

**Осадча С. Еволюційна роль «перехідних епох» у розвитку православного богослужбового співу: від авторитета традиції до феномена авторства.** Стаття присвячена розгляду еволюційної ролі «перехідних» епох у розвитку православного співу, а саме рубежам XIX–XX і XX–XXI ст. Звертається увага на те, що саме співоча, музична сторона виявилася здатною найбільш ясно виявити і відобразити психологічні процеси, що відбуваються в соціумі. У даному контексті особливо важливим стає розгляд феномена авторства і його співвідношення з традицією.

Ключові слова: православний богослужбовий спів, богослужбово-співоча система, духовна музика, церковна традиція, автор.

**Osadchaya S. The evolutionary role of «transition age» for the Orthodox liturgical singing: from the authority of tradition to the phenomenon authorship.** The article considers the evolutionary role of «transitional» era in the development of Orthodox liturgical singing — the XIX–XX and XX–XXI centuries. Draws attention to the fact that it is singing, musical side was able to most clearly identify and display the psychological processes taking place in society. In this context it is particularly important is the consideration of the phenomenon of authorship and its relationship to tradition.

Keywords: Orthodox liturgical singing, liturgical singing-system, sacred music, church tradition, the author.



UDK 78.01+783.2

*S. Osadchaya*

**EVOLUTIONARY ROLE OF “TRANSITION AGES”  
IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ORTHODOX LITURGICAL  
SINGING: FROM AUTHORITY OF A TRADITION  
TO THE PHENOMENON OF AUTHORSHIP**

*The Article considers the evolutionary role of “transitional” era in the development of the Orthodox liturgical singing — the XIX–XX and XX–XXI centuries. Attention is drawn to the fact that it was singing, musical side was able to more clearly identify and reflect the psychological processes that take place in the society. In this context, consideration of the phenomenon of authorship and its relationship to tradition becomes particular important.*

**Keywords:** *Orthodox liturgical singing, liturgical singing-system, sacred music, church tradition, and author.*

In the study of liturgical singing, the most controversial and, therefore, the most interesting there two periods, namely, the XIX–XX and XX–XXI centuries, united tendencies of rethinking and re-evaluation of many social, including as lead, religious, cultural values, and deducing the relationship of cultural and religious consciousness to a new level. Due to many historical circumstances at the turn of XIX–XX centuries signs of secularization of culture, secularization of society dominated; at the turn of XX–XXI problem secular opposition, worldly and church, the temple is even more acute, but rather in the opposite direction. Today we can talk about the tendency of *massification of religious values*, where the debate on religious issues are well positioned in the functioning of mass media through the organization of information space in the modern society that actively manifests itself in various publications and TV programs. This is certainly a very important and significant turn in the history of Russian culture, but with all its positive significance it must be said about the other side of it. When referring to the temple theme, even more so — to the canonical liturgical texts as the basis of modern music often reveals a very weak awareness of the authors (composers) of the true content of the chosen text or liturgical themes of their compulsory formal signs of the functional purpose of the Orthodox service. This situation often occurs in the media, such as television — such as a form of collective creativity, the result of which depends on the concerted efforts of a considerable number of people — a writer, director, cameraman (main creators of transmission), the level of work, and even from a sound engineer engineering services installation. In the application for the transfer of the Orthodox attitude to the world and man, the attitude toward the Church and its involvement in those or other members of the creative process, without substituting their secular professional qualities, is a decisive factor of creative success or failure; While it is important and an inverse relationship: no personal piety cannot replace or substitute for knowledge, talent and professional experience.

In connection with the *promotion* of religious and even liturgical subjects, demonstrating a professional approach is often not possible loss of the contents of the symbolic — symbolic “heat unifying mystery” (C. Averincev), which should be an integral part of everything that is related to the service; In this case, it becomes inevitable blurring of the boundaries between the temple and the secular creativity. This issue is extremely important for understanding the current situation of the Orthodox culture in the world. The attempt to answer is only possible after a careful analysis of the relations be-

tween the church and outside of the church, secular forms of culture, from the beginning of Christianity to the present day.

Today, the theme of Orthodox culture, including singing, has become so urgent (even with some elements of the “mental aggression”), which gave rise to the extraordinary diversity and eclecticism in the estimates of Orthodox musical artifacts. In fairness, I must say that singing culture of the Orthodox Church at the beginning of the XX century is no less controversial. But it is also to be noted that the liturgical singing the beginning of XX century and the end of the XX century — markedly different cultural phenomena, albeit with a common musical intonation origins, the genre “memory” of singing tradition.

If at the beginning of the XX century spiritual singing culture characterized the desire to revive the distinctive singing culture of ancestors, to find the lost ancient melodic layers, the end of XX century, it is trying to “revive” is not only a long-gone past, but also the more recent period of time, raised the Orthodox culture to a new professional level. If at that time, that is at the beginning of the XX century, in the words of A. Gretchaninov “breached”, but now, at the end of XX — beginning of XXI century, the gap closed up, trying to recover what has been lost, but at the same time trying to and create a new one.

A similar duality of problems of modern spiritual singing culture led to the birth of a unique **chronotopical synthesis taking values of style**. Earlier, in the historic deployment processes of evolution of liturgical singing proceeded in a linear fashion, that is, during the rule of the singing style was replaced by another, almost completely replaced the previous, with the border, the joints of these changes in the liturgical singing appeared very remarkable phenomenon: the gap between the outgoing and emerging styles it was so great that it was difficult to imagine this possibility stylistic change in the evolution of the liturgical singing practice.

In other words, such a stylistic shift was presented not with regularity of evolution, but rather with the result of a “bang”, a complete reformation of the collective religious consciousness, and *it is singing, musical side was able to more clearly identify and reflect the psychological processes that take place in the society*. But all kinds of changes made by the ongoing process of personal consciousness development were focused exclusively on a singing part. Statutory canons, canonical pray texts practically did not re-sing the changes as was noted by Egon Velleš, studying Byzantine hymnography.

E. Velleš wrote that “with the exception of a few hymns, anthems, which were added after fixing the rite liturgy, spiritual poetry has remained

almost unchanged, but the musical development could not be stopped. We see that songwriters adorned melodies accompanying spirit poems written in a strict form, or in poetic prose. This happened as long as there was a need to reduce the musical text, as in many cases, decoration music made it impossible to understand the liturgical text” [3]. In other words, ***all changes are focused exclusively on a singing part, while leaving unchanged liturgical texts, and if the party began singing obscure the text, it will certainly make adjustments.***

Musical creativity (both secular and ecclesiastical) end of the XX century was characterized by largely polar stylistic phenomena. So, today we can see the coexistence of all the singing styles of liturgical singing that had previously succeeded one another in the historical diachrony. In other words, the interaction of singing formations having previously horizontal expression almost complete interchangeability of one another in the evolution of traditions in the contemporary culture forms a special unity of a simultaneous, while in the vertical ratio. Today, the Orthodox church and singing practice coexist and are actively developing such seemingly incompatible stylistic phenomenon, as a sign of monody and polyphony, also recently in various historical versions (part, strict polyphonic free, in its unity with the homophonic and harmonic principles of organization of the invoice, and their contamination).

Today, both monodical and polyphonic singing receive a wide resonance in the cultural life: festivals, on which znamenny singing sounds, as well as the scientific-practical conference devoted to the problems of znamenny chant is no longer a rarity. What is most remarkable: today it is not only about what the problems of studying znamenny singing from a scientific point of view (as it was in the beginning of XX century), and the attempts to revive znamenny chant — this way has largely passed, as evidenced by increasing the number of choirs, whose repertoire includes exclusively znamenny chant, and an increase in the number of churches, which during the service sounds znamenny chant. Today we can talk about specific practices, education and training, “workers”, including *regency*, *actual* problems of znamenny singing *development*.

In modern Orthodox singing coexist with different musical forms of singing, in connection with which the process is aimed at addressing the different *semantic tasks*. **On the one hand**, it is *chorister liturgical chants*, which in their turn can be classified as dichotomous.

*First* — it is a group of plays, which is strictly adhered to the tradition established in the previous church-singing practice. These include those

songs that were created specifically by “churched” composers such as Archimandrite Matthew (Mormyl), Deacon Serge Trubachov, Bishop Hilarion (Alpheus), Jonathan Bishop (Eletsikh) and others.

*Secondly* — it’s a group of chants, in which there is a noticeable upgrading of musical composition, but with strict adherence to the indispensable statutory canon. In these works the author’s “I” is quite clearly pronounced, which allows the composer to bring his/her vision and his/her ideas, while maintaining the overall focus on the observance of certain rules of the genre. This group includes works by V. Martynov, in his own way to “hear” the everyday life, the composition of Lebedev, M. Skorik, L. Dychko, E. Stankovic, combining traditional and non-traditional start to the canonical hymns, etc.

On the other hand — it is *spiritual music*, genetically related to the temple, liturgical singing, but designed for the concert and not to participate in worship. This area is expressed most numerously. It should be noted that separation into two main areas is also observed. *Firstly*, it is spiritual songs, which are based on texts related to liturgy, religious life, but that are not canonical. This direction began in the late XIX — early XX centuries in the works of many prominent composers such as Tchaikovsky (“penitential prayers of Russia”), S. Taneyev (“John of Damascus”, “After reading Psalm”) N. Tcherepnin (“The Road to Calvary the Virgin”), A. Castalian (“Fraternal Commemoration”). The turn of XX-XXI centuries, continued this line, including in the works of Ukrainian composers, including the already mentioned Dychko L., M. Skorik, E. Stankovic, V. Kaminsky.

*Secondly, in the modern sacred music a number of works on canonical texts, not intended for performance in church was formed.* There have still not been analogues of this phenomenon, because the use of the canonical text in the mundane work was forbidden, which is strictly controlled by the censorship committee of the Synod. Bypassing the ban, A. Castalian first resorted to the translation of liturgical texts from the Church Slavonic language to Russian.

Today, we can name a number of works that combined the canonical text with out-of-church, concert genre and stylistic, such as the cycle of L. Pankratov “Three spirituals”, which included — “Silent Light”, “Queen of My Preblagaya”, “I believe”; chants of V. Grigorenko “Heavenly King”, “God, cleanse me, a sinner”, I. Sonevitskogo “Dirge”, Bishop Hilarion (Alfeeva) “St. Matthew Passion” and “Chernobyl Liturgy” Bishop Jonathan (Eletsikh), which premiered in Kiev, and a very remarkable is not only the existence of a Capella version of “Chernobyl Liturgy”, but version of the work accompanied by the orchestra.

Thus, the musical culture demonstrates, on the one hand, the desire to restore the lost, “cling to the roots” of religious life of the Church; On the other hand — never even earlier religious and spiritual culture as a whole, in all its forms, was not so turned to the *psychology of the individual*. For example, in modern printing appears literature, which raises serious theological questions, but it is addressed to a greater extent than to the clergy, but to simple laity. In music *it is the emergence of a large reservoir of works on canonical texts, but aimed at a secular version, reflecting the experience of a person with himself/herself, personal meanings*.

It is known that at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in all spheres of spiritual life of society there is a need to search intensified national roots, and ideologues of new tendencies in the development of sacred music began S. Smolensky and S. A. Castalsky engaged in research in the sphere of history of ancient art of singing, conductors and teachers, the author of treatments of ancient chants. In particular, A. Castalsky believed in the revival of the national foundations of church music, and his thought expressed regarding the meaning of the ancient znamenny chants was the basis for the entire ideology of the new direction. A look at the ancient choral formations, as the main source for the formation of a new type of musical thinking gave an opportunity to A. Castalsky to talk about the need to create a polyphonic tissue of a special type saturated with under-voice movement.

Studying the works of ancient singers and being a kind of musical and creative persons, Castalsky tried to understand the process of creating various compositions. Thus the researcher, by working with primary sources and as deep comprehension of ancient znamenny singing, watching the structural features, melodies, rhythms of ancient chants, came to the conclusion that the Western European harmonic functional basis is not suitable for registration of znamenny chants as major-minor system comes in contradiction with their singing structure.

Such thoughts suggest the occurrence of problems relating, in particular, to the relation of tradition and authorship. The phenomenon of the author's style, as well as the concept of “attribution” in general, becomes paradoxical traits in relation to the music (the singing) content of the Orthodox liturgical rank — the central element, and the main “sign” of Orthodox culture — or culture as an Orthodox phenomenon.

Through individual and author's musical language, expressed in the singing of the Orthodox liturgy, “personal meanings” are indicated (a term of Leontiev), therefore, unique structure of personal consciousness. The

author's style always expresses individualized psychological beginning, becomes a "personal poetics", i.e. the existence of personal experience, and as such its meaning is the opposition of catholicity — this major choral collective dominant of the Orthodox consciousness, semantic dominant of the Orthodox culture as a whole. Evolution of the Orthodox singing and the development of *musical and liturgical style* caused by it to the greatest extent is initiated by the author's style, that is, the realization of personal principle in the context of the Orthodox singing tradition; hence, the phenomenon of the author's style may be considered as a creative factor of this tradition — a necessary condition for its historical mobility. **Orthodox singing tradition becomes an autonomous musical and stylistic system as a unity of common usage and author's liturgical music and the language settings.**

On the other hand, the author's style is a symptom of the new European artistic consciousness and in his capacity as part of the Orthodox singing culture; In other words — it is a relatively late historical phenomenon, evolving on the basis of a fundamental, well-established tradition of community, subordinated to the requirements of collective worship, above all, Catholic — as the primary setting of the Orthodox consciousness.

Although the problem of catholicity as a dominant setup of the Orthodox consciousness mentioned in the pages of the work, it should be recalled that collegiality, understood as providing spiritual community towards the truth, it is only possible in the Church. However, community consciousness, even canonized religious cult area, not a constant size, acquires special features in each of the specific historical periods, which are related to its being so — has its own signs of cultural and historical implications, including their principles depending on the level and type of personality psychology. Category of catholicity is not a "frozen" semantic structure; because particularly urgent consideration of its historical dynamics — with regard to changes in the "image rights", including, in the image of "person of the liturgical".

A Byzantine version of Christianity, brought by the monks, artists and singers of Byzantium, started to interact with the Slavic paganism and features of the Slavic character. This mutual influence and mutual interpenetration generate a unique cultural phenomenon, as a church and church-singing culture of the Orthodox Church. Following the Byzantine Orthodoxy, Orthodox of Kiev Rus combines philosophical tendency to consider religion with a high assessment of the importance of the rite. As noted by P. Florensky, "together with the developed theosophy, where relations between the Persons of the Holy Trinity, between natures in the God-man,

the concept of the Church, salvation, immortality, and so on are clarified in the philosophical terms, a deep respect for rite is not less important in the east of religiosity, so that it is placed next to the execution and even higher performance of moral precepts” [2, p. 468]. In other words, respect for the integrity and in all detail the ritual has become one of the main concerns of the church. This attention extends to the side of the signing ceremony. Thus, the distinguishing feature of the Orthodox attitude to the Church is the advantage of participation in the cult and ritual over any preachy actions: direct participation in church life is much more important than the dry study of worship in the books. In turn, the cult of the Orthodox rite and extremely attentive to the most important moments of life is “the birth, death, marriage take place before the face of God and the blessed sacraments and worship” [2, p. 478].

But the creators of the singing part of the service to God had to go through the ecclesiastical life in the cult, in other words, the way they represented, first of all, the life within the church ceremony, the life of a “liturgical person”. It is this feature that was pointed out by S. Averintsev, when contrasted views on the work by the “modern European” and the medieval artists. He said that a “new European artist sees a “creator” and understands his work as “work”. Meanwhile, neither antique nor a medieval artist could do, though for entirely opposite reasons existed for the first biblical concept of God’s creative act, pulling things from nonexistence to existence, and the second, on the contrary, the concept had absolute concreteness without reserve places for rethinking the metaphorical” [1, p. 407].

It should be particularly emphasized that under canon, a canonical form P. Florensky *always implies* the *order* of human relations established *by the church and in the church* with the world, i.e. the world order. The structure of the Orthodox service, the actual rite, space and time — that is, temporal and spatial properties of liturgy, strictly canonized, and do not allow interference of the author, but the attitude to the spoken (sings) verbal text — a method of musical intonation — can be interpreted individually.

In relation to the verbal material chants there are two possible directions of the author’s freedom — individual stylistic choice, of course, in certain canonical stylistic boundaries: interpretation of the melodic horizontally, that is, the temporary expressive and intonation deployment of the canonical text (for example, in the works of A. Castalsky all choruses are extremely melodized while respecting the unity of sound character and the type of movement of choral voices); the formation of texturally-harmonic vertical as a specifically-musical way of organizing space (for example, in colorful



deployed compositions by A. Gretchaninov, Rachmaninov, P. Chesnokov uses a variety of divisi, dynamic effects, complex polyphonic harmony, elements of the polyphonic presentation, the neck, etc.).

Rhythm is common to these areas as the distribution of the significant moments of the sound; rhythmic side most clearly shows the degree of freedom of the author and the character of artistic emotion. In this regard, we should speak about specific ways of modeling emotions in the Orthodox singing *on special building of the “orthodox musical emotion”* and about its always positive estimates.

Even the most intense, “dramaturgically” highlights services essentially devoid of drama or pathos; the most powerful moments of meaning expressed objectively “calm”. Orthodox experience is directed to the integrity, uniformity and consistency of spiritual knowledge, raising above the episodic, fragmented, the transience of mental manifestations of personality. Hence, the special semantics of musical means, a special typology of psychological states (personal emotions) in the Orthodox musical culture, among which should be recognized as the leading peace of repose (removal of mental confusion, sobriety and cleansing in the Spirit), which is connected with assimilation and is required by his side. (This, in our opinion, expressed cathartic installation of the Orthodox consciousness. In addition, the word “peace”, “similarity”, “cathedral-collegiality-unction” in the Russian language have particularly deep and wide semantic associative field ...)

Author’s and individual stylistic features emphasize the importance of the Orthodox singing catholicity as “natural” existence of the tradition. Assimilation and repose, that is a leading cathartic installation of the Orthodox consciousness and its singing expression is the result of conciliar unity. In this regard the concept introduced by D. Likhachev about such stylistic direction in ancient literature as “appeasement psychological style” gets a new relevance; Likhachev considered this stylistic modus in connection with the subordination of the individual feelings of the “world” experience, i.e. the feeling of “the whole world”, together with the whole community; dissolution of individual personality in the collective consciousness is tranquility — not by chance in the Orthodox tradition, preference is given to a collective prayer.

Thus, the Orthodox tradition creates special demands on the semantic structure of personal consciousness and its cathartic properties. *The symbols of Orthodox Music also take on a different character, compared to the artistic one; The pursuit of the full indivisibility of the sign and meaning, form and sense is typical for it, while the autonomous artistic symbols increase the distance*

*between them, reveal the immensity of the values for a given sign form and variability of this sign form for this value.*

The **liturgical symbols in music** appear due to tightness of a certain method, a way of sounding for a certain prayer text, sustainability of its place in the service as a whole. Thus, *a prayer level acts as a factor of semantic stability* — semantic meaning of tightness specific musical elements, which allows the latter to enter the “generalized” musical intonation. As well as verbal, musical *generalized mark consists of simple elements of musical language.*

The semantic structure of a musical symbol is multilayered and designed to active work of the performing and audience perception. “Moreover, these meanings are not only equally present in the internal structure of the work, but also poured into each other: for example, in the form of cosmic equilibrium can, in their turn, only see a sign for the moral and social harmony of the human, but it is possible and meaningful change signified in some places, so the idea is to go from a human to a universal agreement” [1, p. 155]. The meaning of the symbol does not exist as a reality, but as a kind of a “job”. A symbol is impossible to explain with a simple logical formula, it can only be explained by relating “to further symbolic clutch” (S. Averincev), with newly acquired meaning.

Thus, following S. Averintsev, we can conclude that the canonical composer’s consciousness sought and found in the liturgical books, Scripture and in the church Tradition, “governing archetypes of the human condition, dignity and “rank” [1, p. 408]. These sources were becoming a kind of a “symbolic mirror”, in which each artist had to see and understand himself/herself.

Therefore, in general, the task of the author included in the symbolic mainstream of the Orthodox tradition, is fundamentally different from the secular composers and, above all, it is to attract the necessary **symbolic form** for the famous stable and unchanging religious meaning, to adopt a perpetual aspect of temporary, spiritual *usiya* — *by personal incarnation.*

#### REFERENCE LIST

1. S. Averintsev Poetics of the Early Byzantine literature / S. Averintsev. — S.-Pb.: Azbuka-Classics, 2004. — 408 p.
2. P. Florensky Orthodoxy / P. Florensky // Christianity and Culture. — Moscow: Ast, 2001. — S. 465–490.
3. Wellesz E. A history of Byzantine music and himnography / E. Wellesz. — Oxford: At the Clarendon press, 1949. — 494 p.

