

UDK 781(470):781.24(091)

Nina Zakharina

St. Petersburg State Museum of Theatre and Music
Državni muzej za gledališče in glasbo v St. Peterburgu

Works of Russian scholars of the 15th to 20th centuries in the field of notation

Dela ruskih znanstvenikov od 15. do 20. stoletja na področju notacije

Prejeto: 15. februar 2010
Sprejeto: 1. maj 2010

Received: 15th February 2010
Accepted: 1st May 2010

Ključne besede: nevmne, razreševanje, srednjeveška muzikologija

Keywords: neumes, deciphering, medieval musicology

IZVLEČEK

ABSTRACT

Podoba raziskovanja notacije je v Rusiji v premem sorazmerju z zgodovino pisanja o glasbi v naši deželi. Dela o nevmatski notaciji postavljajo začetek tradicije muzikologije v Rusiji v 15. stoletje. Na samem začetku 19. stoletja so nevmne raziskovali kot zgodovinski fenomen. Njihov izvor je postal osrednje vprašanje v 19. stoletju in njihovo razreševanje centralni problem raziskovanja v 20. stoletju. Na začetku 21. stoletja se raziskovalci ukvarjajo z delno notiranimi rokopisi, ki kažejo na ustno tradicijo.

The picture of the investigation of notation in Russia depends directly on history of musical writing in our country. The works on neumatic notation opened the tradition of musicology in Russia in the XV c. In the very beginning of the XIX c. neumes were examined as a historical phenomenon. The origin of Russian neumes became the central question in the XIX c., a central problem in the research of the XX c. was deciphering Russian neumes. In the very beginning of the XXI c. scholars pay attention to partly notated manuscripts, which reflect an oral tradition.

The research into Russian notation is closely connected with the history of musical writing in our country. In 988 Ancient Rus was baptized. It was part of the Eastern World of Christianity with Greece in its center, but the way Christianity came from Byzantium to Russia still remains an open question. According to hypothesis of Priselkov, the Christianization of Rus proceeded from Okhrida (Bulgaria, now Macedonia), and later, from

11th century AD, from Constantinople¹. Together with Christianity Ancient Rus received a writing and a musical writing, too. Byzantine neumes were accepted and developed by the Slavs, so Old Russian notations were born: *znamenny* and *kondakarny*. Later Russia became the only country in the Slavonic world which preserved and cultivated neumatic writing up to the very beginning of the 18th century; and among old believers it has reached our days. New kinds of neumatic notations were invented: *demestvenny*, *putny* and *Kazanskoye znamia*.

That is why the majority of Russian musicologists, who work in the field of notation, study Russian neumes, some deal with notations of Greece or Western Europe and with contemporary musical writing, and a few scholars touch upon the problems of antique notation². This article deals with Russian neumatic notation.

Those were scholarly works on neumatic notation, which opened the tradition of musicology in Russia. The first musicological work is *Imena Znamianiem* (The names of signs) by anonymous author. At the end of the XV c. it was placed in the codex of monk Eufrosin³. The first Russian work in the field of musical theory is one page, which contains musical signs with their names. This is the first time the word *znamia* (sign) was used in the meaning of musical sign, sign of neumatic notation. The page has the names of neumes followed by their pictures: *polkoul(ismy)*, *povodna*, *pojezdna*, *gromn(a)*, *osok(a)*, *kriuk*, *kriuk svet(lyj)*, *s dvema ochk(y)*, *polna(ja) chasha*, *besedk(a)*, *rozhek*, *kobyłka*, *triask(a)*, *sechka*, *zakry(tja)*, *zakrytja svet(laja)*, *zmeits(a)*, *derbitsa*, *paou(k)*, *paouk velik(ij)*, *khamila*, *stat(ia)*, *statia avey(laja)*, *kluch*, *pereviazka*, *slozh(itja)*, *palka*, *palka svet(laja)*, *dva v che(lnou)*, *sorochja (nozhka)*, *mechik*, *kryzh*, *strela sve(tlaja)*, *zdernut(aja)*, *golou(bchik)*, *koulisma*, *chelus(tka)*, *zeln(aja)*, *fita*, *stopits(a)*, *sve(tlaja)*, *zapiataja*.

The last term is written in the centre of the line, designating the very end of the text. D.S.Shabalın supposes the work to contain mistakes. But I prefer the opinion of Z.M.Guseinova, who writes that in this manuscript we can see a preliminary version of "listing". She also supposes, that it is a copy of the original text, because many terms are abbreviated. I have an objection to that as all Russian musical terms first appeared in an abbreviated form, and then – in their full form. For example, *dem – demestvenny*, *pout – putny*, *Log – Loginovo* etc. So, this may well be an autograph of the scholarly work.

An old Russian "listing" has a direct Byzantine prototype well known among scholars. I suppose, that the first Russian musicologist knew the Byzantine theory of music and the Greek language as well. But he did not copy the Greek source, he created the Russian one, writing names of signs used by old Russian singers.

The corpus of musical terminology in the first Russian musicological work demonstrates strata which shows the process of assimilation of Byzantine notation by Russian

¹ M.D.Priselkov, *Istoria russkogo letopisania XI–XV vv.* (St.Petersburg, 1996).

² *Ars notandi: Notatsia v meniauschemia mire: Materialy mezhdunarodnoi nauchnoi konferentsii, posviaschennoi tysiacheletnemu yubileu Gvido Aretinskogo* (Moskva, 1997); Rimma Pospelova *Zapadnaya notatsia XI – XIV vekov: Na materiale traktatov* (Moskva, 2003); Stanislav Englin, *Novy metod ladofunktsionalnogo analiza antichnykh notograficheskikh pamiatnikov: Avtoref* (St.Petersburg, 2005).

³ Now this codex is in the National library of Russia, department of manuscripts, fund 351 (the library of Kirillo-Belozersky monastery), № 9/1086. It is published: Z.M.Guseinova, *Rukovodstva po teorii znamennngk penia XV veka: Istochniki i redaktsii* in *Drevherusskaya pevcheskaya kultura i knizhnost* (Leningrad, 1990), p. 28.

singers. There are some terms of Byzantine origin: *kulizma* (to *kilisma*), *paraklit* (o *paráklitos*), *khamila* (i *chamili*), but the neumes under these names are not Greek. Other terms are certainly Russian.

The main principle of the term formation is visual resemblance between neume and an object. For example, the neume *kriuk* looks like a hook, *chashka* like a cup, *mechik* is like a sword, *strela* resembles an arrow etc. All these objects were quite usual in people's life in the XI–XV centuries, and are still quite recognizable. They show that Russian singers used to name neumes according to their experience, and didn't trouble themselves with the Greek theory of music.

The analyses of this work shows that the first Russian musicologist knew the Greek language, the Greek theory of music, probably sang in a choir, and knew Russian musical instruments. There are two signs in this list, which remind of musical instruments: *rozhok* (a woodwind instrument like a horn or clarion) and *kobyłka* (a bridge of a Russian string instrument *goudok*)⁴.

The next step the theoretical work was a creation of *tolkovania* (explanations) under the title *kako poetsia* («how to sing»). There are two kinds of explanations: professional and sacral. In the first one the singing of each neume is explained from the point of view of the vocal technique. *Kriuk* marks the need to proclaim (*vozglasiti*), it is the accent in the melody, showing when the singer has to raise his voice, *strela – potianut* (to protract), *statia – postoyati* (to stand) is a close, *goloubchik borzyj garknuti iz gortani* (to shout from the larynx), probably means that the melody goes up from the lower register to the higher. The basic meaning of neumes is not a pitch, not a rhythm, but the intonation, the quality of singing. Each term (*vozglasiti*, *stupiti*, *posyojati*) explains what the singer has to do to achieve the necessary effect.

In the XIth c. Guido from Arezzo wrote, that a teacher should explain the meaning of each neume to the pupil. So, the knowledge of singing was preserved in oral tradition⁵. Four centuries later an unknown Russian musician fixed this knowledge on paper.

Another kind of “explanation” is a theological interpretation of old Russian neumes that appeared in the beginning of the XVI c. The name of each neume is accompanied with a didactical phrase, the first letter of the name being the same as the first letter of the commentary. The formulas of the commentaries resemble the quotations from Nil Sorsky (it was mentioned by N.Ramazanova⁶). He was the head of the movement of the Russian clergy in the end of the XV c. that proclaimed the purity of the monastery life and renunciation of material welfare. For example, «*ot vsiakikh strastej dushellennykh krepko sobhudatisia i otbegati*» by Nil Sorsky and «*zmeitsa da zemnyja suetnyja slavy otbeg*» in the musical theory; «*delanije serdechnoe*» and «*stopitsa s ochkom sokrushenie serdechnoe v pokajanii o gresekh k Bogu*» and «*statia sramoslovija i sueslovija otbeganije*», «*myslennoje bludenie*» and «*kriuk krotkoje uma bliudenie ot zol.*»

⁴ N.B.Zakharina, 'K vorosu ob otrazhenii muzykalnogo instrumentaria v drevnerusskikh teoreticheskikh rukovodstvakh po tserkovnomu peniu' in Muzei teatra I muzyki v mezhdunarodnom prostranstve (St.Petersburg, 2008), p. 260-269.

⁵ Pospelova, p. 314.

⁶ N.V.Ramazanova, 'Pevcheskie rukopisnye knigi Kirillo-Belozerskogo monastyrja' in Monastyrskaya traditsia v drevnerusskom pevcheskom iskusstve: K 600-letiu Kirillo-Belozerskogo monastyrja, sost.A.N.Kruchinina, N.B.Zakharina (Sanct-Peterburg, 2000), p. 8-15.

The first copy of this theological interpretation was written by Goury Tushin, the pupil of Nil Sorsky. That is why we can surmise that this kind of musicological work was invented by Goury.

The first signed theoretical work is *Kliuch znamenny* by Monk Khristofor, written in the 1604⁷. In the end of the XVI c. *putny* neumes were invented. *Putny rospev* (or music style) was known in Russia from the end of the XVth c. In the early period it was written by *znamenny* neumes or wasn't written at all, existing in oral tradition. But from the end of the XVI c. many hymns and chant books appeared, written with *putny* neumes.

Putny rospev is very closely connected with *znamenny* one. Comparing *putny* and *znamenny* tunes of the same literary text, we can see common place of culmination, and what we can definite as a melodical idea. It can be a melodical wave or its mirror inversion, passing from one register to another and so on. *Znamenny* chant is the basis of *putny*.

Khristofor wrote several manuscripts, and there are two notated ones among them. These manuscripts have been preserved in the archives. The manuscript dated 1602 is now in the funds of the State Historical museum. It contains only *putny* hymns notated by *putny* neumes. Then, in 1604 Khristofor wrote another book, which he gave to the library of Kirillo-Belozersk monastery, now kept at the National library of Russia. This book consists of *znamenny* chants and contains *Kliuch znamenny*. Three parts of *Kliuch* are devoted to *putny* notation. It is a list of neumes, *Grany* which is the explanation of *putny* neumes with *znamenny* ones.

The third part is *soglasnik*. In this part Khristofor compares 3 melodical segments (or lines) with similar text. First line is *znamenny*, second line is *putny* and 3d line is *znamenny*, but in this line there are no difficult or mysterious neumes (this is *rozvod*). It is an open question, which line, 1st or 2nd, is deciphered in the 3d. Khristofor, who had created *putny* and *znamenny* manuscripts, generalized his experience in this theoretical work.

The title *Klutch znamenny* (the key of signs) is significant for the medieval Russian culture. There is an authentic term *tajnozamknenny* (secret and locked). It means that the reading of neume depends on the context (or whole formula). Neumes, notation is a very mysterious thing, so we must have a key to understand it. Khristofor was the first person who used term *Kluch* in that meaning, later this term became rather usual for Old Russian theory of music.

The next stage of the investigation of the notation in Russia is works, which contain the explanation of so called *kinovarnye pomety* (cinnabar red marks). Red marks appeared in Russian musical manuscripts in the XVII c. Before that time there was no significations of pitch. One or, more often, two points in the picture of the sign meant that this sound or sounds are to be sung in a high register. The special Old Russian term for it is *svetlyj* (light). But the pitch wasn't signified exactly.

Original works of red marks' inventors have not reached our days. The scholarly works contain an explanation of some marks at the minimum or explanation of the system, story about invention and names of inventors with citing of author's material

⁷ Khristofor. *Kliuch znamenny*, 1604, publ. by M.Brazhnikov i G.Nikishov, Pamiatniki drevneru sskogo pevcheskogo iskusstva, 9 (Moskva: Muzyka, 1983).

at most. A contemporary scholar Vorobjev attempted to reconstruct the treatise of Ivan Shaydur on the basis of citing⁸.

The earlier source is some words in the manuscript of National library of Russia Sol. 621/660 (30-40th y. of the XVII c., f. 162 r.)⁹. In the form of question and answer the writer explains the red marks used in this very manuscript. As one can conclude, each mark is the first letter of some term. The author mentions eight marks. Four of them designate the way of singing: *borzo*, *tikho*, *postoi*, *skoro*, but we don't know exactly what they mean. Later this type of marks received a name *ukazatelnye*. Two marks designate a register of singing: *nizko* (low) and *vysoko* (high). Two other marks remain unknown (*M* and *rovno*).

There were different systems of red marks in Russia. Now scholars know about 10 texts of the XVII c., devoted to them. These works are often placed together within the same manuscript. The manuscripts are the following: State library of Russia, f. 379, № 1, № 2, № 4, № 315; f. 299, № 212, National library of Russia, O XVII № 19; Sol. 690\757. Publications by Shabalin and Guseinova¹⁰.

The most popular was the system of Alexander Mezenets. The red mark is written near the neume and usually marks the highest pitch in the intonation of sign. But one can mark all the sounds in this intonation. In this case we can sing the melody without neumes; the neume signifies rhythm only. So, the red marks is an independent type of notation, a sort of letter one. As other letter notations - ancient Greek or West European, it signifies the pitch first of all. That was Alexander Mezenets who improved the red marks and brought them into all the chant manuscripts.

Alexander Mezenets was a member of the State Committee for Correction of Chant Books, which was formed in 1668. Notation was the main object of its work. The results of the correction Mezenets placed in the scholarly treatise *Izveshchenie ezhe hotiashchim uchitisia peniju*.

In this outstanding work he gave a new system of classification of neumes. The quantity of sounds which each neume signifies lies in the basis of this system. Neumes are *edinoglasostepennnye*, which signifies one sound (*stepen* means a degree in Russian musical theory, *glas* in this case is one sound), *dvoeglasnye* - two sounds and so on. Neumes, which signify more than two sounds, are divided into three groups. The first is where the melody goes *gore* (upstairs), the second where the melody goes *dolu* (downstairs) and the third - *vospiatoglasnye* - the melody has a turning.

That was Mezenets who preserved the neumatic notation while other musicians wanted to write church hymns by staff, five-line notation. But neither Mezenets, nor his opponents, have medieval way of thinking with music. It was high time to accept the staff notation. The Mezenets's system of neumes with red marks was used for thirty years. And in the very beginning of the XVIII c. the five-line notation was accepted.

In the XVII c. Russian church divided in two parts: the official church with patriarch Nykon in its head and that of old-believers. The subject of differences was the editing of

⁸ E.Vorobyov "Stroki" Ivana Shaidura', in Aspirantsky sbornik, vyp. 2 (M., 2004), P. 31-56

⁹ Publication by I.F.Bezuglova 'Muzykalnaya deiatelnost solovetskikh inokov; Po pevcheskim rukopisiam Solovetskogo sobraniya' in Istochnirovedcheskoe izuchenie pamiatnikov pismennoi kultury (Leningrad, 1990), p. 39-50 (47).

¹⁰ Pevcheskie azbuki Drevnei Rusi, publ. D.Shabalin (Kemerovo:kusbassvuzizdat, 1991); Z. M. Guseinova, "Izveschenie" Alexandra Mezenetsa i teoria muzyki XVII veka (St. Petersburg, 1994).

liturgical books, but the symbol of schism is a way of crossing with two or three fingers. The later (old-believers) decided to continue the medieval tradition of musical writing, so in the XVIII c. neumes were connected with old-believers, who used this type of notation with its theory. It must be noted, that old-believers copied and used the work of Mezenets, the last word in the musicology of the XVII century.

While old-believers preserved neumatic notations, the majority of Russian people forgot it and were using staff notation. In the very beginning of the XIX c. the interest to neumes revived and they were examined as a historical phenomenon.

The origin of Russian neumes became the central question in the XIX c. Bishop Theoktist (Mochulsky)¹¹ and Metropolitan Eugeny (Bolkhovitinov)¹² decided, that the prototype of Russian neumes was the letters of Greek or Arabic alphabets; the neumes were received from Greece.

The scholars of the next generations - Razumovsky, Metallov, - supported the idea of the Byzantine origin of Russian neumes. Metallov supposed that the neumes were the fixation of heironomic gesture. The important event was an expedition to the mount Athos in the 1906. It was organized by the Society of Lovers of Ancient Writing and Art with financial support of count Sheremetev. Smolensky, who was at the head of the expedition, took a lot of photos of Byzantine manuscripts which became a material for comparative research. Smolensky saw neumes look like Russian ones and concluded that Russian music was imported to Greece. Antonin Preobrazhensky, on the contrary, supposed that Byzantine neumes were the prototype of the Russian musical writing. Now Preobrazhensky's ideas lie in the basis of comparative research in Russia and abroad.

In the 1859 Sakharov listed znamenny neumes and classified them into two groups: *kriuki* and letters of Greek origin¹³.

In the beginning of the XXth c. two special works about Russian notations were published: that by Smolensky¹⁴ and by Metallov¹⁵. Smolensky, Metallov declared the stages of development of neumes. Smolensky saw the renovation of neumes in the 2nd half of the XIII c., Metallov saw it in the 2nd half of the XV c. Both were right. We can see the changes in the neumes in those periods but the detailed research hasn't been done until today.

During the Soviet period there was great pause in the investigation of church music. Only two scholars, Brazhnikov and Uspensky, kept this scientific tradition. As to notation, it remained the object of musicology, and in the works on the history of music there are descriptions of old Russian neumes, but it is very difficult to speak about neumes without hymnography, liturgy and other attributes of church music.

In 1962 a special work about notation appeared, written by V.M.Beliayev¹⁶. He reviewed scholars' statements about each kind of Old Russian notation and gave his own opinions. The most interesting hypothesis is that about relations between *putnaja*,

¹¹ Feoktist (Mochulsky), Rukovodstvo k notnomu prostomu tserkovnomu peniu... (St.Petersburg, 1813).

¹² Istoricheskoe rassuzhdenie voobshe o drevnem khristianskom bogoslužebnom penii... (Voronezh, 1799)

¹³ I.Sakharov, 'Issledovania o russkom tserkovnom pesnopenii' in Zhurnal ministerstva narodnogo prosvещения, 1859, № 7, 8.

¹⁴ S.Smolensky, O drevnerusskikh pevcheskikh notatsiakh, Pamiatniki drevnei pismennosti I iskusstva, 145 (St.Petersburg: OLDP, 1901)

¹⁵ V.M.Metallov, Russkaya semiografia (Moskva, 1912).

¹⁶ V.M.Beliayev, Drevnerusskaya muzykalnaya pismennost (Moskva: Sovietyky kompozitor, 1962).

demestvennaja notations and *Kazanskoje znamia*. Beliaev supposed that these were different terms of the same notation used for the main voice of early Russian multipart music – *strochnoie*. Brazhnikov and Shindin, on the other hand, believed them to be three different ones.

Following the specialists in the field of Gregorian chant, Russian scholars supposed that neumes did not have a precise meaning, they only reminded of a tune. One could not sing the unknown melody using the neumes¹⁷.

Uspensky supported a very interesting hypothesis about *kondakarny* neumes. It is a very mysterious type. Only 5 manuscripts with this type of notation have preserved in the archives; there are also about 5 or 6 fragments in manuscripts with another type of notation. All of them have been written between the very end of the XIth c. and the very beginning of the XV c. Nobody knows how to read this notation. There is no Greek prototype of *Kondakarny* neumes. It must exist, because all Russian writing is closely connected with the Greek one, but it does not exist.

There is a hypothesis that the highest line of *kodakarny* notation is a picture of the gesture of domestic, or heironomic gesture¹⁸.

The most important person in Russian musical medievalistics of the 2nd half of the XX c. was M.V. Brazhnikov. He was a musicologist and a composer, and he used intonational formulas of *znamenny* chant in his music, especially in the concert for the piano with orchestra. He had about 10 pupils, and they had pupils too, so Brazhnikov's school has survived till nowadays.

Brazhnikov offered the method of analysis of the *znamenny* notation of the oldest period¹⁹. He divided all the neumes into two groups: those which pass through the ages (the pivot) and neumes which live during some period and then are out of use. If a manuscript is notated with neumes of the pivot only, it has an archaic prototype.

Brazhnikov examined old Russian theoretical works from the point of view of palaeography, the terminology used²⁰. It was him who divided them into listing, explanation, *kokizniki*, *fitniki*, and defined the time of appearance of each type.

Brazhnikov divided signs of *znamenny* notation into families. Signs are united into a family according to the way of performance. So, *kriuk* is to be proclaimed. The family of *kriuk* consists of main picture *kriuk prostoi* and those with supplementary elements.

Other families consist of different pictures. There are signs which are to be *vygnuti* (bent). It means that the melody goes downstairs. They are *palka*, *stopitsa s ochkom* and *podchashia*.

The division into families is very useful for the investigation of history of a musical text. If we compare two copies of the same hymn, we certainly see the differences, because old Russian writers didn't copy the hymn mechanically, they made corrections or mistakes. If we can see neumes of the same family under the same syllables in two copies, these are really two copies of the hymn. If we see neumes of different families - they are not copies, they are versions, or wordings.

¹⁷ See: N.D.Uspensky, *Drevnerusskoe evcheskoe iskusstvo*, 2nd ed. (Moskva, 1971), p. 36; V.M.Beliaev, *Drevnerusskaya muzykalnaya pismennost*, p. 35.

¹⁸ N.D.Uspensky, *Drevnerusskoe evcheskoe iskusstvo*, p. 55.

¹⁹ M.V.Brazhnikov, *Russkaya pevcheskaya paleographia*, red. N.S.Seriogina (StPetersburg, 2002).

²⁰ M.V.Brazhnikov, *Drevnerusskaya teoriya muzyki: Po rukopisnym materialam XV-XVIII v.* (Leningrad: Muzyka, 1972).

Another Brazhnikov's idea was to examine the term *stroka* (line). In the Old Russian »explanations« this term means the center of musical scale (other sources give other explanations: the part of musical form, the line, or any voice of choir). Some of signs defined according to *stroka*: *kiuk*, *strela*, *zapiataja*. For example: *strela prostaia potianuti ne vyshe stroki i ne nizhe* (*strela prostaia* to protract neither lower, nor higher than *stroka*). Brazhnikov placed these neumes onto virtual scale, reconstructing the pitch of each neume. We can decode melodies of the time when the term *stroka* was used. It is the period from the very beginning to the end of the XVI c. Already monk Khristofor did not use the term »stroka« in his Kluch znamenny.

After 1960 there was not yet a work which surveyed all the kinds and periods of Russian musical writing. Each author concentrates on one problem. The central problem in the research of 1970 – 2000 was deciphering Russian neumes.

Sergey Frolov and independently Dmitry Shabalin made a sort of statistical work²¹. They accounted how often each red mark was used with a certain neume. They wanted to reconstruct the precise pitch of each neume, but were not successful. Each neume was followed by different red marks. I think, this fact shows that the fixing of pitch was not the main task of neumatic notation.

Albina Kruchinina, has introduced a very useful method of deciphering²². She collected musical formulas from the scholarly works of the end of the XVII c. written with red marks and explained by »prostoye znamya – rozvod« simple neumes. Graphic formulas of the end of the XVI c. can be read according to their reading in the end of the XVII c. In 1984 the Academy Capella performed Russian passions deciphered by Kruchinina and it was an outstanding event in the musical life of Saint-Petersburg.

Svetlana Kravchenko made the same work with another type of musical formulas - *fity*, the melismatic ones²³.

Zivar Guseinova deals with notation of XII c.²⁴ She divided neumes into elements. There are 6 main elements. Each neume is one element or a combination of several elements. Then Guseinova compared them with their direct Greek prototypes: the paleobyzantine coislin notation and concluded that the elements are the same, but the combinations are different. The problem of adaptation of the Byzantine neumes in Russia has been solved. Then, believing that *znamennaja* notation of the XII c. is monosemantic, she made an attempt to decode the musical meaning of neumes through many logical operations. Guseinova put neumes to the staff (without key) and found a place on musical scale for each neume.

In the 1987 a collection of articles was published devoted to problems of deciphering of different notations²⁵: *znamennaja* (articles by Kondratovich, Guseinova, Shabalin,

²¹ S.V.Frolov, 'K probleme zvukovysotnosti bespomnetnoi notatsii' in Problemy istorii i teorii drevnerusskoj muzyki (Leningrad: Muzyka, 1979); D.S.Shabalin, Problemy deshifrovki bespomnetnogo znamennogo rospeva XV – serediny XVII vekov: Autoref. (Moskva, 1986).

²² A.N.Kruchinina, 'Popevka znamennogo rospeva v russkoi muzykalnoi teorii XVII veka' in Pevcheskoe nasledie Drevnei Rusi: Istoria, teoria, estetika (St.Petersburg: Ut, 2002), p. 46-150.

²³ S.P.Kravchenko, Fbty znamennogo rospeva na materiale pevcheskoi knigi «Prazdniki»: Avtoref. dis. (Leningrad, 1981)

²⁴ Z.M.Guseinova, Printsypy sistematsizatsii drevnerusskoi pismennosti XI-XIV vekov: K probleme deshifrovki znamennoi notatsii: Autoref. dis. (Leningrad, 1982)

²⁵ Problemy deshifrovki drevnerusskikh notatsij: sb.nauch.tr., ed. by S.P.Kravchenko, A.N.Kruchinina (St.Petersburg: LOLGK, 1987).

Zvereva, Kravchenko), *putnaja* (Bogomolova), *demestvennaja* (Pozhidaeva), five-line *kievskaja* (Kholopov). A series of articles on the topic appeared in other books: article of Shindin²⁶ about *putnaja* notation, that of Yefimova²⁷ about *strannye pomety* (modulating red marks), of Mosyagina²⁸ about red marks.

In the very beginning of the XXI c. Zabolotnaya²⁹ paid attention to partly notated manuscripts, where neumes don't mark each syllable of text, but several, sometimes a few. A singer knew melody by heart, and the neumes pointed out the most difficult intonations. Investigation into this kind of notation expands the range of old Russian musical sources. The last work in this field is a dissertation of E.E. Pletneva³⁰, who is developing Zabolotnaya's ideas.

An investigation of the notation in Russia is continuing. Now scholars know the types of notation and their origin, we can hear many hymns created in the XVI – XVII c., both one-voiced and multipart. But the Russian notation has a lot of secrets yet, and scholars have to unravel the mysteries with modern research methods: the compilation of neumes repertoire, classification, investigation into medieval theory of music. It is very important to know the main task of the neumatic notation. In this field the investigation of notation is closely connected with the history of music and with the research into the way of musical thinking.

Bibliography

Ars notandi: Notatsia v meniauschemsia mire: Materialy mezhdunarodnoi nauchnoi konferentsii, posviaschennoi tysiacheletnemu yubileju Gvido Aretinskogo (Moskva, 1997), 124 p. ISBN 5-89598-009-0

Azbuka znamennoogo penia (Izveschenie o soglasneishikh pometakh) startsa Alexandra Mezentsa. S.l., Bratstvo "Vertograd", 7510 (2002), 11 f., [2], 208 p.

I.V. Bakhmutova etc. 'Kolichestvennoe issledovanie polnogo varianta Oktoikha v znamennoi forme zapisi' in Kulturnoye nasledie Srednievekovoi Rusi v thaditsiakh Uralo-Sibirskogo staroobriadchestva, (Novosibirsk, 1999), pp. 420-439.

I.F. Bezuglova, 'Muzykalnaya deiatelnost solovetskikh inokov; Po pevcheskim rukopisiam Solovetskogo sobrania' in Istochnirovedcheskoe izuchenie pamiatnikov pismennoi kultury (Leningrad, 1990), pp. 39-50.

²⁶ B.A. Shindin, 'Notatsia pevcheskoi rukopisi Solovetskogo sobrania № 752/690' in Problemy istorii russkoi i sovetskoi muzyki, sb. tr. Akademii muzyki im. Gnesinykh, 34 (Moskva, 1977), p. 112-120.

²⁷ I.V. Yefimova, 'Pamiatniki russkogo strochnogo mnogogolosa v rukopisi sobrania P.P. Viazemskogo' in Istochnirovedcheskoe izuchenie pamiatnikov pismennoi kultury: Poetika drevnerusskogo pevcheskogo iskusstva (St. Petersburg, 1992), p. 172-209.

²⁸ N.V. Mosiagina (Sushkivich), 'Osobennosti formirovaniya notirovannykh sbornikov nachala 17 v.' in Gimnologia (Moskva, 2000), p. C.319 - 325; N.V. Mosiagina, 'Domezentsevskie pomety v teoreticheskikh rukovodstvakh I rospevakh 17 v.' in Pevcheskoe nasledie Drevnei Rusi: Istorija, teorija, estetika (St. Petersburg: Ut, 2002), p. 159-163; N.V. Mosiagina, 'Strannye pomety v znamennoi notatsii vtoroi oloviny 17 veka' in 16 ezhegodnaya Bogoslovskaya konferentsia Pravoslavnogo Sviato-Tikhonovskogo Gumanitarnogo Universiteta, T. 2 (Moskva, 2006), p. 343-348; N.V. Mosiagina, 'K probleme arkhaiskogo intonirovaniya: «Kryzhevye» priznaki v znamennoi notatsii kontsa 17 veka' in Golos v kulture: Artikuliatsia i tembr (St. Petersburg, 2007), p. 78-86.

²⁹ I.V. Zabolotnaya 'Tserkovno-pevcheskie rukopisi Drevnei Rusi XI-XIV vekov: osnovnye tipy knig v istoriko-funktionalnom aspekte (Moskva, 2001).

³⁰ E.V. Pletniova 'Notatsia v pesnopeniakh Oktoikhov izbornykh I Shestodnevov Sluzhebnykh' in 13 ezhegodnaya Bogoslovskaya konferentsia Pravoslavnogo Sviato-Tikhonovskogo Gumanitarnogo Universiteta (Moskva, 2003).

V.M.Beliayev, Drevnerusskaya muzykalnaya pismennost (Moskva: Soviety sky kompozitor, 1962).

M.V.Bogomolova, 'O repertuare grecheskogo rospeva v zapisi "grecheskoi" notatsiei' in Germemevtika revnerusskoi literatury, 4, XVII – nachalo XVIII v., pp. 256-285.

M.V.Brazhnikov, Drevnerusskaya teoriya muzyki: Po rukopisnym materialam XV-XVIII v. (Leningrad: Muzyka, 1972), 423 pp.

M.V.Brazhnikov, Russkaya pevcheskaya paleographia, red. N.S.Seriogina (St.-Petersburg, 2002).

M.V.Brazhnikov, Statyi o drevnerusskoi muzyke (L.: Muzyka, 1975), 296, 32 p.

S. Englin, Novy metod ladofunktsionalnogo analiza antichnykh notograficheskikh pamiatnikov: Avtoref (St.Petersburg, 2005), 24 pp.

Feoktist (Mochulsky), Rukuvodstvo k notnomu prostomu tserkovnomu peniu... (St. Petersburg, 1813), [4], 11 pp.

S.V.Frolov, 'K probleme zvukovysotnosti bespomnetnoi notatsii' in Problemy istorii I teorii drevnerusskoj muzyki (Leningrad: Muzyka, 1979), pp. 124-147.

Z.M.Guseinova, Printsypy sistemizatsii drevnerusskoi pismennosti XI-XIV vekov: K probleme deshifrovki znamennoi notatsii: Avtoref. dis. (Leningrad, 1982), 19 pp.

Z.M.Guseinova, 'Rukovodstva po teorii znamenno go penia XV veka: Istochniki i redatsii' in Drevherusskaya pevcheskaya kultura i knizhnost (Leningrad, 1990), p. 20-46.

Istoricheskoe rassuzhdenie voobsche o drevnem khristianskom bogosluzhebno m penii... (Voronezh, 1799), [4], 26 pp.

Khristofor. Kliuch znamenny, 1604, publ. by M.Brazhnikov i G.Nikishov, Pamiatniki drevnerusskogo pevcheskogo iskusstva, 9 (Moskva: Muzyka, 1983), 293 pp.

S.P.Kravchenko, Fity znamenno go rospeva na materiale pevcheskoi knigi »Prazdniki«: Avtoref. dis. (Leningrad, 1981), 23 pp.

A.N.Kruchinina, 'Popevka znamenno go rospeva v russkoi muzykalnoi teorii XVII veka' in Pevcheskoe nasledie Drevnei Rusi: Istorია, teoriya, estetika (St.Petersburg: Ut, 2002), pp. 46-150.

Z.M.Guseinova, »Izveschenie« Alexandra Mezentsa i teoriya muzyki XVII veka (St. Petersburg, 1994), 217 pp.

V.M.Metallov, Russkaya semiografia (Moskva, 1912), [2], 118, 119 pp.

N.V.Mosiagina (Sushkievich), 'Osobennosti formirovaniya notirovannykh sbornikov nachala 17 v.' in Gimnologia (Moskva, 2000), pp. 319 – 325.

N.V.Mosiagina, Domezentsevskie pomety v teoreticheskikh rukovodstvakh I rospevakh 17 v.' in Pevcheskoe nasledie Drevnei Rusi: Istorია, teoriya, estetika (St.Petersburg: Ut, 2002), pp. 159-63.

N.V.Mosiagina, '«Strannye pomety» v znamennoi notatsii vtoroi olovinny 17 veka' in 16 ezhegodnaya Bogoslovskaya konferentsia Pravoslavno go Sviato-Tikhonovskogo Gumanitarnogo Universiteta, t. 2 (Moskva, 2006), pp. 343-348.

N.V.Mosiagina, 'K probleme arkhaicheskogo intonirovaniya: »Kryzhevye« priznaki v znamennoi notatsii kontsa 17 veka' in Golos v kulture: Artikuliatsiya I tembr (St-Petersburg, 2007), pp. 78-86.

Pevcheskie azbuki Drevnei Rusi, publ. D.Shabalin (Kemerovo:kusbassvuzizdat, 1991). 277 p.

E.V.Pletniova, 'Notatsia v pesnopeniakh Oktoikhov izbornykh i Shestodnevo Sluzhebnykh' in 13 ezhegodnaya Bogoslovskaya konferentsia Pravoslavnogo Sviato-Tikhonovskogo Gumanitarnogo Universiteta (Moskva, 2003), pp. 443-451.

R. Pospelova, Zapadnaya notatsia XI - XIV vekov: Na materiale traktatov (Moskva, 2003), 416 pp.

M.D.Priselkov, Istorია russkogo letopisania XI-XV vv. (St.Petersburg, 1996), 352 pp.

Problemy deshifrovki drevnerusskikh notatsij: sb.nauch.tr., ed. by S.P.Kravchenko, A.N.Kruchinina (St.Petersburg: LOLGK, 1987), 200 pp.

N.V.Ramazanova, 'Pevcheskie rukopisnye knigi Kirillo-Belozerskogo monastyria' in Monastyrskaya traditsia v drevnerusskom pevcheskom iskusstve: K 600-letiu Kirillo-Belozerskogo monastyria, sost A.N.Kruchinina, N.B.Zakharina (Sanct-Peterburg, 2000), pp. 8-15.

I.P.Sakharov, 'Issledovania o russkom tserkovnom pesnopenii' in Zhurnal ministerstva narodnogo prosveschenia, 1859, № 7, 8.

D.S.Shabalin, Problemy deshifrovki bespometnogo znamenno rospeva XV - serediny XVII vekov: Autoref. (Moskva, 1986), 21 pp.

B.A.Shindin, 'Notatsia pevcheskoi rukopisi Solovetskogo sobrania № 752/690' in Problemy istorii russkoi I sovietskoi muzyki, sb. tr. Akademii muzyki im. Gniesinykh, 34 (Moskva, 1977), pp. 112-120.

S.V.Smolensky, O drevnerusskikh pevcheskikh notatsiakh, Pamiatniki drevnei pismenosti I iskusstva, 145 (St.Petersburg: OLDP, 1901), 2, 120 pp.

N.D.Uspensky, Drevnerusskoe evcheskoe iskusstvo, 2nd ed. (Moskva, Sovetsky kompozitor, 1971), 623 pp.

E.Vorobyov "'Stroki" Ivana Shaidura', in Aspirantsky sbornik, vyp. 2 (M., 2004), pp. 31-56.

I.V.Yefimova, 'Pamiatniki russkogo strochno mnogogolosia v rukopisi sobrania P.P.Viazemskogo' in Istochnirovedcheskoe izuchenie pamiatnikov pismennoi kultury: Poetika drevnerusskogo pevcheskogo iskusstva (St.Petersburg, 1992), pp.172-209.

I.V. Zabolotnaya, Tserkovno-pevcheskie rukopisi Drevnei Rusi XI-XIV vekov: osnovnye tipy knig v istoriko-funktsionalnom aspekte (Moskva, 2001), 250 pp.

N.B.Zakharina, 'K voprosu ob otrazhenii muzykalnogo instrumentaria v drevnerusskikh teoreticheskikh rukovodstvakh po tserkovnomu peniu' in Muzei teatra I muzyki v mezhdunarodnom prostranstve (St.Petersburg, 2008), pp. 260-269.

Бахмутова И.В. и др. Количественное исследование полного варианта Октоиха в знаменной форме записи // Культурное наследие Средневековой Руси в традициях Урало-Сибирского старообрядчества. Новосибирск, 1999. С. 420-439. ISBN 5-7196-0494-4.

Безуглова И.Ф. Музыкальная деятельность Соловецких иноков: По певческим рукописям Соловецкого собрания // Историческое изучение памятников письменной культуры. Л., 1990. С. 39-50.

Беляев В.М. Древнерусская музыкальная письменность. М.: Сов. композитор, 1962. 134 с.: 4 л. ил., нот.

Богомолова М.В. О репертуаре греческого распева в записи «греческой» нотацией // Герменевтика древнерусской литературы / Рос. Акад. наук; Ин-т мировой литературы. М., 1992. Сб. 4. XVII-начало XVIII вв. С. 256-285.

Бражников М.В. Древнерусская теория музыки: По рукопис. материалам XV–XVIII вв. Л.: Музыка, 1972. 423 с.: факс. и нот ил.

Бражников М.В. Русская певческая палеография / Науч. ред., примеч., вступ. ст., палеогр. табл. Н.С.Сергиной; Министерство культуры Российской Федерации; Рос. акад. наук; рос. ин-т истории искусств; Санкт-Петербургская гос. Консерватория. СПб.: б.и., 2002. 296 с.; 32 с. ил.

Бражников М.В. Статьи о древнерусской музыке. Л.: Музыка, 1975

Воробьев Е. «Строки» Ивана Шайдур // Аспирантский сборник / Гос. Ин-т искусствознания. М., 2004. Вып. 2. С. 31-56.

Гусейнова З.М. «Извещение» Александра Мезенца и теория музыки XVII века. СПб.: б.и., 1994. 217 с.

Гусейнова З.М. Памятники музыкально-теоретической мысли в рукописях Кирилло-Белозерского монастыря XV-XVII веков // Гимнология / Сост. и отв. ред. И.Лозовая. М., 2000. Вып.1, кн. 1. Материалы Международной научной конференции «Памяти протоиерея Димитрия Разумовского» (к 130-летию Московской консерватории) 3–8 сентября 1996. С. 263–273. (Учен. зап. Науч. центра рус. духовной музыки им. прот. Димитрия Разумовского / Моск. гос. консерватория им. П.И.Чайковского). С. 240-248.

Гусейнова З.М. Принципы систематизации древнерусской письменности XI–XIV веков: (К проблеме дешифровки знаменной нотации): Автореф. дис. на соиск. учен. степ. к. иск. Л., 1982. 19 с.

Гусейнова З.М. Руководства по теории знаменного пения XV века: Источники и редакции // Древнерусская певческая культура и книжность / Сост и отв. ред. Н.С.Сергина. Л.: ЛГИТМИК, 1990. С. 20-46.

Гусейнова З.М. Русские музыкальные азбуки 15–16 веков: Учеб. пособие. СПб.: б.и., 1999. 132 с.

Заболотная Н.В. Церковно-певческие рукописи Древней Руси XI–XIV веков: Основные типы книг в историко-функциональном аспекте. М., 2001. 250 с.

Захарьина Н. Б. К вопросу об отражении музыкального инструментария в древнерусских теоретических руководствах по церковному пению // Музеи театра и музыки в международном пространстве: Материалы научно-практической конференции 20-22 марта 2008 года. СПб., 2008. С. 260-269.

Историческое рассуждение вообще о древнем христианском богослужебном пении... Воронеж. 1799. [4], 26 с.

Кравченко С.П. Фиты знаменного распева на материале певческой книги «Праздники». Автореф. дис. на соиск. учен. степ... канд. искусствоведения. Л., 1981. 23 с.

Кравченко С.П. Фиты знаменного распева на материале певческой книги «Праздники». Автореф. дис. на соиск. учен. степ... канд. искусствоведения. Л., 1981. 23 с.

Кручинина А.Н. Попевка знаменного распева в русской музыкальной теории XVII века // Певческое наследие Древней Руси: (История, теория, эстетика) / Сост. Н.Б.Захарьина, А.Н.Кручинина; Науч. ред. А.Н.Кручинина, Н.В.Рамазанова, Т.К.Храмцова. СПб.: Ut, 2002. С. 46–150. ISBN 5-7443-0062-7.

Кручинина А.Н. Попевка знаменного роспева в русской музыкальной теории XVII века // Певческое наследие Древней Руси: (История, теория, эстетика) / Сост. Н.Б.Захарьина, А.Н.Кручинина; Науч. ред. А.Н.Кручинина, Н.В.Рамазанова, Т.К.Храмцова; СПб.: Ut, 2002. С. 46-150. ISBN 5-7443-0062-7

Металлов В.М. Русская симиография. М., 1912. [2], 118, 119 с.

Мосягина (Сушкевич) Н.В. Особенности формирования нотированных сборников начала 17 в. (по рукописи РНБ ОСРК Q. I. 1408) // Гимнология. Материалы Международной научной конференции «Памяти протоиерея Дмитрия Разумовского». М., 2000 г. С.319 - 325.

Мосягина Н.В. Домезенцевские пометы в теоретических руководствах и роспевах 17 в. // Певческое наследие Древней Руси (История, теория, эстетика). СПб., 2002 г. С.159-163.

Мосягина Н.В. «Странные пометы» в знаменной нотации второй половины 17 века. // XVI Ежегодная Богословская конференция Православного Свято-Тихоновского Гуманитарного Университета. Материалы. Т.2. М., 2006. С.343-348.

Мосягина Н.В. К проблеме архаического интонирования («Крыжевые» признаки в знаменной нотации конца 17 века) // Голос в культуре: артикуляция и тембр. СПб., 2007. С.78-86.

Новиков А.В. Кодекс владыки Филофея как памятник путевого роспева // Древнерусское песнопение: Пути во времени: К 100-летию со дня рождения М.В.Бражникова: По материалам научной конференции «Бражниковские чтения-2002» / Сост. Н.Б.Захарьина. СПб.: Изд-во СПбГПУ, 2004. С. 165–177. ISBN 5-7422-0659-6

Певческие азбуки Древней Руси / Публ., пер, предисл. и коммент. Д.Шабалина. Кемерово: Кузбассвуиздат, 1991. 277 с. : ил., нот. ил.

Плетнева Е.В. Нотация в песнопениях древнерусских Октоихов Изборных и Шестодневов Служебных (XIII-XV вв.) // XIII Ежегодная Богословская Конференция Православного Свято-Тихоновского Богословского Института: Материалы 2003. М., 2003. С. 443-451.

Поспелова Р. Западная нотация XI – XIV веков: На материале трактатов: Исслед. М., 2003. 416 с., ил.

Приселков М.Д. История русского летописания XI–XV вв. СПб., 1996. 352 с.

Проблемы дешифровки древнерусских нотаций: Сб. науч. тр. / Сост. и отв. ред С.П.Кравченко, А.Н.Кручинина. Л.: Изд. ЛОЛГК., 1987. 200 с.

Рамазанова Н.В. Певческие рукописные книги Кирилло-Белозерского монастыря: (Материалы выставки Отдела рукописей Российской национальной библиотеки) // Монастырская традиция в древнерусском певческом искусстве: К 600-летию основания Кирилло-Белозерского монастыря / Сост. Н.Б.Захарьина, А.Н.Кручинина. СПб., 2000. С. 8-15.

Сахаров И.П. Исследования о русском церковном песнопении. [СПб., 1849]. 72, 61 с. Из журн. Мин. Нар. Прос. 1849. № 7, 8.

Азбука знаменного пения (Извещение о согласнейших пометах) старца Александра Мезенца (1668-го года). Б.м.: Братство «Вертоград», 7510 (2002). 11 л. старослав. фолиации, [2], 208 с.

Смоленский С.В. О древнерусских певческих нотациях. СПб., 1901. 2, 120 с. (Памятники древней письменности и искусства; Вып. CXLV).

Успенский Н.Д. Древнерусское певческое искусство. М.: Сов. композитор, 1971. 623 с.

Феоктист (Мочульский). Руководство к нотному простому церковному пению... СПб., 1813. [4], 11 с.

Фролов С. В. К проблеме звуковысотности беспометной знаменной нотации // Проблемы истории и теории древнерусской музыки. Л., 1979. С. 124-147.

Христофор. Ключ знаменной, 1604/ Публ. и пер. М. Бражникова и Г. Никишова; предисл., коммент., исслед. Г. Никишова; М.: Музыка, 1983. 293 с.: факс, 4 л. факс. (Памятники рус. муз. искусства / Редкол.: Ю.В. Келдыш и др.; Вып. 9).

Шабалин Д.С. Проблемы дешифровки беспометного знаменного распева XV - середины XVII веков : Автореф. дис. на соиск. учен. степ. канд. искусствоведения. М., 1986. 21 с.

Шиндин Б.А. Нотация певческой рукописи Соловецкого монастыря № 752/690 // Проблемы истории русской и советской музыки М., 1977. (Сб. тр. ГМПИ им. Гнесиных; Вып. 34). С. 112-120.

Энглин С. Е., Новый метод ладофункционального анализа античных нотографических памятников: Автореф. дис. на соиск. учен. степ. канд. искусствоведения. СПб., 2005. 24 с.

Ars notandi: Нотация в меняющемся мире: Материалы международной научной конференции, посвященной тысячелетнему юбилею Гвидо Аретинского. М., 1997. 124 с. (Науч. тр. Моск. Гос. Консерватории им. П.И. Чайковского; Сб. 17). ISBN 5-89598-009-0.

Сокращения: Сов. - советский

Л. - Ленинград

СПб - Санкт-Петербург

С. - страницы

Ил. - иллюстрации

Нот. - ноты

Факс. - факсимиле

Б.и. - без издательства

Автореф. - автореферат

Дис. - диссертация

Соиск. - соискание

Учен. - ученый, ученая

Степ. - степень

Канд. - кандидат

Гос. - государственный

POVZETEK

Raziskovanje ruske notacije je tesno povezano z zgodovino pisanja o glasbi v naši deželi. Stara Rusija je prevzela nevmatsko notacijo Bizanca, tako da je Rusija postala edina slovanska dežela, ki je ohranila in gojila nevmatsko pisavo do samega začetka 18. stoletja; med starimi verniki velja celo, da sega do današnjih dni. Poznamo vrsto notacij: znamenny, kondakarny, demestvenny, putny notations in kazanskoje znamja.

Prvo rusko muzikološko društvo »Znakovna imena« je iz druge polovice 15. stoletja izpod peresa

neznane avtorja. Večina srednjeveških ruskih spisov s področja glasbene teorije je posvečena nevmam. Izvor ruskih nevm je postal osrednje vprašanje v 19. stoletju. V začetku 20. stoletja pa so znanstveniki zasnovali stopnje razvoja nevmatske notacije. V drugi polovici 20. stoletja, po dolgem premoru v raziskovanju cerkvene glasbe, so se sovjetski znanstveniki lotili razreševanja ruskih nevm. Na začetku 21. stoletja se raziskovalci ukvarjajo z delno notiranimi rokopisi, ki kažejo na ustno tradicijo.