



**JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY
FOR ORTHODOX CHURCH MUSIC**

Vol. 6 (1), Section II: Non-refereed articles, pp. 149-160

ISSN 2342-1258

<https://doi.org/10.57050/jisocm.113326>

**THE ALL-NIGHT VIGIL
IN EARLY RUSSIAN DEMESTVENNY POLYPHONY
(ADD. MS 30063 OF THE BRITISH LIBRARY)**

PRESENTATION OF THE CRITICAL EDITION

ELENA CHERNOVA

tschernowa@googlemail.com

University of Heidelberg

In modern musicology, which studies various polyphonic traditions intensively, it would appear that there are no longer any unknown types of polyphony and undiscovered forms of notating music. The most exotic musical phenomena have been researched and transcribed, and a good many of them have been digitized. Still, one must recognize that the focus of these studies up until now has been predominantly on Western and Central European polyphonic schools, while one significant polyphonic tradition, namely, early Russian polyphony, which, moreover, occupied a fairly extensive historical period, is only now beginning to be investigated systematically.

The purpose of this article is to introduce my project involving a critical edition of Russian neumatic polyphony¹. This edition is the culmination of my work on deciphering neumatic scores of the most festive type of early Russian polyphony—four-part Demestvenny singing (or Demestvo). The object of the present study is the Demestvenny All-Night Vigil recorded in a unique source—a ceremonial illuminated codex belonging to the 17th-century Choir of the Tsar's and Patriarchal Singing Clerics, which is now kept in the British Library—Add. MS 30063.

1 The edition is planned as part of the dissertation project "The All-Night Vigil in early Russian polyphony," which I am preparing under the guidance of Professor Dr Christoph Flamm at the Musicology Seminar of the University of Heidelberg. Within its scope, the dissertation examines three types of early Russian polyphony using examples from the All-Night Vigil office. A comprehensive analysis of the hymns themselves will be included in the dissertation but remains outside the scope of this publication.

OLD RUSSIAN POLYPHONY

For more than two centuries, liturgical singing within the Russian state—as practiced by the tsar’s choir (the Tsar’s Singing Clerics), the choir of the Moscow Patriarch (the Patriarchal Singing Clerics and Sub-clerics), and some of the leading choirs of large diocesan cathedrals, consisted of melismatic, predominantly dissonant polyphony of two types: 1) Troestrochny polyphony, or Troestrochie (three-part “linear” polyphony, also known as Strochnoy polyphony, from *stroka*, meaning “line” or “voice”; with the respective voices taking their names from their position in the vocal texture: *Niz*—“bottom,” *Put’*—“path” or “way,” and *Verkh*—“top”); and 2) Demestvenny polyphony, or Demestvo (four-part polyphony, with the voices likewise taking their names from their functional positions: *Niz*, *Put’*, and *Verkh*,² plus the more soloistic part—the *Demestvo*³). These two types of polyphony were recorded using staffless neumatic notation, which at the apex of the tradition took the form of three- and four-part neumatic scores.⁴

This polyphonic tradition, which throughout its duration remained outside the direct influences of Western European music, reached its culmination in the second half of the seventeenth century, at the same time marking the end point in the development of Russian late-Mediaeval chant.

The dissonant sonority of this polyphony—the result of dissonances arising from clashes between simultaneously sounding voices—is beyond doubt today. This can be unambiguously seen from neumatic sources that, starting from the 1670s, are also supplied with diastematic marks (*stepennye pomety*), and also reflected in the surviving staff notation transcriptions of this early polyphony (for example, the MSS ГИМ Муз. 564, РНБ Q.I.875, ГИМ СИН. певч. 658)⁵. The key to its interpretation and transcription starts with

2 In Demestvenny polyphony, the upper voice *Verkh* is a derivative of the *Put’*. Therefore, it is often missing in incompletely notated three-part scores.

3 The naming of the voices *Put’* and *Demestvo* refers to the function of the voices in the polyphonic texture and not to any pre-existing monodic prototypes. Existing early monodic recordings of the Putevoy chant correspond, on the one hand, to the *Put’* voice of Troestrochie, and on the other, contain some typical features of polyphony, among them the element **ж**.

Because the term “Demestvo” is used both in reference to one of the two types of early Russian polyphony—four-part Demestvo, and also to designate the voice part that is one of the constituent voices in this type of polyphony, within the framework of this publication a distinction will be made in spelling: the designation of the polyphonic voice part will italicized. Likewise the names of all the voices of Demestvenny polyphony will be italicized in order to identify these specialized terms unambiguously.

4 Demestvenny polyphony is mentioned in period documents as the most solemn type of early Russian liturgical singing. In historical sources, the mention of Demestvo is accompanied by such epithets as “*samoe prekrasnoe demestvennoe penie*” (“the most magnificent Demestvenny singing”), “*prekrasnoe demestvennoe penie*” (“beautiful Demestvenny singing”), “*ot musikiiskogo krasnoglasiia*” (“[belonging to] the beautiful sonority of music”), “*izlozhennoe o[t] prekrasna[go] osmo[g]llásiia o[t] drévní[kh] premu[d]ry[kh] rítor*” (“coming from the wonderful Eight-Tone chant [as bequeathed by] venerable and most-wise teachers”). There is still no consensus in the research discourse about the origin of the historical term “*Demestvo*” (and its derivatives “*Demestvenny*,” “*Demestvenny singing*,” “*Demestvennik*”), but in the end all hypotheses are reduced to a single common root—the Greek *δομέστικός* (Latin *domesticus*).

5 The erroneous view of some researchers up to the 1960s may be attributed, among other things, to a note from Stepan Smolensky in the MS ГИМ СИН. певч. 182, which he named as “*Litorgija trehstrochno-krjukovaja*”, which led to the perception of the consonant three-part polyphony of the late 17th century as “*Troestrochie*.” On account of researchers’ auditory experience with the consonant music of European and Russian Romanticism at the beginning of the 20th century, they refused to accept the dissonant nature of this polyphony.

the sources written in staff notation. All these sources are in score format, so they were clearly intended to be read as a score. If we look closer, we will find multivoice formulas shared by various hymns in different sources. Moreover, the comparison of these different sources containing one and the same polyphonic hymn shows that they coincide regardless of the form of notation used. A few historical accounts, containing fragmentary descriptions of early polyphony also relate auditory impressions that significantly differ from the consonant qualities of contemporaneous European polyphony.

The origin of Old Russian polyphony goes back to the middle of the 15th century. The research literature traditionally mentions the first reference to Demestvo, which is contained in the Moscow Grand Ducal Chronicle Codex of 1479. It documents the fact that, shortly before his death, Prince Dimitri the Red (before 1421-1440) “began to sing in Demestvenny style ‘Praise the Lord and highly exalt Him through all the ages,’”⁶ which, at the very least, affirms the existence of Demestvenny singing at the time of writing the chronicle, and possibly even before 1440.⁷

Early Russian polyphony arose and continued until the end as not only an elite art, but also as one directly associated with leading figures of state and church. In addition to the Tsar and the Moscow Patriarch, traditional polyphony is documented to have been practiced in the cathedrals of significant episcopal sees—Novgorod, Kholmogory, Vologda, Rostov, and Pskov. The singers who performed this polyphony were nurtured within a professional community, which consisted of “members of the local Russian Orthodox population”⁸, with the training taking place within closely knit guilds.

It is not entirely clear when early Russian polyphony began to be recognized as a distinctly different style or species of liturgical chant. According to available data, hymns composed in Demestvenny polyphony historically predate Troestrochny hymns. My study of the hymn “By the waters of Babylon” (titled *Na retse vavilonstei* in early sources⁹) shows that

It is a known fact that the amateur-musicologist and manuscript collector Vladimir Odoevsky denied the very existence of dissonant polyphony, noting on the title page of the manuscript with Troestrochny Feasts in staff notation that the possibility that these three voices were ever meant to sound together must be excluded.

It is important to note, however, that some researchers, for example, Viktor Belyaev, already in the 1940s transcribed Troestrochie as a dissonant type of polyphony. The situation changed definitively only in the late 1980s, with the discovery of several early 18th-century sources containing transcriptions of dissonant polyphony in staff notation.

6 Полное собрание русских летописей [The complete collected Russian chronicles]. vol. 25 (Moscow–Leningrad, 1949), 261.

7 Based on this account, Johann von Gardner supposed that the prince could have sung one of the voices of a polyphonic hymn, “which, being the fourth voice in a four-part version, later came to be called the ‘demestvo.’” Иванъ А. Гарднеръ, *Богослужбное пѣніе Русской Православной Церкви* [The Liturgical Singing of the Russian Orthodox Church], Vol. 1 (Jordanville: New York, 1978), 432.

8 Евгений Е. Воробьев, “Многогласные идиомы московского патриархата в этносоциальном контексте между 1650 и 1750 гг.” [“Polyphonic idioms of the Moscow Patriarchate in ethnosocial context between 1650 and 1750”]. (Conference paper, *Русское музыкальное барокко: тенденции и перспективы исследования*, Moscow, 19.11.2019). I express my gratitude to the author Evgeny Vorobyov for the opportunity to become acquainted with his research prior to publication.

9 For example, the MS of the State Historical Museum in Moscow, Uvarov collection, ГИМ Увар. 692/904-4 (dated from the 1520s) fol. 426v – 428v, contains a Demestvenny setting of “By the waters of

as early as the 1520s and 1530s, Demestvo was sung in at least two voices, as evidenced by early manuscripts containing this chant with an additional “*Verkh*” part. The notation of this part is not yet amenable to correct transcription.

The first notated examples of individual voice parts date from the first half of the 16th century¹⁰, and only with the beginning of the 17th century does one encounter all four voices notated simultaneously in a single manuscript¹¹. This fact is connected with the implementation of the new form of neumatic notation that was specially invented for recording polyphony in written form. The new neumatic notation is variously referred to in the sources as “*putnoe znamia*” (“put’ signs”—from “*Put*,” the name of the voice part and the type of chant); “*kliuchevoe znamia*” (“key signs”—from the name of the main sign that characterizes this notation, the “*kliuch*” [key] and its derivatives, “*mechik kliuchevoi*” [little sword key] and “*kriuk kliuchevoi*” [hook key]); and “*kazanskoe znamia*” (“Kazan signs”¹² – presumably named after the most important geopolitical event of the time period when this type of notation arose—the conquest of the city of Kazan).¹³

Throughout the entire period of its existence early Russian polyphony followed the mediaeval principle of “one text—one chant;” that is, it did not allow multiple options for the musical setting of a given liturgical text. Each liturgical office, whether sung in Troestrochie or Demestvo, exists in just one setting in the respective type of polyphony, with different manuscripts containing copies of the same Troestrochny and Demestvenny compositions, except for variants of some particularly significant chants, which appear to the mid-17th century.

According to current research, both types of polyphony initially emerged as polyphonic types: Troestrochie as a functional monophony (with two external voices—*Niz* and *Verkh* subordinated to the primary voice—the

Babylon” notated in Znamenny notation. In addition to Psalm 136 and the royal Polychronion, early manuscripts often contain another Demestvenny chant: the hymn “Memory Eternal.” See also: the MSS Кир.-Бел. №652/909 fol. 245r–246r (1557–1558) and Кир.-Бел. №569/826 fol. 295r–296r of the Russian National Library in Saint Petersburg, and the MSS F. 304/1 №415 fol. 181v–182v and F. 304/1 №428 fol. 366r–368r of the Russian State Library in Moscow.

10 MS СоЛ. 690/763 of the Russian National Library in Saint Petersburg (dating from the 1580s) fol. 274v–276r contains this hymn, notated already in three voices *demestvo-Put’-Niz*.

11 Demestvennik of the Russian National Music Museum Moscow F. 283 № 15, dating from the years 1606-1610.

12 In the current discourse, there is no consensus regarding the name of this special type of notation for writing down early Russian polyphony. Thus, one finds various designations, including: “Putny” and “Demestvenny” notation used by those researchers who differentiate between these two subspecies depending on the type of polyphony; “Putno-Demestvenny” notation; and “Kazan” notation. Based on the fact that all three types of early Russian polyphony, at least in the seventeenth century, use the same special type of notation (which is distinct from either Stolp [Znamenny] and square-note staff notation), and are differentiated solely by the dominance of certain signs as opposed to others; the use of some additional signs (such as the *fit* or a special form of the *statia* and some other signs found in Troestrochie but not in Demestvo); or, conversely, by limiting the number of musical symbols used (as in the predominantly consonant polyphonic type), this publication will use the designation “Kazan” notation, as the only historical one still in use today. This terminology, however, is conditional and not directly related to the style of the polyphony itself.

13 This hypothesis was first expressed by Ivan Sakharov (И.П. Сахаров, “Исследования о русском церковном песнопении [Studies on Russian Church Chant],” *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* 61 (1849): 157; 63 (1849): 9. Afterwards this position was reflected in the works of Dimitry Razumovsky, Vasily Metallov, Stepan Smolensky, and others.

Put'), and Demestvo as functional two-voice polyphony¹⁴ (the *Niz* and *Verkh* collectively subordinated to the *Put'* voice plus a contrasting voice, the *Demestvo*), which is opposite to the idea of a pre-existing cantus firmus, typical of early Western polyphony.

Both types of polyphony are constructed on the basis of the formulaic centonic principle, transferred to a polyphonic texture, whereby polyphonic blocks interact with varying degrees of complexity—from simple “stringing together” of extended melismatic melodic formulas of the Octoechos in Troestrochie to multi-layered combinations assembled both horizontally and vertically in Demestvo.

Already by the beginning of the 17th century, the entire liturgical cycle of Russian Orthodox church hymns, starting with the Octoechos, was composed in Troestrochie. This type of polyphony thus has a corresponding range of polyphonic Eight-Tone formulas; certain elements of Troestrochie are notated according to the principle of *tainozamknennost'*—“secret encoding”; Troestrochie contains *fity* and mutations. The Troestrochny repertoire thus practically replicates the repertoire of monophonic Znamenny chant, which continues to exist as the fundamental type of liturgical singing practice in the 17th century.

Demestvo, on the other hand, is focused on hymns of two main services—the All-Night Vigil and the Divine Liturgy. It does not follow the principle of the Octoechos, and any designations of Tones in manuscripts refer exclusively to the texts of the hymns and not to their musical content, reflecting the practice of Tone designations in certain hymnographic genres. “Secret encoding” and the use of mutation are not characteristic of Demestvo.

Therefore, because of its use of Eight-Tone formulas, the presence of *fity* and mutations, as well as the many genres it embraces, Troestrochie is the more diverse type of early Russian polyphony, while Demestvo, though limited to a rather small inventory of formulas, is structurally more complex.

In the vast corpus of manuscript sources from the “Old Russian era” (up to 1700), which includes many thousands of manuscripts, the percentage of sources containing polyphonic compositions is relatively small: about two hundred manuscripts include polyphony of one or several types, among which the prevailing portion contains Troestrochny hymns and only about forty Demestvo¹⁵. This circumstance is dictated not only by the complexity of early Russian polyphony and its notation and the length of time needed to train singers to sing it, but also by the elite

14 The term was established by Evgeny V. Gippius and used in music ethnography: Маргарита А. Енговатова & Борислава Б. Ефименкова, “К вопросу типологии песенного многоголосия [On the typology of Russian song polyphony],” in *Мир традиционной культуры*, сост. М.А. Енговатова & Б. Б. Ефименкова, т. 174 (Москва, 2008), 54-57. In relation to Troestrochie and Demestvo, the term first applied by Vorobyov, in Воробьев, “Многоголосные идиомы московского патриархата.”

15 The absolute majority of the Old Russian manuscripts with neumatic polyphony are held in the Russian archives, but three significant manuscripts outside of Russia are known: two in the British Library and one in Bibliothèque nationale de France (plus one more containing selected polyphonic hymns in Wrocław).

status of the tradition itself: the prevailing part of the sources containing Troestrochny and Demestvenny polyphonic hymns are related directly to the choirs of the Tsar and the Patriarch.

STATE OF RESEARCH

Today, Demestvenny polyphony and Troestrochie, written in Kazan notation with diastematic marks, can be deciphered. To achieve the correct decoding, several manuscript copies of the same hymn must be collated. If only a small number or no additional copies are available, passages of doubtful interpretation can be clarified by finding and collating analogous formulas in other hymns where the reading is unambiguous. Nonetheless, in the case of some rarely occurring hymns with unusual, lengthy melismas, the transcription may remain open to doubt, and will only be resolved when additional copies in other manuscripts are discovered in the future.

Despite the fact that most of the sources of early Russian polyphony from the Russian archives are already known, and some of the hymns therein have been transcribed, there are as yet no detailed scientific editions of these sources; there are no catalogues of musical incipits, or even a systematic list with a universal description of the sources (the descriptions are scattered in different studies by different authors).

EDITION PROJECT

The present project thus stands to become the first critical facsimile edition with transcriptions of the hymns constituting a single liturgical service—the All-Night Vigil—set forth in the most solemn type of early Russian polyphony—four-part Demestvo.

MAIN SOURCE

The main source of this edition is Add. MS 30063¹⁶ from the illuminated manuscript collection of the British Museum, currently held in the British Library. This manuscript, as I have determined, originates from the repertoire of the singers at the Uspensky Cathedral of the Moscow Kremlin. It is a festive, ceremonial codex, quite magnificent in its quality, which is manifested by its lavish decoration and the correctness and precision of its notation. Four-part Demestvo constitutes about 80% of the source's repertoire; thus the manuscript can be classified as a book of the *Demestvennik* category. In terms of its contents and quality, the source has no parallels among all polyphonic neumatic sources either inside or outside Russia.

The five watermarks¹⁷ do not allow the MS to be clearly dated. There are also no entries in this codex that could help with the dating. Based on

¹⁶ The manuscript size is 25.5x19 cm, 4 °, 349 fol. Modern-day binding, smooth blue leather on cardboard.

¹⁷ Watermarks: 1. Arms of Amsterdam, Churchill 25 (1690); 2. The same on thinner paper; 3. Arms of Amsterdam, Churchill 13 (1675); 4. Seven Provinces, Churchill 109 (1656); 5. Blurred, possibly another variant of Seven Provinces or Strasbourg Lily.

the state of the notation, characteristics of the text, the graphic specificity of some signs, and other details, we may assume that the main part of the codex was written in the last 10 or the first years of the 18th century.

A significant portion of the manuscript consists of an extensive All-Night Vigil: 110 folios with 37 hymns, not including the magnifications, the endings of troparia and other small changeable elements of the office. The uniqueness of this manuscript lies in the fact that the source quite fully reflects the practice of performing this office in a single type of polyphony—Demestvenny, and comprises all four voices in the form of a score. The source notates various versions of the hymns of the All-Night Vigil: many hymns are given in two, and some even in three different versions. Most of the hymns in the manuscript have no four-part analogues in other sources, and some are not found at all in other manuscripts. Thus, Add. MS 30063 is one of the most significant Demestvenny manuscripts in that it captures the practice of Demestvenny polyphony in unparalleled detail and scope at the point of its highest flowering and contains the most complete Demestvenny All-Night Vigil known to date.

In addition to the All-Night Vigil in Demestvo, the manuscript contains an extensive second section featuring stichera for various feasts and saints, the Liturgy of Presanctified Gifts, the 11 Gospel stichera¹⁸ (all in Demestvo). A third section is devoted to the chants “pro defunctis”¹⁹: it contains the *Panikhida* in the other polyphonic type, Troestrochie, followed by a three-part “consonant” *Panikhida* with the remark “*grecheskaia* (“Greek”), and some chants for the burial of monastics in Demestvo. At the end of the manuscript, a fragment (two collations) has been added containing four-part consonant chant arrangements based on Znamenny and Demestvenny cantus firmi. This section is written by another hand, on a different paper with a different watermark. The final chants in the manuscript, again written by the first hand, belong to the office of the Divine Liturgy, which is completely missing here, with this single exception.

GB-LBL ADD. MS 30063. REPERTOIRE

I. Section

- fol. 1r–110v **All-Night Vigil** (Demestvo): Great Vespers fol. 1r–20v; Orthros [Matins] fol. 20v–110v

II. Section

- fol. 111r–190r **Stichera** and other chants for feasts and saints (Demestvo)
- fol. 190v–199v **Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts**, incomplete (Demestvo)
- fol. 199v–251v **Stichera** and other chants for feasts and saints (Demestvo)
- fol. 252r–288v **Gospel stichera** (Demestvo)

III. Section

- fol. 289r–297 **Panikhida** (Troestrochie)
- fol. 298r–307r **Panikhida** („*grecheskaia*“, three-part, fol. 306v–307r Memory eternal – Demestvo)
- fol. 308r–314r Chants of the monastic burial (Demestvo)

18 The Gospel stichera were not previously known in this style of polyphony.

19 The paleographic analysis shows that this section was created later.

- fol. 314r–324r Chants of the monastic burial (consonant four-part polyphony, another hand)

Miscellaneous:

- fol. 324r–332r Stichera of the Paraklesis („*grecheskie*“, another hand)
- fol. 333r–346v *Only begotten Son* (from the Divine liturgy, Demestvo, 3 variants, first hand)
- fol. 337v–346v Makarismoï (from the Divine liturgy, Demestvo, first hand)

Although the Polychronia (fol. 107r – 110v) contain only a place holder (“*imiarek*”–“insert name”) the mention of only the tsar and the patriarch indicates the likely Moscow origin of the manuscript. The presence of the “Eis polla” in the Many years is indicative of a hierarchical service, as is the short hymn “Save, O Christ God,” sung in the presence of the patriarch.

The numerous initials in the manuscript are executed with rich floral designs. The book edge is gilt and stamped. The design of the first sheet has a gold cross-section and an engraved headpiece-frame containing a depiction of the Resurrection: Christ’s Descent into Hades, which by its style can be attributed to the hand of the royal engraver and iconographer of the Silver Chamber, Leonty Bunin²⁰. This hypothesis is confirmed by Anatoly Turilov’s remark²¹ that this engraver is credited with producing the engraved headpieces portraying the twelve great feasts of the Orthodox church calendar (with the exception of the Nativity of the Virgin), as well as the Mother of God of the Caves, the Maltese cross, and Holy Week, around the year 1677. I found an identical headpiece-frame in the neumatic collection of hymns of the Russian National Museum of Music²². All these details, taken together, as well as the well-preserved state of the MS, indicate that we are dealing with a ceremonial manuscript that most likely belonged to the Patriarchal (but possibly also the Tsar’s) Choir.

The manuscript Add. MS 30063 was transferred to the British Library as part of a collection of illuminated manuscripts from the British Museum, which purchased it at Sotheby’s in 1876 as part of an extensive collection of illuminated manuscripts belonging to the British collector William Bragge (as evidenced by the entry on the left flyleaf “Purchased as Sotheby’s. Bragge’s sale. June 7-10, 1876”).²³

20 As far as it can be determined, the same handwriting is used in two sections of the convolute, frequently mentioned in the research literature, held in the Russian State Library in Moscow, F. 218 No. 343: fol. 467r – 536r, 552r – 588r.

21 Анатолий А. Турилов, “Заметки дилетанта на полях «Словаря русских иконописцев XVI–XVII вв.»,” *Древняя Русь. Вопросы медиевистики* 4(30) (2007): 123.

22 Fol. 144r of the MS listed as № 5 in the book *Духовная среда России: Певческие книги и иконы XVII – начала XX веков*, сост. Марина П. Рахманова (Москва, 1996), 18, 26.

23 William Bragge (1823-1884) was a British railway engineer and passionate collector of illuminated manuscripts and manuscripts of rare calligraphy, which he collected around the world, thanks to the fact that he was sent by British companies to various countries in Europe, Latin and North America, and Russia for the building of railways. Presumably in 1858, upon his return from Latin America, Bragge paid a working visit to Russia, where he acquired this manuscript. Further information may be held in the archives of Sheffield, which contains Bragge’s letters and documents, including a photograph allegedly taken during a trip to Russia. In 1876, shortly before his death, William Bragge sold the manuscript as part of his huge collection of manuscripts (about one and a half thousand items) at a Sotheby’s auction to the British Museum. There were no other Russian music manuscripts in the Bragge’s collection.

Add. MS 30063 was re-discovered by Ivan Alekseevich [Johann von] Gardner in the early 1960s in the course of his source studies carried out in 1956–1978 in the archives of eight countries (Germany, Great Britain, France, Italy, Finland, Belgium, Poland, and the USA),²⁴ and first described in his 1961 article on the Old Russian neumatic manuscripts in the libraries of Belgium and England.²⁵ Of the 31 manuscripts he found, Add. MS 30063 is undoubtedly the most important source. Furthermore, the manuscript is mentioned in Gardner's dissertation on Demestvenny chant, presented in Munich in 1967.²⁶ Its paleographic description appears in Ralph Cleminson's catalogue of Cyrillic manuscripts in British and Irish collections.²⁷

In an irony of history, what may well be considered the most important source of early Russian polyphony is currently held outside Russia and has not yet been properly investigated.

EDITION

The purpose of my edition project is, to present, on the basis of one of the two most important offices in Russian Orthodox divine worship—the All-Night Vigil, a complete picture of how this office was sung in practice, employing the most solemn type of early Russian polyphony, four-part Demestvenny. Furthermore, the publication offers a detailed description of a unique source of paramount importance, which not only contains the most complete Demestvenny All-Night Vigil, but also a number of other four-part Demestvenny hymns, as well as some hymns in Troestrochny and consonant three- and four-part polyphony, many of which appear in already known sources in incomplete form or were previously not known at all, while making the source available in facsimile.

The publication includes an annotated (bilingual Russian/English) edition of the complete facsimile with transcriptions and a comprehensive critical apparatus.

From the main source Add. MS 30063, thirty-seven hymns of the All-Night Vigil in Demestvenny polyphony were transcribed—all significant and independent compositions, not including the magnifications, the endings of troparia, and other small changeable elements of the office.

24 Funded by the Russian Orthodox Theological Fund Inc., New York.

25 Johann von Gardner, "Die altrussischen Neumen-Handschriften in den Bibliotheken von Belgien und England," *Die Welt der Slaven* 6 (1961): 308–311; also mentioned in his monograph, *Иванъ А. Гарднеръ, Богослужбное пѣнiе*, 132.

26 Johann von Gardner, "Das Problem des altrussischen demestischen Kirchengesangs und seiner linienlosen Notation," in *Slavistische Beiträge*, Vol. 25 (Munich: Sagner, 1967). <https://opacplus.bsb-muenchen.de/title/BV005643573> (last access 15.12.2021).

27 *A Union Catalogue of Cyrillic Manuscripts in British and Irish Collections: The Anne Pennington catalogue*, comp. by R. Cleminson; gen. ed. V. Du Feu, W. F. Ryan (London: School of Slavonic and East European Studies, Univ. of London, 1988), 92–94.

Great Vespers

1. Благословн дѣше моѡ гвѡпода
2. Блаженз мѡжз
3. Свѣте тнхнѣ
4. Свѣте тнхнѣ Бѡшѡнѣ
5. Господь воцарнѣ
6. Господь воцарнѣ Бѡшѡнѣ
7. Свѣте тнхнѣ Інз рѡпѣвз
8. Богз нашъ на небесн
9. Кто богз велѣн
10. Кто богз велѣн Болшеѣ рѡпѣв
11. С нами богз
12. Бѡди нма господне
- *36. С нами богз Малой Роспѣ^Б
- *37. Богороднице дѣво радѣнѣ²⁸

Orthros [Matins]

13. Аллѣліа, ѣктенѣ
14. Богз господь
15. Богз господь Болшеѣ рѡпѣвз
16. Хвалите нма господне
17. На рекахз вавилоникнхз
18. Благословенз єси господн
19. Свѣтнѣ свѣтнѣ
20. Свѣтнѣ свѣтнѣ Інз рѡ
21. Ѡ юности моѡ
22. Ѡ юности моѡ
23. Вѣкѡвѣ дыханіѣ
24. Вѣкѡвѣ дыханіѣ Інз рѡпѣвз
25. Вокрѣвз нѣдѣз ѡтѣз грѡба
26. Величитѣ дѣша моѡ гвѡпода
27. Свѣтѣз господь
28. Свѣтѣз господь Болшѡнѣ
29. Прѣблагѡсловена єси
30. Слава вьшннхз богѡ
31. Слава вьшннхз бѡгѡ
32. Многа лѣта царю
33. Благовѣрномѡ царю
34. Свѣтѣншемѡ нмрѣк патрїархѡ
35. Спаси хрнстѣ боже

OTHER SOURCES USED

In preparing the publication, in addition to the main source, the known copies of Demestvenny hymns of the All-night Vigil from seven manuscripts were collated and a comparative analysis of each hymn was carried out, the results of which are set forth in the Critical Notes.

Only one of the collated sources uses staff notation ГИМ Муз. 564²⁹; the other six sources are neumatic manuscripts. One of these—Paris BnF Slave 59³⁰—has only one additional voice, the *Verkh* of Demestvenny polyphony; the other five MSS are held in different archives in Moscow and Saint Petersburg:

28 These two hymns are placed outside of the section containing the All-Night Vigil.

29 RUS-Mim [ГИМ] Муз. 564 of the State Historical Museum, Moscow, Museum collection: a collection of liturgical hymns from different services in the two types of early Russian polyphony—Troestrochie and Demestvo, 1696-1723, Vologda diocese; three- and four-part score, square-note “Kievan” staff notation.

30 F-Pn Slave 59 of the Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris: *Demestvennik*, the *Verkh* of four-part Demestvo, dates from the reign of Alexei Mikhailovich, Tsarina Maria II’inchna and the tenure of Patriarch Joseph 1648-1652, (presumed) origin: the Choir of the Tsar or Patriarch, Kazan neumatic notation.

- *Demestvennik* F. 283 № 15 of the Russian National Music Museum Moscow—the earliest known source containing all four parts of Demestvenny polyphony³¹;
- БАН Романч. 18, containing three of the four parts³²;
- *Demestvennik*, partbook: *Niz* (only the lower voice) with a very extensive corpus of demestvenny chants of various offices recorded with one part of Demestvenny polyphony РГБ F. 37 Nr. 364³³;
- РГБ F. 379 Nr. 81 with selected hymns of the All-Night Vigil and Polychronia as a three-part score³⁴;
- ГИМ Син. певч. 151 with portions of the Demestvenny All-Night Vigil as a three- and four-part score³⁵.

Given the absence of similar publications in the field of early Russian polyphony and the fact that by most parameters the present study differed from other publications of Western European and Eastern Christian neumatic sources, the norms and format for this publication had to be developed anew, based on the specific requirements of the research topic and the purpose of the publication. One had to take into account the synchronicity of the two forms used to convey the musical material—staff notation and neumatic notation; two parallel transcriptions of the text—the original, seventeenth-century Church Slavonic text with its idiosyncratic division of syllables and a Latin-alphabet transliteration, inclusive of all the signs used in the original text; and finally, the possibility of including commentary with references within the transcription itself.

Taking into consideration all of the aforementioned factors, the central focus of the edition was to convey the original source as precisely as possible.

The edition includes a comprehensive Critical Report, containing notes accumulated during the transcription process and the analysis of the analogous sources. The Critical Notes contain the following parameters: the title or the incipit of the hymn in the main source in original and in transliteration; additional notes in the main source (if any); liturgical name / category / hymnographic genre; parallel copies in other sources with their main parameters: folio numbers, form of notation, textual form, distinguishing characteristics; notes to the transcription: points of doubt or moments with multiple readings, mistakes or blurring in the MS; corrections

31 RUS-Mcm [PHMM] F. 283 No. 15: *Demestvennik*, 1606-1610, origin (presumably): the Tsar's Choir or the Patriarch's Choir, four voices, notated in alternation (DNVP), Kazan neumatic notation, without diastematic marks.

32 RUS-SPan [БАН] Романч. 18 of the Library of the Russian Academy of Sciences, collection of N. F. Romanchenko: a collection of hymns from the Obikhod in Demestvo and Troestrochie, as well as individual hymns in predominantly consonant polyphony, 1650-1670s, presumably of Muscovite origin, a score predominately in three voices.

33 RUS-Mrg [РГБ] F. 37 № 364 of the Russian State Library, Moscow, the T. F. Bol'shakov collection: *Demestvennik*, the *Niz* of Demestvenny polyphony, dating from 1645-1652.

34 RUS-Mrg [РГБ] F. 379 № 81 of the Russian State Library, Moscow, the Archpriest D. V. Razumovsky collection: a collection of hymns from the Obikhod, the third quarter of the seventeenth century, Kazan and Znamenny notation, two- and three-part scores, Demestvo, Troestrochie.

35 RUS-Mim [ГИМ] Син. певч. 151 of the State Historical Museum, Moscow, Synodal Chant Collection: a collection of polyphonic hymns for different services: Demestvo and Troestrochie, 1691-1700, provenance undeterminable, Kazan notation, two- to four-voice scores partially containing diastematic marks and *priznaki*, repertoire: Troestrochie and Demestvo.

or variants / marginal notes in the manuscript, formula-related neumes or ligatures with an irregular reading, special features in the spelling of this manuscript.

The introduction includes an overview of early Russian polyphony: its three types and notation; characteristics of the Demestvenny type of polyphony; the state of research; a comprehensive description of the main source; descriptions of the other sources used; methodology of transcription; comments to the editing process; analytical paragraphs on special aspects of Demestvenny polyphony: clausulae, initial formulas, middle formulas, the element **Ѧ**, kratime; an index of neumes and ligatures; the texts of the hymns: original, transliteration, translation.

The facsimile part includes color digital copies of the entire main source and examples from the other sources used.

The main source GB-Lbl Add. MS 30063 has been entered in the global catalogue of the Répertoire International des Sources Musicales, with detailed description of all included chants, over 200 in total.

The publication will take place in hybrid form: in open access and as a printed book.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Воробьев, Евгений Е. "Многогласные идиомы московского патриархата в этносоциальном контексте между 1650 и 1750 гг." Conference paper, Русское музыкальное барокко: тенденции и перспективы исследования, Moscow, 19.11.2019.

Духовная среда России: Певческие книги и иконы XVII – начала XX веков, сост. Марина П. Рахманова. Москва, 1996.

Енговатова Маргарита А. & Ефименкова, Борислава Б. "К вопросу типологии песенного многоголосия." In *Мир традиционной культуры*, сост. М.А. Енговатова & Б. Б. Ефименкова, т. 174. Москва, 2008.

Гарднеръ, Иванъ А. *Богослужбное пѣніе Русской Православной Церкви*. Vol. 1. Jordanville: New York, 1978.

Сахаровъ Иванъ П. "Изслѣдованія о русскомъ церковномъ пѣснопеніи." *Журналь Министерства народнаго просвѣщенія* 61 и 63 (1849).

Полное собрание русских летописей, Vol. 25. Moscow–Leningrad, 1949.

Турилов, Анатолий А. "Заметки дилетанта на полях «Словаря русских иконописцев XVI–XVII вв.»." *Древняя Русь. Вопросы медиевистики* 4(30) (2007): 112-126.

Gardner, Johann von. "Das Problem des altrussischen demestischen Kirchengesangs und seiner linienlosen Notation." In *Slavistische Beiträge*, Vol. 25. Munich: Sagner, 1967. <https://opacplus.bsb-muenchen.de/title/BV005643573>.

Gardner, Johann von. "Die altrussischen Neumen-Handschriften in den Bibliotheken von Belgien und England." *Die Welt der Slaven* 6 (1961): 305–320.

A Union Catalogue of Cyrillic Manuscripts in British and Irish Collections: The Anne Pennington catalogue, comp. by R. Cleminson; gen. ed. V. Du Feu, W. F. Ryan. London: School of Slavonic and East European Studies, Univ. of London, 1988.