



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

Ed. Ivan Moody & Maria Takala-Roszczenko
Vol. 2, Section I: Peer-reviewed Articles, pp. 44-50 ISSN 2342-1258
<https://journal.fi/jisocm>

THE KIEV THEOLOGICAL ACADEMY CHOIR: ORGANIZATION, TRADITION AND EXPERIMENTATION

NATALIYA KOSTYUK

M.T. Rylsky Institute of Art, Folklore Studies and Ethnology, Kiev, Ukraine
natalyakost22@gmail.com

The Kiev Theological Academy (KTA; officially established 28 September 1819 on the basis of the disbanded Kiev-Mohyla Academy), the only Ukrainian establishment offering higher theological education, played a very significant role in the development and preservation of the national tradition of spiritual choral music. Yet the high quality of the Academy's Choir was achieved after a serious crisis which led to the strict regulation of the choristers' spare time and the prohibition of singing without printed scores. Singing folk songs and practicing music outside the Academy were prohibited as well. In the past, these aspects of the students' life had not only provided an organic connection with their environment but had also helped new music spread. Moreover, they allowed new elements to enter traditional choral performance.

Many poor choristers walked the streets of Kiev every day during dinner time [...] singing sacred verses [...]. Even the students who studied higher disciplines were not ashamed to sing in choirs like the younger ones and to glorify different saints and miraculous icons in that way, creating their own parts ("partes"). [...] And such singing continued not just for one or two or three years, but for a whole century, from year to year!¹

As a result of the standardization of education in the Russian Empire, the former thriving choral singing tradition, flavoured with national features, gradually diminished. Following the Decree of 1789 and the initiative of Igumen Iryney Falkovskyy² of the Kievan Brotherhood Monastery, a study programme of musical notation and "irmological" singing was established in 1803. The curriculum featured the study of reading music, the hymns for the All-Night Vigil, the antiphons and dogmatika. The teaching material that was used included *Pravila dlya notnogo irmologiyynogo peniya* (Rules for Notated Irmologion Singing) by G. Baranovych (between 1799–1804), *Krug prostago tserkovnago peniya, izdavna upotreblyаемaya pri Vysochayshem Dvore* (Cycle of plain church singing, used from ancient times at the Imperial Court, 1830), *The Irmologion of Pochaiv* (1796, 1816), and others transmitting the musical practice of those days. The last conductor of the choir, until 1813, was Joseph Makhnovych. Shortly after this, musical disciplines were taken off the curriculum, the teaching of notation and orchestra were liquidated and group singing was forbidden.

As a result, the general level of choral singing became essentially lower and choral activity was sometimes noticeable only in the field of church singing. One of the basic reasons for such

1 Булгаков 1843, 106.

2 Iryney (secular name: Ivan Yakymovych Falkovsky, 11 June 1762 – 12 May 1823), bishop in the Russian Orthodox Church (ROC). After graduating from different West European educational establishments in 1783, he entered the KTA as a student of theology. In May 1803 he became the *igumen* of the Kievan Brotherhood Monastery and the Rector of the KTA.

a state of things was the administrative division between the Choir and the Seminary. As a result, children's voices were not represented in the Choir during the period 1819–1824. This led to a narrow repertoire of compositions that were performable. These measures weakened contacts with the outside world and transformed the KTA into a purely theological institution; all interrelations with folk music and domestic musical performance became complicated. The most serious crisis occurred after the graduation of students in 1823; the Choir with its 200 years of history practically ceased to function for some time. The older performing traditions were cultivated during this crisis in the Brotherhood Monastery³ where musical compositions from the national spiritual heritage (especially compositions by Artemiy Vedel) were preserved as part of the choral repertoire.

Bishop Meletiy, the Rector of the Academy,⁴ was aware of the negative effects of the past events and proposed in 1825 (15 January) to reinstate the Choir. For that purpose, several students of elementary schools were selected to live in the buildings of the Academy and the Monastery buildings, supported by a scholarship. After the change of voice, the students returned to their schools. The Choir continued to function in this manner for years to come; it consisted of 14 boys (soprano and alto voices) and 30 Academy students (tenor and bass voices).

During the period of Igumen Dymytryy (Muretov, 1841–1850) as the head of the Monastery, the heavy expense of funding the young singers' living threatened the Academy Choir again. The danger subsided as the Monastery's government took a defensive stance in its answer to the Igumen: "Paying respect to the ancient origin of the Choir and in order to support the visible eagerness among people to attend the services at the Kiev Brotherhood Monastery church and to listen to the sermons constantly delivered there, the Choir should remain for the future."⁵ The most prominent voices of that period were those of V. Chumachevsky and V. Askochensky.

The quality of the Choir and the diversity of the repertoire it performed were greatly dependent on the presence of boys whose voices had not yet changed. The general situation improved when a new discipline, "Liturgical Studies", was introduced in the autumn of 1852, following the reorganization of the primary theological schools. It featured teaching of the Typikon and liturgical music. Previously, such subjects had been taught at lower theological schools as part of learning the Oktoechos.

The repertoire of the KTA Choir, chanted at divine services of the monastery, consisted of Orthodox liturgical hymns and sacred compositions which were written by particular composers and approved by the Holy Synod. However, in the second part of the 19th century, the Choir's activities extended beyond the boundaries of strictly Orthodox liturgical practice. The range and number of the compositions performed had naturally become wider. Furthermore, since the Choir had from the 1860s taken part in the concerts of the Philharmonic Society in Kiev, conducted by R. Pfening, they also participated in productions of some of the gems of classical music, such as Rossini's *Stabat Mater* (with Anulin as the Choir's *regent*) and Félicien-César David's *Le Désert* (with P. Kalachinsky⁶ as *regent*), and Cherubini's *Requiem* (with L. Malashkin as *regent*). Although this period of musical "self-determinaton" was of short duration, its influence on the performance style of the Choir proved rather significant. It was not only a question of preserving the artistic and technical skills needed for the performance of such compositions,

3 The monastery was promoted to the first rank in 1842. According to its status, it was allowed to the same number of monks and priests as the St Michael Golden Dome Cathedral. The monastic community included eight hieromonks, five hierodeacons, three monks, and thirty novices. Moreover, there were 120 KTA students and 30 Academy officials and singers.

4 Meletiy (secular name: Mykhaylo Ivanovych Leontovych, 11 June 1784, Stary Sanjary village (Poltava province) –29 February 1840), Archbishop of Kharkiv and Okhtyrka, ROC. Graduated from the Alexander Nevsky Theological Academy of Saint Petersburg (1814). On 30 July 1817 he was appointed the inspector of the Kievan Theological Seminary, in 1819 inspector of the KTA, and in January 1824 Rector of the KTA.

5 Мухин 1893, 251.

6 Petro Olexiyovych Kalachynsky, a KTA graduate. His master's thesis "The Philosophical (Pessimistic) Worldview of Schopenhauer and his Attitude towards Christianity" was not approved by the Holy Synod.

but also of the immediate effects of the performances on the academic process and, even more, on Kievan liturgical tradition and culture.

In the 1870s, the Choir's musical activities had a profound influence on the religious life of the faithful, both during the divine services and in the performance of paraliturgical rites characteristic of some Ukrainian dioceses – the Passion Service⁷ and the procession with willow branches on Lazarus Saturday. The Brotherhood Monastery was more famous for these rituals than other monasteries in Kiev. The Passion Service was celebrated on the first four Fridays of the Great Lent and it always included the chanting of the stichera *You Who Are Clothed With Light* and *The Noble Joseph*. The blessing of willow branches featured a procession on Palm Sunday (originally performed in the 16th century, abolished probably at the beginning of the 19th century and restored in 1878). First, all students of Kievan theological educational institutions gathered in the Church of SS Peter and Paul, at the Kievan Theological Seminary, where the double choir concerto *How Glorious Is Our Lord in Zion (Kol' slaven)* by Bortnyansky was performed. The second part of the ritual consisted of the procession to the Brotherhood Monastery. It began with the chanting of the sticheron *Today the grace of the Holy Spirit has gathered us*. People were delighted by the restoration of the ritual. The impressive power of the joint choirs was mentioned by a witness in 1879: "The glory of that procession recalled the Divine Liturgy on Palm Sunday ... its sacred readings and hymns and amongst them, the double choir concerto chanted once again. There was amazing and magnificent chanting performed by the joint choirs of the Academy and the Seminary, conducted by a student, Mr Makarevych."⁸

However, the success of the 1830s and the 1860-1870s was first of all associated with magnificent soloists and some kind of a spiritual consolidation between several generations of chanters, not with the work of the *regents* themselves. This was, to a great extent, due to the internal administrative policy of the KTA: the Choir was not conducted by an experienced *regent* on a regular basis. Instead, the office was held by some musically gifted student in his last years of study at the Academy. Consequently, the period during which they worked with the Choir was obviously short – only two or three years. Naturally, this did not provide any opportunity to raise the artistic demands and the professional level of the Choir (bearing in mind that the composition of the Choir changed every year with the rotation of the singers). According to the custom, each *regent* had to choose his successor. Therefore he tested the candidates by allowing them to conduct the Choir at rehearsals.⁹ In the course of the Choir's history it was conducted by the following *regents*: Mykhailo Dorosevych (1810–1813), Vasyl Borysovych and Andriy Bakulin (1825–1827), Mykhaylo Gorbachevych (1827–1829), Pavlo Sokolov (1829–1830), Mykola Grigoriev (1831–1833), Stefan Bodrychin and Vasyl Lutchitsky (1833–1835), Klyment Nikitsky¹⁰ and Victor Askochensky (1837–1839), Stefan Kashmensky (1839–1841), O. Posdnosheev and I. Inokiv (1841–1843), M. Lorichenko[v] (1843–1845), Kostyantyn Askochensky (1845–1847), Olexandr Pesotsky (1847–1849), and Mykhaylo Levashev (1849–1850).

The following example illustrates well the results or perhaps the "side-effects" of performing Western spiritual music. On September 29th 1882, Tchaikovsky sent a letter to the KTA Rector. In the letter, he sharply criticized the Choir which he had heard during the liturgy at the Brotherhood Monastery on 26 September, though also he confessed that there was a complete difference between the musical tastes of the Orthodox audience along with the vast majority of the clergy and his own (as he always liked the hymns "which carry all the elements of not only

7 The *passiya* service (from the Latin *Passio*, suffering) was a ritual that probably arose as an alternative to the Passions in the Catholic and Protestant churches. Metropolitan Mohyla introduced the service in central and Eastern parishes of Ukraine on the basis of the *Pentecostarion* printed by the Crypto-Archimandrite Joasaph Kryukovsky (1702). It was celebrated in the monasteries and cathedrals at Compline on the first four Fridays of the Great Lent.

8 Б. п. 1879, 18.

9 Кошиць 1995, 207.

10 A KTA student (graduated in 1839), Klyment Olexiyovych Nikitsky, was appointed the regent of the Choir together with V. Askochensky. In comparison to their predecessors, they increased the level of the Academy Choir substantially.

pure musical beauty but also of original religious musical art")¹¹. In his letter, the composer commented sharply on the consequences that he sensed would arise from the forced "mixing of styles" during the performance of chants from the Orthodox tradition along with the spiritual works of Roman Catholic origin.

The letter is an important witness to the distance between the aesthetics of Orthodox sacred music (so attractive to Tchaikovsky himself, as reflected in the ideas of the recently established Moscow Synodal School, on the basis of the impressive chanting practice of the Moscow Dormition Cathedral Choir – the basis of the "new trend" of performance in the future) and the probably rather stable (at that time) tendencies and not often attractive peculiarities of Kievan sacred choral performance. This can be seen in the comment: "When they sang *It is Truly Meet*, I was somewhat comforted as the composition carries in itself features of ancient chant and, in any case, it was composed and performed without any capriciousness, which is as it should be in the case of liturgical chanting."¹² The composer rejected, in turn, the rhythmic patterns that brought the compositions close to secular genres ("the strange, mazurka-like, nauseatingly mannered chanting of the threefold *Lord, have mercy* that was chanted by the Brotherhood Monastery Choir for the Augmented Litany")¹³, or the simplified psalmody of certain texts, perhaps influenced by common choral singing ("the choristers sang *Praise the Lord from the Heavens* in a hurry, on one chord, as if they were trying to release themselves from hardship of praising the Lord").¹⁴

Yet the greatest irritation for this deeply religious composer was caused the aesthetic and stylistic inconsistency of the manner of performance and the mismatch of voices, which had a destructive effect on the integrity of the divine service, the Sacrament and the clergy:

But when the Holy Doors had been closed, [...] as they seem to have felt they owed it to the audience to treat them to concert music, they gathered their strength and started to perform a concert that was written vulgarly and without talent, full of vocal tricks improper for performance in church, composed in an unknown tone, long, foolish, and frightful. I felt a surge of discontent which, the longer they sang, increased. One moment there is a bass solo roaring in a rough, wild manner, another a lonely descant screaming, or we hear a fragment of some wild Italian trepak, or an unnaturally sugary, operatic love motive set in the most rude, bare and flat harmonization, or the whole choir stands still in an exaggeratedly subtle pianissimo, and then roars out, screams at the top of their voices... Oh Lord, and when, at which moment does this musical orgy take place? – At none other than the moment which is the culmination of the holy Sacrament, when Your Eminence and Your co-celebrants participate in the Body and Blood of Christ... If only they would, at least, confine themselves to performing Bortnyansky's concertos. [...] But the [music] that I had to listen to last Sunday was improper to a sacrilegious extent, yet even more unworthy and pitiful in the musical sense.¹⁵

The remarks of this great composer may be explained (in the context of his admiration of both aspects of I. Kalishevsky's Choir – as the embodiment of the aesthetics of church music and for its potential in musical performance) as some sort of fixation with the lowered level of the Academy Choir's performance. Since we do not have other testimonies to the Choir's performance from the early 1880s, we may suggest that the criticism reflected the inexperience of the *regent*, as well as the choristers' excessive admiration of their own voices (thus compromising ensemble in performance). The Choir was nevertheless considered the best among church choirs in Kiev, as noted in 1879 (during the conductorship of Makarevych), "perhaps if not due to the power of the voices but always due to the power of spirit and the choice of sacred compositions".¹⁶

It seems clear that the situation changed profoundly and the Choir ultimately overcame the crisis, perhaps, as a reaction to Tchaikovsky's criticism. Nevertheless, the custom according to which the regents were appointed remained unchanged. In the last two decades of the 19th and the first decades of the 20th century, the Choir was conducted by Andriy Leliavsky (c. 1883–

11 Чайковский 1882.

12 Чайковский 1882.

13 Чайковский 1882.

14 Чайковский 1882.

15 Чайковский 1882.

16 Б. п. 1879, 18.

1885), Vasyl Petryshevsky (c. 1889–1891), Mykhailo Lisitsyn (c. 1895–1897) and Iakiv (Yakov) Molchanovsky (1910–1912). Although the Choir suffered from the frequent changes of singers as well as conductors, it still remained “the best and the most defined choir in Kiev,” as O. Koshyts recollected.¹⁷

The author of a detailed review of the Brotherhood Monastery, M. Mukhin, shared this view. He emphasized some specific features of the Choir:

The singing of the Brotherhood Monastery chanters that goes back to ancient times and reaches down to contemporary Academy students remains unique. It flows from all over our great and vast motherland. The Academy students who form the Choir sometimes substitute the scarcity of voices with wise understanding of the matter at hand and a Christian, honest feeling. Although the present-day Academy is not one body with the Seminary¹⁸, it includes several boy chanters who are selected from the seminarians. The Choir of the Brotherhood Monastery is very famous, and therefore there are few pilgrims who would not take the opportunity to hear its wonderful singing...¹⁹

Yet there was no continuing development, and some years in its history again demonstrated all signs of crisis. Furthermore, strict obedience to the recommendations of the Holy Synod concerning the repertoire hindered the selection of stylistically interesting compositions. The subjective factor – the professional competence of the regents and their personal musical tastes – also played a role. The Choir is considered to have achieved its highest professional level at the time of O. Koshyts (1899–1901) as its conductor. Paying great attention to the selection of singers, he formed a wonderful Choir ensemble, improved its technical skills and the level of its performance. At the time, the repertoire included (mainly sacred) compositions by D. Bortnyansky, A. Vedel, A. Lvov, P. Lvovsky, P. Turchaninov, G. Lomakin, A. Kastalsky, A. Archangelsky and some other prominent composers.

It is thought that public performances of Vedel’s compositions which acknowledged the composer’s name, rather than anonymously, began at Koshyts’s initiative,²⁰ and his role is

17 Кошиць 1995, 146.

18 Only a few mentions of this choir can be found. For example, in 1866 it took part in the celebrations of Emperor Alexander II’s deliverance from death after an assassination attempt. The performance included the heirmos *Shine, Shine*, the Little Litany, the Dismissal and the singing of Many Years, the first part of *We Praise Thee, O God (Tebe Boga hvalim)* the last part of the concerto *By Thy Strength, O Lord (Gospodi, siloyu Tvoeyu)*, the troparion *Save Thy People, O Lord (Spasi, Gospodi, lyudi tvoya)* and *How Glorious is Our Lord in Zion (Kol’ slaven)* by Bortnyansky. A witness of that event noticed the rather high professional level of the Choir as well as some defects in timbre and perhaps technique in the boys’ parts: “The performance of the pieces was rather successful, I should say. There was a little to be hoped for in the altos and sopranos but the basses and tenors were perfect” (Л. М-чъ 1866, 314). On the contrary, O. Koshyts noticed clear imperfection in the Choir’s singing (probably in the last decade of the 19th century or the first years of the 20th century): “The Choir’s singing is primitive and loud. The boys’ voices are unpleasant (though those boys were selected from the Seminary school) – unready and quite unpleasant. The Choir’s singing is predominantly supported by the Seminary students’ loud throats. On account of to all this roaring, noise, and delays in tempo it seems impossible to follow the conductor’s hand. The high chord in the *Great Doxology* was stretched and dropped at the word “world” (“to see the world”)...” (Кошиць 1995, 248–249).

19 Their mastery was sharply underlined in comparison with the singing of the monastic brethren: “It must be said the Choir is academic in a proper sense. Its singing can be heard only when the Academy students are present at the Liturgy. In other cases, the Monastery Choir consists of the choir of the brethren, conducted by a senior chanter” (Mukhin 1893, 307).

20 The following facts conflict with that: on 3 August 1862, the choir of the Berdychiv Dormition Church (A. B. Basylevych as its *regent*) performed a spiritual concert in which compositions by D. Bortnyansky, G. Lomakin and A. Vedel were performed (“The Orthodox” 1882, 360–361); on 30 January 1896, Vedel’s *Now Lettest Thou Thy Servant* was performed by the Choir of the Orthodox Society for Religious and Moral Enlightenment at the Society’s common meeting. We should also mention the performance of Vedel’s compositions (1890) and the article from *The Russian Musical Newspaper* about “the famous *The Doors of Repentance* by Vedel at the concert on 25 March 1899 under the aegis of the Orthodox Society for Religious and Moral Enlightenment, with the participation of the united choirs of the St Sophia Cathedral and the St Michael Archbishop’s Choir, conducted by I. Kalishevsky. Moreover, as A. Suslow testifies, the compositions by D. Bortnyansky and A. Vedel took “the main part of concert (4 of 10 numbers)” (Suslow 1899, 653–654). While still a Seminary student, O. Koshyts appreciated the Academy Choir for him giving the opportunity to listen to Vedel’s concertos (Кошиць 1995, 146). The first performance of Vedel’s compositions at solemn academic events took place under Koshyts’s conductorship on 26 September 1899.

In 1898, *The Kievan Diocesan News* published an article “To the Ears of Vedel’s Worshipers”, which was a reprint from one of the issues of *The Kazan Diocesan News*. The article described “a Kievan citizen to the core – who was born and educated, who lived and died there – a remarkable singer, the best *regent* of his days, an inspired and gifted composer of spiritual music – Artemy Lukianovych Vedel” (Б. п. 1898, 677), whose compositions, even after the publication of the works of Sarti and Galuppi which the author condemned, “had not been seen worthy of even two lines of official acceptance, not even condescending permission” (Б. п. 1898, 677). The article contained a rather wide-ranging description of the choral

seen as decisive for the delivery of the first lecture about the composer's legacy (in May 1901, featuring V. Petrushevsky and Professor I. Sikorsky from the Kiev University, psychiatrist, publicist, and an honorary member of the KTA). In contrast to the continuous and in practice non-anonymous²¹ liturgical performance of Vedel's music, this action created a real "cult" of the composer: the study of his legacy had been transformed into an official academic field from the sphere of memories and "myths". After this event, there appeared another fracture in the approach to the personality and work of A. Vedel: he was considered to be a symbol and embodiment of Ukrainian liturgical music, a kind of a model for performance style. So, even in Chernigov (where new Russian musical achievements predominated and were cultivated), Vedel's compositions became the most frequently performed during the first decades of the 20th century, compared with other examples of Ukrainian sacred music. Moreover, the Choir of the Philanthropic Religious Singers' Society, conducted by G. Zosymovych, performed a concert which consisted exclusively of Vedel's compositions. This concert was some kind of a precedent and contributed to the establishment of Vedel's liturgical compositions in performance practice. This development took place in many Ukrainian provincial towns, and counteracted the ideas expressed by certain Russian clergy who considered this stylistic direction in Ukrainian music as profanation ("ведельщина", "дехтярѣвщина"²²) that needed to be removed from liturgical practice.

As the regent of the Academy Choir, O. Koshyts had written several hymns for it²³: *The Angel Cried* for children's voices, *Shine, Shine* for a mixed choir, *From My Youth* (whose scores can be found the manuscript anthology of the four-part Choir of the Academy), *Mercy of Peace* (D minor – G minor) for a mixed choir (published as an appendix to journal *The Guide for Parish Clergy* (1907), and the sticheron *You Who Are Clothed* (G minor – B major) for male choir (appendix to the same journal in 1908). This last comes from the Passion Service and relates to the established Kievan tradition in which it was celebrated.

The style of the sticheron *You Who Are Clothed*, based on the Bulgarian chant for the aposticha on Holy Friday, represents Koshyts's early attempts in the field of sacred music, as a synthesis of several factors. Koshyts connects ensemble-type voice leading (the source of which goes back to monastic chant) with rather free movements in the second tenor and bass and crossing melodic lines. It is probable that the reason for the use of such a method was the influence of folk ensemble polyphony, in line with the general tendency to cultivate features of national character in this field of music. The structure of the chant gives the impression of a reassessment of the norms not only of classical but also of contemporary oral tradition with respect to the creation of form. Thus the composer reconstructed special dynamics of liturgical singing. Its style can be seen as being outside the regularity of the contemporary standard compositions

stylistic methods, typical of the composer, as well as of some characteristics of liturgical texts that had been selected by him; the author of the article thought their dramatic, pictorial and naturalistic effect bore some resemblance to religious art "because his talent combined a strong ability to reflect reality with a deep mystic religious feeling" (Б. п. 1898, 686).

21 It would be impossible to announce the composer of each composition in the course of the divine service.

22 These terms reflect the general disdain for the compositional and performing style of two Ukrainian composers – Artemy Vedel and Stepan Degtyarev. This also applies to the compositions (mainly concerts) by Dmitry Bortnyansky. The accusations concern – in comparison with traditional liturgical singing, especially in monasteries – the "concert style", the operatic use of vocal parts, excessive sentimentality, et cetera. The terms have been widely in use from the mid-19th century – the period of stylistic changes in liturgical-musical creativity – to the present.

It had long been generally accepted that compositions should possess a "church spirit", yet the idea of "church spirit" is not very clear: its features are not well defined, and neither is the distinction between "church" and "secular" obvious for everyone. The term "church spirit" in a musical composition "is not free from some subjective understanding of its measures and even its nature. For some people, "church spirit" in singing means the same as "tenderness"; for others, it refers to the use of ancient melodies as the basis of many-part arrangement, or the character of harmony itself, free from spicy combinations and severe in style. There are also some people ready to recognize "church spirit" in every traditional composition in our liturgical practice even if the music resembles 'degytarovship' and 'vedelship'. Finally, there are some people whose desire is to combine all features mentioned above as a "church spirit" (Никольский 1909, 74).

23 His systematic work in the field of liturgical art began in the second decade of the 20th century: during 1920–1940, he created great liturgical cycles and numerous arrangements of different songs.

and their structural models. Perhaps the Kievan liturgical singing tradition is mirrored in the composition by Koshyts, then a *regent* and a budding composer. The fact that the piece was published also bears witness to the young composer's authority in the field of performing sacred music.

According to Koshyts, the Choir's activities were challenged by "systematic stealing" of singing material from its library.²⁴ Consequently, the *regents* of the KTA Choir made great efforts to preserve and complement the repertoire, also outside their tenure. For example, according to L. Rudenko, the last *regent* of the Choir, J. Molchanovsky, contributed to the library collection with two versions of the *Great Doxology*, the "Starosimonovsky" *Cherubic Hymn, Praise Ye the Name of the Lord* by P. Ivanov, and the works of A. Kastalsky to V. Orlov, *The Lord God Has Appeared to Us* by an anonymous composer, and the *Great Doxology* by F. Myasnikov.²⁵

The musical and singing traditions of the KTA came to an end in the second decade of the 20th century: the Choir existed no longer after 1915. This was a notable loss regardless of the continuance of liturgical life in other Kievan centres (the choirs of the Lavra of the Kievan Caves Monastery, the Golden-Domed Monastery of St Michael, St Sophia and St Vladimir's Cathedral were in function for several years more) and in Ukraine in general. Thus, weakened by the loss of personnel, the once famous Brotherhood Monastery Choir with its characteristic performance tradition, succumbed. It was soon to be followed by other centres of national significance. When the Monastery itself was shut down in the early 1930s, even its ordinary church singing was silenced.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Аскоченский, В. *Киев с древнейшим его училищем академией*. Киев 1856.
- Б. п. Во уши почитателей Веделя. *Киевские епархиальные ведомости*, 16, 1898. 677–688.
- Б. п. Открытие богослужения в большой церкви Братского монастыря. *Киевские епархиальные ведомости*, 14-15, 1879. 18.
- Булгаков, Макарий, иеромонах. *История Киевской академии*. Санкт-Петербург 1843.
- Гопцус Павел. Автобиографическая заметка, относящаяся к истории академического хора за 1902–1906 годы. *Труди Київської Духовної Академії*, 12, 2010. 246–252.
- Киево-Могилянська академія в іменах, XVII—XVIII ст.* Київ 2001.
- Костюк, Н. *Киево-Могилянська академія. Українська музична енциклопедія*, 2, 2008. 362–365.
- Кошиць, Олександр. *Спогади*. Київ 1995.
- М-чъ, Л. 20 апреля в Киевской академии и семинарии. *Киевские епархиальные ведомости*, 9, 1866. 314.
- Мухин, Н. *Киево-братский училищный монастырь: Истор. очерк*. Киев 1893.
- Никольский, А. О церковности духовно-музыкальных сочинений. *Хоровое и регентское дело*, 3, 1909. 74–75.
- Православный. Из Бердичева. *Киевские епархиальные ведомости*, 19, 1882. 360–361.
- Радецкий, В., священник. Киевская духовная семинария в первой половине XIX ст. *Киевская старина*, 10, 1907. 96–114.
- Руденко, Л. *Нотна бібліотека хору Київської духовної академії*. Київ 2013.
- Суслов, А. Концерты А.А. Архангельского и киевские церковные хоры. *Русская музыкальная газета*, 1899: 25, 316–318; 26: 653–654.
- Титов, Ф. *Императорская Киевская духовная академия. 1615—1915*. Киев 2003.
- Чайковский, П. Письмо ректору Киевской духовной академии о состоянии церковного пения 1882. Библиотека Гумер – православие. http://www.gumer.info/bogoslov_Buks/ortodox/Article/Chayk_Pism.php

24 Кошиць 1995, 211.

25 Руденко 2013, 63.