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Abstract

This dissertation explores Italian influence on Russian Church music in the late eighteenth-century. The object of this study is to determine the extent to which Italian compositional forms affected the developmental course of Russian sacred choral concertos. Scholars generally describe the latter half of the eighteenth century and early nineteenth century as the "Italianate Period" in Russian Church music. Because of the large number of Italian composers invited by ruling Tsarinas in St. Petersburg, this is not inaccurate. However, many have gone as far as describing the period as Italian blight on Russia’s sacred traditions, further implying that Western (Italian) traditions completely supplanted pre-existing Russian styles. This dissertation attempts to clarify the specific elements at play, defining the national origins of compositional practices evident in contemporary choral concertos. A more complex picture emerges, illustrating a complex interplay of not only Russian and Italian idioms, but also those of Poland and (modern) Ukraine.

Because the Italianization of Russia’s Church music began in the new capital of St. Petersburg, archives in St. Petersburg were an important source of actual music for this study. In order to limit the scope of this study to specific visiting Italian composers and their native Russian/Ukrainian students, recently published books and translations of early Russian scholarship were also used. All sources indicate that Giuseppe Sarti (1729-1802) was in Russia longer than any other Italian composer (1784-1802). He also had the greatest number of known Russian and Ukrainian students through his work (and connections) at the Russian court. Giuseppe Sarti and his native-born students therefore become the center of this study in the attempt to clarify if Russian Church music became
truly Italian by the early nineteenth century. I argue that "Italianate Period" choral concertos retained much of the same Russian characteristics evident in their seventeenth-century counterparts. Furthermore, the absorption of foreign elements was not a one-way street; Giuseppe Sarti the teacher became Giuseppe Sarti the student as he composed his Slavonic-texted Orthodox music in his final years.
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Introduction

The state of Russian church music has always been greatly affected by both foreign influences and the turbulent events within her borders. Perhaps the most profound effects impacting Orthodox singing’s development have been the result of Russia’s isolation from Western Europe. Three such isolating events come to mind: the “Great Schism,” the “Tatar Yoke,” and the communist era of the twentieth century. The earliest isolating event, the “Great Schism” in 1054, separated the Western and Eastern Christian Churches, creating two administrative centers: Rome and Constantinople. As a result, Russia became part of the Byzantine or Greek Orthodox tradition in worship and music making. Thus, the rich traditions of Renaissance modal counterpoint typical of the Catholic Church never found their way to Russian lands. The second isolating event was Russia’s occupation by the Mongol Hordes (a period called the “Tatar Yoke”) for over two centuries (ca. 1236-1480), which completely cut off Russia from Western Europe. The growth and prosperity that occurred in the late Middle Ages in Western Europe never reached Russia. A middle class did not develop, extending Russia’s already long history of aristocratic dominance over the peasant or serf classes. This was illustrated by the Tsars and Tsarinas of the Romanov Dynasty (1613-1917), who controlled most aspects of the daily lives of their people. This included policies that regulated important cultural and religious practices of the Russian people. It was this influence from the top down that ultimately impacted foreign influence on Russian church music. Invited Italian composers, who wrote operas and taught native Russian/Ukrainian composers, in particular dominated the eighteenth century.
The final major isolating event was the communist revolution of 1917 that began a period of anti-religious sentiment and policies that lasted until the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. Aside from the closing of churches and discouragement of church music scholarship, the communist revolution brought a renewed spirit of nationalism, most musically evident with the great nationalist composers such as Prokofiev and Shostakovich. This renewed pride in all things Russian had a trickle-down effect on the views many twentieth-century Soviet scholars had of earlier church music. As sacred music from the eighteenth- and nineteenth-centuries was examined through this new nationalistic microscope, criticisms emerged. These scholars saw this music as dominated by Italian and German styles, to the point of excluding traditional, pre-existing Russian chant melodies and harmonizations. Certain Russian or Ukrainian choral composers – most notably Dmitri Bortniansky – spent a great deal of time studying with visiting Italian composers and going abroad to Italy. Church music of the eighteenth century in particular has thus been harshly criticized as “too Italian,” many believing Italian influence to be a blight on the face Russian Orthodox music, essentially supplanting native Russian styles. These extremely critical views could possibly stem from two separate arguments, the first being an objection to the Italian compositional practice of concertizing, thereby diluting the important liturgical Slavonic texts. Another possibility was the objection to the increasing secularization of the church. This secularization became musically evident through the incorporation of “inappropriate” rhythms and melodies from folk and other secular realms. Either way, the concept of ‘Italian blight’ seems to be an overly simplified, extreme viewpoint. As few things in life are truly black or white, it was of interest to this author to explore the question of whether or
not eighteenth-century Russian church music was entirely Italian, or if it contained intrinsically Russian features.

Such isolating events were certainly not the only significant events that impacted the state of Russian church music. As earlier stated, events within her borders also had significant impact. Previous scholarship has helped define the developments that both preceded and followed the Italianate period. The history of Russian church singing dates back over 1000 years to the establishment of Christianity in Kiev, under Prince Vladimir in 988 or 989.¹ The first epoch of singing, generally agreed to be the period of monophonic singing, occurs from this first date up to 1652.² The years 1652-1654 were a period of tumult in the Orthodox Church, resulting in a schism between the official church and the Old Believers. As a result of changes instituted by Patriarch Nikon to closer align the Russian with the Greek Orthodox, part-singing was henceforth allowed in the church. More specifically, he established harmonic three-voiced *partes* singing based on the traditions in Kiev.³ The second epoch of polychoral singing began in 1654 and continues up to the present day.⁴ Each of these two epochs has been further sub-divided by many Russian scholars in divergent ways.

The twentieth-century scholar Johann von Gardner divides the second epoch into four different periods: ⁵

² Gardner, *Russian Church Singing*, 139.
⁴ Gardner, *Russian Church Singing*, 139.
⁵ Gardiner, *Russian Church Singing*, 145.
1. Period of Polish-Ukrainian influence: from ca. 1654 to mid-18th century or slightly later.
2. Period of Italian influence: Italian-style choral polyphony lasting from the middle 18th century through ca. 1830.
3. Period of German Influence: also called the Petersburg Period, lasting from ca. 1830-1900.
4. Period of the Moscow School: reaching its zenith in ca. 1917, this period (from ca. 1900-today) is characterized by a desire to free Russian liturgical singing from the effects of foreign influence experienced in the first three periods.

Gardner’s division of the second epoch into four separate periods is justified by the time of his work. By the time Gardner conducted his research in 1976, sufficient time had passed to allow contextualization of the compositional developments and various foreign influences that had occurred in the last three centuries. Previous scholars such as the Moscow Conservatory’s Razumovskii and Metallov completed their esteemed work during the late nineteenth century, before even the first three periods, let alone the fourth, were complete and could be placed into context. It is therefore Gardiner’s model that provides this author’s timeline. In order to establish relevant background and context, some attention will be given to the period of Polish-Ukrainian influence. However, the main focus will be on the Italianate period.

Some study has already been made on the Italianate period in Russia, though it is almost exclusively focused on opera. Musicologist Marina Ritzarev has further refined the stages of Orthodox music during Gardner’s second period in her book Eighteenth-Century Russian Music. Based on her examination of spiritual concertos, the dominant genre from
the mid-seventeenth century until the beginning of the nineteenth century, she divides the
Italianate period into three parts:  

a. Baroque-Preclassic style produced by Galuppi and Berezovsky (1760s-1770s)
b. Classic Court fashion (1780s)
c. Sentimental Mode dominated by Bortniansky and Degtiarev (1790s-1800s)

Unfortunately, Ritzarev does not specifically define the specific characteristics of each of
these three styles. Whether or not one totally agrees with her exact model, it certainly
provides further insight into this very interesting period. According to these divisions,
Russian church music had already bypassed the Baroque and Preclassic periods prior to
the arrival of Giuseppe Sarti in 1784. He would have arrived in the middle of the “Classic
Court” fashion. The Classic Court model would have included a variety of elements, most of
them being flashy and complex polyphony, operatic style, and the regular use of
instrumental accompaniment outside of the chapel. Currently, no author has analyzed the
specific impact the Italians had on Russian church music.

Due to Mikhail Gorbachev’s policies of glasnost (openness) and perestroika
(restructuring) in the late 1980s and early 1990s, scholars were once again able to openly
study Russian church music. Access to Russian church archives and research slowly
became a reality for Western scholars, contributing to the resurgence of interest in the
study of Russian church music since that time. These opportunities have allowed scholars
to fill in some of the holes in previous research or simply delve further into new areas. This
author has determined that adequate research concerning the specific connections

between Italian composers, their music and their direct impact on the style of Russian church music are lacking. Consequently, in depth study is needed to create a more accurate picture of the Italian-Russian relationship is important to scholarly studies of sacred choral music. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine the eighteenth-century Italianate period of sacred choral music in Russia in order to determine the true extent of Italian influence on pre-existing Russian choral idioms. Before embarking on this study, it is necessary to further clarify important guiding questions.

Sacred vocal music for the Russian Orthodox Church had existed since the adoption of Christianity in the year 988. Some seven hundred and forty years later, it is difficult to imagine the 1730 arrival of Francesco Araja in St. Petersburg to have caused an instant shift in the trajectory of Orthodox singing’s development. Sacred choral music had been developing for centuries in Russia and would certainly continue to do so after the Italian period ended in the early nineteenth century. How was Russian Church music really transformed during this time? What specific compositional elements were imported and what were already extant? Is there evidence that pre-existing Russian elements survived the Italianate period? Was the transfer of musical ideas a one-way street running from the west to the east? The study of these questions becomes essential to better defining the relationship between native Russian choral traditions and those imported from Italy. The overall goal is to create a more complete scholarly portrait of the period and the question of its sacred music’s inherent Russian and/or Italian traits.

Certain limitations had to be applied to the parameters of this project. First, the music to be examined must be limited to choral scores in parts, particularly the dominant
genre of the choral concerto; the study of Orthodox chant is best left to other scholars.

Second, St. Petersburg, Russia’s new capital built by Peter the Great in the early eighteenth century was ground zero for the importation of all things western into Russia during the eighteenth century. Third, any composers chosen for this study had to have interacted with young Russian student singers and composers of church music. Johann von Gardner, whose model identifies the Italianate period as beginning after the mid-eighteenth century, implies that the first Italians in St. Petersburg had a limited impact on church music. Because they really focused on operatic writing, it was necessary to examine a later period and a specific composer. It was during the latter years of Catherine the Great’s reign (r. 1762-1796) that Giuseppe Sarti (1729-1802) worked with a handful of young Russian composers. Sarti resided in Russia far longer than any other invited Italian composer and had direct contact with more native Russians and Ukrainians than any other Italian. Therefore Sarti, his music, and the music of his composition students – known as the first post-Italianate generation of Russian composers – are ideal examples of the impact Italian composers had on Russian church music. A more detailed account of the importation of Italian composers and other trends toward westernization will appear in the following chapter.

This study will be organized into three chronological periods to help the reader keep track of events, developments and trends in Russian church music. The first section will examine historical context and musical trends leading to the arrival of the Italians. This is necessary to establish the importance of the new capital, the lineage and purpose of these visiting composers, and the state of Orthodox music in Russia at the time of their arrival. In order to provide sufficient context, the information provided will include a brief
history of Russia’s importation of western culture, particularly in the eighteenth century. Western elements were not limited to those of countries such as Germany, Holland and Italy. Poland actually played a significant role in the development of Russia’s church music. As the reader will see, Poland would profoundly influence the styles and compositional elements in the choral concertos of the late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-centuries.

Strongly connected to the Polish influence on the genre of choral concerto was Nikolai Diletskii’s educational tool and treatise entitled “A Musical Grammar.” This document was incredibly important in disseminating a particular western-influenced style of choral concerto right up to the Italianate period. Also included will be an examination of native Russian chant harmonizations, as this was (and still is) and integral part of Orthodox worship. Finally, Russian folk singing became widely popular during the building and expansion of St. Petersburg, resulting in published collections that combined native and western elements. Impacts of the Lvov/Prach collection of the late eighteenth century will therefore be discussed.

The second section of the dissertation will examine Giuseppe Sarti: his life and times in Italy, Denmark and Russia, his compositional styles and interactions with his native Russian and Ukrainian students. Establishing the nature and extent of his interactions with Russian and Ukrainian composers of sacred choral music are essential to clarifying the cause-effect relationship between Italianate style and subsequent native Orthodox compositions. The length of his stay in Russia and the extent of his contact with native Russian students arguably make Sarti the most influential foreign figure in Russian liturgical music at the turn of the century. The successes of Galuppi’s pupil, Bortniansky,
have tended to overshadow the importance of Sarti, as both composer and teacher of church music. It is hoped that this study will redress this oversight.

The final section of this study will examine the music of three of Sarti’s students in Russia: Artemy Vedel, Stepan Degtiarev and Stepan Davydov. Each of these Russian or Ukrainian composers had Giuseppe Sarti as their first or only foreign teacher. Analyzing their music to discover Italian influence alongside existing Russian elements provides a better understanding of the aforementioned “Italian blight.” The conclusions drawn will no doubt pave the way for further scholarly research.
Chapter 1: The Imperial Court of St. Petersburg as the Epicenter of Russia’s Westernization

Because the importation of western ideas and practices is paramount to this study, it is necessary to begin with an overview of eighteenth-century Russia’s increasingly westward focus. With its location on the Gulf of Finland and direct inspiration from the West, St. Petersburg’s early history is inseparable from a study of Russia’s westernization. Many have attributed the beginning of Russia’s westernization to Peter the Great, who reigned 1682-1725. However, this view is not an entirely accurate. Ivan III (r. 1462-1505), imported Italian architects to design and build the walls and towers of the Moscow Kremlin as early as 1485. However, Peter the Great would be the first to aggressively and openly accelerate Russia’s westward-looking cultural development. His most important projects were the founding of St. Petersburg and the building of Russia’s naval fleet. St. Petersburg was founded on May 27, 1703 when the stones were laid for Peter and Paul Fortress on the Neva River where it flowed into the Gulf of Finland. Peter needed the fortress at that location to protect Russia’s interests against Sweden during the Great Northern War. It would be his 18-month “Grand Embassy” of 1697/98 that would solidify his policies to modernize Russia through westernization. He departed Russia with a large entourage to visit the monarchs of Europe in order to secure assistance to defeat the Ottoman Empire on


the Black Sea. Although he was unsuccessful in gaining the desired military assistance, the trip was particularly fruitful in Holland and England. It was in Holland that he gained personal, direct experience with shipbuilding. While there, he engaged workers skilled in building locks and ships. He also hired shipwrights and seamen to bring back to Russia. On his trip to England, he visited London, Greenwich, Oxford and Manchester. He was able to see a naval display, but perhaps most significantly, he learned techniques of city building that he would later apply at St. Petersburg.

Upon his return to Russia, he made significant changes to some of Russia’s traditions. He required his courtiers and officials to cut off their beards and wear European clothes. For those men who resisted the new facial hair regulations, he instituted an annual beard tax of 100 rubles. Peter abolished arranged marriages for the aristocracy and instituted the Julian calendar, which changed the celebration of the New Year from September 1 in the Old Russian Calendar to January 1. Because of his harsh measures and penalties, many viewed their Tsar Peter as the Antichrist. At the very least, it was

clearly felt that he was attacking Russia’s folk traditions, the very foundations of her peoples. However, it was unlikely that all Russian people were against Peter’s changes. Because members of the aristocracy were both educated and well traveled, they supported any changes that modernized Russia and brought her closer in line with the nations of Western Europe. As their education included exposure to the fine arts and literature, they were eager to import many of these traditions as well.

The aristocracy, whose epicenter was now the St. Petersburg Court, initiated the development of Russia’s fine arts and literature. This inevitably meant borrowing from the West. Most cultural practices and trends would spread outward from the Court to first reach other aristocrats. Geographically, western trends would radiate from the capital outwards. Once spread through the aristocratic echelons, these cultural trends and practices would inevitably trickle down to the lower classes, where they often mixed (successfully or not) with folk practices. While French was the chosen language of literature and communication in aristocratic circles, the other arts tended to be more influenced by Russia’s interactions with Poland, Germany, and Italy. Which country would receive favor had a great deal to do with the ruling Emperor or Empress’ personal affinity toward a given country. Peter I was more inclined to borrow from Germany, whereas the remaining leaders in the eighteenth century turned almost exclusively to Italy. After the death of Peter I in 1725, there began a practice of inviting Italian composers to the St. Petersburg Court to compose and stage Italian-style operas. For some of these visiting composers, particularly those of the late eighteenth century, their assignments also included work at the Court Chapel: composing liturgical music, conducting the choir, and teaching young students singing and composition.
The Imperial Court’s domination by eighteenth-century Italian composers began with Empress Anna Ioannovna (r. 1730-40), who brought Francesco Araja to St. Petersburg. However, there is no record of Araja having any involvement at the Court Chapel. He focused exclusively on producing and composing Italian operas for the St. Petersburg Court. Following the death of Anna Ioannovna, Araja continued to dominate at the Court until the end of Empress Elizabeth’s reign, in 1761. During her reign (1741-1762), Elizabeth showed no inclination to allow the liturgical music of the court to be undermined by outside forces. In other words, Elizabeth simply didn’t allow Araja to become involved at the Court Chapel. Although she did embrace and popularize Italian opera in Russia, from the perspective of the Court Chapel, her reign was a time of musical stagnation. As Russia’s church music had not yet been significantly Italianized through direct contact between Italian teachers and Russian students, any such influence would have to occur during the last four decades of the eighteenth century.

The death of Empress Elizabeth ushered in the reign of Catherine II (the Great), who was to become the longest reigning Empress of the eighteenth century. Catherine reigned from 1762-1796. The decades of Catherine’s reign represent the most intense period of Italianization of music at the Russian Court in the eighteenth century. Catherine herself was a foreigner, born in Prussia and later betrothed to Peter III. It was perhaps her own western origin and early exposure to Italian, French and German arts and literature that led to her importation of so many foreign composers at court. She invited many Italian composers work at the Imperial Court during her reign, including Baldassare Galuppi.

---

(1762-1768), Tommaso Traetta (1768-1776), Giovanni Paiesello (1776-1784), Giuseppe Sarti (1784-1787), Domenico Cimarosa (ca. 1789-1791), Vincente Martín (1790-1794), and Giuseppe Sarti once again from 1794 to 1800. The two composers from the above list most associated with Russian church music are Galuppi and Sarti. Baldassare Galuppi was the first Italian composer to work at Catherine’s court. He was employed by Catherine 1762-1768 and is famously known for having taught composition to Dmitry Bortniansky. However, Galuppi’s limited service at the court and inability to recruit a significant number of Russian pupils renders him peripheral to this study. The composers Traetta, Paiesello, Cimarosa, Manfredini, and Martín did not have a significant impact on liturgical music at the Court, their main focus being the operatic realm.

Giuseppe Sarti was the last Italian maestro at the Russian court. His initial contract at St. Petersburg was from 1784-1787. Re-appointed as Kappellmeister in 1793, he remained in St. Petersburg until 1802, bridging the reigns of Catherine and her successor, Paul I and teaching the young composers Stepan Davydov and Stepan Degtiarev while at the St. Petersburg Court. The interim between his two engagements at St. Petersburg, the years 1787-1793, was spent in southern Russia with Prince Potemkin, the infamous lover of Catherine the Great. While there, he continued composing and taught composition to several young Russian and Ukrainian students, including Artemy Vedel, Piotr Turchanninov, Lev Gurilev, Danil Kashin.

Once Sarti died, Dmitri Bortniansky dominated at the St. Petersburg Court, extending the Italianate period until his death in 1825. According to Johan von Gardner’s model mentioned above, it was shortly after the death of the Italianate Bortniansky that a
period of German influence began (ca. 1830), lasting until the turn of the next century. As the German period is beyond the scope of this study, it will receive no further attention here. It is clear that, of all the eighteenth-century Emperors or Empresses, Catherine the Great had the strongest impact on both secular and sacred music in Russia. Now that a sufficient overview of the intense westernization that occurred in eighteenth-century Russia has been provided, we can move on to the development and westernization of the Russian Court Chapel Choir from Moscow to St. Petersburg through the Italianate era.

**The Russian Court Chapel Choir**

Before delving into its history, it is germane to clarify the Russian use of the term *kapella*. The Russian term *kapella*, as borrowed from the German, entails more than it does in most other languages. In Russian, it includes the physical building, the singers, conductors, directorate, as well as the educational establishment. This means that teachers, private and external students are all considered when using the term *kapella* in Russia.14 The ensemble’s history began when Ivan III, Grand Prince of Muscovy, originally formed the Court Kapella in 1479 for the consecration of the Cathedral of the Assumption in the Kremlin. Moscow was then the newly established centre of the Russian Orthodox Church. As such, its festivals and ceremonies required more pomp and circumstance. The new choir, known as the “Choir of the Sovereign Lord’s Singing Clerks”15 sang at the Cathedral and at evening festivities at court. From the reign of Ivan III onward, both the

---


15 Ibid., 2.
size and prestige of the choir increased. Ivan IV (r. 1533-1584), better known as Ivan the Terrible, was deeply interested in the choir, being a singer himself and a choral participant in services and ceremonies. He also increased the size of the choir. Perhaps even more interesting, Ivan IV composed a number of works for his “Singing Clerks.”\textsuperscript{16}

The size of the “Singing Clerks” or “Sovereign Singers” grew during the seventeenth century. The ensemble was divided into two separate groups. First were the Sovereign Singers who were the Tsar’s household choir. They sang at religious services, presumably in the Imperial Chapel. The second group was known as the Patriarchal Singers who served the same role for the Moscow Patriarch.\textsuperscript{17} The Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia was essentially a high-ranking bishop, an office that had begun with St. Job in 1589.

Because part-singing was becoming both popular and accepted within the church even before Nikon’s mid-century reforms, treble voices became increasingly necessary. This resulted in the acquisition of talented young boys by the court. By the time of Alexis Mikhailovich’s (r. 1645-1676) ascension to the throne in 1645, the choir numbered between fifty and sixty singers.\textsuperscript{18} As the size of the court grew and had more churches attached, the function of the Sovereign Singers had to evolve. The choir was divided into several stations of varying rank, each usually containing five singers.\textsuperscript{19} The first two stations (stanitsy) were the highest ranked, with both standing on either side of the altar during court Services. The best and most-experienced singers were in the first two ranks,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{16} Dunlop, \textit{Galuppi to Vorotnikov}, 2.
\item \textsuperscript{17} Findeizen, \textit{History of Music in Russia}, vol. 1, 245.
\item \textsuperscript{18} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{19} Ibid.
\end{itemize}
with the Tsar’s favorite often holding the position of *ustavshchik*, or choir leader. The youngest and least-experienced singers were placed in the lower ranks while they were being trained in the choral art. These singers were most likely placed opposite the first two ranks, to sing from behind the congregation. This happens to be the position taken by most Orthodox choirs in today’s Services. The other advantage to this set up was the ability to perform concerted antiphonal repertoire such as those composed by Vasily Titov when an important occasion arose. It is also likely that the lower ranks would have been assigned to the lesser Imperial Chapels.

Tsar Aleksei is also known for his other contributions to the improvement and maintenance of Church music. He appointed commissions in 1655 and 1668 to correct musical manuscripts. He also brought in a series of composers of vocal music, theorists and writers on the subject of music. He also increased ties with the West by bringing in foreign craftsmen, instrument builders and musicians into Moscow. By the end of the seventeenth century, the Sovereign Singers had filled out to seventy voices in order to accommodate the demands of part-singing and fill the obligations of the multiple Imperial Chapels. As a result of the example set by both the Tsars and Patriarchs of the late seventeenth century, the trend of having one’s own chapel developed. Imperial singers in Moscow often would moonlight by attaching themselves to the homes of wealthy boyars

---

20 Findeizen, *History of Music in Russia*, vol. 1, 246.
21 Ibid., 247.
and aristocrats. The most famous contemporary example was Nikolai Diletskii’s attachment to Grigory Stroganov’s Choir.\textsuperscript{22}

The reign of Peter I (the Great) began only six years after the death of Aleksei. Peter the Great is another Tsar who took great interest and pride in the Kapella, though his musical interests were actually rather limited. During his first trip abroad in 1697, he admitted to his hosts, the Princesses of Hanover and Brandenburg: “I would prefer to go sailing and let off fireworks.”\textsuperscript{23} He was apparently an expert performer on the drums, but his only musical interest lay in church singing. He often sang in the \textit{kliros} (the physical space from which the choir sang in church) and read from the choir books with the others. He apparently preferred to sing the ornamented bass part, suggesting that he had some skill.\textsuperscript{24}

No doubt as part of his desire both to westernize his country and to build a court that rivaled its western counterparts, Peter was interested in building a Kapella to match or rival his western counterparts. He therefore ordered vast recruiting efforts all over Russia to ensure high quality singing in his chapel. He renamed the choir in 1701, calling them simply the Court Choir.\textsuperscript{25} This group often traveled with him on his various trips. Two years later, singers were transferred from Moscow to the new capital at St. Petersburg. For most of Peter’s reign, there were sixty singers in the group. This is a small reduction in numbers considering the smaller size of the new St. Petersburg Court in 1703. In 1721,

\textsuperscript{22} Findeizen, \textit{History of Music in Russia}, vol. 1, 246.
\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., 267.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{25} Dunlop, \textit{Eighteenth-Century Russian Music}, 3.
Peter abolished the Patriarchate and established the Most Holy Governing Synod. This removed the Bishop’s title of Patriarch and returned it to the earlier Metropolitan. The Patriarchal Singers became the Synodal Choir, and it was at this time that the Sovereign Singers finally became known as The Court Chapel or Kapella.26 This terminology is not surprising, as Peter I favored German music. After his death in 1725, the Kapella’s numbers were severely reduced to twenty. Over the course of the reigns of Empresses Anna Ioannovna and Elizabeth from 1730-1761, the Court Kapella’s numbers once again increased to approximately one hundred singers, with forty-eight men and fifty-two boys.27

The reign of Elizabeth Petrovna ushered in an era of protectionism in the area of Russian traditions. She was highly concerned with protecting Russia from incoming foreigners and protecting the rights of native Russians.28 Her goal certainly included protecting the tradition of liturgical singing at her court. She was very protective of her court singers, often rewarding them greatly. For example, one of her closest intimate friends, A.G. Razumovskii, was a Cossack from the Ukraine and one of her court singers. She raised him to the rank of a count.29 She maintained a good number of native singers, composers and conductors at her chapel. Her reign became known by many as the age of the song,30 in part because of the resurgence of new kant compositions, many written to honor her.

26 Findeizen, History of Music in Russia, vol.1, 245.
27 Ibid.
29 Ibid.
When Catherine ascended the throne in 1762, the nature of the ensemble underwent significant changes. Catherine was an astute leader and no doubt desired to maintain some control of all Imperial institutions. She was a good and devout member of the Orthodox Church since her conversion from Lutheranism on June 28, 1744, but she did not wish to relegate control of her Chapel to the Church, as was the custom. Instead, the ensemble became a secular organization under the jurisdiction of court officials. This administrative change was accompanied by a name change. From this point forward the Court Choir became known as the Imperial Court Kapella. This re-structured office required the appointment of a Director of the Court Kapella, a position that would be filled by visiting Italian composers.

Catherine’s reign began a period of expansionism within the chapel. The newly secularized ensemble was now able to actively participate in opera productions. Opera was really the Empress’s most important musical concern. The primary purpose of all of the invited Italian composers was, after all, to bring their previously composed works to life at court and to compose new operas suitable for performance in Russia. Some of the composers brought during Catherine’s reign had more involvement with the Kapella than their earlier counterparts during the reigns of Anna Ioannovna and Elizabeth. Both Galuppi and Sarti instructed Russian students in singing and composition, and composed some works for Orthodox Services.

As time progressed and more opera productions were being mounted, more singers were needed to cover the parts, not to mention the requisite numbers in the various churches and chapels. Her singers traveled with her on various trips and were frequently involved in various festivities around Russia. Because of the wide-reaching nature of the Kapella’s exposure, musical culture began to permeate the lives of those in the more remote provinces. Trained orchestras and choirs were started outside of both capitals. In this way, nobility and the wealthy in both capitals and in the provinces began to create their own “court” chapels and serf orchestras and theatres. Major players such as the Naryshkins and the counts Sheremetev would have a significant impact in the development of Russian music.

As for the court Kapella, the sheer amount of singing required to cover theatrical productions and the many festivities created some challenges in maintaining the quality of the choir. Whether or not the quality of singers was maintained or diminished is a matter of conjecture. However, it is known that after Catherine’s death in 1796, Dmitry Bortnyansky was promoted from his position of Kapellmeister to Director of Music and Administrator of the Court Kapella. In this new position, Bortnyansky was responsible directly to the new Tsar, Paul I. For a variety of reasons, not the least of which was Catherine’s desire to have him bypassed for the throne, Paul I despised the excesses at Catherine’s court. Whether it was upon his orders or Bortnyansky’s personal goals, a serious cut was made to the number of the Imperial Court Kapella. Almost immediately, he
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fired eleven singers for being inadequate. On September 30, 1797 he cut the number from eighty to only twenty-four. These actions certainly illustrate the large size of Catherine’s choir, while also indicating that quality had indeed been sacrificed in order to perform operas at court and festivities beyond.

35 Dunlop, *Galuppi to Vorotnikov*, 7.
Chapter 2: The State of Orthodox Music in St. Petersburg Before the Arrival of Visiting Italian Composers

Before delving into the specific compositional elements introduced by Western composers visiting during Gardner’s second period, it is essential to examine the state of Russian Orthodox music before the arrival of Francesco Araja in 1735. As stated in Gardner’s model, 36 liturgical music after 1654 was greatly influenced from the west (and south) via Poland and the Ukraine. Although the Ukraine lies in the southern Russian lands, it was still relatively westernized compared to eighteenth-century Russia. It is also important to note that modern borders did not exist as they do today. The Ukrainian people were basically a cultural minority controlled by their not-so-friendly neighbors to the north.

It is the Polish/Ukrainian-influenced choral concerto that dominated at the Court Chapel by the time of Anna Ioannovna’s ascension to the throne in 1730. The works of Vasily Titov and his contemporaries prevailed until the arrival of the Italianate style. 37 The domination of this choral format was due in part to the style’s earlier popularity in the Moscow Synod and surrounding areas. When Peter the Great moved the capital from Moscow to St. Petersburg in 1712, the genre naturally followed. Importantly, Peter is known to have had great love and appreciation for the partes-singing concerto. 38 This style had become highly integrated in both sacred and secular Russian music of the time. The kanty style from Poland was also very popular. Kanty and partes-singing concertos were

36 Gardner, Russian Church Singing, vol. 1, 145.
38 Ritzarev, Eighteenth-Century Russian Music, 35.
also performed to commemorate contemporary military victories.\textsuperscript{39} Two key elements of the early eighteenth-century sacred choral concerto were the Polish \textit{kanty} and the Ukrainian \textit{partesnoe penie} style. These elements, taken with the popular and influential treatise \textit{Musical Grammar} written by Nikolai Diletskii, became the dominant genre of sacred music during the Italianate period. In order to better understand the genre of choral concerto, it is helpful to examine its various elements, starting first with the \textit{kant}.

\textit{Kanty}

Russians were first exposed to Western forms of music when Polish armies occupied Moscow during part of the period known as the Time of Troubles (1606-1613). It was during this occupation that Russians first heard organ playing and Western-style part-singing from their Catholic occupiers.\textsuperscript{40} Any new style of church singing performed by citizenry of an occupying country would unlikely not have been readily welcomed. This situation was certainly no exception. As chant and chant harmonizations were still dominant in Russia, part-singing received mixed reviews. The Russia’s Orthodox Church establishment’s view was famously expressed by Moscow’s Patriarch Germogen’s statement, “The singing of the Latins I cannot bear to hear!”\textsuperscript{41}

The Polish \textit{kanty} style was essentially a three-voiced structure consisting of two upper voices moving in parallel thirds, with a supportive harmonic bass voice below. Aside from having a simple three-part foundation, the bass line followed a tonic/dominant

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{39} Ritzarev, \textit{Eighteenth-Century Russian Music}, 35.
\textsuperscript{40} Vladimir Morosan, \textit{Choral Performance in Pre-Revolutionary Russia}, (Guildford: Musica Russica, Inc., 1986), 37.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid.
structure. This is important because kanty became one of the means that western harmonic approaches were introduced, adding to Russia’s traditional modal approach. Western tonic-dominant structure was really introduced via Poland a full century before the arrival of the Italians. The kanty structure used in various choral genres, proliferated mostly in popular songs within Russia’s growing urban population. Without the popularization of the three-part kanty, it is unlikely that partesnoe penie (the generic term for part singing) would have been so readily accepted by the Church or the Russian people. Kanty (and psalms) were always sung a cappella in three parts, text written beneath the score, rather than under each voice, as illustrated on the following page.

---
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In the example, one can clearly see the tonal nature of the bass line: there are two phrases, the first in the tonic, C major, and the second, a transposed version in the dominant. The two tenor voices operate almost exclusively in parallel thirds.

There was also a second (though musically indistinguishable) Polish form: the psal'my. As the name implies, these were psal'my were settings of psalm texts, whereas the kanty were predominantly a secular musical genre. It was the seventeenth-century poet, dramatist, churchman, and enlightener Simeon Polotski (1629-1680) who has been

---
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credited with bringing this form to Moscow.\textsuperscript{47} Polotski’s translation of the original Polish texts to Russian was published in his \textit{Versified Psalter} (1680). Most notably, Vasily Titov set these to music in 1686, within a few years of Polotski’s death.\textsuperscript{48} Titov’s musical settings of Polotsky’s \textit{Psalter} became so popular that they were sung in homes, at non-liturgical feasts and official festivities. They sometimes replaced concertos and festive cantatas, occasionally becoming substitutes for folk songs.\textsuperscript{49} The popularity and wide proliferation of \textit{kanty} were likely due to its pleasing sounds and accessibility of its harmonies. Because of this, the three-part structure made its way into contemporary spiritual concerto settings. However, it was not simply two upper voices in parallel thirds that would become a significant element in Orthodox music. It was also the tidy nature of the syllabic text in their mainly homophonic settings. Polotsky was a strong proponent of syllabic verse settings, a style that limited the expressive possibilities of Church Slavonic texts. This would later become a complaint of many in the church. Many members of the clergy, particularly traditionalists, viewed the oversimplification of meter and use of homophony as ruinous to the effectiveness and inherently “Russian” sound of Russian church music. The \textit{kanty} and \textit{psalmy} were popularized in Moscow at the end of the seventeenth century. In the eighteenth century they were brought to the new capital of St. Petersburg where they also flourished. These contemporary forms can be seen in excerpts from the compositions of Vasily Titov (c.1650-c.1715).

\textsuperscript{47} Findeizen, \textit{History of Music in Russia}, vol. 2, 133.  
\textsuperscript{49} Findeizen, \textit{History of Music in Russia}, vol. 2, 133.
Vasily Titov's Kanty and Psalmy

Although not the prime focus of this study, the Russian “baroque” composer, Vasily Titov (c. 1650-c.1715) was the most prolific composer of the pre-Italianate era. One of Nikolai Diletskii’s students in Moscow, he composed over two hundred choral works, including some significant compositions for Peter the Great. Titov’s student-teacher relationship with Diletskii was incredibly important in the establishment of a dominant Russian style prior to the arrival of the Italians. Titov’s many popular works emulated the style and rules of Diletskii’s Musical Grammar. Perhaps most important of all, his location in Moscow allowed his music to become firmly established at the seventeenth-century court. As noted above, Titov set Polotsky’s Versified Psalter in the mid-1680s. This collection consisted of 165 compositions of these paraphrased Biblical texts. Because they were spiritual in nature, the Orthodox Church permitted them. This significant collection also became the domestic chamber music to be sung in homes around Moscow. By all accounts, the collection was incredibly popular, resulting in its wide dissemination throughout Moscow. As a result, Titov is credited with having brought the Polish Kanty to Moscow where Peter the Great first heard them, then eventually transported them to his new capital at St. Petersburg. As both art music and church music migrated and developed, they frequently mixed with folk idioms. A brief examination of the folk elements in Titov’s music will illustrate this process of absorption.
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Little is known of Titov's life, so it is difficult to ascertain where his folk influences originated. His settings of the psalms contained a wide variety of melodic and rhythmic constructions. Nikolai Findeizen gives two main examples of Titov's folk-inspired rhythms. The first involves Titov's accent of the penultimate quarter note of a measure. In his setting of Psalm 45, *Bog nam sila pribezhishche* (God is our strength and refuge), the first measure opens and closes with pairs of quarter note C Major triads, the first of which is accented. In the final measure, Titov achieves this stress by augmenting the quarter-note chord to a half-note chord further accentuated by a downward octave leap in the bass.

**Music Example 2.2**

![Music Example Image]

This penultimate accent is hardly unique, but in the context of its 3/2 meter, it does create an accent on beat three, resulting in an off-kilter rhythmic feel, which may likely be the folk feature referred to by Findeizen. Clearly evident is the syllabic setting of the verses. Like many English language church hymns for congregational singing, it is difficult to accurately represent correct syllabic or word stresses in a strophic setting.

---
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Another folk element used by Titov in his psalm settings is the use of similar descending passages at the end of phrases. Here, Findeizen uses *Silne v zlobe chto blazhishi* (Powerful in evil why do you stray) as his example.\(^{54}\)

**Music Example 2.3** \(^{55}\)

If we compare the soprano line in measures two and four, we see they differ only in the pitch of the first quarter-note chords. This near similarity is reinforced by the bass line, which harmonizes the first pair in a-minor and the final two in C-Major. The repeated use of such descending lines, despite variations in the actual melody and harmony, exemplify folk practices. It is difficult to establish what folk practice in the seventeenth century or earlier truly was. Without the ability to record and transcribe music as it was performed in the villages, one can only rely on manuscript and/or published sources. In example III-3, I believe that the variation between bars two and four were intended to be imitations of a solo singer taking liberties amidst the group’s harmonization. Whether this conclusion is

\(^{54}\) Findeizen, *History of Music in Russia*, vol.1, 238.

\(^{55}\) Ibid.
true or not, Titov seems to have been inspired by folk elements in his compositions. We will return to Titov when examining the spiritual concerto of the pre-Italianate period.

The *Kant* style wasn’t only popular in Moscow circles. Though Titov didn’t visit the new court at St. Petersburg, Peter the Great’s love for the *kant* style likely meant that arrangements of Polotski’s psalms were taken to the new capital. Once Peter the Great was in power, his love of singing and particularly the *Kant* form guaranteed a degree of longevity for the genre. The proliferation of the style throughout Russia was also accomplished through transmission in various manuscripts. Manuscript songbooks circulated before 1700 consisted almost exclusively of spiritual songs. From 1700-1750, manuscripts contained a mixture of spiritual and secular songs. After 1750, the collections were dominated by secular fare, reflecting the popular fascination with folk music, leading to such collections as that by Lvov and Prach, which will be discussed below.

Another resurgence in *kant* compositions at the Russian Court occurred during the reign of Elizabeth Petrovna (r. 1741-1762). After the relative dearth during Anna Ioannovna’s reign (1730-1740), a number of festive *kanty* were composed for Elizabeth’s accession. Many “Elizabethan” *kanty* used the rhythm of the polonaise, which reflected openness to some foreign influences, but limited to the country of the *kanty’s* origin. Once Catherine ascended the throne in 1762, the cantata began to replace the earlier *kanty* for use in festive occasions with instruments. However, the *kanty* style had developed such a prominent place at the court before 1762 that its structure became part of most liturgical


compositions for the ensuing decades. The use of long passages of parallel thirds (or their inversion – parallel sixths) over a foundational bass line (frequently a drone) assumed paramount importance in Russian Orthodox choral music for decades, indeed, centuries to follow. Also important to Russian Church music were the elements found in the Ukrainian *partesnoe penie* (part singing).

*Partesnoe Penie*

Whereas the *kanty* style was a Polish invention, the *partesnoe penie* derived from southwestern Russia in what is now the Ukraine and Byelorussia. A distinction between Poland, Byelorussia and the Ukraine is somewhat moot considering they were all part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The Commonwealth’s wide swath of territory allowed for the spread of many cultural practices, including *partesnoe penie*. The term *partesnoe* is actually a fairly generic term that refers to both “part-“ (or polyphonic) and polychoral singing; *penie* translates simply as “song.” This genre was sung using part books rather than the single, multi-voiced scores typical of *znamenny* (chant) polyphony. Singing from part books was obviously a tradition borrowed from the West. There were two types of *partesny*-singing: one based entirely on Western formats and another that used *znamenny*-based melodic and harmonic organization.⁵⁸ Both styles developed simultaneously, though the former required more training in Western techniques and incredibly advanced vocal skills. Because this new style began in southwestern Russia, the
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singers from these regions (particularly Ukrainians) developed these advanced skills that were later prized by the courts in Moscow and St. Petersburg.

*Partesny*-singing was brought to Muscovy at the very beginning of the epoch of polychoral singing in 1654. It was Patriarch Nikon himself who, as part of his reforms, encouraged the dissemination of part-singing at the Moscow Court. Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich was also very fond of this new music. Once he discovered just how successful part singing was in Kiev's church choirs, he ordered Ukrainian teachers and singers be brought to his court. As his singers became proficient in performing the repertoire, the style began to spread throughout greater Muscovy. Many of his court singers were also renowned for their ability as music copyists, further contributing to the form's wide dissemination. The form and structure of part-singing became essentially the same as that of the spiritual concerto. As such, it is really not necessary to provide examples here, since examples of the spiritual concerto will appear in the following chapter. What developed in Russia was a fusion of *kanty* and *partesnoe penie* that proved highly popular and was widely disseminated in the second half of the seventeenth century.

**The Establishment of the Spiritual Choral Concerto in Russia**

Prior to the era of Patriarch Nikon's reforms of 1652-1654, the state of church singing in Russia had fallen into a state of disrepair. Its linear polyphonic forms had
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become disorganized and dissonant, due greatly to the artistic licenses taken by many church singers who were more interested in showing off their technique than in teaching liturgical texts to their congregations. In his 1651 commentary on singing in the Russian church, the Monk Evfrosin stressed the importance of text clarity so that “...the singer would know what is being sung, and the hearer would understand the meaning.”62 He then continued on to criticize what was actually happening, “in our singing we only decorate the voice and preserve the znamennyi neumes, while crippling the sacred words.”63 These harsh words underscored the need for the serious reforms that would occur a few years later.

In order to carry out reforms in church singing, a commission was convened in Moscow in 1655. Headed by the monk and scholar, Aleksandr Mezenets, the group was made up of “expert singers and composers.”64 Unfortunately, an outbreak of the plague in 1655-56 and the raskol (schism) that bitterly divided the church into two opposing factions interrupted the commission’s work for thirteen years.65 As Bishop of Novgorod, Patriarch Nikon (from 1652-1658) undertook his reforms of both liturgical books and church ritual, he banned the problematic chant forms, replacing them with the Kiev-based partes-singing as the standard in Russian churches.66 Partes-singing developed as two genres: chant harmonizations and the a cappella choral concerto. This discussion will first focus on the choral concerto.

63 Ibid.
64 Ibid.
65 Ibid., 38.
66 Ibid., 25.
The roots of the Russian choral concerto can be traced to the Venetian spiritual concerto\footnote{Morosan,}\footnote{Choral Performance, 26.} Andrea Gabrieli composed in Venice.\footnote{Ritzarev,} Not only did Gabrieli’s genre spread north to Germany and Western Europe, but it also migrated north to Poland, east to the Ukraine and eventually to Russia. The original Gabrielan form could include multiple choirs comprised of voices, wind and/or brass instruments, and organ. Both Poland and western Ukraine used this model, including the organ where the Catholic Church allowed its use. The Orthodox Church had never permitted instruments; therefore the Russian version had to be\textit{ a cappella}. Key elements in the Venetian spiritual concerto included antiphonal structure, homophonic texture at climaxes, and variations/contrasts in texture. These Venetian elements had to pass through the sieve of accepted Ukrainian Orthodox traditions before they could become part of the late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century Russian choral concertos.

Geography played an integral role in the development of the Ukrainian concerto. Because a significant portion of the Ukraine bordered Poland, Austria-Hungary and Bessarabia (modern Moldova), the major-minor harmonic system had already been imported from the West.\footnote{Ritzarev,} This reality was, in no small part, due to the dissemination of the Polish \textit{Kanty}, with its tonic-dominant bass lines. The Ukrainian lands were also bracketed geographically between the opposing sides of the Polish-Ottoman War (1672-1676). As a result, there was considerable Turkish influence in Ukrainian culture. This manifested itself musically in the melodic augmented second typically found in the songs of captured

\footnote{Morosan, Choral Performance, 26.} \footnote{Ritzarev, Eighteenth-Century Russian Music, 30.}
Turkish women. This Turkish melodic element ultimately surfaced in the part-singing of Ukrainian churches. As people migrated back and forth between Muscovy in the north and the southern (Ukrainian) provinces, Russians were increasingly exposed to Ukrainian singers, composers and musicians. The beauty and quality of their singing gained their reputation in Russia as having superior talent and knowledge of music. In fact, they were so highly valued by the Russians that they were heavily recruited or taken against their will to the north. They brought all of their musical and cultural imprints with them, resulting in the Ukraine’s indelible influence on the development of Russian church music.

As the spiritual concerto migrated through Poland and the Ukraine, it exercised an influence on the polyphony of both countries. At the beginning of the seventeenth century, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was at its peak. Including modern Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Belarus, and the Ukraine, the Commonwealth had predominantly Roman Catholic populations. The Catholic churches used the same system of polyphony as the West. Orthodox Churches in the same villages were thus were exposed to Western polyphony. The relatively complex and richly textured part-singing caused admiration, envy and its inevitable absorption into the Orthodox music of these southern provinces. Once this new partes-singing was introduced and named partesnoe penie, the state of Russian church singing was revolutionized. The changes resulting changes included a required acceptance of the five-line staff (with square notation) and a modernized

70 Findeizen, *History of Music in Russia*, 231.
harmonic approach to composition. Prior to this time, Orthodox chants and their polyphonic variations were reliant on modal structures. There were certainly those opposed adopting a new system, but the reality of an increasingly cross-cultural population made its use inevitable. As the form grew in popularity, the structure of partesnoe penie grew in its complexity.

Late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century concertos in Russia were typically scored for three, four, six, or eight parts, some including as many as twelve or even twenty-four parts. The texts of these spiritual choral concertos were generally taken from the Psalms of David. Unlike liturgical chant, concertos had no assigned function in worship, but often became the climactic point of any given Service. One likely reason for the permitted use of concertos was the predominance of chant by the clergy in the majority of services. It wasn’t as though the concerto completely replaced all previous forms, but they were being used to embellish already singing-laden traditions. This was more attractive for congregations who had grown accustomed to otherwise chant-focused, all-sung Services. Now there was more variety from beginning to end. Concertos also began to appear in para-liturgical settings such as secular ceremonies or entertainments, bringing to the Russian Court the air of majesty already part of many other European Courts. The influence of extended western-European forms like opera seria, Mass and oratorio began to dominate the concertos of the mid- to late-eighteenth century, after there had been
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significant exposure to Italian opera in St. Petersburg. As previously stated, the exemplars of the Russian concerto style are apparent in the works of Vasily Titov, whose music was performed and disseminated throughout Russia up to the early years of the Italianate period.

One of the most popular pre-Italianate choral concertos is Vasily Titov's six-voice setting of Bolshóye Mnogolétiye (The Great Many Years). According to Findeizen, this composition remained in the Russian Orthodox consciousness up to the time of his writings in the early twentieth century. The work is scored for two sopranos, two tenors and two basses. It is a relatively short work that demonstrates the Russian national church style before the arrival of Araja in 1735. The dominant quality of this work is Titov's use of the kanty style. The question that naturally arose was how to expand the basic three-voice Polish form into six voices? By looking at the opening three measures, one can clearly see how Titov accomplished this feat.

78 Findeizen, History of Music in Russia, vol. 1, 235.
Titov obviously keeps the bass line in the bass voices, though with octave leaps and voice crossings. It is in the divided soprano parts and tenor parts that we find the use of parallel thirds that is the hallmark of the Kanty style. Throughout the work, Titov uses the same kind of voice doublings and crossings already seen in the two bass lines. In the first measure, the second soprano and first tenor form the lower part while the first soprano sings the upper voice. In the second measure, the first tenor and first soprano cross, each

taking the role of a kant voice. Titov’s method of setting the main line (mnogaya leta) in measure three is quite interesting. Here, he implies a kant texture by setting only the parallel thirds and omitting the harmonic bass line. All six parts sing the descending lines beginning either on an F or an A in their respective octaves. He repeats this process once more before introducing a new variant of the kant style in the third statement.

Music Example 2.5

In measure sixteen, he allows the second tenor to complete the melodic line, creating a passing major seventh. This brief dissonance is not as significant as that which occurs in measure eighteen resulting from passing and neighbor tones in both tenor voices. These represent a phenomenon typical of both folk and church polyphony. While the voices are each singing around a common melody and/or harmonic structure, there is a brief allowance of heterophony, thus the passing dissonances.
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One of Titov most significant accomplishments was his ability to capture the national character of his time. Most musicologists attribute this to his incorporation of the elements of folk performance. These elements included folk rhythms and heterophony, as well as the distinctive kant melodic style. Another distinctive feature attributed to Titov is his use of the “Russian seventh.” When creating variation between phrases, Titov sometimes created the feel of a dominant seventh harmony by means of passing tones, most often applied in the final measures of a section or entire composition. We see this harmonic seventh in a bass passing tone in the final measures of his *Mnogaya leta*.81

**Music Example 2.6** 82

---

Here, Titov used the device only once, though he frequently repeated this gesture several times in other compositions. The most common place for the appearance for such a descending bass line was in the penultimate measure before the final cadence (as we see in this example). The “Russian Bass” or passing seventh was later used by Glinka to indicate a folk-like harmonization.  We also find this device in Rachmaninoff’s *All Night Vigil*, op. 37, at the conclusion of the second movement, *Blagoslovi dushe moy* (Bless the Lord, O my soul). The use of this device has continued to represent not only the Russian folk style *per se*, but Russian singing in general.

Another feature of Titov’s setting is his consistency of voicing:

**Music Example 2.7**

---

This example shows the only two instances in which all six voices are not consistently used. In measures twelve and fourteen of his *Mnogaya leta*, Titov reduced the vocal texture to just the two soprano parts singing in parallel thirds. In this particular work, Titov focuses almost exclusively on the *Kanty* structure, achieving a sound unique to Russian music of the late seventeenth/early eighteenth century sound through its voice doublings, crossings, and the use of folk elements.

Now that we’ve seen an example of a choral piece that is predominantly based on the *kant* structure, it behooves us to examine an example of *partesnoe penie*. A fine example of Titov’s part- and polychoral singing is his *Sláva…Yedinoróniý Sïňe* (Glory…Only begotten Son), the first movement of his “Divine Service in a Minor Key”. This is a very typical concerto set for twelve voices, divided into three four-voice choirs. It is the use of multiple parts and polychoral writing that categorizes this piece as *partesnoe penie*. The dominant feature of this work is the use of contrast between various forces. Throughout the work, the four choirs are consistently handled in a concerted manner. The first example occurs in measures four through six. The first choir sings a g minor triadic statement of *i nine i prisno*, followed immediately by the second choir’s statement in c minor, and then the third choir’s statement in F Major. This is not an example of Italianate antiphony, but rather a more continuous, layered texture.
Aside from the obvious Ukrainian style of “concertization,” this example illustrates the importation of western harmonic language. In this case, Titov rapidly passes through a
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descending circle of fifths (G-C-F-B♭), demonstrating his adoption of this typical western harmonic principle. That said, Titov once again includes traditional Russian nationalistic elements into his music. The first of these is a folk “rhythm,” consisting of a repeated series of descending eighth notes. In his setting of Slava..., Titov uses this device quite early, in measures seven and eight.

Music Example 2.9

86 Dolskaya-Ackerly, ed., Sláva...Yedinorónyi Síñe (Glory...Only begotten Son), Musica Russica, 1995.
The first and second tenors sing *i vo véki vékóv* as a descending line of parallel thirds. This *kant* structure is immediately followed by second and third tenors, who repeat the material, literally. The same pattern emerges again several times later in the same composition.

Another interesting feature of this concerto is Titov’s repeated use of a melodic tritone over a drone. We see this repeated c-sharp over the g drone occurring several times, initially in measure forty-one. From a harmonic point of view, the c-sharp might represent an apparent tonicization of D major (the dominant of the drone). Because Titov was known for capturing Russia’s character, it is reasonable to look toward those elements for an explanation. Whether a quotation of a chant melody or a reflection a folk tune, it is an element that makes this passage very unique.

**Music Example 2.10**
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Titov repeats this gesture once again in measures forty-five through forty-seven, creating a certain degree of formal significance. What is most informative about this piece and most contemporary Russian concertos is the evidence it provides of the existence of concerted style prior to the arrival of the Italians. In other words, the concept of concerted form was not unknown when Araja arrived in 1735. It therefore seems that the Italian manner of concerted music was only a different approach rather than a totally new concept. It is also important to note that, despite foreign influence from Poland and the Ukrainian lands during the late seventeenth century, many Russian national elements managed to survive in her church music. Could this same resilience not have recurred during the Italian incursion in the eighteenth century?

The last key element in defining Russian choral concertos before the Italian “invasion” is an important document written by Nikolai Diletskii in the late seventeenth century. This musical treatise and educational tool was widely disseminated throughout Russia well into the eighteenth century. It was instrumental in defining pre-Italian, Russian church singing.

**Nikolai Diletskii and his treatise *A Musical Grammar***

During most of the eighteenth century, especially during the reign of Catherine the Great, many musical treatises were both copied and published in both Moscow and St. Petersburg. These treatises can be divided into two broad categories: foreign treatises
translated into Russian and those written by native Russians and Ukrainians.\textsuperscript{88} The presses of Moscow University and the Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg were the sole issuers of all foreign treatises. Their target audience was the aristocratic circles who loved Western music. The Russian treatises were all associated in some way with the Holy Synod in Moscow and focused on the composition of music for the Orthodox Church.\textsuperscript{89} The location of the Holy Synod in Moscow certainly did not prevent the distribution of treatises in St. Petersburg. Rather, it placed high priority on keeping St. Petersburg churches, including the Court Chapel, in line with the accepted traditions of Russia’s Church. This control was likely necessary due to the popularity of Italian opera at the St. Petersburg Court. Without some guidance from the Russian and Ukrainian composers and theoreticians at the Court Chapel, one can only imagine the degree to which Italian techniques would have supplanting Russian traditions. One of the most important treatises concerning eighteenth-century church music in Russia was Nikolai Diletskii’s \textit{Musical Grammar}.

Unfortunately, very little is known of Diletskii’s life. His ethnicity is generally agreed to be Ukrainian, due to the remark of another theorist, Ioannikii Trofimovich Korenev, who said that he was a “resident of the city of Kiev.”\textsuperscript{90} This single statement has been accepted as sufficient proof of Diletskii’s’s ethnicity. Assuming this ethnicity to be accurate, Diletskii was one of many Ukrainian theorists, composers and musicians who were brought into various parts of Russia during the late seventeenth century. His treatise

\textsuperscript{88}Jensen, \textit{A Theoretical Work of Late Seventeenth-Century Muscovy}, 305.
\textsuperscript{89}Ibid., 306.
\textsuperscript{90}Ibid., 310.
is important both for its content and because it is the first attempt to teach Russians how to write Western-style polyphonic compositions for the church. Its significance also derives from its appearance during the height of the struggle between those who advocated the new partesnoe singing and the adherents of the old znamennoe singing, particularly its polyphonic forms.

Diletskii actually produced several different versions of the same treatise, the first of which was published in Vilnius in 1677. Vilnius, now the capital of Lithuania, was then an important city in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. This first version, written in Polish, has been lost. Diletskii produced three subsequent Russian versions, each with textual and musical variants. The three versions occur as follows:

1. *A Grammar of Musical Singing* – Smolensk, 1677
2. *An Idea of Musical Grammar* – Moscow, 1679
3. *A Grammar of Musical Singing* – Moscow, 1679 & 1681

Each of these three Russian versions underwent multiple re-printings and copying over the course of the eighteenth century, the last appearing in the 1780s. The multiplicity of these copies is testimony to the importance and utility of the treatise for eighteenth-century composers. From its first publication in 1677 to the copies made in the 1780s, Diletskii’s rules became common knowledge and common accepted practice.

---
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For the purpose of this study, I will refer to the 1723 Lviv manuscript copy of Diletskii’s treatise. Written in Ukrainian script, the 1723 Lviv edition is actually a copy of the 1677 Smolensk edition of Diletskii’s treatise. The anonymous scribe introduces his copy with the following dedication on his title page:

Nikolai Diletskii, in Smolensk wrote here in God’s (words) in 1677; this author at present writes the same in the regal Tsar’s city of St. Petersburg, in the year of our Lord 1723, October, the 21st day.”

He also included some phrases in Latin and some pages from Simeon Polotsky’s book, “The Rod of Governance,” which had served as the Moscow Court’s official reply to the Old Believers’ assertion that Patriarch Nikon’s reforms were heretical. Polotsky, a respected poet and author, was strongly associated with the movement to establish Tsar Alexei Michaelovich (r. 1645-1676) as the champion of the Russian Orthodox Church. This support created a long-lasting link between the Russian ruler and the Orthodox Church. Polotsky wrote his book in 1667, a full ten years before the first version of Diletskii’s *Musical Grammar* appeared in print. Clearly, the Diletskii’s inclusion of a quotation from Polotsky’s pro-imperialist book would lay the groundwork for royal approval of his treatise.

There is an unusual feature on the title heading of this particular manuscript. The title page associates the main stages of Diletskii’s work on his *Musical Grammar* in

96 Manuscript Edition, Folio I, *Tak yako gramatika muzikalna nadto svitlo prikladami ob’yacnena v Vilni, nini paki svitoo podano chrez troodi Nikolai Diletskii v Smolensk ot voploshcheniya boga slova 1677; abtorom tim zhe nini zhe napisasya v tsarstbyoushchem gradi Sankt Peterborg lita or Christa 1723, oktobria, dnya 21; ha avtora troodelsya Diletskii; Bog tebi za toe zaplati, Bog tebe za toe vvedet v nevo z angeli likovati.

connection with the cities of Vilnius, Smolensk, and St. Petersburg. What is strange is that the copyist omitted Moscow, the former location of the Imperial Court and the city in which two different editions of the treatise were published. The future capital of St. Petersburg was still just a marshy swamp when Diletskii died in the 1680s. Despite this fact, the most prominent image on the bottom of the second folio page is of the fortress at St. Petersburg, a ship, and the date of 1723. Whoever the scribe was, he (or his superiors) clearly wanted to connect this treatise with the new capital. Given that the text of this copy is in Ukrainian, this imagery may seem an even odder choice; however, connecting the Ukraine and the Russian Court was a high priority for Peter the Great.

In 1723, Peter the Great was still in power, conquering lands to expand the Russian empire to the south and the east. In 1721, the Great Northern War had come to an end, establishing Russia as the power of the Baltic Sea, with Peter the Great and St. Petersburg at its center. Russia had just conquered Persia to gain control of the Caspian Sea port of Baku, along with Derbent. On September 12, 1723, less than one month before the Lviv manuscript copy of Diletskii’s treatise, the government of Tahmasp II signed the St. Petersburg Peace Treaty. The combination of these two recent victories establishing Peter’s Russia as a great world power might have been enough to re-establish a connection between the Ukraine and St. Petersburg. However, there was one significant complicating factor - Russian-Ukrainian relations and the reforms of Peter the Great.

99 Ibid., Folio II.
Russia was essentially a suzerain to the Ukraine, controlling the Ukrainian lands in international affairs, but allowing some self-governance in domestic issues. Not yet a state, the Ukraine was a Hetmanate, or a collection of Cossacks living on the east bank of the Dnieper River.\textsuperscript{101} Since 1709, Peter the Great had sought to reign in the Ukrainian Cossacks, further limiting their few powers. Forced taxation, the moving of Hetmanate offices and homes, and the incursion of Russian troops into the Ukraine were some of the methods used by the Tsar to increase his control of the region. In his final years, Peter I further increased the intensity of his strategies to control “Little Russia.” In 1720, he issued a decree banning the publication of new books, the sole exception being religious books, and then only after they conformed in all ways with the “Great Russian Church.”\textsuperscript{102} After the Great Northern War concluded in 1721, reforms in the Ukraine were further intensified. In the spring of 1723, Russian troops were formally accused of destroying Ukrainian lands, creating further tensions in the Russo-Ukrainian relationship.

The Lviv manuscript of Diletskii’s \textit{Musical Grammar} may therefore, have been part of an effort to salvage the Ukrainian Orthodox Church’s relations with the Russian Court. Since there is no information about the scribe (his employers), the true motivations for the production of this manuscript copy cannot be known with certainty. However, it is interesting to note two specific elements included in the scribe’s title page dedication. He wrote, “Nikolai Diletskii, in Smolensk wrote here in God’s (words) in 1677...” in order to confirm the religious association of the document, adhering to Peter’s decree that only

\textsuperscript{102} Ibid., 14.
religious books could be published in the Ukrainian language. Perhaps more obvious was the scribe’s servile reference to the “regal Tsar’s city of St. Petersburg.” This dedication has the hallmarks of an effort to ingratiate the treatise to Peter the Great. Whether or not it was an actual gift to the St. Petersburg Court or not, Diletskii’s treatise was a significant early eighteenth century document associated with the St. Petersburg Court.

At ninety-four pages in length, the manuscript has illustrations and numerous musical examples taken from the compositions of Diletskii and contemporaries such as Nikolai Bavykin, Fyodor Redrikov, Mikhail Sifov, and Vasily Titov. The treatise is divided into six sections plus a separate conclusion, each section being devoted to specific areas of music composition, instruction or performance practice.

The first section, entitled *O Musiki* (On Music), provides a general, aesthetic definition of music, including the nature of its sounds. Here, Diletskii defines music as “something that moves man’s heart to happiness or to sadness.” He further specifies that emotions in music - the concept of *smyl’* are of three types: happy music (*veselaia, radostnaia*), sad music (*pechal’naia, skorbnaia*), or a mixture of the two (*smeshennaia*). He refers to ut-mi-sol as being happy, and re-fa-la as being sad. At first glance, it seems that Diletskii is referring to major and minor modes. The concept of major and minor triads had been established a full century before in Zarlino’s *Dimonstrationi harmoniche* of 1571. However, it is unlikely that Diletskii would have had a great working knowledge of these

_---------------------_
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concepts. His “happy music” does appear to be in major mode, while “sad music” appears to be in the minor modes. His reference to mixing happy and sad implies a form of modulation typical in Russian church music, the *peremnost*, or sudden move from a major key to its parallel minor or vice versa. He further specifies this by using solmization syllables derived from the hexachords that outline major and minor thirds. This may be an oversimplification, considering Diletskii’s unclear presentation of terminology and concepts.\(^{107}\) Regardless of the clarity of the system he presents, Diletskii did expose Russian readers to the concepts of major and minor tonalities. Russian composers would have been able to receive further clarification on major/minor tonality by reading the *dvoznamenniki*, contemporary manuscripts that acquainted readers with the five-line staff and the system of hexachords.\(^{108}\)

The second section of Diletskii’s treatise addresses the basics of solmisation and harmony. He discusses solmization very briefly in a passage that demonstrates how to combine letters and hexachordal syllables in the various keys.\(^{109}\) For example, in music lacking a key signature, he suggests that A may be thought of as *la* or *re*, B as *si*, C as *fa* or *ut*, D as *sol* or *re*, E as *la* or *mi*, F as *fa*, and *G* as *sol* or *ut*.\(^{110}\) His failure to cover all keys suggests an expectation that informed Russian readers would also have been familiar with the *dvoznamenniki*, which contain a more complete and fundamental description of the system of solmization.

---

\(^{107}\) Jensen, *A Theoretical Work of Late Eighteenth-Century Muscovy*, 323.
\(^{108}\) Ibid., 323.
\(^{109}\) Ibid., 316.
\(^{110}\) Diletskii, *Musical Grammar*, Folio IV.
The second section continues by addressing the basic elements of harmony. Diletskii provides patterns for building triads and first inversion chords. He includes consonances and dissonances, giving special attention to the leading notes in cadences.\textsuperscript{111} Of particular interest with the second section is that his association of the interval of a sixth with the word “elegance.” He provides musical examples that demonstrate the possible use of sixths in various ways, first in contrary motion.

**Music Example 2.11\textsuperscript{112}**

Here he demonstrates the alternation of sixths with fifths and thirds, with the voices moving in contrary motion. He then provides a possible bass line (in root position) that demonstrates the progression: V - V/V - V – I – IV – V - I. Diletskii then demonstrates extended parallel motion, showing both fifths and sixths.\textsuperscript{113}

\textsuperscript{112} Ibid., 13.
\textsuperscript{113} Ibid., Folio XIV.
This demonstration is most interesting because one of the key defining features of Russian sacred concertos are passages using extended parallel motion between two voices in either sixths or thirds (the inversion of a sixth). This extended parallel motion may occur with or without an accompanying drone or other “bass” line. Diletskii certainly did not create this structure, but as a proponent of the Ukrainian kant style, his discussion of parallel thirds or
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sixths is quite telling. His treatise was one of many vehicles by which the kanty style migrated from the Ukraine into Russia proper, where Peter the Great himself would become one of the form’s leading proponents.

The sections of *Musical Grammar* most germane to this study are those that deal specifically with the art of composing multi-voice choral concertos, the formal genre that dominated the scene from the late seventeenth century through the eighteenth century. Diletskii discussed elements of concerto composition in the third, fourth, and fifth sections of *Musical Grammar*. In these sections imitation, canonic sequence, and text underlay are the topics of discussion. Diletskii also addresses the possibility of borrowing material for a “cantus firmus” either from liturgical chants or the melodies of popular songs. Since the Orthodox Church did not encourage the use of popular melodies, Diletskii’s advocacy of their use decades prior to the eighteenth-century fascination with popular folk tunes is significant. He also addresses counterpoint and the process of concertizing a composition through the contraposition of solo voices with the larger sound of the choral tutti. These aspects of the study reflect, in part, a late seventeenth-century Ukrainian interpretation of the late sixteenth-century Venetian polychoral concerto.

In the third section of his *Musika Grammatiki*, Diletskii addresses pervaya regula – the rules of utmost importance.¹¹⁵ The most significant part of this text addresses the rules of imitation. Imitation was as fundamental to the structure of late seventeenth-century Russian polyphony as it had been in the West a century earlier. In the imitation of parts, he advocates bass imitating bass at the unison, and descant imitating descant, also at the

¹¹⁵ Diletskii, *Musical Grammar*, Folio XVI.
unison. Why he specifies only the soprano and bass voices to illustrate this rule of imitation is unclear. It is possible that he was supporting the foundational harmonic role of the bass voice, along with the melodic function of the soprano part. It is also possible that he advocated the same procedure for the alto and tenor voices, assuming the reader would inherently understand his intentions. Regardless of his actual intent, he demonstrates this principle using a musical example of his own composition. This example demonstrates imitation at the unison, as well as good voice leading in a perfect authentic cadence.

Musical Example 2.13

Imitation at the unison becomes very apparent in eight-part concertos when bass lines descend by fifths, or when there is antiphonal alternation of choirs. We can see this in Vasily Titov’s eight-part setting of Beźnevněsňayá Dévo (O Virgin Unwedded), mm. 23-26.

116 Diletskii, Musical Grammar, Folio XVI.
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In this excerpt, he applies the rule in its extreme, imitation at the unison occurring between each of the voice pairs. Strict application of this rule can create dissonances, such as we see on beat four of measure twenty-four. The section is in a-minor and shifting between the tonic and dominant chord. The passing dissonance occurs between the second alto’s g-

118 Morosan, One Thousand Years, 211.
sharp and the first alto and baritone a-natural. While not a particularly striking dissonance, this passage does illustrate a somewhat rigid approach to the rule of imitation at the unison. One might normally invert pitches to have the semi-tone dissonance on the weak part of that beat to create a passing tone dissonance. With time, the application of this particular rule would become more flexible.

Diletskii does not limit his discussion of imitation to the unison, but also discusses imitation at the fifth as an acceptable technique, providing several examples. The first demonstrates a three-part texture in which two descant voices imitate the bass. The upper voice is in canon with the bass at the octave, while the middle voice is imitating at the sixth (or moving in parallel thirds with its neighbor). The interval of the fifth occurs between the bass half note and the descant voice’s initial eighth note. In other words, the descant initiates its sequence on a C, a perfect fifth (plus one octave) above the bass F.

Musical example 2.15

![Musical example 2.15](image)

Obviously, there is also extended parallelism between the upper two voices operating in parallel thirds. The resulting structure outlines an ascending the circle of fifths. Here, Diletski attempts to “kill two birds with one stone” by addressing another form of imitation

---
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while reinforcing the tonic system of harmonization. Diletskii follows with two more examples of imitation at the fifth. The first is a four-voice example, with bass imitating bass at the unison and the two descant parts at a fourth (as inverted fifth). The second example is only two parts with the bass imitating a descant at a perfect fifth below. In all of his examples, Diletskii demonstrates a clear understanding of proper voice leading for cadences.

In the fourth section of his treatise, Diletskii addresses a series topics: ascending and descending imitation, step sequences, canons for two choirs, subjugation of thematic pitch material to rhythmic concerns, tonal and textural transformations, and the important topic of the drone. This is a good place to begin. He first defines a drone as the bass part holding a note for many measures. Although Diletskii does not give a specific number of measures, it is important to note that an Orthodox drone (called *isocratema*) is held for significantly longer than pedal points encountered in Western-style music. Pedal point and drone are distinct features that can become confused when analyzing Russian church music during the Italianate period. Diletskii indicates that the drone note may change by moving up or down by the interval of a fifth or sixth. Above this, the other voices sing in canon or in parallel thirds or fifths. He demonstrates this in the following three-voice example:

---
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In the example, Diletskii clearly focuses on the principle of imitation as a canon between the top two voices. Such patterns between the upper two voices are very typical of *kant* texture in their essential parallel third movement (with the occasional unison as voices cross). He also demonstrates the drone pitch change at the perfect fifth, with the final two measures demonstrating a perfect authentic cadence. Ensuing examples demonstrate how a bass pedal point can utilize octave leaps and still be a drone. This alternation can occur in one voice or as imitation between two voices.

Although he initially advocates changing the bass drone only by intervals of a fifth or sixth, Diletskii does provide an example in which the bass drone changes pitch by thirds and fourths.

121 Diletskii, *Musical Grammar*, Folio XXVIII.
In the example, the bass is outlining the C minor tonality suggested by the two flats in the key signature, along with the accidentals A-flat (in the natural minor scale) and the raised seventh degree B-natural (to create the dominant chord). Why Diletskii breaks his own rule about pitch changes in drones is unclear. One can argue that he does follow his rule by moving from G in the first two measures to an E-flat in the sixth measure, an interval of a minor sixth. In this particular case, he breaks the sixth by placing the B-flat in between, outlining an E-flat major triad in first inversion. The problem with this argument is that he no longer uses a drone once that E-flat is reached. He writes a harmonically functional bass line in those last five measures. It is the author’s experience, however, that changes in the bass drone pitches generally involve movement by fifth and sixth as mandated by Diletskii.

---
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Another important topic for composers of choral concerti was the appropriate setting of texts. In the late sixteenth century, the Moscow Synod exercised nearly complete control over all aspects of the Orthodox Service. Despite Patriarch Nikon’s reforms that encouraged part-singing, the Synod still insisted clarity of text declamation in composed music. To what extent they attempted to exert control is unclear, but it was a topic that had to be addressed. In his section titled “Disposition” Diletskii discusses some general rules of setting text, as well as the juxtaposition of small ensembles with tutti in large choral works. In his discussion about text setting, he uses the text *Slava...Yedinorodni Sine* (Glory...Only begotten Son) as his example. His primary focus is where the text is divided to accommodate tutti choir and small ensemble.\(^\text{123}\) His suggestions are outlined in the chart below:

**Table 2.1: Diletskii *Slava* Text Declamation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Division</th>
<th>Text and Translation</th>
<th>Texture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I izvoliviy (and didst will for our salvation)</td>
<td>tutti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Voplotitisya (to be incarnate of the Holy Theotokos)</td>
<td>small ensemble</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I prisno dvevoy Maria (and ever Virgin Mary)</td>
<td>tutti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. rasniysia zhe (and was crucified, O Christ God)</td>
<td>small ensemble</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. smertiyoo (trampling down death by death)</td>
<td>tutti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sviatiya troytsi (who art one of the holy trinity)</td>
<td>small ensemble</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sproslaviyemiy Otsu (glorified with the Father and the Holy Spirit)</td>
<td>tutti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{123}\) Diletskii, *Musical Grammar*, Folio XV.
It is important to note how these concerti were used in the Orthodox Services then and now. The entirety of the Service is sung almost exclusively by the clergy, whether as solo singing by the Archpriest, or group singing involving all clergy present. This singing takes place both behind the “Heavenly Gate” (hidden from the congregation), and at in full view of the congregation. There are some moments in the Service where the congregation will sing an “Amen” or some other brief textual response. These are liturgically prescribed and understood by the congregation. The role of choral concerti is really to punctuate certain points of the Service. Text is always the principal factor in choosing which concerto will be performed. Given this liturgical function, why should there be any differentiation between tutti and small ensemble within a composition? The answer lies in a desire to echo the overall progression of a Service. There is constant variety between the solo Archpriest, the group of clergy, and the congregation. This concerto itself represents an extension of this practice. Another consideration is the composer’s choice of which lines of text are assigned to the small ensemble (imitating either priest or group of clergy) and which will be sung by the tutti choir (imitating either group of clergy or full congregation). Generally speaking, the more important portions of the text will are assigned to the small ensemble because they are able to better articulate these than the tutti group.

In examining Diletskii’s breakdown of the above text into tutti and small ensemble passages, he seems to simply alternate back and forth. As the author is neither a scholar of Church Slavonic texts nor liturgical practice, no judgment can be made as to the propriety of these divisions. Diletskii’s contemporaries may have made different choices when setting the same text. By making reference to specific textual performance practices, Diletskii seems to be dedicated to the Orthodox tradition of placing text above all else.
However, he later contradicts himself by suggesting that each composer of new music simply set the words according to his own musical ear.124

Aside from his suggestions about dividing sections of text between small ensemble and tutti chorus, Diletskii also makes a rather broad suggestion for setting a text in a large-scale choral work. He basically applies a mathematical formula to the process, advocating the counting of textual syllables so the composer could write a sufficient number of separate notes for each vocal line in the composition.125 When counting the syllables, it is assumed that a composer will understand that there is a rhythmic focus more than a pitch focus. In other words, the composer will consider how many eighth notes might be required to cover all the syllables in a line of text. Once again, Diletskii uses the text Glory…Only begotten Son as his illustrative example. He provides the music and assumes that the reader knows the text.

124 Diletskii, Musical Grammar, Folio XV.
125 Ibid., Folio XV.
Diletskii clearly intended his treatise to be used by students because he does not actually provide the text setting, instead allowing the reader to complete the exercise. It takes some degree of manipulation due to the different numbers of notes in each voice part. It makes sense to solve the problem by approaching each voice from the final measure and move backwards. By taking this approach, with some trial and error, a reasonable solution can be achieved. This exercise illustrates an important element of Diletskii’s treatise: his belief that melodies could be composed before inserting text. He refers to this as “non textual inspiration.”\textsuperscript{127} He believes this to be useful in order to allow for the incorporation of violins and other instruments. This does not suggest that he advocated the use of

\textsuperscript{126} Diletskii, \textit{Musical Grammar}, Folio XV.
\textsuperscript{127} Ibid., Folio XXXIII.
instruments within the church, but was reflecting the importance of instrumental music in Western Baroque music. Instruments were used in contemporary Moscow feasts and festivals outside of the church.

Despite his perhaps questionable approach to text setting and his self-contradictions, Diletskii’s seventeenth-century treatise was a landmark document in the development of Russian church music. Not only did it provide Russian composers with techniques necessary to write their own choral concertos, but also it reflected the Russian and Ukrainian techniques at play in the late seventeenth century and through most of the eighteenth century. Its wide dissemination through publication and eighteenth century manuscript copies give it a prominence over many other Russian and foreign treatises. Diletskii’s students, particularly Vasily Titov were strong proponents of his compositional rules. The compositions of Titov, closely mirroring the treatise, were widely performed in Russia right up to the arrival of the Italians in St. Petersburg. Now that we’ve examined the music within the pre-Italianate Russian Orthodox Church, it is useful to explore influences from folk traditions.

The Influence of Folk Traditions in Church Music

Since the two traditions did not exist exclusively of one another, any study of Russian polyphonic church music must include the style of polyphony evident in early Russian folk music. Unfortunately, almost any discussion of influence between folk and
church music will essentially end up as a “Which came first, the chicken or the egg?” Johann von Gardner, an important twentieth-century scholar on Russian church music discusses the two sides of the debate in his second volume of *Russian Church Singing*. According to Gardner, some scholars (un-named) believe that *znammeny* chant melodies originated in folk songs. Gardner takes the opposite position. He believes that folk songs unconsciously borrowed from elements heard in worship. This makes a great deal of sense due to the important role the church played in Russians’ everyday lives. All people, regardless of class, attended church Services on a regular basis. The church had a great deal of influence and power in most villages and towns. Whether folk polyphony preceded church polyphony or vice versa, there is unlikely going to be a “smoking gun” that proves which argument is accurate or when and where one influenced the other. It is most important to recognize that both forms of polyphony shared many common traits.

In examining the history of Russian folk music in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, it becomes apparent that St. Petersburg and Moscow were the two primary centers by which folk music crossed over from peasant country life into urban consciousness. Once these songs, dances and poetry entered the cities, it was only a matter of time before they would reach the upper echelons of aristocratic life and, eventually, the court itself. Because St. Petersburg was a brand new city built on swampland, a great deal of labor was required from the serf population. The large influx of forced and voluntary labor brought into St. Petersburg for the first several decades of the eighteenth century would have a long-lasting impact on her cultural development. Masses of shipbuilders,

---

carpenters, construction workers and other craftsmen poured into the new capital region from the countryside. As a result, there was a constant circulation of trains of carts bringing in supplies. These certainly included the peasant workers and their songs.\textsuperscript{129}

In addition to the hard laborers were clerks, scribes and soldiers who were quartered in St. Petersburg when not fighting one of the many wars of the eighteenth century. Because singing was such an important part of daily life for the Russian people, this tradition quickly transplanted itself to the streets of St. Petersburg.\textsuperscript{130} When the new urban clerks sang, they apparently sang newly composed love songs about flirtation, abandonment or a broken heart. These were themes that reflected their newfound social freedom, and the heartaches that accompanied them.\textsuperscript{131} These love songs became quite popular with the rest of St. Petersburg’s residents, including the aristocrats who were recent transplants from Moscow or elsewhere.

Peter the Great had to establish a regular army at his new capital. The soldiers were mostly recruited from amongst the peasant population. These soldiers were conscripted to twenty-five years of service, forcing the men from various parts of Russia to live in close quarters. This created a new melting pot of regional and urban singing.\textsuperscript{132} The songs were sung with such regularity that many became familiar favorites of the residents in the new capital. As interest grew in the more popular songs, thoughts of transcribing or arranging them became more evident. The first such popular distribution of folk songs came about as

\textsuperscript{129} Brown, \textit{A Collection of Russian Folk Songs}, 5.
\textsuperscript{130} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{131} Ibid., 6.
\textsuperscript{132} Ibid.
early as 1700, in Moscow. These songs were certainly transplanted to St. Petersburg by the migrant workers who made the trip. Initially, written forms of popular songs were disseminated in the form of manuscripts and notebooks of many of the middle and lower working classes in urban populations. These informal collections date back to the seventeenth century. They were written in various forms, many including only texts of the songs, while some also included the music. The songs came from Poland and the Ukraine as well as Russia. Researcher A.V. Pozdeev found certain problems with the manuscripts, such as the legibility of handwriting, and the inconsistent use of text- and music-setting conventions. This merely reflects their amateur nature and does not undermine their importance to the popularity and spread of folk singing decades before the published collections of the late eighteenth century. The continued appreciation and dissemination of folk singing would inevitably be a factor in the composition of church music. The question remains: what elements from folk singing might turn up in Russian church music? Was the heterophony that occurred in folk music the same that occurred in chant harmonizations? These questions will be addressed in subsequent sections of this paper. In order to maintain a chronological flow, the well-known Lvov Prach folk song collection published in the late eighteenth century, will receive attention during the chapter about Giuseppe Sarti.
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Chant harmonizations in the eighteenth century

Although this study is intended to focus on the genre of choral concertos, one cannot completely ignore other polyphonic forms of church singing. Eastern Orthodox chant is complex and fascinating, differing significantly from its Western counterpart. There are many studies devoted solely to attempts at understanding its various forms, manuscript styles and performance practices. Because this study focuses on Italian influence during the epoch of polychoral singing, it is logical to leave the topic of monophonic chant to others. This brief section will attempt to describe the general traits of chant harmonizations during the mid to late eighteenth century.

A discussion of Russian Orthodox chant in its monophonic and polyphonic forms will include two separate forms: demestvenny and znamenny. In order to avoid getting bogged down with too many details, I will focus on their key elements. The demestvenny harmonizations emerged in the final part of the first epoch of monophonic singing, in the years leading up to 1652 and Patriarch Nikon’s reforms. As mentioned previously, one of the important reasons for Nikon’s musical reforms came as a result of the state of chant harmonizations. The Demestvenny was characterized by an abundance of dissonant combinations and asymmetric rhythms resulting from their heterophonic structure. The dissonance and heterophony is evident in the late seventeenth-century, three-voiced demestvenny polyphony below.

\[\text{136} \text{ Gardner, } \textit{Russian Church Singing}, \text{ vol. 2, } 298.\]
When looking at the upper two voices, the heterophony is prevalent, particularly in the second stave of the example. If one considers the middle voice to represent the melody, the top weaves above and below, frequently creating dissonances of seconds. The octave G is immediately followed by an incredible dissonance of F-G-A. This can be considered a relatively conservative version of the demestvenny type of harmonization compared to those that gave Patriarch Nikon such grief.

The other type of Russian Orthodox chant is the znamenny, her most ancient form of liturgical singing. Znamenny was initially performed in monophonic form, and eventually included a drone (ison) that was generally not notated. By the mid-seventeenth century, harmonizations of znamenny chant were most often in three voices, likely a result of kant.
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137 Gardner, Russian Church Singing, vol. 2, 299.
proliferation after Nikon’s reforms. A typical example is the three-voiced, seventeenth-century setting of “The Cherubic Hymn” below:

Music Example 2.20

This example highlights the parallel nature of the parts, reflecting a rather elementary understanding of Western harmony. The parallel triads show poor voice leading, though church singers were not overly concerned with this. Compared to the previous demestvenny example, there is much less dissonance. Although dissonance within later

---
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znamenny was less frequent, it still was a factor. In the same three-voice setting of “The Cherubic Hymn,” we can see some striking dissonance that occurs in a later passage.

**Music Example 2.21**

In the first system above, there are still parallel triads that dominate until the end of the system. If we focus on the final four half notes of the first system, we initially see parallel thirds from *kant* that lead to the dissonance of F-A-B♭. This dissonance leads to an even more dissonant G-A-B♭ at the beginning of the bottom system. It takes a few more beats to revert back to parallel triads. In this case, the middle part sings the chant melody and the top voice is working heterophonically around it.
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Evidently, Nikon had addressed the majority of dissonant clashes in church chant in the mid-seventeenth century. However, the linear approach to harmonizations, often resulting in folk-like heterophony, clearly remained an accepted practice. When a seventeenth- or eighteenth-century composer attempted to harmonize a chant melody, he was faced with the challenge of forcing the rhythmically irregular melody into a form conducive to contemporary harmonic practices. Kastalsky referenced this challenge when he said, “znamenny tunes seem to hate being worked up, and wriggled about rebelliously and were as capricious as children about to be washed – except that they don’t yell.”\(^{140}\) With all of their inherent challenges, chant harmonizations demonstrate two key elements: they are constructed linearly and they are rife with heterophonically derived dissonances.

There is a third element that must be addressed within any discussion of Orthodox chant: the drone.

In the section about Diletskii’s treatise, the concept of a drone was briefly addressed. Because of its importance to polyphonic Orthodox music, it merits further discussion. The znamenny monophonic chants were regularly performed with a drone. The use of drone is a tradition integral to Byzantine chant, from whence Russian church music originates. The drone is properly known as isocratema, or more succinctly, ison.\(^{140}\)

David J. Melling is a scholar and longtime performer of Byzantine chant. In 2000, he self-published Psalmodia, a guide to the correct performance of these chants. He devotes some time in part one of his book to the nature of the ison. He outlines five main types:

1. Stable ison – the basic (tonic) note of the melody is held throughout.

2. Isocratema on the basic note of the tetrachord – as the tetrachord changes, the ison will change to support the new tetrachord.

3. Mobile isocratema using dominant notes – here the ison will move to sustain dominant notes of the of the mode. The ison will support the final note of a given phrase.

4. Semi-harmonic isocratema – this is, in essence, a false drone. Here, a composer or choir director may have an ison added to support any given tonality.

5. Compound isocratema – an ancient practice that uses the basic note of the mode, plus one or more dominant mode simultaneously. This may sound somewhat like Western organum.\textsuperscript{141}

Melling adds another important fact about authentic isocratema practices: that in all of the above forms, it is possible to replicate the ison an octave higher, or as the case permits, an octave lower. This statement is consistent with Diletskii’s notion that a drone could be broken by octave displacement within one voice part or between multiple voice parts. As Byzantine chant has not changed immensely in its long history, it is logical to assume that these forms of isocratema (with the exception of the semi-harmonic form) have been in existence for centuries. Therefore, any treatment of drone within a late-eighteenth or early nineteenth-century choral composition had some grounding within the Orthodox rite. We do, in fact, see some of these forms ison in contemporary works. Even Diletskii established ground rules about using drones and how to change pitches.

What was the state of Russian Orthodox Music by 1730?

The evidence compiled creates a complex image of Russian church music by Araja’s arrival in 1730. At this time, there had already been significant foreign influences from both Poland and the Ukraine. *Partesnoe penie* and *kanty* had already been ingrained in the Russian consciousness for almost a century. Although the Italians had approximately 150 years of polychoral experience, they were not the first to bring the style to Russia. The Ukrainian form of the spiritual concerto had been incorporated by the mid-seventeenth century. The compositions of Vasily Titov and his contemporaries during Russia’s Baroque were accepted and highly popular amongst both clergy and congregations. Their works were not criticized for being too foreign in nature, but were rather admired for their ability to capture Russia’s national character.

*Kanty* were also quite familiar to the Russian people by the beginning of the eighteenth century. Not only had they been evident in the church since Nikon’s reforms, but they also played a significant role in the same manuscript collections as folk songs in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.\(^\text{142}\) According to musicologist Tamara Livanova, the general nature of the sacred *kanty*, although not specifically performed in churches, displayed many of the same traits of both the *znamenny* chant harmonizations and the contemporary *partesnoe penie*.

\[\text{...the characteristic Russian melodies of some *kanty* sometimes approach the melodic gestures of and resemble those of the Great *znamenny* chant [Old Orthodox church chant], while their general cast – harmony, parallel voice}\]

\(^{142}\) Brown, *A Collection of Folk Songs*, 12.
movement, and character of the melismata – discloses a kinship with *partesnoe penie*.¹⁴³

Livanonova goes on to say that there was essentially a new style that emerged, consisting of a mixed style that blended the church modes and folk modes, the new tonic system, along with the harmonic functions that reflected folk parallel voice-leading traditions.¹⁴⁴ Whatever the reason, perhaps a trend led by the Russian people to incorporate “their” singing into the church or a concerted conscious effort by the Orthodox Church to make Services more palatable, the lines between sacred and secular music were already becoming blurred before the beginning of the eighteenth century. The turn of the century would only begin the acceleration of the secularization of Church Services. By the arrival of Araja in 1730, conditions were ripe for the incorporation of Western approaches. The continued urban interest in folk music, the aristocratic fascination with Italian opera, and the popularity of Diletskii’s treatise (advocating Western approaches to harmony and instrumental approaches to text setting) were strong factors that opened the Russian ears and minds to further changes. Finally, the publication of various folk music collections gave a further push toward the melding of Russian and Western musical elements.

By the time Sarti arrived at the St. Petersburg Court in 1784, there had been five decades of Italian operatic influence. Russia’s liturgical music didn’t begin to feel the effects of Italian influence until Baldassare Galuppi’s arrival in 1762. With Traetta and Paisello who followed Galuppi, the liturgical influence of Italy was once again minimized. Thus, Sarti found himself in a St. Petersburg Court led by Catherine the Great, whose

¹⁴⁴ Ibid.
musical tastes were extravagant and open to Italian influence. This included some freedom for Sarti to experiment with the popular Russian horn bands and orchestras for his non-liturgical sacred works. He was able to push the boundaries of foreign acceptance, while being exposed to native Russian and Ukrainian traditions through Diletskii’s treatise and the Lvov Prach Collection of folk songs.
Chapter 3: Giuseppe Sarti’s Russia: His residency in Russia, his Italian sacred compositions and Russian Orthodox music, Contemporary Folk Song Collections

Now that one has a picture of eighteenth-century Russia’s church music, we can begin to look at what Giuseppe Sarti brought to the table. Unfortunately, some confusion surrounds the chronology of events at the eighteenth-century Russian Imperial Court in St. Petersburg. These same difficulties also complicate current attempts to know exactly what composers were employed at the court, in what position and when. One has to read between the lines in various sources, creating a composite picture from the many parts. Therefore, the following chronology of Sarti’s life and times in Italy, Copenhagen, St. Petersburg and southern Russia is a tapestry woven from the facts gleaned from many disparate sources.

Little is known of Sarti’s early years in Italy. He was born the seventh of eleven children to a jeweler in the Italian city of Faenza in November of 1729. His father served as a violinist at the cathedral. According to the Sarti family, he received his early musical training from G.F. Vallotti in Padua. At the age of ten he began his studies with Padre G. B. Martini in Bologna, who taught organ and composition to the young man. Martini’s teaching and Sarti’s talents resulted in his being appointed organist at the Faenza cathedral in 1748. The duration of his tenure there is unclear. According to the New Grove Dictionary of Opera, he remained at the Faenza Cathedral until he assumed the position as

music director of the Faenza Theatre in 1752.\textsuperscript{146} His first opera \textit{Pompeo in Armenia} (1752) was highly successful. In the same year, Sarti also composed \textit{Il re pastore}, which was even more successful than its predecessor when it opened in Venice in 1753.\textsuperscript{147} His career henceforth would be devoted mainly to the composition and production of operas. Two significant periods of this output stemmed from foreign residencies, first in Denmark (1753-1765) and finally in Russia (1784-1802).

Shortly after his appointment to the Faenza Theatre, Sarti travelled with Pietro Mingottis's opera troupe to Copenhagen, arriving there by the end of 1753. He obviously made an impression at the court of Frederick V, because on April 1, 1755 he was named to replace Paolo Scalabrin as HofKapellmeister.\textsuperscript{148} In addition to opera, Sarti's Copenhagen tenure was marked by a prolific production of instrumental music. During the 1757 and 1758 seasons, he wrote a total of 76 symphonies, all for the King's Table.\textsuperscript{149} This was not entirely satisfying to Sarti, whose real passion lay with Italianate singing and opera. In 1754, he wrote \textit{Ciro riconosciuto}, which was published without recitatives, presumably because Danish performers were incapable of performing them well. The opera was an instant success, acclaimed by the public and critics alike.\textsuperscript{150} This first great success paved


\textsuperscript{149} Ibid., 528.

\textsuperscript{150} Thrane, \textit{Sarti in Kopenhagen, Sammellb"{a}nde der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft}, 3. Jahrg., H. 3. (May, 1902)
the way for his appointment as Kapellmeister of the Danish Court opera in 1763. Here he was able to form a good orchestra of 24 players, enabling him to compose *Didone abbandonata*. Apparently, the quality of operatic singing had improved, since he included the recitatives for this opera. Since contemporary opera seria consisted predominantly of virtuosic solo singing, *Didone abbandonata* excluded polyphonic singing. By 1764, it was mainly Italian operas that were being performed at the court.

In 1765, the same year of Galuppi’s appointment to the St. Petersburg Court, Sarti took a leave of absence from Denmark. At King Frederick’s request, he travelled to Italy to engage more Italian singers for the Copenhagen opera. Unfortunately, King Frederick died January 14, 1766 at the age of 42, leaving Sarti without employment. He luckily gained employment as a teacher from May 1766 until September 1767 at the Pieta Conservatory in Venice. Upon the 1768 ascension of Christian VII to the Danish throne, Sarti resumed his former position in Copenhagen, while also becoming singing teacher to the new king. It was during this second period in Copenhagen that he married the Italian prima donna, Camilla Pasi. They had two daughters together. Despite being busy composing and directing operas at the court, Sarti managed to become ensnared in the intrigues of the Copenhagen Court. His political involvements at work became an unfortunate part of his life. He foreshadowed his later difficulties in Russia by siding with the losing party and was dismissed from his Danish post in 1775.

---

He immediately returned to Italy where he became Maestro di Cappella at the Conservatorio dell'Ospedaletto. He remained there with great success until Giovanni Fioroni’s death in 1779 opened an even more prestigious position, Maestro di Cappella at the Cathedral of Milan. Sarti won this position through a competition held at the Conservatory of Naples. Giovanni Piaiesello, who also vied unsuccessfully for the position, went on to become the new Kapellmeister at Catherine’s Court in St. Petersburg. Winning the Cathedral of Milan position over other eminent Italian musicians elevated Sarti’s reputation in his country. This victory likely led to his attracting some distinguished pupils. Most notable was Luigi Cherubini, who was not only his pupil, but served as his assistant for a few years. Sarti remained in Milan until 1784, when he departed for St. Petersburg at the invitation of Catherine II.

By most accounts, Catherine had little appreciation of music. Some chroniclers have even gone so far as to suggest that she disliked it. Such a conclusion seems highly unlikely, as her memoirs contain passages about playing the harpsichord during her early days in Russia. Her contemporaries have described her as simply being indifferent to music, viewing musical performances at court as intelligent entertainment. Her real passion was writing and literature, but she definitely understood the importance that music held in aristocratic circles. She certainly would have felt the need to continue the trend of westernization started by her predecessors. But why did she specifically invite
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Giuseppe Sarti to St. Petersburg? There were definitely other western European composers she could have afforded. In fact, Mozart was considering making the trip himself. He went so far as to authorize the Russian ambassador in Vienna to start negotiations with Prince Gregory Potemkin.\footnote{Ritzarev, \textit{Eighteenth-Century Russian Music}, 1.} However, the negotiations failed and Mozart never traveled to Russia.

When Giovanni Paiesello departed Russia in 1784 after eight years of service to the court, Sarti was invited to replace him. It is somewhat unclear exactly how Sarti was selected to replace Paiesello. It is possible that Paiesello himself may have recommended Sarti, though it is hard to imagine since Paiesello lost the Milan position to Sarti only five years earlier. It may have been Grand Duke Pavel Petrovich who made the suggestion. The Grand Duke had traveled to Italy and is believed to have seen Sarti’s opera \textit{Alessandro e Timoteo} at Parma in 1782.\footnote{Ibid., 215.} Whatever the source of the invitation, Sarti accepted the offer, becoming the last of the Italian maestros to serve at the St. Petersburg court.\footnote{Findeizen, \textit{History of Music in Russia}, vol. 2, 97.}

Sarti was a rising star in Italy at the time of his invitation to Russia. His operas were being performed throughout Italy and beyond. In fact, his opera \textit{Il filosofo di compagna} was performed in St. Petersburg in 1758, during the reign of Empress Elizabeth. By 1762, his revised operas \textit{Didone Abbandonata} and \textit{Olimpiade} were bringing his name to the forefront of the operatic world. Catherine wanted a star, but her tastes were somewhat simple. It seems likely that Sarti was invited over Mozart in part because his music lacked the
melodic and contrapuntal “embroidery” of Mozart’s. Sarti received this and other comparisons to the great Austrian master both during and after his lifetime. He actually met Mozart in Vienna on his way to St. Petersburg in 1784 and played some of his works for him. Mozart wrote a letter to his father on June 12, 1784, in which spoke highly of Sarti:

Sarti is an honest and good man! – I have played him a great deal, and finally wrote some variations on one of his arias, which he was very happy with.

Mozart set the aria *Come un agnello* from Sarti’s opera *Fra i due litiganti il terzo gode* in K. 460, published in 1787. Despite this, Sarti seemed to think that Mozart gave his music a cool reception. He later became openly critical of passages in Mozart’s string quartets, accusing him of “musical nonsense.” Those who feel that Sarti actually copied Mozart in his own music may consider this an ironic position. Hermann Abert attributes Sarti’s criticisms to an Italian composer who was out of touch with German music and instrumental music in general. Abert’s assertion hardly seems accurate, considering the large volume of instrumental music Sarti had composed for the Danish Court. Whether or not Sarti actually copied Mozart, it is widely accepted that Mozart did quote Sarti’s opera *Fra I due litiganti il terzo gode*. One aria, *Come un agnello*, is famously quoted at the end of
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Mozart’s *Don Giovanni*.\(^{168}\) In fact, this is the same music Mozart was referred to in the aforementioned letter to his father.

Once he arrived in St. Petersburg, Sarti he was well received. His first contract was from March 1, 1784 until January 1, 1787, with an annual salary of 3000 rubles, an apartment with firewood, permission to give an annual benefit concert, and a one-time payment of 500 rubles for travel expenses.\(^{169}\) Upon his arrival, he immediately took the reigns of the court opera. The first production under his guidance was his own opera buffa, *Gli Amanti consolati*. It was written shortly before his arrival in St. Petersburg and dedicated to the Empress Catherine II. It was staged in December 1784, receiving great praise and winning some influential admirers. Without a doubt, the admirer who most significantly impacted Sarti’s career was Prince Gregory Potemkin. While in St. Petersburg, Sarti began a professional relationship with the Prince that would continue until Potemkin’s death in 1791.

Sarti spent almost two decades in Russia. His first tenure at the St. Petersburg court was marked by the great success of his compositional output. His successes were certainly not limited to his operas, but little specific information is known of his compositions for the Orthodox Church. However, he did receive several commissions from Prince Potemkin to write the Russian-texted oratorios *Gospodi, vozzvakh k Tebe* [I cried unto Thee, O Lord] and *Pomiluy mya, Bozhe* [Have mercy upon me, O Lord], both of which were first premiered in

\(^{168}\) Wikipedia online, “*Fra I due litiganti il terzo gode*,” http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fra_i_due_litiganti_il_terzo_gode

April 1785. One important novel feature of these works was the inclusion of horn band. Horn bands in Russia were normally amateur groups whose repertoire consisted mainly of arrangements of popular music. Sarti elevated this ensemble by utilizing the horns to play organ-like pedal points in his oratorios. These first Russian oratorios of his became staples of the Russian repertoire during the 1780s and 1790s. This success with horn band was a repeat of his great orchestral successes in Copenhagen. As his first tenure at court continued, he enjoyed further successes with the staging of several more operas, including his opera seria Armida e Rinaldo for the February 1786 opening of the Hermitage Theatre at the Winter Palace.

Sarti’s successes in St. Petersburg were intertwined with various intrigues at the court. He was a complicated figure, described by various contemporaries as egotistical, haughty and a wise diplomat. His diplomatic skills were noted for his uncanny ability to align himself with the powerful side at any time. Perhaps he had learned some hard lessons in Copenhagen. Unfortunately, his luck ran out toward the end of his first contract. Although the details are unclear, the invited prima donna, Luisa da Todi, who arrived in St. Petersburg in May 1784, managed to damage the court’s opinion of Sarti. Despite his obvious successes with the court’s opera troupe, the spectacular performances and the impressive quality of the orchestra, Sarti was notified on June 12, 1787 that his contract would not be renewed. Sarti chose not to leave Russia at this time. Instead, he accepted
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an offer of employment from Prince Potemkin to serve at his palace in the south, putting him in contact with several potential students.

Prince Potemkin is a fascinating figure in Russian history. He is known mostly as the lover and confidante of Catherine II. He is infamous for his purported deception of Catherine through his construction of the “Potemkin Villages” for her 1787 tour of the Crimea. He supposedly had village facades erected along the Dnieper River to amplify Catherine’s perception of the value of her newly conquered southern lands. Such a bold strategy, if successful, would certainly have secured his esteem in the eyes of the Empress!

Sarti’s relationship with Prince Potemkin began shortly after his arrival in Russia. The 1785 oratorios he composed for Potemkin solidified the mutual respect the two men held for one another. When Potemkin fell out of favor with Catherine, he moved his own court to his palace in Bender, Bessarabia (located northwest of Odessa, on the Black Sea in modern Ukraine). Sarti was still in good standing with Catherine in January of 1787 when he accompanied her on her triumphal, post-annexation visit to the Crimea.

Catherine toured the spoils of her latest victory over the Ottoman Empire, leaving her palace at Tsarskoe Selo on January 7 and returning some time in late summer. This was an important trip that included some of her western European counterparts, most notably her ally, Emperor Joseph II of Austria, who met her in the Crimea. The importance of this trip required a certain pomp and circumstance; thus she brought along her famous Kapellmeister to conduct concerts. Sarti brought his family on the Crimean trip, allowing
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him to conduct concerts in Moscow, Byelorussia before arriving in the south.\textsuperscript{177} Perhaps the most notable concert was during the final stop at the new city of Kherson. Prince Potemkin had founded this new port city in 1778 on Catherine’s orders to protect Russia’s new southern border. The final concert on May 15 included Sarti conducting his own fugue played by a horn band.\textsuperscript{178} Whether the aforementioned difficulties with the soprano, Luisa da Todi, played out during the southern tour, or Sarti had already fallen out of favor by January of 1778, Catherine still felt that he was still needed for some important concerts whose audiences included the Austrian Emperor. Either way, since Sarti’s contract was not being extended beyond June 12, it is likely that May 15 was his last concert during his first contract with Catherine. Sarti then stayed onward with Potemkin, traveling with him back to his palace in Kremenchug, where he resided in a new building with his family.\textsuperscript{179}

Once Sarti arrived at Kremenchug, he began composing and conducting works for the performing forces at his disposal, including large choirs, a concert orchestra and a fifty-piece horn band.\textsuperscript{180} Most of the music he wrote during his tenure with Potemkin tended to be large and festive in nature, matching the Prince’s personal tastes. In 1789, an outdoor performance was given of Sarti’s 1785 \textit{Te Deum}, composed specifically for Potemkin, in the town of Jassy, (located in what is now Romania). This performance, which occurred in the midst of the Russo-Turkish War (1787-92), involved a large number of participants, most
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notably Sarti’s student, Daniil Kashin.\footnote{Findeizen, \textit{History of Music in Russia}, vol. 2,100.} Two other famous works composed during this southern sojourn were Sarti’s \textit{Te Deum} with cannonade in 1789 and his opera choruses for the fifth act of Catherine’s libretto version of “The Early Reign of Oleg” in 1790. These choruses, sent to St. Petersburg and performed for Catherine on August 30 to favorable reviews, showed that Sarti’s relationship with the Empress was still salvageable, paving the way for his return to court.\footnote{Ibid., 101.}

Another significant event in the Crimea was Potemkin’s establishment of a musical academy founded in the city of Ekaterinoslav. Prince Potemkin first established Ekaterinoslav, now modern Dnipropetrovsk in the Ukraine, in 1776. Due to the marshy geography of its original location, it was moved to its current site in 1783.\footnote{Wikipedia, “Dnipropetrovsk,” http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dnipropetrovsk} As many of his projects tended to be, Potemkin’s vision for this new city was overly ambitious. One of his projects included an academy of music. This is not surprising, as Potemkin was known to be a refined music lover, one who began his day with performances by his choirs.\footnote{Ritzarev, \textit{Eighteenth-Century Russian Music}, 218.} He apparently wrote music himself, as directly observed by Francisco de Miranda. Miranda witnessed Potemkin write music and hand it over to Sarti, with some discussion, to arrange it for the orchestra.\footnote{Ibid.} This highlights the close relationship between Sarti and Potemkin and explains Potemkin’s need to have Sarti involved with his new musical academy.

The primary purpose of this academy was to cultivate talented young singers and musicians for Catherine’s St. Petersburg Court. Many talented young court singers did
actually come to St. Petersburg from the southern provinces, including the famous composers Bortniansky and Berezovsky.\textsuperscript{186} The school, called Ekaterinoslave University, was established in early 1785, shortly after Sarti’s arrival in Russia. The location of the music academy was later changed to Kremenchug\textsuperscript{187} and Sarti was named as director of the Academy in 1791 or 1792, though his actual involvement with the Academy has been highly disputed. However, esteemed scholar Marina Ritzarev managed to access Potemkin’s papers in a Moscow archive. These confirm Sarti’s appointment at Ekaterinoslav, along with further details. Life was not easy for Sarti in the middle of undeveloped land. Perhaps to reward his dedication, Potemkin granted Sarti a 22,000-hectare plot of land, the village Sofia, 150 serfs and livestock.\textsuperscript{188} Furthermore, documents indicate twelve academy students for Sarti, including Artemy Vedel, Ivan Turchaninov and Danil Kashin.\textsuperscript{189}

During his period in the Crimea, Sarti was replaced by Domenico Cimarosa at the St. Petersburg Court. Cimarosa arrived in December 1787, ready to embark on composing \textit{opera buffa}. Unfortunately, he arrived at a time when the state of Italian opera in Russia was in a state of decline. Unlike previous times, new \textit{Kapellmeisters} were no longer provided with new star singers, nor were vacant positions replaced.\textsuperscript{190} Cimarosa left Russia in June 1790 for Vienna, where he experienced great success.\textsuperscript{191} Sarti returned to St. Petersburg, History of Music in Russia, vol. 2, 101.
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Petersburg in 1790 to participate in the production of *The Early Reign of Oleg*.\textsuperscript{192} At this point in time he was more or less unemployed, his position with Potemkin finished and the St. Petersburg Italian opera disbanded. His association with Potemkin was permanently ended when the Prince died on October 5, 1791.\textsuperscript{193}

The period immediately following Potemkin’s death began Sarti’s involvement with Count Nikolai Petrovich Sheremetev (1751-1809). Sheremetev, a great patron and refined lover of music, had his court in Moscow. Although Sarti never served as *Kappelmeister* at his court, he did compose cantatas and oratorios for performance in Moscow.\textsuperscript{194} Most significant to this study is the association of Sarti with Stepan Degtiarev through Count Sheremetev. Degtiarev became Sarti’s pupil, the two of them traveling to Italy at the end of 1791.\textsuperscript{195} Also during the Sheremetev years, Sarti taught singing at the St. Petersburg Theatre School. It was here that he likely taught Stepan Davydov (1777-1825).\textsuperscript{196} Though it isn’t clear exactly when Sarti returned to Russia, he was back sometime in 1792. He was reappointed court *Kapellmeister* in March 1793.\textsuperscript{197} Because of the decline of Italian opera, he composed mainly ceremonial music for official occasions. Among these were the cantata *Brachnaia pesn* (Nuptial song) and the chorus *Tsaritsa severa mat* (The Empress, mother of the North) in 1793.
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While much is known about the dates and circumstances of Sarti’s operatic compositions for St. Petersburg, very little is known about his a cappella sacred works for the Orthodox Church. Nikolai Findeizen suggests that his published sacred works are from his final years at the court, under the rule of Catherine’s successor, Paul I. If this belief is accurate, the timing of Sarti’s compositions for the Orthodox Church were likely a result of the decline of Italian opera and free time created by Paul’s appointment of Bortnyansky as Court Kapellmeister. Paul was not a great supporter of the lavish arts scene established by Catherine. However, despite Sarti’s prominence at the despised Catherine’s court, he managed to keep employment within Paul’s court. This may have been due to Sarti’s savvy approach to court relationships or his 1793 re-appointment as director of the St. Petersburg Conservatory. It may also have been his 1796 chorus composed in honor of the birth of Paul’s son, Nikolai Pavlovich. Whatever the case, he survived the regime change, being appointed as music teacher to the daughters of Emperor Paul I.

Giuseppe Sarti may also have sought Tsar Paul’s favor by composing liturgical music appropriate to the Orthodox Service. One of Catherine’s most controversial excesses was her encouragement of liturgical compositions accompanied by instruments performed in her chapel. The vast majority of Sarti’s music on Slavonic texts had therefore been written with instrumental accompaniments. Cantatas, such as Slava v vyshnikh bogu (Gloria in Excelsis, 1792) or the Easter Oda minu (Ode to Peace, 1793) required the use of orchestras, horn bands, or even gun salvos. These works satisfied Catherine’s extravagant tastes, but clearly and necessarily precluded their liturgical use. Knowing that Catherine and Prince
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Potemkin had similarly flamboyant and excessive tastes in music, whether for festivities or for worship, it does seem very possible that the celebrated *a capella* Slavonic-texted concertos of Sarti were not composed until he had the time and extrinsic motivation to do so. This set of compositions contains at least some native Russian characteristics. Since he could not have had any knowledge of these traditions upon his arrival in 1784, he would have likely delayed efforts to incorporate these features to a later time when he better understood what was needed and acceptable in an Orthodox setting. In her 2006 book, *Eighteenth-Century Russian Music*, Marina Ritzarev refers to the Russian national elements evident in his spiritual concertos.  

Included in her list are his incorporation of *kant* and *partes*-singing. It only makes sense that Sarti would have absorbed some of Russia’s sacred singing traditions during his long tenure in that country. He attended Orthodox Services as part of his job at Catherine’s Court. Simply by passively hearing concertos and chant harmonizations sung by the clergy, Sarti’s trained ear would have allowed him to have a technical understanding of the structure of these traditions. In the final years of his life, Sarti’s liturgical music would demonstrate that the teacher had become pupil.

**Sarti’s Compositional Styles in his Italian and Russian Church Music**

In order to establish which compositional elements Giuseppe Sarti may have taught his students, it is useful to examine his own sacred compositions in Italy and Russia. During his time in Copenhagen, his time and efforts were consumed with the composition of opera, so there are no known liturgical works that specifically come from Denmark. It is
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most logical to begin with the sacred music he composed while in his native Italy. There were several styles of sacred music in Italian churches throughout the eighteenth century. According to Paul R. Laird, there were four styles of sacred music simultaneously used in eighteenth-century Italian churches: stile antico, polychoral writing, homorhythmic textures and operatic passages for soloists or duets.\textsuperscript{201} The stile antico refers to the smooth modal contrapuntal style of Palestrina and his contemporaries, as well as later versions of the style that added basso continuo. By mid-century, stile antico had practically become obligatory for Mass Ordinary movements and psalms.\textsuperscript{202} It is not always easy to find specific evidence from an outside observer to confirm such facts. In this case, we have the words of a famous traveler and English music historian. During his visit to the Milan Cathedral (Duomo) on July 17, 1770, Charles Burney noted about the music being rehearsed for that Sunday’s Service:

These Services were composed about one hundred and fifty years ago, by a Maestro di Capella of the Duomo, and are much in the stile of our services of that time, consisting of good harmony, ingenious points (of imitation) and contrivances, but no melody.\textsuperscript{203}

Clearly, Burney had a copy of the music in question and knew of the composer. Burney’s statement obviously refers to music in the florid counterpoint style, essential in the stile antico.

\textsuperscript{202} Ibid., 31.
Polychoral writing in Italy originated in the sixteenth-century antiphonal practice of *salmi* and *spezzati*, subsequently refined by Andrea and Giovanni Gabrielli and their many students and imitators. This polychoral style continued into the eighteenth century, though its frequency of use did slowly decline. The fundamental feature of the style was the use of more than one “choir” of voices and/or instruments. It featured homorhythmic passages that allowed for powerful block chords performed by groups of players and/or singers. It was also conducive to the contrast of opposing groups of instruments and voices in various combinations that was the foundation of the Baroque concerted style. The formal advantage of the homorhythmic sections was the distinct contrast it afforded from passages of imitative counterpoint and a resulting clarity of text. When composers began alternating homorhythmic sections with contemporary operatic solo and/or duet passages, the result was the *stile misto*, to which J.J. Fux (1660-1741), amongst others, was opposed.\(^{204}\) Despite such conservative opposition, this new *stile misto* prospered precisely because celebrated composers of Italian church music were primarily prominent opera composers.\(^{205}\) Furthermore, because of the popularity and rapid expansion of opera, liturgical standards in the larger cities of Bologna, Naples, Venice, Rome and Milan became so relaxed that in 1749, Pope Benedict XIV noted, “... on certain days of the year, sacred buildings are the theatre for sumptuous and resounding concerts, which in no way agree with the Sacred Mysteries.”\(^{206}\)

\(^{204}\) Laird, *Catholic Church Music*, 31.
\(^{205}\) Ibid., 30.
The compositional output of eighteenth-century Italian composers certainly reflected this mixture of styles. When writing a concerted mass, only the Kyrie and Gloria were set, the remaining sections of the Ordinary being replaced by motets with non-liturgical texts and even instrumental music. Otherwise, Italian composers of church music wrote psalms, canticles, hymns and motets. An interesting development during this time was the resurgence of the motet. In its contemporary form, the motet could use texts crafted in the style of operatic music. Such newly-composed motet texts were sold like opera librettos! Contemporary motets clearly demonstrated operatic origins with their emphasis on arias, which were usually in da capo form, though it was usually only the opening ritornello and/or first vocal phrase that were repeated.

To place Giuseppe Sarti into the context of eighteenth-century Italian church music requires some consideration of several elements. Before actually looking at his church music, it is instructive to know his teachers, their styles, and where Sarti worked. This latter point is germane simply because it is likely he adapted his compositional to the dominant idioms in each of those locations. In this respect, Sarti was likely no different than any other composer, in that he conformed as necessary to meet the expectations of his employers. Since we know that he studied composition with Francesco Antonio Vallotti of Padua and Padre Martini of Bologna, they are an ideal place to begin.

Although there is no specific documentary source that indicates when Sarti studied with Francesco Vallotti, he is known to have been a pupil. He apparently studied with
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Vallotti before turning to Padre Martini. Vallotti was the maestro di cappella at the Basilica of San Antonio in Padua, a position he held from 1730 until his death in 1780. Vallotti composed only church music either in a concerted style or the strict contrapuntal style of the sixteenth-century masters he studied. Through his transcriptions of Palestrina’s works he gained the reputation of being a fine contrapuntist. Vallotti was entirely dedicated to the stile antico and never composed any music for the theatre. Sarti’s second teacher, Padre Martini, shared the same attributes ascribed to Vallotti.

Giovanni Battista Martini (1706-1784) was a celebrated composer and teacher whose life spanned the majority of the eighteenth century. He spent the entirety of his seventy-eight years in his hometown of Bologna. Despite having lived through many significant musical developments, he composed mainly in the stile antico and taught strict counterpoint to all of his composition students. He also prepared his over one hundred students for the entrance examination to the Academia Filarmonica. Martini’s reputation was such that Johann Christian Bach, Niccoló Jommelli, W.A. Mozart and Giuseppe Sarti all elected to study with him. In fact, he also taught the Ukrainian singer and composer Maksim Berezovsky, who was sent by Catherine’s court in 1769 to study with Martini at the Bologna Philharmonic Academy. After the middle of the century, Martini’s compositions were no longer in line with contemporary trends. Overall, his output of sacred choral
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music was written either in the luxuriant contrapuntal or early classical homophonic style, emphasizing a spare texture and dominated by the treble voice.214 Logically, we may assume that it was these same traits that were taught to the young Sarti, providing him with a solid grounding in the rules of effective contrapuntal writing.

For the acquisition of skills appropriate to operatic writing, Sarti had to turn elsewhere. Unfortunately, there are no sources that document specifically with whom Sarti studied operatic composition. There are only passing references of Sarti’s interest in exploring the operatic realm during his brief tenure at the Faenza Cathedral between 1748 and 1750. He is named to the Faenza Theatre around 1752, the same year of his first successful opera.215 The missing link lies in the two-year span from 1750-1752. It seems that he was in Faenza, but current scholarship is unable to say if he was working in the church AND studying operatic composition or if he left the church to study operatic composition on a full-time basis. Regardless of his activities during those two years, Sarti is today known primarily as an operatic composer who also dabbled in church music.

Contemporary composers and critics, as well as modern historians have described his style mainly in a positive light. In his famous biography of Mozart, Hermann Abert devotes several passages to Sarti’s music and his interactions with Wolfgang Amadeus. He describes Sarti as an important representative of the neo-Napolitan school. More specifically, he praises the form and style of his arias, as well as his “virtuosic” handling of

215 DiChiera, Giuseppe Sarti, 503.
the orchestra. Abert also notes Sarti’s ability to retain an understanding of the style of Metastasio AND the old Renaissance style (stile antico). He further praises Sarti’s vast number of musical ideas, while simultaneously criticizing his overuse of motifs. Overall, he paints a positive picture of a composer who favorably influenced Mozart and one who had a strong command of both early forms and a strong sense of creativity when using modern techniques.

**Sarti’s Miserere Dei**

Though it would be informative to analyze the operatic compositions of Sarti, it is more germane to this study to focus on his sacred music. Choosing which compositions to analyze is not an easy process. If one selects a composition from his Italian period, will it accurately represent the style of music he composed during his tenure in Russia? The fact that organ (or other instruments) frequently accompanied Italian church music makes it difficult to draw effective comparisons to the rigorously *a cappella* style of Russian church music. Nonetheless, an analysis of one of his Latin-texted sacred works is worthwhile in order to provide a basis for comparison with his later, Slavonic-texted works. With that in mind, we will now turn to his setting of *Miserere Dei*.

The setting used here is the manuscript available online from the *Sächsische Landesbibliothek* of the *Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek* (Dresden). There is no date
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attributed to the manuscript, though 1790 is suggested as an approximate date. The manuscript is titled in German, *Der ein und funftzigste Psalm Davids: Miserere mei, Deus in Musik gesetzl von Sarti*. The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians lists this work as being from Leipzig. This likely refers to the origin of the manuscript since there is no record of Sarti having spent any time in Leipzig. However, it is not entirely impossible that he himself delivered the work to someone in Leipzig, since it was essentially on the route from Faenza to Copenhagen. Geographic origin aside, Sarti composed this music using the Latin text and in traditional Italian style.

The work is very much a cantata, divided into fourteen movements. It is set for a single SATB chorus with three violas, bass, violoncello and basso continuo. There are solo movements that feature all four voice parts. Sarti employs basically every element typical of eighteenth-century Italian church music: *stile antico*, polyphonic writing, homorhythmic textures and operatic passages for soloists or duets, and the *stile misto*. The breakdown of his setting of *Miserere Mei* can be seen in my chart below. All movements use the full instrumental complement, so this is no separate column for instrumentation.

**Table 3.1 Movement Analysis of Sarti’s *Miserere Mei***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Title/tempo</th>
<th>Voices</th>
<th>Time Signature</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Form/style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Miserere</em></td>
<td>SATB</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>homorhythmic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>Serzetto - andantino</em></td>
<td>SATB</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>A-flat</td>
<td><em>Stile misto</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>Largo</em></td>
<td>SATB, tenor solo</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Aria, homorhythmic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Moderato</em></td>
<td>SATB</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E-flat</td>
<td><em>Stile antico</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>Allegro spirituoso</em></td>
<td>Bass solo</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Virtuosic da capo aria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>Adagio</em></td>
<td>Soprano solo recit.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td><em>Recitativo accompagnato</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>Andante</em></td>
<td>SATB</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>homorhythmic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the reader can see, the composition is really a typical cantata for the period. The division of text into movements, the variations in time and key signature, the use of solos, etc. were common practice in Italy at the time. Because we know of his extensive training in the stile antico, a look at one such movement is of interest here.

A fine example of his stile antico writing occurs in the fourth movement, Moderato.

However, the final movement displays both this style as well as Sarti’s excellence in contrapuntal writing. In measure twenty, Sarti’s begins his fugue by setting of the text that starts with Tunc acceptabis sacrificium, as seen in the following example.
He sets the string parts *colla parte*, with the first viola paired with the soprano, the second viola with the alto, the violoncello with the tenor, and the bass with bass voice. The voices make their entrances from the top down, beginning with soprano, followed in order by alto, tenor, then bass.
The head motive of Sarti’s subject consistently sets the words *Tunc imponent super alta*, demonstrating a strong (albeit traditional) use of counterpoint. During his first fugue, he makes a complete statement of the entire final section of text: *Tunc acceptabis sacrificium iustitiae, oblationes, et holocausta: tunc imponent super altare tuum vitulos.*

As a means of variation, he begins his second full statement of the text with an inversion of his first fugue subject in measure 70.

The first statement of the inverted subject is made by the alto voices, once again doubled by the second viola. In addition to creating an inversion, Sarti alters the order in which voices enter, choosing to create pairings: alto followed by soprano, then bass followed by tenor. Whether he had motives other than creating variation from his first fugue is not clear. His obvious strength in fugue writing brings to mind the previously mentioned comparisons to Mozart.
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The most dominant and researched elements Sarti and his Italian colleagues brought to St. Petersburg were those from opera forms, particularly opera seria. The use of operatic elements was also typical of eighteenth-century Italian church music. In this setting of Miserere, the most obvious displays of operatic virtuosity come from the solo movements.

Music Example 3.4

In this section the soprano soloist is singing melismatically on the penultimate syllable of exsultabant, for the phrase et exsultabant ossa humiliata. Even though the tempo is marked
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Largo, there is still considerable technique and flexibility required to successfully sing this part. There is also a rather extreme range and enormous leaps to navigate. This kind of vocal showing off and the obscuring of the text through melisma were the norm for opera, but certainly would not be within Orthodox Services. The final two elements common to eighteenth century Italian church music are homorhythmic writing and the use of stile misto. Sarti displays these in several movements of his Miserere. Because the previous examples have sufficiently displayed Sarti’s prowess in typical Italian extravagant church music during the eighteenth century, it is useful to now move on to his late works composed for the Russian Orthodox Service.

**Sarti’s Slavonic-Texted Orthodox Music**

In examining Sarti’s Slavonic-texted works composed in Russia, there are three main points of interest. Because of their a cappella nature, it is enlightening to observe how he treats a cappella voices when applying Italian traits. Second, evidence of his absorption of Russian polyphonic traditions will provide further insight into the hybrid style he helped develop. Finally, because these works were composed during his time in Russia, we have a better representation of styles and techniques he likely taught his students. He had to create a synthesis of his Italianate style to their national traditions. For example, if a student wished to learn how to better transition into or out of extended parallelism over a drone, he may have been able to at least attempt to address the problem. Because it is an excellent representation of Sarti’s synthesis of Italian and Russian styles, we will look at his six-voice concerto, Niñe sili ñebésnïya (Now the Powers of Heaven).
“Now the Powers of Heaven” belongs to that group of compositions thought to have been completed during the last five years of Sarti’s life. Again, it is nearly impossible to ascertain accurate dates for any of these sacred compositions. Dating one’s church music was not standard practice, since this music was composed for the glory of God; accordingly, any attribution to mere mortals was contrary to the stance of the Orthodox Church. By the eighteenth century, however, it had become standard to at least allow for the composer’s name to be attached to his work, though their dates of compositions were still excluded. Further complicating the search for specific information about early Russian church music was the tragic burning of a vast collection of eighteenth-century sacred music from the Imperial Chapels musical archives in 1927. This took place on the bridge (now Dvortsovaya Ploshchad) connecting the chapel to the Imperial Winter Palace. Countless scores were lost. For modern scholars, the result is a reliance on surviving nineteenth-century publications of earlier works.

In the case of Sarti’s “Now the Powers of Heaven,” it was one of approximately ten he wrote for Orthodox Services that was published and widely distributed throughout Russia during the nineteenth century. Ironically, publication of select Italians’ works resulted from an imperial decree that gave the Ukrainian-born Bortniansky right of approval for any work published, and prohibiting the further use of manuscript forms. The Slavonic text Niñe sīlī ſebēsniya is liturgically the Cherubic Hymn (symbolically incorporating those present at the liturgy into the presence of the angels gathered around

God’s throne) at the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts. A strong liturgical tradition taken from the Byzantine, even today the hymn is performed during the part of the Service where the Holy Gifts are taken from the Table of Preparation and carried in a solemn procession to the Holy Table.²²⁴

Sarti’s setting of “Now the Powers of Heaven” is an a cappella concerto for six voices: two sopranos, one alto, two tenors, and one bass voice. The work is in the key of g-minor with modulations to the relative major and dominant. He also employs three different time signatures, beginning with alla breve meter before moving to ¾ and finally ending with common time. Sarti seemed to approach this work with the text first, using it to determine divisions and points of repetition, as can be seen in the chart below.

Table 3.2 Text Divisions of Sarti’s “Now the Powers of Heaven”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slavonic Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Time Signature</th>
<th>Stylistic Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Niňe sľři řebesnyaja s nāmi....</td>
<td>Now the Powers of Heaven serve invisibly with us;</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>C⁰</td>
<td>homorhythmic, ison, suspensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Se bo fhődit Tsar Slāvi,</td>
<td>Lo, the King of Glory enters.</td>
<td>B⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subito f, homorhythm, suspensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Se, zhěrťva tāynya sovershēna dorinōsitsia.</td>
<td>Lo, the mystical sacrifice is upborne, fulfilled.</td>
<td>g-D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kant, homorhythm, chromaticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Se bo fhődit Tsar Slāvi,</td>
<td>Lo, the King of Glory enters.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subito f, homorhythm, suspensions, imitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Še, zhěrťva tāynya sovershēna dorinōsitsia.</td>
<td>Lo, the mystical sacrifice is upborne, fulfilled.</td>
<td>E⁰-g</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kant, homorhythm, chromaticism, suspensions, imitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sarti’s setting of “Now the Powers of Heaven” has been structurally divided in the manner of an Italian cantata. As is normally the case, the text is the determining factor in dividing the music into sections with different textures, time signatures, and tonal centers. Sarti repeats, “Lo, the King of Glory enters,” both times in major keys, to reinforce the Holy Gifts entrance to the Holy Table. He also repeats “Lo, the mystical sacrifice is up borne, fulfilled,” initially on g-minor moving to the dominant before touching on the flat six and returning once more to g-minor. This section creates a nice harmonic progression away from and returning to the tonic g-minor.

To overview the stylistic features of this work, I’ll start with those of Italian origin. The first feature to look at will be his use of homorhythmic passages. He uses these in several sections of this work. The block chords are used as a means of contrasting different groups of singers. The first example occurs in mm. 32-43 where he begins with a four-bar statement by the women’s voices, immediately followed by the contrasting group consisting of the bottom four voices. The example is provided on the following page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Time Signature</th>
<th>Modes/Techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Véroyu i liubóviyu pristúpim, da prichástñitsí zhizñi véchníya búdem.</td>
<td>Let us draw near in faith and love and become communicants of life eternal.</td>
<td>g-D</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>Implied kant (parallel voices but no bass), antiphony, virtuosic operatic duet, counterpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allilúya, allilúya, allilúya.</td>
<td>Alleluia, alleluia, alleluia.</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Homorhythm, imitative counterpoint, Diletskii-rules imitation (at the unison), chromaticism, homorhythm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.2 (cont.)**
Music Example 3.5

Clearly, Sarti shifts chords with each syllable of text. He manages to set the text utilizing appropriate declamation, demonstrating his understanding of the language. After being in the country for approximately twenty-five years, one hopes that he had a working knowledge of Russian and Church Slavonic. Aside from the predominance of homorhythmic structure in this section, there is also his Western harmonic approach. The first chord in measure thirty-six is the dominant seventh in g minor, repeated in the following measure. Sarti also uses chromaticism - melodic and harmonic - in the last four measures.

Aside from concertization, another function of the homorhythmic passages is to contrast with preceding or subsequent polyphonic sections. The above example was immediately preceded by a *forte* polyphonic passage, in measures twenty to thirty, immediately followed by a grand pause. Those two sections are separated by a fermata or grand pause, intended either to reflect a shift in the Service procession or to allow for an acoustic clearing of sound. Immediately following the above example is another *forte* polyphonic passage very similar to the first, essentially framing the homorhythmic passage.

Another Italian feature Sarti uses in “Now the Powers of Heaven” is his incorporation of operatic style. This takes place in the form of solo writing and virtuosic passages. The possible use of soloists occurs in the section starting at measure eighty-eight. In his notes for the 1991 Musica Russica edition, Vladimir Morosan suggests that the
typical performance practice of the time would have been to have this soprano duet performed by soloists and the bottom four voices performed \textit{tutti}.\footnote{Morosan, Vladimir. \textit{Notes from edition of “Now the Powers of Heaven,”} Musica Russica, 1991.}

\textbf{Music Example 3.6} \footnote{Ibid.}

The grace notes and runs of sixteenths as seen in this passage were certainly not typical of traditional Russian church music. Interestingly, this soprano duet with its parallel thirds is an example of \textit{kant} texture, obviously absorbed by Sarti. Because we know counterpoint was integral to Sarti’s own training, observing its incorporation into his Slavonic music is informative. We see this in the musical example on the following page.
Music Example 3.7

In the example, there is obviously close, almost stretto-like imitation. The head motives either outline a perfect fourth or its inversion, a perfect fifth. Sarti treats the opening intervals two ways. The first method is to write the voice part as an immediate leap (up or down) between D and G, or G and C. The soprano voices jump from D up to a G in measure 106 to 107. The basses make a downward leap from G down to C one measure later. The second method is to fill in the interval with diatonic motion, essentially disguising the intended leap. The tenor one part and the altos are employed thusly. The tenor part starts on D then descends diatonically to the G below. The altos start on their D, move first down to B-flat before ascending to their G above. For a contrapuntal section, this second method is somewhat unusual. However, when the purpose behind the diatonic obfuscation of head motive pitches is realized, it makes perfect sense.

The actual goal of Sarti’s diatonic insertions is to create a *kant* texture between two neighboring voices. If one looks at the tenor one and alto parts in measure 107, the movement in parallel thirds becomes apparent. The second soprano’s entry repeats the initial tone in order to delay their C until beat two, initiating descending parallel thirds with the soprano one part. As explained earlier, a traditional *kant* texture requires a drone or functional bass line to support the parallel melodic motion. Sarti does actually provide this each time. In measure 107, the sopranos are sustaining a G above the tenor and alto parallel thirds. In measure 108, octave C’s are occurring in the bottom two voices to support the two parallel soprano parts.

This very compact form of the traditional *kant* is indicative of the expansion of the form during the late eighteenth century and into the nineteenth century. These expanded
forms would become even more apparent in the compositions of Sarti’s students. The section just analyzed demonstrates a rather compressed and layered version of *kant* texture. One has to ask whether this was conscious or coincidental. I believe that Sarti was consciously creating a hybrid form that in this case combined a traditional stretto counterpoint with the native *kant* texture. In order for him to experiment in such a manner, he obviously needed to be aware of this important pre-existing Russian form. It is relatively easy to determine Sarti’s knowledge of Russian compositional traditions by looking for evidence of their inclusion in his Orthodox repertoire.

There are several passages within “Now the Powers of Heaven” that demonstrate some command of Russian practices. In this piece, one sees the use of drone supporting parallel thirds and sixths, as well as evidence that Sarti followed Diletskii’s rules for imitation. The first element of interest here is a traditional use of *kant* texture and drone. The most obvious example of a Russian drone occurs in measures seventy-five through eighty-two. As might be expected, the drone occurs in the bass part, sustaining the dominant tone on D. This sustained tone lasts for eight measures, clearly going beyond the traditional Western European pedal point. We see this in the example on the following page.
At measure seventy-six, the bass drone is doubled at the octave by the second tenor and the alto voices. This is consistent with the previously mentioned ancient practices of the Byzantine ison. Measures seventy-six and seventy-seven represent standard Western practice suspensions and resolutions. However, in order to achieve kant it is necessary to have passages with extended parallelism. Sarti seems to manipulate this by having two voices remain in parallel motion with consistent intervals. Rather than maintaining the parallel thirds between the same two voices for many measures, he alternates them between voice pairings - first with alto and tenor two in parallel thirds (in measure seventy-eight), then sopranos one and two in parallel thirds (in measure seventy-nine). This passage is immediately followed by a series of suspensions, similar to those in the works of Antonio Lotti (1667-1740).

---

As previously stated, Nikolai Diletskii’s *Musical Grammar* was highly disseminated throughout Russia well into the eighteenth century. His rules of imitation specifically stated that like voices were to imitate at the unison. In the final *Alleluia* section of “Now the Powers of Heaven”, Sarti uses a great deal of imitation. This is obviously not intrinsically Russian. However, he uses a combination of Italian and Russian methods.

**Music Example 3.9**

![Music Example 3.9](image)

The passage above is not the first statement of Alleluia. Perhaps for contrast from the first statement, he follows Diletskii’s rules. The first tenor states the descending *alleluia*, immediately imitated by at the unison by the second tenors. This is immediately followed
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by soprano twos, then first sopranos. The fact that they use the exact same pitch set as the
tenors is much less important than the exact imitation between the two tenor parts and
two soprano parts. He does this once again in the final descending *alleluia* passage.

**Music Example 3.10**

Once again tenor imitates tenor at unison and soprano imitates soprano at the unison. The
difference here is that Sarti takes some minor creative license by alternating soprano,
tenor, soprano and tenor. Whether Sarti actually read Diletskii’s treatise or he had been
sufficiently exposed to this rule in repertoire, he does show some awareness of its
existence. Once again, there is no smoking gun to prove Sarti sat and read Diletskii’s
document, but his long stay in Russia, working at the Court where the treatise is known to
have existed, and his exposure to multiple Russian and Ukrainian composers and students
all make it likely he did know about this treatise and its long-standing rules.

I believe that Sarti became an innovator when he wrote his Orthodox music in the final years of his life. However, his motivations for combining and altering Italian and Russian compositional practices are not absolutely clear. When approaching the drone, it is possible he simply couldn't bear the simplistic nature of the original kant form, and its limitation to parallelism between two voices for multiple measures. His musical ear had grown accustomed to the more complex harmonies and concertization from Italy. If he wrote his Orthodox music in the pure kant or psalmy style, it would have felt like a giant step backwards. Another important factor was that the Russian people had developed a taste for Italianate concerted music. He couldn't disappoint the people, or even his final employer, Emperor Paul I, who famously resented the extravagance of Catherine’s Court music. For whatever reason, intrinsic or extrinsic, Giuseppe Sarti’s Orthodox music demonstrated a hybrid of Russian and Italian features.

**Folk Music Influences during Sarti’s Tenure**

As previously stated, manuscript forms of folk music had been passed around the Russian people since the late seventeenth century. Because Giuseppe Sarti didn’t arrive until 1784, he would not have arrived in Russia with a pre-existing knowledge of local folk practices. However, he did arrive at a time when urban interest in folk music was at its peak. Examining important collections of folk music published after Sarti’s arrival therefore becomes germane to this study. Any popular musical forms in sacred or secular music could potentially impact one another. Whether chant harmonizations heard in Service were then imitated in folk singing or vice versa, it is generally agreed that there was
some cross pollination. The degree to which popular folk music impacted Sarti’s Orthodox compositions is difficult to determine. We cannot forget that his native students had closer personal experience to this music and may have therefore been influenced when writing their music for Orthodox Service. It thus becomes important to consider the Lvov/Prach collection published in 1790.

It is important to note that ethno musicological practices as we know them today simply didn’t exist in the early to mid-eighteenth century. The practice of visiting outlying villages and recording true folk singing didn’t come about until the early twentieth century with the invention of the gramophone. During the eighteenth century, those who decided to collect and publish collections of folk songs would frequently refer to earlier collections.232 From those earlier collections, the compilers would really just update the melodies and accompaniments to reflect contemporary tastes. Although these collections are problematic, they certainly do reflect the musical tastes and styles at play in the late eighteenth century.

In 1790, Kapellmeister, Ivan Prach published his *Collection of Russian Folk Songs with their Tunes Set to Music*. This first publication contained one hundred songs. More songs were added to subsequent publications in 1806, 1815, and 1896. Nikolai Aleksandrovich Lvov wrote the introduction that was included with the first and subsequent editions. For some reason, Lvov’s name wasn’t attached to the collection until the fourth edition in 1896. It has henceforth been known as the Lvov Prach Collection (LPC). Lvov was not actually a composer, though he was a member of the Academy of Arts and held the position of Privy

Councillor. His role, according to his cousin, was the host of singing parties prior to 1790. At these parties, those in attendance performed traditional songs, and Prach simply transcribed what he heard.\textsuperscript{233} It should be obvious that the singing style of those urban aristocrats likely didn’t accurately reflect how the same songs would have been performed in provincial villages. Many criticized Lvov’s collection when it was first published, rightfully noting that western harmonies and melodies had been imposed upon the original melodies and accompaniments. Although imperfect, this collection is highly significant to this study because it was completely an urban product of the city of St. Petersburg in the late eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{234} Thus, it provides clues as to the nature of the popular musical trends during Sarti’s time in St. Petersburg.

When deciding how accurately the collection reflects the nature of true folk music, it is necessary to compare it with the earlier manuscript sources. According to musicologist Malcolm Brown’s study, authentic folk practices in eighteenth-century Russia would have included: \textsuperscript{235}

\begin{enumerate}
\item three-voice \textit{kant} texture without accompaniment.
\item descant part-singing typical of the choral texture found in peasant songs. These textures included flexible voice leading and peculiar harmony, both a product of heterophony.
\item the custom of beginning each song with a solo in order to introduce the mode and melodic content of the song.
\item the use of unisons, open fifths, or only thirds at cadences, instead of full triads.
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{233} Brown, \textit{A Collection of Russian Folk Songs}, 24.
\textsuperscript{234} Ibid., 4.
\textsuperscript{235} Ibid., 74-76.
This is a helpful short list when beginning to understand the features unique to Russian folk singing practices. When searching for evidence of these features in Prach’s collection of 1790, one must take a careful, selective approach. For example, a bass line in the Western style was imposed on the melodies of these songs. On the other hand, the bass lines provided for many of the songs do seem to represent the ancient Russian practice of using an *isocratema* or drone, often with repeated octave displacement. As for the melodies themselves, their harmonizations seemed to reflect some of the practices found in the earlier manuscript songbooks polyphonic music. Most notable of these are the extended use of parallel thirds and sixths. In the following example, one can clearly see parallel thirds in the middle stave from beginning to end.
When looking at the final cadence above in measure fourteen, there is only a major third, not a complete triad. This is consistent with Malcolm Brown’s fourth item listed above.

When examining the bass line, one sees traits that appear to be both Western and Russian.

---

\[236\] Brown, *A Collection of Folk Songs*, Facsimile 111, Section 2, Song #25.
The song is written in F Major, with the bass alternating exclusively between the pitches F and C, clearly demonstrating the Western harmonic progression of tonic-dominant-tonic (I-V-I). The explanation for the octave displacement in the bass drone lies mainly with the keyboard style intended. It is much more idiomatic for a keyboard player to alternate between the two octaves rather than sustain the pedal for seven measures without restriking. The first seven bars unfold over a drone F. Above, the upper three voices (though really only two separate parts) move exclusively in parallel thirds. This drone-implied bass in combination with the harmonized melody harmonized in thirds is clearly derives from the folk texture known as kant.

Regardless of whether or not Prach was faithful to the older manuscript forms in his publication of 1790, his work had a major impact at the time:

> During the last decade of the eighteenth and throughout the nineteenth century, the [Lvov Prach Catalogue] was the wellspring into which everyone dipped in search of material on Russian folk song – composers, poets, amateurs, and compilers of anthologies.237

Since Giuseppe Sarti had already been in St. Petersburg for some six years by the time the collection was published, it seems safe to assume that he was familiar with it. This assumption is supported by the fact that both Catherine II and Paul I were patrons of Lvov. Like Sarti, Lvov accompanied Catherine on her journey to the Crimea in 1787.238 The first edition of his collection was dedicated to Catherine and the second edition to Paul I. If Catherine had an active financial interest in and respect for this loyal monarchist and lover

---

237 Brown, A Collection of Russian Folk Songs, 76.
238 Ibid., 27.
of Russian traditions, it is hardly far-fetched to imagine that copies of the collection were available at the court. Lvov acknowledged the supportive royal family in his first edition.\textsuperscript{239} Sarti, along with Vasily Pashkevich and Carlo Cannobio, used the song \textit{Zain'ka poskachi} in Act Two of their setting of Catherine’s libretto to \textit{The Early Reign of Oleg}.

Lvov’s collection was also farmed for materials by Sarti’s student, Stepan Davydov, and reached as far afield to Beethoven and Rossini.\textsuperscript{241}

Since folk singing is an oral tradition, written treatises comparable to those in the classical realm simply do not exist. Ethnomusicologists have had to conduct field studies to encounter folk music in its authentic forms. The systematic study of authentic Russian folk music practices did not begin until the middle of the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{242} In the early twentieth century, the invention of the phonograph finally allowed for recordings and accurate transcriptions of authentic folk polyphonic elaboration.\textsuperscript{243} From his excursions and the recordings he made, Aleksandr Dmitrievich Kastalsky developed a basis for classifying the harmonic and melodic elements of Russian folk music in his book \textit{The Principles of the Russian National Musical System}. His focus was to obtain an accurate record of how folk music was actually performed by the people. He was a pioneer in the field of ethnomusicology, transcribing the music for the purpose of analysis. The following list represents a summary of key elements of folk polyphony as discovered by Kastalsky:

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{239} Brown, \textit{A Collection of Russian Folk Songs}, 27.
\item \textsuperscript{240} Ibid., 441.
\item \textsuperscript{241} Ibid., xii.
\item \textsuperscript{242} Belaiev, S.W. Pring “Kastalsky and his Russian Folk Polyphony,” \textit{Music & Letters}, Vol. 10, No. 4 (Oct. 1929), 378.
\item \textsuperscript{243} Ibid., 379.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
1. The use of natural major and minor diatonic scales. Lowering the second degree or raising the sixth degree by a semitone often varies the natural minor.

2. The natural major scale often employs a raised fourth degree or a lowered sixth (creating the melodic augmented seventh).

3. The natural major scale often employs a lowered seventh degree.\textsuperscript{244}

4. Harmony is frequently diatonic, based on a characteristic alternation of triads in a mutual relation of a second (fifth and sixth degrees).\textsuperscript{245}

5. Unisons are frequently employed at the beginning, middle and final cadences.

6. The bass line is highly mobile compared to the western (Italian) standard.

7. There is frequent vagueness of tonality at beginnings due to the omission of the fundamental tonic pitch.

8. There is the use of the fourth as a consonant interval.\textsuperscript{246}

Much of the folk character of the music is derived from the unique scales used; these included raised and lowered degrees – including the second, fourth, sixth and seventh - in both major and minor. Folk harmonic style seems is more modally based. In point number four above, harmonic changes will occur with two triads that are essentially one step apart, reflecting the often-parallel motion of voices.

In their 1929 article for \textit{Music & Letters}, not long after Kastalsky published his folk system, Belaiev and Pring emphasized the heterophonic nature of Russian folk polyphony.

\textsuperscript{244} Belaiev/Pring, \textit{Kastalsky}, 379-384.
\textsuperscript{245} Ibid., 384.
\textsuperscript{246} Ibid.
Point number five in the list above refers to the appearance of unisons at the beginning, middle and end of many songs. This practiced reflected the appearance of the primary melody in various parts. The group will begin on the same pitch of the principle melody before each voice separates in order to trace the melodic line, creating various points of harmony. Much of the time, there are “passing tones” that create dissonances unique to the genre. Likely to keep all of the singers on track, the various voices return to a common pitch in the middle of the song before once again going on their divergent ways. To end, they once again return to a common tone, not necessarily the original tonic of the song. This may seem to be random singing to an outsider, but it is really a learned oral tradition.

Although Kastalsky’s recordings, transcriptions and analyses were not made until after 1917, the music he heard in the remote villages reflected traditions many centuries old. One cannot accurately pinpoint exactly what degree western styles may or may not have reached these villages. Based on his findings, it seems that ancient folk polyphony survived the Italian invasion. When examining the liturgical Orthodox compositions of Sarti’s Russian students for evidence of folk elements, one can use a combination of both of the above lists as a guide. Sarti’s students would certainly have been aware of these trends. They also would have had varying degrees of personal folk-singing experiences from their own upbringings. Finally, they would have likely had different motivations to specifically preserve and/or showcase traditional Russian music in their own operatic and liturgical compositions.

The final step in this study is an examination of the compositions of Sarti’s native Russian and Ukrainian students in an effort to determine the extent to which their music
reflects Sarti’s Italian influence through his teaching. It is likely that their church music will reflect the Western harmonic system moreso than the ancient Russian modal system. Since Sarti himself shows evidence of combining both Russian and Italian methods, will his students display the same type of combination? Also, will his students manage to transition between Russian and Italian elements in the same seamless manner Sarti could? Finally, will the selected students demonstrate influences from the prevalence of folk music in urban society?
Chapter 4: Giuseppe Sarti’s Russian Students, the First Generation of Post-Italianate Composers

Before delving into Sarti’s students’ lives and works, it is important to delineate the process used to select the chosen composers. The first step was to determine who exactly Sarti’s students were. Once those students were determined, it became important to selecting those whose life spans ended on or before 1830, as this date is generally agreed to be the beginning of the Germanic period in Russian church music. Because this is a study of the Italianate period’s influence on Russian church music, it was important to eliminate those later composers who were potentially impacted by German composers and imported German styles. There are challenges in accurately choosing Sarti’s students, as the lists provided in various sources are inconsistent. An additional problem is a lack of documentation describing where or when any given student studied with Sarti. The possibilities are that any given student would have studied with him at the St. Petersburg Kapella, the Conservatory in the capital, or in Kremenchug while Sarti was employed directly by Prince Potemkin beginning in 1787.

According to Vladimir Morosan, in his notes attached to his published edition of “Now the Powers of Heaven,” Sarti’s students included Artemy Vedel (1767-1808), Lev Stepanovich Gurilyov (1770-1844), Stepan Ivanovich Davydov (1777-1825), Stepan Anikievich Degtiarev (1766 – 1813), and Daniil Nikitch Kashin (1769-1841). Marina Ritzarev lists Piotr Ivanovich Turchaninov (1779-1856) as another of Sarti’s pupil’s.\(^{247}\) Gurilyov was a Moscow-based composer who specialized in piano music, composing only a

few works that are difficult to obtain. Kashin may have been of some interest, as we know that in 1788, he studied with Sarti in Bessarabia (Crimea).\textsuperscript{248} His compositional interests lay in Russian folk music, of which he published a three-volume collection of Russian folk songs in 1833 and 1834.\textsuperscript{249} He may have composed some liturgical music, but most of his music has been lost thus eliminating him from this study. Turchaninov is also known to have studied with Sarti in the Crimea, along with Kashin and Vedel. However, his year of death, 1856, is well into the period of Germanic influence. Because Orthodox compositions from this period are not dated, separating earlier Italianate from later German-influenced works is impossible.

The three remaining composers of interest to this study are Davydov, Vedel, and Degtiarev. All three composed their works prior the period of German influence that began circa 1830. They also illustrate the wide geographical reach Sarti’s influence, with Vedel in the Ukraine, Degtiarev in Moscow, and Davydov in St. Petersburg. Each of these students of Sarti had a unique background and compositional output, from Vedel’s focus on folk-inspired liturgical collection, Degtiarev’s Italian-based oeuvre, to Davydov’s strength in folk music, theatre music and large liturgical output. For the purpose of organization, I will look at the music of these three in chronological order, based on year of each composer’s death.

Before embarking on a discussion of Artemy Vedel’s life and liturgical works, the musical sources used in this study need to be addressed. As stated earlier, there are simply no known original manuscripts of eighteenth-century Russian church music, due to the

\textsuperscript{249} Ibid.
1927 Soviet destruction of the Imperial Chapel’s scores. It is logical to assume the possible existence of some manuscripts that survived this event, saved by members of the Chapel library or singers. However, such manuscripts have not yet come to light. Scholars therefore must rely on either nineteenth-century or modern publications of this repertory. In order to improve access to such compositions, the author embarked upon a research trip to St. Petersburg, Russia in June 2010.

The decision to limit the trip to St. Petersburg, rather than include Moscow or beyond, was prompted by both financial considerations and time limitations. There are certainly further archival resources to study in Moscow, but they will have to wait for another trip. While in St. Petersburg, three archives were accessed: the Russian State Historical Archive (RGIA), the National Library of Russia (NLR), and the Academic Glinka Capella (AGC), which is the re-named Court Kapella in St. Petersburg. The RGIA is one of the largest archival facilities in the world, with over seven million items that are catalogued and stored.
This brand new facility was opened to researchers in the fall of 2008 and has a high degree of security to protect its treasures. Despite its state-of-the-art facilities, it proved to be a very difficult place to navigate due to its reliance on old-fashioned, hand-written card catalogues. Even under the best of circumstances, it is quite difficult to read cursive Cyrillic, as the letters are significantly different in appearance from typed script. Add in the varied legibility of the individual handwriting samples, and the result was a painstaking process. Musical scores are within the archive’s collection, but finding lesser-known composers was impossible.

In the second week of the trip, I visited the Court Capella itself, right off of Palace Square and across the Dvortsovaya Ploshchad Bridge, where the 1927 burning of church
music took place. The building itself was constructed during Catherine the Great’s reign, between 1773 and 1777. Since then, additions have been made to the building, the most significant being in 1886-1889, when architect L.N. Benois completed the structure in the French classical style and surrounded it by a courtyard along the Moika River.²⁵⁰

Figure 4.2 Main Entrance to Glinka Capella (author’s photograph)

While at the Glinka Capella, I was granted access to the library and afforded the opportunity to take longer scores for offsite photocopying. These scores included the

works of Davydov, Degtiarev, as well as some by Vedel, Sarti, and others. This relatively large collection of music was the primary source for this study.

The third and final week of my time in St. Petersburg was spent at the National Library of Russia. This was a comparatively easier task than at the RGIA, as the music was housed in a dedicated section of the historical building on the Fontanka Embankment.

![Figure 4.3 Russian National Library, Fontanka Embankment (author's photograph)](image)

The NRL Fontanka building contains the largest collection of printed music in Russia, with some of the earliest printed music being made available. Of particular interest was its collection of early eighteenth-century liturgical music publications. Most of these had already been acquired by the author from either *Mussica Russica* or the Glinka Capella. However, I was able to transcribed by hand (photocopying is forbidden) Stepan Davydov's
Slava otsu from his four-voice liturgy, and an antiphonal work for six voices, Gospodi, kto obitaet v zhilishchi tvoem?

Artemy Vedel (1767-1808)

Very little is known of Artemy Vedel’s early life, a common problem in researching native Russian composers of the early eighteenth century. He was a native Ukrainian and a graduate of the Kiev Ecclesiastic Academy, where he was known for the expressive nature of his spiritual music. He apparently met Sarti in Kiev, as records indicate that he and Turchaninov arrived with Sarti in Kremenchug (southeast of Kiev) at the end of January 1787. Both Turchaninov and Vedel were there to study with Sarti at Potemkin’s Ekaterininburg Musical Academy. Nothing more specific is known about his studies with Sarti. Vedel spent the majority of his life in the Ukraine, except for a brief sojourn in Moscow when he was called by Governor General P.D. Eropkin to manage his choir and orchestra for approximately four years, 1788-1792. Vedel lived in Kiev and in Kharkov (in eastern Ukraine) serving as the director of vocal music and choirmaster for the Kharkov Collegium, which had been an important centre for preparing Imperial Court Cappella singers since 1773. Vedel’s life took a tragic turn when he was imprisoned for “political crimes” in 1800, dying in prison in 1808.

252 Ibid.
253 Ibid.
254 Ibid., 299.
255 Ibid., 298.
Vedel’s ethnicity and life story certainly impacted his liturgical music. As one who lived almost exclusively in the Ukraine, he had been raised in the stronghold of the *partes*-singing tradition. Because he never studied at the court nor was he directly employed at Catherine’s or Paul’s courts, he wasn’t pressured to compose music with Western features. Thus, he chose to continue writing in the *partes*-tradition, despite of Italian-based compositional instruction received from Sarti. There is no record that Vedel studied with any other Western composers; therefore one can assume that Sarti was the main source for his Italianate compositional techniques.

Vedel essentially composed concertos that were a reflection of a sub-genre called repentance concertos. These were highly emotional works that mainly reflected emotions of sorrow and grief with the goal of achieving catharsis.\(^{256}\) His overall style can be described as melodically driven, though with some development occurring through variations in texture.\(^{257}\) Because of his religious training, one might assume that his melodies would be primarily from the chant repertoire. According to Vladimir Morosan, however, Vedel did not use chant melodies but rather was influenced by both Italian and Ukrainian secular music.\(^{258}\) As a result of his penchant for the “repentance concerto”, much of his music is written in minor keys. The first work to be examined will be his four-voice concerto *Niñe otpushchayeshī* (Lord, Now Lettest Thou), the Canticle of St. Simeon (known as the *Nunc Dimittis* in Western churches) from the Vesper Service. This score was obtained from the Glinka Capella choral library in June 2010.

\(^{257}\) Ibid., 300.
For this particular work, Vedel chose the key of a minor and adopted a through-composed approach to setting the text. By “through-composed,” I mean that there is little variation in the motives or changes of texture from one section to the next. He does create divisions based on the text, but there are no obvious pauses or even many corporate rests. There is, in fact, only one spot in the entire work where all four voices rest; this occurs on the last quarter note of measure twelve, just prior to the next section of text, *Yako videsta*. Otherwise, texture changes occur suddenly between consecutive beats with or without some connecting device. One such spot occurs in measure eight:

**Music Example 4.1**  

In measure eight, Vedel simply creates a perfect authentic cadence moving from an E-major seventh to an a-minor chord on beat three. Beat four begins a new imitative passage that features parallel thirds (actually parallel tenths) between the tenor and soprano voices,

---

followed by a rhythmic imitation in the bass voice (a minor third below the tenor). The alto entrance in measure nine does not follow suit; indeed, this part seems to function as an interior drone. Here, Vedel has created a variation on the *kant* structure, compacted in a manner similar to Sarti’s method. When transitioning from the word *vsekh* to the following section *svyet vo otkrovyenie* (mm. 20-21), Vedel once again changes texture, expanding from three voices to all four voices.

**Music Example 4.2**

\[260\]

\[\text{Editor unknown, } Muzfonda CCCP, 1990\]
In this particular transition, he creates a connecting melodic “bridge” in the bass voice, after which he reverts to homophonic declamation. Another textural change occurs in measure twenty-three, where he switches to a compact kant-like style, with the soprano and alto voices in parallel thirds and the bass as harmonic foundation. Here the tenor is also serving a harmonic function, first creating parallel six-four chords, then joining parallel movement in measure twenty-four.

Vedel’s treatment of the text is indicative of his dedication to the Orthodox Church’s practice of clear text declamation. The fact that he was a graduate of ecclesiastical school no doubt impacted his approach. First, he divides this liturgical text into six sections as indicated in the chart below.

**Table 4.1 Vedel’s Text Divisions in “Lord, Now Lettest Thou”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Compositional Style/Texture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Niñe otpushcháyeshi rabá Tvoyegó, Vladiko,</td>
<td>Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant</td>
<td>Polychoral element alternating tutti and solo soprano/alto, tenor bass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Po glagólu Tvoyemú s mírom,</td>
<td>depart in peace, according to Thy word,</td>
<td>Imitation, duets in parallel thirds, quasi-kant structure, homorhythm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yáko videsta óchi moí spaséniye Tvoyé,</td>
<td>for mine eyes have seen Thy salvation,</td>
<td>Extended parallel motion, voice pairings, kant structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yèzhe yesí ugotóval pred lítsém vseh liudéy</td>
<td>which Thou hast prepared before the face of all people-</td>
<td>Three-voice kant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svet vo otkrovéniye yazikov,</td>
<td>a light to enlighten the Gentiles,</td>
<td>Predominantly homorhythmic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i slávu liudéy Tvoih Izrália.</td>
<td>And the glory of Thy people Israel.</td>
<td>Diletskii-esque imitation, homophonic chord support, duets in parallel thirds, stile antico</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vast majority of this composition employs a homophonic setting of the text. Even when various forms of imitation appear, Vedel maintains clear text declamation as we see in the following example:
Music Example 4.3

In this case, the melisma on the first syllable of slavu is heard first in the bass voice, while the upper three voices provide a clear F-Major second inversion triad on a homophonic statement of i slavu. Following western principles of imitation, Vedel repeats the theme in the soprano voice, up a major fifth. Now the lower three voices are making a homophonic statement of i slavu moving from a G7 chord to a C-Major chord. As a result, the listener will distinctly hear the statement of i slavu lyudei tvoikh. Although this section is structured in a Western manner, there is another way to look at Vedel’s manner of imitation.

It is quite conceivable that a Ukrainian composer of church music at the beginning of the nineteenth century would have known and studied Diletskii’s treatise, in part because this text was so significant to the Ukrainian musical psyche. According to Diletskii’s Musical Grammar, the ideal manner of imitation is to have like voices imitate at the unison. Thus, soprano imitates soprano and bass imitates bass, etc. However, the question arises of how one can apply that rule when there are only four parts, or one of each voice part. When writing a four-part texture, the upper two voices can be treated as being like voices, with the same applying to the bottom two voices. In this case, the bass melismatic line in measure twenty-five is imitated at the octave in measure thirty. The soprano’s version starting on C in measure twenty-seven is imitated an octave lower by the tenors in measure thirty-one. The octave displacement might completely negate this viewpoint for many, however Diletskii did encourage breaking up a bass drone with octaves and the same element occurs in many kant textures. Therefore, octave displacement had been considered an accepted part in both partesnoe penie and folk structures. Is it too much of a

262 Diletskii, Musical Grammar, Folio XXVII.
stretch to allow this same displacement when applying Diletskii’s rules of imitation? Isn’t this merely an expansion of the original three-voice *kant* texture? If not, one can at least observe a certain amount of similarity in structures between Russian/Ukrainian and Italian forms.

Another work of Vedel’s to examine is his setting of *Na redkáh vavilónskih* (By the Rivers of Babylon), Psalm 137 likely intended for performance during the Divine Liturgy or at “Passion Services.” In this work, he relies on two main developmental devices: concertization and *kant*. Compared to his setting of *Niñe otpushcháyeshi*, *Na redkáh vavilónskih* is scored for solo/soli voices in several sections. Each duet, trio or quartet is contrasted by choral tutti section as outlined in the chart on the following page. Note the second column, which lists the texture used, in chronological order. Each time he uses the SATB texture, it is scored *tutti*.

Table 4.2 Vedel’s Text Divisions in “By the Rivers of Babylon”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Voices</th>
<th>Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Na rekáh vavilónskih</em></td>
<td>ATB, SSTB, SATB</td>
<td><em>Kant, kant variant</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Támo sedóhom i plákahom,</em></td>
<td>AT, SATB, SSA, SATB</td>
<td>Duet, <em>kant</em>, homorhythm, drone, <em>kant</em> variants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vinégdá pomianútí nam, Sióna</em></td>
<td>TTB, SSB, SATB</td>
<td><em>kant</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Na vérbiih posredé yegó....</em></td>
<td>TB, SA, TB, SATB</td>
<td>Duets, <em>kant</em>, <em>kant</em> variants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>o slovesé pesney,i vedshii nas o pěníi:</em></td>
<td>SATB</td>
<td>Western counterpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vospoyte nam ot pesney Siónskih...na zemili chuzhdéy</em></td>
<td>TTB, AT(solos), ATTB (tutti), SA(solos), SATB, SATB</td>
<td>Duets, homorhythm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ashche zabúde...desñitsa moyá</em></td>
<td>TTB (solos), SATB</td>
<td><em>Kant, kant</em> variant (octave drones)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Aside from his constant changes in texture, Vedel uses key change to further divide the work. The piece begins with three flats, clearly in the tonality of c-minor complete with raised seventh and an f# as part of the secondary dominant triad. This entire section is harmonically constructed around tonic, dominant and secondary dominant chords. In measure thirty-four, Vedel changes to the key of g-minor, reducing the signature to two flats. Once in the new tonal center, he again alternates between tonic, dominant and secondary dominant chords. He returns to c-minor in measure sixty-two.

This composition highlights two contrasting elements: the kant structures (along with their variations), and Italian concerted sections. First it is necessary to clarify my term, “kant variant.” In reading through countless scores of eighteenth-century Russian church music, I kept encountering examples of extended parallelism. Sometimes these occur in isolation, but the majority of the time they appear with at least one other voice. Once familiar with the fundamental definition of kant as two upper voices in parallel thirds above a drone or functional harmonic bass line, I began to see a development of the style beyond its origin form. I have found variants of kant to fall into several different categories:

* kant variants are four- or five-voice versions of the original three-part structure, usually relying on octave doublings of the drone, placing drone in alto voice, etc.

** kant duets occur in short passages when two voices perform parallel thirds or sixths, without the accompanying drone.
1. Octave displacement of the drone.
2. Bass line (drone) shared between two voices (in octaves, alternation, or both)
3. Drone moved to voice other than bass.
4. Four-voice (or more) texture: relies on octave sharing of drone between voices, or an almost figured bass (creating chords rather than just the one note) between multiple voices.
5. Multi-voiced textures: the parallel lines may be in shorter segments, allowing for contrast between voices

These categories are closely related to the categories of *isocratema* already outlined in this dissertation.\(^{264}\) The octave displacement is common to all forms of *ison*. In the four-voiced texture, the chord-inspired, multi-voiced drone can be viewed as a more modern development of the compound *isocratema*. The original elements of *kant* were bound to undergo some changes in order to be useful to post-Italianate composers. This was due, in part, to the dominance of the four-part Western texture that became popularized in the church. Between the four-part dominance and the continued proliferation of the *partes-* concerti, composers like Vedel who were dedicated to preserving earlier forms, would have to bring the seventeenth-century *kant* into the nineteenth century.

Returning to Vedel’s setting of *Na rekáh vavilonskih*, Vedel's predominant Russian feature happens to be the *kant* structure. As indicated in the previous chart, he uses *kant* in its pure form, as well as in some variants. Since there have already been sufficient examples of the pure form, it is more interesting to examine some of the variants he applies. The first example occurs in measure eighty-six, immediately following a seven-measure passage of pure *kant* in *soli* TTB voices. This variation can be seen in the example on the following page.

\(^{264}\) Colin Armstrong, dissertation, 82.
Music Example 4.4

One can clearly see that the three lower voices finish up the *kant* in measure eighty-five.
The previous section finished here represented the eighteenth-century concept of a harmonic bass line, whereas in measure eighty-six, Vedel shifts to the typical Orthodox use of an *ison*. For five-and-a-half measures, the tenors replicate the bass drone one octave higher. In this variant, sopranos and altos move in parallel thirds, displaying contrast between the parts, beginning with the alto duet followed by the soprano duet. Although short-lived, Vedel applies the compound *isocratema* by having the alto voice sustain twice on half note F-sharps, in measure eighty-seven and eighty-nine. An F-sharp is considered to be a dominant note in the major mode on D. Obviously, the other interpretation of those F-sharps is simply that he needed a third to create a complete D⁷ chord. Perhaps this is more likely, but it does happen to fit in with the compound *isocratema* model.

Another example of a *kant* variant is Vedel’s use of a quasi-figured bass approach to the traditional harmonic bass line. We see this in measures thirty-eight and thirty-nine on the next page.
The requisite parallel thirds are in the two tenor voices, with the bass providing the tonic of the underlying chords. Vedel could have left the texture to these three voices, but chose instead to keep the full SATB texture intact, likely to paint a full texture for the word *orgāni*, implying organ. Vedel fills out the remaining chord tones in the soprano and alto voices to achieve the desired effect. Once again, here is a very Western harmonic approach that happens to fit into the rules of applying Orthodox compound *isocratema*.

When examining the liturgical music of Artemy Vedel, it becomes evident that he composed in a style that combined Italian elements learned from Giuseppe Sarti and the forms so important to Ukrainian national music, including the part-singing tradition and particularly the long-absorbed Polish *kant*. He uses Western harmonic approaches,

---

particularly focusing on tonic and dominant features of both major and minor tonalities. He also demonstrates the style of Italian concerted form, contrasting opposing groups. It becomes clear, however, that the kant was important to him. He applied kant in its original form as well modifying it to fit into textures that used more than three voices. He managed to modify kant while conforming to both Western and ancient Byzantine structures, demonstrating a hybrid Italian-Russian form. If Vedel’s approach was a hybridized style, will we find the same in the music of Sarti’s student, Stepan Degtiarev?

Stepan Anikievich Degtiarev (1766-1813)

One of the most interesting students of Giuseppe Sarti was the serf-composer, Stepan Degtiarev, who became the most famous of Count Sheremetev’s foreign-trained musicians. He was sold to Sheremetev at the age of seven, specifically for the purpose of developing his musical talents. Like most of his fellow serfs, he received training from Italian teachers. He was trained as an operatic singer, performing in the 1780s and eventually became a conductor and vocal coach. In Degtiarev’s case, instruction in composition wasn’t limited to only one teacher. He studied with Bortniansky, Antonio Sapienza Jr. and Giuseppe Sarti. Because Sheremetev invested so much time and money in the education of his serf musicians, he was reluctant to grant their freedom when requested. This was certainly the case with Degtiarev, who remained in his service until Sheremetev’s death in 1809. Because of his minute salary and the restrictions he faced,
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Degtiarev wrote music under several pseudonyms, including Stepan Nikeev and Stefan Anikeev. Degtiarev died on April 23 1813, leaving behind a widow and three children, only receiving his emancipation two years after his death.

Before jumping into an examination of a specific work of Degtiarev’s, it is important to note Marina Ritzarev’s scholarly work on his liturgical compositions. In her 2006 book *Eighteenth-Century Russian Music*, she devotes a complete section to a discussion of the Italian influence his works displayed, as imitation of Bortniansky and Sarti. Ritzarev describes characteristics such as cyclic divisions, use of time signatures, motifs (such as the sigh motif), and the abundant use of dominant seventh chords. She characterizes his later concertos, including the first decade of the 1800s, as displaying operatic tendencies, particularly an arioso-esque style. She applies these elements to her examination of several redactions of Degtiarev’s concertos, including *Izmi mya ot vrag moikh, Bozhe* (Deliver me from the workers of iniquity), *K Tebe, Gospodi, vozdvigokh* (Unto Thee, O Lord, have I lifted up), and *Gospodi, vozlyubikh blagolepie* (O Lord, I love the magnificence). Her work is thorough, and clearly identifies Degtiarev’s style as being predominantly Italian.

In order to take a different approach in exploring of his Italianate concerto, I will make a comparison of his setting of *Hvalite ímia Ghospódñe* (Praise the Name of the Lord) to Diletskii’s setting of the same text. This text is known as the *polyeleion*, a hymn performed at Matins comprised of select verses from Psalms 134 [135], and 135 [136]

---
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followed by the refrain “Alleluia.” I will compare Degtiarev’s setting to that of Nikolai Diletskii’s in order to contrast a more traditional Russian approach (one that was in vogue through the first part of the eighteenth century) to Degtiarev’s unique manner of setting the same text. Because a full century had elapsed between Diletskii’s influential treatise in the late seventeenth century and Degtiarev’s work for Sheremetev, one certainly would expect to see a considerable difference in their settings of the same text. Diletskii’s style strongly represented the Polish-Ukrainian partes-singing tradition that included the kant. It is instructive to observe the degree to which Degtiarev included or excluded these traditions.

The very title “Praise the Name of the Lord” suggests a celebratory mood to be matched by a Major tonality. In Degtiarev’s, he creates a semantic clash by setting the laudatory text in c-minor. Diletskii’s setting of a century earlier is clearly in G-Major, though with no F# in the key signature. Another difference in these settings is which verses are utilized. Degtiarev set four verses while Diletskii set only two. In the interest of direct comparison, it will be the two common phrases that will receive focus here. From the very beginning of both settings the differences are apparent. In Degtiarev’s setting of the opening text, *Hvalite imia Gospodnë*, he begins with a kant texture using three solo voices, two sopranos and one alto.

---

The alto serves the same function as a harmonic bass, while the two sopranos move almost exclusively in parallel thirds. Degtiarev's choice to open the work with a traditional *kant* sets a distinctly Russian tone to this work. If we compare Diletskii's opening passage, the difference lies not only in the mode and four-voice texture, but also in the *partes*-style of the setting. This can be seen in the example on the following page.

---

Here, Diletskii uses distinctly Western harmonic language, alternating between tonic and subdominant in the G-Major tonality. It is the expanded form of kant here, featuring the octave doubling of the ison. Although both demonstrate traditional Polish and Ukrainian features, it is ironic that Degtiarev’s setting sounds distinctly more Russian in character.

When examining the treatment of the Alleluia refrains in both settings, there are some striking differences. Degtiarev seems to be more interested in preserving the sanctity and clarity of the text, as he inserts an Alleluia between each verse of text. His repetition of the Alleluia for verse one after the third verse of text retains the intended refrain form.

Diletskii, on the other hand, telescopes text by placing two-voiced statements of Alleluia simultaneously with actual verses of text. This artistic license may have been part of an effort to expand the two verses through text repetition and telescoping. Degtiarev, on the other hand, used almost no text repetition and no telescoping of text. When comparing each composer’s first statement of Alleluia, it becomes evident that they both use a form of \textit{kant} before reaching their cadences. Diletskii’s first Alleluia is only two bars, but features something striking.

\textbf{Music Example 4.8} \textsuperscript{276}
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Once again, the parallel thirds are located in the soprano one and soprano two parts, with the compound \textit{isocratema} (using the tonic and dominant of C-Major) in the alto and bass occurring in the first two beats. The second half of the bar sees the alto and bass come

\textsuperscript{276} Morosan, editor, \textit{Musica Russica}, 1991.
together in octaves, representing a functional bass line, in this case showing flat-seven to one. The fascinating feature occurs on the downbeat of measure five. Here there is a dominant chord on D, featuring a traditional 4-3 suspension. However, the F-sharp in the alto on the downbeat creates a striking dissonance remnant of both folk heterophony and chant harmonizations typical of the time. Diletskii repeats this exact structure seven more times in this composition, lending it a degree of significance to his statements of Alleluia.

Degtiarev's Alleluias are all of longer duration than Diletskii’s, each being five measures in length until the final seven-measure version. The first five-measure Alleluia is seen in the example on the following page.
Music Example 4.9

277 Morosan, Vladimir, Editor in Chief, One Thousand Years of Russian Church Music, Series I, Volume 1, 192.
In the Alleluia following verse one (repeated after verse three), the *kant* structure is clearly visible. In measures five and six, the *ison* in the bass two is doubled over two octaves, by the baritones and the soprano two voices, although with different rhythm. The parallel voices occur between the tenors and first sopranos. In this case, rather than thirds, the parallelism is the inversion of a sixth. The parallel voices continue through measure seven. Once again, Degtiarev demonstrates his allegiance to distinctly Russian forms. He continues the use of *kant* throughout this work, verse three being sung entirely in the original three-voice texture.

Finally, a comparison of the final two Alleluias settings by both composers generates further useful information. First, by looking at Diletskii’s final three measures, we see completely Russian features, even during the final authentic cadence.

**Music Example 4.10**

---

278 Morosan, Vladimir, Editor in Chief, One Thousand Years of Russian Church Music, Series I, Volume 1, 197.
In measure forty-three, there is once again an obvious kant-based texture, with the parallel thirds in the two soprano voices, the ison in the alto, and harmonic bass. The last two beats of the same bar show the use of descending roulades in the bass, a feature borrowed from the West, but one that became typical to Russian music. In measure forty-four, on the dominant chord, we see what becomes later named the Russian bass. This becomes very typical at the end of phrases and the end of entire compositions, the important feature being a harmonic seventh presented as a passing tone during the diatonically descending bass line.

If Diletskii’s final two Alleluias are distinctly Russian, then Degtiarev’s in his final four bars are really more Italian.

**Music Example 4.11**

---

In measure thirty-two, there are no parallel parts or ison. The one unique feature of this bar is the dissonance created between the tenor and soprano one for the first half of the bar. Certainly the harmonic function of the d-half-diminished chord is pre-cadential, but the unusual element is its duration in the strong first half of the bar. This is possibly represents an element of folk-inspired heterophony. Otherwise, this final section of Degtiarev’s setting is entirely Italian in its structure.

Given Ritzarev’s work on his distinctly Italian works, and this examination of his “Praise the Name of the Lord,” it seems that Degtiarev composed in a variety of styles. Other works found in the Glinka Capella library confirm his disparate styles. His four-voice setting of Vzide Bog (God grants joy) is almost a study in the basics of Western harmony. His Bozhe, vo imya Tvoe, spaci mya displays a mix of kant and typical Western polyphony. His K tebe, geroi, vzivaem is an exercise in counterpoint. Because we don’t have dates for his compositions, it is impossible to determine a work’s association with his studies or even a period of his life. However, what has become clear is the variety of styles in which he composed. The important question becomes why did he do this? Any answer to this question could be described as conjecture. In my opinion, a logical explanation for this diversity in style was his need to compose in popular styles, allowing him to sell his works.

Degtiarev made very little money from Sheremetev, with an annual salary in 1802 of only 63 rubles 50 kopecks.\textsuperscript{280} As his ability to sell music or give concerts elsewhere was limited by Count Sheremetev, Degtiarev had to resort to selling his music, most often using one of his pseudonyms, to outside sources. He was in fact caught in the act in 1794 by one

\textsuperscript{280} Ritzarev, \textit{Eighteenth-Century Russian Music}, 264.
of Sheremetev’s paid informants, resulting in a five-ruble reduction in his salary.\textsuperscript{281} Knowing his need to better support himself, it is hardly surprising that Degtiarev took the risk to sell his scores wherever possible. So many of his works were Italianate because, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, this was the popular style in most circles. It made good business sense for him to compose predominantly in that style. Though outnumbered, he did compose some of his liturgical music featuring both \textit{kant} and \textit{partes} traditions.

We now see that Vedel composed predominantly in traditional Ukrainian styles, while Degtiarev seemed somewhat schizophrenic in his stylistic \textit{oeuvre}. Since both were students of Sarti, one would assume that there would be more consistency between them. However, life is never that simple or straightforward. Many factors, including mundane financial concerns, ended up informing stylistic choices. There is one final student of Sarti’s to examine: Stepan Davydov. Will this lead to any further clarity in determining Sarti’s influence?

**Stepan Ivanovich Davydov (1777-1825)**

Of Sarti’s native Russian and Ukrainian students chosen for this study, Davydov is perhaps the most significant because he composed the largest surviving and accessible body or work for the Russian Orthodox Church. Unfortunately, biographical information about Stepan Davydov is even less available than that of Vedel or Degtiarev. Nikolai

\textsuperscript{281} Ritzarev, \textit{Eighteenth-Century Russian Music}, 265.
Findeizen's monumental volumes, *History of Music in Russia from Antiquity to 1800* doesn't even mention him! Morosan makes only passing reference in his book *Choral Performance in Pre-Revolutionary Russia*. Even Marina Ritzarev's book only mentions him in passing.

Because he gained his reputation as an opera composer, it is less than surprising to find the most complete biographical information in the *New Grove Dictionary of Opera*.

Stepan Davydov was born in January 1777 near Chernigov, now called Chernihiv in the far north of the Ukraine. It isn't clear how he was recruited, but by the age of nine he was a member of the St. Petersburg Chapel Choir and receiving musical training. He remained at the St. Petersburg Court until 1814, studying with Giuseppe Sarti after his return from the Crimea, 1795-1801. During his studies with Sarti, he succeeded Bortniansky as conductor of the Imperial Chapel Choir from 1797-1800. According to Taruskin, Davydov's sacred choruses likely came from this three-year period, likely due to the additional composition requirements for one in such a position.

Between 1800 and 1810, he was employed as a teacher of singing and music at the imperial theatre school. There is a four-year period unaccounted for, after which Davydov moved to Moscow in 1814 where he lived for the remainder of his life where he composed theatre music. As for his liturgical music, there is a significant amount to study, including ten four-voice concerti for double chorus, three concerti for double chorus and a complete liturgy (eight numbers) for four voices. His sacred music was judged by many critics to be too Western for use within Services. Because of this and the fact that he wasn't put on Bortniansky's list of

---
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approved music (though it did include Sarti’s), Davydov’s works were not approved for publication by the Imperial Chapel until as late as 1871.\textsuperscript{285} The fact that his music was eventually approved for publication either means the church found some intrinsic value or that both tastes and views had changed. Either way, his music was finally deemed worthy for use in Orthodox Services.

The relatively large volume of Davydov’s liturgical output is too vast for the scope of this study. The works I personally collected and transcribed include his complete liturgy, and select other works. Because they are an excellent representation of his overall style, containing the elements typical to most of his compositions, I will focus my attention on Davydov’s setting of \textit{Obnovliaysia, nóvìy Iyerusalíme} (Be Renewed, O New Jerusalem). The work is scored for seven voices – two sopranos, two altos, two tenors and one bass – though all seven voices are never heard simultaneously.

Like most of his other Orthodox compositions, this work represents an interesting blend of Western and some striking folk-inspired elements. In Davydov’s setting there are three verses of text as demonstrated in the chart on the following page. I’ve numbered each line of verse with a Roman numeral. I’ve subsequently broken down each verse into lines of text, each of which is indicated by an Arabic numeral. This was done in an effort to clarify the styles used for each verse and line of text.

\textsuperscript{285} Taruskin, Davidov, 1089.
Table 4.3 Textual Divisions for Davydov's "Be Renewed, O Jerusalem"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obnovliaysia, nòvìy Iyerusalìme</th>
<th>Time Signature</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Be Renewed, O New Jerusalem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-1 Obnovliaysia, nòvìy Iyerusalìme,</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Be renewed, O new Jerusalem,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-2 priîde bo tvoy svet,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for your light has come,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-3 i sláva Ghospódnìa na tebì vossiyà.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And the glory of the Lord has shone on you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-1 Sey dom Otéts sozdá</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>This house the Father has created,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-2 sey dom Sìn utverđí,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>this house the Son has established,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-3 sey dom Duh Sviatiy obnovì.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This house the Holy Spirit has renewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-1 Obnovléñìy sviashchëñìh bozhëstvennoyë torzhëstvò</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Let us celebrate in hymns and praise in psalms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-2 v pësñëh vosprázdñuyem i vo psalmëh vosklíkñìem,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>this divine feast – the renewal of sacred things,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-3 yáko da mílostì obrìashchem Spása i Ghóspoda.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and we shall obtain the mercy of the Savior and Lord.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Davydov sets all three verses in a predominantly homophonic manner, for clear text declamation at all times. Since he was working at the St. Petersburg Chapel, it made sense for him to follow the guidelines of text long before established by the Holy Synod. When Davydov departs from strict homophony in this work, it tends to occur when featuring a particular section of voices. We can see this beginning in measure 102 of the piece on the following page.
In this passage, the bass line is in the midst of repeating the text vospráždnuyem i vo psalmeh vosklikňem, while creating a transition from the key of a-minor to e-minor in measure 107. He uses a pattern of descending fifths to achieve the modulation, moving from a-D7-G7-f#-B7-e. The upper three voices are entirely homophonic as they outline the remaining chord tones left vacant by the bass line. This passage represents both Western and Russian traditions. The harmonic movement and modulation is clearly Western in structure, relying on the circle of fifths as its inspirations. However, one can view this also as an expanded kant form. The top two voices maintain motion in parallel sixths, which is very traditional. The tenor voice is acting as the third part in what I earlier described as a realized figured-bass version of the parallel voices. Although the bass line is the featured voice and moves quickly, it is very much a functional bass part. Once again, we see the melding of Russian and Western forms.

---

Another feature of Davydov’s text setting is the use of repetition as a means of development and expansion. The first verse is stated once without repetition, in a homophonic setting. He then repeats the verse, but this time using antiphonal imitation as an important device. In the example below, he contrasts the treble voices with the male voices, using the consecutive entries to modulate from C-Major through a-minor, F-Major to G-Major in measure thirty-five. Each time, the trebles initiate the text which is then immediately repeated by the male voices.

Music Example 4.13 287

The first two measures of the example represent an Italian antiphonal approach whereas the third and fourth measures imply a kant structure. In measures thirty-four and thirty-five, the two descant parts are in the requisite parallel thirds. The alto voices are in contrary motion to the descants in measure thirty-five until they reach their ison in measure thirty-five. The element of contrary motion is hardly a Russian feature, as it had

existed in Western music for centuries. Davydov could have simply kept the altos on a sustained F and that would have worked. However, it certainly would have been a much less interesting transition into the following measure’s G-Major tonality. Once measure thirty-five is reached, the altos sustain a G and the two descants sustain their compound isoratema notes (obviously outlining G-Major) while the men move in parallel thirds. Davydov was giving a nod to kant in these two bars while clearly outlining Western harmonic structures, repeating seventh chords several times. Viewing this passage and others like it requires a more open-minded approach, taking into account both Italian and Russian styles.

Davydov continues the second verse, repeating the final section of text i sláva Ghospódniia na tebé vossiyá four times. The first verse had been set in 4/4 time, but Davydov changes to ¾ time for the second verse. These changes in time signature (including the change to 2/4 for the third verse) are a Western cantata approach to text divisions. The second verse is set twice in its entirety, with antiphonal imitation once again being Davydov’s method of choice. The first time through the verse, he employs only solo voices as seen in the example that follows.
Music Example 4.14

The bass is the featured voice, operating as a cantor or the role of priest while the upper three voices act as remaining clergy, repeating each line of text. The soprano, alto and tenor soloists clearly sing in a *kant* structure as they repeat the text *Sey dom Otéts sozdá*. In measure forty-three, the tenor part demonstrates a similar turn taken by the alto voice in measure thirty-five. This three-note chromatic ascent in the functional bass of the three-voiced *kant* structure becomes a typical Russian feature. Here, the tenor sings D-D#-E, while in measure thirty-five, the alto performs the same function (see music example V-13) when singing F-F#-G. It is the final pitch in the group of three that is the next stable *isón*.

Examining the overall musical structure of Davydov's setting reveals a three-part form separating the three verses of texts into contrasting sections with different time signatures. The styles and textures he employs are indicated in my chart below, organized by each numbered line of text.

Table 4.4 Davydov's Compositional Styles in "Be Renewed, O New Jerusalem"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line of text</th>
<th>Textures used (in order)</th>
<th>Styles evident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-1.</td>
<td>SATB, SA, TB, SATB</td>
<td>Homorhythm, antiphonal imitation, homorhythm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-2.</td>
<td>SATB, SSA, TTB</td>
<td>Homorhythm, <em>kant</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-3.</td>
<td>SATB, SSA, TTB, SATB</td>
<td>Homorhythm, antiphonal imitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-1.</td>
<td>Bass solo, SAT soli/SATB</td>
<td><em>Kant</em>, homorhythm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-2.</td>
<td>Bass solo, SAT soli/SATB</td>
<td><em>Kant</em>, homorhythm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-3.</td>
<td>Bass solo, SAT soli/SATB</td>
<td><em>Kant</em>, homorhythm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-1.</td>
<td>SAT soli, SATB</td>
<td><em>Kant</em>, homorhythm, <strong>chant harmonization</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-2.</td>
<td>SATB</td>
<td>Duets (SA, TB), <em>Kant</em>, <strong>melodic augmented second (FOLK)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As evident in the chart, his compositional style for *Obnovliaysia, nòviy lyerusalìme* revolves around Italianate homorhythmic and antiphonal sections, along with a final *stile antico* section, obviously learned from his Italian teachers including Sarti. As a reflection of Russian traditions, he uses *kant*, old chant harmonizations, and elements of folk traditions. Because there have been many examples of *kant* already examined in this study, it is perhaps more interesting to observe Davydov's use of chant harmonizations and folk melody.

The occurrence of what seems to be a chant harmonization is in measure seventy-three. Here, Davydov writes in a Western homorhythmic style in measures seventy through seventy-two. Upon arrival at measure seventy-three, something strange occurs.
It is the soprano’s C# on beat two that creates a unique dissonance that is difficult to explain from a Western point of view. If we examine each voice part individually, each makes sense. The bass line is serving a typically harmonic function with many half steps. The tenor and alto are filling out chord tones not present in the soprano or bass. The soprano is clearly singing a melody, whether it comes from folk or chant tradition. It is the soprano C# that seems peculiar. When combining various voices (AT, AB, TB, etc.), once again there is little that cannot be applied to Western theoretical principles. It is when all four voices occur together on beat two of measure seventy-three that we see two tritones on top of one another: the C# against G in the soprano and alto, and the B against an F in the tenor and bass. Of course, the C# is quickly left, moving immediately to the D that follows, but that moment is so striking to the Western ear and because it occurs only once in the entire composition, it becomes a more significant moment. I believe this moment was intentionally created by Davydov to capture heterophonic dissonance typical of folk

harmonizations. Heterophony is defined as being two or more voices singing slightly different parts based on the same melody. They might begin on the same pitch, but then one might move while the other stays. Resulting dissonances are usually close intervals such as major and minor seconds. If the soprano part has the melody beginning at measure seventy, the tenor is the second line hovering around the part. They are in octave Ds on the downbeat of measure seventy-one before moving separately. In consecutive measures the tenor maintains the pitch C as the soprano moves up and then back towards their starting C. By the downbeat of measure seventy-three, they have almost come together until a variation occurs pitting the soprano C# against the tenor B. They quickly move away again until they return to the same C and E from where they started, arriving at this tonic location on beat two of measure seventy-four.

Davydov was known for integrating folk elements into his theatre music, so it’s no surprise that he would do the same in church music. In Obnovliaysia, nôviy lyerusalíme, he also incorporates the melodic augmented second, a trait earlier discussed as being prominent in the Ukraine as a result of female Turkish prisoners during the Ottoman War. This melodic device appears only in his setting of the second line of the third verse, as can be seen in the example on the following page.
The melodic augmented second occurs in the soprano solo, which is paired in parallel thirds with the alto solo. To complete the *kant* structure, the *ison* occurs with the bass and tenor soloists in octaves. Because this phrase is in a-minor, the augmented second is merely part of the descending harmonic minor scale. Another interesting folk characteristic of the soprano's melody is the F-natural in measure ninety-four. With the tonality of this measure being e-minor, the lowered seventh degree confirms Kastalsky's description of altered scales degrees in folk singing.

---

In reality, the soprano melody in measures ninety-four through ninety-seven is really a re-statement of the material that occurs in the previous phrase.

**Music Example 4.17**

The soprano solo line in measure ninety-one to the B on the downbeat of measure ninety-three is a descending G-Major scale. There is of course a half-step from the G to the F#, but was it necessary for him to re-create the same half-step in the next phrase, A-G#? The G# does create the major dominant chord in the e-minor tonality, but he could have chosen a minor dominant tonality, thus avoiding the augmented second that significantly changes the melody. It isn't known why he chose this, but it does seem to be an intentional nod to this known Ukrainian folk feature. Like Sarti’s other students, Stepan Davydov clearly demonstrates a hybrid approach to his Orthodox music, combining both Italian and Russian compositional elements.

---

Chapter 5: Conclusion

In the period before the arrival of the first Italian composers at the Russian Court of Catherine the Great, Russian church musicians had already developed part-singing that reflected the practices of Roman Catholic Churches in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. These forms included the *partes*-singing, which was a style that featured multiple parts written to reflect fundamental Western harmonic practices, particularly the tonic-dominant functions. Nikolai Diletskii’s late seventeenth-century treatise expanded on the *partes*-concerto tradition with his attempt to standardize the practices of imitation, *ison*, parallel voice-leading, etc. Aside from the Ukrainian *partes*-singing, the Polish *kant* was firmly established by the beginning of the eighteenth century because its forms existed in both the church and in folk singing. The original three-voice structure that featured a functional bass and two upper voices in parallel thirds was eventually expanded for thicker textures of four voices and beyond.

Another element to consider in pre-Italianate Russian church music were the chant harmonizations heard regularly in Services. Chant harmonizations and folk polyphony were very similar at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Whether the chant harmonizations imitated folk practices or vice versa, both reflected a predominantly horizontal and heterophonic construction that resulted in frequent dissonances. As these traditional chant harmonizations developed through the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, they absorbed Western harmonic principles as a result of the popular Ukrainian *partesnoe penie* and Polish *kant* that were so pervasive at the turn of the
eighteenth century. As a result, these harmonizations became increasingly triadic in nature. Moving from heterophonic dissonance through to parallel triads actually worked very well with the parallel thirds and sixths typical to kant structures! It is therefore not surprising that the kant (or psalmy) structure became the most important element connecting the seventeenth century pre-Italian music that of the early nineteenth century, post-Italianate period.

When Giuseppe Sarti arrived in St. Petersburg in 1784, Italian influence had already been in Russia for a half-century. With the exception of Baldassare Galuppi’s three-year tenure in the 1760s, most of that influence took the form of theatre music, particularly in opera seria. When not composing or directing opera productions at the Court, Sarti was teaching his composition students both operatic and liturgical styles. The liturgical skills he had acquired in his early training from his teachers Vallotti and Martini focused on counterpoint and the stile antico, which he undoubtedly passed on to his Russian and Ukrainian students. As we now know, Russian liturgical music was impacted by the influence of opera seria, particularly the virtuosic solo passages associated with arioso. As Sarti was rather adept at this, he certainly included these elements in lessons with his composition students. It is logical to assume that Sarti would also have passed on his knowledge of contemporary Western harmonic practices, including chromaticism resulting from secondary dominant and augmented sixth chords. Finally, he would have also taught his students the concept of the cantata as it existed in Italy, complete with approaches to textual divisions.
Giuseppe’s students were from disparate locations within Catherine’s Russia, covering Moscow, St. Petersburg and the Ukrainian territories. Each of them would take divergent paths in both career and liturgical output. Artemy Vedel stayed in the Ukraine for most of his life, while Degtiarev was forced to remain in Moscow under the employ of his owner, Count Sheremetev. Finally Stepan Davydov was the one student who was employed directly at the St. Petersburg Court, residing in the new capital until he moved to Moscow in 1814 to compose theatre music. Although these three students took separate paths, their music reflected the imprint of their esteemed teacher. They all applied Western approaches, but demonstrated an allegiance to Russian tradition by applying *partes, kant* and the linear, dissonant-prone heterophonic approaches that was part of their musical culture. The main difference here was the degree to which each applied and developed these traditional practices.

The impact of Italian harmonic language, stile antico, counterpoint on the face of late-seventeenth and early eighteenth-century Russian church music cannot be denied. These elements brought to Russia by Sarti and his contemporaries essentially changed the *partes*-singing tradition, causing an important development in the form. Basically the very simple tonic-dominant, triadic *partesnoe penie* expanded to become a more harmonically-complicated and sophisticated genre. Choral concertos became truly concerted forms that used antiphony and some sections of counterpoint as developmental techniques. The compositions of Sarti’s students demonstrated the Italian cantata tradition with text divisions determining different tonal centers and time signatures. Sarti brought significant Italian influence to Russian church music, but it occured in an environment/style that was
ripe for change. Partes-singing was conducive to incorporating Italian elements as it was already a Western-inspired form.

The impact of Italian forms on Russian church music has never been questioned. The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not any pre-existing Russian forms managed to survive. Even a cursory examination of late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century liturgical music composed by native Russian and Ukrainian composers shows that Russian forms did survive and blend with the newer Italian techniques. I have found that various pre-existing Russian forms survived to varying degrees in post-Italianate Russian church music. For example, the heterophonic dissonances found in both church and folk polyphony can still be found. The very close nature of heterophony really precluded its survival in pure form. Western triadic structure is not conducive to multiple, consecutive harmonic seconds. Post-Italianate composers (and even Sarti himself) could only allude to these dissonances, usually by touching on them and then departing once again. The easier folk elements to maintain were melodically oriented. Post-Italianate Russian composers were able to incorporate traditional folk melodies that included elements such as the melodic augmented second inspired by the captured Turkish female prisoners. It was also relatively easy for this group of composers to incorporate melodies that reflected scale alterations that included both raised and lowered scale degrees typical to folk singing practice.

There are two main important discoveries that come this study. First, is that Sarti himself ended up absorbing some Russian elements as evidenced by his own Orthodox compositions. As I demonstrated earlier, he incorporated the kant structure, used drone,
and demonstrated awareness of Diletskii’s rules of imitation at the unison. It only makes sense that a studied composer such as Giuseppe Sarti would absorb some of these traditions after being in Russia for fifteen years before composing his Orthodox settings. Whether he consciously studied scores and Diletskii’s treatise, or he absorbed things through osmosis, he made a point to not only include these elements in his late works, but he developed them to a higher form. A prime example of this development comes from his work with the three-voiced \textit{kant}.

The second and most significant discovery I've made relates to the importance of the Polish \textit{kant} in bridging the divide between the pre- and post-Italianate era. Obviously, the form originated in Poland so it technically cannot be referred to as inherently Russian. However, it had been pervasive in both folk and church music for such a long time that it really became adopted as a Russian idiom. The original form of the \textit{kant} required extended passages of parallel thirds or sixths between two voices, along with a functional bass line or drone. This form was prevalent in the Lvov Prach folk song collection published in 1790. As the eighteenth century progressed, a better understanding of Western harmonic principles occurred. These more complex harmonies with moving bass lines tended to preclude long sustained drones. Also, the public tastes had been sufficiently exposed to Italian music, so a desire for concertized music that often featured some form of counterpoint was created. The late eighteenth century Russian had tastes for both Polish \textit{kant} – now considered Russian – and Italian concertized music. How could the two both occur?
What occurred was the development of a hybrid Russian-Italian form that combined mainly *kant* as Russian element, and concertization and counterpoint as Italian forms. As I highlighted in Sarti’s music and the music of his Russian students, this hybrid forced an expansion of the original three-voiced *kant* to fit compositions that required four voices or more. When expanding to suit multiple-voiced compositions, it is particularly interesting to note that the new forms actually remained faithful to ancient practices such as those long deemed acceptable with *isocratema*. These included the doubling of the drone in octaves (through different voice parts) and using compound forms that happened outline contemporary triadic structures. The parallel thirds or sixths could frequently be broken up into shorter segments between different voice pairings, often allowing harmonic functions outlining the circle of fifths to occur quicker than a drone would allow. This also resulted in a shortening or telescoping of the mini-*kants* between voice groupings, aiding antiphonal statements of text. Post-Italianate church music often demonstrates a *kant* form that excludes the bass part, only using extended parallel thirds in two voice parts. Truly, the variations and combinations are almost endless. With the prevalence of the *kant* and accepted heterophonic-inspired dissonances, the emergence of a hybrid Italian-Russian model was formed, one that would be further developed with nineteenth-century German influencess and the twentieth-century pro-Russian Moscow School. Perhaps the greatest proof of the significance *kant* plays in identifying Russian music, is Rachmaninoff’s significant use of the form in his *All Night Vigil*, Op. 37, composed in 1915.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


