

## THE PROFESSIONAL MUSICAL ART IN THE RUSSIAN MONASTERIES IN THE 16<sup>TH</sup> — 17<sup>TH</sup> CENTURIES

*N. P. Parfentjev, South Ural State University, Chelyabinsk, Russian Federation,  
parfentevnp@susu.ac.ru*

Preservation and development of the ancient church singing as the high musical art occupied an important place in the spiritual life of Russian monasteries in the 16<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> centuries. On the basis of the documents the author reveals the activities of the monastic choirs, their composition and structure, information about the peculiarities of the chanting repertoire, the system of salaries for the singers and their service and off-duty employment. The researcher also presented the most outstanding monastic chanting masters' creative works of their authorship which have gained recognition among their contemporaries.

*Keywords: ancient Russian art of chanting, the monastic choirs, work of authorship, Russian monasteries 16<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> centuries.*

Monasteries played a crucial role in the feudal Russia in the 16<sup>th</sup>—17<sup>th</sup> centuries. According to V. O. Kluchevsky, there were 168 monasteries in Russia in the 15<sup>th</sup> century; throughout the 16<sup>th</sup> century their number increased up to 254; 104 out of 254 were located in cities and suburban territories [33, p. 233]. In the 17<sup>th</sup> century the number of monasteries was still growing. The most significant among them were the Troitse-Sergievsky, Vladimiro-Rozhdestvensky, Kirillo-Belozersky, Iosifo-Volokalamsky and Solovetsky Monasteries. Monasteries kept up with the cities and often left them behind. As in the cities, the stone construction in the monasteries was unfolded. The cathedrals were erected in the Pokrovsky monastery in Suzdal (1515), in the Spaso-Prilutsky monastery near Vologda (1542), in the Boldino-Dorogobuzhsky monastery near Smolensk (1580—1605), in the Ipatyevsky monastery in Kostroma (1652), in the Mikhailo-Arkhangelsky monastery in Ustug the Great (1653) etc. In monasteries there appeared refectories meant not only for ordinary meals but also for state receptions (visits of tsars, princes and church hierarchs). The carrying out the liturgical ceremonies outside church here was accompanied by performance of stylistically various chants.

Monastery choirs were usually formed from monastery brethren. It should be noted that their structure differed from the *stanitsa* system typical of the mundane choirs. A monastery choir was divided into two parts headed by choirmasters who were to control singers' discipline and diligence: singers were to arrive in time, to behave properly and decently, to sing well and to gather for mastering their art on definite days. According to the rules singing accuracy was supervised by a senior chorister [37, p. 129]. Singers were called choir brothers. However, not always choir brothers were singing diaki. Frequently they were members of the monastery clergy (deacons, precentors, sextons etc.). It can be explained by their participation in the choir (especially if the choir consisted of few singers).

People from various social layers could sing in a monastery choir. Ivan the Terrible remembered in his letter to the Kirillo-Belozersky monastery in 1573 that there was an unknown singer Lopotukha Varlam on the right choir in the Troitse-Sergiev monastery whereas on the left side there was the son of prince Alexander Vasilyevich Obolensky called Varlam. Thus, a prince's

son became a singer in a monastery choir. The tsar also wrote that there was Ignatey Kurachev from Belozerye on the right side and Fedorit Stupishin on the left side. Stuposhin came from a noble family<sup>1</sup> that is why Ivan the Terrible marked that he was the same as other choir brothers [1, p. 385]. Monastery choirs united people of various social statuses and various age. Some data can be found in the Census book of the Zvenigorod Savvo-Storozhevsky monastery (1678). It mentions the age of the following choir brothers: Mitrofan, 49, Sergiy, 32, Avel, 24, Melety, 50, Pakhomy, 70, Martiry, 66, Leonty, 45, Aniky, 30 and Iosiph, 50 [38, p. 23].

Forming the choir in a newly-opened monastery the authorities sent there experienced singers from other monasteries. Thus, the tsar's letter (1579) to the Mother Superior of the Pokrovsky monastery in Suzdal ordered her to choose two educated elderly nuns for the new convent in Kazan for teaching singers [32, p. 60—61].

To estimate the number of singers in monastery choirs is not an easy matter. On the one hand, choirs were constantly renewed (some choir brothers stayed in the monastery for a month or even less), on the other — sources rarely mention the complete singing staff. In 1548 Ivan the Terrible with his wife Anastasia visited the Savvo-Storozhevsky monastery which had a choir of 11 singers on each side [1, p. 386]. The choir consisted of about 20 people in total and was likely to be a typical choir for the large monasteries attended the tsar's family and Metropolitan (later Patriarch). The Solovetsky monastery in 1585 and the Kirillo-Belozersky monastery in 1601 had a similar number of singers [158, p. 122—123]. The Suzdal Pokrovsky monastery in 1650 had 23 choir sisters [150, p. 89]. The Moscow monasteries in the 1650-s had up to 29 singers (the Spassky monastery) and 20 singers (the Chudov monastery) [40, p. 842, 256]. It is worth mentioning that the choir of the Savvo-Storozhevsky monastery in Zvenigorod in 1674—1677 also had 20—22 singers, in May 1688 — 3 choirmasters and 29 choir brothers. After Tsar Ivan Alekseevich and Tsarevna Sophia visited this monastery, the number of singers was increased — 2 choirmasters with 6 choir brothers on each side plus 4 choir brothers in the side chapel and the church hospital for each [17, p. 166].

<sup>1</sup> In 1563 one of the Stupishin family became archbishop of Polotsk [139, p. 175].



In the monastery. Miniature of the 16th century. Fragment

The choirs of less significant cloisters consisted of a smaller number of singers, though priests, deacons and sextons sang here as well for additional payment. Thus, the documents of the Boldinsky monastery (1569) mention only 5 choir brothers. Later, in 1591—1600, the number of singers did not increase but 1—3 deacons and 3—4 priests received “krylosnoe” (“singing payment”) [140, p. 3—11, 92—114 etc.]. The expenses book of the Solodchinsky monastery (1596) does not mention choir brothers at all but contains records of “singing payment” given to deacons, sextons and one diak [152].

At times the number of singers decreased by halves and even more: they left the cloister, ran errands to different cities, suffered from epidemics and wars. If necessary, even ordinary monks could sing in the choir. Thus, on January, 19, 1659, the commemoration day of Savva Storozhevsky (the founder of the monastery) there were 17 singers on the right side with a senior chorister and a choirmaster and 12 people on the left side with choirmasters; among them there were no choir brothers as far as their function was performed by priests, deacons and ordinary monastic elders. Choir brothers were singing in the church chapel of St. Savva and in the church hospital (4 people in each place) [60].

For performing their duties all singers got “zazhiloe” — money payment which depended on the monastery’s wealth and established rules. Due to the constant staff turnover choir brothers received money every month. The Boldino-Dorogobuzhsky monastery of the Smolensk eparchy in 1569 paid 2 altyns and 1 grivna to choir brothers; young choir brothers got 5 altyns for three months of their service; in 1585—1587 choir brothers were given 1 grivna per month, choirmasters — 2 altyns and 4 dengas; in 1591—1600 choir brothers and choirmasters received the same amount of

money — a little more than 2 altyns per month [138, p. 293—312; 140, p. 3—11, 92 etc.]. The Kornilyev monastery of the Vologda eparchy in 1576 paid the same “zazhiloe” to choir brothers and choirmasters — 2 altyns; the same year the Spaso-Prilutsky monastery gave its choir brothers only 4 dengas; in total all choirmasters and choir brothers (13 people) received 20 altyns and 7 dengas; in 1605/6 choir brothers were paid up to 2 altyns, some of them got 1 grivna [55, fol. 13, 18 etc.; 56, fol. 10v, 20v; 153]. In 1668 the singers of the Prilutsky monastery (10—12 singing diaki) received 2 altyns per month, the choirmaster — 3 altyns and 2 dengas [101, fol. 20v, 24, 29 etc.]. The Chudov monastery in 1585/86 paid 1 grivna to a choirmaster, 2 altyns and 0,5 denga to a choir brother; the Iosifo-Volokalamsky monastery in 1592 gave 1 grivna to a choirmaster, 2,5 altyns to a choir brother but later (in the early 17<sup>th</sup> century) all singers were paid 1 grivna [57, fol. 78—79, 102 etc.; 68—73].

As we can see the amount of money payment in monastery choirs of various regions was practically the same. In the late 17<sup>th</sup> century some monasteries introduced yearly payments. The sums of money were calculated on the base of monthly payments and term of service. For example, the Savvo-Storozhevsky monastery in the 1670—80-s paid 4,5—5,5 roubles to a senior chorister (including 1 rouble for “the Ustav” (observing the rules of singing), others — for his singing duties; a choirmaster received 4—4,5 roubles, a choir brother — 3 roubles; in 1680/81 choirmasters and senior choristers of the Voznesensky monastery got 2,5 roubles, choir sisters — 2 roubles; in 1685/86 a senior chorister in the Bogoslovsky monastery received 3 roubles, a choirmaster — 2,5 roubles, a choir brother — 1,5 roubles, since 1686/87 and till the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century a senior chorister was paid 4 roubles, a choirmaster — 3 roubles, a choir brother — 2—3 roubles [41, p. 411; 50, p. 88, 103, 212; 51, p. 31; 77; 80—83; 85; etc.].

Monastery singers also received additional financial assistance. During Christmas and Easter holidays, like singers of mundane choirs, choir brothers took part in “slavlenoe” (glorifying) rites. In December 1585/86 the choirmasters and choir brothers of the Chudov monastery received 0,3 rouble from the Father Superior, for singing during official ceremonies — 1 grivna from the treasury [57, fol. 122]. In 1605/06 the choir brothers and sextons of the Spaso-Prilutsky monastery received 0,17 rouble for “slavlenoe” on Christmas [55]. The choirmasters and choir brothers of the Savvo-Storozhevsky monastery in 1667 were given 0,63 rouble, in 1685 — 0,6 rouble for Christmas “slavlenoe” [78; 84]. The singers of the Ryazan Bogoslovsky monastery in December 1685 were paid 0,25 rouble, in 1687 — only 0,2 rouble (including the clergy of the parish) [50, c. 93, 218]. On December, 24, 1696, choir sisters were glorifying Christ in the Voznesensky monastery and were granted 1 rouble each from the Mother Superior, 0,5 rouble from the cellarer, 0,25 rouble from the treasurer. Besides, by the Mother Superior’s order all choir sisters received 30 roubles, as far as “earlier they were glorifying in boyar places and now it is prohibited by law” [40, p. 310].

Thus, singers from the capital and eparchial centres gained a lot from the location of their monasteries as far

as they could also glorify Christ at the hierarch's place and till the mid 1690-s — in boyar residences. Some singers were invited for glorifying Christ to the tsar's and patriarch's chambers. In 1621—1627 the choir sisters of the Novodevichy monastery (where the tsar's mother, Marfa Ivanovna, was staying) sometimes were given furs for Christmas glorifying (in 1621 and 1624 they were given sable fur, in 1626 — 11 martens and 11 pairs of sables, in 1627 — only sables) [61—64]. Most probably, furs were meant for choir sisters of noble origin.

At times the tsars, tsaritsas or patriarchs while visiting close and remote monasteries gave money to monastery brethren and singers. In the 1620—30-s Tsar Mikhail and Patriarch Filaret often visited the Novodevichy monastery giving money to choir sisters for their singing; sometimes the patriarch sent them 1 rouble for each part of the choir [7, p. 20, 23; 15, p. 67, 199 etc.; 40, p. 794—796]. The choir sisters of the Voznesensky monastery received the same sums of money in the 1630-s [40, p. 286]. It is worth mentioning that in February 1635 the tsaritsa visiting the Novodevichy monastery awarded choir sister Emanarkha Timiryazeva with 2 roubles, in November 1637 while staying in the Troitse-Sergiev monastery the tsaritsa awarded choir brother Zakha with 1 rouble [67; 157, p. 621]. When patriarch Nikon visited the Savvo-Storozhevsky (in January, 1652) and the Simonov (in January, 1653), he gave the choir brothers and choirmasters 1 grivna each [40, p. 856; 118]. On the Archangel Michael's day (in 1657) and on the Ascension Day (in 1658) the patriarch was staying at the Chudov. In the first case the senior chorister and 20 choir brothers got 5 altyns each, in the second — 1 grivna each [40, p. 256—257]. The Savvo-Storozhevsky monastery in 1659 was visited by Tsar Aleksey. As a result, the senior chorister got 2 roubles, 3 choirmasters got 1 rouble each, the choir brothers were given 0,5 rouble [147, p. 26]. This tradition was preserved for a long time.

Monastery singers also received additional payment for participating in the funeral ceremonies of high-ranking people which usually took place in monasteries. In 1675 for singing at the funeral ceremony of the Krutitsky metropolitan Pavel the Chudov choir master received 0,5 rouble, the choir brothers — 2 roubles [154, p. 74].

Alongside permanent salary and additional payments monastery singers received the so-called "monastery food". Besides ordinary meals they also were treated on great holidays and funeral ceremonies. Money for such dinners came from monastery lands and trades but also from other sources<sup>1</sup>. In 1581 Ivan the Terrible granted 300 roubles to the Borisoglebsky monastery for the funeral service of the late tsarevitch Ivan Ivanovich and funeral dinner [151, p. 4]. The Troitse-Sergiev monastery had a special edict ("The ukase on meals") which regulated giving additional food to monastery brethren: "Choir brothers get fish or pie and three quarters of beer all the year round on Monday, Wednesday and Friday, those who sing the Passion of Christ get three quarters of honey" [18]. Most probably, this rule existed in other monasteries and was

<sup>1</sup> There were were the books in monasteries which indicate when and what to sing [100; 115].

preserved throughout the 17<sup>th</sup> century. One record in the book of the Voznesensky monastery says that choir sisters should be given 2 poods (1 pood — 16,8 kg) of honey on Easter or 40 altyns per each part of the choir [40, p. 311]. Some monasteries gave not only food but also clothes and footwear [143].

The feudal monastery household was a complex organism which included lands, trades and businesses. Choir brothers often took part in managing this household for additional payment. The activities of the Solovetsky choir brothers can serve as a bright example. In 1579 choir brother Isaak delivered 30 roubles to the salt mine and accompanied boyar children to Virma; choir brother Philipp in 1583 took quitrent money from Sumskaya volost and other lands, his fellow Mephody in July, 1584, was sent "to sail for salt"; in 1587/88 Philipp was selling monastery rye in Suma; choir brother David in 1604 was selling monastery fish in Kholmogory and was sent for salt to Lyamtsa (1604) and Unezhma (1607) [87, fol. 83v, 91; 88, л. 31v, 53; 90, fol. 47v, 153 etc.; 91, fol. 43v].

The singers of the Volokalamsky monastery also participated in the monastery trading business: choir senior Varlaam in September 1607 visited monastery lands near Tula and stayed there managing the monastery money; choir brother Arseny Kuzminsky in April 1629 got money for staying in Moscow and taking part in monastery business; in 1630 monastic elder Vitail controlled the granary business and Vassian Yuryatin took money from peasants mowing the monastery lands; in 1632 Vassian was in charge of money matters in Moscow [72, fol. 89, 107; 74—76].

The choir brother of the Savvo-Storozhevsky monastery called Nektary Ryazanets in August, 1673, was sent to supervise fishery in the lower lands, in 1674/75 Iov Okulov replaced him there. In the mid 1670 — early 1680-s Iona Moskvitin, Kirill Dorofeevsky, Nektary Ryazanets, Anofry Gorlov and Iona Moskvitin were in charge of small monasteries (Ol'gov and Medvedsky monasteries, Dorofeev hermitage, Spaso-Zaretsky, Stephanov, Terekhov monasteries). Their salary was 1 rouble more than the salary of other singers. The Savvo-Storozhevsky choir brothers called Iov Okulov and Anfinogen Savvinsky stayed at the Nadeinsky Ussol'e of the Kazansky Uezd in 1680/81 and 1685 respectively; Eremiya Savvinsky and Vasyan Kazanets worked as builders in Moscow in 1683/84 and 1684/85 [77; 79; 82, fol. 230 etc.; 83, fol. 136 etc.].

Some choir brothers were skillful craftsmen. The choir brother of the Chudov monastery called Filaret repaired 18 icons by September 1585 and was awarded 0,2 rouble [57, fol. 83]. Kirill Sviyazhenin from the Iosifo-Volokalamsky monastery in 1591 was doing the engraving on gold winebowls [158, p. 121]. In 1605 Varlaam Svinsky was making palls for the brethren and was awarded 0,6 rouble [70, fol. 53]. In 1626 the choir brother of the Kirillo-Belozersky monastery called Efrem Kamensky received 0,2 rouble for making "lestvitsa" (leather beads) [92]. In April 1658 the Solovetsky monastery bought 40 such beads which were given by the tsar to his singers [156, p. 688]. The choir brothers of the Savvo-Storozhevsky monastery called Isaiah and Pakhomy in October 1681 received 1 rouble each for their repairing the icon paintings in

the altar and window openings; Semeon Kopynsen in November, 1685 received 0,75 rouble for binding 25 accounting books of small monasteries and in August 1686 — 0,1 rouble for binding 5 cadastres [82, fol. 119v; 84, fol. 76v].

Book business was the most widespread duty of monastery singers. Choir brothers were to write not only chant books but also other different books. It was considered a special work of penance and was awarded (2—3,5 roubles and more). Chant books were kept in monastic cells; the best books were kept in the choir-place or in the library. The monastery library was gradually accumulating all the manuscripts as well as those donated to the monastery. Thus, the library of the Troitse-Sergiev monastery contains chant books which belonged to the following choir brothers: Iov Lupanda, Dionysy Bozhedomsky, Varlaam Obolensky, Varlaam Lopotukhin, Feodorit Stupishin, Login Shishelov and others [108—111].

Documents and manuscripts contain numerous references of book-writing activities performed by choir brothers. Throughout the second half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century a choir brother of the Iosifo-Volokolamsky monastery called Simeon Pustynnik was actively involved in book-copying; the records dated the 1530-s inform that he was a “priest’s son”. He copied the Book of Needs, the Gospel, several Psalters, “The Word” by Isaak Sirin and a lectionary [34, p. 30, 39, 137 etc.]. The Volokolamsky choir brothers called Dionysy and Levky copied “The Book of Hours” and “The Psalter” respectively. The choir brother called Akakiy started to copy “The Lives of Holy Fathers” from Pechera, which was completed by a Father Superior, called Pimen. The books of these choir brothers as well as Simeon’s books were kept in the monastery library and are mentioned in the inventory book dated 1545 [34, p. 29—39]. The chant books “The Octoechos” and “The Hirmologion” were written in 1572 by monk Vassian (in the secular world — Vasily Shemyakin) [39, p. 8].

The choir brothers of other monasteries were also engaged in book writing activities. Ignaty Kurachev from the Troitse-Sergiev monastery in 1543 copied the Psalter. The name of this singer and his place of origin (Belozerye) were known to the tsar Ivan the Terrible [1, p. 385]. The renowned singer died in 1559 and was buried in the Sergiev lavra [148, p. 72]. Monk Tit from the Kirillo-Belozersky monastery in the 1550-s copied 2 explanatory Gospels, monk Bogolep from the Solovetsky monastery in 1580 copied the book of St. John the Theologian and got 3,5 roubles for it [87, fol. 104; 120]. Monk Gerasim from the Pereslavsky and Mirzin monasteries copied an extensive collection of sticherons in 1594 [94, fol. 12—31]. There also exist detailed records dated the 17<sup>th</sup> century. For example, monk Varlaam Mylevsky on August, 3, 1682, received 0,2 rouble from the treasury of the Savvo-Storozhevsky monastery for copying 4 canons of St. Savva [82, fol. 148v; 158, p. 119—121].

The main singing activities of choir brothers were connected with church services and were regulated by the church rules. There also existed non-religious activities which were of great importance. Let us mention the tradition of singing chants during taking meals fixed in the book of church songs for the Kirillo-Belozersky and Troitse-Sergiev monasteries in the late 16<sup>th</sup> century.

After the choir brothers finish the church service, they walk to the refectory singing chants. Then the choir brothers take their places while all the brethren are sitting at table. The archimandrite walks in front of the priests and monks and gives them honey while the choir brothers are still singing [20, p. 260]. According to N. F. Findeizen, the rite of the Toast cup came from such old tradition which exceeded the monastery limits [20, p. 263; 131, fol. 105—112]. Both inside and outside the monastery this rite was to demonstrate great loyalty to autocracy<sup>1</sup>.

Interestingly enough that choir brothers often served as readers of short instructive stories. For example, the book of church songs from the Kirillov monastery dated the mid 17<sup>th</sup> century says that during the tsar’s or other officials’ visits to the monastery a choirmaster usually reads stories after dinner service, while choir brothers read them during Orthros [158, p. 118]. Public reading was a special art which went back to the first centuries of Christianity in Russia. The 11<sup>th</sup> century manuscripts contain texts for public reading with ephonic notation. In the course of time it got out of use but the art of reading was preserved and choir brothers were to study this art. In fact, the choirmaster of the Kirillov monastery called Efrem in the late 16<sup>th</sup> century compiled a reference book about his experience in reading and teaching. This reference book contains useful recommendations concerning the art of reading (the initial and final lines, breathing techniques etc.). The book also contains the glossary of singing terms [158, p. 118]. Thus, the established manner of public reading was meant for professional and experienced singers who knew the Znamenny chant very well.

The repertoire of monastery choirs depended upon numerous factors. After the council of 1547 the metropolitan informed the archimandrite and the father superior that new miracle-workers were established in Russia [3, p. 203—204]. Some monasteries were to celebrate new holidays — the days of their patron saints. This tradition was preserved for a long time. By the decision of Tsar Boris and the Church Council of February, 1600 the Kornilyev monastery and the whole Vologda eparchy were to celebrate Kornily Komelsky’s day on May, 19; in June, 1667, the Novgorod metropolitan informed the Nilo-Stolbensky hermitage about the permission to celebrate on May, 27 “finding of the venerable relics” of their founder Nil [4, p. 379, 380; 6, p. 207—208]. The letters sent to monasteries ordered the rules of singing during different rites (Toast cups and victory of Russian armies) [3, p. 201—202 etc.; 5, p. 222, 247; 6, p. 126].

The diversity of the choir repertoire can be demonstrated by the monastery manuscripts which are well preserved till the present. These books contain an extensive range of chants. The church rules regulated the sequence and set of the chants whereas the use of additional chants depended upon the priests who were holding services, upon the level of choir brothers’

<sup>1</sup> For example, in a petition to the Tsar Mikhail it was asked what to do with the elder, who renounced the sovereign grace-cup and at the interrogation showed that adopted a “covenant” not to drink alcoholic intoxicating. In the Letter January 30, 1642 the Tsar pointed out that in such cases the cup to drink “is not necessary” [5, c. 455].

education and musical tastes of monasteries. The chant collections of the Kirillo-Belozersky monastery contain numerous “local chants”. Among them one can single out the works of famous singing centres of Russia: the Usol’e, Moscow, Novgorod and Yarozlavl schools. We can also mention the chants presenting different national traditions: (including the Orthodox East): Antiochian, Bulgarian, Byzantine, Greek, Jerusalem, Kiev etc., as well as some other chants which were created inside monasteries and will be described further on. One more group of chants is presented by “author’s variants” whose names are derived from the names of definite chant masters: Lyvov, Leontiev, Loginov, Lukin, Khristianinov etc. Besides, most of the chants are given in several styles (Demesvenny style, Put, the Great Chant). All these works were included in the collections written in the Kirillo-Belozersky monastery or donated to it [29]. Most probably, some of them were performed during church services, though it was quite typical at those times. Many of the listed chants were widespread in the country and got into chant manuscripts of other monasteries [8; 9]. Individual peculiarities of monastery musical art can be traced in the chants created inside the monasteries.

Dwelling upon the creative works of monastery masters we should take into account that in an old-Russian monastery there were no long-term singing traditions. M. V. Brazhnikov noted that the staff turnover resulted in the constant appearance of new trends and traditions [11, p.15]. There were other ways of getting acquainted with the peculiarities of different local schools: choir brothers often travelled on business to different monasteries and cities, where they were present at church services; local hierarchs who visited monasteries were often accompanied by their singing diaki and podiaki who sang together with choir brothers; the hierarch’s singers visited monasteries for glorifying Christ and celebrating their patron saints. The monasteries situated near Moscow often invited the patriarch’s and tsar’s choirs. For example, in January 1649 both great “stanitsas” (choir structural parts) of the tsar’s singing diaki headed by Mikhail Osipov and Mikhail Merkuriev were given cloth for singing in the Savvo-Storozhevsky monastery [65].

Sometimes the singing diaki of the main choirs served as teachers for choir brothers. The patriarch’s diak called Bogdan Zlatoustovsky on January, 13, 1650, received cloth for singing together with choir brothers [66]. The Fathers Superior also influenced the singing traditions of their monasteries especially if they were chant masters themselves (Varlaam Rogov, Ivan Lukoshkov). Finally, the books donated to monasteries brought new trends and traditions born in remote lands. According to the inventory book of the Iosifo-Volokalamsky monastery library (1573) some chant collections belonged to Novgorod, Rostov and Turov chant masters and to scribes from the Yuryev, Ferapontov and other monasteries; these books were granted by the Novgorod, Ryazan, Krutitsky, Rostov, Kazan hierarchs, by fathers superior from the Ugreshsky, Selizharovsky monasteries, by monastic elders from Novgorod, Rzhev and Sviyazhsk [96].

Thus, the majority of monasteries (first of all, those with small choirs and frequent turnover) could not work

out their own singing traditions. The biggest monasteries maintained and strictly observed these traditions. The Troitse-Sergiev monastery can serve an example<sup>1</sup>. Nevertheless, the influence of the above-mentioned factors was really very strong. On the other hand, the interaction of the old and new material gave rise to specific chants which were named in reference to the place of their birth. This was the formation process of the artistic traditions in local monasteries.

In spite of the fact that monastery chants are extremely numerous they rarely can be referred to separate authors. We have already mentioned the names of some chant masters<sup>2</sup>. The majority of chants in monastery manuscripts are marked by the name of the monastery: Kirillovsky, Opekalovsky, Solovetsky, Troitsky, Tikhvisky, Chudovsky variants etc. The samples belonging to the chant masters from the Kirillo-Belozersky monastery can be met both in the monastery library and outside the monastery. The Kirillovsky variant can be traced in the manuscripts of the early 17<sup>th</sup> century. These are chants dedicated to the Virgin Mary: “Blazhimo tyа vesi rody” (Блажимо тя веси роды), “Dostoyno est’” (Достойно есть), “Chestneyshuyu kheruvim” (Честнейшую херувим) [125; 126; 130], as well as “Trisvyatoye” (Трисвятое) [121; 129], “Molity radi” (Молитв ради) and a cycle in honor of the Trinity [123]. The manuscripts of the mid — late 17<sup>th</sup> centuries contain often three chants in the Opekalovsky variant — “Trisvyatoye”, “Dostoyno est’” (Достойно есть) and “Pridite ublazhim Iosifa” (Придите ублажим Иосифа)<sup>3</sup>. For a long times scholars referred this variant to the Novgorod chant master called Opekalov (e. g. D. V. Razumovsky, N. F. Findeizen, N. D. Uspensky), though it is more correct to refer the chants of the Opekalovsky variant to the creative works of the masters from the Opekalovsky monastery [10; 19].

A number of marks which accompany these chants let us refer their appearance to the creative activities of monastery choir brothers. For example, scholars assume that the explanatory notes called “Telegin’s and Yuriev’s variants” for the chant “Nyne sily nebesnye” (Ныне силы небесные)<sup>4</sup> contain the names of chant masters [21, p. 356; 36, p. 129]. However, we can face here the collective creative activities of monastery chant masters. The remark is evidence of the fact that the chant appeared and was widespread in the northern Ustug Telegov and Arkhangel’sk Yuryev monasteries<sup>5</sup>. In his “Tale of different heresy” monk Evfrosin mentioned the singers “krasnopevtsy” who boasted their manner of singing called “dudkin manner” [155]. Apparently, he meant the chant which appeared in the Dudin monastery in Nizhny Novgorod. It is not present so far in chant manuscripts.

<sup>1</sup> This monastery elders Filaret and Login argued that they sang as it was established here from the old times [31, c. 67].

<sup>2</sup> We supplement these examples. In the elder Bogolep’s manuscript (17<sup>th</sup> century) it is written to the Assumption sticheron: “Another interpretation. Bogolep have written neumes himself” [93].

<sup>3</sup> For example, the earliest lists are: 103; 117. The attempt to date the chant appearance to the end of 1560-s does not have direct evidence yet [19].

<sup>4</sup> In the manuscript of the mid-17<sup>th</sup> century [132, л. 209 об.].

<sup>5</sup> Major Yuriev Monastery was in Novgorod the Great.

There were even more chants interpreted in the old-Russian monasteries and marked as “monastery variant”. These are the works in the style of ordinary Znamenny chant: “Velichaem tyа zhivodavche” (Величаем тя, живодавче), “Izhe kheruvimy” (Иже херувими), “Blagovernomu Tsaru” (Благоверному царю), “Ne otvratilitsa” (Не отврати лица), “Rodi vesi pesn’mi” (Роди веси песньми), “Hallelujah” (Аллилуйя) [13; 24, fol. 223v, 282v, 301; 95, fol. 237v; 116, fol. 369v; 131, fol. 78v; 135; 136]; works in the Great Znamenny chant — “Trisvyatoe” and “Hallelujah” [102, fol. 143v; 112, fol. 163; 128]; the Demesvenny style chant — “Svetisiya, svetisiya, Novy Ierusalem” (Светися, светися, Новый Иерусалим) [134, fol. 449v]; the Put style — “Pridite ublazhim Iosifa” (Придите убожам Иосифа), “I nam darova” (И нам дарова), “Svyatye slavy” (Святые славы), “Vladychitse priimi” (Владычице приими), “Dukhovnaya moya bratiya” (Духовная моя братия), “Svetisiya, svetisiya” (Светися, светися), “Krestu tvoemu” (Кресту твоему) etc. [12; 24, fol. 328, 346; 95, fol. 281; 97, fol. 202; 102, fol. 359v; 112, fol. 203; 116, fol. 579v; 121; 128; 132, fol. 164v; 134, fol. 496v; etc.]. These examples, beyond any doubt, prove that monastery chant masters were great professionals in the art of church singing.

The dynamic creative activities of monastery singers gave rise to the appearance of musical theorists who strove to grasp the foundation of their art. “The Key to the Znamenny Chant” written by a choir brother of the Kirillo-Belozersky monastery called Christopher in 1604 is an outstanding written monument of the old-Russian musical theory.

As we know, this chant master came from Moscow but took a monastic vow in the Belozersky monastery. Then for some time he stayed in the Moscow Chudov monastery. Christopher appeared in the Kirillo-Belozersky monastery in 1601 which can be proved by his remark in the “The collection of Putny sticherons” [28]. It says that the book was written during 40 weeks in the Kirillov monastery in “the summer of 7110” (fol. 419). This was approximately in 1601/1602. Taking into account that the whole work took the master more than 9 months, we can refer its start on 1601. This book presents an extensive collection of chants in the Put style and Putevoy notation: wishes for the long life of Tsar Boris Godunov are marked as “Great Demesvenny chant” (fol. 328v). Christopher donated this collection to the Kirillov monastery being a monastic elder (fol. 3—7).

In his notes to “The collection of Putny sticherons” Christopher called himself a pupil of monastic elder Pimen Khomutina (fol. 419). It was not mere spiritual guidance. Pimen Khomutina used to serve as a *krestovy* priest at the place of Prince Mikhail Vorotynsky [16, p. 197]. It proves that he had good command of church singing art. Most probably, Christopher grasped from him the subtleties of the Putny singing which resulted in the creation of this collection of Putny sticherons. It is also possible that Christopher came back to the Kirillov monastery for obtaining this knowledge.

Christopher’s second collection of sticherons is closely connected with the first one and contains a famous theoretical work “The Key to the Znamenny Chant” (1604) [16, p. 1—176]. The sections “The ac-

cordance of the Znamenny chant with the Putny neume”, “The neumes of the Putny chant” and “The Putny chant in the Stolpovoy notation” supplement the first book facilitating the process of transforming the new musical style from the Putny into the Stolpovoy neume notation. The master marked in his foreword that he selected the sticherons and doxastikons in honour of Christ, the Virgin Mary and saints (including “the new miracle-workers”), that these chants are presented in different variants taken from “wise people” who are traditionally called head masters of choir [16, p. 171].

In 1605 the master’s position in the monastery changed. In February the monastery librarian called Iliya informed the monastery treasurer Evstafy that choir brother Pimen’s disciple Christopher lost the book of psalms taken from the library. At the end of the same year the librarian received books from the “young monastic elder” Christopher [119]. Most probably, in spite of his young age, the master became one of the monastic elders who occupied a special position in Russian monasteries and dealt with all important matters.

In the following years Christopher continued to write books. In 1609—1619 he wrote “The Mineya”, “Triodion” and others [16, p. 194—196]. Some books were completed; others were presented in separate copybooks according to the tradition of monastery scriptoria.

Christopher created the first theoretical treatise in Russia. He employed unique ways of presenting the reference material (the contrastive analysis of two notation systems, the usage of tables). His name is ranked high among the most outstanding chant masters and musicians of old Russia. The date of Christopher’s death is still unknown. According to the document of the Kirillov monastery (the list of names of dead and sick persons to be prayed for) he died presumably in 1627 [16, p. 199].

The creative activities of other monastery theorists were connected with searching for new ways to improve the neumatic notation systems. One of the ways was the creation of “master’s pomety” (notes or remarks), which were written near the neumes and specified their pitch characteristics and nuances. We have to mention that according to manuscripts there existed different systems of “master’s pomety” in the mid 17<sup>th</sup> century. “The tale about zaremby” written in the second half of the century informs that “those *pomety* were created by Russian philosophers after the Lithuanian devastation during the reign of Tsar Mikhail” and enumerates the authors of the *pomety* system. Thus, it mentions the name of the Moscow priest of the Nikolo-Yavlenskaya church near Arbatskiye gates called Luka (Moscow chant master) and the Father Superior of the Vologda Pavlovsky monastery called Pamva [43, p. 58].

There were two Pamvas among the Fathers Superior of the Vologda monastery: the first is the Father Superior who headed the monastery in 1614, the second — in 1633—1639 [149, p. 746]. The gap between these two terms is rather big. Luka (Ivanov) served as a deacon in the church mentioned in “The tale about zaremby” in the 1630-s, as a priest — since the late 1630-s till 1649/50 [43]. That is why we can assume that the musical theorist was the second Pamva.

Let us remind that Luka and Pamva are mentioned in one more source — the Yaroslavy collection written

by the order of hierodeacon Lavrenty in the 1640-s. This manuscript contains chant books written from the copies of Luka, Moscow deacon, as well as the collection “Obichod” written from Pamva’s copy [22, fol. 192v]. The text written by Pamva reflects the monastery tradition of church-singing. It mentions the performer of the chant (the choir or the choirmaster) and informs what a father superior should do. Pamva’s creative activities can be traced in his *fita* (formula  $\theta\eta\tau\alpha$ ) interpretation presented in another collection in comparison with the interpretation of the outstanding Usol’e chant master — Ivan (Isaiah) Lukoshkov [53].

The future prominent theorists-didascaloï also came from monastery masters, especially during the reform period.

Thus, old-Russian monasteries alongside cities were important centres of professional musical culture. Constant interchange of singing traditions brought by new choir brothers, the appearance of masters who could comprehend and generalize them contributed to the intonation enrichment of local chants and gave rise to new musical works. In the framework of regional artistic trend one can single out the specific centres of old-Russian music — big monasteries which could afford to have choirs, the best choirmasters and senior choristers. The Troitse-Sergiev monastery was one of such centres. The regional Moscow traditions were established here thanks to the tsar’s and patriarch’s choirs, who often visited the monastery and took part in church services together with choir brothers, as well as thanks to chant masters who used to serve in Moscow monasteries and the court’s cathedrals.

The activities of the court’s deacon Foma could serve a good example of that interaction which existed between the court and monastery singers. They also demonstrate a close connection of regional and capital centres. Deacon Foma was serving at the court of Tsar Ivan Vasilyevich (in Alexandrovskaya Sloboda) in the 1560-s [e. g. 46, p. 95]. At the end of the 1560-s he took a monastic vow, got the name of Filaret and stayed in the Troitse-Sergiev Lavra. Thanks to his deep knowledge of singing art he became the chief musician of the monastery choir: since the late 1570-s Filaret served as the head of the choir for more than 40 years [31, fol. 63]. During this time the master greatly contributed to the enrichment of monastery traditions due to his great experience of a court singer.

The year 1610 is connected with the activities of Login Shishelov who came into the history of old-Russian church singing as an outstanding singer, chanting master, head of the one kliros, head of the Troitse-Sergiev choir though his life was connected not only with this monastery. He also served at the Chudov monastery (1585—1610). After Login’s editing work as a *spravshik* at the first edition Rules of the Russian church 1610 he left the Chudov monastery and Moscow occupied by the Poles (September, 1610) and settled till the end of his life at the Troitse-Sergiev monastery where his father used to be a monk.

The Troitse-Sergiev monastery at that time had just withstood the celebrated 16-month Polish-Lithuanian siege. Monks, monastic elders, monastery servants were fighting alongside the Streltsy (Russian military corps) and Cossacks. The head of right kliros choirmaster Paisy Litvinov and the head of left kliros Gury Shishkin dis-

tinguished themselves most of all [2, p. 284—285]<sup>1</sup>. The newly-elected (February 1610) archimandrite Dionisy (Zobninovskiy) was to restore the monastery and help the victims of the siege (around 4 thousand people were buried after those events) [31, p. 41 etc.].

On arriving at the Troitse-Sergiev monastery Login became a head of one kliros (choirmaster). He made friends with the head of monastery choir Filaret who served at that time for 30 years already.

The Father Superior of the Troitse-Sergiev monastery Dionisy ordered to perform night services, to sing hymns in praise of the Virgin Mary with Paul Ammoreysky sticherons and read out the names of donators. They also introduced festival bell-sounds. All this prolonged the church services and broke the existing monastery traditions that is why choir brothers especially Login Shishelov were against such changes [31, p. 18—20]<sup>2</sup>. Soon both Login and Filaret were in opposition to the archimandrite.

The monastery cellarer Simon Azaryin wrote “The Life and Deeds of Dionisy” after the archimandrite’s death in 1633. He mentioned several times the names of both chant masters who were “mad enemies” of Dionisy. Ivan Nasedka who served as a priest of the monastery gateway church since 1611 revised this biography and added a special part devoted to the relations of all the three — “About choirmaster Login and senior chorister Filaret” [31, p. 62—71].

Judging by Ivan Nasedka’s story (no matter how tendentious and biased it is) Login had a stormy nature and often initiated conflicts with choir brothers and monastery brethren as well as with archimandrite Dionisy as regards the norms of singing.

Archimandrite Dionisy introducing changes in the church services paid special attention to church singing. He himself was singing in the choir and “his voice was pleasing all the people present”. There were 27 people in the each of the two kliros in his time and even more sometimes [31, p. 19, 21]<sup>3</sup>.

In these conditions in spite of the existing conflict Login Shishelov was ranked high in the monastery. Ivan Nasedka wrote that Login had a “God-given talent more than human nature: beautiful, bright and powerful voice, and very few of his contemporaries could compare with him. ... He was very skilled in singing. He could sing 5, 6 or 10 singsong variants of the same chant text” [31, p. 62]. Dionisy himself called him “a beautiful singer” but blamed him for “thoughtless singing” (“he sings as he likes”), for new word stress: “You are the master of your singing, why do you sing in the new way not like it is written in the book? You are the first choir master who sings and does not understand it” [31, c. 66]<sup>4</sup>. Login and his friend, senior chorister Filaret answered

<sup>1</sup> Guri Shishkin wrote in July 1609, that during the siege 15—20 people were buried every day [2, p. 289].

<sup>2</sup> In one of the Trinity St. Sergiy collections there are the “Sticheras-dogmas” that Archimandrite Dionysiy “commanded to sing in Lithia on Sundays” [114].

<sup>3</sup> In large monasteries in each cliros no more than 11 choristers sang, as a rule.

<sup>4</sup> Login’s opponents pointed out that he had thundering voice and “cried a great voice” etc. Perhaps this was the reason for the appearance of his everyday nickname “Korova” (“Cow”). In the documents it is not found.

the archimandrite the following: “We sing and read and speak in the old manner which appeared in the Trinity monastery long ago, and stick to it at present” [31, p. 67—68].

Login also had many pupils. However, his teaching activities were highly criticized as well. Ivan Nasedka noted: “When his pupils start to sing together there is no consensus, everybody sings in a different way”. Login was very strict while teaching and even came to blows when somebody argued with him [31, p. 63]<sup>1</sup>. Archimandrite Dionisy called his teaching activities “pride and vanity”.

There was one pupil, Login’s nephew Maksim, whom the master taught “the same chant text to sing by 17 singsongs written different neumes and who could sing 5, 6, 10 or more interpretation variants of the same chant text” [31, p. 68]. Thanks to this study Maksim made a career in the church. He became a priest of the main Russian church — the Assumption Cathedral of the Moscow Kremlin. He was blessed by Login and received the most extensive collection of sticherons which is considered an outstanding monument of Russian book-writing art. This collection is mentioned in reference to the cycle of Znamenny chants in honour of St. Peter, the metropolitan of all Russia, and the Mother of God Vladimir Icon which are marked as Ivan the Terrible’s variants [47, 142].

The confrontation between choir master Login and senior chorister Filaret with the monastery brethren was accompanied by constant reproaches, offences and accusations. Ivan Nasedka thought that Login did not follow the Orthodox doctrine and considered grammar deviations a heresy. Login, in his turn, told Dionisy that there appeared a great number of uneducated country priests who preach what they do not know themselves [31, p. 62, 66]. These hostile relations reached their peak in reference to the editing work at “Trebnik” (The Book of special liturgical rites) entrusted to the monastery brethren.

According to the tsar’s order dated November, 8, 1616, the correction of the book should be performed by archimandrite Dionisy, monastic elders Arseny Glukhoy and Antony Krylov, priest Ivan Nasedka and some other monastic elders. The monastery library at that contained numerous books with necessary information. All the expenses were to be covered by the monastery treasury [31, c. 80—83]. Neither Login, nor Filaret participated in this project that is why they were of low opinion of the work done. When the book was published in 1618 they accused the Trebnik editors of heresy. Login made a denunciative speech at the Church Council of the same year and announced that the correction work contradicts the Church Rules (“Ustav”) edited by him. Apparently this gave rise to criticizing Login Shishelov’s variant of Ustav. Dionisy and his team were condemned by the Council: the archimandrite was kept in the Spaso-Novy monastery (he was waiting there for his exile to the remote Kirillo-Belozersky monastery), Ivan Nasedka was to stop holding church services etc. With the advent of patriarch Filaret (Romanov) and after consultations with ecumenical patriarchs of Jerusalem (Pheophan) and Alexandriya (Gerasim), the archimandrite and his

fellows were acquitted. In 1619 Dionisy returned to the Troitse-Sergiev monastery [31, c. 23—26; 146].

Senior chorister Filaret died in the same year at an advanced age. After his friend’s death Login Shishelov became the chief musician of the whole monastery choir and became its senior chorister. He died in 1624 and his name was included in the Synodic, list names of dead and sick persons to be prayed for [105; 106].

While staying at the Chudov monastery Login Shishelov wrote an extensive chant book *Sticherarion* — the collection of sticherons. More extensive collection of the same name he rewrote in the Troitse-Sergiev monastery. In the new edition one also pays attention to the chant cycles in honour of St. Peter, the metropolitan of all Russia, and the Mother of God Vladimir Icon which are marked as Ivan the Terrible’s variants. Login’s collections of sticherons are worth studying in great detail. Scholars who analyzed the Troitsky manuscript found out unique musical works. The 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> cathismas of the Psalmbook (Sunday cathismas) are interpreted for all 8 modes which is typical of old monastery tradition of singing psalms [144]. As far as each cathisma is divided into three parts there exist 48 chants. The majority of those chants are unique and original; others are the revised variants of existing chants. It is quite possible that Login himself was the author of this “8 modes Psalmbook” [35].

We have already mentioned that Login knew very well the creative works of other chant masters and could interpret the chants in different styles. Like prominent masters who were at the same time chief musicians and didascaloi (teachers and theorists of singing art), he created his own variants and interpretations of complicated *fita formulae* [e.g., see.: 44, 45].

Login’s variants can be found in the early 17<sup>th</sup> century collections. They were created mainly to the *Monthly Sticherarion* and dedicated to different holidays: Annunciation Day “*Blagovestvuet Gavriil*” (Благовествует Гавриил), Assumption of Virgin Mary “*Egda prestavlenie*” (Егда преставление), Meeting of the Miracle-Working Vladimir Icon Mother of God “*Egda prishestvie*” (Егда пришествие) [30, p. 197]<sup>2</sup>. The collection of *Triodion sticherons* contains Login’s variant of the chanting sticheron “*Dnes’ Vladyka tvari*” (“Днесъ владыка твари”) [30, p. 197]. *Fita formulae* interpretations of his authorship were performed to the sticheron “*Dushepoleznuyu sovershivshe*” (Душеполезную совершивше) and to the *Bogorodichen* “*O velikogo ti tainstva*” (О великаго ти таинства) [46, p. 99; 113]. The master’s greatest achievement was the creation of his own interpretation the cycle “*The Podobny* (musical samples) in 8 modes” and his musical version (in the Great chant style) of the sticheron cycle in honour of St. Nicolas the Miracle-Worker. Let us analyze this musical version in detail [also see : 46; 48, 49].

The sticheron cycle dedicated to St. Nicolas, attributed to Login Shishelov, was found in the early 17<sup>th</sup> century chant collection. It contains two groups of works — three sticherons of the 8<sup>th</sup> mode: “*Na nebo tekushe*” (На небо текуще), “*Molebenymi*

<sup>1</sup> Recall that in the 17th century, while learning, it was allowed even the use of the rod.

<sup>2</sup> The first stichera singsong is given in the line-variant. It is known and another Login’s “interpretation” of the same chant [24, fol. 494v—495].



pesnemi” (Молебными песнями), “Angeleskimo zhelaniemo” (Ангелеским желанием); and three sticherons of the 4<sup>th</sup> mode: “Zvezdu nezakhodimuyu” (Звезду незаходимую), “Vo mire svyatitelyu” (Во мире святителю), “Divnym voskhozheniem” (Дивным восхождением). All the chants were performed during “bringing the relics of St. Nicholas Mirlikiysky, archbishop and miracle-worker”, on Calling the Lord at the Great vespers on May, 9. The original variants are placed in the manuscript after their analogues of the same mode and are marked: “The same sticherons of the Great neume. Login’s interpretation” and “The same sticherons of the Great neume, mode 4, Login’s variant [25]”. Thus, the chants of the anonymous (short) variant are given versus Login’s interpretation. They are followed by the doxastikon of the 6<sup>th</sup> mode “Shine on a bright day”. We could also attribute this chant to the creative works of the Troitsky choirmaster as far as it is closer to the Great style chants, but the doxastikon is left anonymous here. Besides, in other manuscripts this cycle of sticherons is finished by the doxastikon “The good servant of the Lord”, mode 6 [e.g.: 23].

Let us turn to the 8<sup>th</sup> mode sticherons of Login authorship. Anonymous sticherons of the small chanting can be frequently met in the manuscripts of the late 16<sup>th</sup> — early 17<sup>th</sup> centuries. Some texts have references to the podobny (sample) variant “Na nebo tekushe” [23; 104, fol. 414—416]. Others, vice versa, stress their originality and independence [94, fol. 193v]. Frequently these sticherons are not marked at all. Studying these works we can assume that they present the typical chant which appeared in the late 16<sup>th</sup> century, i. e. before Login’s variant. Creating his variant Login Shishelov was sure to know the earlier edition. He decided to interpret the sticherons in honour of the particularly revered Saint in Russia in his own way.

Creating his interpretation of the first sticheron “Na nebo tekushe” Login deliberately changed the chant complicating its intonation pattern and extending its length. It is beyond doubt that he rested upon the existing variant. At the same time all common features that can be traced in both variants are rather random, whereas their differences are more numerous because of the new formula system. Login manages to transform the syllabic proportion of the text and its melody into melismatic one. Thus, Login Shishelov created his own work and later used it as a sample for the following sticherons. This is the example of the unique phenomenon: the original sticheron became the podobny variant (sample) for the other two<sup>2</sup>.

We proceed to consider the 4<sup>th</sup> mode sticherons. In anonymous chants we can also find here references to the podobny variant “Yako dobya” (Яко добля) [104, fol. 487—487v] or the marks “independent” [23]. Login Shishelov was to perform a difficult task of renewing the existing typical variant. The master must have studied the formula structure of the typical variant and preserved only some of its formulae. He also enriched their fund with his own formulae. While interpreting the sticherons Login modified the podobny variant so much that his

<sup>1</sup> Researchers have mentioned the sticherons in their works repeatedly.

<sup>2</sup> Master applied the similar art technique to the sticheras chanting creation in honour of the Virgin [141, p. 229—232].

chants became original and independent works. The chant master interpreted his sticherons employing the principle of structure-renewing variability and created absolutely new works. Here he edited the hymnographic texts of the chants as well.

The study of Login Shishelov’s life and creative activities shows that he was an outstanding chant master in the history of Russian church singing art in the 16<sup>th</sup> — 17<sup>th</sup> centuries. He gained great popularity and recognition among his contemporaries. Even those who became his opponents could not but admit his versatile talent.

Both chant masters, Filaret (Foma) and Login Shishelov, were closely connected with Moscow but gained popularity while staying in the Troitse-Sergiev monastery. Some chant books mention the names of the Troitsky monastic elders who as chanting masters are not present in other sources. Thus, the collection of the late 16<sup>th</sup> — early 17<sup>th</sup> centuries contains several variants of the chant “Da molchit” (Да молчит) including a complicated melismatic variant which is marked “Troitsky variant, close to Zuevsky variant” [26, fol. 16—18]. The collection of sticherons dated the 16<sup>th</sup> century and the Psalmbook dated 1543 belonged to deacon Iona Zuy from the Troitse-Sergiev monastery. Iona Zuy donated them to the monastery. One of the marks in the Psalmbook informs that the monastic elder took the monastic vow not long before his death on February, 7, 1559 [98; 107]. Thus, Iona Zuy was likely to be the author of the Zuevsky variant.

The majority of Troitsky chants remained anonymous. The written monuments usually mark them as “Troitsky variant”, “Troitsky interpretation” etc. The book of church songs contains the greatest number of these chants (they can be traced since the early 17<sup>th</sup> century). For example, the manuscript created in the Troitse-Sergiev monastery contains more than 10 chants marked like this. One can find here exaltations and songs performed at Orthros on different holidays — Presentation of the Lord: “Bogoroditse devo” (Богородице дево); on the Annunciation Day: “Arkhangelskii glasoy” (Архангелеский гласо); to metropolitan Aleksey: “Blazhimo tyu” (Блажимо тя) etc.; a kontakion “So svyatymi pokoyu” (Со святыми покой) from the funeral rite etc. [133, fol. 148—152, 234 etc.]. The Troitsky masters interpreted the chant “Da molchit” which was sometimes performed instead of the Cherubic Hymn [26, fol. 11v]. There existed the first antiphon from the Passions called “Knyazi lyudestii” (Князи людестии) in their interpretation as well [14; 99, fol. 378v]. The cycle which consisted of 5 sticherons (“Vo prorotsekho”, “Videkho svet” et al.) performed on Trinity Sunday also had the Troitsky interpretation [122]. There existed other works of this chanting for different holidays [e. g.: 99, fol. 338]. Like the chant masters of large singing centres, the Troitse-Sergiev masters had their own interpretations of complicated neume formulae, neumes in separate lines of the chants. In the early 17<sup>th</sup> century there appeared a special reference book for the sticherons dedicated to St. Sergius of Radonezh — “The Interpretation of lines and fitas in the Troitsky singsong. Put (style)” [99, fol. 425—430]. Some lines, for example, the first line of the psalm “Na retse Vavilonstey” (На реце Вавилонстей), can be frequently met in manuscripts [e.g.: 27; 59; 124].

It should be noted that the creative activities of the chant masters from the Troitse-Sergiev monastery — a powerful centre of old-Russian culture — were closely connected with Moscow. For decades the monastery choir was headed by chief musicians who arrived from Moscow. The tsars and patriarchs with their choirs who sang together with the choir brothers also paid visits to this monastery. Thus, this monastery had much in common with Moscow church singing traditions. We can assume that other monasteries were closely connected with their regional singing centres.

The present overview of the activities of choir brothers shows that they themselves were professional masters, the most educated and competent monks. It is no mere chance that they were often appointed priests. Choir brother Makary and deacon Iosif from the Solovetsky monastery in summer, 1583, were sent to Novgorod to serve as priests; in 1588 several Solovetsky choir brothers became priests and deacons in Novgorod — Alexander, Markel, Iosif and deacon Pamva; in October 1595 choir brother Siluyan and monastic elder Germoghen were also sent there to become priests [88, fol. 15v; 89, fol. 68; 91, fol. 55v]. The same practice was likely to take place in each monastery. For example, in 1677 choir brother Sergius became a priest in the Savvo-Storozhevsky monastery [52].

All this is evidence of the high moral values and spiritual culture of monastery singers. At the same time constant staff turnover led to the appearance of secular concerns both positive and negative ones.

It is common knowledge that medieval society was characterized by great rudeness, cruelty and haughtiness in the relations of noble people and lower classes. Taking the monastic vow many noble monks humbly continued to perform their duties as choristers, e.g.: Varlaam Obolensky in the Troitse-Sergiev monastery, Iona Stroganov in the Kirillo-Belozersky monastery, Ferapont Kurakin in the Iosifo-Volokalamsky monastery [1, p. 385, 404; 72, fol. 157]. But there also were those people who could not stop demonstrating their superiority in front of the rest choir brothers. They often wished to preserve their way of life as regards living conditions, clothes, food and drinks. On the eve of the Council of the Hundred Chapters (1551) there appeared “The monks’ petition” condemning such indecent behavior. This document blamed the Fathers superior for having festive dinners and demanded to set equal requirements for everybody [42, p. 54].

The most outrageous cases of monastery misconduct were well-known and demanded public attention. During the reign of Ivan the Terrible a lot of feudal aristocrats found themselves in monasteries because of repressions [145, p. 127, 167, 197]. The tsar strictly observed how they followed the monastery rules. Thus, in 1573 he sent a letter to the Kirillo-Belozersky monastery to Father Superior Kozma with his brethren. He wrote that “boyar I. Sheremetev who escaped from the tsar’s wrath and took a monastic vow had his own cooks there, that he was served food on the tray, that he was sitting in his cell like a tsar and monks visited him and ate and drank with him a lot”. As an example of strict order and equality the tsar mentions the Troitse-Sergiev monastery where a prince’s son is singing together with peasants. Ivan the Terrible concludes that monastery misconduct was before and exists at present [1, p. 380—385].

As a rule, monks of noble origin occupied the privileged position of monastic elders who supervised various spheres of the monastery household (cellarers, treasurers etc.) and the activities of choir brothers. The problem of monastery inequality raised by “The monks’ petition” as well as by Tsar Ivan the Terrible was still acute. Throughout the 17<sup>th</sup> century numerous chant collections contained a verse “Remembering one’s life as a choir brother” which was presented in different musical versions [54; 127; 137]. The popularity of this chant proves that it reflected the realia of monastery life true to fact, described it in detail which gave rise to constant revising of the verbal and musical material and new interpretations. In this reference we can mention one version which was included in Alexander Mezenets’ collection. Let us analyze this variant of the chant.

The content of the chant is the following. A choir brother (called Grigory in one of the variants) criticizes monastery authorities and monastic elders calling them “haughty, proud, greedy for money, hateful and wicked”. They “wallow in vice” themselves but punish choir brothers for the slightest faults. They glut themselves with delicacies and give frugal dinners to their brethren. They abuse alcohol and save on wine and beer for their brethren. In Alexander Mezenets’ variant we can find the lines which are absent in other versions: “They are concerned with food, clothes and their wealth more than mundane people”. The verse finishes with the address to the Lord to give patience and strength and to deliver from their violence [127]. Perhaps, such morals and manners were the reason of choir brothers’ wandering in search of better living conditions.

Cases of violence in the relations of monks, monastery singers were quite common. It has already been mentioned that archimandrite Dionisy with some monastic elders and choir master Login with senior chorister Filaret from the Troitse-Sergiev monastery expressed hostility towards each other, reproached and blamed each other for slightest things. Such relations sometimes reached a critical point. Thus, in July, 1678 during dinner in the Solovetsky monastery choir master Iosif was swearing dirtily at choir master Pitirim promising to complain to the cellarer. Pitirim, in his turn, started to threaten him and used obscene words in the cellarer’s address. Choir masters Stephan Shenin and Evloghy tried to bring Iosif to reason. Only when reader Dionisy hit him on his head telling him to stop the quarrel, Iosif said: “I will listen only to you, nobody else” [86].

Documentary sources frequently mention criminal cases (robberies) connected with choir brothers. In December 1666 choir brother Feodosy from the Moscow Znamensky monastery stole a box with money and church utensils from the treasury: a gold panagia (icon) with 58 pearl beads, an ivory panagia in argent, a golden cross with pearl beads, 6 silver gilded crosses, 16 silver “white” crosses, 105 coins of pure gold, 2 silver coins etc. All the monasteries received the tsar’s letters ordering to find Feodosy and bring him to Moscow [58]. One more case took place in the Savvo-Storozhevsky monastery where the monastery groom called Ivan Romanov filed a petition against choir master Afanasy accusing him of assault and money robbery (0,5 rouble) [52, fol. 90v].

We have already mentioned that rough manners were typical of medieval society. As we can see Russian

medieval monasteries also suffered from them. It should be noted that both the church and state authorities tried to eradicate violence and breach of peace punishing guilty people severely. In their turn, church authorities maintained strict discipline of their choir brothers. Thus, in 1685 the archimandrite of the Moscow Simonov monastery ordered his choir masters to control their singers. Choir brothers were “to come in time, to behave decently, to sing well and to gather for rehearsals once or twice a week” [37, p. 129].

In the course of time old-Russian monasteries became the centres of great cultural achievements, the birthplace of invaluable monuments of art as well as unique musical works.

Thus, studying the history of monastery singing we can conclude that in the majority of monasteries especially in those with small choirs and great turnover there were no stable singing traditions. Only significant monasteries or those visited by the tsar and high officials could establish and maintain these traditions thanks to the constant control of choir masters, senior choristers and Fathers Superior (who were prominent chant masters, e.g. Varlaam Rogov and Isaiah Lukoshkov). These monasteries produced not only original musical works but also prominent musical theorists who generalized vital issues of singing art in their musical treatises (monk Christopher, monastic elder Alexander Mezenets). Local singing traditions were also supported by eparchial choirs (in Moscow — the tsar’s and the patriarch’s choirs) who frequently took part in monastery services together with choir brothers. Due to the constant turnover of monastery singers there appeared new intonation patterns which resulted in the creation of original chants exceeding the limits of the local tradition. Thus, within regional artistic schools there appeared special monastery centres of church singing which was considered a high art phenomenon.

## References

1. Acty istoricheskije, sobrannye i izdannye Arkheograficheskoy Komissiiy [Historical Acts collected and published by the Archaeographical commission]. St. Petersburg, 1841, v.1.
2. Acty istoricheskije... St. Petersburg, 1841, v.2.
3. Acty, sobrannye v bibliotekakh i arkhivakh Rossiyskoy imperii Arkheograficheskoy ekspeditsiiy [Acts collected in libraries and archives of the Russian Empire by Archaeographic expedition.]. St. Petersburg, 1836, v. 1.
4. Acty, sobrannye... St. Petersburg, 1836, v. 2.
5. Acty, sobrannye... St. Petersburg, 1836, v. 3.
6. Acty, sobrannye... St. Petersburg, 1836, v. 4.
7. Antushevich N. Istoricheskoe opisanie moskovskogo Novodevichiya monastyrya [The historical description of the Moscow Novodevichy Monastery]. Moscow, 1885.
8. Arseniy, ier. Opisanie slavyanskikh rukopise' biblioteki Svyato-Troitskoy Sergievoy lavri. [Description of the Holy Trinity Sergius Lavra library Slavic manuscripts]. Moscow, 1878. Ч. 2.
9. Bezuglova I. F. Muzikalnaya deyatel'nost' solovetskikh inokov [Musical activities of the Solovetsky monks]. *Istochnikovedcheskoe izuchenie pamyatnikov pis'mennoy kul'tury* [Source-study of the monuments of written culture]. Leningrad, 1990, p. 48–49.
10. Bezuglova I. F. Opekalovskiy raspev [Opekalovsky chanting]. *Pamyatniki kul'tury. Novije otkrytiya, 1978*. [Monuments of culture. New discoveries, 1978]. Leningrad, 1979, p. 196–204.
11. Brazhnikov M.V. Drevnerusskaya teoriya muzyki [Old Russian theory of music]. Leningrad, 1972.
12. BRAN. Osn. 16.7.23, fol. 27–28v.
13. BRAN. Osn. 16.7.24, fol. 121.
14. BRAN. Osn. 32.16.18, fol. 116.
15. Chinovniki Moskovskogo Uspenskogo sobora i vykhody patriarkha Nikona [Books for divine service of the Moscow Dormition Cathedral and journeys of Patriarch Nikon]. Publ. A. P. Golubtsov. Moscow, 1908.
16. Christofer. Kluch znamennoy, 1604 [Key znamenny, 1604] / publ. by M. Brazhnikov, G. Nikishov. *Pamyatniki russkogo muzykal'nogo iskusstva* [The monuments of Russian musical art]. Moscow, 1983, issue 9, p. 1–176.
17. Delo o bratii Savvo-Storozhevskogo monastyrya 15 maya 1688 g. [The Case about the brotherhood of the Savvino-Storozhevsky monastery May 15, 1688]. *Chleniya v Obshestve Istorii i Drevnostey Rossiyskikh* [Readings in the Imperial society of history and Russian antiquities], book 1, 1887.
18. Dopolneniya k Actam istoricheskim, sobrannye i izdannye Arkheograficheskoy Komissiiy [Additions to historical acts collected and published by the Archaeographical commission]. St. Petersburg, 1846, v.1, p. 218–219.
19. Drozdetskaya N. K. Opekalovskiy raspev [Opekalovsky chanting]. *Drevnyaya Rus': voprosy medievistiki* [Old Russia: questions of medieval studies], 2005, № 1(19), p. 80–91.
20. Findezen N. F. Ocherki po istorii muzyki v Rossii. [Essays on the Russian history of music]. Moscow; Leningrad, 1928.
21. Frolov S.V. «Inogo perevodu Lukoshkovo»: opyt issledovaniya [«The Lukoshkov's variant»: experience of research]. *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoy literatury Instituta russkoy literatury* [Treatises of the Ancient literature department of the Russian literature institute]. Leningrad, 1979, v. 34, p.351–357.
22. GAYaO [State Archives of the Yaroslavl Region]. Kol. rukop. №459 (97).
23. GIM [State Historical Museum, Moscow]. Edinov. № 37, fol. 678–679.
24. GIM. Sinod. pev. № 99, fol. 223–495.
25. GIM. Sinod. pev. № 1334, fol. 400–403.
26. GIM. Sinod. pev. № 1357, fol. 11–18.
27. GIM. Uvar. № 177, fol. 111.
28. GIM. Schuk. № 767.
29. Guseinova Z. M. «A sie v Kirilove monastyre poyut». O pevcheskom repertuare Kirillo-Belozerskogo monastyrya XVII v. [«And these chants they sing in Kirillov monastery». About chant repertoire of the Cyril Belozersky monastery in the 17<sup>th</sup> century] *Peterburgskiy muzikalnyi arkhiv* [St. Petersburg Musical Archive]. St. Petersburg, 1998, v. 2, p. 24–41.
30. Guseinova Z. M. K voprosu ob atributsii pamyatnikov drevnerusskogo pevcheskogo iskusstva [About the attribution of old Russian monuments of chant art]. *Istochnikovedenie literatury Drevney Russii* [Source Studies in the field of Old Russia literature]. Leningrad, 1980.
31. Kanon prepodobnomu ottsu nashemu Dionisiyu, arhimandritu Sergiev Lavry [Canon and life of our father Dionysius, Archimandrite Sergius Lavra]. Moscow, 1855.
32. Kataev I. M., Kabanov A. K. Opisanie aktov sobraniya grafa A. S. Uvarova [Description acts of Count A. S. Uvarov's collection]. Moscow, 1905.
33. Kluchevskiy V.O. 1987. Sochineniya, v.2: Kurs russkoy istorii [Course of Russian History]. Moscow, 1987.
34. Knizhnye tsentry Drevney Rusi: Iosifo-Volokolamskiy monaster' [Book Centers of Old Russia: Joseph Volokolamsk Monastery]. Red. D. S. Likhachev. Leningrad, 1991.
35. Korotkikh D. Pevchaya Psaltyr' v pamyatnikakh XVI–XVII vv. [The chanting collection of the Psalms in the monuments of 16<sup>th</sup> – 17<sup>th</sup> centuries]. *Muzikalnaya akademiya* [Musical Academy], 2001, №4. – p.136–142.
36. Kruchinina A. N. Pevcheskie rukopisi iz Sofiyskogo sobraniya GPB [Chant books from the Sofia collection of the State Public Library]. *Problemy istochnikovedcheskogo*

*izucheniya rukopisnykh i staropechatnykh fondov: Sb. nauch. trudov* [Problems of source study of manuscripts and early printed funds: collection of proceedings]. Leningrad, 1979.

37. Kudryavtsev M. Istoria pravoslavnogo monashestva v Seveo-Vostochnoi Rossii. [The history of Orthodox monasticism in North East of Russia]. Moscow, 1881.

38. Leonid (Kavelin). Moskovskiy Zvenigorod i ego uезд [Moscow Zvenigorod and its apskritis]. Moscow, 1878.

39. Materialy dlya arkheologicheskogo slovarya [Materials for the archaeological dictionary]. *Drevnosti. Trudy Moskovskogo arkheologicheskogo obschestva* [Antiquities. Proceedings of the Moscow Archaeological Society]. Moscow, 1870, v.2.

40. Materialy dlya istorii, archeologii i statistiki goroda Mosevy [Materials for the history, archaeology and statistics of Moscow] / publ. by I. Zabelin. Moscow, 1884, v. 1.

41. Materialy dlya istorii... Moscow, 1891, v. 2.

42. Moiseyeva G.N. "Valaamskaya beseda" – pamjatnik russkoy publicistiky serediny XVI veka. ["Balaam conversation" – relic of Russian journalism of the mid 16<sup>th</sup> century]. Moscow; Leningrad, 1958.

43. Parfentjev N.P. O tvorcheskaoy deyatel'nosti moskovskogo мастера tserkovno-pevcheskogo iskusstva XVII v. Luki Ivanovicha Tveritina [About the Moscow master of the church-chanting art Luka Ivanovich Tveritin's creative activity in the 17<sup>th</sup> century]. *Vestnik Uzhno-Ural'skogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Ser.: Sotsial'no-gumanitarnye nauki* [Bulletin of the South Ural State University. Series: Social Sciences and the Humanities], 2009, № 12, p. 57–62.

44. Parfentjev N.P. Reflection of the main directions didaskal Feodor Krest'ianin's creative activity in monuments of writing XVI–XVII centuries. *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences*, 2013, v. 6, № 10, p. 1423–1432.

45. Parfentjeva N.V., Parfentjev N.P. Osvoenie repertuara masterami pevcheskoy shkoly Fedora Krestjanina na rubege XVI–XVII vv. [Mastering the repertoire by masters of Fedor Krestjanin's chanting school at the turn of 16<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> centuries]. *Vestnik Uzhno-Ural'skogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Ser.: Sotsial'no-gumanitarnye nauki* [Bulletin of the South Ural State University. Series: Social Sciences and the Humanities], 2012, № 19, p. 83–90.

46. Parfentjeva N.V., Parfentjev N.P. O deyatel'nosti masterov Troitse-Sergievskego monastyrya v oblasti drevnerusskogo muzikalnogo iskusstva (na primere tvorchestva Logina Shishelova) [The activities of the Trinity Sergius monastery masters in the ancient Russian art of church music (on the example of Login Shishelov's creative activity)]. *Vestnik Uzhno-Ural'skogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Ser.: Sotsial'no-gumanitarnye nauki* [Bulletin of the South Ural State University. Series: Social Sciences and the Humanities], 2013, issue 1, p. 92–103.

47. Parfentjeva N.V., Parfentjev N.P. Stikhiry "na podoben" tsarya Ivana Groznogo v chest' svyatitelya Petra, mitropolita vseya Rusi [Ivan the Terrible Sticherons on the «podoben» (sample) in honor of St. Peter the Metropolitan All Russia]. *Vestnik Uzhno-Ural'skogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Ser.: Sotsial'no-gumanitarnye nauki* [Bulletin of the South Ural State University. Series: Social Sciences and the Humanities], 2014, v.14, №1, p. 60–73.

48. Parfentjeva N.V., Parfentjev N.P. On the Structural-Formula Method of Researching Ancient Russian Chants as Musical-Written Art. *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & social sciences*, 2008, v.1, p.384–389.

49. Parfentjeva, N.V. Principles of Author's Art Creativity in Ancient-Russian Church Musical-Written Chanting of the XVI–XVII Centuries. *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences*, 2009, v.2, №2, p.184–199.

50. Prikhodno-raskhodnye knigi Bogoslovskogo monastyrya [Cash receipts and payments book of the Bogoslovskiy monastery]. *Trudy Ryazanskoi uchenoi arkhivnoi komissii* [Proceedings of the Ryazan scientific archival commission], 1903, v.18.

51. Prikhodno-raskhodnye knigi..., 1904, v.19.

52. RGADA [Russian State Archives of Ancient Acts, Moscow]. F. 137. Inv. 1. № 3, fol. 84–90.

53. RGADA. F. 181. Inv. 1. № 600, fol. 90.

54. RGADA. F. 188. Inv. 1. № 947, fol. 170v–173.

55. RGADA. F. 196. Inv. 1. № 141, fol. 26–27.

56. RGADA. F. 196. Inv. 1. № 200.

57. RGADA. F. 196. Inv. 1. № 273.

58. RGADA. F. 196. Inv. 2. № 82, fol. 1–2.

59. RGADA. F. 381. Inv. 1. № 303, fol. 136v.

60. RGADA. F. 396. Inv. 1. № 6308, fol. 1–5.

61. RGADA. F. 396. Inv. 2. № 206, fol. 222v.

62. RGADA. F. 396. Inv. 2. № 210, fol. 82.

63. RGADA. F. 396. Inv. 2. № 211, fol. 80v.

64. RGADA. F. 396. Inv. 2. № 212, fol. 82.

65. RGADA. F. 396. Inv. 2. № 304, fol. 110v.

66. RGADA. F. 396. Inv. 2. № 305, fol. 70.

67. RGADA. F. 396. Inv. 2. № 632, fol. 804v.

68. RGADA. F. 1192. Inv. 2. № 10, fol. 52 etc.

69. RGADA. F. 1192. Inv. 2. № 12, fol. 76 etc.

70. RGADA. F. 1192. Inv. 2. № 15, fol. 48 etc.

71. RGADA. F. 1192. Inv. 2. № 16, fol. 69 etc.

72. RGADA. F. 1192. Inv. 2. № 19, fol. 84 etc.

73. RGADA. F. 1192. Inv. 2. № 24, fol. 59 etc.

74. RGADA. F. 1192. Inv. 2. № 67, fol. 46.

75. RGADA. F. 1192. Inv. 2. № 74, fol. 14.

76. RGADA. F. 1192. Inv. 2. № 82, fol. 4–5, 187.

77. RGADA. F. 1199. № 1, fol. 39–48, 68–78.

78. RGADA. F. 1199. № 22, fol. 50.

79. RGADA. F. 1199. № 30, fol. 157v.

80. RGADA. F. 1199. № 38, fol. 192–199.

81. RGADA. F. 1199. № 49, fol. 232–242.

82. RGADA. F. 1199. № 53, fol. 148–232.

83. RGADA. F. 1199. № 58, fol. 216–226.

84. RGADA. F. 1199. № 61, fol. 62–63.

85. RGADA. F. 1199. № 66, fol. 2–3.

86. RGADA. F. 1201. Inv. Оп. 1. № 94, fol. 1–3.

87. RGADA. F. 1201. Inv. Оп. 1. № 209.

88. RGADA. F. 1201. Inv. Оп. 1. № 211.

89. RGADA. F. 1201. Inv. Оп. 1. № 213.

90. RGADA. F. 1201. Inv. Оп. 1. № 214.

91. RGADA. F. 1201. Inv. Оп. 1. № 424.

92. RGADA. F. 1441. Inv. Оп. 1. № 230, fol. 84, 101.

93. RGB [Russian State Library, Moscow]. F. 37. № 93, fol. 553A.

94. RGB. F.37. № 100, fol. 12–31, 193v.

95. RGB. F. 37. № 355, fol. 237–281.

96. RGB. F. 79. № 37, fol. 107–113, 125–128.

97. RGB. F. 122. № 19, fol. 202.

98. RGB. F. 173. № 231, fol. 2, 14–16.

99. RGB. F. 178. № 875, fol. 338–430.

100. RGB. F. 178. № 7174.

101. RGB. F. 178. № 7528.

102. RGB. F. 199. № 237, fol. 143–359v.

103. RGB. F. 228. № 36, fol. 219.

104. RGB. F. 292. № 45, fol. 414–487v.

105. RGB. F. 304. № 41, fol. 31.

106. RGB. F. 304. № 42, fol. 36.

107. RGB. F. 304. № 316, fol. 3–10, 391.

108. RGB. F. 304. № 414.

109. RGB. F. 304. № 416.

110. RGB. F. 304. № 421–423.

111. RGB. F. 304. № 428.

112. RGB. F. 304. № 429, fol. 163–203.

113. RGB. F. 304. № 449, fol. 344v.

114. RGB. F. 304. № 700, fol. 401–409.

115. RGB. F. 304. № 739.

116. RGB. F. 354. № 144, fol. 369–579v.

117. RGB. F. 379. № 29, fol. 111.

118. RGB. F. 380. № 8/5, fol. 1.

119. RNB [Russian National Library, St. Petersburg]. Kir.-Bel. № 72/1311, fol. 235, 508.

120. RNB. Kir.-Bel. № 95/1332, fol. 93v.

121. RNB. Kir.-Bel. № 605/862, fol. 166–167.  
122. RNB. Kir.-Bel. № 622/879, fol. 153–154v.  
123. RNB. Kir.-Bel. № 624/881, fol. 128, 273–278v.  
124. RNB. Kir.-Bel. № 628/885, fol. 171.  
125. RNB. Kir.-Bel. № 639/896, fol. 169.  
126. RNB. Kir.-Bel. № 643/900, fol. 191–192.  
127. RNB. Kir.-Bel. № 649/906, fol. 141–143.  
128. RNB. Kir.-Bel. № 657/914, fol. 148, 150.  
129. RNB. Kir.-Bel. № 682/939, fol. 258v.  
130. RNB. Kir.-Bel. № 684/941, fol. 15v.  
131. RNB. Kir.-Bel. № 707/964, fol. 105–112.  
132. RNB. Sof. № 480, fol. 164–209v.  
133. RNB. Sof. № 492, fol. 148–152 etc.  
134. RNB. Sof. № 498, fol. 449–496v.  
135. RNB. Sol. № 277/282, fol. 300.  
136. RNB. Sol. № 277/286, fol. 403.  
137. RNB. Q.XVII.67, fol. 222v.  
138. Russkaya istoricheskaya biblioteka [State Public Historical Library of Russia]. St. Petersburg, 1875, v. 2.  
139. Russkaya istoricheskaya biblioteka. St. Petersburg, 1876, v. 3.  
140. Russkaya istoricheskaya biblioteka. Petrograd, 1923, v. 37.  
141. Seregina, N.S. Pesnopeniya russkim svyatym [Chants in honor of Russian saints]. St. Petersburg, 1994.  
142. Sergievo-Posadskiy muzey-zapovednik [Sergiev Posad Museum-Reserve]. № 274.  
143. Shlyapkin I. Akty Velikoustyuzhskogo Mikhailo-Arkhangelskogo monastyrya [Acts of the Velikoustyuzhsk Michael the Archangel monastery]. Velikiy Ustyug, 1913, v. 2, p.209.  
144. Shvets T. V. Drevnyaya traditsiya psalmopeniya v pevcheskoy rukopisi serediny XVI v. [The ancient tradition of psalm singing in the manuscript of the mid-16th century]. *Drevnerusskoe pesnopenie. Materialy nauch. konf. [Ancient chant. Proceedings of the conference]*. St. Petersburg, 2011. Iss. 5, p. 94–112.  
145. Skrynnikov R. G. Ivan Groznyi [Ivan the Terrible]. Moscow, 1980.  
146. Skvortsov D. Dionisiy Zobninovskiy, arhimandrit Troitse-Sergieva monastyrya [Dionysiy Zobninovskiy, Archimandrite of the Trinity-Sergius Monastery]. Tver', 1890, p. 252–308.  
147. Smirnov S. Istoricheskoe opisanie Savvo-Storozhevskogo monastyrya [Historical description of Savva Storozhevsky monastery]. Moscow, 1860.  
148. Spisok pogrebennykh v Troitse-Sergievoj lavre ot osnovaniya do 1880 g. [The list of buried in the Trinity-Sergius Lavra from its founding until 1880]. Moscow, 1880.  
149. Stroev P. M. Spiski ierarkhov i nastoyateley monastyrey rossiyskoy tserkvi [The lists of hierarchs and hegumens of the Russian Orthodox Church]. St. Petersburg, 1877.  
150. Tikhonravov, K. Vladimirskiy sbornik [Vladimir collection]. Moscow, 1857.  
151. Titov A. A. Vkladnye i kormovye knigi Rostovskogo Borisoglebskogo monastyrya XV–XVIII vv. [Books of donations and feeding books of Rostov Boris and Gleb Monastery 15<sup>th</sup>–18<sup>th</sup> centuries]. Yaroslavl', 1881.  
152. Trudy Ryazanskoj uchenoj komissii [Proceedings of the scientific committee of the Ryazan], v.19, is. 2, p. 147–156.  
153. Truvorov A. Prikhodno-raskhodnye knigi Korniljeva Komelskogo monastyrya [Cash receipts and payments book of the Kornilev Komel'sk monastery]. *Letopis' zanyatiy Arkheograficheskoy komissii [Chronicle meetings of Archeographical Commission]*. St. Petersburg, 1871, v.5, p. 25–27.  
154. Undolskiy V. M. Biblioteka Pavla, mitropolita Sarskogo i Podonskogo [Library of Sarsky and Podonsky Metropolitan Paul]. Moscow, 1850.  
155. Undolskiy V. M. Zamechaniya dlya istorii tserkovnogo peniya v Rossii [Notes for the history of church chanting in Russia]. Moscow, 1846.  
156. Zabelin I. E. Domashniy byt russkogo naroda v 16<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> vv. [Home life of the Russian people in the 16<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> centuries]. V.1. Domashniy byt russkikh tsarey [Home life of the Russian tsars]. Moscow, 1895.  
157. Zabelin I. E. Domashniy byt russkogo naroda v 16<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> vv. [Home life of the Russian people in the 16<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> centuries]. V.2. Domashniy byt russkikh tsarits [Home life of the Russian tsarinas]. Moscow, 1901.  
158. Zvereva S. G. Monastyrskie kliroshane XVI – pervoy poloviny XVII v. [The monastic chanters of the 16<sup>th</sup> – first half 17<sup>th</sup> century]. *Literatura Drevney Rusi. Istochnikovedenie: sbornik nauch. trudov [The literature of ancient Russia. Study of the sources: collection of proceedings]*. Leningrad, 1988.

Received December 18, 2015

**Bulletin of the South Ural State University  
Series «Social Sciences and the Humanities»  
2016, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 88–102**

УДК 783(470.5)+94(470.5)  
ББК Ч611.3+Т3(2Р36)-7+Щ313(2)

DOI: 10.14529/ssh160116

## ПРОФЕССИОНАЛЬНО-МУЗЫКАЛЬНОЕ ИСКУССТВО В МОНАСТЫРЯХ РОССИИ XVI—XVII вв.

**Н. П. Парфентьев**

Сохранение и развитие древнего церковного пения как высокого музыкального искусства занимало важное место в духовной жизни русских монастырей XVI—XVII вв. В статье на основе документов освещаются деятельность монастырских хоров, их состав и структура, сведения об особенностях певческого репертуара, о системе жалования для певчих и их служебных и внеслужебных занятиях. Представлено также творчество наиболее выдающихся монастырских мастеров-распевщиков, создававших авторские произведения, получавшие признание современников.

*Ключевые слова: древнерусское певческое искусство, монастырские хоры, авторское творчество, русские монастыри XVI—XVII вв.*

## Литература и источники

1. АИ. — СПб., 1841. — Т. 1.
2. АИ. — СПб., 1841. — Т. 2.
3. ААЭ. — СПб., 1836. — Т. 1.
4. ААЭ. — СПб., 1836. — Т. 2.
5. ААЭ. — СПб., 1836. — Т. 3.
6. ААЭ. — СПб., 1836. — Т. 4.
7. Антушевич, Н. Историческое описание московского Новодевичья монастыря / Н. Антушевич. — М., 1885.
8. Арсений, иер. Описание славянских рукописей библиотеки Свято-Троицкой Сергиевой лавры / иер. Арсений. — Ч. 2. — М., 1878.
9. Безуглова, И. Ф. Музыкальная деятельность соловецких иноков (по певческим рукописям Соловецкого собрания) / И. Ф. Безуглова // Источниковедческое изучение памятников письменной культуры : сб. науч. тр. — Л., 1990. — С. 48—49.
10. Безуглова, И. Ф. Опекаловский распев / И. Ф. Безуглова // ПКНО, 1978. — Л., 1979. — С. 196—204.
11. Бражников, М. В. Древнерусская теория музыки / М. В. Бражников. — Л., 1972.
12. БРАН. Осн. 16.7.23. Л. 27—28 об.
13. БРАН. Осн. 16.7.24. Л. 121.
14. БРАН. Осн. 32.16.18. Л. 116.
15. Чиновник Московского Успенского собора и выходы патриарха Никона / изд. А. П. Голубцов. — М., 1908.
16. Христофор. Ключ знаменной (1604) / публ. М. Бражникова; комм. Г. Никишова // Памятники русского музыкального искусства. — Вып. 9. — М.: Музыка, 1983.
17. Дело о братии Савво-Сторожевского монастыря 15 мая 1688 г. // ЧОИДР. — Кн. 1. — М., 1887.
18. ДАИ. — Т. 1. — СПб., 1846. — С. 218—219.
19. Дроздецкий, Н. К. Опекаловский распев: именование и бытование / Н. К. Дроздецкий // Древняя Русь: вопросы медиевистики. — 2005. — № 1(19). — С. 80—91.
20. Финдейзен, Н. Ф. Очерки по истории музыки в России / Н. Ф. Финдейзен. — М.: Л., 1928.
21. Фролов, С. В. «Иного переводу Лукошкова»: опыт исследования / С. В. Фролов // ТОДРЛ. — Т. 34. — Л., 1979. — С. 351—357.
22. ГАЯО. Кол. рукоп. Оп. 1. № 459 (97).
23. ГИМ. Единоф. № 37. Л. 678—679.
24. ГИМ. Син. певч. № 99. Л. 223—495.
25. ГИМ. Син. певч. № 1334. Л. 400—403.
26. ГИМ. Син. певч. № 1357. Л. 11—18.
27. ГИМ. Увар. № 177. Л. 111.
28. ГИМ. Щук. № 767.
29. Гусейнова, З. М. «А сие в Кириллове монастыре поют». О певческом репертуаре Кирилло-Белозерского монастыря XVII в. / З. М. Гусейнова // Петербургский музыкальный архив : сб. ст. и материалов. — Вып. 2. — СПб., 1998. — С. 24—41.
30. Гусейнова, З. М. К вопросу об атрибуции памятников древнерусского певческого искусства (на примере рукописи Соловецкого собрания № 690/751) / З. М. Гусейнова // Источниковедение литературы Древней Руси. — Л., 1980.
31. Канон и житие преподобному отцу нашему Дионисию, архимандриту Сергиевы Лавры, радонежскому чудотворцу, с присовокуплением жития его. — М., 1855.
32. Катаев, И. М. Описание актов собрания графа А. С. Уварова. Акты исторические / И. М. Катаев, А. К. Кабанов. — М., 1905.
33. Ключевский, В. О. Сочинения : в 9 т. — Т. 2. — Ч. 2 : Курс русской истории / В. О. Ключевский. — М., 1987.
34. Книжные центры Древней Руси. Иосифо-Волоколамский монастырь как центр книжности / отв. ред. Д. С. Лихачев. — Л.: Наука, 1991.
35. Коротких, Д. Певчая Псалтирь в памятниках XVI—XVII вв. / Д. Коротких // Муз. академия. — 2001. — № 4. — С. 136—142.
36. Кручинина, А. Н. Певческие рукописи из Софийского собрания Государственной публичной библиотеки / А. Н. Кручинина // Проблемы источниковедческого изучения рукописных и старопечатных фондов : сб. науч. тр. — Л., 1979.
37. Кудрявцев, М. История православного монашества в Северо-Восточной России / М. Кудрявцев. — М., 1881.
38. Леонид (Кавелин). Московский Звенигород и его уезд в церковно-археологическом отношении / Леонид (Кавелин). — М., 1878.
39. Материалы для археологического словаря // Древности. Труды московского археологического общества. — Т. 2. — М., 1870.
40. МДИМ. — М., 1884. — Т. 1.
41. МДИМ. — М., 1891. — Т. 2.
42. Моисеева, Г. Н. Валаамская беседа — памятник русской публицистики середины XVI в. / Г. Н. Моисеева. — М.: Л., 1958.
43. Парфентьев, Н. П. О творческой деятельности московского мастера церковно-певческого искусства XVII в. Луки Ивановича Тверитина / Н. П. Парфентьев // Вестник Южно-Уральского государственного университета. Сер.: Социально-гуманитарные науки. — 2009. — Вып. 9. — С. 57—62.
44. Parfentjev, N. P. Reflection of the main directions didaskal Feodor Krest'ianin's creative activity in monuments of writing XVI—XVII centuries / N. P. Parfentjev // Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences. — 2013. — V. 6. — № 10. — P. 1423—1432.
45. Парфентьева, Н. В. Освоение репертуара мастерами певческой школы Федора Крестьянина на рубеже XVI—XVII вв. / Н. В. Парфентьева, Н. П. Парфентьев // Вестник Южно-Уральского государственного университета. Сер.: Социально-гуманитарные науки. — 2012. — № 32. — Вып. 19. — С. 83—90.
46. Парфентьева Н. В. О деятельности мастеров Троице-Сергиевского монастыря в области древнерусского музыкального искусства (на примере творчества Логина Шишелова) / Н. В. Парфентьева, Н. П. Парфентьев // Вестник Южно-Уральского государственного университета. Серия: Социально-гуманитарные науки. — 2013. — Т. 13. — № 1. — С. 92—103.
47. Парфентьева Н. В. Стихиры «на подобен» царя Ивана Грозного в честь святителя Петра, митрополита всея Руси / Н. В. Парфентьева, Н. П. Парфентьев // Вестник Южно-Уральского государственного университета. Серия: Социально-гуманитарные науки. — 2014. — Т. 14. — № 1. С. 60—73.
48. Parfentjeva, N. V. On the Structural-Formula Method of Researching Ancient Russian Chants as Musical-Written Art / N. V. Parfentjeva, N. P. Parfentjev // Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & social sciences. — 2008. — V. 1. — № 3. — P. 384—389.
49. Parfentjeva, N. V. Principles of Author's Art Creativity in Ancient-Russian Church Musical-Written Chanting of the XVI—XVII Centuries / N. V. Parfentjeva // Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences. — 2009. — V. 2. — № 2. — P. 184—199.
50. Приходно-расходные книги Богословского монастыря // Труды Рязанской ученой архивной комиссии. — Т. 18. — 1903.
51. Приходно-расходные книги... — 1904. — Т. 19.
52. РГАДА. Ф. 137. Оп. 1. № 3. Л. 84—90.
53. РГАДА. Ф. 181. Оп. 1. № 600. Л. 90.
54. РГАДА. Ф. 188. Оп. 1. № 947 (посл. четв. XVII в.). Л. 170 об. — 173.
55. РГАДА. Ф. 196. Оп. 1. № 141. Л. 26—27.
56. РГАДА. Ф. 196. Оп. 1. № 200.
57. РГАДА. Ф. 196. Оп. 1. № 273.
58. РГАДА. Ф. 196. Оп. 2. № 82. Л. 1—2.
59. РГАДА. Ф. 381. Оп. 1. № 303. Л. 136 об.
60. РГАДА. Ф. 396. Оп. 1. № 6308. Л. 1—5.
61. РГАДА. Ф. 396. Оп. 2. № 206. Л. 222 об.

62. РГАДА. Ф. 396. Он. 2. № 210. Л. 82.  
 63. РГАДА. Ф. 396. Он. 2. № 211. Л. 80 об.  
 64. РГАДА. Ф. 396. Он. 2. № 212. Л. 82.  
 65. РГАДА. Ф. 396. Он. 2. № 304. Л. 110 об.  
 66. РГАДА. Ф. 396. Он. 2. № 305. Л. 70.  
 67. РГАДА. Ф. 396. Он. 2. № 632. Л. 804 об.  
 68. РГАДА. Ф. 1192. Он. 2. № 10. Л. 52 и др.  
 69. РГАДА. Ф. 1192. Он. 2. № 12. Л. 76 и др.  
 70. РГАДА. Ф. 1192. Он. 2. № 15. Л. 48 и др.  
 71. РГАДА. Ф. 1192. Он. 2. № 16. Л. 69 и др.  
 72. РГАДА. Ф. 1192. Он. 2. № 19. Л. 84 и др.  
 73. РГАДА. Ф. 1192. Он. 2. № 24. Л. 59 и др.  
 74. РГАДА. Ф. 1192. Он. 2. № 67. Л. 46.  
 75. РГАДА. Ф. 1192. Он. 2. № 74. Л. 14.  
 76. РГАДА. Ф. 1192. Он. 2. № 82. Л. 4—5, 187.  
 77. РГАДА. Ф. 1199. № 1. Л. 39—48, 68—78.  
 78. РГАДА. Ф. 1199. № 22. Л. 50.  
 79. РГАДА. Ф. 1199. № 30. Л. 157 об.  
 80. РГАДА. Ф. 1199. № 38. Л. 192—199.  
 81. РГАДА. Ф. 1199. № 49. Л. 232—242.  
 82. РГАДА. Ф. 1199. № 53. Л. 148—232.  
 83. РГАДА. Ф. 1199. № 58. Л. 216—226.  
 84. РГАДА. Ф. 1199. № 61. Л. 62—63.  
 85. РГАДА. Ф. 1199. № 66. Л. 2—3.  
 86. РГАДА. Ф. 1201. Он. 1. № 94. Л. 1—3.  
 87. РГАДА. Ф. 1201. Он. 1. № 209.  
 88. РГАДА. Ф. 1201. Он. 1. № 211.  
 89. РГАДА. Ф. 1201. Он. 1. № 213.  
 90. РГАДА. Ф. 1201. Он. 1. № 214.  
 91. РГАДА. Ф. 1201. Он. 1. № 424.  
 92. РГАДА. Ф. 1441. Он. 1. № 230. Л. 84, 101.  
 93. РГБ. Ф. 37. № 93. Л. 553А.  
 94. РГБ. Ф. 37. № 100. Л. 12—31, 193 об.  
 95. РГБ. Ф. 37. № 355. Л. 237—281.  
 96. РГБ. Ф. 79. № 37. Л. 107—113, 125—128.  
 97. РГБ. Ф. 122. № 19. Л. 202.  
 98. РГБ. Ф. 173. № 231. Л. 2, 14—16.  
 99. РГБ. Ф. 178. № 875. Л. 338—430.  
 100. РГБ. Ф. 178. № 717А.  
 101. РГБ. Ф. 178. № 752В.  
 102. РГБ. Ф. 199. № 237. Л. 143—359 об.  
 103. РГБ. Ф. 228. № 36. Л. 219  
 104. РГБ. Ф. 292. № 45. Л. 414—487 об.  
 105. РГБ. Ф. 304. № 41. Л. 31.  
 106. РГБ. Ф. 304. № 42. Л. 36.  
 107. РГБ. Ф. 304. № 316. Л. 3—10, 391.  
 108. РГБ. Ф. 304. № 414.  
 109. РГБ. Ф. 304. № 416.  
 110. РГБ. Ф. 304. № 421—423.  
 111. РГБ. Ф. 304. № 428.  
 112. РГБ. Ф. 304. № 429. Л. 163—203.  
 113. РГБ. Ф. 304. № 449. Л. 344 об.  
 114. РГБ. Ф. 304. № 700. Л. 401—409.  
 115. РГБ. Ф. 304. № 739.  
 116. РГБ. Ф. 354. № 144. Л. 369—579 об.  
 117. РГБ. Ф. 379. № 29. Л. 111.  
 118. РГБ. Ф. 380. № 8/5. Л. 1.  
 119. РНБ. Кур.-Бел. № 72/1311. Л. 235, 508.  
 120. РНБ. Кур.-Бел. № 95/1332. Л. 93 об.  
 121. РНБ. Кур.-Бел. № 605/862. Л. 166—167.  
 122. РНБ. Кур.-Бел. № 622/879. Л. 153—154 об.  
 123. РНБ. Кур.-Бел. № 624/881. Л. 128, 273—278 об.  
 124. РНБ. Кур.-Бел. № 628/885. Л. 171.  
 125. РНБ. Кур.-Бел. № 639/896. Л. 169.  
 126. РНБ. Кур.-Бел. № 643/900. Л. 191—192.  
 127. РНБ. Кур.-Бел. № 649/906 (втор. пол. 1650-х гг.).  
 Л. 141—143.  
 128. РНБ. Кур.-Бел. № 657/914. Л. 148, 150.  
 129. РНБ. Кур.-Бел. № 682/939. Л. 258 об.  
 130. РНБ. Кур.-Бел. № 684/941. Л. 15 об.  
 131. РНБ. Кур.-Бел. № 707/964. Л. 105—112.  
 132. РНБ. Соф. № 480. Л. 164—209 об.  
 133. РНБ. Соф. № 492. Л. 148—152 и др.  
 134. РНБ. Соф. № 498. Л. 449—496 об.  
 135. РНБ. Сол. № 277/282. Л. 300.  
 136. РНБ. Сол. № 277/286. Л. 403.  
 137. РНБ. Q.XVII.67 (перв. четв. XVII в.). Л. 222 об.  
 138. Русская историческая библиотека. — Т. 2. — СПб., 1875.  
 139. Русская историческая библиотека. — Т. 3. — СПб., 1876.  
 140. Русская историческая библиотека. — Т. 37. — Петроград, 1923.  
 141. Серегина, Н. С. Песнопения русским святым / Н. С. Серегина. — СПб., 1994.  
 142. Сергиево-Посадский музей-заповедник. № 274. Л. 124 об, 125, 279.  
 143. Шляпкин, В. П. Акты Великоустюжского Михаило-Архангельского монастыря / В. П. Шляпкин. — Ч. 2. — Великий Устюг, 1913. — С. 209.  
 144. Швец, Т. В. Древняя традиция псалмопения в певческой рукописи середины XVI в. / Т. В. Швец // Древнерусское песнопение. Пути во времени : материалы науч. конф. — Вып. 5. — СПб., 2011. — С. 94—112.  
 145. Скрынников, Р. Г. Иван Грозный / Р. Г. Скрынников. — М. : Наука, 1980.  
 146. Скворцов, Д. Дионисий Зобниновский, архимандрит Троице-Сергиева монастыря / Д. Скворцов. — Тверь, 1890. — С. 252—308.  
 147. Смирнов, С. Историческое писание Савво-Сторожевского монастыря / С. Смирнов. — М., 1860.  
 148. Список погребенных в Троице-Сергиевой лавре от основания оной до 1880 г. — М., 1880.  
 149. Строев, П. Списки царяхов и настоятелей монастырей Российской церкви / П. Строев. — СПб., 1877.  
 150. Тихонравов, К. Владимирский сборник / К. Тихонравов. — М., 1857.  
 151. Титов, А. Вкладные и кормовые книги ростовского Борисоглебского монастыря XV—XVIII вв. / А. Титов. — Ярославль, 1881.  
 152. Труды Рязанской ученой комиссии. — Т. 19. — Вып. 2. — Рязань, 1904. — С. 147—156.  
 153. Труворов, А. Приходно-расходные книги Корнильева Комельского монастыря / А. Труворов // Летопись занятий Археографической комиссии. — Вып. 5. — СПб., 1871. — С. 25—27.  
 154. Ундольский, В. М. Библиотека Павла, митрополита Сарского и Подонского / В. М. Ундольский. — М., 1850.  
 155. Ундольский В. М. Замечания для истории церковного пения в России / В. М. Ундольский. — М., 1846.  
 156. Забелин, И. Домашний быт русского народа в XVI—XVII ст. / И. Забелин. — Т. 1. Домашний быт русских царей. — М., 1895.  
 157. Забелин И. Домашний быт русского народа в XVI—XVII ст. / И. Забелин. — Т. 2. Домашний быт русских царей. — М., 1901.  
 158. Зверева С. Г. Монастырские клирошане XVI — первой половины XVII в. / С. Г. Зверева // Литература Древней Руси. Источниковедение : сб. науч. тр. — Л. : Наука, 1988.

Поступила в редакцию 18 декабря 2015 г.

**ПАРФЕНТЬЕВ Николай Павлович**, доктор ист. наук, доктор искусствоведения, профессор, заслуженный деятель науки Российской Федерации, заведующий кафедрой искусствоведения и культурологии, Южно-Уральский государственный университет. Автор более 100 научных трудов, в том числе 6 монографий, в области истории духовной культуры России и древнерусского искусства. E-mail: parfentevnp@susu.ac.ru