred works and pursuing scholarship. Preobrazhensky’s last major oeuvre was published in

---

86 These were not available to me.
87 Kornetova, *Russian Sacred Music of*, 12–13. Although many of today’s large documentary repositories in Moscow and St. Petersburg were already then in existence, relevant manuscripts were still widely scattered, and several pre–Revolutionary scholars compiled important collections.
89 Morosan, *Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary*, 235–238. Before the 1917 Revolution, Chesnokov had composed several hundred sacred works. He directed the choir in the Cathedral of the Saviour in Moscow, built to commemorate Russia’s victory against Napoleon in 1812. The
1924. It is notably different from his previous work, and toes the Soviet line, perhaps the result of some ‘negotiation’ with the new regime. For example, he reversed his previous positive opinion of Bortniansky, now criticising his work as overly Italianate and calling him the ‘Prima Donna of the Italian Operatic Scene’.  

He also included some provocative, critical comments on the Tsar’s Choir and Empresses Elizabeth and Catherine II that lend his work an anti-religious and anti-royalist slant. The other major work of the 1920s was a two-volume general history of music in Russia, published by the musicologist Nikolai Findeizen in 1928. This has been translated into English by Samuel W. Pring and edited by Milos Velimirović (see below) and Claudia Jensen (see below). This book provides an extremely detailed general historical account of music in Russia spanning the time of this thesis, although the coverage of liturgical music is relatively limited.

During the 1930s, Stalin’s Great Terror ratcheted up repression and a climate of fear, culminating in a further reduction in the number of musicology publications. One of the few publications from that period, a thesis by Tamara Livanova, was submitted in 1935 to the Moscow Conservatoire. It included consideration of both Russian sacred music and Western music, and included an important discussion of the contributions of Kant to Russian music (Chapter 2). However, it attracted harsh criticism from the Union of Soviet Composers, and accusations of disrespect for Russian music. Livanova was forced to ‘reconsider’ her approach, and to admit that she had overemphasised the role of Western influence and given short shrift to Russian musical identity. Her work was eventually published in substantially revised form in 1938. It now included fulsome accounts of the superiority of the motherland, and comments on the negative impact of sacred music on secular music. This dramatic change of heart shows the difficulties of accepting accounts and conclusions from musicological texts of the Soviet period at face value, without further scrutiny and triangulation.

Following the Second World War, the Iron Curtain came down. Later, in the 1960s, there was a degree of thawing in official State opposition, and Soviet researchers began to dig again into aspects of sacred music in Russia. This new generation of academic musicologists included Viktor Belyaev, Maksim Brazhnikov, Yury Keldysh, and Nikolai Uspensky, and the Ukrainian Nina Herasymova—Persyds’ka, (Russian—Nina Gerasimova—Persidskaya). The scope of these studies was broad, spanning both early monophonic chant and later polyphonic sacred music. Some International musicological meetings took place, but the Soviet Union continued to
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90. Preobrazhensky, Ku’tlovaia muzyka v Rossi [Culture of music in Russia], 72.
92. Findeizen, Ocherki po istoriyi muzyki, [Essays on the history of music]; Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 32–32. Findeizen also compiled a large collection of early musical manuscripts.
93. Findeizen, History of Music in, Volumes 1 and 2.
94. Dolskaya, Spiritual Songs in Seventeenth–Century, XV–XVI.
96. Velimirović, ‘The Present Status of’, 235–265. This article was commissioned to provide a summary of musicology research in Slavic sacred music undertaken in the 1960s.
97. Gerasimova–Persidskaya, Russkaya muzyka XVII veka [Russian music of the 17th century]; Uspensky, Drevne–russkoye pevcheskoye iskusstvo [Ancient Russian singing art].
impose a restrictive filter which again renders the extant liturgical musicological literature of that era somewhat difficult to interpret with confidence.

Interestingly, Brazhnikov, Belyaev, and Aleksandr Kastalsky, provided extensive accounts of narodnaya muzyka (folk music). This is in line with the strong desire of the Soviet regime to professionalise democratic, ‘Russian peoples’ music, as compared with ‘art’ music, which was often criticised as bourgeois and decadent. On wonder if an elective focus on folk music could have provided these musicologists with some cover for furtively working on Russian sacred music. On the other hand, there has long been serious speculation on the possible influence of Russian folk music on the early development of liturgical chant, and in particular native music distinct from that of the Skomorokhi (see above and Chapter 1). The obvious difficulty is that folk music generally involves a largely oral tradition, with little actually written down and most performed from rote memory. Comparative musical analysis becomes difficult or impossible, or at least mandates very different methodologies from those more applicable to written repertories. This invites conclusions based more on speculation than hard data. Nonetheless, as noted by Poliakova, the possible contribution of folk to sacred music was floated as far back as pre–Revolutionary times, and has been debated since.

The Cold War greatly restricted access to Soviet libraries and repositories for musicologists outside Russia and those writing in English. As late as 1984, Taruskin stated ‘we Americans will never gain freedom of access to the mother lode, the archives of Moscow and Leningrad. We had best leave them to the Soviets, who, as we all know from our personal experience, are determined that if major discoveries are to be made there, then they will make them’. Nevertheless, some scholars still managed to provide salient analysis. Alfred Swan was born in pre–Revolutionary Russia and studied at Oxford and Bristol Universities in England early in the 20th century, before moving to the USA to work at Swarthmore and Haverford Universities. In the late 1930s, he wrote extensively in English on Znamenny Chant and neumatic notation and provided a compendium of early Znamenny manuscripts. Another émigré, Milos Velimirović was born in Serbia, emigrated to the USA after World War II, and worked at Harvard, Yale, and the Universities of Wisconsin and Virginia. He wrote widely, also in English, on the historical sweep of Russian sacred music, and compiled an updated list of early monophonic manuscripts. He was the principal author of the entry on Slavic Music in the ‘Grove

---

98 Olson, Performing Russia: Folk Revival, 58–62. The Soviet Union provided strong support for folk music as a key element of Narodnost (a construct of nationality, ethnicity, and the common man). However, rather than the authentic village music actually performed by local amateurs, Soviet performances often involved sentimental, mass–produced ‘Folkloric’ (aka ‘Fakeloric’) versions, with large orchestras and professional singers. These were heavily promoted in the West, for example by the Red Army Ensemble.

99 Olson, Performing Russia: Folk Revival, 138–159. It is interesting to speculate on the strength of the Soviet passion for Folk Music and Narodnost. Could this be in part a substitute for that other great, forbidden component of Narodost, namely Russian Orthodox Christianity and its music?


101 Taruskin, ‘Some Thoughts on the’, 322.


Dictionary of Music'.\textsuperscript{104} Constantin Floros is a Greek–German musicologist who worked on deciphering early Russian Kondakarion notation.\textsuperscript{105}

The fall of the Berlin wall in 1989, and of the Soviet Regime in 1991, allowed a resurgence of active research into Russia’s liturgical music, both by native musicologists, and by those in the West now able to travel more freely to the former Soviet Union. Multiple publications and books were published, with some important new studies of polyphonic sacred music, including during the period of the Russian Baroque (1650–1750) that is the focus of this thesis. Natal’ya Plotnikova provided a particularly helpful and detailed musical analysis of both harmonised traditional liturgical chant and more florid \textit{kontsery} (concert pieces – see Chapter 2).\textsuperscript{106} Nina Herasymova–Persy’d’ska described the transition from traditional monophonic chant during the middle ages to polyphonic singing in the modern era.\textsuperscript{107} Both these authors’ work involved the extensive use of primary source material. Consistent with this, the focus is more on musical analysis and less on historiographic analysis of the factors promoting or inhibiting the appearance of Western partesny from mid–17\textsuperscript{th} century. One other recent publication by Irina Gerasimova did deal more directly with transfer and adaptation of Western musical technologies, although as a conference presentation its scope was somewhat limited.\textsuperscript{108}

I also note that several Russian musicologists, including Maria Bogomolova, Lada Kondrashkova, Anatoly Konotop, and Galina Pozhidaeva, have recently published studies of a time–limited form of Russian ‘indigenous’ polyphony dating earlier, from the 16\textsuperscript{th} century. This is discussed in Chapter 1. I will argue that this is distinct from the Western partesny that appeared from mid 17\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{109} One other important general musicology resource is the multi–volume series \textit{Russkaya dukhovnaya muzyka v dokumentakh i materialakh} [Russian sacred music in documents and materials]. This contains numerous documents and other primary–source materials relevant to Russian sacred music from pre–Revolutionary and Soviet eras, collated by several guest editors. However, sadly, there is no equivalent coverage of the period studied in this thesis, that is during the Russian Baroque from 1650 – 1750.

Several important ‘post fall–of–the–wall’ musicological publications also appeared in English. I note in particular a troika of publications including extensive chronological accounts of sacred music from earlier times leading up to the arrival of part singing in Russia from the mid–1650s. The first of these was by Johann von Gardner, a Russian Orthodox priest who emigrated to Germany after the 1917 Russian Revolution, completed a Ph.D., and eventually settled at the University of Munich. He penned a large number of works on Russian sacred music. The book I have found

\textsuperscript{104} Velimirović et al., ‘Russian Church Music.’.

\textsuperscript{105} Floros, ‘Die Entzifferung der Kondakarion’ [The deciphering of kondakarion notation]; Velimirović, ‘The Present Status of’, 249–250. While there is general agreement that Floros’ work is ground–breaking, it has continued to provoke controversy.

\textsuperscript{106} Plotnikova, \textit{Russkoye strochnoye mnogogolosiye kontsa} [Russian partesny polyphony from the end].

\textsuperscript{107} Gerasimova–Persidskaya, \textit{Russkaya muzyka XVII veka}; [Russian music of the 17\textsuperscript{th} century: ]


\textsuperscript{109} Bogomolova, \textit{Znamennaya monodyya i bezlineinoye} [Znamenny monophony and staveless]; Kondrashkova, \textit{Ranneye Russkoye strochnoye mnogogolosiye} [Early russian strochny polyphony]; Konotop, \textit{Russkoye strochnoye mnogogolosiye XV–XVII}; [Russian strochny polyphony]; Pozhidaeva, \textit{Pevcheskiye traditsiyi drevneyi Rusi}; [Singing traditions of old Russia].
particularly helpful is his *Russian Church Singing, Volume 2*, which was translated from the Russian by Victor Morosan (see below) and published in 2000.\(^{110}\) It gives one of the more authoritative accounts of the early development of Russian sacred music, and offers the added advantage of detailed coverage of liturgical aspects. Sadly, Gardner stopped his coverage at mid–17th century, the very point at which polyphony arrived on the sacred music scene in Russia. Gardner’s musical analysis is also somewhat stilted by his clearly-stated preference for the traditional, ‘canonical’ chant of the earlier, monophonic era, as against the ‘distortions’ of later partesny harmonisations (see also Chapter 2), and some other strong opinions for which little documentary support is not always in evidence.\(^{111}\)

The second publication in this troika is by Gardner’s translator, Vladimir Morosan, an American of Russian heritage who led the millennium publications on sacred music at Musica Russica. Morosan’s book, *Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary Russia*,\(^{112}\) is based on his PhD thesis at Indiana University. It covers the entire historical sweep of Russian sacred music through to the 20th century, with a unique focus on performance aspects of liturgical music. I note (Chapter 1) that his conclusions concerning the preponderance of clergy and monks in liturgical singing, while not unreasonable, lack fully supportive evidence. Similarly, I view an implication that 16th–century Novgorodian polyphony might possibly have been an early attempt to replicate Western–style polyphony before partesny arrived in mid 17th century (Chapter 1), as speculative.

The third publication is by Jopi Harri, who completed his thesis, *St. Petersburg Court Chant and the Tradition of Eastern Slavic Singing*, at the University of Turku in Finland. This work again includes a detailed historical review of sacred music through to modern times, focusing on the Tsar’s Choir and their singing.\(^{113}\) From my perspective, the major shortcoming of this excellent account is that it gives rather short shrift to the geopolitical, cultural and social context within which Western polyphony suddenly appeared in mid–17th century.

I emphasise that none of these three books contains much detailed analysis related to the main thrust of this thesis – namely the labelling and taxonomy of the key factors enabling the abrupt embedding of Western polyphony in Russian music after locking it out for almost seven centuries. These authors do mention some of the key promoters and inhibitors that I consider in this thesis. However, these are often broached in passing, or alternatively are considered in isolation rather than in concert with other factors affecting the uptake of Western partesny. There is also limited analysis of the broader political, religious, cultural and social realities operative in Russia at mid–17th century. Nevertheless, collectively this troika of musicology texts in English provides an important historical account of events leading up to, and surrounding, the appearance of polyphony in Russia. In addition, although narratives

\(^{110}\) Gardner, *Russian Church Singing, Volume 2*, xiii–xvii. The original Russian version was published in 1982. Gardner’s family was descended from a Scottish shipwright named Frances Gardner, whom Peter I recruited to supervise building his new Navy. Gardner’s family remained in Russia and prospered. Ivan Gardner was born in 1898, and became a prominent priest and musicologist.

\(^{111}\) Gardner, *Russian Church Singing Vol. 2*.

\(^{112}\) Morosan, *Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary*.

\(^{113}\) Harri, *St. Petersburg Court Chant*. After the October Revolution in 1917, the Tsar’s Choir became a secular institution, the Leningrad State Academic Capella.
and conclusions are possibly influenced by musicological filters and cognitive biases of our modern age, they are not obviously distorted by the earlier musicological optics of the 19th–century pre–Revolutionary Tsarist period, nor those of the Soviet era (see above). For these reasons, I have cited this body of work frequently, either individually, or conjointly where I was unable to access relevant sources. Finally, and this is no small matter given the Covid Pandemic and the Russian invasion of Ukraine (see below), these publications are readily available to readers in the West.

Finally, I single out two other publications for particular mention. Claudia Jensen published a detailed account of selected key events occurring during the 17th century, and bracketing the time at which polyphony appeared in Russia. Marina Ritzarev compiled a general description of Russian music in the subsequent 18th century. Although neither of these books focuses specifically on liturgical music, and neither provides a chronological approach to events before or during the incursion of partesny, both provide valuable social and cultural perspectives.

In closing this brief review of available data and literature, I should mention one other potential confounder. This is the possibility that some historical accounts echo previous secondary sources that are either not grounded or are simply inaccurate. One case in point concerns the Tsar’s Choir (see Chapters 1–3). Interestingly, several authors cite the same, specific numbers for the number of choristers at different time points after its creation, and how they were divided up into stanitsy (choral stands). Tracing the provenance of these various accounts leads back to a particular publication by Razumovsky in the 1860s, written several centuries after the events reported. Yet, as noted by Morosan, this report gives no indication whence Razumovsky obtained this data. The date of this choir’s formation is equally suspect. While this is usually dated to 1479, at the time of the dedication of the Cathedral of the Dormition in Moscow, the basis for this conclusion is obscure. In point of fact, Zvereva suggests that this choir may not actually have been active on a regular basis until later, with documented evidence available only from 1526. This lack of precision is not surprising given the generally sketchy nature of record–keeping in Russia during the Middle Ages. Nevertheless, it is unclear how sanguine we can be about the very precise numbers of choristers and dates given by Razumovsky, and reproduced slavishly by succeeding authors. Consequently, in those instances where I include conclusions that I cannot support by my own review of primary sources, or through consistent reportage across multiple secondary reports, I indicate my level of confidence.
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115 Jensen, Musical Cultures in Seventeenth–Century.
118 Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 314 fn74. Razumovsky’s publication entitled ‘Patriarshiye pevchiye d’iaki i podd’iaki i gosudarevy pevchiye d’iaki’ [The patriarchal singing clerks and subclerks and the tsar’s singing clerks] was published in Russkaya muzyl’naya gazeta [The Russian Musical Gazette]. I was unable to access it.
119 Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 31–36.
120 Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 30.
121 Zvereva, ‘Russkiye khory i masters’ [Russian choirs and masters], 27; ‘O Khore gosudarevykh pevchikh’ [On the choir of the sovereign’s singing].
Finally, the time span of work on this thesis has seen two wholly unanticipated and unprecedented events that have dramatically restricted access to relevant study materials. The first is the global Covid–19 pandemic, which started in early 2020 just as my research was getting underway. This has caused a major block in availability of sources, by shutting down travel to Russia and Ukraine and preventing access to both primary and secondary source materials in libraries and repositories, and to inter-library loan. While some secondary source, musicological literature is available in digitised form, much primary source material remains paper–based and ‘filed by pile’ in storage boxes. Only a minority is catalogued, codified, and digitised and available online. Even after libraries and repositories have reopened, access to materials has remained sporadic and unpredictable, due to staff Covid infections. There have also been reports of other, undocumented roadblocks. On the plus side, I have been able to access much secondary material in Russian, from a mix of online sources, specialised book sellers, and helpful researchers who have kindly sent me material in various formats. Regardless, the Covid pandemic has undoubtedly limited my access to materials.

More recently, Russia’s invasion of Ukraine has thrown up another major roadblock to the accessibility of materials, and it is unclear when unrestricted travel to Moscow, St. Petersburg and Kyiv for UK citizens will be feasible again. The invasion also raises moral and political questions. For example, I have been asked why I am continuing to pursue a thesis that can be viewed as showcasing Russia, or indeed anything Russian, at such a time. Bluntly, I am appalled at the unjustifiable invasion, the indiscriminate maiming and killing of innocent people, and the widespread reports of horrific Russian atrocities. However, I should stress this thesis in no manner condones the callous actions of Russia as the aggressor in this barbarity. Instead, I am focussed on Russia’s exquisite sacred music, on dispelling the veil of mystery surrounding the incorporation of polyphony in mid–17th century, and on the special contributions of the Southwest, and Ukraine in particular. Religion has long been a vital salve and a source of comfort for long–suffering Slavs, and Russia’s peerless liturgical music deserves to be more often heard and better understood in the West. The sceptic could argue that the Russian Church, alone among all of Christianity, has been openly supportive of Russia’s appalling aggression in Ukraine. I can only hope this view reflects Patriarch Kirill’s particular relationship with President Putin, and is not shared voluntarily by the vast majority of the Orthodox hierarchy in Russia.

The lengthening Russian invasion of Ukraine and the continuing emergence of new Coronavirus variants seem certain to ensure that travel to the major repositories in St. Petersburg, Moscow and Kyiv, and access to relevant materials, will continue to be challenging for the foreseeable future. Given these realities, I have cited a very limited number of unread publications in the body of the thesis, where the points raised were crucial to my argument, but only where I felt confident in supporting the claims made by triangulation and corroboration by other independent accounts. In contrast, I stress that I have read all the publications included in the bibliography.

\[122\] Word of mouth suggests that visitors may need proof of vaccination specifically with the Russian ‘Sputnik’ Covid vaccine which is not available in the UK, and perhaps even Russian citizenship.
Thesis Anatomy

The above analysis identified some salient factors affecting the ebb and flow, and content of musicological publications from 1650 to the present. These factors appeared to line up under the following headings: Environment and Training, and Singers and Singing. Since these factors seem in addition to be directly relevant to the analysis of promoters and inhibitors of polyphony in the following chapters, this taxonomy of headings is reproduced throughout, together with addition of a third heading of Music.

Chapter 1 (at mid–17th century) begins by briefly comparing the resolute adherence to monophony in Russian sacred music from 10th to mid–17th century, with the active development of rich choral polyphony in the West over the same time period. From this, I tease out the main factors driving the adoption and development of polyphony in the West, and either failing to drive it or more likely holding it at bay in Russia. My analysis is not inconsistent with the default unwritten gestalt, that the coming of polyphony might simply have been delayed by the slow economic and cultural development of Russia. However, I argue that to postulate ‘prolonged Middle Ages’ as the sole explanation for the much later adoption of polyphony in Russia than in the West is simplistic and untenable; in Europe, the first stirrings of polyphony occurred as far back as the ninth century, many centuries before the Middle Ages even began, much less before they ended. Rather, I conclude that the more plausible explanation was an impenetrable barrier of powerful interlocking local inhibitors in Russia that had effectively kept polyphony actively locked out in previous centuries. I enumerate and describe the major inhibitors, including geopolitical isolation, religious opposition, a lack of experience and training, a shortage of polyphony–ready singers, and inhibitors inherent in music of the time. The chapter closes with summary of the status of promoters in Europe and Russia, and of inhibitors in Russia.

Chapter 2 (1650 – 1700) documents the sudden and unexpected easing of the inhibitors of polyphony identified in Chapter 1. The implacable opposition of Russian Orthodoxy to Western musical trends seems to have been paused during a choral ‘arms race’ between Patriarch Nikon and Tsar Aleksei, and a subsequent wrenching schism within the Russian Church. Further, the previous geopolitical isolation and xenophobia of old Russia were relaxed by Tsar Aleksei, and flatly rejected by Peter I. As to Singers and Singing, the lack of opportunities for experience and training, and the shortage of capable native Russian polyphonists, were papered over by importing trained liturgical part singers from Ukraine and Belarus, and even from Catholic Poland and Lithuania. Musical barriers also began to be lowered. Collectively, these changes allowed Western–style polyphony to win a bridgehead, and begin to be incorporated into Russia’s liturgical music. I also note that previously missing promoters of polyphony began to appear in Russia during this half century, although only in the latter years after the inhibitors defined had already begun to ease. The agency of promoters and inhibitors in Russia at the end of the 17th century is compared with that in Chapter 1. Finally, despite the abrupt, appearance of part singing after the long reign of monophony, I emphasise that long–standing barriers to polyphony were only paused or partially lowered, but still not definitively removed.

Chapter 3 (1700 – 1750) covers the further relaxation, and disappearance of the inhibitors identified in Chapters 1 and 2. Thus, Peter the Great degraded the power of the Russian Church by abolishing the Patriarchate, thereby throttling back religious
opposition. He also established the new Russian Empire and threw it open to the West, building St. Petersburg on the Baltic as a direct link with the West, with the help of European architects, designers, and artists. Belatedly, his newly-declared Russian Empire began to organise education more formally, and the first university was opened in St. Petersburg. Migrant singers and composers were now also welcomed from Europe, in addition to polyphonists from the Southwest. The Russian elite developed a taste for secular music, and particularly for opera. Musically, replacement of neumes by stave notation continued. Some more previously absent promoters of polyphony now began to appear. Trebles were included in the Tsar's Choir, and a special school for training of Ukrainian boys in Hlukhiv was commissioned to train them. The status of promoters and inhibitors at mid–18th century is compared with that of previous time points (Chapters 1 and 2). Despite continuing opposition to the new polyphony, especially from Old Believers, I conclude that by mid–18th century, the previous dense thicket of inhibitors of polyphony had largely vanished. Although Western partesny likely took some time to percolate out into the most distant and smaller rural parishes, polyphony had become inextricably interwoven into Russia's sacred music and was fostering the vigorous development of a parallel thread of secular music.

Chapter 4 summarises the findings of this thesis, and briefly considers some of the broader implications for Russian music following the incorporation of Western partesny. These include the further growth of sacred polyphony, resulting in the glories of 19th- and 20th-century choral compositions. Such development occurred despite continuing, episodic resistance to the resulting polyphonic 'pollution' of traditional 'pure', monophonic, Russian Orthodox chanting. A separate, parallel thread of secular music also emerged in the 18th century, of which Russian opera was an important part, and this thread rapidly became world-class in the 19th century. I speculate as to whether polyphony could have been successfully introduced to Russia at any time point other than around mid–17th century. Finally, I conclude that even a slightly different unfolding of events might have led to persistence of monophony in Russian sacred music to this day, as has largely been the case for Greek liturgical music.\(^{123}\)

\(^{123}\) Moody, 'Some Aspects of the', 1–9. Notwithstanding the appearance of some polyphonic Greek sacred music, especially in the U.S.A.
Chapter 1.
Russian Music up to Mid–17th Century: Monophony Rules

‘Plus ça change, plus c’est la même chose.’

Jean-Baptiste Karr

In this chapter, I address the first research question:

1. After almost seven centuries of steadfast monophony, what were the major promoters and inhibitors of polyphony in Russia approaching the mid–17th century, and how was this situation different from that in the West?

Environment and Training

In stark contrast to the polyphony-permissive milieu of the West approaching mid–17th century, my analysis revealed a lack of promoters in Russia and more importantly a dense, impassable tangle of inhibitors.

Geopolitical Isolation: It is difficult to overestimate the pervasive effect of geography on the Russian psyche. The precursor state, Kyivan Rus, began as a moderately-sized, landlocked country, in a very large land mass. Since it occupied a huge plain with no natural barriers for protection other than a few rivers, Rus’s developing principalities were inviting targets for a seemingly endless series of raids. Some attacks came from competing principalities, but others involved external invaders. Following attacks from Teutonic Knights from the North and West, the capital of Rus was moved 1000 Km or so eastwards from Kyiv to Vladimir (in 1263 CE), and thence to Moscow (in 1328 CE), further distancing Rus from Europe. While the quarrelling principalities were eventually united under Moscow into a single nation by Ivan III, other invaders included Mongols from the East, Tatars from the South, Poles and Lithuanians from the West and Swedes from the North. The overwhelming priority for the new nation of Rus was to secure its borders, through creation of a defensive buffer zone around Russia and the major cities and expansion out into the vast surrounding territories. This process began in the 16th century under Ivan IV (The Terrible), and was extraordinarily successful. As Russia ballooned in size, the primary rationale gradually shifted from creation of a buffer zone to colonisation, and eventually under Peter I (The Great) to frank empire-building (Chapter 2).

By early 17th century, Russia stretched East across Siberia to the Pacific Ocean, North to the Arctic Ocean, and South to the Caspian Sea, roughly a dozen times bigger than the precursor Rus had been when Christianity was first adopted in 980 CE (Figure 1.1). Despite such massive geographic expansion, the large plain to
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124 Originally, Rus was marginally larger than present-day Norway, Sweden and Finland combined.
125 A recent resurgence of zeal for empire can be inferred from Putin’s stated justification for the current invasion of Ukraine (aka Russia’s ‘Special Operation’).
126 Dixon, The Modernisation of Russia, 7–18; Hosking, Russia and the Russians, 142–148. This was a time during which advances in shipping and navigation were allowing Western European countries to embark on an era of aggressive colonisation and empire-building for economic and nationalistic reasons. In contrast, Russia had no immediate need of ships to pursue colonial expansion.
the West was still largely indefensible. Moreover, Russia was still land-locked, and geographically isolated from Europe. Moscow was around 2000 Km from the nearest major European cities – Berlin, Prague, Vienna and Budapest – and 3000 Km or more from London, Paris and Rome (Figure 1.1). Moreover, geographic expansion was not an unvarnished benefit; it brought with it many new problems. The conquered territories needed to be colonised, but lacked basic transport and communications infrastructure. They were also home to indigenous peoples of many different ethnicities, cultures, religions and languages; that is to say few were Russian and Orthodox. Dealing with these issues was more pressing than intercourse with the West, and one important cause of xenophobia.

Figure 1.1. A Schematic of Rus Shortly after the Adoption of Christianity

Russians were also deeply suspicious of the West. Massie sums up the general reaction of Russians to Western Europe in mid–17th century as follows: ‘They

---

127 Other later invasions, for example by the Lithuanians and Polish, the Swedish under Charles XII, the French under Napoleon, and the Germans under Hitler, were to prove this point.
128 Hosking, Russia and the Russians, 142–143. One problem was how to assimilate the newly colonised.
129 This figure was obtained from Wikipedia’s article on Kievan Rus, accessed on August 11, 2023, at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kievan_Rus%. It is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution–ShareAlike License 4.0.
(Russians) disbelieved in or disapproved of most of what they saw. Foreigners, of course, were heretics, and contact with them was likely to contaminate. Within Russia, most large cities permitted almost no foreigners. In Moscow, the small numbers present had been physically segregated from native Russians following a period of heightened tension in the early 17th century. Tsar Aleksei had decreed that foreigners could not live within the walls of ‘Holy Moscow’. Accordingly, they were then confined to a Nemetskaya Sloboda (German Suburb) outside the city, a clear instance of xenophobia mandated by the State.

Trade with the West was also non–existent, although Novgorod was the exception that tested this rule. It was one of the very few towns in Russia that had escaped the destructive proclivities of the Mongol occupation. Like Pskov, it was situated in the Western part of Russia, relatively close to the seaports of the Baltic. Novgorod developed some trade ties with Western Europe, through the Hanseatic League and the English Muscovy Company, and supported a small, but stable colony of foreigners. It also enjoyed relatively harmonious relationships with Catholic Poland and Lithuania to the Southwest. However, Novgorod was razed to the ground by Ivan IV (see below). At this point, Russian trade with the West was reliant on access to the Baltic ports of Riga (Latvia) and Reval (present–day Tallinn in Estonia), neither of which belonged to Russia. If access were ever denied, the only ports physically within the borders of Russia were in the North, far from Moscow and subject to freezing in the winter months. Predictably, leaders became obsessed with the notion of building or incorporating suitable, warmer water ports into Russia. However, it was not until the 18th century under Peter the Great that Russia achieved this goal, at St. Petersburg (Chapter 3). The upshot of Russia’s geographic and geopolitical isolation was that while the Renaissance, Reformation and Counter–Reformation flowered in Europe, Russia was consumed with local priorities – establishing and protecting its geopolitical isolation.

The new nation state of Russia was further distracted by another conundrum, namely which of three very different national visions to pursue, that of:

- a sovereign, Slavic country
- the leader of the Orthodox oecumene, or
- a multi–ethnic empire?

Up until mid–17th century, attention had primarily been on the first of these, but approaching mid–17th century Tsar Aleksei staked out his desire to provide leadership of the Orthodox oecumene (Chapter 2). Under his successor, Peter the Great, zest for empire became all–consuming (Chapter 3). Eventually it was

130 Massie, Peter the Great, 165.
131 Massie, Peter the Great, 110–112. To Russians, all foreigners seem to have been ‘German’. Other measures involved interrogating all foreigners at the border before allowing them entry, censoring foreign mail, and destroying all Protestant churches in the German Suburb.
132 Novgorod was at one point a fiefdom of Poland, and even invited the King of Lithuania to rule it.
133 Hosking, Russia and the Russians, 120 and 126. One example was the ‘favoured trade’ set up between Russia and merchants of the Muscovy Company. Ivan IV also communicated directly with Queen Elizabeth I of England, from whom he apparently requested asylum in the event he had to flee Russia.
134 Dixon, The Modernisation of Russia, 27–32.
untenable to continue to ignore the West, and unavoidable that Russia should become a European power (see Chapters 2 and 3). However, in the early 17th century, I conclude that Russia remained implacably isolated and anti-Western—hermetically sealed off from the astonishing progress and changes then underway in Europe, and from exposure to Western musical trends, including polyphony.

Religious Opposition: The Church had long served an important role in unifying Rus, and later Russia, and its influence expanded during the long Mongol occupation of the 13th–15th centuries. The Mongols, who were mostly pagan and/or Shamanists, in the main showed considerable religious tolerance. Unlike the misery and oppression meted out to everyone else, and the burdensome tributes that were demanded of the Russian princes, the Mongols exempted the Church from payments and from providing clergymen for labour or military service. Whilst the organisational structures and authority of the princes were fragmented during the Mongol Yoke, those of the Church remained largely unaffected. In addition, the Church provided spiritual comfort and salve to the people living through an onerous occupation, and enhanced and consolidated its position at the core of every day Russian life. The number of parish churches and monasteries also grew extremely rapidly, especially outside towns and cities. While the princes of Russia remained divided, hobbled, and subservient to Mongol suzerainty, the Church accumulated enormous power and vast tracts of land, and exercised increased hegemony.

Another crucial factor in the growing influence of the Church, and its lands and wealth, was the territorial expansion of Russia. This was because the sheer size of the dilating country caused difficulties for the State in projecting anything beyond patchy authority at the local level. Meanwhile, local parish churches and monasteries proliferated across the new territories, and were supported and controlled by a robust, parallel ecclesiastical power structure radiating out from the Metropolitan in Moscow, with many thousands of servitors. It was only to be expected that the Church would take on an important local role in the pravda (truth) of day-to-day life. To protect their growing wealth and heft, just as in the West, clerical leaders made sure to keep a finger firmly on the geopolitical pulse, even assisting periodically in raising armies and waging war. The Western obsession with L’homme Armé (The Armed man) in the liturgy would not have been out of place in Russia.

In parallel with its growing power, the church was deeply intolerant of any non-Orthodox religious thinking and practices, and became progressively more doctrinaire. This was perhaps natural following a prolonged series of serious threats, including: the Great East-West Schism in 1054; repeated attacks by invaders holding discrepant religious beliefs (Catholics from the West and North, and Shamanists and later Muslims from the East and South); and the emergence of Protestantism in 1517. The Russian Church maintained a clear-eyed, abiding obsession to protect...

135 Massie, Peter the Great, 54.
136 Hosking, Russia and the Russians, 17–18. The concept of pravda, and nepravda (not truth), in the community was complex, embodying ‘rightness’, God’s will, morality, conscience, and justice.
137 Gardner Russian Church Singing Vol. 2, 37–38; Hosking, Russia and the Russians, 73. Examples include the war waged by Constantinople on the Bulgarian kingdom in 1014–1018, and the later requirement for the Metropolitan in Moscow to maintain his own armed regiment and make it available to the grand prince of Moscow if requested.
Orthodoxy, as the true faith. In 1436–1439, when Byzantium was already under threat from the Turks and Islam, an attempt was made to reunite Catholicism and Orthodoxy at the Council of Ferrara (eventually completed in Florence). The Russian Metropolitan, Isidor, and the Greek delegates from Constantinople, meekly signed a document that passively accepted Rome’s position on most of the issues that had caused the Great East: West schism in the first place. Worse, although Rome had promised military succour to Constantinople in return, this never materialised. In Moscow, such chicanery was seen as abject capitulation to Rome. Moscow promptly replaced Isidor as Metropolitan, without even a ‘by your leave’ to the Patriarch in Constantinople. The Russian Church had de facto proclaimed autocephaly.

Another primal threat came shortly afterwards when Constantinople, the epicentre of Eastern Christianity, fell to the Turks in 1453. Orthodoxy now faced a crisis of identity. Russia was unquestionably the next most important locus of Orthodoxy, and a natural candidate for the mantle of leadership. After some delay, a Russian, Job, was enthroned for the first time as Patriarch in Moscow in 1589. I stress that this occurred just a few years after the Stoglav Conference of 1551, which had actively promoted and endorsed several local, Russian features of worship that were demonstrably different from Byzantine tradition. One might therefore have anticipated the new Patriarch to take advantage of this opportunity to make even more changes and impose a new, distinctly Russian stamp on Orthodoxy. On the other hand, the Russian Church had spent 600 years under the thumb of Constantinople, as a rule–taker rather than a rule–maker, and the new religious hierarchy in Moscow lacked the organisational experience and skills built up over centuries in Constantinople. In the event, the new Patriarchate dug in its heels, and changed exactly nothing, including its continued embrace of monophonic chanting. However, ongoing debate between those wishing to preserve the Byzantine tradition of Christianity, and those supporting derivative Russian customs, was an important contributor to the tearing schism within the Russian Church that occurred a century later, and which in turn helped polyphony to slip into the liturgy, almost through the back door (see Chapter 2).

Meanwhile, another manifest threat to Orthodoxy materialised in Europe, in the form of the Protestant Reformation starting in 1517, with Martin Luther, John Calvin, John Knox, Ulrich Zwingli and other vocal proponents. Their humanistic ideas were explicitly perilous and threatening to Russian church leaders with strong theocratic leanings, and no less so to the country’s autocratic secular leaders. Worse, quantities of Protestants even appeared right next door, in countries of the Southwest. Religious thought in Europe then underwent a long period of considerable flux, with
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139 Hosking, *Russia and the Russians*, 81. Among other things, these included such issues as: the Roman addition of *filioque* (and of the son) to the wording of the Nicaean Creed; conduct of the Eucharist; the concept of Purgatory; and supremacy of the Pope and the Church in Rome.


141 Jensen, *Musical Cultures in Seventeenth–Century*, 1–5. This gives a rich account of the attendant festivities.

142 Hosking, *Russia and the Russians*, 113–114. Called Stoglav (hundred) because a hundred questions were considered. Of special note, it was agreed to continue the Russian habit of making the sign of the cross with two fingers, rather than the three used by Greeks (cf., Chapter 2 Schism).

143 Burkholder, Grout and Palisca, *A History of Western*, 243–244. This is reminiscent of the reluctance of the Catholic Church to change basic doctrine and practices at the Council of Trent.

144 Gerasimova–Persidskaya, ‘Italian Influences on East,’ 582.
the Council of Trent and the Catholic counter-reformation. This was followed by an extended period of religious upheaval and ferment in Europe, and the unbelievably bloody Thirty Years War (1618–1648). While the Russian Church might otherwise have been reassured by the violent religious ferment boiling in the West between Catholics and Protestants, it was in fact immersed in its own problems. During the chaotic Smutnoye Vremsya (Time of Troubles) that followed the death of the last Rurik ruler, Vasily IV (1598–1613), Poles and Lithuanians occupied Moscow from 1605 to 1613 and the Kremlin itself from 1610 to 1612. Ordinary Russians were consequently exposed to Catholic church services and polyphonic singing during this period. \footnote{Gardner, Russian Church Singing, Vol. 2, 340–341. The extent of such exposure is undocumented.} Patriarch Germogen’s response to the Polish Prince Wladyslaw (the third False Tsar Dmitry – see below) in 1610 was crystal clear: ‘I see the trampling of the true faith by the heretics and by you traitors, and the destruction of God’s holy churches; and I cannot bear to hear Latin singing in Moscow’. \footnote{Gardner, Russian Church Singing, Vol. 2, 339–341; Preobrazhensky, Kul’tovaya muzyka v Rossii [Culture of music in Russia], 46.} The Russian Church called itself Orthodox for sound reason, and anything that smacked of religious syncretism was vigorously resisted. \footnote{Gerasimova-Persidskaya, Russkaya muzyka XVII veka, [Russian music of the 16th century], 8.} It therefore viewed the cauldron of religious ferment in Moscow, and indeed in Europe, as an existential threat, and resolved to hold the course. The result was a further upsurge of xenophobia and religious opposition to Western Catholics, with their ugly, polyphonic music (see False Dmitry I below). \footnote{Gardner, Russian Church Singing, Vol. 2, 340–341; Metallov, Ocherk istorii tserkovnogo peniya [Essay on the history of church singing], 101, fn2.}

After the Time of Troubles, the Russian Church continued to promulgate the uncompromising, anti–pagan approach of earlier centuries, \footnote{Nixey, The Darkening Age, xix–xxxiv.} combined with zero tolerance of ‘godless’ Western Christianity, and an unambiguous, even rigid approach to living and worship. Russia was never quite a full theocracy in the sense of being officially ruled and governed by the priesthood, but by the early 17th century it had come very close (see below). The Church dictated almost every aspect of daily existence, demanding unquestioning obedience and devotion from all Russians, up to the Tsar, on pain of serious sanction. Important parts of ceremonies took place out of view behind the iconostasis (the barrier between the altar and main body of the Church). \footnote{This was not then dramatically different from the situation in Western Catholic churches.} The perception of mystery was deepened by invoking the senses: the ear with words, music and bells; the eye with dim light, rich vestments, and gorgeous icons; and the nose with incense. Worship reinforced mysticism, conformity and obedience. There was also the concept of strada (suffering) of the individual as a necessary contribution to the community \footnote{Hosking, Russia and the Russians, 41.}

The dominance of the Russian Church in the early–17th century also allowed it to play a key gate–keeper function in relation to liturgical music, continuing to forbid women’s and boy’s voices, which by this point had become more or less standard in liturgical music in the West. Moreover, while castrati had been numerous in Constantinople during the first millennium at court and within the choir of the Hagia Sophia, \footnote{Moran, ‘Byzantine castrati’.} there is no evidence that castrati were used in Russian liturgical singing. In the early 17th century, chant continued to be sung in unison, by adult men. Boys were not permitted
to sing until the early 18th century, and then only initially in the Tsar’s Choir (see Chapter 3). Women were not countenanced as choristers until the late 19th century. The Russian Church exerted an iron grip in other ways. Polyphony was forbidden, as was instrumental accompaniment.

The swelling power of the Church in Russia had not gone unnoticed by its secular rulers, and successive princes and Tsars jostled regularly for authority with hierarchs. This struggle revolved around several realities. Rulers were generally pious and personally bound up in the Church, and from Tsar Ivan IV onwards declared themselves to be anointed by God, a position of robust Caesaropapism comparable to the position of some monarchs in the West. This naturally led to autocratic Tsars voicing ex cathedra pronouncements on how things should go within the Church, and Tsars Ivan IV, Aleksei and Fyodor all justified these opinions in part based on their studies of music and chant compositions. Several clearly felt threatened by, and wished to check, the enormous power of the Church. In the early centuries of Christianity, the Russian Metropolitan was required to render substantive tribute to the Byzantine Patriarchate. As Constantinople dwindled in importance, Russian leaders repeatedly tried to apportion these riches to themselves, undertaking what amounted to an alternative, involuntary programme of wealth transfer from Church to State. Typically, this involved confiscating Church lands. Where the interests of State and Church diverged, the offending cleric(s) might be imprisoned or even liquidated. At other times, given the power of the Church to influence public opinion, it was in the monarch’s interest to be seen to be toeing the Church’s line.

Given the above, the balance of power see–sawed constantly between Church and State. When Ivan III as Prince of Moscow united the princedoms of Rus into a single country, he contrived to confiscate large tracts of Church lands in the process. With this, and the shambles of the Council of Ferrara and the fall of Constantinople (see above), the balance of power in Russia yawed from Church towards State. This shift was further reinforced by Ivan IV (‘the Terrible’), a powerful and Machiavellian leader. At his coronation, he summarily appointed himself Head of the Church and proclaimed his divine right to unlimited power under God. His brutality and sadism were legendary. He ordered the killing of Metropolitan Philip, tortured many clerics to death in his Novgorod Massacre of 1570, and confiscated a large portion of the lands belonging to the surrounding monasteries. Yet, he could be pious to a fault, and was viewed as a devoted defender of Orthodoxy, involving himself in creation of Chant. In wrapping himself in the Church, he enabled its reactionary tendencies.

In the late 16th century, the power pendulum began to swing back from State to Church. This started with the installation of Patriarch Job in Moscow in 1569. Gardner describes an inflationary ecclesiastical chain reaction, with the archbishops of Novgorod, Rostov, Kazan and Krutitsy being elevated to Metropolitans, bishops
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153 Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 155–157. Ritzarev, Eighteenth–Century Russian Music, 255–264. Unofficially, women probably sang earlier than this, in serf choirs or in rural churches lacking male singers. Objections to women singing were less doctrinal and more a wish for physical segregation of the sexes, and women singers sometimes had their locks shorn or were disguised as boys.

154 Meyendorff, Byzantine Theology, 6.


156 He was a near contemporary of Henry VIII, but did him one better, working his way through no less than 7 wives, even after the Russian Church had refused him permission to remarry.
being promoted to archbishops, and so on down the line. This further enhanced the reach of the Church. The Time of Troubles saw the relative power of the State reaching a nadir. As noted above, Moscow was occupied for a time by the Polish, and the very existence of Russia as a sovereign state was in serious doubt. Even after the eventual coronation of a native Russian, Tsar Mikhail, his father, Filaret, became Patriarch and sovereign co-regent (1619 – 1633). Apart from organising the army and taxation, Patriarch Filaret assigned to himself the power to judge the peasantry and clergy on all matters except robbery and theft. This effectively set up the Patriarchate as a state within a state, and moved the needle almost to full theocentric government.

It is important to emphasise that the historical tussle for agency between Church and Tsar leading up to mid–17th century was in no respect a battle between reactionary conservatives, and progressive liberals. Both were equally reactionary and Orthodox in outlook, and adamantly opposed to all things Western, including its religious and musical practices. Equally importantly, the same was true for the ordinary citizens of Russia. This was perhaps predictable after centuries of trenchant opposition from the Church to any change in worship practice, including polyphony and instrumental accompaniment. Such attitudes had become internalised by the public – almost as an article of faith. This is in line with the post–modern political dictum that something oft repeated becomes a fact, or at least a reality.

The circumstances of the murder of ‘False Dmitry I’ are instructive. He was the first of three Izhedmitriye (Dmitry pretenders) to the Russian throne from Poland, and succeeded in being crowned Tsar in 1605 during the Time of Troubles. As described by Jensen, he was acceptable by virtue of being both Russian and Orthodox, but he immediately offended in several key respects. He had Jesuit advisers and did not fast ‘properly’. Despite strenuous remonstrations from the Church, he settled on a Polish, Catholic woman, Marina, to be his bride, and neglected to require her to convert to Orthodoxy before their marriage. She then celebrated a sumptuous Catholic pre-nuptial mass, with Polish polyphonic singers and instrumentalists. Worse, the couple’s wedding celebration proceeded with a 40–piece instrumental group playing light, secular music, with mixed dancing, in public. The couple compounded their folly by celebrating on a particularly auspicious holy day, that of St. Nicholas, on May 9th. They even had plans to dress in costumes and masks for a masquerade, akin to the devil worshipping Skomorokhi (jongleurs – see below). Muscovites were outraged, and a public mob inflamed by the boyars hunted down and killed Dmitry, and up to 100 of his musicians. I conclude that long–standing, strict religious prejudices and practices were not just petty rules to be ignored, or only to be enforced in church. They had been baked into the collective national psyche, and in the early 17th century were guiding principles for correct, moral behaviour. The vituperation of the mob against Western music could not have been clearer.
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158 Jensen, Musical Cultures in Seventeenth–Century, 10–11. In Mussorgsky’s initial version of his opera ’Boris Godunov’, False Dmitry manages to escape by jumping out of an inn window.
159 Jensen, Musical Cultures in Seventeenth–Century, 10–24. Dmitry was called out and reviled as a heretic and the ultimate insult, as a Polish piper! His corpse was decorated with instruments and a mask.
160 Jensen, Musical Cultures in Seventeenth–Century, 79; Massie, Peter the Great, 61, fn. In one incident, several wagons full of musical instruments were torched at the behest of the Patriarch.
The Church also went out of its way to pillory, and suppress, any music outside church. Strenuous objections were consistently raised by the clergy to non–liturgical music, which they pronounced to be lewd, and an undeniable excuse for excessive drinking. Worse, secular singing accompanied by dancing was seen as legitimising intimate mingling of the sexes, with further drinking and licentiousness. Secular music, especially for dance, also tended towards the light and jolly, in contrast to the slow, dignified, reverential chant of the Church.\footnote{Findeizen, \textit{History of Music in}, Vol. 1, 113–127; Ritzarev, \textit{Eighteenth–Century Russian Music}, 16–22.} Skomorokhi put on a rambunctious, bawdy mix of music and acting, that made them very popular with the public. They often wore masks, considered by the Church to be a particular abomination that reeked of paganism. Worse, they were often paid to perform at weddings and funerals, thereby directly competing with the Church's self–declared remit.\footnote{Findeizen, \textit{History of Music in}, Vol. 1, 124; Jensen, \textit{Musical Cultures in Seventeenth–Century}, 79.} Accordingly, Patriarch Filaret attempted a direct ban. Not surprisingly, given the Russian public’s long–standing support for folk music, this failed. Tsar Aleksei then outlawed the Skomorokhi, and they were systematically driven out of Muscovy.\footnote{Gardner, \textit{Russian Church Singing}, Vol. 2, 272.} I surmise that the authorities may have had another unstated but not unimportant rationale for demonizing the Skomorokhi. In Europe, sacred polyphony had developed in parallel with a vibrant parallel thread of secular and instrumental vocal music, including often risqué songs and motets, and by mid–17th century the first stirrings of the wildly popular new genre of Italianate opera. The reactionary Russian Church may have viewed tolerance of the Skomorokhi as permitting a slippery slope that would inevitably lead to godless polyphonic and secular music gaining traction – and worse, outside Church control.

In the run–up to mid–17th century, the Russian Church dictated much of everyday life. Russia was a theocracy in all but name. The austere and unchanging tradition of Orthodoxy brooked no unjustified change, and liturgical chant was no exception. Even during periods when the power equilibrium canted from Church towards State, Russia’s secular leaders were equally conservative, with little evident interest or stomach for changing liturgical practices and music. Religion was an integral part of daily life, and the public had grown accustomed to worship and sacred music unfolding in a very particular way. The result was that religious opposition continued to lock out Western musical influences, including polyphony. I conclude that to this point, change in any respect resembling Western musical practice, and specifically acceptance of polyphony, were simply inconceivable.

\textit{Lack of Training and Experience:} While the sons of the aristocracy could be sent to private schools in Russia or abroad, ordinary Russians had little chance of being educated, and even less so in music. The Church provided what little general schooling did take place. Instruction was patchy, and highly variable in quality and quantity from one parish to the next. The focus was primarily on religious and moral teachings. There was meagre attention to literacy, much less music, perhaps unsurprising since boys, girls and women were not allowed to sing in church (see above). A few larger cities did have superior choirs, and possibly associated choir schools. Novgorod is worth special mention. It was a major singing centre, and the
Cathedral of St. Sophia built in 1045–1050 was the oldest Church in Russia. As documented by Findeizen and Gardner, Novgorod was unique in recording the names of singing masters and composers for posterity as far back as the 16th century. The Tsar’s Choir and the Patriarch’s Choir also provided training for their choristers (see below). However, outside these few prominent choirs, I could find no clear record of vocal training or musical education at this point. Notably, there were no universities in Russia until the 18th century (Chapter 3), and no music conservatories until mid–19th century (Chapter 4). Furthermore, I assume that vocal training and musical education would have been of low priority, given the continued adherence to a restrictive apprenticeship model, in which monophonic chant was committed to memory by adult men and recited by rote (see below).

Opportunities for vocal training were substantially more varied in the West. Even though political ferment and war were boiling across Europe for much of the period between ninth and 17th centuries, development of polyphony proceeded anyway. This was due in no small part to support provided by the Catholic Church, and later the Protestant Church. From the Middle Ages onwards, most large churches had standing choirs and associated schools that provided formal training for choristers singing polyphonically. These attracted the sons of the wealthy, but also provided support and education for many impoverished or orphaned boys, and even girls. Music conservatories also appeared; in the 17th century, Naples had four for boys and one for girls. Some of the better child singers were selected and sponsored for training in music schools or in universities. Later, some became monks or nuns, while others joined the priesthood and a favoured few enjoyed the attractions of benefices. Other trained singers left the relative safety of the Church for the potentially greater, but riskier rewards in the courts of monarchs and wealthy nobles, contributing in the process to noted choirs and singing centres. Yet other singers straddled both worlds. The lowly artisanal status of singers and instrumentalists improved. Retainers and sponsorship from wealthy nobles for service in private choirs began to enable professionalisation. Vocal training and experience provided primarily by Church choirs and choir schools were eventually expanded to private choirs operating under the patronage of monarchs and wealthy nobles, and by Latin schools such as that attended by J.S. Bach.

Opportunities for formal musical education also sprang up to the Southwest of Russia, often in association with, and supported by the Catholic Church. The first was at the Jagiellonian University, which was associated with the Wawel Cathedral School; this opened in 1364 in Krakow, the then capital of Poland, and rapidly became one of the foremost universities in Europe. The Jesuits also opened a

167. Burkholder, Grout and Palisca, A History of Western, 405–407; Taruskin, Music in the Seventeenth, 650 and 736. These were originally set up to provide for poor, orphaned children. They also taught music, this later becoming the primary function as other conservatories opened.
168. Fitch, Renaissance Polyphony, 28–31. Benefices granted a priest a stipend to perform duties in a specified location. He was then allowed to deputise someone else to undertake such duties, while pocketing the difference and living in a different and often more desirable location.
169. Gardiner, Music in the Castle, 38–43.
Society of Jesus school in Krakow that was involved in musical education during the 17th century, part of a web of such schools across Europe making major contributions to the theory, practice and dissemination of sacred music.\textsuperscript{171} In Lithuania, a Jesuit school was started in Vilnius in the years between 1568–1579, and was associated with St. John’s Church. This became the University of Vilnius. At least one Italian composer, Marco Schacchi, is known to have moved to Warsaw and to have taught there from 1621–1651.\textsuperscript{172} Unlike in Russia, education in the Southwest was explicitly supported by the Orthodox church. A particularly prominent centre developed in Kyiv under the leadership of Peter Mohyla, Metropolitan of Kyiv, who founded the Lavra school for monks in 1632. This was then merged with the Kyiv Brotherhood school (see below) to form the Mohyla Collegium,\textsuperscript{173} which among other topics taught part singing. A highly talented faculty was established there, together with a network of schools across Ukraine and a press that printed music.\textsuperscript{174} The advent of musical education in Ukraine seems to have been encouraged by Catholic Poles and Lithuanians, and it is also notable that polyphony arrived at some point in the 16th century, well before it appeared in Russia (see Music below and Chapter 2).

In Russia, another factor potentially slowing the acquisition of facility with polyphony was the continued rather shabby treatment of native singers. The Russian Church treated them as dependent artisans; they were not free to move about, and collectivisation in any form was still discouraged. This was very different from the situation in in the West, where singers could be mobile and fraternal organisations and confraternities of singers had long been proliferating.\textsuperscript{175} The latter groups accepted some level of regulation and scrutiny, in return for social acknowledgement, and support from their churches and towns. Many eventually organised into guilds, and made important contributions to vocal training and experience; some achieved considerable fame and renown – for example the Meistersänger (Master singers) of Nuremberg, and the redoubtable Hans Sachs (Singers and Singing below).

In the Southwest, similar organisations were termed bratstva (brotherhoods). These had grown up in part to resist Polish and Lithuanian influence, and especially Catholic cultural and religious pressures intensifying with the Counter-Reformation. To head off forced conversion to full Catholicism, Orthodox Christians had agreed reluctantly in the Union of Brest–Litovsk in 1596 to switch their allegiance to the Pope in Rome, rather than the Patriarch in Moscow; they were subsequently known as Greek Catholics, or less respectfully as Uniates.\textsuperscript{176} Orthodox bratstva then appeared in quick succession in L’viv, Kyiv, Luts’k, Minsk, and Vilnius. These institutions made schooling, and musical education a major priority. In the 1590s, brotherhoods sought, and received, specific dispensation from the Patriarch of Kyiv, and later in the 1640s from the Patriarchate in Constantinople, to incorporate Western–style part singing into the Orthodox liturgy.\textsuperscript{177} The Brotherhoods also commissioned printing of music

\textsuperscript{171} Kalarus and Konkol, ‘Music Education in Poland’, 8.
\textsuperscript{172} Gerasimova–Persidskaya, ‘Italian Influences on East’, 589–590.
\textsuperscript{173} This became the Kyiv Mohyla Academy and then the National University of Kyiv–Mohyla Academy.
\textsuperscript{174} Gerasimova–Persidskaya, Russkaya muzyka XVII veka [Russian music of the 17th century], 3–4.
\textsuperscript{175} Slocum, ‘Confrérie, Bruderschaft’ and Guild’, 257–262.
\textsuperscript{176} Harri, St. Petersburg Court Chant, 44.
\textsuperscript{177} Kuz’minski, ‘Istoiriya tserkovnoyi muzyki cherez’ [The history of church music through], 32; Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 40. These accounts describe the favourable response of the Patriarchs from Kyiv and Constantinople. I do not have access to the originals.
and provided support for singers. In this way, while pursuing a liturgical approach that was fundamentally Orthodox, Southwestern communities absorbed stave notation and polyphony into their music during the 16th century. This was clearly very different from the situation in Russia (see also Chapter 2).

I conclude from this that a lack of training and experience would have been another important inhibitor holding back the entry of polyphony into Russian music up to mid–17th century. This was perhaps a less potent barrier than the burning religious opposition of the Russian Church to Western music and the geopolitical isolation and xenophobia noted above. Nevertheless, I stress that these environmental inhibitors probably interacted in ways that were not merely additive, but synergistic. Thus, the opposition of the Russian Church to Western Christianity was almost certainly branded deeper by the continual threat of invasion and resultant xenophobia. Similarly, the continuing poverty of training and experience ensured that few Russians would have been capable of singing ‘godless’ Western music including polyphony (Singers and Singing below). In contrast to the situation in Ukraine, where stave notation and polyphony had already become established in the 16th century, the ‘Environment and Training’ in Russia leading up to mid–17th century could not have been better arrayed to repulse the incursion of Western partesny.

**Singers and Singing**

I was able to find very little reliable information concerning Russian singers in the run–up to mid–17th century. Nevertheless, I believe it is possible to make some relevant inferences based on the secondary literature. I conclude that outside a few leading Russian choirs, there were hardly any native ‘polyphony–ready’ singers with sufficient experience or training to handle the incipient onslaught of Western polyphony. This is hardly surprising. Singing polyphonically, and unaccompanied, is a complex undertaking. Most humans can readily coordinate the function of the multiple anatomical structures (e.g., larynx, vocal cords, sinuses, soft palette, breathing apparatus and postural muscles) to undertake basic phonation and vocalisation, especially if singing in unison and with instrumental accompaniment. Many can also coordinate a complex neural web of hearing and memory to ensure that the correct words and notes come out at the right time,178 although achieving more sophisticated levels of performance requires much practice. However, a cappella singing in parts mandates an additional layer of higher skills. These include the ability to hold fast to a unique line of music, while listening to, and blending with, other vocal lines that may be rhythmically as well as harmonically distinct. There is also no pitch support from tuned instruments. In addition, where the number of singers is limited, or music has more than four lines, singers may be required to sing a vocal line on their own.

In the West, the higher skills necessary for successful part singing were acquired over many centuries.179 They were developed hand–in–glove with the growing complexity of polyphony, and in turn facilitated its further development. By contrast, when polyphony suddenly appeared in Russia in mid–17th century, the skills of native singers can be assumed to have been at the baseline extant in the West in the ninth
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178 Goody, *The Interface between the*, 290–300. Although psychologists differentiate between abilities as inherent and constant, and skills as learnt and variable, I use the terms interchangeably.

century before polyphonic singing started to grow out of traditional monophonic chanting. For purposes of further discussion, I propose an organisational scheme of relevant singing skills in Table 1.1. The most basic step was that of simple aural imitation of music sung in unison. This could be supplemented by deliberate memorisation. With repetition, accurate verbatim or ‘rote’ singing could then be achieved quite rapidly.\(^{180}\) Singing from memory was further imprinted by performing with others, in unison, and often in association with relevant human activities and cues, in lullabies, work songs, story–telling – and the focus of this thesis, singing as a key part of worship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYSTEMS</th>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>SINGING PROFICIENCIES –ORAL CULTURE</th>
<th>SINGING PROFICIENCIES –WRITTEN CULTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAR</td>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td>Aural Imitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EYE</td>
<td>Seeing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Literate Singing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIND</td>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>Rote Singing</td>
<td>Rules–based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audiation</td>
<td>Harmonisation</td>
<td>Improvisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visualisation</td>
<td>Memory–Assisted</td>
<td>Partimento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imagination</td>
<td>Improvisation</td>
<td>Sight Singing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>Free Improvisation</td>
<td>Composition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1. Putative Scheme of Neurophysiological Systems and Functions in Singing

During the extended period of orality in the West, before text and music became available in written form, individual memory was the only mechanism for codifying and storing music, and for that matter the entire knowledge base of humanity. For monks and many priests, singing was a full–time occupation. They spent many hours in daily services and were expected to be able to chant all the psalms, and hundreds of antiphons, canticles, and other hymns, from memory.\(^{181}\) They learnt these by ear and the more gifted could apparently reproduce all 150 canonical psalms in as little as six months.\(^{182}\) In pre–literate times, building and nurturing a highly ordered and authoritative, personal memory became a highly prized attainment in scholars.\(^{183}\) However, the prominence of orality and memory for singing had some obvious drawbacks. These included introduction of unintentional errors, or even the creation of deliberately different versions of the ‘true’ chant form. In the absence of authorised canonical forms, disparate forms could easily proliferate and lead to wide regional variations.\(^{184}\) While these might have suited local tastes and preferences, central authorities both in the West (viz the Church in Rome, the Carolingian Empire, and the

\(^{180}\) Busse Berger, Medieval Music and the, 1–8; Carruthers, The Book of Memory, 21, 56–64 and 122–131; Carruthers and Ziolkowski, The Medieval Craft of, 1–31; Yates, The Art of Memory, 11–14. Aristotle is commonly credited as the first authority to propound the importance of memory.

\(^{181}\) Fassler, Music in the Medieval, 59–60; McKinnon, ‘The Emergence of Gregorian’, 89 and 113.

\(^{182}\) Busse Berger, Medieval Music and the, 47–50; Carruthers, The Book of Memory, 100–106; Fassler, Music in the Medieval, 61–62. Catholics could chant through the psalter in its entirety in a week, although this cycle has recently been extended following Vatican II to four weeks. In addition, monks could achieve this feat without an a priori knowledge of Latin, the canonical language of chant. Of note, in monasteries with a rule of silence, chanting was the only acceptable form of vocalisation.

\(^{183}\) Carruthers, The Book of Memory, 186–187. Ars Memoria (the Art of Memory) was taught in Western universities from the 13th century onwards.

Frankish Kings) and the East (the Emperor and Patriarch in Constantinople, and later the Church and Tsars in Russia), repeatedly attempted to standardise liturgical music. Periodically over the centuries, flights of trained singers with officially approved versions of chant were sent forth to the corners of the oecumene.\(^{185}\)

Before the Schism in 1054, there is no reason to believe that the development and skills of singers in Europe and in Rus were notably different, although I note there already instances of some scattered earlier attempts to record music in the West (see below). Chanting occurred in unison; it was an oral matter, involving hearing, memorisation and accurate rote reproduction. Thereafter, as polyphony developed in the West, and monophony continued to rule in Russia, singing capabilities almost certainly diverged. As summarised above, Russia became a virtual theocracy, and remained mired in the Middle Ages. Further, the Orthodox Church was strongly opposed to innovation in any guise, and virulently anti–Western, anti–Catholic and anti–Protestant. Morosan has argued that chanting relied largely on monks and clergy in the employ of the Church,\(^{186}\) a suggestion that is intuitively attractive, even if not definitively supported by available records. Further, it can be assumed that into the 17\(^{th}\) century, Russian singers would have continued to rely upon an oral tradition, performing liturgical music from memory. After all, aside from the difficulties of reading neumes (see Music below), they were chanting in unison in Church Slavonic, an earlier recension of their native language rather than the unfamiliar canonical Latin which Catholics of all nationalities were required to use.\(^{187}\) Relying on memory would have been an obvious and straightforward strategy for Russian singers.

Subsequently, I propose that the growth of polyphony in the West began to drive the progressive development of other higher singing skills. One such is audiation, the ability to hear individual notes and sequences of notes in one’s head in the absence of any auditory stimulus – effectively the mind’s ear (Table 1.1).\(^{188}\) Where audiation came into its own was in being able to imagine and ‘hear’ musical notes de novo, and then to vocalise them. Gordon argues that ‘audiation is to music as thinking is to language’, and the ability to audiate has been observed from the second year of life onwards.\(^{189}\) It may contribute to the quasi–random, semi–conscious humming and other vocalisations made by humans when concentrating or doing repetitive work, and is assuredly key to the ability to improvise, both melodically and harmonically. Improvisation is another important higher singing skill.\(^{190}\) Carruthers and Hughes have argued persuasively that free improvisation in the West was an important means of creating new music early in the oral period,\(^{191}\) and was likely crucial for assembly of

\(^{185}\) Levy et al, ‘Plainchant [Plainsong]’; Hughes, ‘Evidence for the Traditional’, 399–401; McKinnon, ‘The Emergence of Gregorian’, 99–100; Harri, St. Petersburg Court Chant, 71 and 76. Liturgically–sanctioned choirs were an important mechanism for standardisation of chant e.g., Vatican’s Schola Cantorum (School of Singers), and the Tsar’s and Patriarch’s Choirs in Russia (see below).

\(^{186}\) Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 1–13 and 32–36.

\(^{187}\) Gardner, Russian Church Singing, Vol. 2, 79 and 255–261; Harri, St. Petersburg Court Chant, 87–91. Although it should be noted that Orthodox services were longer than those in the West.

\(^{188}\) Carruthers, The Book of Memory, 21. Although Carruthers states that there was no recognition of the ‘ear of the mind’ in classical and early medieval worlds.


\(^{190}\) Busse Berger, Medieval Music and the, 36–38 and 128–130.

\(^{191}\) Carruthers, The Book of Memory, 255–257; Hughes, ‘Evidence for the Traditional’, 377 – 404. Although since memory still reigned supreme, improvisation was likely ‘memory–assisted’ with at least some fragments recalled from existing pieces. N.B., I use the term ‘improvisation’ throughout
the original body of chant that later became canonical, being subsequently learnt by rote.\(^{192}\) Later, improvisation in the West became a more ordered, rules–based exercise, constrained by explicit conventions. The latter included pedagogical exercises involving bicionia (two–part compositions) in the 16\(^{th}\) century. Partimenti improvising multi-part compositions on single written vocal lines (usually the bass) were used for practice from the 17\(^{th}\) century. Trainee musicians, initially in Italy and later in France and Germany, were required to spend long hours improvising full four–part compositions. Partimenti were guided by regole (rules), and were specifically intended to develop higher skills e.g., audiation and improvisation.\(^{193}\) While conventions for improvisation were eventually written down, I surmise that earlier in the period of orality, some rules existed unwritten in memory. Equally, many improvised works were likely never written down, and have therefore been lost to posterity. Yet others may have been initially memorised and recorded only later, and are now classed as ‘composed’. In Russia, some level of improvisation did apparently occur in Novgorod during the 16\(^{th}\) century, during early experiments with polyphony (see Music Below). However, I infer that Russian adherence to monophony, combined with the inhibitors identified above under Experience and Training, meant that neither audiation nor improvisation were important priorities.

Another set of higher singing skills developed in concert with polyphony in the West involved vision, and related mind functions – e.g., visualisation and imagination (Table 1.1). Christian chanting had involved a visual element since its earliest days in Byzantium, in the form of cheironomy (hand movement) that was used by a lead singer to shape the flow of sound.\(^{194}\) However, the eye was more actively pressed into service when music began to be written down. Viewed from a strictly modern perspective, we might assume that singers would rapidly switch to reading music rather than having to remember it, but historically this transition took a long time to happen. This reflected several issues, the first of which was musical notation. Unlike the scripts used for text, which by the eighth century were becoming stabilised for Latin and the major European languages, musical notation did not achieve standardised form or usage for some centuries to come. Even after Guido of Arezzo introduced stave notation in the 11th century,\(^{195}\) it took several more centuries for this to catch on widely. A second issue was the growing requirement for textual and musical literacy on the part of the singer. In most of Europe, such literacy remained rare outside the clergy, choir schools and the musically educated, until widespread schooling of children began in earnest from around the 17\(^{th}\) century (see Chapter 3). The progressive recording of liturgical chant that started with the Carolingians\(^{196}\) meant that singers’ eyes could begin to supplement their ears.\(^{197}\) Nevertheless, the haphazard development of notation, and of literacy, meant that many singers continued to pick things up, particularly in terms of style and subtle nuances of rhythm and metre in psalm singing, from the more experienced singers around them.

\(^{193}\) Gjerdingen, ‘Partimenti Written to Impart’, 43–70. Partimento exercised baroque musical creativity – voice leading, harmonisation, fugue and counterpoint, and led to great fluency of composition.
\(^{194}\) Gerson–Kiwi, ‘Cheironomy’.
\(^{195}\) Palisca, ‘Guido of Arezzo [Aretinus]’.
\(^{197}\) McKinnon, ‘The Emergence of Gregorian’, 114.
Even in modern written cultures, music in hand is still an *aide memoire* or mnemonic device as well as a go-to primary resource. From personal experience of singing, I know this to be still true today.\(^{198}\)

Another reason memorisation was not replaced overnight was that written text and music were engaged at the same time in building an extensive repertoire of memory aids, including tonaries, florilegia, mnemonics, diagrams such as ‘Guidonian’ hands, versification, consonance tables, sight treatises, and interval progressions.\(^{199}\)

Eventually, as singers received more formal training, and musical notation became better standardised and literacy improved, singers started to transfer their trust from memory to the written page, and began to look to manuscripts as an important guide for singing. In this way, vision progressively supplemented and tempered the previously exclusive role of memory.\(^{200}\)

At about the same time, lead singers began supplementing visual aspects of cheironomic hand movements by head nodding and word mouthing during performance, and later dedicated conductors emerged.

The progressive growth in the West of a visual and written musical tradition during the Middle Ages and Renaissance in the West had powerful consequences. Singers had a new mental hook for learning in addition to memory, and manuscripts often included elaborate decoration and word-pictures, as well as copious marginal notes.\(^{202}\)

Choristers could begin to read and sing music *de novo*, from a manuscript, rather than having to rely on their ears and memory to imitate and learn it. They could also begin to imagine and ‘see’ music and its overall shape in their ‘mind’s eye’ (Table 1.1). Such visualisation and imagination could now happen on an as needed basis, and these skills were further reinforced by audition of written notes and intervals. The result was a reduced need for repetitive ‘note bashing’ and time-consuming memorisation. With further standardisation of stave notation, trained, literate singers could begin to sight sing. Such literate singing broadened the singing repertoire possible, from relatively straightforward homophony to later metrical psalms and hymns, and eventually increasingly complex counterpoint.

Another advantage of writing things down, as opposed to relying on pure memorisation for the storage of knowledge, was a dramatic reduction in mutability, and improved reliability and standardisation. In turn, this enabled the building of collections of music and books on music, and of authoritative, canonical versions of music to temper the proliferation of variant forms. Writing God’s word in music on parchment also strongly reinforced its power and suasion. Given the low general level of literacy, literate clergy projected unimpeachable legitimacy for thundering ex
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200 Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, 139, 143 and 151–152. Written letters were invented in order to remember things in physical form. They allowed the taking of notes and the building of musical libraries; these supported but did not immediately substitute for trained memories.

201 Gerson–Kiwi, ‘Cheironomy’.

cathedra pronouncements. On the other hand, it seems clear that written music was not an instant magic bullet, its rich potential benefits notwithstanding. The new written tradition certainly supplemented memory and was in turn reinforced by it. However, it took a long time to achieve its pre-eminence of today, when it is hard to imagine proficient, unaccompanied, polyphonic singing without benefit of written music, and the ability to read it fluently.

In contrast to the growing development of higher singing skills in the West, I consider it unlikely that Russian singers would have acquired any working facility with audiation or visualisation in the run-up to mid-17th century. This is entirely of a piece with the continuing oral tradition of chanting by rote, in unison. Memory was the preeminent skill required. Further, we know now that failure to teach and develop musical skills early in life can result in a lifelong deficit in audiation that is difficult to remediate with later training and experience. In fairness, organised education was still a rarity everywhere in the early 17th century, but what the West did have was a growing web of choir schools and institutions of education, providing training for young boys and even girls. Comparable facilities do not appear to have existed in Russia (Lack of Training and Experience above), and the enduring primacy of memory in Russia would presumably have rendered such training a low priority, or even ‘dangerous’. Further, since higher singing skills beyond memorisation could be seen to facilitate improvisation and innovation, their acquisition, and appropriate training, could well have been resisted by the Russian Church. Monophonic chanting occurred within a straitjacket of tradition. Learning the repertoire by rote, and singing it in unison, had worked well for many centuries. There was little reason to write the sung liturgy down, although a drive to standardise performance in Russia did emerge later in the 17th century (Chapter 2).

The other problem in Russia in the early 17th century was that of literacy. In monks and the clergy, on whom the task of liturgical singing may have fallen most often, textual literacy has been estimated respectively at about 70% and close to universal. However, although relevant data is lacking, I assume that musical literacy was exceedingly rare in both groups, a natural consequence of centuries of rote singing and a relative lack of manuscripts. Further, the new Western partesny was initially sourced from Ukraine and was recorded in Kyivian square notes (Chapter 2), and the number of native Russians singers capable of reading such ‘foreign’ staved notation in the mid-17th century must have been negligible. We can similarly assume that few neume-based Russian scribes were au fait with stave notation. Even if native Russian singers steeped in a centuries-long tradition of singing in unison from memory had been able to read the newly polyphonic, staved manuscripts, the sudden need to master the unfamiliar harmonisations and sing in parts would still have been challenging.

203 Carruthers, The Book of Memory, 13; Goody, The Interface between the, 161 and 163. Authority warranted by literacy assuredly makes things explicit.
204 Busse Berger, Medieval Music and the, 159, 198 and 253–254; Carruthers, The Book of Memory, 21. In the heyday of memorisation, composition occurred in the mind, being reduced only later to paper. Later, composition occurred more through the act of writing, and provided something to be seen.
205 Gordon, A Music Learning Theory, v–vi. Given that relevant, prospective controlled studies are not ethically feasible, this construct has not been directly tested.
206 Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 7–13 and 32–36.
207 Mironov, 'The Development of Literacy', 231 and 247. Priests needed to read from service books.
Outside the clergy and monks, we can only guess at how many other Russians sang regularly in church.\textsuperscript{208} Russia’s population in the early 17\textsuperscript{th} century included vast numbers of serfs, who were uneducated and unable to read text, much less music.\textsuperscript{209} This was another reason that painted icons telling important biblical stories pictorially assumed enduring importance in Russian Orthodox worship (see Introduction).\textsuperscript{210} On the other hand, it is reasonable to assume that at least some laity might have sung in church, for example in the many new far-flung rural churches opening at the extremities of the ballooning country. Harri suggests that volunteer ‘amateur’ singers would have been cloistered and effectively hidden away in the choir loft rather than singing with the regular singers on the kliros (raised platform) in the main body of the church. This would also have provided one way in which women could sing without obvious detection.\textsuperscript{211} However, lay singers sequestered in this location would not have been supported by regular singers in the body of the church, including clergy, and their working musical repertoire would likely have been restricted to invariant ordinaries that could easily be memorised. Audiation and visualisation would have been even less well developed than in priests and monks, who after all spent much of their lives singing. Further, the Church would have been suspicious of any lay singers capable of fluent polyphony, since they might be presumed to have learnt this skill through secular singing with the Skomorokhi, who were viscerally hated and ruthlessly suppressed (Religious Opposition above).\textsuperscript{212}

Another key difference between East and West in mid-17\textsuperscript{th} century was in the perceived recognition and value of singers. As noted in more detail above (Lack of Training and Experience), in the West community-based fraternities and confraternities of singers were a fact of life. Many organised into guilds, undertaking social contracting to secure performance rites and agreed-upon wage rates, as a quid pro quo for maintaining high standards of sacred and secular singing.\textsuperscript{213} The cult of individuality was also gathering steam. Musicians in Western Europe were by now permitted to add their names to compositions, and even to assert assignable legal rights.\textsuperscript{214} There were frequent public performances of sacred and secular singing that involved soloists – to wit the oratorios and opera that began in Italy in the 17\textsuperscript{th} century. This newfound freedom of self-expression, and the growth of payment for performance, directly drove further creativity in composition and the virtuoso pyrotechnics of famous sopranis and castrati.\textsuperscript{215} As polyphony developed, the more talented and accomplished singers and musicians began to weave such expanded vocalisation skills together with hearing, memory, audiation (the mind’s ear), and

\textsuperscript{208} Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 7–13 and 32–36.
\textsuperscript{209} Kluchevski, A Course in Russian, 174–199.
\textsuperscript{210} This is comparable to the modern trend of representing important notices exclusively in images rather than in words, in order to circumvent limitations in literacy and knowledge of language on the part of the reader.
\textsuperscript{211} Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 155–157.
\textsuperscript{212} Jensen, Musical Cultures in Seventeenth–Century, 83–89.
\textsuperscript{213} Slocum, ‘Confrérie, Bruderschaft and Guild’, 257–262.
\textsuperscript{214} Burkhoulder, Grout and Palisca, A History of Western, 115, 194, 223 and 245. For example, Guillaume de Marchaut (14\textsuperscript{th} century), and Josquin des Prez (15\textsuperscript{th} century) managed to leave behind named manuscripts. In the 16\textsuperscript{th} century, several composers even secured early forms of copyright, including Orlande de Lassus (from the French King Philip IX and the Holy Roman Emperor Rudolf II), and Thomas Tallis and William Byrd (from Queen Elizabeth I).
\textsuperscript{215} Burkhoulder, Grout and Palisca, A History of Western, 281, 284 and 309–311.
visualisation and imagination (the mind’s eye). This rich and highly integrated skill set allowed free improvisation of new melodies, harmonisation, and then actualisation – either by vocalisation or in recorded compositions (Table 1.1).

During the developmental trajectory of polyphonic music underway in the West, some ‘fortunati’ emerged with unusually high levels of innate musical skills. However, full attainment of musical maturity necessarily involved much additional training and experience, especially in such areas as the theory and art of music, and performance. This meant long hours spent in choirs and choir schools. Many composers also laboured diligently over composing exercises, and two of partimento’s most distinguished Italian practitioners, Domenico Cimarosa and Giovanni Paisiello, later emigrated to Russia in the 18th century and served as Directors of the Tsar’s Choir (Chapter 3). Other composers immortalised for their astonishing creative fluency (e.g., Mozart and Schubert during their short lives), or their sophistication in counterpoint (e.g., Bach), had their already prodigious musical talents honed by many years of rigorous childhood training and experience as instrumentalists and singing as choir boys. The fruit of such labours was the widespread fame the better composers were able to garner during their lifetimes, and it helped that they could now print and claim attribution for their works, both to earn much-needed cash and for posterity. Moreover, thus armed with impressive named portfolios of compositions, they were well placed to catch the eye of potentially interested patrons and thereby gain employment and continue to drive the development of polyphony.

The situation was very different in Russia. The Church generally viewed singing as its exclusive preserve. It went out of its way to demonise and proscribe the Skomorokhi, the principal community–based singers and their particular and highly popular form of polyphonic, instrumented, staged singing performances. Again, relevant information is wanting, but it appears that the Church exerted iron control over its singers, treating them as lowly artisans or even stooges, and firmly disabusing them of any notions of individuality, including self–determination and social collectivisation. Singers were lowly, dependent cogs in the vast machinery of the Church. One exception testing this general rule was an extraordinary pedigree of singing masters in Novgorod during the early 16th century, that introduced some early ‘experimental’ forms of polyphony (see Music). In a departure from the anonymity of medieval Russian music, their names are actually known and recorded. Some of these musicians may have received training or gained experience in Western polyphony. More than one actively composed music, and two early forms of polyphony materialised (see Music). However, this talented group was actively broken up and disbursed by Ivan the Terrible (see below), and elsewhere in Russia, individual
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216 The extraordinary later works of Beethoven, when he was completely deaf, come to mind.
217 Bettman, ‘Bach at Potsdam’, 81–87. Frederick the Great gave Bach a complex musical theme, full of chromaticism and awkward intervals, to improvise a multi–part fugue on the spot. Bach not only complied, but followed this up with his sublime Musical Offering.
218 Parrott, ‘A Brief Anatomy of’, 7. Up the end of the 17th century, some of the greatest choral composers of the West (e.g., Josquin des Prez, Tallis, Victoria, Monteverdi, Charpentier, and Bach) had been choir boys, and came from a long oral tradition of extempore polyphony.
219 Gardner, Russian Church Singing, Vol. 2, 261–265; Harri, St. Petersburg Court Chant, 43; Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 16–20. Their names include Deacon Tver, Savva Rogov, Vasily Rogov, and Markel Bezborody (the Beardless); Feyodor Khristianin (the Christian), Ivan Nos (the Nose), Stepan Golysh (the Pauper); and Ivan Lukoshka.
creativity and virtuosity were vigorously discouraged. In this environment, there was little chance of singers being individually valued. Music remained exclusively for the glory of God and his Church, and was not to be credited to its earthly composers or singers, nor used by them for gain.\footnote{Goody, The Interface between the, 219–221, 233.} The essence of liturgical music was solemn, reverential chant sung in unison, in which everyone blended in and no individual stood out. This culture was hardly facilitative of singers striking out from the safety of monophony, and fearlessly taking on a new vocal line of partesny harmony.

No comparative analysis of Singers and Singing would be complete without consideration of the choirs in which they sang. By the 17th century, the West could boast a rich network of excellent choirs, supported and sponsored by larger churches, royal courts and wealthy patrons. These now actively competed to attract known leaders and composers, who in turn worked to ensure that the choirs they directed could handle increasingly complex music, thereby further impelling the development of polyphony. Although the changeover from reliance on memory to fluent reading of written music did not happen overnight, visual and mental pathways did eventually meet and intertwine in ways that were mutually facilitative of elaborate part singing. The ability to read written music supplemented memory, and in turn memory aided the parsing, interpretation and singing of new, unfamiliar, notated music. The new written tradition did not simply banish the old oral tradition; what emerged was a stronger, combined oral and written tradition.\footnote{Goody, The Interface between the, 262–266; Levy, ‘On Gregorian Orality’, 190–191. Goody describes substantive lexical, syntactic and grammatical differences between oral and written registers.} Similarly, formal training and effective application of mind’s ear and mind’s eye clearly facilitated aural and visual musical abilities, but such higher proficiencies were feasible precisely because they were grounded on solid oral and written footings.\footnote{Dunlop, The Russian Court Chapel, 1–3. Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 314, fn71. D’iaki is usually translated as ‘clerks’ or ‘clerics’.}

Considerably less is established concerning the choirs in Russia leading up to mid–17th century. The best–known is the Gosudarevy pevchie d’iaki (the sovereign lord’s singing clerks) – the Tsar’s Choir.\footnote{Zvereva, ‘Russkiye khory i mastera’ [Russian choirs and masters], 27; ‘O Khore gesudarevykh pevchikh’ [On the choir of the sovereign’s singing].} This is traditionally said to have been founded by Ivan III in 1479, when building of the Cathedral of the Assumption (Cathedral of the Dormition) started in the Moscow Kremlin, although evidence of active choristers has also been dated later, to 1526.\footnote{Fassler, Music in the Medieval, 16.} This choir followed the earlier historical precedent of the great Carolingian Monarch Charlemagne, who created a reportedly rate personal choir that travelled with him.\footnote{The Interface between the, 221, 233. Morosan, The Russian Court Chapel, 1–3. Persidskaya, Russkaya muzyka XVII veka, [Russian music of the 17th century], 8.} The Tsar’s Choir was the first professional choir in Russia, and its choristers performed at a high level. It is still in existence today, although it has been renamed many times since its founding.\footnote{Other titles have included Imperial Court Chapel Choir, the Court Choral Capella, and the St. Petersburg Court Chapel Choir. After the October Revolution in 1917, this choir became mixed voice and included secular works in its repertoire. It was called in turn the Peoples’ Choral Academy, the Leningrad Academic Cappella, the Glinka Cappella, and currently the State Academic Cappella Choir of St. Petersburg. I refer to it throughout as ‘the Tsar’s Choir’.} The development of this choir through to the end of the Russian Baroque was described in some detail by Razumovsky, although the very precise numbers of choristers he...
reported by date are unverified (See also Introduction). Singers were divided into stanitsy (choral stands – singular stanitsa) of five, ranked and paid according to ability. It is thought that generally no more than ten singers sang on the kliros (raised platform) during services, with the first stanitsa on the right kliros and the second on the left kliros.

A second national choir was formed in 1589, after the fall of Constantinople and establishment of the Patriarchate in Russia (Religious Opposition above). This was the Patriarshie pевчие d’iaki i poddi’iaki (the patriarchal singing clerks and subclerks – hereafter the Patriarch’s Choir). As with the Tsar’s Choir, the numbers of choristers given by Razumovsky are of questionable attribution and accuracy. However, this choir was likely divided again into groups of 4–5 choristers. The creation of a choir specifically for the newly elevated Patriarch was hardly surprising, given the enhanced importance of the Russian Church. After all, the Tsar already had his own personal choir with trained, paid singers, and the Pope had access to his own papal choir in Rome – the Schola Cantorum (School of Singers), as far back as the 3rd century.

Beyond the Tsar’s and Patriarch’s ensembles, standing choirs in Russia were apparently confined to the larger cathedrals and churches. In the early 17th century, unlike in the West, choirs in Russia were not yet a prominent feature of entertainment at court, nor sponsored privately by the wealthy. Historically, the most eminent church choir was in Novgorod, which had a long tradition of superior singing dating back to the 11th century, and was also somewhat open to innovation (see Music below). Smaller churches were more likely to have irregular or scratch choirs, and judging by periodic complaints, the standard of singing was probably patchy. In 1551, at the Stoglav (Hundred Question) Conference called by Ivan IV, serious strictures were raised concerning the variable quality of singing across Russia. Ivan IV pushed Novgorod’s superb corps of singing masters to spread out to Moscow and other cities across Russia. Over the next few years, a number did so, willingly, or otherwise. The tsar’s intentions are anyone’s guess. He might have wished to spread the musical largesse of Novgorod to the rest of Russia, or to move its musicians under his eye in Moscow, or simply to deflate the musical prominence of Novgorod. Regardless, he followed this with a savage Massacre in 1570, in which he laid waste to the city and its surrounding monasteries.

These actions drained the pool of singing talent in Novgorod, and thereby its prominence as a centre of musical innovation. Indeed, the Tsar’s attentions to
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227 Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 314 fn74. See also fn118 above.
228 Harri, St. Petersburg Court Chant, 63–67; Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 27–32. The split kliros is comparable to the two Decani and Cantoris sides maintained in some Western churches.
229 Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 314 fn74. See also fn118 above.
230 Gardner, Russian Church Singing, Vol. 2, 273–274. Each kliros had a golovshchik (leader). When singing together, the Tsar’s Choir was on the right kliros and the Patriarch’s Choir on the left.
231 McKinnon, ‘The Emergence of Gregorian’, 115–116. Although it became established in permanence only in the late seventh century.
232 Hosking, Russia and the Russians, 113–114.
233 Jensen, Musical Cultures in Seventeenth–Century, 4–5;
234 Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 26.
235 Hosking, Russia: People and Empire, 55–56.
Novgorod may have further constrained the numbers of singers in Russia with higher skills when Western partesny showed up a century later. On the other hand, there is some unpublished evidence that the Tsar's Choir, and also the Patriarch's Choir and the Novgorod Cathedral choir, could sing at least some liturgical music polyphonically in the early 17th century (see Appendix). I emphasise that this antedates the appearance of Western partesny in mid–century (Chapter 2) by several decades. The relevant data was compiled by Zvereva from expense books and Tsar's Treasury orders curated at RGADA – the Russiskiy Gosudarstvenniy Archiv Drevnikh Aktov [The Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts].236 These administrative records show that certain singers in the bol'shaya (Big, ergo Senior) stanitsa of the Tsar's Choir were identified individually by name. The crucial point to emphasise is that they were further specifically designated as singing one of four separate voice lines. Thus, in 1617/18, the Big stanitsa consisted of: Ivan Fedorov, niz (bottom line); Bogdan Kipelov, verkh (top line); Yuri Bukin and Vasily Nikitin, both put' (middle line); and Peter Podunayev, demestvo (probably middle line). There is some confusion as to the range of the demestvo voice, with various scholars suggesting it was the lowest, or even the highest vocal line.237 This distribution of voices was apparently maintained during the reign of Tsar Feyodor (1676–1682).238

This vocal differentiation does not seem to be accidental, and was consciously maintained, by replacing singers 'like for like'. However, Zvereva suggests that replacements for polyphonists in the Big stanitsa sometimes needed to be drawn from the Patriarch’s Choir, or the cathedral choir in Novgorod. This indicates to me that only a few choristers of those otherwise available as replacements from the lower stanitsy of the Tsar's Choir were actually capable polyphonists. From the records available, it is unclear if the Tsar’s choristers could sing in parts earlier than 1617/18, although the use of replacements from Novgorod, where strochny and demestvenny polyphony had been developed earlier in the previous 16th century (see Music below), is consistent with this possibility. Moreover, the fact that many choristers sang for life suggests that some of those named could have been singing polyphonically since the last decades of the 16th century.239

Zvereva discusses the assignment of the five singers in the Big stanitsa to four–part music, and notes as above that three singers were respectively niznik, verskhnik and demesvennik, and two were put'niks. This emphasis on the put’ line is consistent with the fact that the cantus firmus in both strochny and demestvenny polyphony was generally assigned to that line (see Music below), much as it was in the West during the early Renaissance. However, there is no comparable data on assignment of the demestvennik to the more common three–line forms of strochny and demestvenny (Music below). Equally, information on details of the working polyphonic repertoire is missing. When Four–part Western partesny did arrive in Russia later in mid–17th century, the cantus firmus was generally in the top verkh line (Chapter 2). It is fair to
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236 Zvereva, 'Ob osobennostyakh ispolneniya rannego', [On the performance features of ancient], A–E. This work is unpublished, but is included in the Appendix in my translation from the Russian.

237 Gardner, Russian Church Singing, Vol. 2, 297–8 and 301–3. In part, this may reflect confusion with Demestvenny chant (see below).

238 Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 32 and fn79.

239 Zvereva, 'Ob osobennostyakh ispolneniya rannego', [On the performance features of ancient], D.
assume that in 1617/1618, the few choristers capable of polyphony were singing a mix of 16th–century polyphony, and traditional monophonic chant.\(^{240}\)

One other important suggestion made by Zvereva is that trained polyphonists coached the less experienced singers.\(^{241}\) This reinforces the point made above that the number of skilled proponents of part singing was probably limited. Furthermore, even in those choristers successfully acquiring the basics of polyphonic singing, not all may have been confident in singing a separate vocal line as a soloist, especially at a time when the vast majority of liturgical music was still chanted in unison and by rote. This is an additional reason for the warm welcome extended to migrant singers from the Southwest later in mid–17th century when partesny abruptly appeared (chapter 2). The coaching of lower stanitsy singers also supports the very reasonable suggestion that ‘on the job’ training, following an apprenticeship model, was normal practice in such an important national choir. I infer that mechanical aspects of singing were honed by regular practice and performance, but that neither audiation nor visualisation were emphasised. Neither is there evidence of pedagogical use of the Bicinia and Partimenti employed in the West. Despite this, certain of the Tsar’s choristers, such as Mikhail Osipov, were presumably accomplished in such higher skills, since they set down much of the part music being sung from memory.\(^{242}\)

Outside the Tsar’s and Patriarch’s Choirs, and some other choirs in larger cities such as Moscow and Novgorod,\(^{243}\) opportunities for formal training appear to have been extremely limited. Unsubstantiated claims by Razumovsky for the existence of choral schools were later disputed by Gardner.\(^{244}\) The only other, realistic means of obtaining a musical education would have been to travel to the West, or at least the Southwest. While this might have been possible for a very few educated individuals with sufficient means, it was inconceivable for the masses of illiterate bonded serfs. Equally, the Russian Church was doctrinaire, unapologetically anti–Western, and fiercely anti–Catholic and anti–Protestant (Environment and Training above). Contact with Polish and Lithuanian Catholics was not allowed, nor any musical trend smacking of Western provenance. It is also inconceivable to me that any Russian clergy would have received licence or support to travel for purposes of training.

I conclude that approaching mid–17th century, the large pool of liturgical singers in Russia’s many sacred spaces could command an extraordinarily rich repertoire of highly–developed monophonic chant, singing in unison from memory. However, higher singing skills would have been otherwise underdeveloped, or even actively suppressed. Few native Russian singers would have had any experience of singing in parts, and equally few would have been musically literate and able to read polyphonic choral music, either in neumes or in stave notation. Furthermore, outside the Tsar’s Choir, the highly reactionary Russian Church controlled all the major choirs and singing centres. Opportunities for training were few and far between, and singers

\(^{240}\) Zvereva, ‘Ob osobennostyakh isp polneniya rannego’, [On the performance features of ancient], D.

\(^{241}\) Zvereva, ‘Ob osobennostyakh isp polneniya rannego’, [On the performance features of ancient], B–C.

\(^{242}\) Zvereva, ‘Ob osobennostyakh isp polneniya rannego’, [On the performance features of ancient], C.

\(^{243}\) Gardner, Russian Church Singing, Vol. 2, 263. Gardner reports that the Rogov brothers began a singing school in Moscow after they had moved there from Novgorod.

\(^{244}\) Razumovsky, Tserkovnoye peniye vRossii, [Church singing in Russia], 65–66; Gardner, Russian Church Singing, Vol. 2, 195, and fn33–35.
were not yet encouraged, much less allowed, to engage in the rich ferment of harmonisation, improvisation and composition that had nourished and simulated the progressive development of polyphony in Western Europe over the centuries. This raises the question of where then was Russia to find competent polyphonists for the impending crash transition to liturgical polyphony from mid–17th century (Chapter 2)?

**Music**

In contrast to the stave notation evolved in the West, musical notation in Russia approaching mid–17th century was still reliant on pictographic neumes. The major liturgical chant form, Znamenny (sign) had, from the 15th century onwards, been primarily notated in neumes termed Stolp (support or pillar). Stolp had increased in complexity to a point where look–up compendia termed Azbuki (Russian for ‘ABC’s) were required to tabulate and explicate all the neumes and their modifiers. The best–known azbuka was compiled by Aleksandr Mezenets; this was later published by Stepan Smolensky (Introduction and Chapter 2). An example of Stolp is shown in Figure 1.2, in a fragment from a theotokion (hymn to Mary, Mother of Jesus). Each syllable of text in Church Slavonic is marked up with one or more neumes. Stolp specified certain characteristics of each note to be sung – duration, quality, and accentuation. Numerous modifier markings were also superimposed, to provide additional direction. Neumes indicated the general shape of chants, but did not provide the more comprehensive specification of fully developed stave notation. So, neumatic manuscripts really functioned primarily as reminders for singers that had already memorised the chant, and then only for the few that were neume–literate.

![Figure 1.2. Example of Stolp Notation](image)

Translation: It is worthy to truly bless you.....

This issue of readability was one of several potential limitations that neumes would have imposed on the introduction of polyphonic music to Russia. Complicating matters was the fact that the already large repertoire of neumes in Russia continued to expand through the early 17th century, with addition of several hundred lica or fity (shorthand signs), introduced to codify the sizeable body of melismata then in use. In theory, this increased available information for singers, but in practice it further
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247 Harri, *St. Petersburg Court Chant*, 117–127. The most common note duration was a minim.
248 Ancient neumatic manuscripts, and especially early painted woodcuts or engravings known as lubki (prints – singular lubok), are aesthetically gorgeous.
249 Harri, *St. Petersburg Court Chant*, 43–44; Smolensky, *Azbuka znamennago peniya* [Alphabet of znamenny singing, 15 and 18. Over 200 were in use by the late 17th century. They could be found in compilations called fitniki (from the Greek symbol theta, Θ or fita in Russian).
complicated full familiarity with the exploding repertoire of neumes. Chanting the extant repertoire from memory was straightforward, and new monophonic music, including hymnography to honour newly canonised saints or reworked traditional chants, could certainly have been learnt by rote. On the other hand, decoding and learning the additional, new vocal lines of partesny from neumatic manuscripts would have been taxing, even for the few singers who possessed sufficient musical literacy. It is therefore implausible that more than a small minority of singers could have sight sung new Western partesny from neumes, even if they had had any experience with part singing.

A related point is that surviving neumatic manuscripts of this period are much smaller than the large choir book format that was used earlier for many centuries in the West. Morosan concludes that these Russian manuscripts would not have been readable by more than two, or three singers. Further, with the added problem of lining up neumes vertically in a manuscript with more than one vocal line, it is not surprising that only a handful of multi-part neumatic manuscripts still exist from the late 17th century, when Western partesny appeared in Russia.

Another issue with neumatic notation was that while the pitch of notes was generally specified relative to preceding and following notes, reference pitch was not. Historically, this situation had been manageable when chanting in unison by rote; singers simply followed the starting pitch of the lead singer. However, pressure was now mounting to specify pitch more precisely. The first attempted solution is credited to the monk Shaidurov (see Introduction), who added kinovarnye pomyety (cinnabar or red marks) above each neume (Figure 1.3).

Translation: It is worthy and righteous to bow……

Figure 1.3. Example of Stolp Notation with Shaidurov Pitch Markings (in Black)

The neume for the second syllable is a kryuk (hook) indicating a minim. The two additional blobs in the centre of the kryuk make it a kryuk svyetlo (light kryuk), which narrows the pitch down to either F, G, or A. The 'П' pitch mark then further specifies a G.

Cinnabar marks were used for pitch specification, until stave notation spread across Russia with adoption of polyphony, and provided a potentially simpler solution (see Chapter 2). However, while such marks provided a better indication of pitch,
they did not necessarily assist in the matter of readability, nor of timing (see below). The fragment of chant from Figure 1.3 is transcribed to Western stave notation in Figure 1.4.

![Figure 1.4. Transcription of Figure 1.3 to Stave Notation and Transliteration](image)

Given minimal familiarisation, this version is now straightforward for singers to read. Intriguingly, a tiny number of such dvoznamenniki (double sign) manuscripts survive with a mixture of neumatic and stave notation. On the other hand, there is no evidence of transitional forms of Stolp, with superimposed heightening or staving clues, such as appeared in some early Western neumatic manuscripts. I assume that this is a consequence of the rapidity in changeover from neumes to stave notation in Russia, and particularly in Moscow, starting at mid–17th century. It also suggests that stave notation was adopted 'as is', rather than being developed or modified locally.

Notation in neumes posed another difficulty for a move to polyphony in the matter of timing. While it might have been possible more or less to line up neumatic vocal lines vertically in score format in pieces that were homophonic and homorhythmic, this would have been more difficult where they diverged rhythmically. Although each vocal line could still have been recorded separately in individual part manuscripts, this would have increased opportunities for disjunction between the various voices.

Neumes also complicated the setting down and dissemination of the new multi–part music to the many thousands of churches and other sacred spaces scattered across Russia’s vast galaxy of sacred spaces. Creation of neumatic manuscripts required skilled scribes, often monks labouring in the scriptoria of monasteries. It might theoretically have been possible to bypass this bottleneck by printing music. After all, printing had been available in Russia since 1553, when Ivan IV created the Moscow Print Yard. However, in the early 17th century, Russian music was still dependent on neumes, and the sheer number of different type characters needed to print the massive repertoire of neumes was a daunting challenge for the presses (Chapter 2).

Another musical difference between East and West approaching mid–17th century was the continued use of the Russian Gamut in Russia, as opposed to emerging modern major:minor tonality in Europe. As in the West, the original basis of tonality in Russia was the Oktoechos (Greek for eight tones), the tonal system imported with
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260 Fassler, Music in the Medieval, 41–42. Scriptoria were often managed by prominent, monastic singers who had memorised vast amounts of chant – so–called cantors.
Greek Byzantine chant. The Greeks termed the eight tones, or modes, 1 – 4 authentic, and 1 – 4 plagal. in Russia, this system was termed osmoglassiye (Slavonic for eight tones), and tones were labelled 1 – 8. Later in the 14th or 15th centuries, a basic tonal palette became established in the form of the Russian Gamut, with 12 notes pitched from G2 up to D4 (Figure 1.5). This system was rationalised and codified early in the 17th century by Shaidurov, of cinnabar pitch mark prominence (see above). It encompassed the range of pitches used in standard medieval Znamenny chant that could be comfortably handled by male singers. This range could be extended by doubling at an octave below by oktavists (ultra–low basses or bassi profundi), or at an octave above by high tenors and later boys. The gamut spanned four successive groups of trichords, each of which was called a soglassiya (a domain or concordance). Figure 1.5 shows the Russian Gamut in both treble and bass clefs, together with qualitative Russian descriptors for how they were purported to sound in men’s voices (Low, Dark, Light and Very Light). Figure 1.5 includes the Russian letters used to specify pitch (see fn256 above).

![Figure 1.5. The Russian Gamut](image)

The Russian Gamut is reminiscent of the Gamut set out six centuries earlier by Guido of Arezzo in the West, and has some interesting properties in common. The intervals within each trichord are whole tones, while the intervals between successive trichords are semitones; clearly, this does not line up with any modern Western scale. To maintain these intervocalic relationships, the note one octave above B3 is flattened from B4 to B♭4. The result is that each note of the Gamut is a perfect fourth below the corresponding note of the trichord above (e.g. from the bottom G – C, A – D, B – E and so on…). This means that it is straightforward to transpose any melody up or down by a perfect fourth, without the need for added accidentals. However, the Gamut lines up only with three modes, and transposition by just a second means that the new version is intervocalically distinct – that is in a different mode. The Russian Gamut could also be arrayed in hexachords, with the middle 6 notes of C – A spanning much of the range used for chanting. I note that earlier polyphonic compositions in the West were also pre-tonal, and it is reasonable to speculate that
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262. Palisca, ‘Guido of Arezzo [Areinus].’
263. Morosan, *Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary*, 152–154. An oktavist (or contrabass) can comfortably sing an octave below the main bass line, easily singing G1 and sometimes lower.
265. Simmons, ‘A Primer of Kyivan’. Although set out here in Western treble and bass clefs, in Kyivan notation the Gamut would have used the alto clef.
266. Burkholder, Grout and Palisca, *A History of Western*, 39–40; Fassler, *Music in the Medieval*, 96. The original Western gamut was conceived as a conjunction of hexachords, hard, natural or soft. Neither this gamut nor the Russian version allowed a B3b in the lower octave.
these could have been adopted in Russia relatively easily. In this regard, persistence of the Russian gamut into the 17th century may not have been sui generis a major barrier to the incorporation of Western polyphony. However, as we shall see, at mid-17th century the different tonal palette of the Russian Gamut meant that early partesny was not immediately and fully realised in Western major:minor tonality of the time (Figures 2.1–2.4, and 3.1).

Another similarity with Guido’s earlier work in the West was in the solmisation (naming) of component pitches. Guido had earlier solmised the overlapping hexachords from G2, or Γ (gamma) upwards, using the initial letters of the first six words of a Latin hymn – namely Ut, Re, Mi, Fa, Sol, La. The use of just six notes reflects the historical focus on hexachords, rather than the octaves of current usage. Later a seventh note, Si or Ti was added, and Do was substituted for Ut. Solmisation in Russia diverged but slightly. La was Lya, but Si or Ti remained absent, and Ut remained Ut. In Russia, as in other Slavic and Romance language countries, Ut was fixed (i.e., ‘fixed Do’), unlike in most Germanic and English–speaking countries where Do/Ut could start on the tonic of any scale (‘movable Do’). The similarities of the medieval Russian gamut and solmisation system to older Western versions is perhaps unsurprising. Shaidurov worked in Novgorod, then the most Western–leaning city, and was reportedly familiar with European musical customs. As in the West, the term echos (tone) in Octoechos did not have much to do with reference pitch. This was defined more relatively, by comparison with preceding and succeeding notes, and with attention to the appropriate intervallic speciation. Singing in a particular tone had come to mean chanting the various liturgical texts according to a particular collection of melody ‘blueprints’ under the rubric of that tone, reminiscent of early modal chanting in the West. This led to the eight tones being set out in a book – the oktoikh (Slavonic for octoechos) – specifying the correct chant melodies for the appropriate propers and ordinaries to be chanted during the various weeks of the year. The tone was then rotated every week on a repeating cycle of eight weeks starting each year after Easter. The oktoikh was supplemented by other special tones, and also by the Menaion (Slavonic for ‘the month’), which contains many of the propers for fixed dates independent of Easter. This paralleled comparable books compiling chants and their melodies by tone in the West.

Another reality of liturgical music in early 17th-century Russia was problems of coordination between music and text. These have been described in detail elsewhere, and often as interesting but harmless historical curiosities. Nonetheless, I cannot escape the conclusion that they constituted another musical impediment to the incorporation of polyphony into Russian sacred music, especially when they were present at the same time. The first problem involved changes in

268 Fassler, Music in the Medieval, 96–97; Fitch, Renaissance Polyphony, 52–54; Palisca, ‘Guido of Arezzo [Aretnus]’. Ut queant laxis Resonare fibris Mira gestorum Famuli tuorum Solve polluti Labii reatum – loosely translated as ‘so that the slaves might resound the wonders of your creations with expanded vocal cords, wash the guilt from the polluted lip’.
269 Taken from the following part of the above hymn, Sancta Iohannes.
271 Harri, St. Petersburg Court Chant, 91–94.
language. By early 17th century, spoken Russian, the ‘true speech’ of the street, had diverged in several respects from the old Church Slavonic recension still used in the liturgy. One example involved the semi–vowels ‘ь’ and ‘ъ’, which were both originally vocalised as separate syllables in speech and singing, most likely as ‘о’ and ‘е’ respectively. Later, both signs became silent ‘missing syllables’, and served to modify pronunciation of the letters preceding them, making them hard and soft respectively.274 However, both signs were still assigned their own musical neumes. Since the chant melody remained unmodified, this caused a syllabic disconnect between melody and text.275 This was termed khomoniya (divergent speech). Other changes in accentuation meant that word meaning became altered or even nonsensical. Preobrazhensky states ‘the text was sacrificed to the tune’.276 This was clearly out of kilter with the traditional importance of the text, and the question of if, and how, to correct musical melodies to accord with true speech began to cause serious conflict (Chapter 2).

Nonsense syllables constituted another problem in coordinating music and text. These were, and still are chanted as ‘fillers’ in the Byzantine liturgy, for example ananeanes (the filler syllables an–an–e–an–es), They were also being used over the centuries in Russia, albeit in modified form viz. anenaiki in Church Slavonic. An example from the liturgical annunciation text is shown in Figure 1.6.277 Note the filler syllables between ‘taini’ and ‘raduisya’ on line 2. There is also a six–note melisma on ‘ti’ in line 1. Another filler syllable then in use was khabuva (e.g., ha–bu–va). Since initially Western partesny was largely homophonic, the florid melismata in the traditional monophonic chant being harmonised needed attention to avoid dyssynchronisation with the other vocal lines now added (Chapter 2).

The strangest issue of text: music coordination flowed directly from the extreme length of services. With the monastic rite introduced into Russia in the 15th century, Matins could easily last five hours or more.278 This might be acceptable in a
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274 Harri, St. Petersburg Court Chant, 50 and 54–55.
275 Metallov, Ocherk istorii tserkovnogo peniya [Essay on the history of church singing], 46–49.
276 Preobrazhensky, Kul’tovaya muzyka v Rossii, [Culture of music in Russia], 10; Gardner, Russian Church Singing, Vol. 2, 275–281, ‘Razumovsky, Tserkovnaye Peniya v Rossii, [Church singing in Russia], 75. As one example, with stress on the first syllable (true speech), the word dushu (accusative) means ‘soul’. With stress on the second syllable (khomoniya), dushu means ‘I strangle’.
278 Fassler, Music in the Medieval, 59–60. Matins in the West then lasted for around two hours.
Although sacred chanting remained largely monophonic in Russia until the mid-17th century, some experimentation with part singing did occur during the previous century. One form of such polyphony is termed strochny peniye (Figure 1.7).

![Figure 1.7. An Example of Concordant Strochny Polyphony](image)

---

279 Preobrazhensky, Kultovaya muzyka v Rossi, [Culture of music in Russia], 11. ‘It is impossible for the listener to understand what is sung and honoured.’ Theoretically, services could also be read and not sung.

280 Gardner, Russian Church Singing, Vol. 2, 255–261; Harri, St. Petersburg Court Chant, 99. This should be distinguished from mnogogolosiye (many voices), the Russian term for polyphony.

281 Cook, The Cyclic Mass, 59–61. Mnogogolasiye is somewhat reminiscent of the deliberate ‘speeding up’ of the otherwise lengthy Credo in the earlier English Cyclic masses of the 16th century, either by telescoping two or more lines of text in different voices, or deliberate omission of text.

282 Gardner, Russian Church Singing, Vol. 2, 231–232. Monophonic chanting in Russia might have been accompanied by an ison (Greek for pedal note), or stopitsa (Russian for pedal note), following its introduction into Greek usage around the 16th century. However, the presence of a fixed ison is not considered to represent part singing.

283 Harri, St. Petersburg Court Chant, 45; Uspensky, N, Obraztsy drevne–russkogo pevcheskogo iskusstvo [Examples of the early art of russian singing], 165, fn189. This is Uspensky’s transcription. The original neumatic manuscript was unavailable to me.
There remains some dispute as to the exact nature of this form.\textsuperscript{284} There is agreement that it usually consisted of three voices (Figure 1.7), hence the alternative designation of troyestrochny (three line), although sometimes two, or four voices were employed. The cantus firmus (fixed song), corresponding to the original monophonic chant melody (and labelled *), was usually placed in the put' (a middle or tenor voice). To this was added a verkh (upper voice, high tenor), and a niz (bottom voice, bass). Less often, a demestvo (fourth voice) was also included.\textsuperscript{285} Strochny generally involved partial or complete replication of the melodic contour and rhythm of the original monophonic chant at different pitch levels, as in this example at thirds and fifths. Other notable features of this example are that most of the triads are in root position, and the piece ends with a chord not dissimilar to a perfect cadence as found in the West, although the 7th is missing. However, it is pre-tonal, consistent with the traditional Russian Gamut. There is also much parallel motion, something that was prominent in Western Europe in earlier times but that by mid–17th century would generally have been considered poor practice (Figure 1.7).

Strochny was usually aligned vertically, and was therefore both homophonic and homorhythmic, consistent with maintaining optimal textual clarity. However, debate persists as to whether this form was concordant or discordant. Examples of both exist. Some, as that presented in Figure 1.7 are concordant.\textsuperscript{286} However, others are not (Figure 1.8). This example is homorhythmic and to some extent follows the

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure18.png}
\caption{An Example of Discordant Strochny Polyphony\textsuperscript{287}}
\end{figure}

Translation: And now, and forever, unto the ages of ages, Amen.

The Only–Begotten Son, and immortal word of God.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Figure 1.8. An Example of Discordant Strochny Polyphony}\textsuperscript{287}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{284} Although strochny is often translated as ‘linear’, I do not find this helpful, and so have used the Russian descriptive term ‘strochny’ untranslated throughout.

\textsuperscript{285} Cook, ‘Three–voice Textures in’, 46–48; Trowell, ‘Faburden’. This profile is not dissimilar to some early polyphonic forms in the West – e.g. English discant and faburden/ fauxbourdon.

\textsuperscript{286} Harri, St. Petersburg Court Chant, 45–46; Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 24–27.

\textsuperscript{287} Ex Libris Ensemble, ‘Gumn Edinorodnyi syne. Strochnoye’ [Hymn ‘only begotten son’. strochny].
melodic profile of the cantus firmus, but it is hard to discern any rational intervallic pattern between the voices, and both pauses span G₃, A₃ and B♭₃! It appears almost as if the vocal lines were created independently and then combined without regard to vertical, harmonic relationships, and the effect is almost atonal. It remains unclear to what degree strochny polyphony was discordant. However, Plotnikova recently noted that Russian musicologists increasingly emphasise dissonance over consonance. She also pointed out that Korenev, writing at a time when strochny was still in the repertoire, was critical of this form precisely because it was discordant.²⁸⁸

Alternatively, could such discordance reflect technical issues? For example, Bogomolova pointed to possible inaccuracies arising during post–facto transcriptions of the original neumes into stave notation, although this might have been more the case with demestvenny polyphony (see below). She also noted the provocative suggestion that some ‘hidden’ meaning in the original neumes may have been lost in translation.²⁸⁹ This notion was repeated by Konotop, who also discussed parallels between early Russian part singing and polyphonic folk singing of the time.²⁹⁰ There is another more prosaic explanation for dissonance. Given the strongly isolationist and anti–Catholic stance of the Russian Church in the 16th century, I wonder if dissonance was partly a deliberate, tactical device, to differentiate such early Russian mnogogolosiye from contemporaneous Western polyphony. A century later, when Russia was opening up to Europe and incorporating Western partesny (Chapter 2), perhaps this distinction was less crucial?²⁹¹

Relevant records are very sketchy, but on balance it appears reasonable to assume that strochny polyphony could have started up spontaneously through improvisation by accomplished choristers, with the usual suspects being the singing masters of Novgorod.²⁹² It is possible to imagine a sequence of events resembling the evolutionary arc of polyphony in Western Europe, with ‘intermediate oral’ forms comparable to organum and motets improvised according to unwritten choral rules and conventions. If so, this would provide one important explanation for the relatively small number of strochny manuscripts surviving, since many improvisations, unlike formal compositions, may never have been written down.²⁹³ It is possible that on–the–fly improvised part singing could have occurred elsewhere in Russia. However, this seems unlikely given the special, creative, singing environment of Novgorod before Ivan IV’s dispersion of its singing masters and subsequent brutal massacre, and the continued reliance on memory elsewhere. Above all, I imagine that any experimentation with polyphony was limited, or even surreptitious, given the enduring

²⁸⁸ Plotnikova, Poliphoniya v russkom bezlineinom, [Polyphony in Russian lineless], 7. Korenev’s manuscript was not available to me.
²⁸⁹ Bogomolova, Znamennaya monodiya i bezlineinoye [Znamenny monophony and lineless], 21–22.
²⁹⁰ Konotop, Russkoye strochnoye monogolosiye XV–XVII, [Russian strochny polyphony XV–XVII], 127.
²⁹² Gardner, Russian Church Singing, Vol. 2, 261. For example, we know that the Novgorodian, Vasily Rogov, composed troyestrochny (three–part singing) in the mid–16th century.
and implacable opposition of the Church (see below). One other possibility is that the Church simply turned a deaf ear in Novgorod.

![Figure 1.9. An Example of Demestvenny Polyphony](image)

A second form of early polyphony was *demestvenny peniye* (of uncertain meaning). Demestvenny polyphony generally also featured three vocal lines (Figure 1.9). However, there was little melodic coherence, and the vocal lines were much less conjunct rhythmically. In this example, the verkh line often contains two or three notes for each note of the put' line, while the niz line contains even more.

Interestingly, this may not seriously have compromised comprehension of the text since syllables were still more or less lined up vertically. However, there were frequent harsh dissonances. As with discordant strochny (Figure 1.8), it is unclear if this reflects a very different harmonic grammar, or simple disregard for, or antipathy to, more pleasing Western consonances. Beyond that, the overall effect seems distinctly at odds with the slow, solemn, reverential norm of traditional monophonic chant. Unlike discordant strochny, it is hard to imagine this form being improvised, even by accomplished choristers. Equally, memorisation would have been far from
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294 Harri, St. Petersburg Court Chant, 46, fn23. The relevant book by Uspensky and the original neumed manuscript were unavailable to me. This reconstruction is from Harri. An English translation of the text is shown in Figure 1.7.
straightforward, and yet, as noted above, written music would have been highly problematic to create, disseminate and read using neumes.\textsuperscript{295} The uncertain origin of demestvenny, whether from Byzantium, Russia, or other Slavic sources, is discussed in detail by Poliakova.\textsuperscript{296} The only Western polymorphic form that seems remotely analogous is florid organum, for example from Aquitaine, which dates back to the 12\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{297} Another factor complicating this analysis is that the particular example of demestvenny shown in Figure 1.9 is dated to the years between 1690–1707.\textsuperscript{298} This is more than a century after this form first appeared, and also well after Western partesny first penetrated Russian sacred music in mid–17\textsuperscript{th} century (see Chapter 2).

One wonders what Russians long accustomed to hearing traditional monophonic chant would have made of these new polyphonic liturgical forms, especially discordant strochny and demestvenny. Their fate lies shrouded in mystery; numerous, vexatious questions remain. Might early Russian polyphony have owed its existence in part to polyphonic folk music, as may have occurred in the West? Did such part singing represent distinct, indigenous forms of native polyphony, or early imperfect representations of Western–style part singing (perhaps imported from the Southwest or via Novgorod)? Was such part–singing undertaken by regular church choirs, or consigned to a few experienced soloists singing \textit{en ensemble}?\textsuperscript{299} And the most important question of all – was 16\textsuperscript{th}–century polyphony a significant step on the path to 17\textsuperscript{th}–century Western partesny, or a mere blip in the steady drum–beat of monophony that was possible transiently in the special musical environment of Novgorod before the massacre? My admittedly tentative, conclusion is that strochny and demestvenny were innovative, indigenous, Russian forms of part–singing, perhaps influenced in a minor way by Western polyphony of that period, but otherwise distinct, time–limited, experimental, musical threads.

A form of polyphony also occurred in the folk music of the Skomorokhi (see Singers and Singing above). However, its secular nature, frequent accompaniment by instruments, and its popularity for secular, community and social gatherings, made it unacceptable to the Church in any form. There was as yet little other secular or instrumental music anywhere in Russia, apart from the fanfares used militarily or at special state occasions such as weddings of the Tsar.\textsuperscript{300}

The status of music and notation approaching 17\textsuperscript{th}–century in Europe could hardly have been more different. Although early musical recensions had used neumes, notation had progressively moved to the seminal stave form introduced by Guido of Arezzo in the 11\textsuperscript{th} century. In fully realised form, this specified key musical properties essential for adequate visual representation of polyphony, including those mentioned above which were imperfectly addressed Russian neumes – e.g., simultaneous specification of pitch and rhythmicity in the various vocal lines.\textsuperscript{301} Stave notation was also easily readable. Singers needed only to learn a small, invariant ‘alphabet’ of

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Morosan, \textit{Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary}, 27.
\item Poliakova, ‘On the Establishment of’, 190–194
\item Burkholder, Grout and Palisca, \textit{A History of Western}, 80–86.
\item Harri, \textit{St. Petersburg Court Chant}, 46, fn24.
\item Morosan, \textit{Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary}, 32–36. The use of just 4–5 singers on each kliros would favour soloists singing \textit{en ensemble}, and neumatic manuscripts may have been too small to be legible by more.
\item Jensen, \textit{Musical Cultures in Seventeenth–Century}, 77–104.
\item Palisca, ‘Guido of Arezzo [Aretinus].
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
notes, which could be used as building blocks to construct and reveal a comprehensive representation of the music to be sung. This required less time than learning a vast and unwieldy pictorial encyclopaedia of specific, ideographic neumes. Consequently, by the 14th century, Western choral music was largely in stave notation, although ligatures continued to appear until the 17th century. In parallel, the largescale, choir book format of music and part books used for many years was beginning to yield to modern score format, with multiple vocal lines stacked vertically. This allowed singers to see clearly what the other vocal lines were doing harmonically and rhythmically at the same time. This in turn reduced the risks of getting irretrievably lost, and made sight singing more feasible. The other advantage was that when printing presses appeared in the 15th and 16th centuries, it proved to be easier to print stave notation than neumes (see Chapter 2). This obviated the time-consuming manual copying of manuscripts and allowed their rapid, inexpensive dissemination.

In parallel to the notation of music, a robust body of scholarship on the theory of music had also emerged, with texts such as: Musica enchiriadis (Music Handbook) and Scolica enchiriadis (loosely translated as Notes on the Handbook); Musica Disciplina (The Discipline of Music) of Aurelian; and De Musica (About Music) by Hucbald dating back to the ninth century. These texts covered several important points, including the fact that the Gamut used in the West was different from ancient Greek practice. In an early foretaste of modern tonality, these documents stressed the importance of octaves, 4ths and 5ths, and defined parallel, contrary and oblique motion, principles that remained unfamiliar in Russia in mid–17th century.

Another important driver of the development of polyphony in the West was the parallel development of secular music, both choral and instrumental, and also the addition of instrumental accompaniment to sacred singing. Although much earlier secular music may simply not have been written down, extant examples include the troubadour/ trouvére movement of the 12th and 13th centuries, and secular motets and forms fixes of the 13th and 14th centuries. The 16th century saw the rapid proliferation of madrigal forms and other secular songs all across Western Europe, and in the 17th century Italian opera was born and rapidly became all the rage. These polyphonic secular forms were extremely popular, and were often composed, at least initially as a profitable side line, by composers of sacred works. The progressive addition of instruments to sacred choral music was also an important promoter of polyphony, given the extraordinary versatility and virtuosity possible, especially with stringed instruments. In turn, these developments were a powerful inducement for composers to push the boundaries of vocal polyphony.

The progressive evolution of tonality to the modern major:minor construct also took place during the flowering of polyphony in the West. In early times, with the fall of the Western Roman Empire and the ascendancy of Constantinople in the early Middle
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302 Burkholder, Grout and Palisca, A History of Western, 100
303 Erickson, Raymond, ‘Musica enchiriadis, Scolica enchiriadis’. Enchiriadis is thought to be derived from the Greek word for ‘handbook’. These manuscripts were apparently read as widely as Boethius’s De Instituione Musica and Guido de Arezzo’s Micrologus. They also included important discussions of the eight modes, and organum.
304 Fassler, Music in the Medieval, 52–54. Such discussion of polyphony also applied the label of symphonia (Greek for sounding together)
Ages, Western chant had been influenced to some degree by Eastern liturgical and musical practice and had taken on the Greek nomenclature of seven different ‘species’ of modes. In the West, tonality then travelled along a trajectory involving the Gamut (spread of pitches) regularised by Guido, and Church modes. After further changes during the 15th and 16th centuries, tonality in the early 17th century had developed close to the version that still persists today. However, the term ‘tonality’ did not actually come into use until the early 19th century when Alexandre Choron suggested the term to describe the system of tonic, dominant, and subdominant harmonies. Shortly thereafter, François–Joseph Fétis proposed the date of 1600 CE as the watershed between medieval and modern tonality. Both these authors highlighted the first apparent use of dominant sevenths, and even ninths, resolving to the tonic, in madrigals written by Claudio Monteverdi in the 1590s. While Hyer recently pointed out that at least one of the dominant seventh chords identified did not actually resolve to the tonic, 1600 CE has stuck as the more or less accepted birth date of modern tonality.

In contrast to the seven modal species or scales, Western tonality in the early 17th century was coming to rely on just two – major, and minor with its variants.

Music in the Southwest in the early 17th century can be regarded as intermediate in character between that in Russia and the West. In the 16th century, Southwestern singers adopted a modified version of stave notation in the form of Kyivan square note (quadratic) notation (Chapter 2), and this form began to be taught in schools along with the basics – reading, writing and arithmetic. Square stave notation had almost completely replaced neumatic notation in Ukraine by the end of this century, and only four manuscripts using neumes are known to survive from the entire 16th century. Under Polish and Lithuanian suzerainty, stave notation facilitated incorporation of Western polyphony into sacred music in Ukraine during the 16th century, a full century before this occurred in Russia (Chapter 2).

The above indicates that Russian sacred music approaching mid–17th century was still monophonic, based on the pre–tonal gamut and recorded in neumes. Music in the West had become polyphonic, largely tonal, and notated in staves, while that of Ukraine and the Southwest was intermediate – largely polyphonic and moving towards Western tonality and stave notation. Moreover, I conclude that these characteristics of Russian liturgical music collectively constituted another factor inhibiting the incorporation of polyphony. There was also a dearth of the musical promoters of polyphony that had already become evident in the West (see above).

**The Balance between Promoters and Inhibitors**

The above analysis demonstrates that the soil about to receive the seeds of Western partesny in mid–17th century was not only barren from a lack of promoters,
but completely choked with a thatch of potent inhibitors that were particular to Russia. The status of the promoters teased out above is compared in Russia and in the West (Table 1.2). A parallel tabulation of inhibitors identified in Russia is shown in Table 1.3. In later chapters, comparisons are also made in the agency of promoters and inhibitors in Russia during the incorporation of polyphony – at around 1700 (Chapter 2) and 1750 (Chapter 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotersa</th>
<th>The West c. 1650</th>
<th>Russia c. 1650</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment and Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from Church and State</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth of choirs and choir schools</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal musical education</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical theorists, educators and texts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confraternities, brotherhoods, guilds</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singers and Singing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide vocal range (men, women &amp; children)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorisation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visualisation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonisation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual and musical literacy</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalisation and payment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution and Naming</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patronage and Sponsorship</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous polyphonic forms</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secular and non-liturgical sacred music</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental music</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of folk music</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on art and beauty in music</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stave notation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Promoters clearly present, regardless of relative agency, are marked with a green tick (✓). Those of uncertain status are either marked with a smaller tick (✔), or left unmarked.

Table 1.2. Promoters of Polyphony in Mid–17th Century in Russia and the West

Since accurate quantitation of the various factors is not possible, these tabulations are purely qualitative and based on my reading of the available literature. I should also reiterate that there were particular limitations and gaps in the data available to me for analysis of the situation in Russia, due both to sketchy record-keeping early on, and recent restrictions in travel and access to materials (Introduction). This is especially the case in relation to Environment and Training, and Singers and Singing. I have been unable to determine if missing data does not exist, or was simply not reported, especially if negative. I cannot therefore be certain of the completeness of this representation of promoters in Russia leading up to 17th century, nor any ranking in relative agency thereof. Even with these provisos, I find it difficult to escape the
conclusion that most of the promoters already functional in the West were simply absent in Russia approaching mid–17th century. The only promoter that seems comparably developed in Russia is memorisation. Equally, it seems unlikely that strochny and demestvenny polyphony were lineal progenitors of the Westen partesny that arrived a century later, given the obvious musical differences (see also Chapters 2 and 3) and their restricted geographical spread outside Novgorod and Moscow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inhibitors*</th>
<th>Russia c. 1650</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment and Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious opposition</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geopolitical isolation and xenophobia</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opportunities for training and experience</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression of Skomorokhi and guilds</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singers and Singing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited textual and musical literacy</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisanal dependency of singers</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistent culture of anonymity</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discouragement of improvisation</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of experience singing polyphonically</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opportunities for training and experience</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence on neumatic notation</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text: music coordination issues</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Any inhibitor that was clearly present, regardless of relative agency, is marked with a red tick (✓). Those of uncertain status are either marked with a smaller tick (†), or left unmarked.

Table 1.3. Inhibitors of Polyphony in Mid–17th–Century Russia

The inhibitors of polyphony discussed above are listed in Table 1.3. In contrast to missing promoters, these inhibitors are generally better documented than promoters in historical accounts in the secondary literature, both in Russian and in English. In the main, these inhibitors were unique to Russia. Moreover, the agency of inhibitors was definitely most evident under the Environment and Training heading; this is in contrast to missing promoters where Singers and Singing, and Music, seem to be the most affected headings (Table 1.2). I also note that some of these inhibitors are the mirror image of promoters operative in the West. For example, under Singers and Singing, the social ordering and advancement of itinerant, professional musicians in confraternities, brotherhoods, and guilds in the West contrasts with the ruthless suppression of the Skomorokhi and secular singers outside the Church in Russia. A similar situation applies under the Music subheading in respect of the inhibitory effects of neumatic notation in Russia versus the promoter function of stave notation in the West.

I conclude that this array of powerful inhibitors constituted an impenetrable revetment that had held polyphony at bay and kept it out of Russia during previous centuries. Further, such inhibitors were not only potent individually, they also acted synergistically, to wit the mutually incendiary nature of geopolitical isolation and
religious opposition. Further, this solid shield of inhibitors naturally fuelled Russia’s general inertia and unwillingness to change. Beyond strong reactionary sentiment and pragmatic reasons to retain monophony, there was simply no burning platform arguing for its abandonment. In this way, the sway of inhibitors ensured a corresponding lack of promoters. For example, there was little ostensible rationale to go to the trouble and expense of implementing educational initiatives to promote textual literacy, much less musical literacy, when monophony and rote singing had long worked well and were the established norm.

Comparison of the situation in Russian and the West early in the 17th century therefore then shows a rather obvious difference:

- Russia – potent inhibitors, few promoters → persistent monophony
- The West – multiple promoters, few or no inhibitors → growth of polyphony

This reductionist construct does not however address the derivative question of the relative roles of deficient promoters and muscular inhibitors. Certainly, the lack of promoters in Russia could at face value be viewed as vindicating a null hypothesis implicating prolonged Middle Ages and delayed cultural development in the much later appearance of polyphony in Russia as compared with the West (Introduction). However, I would argue that the combined effects of the powerful inhibitors identified would have swamped the effects of any promoters, even if the latter had already been present at mid-17th century at the robust levels evident in the West. Novgorod may provide the best illustration of this. During the earlier experimentation with polyphony in the 16th century, it is plausible that other promoters might have been operative beyond memorisation (Table 1.2). Thus, Novgorodian master singers may have benefitted from some level of undocumented textual and musical literacy, training opportunities, improvisation, and harmonisation. They were also the first composers in Russia to have their names recorded for posterity. Yet, such promoters were no match for the prevailing inhibitors, and Ivan IV’s dispersal of its singing masters and brutal Massacre could have done little to help indigenous polyphony to prosper and proliferate. Moreover, Russia then moved close to theocracy (Religious Opposition above), and I conclude that the Church would have been more than equal to the task of keeping the lid on Novgorodian exceptionalism, and for that matter on Western partesny, at least until the latter suddenly materialised around mid–17th century (Chapter 2).

The powerful inhibitors described above were not only formidable individually, but had also locked together in an impregnable, multi–layered, protective cocoon around Russia’s sacred monophony, in a fashion not unlike the multi–layered defences of medieval European castles. In light of this, the historical fact that from mid–17th century Russia suddenly swallowed Western partesny, hook, line and sinker (Chapter 2), is both unexpected and remarkable.
Chapter 2.
1650–1700: Easing of Barriers to Western Polyphony

‘Oh God, how do the world and heavens confine themselves, when our hearts tremble in their own barriers!’

Johann Wolfgang von Goethe

At the midpoint of the 17th century, mainstream Russian liturgical music had largely held to monophony for almost 700 years, while in the West polyphony had developed apace. In Chapter 1, I offered a tentative conclusion that Russia’s abiding monophony was principally due to a tangle of inhibitors that flatly interdicted the intrusion of polyphony. Chief among these were geopolitical isolation, religious opposition and a lack of relevant training and experienced singers. In addition, most promoters of polyphony present in the West were missing. Consequently, the sudden appearance of partesny at mid–17th century portended a major shift in the relative agency of inhibitors on one hand and promoters on the other. In this chapter, I address these changes in relation to the second research question:

2. Was the adoption of Western partesny from mid–17th to mid–18th century primarily due to the appearance of promoters comparable to those in effect in the West, or the disappearance of long–standing local barriers in Russia?

Environment and Training

This underwent a sea change during the second half of the 17th century, due principally to the actions of three autocratic leaders, two Tsars – Aleksei (enthroned in 1645 aged 16) and Peter I the Great (enthroned in 1682 aged 10), and one patriarch – Nikon. On their watch, polyphony gained an initial liturgical foothold in Russia, although as I will demonstrate this was in large part a result of serendipity.

Easing of Geopolitical Isolation: During this half century, Tsar Aleksei initiated an important further expansion Westwards, and ‘recovered’ former territories of Rus that were now part of Ukraine and Belarus and under Polish and Lithuanian suzerainty.313 The Khmelnytsky Uprising against Polish rule (1648–1657) created a Hetmanate of Cossacks In Eastern Ukraine,314 and led to the 1654 Pereyaslav Agreement and Union with Russia. Ukrainian Cossacks swore ‘eternal loyalty’ to Tsar Aleksei, in return for support and protection from Poland, a degree of autonomy, and the right to select their Hetman. Then followed a long and confused series of wars315 which ended in 1667 with the treaty of Andrusovo. Poland gave Russia Smolensk and ‘Left Bank Ukraine’,316 and effectively ended their previous dominion. As a result, Kyiv, then perhaps the most cultured city in Eastern Europe,317 moved directly into

313 Known subsequently in Russia as Malorossiya (Little Russia). This perhaps offers some context for Putin’s stated rationalisation of Russia’s invasion (aka ‘Special Operation’) in Ukraine.
314 Hosking, *Russian and the Russians*, 115–117. Derived from the Turkish and denoting free man (as opposed to serf). Cossacks were independent, peripatetic horsemen, warriors, traders, and mercenaries. The two largest concentrations were around the Dnieper and Don rivers.
315 These included: the Russo–Polish War alias ‘the Deluge’ (1654–1667); the Second Northern War with Sweden (1655–1660); and the ‘Ruin’ in the Hetmanate (c. 1657–1687).
316 The land East of the River Dnieper including Eastern Kyiv.
Moscow’s orbit. The immediate musical benefit was to provide Russia with potential access to experienced Ukrainian polyphonists and music (Singers and Singing below) and vocal training (New Opportunities for Training and Experience below), but Tsar Peter had wider ambitions to swallow Ukraine fully into ‘mother’ Russia. In 1686, oversight of the Kyiv Metropolitanate was transferred from the Patriarchate in Constantinople to the Patriarchate in Moscow. Hetman Ivan Mazepa then crossed sides from Russia to King Charles XII of Sweden. Peter put this rebellion down with brutal force, and summarily moved all the mechanisms of Ukrainian government to Moscow.

Belying its previous isolationism, Russia began to reach out to the West and play a more active role on the European stage. One of Tsar Aleksei’s first actions had been to reorganise the Russian Army, arming and training it to Western standards, taking advantage of the European military specialists available a plenty when the Thirty Year’s war ended in 1648. Aleksei also began tentatively to interact politically with Europe. Wealthier Russians started to look to the West, rather than solely to Asia and the East. The gain of Left–bank Ukraine, and especially of Kyiv, also drew Russia closer geographically to Europe. It exposed Russia directly to Western culture, both from a Polish and Lithuanian Catholic perspective, and through a more familiar Slavic, Orthodox filter. Despite all these changes, Russia’s economy still remained medieval, agrarian, and inefficient.

The desire to westernise Russia really took hold with Aleksei’s son, Peter the Great. His urge to wrench Russia out of the Middle Ages and into the Modern Era, through emulation of Europe, became a magnificent obsession. As a teenager, he had spent much time in, and been fascinated by the Nemetskaya Sloboda (German Settlement) just outside Moscow, where foreigners were sequestered. The number of Europeans living there was increasing, with some 3,000 long–term residents by the 1680s. These included Royalists fleeing the English Civil War, Catholic Scots and French Protestant Huguenots escaping religious persecution, and quantities of Germans and Dutch. Foreigners wore European dress, and conversed in their own languages. They heard Western singing in Protestant Churches, and even in Catholic masses when celebrated discreetly in the privacy of their homes. Many played instruments, and musicians and actors regularly put on Western concerts and theatre. Despite Patriarch Joachim’s fulminations against consorting with such heathen foreigners, curious native Muscovites began to mingle circumspectly with inhabitants of the Suburb, and to take on Western habits, including tobacco. Intermarriage with Europeans occurred, encouraged by Peter, and soon became a norm for Russia’s future leaders.

After the death of the virulently xenophobic and anti–Catholic Patriarch Joachim in 1690, Peter was free to visit the German Suburb without let, and did so, frequently. As an impressionable 18–year–old, he could enjoy scintillating conversation and relaxed social events. Peter also made some important and influential acquaintances,
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318 Massie, _Peter the Great_, 12. When Charles I of England was beheaded in 1649, Tsar Aleksei showed solidarity by hosting Royalist refugees in Moscow, banning English merchants from Russia, and offering money to the widow of the ‘martyred King’.
319 Massie, _Peter the Great_, 109–112.
320 Massie, _Peter the Great_, 111–112.
321 Hughes, _Russia in the Age_, 13–14; Massie, _Peter the Great_, 111–112.
including two soldiers of fortune – Patrick Gordon, a Scot, and Peter Lefort, a Swiss. They became crucial military tutors and close friends. Peter also met his mistress of the next 12 years, a German woman, Anna Mons; he affected European dress, and became clean-shaven. In aggregate, these are clear indications that he was gearing up for the great Westernisation of Russia.

In 1697, Peter's Euromania bubbled over, and he decided to visit and see Europe for himself. The ‘Great Embassy’, with a retinue of several hundred Russians, was born. This aroused powerful consternation, and opposition. No previous Russian leader had spent time outside Russia in peacetime, and certainly not in the West. In the event, the Grand Tour did not net him the political and military alliances he desired. However, on the plus side, he did meet several European heads of state in person. His passion for building a Russian navy was advanced by what he learnt about the specifics of ship-building and naval matters in Amsterdam and London, and he discussed religious matters with leading Protestants in England and Catholics in France. He also proclaimed Russia open for business with Europe, and actively recruited hundreds of individuals with key skills, a foretaste of a later torrent of European immigrants, including musicians (Chapter 3). Unfortunately, the Great Embassy had to be cut short, due to rebellion of the Streltsy Guard in Moscow. However, Peter had experienced at first hand the explosion of creative energy underway in Baroque Europe, and had grasped some measure of the collective consequences of the Renaissance, the Protestant and Catholic Reformations, and the beginnings of the Enlightenment. His response was renewed determination to drag Russia out of the Middle Ages and to Westernise as rapidly as possible, and he spent the last quarter century of his reign from 1700–1725 doing just that, full speed ahead (Chapter 3).

By the end of the 17th century, Russia was becoming a power to be reckoned with, and a new organising principle for territorial enlargement – that of empire-building – had emerged as an unabashed priority. Equally, Peter had contrived a seat at the table of European affairs, and resolved to use this as a conduit to import European expertise in almost every field. I conclude that these actions greatly eased the geopolitical isolation of Russia.

**Softening of Religious Opposition:** In mid–17th century, Russia was virtually a theocracy, and the Church continued to exert an iron grip on almost every aspect of daily life (Chapter 1). Given the deep piety of the new, young Tsar Aleksei, the pre-eminent position of the Russian Church seemed secure. There was no obvious
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323 Hughes, *Russia in the Age*, 22–25; Massie, *Peter the Great*, 150–177. Peter travelled nominally incognito, but was 2.00 M (6ft 7in) tall; he towered over everyone and was easily recognizable.

324 Cracraft, *The Church Reform of*, 28–37. Peter was pleased to hear from Gilbert Burnett, the Bishop of Salisbury, that Popery was a conspiracy to augment the power of the Catholic clergy.

325 Cracraft, *The Church Reform of*, 37–45. Peter reluctantly received a papal nuncio attempting to gain his support for reconciliation of Orthodoxy and Catholicism; he was not notably receptive.


indication of the imminent, tearing changes that would strip the Church of much of its power. To the contrary, in mid–17th century, the Church appeared on course to further strengthen its position. The massive ongoing territorial enlargement of Russia had lent urgency to actively colonising the vast swathes of newly acquired lands. The creation of the Patriarchate in 1589, and Filaret’s later expansion of the powers of this office, had positioned the Russian Church to be a major participant in this process. Many new churches were built, and the number of eparchies (dioceses) increased – in Moscow from 10 in 1589, to 13 in by 1650, and to 22 by the end of the 17th century. As against that, there were some warning signs of change to come. Orthodoxy was now just one of several religions, including Islam, Catholicism, Lutheranism, and Judaism, practiced within Russia’s rapidly expanding borders. This had the potential to diminish the central dominance of the Russian Orthodox Church and sap its ability to resist changes such as the incursion of Western musical influences, including polyphony. Further, following Tsar Aleksei’s Sobornoye Ulozheniye (Code of Law) of 1649, much of Russia’s peasantry became enserfed, and bound to landowners and their lands for life. The rub for the Church was that this also restricted its control of the multitudes of serfs now bound to its expanding lands.

Notwithstanding the accumulated power of the mighty Russian Church, mid–17th century brought a Black Swan. This grew out of a vision of Moscow as the ‘Third Rome’, a concept that had sprung up after the fall of Byzantium and had been reinvigorated with installation of the Patriarchate in Moscow (Chapter 1). In brief, the logic went that Rome had ceded the true faith to the ‘Second Rome’ in Constantinople. With the fall of the latter, guardianship had now passed to the ‘Third Rome’ in Moscow, which was now responsible for leading the entire Orthodox oecumene. The loudest champion of this notion was none other than the Tsar, Aleksei, who saw himself as a worthy successor to the Byzantine emperors. As a zealous leader of Russia anointed by God, he now vigorously pursued a mission to realise the third Rome in Moscow. I emphasise that in promoting this narrative, Aleksei was not advocating a strengthening of clerical hegemony, nor the persistence of Filaret’s virtual theocracy. Rather he favoured the exact opposite, namely the State controlling and subjugating the Church – in other words a single power structure of Church and State with the Tsar in charge of both. This was entirely consistent with the Caesaropapism promulgated previously by Ivan IV at his coronation in 1547, and with the subsequent seismic shift of power from Church to State effected by Peter when he abolished the Patriarchate altogether early in the 18th century (Chapter 3). Aleksei was also exercised by the wide discrepancies he perceived in religious practices across Russia, and standardisation of the liturgy and worship was therefore an important secondary rationale for his Third Rome doctrine.

331 Nikolaevsky, ‘Patriarshaya oblast I Russkiye’, [The Patriarch’s region and russian], 1–46.
332 Chmiavsky, ‘The Old Believers and’, 2; Hosking, Russia and the Russians, 171–172. This did not endear rulers and landowners to the peasantry, and there were several rebellions. The most serious was led by Stenka Razin, a Don Cossack who managed to take Astrakhan, and multiple towns along the Volga between 1669 and 1671, before being captured and killed, unpleasantly.
333 Harri, St. Petersburg Court Chant, 50–55; Massie, Peter the Great, 55–57; Meyendorff, Russia Ritual and Reform, 96–97.
334 Meyendorff, Russia Ritual and Reform, 90–92 and 96–98.
The overall rationale for religious reform was thus defined, but the question of how to accomplish it remained open. The Stoglav Council of 1551, convened by Ivan IV, had been in favour of retaining the liturgy and external worship practices as evolved within Russia. One crucial feature included signing the cross with two fingers, rather than the three used by other worshippers, including Greek Orthodox. Herein lay the Black Swan. Aleksei was now promulgating the exact opposite, namely reform of the liturgy and repertoire of evolved Russian worship practices back to the ‘true’ Greek tradition whence they had originated. In the case of the cross, that meant a change in signage from two to three fingers. Aleksei’s thinking was reinforced by strong Graecophile tendencies that had been fostered during his education and especially by his personal confessor, the priest Stefan Vonifatiev. The latter was a leader of the revniteli blagochesty (The Zealots of Piety). This group was sympathetic to religious writings from Southwestern scholars, such as Peter Mohyla, who had recently instituted reforms with the aim of bringing liturgical practice in Kyiv back closer to Greek usage. Moreover, Aleksei could expect his vision to be supported by Greek leaders of Eastern Orthodoxy, including Patriarchs Athanasios of Constantinople and Paisios of Jerusalem.

Thus reassured, and seeing no need to waste time consulting with Church leaders, or anybody else, the youthful Tsar Aleksei sent to Ukraine for translators with knowledge of Greek, Latin and Slavonic. Arseny Satanovsky and Epiphany Slavinetsky were duly dispatched from Kyiv to Moscow in 1649, and correction of Russian service books began, using Greek service books. Aleksei at this point was only 20, and his rather naive approach failed to take account of some inconvenient realities. His assumption that the Greeks had maintained ancient liturgical practices, texts, and appropriate documentation, with creditable fidelity over seven centuries, was just that, an assumption, and it was incorrect. Further, full reform meant both resolution of liturgical differences, and harmonisation of external worship practices. For this, even as absolute monarch and God’s representative on earth, Aleksei needed unambiguous support and co–leadership from the powerful Church hierarchy to successfully change the highly reactionary corpus of Russian Orthodoxy.

As luck would have it, Aleksei met a cleric that seemed to fit the bill. This was Abbott Nikon, who visited Moscow in 1646 when the Tsar was just 17 years old. Aleksei took a shine to Nikon and asked him to become archimandrite of Novospassky Monastery. Then followed a period of deepening personal friendship between the two. Nikon’s outlook was transformed, at least nominally, from that of Russian
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nationalist and xenophobe to graecophile.\textsuperscript{344} His meteoric rise continued. In 1649, he was appointed Metropolitan of Novgorod, where he pursued an activist agenda in all things musical,\textsuperscript{345} interdicting mnogoglasie,\textsuperscript{346} and supporting Aleksei’s ban on the Skomorokhi (Chapter 1). However, his most consequential action was to deliberately enlarge his choir in Novgorod with part singers from the Southwest, and in so doing to introduce not only Kyivan and Bulgarian forms, but also Western partesny (see Music below). If Nikon’s new choral splendour was calculated to make an impression, it was highly successful.\textsuperscript{347} Indeed, Aleksei felt compelled to initiate a similar recruitment drive from the Southwest to equip his own choir with experienced singers of Western–style polyphony (Singers and Singing below).\textsuperscript{348} It is important to emphasise that the official position of the Church prohibiting polyphony had not actually changed at this point. However, this seems conveniently to have been forgotten during the new choral rivalry between these two powerful men.

In 1652, Patriarch Joseph died. Nikon was away at the Solovki monastery.\textsuperscript{349} Aleksei summoned him back to Moscow to become Patriarch, with the notion of putting his chosen clerical agent in place to implement his reform. In an extraordinary act of chutzpah, Nikon refused to accept the Patriarchate until the Tsar, the bishops and the boyars, had all taken an oath of obedience to him as Patriarch.\textsuperscript{350} This was a foretaste of things to come. As Patriarch, Nikon now had full licence to be a ruthless tyrant. He was determined to create a theocracy in which the Church would dominate the State, a position diametrically opposed to the Caesaropapism of Aleksei. Nikon often overshadowed the young Tsar, and regularly wielded supreme power styling himself as \textit{Vellky Gosudar} (Great Sovereign). He aggressively expanded his landed estates, and grew supremely wealthy. In church, he presided over ceremonies of increasingly elaborate pomp and circumstance, in fabulous golden vestments, demanding armies of priests to attend his services and con–celebrate with him.\textsuperscript{351} Predictably, these actions made him many enemies, both in the Church and amongst the boyars competing for favour with Tsar Aleksei. However, in that Nikon supported church reform, albeit as an essential vehicle to cement his own authority, he threw himself into the process. This was exactly what Aleksei wanted, and for now he gave Nikon unwavering support.

The proposed reform involved two main sets of changes, in: textual changes in the Russian service books; and external practices. The thrust was to be modification back to ‘true’ ancient Greek form. For external practices, mandated changes included such things as: the correct number and execution of prostrations; the pronouncement of Alleluiya thrice rather than twice; and making the sign of the cross with three

\textsuperscript{344} Meyendorff, \textit{Russia Ritual and Reform}, 84–85.
\textsuperscript{345} Lobachev, \textit{Patriarh Nikon} [Patriarch Nikon], 83–95.
\textsuperscript{346} Ritzarev, \textit{Eighteenth–Century Russian Music}, 25.
\textsuperscript{348} Harri \textit{St. Petersburg Court Chant}, 53. As noted in the Appendix, on page C, Aleksei was no stranger to three–line singing, having studied 16th–century Russian polyphony with Osipov and Semenov of the Tsar’s Choir a full decade earlier.
\textsuperscript{349} Lobachev, \textit{Patriarh Nikon} [Patriarch Nikon], 102–107; Meyendorff, \textit{Russia Ritual and Reform}, 85. Metropolitan Philip had been executed by Tsar Ivan IV, and Nikon was on a very visible mission to bring Philip’s relics to Moscow.
\textsuperscript{350} Lobachev, \textit{Patriarh Nikon} [Patriarch Nikon], 111–112; Meyendorff, \textit{Russia Ritual and Reform}, 86.
\textsuperscript{351} Meyendorff, \textit{Russia Ritual and Reform}, 90–91.
fingers rather than two.\textsuperscript{352} Meanwhile, Russian service books were to be ‘corrected’ back into compliance with their Greek antecedents. Although much was made of the methodology of using ancient Greek texts collected from Mount Athos and elsewhere, these turned out to be remarkably discrepant. In the end, Russian texts were not actually revised back to the ancient Greek, but simply replaced with texts from the Greek \textit{Euchologion} (Greek for service book) that had been printed in Venice in 1602.\textsuperscript{353}

Nikon was doggedly prescriptive about external practices, but left the details of service book revision largely to his translators.\textsuperscript{354} These were led by Arsenios the Greek, a colourful Greek monk, and Epifany Slavinetsky, a Ukrainian hieromonk.\textsuperscript{355} The reforms proposed were discussed extensively between 1654–1666, in a succession of church \textit{sobors} (synods) and councils convened by Aleksei. With the intent of improving the credibility and acceptability of the reform process, other Eastern religious leaders were invited, including Patriarchs Paisios of Jerusalem and Makarios of Antioch, and Metropolitans Gabriel of Syria and Gregory of Nicaea. It made sense for Aleksei to include these leaders, since they could be expected to be supportive of Graecophile reform. It was also the case that following the fall of Constantinople, Tsar Aleksei effectively led the Eastern Orthodox oecumene, and could legitimately offer financial support to these impoverished, Eastern church leaders. A series of books containing reformed text was published by the Moscow Print Yard (\textit{Music} below), starting with \textit{Sluzhebniki} (service books) in 1654.\textsuperscript{356}

The changes in external practices proposed may seem relatively minor today, but they aroused abject fury across Russia. Large numbers of worshippers simply refused to adopt the newly mandated three–fingered sign of the cross. Further, although the 1602 Venice Euchologion was printed in a press run by Greeks exiled from Constantinople after its fall in 1453, opponents of reform railed that this press had been irredeemably polluted by godless Italian Catholics.\textsuperscript{357} Moreover, with leadership of Orthodoxy passing from Constantinople to Moscow as the new Third Rome, critics questioned, not entirely illogically, why precedence should now be given to a return to ancient Greek liturgy and ritual over long–established Russian traditions? The fiery Archpriest Avvakum, formerly Nikon’s friend and colleague, was everywhere denouncing Nikon and his reform in inflammatory, apocalyptic sermons and writings.\textsuperscript{358} The result was that as reform unfolded, opponents began to be anathematised and excommunicated, and a potential schism within the Russian Church became an ugly reality.\textsuperscript{359}

Reform was a major priority for Aleksei, and up to this point he had stood by Nikon staunchly. However, he now became alarmed by Nikon’s dictatorial behaviour, and
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the implied threat posed to his own sovereign authority. When Nikon abruptly resigned the Patriarchate in 1658, for tactical reasons, expecting to be begged to return, much to his surprise Aleksei did no such thing and promptly took over as the leader of reform. Aleksei then held off appointing a new Patriarch for the next nine years, deflating the extraordinary power this office had consolidated under Nikon. In a remarkable volte face, church reform was now the responsibility of the Tsar and the State. Nikon, meanwhile, appeared to lose all interest.

Following this, Aleksei convened two further Councils to resolve and finalise all the outstanding issues implicit in reform. The first, in 1666, approved the proposed reforms, and dealt with opponents by summarily anathematising them. The second, the Great Moscow Synod of 1667, again approved reform and the New Church Rite which it de facto created. This decision was affirmed by the two non–Russian patriarchs present, Paisios and Makarios. The 1551 Stoglav Council, that had favoured Russian practices over Greek rituals and usage, was pronounced heretical. Nikon was found guilty among other things of reviling the Tsar and the Church, and of beating and torturing his dependents. He was ordered defrocked and reduced to monkhood.

Amongst the clergy, this was not a popular move, even amongst his many enemies, since it involved clear subordination of clerical to civil authority. Nevertheless, Nikon was packed off to a monastery, and remained a simple monk until his death in 1681.

The 1667 council also abolished khomoniya and mnogoglasie, again, and a new Patriarch was finally appointed (Joasaphus II). All the main principles of reform were now thereby assured, but so were a rending Schism within the Russian Church, and a dramatic weakening of its authority.

Despite all this sturm and drang, the specific question of the appropriateness of polyphonic music in the Orthodox liturgy still had not been directly addressed nor resolved. Instead, this question was only considered, ‘after the fact’, in the aftermath of the 1667 council, by the visiting Patriarchs Paisios and Makarios. Traditionalists still opposed changes in liturgical music, but Western partesny singing had now been heard in Russia for nigh on twenty years since its introduction by Nikon and Aleksei. Further, the Southwestern immigrants initially responsible for singing it had few qualms; they had grown up singing Western partesny, and had moved to Russia specifically to make a living from performing it. Patriarchs Paisios and Makarios addressed the vexed question of liturgical polyphony carefully. They eventually opined that Orthodoxy had a long tradition of respecting divergences in liturgical practice, providing that these did not degrade the substance of worship or faith.

---

360 Lobachev, Patriarkh Nikon [Patriarch Nikon], 7. Nikon did this in dramatic fashion, throwing off his patriarchal robes during the divine liturgy and donning simple monk’s robes.

361 Hosking, Russia: People and Empire, 67–68.
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363 Meyendorff, Russia Ritual and Reform, 66–71.
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While hardly a full-throated endorsement of polyphony, this statement nonetheless signalled that Western partesny was more or less acceptable in Orthodox worship. Seemingly, polyphony was, if not actively welcomed, to be passively tolerated. This is reminiscent of the earlier discussion of the appropriateness of polyphony in Catholic liturgical chant at the Council of Trent in 1545–1563.367

In reality, furious resistance to reform and Western influences, including partesny, had in no sense been stilled, and predictably, this was not the end of the debate. Traditionalist holdouts continued to fulminate that Western polyphony sounded like music played on an organ or some other instrument, and raised again the spectre of similarities with the heathen Skomorokhi. Avvakum, never one to stint on hyperbole, thundered that ‘In many churches in Moscow instead of bozhestvennoye peniye (divine singing), they sing pesni (songs) in Latin; wave their arms and nod their heads and stamp their feet as is usual with the Latins with their organs’. Others huffed that liturgical singing would thereby be downgraded to the level of secular music in ‘common’ public places.368 After the Schism, a large segment of the general population also opposed the reforms, regarding the New Rite as corrupt and ‘Latinised’, and sticking steadfastly with the Old Rite and monophonic chant. They became known as starovery or staroobryadytsy (Old Believers). Other epithets included ‘Old Ritualists, ‘Schismatics’, and more pejoratively raskolniki (splitters).369

Yet despite mass opposition from both the Church and the general public, reform and all its attendant changes were not knocked off course, and stuck, at least for now. This reflected twin realities. The Church was now deeply divided, and weakened. It had not just lost its authority within the community, but also credibility as the ultimate purveyor of ‘pravda’ – truth and justice. The Russian masses were equally powerless, and unable to effectively organise active resistance, especially without support from the Church. Old Believers were treated harshly by Tsar Aleksei, and more harshly still by his immediate successors, Tsar Fyodor and Regent Sophia. Large numbers were anathematised or excommunicated. Others were persecuted or executed, sometimes even with support from the Church. Archpriest Avvakum continued his fanatical rants, and was eventually burnt at the stake; his death inspired thousands more to self-immolate.370 Many more fled and formed obshchinas (communities) in isolated, sparsely populated regions in the North and East of Russia. Even there, they were not necessarily safe.371 Others scattered even further afield in a global diaspora. The trials and tribulations faced by Old Believers stirred up discontent among many other disaffected Russians. This combined with a ‘Little Ice Age’ in the second half of the 17th century,372 the wretched lot of serfs, and a generally

367 Burkholder, Grout and Palisca, A History of Western, 243–244.
368 Jensen, Musical Cultures in Seventeenth–Century, 53.
369 Chemiavsky, ‘The Old Believers’, 1 and fn1; Hosking, Russia: People and Empire, 69–74.
370 Massie, Peter the Great, 63–64. The last straw was apparently when Avvakum wrote to Tsar Fyodor concerning a dream in which Christ had allegedly told Avvakum that Fyodor’s father, Tsar Aleksei, was in hell because he had approved reform of the Church.
371 Hosking, Russia: People and Empire, 70–71. When monks at the Solovki monastery 650 miles North of Moscow defied Church Reform, Aleksei sent soldiers, who laid siege to the monastery and eventually killed almost all the monks. A commemorative stone now stands in Moscow outside the former headquarters of the KGB. Ironically, in 1921, the Solovetsky islands were ‘repurposed’ under Lenin as the site of the first Soviet Gulag (prison camp).
372 Christian, A History of Russia, 143–145.
apocalyptic national mood, led to a stream of uprisings in which many died.\textsuperscript{373} A new phenomenon of mass community suicides emerged.\textsuperscript{374}

Old Believers also faced the serious, practical problem of maintaining adequate numbers of ‘Old Rite’ priests. Even though many priests joined the Old Believers, no bishops did, apart from Bishop Pavel who was soon executed. The absence of Old Believer bishops meant that no new priests could be ordained to replace incumbents. Two main denominations of Old Believer evolved, with different solutions. The \textit{Popovtsy} (priestist) denominations convinced Ambrose, a Greek Orthodox Bishop, to elevate three priests to the Bishopric. These, in turn, ordained a generation of new priests, thereby ensuring continued delivery of all sacraments, including the Eucharist. In contrast, the \textit{Bezpopovtsy} (priestless) denominations followed a more radical approach, preaching withdrawal, asceticism, the coming end of the world, and strict adherence to the old faith and its rituals. They also decided to worship without priests, in the process deliberately foregoing all sacraments except baptism.\textsuperscript{375}

After Tsar Aleksei died, the Church continued to struggle with the new post-Reform reality, and challenges to its authority. To add insult to injury, it was then confronted with the ‘godless antics’ of the teenaged Tsar Peter I. He and his so-called ‘Jolly Company’ started to poke fun at, even to mock, the Russian Church. With a group known as \textit{vsesviateishii pianyi sobor} (All Holy Drunken Council – also known as The All-Joking, All-Drunken Synod of Fools and Jesters),\textsuperscript{376} which had a ‘Prince–Pope’, and a collection of ‘senior clergy’. Peter appointed himself Deacon and leader, and created a set of rituals and ceremonies, in the main an excuse for prodigious drinking and general mayhem. Regular clergy were also dragooned into participating. Peter then refused to allow holy water to be sprinkled on him during Epiphany, instead carousing with his friends. Initially, many shrugged this off as just the young tsar letting off steam. However, Peter’s continued louche behaviour increasingly appalled and angered the clergy, traditional Russians, and especially Old Believers. Tsars Aleksei, Vasily and Peter were all accused of being Antichrists.\textsuperscript{377} Peter eventually clarified that the butt of his fun was Catholicism rather than Orthodoxy. He did not view his synod as blasphemous, and it persisted for the rest of his reign.\textsuperscript{378} Yet, his lack of respect for the clergy did not augur well for the Russian Church (Chapter 3).

The mighty Russian Church had begun the second half of the 17\textsuperscript{th} century in fine fettle, functioning almost as a theocracy. Following a lacerating schism, it ended this period in an unexpectedly precarious state. Although opposition to Western music and polyphony were far from expunged, Western partesny had managed to infiltrate Russia’s liturgical music and was now a fact of life in the larger singing centres, courtesy of a cadre of willing Southwestern migrant polyphonists.

\textsuperscript{373} Cherniavsky, ‘The Old Believers’, 5–6 and 39. Old Believers included many of those enserfed by the Ulozhenie of 1649, raising the possibility that the Schism was precipitated in part by social oppression and populism, in addition to ecclesiastical issues.
\textsuperscript{374} Hosking, \textit{Russia: People and Empire}, 68–69.
\textsuperscript{375} Harri, \textit{St. Petersburg Court Chant}, 54.
\textsuperscript{376} Hughes, \textit{Russia in the Age}, 249–257.
\textsuperscript{377} Cherniavsky, ‘The Old Believers’, 36. The logical endpoint of this notion was that submitting to Church Reform meant of necessity accepting Antichrists as the titular leaders of the Church,
\textsuperscript{378} Massie, \textit{Peter the Great}, 117–121.
New Opportunities for Training and Experience: In mid–17th century, Russia had no national systems of primary and secondary education. This was no different from the situation in Western countries. However, Russia also lacked the choral training schools and universities that were by then proliferating across Western Europe (Chapter 1). The union with Left–bank Ukraine in 1654 was therefore auspicious in that it offered Russia direct access to the existing educational facilities of the Southwest. Russia took full advantage. Almost every aspect of Russian life and art fell under the influence of the scholars and educational institutions of Ukraine, and notably the Kyiv Theological Academy/ Mohyla Collegium, which also encouraged its students to study in Europe. These institutions played a vital role in fostering literacy, and bringing Western learning back to Ukraine and now on to Russia. Numerous distinguished alumni from Mohyla that provided scholastic, religious and musical leadership in Ukraine were now regularly consulted, or appointed, in Moscow. Some made important contributions to modern Russian language. Others actively supported reform of the Russian Church and were instrumental in defrocking Patriarch Nikon (Softening of Religious Opposition above). Russia did start one Academy in Moscow in 1685 at the Novospassky Monastery, under Simeon of Polotsk, along the lines of Kyiv’s Mohyla Academy. However, this institution was focused on religious education with a Jesuitical flavour, and soon ran into serious opposition from Patriarch Ioachim, who was strongly anti–Catholic.

Despite a deficiency in educational institutions, Russia did have the benefit of some influential individual musical educators and theoreticians in the 17th century (see also Introduction). The Novgorodian Nikolai Shaidurov devised cinnabar red pomyety pitch marks, and systematised the Gamut and Russian solmisation. The Ukrainian Aleksandr Mezenets provided further precision in specifying reference pitch, with the addition of priznaki to neumatic manuscripts (see also Music below). His other major contribution was an exhaustive cataloguing of neumes then in use, in an azbuka. The other major figure on the educational scene was another Ukrainian, Nikolai Diletsky, author of Grammatika musikiyskago peniya [A Grammar of Musical Singing]. The latter provided a seminal account of Western keys and the circle of fifths (see Introduction). There were other music theorists of this time, although almost nothing is known about them. Ioann Korenev was a contemporary of Diletsky, and the two certainly knew each other. Korenev wrote O peniye bozhestvennom (On Sacred Singing) in 1671, and a Grammatika between 1679–81. The latter is concerned primarily with hexachords as derived from the Russian Gamut, and was appended to the 1681 Moscow edition of Diletsky’s Grammatika. The monk, Tikhon Makar’evski, was another theorist; he wrote Kliuch ili pravila musikiishkago penia,

---
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soglasno i chino sochinennago (The key or rules of musical singing, harmoniously and decorously composed).\textsuperscript{385}

The effect of these musical pedagogues on the subsequent incorporation and further development of polyphony in Russia is not clear. The timing of their scholarship in the closing decades of the 17th century, seems auspicious, given the number of Southwestern migrants and the many native Russian singers training and singing in Moscow at that point (Singers and Singing).\textsuperscript{386} Morosan argues that mastery by Russian composers of Diletsky’s compositional principles contributed to their impressive output of partesny, but that this treatise was otherwise of limited practical application e.g., for performance.\textsuperscript{387} Preobrazhensky seems to agree,\textsuperscript{388} although not without some asides.\textsuperscript{389} On balance, I concur with Jensen\textsuperscript{390} that Diletsky’s treatise was an important and timely catalyst for disseminating polyphony and embedding it in the music of Russia. Notably, it remained in publication well into the 18th century, and more recently has attracted contemporary commentary by Smolensky (1910) and Protopopov (1979) in Russia, and Tsalai–Iakymenko (1970) and Herasymova–Persyds’ka (1981) in Ukraine.\textsuperscript{391}

The above consideration of Environment and Training in Russia during the second half of the 17th century demonstrates substantive changes that suddenly and collectively transformed the environment into one that was at least passively permissive of polyphony. The unanticipated and cataclysmic schism within the Russian Church did not lead to explicit, formal approval of part singing. However, the public introduction of Western partesny into the liturgy by Nikon, Aleksei, and other key figures, more or less gave it licence, and the national trauma and chaos of the Schism provided cover pro tem for part singing to exist. At the same time, easing of geopolitical isolation under Aleksei morphed under Peter into a single–minded frenzy to embrace all things Western. Further, although Russia itself remained poorly equipped with opportunities for choral training and education in musical theory, union with Ukraine in 1654 offered valuable educational facilities at a perfect time for Russia to take advantage.

**Singers and Singing**

Relevant information concerning the singers in Russia at mid–17th century is extraordinarily limited, but some relevant inferences seem feasible. The first is that the experience of native Russians of singing in parts was extremely sketchy. As noted in Chapter 1, there was some limited experimentation with part singing, in the strochny and demestvenny polyphony that appeared in Novgorod earlier in the 16th century (Chapter 1). However, such singing was probably confined to a few experienced choristers in the Tsar’s and Patriarch’s Choirs in Moscow, and the St.
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\textsuperscript{388} Preobrazhensky, Kul’tovaya muzika v Rossii [Culture of music in Russia], 40.
\textsuperscript{389} Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 43. Morosan offers a translation of a Preobrazhensky publication that was unavailable to me. It includes the following gem. ‘Diletsky’s baggage was mere tinsel, which reflected the glitter of the latest Western schools of counterpoint, but had lost the main value…’.
\textsuperscript{390} Jensen, Musical Cultures in Seventeenth–Century, 162.
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Sophia cathedral choir in Novgorod (Appendix and Chapter 1). Further, early Russian polyphony of the 16th century did not apparently spread widely outside Novgorod, Moscow and a few other large singing centres. In consequence, most native Russians, including monks and priests in the provinces, had probably never heard polyphony, much less sung it.

A second reality (detailed in Chapter 1) was the extreme rarity of singers able to read music, much less from the Kyivan stave notation in which the new Western partesny appeared. Even though the priests and monks that may have formed the backbone of regular liturgical singers were textually literate, few would have been musically literate; singing still relied primarily on memory, and any manuscripts that were used would have been set out in relatively inscrutable neumes. Even fewer lay singers could reasonably have been expected to be musically literate, since their numbers included many illiterate serfs. Equally limiting was the reality that travel outside Russia was not an option, further reducing any opportunity for exposure outside Russia to part singing and written music in stave notation.

A third issue was that priests and monks were fundamentally journeymen, artisans singing at the beck and call of the Orthodox Church. This meant rigidly enforced conformance with long-standing tradition, limiting any opportunity for individual self-expression, self-development, ‘work on the side’ and the self-employment now feasible for singers undergoing progressive professionalisation in Western Europe. Neither had monks and priests organised into, nor participated in, community-based singing networks, such as the guilds, fraternal organisation, bruderschaften, and confreries of Europe, or the bratstva of the Southwest (Chapter 1).

Fourthly, the historical reliance on memorisation for rote chanting of monophonic text would have provided scant stimulus for development of other higher singing skills, such as the audiation and visualisation now au courant in many Western choirs. Theoretically, it might have been possible to fast track formal training of native Russian singers, and development of such higher singing skills. However, this assumption is predicated on the premise that the invasion of Western partesny was both anticipated, and welcomed; all the evidence points to the contrary (Chapter 1). The rudimentary parochial school system that existed in Russia in the early 17th century, and the few choir schools, were firmly in the grip of the Church, which showed no inclination to innovate. Further, as already noted, there were no institutions of higher education in Russia until the 18th century (Chapter 3), nor any dedicated to musical education until mid–19th century (Chapter 4).

Given these considerations, I conclude that there could not have been more than a handful of polyphony-ready native Russians to kickstart the Western partesny coup when it boiled up out of the blue at mid–17th century. One immediate remedy was to import polyphony-capable singers – but from whence? Western Europe was hardly an appropriate choice, given Russia’s historical xenophobia and anti–Catholic and anti–Protestant fervour (Chapter 1). On the other hand, Ukraine, and other countries to the Southwest, were more reasonable options. These were much closer

393 Kliuchevski, A Course in Russian, 174–199. Serfs were bound to owners’ estates in abject servitude not much different from that of slaves.
394 Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 39–40.
geographically to Russia than was Western Europe. They had originally been part of Rus, and were ethnically Slavic and culturally Orthodox. Although many years of suzerainty under Catholic Poland and Lithuania had forced many to switch their religious allegiance to the Pope in Rome and become Greek Catholics (or Uniates), others had remained Orthodox and were led by the Patriarch in Kyiv.\footnote{Morosan, \textit{Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary}, 40.} Polish and Lithuanian Catholic influence had already led to adoption of Western polyphony and a Kyivan square note form of stave notation in the 16th century. Ukraine and Belarus had also established singing bratstva and other community–based forms of vocal training (Chapter 1), and singers could now acquire the necessary choral and musical education for polyphonic singing, without needing to travel to the West. Ukraine and Belarus were in an ideal position to provide an important ‘musical translator’ function from West to East, including the provision of capable, trained polyphonists. Southwestern singers thereby became an obvious target for acquisition by Russian choirs starting to tackle Western partsenya.

As noted above (Softening of Religious opposition), Nikon’s desire for liturgical musical splendour led him to recruit a quantity of experienced Southwestern singers, together with their music. What happened next was almost predictable. The resulting ostentatious displays of choral polyphony by his choir in Novgorod and then in Moscow encouraged Tsar Aleksei to match them, and ignited what became an ‘arm wrestle’ to recruit Southwestern singers.\footnote{Burkholder, Grout and Palisca, \textit{A History of Western}, 26–27; Harri, \textit{St. Petersburg Court Chant}, 53. Tsar Aleksei’s desire to improve his choir appears reminiscent of the actions of Pippin ‘the Short’, King of the Franks. After hearing the \textit{Scola Cantorum} (School of Singers) of Pope Stephen II during a visit of the latter in 752 –754, Pippin begged the Pope to send singers from Rome. Morosan, \textit{Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary}, 42–43. This cites Kharlampovich, \textit{Zapadorusskiye pravoslavnye shkoly} [Western russian orthodox schools], which was not available to me.} Morosan gives the translation of a relevant account, in which Aleksei dispatched Ivan Kurbatov, a priest, to Kyiv in 1652 to garner Southwestern singers and music for the Tsar’s Choir. Kurbatov returned with 11 singers. This was then followed by two further sorties, netting 6 and 7 singers respectively.\footnote{Findeizen, \textit{History of Music in}, Vol. 1, 259–266. Harri, \textit{St. Petersburg Court Chant}, 53; Morosan, \textit{Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary}, 42–43; Preobrazhensky, \textit{Kul’tovaya muzyka v Rossii} [Culture of music in Russia], 30–32.} Once Patriarch Nikon, Tsar Aleksei, and some pliant worthies, had made their desire for Southwestern singers known, a loose network of courtiers, merchants and military officers sprang up to recruit more migrant singers. Ukrainian noblemen thought it auspicious to send singers to Moscow on spec. Some Southwestern singers, reading the signs correctly, showed up in Moscow and other large cities, and made themselves available. Demand was sufficiently great that even detested Catholics could apparently find employment in Russian churches, if they were accomplished polyphonists, and could sing in Russian. Choral registers in the latter half of the 17th century included Polish names, as well as many from Ukraine.\footnote{The other formative event was the signing of the Treaty of Pereyaslav in 1654. This union effectively gave Russia free access to the new Ukrainian Cossack Hetmanate, in return for provision of support against Poland (Easing of Geopolitical Isolation above). In turn, this provided a serendipitous opportunity to expand relocation of Southwestern singers to Russia. Initially, the primary receptacles for such experienced singers of polyphony were key standing choirs – e.g., the Tsar’s Choir}
and the Patriarch’s Choir. These were responsible for regular, public, liturgical singing at a consistently high level. However, the needs of the court and the aristocracy were served by several other choirs. For example, the krestovye d’iaki (Clerks of the Cross) were responsible for private liturgical worship involving the Tsar. Not all were professional singers; some had administrative and organisational duties. Their number expanded later in the 17th century as different members of the royal family required their services. This and other comparable choirs now took on newly available immigrant singers.

Southwestern singers were also sought by choirs in the larger churches and cathedrals; Nikon had role–modelled this approach very effectively in Novgorod. Other singers were not necessarily attached to standing choirs but were freelancers – so–called vspevaky (singers). Although they also performed for the Tsar, they sang the All–Night Vigil, rather than the Divine Liturgy which was traditionally the domain of the Tsar’s Choir. Yet other foreign singers arrived with the many delegations that visited Russia during the series of Councils that occurred during Church reform between 1654 and 1667 (Softening of Religious Opposition above). The Greek cleric, Meletios, stayed in Moscow and taught for around 30 years. Collectively, these various choirs fed a steady demand for a stream of migrant singers. Pari passu, establishment of a reliable conduit delivering Southwestern singers led to expanded interest in part singing. The latter was further heightened by the contemporaneous appearance of polyphonic formulations of sacred singing other than Western partesny, including Kyivan and Bulgarian singing, and a Russian version of Greek singing (Music below).

The number of experienced migrant singers recruited by Russian choirs during the latter half of the 17th century is unknown. Two and a half centuries later, Findeizen compiled ‘A Brief Survey of Singers, Composers, and Music Theorists’. However, this account, while illuminating, is not straightforward to interpret, and does not directly answer the question of numbers. For example, it spans the period ‘from Antiquity to the Beginning of the Eighteenth Century’, and therefore includes earlier singers and composers, such as Novgorodians from the 16th century. In addition, the choirs included are limited to those of larger, more prominent churches. Nevertheless, it is also generally consistent with other reports indicating that by the end of the 17th century, the Tsar’s Choir had swollen from 30–40 singers to between 80 and 100, and the Patriarch’s Choir from 30–40 to 47. Choir size was perhaps now limited less by availability of accomplished migrant polyphonic singers, and more by the burgeoning costs of supporting and housing them.

As polyphonist singers became more broadly available, choirs became subdivided into smaller groups. In the case of the Tsar’s Choir, subgroups could serve the individual needs of different members of the royal family. By the end of the 17th
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century, Tsar Peter’s personal choir typically had no more than 20 singers, consistent with the long-standing practice of having one or two stanitsy of five singers on each kliros. Peter was also constantly on the move, and his choir was kept small to facilitate travel with him (Chapter 3). In addition, trained Southwestern musicians were not needed in large numbers to perform the new Western partesny, because although singing in parts many could acquit themselves adequately as soloists. Native Russian singers in such choirs could presumably pick up part singing from imported Southwestern singers. However, this transition could hardly have happened overnight, and initially it seems likely that polyphonic singing was probably mostly the preserve of the superb choirs of the Tsar, the Patriarch, and larger cathedrals, courtesy in large part to their numbers of adopted Southwestern choristers.

This half century also saw the beginnings of composition of Western partesny within Russia, both harmonisations of extant chant and new works. Unlike in previous times (Chapter 1), the names of several dozen composers are known, although I was unable to find other relevant information about them, and much of their music is lost to posterity. One of the earliest, Ivan Ignatiev, was active during the 1640s, just before the initial wave of migrant singers from the Southwest in the 1650s. However, although some dates are missing, Findeizen’s compendium of musicians indicates that many of these native Russian musicians were active in composition quite a bit later, towards the end of the 17th century. Significantly, this would have been several decades after immigrant Southwestern singers began to arrive in Nikon’s and Aleksei’s choirs (c. 1650), and after union with Ukraine made its singers and musical training facilities available to Russia (1654 – the Easing of Geopolitical Isolation above). This wave of composition by native Russians also occurred after the Church schism at which polyphony became officially tolerated (1667 – Softening of Religious Opposition above), and after the printing of treatises by Diletsky and Korenev (1677–1681 – Introduction).

Establishing the above timeline is important, because even in the absence of reliable published data, it suggests an intriguing explanation for the compositional flourish of native Russian musicians in the late 17th century. I reason that this large, active class of native Russian composers would have been children or young adults at mid-century. Many would then have served in the Tsar’s or Patriarch’s Choirs, or prominent cathedral choirs, where they would have grown up singing the new Western partesny, and become conversant with new Kyivan stave notation. Given the prominence of this top cadre of choirs and their high standards of performance, choristers may have received formal training as well as on-the-job experience.
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and would likely have developed some higher singing skills beyond pure memorisation. Most would also have been exposed, directly or indirectly, to the teachings of Korenev and Diletsky. In addition, it is noteworthy that many lived and worked together in groups close to the Moscow Kremlin and its churches, creating a critical mass of singers and a close–knit ‘natural laboratory’ for the nascent composers among them to work and experiment. In short, I infer that an entire generation of fledgling Russian composers received a comprehensive crash course in composition of Western–style polyphony during the second half of the 17th century. This talented class of musicians became a compositional spring ready to be released, and as restraints eased they produced Western partesny – prolifically. Further, this construct strongly implies that limited knowledge and facility of native Russian singers and musicians in polyphony (see Chapter 1) could soon be remedied with appropriate experience and training, even if the process was largely ‘on–the–job’ and not particularly academic.

Vasily Titov is a tangible product of the above postulated sequence. He was born in 1650, sang in the Tsar’s Choir for many years, was a pupil of Diletsky, and represents a particularly felicitous meeting of extraordinary ability and good timing. From around 1680 to 1710, he is known to have composed more than 200 polyphonic vocal works, including many settings of psalms from the notable psalter of Simeon de Polotsk. He became the best–known composer of his generation.409 Titov actively harmonised extant monophonic chant, and composed de novo sacred compositions, such as kontserty (concerts) and also paraliturgical kanty (chants) – (see Music below). He also produced secular kanty to celebrate Tsar Peter’s military victories, for example at Poltava (Chapter 3). Importantly, a considerable portion of his work survives in published form. Some examples are included below (Music – Figures 2.2 and 2.4). Overall, Titov’s music represents a fusion between Russia’s traditional monophonic tradition and innovations arriving with Western partesny, with an important nod to native Folk Music. Given his pre–eminence in the Russian Baroque and the large body of his work that still survives, it is disappointing that little is still performed today, not even his famed Bol’shoye mnogoletiye (Great Anniversary).

I conclude that Russia can have possessed few native singers with training or experience to tackle part singing and stave notation when Western partesny suddenly materialised in mid–17th century. Furthermore, massive numbers of traditionalist Old Believers absolutely refused to sing anything other than ‘pure’ monophonic chanting, by rote or from neumes. Russia was desperately short of singers both willing and able to sing polyphonically, but in the short term finessed this shortage by effectively outsourcing the initial introduction of Western partesny to experienced Southwestern migrant polyphonists. Another serendipitous ingredient was a gifted generation of young native musicians, who after gaining training and experience in the new part singing, began actively to compose Western partesny, ‘Russian style’ (see Music below) by century’s end. In a few short decades, something almost magical had happened.

Music

It is important to stress that the stream of Southwestern migrants arriving in Russia brought not just their part singing expertise to Russia, but also their Western–style music. There is a dearth of Southwestern musical manuscripts from that time, but travellers’ descriptions of part singing survive.

‘They (the Muscovites) mock the Cossacks (Ukrainians) for their chants, saying that these are the chants of Gallic people and Pollacks as we know them’ (Archdeacon Paul of Aleppo).410

…’where they sing daily with a musical art in which the descant, alto, tenor and bass are distinctly heard in a sweet and sonorous harmony’ (Johannes Herbinius).411

We do know that Southwestern music was set out in Kyivan stave notation. This had not yet achieved the fully developed round note version then generally in use in the West, but was in quadratic or square note format, similar to the semi–neumatic stave notation of early Gregorian chant.412

The most important differences from Western stave notation are summarised below. The Russian Church officially adopted the C4 alto clef used in the Southwest, until Western stave notation took over later. The C on the middle line was defined with a flag (see right). The end of chant symbol, equivalent to the double vertical line in Western stave notation, was curvilinear (see right). Kyivan note forms for semi–breves, minims, crotchets and quavers are shown below from left to right. Stems could go upwards or downwards.

Dotted notes were also used, just as in Western notation, but with a square dot, as with the dotted crotchet shown to the right.413 The value of notes was about half that of modern Western stave notation, such that minims were equivalent to steps of a leisurely walking pace today. Kyivan notation was mensural, and helped to resolve issues of readability, reference pitch and synchronicity posed by neumes (Chapter 1). However, other important information already mostly in place in Europe by the end of the 17th century e.g., key signatures, time signatures and bar lines, did not appear generally in Russia until the 18th century when fully Western stave notation started to become more widely adopted. Extant Russian manuscripts from the second half of the 17th century are either recorded in traditional neumes, or in fully–developed Kyivan stave notation; only a handful of chant manuscripts contain both neumatic and stave notation (dvoznamenniki – see Chapter 1).414 This is quite unlike the historically lengthier transition in notation in

---

411 Harri, St. Petersburg Court Chant, 48; Harri provides a translation from Herbinius. The original was unavailable to me.
412 Cardine, Première Année de Chant [First year of chant], 57. Kyivan square notes show some similarities with the semi–neumatic stave notation employed in ‘Solesmes’ Gregorian Chant.
413 Simmons, ‘A Primer of Kyivan’, 1–10. Illustrations are used with kind permission of the author.
414 Harri, St. Petersburg Court Chant, 55; Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 253–255 and example 7.5; Plotnikova, Russkoye partesnoye mnogogolosiye kontsa [Russian partesny polyphony from the end], 50–61.
Europe, where intermediate forms such as heightened or staved neumes were used.\textsuperscript{415} Further details of Kyivan notation and differences from Western stave notation are discussed elsewhere.\textsuperscript{416}

The reaction of Russian singers to this new Kyivan stave notation is unknown. However, we can assume that most Old Believers would have had little truck with any device of Western music on principle (Softening of Religious Opposition above). Outside Old Believers, resistance could also have been expected in the smaller rural churches and monasteries; these were more conservative and relatively isolated from musical trends prevalent in large towns and cities. In contrast, migrant singers from the Southwest were already at home with Kyivan notation, since this had been the standard form used to record polyphonic music in the Southwest for the previous century. They had been raised on it and knew how to read and sing it,\textsuperscript{417} whereas few would have had any experience of singing from Russian neumes. Meanwhile, for other singers long reliant on memory for the traditional monophonic chant they sang, and who had no need of music nor ability to read it, a change in notation would have been largely irrelevant - that is unless they were now struggling to learn the new partesny from manuscripts.

The progressive uptake and use of stave notation addressed previous shortcomings of neumes (Chapter 1), although the latter did not disappear overnight. For now, there remained the problem of how to record a brand–new body of polyphonic music, and disseminate it across the prodigious distances of Russia, to literally thousands of churches, monasteries, chapels, and other sacred spaces. In order to create sufficient handwritten manuscripts, an army of scribes would have been required, and few would yet have been familiar with the new Kyivan notation. In short, this was an ideal time to consider using new printing technology to produce the reams of music needed. The Moscow Print Yard created by Ivan IV in 1553 was theoretically available, although a century later, in the 1650s, it was supervised by the autocratic Patriarch Nikon.\textsuperscript{418} More to the point, this press had focussed on printing texts, mostly with a religious bent, and it had no real–world experience with printing staved music or dealing with the attendant issues. In the West, music printing at this point had shown that when typeface for stave, notes and text were used together in a single impression, stave lines were often fractured or wavy. To this end, the first polyphonic text printed in the West in stave notation in 1501 had employed three sequential impressions, one for staves, a second for words, and a third for notes and other markings.\textsuperscript{419}

Despite these difficulties, A plan to use the Moscow Print Yard’s ability to print music was hatched. Tsar Aleksei had directed a group of fourteen clerics to solve the issue of khomoniya (Chapter 1), by correcting speech and making necessary melodic

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{415} Burkholder, Grout and Palisca, \textit{A History of Western}, 29–32 and Figures 2.7 and 2.8.
\textsuperscript{416} Andreev, Shardt, and Simmons, ‘Proposal to Encode Medieval’, 2011.
\textsuperscript{417} It is unclear if extant polyphonic music in the Southwest had been transcribed from Western music in stave notation, or had been recorded directly in Kyivan quadratic notation.
\textsuperscript{418} Meyendorff, \textit{Russia, Ritual & Reform}, 38. He had sent an expedition to Mt. Athos to gather extant Greek texts as part of the process of Church reform. This resulted in a haul of some 500 books and manuscripts being brought back to the Moscow Print Yard.
\textsuperscript{419} Burkholder, \textit{A History of Western}, 156–157. The other alternative was copper–plate engraving; this became available in Europe in the late 17\textsuperscript{th} century, around the time that Mezenet’s Committee was considering the publication of their new chant books.
\end{flushleft}
changes in chant books of traditional Chant. Unfortunately, work had only just started in 1654 when a severe outbreak of plague occurred.\textsuperscript{420} The clerics’ report, entitled \textit{Izveshenie o soglasnishikh pometakh} [Report on the most consonant markings], did not emerge until more than a decade later. In 1667, a church music committee was reconvened, with six master singers, including Alexander Mezenets as Chairman,\textsuperscript{421} the remit again being to better fit chant melodies to texts already revised to true speech. After some years of work, the Committee had succeeded in revising some chant books. The intention was to print them, and thereby avoid labour-intensive serial manual copying of manuscripts, with all the attendant errors. However, despite the adoption of Kyivan notation underway, in the event the committee stuck with neumes.

At first glance, this decision defies logic. Stave typeface was becoming widely available, and the Moscow Print Yard likely did not have sufficient typeface to handle the large repertoire of extant Russian neumes (Chapter 1). Further, a second print run would have been needed for Shaidurov’s recently introduced pitch markings in red, although these could notionally have been printed ‘in one run’ in black. As against that, I can see that printing in neumes might have made some sense at the time, given other coeval realities. For example, the original charge from Tsar Aleksei in the early 1650s occurred before the invasion of Western partesny was fully underway. It was clearly focussed on correction of canonical monophonic Znamenny Chant, which was notated in neumes. Mezenets had some made significant investments of time and effort in neumes, both in the epic, comprehensive compilation of neumes in his seminal azbuka (Chapter 1) and in doggedly devising another system of pitch marks, \textit{priznaki} (auxiliary signs – see Introduction), which were black.\textsuperscript{422} Further, although he was educated in Ukraine and would therefore have been familiar with both Western polyphony and Kyivan stave notation, Mezenets was by then a senior employee in a traditional Russian monastery amongst the generation of monks antedating the appearance of Western partesny. It is also hard to discount the powerful undertow exerted by the Church Reform and schism underway during the working life of these two committees, and the boiling resistance to polyphony and stave notation it occasioned amongst Old Believers (Softening of Religious Opposition above). In the end, the revised books were never printed.\textsuperscript{423} Possibly, the Committee plumped to play it safe with hand-written neumatic manuscripts rather than new-fangled printed staved versions. It is also true that the Moscow Print Yard was very busy printing the new service books texts resulting from the religious reform impelled by Patriarch Nikon. So, musical manuscripts were copied by hand, in a wide variety of formats.\textsuperscript{424} I emphasise that following this failed attempt, chant books were not printed in Russia until 1772, more than a hundred years later (Chapter 3).\textsuperscript{425}

\textsuperscript{420} Razumovsky, \textit{Tserkovnoye peniye v Rossii} [Church singing in Russia], 50–52; Metallov, \textit{Russkaya semiographiya} [Russian Semeiography], 60; Morosan, \textit{Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary}, 37–38.
\textsuperscript{422} Harri, \textit{St. Petersburg Court Chant}, 54–55.
\textsuperscript{423} Harri, \textit{St. Petersburg Court Chant}, 55–56.
\textsuperscript{424} Plotnikova, \textit{Russkskoye partesnoye mnogogolosie kontsa} [Russian Partesny Polyphony from the end], 50–61.
\textsuperscript{425} Harri, \textit{St. Petersburg Court Chant}, 8; Morosan, \textit{Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary}, 251–252; Zakharina, \textit{Russkiye bogosluzhebnye pevcheskie knigi} [Russian liturgical song books], 135–146. These were printed in Kyivan stave notation.
As noted in Chapter 1, there were three issues with regard to the handling of text that had not been fully resolved by mid–17th century. The first was the khomoniya resulting from linguistic evolution of the Russian language, an issue that had prompted seating of the Mezenet’s committee in the first place. Khomoniya was formally banned by the Russian Church at the Moscow Council in 1667, and eventually disappeared from the standard liturgy with syllabic realignment of melodic structures to contemporary Russian pronunciation. Traditionalist Old Believers viewed this as the sacrifice of yet another precious tradition on the false altar of reform; many have since stuck obdurately to the practice of khomoniya.426 The second issue involved filler syllables, e.g., an enaki and khabuv, used as vocalisations in some extended melismata. These were also banned at the Moscow Council of 1667, and seem to have disappeared from the New Rite quite quickly. This makes sense in so far as I assume that florid melismata in the single vocal line of the source material would have complicated the creation of homophonic Western partesny, besides which the Church at that point continued to discourage anything resembling a solo. Perhaps unsurprisingly, filler syllables have continued in use by Old Believers.427 There is little written on the third text issue, involving mnogoglasiye. Beyond the fact that this was forbidden, there is little mention of it in the second half of the 17th century. One can easily envisage that its continuation, now with the three additional vocal lines of Western partesny, would have made services even more disharmonious and chaotic.428

An example of Western partesny involving a harmonised Znamenny theotokion–dogmatikon from late 17th – early 18th century is shown in Figure 2.1.429 It is clearly different in several respects from earlier strochny and demestvenny polyphony (Chapter 1). It includes four, rather than three vocal lines, and the cantus firmus is in the upper voice (labelled *), rather than the middle voices (cf Figures 1.7 and 1.9). The tenor follows the soprano generally at thirds (or compound thirds when boys began to sing this line early in the 18th century – see Chapter 3). Vocal lines remain mostly conjunct with the original cantus firmus line, with text syllables and pauses aligned vertically.430 Although this is nominally comparable to Western polyphony of the time, there are differences. For example, although parallel movement was largely eschewed in the West by this point, it is still clearly present in this example. Another dimension in which variance is common is that of tonality. Early on, the influence of the Russian Gamut (Chapter 1) was often evident. Later, as here, partesny began to move towards Western major: minor tonality. The work in Figure 2.1 defies exact pigeon holing. It does not conform with the Western key of G major, since none of the Fs are sharpened. Neither does it follow the Russian gamut, in that upper Bs are not flattened. However, it is consistent with G mixolydian. Cadence structure is plagal, rather than the perfect form then favoured in the West.

426 Harri, St. Petersburg Court Chant, 50 fn40. This contains a brief discussion of the possible derivation of the term khomoniya.
427 Preobrazhenskii, Kul’tovaya muzyka v Rossii [Culture of music in Russia], 25–26. These vocalisations were assumed to have had significance in the past, although their meaning had mostly been lost. However, Old Believers sometimes imbued them with almost mystical properties.
428 Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 47–48. This is a reconstruction of an example from Uspensky. Neither the latter nor the original neumed manuscript were available to me.
430 Plotnikova, Russkoye partesnoye mnogogolosiye kontsa [Russian Partesny Polyphony from the end], 7.
Translation: In the dark sea of old, a type of the Virgin Bride was prefigured...

Figure 2.1. An Example of Partesny: Portion of Harmonised Znamenny Chant
On the other hand, there are also some indications of the imitation then becoming popular in Europe.

Although Western partesny was initially brought from the Southwest, the repertoire in Russia thereafter developed in two more or less separate threads. The first focussed on harmonisation of extant ‘canonical’ monophonic Znamenny chant, as shown in the example above (Figure 2.1). The second involved de novo ‘non–canonical’ compositions, including creation of new hymnography for new saints, melodic reformulation of traditional chant, and para–liturgical and brand–new compositions. From a liturgical standpoint, this raises the vexed question of what exactly is the difference between these two threads. For example, does harmonisation of a venerable body of canonical monophonic chant cause it to become non–canonical? Moody considers this issue in detail.\[431\] While the application of polyphony does not de facto impugn its canonicity, a point consistent with the lack of any Canon prohibiting the practice of polyphony in Orthodoxy, concurrent melodic or format changes in the chant form per se could well render the resulting music non–canonical. Moody also points out that canonicity is to some degree in the eye of the beholder, and subject to a variety of influences that change over time. Neither can canonicity necessarily be assured or recaptured by a return to monophony.\[432\]

From a musicological perspective, these two new musical threads can be termed respectively postoyannoye mnogogolosiye (constant polyphony) and peremennoye mnogogolosiye (variable polyphony).\[433\] Constant polyphony focused on chants that were already an integral part of the liturgy, and derivative harmonisations were intended for use in regular worship services. Although they now included four vocal lines rather than just one, derivative partesny was generally homophonic, homorhythmic and relatively unadorned, thereby maintaining comprehension and primacy of the text (see Figure 2.1).

In contrast, newly composed kontserty tended to be much showier, with ‘Italianate’ vocal embellishment and artistry more consistent with the splendour of the Baroque underway in Western Europe. Some could rightly be considered to emphasise ‘art’ or ‘value as entertainment’. Another difference was that Kontserty texts were often drawn from biblical sources outside the standard liturgy.\[434\] The vocal fireworks of many kontserty were at odds with the time–hallowed simplicity of traditional Orthodox chant, and the asceticism of the Russian Church. Accordingly, kontserty were only permitted during worship in certain parts of the Divine Liturgy e.g., during communion, or as stand–alone hymns for special occasions.\[435\] On the other hand, kontserty were frequently employed in the newer practice of sacred singing outside churches, for example for the Royal Family, and for nobles in private chapels.\[436\] An extract from one of Titov’s kontserty – ‘O divnoye chudo’ [O wondrous miracle]\[437\] – is shown in Figure 2.2. This is quite different from the composition in Figure 2.1.

\[433\] Plotnikova, Russkoye partesnoye mnogogolosiye kontsa, [Russian Partesny Polyphony from the end], 233–234.
\[434\] Jensen, Musical Cultures in Seventeenth–Century, 33.
\[435\] Comparable to the practice of including special anthems in Catholic and Protestant services.
\[437\] Dolskaya–Ackerly, ‘Vasily Titov and the’, 209, Ex. 2. More complex kontserty survive, with more elaborate imitation, such as the two 12–part examples included in this publication (Ex. 4 and Ex. 8).
There are eight voices – in essence SATB doubled – and the music is far from homophonic and homorhythmic. There is also imitation, and some quasi–Italianate ornamental flourishes on the words ‘divnoye’ and ‘chudo’; these may have been included for emphasis, but effectively lend the piece a mildly operatic veneer.

Figure 2.2. A Titov Kontsert ‘O divnoye chudo’ [O wondrous miracle]

Again, this is not a straight replica of Western polyphony of the time. The tonal home of this short fragment is unclear, and clarity is not helped by addition of accidentals pro re nata instead of a key signature. One possibility is that the piece was envisioned in A minor, but the corresponding leading note, G, is not sharpened. Equally, a move to the parallel A major, is not realistic, since both Fs and Gs are unsharpened. The sharpened Cs suggest another possibility, namely a transition to D minor. As against this, the only B evident in this fragment, in the S2 line in this extract, is not flattened, although analysis of a more complete transcription from Dolskaya–Ackerly actually shows a dearth of Bs throughout. One other possibility is that the piece was conceived in melodic D minor, but it should be noted that Cs remain sharpened even in descending passages. Overall, the tonality of this piece again appears to be transitional, in passage to fully Western tonality, perhaps on balance in D minor.

In addition to harmonisations of the vast quantities of extant traditional Znamenny Chant (viz., Figure 2.1.), and newly–composed kontserty (viz., Figure 2.2), some other choral forms also appeared in Russia in the latter half of the 17th century. Union with Ukraine in 1654 (Easing of Geopolitical Isolation above) brought Kyivan chant to
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438 This would have been normal in the Kyivan quadratic notation in which this piece was likely written.
439 Dolskaya–Ackerly, ‘O divnoye chudo’.
Russia, This was in essence Ukraine’s version of Russia’s Znamenny Chant. The two had diverged during the previous centuries of separation, and followed parallel but different tracks of development. Another import from Ukraine from the 1650s was Bolgar or Bolgarsky (Bulgarian Chant). The provenance of this choral form remains a mystery. It is not part of the standard choral repertoire of the Bulgarian Church, and the rationale for its naming is therefore unclear. A third new choral form, so-called Greek Chant, also arrived in Moscow in the 1650s, perhaps with Hierodeacon Meletios of Constantinople, who was invited by Tsar Aleksei to teach the Tsar’s Choir. It should be emphasised that while these three forms are traditionally labelled ‘chant’, many examples are polyphonic. Poliakova offers a comprehensive discourse on the possible provenance of the various musical forms used in the liturgy during the time of the Russian Baroque.440

The importance of non-liturgical singing as a driver of polyphony in the West has already been noted (Chapter 1). The first inklings of such a trend could now be heard in Russia. There was increasing demand at court for non–liturgical sacred singing, a form of virtuous evening entertainment that suited the pious proclivities of Tsar Aleksei. Singers, verkhniye bogomol’tsy (upper pilgrims), were mostly lay mendicants who had sung for their supper since at least the 16th century.441 Bogomol’tsy had previously sung paraliturgical works such as the pokayannye stikhi (penitential verses).442 This trend strengthened with the serendipitous throwing together of Southwestern singers, musical theorists, and composers (see Singers and Singing above). A rich new brew of polyphony–friendly liturgical forms, Kyivan, Bulgarian and Greek, and Western partesny then developed.

To this ferment a para–liturgical polyphonic musical form was now added, that of kant (plural Kanty – chant). This Polish form became more common in Russia following union with Ukraine in 1654, and became enormously popular subsequently during the Russian Baroque.443 Kanty were generally notated in staves and three parts. Initially, in mid–17th century, the text was still primarily in Polish, with some in Ukrainian or Belarussian. By century’s end, most texts had been translated, or were written de novo in Russian or Church Slavonic. Texts were drawn from varied sources. Some were derived from liturgical texts, including psalmy (psalms), ancient dukhovnye stikhi (sacred verses), and the paraliturgical pokayannye stikhi (penitential verses) sung by the Bogomol’sky. Others were drawn from secular texts. Melodically, several Kanty contained recognisable fragments of traditional monophonic liturgical chant, but almost none were drawn entirely from this source. Yet others were derived from byliny (epic songs), and even dance music.444 Finally, although the standard view of kanty is that of music composed and recorded semi–formally, it is fair to speculate that some may have begun life informally as oral community–based folk song. To the extent this may have been true, this provides another possible point of influence of popular folk music upon liturgical music.445

---

441 Jensen, Musical Cultures in Seventeenth–Century, 28–38. Such new polyphonic secular music should be clearly distinguished from older folk music such as that performed informally by the Skomorokhi, and which was often accompanied by musical instruments (Chapter 1).  
442 Jensen, Musical Cultures in Seventeenth–Century, 57–60.  
443 Jensen, Musical Cultures in Seventeenth–Century, 60–70.  
444 Dolskaya, Spiritual Songs in Seventeenth–Century, XX–XXX.  
445 Dolskaya, Spiritual Songs in Seventeenth–Century, XVII–XXVI.
Given the large number of kanty created in the latter half of the 17th century, it is fortunate that several comprehensive compilations have been made. One noteworthy example is manuscript MS 1938, produced in the 1680s. It contains 170 semi–sacred kanty dating from around 1650 to the early 1680s, a period straddling the Union of Ukraine with Russia in 1654. Although some monasteries were slow to embrace partesny, the New Jerusalem Monastery actually contributed several polyphonic kanty. I suspect this may reflect the early adopter proclivities of its founder, Patriarch Nikon. Most of these kanty texts are anonymous, but some can be attributed to known authors e.g., Dmitry Tuptalo, Epifany Slavinetsky, and Simeon of Polotsk.

MS 1938 offers some fascinating ethnomusicological insights, with progressive changes in language, texts and music during this half century. The example shown in Figure 2.3. is one of the earlier examples in this collection. It is in Polish, derived from the Latin Angelus pastoribus dixit (The Angel said to the Shepherds). In the original manuscript, Polish language was retained, but the text was actually transliterated into Cyrillic, presumably for readability in Russia. This example has regular structure, with two bar phrases ending with cadences and interspersed with a single one bar.

Figure 2.3. Early Polish Christmas Kant ‘The Angels Said the Shepherds’

**SOPRANO**

\[\text{An - iol past - er zom mó - wil, Christ - sus się wam na - rod - zil,}\]

\[\text{w Bet lejem, w bardzo pod łym mieście, na - rod - zil}\]

\[\text{w u - bóstwie, pan w - sheg - o stwor sen - ia} \]

**ALTO**

\[\text{she - phers, Christ is born to you,}\]

\[\text{a very dir - ty place, He was born in}\]

\[\text{Lord of all cre a - tion}\]

**BASS**

\[\text{The Angel said to the shepherds, Christ is born to you,}\]

\[\text{in Bethlehem a very dirty place, He was born in}\]

\[\text{in poverty, Lord of all creation}\]

---

446 Dolskaya, *Spiritual Songs in Seventeenth–Century*, 1–320. MS 1938 is from the Muzeinoye sobraniye (Museum Collection) curated in the Gosudarstvennyi Istoricheskiy Muzei (The State Historical Museum) in Moscow.

447 Dolskaya, *Spiritual Songs in Seventeenth–Century*, 21 and XXXII–XXXIII. There is some suggestion that this kant (number 52) may date back to the 16th century. For clarity, I show the Polish text here in Roman script, and translated into English. I have also added a time signature and bar lines for descriptive purposes.
phrase. Unlike much early partesny, which contains vestiges of the Russian Gamut (Figure 2.1), this piece can be considered to be closer to then Western tonality. It is clearly in F major, and begins and ends on the tonic. However, there are some features that would have been unusual in 17th century Western music. For example, the final notes of each phrase are mostly in unison rather than chordal. In addition, the key progression from tonic to subdominant, to relative minor (viz. F major – Bb major – G minor) and back again to F major would have been atypical in the West at that time. This piece is both homophonic and homorhythmic. The two top lines move primarily in thirds, with occasional fourths and fifths. However, there are some sixths (e.g., bar 10), an interval rarely seen in Russia previously, although by now becoming more commonplace in the West. The bass line is not just an alternative melodic or rhythmic element, but provides triadic harmonic support. Some kanty contained bass lines which were busier and more prominent, termed esselentirovanyi bas, or ekstsellentovanniyi bas (excellent or extravagant bass).

Overall, this piece is tonal and seems quite Western, particularly when compared with the partesny shown in Figure 2.1. This could reflect the fact that the example in Figure 2.1 is a new Russian harmonisation of traditional canonical chant, from a time when native composers were still coming to grips with Western partesny. Conversely, the kant in Figure 2.3. more likely represents a distinct, earlier heritage of unambiguously Western Catholic polyphony from Poland. Intriguingly, Dolskaya discusses the possibility that the musical roots of this kant may date back even earlier, to the 16th century. In line with this, I did consider the possibility that the 16th–century Russian polyphony described in Chapter 1 might conceivably represent an ‘original Russian’ form of kanty. However, while a comparison of strochny polyphony with Polish kanty (Table 2.3) reveals some musical similarities, there are obvious differences beyond the country of origin and language – in sourcing of text and usage, not to mention strophism and notation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Strophic</th>
<th>Notation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strochny</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Liturgical</td>
<td>Liturgy</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavonic</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanty</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1. Comparison of 16th–Century Russian Strochny and Polish Kanty

Further, as noted in Chapter 1, some examples of demestvenny and strochny involve obvious discordance, whereas Polish kanty are usually concordant. I would also emphasise some thorny, practical issues in any such comparative musical analysis. One is the unreliability of dating. Another is the presence of clear alternative melodic or harmonic variants that complicate settling on the definitive version for analysis. In this vein, Dolskaya includes three alternative melodic variants for this kant.

---

450. Dolskaya, *Spiritual Songs in Seventeenth–Century*, XXXII.
As to use, kanty were sung in a wide variety of contexts, but not generally within the liturgy. I speculate that this song form can be viewed as a kind of chamber choral music that remained popular in part because of the connections it retained to spiritual texts and melodies. The sheer number of extant kanty manuscripts dating from the last 25 years of the 17th century attest to the fact that this form became very popular in Moscow, and it was encouraged and performed frequently at court. One prominent source of text was the versed psalter of Simeon of Polotsk, published in Russian in 1680. This was then set to music in kanty form, by Vasily Titov (see Singers and Singing above). The copies he sent to Peter I and Ivan V, then jointly Tsars, and to their sister, Sofia Alekseevna, then Regent, contain fulsome dedications. This and Polotsky’s prominent role tutoring Royal Family members confirm that kanty were much in favour at court. There is also evidence of significant monastic contributions to kanty, and Nikolai Diletsky used several kanty as illustrative examples in his treatise (see New Opportunities for Training and Experience above). Another use of kanty was to document historical events, such as the Union between Russia and the Cossack Hetmanate of Ukraine in 1654 (Easing of Geopolitical Isolation above). Later, this form became a staple of the official celebrations of Peter I’s military victories (Chapter 3). Overall, kanty seem to have been another important ingredient in the suddenly fertile polyphonic environment of the Russian Baroque. I conclude that their adoption provided further support and even cover for the incorporation of Western partesny into liturgical music.

The main musical focus in mid-17th century remained firmly on liturgical and paraliturgical singing, but the musical tastes of Russian rulers were slowly tilting more catholic. Tsar Aleksei, whose piety and antipathy towards the Skomorokhi early in his reign were legendary (Chapter 1), later seemed to develop a taste for Western secular and instrumental music and actively sought it out. The musical differences between his two weddings, occurring a quarter of a century apart, are instructive. His first, to Maria, involved almost exclusively liturgical singing, including strochny and demestvenny, and foresaw the instrumental ‘consummation’ fanfares performed for previous Tsars. In contrast, his second wedding, to Natalya, welcomed trumpets, shawms, violins, gusli (zithers), and even an organ played by a foreigner. This is quite a change from the situation with false Dmitry I, who was murdered following the use of instrumental and secular music during his marriage a half century earlier (Chapter 1). Aleksei also ensured that his son, Peter I, was well supplied with instruments and exposed him to Western music, a practice which Peter continued by frequenting the German Suburb and its European musical events (Easing of Geopolitical Isolation above).

Although Aleksei’s sudden royal interest in secular music could theoretically have antedated his embrace of partesny in the liturgy, I suspect that it actually was an unanticipated result of the latter. Regardless, the important point is that in a strongly

452 Findeizen, History of Music in, Vol. 1, 371. Simeon of Polotsk (Samuel Piotrowski–Sitnianowicz) was born in Belarus, and after study in Kyiv and Vilnius became a Greek Catholic monk. A supporter of the ‘Third Rome’ concept, he was invited to Moscow, and tutored the Tsar’s children. He drafted articles deposing Nikon and anathematising opponents. He is known as an early Russian poet, despite writing in Polish and Church Slavonic.
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Orthodox country led by an absolutist monarch who was also the anointed head of the Church, Aleksei’s new interest in instrumental and secular music was a departure of great note. Instrumental music, including trumpet fanfares, was now increasingly heard in a military context. This followed Western reforms of the Army by Aleksei and his son Peter, although such music was still only performed outdoors, in contrast to Europe where musical instruments had long been allowed inside. Further, instrumental music began to be heard at court. On the opening night of Moscow’s first theatre in 1672, Tsar Aleksei reportedly sat entranced for hours. The Court Theatre then continued in operation until Aleksei’s death in 1676, and although disbanded by his son Feyodor, then returned in public form under Peter I (Chapter 3). Court plays initially involved biblical themes, but became progressively more secular. Although no manuscripts survive, productions are reported to have involved instrumental as well as choral music. The latter included chanting of psalms in Hebrew with Russian translations, but some singing was of a more secular bent.

Occurring so recently after the affair of false Dmitry I (Chapter 1), I conclude that Tsar Aleksei’s growing interest in polyphonic instrumental and secular music was an unintended fillip for the new part singing. However, it also had major, negative ramifications, reinforcing the massive resentment and opposition of Old Believers (Softening of Religious Opposition above). These traditionalists refused resolutely to change one iota of their religious practices under the Old Rite, and persisted resolutely with traditional chanting of ‘pure’ monophonic canonical Chant. Such staunch resolution appears to have frozen any further evolution of their chant repertoire from this point onwards. The determination of Old Believers to change nothing and endure serious persecution, dislocation, and death for their pains, support their contention that their monophonic singing today is an accurate replica of the original. If so, then one unintended benefit of their obduracy is that modern monophonic Old Believer singing can be viewed as one proxy for Russian canonical chant as it sounded immediately before the advent of Western partesny in mid-17th century.

Later in the 17th century, Western partesny began to be known as muzykiya (music from the Latin musica). Singing it required being conversant with stave notation, new intervallic leaps, changing tempi and rhythmic complexity, and eventually new major: minor tonality with sharps and flats. For native Russian singers accustomed to simple rote monophony and the Russian Gamut, this must have been a huge adjustment, and performance of complicated, multi-part kontserty seems to have
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457 Jensen, Musical Cultures in Seventeenth–Century, 163–164.
459 Jensen, Musical Cultures in Seventeenth–Century, 61–62 and 75. Interestingly, although instruments were never played in Orthodox churches, reports exist of ‘illicit’ musical instruments in homes, and even monasteries.
461 Findeizen, Ocherki po istorii muzyki [Essays on the History of Music], 184; Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 38. Previously, peniye (singing) was distinguished from muzykiya (instrumental music). Later, usage of muzykiya changed to include singing, and specifically Western partesny.
462 Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 43–50.
relied at least initially on superior choirs, such as those of the Tsar or Patriarch,\textsuperscript{463} and naturally their adopted Southwestern choristers.

It seems appropriate to end this chapter with an example of Western partesny composed by Titov. Figure 2.4 shows a simple harmonised setting of Psalm 52,\textsuperscript{464} such as would have been used in bozhie sluzhbe (the Divine Liturgy).

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{psalm52.png}
\caption{A setting by Titov of Psalm 52}
\end{figure}

**Translation:**

Powerful in evil why do you stray  
And from malice more evil make:  
Your tongue like a sharp razor  
Plots flattery (Revised Standard Version).

This is one of his earlier pieces, with just three voices, although in contrast to 16\textsuperscript{th} century polyphony, the cantus firmus is in the upper voice. It is both homophonic and homorhythmic, and in keeping with the importance of the text in the original monophonic chant, there is also extensive parallel movement in the upper two voices. Moreover, although this piece can be considered to have moved away from the Russian gamut towards contemporary Western tonality, it is still at a transitional point. Thus, the key appears to move from A minor at the beginning to the relative C major, with a visit to G major, and ending in C major. This is consistent with a tonal centre in C major, but the start on A minor would seem unusual in the West. There are also clear cadences, but their structure is somewhat different. For example, the cadence at the text syllables ‘zhi–shi’ appears to be a straightforward perfect cadence (V – I) in C major, but the fifth of the triad, G, is omitted. The cadences at ‘ri–shi’ and ‘byl–est’ are also likely V–I cadences in C major, but in bare octaves. Although the cadence at the ‘slil–est’ fits with a perfect (V – I) cadence in G major, it

\textsuperscript{463} Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 50–51.  
\textsuperscript{464} Findeizen, History of Music in, Vol. 1, 238, Example 9.6.
could also be an imperfect secondary dominant (II – V) cadence in C major. I note that this cadence structure is not standard form at this point in time, either in Western choral music or in Polish kanty.

In many respects, Titov’s music can be considered to straddle the older Russian tradition and the newer Western form. Throughout his sacred compositions, he emphasised the importance of the underlying Slavonic text, but sometimes employed elaborate word painting. Although this was then commonplace in the West, it could well have been a red flag to the reactionary Russian Church. On the other hand, he included onomatopoeic figurations reminiscent of the bells much beloved of the Russian Church, but also some quasi-Italianate ornamentation. His melodic lines played homage to traditional Russian chant, but at the same time featured elements more typical of Russian folk music. Even in his multi-part Kontserty, the choir is not split in the antiphony found in the Venetian polychoal style with which partesny has sometimes been compared. Titov’s frequent use of a passing seventh chord was later echoed by Mikhail Glinka, the undisputed father of Russian opera.

I conclude that early on, the partesny that appeared in Russia from mid–17th century was not fully ‘Westernised’. This is consistent with Gerasimova’s more detailed analysis of the differences between musical copies brought from the Kyivan Metropolitanate and those newly composed in Russia. The situation is perhaps best viewed as a Russian representation of contemporaneous Western polyphony, viewed through a Ukrainian, Slavic lens, the latter being polished by Polish and Lithuanian occupation and resultant Western and Catholic musical influences. In other words, early Russian partesny was a work in progress, and its transitional nature may also reflect its birthing early in the cultural awakening of the Russian Baroque, and conceivably some minor influence from 16th–century Russian polyphony. I conclude that Nikon and Aleksei unwittingly set in train a wholesale importation from the Southwest of some key elements of an incipient system of polyphonic music – singers, notation, and music. Although this change was seismic, I doubt that it involved any concerted planning or deliberate intent. Rather, the effective outsourcing of parts of Russia’s musical development to the West, initially only in sacred music (this chapter) and later in secular and instrumental music as well (Chapters 3 and 4), reflected a tumbling succession of short-term expedients that seemed opportune at the time.

**The Changing Balance of Promoters and Inhibitors**

I address the second research question by comparing the agency of promoters of polyphony (Table 2.2) and inhibitors (Table 2.3) at c. 1700 with the earlier baseline (c. 1650) in Chapter 1. This indicates that several promoters absent in Russia at mid–17th century were becoming evident by century’s end, even if not yet in fully developed form or potency (Table 2.2). Admittedly, there is no reliable means of quantitating changes, but I would speculate that music theorists, educator’s texts,
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469 As noted above, the Tsar’s and Patriarch’s Choirs may still have been singing earlier 16th–century polyphony, although the three-voice (troystrochny) structure and tonality of strochny and demestvenny polyphony were demonstrably different from mid–17th–century Western partesny.
harmonisation, secular and non–liturgical music, and stave notation were each salient. Along with the recruitment of trained, experienced Southwestern singers and their concentration in communal housing, these promoters now provided an informal learning environment for native Russians, in which higher singing skills, musical literacy and polyphonic singing could be modelled and promoted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promoters^a</th>
<th>The West</th>
<th>Russia c. 1650</th>
<th>Russia c. 1700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment and Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from Church and State</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth of choirs and choir schools</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal musical education</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical theorists, educators and texts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confraternities, brotherhoods, guilds</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical theorists, educators and texts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confraternities, brotherhoods, guilds</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singers and Singing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide vocal range (men, women &amp; children)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorisation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visualisation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonisation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual and musical literacy</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalisation and payment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution and Naming</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patronage and Sponsorship</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous polyphonic forms</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secular and non–liturgical sacred music</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental music</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of folk music</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on art and beauty in music</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stave notation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aPromoters clearly present, regardless of relative agency, are marked with a green tick (✓). Those of uncertain status are either marked with a smaller tick (✓) or left unmarked

Table 2.2. Comparative Agency of Promoters in Russia in 1650 and 1700

This led by the end of the century to a generation of native Russians composing fluently and polyphonically, even if not always yet in fully realised Western form. Further, many of these composers are known by name, even if their music has not survived. Another nascent promoter came from the emergence of kontser, which offered a new outlet for art and beauty in the music being composed, although I note that this represented a departure from the austere tradition of Russian liturgical music. The rivalry between the choirs of Patriarch Nikon and of Tsar Aleksei opened up the possibility of competition between other choirs. The availability of expat polyphonists led, together with recruitment of serfs, to the formation of some private
choirs sponsored by the wealthy. On the other hand, singers were still viewed as lowly artisans, remained unsupported by Church and State, and unable to self-organise or professionalise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inhibitors&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Russia c. 1650</th>
<th>Russia c. 1700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment and Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious opposition</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geopolitical isolation and xenophobia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opportunity for training or experience</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression of Skomorokhi and guilds</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singers and Singing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited textual &amp; musical literacy</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisanal dependency of singers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistant culture of anonymity</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discouragement of improvisation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of experience singing polyphonically</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opportunities for training and experience</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence on neumatic notation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text: music coordination issues</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Inhibitors clearly present, regardless of relative agency, are marked with a red tick (✓). Those of uncertain status are either marked with a smaller tick (✓) or left unmarked.

Table 2.3. Easing of Inhibitors in Russia by the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> Century

Changes in the agency of inhibitors are summarised in Table 2.3. This picture is notable for the substantial waning in brute force of several of the inhibitors described in Chapter 1 (Table 1.3). Most importantly, previously virulent religious opposition to Catholics and their ‘godless’ music had been effectively set aside in the choral ‘wrestling match’ between Patriarch Nikon and Tsar Aleksei. The question of whether or not polyphony was acceptable continued to be side-lined during the wrenching schism within the Russian Church, and was then deftly finessed after the 1667 Moscow Council. Geopolitical isolation and xenophobia had largely subsided. Russia had undergone union with Ukraine, and could take advantage of the Southwest’s educational facilities. The lack of polyphony–ready singers had been solved by recruitment of trained, experienced Southwestern singers. This had enabled Western partesny to be adopted by choirs of the Tsar, the Patriarch, larger cathedrals, and then other churches, and thereby to enter the liturgy almost by stealth. The massively consequential nature of the advent of polyphony, after many centuries of resolute monophony, was obscured by the tempest raging during the Schism around the hot button issues of liturgical and worship reform. In this regard, Western partesny cannot be said to have been explicitly approved. Much of the general population, and indeed many priests, remained adamantly opposed to any alteration in Russian liturgical musical practice, including changes to the long tradition of monophonic chanting. In effect, polyphony was effectively ‘allowed in’ almost surreptitiously because of the rather petty choral rivalry between the two most powerful men in Russia. However, I emphasise that a formal ban on polyphony could still have been reinstated by a
subsequent powerful, traditionalist patriarch, or by the wild, teenaged Tsar Peter I, when as many hoped, he gained the maturity of adulthood (Chapter 3).

Beyond helping to backfill the lack of polyphony–ready Russian singers, the recruitment of Southwestern singers likely had secondary effects facilitating the emergence of promoters, for example informal vocal training and the development of higher singing skills and musical literacy in native Russian singers. The polyphonic music that migrants brought with them from the Southwest also helped the process of seeding a transition to stave notation across Russia. For completeness, I should mention one other possibility, namely that the changes in promoters and inhibitors that allowed partesny into Russia in the latter half of the 17th century might also have been related in some part to the contemporaneous flowering of the Russian Baroque.

I also compared the relative time course of changes in promoters and inhibitors during this period from 1650 – 1700. In the first few years, Patriarch Nikon and Tsar Aleksei effectively paused the religious opposition to polyphony and ordered in appropriate polyphonic expertise and experience from the Southwest. The Union with Ukraine occurred in 1654 and further eased geopolitical isolation. These changes gave a green light to active recruitment of Southwestern polyphonists. In other words, relaxation of the most potent inhibitors occurred right at the beginning of this half century, whereas most of the newly–emerged promoters only became evident some decades later. This was especially obvious for informal training opportunities, which I have argued required accumulation of a critical mass of polyphonists, theorists and educators in Moscow; this only occurred towards the end of the century.

Thus, in regard to the second Research Question, I would argue that this chapter confirms the tentative conclusion reached in Chapter 1 concerning the prime mover effect of inhibitors – that is to say that the abrupt acceptance of Western partesny around mid–17th century was due primarily to a sudden reduction in the agency of major inhibitors, rather than the appearance of appropriate promoters. I acknowledge that missing promoters may later have played a secondary facilitatory role, but only later after relaxation of the thoroughgoing inhibitors identified allowed them licence and sufficient substance. Promoters had simply not to this point been at liberty to become active, given the stultifying atmosphere of relentless religious opposition, geopolitical isolation, and a lack of trained, experienced singers. This does not negate the unwritten implication (see Introduction) that the appearance of polyphony could have been delayed in part because of retarded cultural development. However, given the stability, durability and power of this dense thicket of inhibitors over previous centuries, I dispute the notion of an almost inevitable march from monophony to polyphony, as a matter of course (see Introduction). Furthermore, I find the sudden relaxation of all these inhibitors at the same time surprising, even astonishing. The reactions of Old Believers indicate that ordinary Russians of the time had similar reactions. In particular, it is ironic to note that after centuries of relentless opposition from the Russian Church to changes in liturgical music, including polyphony, incorporation of partesny was apparently set in train by the actions of the Patriarch.
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Chapter 3.
1700–1750: Obliteration of inhibitors to Western Polyphony

‘If you become restless, speed up. If you become winded, slow down.
You climb the mountain in an equilibrium between restlessness and exhaustion.’

Robert Pirsig ‘Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance.’

Notwithstanding the sudden relaxation of longstanding inhibitors, followed by the later appearance of some promoters (Chapter 2), the status of nascent polyphony in Russia at the beginning of the 18th century remained distinctly parlous – effectively balanced on a knife edge. Any or all of the recently eased inhibitors (Table 2.3) could well have roared back in full force. Above all, trenchant religious opposition to all things Western was far from vanquished, and a substantial proportion of Russians, including Old Believers, remained ‘polyphobic’, flatly rejecting the new Rite and Western–style polyphony. The brutal schism and Peter’s impetuous and comprehensive throwing of Russia open to Europe amounted to a revolution in all but name (Chapter 2). Peter now drove further formalisation and sustenance of the social and cultural changes spawned by this upheaval, both to achieve full expression and to avoid snap back to the previous status quo ante. I also note that fledgling latter day promoters of polyphony had yet to acquire full agency, and others long in effect in the West were still missing (Table 2.2). As one example, in taking advantage of trained, experienced Southwestern polyphonists, Russia had taken no active steps to build facilities for formal training of native singers in musical literacy or part singing. In this chapter, I continue a general examination of the factors sustaining newly–emerged polyphony during the first half of the 18th century, and expand consideration of the second research question:

2. Was the adoption of Western partesny from mid–17th to mid–18th century primarily due to the appearance of promoters comparable to those in effect in the West, or the disappearance of long–standing local barriers in Russia?

Environment and Training

The End of Geopolitical Isolation: In Chapter 2, I concluded that Tsar Aleksei had tentatively cracked the door to Europe, and that Peter had opened it wide. In this chapter, I argue that Peter figuratively threw the door away. He had become the undisputed ruler of Russia, after the co–Tsar Ivan V died in 1696, and then reigned until his death in 1725, spanning exactly half of the period covered in this chapter. He was the complete autocrat and bestrode Russia like a colossus. The message from his Grand Embassy to the West at the close of the 17th century (Chapter 2) could not have been clearer. The ‘old medieval, isolationist Russia’ was out, and a ‘new, modern, European Russia’ was in. Even so, ending geopolitical isolation and winning the Westernisation of his highly reactionary country were not going to be quick or easy things. There were still powerfully anti–European voices at the highest levels of the land, but such proponents of business—as–usual had reckoned without the elemental force that was Peter, and the breath–taking scale and speed of the transformation on which he now embarked. In essence, he intended nothing less than to catapult his country into the modern era as a major European power, and

470 While ‘fear of many things’ seems a not inappropriate characterisation of Russia in the late 17th century, I use ‘polyphobic’ rather than the more accurate but inelegant term ‘polyphonophobic’.
improbably, to do this without first putting in place the necessary infrastructure and base of education and skills. Almost everything would need to be imported from Europe.\textsuperscript{471}

Upon his return from the Great Embassy to Europe, Peter was a frenzy of action, promulgating a blizzard of decrees specifically designed to morph the slow–moving, medieval Russian caterpillar into a nimble, modern European butterfly. He decreed that all Russians become clean–shaven, except peasants and the clergy; this was to be enforced by designated ‘beard–cutters’, and beards could be retained only on payment of a beard tax.\textsuperscript{472} He personally supervised the shaving of the traditional beards worn by his entire circle of close friends and colleagues. Further, dress was to be European, and all who arrived at the gates of Moscow in traditional dress, peasants excepted, were required to pay a fine before entry.\textsuperscript{473} Inter–marriage with Europeans was encouraged, and over the next century the Russian court and civil service was full of foreigners.\textsuperscript{474} The old Russian calendar was brought into line with the European Julian calendar, 1\textsuperscript{st} September 7206 becoming 1\textsuperscript{st} January, 1700.\textsuperscript{475} To reach out to the outside world, and project the trappings of a European great power, Peter instituted a new diplomatic service, training aristocrats to serve. The first embassies were set up in Poland and Sweden, and by 1725, Russia had twelve new, permanent embassies.

Peter’s extensive military adventures were also completely consistent with opening Russia up to the West. Unfortunately, his conquest of Azov in 1697 had not yielded a port with untrammelled access to the Mediterranean, and in 1711 Peter was forced to relinquish both Azov and Taganrog to the Ottomans. Dreams of access to the Mediterranean and a Russian Navy remained unrealised. His quest for warm water ports turned to the Baltic Sea, but suitable locations were all controlled by Sweden, then the dominant regional power. Peter determined to eject them, and much of his reign was taken up with the Great Northern War against Sweden, which started in 1700 and only ended in 1721, just four years before his death. Peter’s first campaign, in 1700, was to make a play for direct access to the Baltic Sea. He attacked Narva (in Northern Estonia), just to the West of the mouth of the River Neva. Peter’s army substantially outnumbered the Swedes, but to his great chagrin, he lost to their new military prodigy, the young King Charles XII.\textsuperscript{476} This stinging defeat caused Peter to overhaul the Russian Army and to introduce permanent conscription.\textsuperscript{477}

Three years later, in 1703, with a huge, revitalised army of 200,000, Peter returned, attacked the Swedes at the mouth of the Neva, and defeated them, decisively. He immediately started to build his new port city and navy base there, and named it St.
Petersburg\(^{478}\) (see below). He followed this shortly thereafter with a second naval base a few miles to the West, in Kronstadt. The most decisive battle of the Great Northern War with Sweden occurred at Poltava in 1709, when Peter routed the Swedish Army and stopped their attempted invasion of Russia. Thereafter, war with Sweden dragged on until their final defeat in 1721, and the Treaty of Nystad. During this time, Peter managed to pick apart Sweden’s large Empire and to gain much new territory, securing a substantial buffer zone around St. Petersburg for its defence.

By 1721, Peter’s various conquests had further enlarged Russia, and he now declared it to be an Empire.\(^{479}\) Following his victories, he had developed a taste for entering Moscow triumphantly, under magnificent victory arches. He also graciously accepted a number of splendid titles, including: *Russorum Imperator* (Emperor of the Russians); and *otets otechestva* (Father of the Fatherland).\(^{480}\) At this point, the previous quandary of which strategic vision Russia should follow, namely: multi-ethnic empire; leader of the Orthodox oecumene; or independent, sovereign state (see Chapter 1), had become academic. To Peter, the correct vision was blindingly obvious, the forging of a multi-ethnic empire. Arguably, this had already become an organising principle (Chapter 1). What was new with Peter was his single-minded and explicit embrace of Empire as a national strategy, and his obsession that success in this venture was part and parcel of grasping and maintaining credibility as a great European power.

Immediately after his win against the Swedes in Ingria, and without waiting for the Great Northern War to end, Peter threw himself into creating a brand-new ‘European’ port city – St. Petersburg.\(^{481}\) The first priority was to create a fortress and shipyard, followed by houses, palaces, churches, and other buildings. He also designed an extensive system of canals. St. Petersburg was very consciously built along Western lines, with the use of dozens of architects and designers from Europe. Peter resolved to build in stone; this was more European in style,\(^{482}\) and less susceptible to the regular conflagrations that plagued Russia’s wooden towns and cities (see Introduction). This required vast quantities of stone to be hauled to St. Petersburg, and Peter forbade all masonry work elsewhere, so that every possible stonemason would be available. The land was swampy and subject to frequent flooding, and countless thousands of serfs conscripted for service died of disease and malnutrition.

Peter then summarily transferred the capital from Moscow to St. Petersburg in 1712. This was a perfect opportunity for ‘out with the old and in with the new’ – replacing the traditional, medieval, Muscovite systems of government with modern, organised, European approaches, relying in part on concepts imported from the Western
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\(^{478}\) Its name in Russian, *Sankt Peterburg*, uses a Russified version of the Latin word *Sanctus* for Saint, rather than the traditional Russian word for Saint, *Svyatoyi*.

\(^{479}\) Christian, *A History of Russia*, 289. In 1725, the Russian, Bering, discovered Alaska. A few hardy souls settled there, but Alaska did not much interest Russia and it was eventually sold to the U.S.A.

\(^{480}\) Hughes, *Russia in the Age*, 94–100. There was a long Russian tradition of allusions to Rome and its emperors. The word Tsar, or ‘Czar’ was derived from *Caesar*, and ‘otets otechestva’ came from the honorific *Pater Patriae* that previously had been bestowed on the Roman Emperor Augustus.

\(^{481}\) Massie, *Peter the Great*, 355. It is unclear if St. Petersburg would ever have been built if the port of Riga had already been captured, rather than seven years later in 1710.

\(^{482}\) Hughes, *Russia in the Age*, 326–330. Sometimes termed ‘Petrine Baroque’.
Enlightenment. In addition, moving from an ancient, disorganised conurbation to a new European ‘designer’ city could not have been a clearer signal of Peter’s desire to drive Russia Western, and to achieve parity or even superiority. It was only to be expected that many Muscovites initially resisted the charms of the new ‘Venice of the North’, especially since the wealthier among them were expected to build and pay for their new homes in what they viewed as ‘the Swamp of the North’. The impoverished surrounding land meant that most food had to be imported from elsewhere, causing shortages and high costs. Nevertheless, barring a brief period from 1728–1732, this new, European city remained the capital of Russia until the October Revolution in 1917. Peter was also determined that St. Petersburg was to be beautiful as well as functional. In addition to well-known, established architects, and famous musicians, noted painters and sculptors were also welcomed to live and work there. This large community of talented expats in turn provided training for native Russians.

In another major move to open up Russia to Europeans, Peter decreed that foreigners should be allowed to live openly amongst native Russians, rather than being summarily corralled off in a Nemetskaya Sloboda, as had happened previously in Moscow (Chapter 2). This was entirely consistent with his other actions. Russia was to be made attractive to Europeans, so that they would feel welcomed, and would bring their manifold skills to live and work in Russia. Westerners could travel in comfort by ship to St. Petersburg, and be fully integrated into a new, modern, European city with growing cultural attractions. Russia’s other major cities were also filling up with Europeans of every stripe, including singers, and especially Italians and Germans (see Singers and Singing). St. Petersburg and Moscow must have been veritable towers of Babel. The language of communication at court and amongst the nobility was increasingly French, or failing that, German. Many Europeans played important roles in court, government, the military, and in music. The Russian language itself was in a state of considerable flux. There were multiple distinct dialects, including Chancery Russian, the Church Slavonic still used liturgically, and many regional and local accents. Peter, and several other notables such as Lomonosov (see below), introduced substantive changes, and many German and other European words were subsumed into everyday Russian.

Peter’s energy and influence were equally far-reaching in many other areas. He completely refashioned the aristocracy and the government. Another undertaking was an enormous system of canals. One project connected the River Volga to the River Don in the South, and to Lake Ladoga in the North, permitting passage of ships from the Baltic to the Mediterranean and further connecting the Empire and its major cities to Europe. Peter also wished to refashion Russia’s antiquated agrarian economy by industrialising. To pay for the enormous costs of all his projects, he
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486 Hosking, Russia: People and Empire, 89–90. Peter built a series of public buildings that were firsts in Russia, including a museum (Kunzkamera), zoo, Public Library, and the Academy of Sciences.
487 Massie, Peter the Great, 774–776.
488 Hughes, Russia in the Age, 328–330.
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instituted taxes on pretty much everything, including a Poll tax. These heavy taxes, and other convulsive and pell mell changes, were a prominent cause of social unrest, and there were major rebellions, in Astrakhan, and amongst the Bashkirs and Don Cossacks in 1707. Although Peter did abolish slavery in 1723, he did little to better the lot of the common Russian peasant, who in censuses of 1678 and 1719 made up a large percentage of Russia’s inhabitants, While Peter’s reforms and other actions boiled, he determined to revisit Europe in 1716–1717. In his previous Grand Embassy, he had come as a curiosity, an unusually tall, naive boy King of a foreign place in Asia. This time, he entered Paris as a seasoned, powerful and respected leader of an Empire and a major European power.

At his death in 1725, Peter was followed in succession by his second wife, Catherine I, by Peter II in 1727, by Anna Ioannovna in 1730, by Anna Leopoldovna as regent for her infant son Ivan VI in 1740, and by Elizabeth Petrovna after a successful coup in 1741. The prominence of women rulers in this period is particularly striking, since Russia had never previously had a single female ruler. The massive cultural, social and political changes started by Peter did not die with him; his successors, and especially Catherine the Great, followed his policy of ‘take no prisoners’ Westernisation and modernisation faithfully. Geopolitical isolation was officially consigned to the history books.

_The Collapse of Religious Opposition:_ The recent, rending Schism within Orthodoxy engendered by Tsar Aleksei and Patriarch Nikon had served to temporarily distract and mute long–standing Orthodox opposition to innovation and changes in music (Chapter 2). Western partesny had been able to establish a toehold in Russia, but could hardly yet be counted a reliable component of liturgical music. The Russian Church had been weakened by the Schism, but was far from toothless. As recently as 1690, just before dying, Patriarch Joachim had thundered in his testament:

> May our sovereign never allow any Orthodox Christians in their realm to entertain any close friendly relations with heretics and dissenters – with the Latins, Lutherans, Calvinists, and godless Tatars (whom our Lord abominates, and the Church of God damns for their God–abhorred guile); but let them be avoided as enemies of God and defamers of the Church.

Religious opposition also remained relentlessly strong among the masses, and especially Old Believers who lamented the sacrifice of much ancient Russian tradition, not to mention the invasion of godless and secular trends from the West. These considerations lead me to the view that sudden, tractable toleration of
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490 Massie, _Peter the Great_, 388. Including for example, on beehives, nuts, melons, cucumbers, and wearing boots!

491 Hughes, _Russia in the Age_, 92. Peter was the complete samoderzhets (autocrat).

492 Hughes, _Russia in the Age_, 402–411. Notably, Peter I had disinherited his son, Aleksei, accusing him of treason, and having him tortured to death.

493 Monter, _The Rise of Female_, 179–213. Peter’s upending of primogeniture led to five women ruling for all but four of the following 70 years. Three were born in the West. Catherine I was born a Polish–Lithuanian peasant, and during her extraordinary progression to Empress remained illiterate. Parenthetically, this also illustrates an important and hitherto unrecognised facilitatory role for women in the spread of polyphony in Russia!

494 Hughes, _Russia in the Age_, 13.
polyphony in the latter half of the 17th century was a very close-run thing, and one with an uncertain outcome. The untimely death of Tsar Aleksei at the age of 47 ushered in Peter I, who in short order transitioned from boy Tsar to supremely powerful, absolute monarch, as well as God’s anointed representative on earth. Much now depended on his actions. Specifically, how did he stand on church reform? Would he support recent reforms, including tolerance of Western partesny, or simply strike them all down? The answer took time to emerge.

There are no clear indications that Peter was anti-religious, and he participated enthusiastically in church services, singing as a bass baritone. However, it quickly became evident that his approach to religion was poles apart from the deeply pious Orthodoxy of his father, Aleksei. Peter’s demands to forego traditional clothing, and to shave off beards were genuinely horrifying to most Russians. Much ado was made of his own Western dress, and his lack of beard and of appropriate fasting. The satire and mockery of the Church meted out by his ‘All-Joking, All-Drunken Synod of Fools and Jesters’ was deeply disturbing, the more so since it outlasted his teenage years. Throwing more salt in the wound, Peter liked to be seen in military dress and armour, in strong contrast to the quasi-religious garb of his father. Traditional, serious religious observances of military victories were taken over by raucous, secular celebrations. Not surprisingly, Peter was regularly accused of being ‘foreign’, or the Anti–Christ.

Another serious cause for concern was Peter’s persistent interest in other denominations; this was viewed as clear evidence of heresy, and an intent to destroy Russia’s Orthodoxy or even secularise the country. For instance, he became much enamoured with Feofan Prokopovich, an Orthodox priest and Rector of the Kyiv Mohyla Academy (see also below). Prokopovich was suspect; he had received Jesuitical training, but although he had become anti-Catholic was now seen to favour the extreme Protestantism of Thomas Hobbes. I surmise that aside from his invertebrate curiosity, Peter favoured the secular and rational over the devotional and mystical. He was intensely pragmatic, believing that the church should be useful to both community and state, and not just their spiritual guide. Since Russia had no schools, this meant that the church should provide schooling, and Peter sent priests off to Kyiv for training. Despite his restless searching, there is no real evidence to refute the notion that that Peter remained Orthodox to his bones.

Nonetheless, religious traditionalists scrutinising his actions for signals were not reassured when at the death of Patriarch Joachim in 1700, rather than making a permanent replacement, Peter temporised and appointed a temporary placeholder, Stefan Yavorsky, who then served in loco tenens for fully 20 years. I suspect that

496 Hughes, Russia in the Age, 249–257; Massie, Peter the Great, 118–121. This was one of the most bizarre phenomena of the Petrine Court. Scholars have wrestled with its significance and impact. For some, it was simply harmless fun for Peter’s relaxation, for others a means for Peter to poke fun at the Church, and for yet others an excuse for full-blown, pagan orgies.
497 Hughes, Russia in the Age, 18–20.
498 Hughes, Russia in the Age, 283–286.
499 Hughes, Russia in the Age, 94–100; Massie, Peter the Great, 119–121, 209–211, and 661.
500 Cracraft, The Church Reform of, 53–57.
501 Hosking, Russia: People and Empire, 227.
502 Cracraft, The Church Reform of, 122–123 and 128–130. He was pro-Catholic and anti-Protestant.
beyond other more pressing problems, including ongoing war with Sweden, Peter was determined not to allow a repeat of the great tilts towards theocracy that had occurred under Patriarch Filaret from 1619–1633 (Chapter 1), and Patriarch Nikon from 1652–1658 (Chapter 2). Quite the reverse, he wished to reinforce pre-eminence of the State. Peter was also exercised by the vast number of monasteries, their ‘lack of productivity’, and their access to serfs, land and other resources. They were also a potential bolt hole for men that he believed should serve in the military. In short, they were a waste of money that he needed for other priorities, including war. In 1701, he decreed a new Monastery Office, to manage all financial affairs and monastery lands. Admission of monks was restricted; entrants required literacy certification, and eventually his explicit permission. Monasteries with less than 30 monks were closed or merged with others, to make more men available for the military and reduce costs.

Peter saw the Church as a source of funds for the State. He stripped its ability to collect duties from its lands and from the lucrative distillation of spirits, extracted his own duties and taxes, and transferred Church lands to the State. He also started to ‘borrow’ large sums of money which were not paid back. Further, to discourage opposition and sedition, monks were prohibited access to paper and ink.

Over the next two decades, Peter temporised and stubbornly left the Patriarchate vacant, despite repeated, vigorous pleas from the Church leadership to fill it. Beyond the demands on his time exerted by war and Westernisation, and uncertainty over the best course forward, he also lacked a Patriarchal candidate that suited him. So, Peter consulted with several Ukrainian clerical leaders, whom I suspect he viewed as less dyed-in-the-wool supporters of Russian Church tradition and also more European in their views. Peter’s eventual choice for locum tenens, Stefan Yavorsky, was a professor from the Kyiv–Mohyla Academy, who had received Jesuitical training, just as had Prokopovich. However, Yavorsky resisted any state control over the Church. He also became identified with Peter’s son, Aleksei, who had been accused and convicted of treason (see above), causing Yavorsky to become discredited. Peter’s attention now turned to Feofan Prokopovich, and he proposed him as Bishop of Pskov and then Archbishop of Novgorod, suggestions vigorously resisted by Yavorsky and other leading clerics.

The notion of simply abolishing the Patriarchate seems to have first surfaced in 1718, when Prokopovich was working on his very influential Dukhovnyi reglament (Ecclesiastical Regulation), which was published in 1721. Prokopovich argued that humans are naturally evil and need strong leadership from a single state authority, to whom the clergy owe loyalty. He proposed that the ultimate authority for the Church be the Tsar as the ‘supreme bishop’, with governance by an ecclesiastical council rather than a single patriarch. I am confident that this narrative was music to Peter’s ears. It would permit him to separate the administrative, secular functions of the
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Church from its theological and spiritual remits; further, he could gain control of the former while leaving the latter to the clergy. Naturally, for the Russian Church, this was an unacceptable carving up and attenuation of its authority. Worse, it seemed to smack of the ‘Western’ Protestantism of which Peter already stood accused.

Following the Treaty of Nystad and the end of the long war with Sweden in 1721, Peter finally felt ready to pronounce his disposition on the matter of the Patriarchate. After offering hierarchs the ‘opportunity’ to sign Prokopovich’s Ecclesiastical Regulation, and the loyalty oath it contained, Peter then formally abolished the patriarchal Prikaz (Order), and with it the Patriarchate. He created instead an Ecclesiastical College to govern the church. This was later renamed the Holy Governing Synod. It consisted of 10, later 12 bishops, selected by Peter and reporting to a secular Chief Procurator, who in turn answered to Peter. At a stroke, the Russian Church had been downgraded from a structure with power not dissimilar to that of the Tsar to just another government agency under the Tsar. Unlike previous independent and quasi–theocratic Patriarchs, the new chief prelate of the Synod was now no more able to resist the Tsar’s whims and wishes than was any other, secular governmental official.

The new Synod gave Peter substantial control of most important Church activities, while also assuring him a modicum of strategic distancing and surface credibility. Peter followed this up with a blizzard of related stipulations, decrees and laws. These were even harder for clergy to stomach, since in effect their status was reduced to that of mere functionaries in an agency of the state. A few strategic religious relaxations were enacted, for example to permit greater tolerance of other denominations, and intermarriage between Orthodox and Western Christian; these just rubbed more salt in the Russian Church’s wounds.

Peter’s reforms unambiguously subordinated the Church to the State, took over its finances and dramatically downsized its remit to theological, spiritual, social and charitable affairs, along with education. This was viewed by some as a Russian version of the Protestant Reformation, and appeared to sacralise the monarchy, raising Peter to almost God–like status. In theory, this was a risky position for Peter, since he claimed divine right for his authority, and yet had just shattered that of the Church, effectively his guarantor. In the event, resistance was muted, both from clergy and laity. Peter’s reputation for getting his own way preceded him, and in the item of ruthless brutality he had form. Equally, unlike Patriarch Nikon and Tsar Aleksei, I emphasise that he was not tampering with liturgy, dogma or ritual (Chapter 2). His reforms were more administrative, political and financial, although they were no less unpopular and injurious for all that.

The relative religious sufferance of Peter’s actions seems to have had another unanticipated effect that further enfeebled Orthodoxy’s traditional agency. This was

---
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because the new imposition of religious tolerance now enabled adherents of other religions to practice their different faiths more openly within the swelling Empire; Orthodoxy was no longer the only recognised religion. At the same time, the notion of Russia as the leader of Orthodoxy and Moscow as the third Rome that had led to the wrenching Schism (Chapter 2), had been seriously watered down.

The Kyiv–Mohyla Academy was greatly favoured by Peter and his successors, and the subsequent leadership of the Russian Church was peopled by a gusher of clergy from Ukraine. By the end of Elizabeth’s reign in 1762, fully 70 of the 127 leaders of the Church in Russia in the intervening years had been drawn from the Southwest. Another consequence of ecclesiastical impoverishment and tighter regulation was a further dramatic drop in the number of nuns and monks in Russia. The 1678 census had counted 86,300 clergy. This number had decreased to 25,207 by 1734, and just 14,282 by 1738. The Russian Church was defanged, and a much less effective voice for social justice and pravda in the community. In turn, this diminished the authority of the Church hierarchy and its perceived effectiveness in the view of the peasantry, as well as with the bureaucrats in St. Petersburg that now controlled its affairs. Yet for Russians, their religion and sacred music remained an indestructible vehicle for sustaining hope in adversity, with the power to soften and transcend the dire and grubby realities of day–to–day existence. Despite a loss of trust in the organised Church, the Orthodox faith of peasants appears to have remained strong, even as their grievances against the State multiplied. Nevertheless, the enervation of the Church brought down more misery upon the masses of Old Believers. To the galling nature of liturgical and musical reforms were now added the insults of forced shaving of beards, Western clothing, advancement of women, violation of the confessional, openly licentious behaviour of the wealthy, and adoption of ‘foreign’ learning and the new Julian calendar. Moreover, Peter’s successors, Anna, Elizabeth and Catherine II, all targeted Old Believers for further active persecution.

It remains debatable to what extent Peter consciously set out to break the Russian Church, as opposed to pruning its heft, but break it he did. The Church went from virtual theocracy under Patriarch Nikon to just another governmental agency under the Tsar. Peter continued to sing periodically with the Tsar’s Choir, and one assumes that this might have included the new partesny. Regardless, I found no evidence that he took any clear public position on the relative merits of monophony and partesny, other than that perhaps the latter was Western and thereby worthy of automatic support. However, I have no doubt that in hobbling the Church and dramatically downgrading its authority and heft, he stymied any effective further religious opposition to the continued incorporation of Western partesny.

More Opportunities for Training and Experience. Peter is generally credited with ‘street smarts’ rather than ‘book smarts’. He had a distinctly limited formal education and was no academic. Yet, what leaps out to me is his clear–eyed realisation of the enormous practical import of education, and equally its absence in
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Russia.\footnote{Hughes, Russia in the Age, 3. Other Royals were ‘classically’ tutored (by Simeon of Polotsk), but Peter more often spent his youth in military games and with foreigners, including mercenaries.} This assessment was doubtless reinforced during his incessant, restless travels. Much of Europe still lacked primary and secondary level education (see below), but most countries had universities, including in the Southwest: Kyiv in Ukraine, Krakow and Torun in Poland, and Vilnius in Lithuania (Chapter 1). In contrast, there were still no universities in Russia. Neither were there trade and technical schools, nor academies along the lines of the Royal Society in London (1660) or the Academie des Sciences in Paris (1666). The only printing press in Russia, the Moscow Print Yard, had previously been under the control of the Patriarch, and had printed less than a dozen books on topics outside religion during the entire 17th century.\footnote{Hughes, Russia in the Age, 298. Europe by then had seen publications by Harvey on the heart and circulation, Leibniz on calculus, Keppler and Copernicus on astronomy, and Newton’s Principia.} Moreover, there were as yet no public libraries in Russia, and as already noted literacy was the exception rather than the rule.\footnote{Mironov, ‘The Development of Literacy’, 231.} The result was that Russia was woefully short of the necessary education and technical skills to power the modernisation and Westernisation of Russia that Peter craved.

The obvious short–term solution was the wholesale importation of requisite people and skills, in just about every field, just as was already occurring with recruitment of Southwestern part singers (Chapter 2). At the same time, Peter dispatched large numbers of people abroad, for training in specified areas.\footnote{Mironov, ‘The Development of Literacy’, 305–07.} However, he understood that recruiting expertise, and outsourcing training, could only be stop–gap measures, and that in the longer term it would be necessary to build an effective educational system at home. Yet, where to begin? While the sons of the nobility could attend private schools or education in the West, the majority of Russia’s population were peasants and serfs. What sparse education they received came from the Church and was largely focussed on religious and moral teachings.\footnote{Mironov, ‘The Development of Literacy’, 231.}

By the early 17th century, some national models of primary and secondary education were starting to emerge in the West. These were mostly parochial initiatives created with the twin pedagogical aims of religious instruction and literacy. The earliest national initiative was in Scotland, starting in 1616, through the combined efforts of Church and State.\footnote{Houston, ‘The Literacy Campaign in’, 49–52.} Shortly thereafter, comparable parochial schools were started up in Prussia, and New England in America, and a system in Sweden that depended more on home schooling.\footnote{Gawthrop, ‘Literacy Drives in Pre–Industrial’, 33–35; Johansson, ‘Literacy Campaigns in Sweden’, 97–98; Stevens, ‘The Anatomy of Mass’, 99–103.} It should be stressed that these initiatives were often built on top of parallel networks of existing private schools with distinct funding and administration. In effect, the new national systems were about broadening education to include the poor. In contrast, Russia in the early 17th century was still stuck in medieval mud, and further held back by geopolitical isolation and religious opposition; formal education held little perceived value. Indeed, to the reactionary Russian Church, formal education may have seemed frankly dangerous (Chapter 2).

In the early 18th century, apart from laying waste to the concept of geopolitical isolation, and bearding the Russian Church (see above), Peter set in train several educational initiatives that were regional or national in scope. Ever the pragmatist,
his initial focus was on technical and military schools, including the Preobrazhensky Guards school, a naval training school at Azov, an artillery school that sired the Moscow School of Engineering, as well as medical schools and mining institutes. The most enduring was his School of Mathematics and Navigation, founded in Moscow in 1701. This was modelled on the Royal Mathematical School at Christ’s Hospital in London,\textsuperscript{529} and employed British teachers. After graduation, attendees were packed off to live in churches and monasteries in the provinces, and were also expected to teach. This school eventually became the Naval Academy.\textsuperscript{530} Peter also attempted to boost the educational level of the priesthood so that they could teach more effectively.\textsuperscript{531} Just before his death, Peter founded the St. Petersbu\textsuperscript{532} Later, after a period of reorganisation, this became St. Petersburg State University,\textsuperscript{533} the first in Russia. Peter initially relied heavily on imported teachers and scientists from the Southwest and from Europe, especially Germany. Collectively, these initiatives began to piece together a hitherto non-existent system of education. However, I was unable to find any record of organised musical education, although some might have been included as part of Mathematics (as in the quadrivium in Europe). Choirs now scrambling to find singers capable of Western partesny remained reliant on trained migrants (Singers and Singing).

The creation of educational facilities continued under Peter’s successors. Anna Ioannovna focussed particularly on the Arts (see above), but also prompted development of Cadet Corps secondary schools. These became an important destination for sons of the nobility, many of whom had been previously sent to study abroad at German universities. Elizabeth was also interested in expanding university education, and saw an opportunity in the person of Mikhail Lomonosov, an extraordinary polymath who trained in Moscow, Kyiv, St. Petersburg, and Marburg. Apart from his seminal observations in Physics and Astronomy, he made original contributions in many other areas, including modern Russian language. His rapid rise to fame allowed him to help found Moscow University (later Moscow State University), along with Ivan Shuvalov, in 1755. Relevant detailed information on curriculum is lacking, but neither this university, nor the State University in St. Petersburg, had a faculty of music or vocal education tracks until later, and there was no apparent focus on music, beyond possibly teaching in astronomy and mathematics.

Despite a lack of facilities geared to musical education, there is little doubt that Peter, Anna Ioannovna and Elizabeth supported the Tsar’s Choir, and enjoyed any opportunity to show it off. Both Peter and Elizabeth joined in singing with the choir on occasion.\textsuperscript{534} Choristers were expected to perform a high standard — and to create a favourable impression with visiting dignitaries. However, given the demands of a busy performance schedule, it is unclear how much formal training occurred as opposed to ‘learning on the job’. After Peter’s death in 1725, the Tsar’s Choir
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contracted again, the number decreasing to 15 in 1725–1732. The overall membership of the nation’s prime choir number was now dangerously small. Around this time, boy trebles started to be included in the Tsar’s Choir. I am unable to find any explanation or concerted planning for this sudden departure, after centuries of officially ‘men only’. European choirs had long used boys and even girls, perhaps since the 12th or even 11th centuries (Chapter 1). Was this new acceptance of trebles in Russia’s sacred music another reflection of aggressive Westernisation? Or, since unlike men, boys were not paid, and the costs of training were outsourced to a school in Ukraine (see below), was their inclusion a cheap way of expanding the number of singers? Alternatively, was this a move to include trebles now that Western partesny included higher soprano lines (Figure 3.2 below), and women were still not officially permitted to sing?

In 1730, Anna Ioannovna enacted an ukaz (decree) to increase the flow of singers from the Southwest. While this had proved a tried and tested means of recruiting adult singers (Chapter 2), it appears to have been unequal to the task of gathering the number of trebles now desired for the choir. There were several possible reasons for this. It took time for young boys to achieve proficiency at the high level demanded by the Tsar’s Choir. Unlike men, whose singing careers could last decades, the time until trained boys’ voices broke was at best a handful of years, and at worst just a few months. Further, few were ever retained in the choir after their voices broke, since their adult voices were not always adequate, and turnover amongst the adult men was in any case minimal (Chapter 1). As a result, new batches of trained trebles needed constantly to be found. Western countries could look to plentiful supplies of child choristers from parochial, church and cathedral schools. Then there was the network of Latin schools, such as that attended by J.S. Bach, in which music played a substantive role in the curriculum. Classes usually started with singing of the Katechismuslied (Catechism Song), and the particular tenet of the day, and continued for an hour after lunch – nominally to aid in digestion! Students typically had access to a hymnal, the 1673 Neues vollständiges Eisenachisches Gesangbuch [The New Complete Eisenach Songbook] by Johann Günther Rörer, and Bach would have sung from this book daily from the time he could first read. By contrast, Peter, now the prime mover of education in Russia, had spent much of his youth building models of ships, playing military games, and blowing things up.

While theoretically it would have been possible to set up schools of musical education within Russia to train additional trebles, the decision was made again to outsource this to Ukraine. In 1738, Anna Ioannovna promulgated an ukaz to formalise a school of singing in Hlukhiv. By the outsized standards of Russian geography, this town was relatively close to St. Petersburg. From 1708–1764, it was
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the administrative centre and capital of the Ukrainian Hetmanate (Chapter 2). The Hetman, who functioned effectively as the Russian governor, was based there, and sponsored a superior choir. The formal remit was for the school to train 20 boys every year, the only proviso being that they be residents of Hlukhiv. Education involved vocal training, part singing, and important music theory. After training, boys were to be sent on to St. Petersburg for service in the Tsar’s Choir, and elsewhere. This new annual infusion of Hlukhiv trebles soon made a tangible difference. Thus, in 1741, 11 trained singers were dispatched from Hlukhiv to St. Petersburg. Recruitment was further augmented during the reign of Empress Elizabeth (1741–1762). This school remained in operation until at least the early 1770s. The total sent to St. Petersburg is unknown, but if the tally of up to 20 a year in the original ukaz was maintained for 30 years, the number of trainees would have been considerable. The Hlukhiv school helped to restore the Tsar’s Choir, which by 1752 could field 48 men and 52 boys, all trained and experienced in part singing. The 1750s saw two notable Ukrainian trainee boys who later achieved considerable fame as composers – Maksim Berezovsky and Dmitry Bortniansky (see Introduction).

The school in Hlukhiv appears to represent the first formal Russian initiative to create an educational facility feeding polyphonically trained singers to the best choirs in Russia. But why in Ukraine? Russophiles could argue that Hlukhiv, or rather Glukhov to give it its Russian name, was by then actually in Malorossiya, within the Russian Empire. Alternatively, perhaps it was felt that Russia’s poorly developed musical and vocal training infrastructure was not yet up to the task. In contrast to the situation in Ukraine, much of Russia’s clergy and the general population were still indomitably opposed to liturgical change, including the intrusion of polyphony. Given this, formalising this educational function in a more pliant, relatively distant outpost of the new Empire, rather than in a major singing centre in the heartland – e.g., St. Petersburg or Moscow, was perhaps viewed as a safer strategy? It is also true that the necessary resources to build a brand new educational institution from scratch in Russia were being consumed by war with Sweden and by Europeanisation. Plus, Peter was in a tearing hurry to Westernise, and an extant school in Hlukhiv was consistent with a policy of ‘outsource now and create in house later’.

During the first half of the 18th century, work did begin to build out a new national system of education, and two brand new universities. However, other than the choral school set up in Hlukhiv, in Ukraine, Russia continued to procrastinate in the item of establishing musical education. I conclude this was predominantly due to success in expanding migration of singers and musicians from the Southwest, and in the 18th century from the whole of Europe (see Singers and Singing below). Meanwhile, these recruits often lived and worked in close proximity in Moscow and St. Petersburg, and I would argue that they constituted a critical mass of expertise providing informal training and role modelling for native Russian singers and composers.

**Singers and Singing**

At mid–17th century, when Western partesny arrived, I suggested that there would have been very few native Russians willing and able to sing polyphonically.

---

544 Harri, *St. Petersburg Court Chant*, 64, fn14. Harri suggests this school’s function was briefly transferred to the gymnasium in Kharkiv (Russian Karkov), before the school was closed in 1806.
(Chapter 1). In the subsequent latter half of the 17th century, no organised planning for the arrival of polyphony had apparently occurred, and no formal musical educational facilities had been created (Chapter 2). Russia undoubtedly benefitted from a significant number of immigrant singers from the Southwest, but still lacked sufficient numbers of experienced practitioners to ensure the successful roll–out of polyphony nation–wide. Consequently, at the dawn of the 18th century, the obvious, short–term expedient was to continue to actively attract, some might say unrepentantly poach, part singers from elsewhere. Peter I’s ‘Wild Westernisation’ dramatically expanded Russia’s welcome beyond the Southwest to include European singers, and also now instrumentalists. His visible ‘Great Embassy’ in Europe in 1697–98 had functioned in many respects as a trade and recruitment mission, painting Russia as a country awakening culturally and now open for business after centuries of geopolitical isolation and religious opposition. His subsequent conjuring up of St. Petersburg from the marshes had created a vibrant, cosmopolitan, European capital city, welcoming and integrating foreigners and their precious skills into Russian society. ‘Peterburg’ was within easy reach of Europe by sea, and Peter’s comprehensive victories over Sweden, the major military power in the North, ensured safe passage to Russia from the West via the Baltic. Russia now began to exert a substantive ‘pull’ on migrants, including singers and musicians, from countries in the West.

At the same time, immigration of European singers to Russia in the first half of the 18th century was serendipitously benefitted by events that exerted in effect a ‘push’ function of musicians out of Western Europe. The Baroque was in full flood, and Italy was pre–eminent in numerous fields, including music. An extraordinary pool of musical talent appeared, influencing generations of musicians from other countries, through study opportunities in Italy, or through export of musicians and key Italian musical trends such as opera. Such influence was nowhere more obvious than in the next generations of Germanic composers, including Heinrich Schütz, Georg Philipp Telemann, Johann Sebastian Bach and George Frederic Handel, familiar names that heralded the extraordinary pre–eminence of Germanic composers during the 18th and 19th centuries; all studied Italian music intensively.546 However, the profusion of musicians, and their growing professionalisation, meant that many were struggling to win their daily bread solely from their musical skills, especially in Italy and Germany. The stress of securing commissions and patronage was a constant headache, even for the most successful, and many musicians wound up migrating to find paid work. Poland had been one early target destination. As a Catholic country, it had strong, natural connections with Italy. Several composers, including Luca Marenzio, Giovanni Anerio and Marco Scacchi, had beaten a path to the Royal Court in Warsaw. In addition, King Władysław IV (reigned 1632–1648) had sojourned in Italy while a prince, and worked hard to bring Italian musicians and opera to Poland, forming a company that travelled with him.547 Notably, Russia was but a short step to the East from Poland.548

Another rationale for recruitment of European musicians was that Peter and his successors increasingly tasked the Tsar’s Choir with performing secular music, including the opera now spreading across Europe. The inevitable consequence was

546 Gardiner, Music in the Castle, 32–36.
547 Glowacki, The History of Polish Opera, 233–234.
548 Remarkably, even Bach and Mozart put out feelers about positions in Russia (see Introduction).
that itinerant European singers, instrumentalists and composers skilled in these genres were welcomed in Moscow and in St. Petersburg. Unlike early migrants from the Southwest, European singers lacked experience of Orthodox liturgical practices, music and language, and few likely sang in church services. Nevertheless, such European musicians had important influences on the changing musical scene in other ways. They wrote and performed contemporary Western polyphony, including instrumental, secular music and increasingly opera. This broadened the experience of native Russian singers with the new polyphony, and undoubtedly offered opportunities for on-the-job training, although Russian high tenors and even counter tenors would have struggled with the higher soprano lines of Western polyphony. Italian castrati were equal to this task, but not suited to liturgical singing in Russian, and the infusion of trained trebles from the new boy’s vocal training school in Hlukhiv (see above) filled this gap.

Numbers of choristers in the Tsar’s Choir continued to fluctuate. In the early 18th century, the number declined from 80–100 at the close of the previous century, to 22 between 1701 and 1703, and to just 15 in 1711. This was despite the continued availability of Southwestern singers. There are several other plausible explanations for this seeming paradox. For example, the choir now primarily served Peter’s needs. He was constantly on the move, and preferred a slimmed-down choir to travel with him and provide showcase performances en route. He was also determined to move his choir from their traditional home in the Moscow Kremlin to the new capital of St. Petersburg, along with the court. This caused some choristers to put up resistance and petition to remain in Moscow. It is also possible that the choir might have been slimmed down as a result of immigrant singers being better able to perform polyphonically as soloists. Between 1711 and 1722, numbers increased again from a nadir of 15, to 27–34, perhaps because Peter and his choir were becoming less itinerant. After Peter’s death in 1722, the Tsar’s Choir expanded again, by 1752 to 48 men and 52 boys, the latter reflecting the new stream of trebles from Hlukhiv.

The need for migrant singers in the Patriarch’s Choir was less immediate. As noted above (The Collapse of Religious Opposition), Peter decided not to appoint a permanent replacement for Patriarch Adrian, and put the future of the vacant Patriarchate on ice for the next two decades, before abolishing it. Since the Patriarch’s Choir had no titular head and was therefore now ‘between assignments’, choir members were regularly dispatched to serve in St. Petersburg for up to a year, apparently as back-ups for the Tsar’s Choir. The rest remained in Moscow, at their traditional base at the Cathedral of the Dormition. After creation of the Synod in 1721, 32 of the 44 members of the Patriarch’s Choir were moved en bloc to St. Petersburg. In 1725 when Peter died, the Moscow contingent of singers was eventually topped back up to 40, and became known as the Moscow Synodal Choir. It is hard today to confidently track all the ups and downs in numbers at the Patriarch’s Choir. They appear to reflect the net result of Peter’s quirks, including: itinerancy and restless energy; less focus on music as compared with naval and military matters; growing disenchantment with the organised Church; and lack of funds or their use for more

548 Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 57–59.
550 Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 57–59. Renamed as the pridvornyi khor (Court Choir), and later by Catherine II as Imperatorskaya pridvornaya pevcheskaya kapella (Imperial Court Singing Chapel).
551 Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 62–63.
pressing needs. One small bright spot for the Patriarch’s Choir was that it was shielded from the increasing secular singing duties demanded of the Tsar’s Choir. This, and its close relationship to the Synod, allowed this choir to remain more directly focussed on Orthodox liturgical singing than the Tsar’s Choir.\textsuperscript{552}

Records concerning other choirs in Russia during this period remain sparse. We know that cathedrals, for example in Novgorod, Tver, Voronezh and Kazan, were required by Imperial decree to provide singers for service in St. Petersburg, and must therefore have already been singing Western partesny at an acceptable level. There were also a very few private choirs, maintained by the nobility.\textsuperscript{553} This was a very different situation from that in Europe, where private or domestic choirs were common, with numerous superior ensembles sponsored by royalty, nobility, wealthy individuals, and even community–based groups of the bourgeoisie.\textsuperscript{554} In the West, such choirs provided an important form of entertainment at soirées, and rivalry between their patrons impelled both innovation and high standards of performance. The best of these choirs also provided important landing spots for superior musicians, and commissions for new compositions.\textsuperscript{555} In some cases, their financial supporters were amateur musicians and composers, and performed alongside. Such European choirs made important cultural and musical contributions. In Russia by contrast, the few private choirs seem to have been pragmatic ‘trophy’ enterprises – maintained as a ‘cost’ of making a public statement of power, position, social arrival, or sufficient wealth. They tended to parrot the latest musical trends at court, and their quality was reportedly patchy. They also relied on large numbers of serfs dragooned into performing by their wealthy owners.\textsuperscript{556}

The 1730s saw a further increase in the numbers of European singers and musicians migrating to Russia. This coincides with the appearance of opera in Moscow, with a very visible performance apparently in 1731 at the coronation of Empress Anna. The pre–eminent Italian composer, Francesco Araja, was then invited to St. Petersburg in 1735 with a large troupe of singers to entertain Anna and her court.\textsuperscript{557} Other Italian composers moved to St. Petersburg and put on opera, eventually with libretti in Russian. Opera became extraordinarily popular in Russia, at court and among the aristocracy where this genre became regarded as an important stamp of European sophistication. Predictably, this led to a desire to reproduce the glitter of opera in Russian. Initially opera was performed in larger spaces at court, and it was not until the 19\textsuperscript{th} century that dedicated public venues e.g., the Bolshoi and Mariinsky Theatres were built (in Moscow and St. Petersburg respectively), and the bourgeoisie started to attend in numbers.

\textsuperscript{552} Morosan, \textit{Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary}, 58 and 62–64. Peterburg was also still under construction and not a popular place to live. Choristers petitioned to remain in Moscow.

\textsuperscript{553} Findeizen, \textit{History of Music in}, Vol. 2, 37–39 and fn70; Morosan, \textit{Choral Performance}, 65–68. The number of private choirs increased during the second half of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century as European customs were progressively embraced by Russian society.
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\textsuperscript{556} Morosan, \textit{Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary}, 64–69; Ritzarev, \textit{Eighteenth–Century Russian Music}, 255–268. Nikolai Sheremetev apparently ‘owned’ the astonishing number of over 200,000 serfs, including Stepan Degtyarev (see Introduction), and sponsored several serf choirs.

The effects of these changes in the singers and musicians living and working in Russia were mixed. The new infusion of migrant singers was beneficial from a numerical perspective. Moreover, for the Tsar’s Choir, singing opera, and not necessarily in Russian, under the direction of world-class European musicians and composers, strengthened the singers’ facility with stave notation, polyphony and major: minor tonality. However, substantive new demands to sing secular music competed with the choir’s traditional remit of sacred music. Another unanticipated consequence was that visiting non-orthodox musicians, starting with Araja,\footnote{Findeizen, *History of Music in*, Vol. 2, 13–14 and 31. Araja worked successively for Anna and Elizabeth, but Catherine II passed him over in favour of Galuppi, Paisiello, Sarti, and Martin.} were appointed to lead the Tsar’s ‘liturgical’ Choir, as Kapellmeisters or Directors. The Tsar’s Choir was then directed exclusively by a succession of Europeans, the majority Italians (see Introduction, fn29 and fn32). It was not until 60 years later, in 1796, that the first Slav, Dmitry Bortniansky, born and trained vocally in Ukraine, was appointed to the Directorship.

**Music**

During the first half of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century, stave notation continued to replace neumes, and the three issues of text: music coordination noted previously (Chapter 1) also receded. These developments removed the main musical impediments to the uptake of Western partesny. However, there remained the problem of how to disseminate the new polyphonic music across the vast spread of Russian sacred spaces. As noted in Chapter 2, the commission empanelled by Tsar Aleksei in 1667 to compile and organise the extant body of Russian chants had come close to printing several revised chant books, albeit in neumatic notation. In the end, for reasons that are not entirely clear (Chapter 2 – Music), publication was not pursued, and revised chant books were released as handwritten manuscripts. By this point, print shops in Europe had demonstrated the feasibility of publishing music in stave notation, inexpensively and quickly. However, prior to Peter, the only press in Russia had been the Moscow Print Yard, which was under the control of the Patriarch and reserved for publications of sacred texts. The first book of Orthodox chant to be printed was actually published in the West of Ukraine, in L’viv (Russian L’vov), by the Brotherhood of St. George, in 1700. In the foreword of this heirmologion, the hegumen rationalised publication based on a shortage of hand-written manuscripts, and frequent inaccuracies therein. He further noted that these deficiencies contributed to singing of poor quality.\footnote{Harri, *St. Petersburg Court Chant*, 56–57. I was not able to access the relevant citations.} These arguments echo previous criticisms of liturgical singing, such as those aired in the Stoglav Conference (Chapter 1), and by the Mezenet’s commission (Chapter 2). A second heirmologion was printed in 1709 by the Brotherhood of the Church of the Dormition, also in L’viv.\footnote{Harri, *St. Petersburg Court Chant*, 57.}

Hughes notes that Peter’s reign was associated with a printing revolution, and improving print capability within Russia was undoubtedly one of his major priorities.\footnote{Hughes, *Russia in the Age*, 316–325.} He opened two new presses in St. Petersburg, one at the Senate and another at the Alexander Nevsky Monastery. He also co-opted printing capacity outside Russia – e.g., in Kyiv, Chernihiv (Russian – Chernigov), Riga and Reval (Tallinn). He involved himself in the creation of a new typeface that could render printed books smaller,
Comparison with the kant shown in Chapter 2 (Figure 2.3) is instructive. Notation, with added time and key signature, took precedence.\footnote{Hughes, \textit{Russia in the Age}, 319. This type face was expanded by royal decree to 38 letters.} Another major priority gobbling up significant capacity at the presses was the blizzard of decrees and laws Peter now churned out.\footnote{Hughes, \textit{Russia in the Age}, 321.} As a result, no printed music appeared in Russia until the Synod in Moscow finally published chant books in stave notation, in 1772. Meanwhile, even though the 1700 and 1709 Ukrainian chant books were printed by Greek Catholics, and in the Kyivan stave notation then in use in Ukraine, they were actually used in some churches and monasteries in Russia.\footnote{Harri, \textit{St. Petersburg Court Chant}, 56–60.} The Polish kanty introduced in
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\caption{Kant on the Death of Peter and Elevation of Catherine to the Throne}
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\begin{verbatim}
Translation: In tears was Russia all immersed
By Peter as an orphan
Darken the light and writhe
Your crown fades at the tomb
Only to moan only to groan
Only the womb should be despondent
\end{verbatim}

The Polish kanty introduced into Russia in the 17th century (Chapter 2) remained highly popular; an example is shown in Figure 3.1. This work was composed upon the death of Peter the Great in 1725 and was later published by Findeizen, in stave notation, with added time and key signatures, tempo markings, and bar lines.\footnote{Findeizen, \textit{History of Music in}, Vol. 1, 297.} Comparison with the kant shown in Chapter 2 (Figure 2.3) is instructive. Both exhibit obvious structure, in this case a mixture of two and four bar phrases with cadences.
Both are largely homophonic, mirroring the move towards chordal hymns and songs that was underway in the West.\textsuperscript{566} In both, the bass line contains some examples of ‘excellent’ bass. However, this kant was written some decades later than that in Figure 2.3, and the text is in Russian, rather than Polish. Tonality is still not unambiguously that of Western European music of the time. The tonal home, D minor, seems clear, but there are some other features that are inconsistent. The phrase from bars 5–8 is one example. It does not fit with modulation to the dominant A major, since neither Fs nor Gs are sharpened. Or does this phrase remain in D minor and end with an imperfect iv–V cadence? Then, there is the rather odd B natural in the bass in bar 10, followed by a return to B in bar 11 as part of the same triadic structure; is this a transition from G major to G minor? The closest modal option would be A Phrygian, but the Cs are sharpened. The final V7–i transition in D minor lacks the leading note, C#.

As with the earlier kant in Figure 2.3, the piece in Figure 3.1, written in 1725, seems not quite on a par tonally with 18th–century Western polyphony. This is unsurprising when one considers that it was composed in Russia by native musicians who at the time were in the process of absorbing Western polyphonic techniques, albeit with the help of Southwestern polyphonists who were largely Slavic and Orthodox. In contrast, the earlier kant in Figure 2.3 was composed by Catholic Polish musicians, who were clearly familiar with contemporaneous Western polyphony, but this piece was written much earlier in the 16th century (see Chapter 2), before Western tonality had become indisputably major: minor.

Findeizen, and more recently Dolskaya, devoted considerable attention to compiling and documenting examples of kant.\textsuperscript{567} These collections reveal that large quantities appeared during Peter’s reign, in part probably a reflection of the extraordinary productivity of Vasily Titov until his death in 1715. On the other hand, during the reign of Anna Ioannovna, from 1730–1740, only a single kant is documented; this was written by Trediakovsky for Anna’s coronation. Creation of kanty then took off again under Elizabeth, who reigned from 1741–1762. Numerous kanty were composed to mark major victories, for example against the Swedes at Poltava in 1709.\textsuperscript{568} In certain respects, as polyphonic, unaccompanied pieces drawn from both secular and sacred texts, kanty could in some respects be considered to be distant relatives of the madrigals that were popular in the West from 15th to mid–18th century.

At the dawn of the 18th century, the repertoire of liturgical music in Russia had become quite broad. Traditional Znamenny chant had been supplemented with Kyivan, Bulgarian and Greek Chant (Chapter 2), and some put’ and demestvenny chants were still in use. Moreover, the spread of polyphony meant that most of these forms were now being sung in parts, in the new harmonisations of Western partesny. New, free kontserty compositions, with up to 24 or even 48 parts, were also performed where sufficient choristers capable of singing them were available.\textsuperscript{569} The sudden smorgasbord of chant forms and polyphony represented an exciting, brave new world for younger pioneering musicians, but traditional singers, including Old
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Believers, were appalled. They resolved to stick resolutely to the old ways, chanting in unison (Chapter 2).

At the start of the 18th century, opera was still a relatively new phenomenon. It had become wildly popular in Europe, but had yet to percolate to Russia. St Dmitry of Rostov, a Ukrainian, apparently wrote an early opera, *The Rostov Mysteries*, in Russian in 1705. However, opera was not actually performed in Russia until 1731, during the reign of Anna Ioannovna, and then in Italian. In 1735, Francesco Araja performed his opera, *Forza dell’Amore et dell’Odio* (The Force of Love and Hatred), also in Italian. He then remained in Russia for some 25 years, and continued to compose and stage opera. Hasse’s *La Clemenza di Tito* (The Clemency of Tito) was performed at the coronation of Tsarina Elizabeth in 1742, with the Tsar’s Choir singing the choruses transliterated into Russian. The first opera actually written in Russian, *Tsefal i Prokris*, (Cephalus and Prokris), was debuted in 1755.

Anxieties about the potential of opera to contaminate sacred music were not entirely misplaced. As noted above, the Tsar’s Choir was increasingly caught up in performances of opera and other secular music. These duties did bring the benefit of offering valuable singing experience and vocal training to choristers, but increasingly impinged on their primary remit of singing during liturgical services for the Tsar and the Royal Family. Moreover, as noted above, directors of the Tsar’s Choir for the latter half of the 18th century were all European transplants, mostly Italian, who were interested in opera. Besides, the Russian church was severely debilitated by Peter’s crushing administrative reforms (The Collapse of Religious Opposition above), and scarcely in a position to mount any effective resistance.

As against this, I would highlight several countervailing realities that may have limited the otherwise powerful undertow of opera. Thus, despite its exploding popularity, opera was actually heard by few in Russia outside royalty and the nobility. Had opera been performed more widely, as in Europe, I speculate it might have had a more direct and obvious effects on the course of sacred polyphony. Further, despite the increasing number of ex—pat musicians and composers in Russia, Italianate influences on Russian sacred music seem to have been actively restrained by several factors. Perhaps most importantly, Italian composers composed just a handful of Russian church musical works in Church Slavonic (see Introduction, fn29).
Beyond ignorance of Orthodox liturgical practices, and language difficulties, we can reasonably assume that composers of fashionable Western opera would have had little desire, or for that matter ability, to compose ‘non–paying’ Russian liturgical music. They were busy turning out the popular secular music of the day. Another factor shielding Russian liturgical music from the excesses of Italianate operatic practice, was the continued enforced absence of the prima donna soloists so much a part of the world of opera. Moreover, new harmonisations of traditional chant for liturgical use generally followed a homophonic approach to maximise textual clarity; addition of florid ornamentation, melismata and soloists simply did not fit. Although a few ornamented kontserty did enter general liturgical usage as added individual anthems, both Peter and Elizabeth drew the line at allowing their performance at private services.575

By mid–18th century, Russia had accepted part singing into its liturgical music, but other related Western influences penetrated more gradually (tonality), or not at all (instrumentation). This is evident in later sacred compositions. As one example, a fragment of one of Bortniansky’s best–loved sacred pieces, his Cherubic Hymn No 7, is shown in Figure 3.2. This was composed in the 1780s, some 30 years after this chapter ends, while Bortniansky was Director of the Tsar’s Choir (see above).576 Notably, it was written in full Western stave notation, with extensive composer’s markings and directions. Although Bortniansky was often criticised for extensive Italianate ornamentation, especially in his secular music, this hymn is largely unadorned, homophonic, and almost chorale–like. It also places the top voice higher, in soprano rather than high tenor territory. The tonal home is clearly D major, and the cadences included are as one would expect in Western usage, that is to say IV–I in D major (bars 3 and 4), V7–I in the dominant A major (bars 10 and 11), and V7–I in D major (bars 15 and 16). These features are entirely consistent with the decade Bortniansky spent in Italy with Galuppi, involved in composition of sacred hymns, in Italian, French, German and Latin, and also secular works including opera. This, and other sacred works by Bortniansky and his contemporaries, are more fully Westernised than earlier ‘halfway house’ partesny compositions from mid–17th to mid–18th century (see figures in Chapters 2 and figure 3.1 above), when newly arrived polyphony was still in the process of maturing from early harmonisations of traditional monophonic chant. In addition, there are plentiful composer’s markings, including medlenno (slow) consistent with the long tradition of monophonic chant. In sum, I would argue that this work is a fine example of what to expect from a Western–trained Slavic musician of the period composing a polyphonic hymn appropriate for Orthodox liturgical usage.

The other feature of this composition that is entirely consistent with traditional Russian liturgical music is the lack of instrumental accompaniment. In fact, the progressive fleshing out of sacred music in the West with instruments, including organ, strings, wind instruments, and eventually full orchestras, never happened in Russia.577 Instrumental music was unknown in Russia at this juncture (Chapter 2).

575 Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 59–60. Catherine II (the Great) had no such scruples.
576 Findeizen, History of Music in, Vol. 1, 204 and 411. This was among the first liturgical works to be actually printed in Russia.
577 Velimimirović, ‘Russian Church Music’.
Nevertheless, it was forbidden in sacred music as a core tenet of Orthodoxy, and Tsar Aleksei and Patriarch Nikon had refused to countenance instruments in sacred singing, even as they went along with the incorporation of polyphony (Chapter 2). Peter and succeeding rulers held to this position, although Peter did organise
instrumental music with nine regimental flautists for the funeral of his great friend, General Lefort.\textsuperscript{578} The result was that while sacred compositions became increasingly instrumented and orchestrated in the West, Russian liturgical singing remained strictly a cappella. Another Western trend of this period was performance of sacred music in public spaces – increasingly with soloists, paid performers, mixed voice choirs, and instruments\textsuperscript{579} – in effect a form of sacred opera or oratorio.\textsuperscript{580} This was resisted in Russia, and performance of sacred music continued to occur only in sacred spaces, as part of worship, until the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{581}

In Europe, the long developmental thread of sacred part singing starting in the ninth century had been paralleled by a thread of instrumental, secular music. During the Baroque, European instrumental, secular music became a growth industry and began a process arguably of eclipsing sacred music in importance, innovation, and scope. In 18\textsuperscript{th}–century Russia, instrumental secular music was a new concept, and was also slower to diverge and develop independently from sacred music. The popularity of the para–liturgical, quasi–secular form of kanty has already been noted (Figure 3.1). However, beginning in the early 18\textsuperscript{th} century, the Russian court began regularly to include instrumental music in their entertainment. They watched European troupes playing music for dancing, theatre and ballet.\textsuperscript{582} Under Peter, growth occurred in military usage of secular music, with trumpets, pipes and drums being widely employed for his victorious entries to the capital after military victories.\textsuperscript{583} Anna Ioannovna started a court orchestra, which increasingly provided entertainment with tafelmusik. Elizabeth was a lover of music, and a regular singer and instrumentalist, and it was during her reign that the Russian secular art song took off in the form of rossiiskaya pesn’ (Russian song); several of these may have involved her as author, or even as singer.\textsuperscript{584} The court orchestra was later split into a chamber ensemble, and a second group ‘for dances’\textsuperscript{585} and the performance of both opera and ballet was encouraged.\textsuperscript{586} However, I would argue that Russian secular music did not fully separate from sacred music until the late 18\textsuperscript{th} century, with a distinct, parallel body of instrumental, secular works produced by native Slavic composers such as Bortniansky, and the establishment of concert life in St. Petersburg and Moscow (see Introduction).\textsuperscript{587}

During this half century, the incorporation of polyphony into sacred music proceeded, with compositions by native Russians continuing to differ both from Southwestern and contemporaneous Western forms,\textsuperscript{588} a phenomenon that I view as consistent with an ongoing process of transition. A separate thread of secular polyphony also
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  \item Harri, \textit{St. Petersburg Court Chant}, 84–85. The first composition not written primarily for performance within the liturgy was apparently Tchaikovsky’s \textit{St. Chrysostom’s Liturgy} in 1878.
  \item Findeizen, \textit{History of Musi in}, Vol. 2, 28–33. Many instrumentalists were Polish, or Italian.
  \item Findeizen provides a table with performances of opera and ballet during the reign of Elizabeth.
  \item Gerasimova, ‘The Transfer and Adaptation’, 276.
\end{itemize}
made its appearance. By the end of this period, I conclude that Russia was importing not just polyphonist stand-ins from the Southwest (Chapter 2), but an entire musical system – singers, other musicians, composers, instrumentalists, notation, music printing, vocal training and musical education – from the Western world.

The Changing Balance of Promoters and Inhibitors

By the end of this epoch in 1750, I found indications that most of the promoters of polyphony identified had appeared in Russia, even if they were not yet operating at agency fully comparable to that in the West (Table 3.1). To wit, the number of choirs was increasing, especially in the private sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotera</th>
<th>The West</th>
<th>Russia</th>
<th>Russia</th>
<th>Russia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. 1650</td>
<td>c. 1650</td>
<td>c. 1700</td>
<td>c. 1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from Church and State</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth of choirs and choir schools</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal musical education</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical theorists, educators and texts</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confraternities, brotherhoods, guilds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singers and Singing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide vocal range (men, women &amp; children)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorisation</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiation</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visualisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual and musical literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalisation and payment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution and Naming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patronage and Sponsorship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous polyphonic forms</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secular and non–liturgical sacred music</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of folk music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on art and beauty in music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stave notation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Promoters clearly present, regardless of relative agency, are marked with a green tick (√). Those of uncertain status are left either unmarked or marked with a smaller tick (•).

Table 3.1. Comparative Agency of Promoters in Russia In 1650, 1700 and 1750

Boys were now officially a part of the Tsar’s Choir, and other choirs could now include them; this facilitated the inclusion of higher–pitched voice lines in new Western partesny compositions.589 The progressive switch to stave notation in manuscripts, and the sizeable number of native Russian composers now using this

589 I surmise this might have allowed women to sing more openly, if unofficially, in rural churches.
form of notation, suggests that visualisation and musical literacy may have been becoming more prevalent, even if many singers still leaned heavily on repetition and memorisation, and of course their immigrant polyphonist colleagues. Composers could also freely harmonise traditional monophonic chant, and compose de novo art works such as kontserty. This indicates that improvisation was becoming acceptable. Individual musicians were also being recognised, known by name, and in a few cases by being paid; these were collectively signs consistent with the nascency of professionalisation. Equally importantly, for the first time, both secular and instrumental music were now not just merely tolerated, but beginning to be actively encouraged.

On the other hand, the line-up of promoters was still not yet really ideal for development of polyphonic music. Even though the rivalry between Aleksei’s and Nikon’s choir may have been replicated elsewhere, and the number of choirs providing choristers with experience of polyphony and some degree of training continued to grow, dedicated training establishments, such as music conservatories, were still more than a century in the future (Introduction and Chapter 4). Moreover, outside the major choirs, many singers were serfs and continued to be treated poorly, being often unpaid and unappreciated. Few of these would yet have the opportunity to self-organise.590

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inhibitors*</th>
<th>c. 1650</th>
<th>c. 1700</th>
<th>c. 1750</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment and Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious opposition</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geopolitical isolation and xenophobia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of training opportunities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression of Skomorokhi and guilds</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singers and Singing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited textual and musical literacy</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisanal dependency of singers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistent culture of anonymity</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discouragement of improvisation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of experience singing polyphonically</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opportunities for training and experience</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence on neumatic notation</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text: music coordination issues</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Inhibitors clearly present, regardless of relative agency, are marked with a red tick (✓). Those of uncertain status are left either unmarked or marked with a smaller tick (•).

Table 3.2. Obliteration of Inhibitors in Russia by Mid–18th Century

Considering the status of inhibitors at mid–18th century, most were no longer in evidence (Table 3.2). Perhaps most significantly, any lingering doubts that religious opposition might again well up and snap liturgical music back to traditional monophony had been put to rest by Peter’s administrative reforms, and resulting fragmentation of the power and authority of the Church. Although Old Believers still resisted Westernisation, they

were ruthlessly suppressed, and many fled the country, committed suicide, or were killed. In parallel, from the Great Embassy in 1697–1698 (Chapter 2) until the time of his death in 1725, Peter whipped Russia unmercifully onto the path of intensive Europeanisation. His obsession with the West was not just a transient infatuation of youth, but a deep–seated, iron determination to propel his country into the modern era and to match Europe – costs be damned! Even his more vocal critics later conceded that his frenetic Westernisation had vaulted Russia a century or more into the future. However, such intense and single–minded Westernisation naturally provoked considerable backlash. Even though modernisation primarily favoured the elite, many well–born felt excluded from the positions they deserved, and from the delights of a court that had become sumptuous in the extreme. At the other end of the social scale, resentment was bubbling amongst serfs, for whom life continued to resemble slavery and was awful in every way. Accordingly, socio–political unrest bubbled up periodically. Nonetheless, geopolitical isolation had been exploded.

Russia was now actively courting Europeans, including musicians and the latest musical fashions, and welcoming them into the new Empire. This continued the Westernisation begun in Chapter 2, and went some way towards dismantling another major barrier – the lack of native polyphonist singers. Under Peter, Russia took the first halting steps towards a national system of education, even though in the case of music this was still informal, and relied for now upon the sizeable expat musician community assembled, rather than de novo organised educational initiatives. Moreover, although the status of native singers was still largely execrable, the brutal suppression of Skomorokhi had subsided. Finally, along with progressive adoption of stave notation, musical inhibitors were continuing to fade.

In relation to Research Question 2, I conclude that building on the changes begun in the previous half century (Chapter 2), long–standing inhibitors of polyphony had largely dissipated during the first half of the 18th century. This was particularly true in the case of religious opposition, geopolitical isolation, and the poverty of polyphonist singers. I further propose that erasure of such inhibitors was the proximate event in allowing admittance of polyphony and enabling its incorporation into Russian music; this also allowed promoters that had long been suppressed the latitude to develop. The remarkable result was that after many centuries of unwavering monophony, polyphony was swallowed into the venerable Russian liturgical musical canon in a mere hundred years.

591 Hughes, Russia in the Age, 464. Notable critiques came from Prince Mikhail Scherbatov (1733–1790), an archivist; and Nikolai Karamzin (1766–1826), one of Russia’s first serious historians.
592 Hosking, Russia: People and Empire, 97–100. Peter’s successors, and especially Anna, relied on copious numbers of expats to staff government. These were chiefly Germans, with some Poles.
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Chapter 4. Summary and Concluding Comments

Tell all the truth but tell it slant —
Success in Circuit lies
Too bright for our infirm Delight
The Truth's superb surprise
As Lightning to the Children eased
With explanation kind
The Truth must dazzle gradually
Or every man be blind’ —

*Emily Dickinson*

Summary

In this thesis I have set out to explore the coming of polyphony to Russian sacred music, and to assemble a more complete account of the factors resulting in this cataclysmic change than has been available previously. I was particularly concerned with explaining why polyphony appeared so many years after it started in the West. I addressed two main research questions:

1. After almost seven centuries of steadfast monophony, what were the major promoters and inhibitors of polyphony in Russia approaching mid–17th century, and how was this situation different from that in the West?
2. Was the adoption of Western partesny from mid–17th to mid–18th century primarily due to the appearance of promoters comparable to those in effect in the West, or the disappearance of long–standing local barriers in Russia?

Before discussing my findings, and the conclusions I reached, it is important to acknowledge again the incompleteness of some enduring materials, and especially of primary documents. I also note various issues bearing on the reliability of the materials that were available to me (see Introduction). These issues all seem to have been more or less salient at different historical time points (see also Introduction). They are summarised below.

For enduring materials dating from mid–17th century, at appearance of Western partesny in Russia, issues include:

- Limited documentation in general during Russia’s long medieval period
- Limited recording of music and text due to a long oral singing tradition
- Limited recording of music due to low textual and musical literacy
- Limited recording of music in neumes due to high level of skill required
- Strong church control of singers and other potential authors
- Reservation of Russia’s only press for printing of religious texts, and
- Suboptimal curating or frank destruction of relevant documents.

For materials dating from 1650–1750, some other factors must be considered:

- Delayed recording during conversion from neumes to stave notation
- Focus of migrant European singers and musicians on secular music viz. opera
- Failure to build formal education in music theory and musicology, and
• Added printing presses, but monopolisation by non-musical publications.  

In the 19th century, state censorship led to:

• Broad suppression of new sacred music and related musicology.

On the other hand, the mid-1800s were a time when a number of Western composers, including Schumann and Bizet, heard the Tsar’s Choir perform, and wrote glowingly of its superb ability and musicianship.

In the pre-Revolutionary period from mid-19th century to 1917, censorship was repealed, and a national network of conservatories built. This collectively provided an abundance of educational opportunities, and led to a flowering of Russian compositions and related musicological scholarship (see Introduction). However, it should be borne in mind that retroactive reconstruction of the incursion of Western partesny occurring two centuries earlier could well have been portrayed inaccurately, due to:

• Temporal dislocation, and failure to appreciate relevant historical and histiographic context.

The October Revolution in 1917 and the subsequent Soviet era introduced another group of factors that greatly constrained the availability, and reliability, of relevant materials, including:

• Further destruction of enduring materials for political reasons
• Constraints on access to existing materials, especially for foreigners.
• Proscription of composition and performance of Russian sacred music
• Persecution and liquidation of priests and clerical musicians, and
• State suppression of sacred music scholarship and control of publications

Finally, the liberalisation of access to materials that followed the demise of the Soviet Union was effectively stopped in its tracks by two recent barriers to access:

• The current Covid pandemic, and
• Russia’s invasion of Ukraine.

I reiterate this litany of factors not as an apologia, but a fundamental reality that should not be ignored. It raises the important question of how representative are the materials, including musical examples, that I have been able to access. In terms of primary source material, it is possible that some relevant documents remain to be discovered and analysed that have not already been scrutinised and rescrutinised by the considerable numbers of serious academic musicologists that have conducted painstaking research and published it over the last 150 years or so, including:

---

593 Hughes, Russia in the Age, 316–325. A blizzard of records grew up around Peter’s enormous state administrative bureaucracy, including administration of the Russian Church and monasteries, but much of this occurred after 1750, the end–point of this thesis.
594 Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 82 and 190.
- Pre–Revolutionary musicologists (e.g. Arnol’d, Lisitsyn, Metallov, Preobrazhensky, Razumovsky, Smolensky, and Undol’sky)
- Soviet–era musicologists (e.g. Belyaev, Brazhnikov, Findeizen, Gardner, Kastalsky, Keldysh, Livanova, and Uspensky)
- Contemporary musicologists writing in Russian (e.g. Bogomolova, Gerasimova–Persidskaya, Kondrashkova, Konotop, Plotnikova and Pozhidaeva), and
- Contemporary musicologists writing in English (e.g. Dunlop, Harri, Jensen, Morosan, and Ritzarev).

On the other hand, the rich corpus of secondary source material assembled by these musicologists has allowed me to take full advantage both for histiographic analysis, and to tease out the salient promoters and inhibitors of polyphony for further discussion. From this perspective I would submit that the materials referenced in this thesis are likely to be largely representative, although I acknowledge the persistence of some remaining gaps in the secondary Russian literature available to me as a consequence of travel restrictions (see Introduction). Even then, much triangulation is possible across the body of material that I have been able to access. I surmise that this makes it less likely that access to the relatively small number of missing publications would substantially change the historical narrative upon which I have relied to analyse the status of promoters and inhibitors of polyphony.

To summarise, my scramble to source relevant materials has not been ideal, and unfettered access to primary source material in Russia or Ukraine might conceivably have allowed the delights of discovering a previously unreported piece of pertinent information. Having said that, I believe this thesis provides a fresh and comprehensive view of the arrival of polyphony in Russia and the extraordinary consequences thereof, and I am confident of the conclusions presented.

Research Question 1. Chapter 1. Up to Mid–17th Century: I identified key promoters in Western Europe appearing in the many centuries over which polyphony was progressively developed. I also undertook comparative analysis of the situation in Russia, where chant by and large remained steadfastly monophonic. This indicated that almost without exception, promoters of polyphony that developed in the West were absent in Russia approaching mid–17th century. In addition, I found several potent inhibitors of polyphony in Russia. I proposed that these inhibitors, and especially religious opposition, geopolitical isolation, and a lack of polyphony–ready native singers, constituted the primary basis for the many previous centuries of Russia’s unrelenting monophony. I also suggested that these inhibitors had pari passu suppressed the emergence of ‘missing’ promoters in Russia, the paucity of which had played an additional role in failure of polyphony to take root prior to mid–17th century.

Research Question 2. Chapter 2. 1650 –1700: I demonstrated how major inhibitors identified in Chapter 1 suddenly and unexpectedly began to ease early in the second half of the 17th century. Religious opposition was paused, geopolitical isolation relaxed, and experienced part singers were recruited from the Southwest. I argued that this allowed Western partesny to penetrate the liturgical repertoire of the choirs of the Patriarch, the Tsar, and some major cathedrals and churches. Later, in the closing decades of this half century, I noted that several of the promoters already operative in the
West also then became evident in Russia. I therefore suggested that relaxation of inhibitors was the proximate event in unlocking the entry of Western partesny into Russian music, with emergent promoters later playing a secondary, supportive role. At the same time, I emphasised that blunting of the major inhibitors was not an immutable *fait accompli*, and that their agency as inhibitors of polyphony could yet have reverted to the *status quo ante*. I argued that partesny polyphony and para–liturgical kanty were demonstrably different musically from 16th–century strochny and demestvenny polyphony, and especially in the item of dissonance. In addition, given the time–limited usage and apparently limited dissemination of 16th–century polyphony, I proposed that such 16th–century polyphony was unlikely to have been a direct lineal forefather of the partesny that appeared in the second half of the 17th century.⁵⁹⁵ I concluded by noting that the musicians and music imported from the Southwest resulted in polyphony that was not fully Western, but transitional, especially in terms of notation and tonality.

*Research Question 2 (continued). Chapter 3. 1700 – 1750*: I established that the agency of major inhibitors did not in fact snap back to their previously suffocating levels; instead, they were largely swept away. Tsar Peter I shattered the power of the Church, and of religious opposition. He also ended geographical isolation by deliberately opening Russia wide to Europe, and facilitated the immigration of Westerners and their expertise, including singers and musicians to supplement those continuing to migrate from the Southwest. These approaches were continued by his successors, with Anna formalising a feeder choral school in Hlukhiv, for the trebles now accepted into the Tsar's Choir. Additional promoters of polyphony now appeared. I concluded that liturgical music continued to mature from Western partesny (Chapter 2) into contemporaneous fully Western polyphony. Initially the main focus was Moscow, and then St. Petersburg after it was built, with polyphony then likely spreading out more slowly thereafter across the huge land mass of Russia. Finally, I noted the emergence of new parallel threads of polyphonic secular, and instrumental, art music, including opera.

**Concluding Comments**

This thesis is primarily concerned with a detailed narrative analysis of the geopolitical, cultural and social milieu that constituted the stage on which the various promoters and inhibitors identified then played their parts in the embrace of Western polyphony between 1650 – 1750. It is important to note a similar process of assimilation of Western influence in other domains of Russia's national development during this period (see also Chapter 3). The most relevant to liturgical music is in the closely related area of religious icons. Although many icons focus on Mary, the Theotokos (Mother of God or God bearer – Russian Bogoroditsa) and Jesus, others depict representations of important biblical events. These have always provided a powerful visual parallel 'narrative' to the texts being chanted, an indivisible 'verbal–figurative expression of Revelation'.⁵⁹⁶ As such, they are a crucial component of Orthodox worship, being displayed on the iconostasis and around the church, and venerated in formal fashion by the congregation throughout services. The practice and principles of icon painting, or 'writing',⁵⁹⁷ were adopted along with the liturgy and related monophonic chant from Constantinople when Russia accepted Christianity in 988CE. Thereafter, icons in Russia underwent rich development, while acquiring a

---

⁵⁹⁵ To use a linguistics analogy, 16th–century Russian polyphony and 17th–century partesny could be viewed less as distinct languages, and more as dialects.


⁵⁹⁷ The relevant Russian verb *pisat* can be translated as either ‘to paint’ or ‘to write’.
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distinctly Russian provenance, in a fashion similar to that of Russia’s monophonic liturgical chant.\textsuperscript{598} The appearance in Russia of Southwestern influence starting around mid–17\textsuperscript{th} century (Chapter 2), and of European influence starting in the early 18\textsuperscript{th} century (Chapter 3), brought Western painters and techniques to Russia, and icon writing in Russia underwent modification. The latter process was almost certainly affected by the Schism within the Russian Church during the latter half of the 17\textsuperscript{th} century (Chapter 2), which resulted in the Old Believers adhering to traditional stylised ‘canonical’ icons while the Russian Church moved towards Western realism and icons that were ‘non–canonical’.\textsuperscript{599}

The arrival of Western partesny from mid-17\textsuperscript{th} century was a disruptive sea change for Russia’s music in every sense, and I would be remiss in not outlining some of the major ramifications, some of which could represent important opportunities for future research. One very obvious consequence is the glorious polyphonic sacred compositions of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, culminating in the All Night Vigil (often termed ‘Vespers’), composed by Sergei Rachmaninov in 1915, just before the October Revolution effectively shuttered sacred music composition for much of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. Obviously, there is a risk that this statement could be viewed as presentism, or even as patronising Western–think, along the lines of ‘polyphonic Russian sacred music finally caught up and achieved a standard comparable to choral music in the West’.

Historically, there has been no shortage of opposition, sometimes virulent, to any tainting of the ‘rectitude of monophony’ with the ‘vainglories of part singing’. The most acute period of resistance in Russia occurred in relation to the Schism (Chapter 2), and a comparable spasm had also occurred in the Western Catholic Church 150 years earlier (see Background in the Introduction).\textsuperscript{600} Certain similarities are particularly striking, for example some larger–than life personalities (e.g., Avvakum in Russia and the fiery friar Girolamo Savonarola in Italy), and the free use of hyperbole and \textit{ad hominem} attacks designed to disparage and negate opponents. As one example reminiscent of Russian thunderings against polyphony (Chapter 2), one 15\textsuperscript{th}–century Western opponent compared polyphonic singing to listening to a ‘sackful of piglets, since they clamoured loudly, but left the hearer without understanding’.\textsuperscript{601}

In Russia, criticism and resistance persisted long after the Schism. In the late 17\textsuperscript{th} century, this was particularly evident amongst Old Believers. They viewed traditional Russian monophonic chanting of text as the only true vehicle for worship, with polyphonic singing an inappropriate and almost effete elevation of the importance of music over text and its meaning. New–fangled polyphonic compositions were simply not real sacred music. Further, long–standing xenophobia led to flat rejection of what they saw as the sacrifice of familiar centuries–old unison chant on the altar of

\textsuperscript{598} Poliakova, ‘On the Establishment of’, 190–194.
\textsuperscript{600} Wegman, \textit{The Crisis of Music}, p1–15.
\textsuperscript{601} Wegman, \textit{The Crisis of Music}, p24. Savonarola, of ‘Bonfire of Vanities’ fame, was successful in prohibiting polyphony in Florence 1493, but this ban was then removed immediately after he was killed. Between 1470–1530, there were constant characterisations of polyphony as evil and Satanic. Other insults, such as \textit{hofereyen} (pride, vanity) and \textit{krausengesang} (frilly singing), were also hurled at polyphonists.
Western envy. Old Believers continued to be roundly persecuted, exiled and killed. Other opposition has bubbled up periodically ever since, with protests from the clergy, and from musicologists including Preobrazhensky and more recently Gardner. The chief charge has been broadly similar – that the coming of Western polyphony, including the transitional form represented by partesny, denoted a musical subjugation of traditional Russian monophonic chant to part singing – perhaps even a triumph of musical art and technique over liturgical and textual common sense. On the other hand, we should consider that other than polyphony, penetration of other Western musical trends has been limited. While boys and women were eventually accepted as choristers, Russian sacred music has remained strictly a cappella to this day.

I have already stated my intent to avoid any personal judgement about the relative worth of monophony and polyphony in Russian church music (Introduction). However, I note that until the fall of the Soviet Union and the explosion of the Internet in the 1990s, Western-sounding, polyphonic liturgical music sung by mixed choirs was really the only sacred Russian music available in the West. Consequently, the works by Gretchaninov (viz., his Litany of Fervent Supplication) and Rachmaninov (viz., his ‘Vespers’) that I heard therefore provided an informal standard for how this previously unknown genre should sound, and an important, ‘comfortable’ entrée to Russian liturgical music for new listeners (see Proem).

Another point to be emphasised is that between 1650 and 1750 Russia did not just import polyphonist singers from the Southwest and the West, but in effect an entire musical system—viz instrumentalists, composers, notation, music printing, vocal training and musical education—in addition to singers. The special contribution of Ukraine further included educators such as Mezenets and Diletsky, a large number of senior clergy such as Prokopovich and Yavorsky, and the important model of musical education in choir schools and universities. It can even be argued that Peter Mohyla, after whom the Kyiv Institute was named, contributed directly to the Third Rome obsession of Tsar Aleksei and therefore the schism, while translators such as Satanovsky and Slavinetsky translated relevant Greek texts. As relevant expertise from the Southwest and the West was internalised and stockpiled in Russia, this predictably had effects on other genres of music, beyond the liturgical. It is important to emphasise that up to the 17th century, music in Russia was largely a religious enterprise sung inside, in sacred spaces. Secular folk music was popular among the public, but was distrusted and suppressed by the Church (Chapter 1).

Notwithstanding this, the introduction of Western partesny into liturgical music, was soon paralleled by the emergence of a separate thread of polyphonic secular music. Timing was important for success of this thread, just as it had been for sacred music. This was because the highly reactionary Church and successive tsars had long disapproved of, and actively suppressed, secular music, in particular demonising and persecuting the Skomorokhi and their particular brand of music and theatre.

602 Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 43.
603 Morosan, Choral Performance in Pre–Revolutionary, 301.
604 Moody, ‘The Idea of Canonicity’, 339–342. This discusses the benefits of homophony in preserving ‘original meaning’ in the text of the chant being harmonised.
Opposition of the Church to secular music seems to have been side tracked by the Schism in the latter half of the 17th century. Coincidentally, Tsar Aleksei, who was renowned for his piety, started to take an interest in secular music at court (Chapter 2). Shortly thereafter, Peter I muzzled the Church, and threw Russia open to all things Western, including music. The result of these events was that new threads of instrumental and secular music exploded in Russia later in the 18th century.

The early 19th century saw the dawn of a robust tradition of Russian opera fathered by Glinka, and continued by the Mighty Five and Tchaikovsky. In parallel, Russia now built its own world-class, national musical enterprise. A web of music conservatories was created in the larger cities, staffed by the cream of Russian and expat musicians. These then trained and nurtured generations of highly accomplished singers, instrumentalists, composers and conductors. Together with funding from government and patrons, musicians and impresarios built a vibrant concert life in Russia, together with a vocal cadre of critics. Russian musicians also began to be known and in demand internationally, both in Europe and in America. New world-class ballet troupes were built, and Russia’s choirs began to undertake international singing tours. There was also a profusion of talented composers, some of whom now conducted their works abroad.

In the 20th century, many musicians and composers emigrated after the October Revolution, and the resulting diaspora had the important function of expanding the introduction and dissemination of world-class Russian musicians and music around the globe. Meanwhile, although Russia sacred music remained on ice throughout the Soviet era, secular music and its musicians and composers were crucial components of the state approach to showcasing Soviet culture. Between those remaining in the Soviet Union, and ex-pats, the Russian music scene shimmered with world-leading composers, singers and instrumentalists, many of whom remain household names today. Simply put, Russia built a superb national music enterprise, one matched by few other countries. More remarkably, this came to pass a mere three centuries after Western polyphony first showed up in Russian music.

It is instructive to speculate how much of this extraordinary musical bloom would ever have happened, and how quickly, without the initial, limited seeding of Western partesny into sacred music, and the related embrace of the West’s musical enterprise. In sum, it is no exaggeration that the coming of polyphony in mid–17th century was a seismic event, with many extraordinary consequences for Russian music, both sacred and secular. Nevertheless, I conclude that this was a close-run thing, almost an accident of history involving an extraordinary interplay between three autocrats with outsized personalities, Tsars Aleksei and Peter, and Patriarch Nikon. The process was started by rivalry between Nikon and Aleksei, and accelerated and solidified by Peter’s determination to take Russia European and control the Russian Church. It also depended on the ability of Slavic singers from the Southwest, and later the West, and their willingness to move, and sing and make music in Russia. By extension, we should also acknowledge the contributions of Poles and Lithuanians and their Catholic liturgical canon in bringing polyphony stave notation, and kanty to the Southwest in the first place. Beyond that however, for polyphony to become permanently embedded in Russia, a thicket of potent, long-standing inhibitors needed to disappear, thereby also allowing a collection of previously missing
promoters to emerge. It is also important to stress that while much of the Russian masses and clergy were strongly opposed to any musical change, in the end they were powerless to stop it. Above all, timing was everything. All the right forces had to come together, at exactly the right time, to create a historical oasis of opportunity in the medieval, cultural desert of the early 17th century. Only then could polyphony sneak into Russia, establish a beachhead and mount a successful invasion, in sacred music and then in secular music.

This raises the interesting, albeit entirely rhetorical question of whether or not polyphony could have shown up and been incorporated in Russia’s sacred music at any historical juncture other than between 1650 and 1750. Arrival any earlier than mid–17th century must be viewed against a backdrop not only of the formidable inhibitors discussed in the thesis, but also of the extraordinary geopolitical turbulence leading up to mid–17th century. Realities such as the difficulties in creating and securing the new country of Russia, the paranoia and chaotic rule of Ivan the Terrible, the near extinction of Russia as a country during the Time of Troubles, and the theocratic tenure of Patriarch Filaret (Introduction), together erected a particularly robust barrier of isolationism, xenophobia and religious opposition. Given this, I believe it would be far–fetched to envisage any successful incursion of Western polyphony into Russia’s liturgical music before mid–17th century.

Alternatively, could polyphony have appeared in Russia’s sacred music any later, for example between 1750 and 1800, after Peter had abolished the Patriarchate and opened Russia up to Western Europe? At first glance, this does seem possible, but this supposition ignores several realities. Most significantly, Russia would not then have had the benefit of the services of the 17th century Southwestern polyphonist immigrants that were actually proficient in Orthodox liturgical music. The European migrants of the 18th century were primarily concerned with secular polyphony and opera, and evinced little interest or aptitude for the unprofitable ‘niche’ of Russian sacred music. Moreover, Peter’s muzzling of the Church, and the long monopolisation of the directorship of the Tsar’s Choir by secular Western musicians rather than by Orthodox Slavic musicians (Chapter 3), could hardly have emphasised the importance of taking Russia’s sacred music polyphonic. This suggests to me that importation of elements of the European musical system between 1750 and 1800 could still have resulted in the birth of Russian polyphonic secular music, including opera. However, in that stolidly secular Western world, incorporation of part singing into Russian sacred music might have occurred only slowly, or perhaps not at all.

Considering next the 19th century, this brought a different threat to Russian sacred music, in the form of new state regulation that gave the Director of the Tsar’s Choir, then Bortniansky, the power to approve, or disapprove, new sacred compositions. During the tenure of successive Directors, Fyodor L’vov, Aleksei L’vov and Nikolai Bakhmetev, this regulatory function turned into increasingly heavy–handed, frank censorship, such that eventually almost no new sacred compositions were actually approved. Had polyphony not already entered the liturgical canon in mid–17th century, I surmise that censorship would also have barred new sacred works featuring part singing. Moreover, this embargo was only belatedly abolished in 1879, less than 40 years before the 1917 October Revolution and Soviet proscription of religion effectively shut down sacred music. Had polyphony not already been subsumed into Russia’s sacred music, could such a major change have occurred in
the short interval between 1879 and 1917, and led in that short time to compositions of the calibre of Rachmaninov’s Vespers? I think not. On the other hand, censorship of sacred music seems unlikely to have seriously impacted de novo incorporation of polyphony into secular music during this period.

The October Revolution early in the 20th century effectively proscribed religion and sacred music. With rare exceptions, composers of sacred music turned their hands to secular music or simply stopped composing, and performances of Russian sacred music became infrequent and highly risky (Introduction). If polyphony had not already been incorporated into Russia’s liturgical music, the chances of this happening during the Soviet era seem to me to be trifling. In marked contrast, Russian secular music was often showcased and used to proclaim the superiority of Soviet culture, even though the state regularly meddled in both its composition and performance. It therefore seems reasonable that polyphony could have been first incorporated into Russia’s secular music while the Soviets were in power.

Although the above mind experiments are purely hypothetical, they suggest that a robust thread of polyphonic secular music could have appeared and prospered at more than one different historical points outside the period of study in this thesis. In contrast, I conclude that acceptance of polyphony into Russia’s liturgical music was only really likely, or even possible, during the perfect historical planting season from 1650 – 1750. I suppose it is just possible that polyphony could have become first embedded in secular music and then leaked ‘backwards’ into sacred music, for example in the pre—Revolutionary period after the abolition of censorship. However, on balance I conclude that if polyphony had not been incorporated into liturgical music during the Russian Baroque between 1650 and 1760, then just like Greek sacred music, Russia’s sacred music might just have remained largely monophonic to this day.606

---
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Ob osobennostyakh ispolneniya rannego mnogogolosiya v khore Gosudarevykh pevchikh d’yakov v tsarstvovaniye Mikhaila Feyodorovicha (On the performance features of early polyphony in the choir of the sovereign’s clerks in the reign of Mikhail Feyodorovich)

Svetlana Zvereva
Royal Conservatoire of Scotland, Glasgow.

Early Russian polyphony is one of the most attractive forms of Russian choral music for modern choirs, and relevant research involving the efforts of a whole array of investigators has achieved substantive progress. At the same time, there remain still many blank spots, including performance traditions in polyphony, the development of which is inextricably linked to the activities of the Tsar’s Choir – the most significant and influential choir of the Moscow Principality. The genesis of early polyphony and its terminology have been the subject of a recent study by M. B. Bogomolova, who writes that the 20s decade of the 17th century saw the beginning of the third stage of polyphony, characterised by three-line singing and the emergence of records in score format.

In this report, we pose a modest, but interesting question for modern performers. Based on administrative documents from the reign of Tsar Mikhail Feyodorovich, we will attempt to determine how subgroupings of the choir were organised for performance of polyphony.

Typically, choirs of singing clerics were organised into stanitsy (choral stands) – each stanitsa averaged five singers. In the Tsar’s Choir, replenished in 1617/1618 after the depredations of the Time of Troubles, there were five stanitsy: three with adults – termed in Russian ‘Big’, ‘Other’ and ‘Third’; and two with younger members. This structure was maintained for ten years, while the number of choristers varied from 21 to 26. In 1628/29, a fourth adult stanitsa was added; the choir then sang in this formulation until the middle of the century.

After 1613/14, occasional indications of specialization in the singing of choristers begin to appear in account books and columns of the royal Treasury books. For example, Ivan Feyodorov is sometimes called the ‘nizhnik’ or ‘lower’ (in 1613/14 and 1617/18), Semyon Ivanov – ‘demesvennik’ (unclear but probably mid-range, 1635/36, 1640/41), and Ivan Semyonov – ‘verskhnik’ or ‘top’ (in 1617/18 and

607 Translator’s Note: I am particularly grateful for permission to include this unpublished communication. I was unable to access any of the documents and sources cited, and therefore include attributions as cited by Dr. Zvereva.

608 Translator’s Note: See Chapter 1, fn 223 and 226 for naming of this choir.

609 Bogomolova, Maria B. Russkoye bezlineynoye mnogogolosiye [Russian Staveless polyphony], Doctor of Arts dissertation, 2006.

610 Translator’s Note: The direct English translations of the Russian stanitsy labels – ‘bol’shaya, drugaya, and tret’ya’ are ‘Big, Other and Third’ respectively, and I have used these labels in English throughout. The two younger stanitsy were also called ‘Big’ and ‘Other’, but I have omitted these labels to avoid confusion with the commoner references to Big and Other adult stanitsy.

611 Translator’s Note: The words ‘niz’ and ‘verkh’ refer to ‘low’ and ‘high’ vocal lines, while ‘nizhnik’ and ‘verskhnik’ relate to the singers thereof. There are no fully satisfactory translations of ‘put’ and
In other words, this suggests that these singers were differentiated in the performance of such lines of polyphonic scores into three, or sometimes four, vocal lines of different pitch.

Why did such vocal restriction or specialization arise? It is possible that the singing of each line of the polyphonic score was accompanied by distinctive and intricate skills.

On one hand, these indications of specialization reflected new scope in the choir's repertoire, and, on the other, they emphasized the skill and qualifications of singers able to do what others could not. Judging by the fact that these indications of vocal specialisation are notably rare, there were few such masters in the choir. Evidence that choristers had the skills to perform more than one line is good, and in the main, these were the singing teachers. For example, three lines were mastered by the chorister Samoyll Evtkhiiev, who from 1620/21 to 1623/24 was in Tobolsk and taught Archbishop Kipriyan to sing in a stanitsa of the Tsar's choristers, and taught 'three-line singing' to the 'Other' stanitsa of choristers. All three lines were mastered by the senior choristers that taught the younger Patriarch's singers the 'roles' of Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah in 'Peshnom deyistve', where each youth sang one of the lines of the three-line score. Interestingly, choristers from both Patriarch's and Tsar's Choirs played the role of 'master of the adolescents,' leading to the supposition that training of young singers was a normal occurrence. Notably, these choirs sang at services in neighbouring churches of the Moscow Kremlin, and also in the same church when both their patrons prayed there.

Some conclusions about the capability of individual choristers on a particular line can be drawn on the basis of information in the inventory of the Musical Library of Tsar Feyodor Alekseyevich. In this document, a whole list of musical manuscripts is named that were written down by the choristers of Tsar Mikhail Feyodorovich.

The hand of Mikhail Osipov can be seen in "Gospel stikhera and range in old three-line singing", 'Stikhera for three months — March, April and May — from put' to niz', 'Stikhera from niz to put' for half a year', 'Transfer downwards from demestvo to niz', etc.

One's attention is drawn to the fact that most of the manuscripts transcribed by Osipov are presented from put' to niz. This tendency to emphasise the put' is quite understandable, since the account book of the tsar's Treasury order says that he was a 'putnik'. By all indications, he also knew the niz perfectly. Judging by the transcribed scores, Osipov also mastered the secrets of performing 'demestvo' and 'verkh'.

'demestvo' vocal lines, nor 'putnik' and 'demestvennik'. For this reason, I have used these Russian labels throughout. Both the put' and demestvo vocal lines are generally in the middle range.

612 RGADA ph. 396, op. 2, № 199, l. 425 ob. 426; № 203, l. 106—106 ob., № 291, l. 109 ob.—110; № 293, l. 172—172 ob.; № 296, l. 182.

613 RGADA ph. 396, op. 2, № 283, l. 314—315.

614 Translator’s Note: Daniel’s three friends with Babylonian names of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego.


616 RGADA ph. 396, op. 2, № 293, l. 172—12 ob.
What was the significance of this particular chorister in the Tsar’s Choir?

Osipov was one of the young singers in a group that joined the choir in 1617/18, after it had been reduced in number during the Time of Troubles. This group was destined to sing in the choir later when three-line singing won wide recognition not only at court, but also began to spread to distant dioceses. Evidently, the role of Mikhail Osipov was also significant in the formation and development of this type of singing. In 1636, almost 20 years after joining the choir, he reached the top rung of the service ladder and was accepted into the Big stanitsa, and around 1647/48 he became its leader.

Osipov’s erudition is demonstrated by the fact that in 1638/1639 he, together with the more senior chorister, Ivan Semenov, were instructed to teach this ‘difficult’ three-line singing to Tsarevich Alexei Mikhailovich. Apparently, it was for this in 1640 that Osipov was awarded a very substantial gift for his singing, namely a fur coat, a caftan and a hat. In the late 1630s, he began to study church hymns, and in March 1638 he was awarded a salary for ‘ordering old chant and teaching singing to a chorister of the ‘Other’ stanitsa, Ivan Konyukhovsky’.617

It is possible that Mikhail Osipov himself attended the school of polyphonic singing under Ivan Semyonov (see above). After all, when Osipov joined the choir, Semyonov was already a ‘verkhnik’ in the Big stanitsa, and received a special salary for teaching young choristers. In this role, Semyonov participated in the most significant services and sang the most complex hymns, for example, ‘The great descending demestvenny transfer’ sung at the time of the Great Exit during the Liturgy when the transfer of the Holy Gifts is performed. Interestingly, this was written out for the Choir by the same Mikhail Osipov.

Ivan Mikiforov, an experienced scribe and possibly an editor, was accepted into the choir as a chorister in 1617/18. He, like Ivan Semyonov, was a ‘verkhnik’ 618 and when Semyonov was transferred to administrative roles in 1644, Mikiforov took his place in the Big stanitsa.

Within the musical library of Tsar Feyodor Alekseyevich is a whole series of books transcribed by Mikiforov: e.g., ‘Authentic stikhera from verkh to put’; ‘Triody coloured from verkh to put’, ‘Obikhod for verkh’; ‘Lord, cry out in eight voices ranging from verkh to put’, and so on. It can also be seen that Mikiforov rewrote one verkh to combine it with a put.

Two other scribes of polyphonic hymns were ‘Master of the Adolescents’ Yuri Bukin, and the clerk Grigory Panfilov. The latter, a ‘putnik’ by specialization, 619 wrote ‘Six notebooks of verses of repentance for 8 voices from put’ to niz’. Yury Bukin’s hand is also obvious in ‘Stichera for put’.

Comparison of information from the ‘Inventory of the Musical Library’ and state documents shows that these choristers rewrote primarily those lines of the score in

617 RGADA ph. 396, op. 2, № 294, l. 172—172 ob.
618 RGADA ph. 396, op. 2, № 295, l. 139—139 ob; № 299, l. 71—71 ob.
619 RGADA ph. 396, op. 2, № 299, l. 71—71 ob.
which they specialized as performers. As a rule, this was the put' and an adjacent line, that is put' and niz, or put' and verkh, but not niz and verkh.

How were vocal specialists replaced when they left stanitsy? Documents indicate that when the position of niznik became vacant in a stanitsa, it was filled by another niznik, while verskhnik was replaced by verskhnik, etc. For example, in 1625/26, the niznik of the Big stanitsa, Bogdan Kipelov, was replaced by the niznik of the Other stanitsa, Ivan Semenov. Similarly, when Ivan Semenov left the choir, he was replaced by the then verskhnik of the Other stanitsa, Ivan Mikiforov.

In replacing choristers in the Big stanitsa, the general rule was that this could only be undertaken with singers from the next in line, the Other stanitsa, and not from any lower. The singers were very jealous of consistent advancement up the rungs of the choir’s hierarchical ladder, from the most junior to most senior stanitsy. Apart from that, a clear concept existed of how many years a clerk should serve in a junior stanitsa before being honoured with service in a more senior stanitsa. On average, climbing the steps of the service ladder in the Tsar’s Choir during this period required 20–25 years.

In cases where there was no worthy replacement for a retired singer in the Tsar’s Choir, a specialist polyphonist was invited from another choir – often that of the Patriarch or the Archbishop of Novgorod. The call for singing masters from Veliky Novgorod was not accidental, since demestvenny and strochny polyphony were performed very widely in Novgorod’s St. Sophia Cathedral.

So, in the leading Big stanitsa of the Tsar’s Choir, four specialists must certainly have been present during the period during which polyphony developed: niznik, putnik, verkhnik and demestvennik. What then was the vocal specialization of the fifth member of the stanitsa? Specifically, what lines of a three- or four-part score were doubled in a stanitsa consisting of five choristers?

Only one specific example has been encountered that clarifies this issue. It concerns ‘the transfer of the great descending demestvenny in the Church of the Miraculous image of the Saviour to the senekh’ (in the Verkhospassky house church), which was sung by the choristers of the Big stanitsa, verkhnik Ivan Semyonov, demestvennik Semyon Ivanov, putnik Konan Fedorov, niznik Ivan Prokofiev and additional putnik Vasily Nikitin. Thus, the niz, verkh, and demestvo in the demestvenny score were performed by one singer each, while the put’ was sung by two singers (in two variant forms).

How typical is this example?

For the answer to this question, we will undertake the reconstruction of the performers in one specific stanitsa. For our example, we will choose the year

---
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1617/18, when the Big stanitsa consisted of the five choristers: Ivan Feyodorov, Bogdan Kipelov, Pyotr Podunayev, Yury Bukin and Vasily Nikitin. Upon cross-referencing the information from various documents concerning the specializations of these singers, it turns out that the first three were niznik, verskhnik and demesvennik, and the last two putniks.

Thus, the Tsar’s Choir was a unique choral instrument, made up of similar but individual voices, which either diverged or came together, performing chants of varying complexity and significance. Chanting in unison was interspersed with polyphonic singing, the latter sparkling like the bright gems of royal and patriarchal vestments against a background flow of monody. Further, in the performance of polyphony, the put’ line sounded dominant, reflecting the larger number of singers, while the other lines, like lace ornaments, encircled the monophonic stem of the chant.

Contemporary performers of polyphony would be able to follow the structure of these choirs, singing in small groups, with a similar distribution of singers across the lines of polyphonic music. The documentary evidence presented here invites such an experiment.