

UDC 783.2 (477)
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32461/2226-3209.4.2019.191339>

Shumilina Olga
Doctor of Art Studies, Professor
Department of Music Theory
Lviv National Musical Academy
named after M. V. Lysenko
ORCID 0000-0002-3789-2489
shumili2016@gmail.com

CHURCH WORKS BY M. BEREZOVSKY IN THE INTERPRETATION AURUM OF POST-AUTHOR EDITIONS

The purpose of the article. The article is devoted to the study of two versions of the musical text of the concert «Ne otverzhi mene vo vremia starosti» by M. Berezovsky. The manuscripts of the late XVIII century, in which this concert has a different version of musical text, is being studied, is absolutely unknown today. It is concluded that this version is the original author's version of the concert «Ne otverzhi.» **The methodology** of the research is an integrated approach, and it is based on the use of analytical and comparative methods. **The scientific novelty** of the work is to find out the tendency to correct the musical texts of choral works of Berezovsky during the preparation for printing in the XIX and early XX centuries, and in attracting a wide range of manuscript sources for the purpose of establishing the original version of the concert «Ne otverzhi,» which has no further editing. **Conclusions.** It is noted that the prospects for studying this topic are to find out the reasons and methods of later editing of the original author's text in all choral works of Berezovsky, which were published during the XIX - early XX centuries, as well as in the publication of original versions that were created by the author and sung during his life. The second fundamental difference between the manuscript and published versions of the Concert is associated with the use of accidentals, which in some cases are added, and in others – removed. The addition of accidentals occurs in the overwhelming majority of cases in the chords of the subdominant group used in S – D idioms, which leads to their transformation into a double dominant, and also while transfer from the tonic to subdominant in minor keys, which creates the effect of a short-term transition to a new tonal center. Consequently, M. Berezovsky's harmonic innovations, referred to by many modern researchers, are the result of a later editorial revision.

Key words: Maksym Berezovsky, choir concert, manuscript collections XVIII century, publications XIX century, original author's version.

Шуміліна Ольга Анатоліївна, доктор мистецтвознавства, професор кафедри теорії музики Львівської національної музичної академії ім. М.В.Лисенка

Хорові твори М. Березовського в інтерпретаційній аурі поставторських редакцій

Мета роботи. Стаття присвячена вивченню двох варіантів нотного тексту концерту «Не отвержи мене во время старости» М.Березовського. Вивчаються рукописи кінця XVIII століття, у яких цей концерт має інший варіант нотного тексту, сьогодні практично невідомий. Робиться висновок, що саме цей варіант є оригінальною авторською версією концерту «Не отвержи». **Методологія** дослідження полягає в комплексному підході до вивчення вказаних явищ і ґрунтується на застосуванні аналітичного та компаративного методів. **Наукова новизна** роботи полягає у виявленні тенденції до виправлення нотних текстів хорових творів Березовського під час підготовки до друку у XIX – на початку XX століть, і у залученні широкого кола рукописних джерел задля встановлення початкової версії концерту «Не отвержи», що не має пізнішого редагування. У **висновках** зазначено, що перспективи вивчення цієї теми полягають у виявленні причин і методів пізнішого редагування початкового авторського тексту в усіх хорових творах Березовського, які публікувалися протягом XIX – початку XX століть, а також у виданні оригінальних варіантів, що були створені автором і співалися під час його життя.

Ключові слова: Максим Березовський, хоровий концерт, рукописні джерела XVIII століття, видання XIX століття, оригінальна авторська версія.

Шумилина Ольга Анатольевна, доктор искусствоведения, профессор кафедры теории музыки Львовской национальной музыкальной академии им. Н.В.Лысенко

Хоровые сочинения М. Березовского в интерпретационной ауре поставторских редакций

Цель работы. Статья посвящена изучению двух вариантов нотного текста концерта «Не отвержи мене во время старости» М.Березовского. Изучаются рукописи конца XVIII века, в которых данный концерт содержит другой вариант нотного текста, ныне практически неизвестный. Приходим к выводу, что именно этот вариант и является подлинной авторской версией концерта «Не отвержи». **Методология** исследования представляет комплексный подход у изучению указанных явлений и основывается на обращении к аналитическому и компаративному методам. **Научная новизна** работы состоит в том, что нами выявлена тенденция исправления нотных текстов хоровых произведений Березовского при подготовке их к изданию в XIX – начале XX века, и был привлечен широкий круг рукописных источников для обнаружения первоначальной версии концерта «Не отвержи», не имеющей следов более позднего редактирования. **В выводах** указано, что перспективы изучения данной темы состоят в выявлении причин и методов более позднего редактирования первоначального авторского текста во всех

хоровых произведениях Березовского, изданных на протяжении XIX – начала XX века, а также в издании подлинных вариантов, созданных автором и исполнявшихся при его жизни.

Ключевые слова: Максим Березовский, хоровой концерт, рукописные источники XVIII века, издания XIX века, оригинальная авторская версия.

Formulation of the problem. The subject of the article partly pretends to be sensational, since the question of editions of choral works by Berezovsky has never been raised, moreover, nothing was known about any author's or poster editorials. For many years we have all studied choral works by Berezovsky in a collection of 1989 [1]. In the introductory article of this collection, the sources of the musical text of all compositions are indicated - the printed editions of the XIX and the beginning of the XX century, as well as handwritten copies of the late XIX century.

As we see, the material that has become the basis for publication, has no direct relation to the Berezovsky era, but represents later periods. At the same time, the handwritten materials of the XVIII century, including the lifelong ones, which also contain the texts of Berezovsky's published works for the choir, have survived.

Studying these sources and comparing handwritten and published variants has led to unexpected results. In practically every published work, traces of the later editorial changes were discovered, which, to varying degrees, changed the original author's text. Changes cover different levels: in one case the tonality changes, the form is corrected in the other, the voice is in the third, the harmony in the fourth, the invoice in the fifth, etc.

As an example, we will consider the textbook and the well-known example of Berezovsky's work – the choir concert «Ne otverzhi mene vo vremia starosti» (hereinafter – the Concert). It refers to the peak events in the Ukrainian musical culture of the second half of the XVIII century. It has been for a long period of time the only preserved composition by M. Berezovsky in the concert genre and gave an idea of not only his work, but the composer's fate as well. It was republished and often performed, and today, it has a strong presence in the curriculum and concert repertoire, and the leading musicologists, authors of works on M. Berezovsky's life and creative work were studying it.

All Concert publications are identical in terms of the note text reproduction and, as indicated in one of the collections, are based on the edition of the Court Chapel of 1842 [3, 486], which, in its turn, is based on the text of edition 1817-1818 (List of all publications of the Concert [5, 26-27]). Consequently, the known to us Concert version, which is unquestionably considered the author's one, was published 40 years after M. Berezovsky death.

The Concert is also found in manuscript collections of an earlier origin, including of the lifetime, which date back to the last decades of the XVIII century, and therefore contain the note text not from the first edition, but from other sources, possibly ascending to autograph. The most famous list is the British manuscript of the late XVIII century, which contains the four-voice score of the Concert (British Library, London, Add. 24288, f. 97r.-114 r.).

Analysis of recent research. The musicologists who studied this manuscript noticed that its note text in some details does not coincide with the well-known published sample. Thus, V. Vitvitsky in his book about M. Berezovsky, published in 1974 in New Jersey, indicated that the British list of the Concert «Ne otverzhi» does not distinguish between the first and second voices, and the four-voiced voice is more compact [3, 47; 3, 53]. M. Rytsareva, when comparing the note text of the British manuscript with the publication by P. Jurgenson (1890), detected «a large number of misunderstandings concerning individual notes, durations, a number of *divizi*, dynamic indications, etc.» and suggested that «the source of discrepancies could consist not only of the concert editing at publication, but in another version of the manuscript of the XVIII century as well» [6, 131].

The information reported was based on the study of the British manuscript alone and was perceived as a minor fact, explained by the rather common tradition of making changes to the newly created lists. They don't provide for the representations about the true state of affairs, as well as the causes and consequences of the phenomenon described. And only the reference to other manuscripts containing the text of the Concert and study of this text made it possible to establish that the discrepancies found are not accidental. The discovery of differences between handwritten and printed variants and the determination of the reasons of this phenomenon is the purpose of the study.

The scientific novelty of the work is to attract a wide range of manuscript sources and to find out from them an original version of the musical text of the concert «Ne otverzhi», which has no later corrections. It was in this form that he was conceived by Berezovsky and was carried out during his lifetime

Presenting main material. In addition to the British manuscript, the Concert lists were identified in two manuscripts:

1) the collection of the spiritual works by B. Galuppi and M. Berezovsky, maintained with the Central State Archive-Museum of Literature and Art of Ukraine (Kiev) and dates back to the 70-ies of the XVIII century (F. 441, № 907, concert № 13);

2) the collection of choral concerts of the end of the XVIII century from Russian national Museum of music (F, 279, №№ 937 – soprano I, 172 – alto I, 882 – alto II, 884 – tenor II, concert № 26).

Same as with the Concert publication, all three lists were identical in the reproduction of the note text, with the exception of the fixation form – scores in the British manuscript and voice-part in Kiev and Moscow collections, with the differentiation of choral parts for soloists and ripienists. This allowed us to assume that the discrepancies between the manuscript and published versions are systemic, and their comparative analysis provided the absolutely unexpected results, since not only revealed the materiality of the discrepancies, but also sowed grains of doubt in the authenticity of certain sections of the Concert well-known version unconditionally accepted by us as original.

What is the original author's version and why did another one appear that we consider original?

Before giving answers to both questions, it should be noted that both M. Berezovsky's biography and work are obscured for some reason, and that the process of «plunging into oblivion» began, apparently, as early as back in the XVIII century. We can say that «Ne otverzhi» Concert was lucky, because contemporaries showed their interest in it. This is evidenced, in particular, by Count V.G. Orlov's letter to I.A. Fursov (1787): «Visit Dmitriy Stepanovich [Bortnyansky] and notify me, who composed the “Ne otverzhi mene” Concert. He wrote to me that this is not his work» [2, 327].

We will get back to the role of D. Bortnyansky mentioned in the letter in the matter of preserving and popularizing the M. Berezovsky's «Ne otverzhi» concert, and now let us turn to the observations over the note text of the Concert manuscript. The first fundamental difference is the interpretation of solo ensemble constructions in the first three parts. As is known, in the published version, most ensembles are three-voiced and inherit the features of a cantilever texture, and the *divizi* principle of choral parts, already mentioned in M. Rytsareva and V. Vitvitsky publications, is used to create a three-part voice. There is nothing like this in the manuscript version. All solo-ensemble constructions of I, II and III parts are fundamentally two-voiced, and *divizi* is not even supposed, aside of absence at all. It is not present in other choral works by M. Berezovsky, therefore, the third voice is introduced artificially here, in order to comply with certain principles of organization of the texture, which were established in choral concerts of a later period.

Let's consider the phenomenon noted on specific examples and we will start with the analysis of the I part solo-ensemble constructions. Thus, the first three-voice is formed here in the second pair of expositions of the theme (alt-soprano), to which one more voice is added – the first soprano (vols. 5-10). In melodic terms this voice is absolutely not developed, however, with its active participation, sharp-dissonant harmonious consonances, which are absent in the manuscript version of the Concert, are created. Another consequence of adding a third voice is the change in the melodic relief of the theme when it is performed with soprano voice: to create the three-voiced chord structures it was necessary to «immolate» the high sixth stage (B-natural sound was replaced with B-flat) followed by the expressive ascending quart jumps, and to transfer the ending of the theme to an additional third voice, contenting with an intonationally neutral movement over the tones of chord accords. Such a violation of the linearity of voice principle is not characteristic of Concerto manuscript version, where the second pair of themes is derived from the first pair (bass – tenor) and repeats exactly the original two-voice combination with no intonational transformations and additional counterpoints; only the altitude position changes, in accordance with the range of a new pair of singing voices.

All subsequent paired performances of the Concert I part in the manuscript version are also derived from the initial two-part combination in bass and tenor parts. They are based on the principles of direct and opposite voices rearrangement in the double counterpoint of the octave, and, embracing the traditional circle of tonalities (a-moll, F-dur, d-moll), contain nothing, but the actual theme. In the same version, an additional voice is getting involved to each paired statement, transforming a two-part polyphonic combination into a three-voiced chord. Each time this voice comes in imitation, with an interval of one cycle as failed statement, and in one of the combinations even begins to present the theme, which leads to an intonational adjustment of one of the main voices (see vols. 32-34, statement in F-dur tonality).

By the same principle, the links between the blocks are changed (the latter are formed by solo-ensemble statements and choral interludes). In the manuscript version the links are arranged uniformly. These are short two-voiced constructions based on a common thematic material and repeated in different pairs of voices (tenor-bass, alto-tenor, alt-bass, and soprano-alt) with a change in altitude, depending on the tonal plan of the theme. In the published version, both the number of voices and material distribution between them varies arbitrarily: the first link turns out to be a three-part (second tenor is added), the second and third are two-voiced, and the fourth is four-voiced (all the choral parts are involved).

Thus, the introduction of additional voices breaks the perception of the repetitive constructions as derivatives of the original contrapuntal combinations, which are undoubtedly conceived as two-voiced and organizing sections of a large imitation-polyphonic composition into a single integrated structure.

Even more changes are found in the third part of the Concert. Since it is dominated by a solo-ensemble presentation, the overwhelming majority of thematic constructions undergo editing, which fundamentally changes the textural weaving of musical tissue. So, in the initial exclamation «Bozhe moj!» («My God!»), harmonized with the T – D – T idiom, with the distribution of chord tones between the three voices (alt – tenor – bass), the material from the alt part is moved for some reason to the second tenor missing in the manuscript version. The ensemble of two tenors and bass continues further (vols. 124-129); the functional-harmonic certainty of each chord is preserved throughout the construction structurally similar to the

first sentence of the period, and the sharpness of the second combinations in D₇ is emphasized, as well as the reduced quints and septims in the double dominant chord.

The manuscript is limited to a tenor and bass voices duet, based on the material from the second tenor and bass parts. It is curious that the harmonically arranged middle voice from the three-voice version is transformed here into a full-fledged melodic line, and the interval accords formed between the voices repeat the idioms already encountered in the paired statements from Part I of the Concert.

Such transformations occur in the subsequent construction, which in the manuscript version is a two-voiced canonical imitation in the parts of the alt and soprano, which follows from the top-source and resembles the so-called golden sequel, well-known for instrumental concerts of the Baroque Era; in the printed version, the imitation parts in *proposta* are veiled by adding a second alt that creates unison, seconds combinations and tertiary duplications of the original voice. Also, there is a correction of the intonational relief of each of the voices, which transforms the two-part counterpoint into accordion-harmonic structures and is especially noticeable in the melodic cadence, which concludes the III part solo-ensemble section.

The only two-voiced construction of the Concert II part (alt-bass, vols. 53-63) also turned out to be transformed into a three-voice as a result of doubling the bass voice into the upper third.

The second fundamental difference between the manuscript and published versions of the Concert is associated with the use of accidentals, which in some cases are added, and in others – removed. The addition of accidentals occurs in the overwhelming majority of cases in the chords of the subdominant group used in S – D idioms, which leads to their transformation into a double dominant, and also while transfer from the tonic to subdominant in minor keys, which creates the effect of a short-term transition to a new tonal centre. Consequently, M. Berezovsky's harmonic innovations, referred to by many modern researchers, are the result of a later editorial revision.

The conclusions. Summing up our observations, we would like to note that M. Rytsareva's assumption expressed in the book about M. Berezovsky turned out to be true: the Concert editing was indeed performed, but not for P. Jurgenson's publication, but for the first edition of 1817-1818, the note text of which was reproduced without modification in subsequent publications and considered today as genuine. Concert manuscript lists, including British manuscript studied by M. Rytsareva, in fact contain another version of the note text, which is not virtually known today. In all likelihood, this version is the original author's version of «*Ne otverzhi*» Concert, and the various readings are more significant, since they are not limited to external manifestations, but affect the deep compositional level.

D. Bortnyansky's note archive answers the question regarding person who performed the editing, or rather the register of this archive, compiled after composer death by his widow Anna Bortnyanskaya. M. Berezovsky's Concert «*Ne otverzhi mene vo vremia starosti*» is listed in the register in section «[Works] of different writers, re-corrected», which indicates directly the editorial corrections by D. Bortnyansky, introduced by him for the publication of 1817-1818. Specific features of the changes introduced, in particular, the use of the *divizi* technique, which is very characteristic of D. Bortnyansky's choir concerts, also indicates his participation in this process. Therefore, we mistakenly consider the version edited by D. Bortnyansky as the Concert original. Fortunately, the editorial corrections did not affect the choral parts of the Concert. Magnificent, masterly written large polyphonic sections (*fugato* «*Pozhemite i imite jeho*» from the II part and famous final fugue «*Da postydjatsja*») are undoubtedly issued from the true Master's pen, and convince us that M. Berezovsky's creative heritage needs only one thing – most rapid return from oblivion.

Prospects for studying this topic are to identify the causes and methods of editing the original author's text in all choral works published during the XIX and early XX centuries, as well as in the publication of authentic versions of M. Berezovsky's choral works created by the author and performed during his life.

References

1. Berezovsky, M. (1989). Choral works. M. Yurchenko (Comp., Ed., Int. article). Kyiv: Musical Ukraine. [in Russian].
2. A biographical sketch of Count Vladimir Grigoryevich Orlov, compiled by his grandson, Count Vladimir Orlov-Davydov (1878). SPb.: Type. Imp. Acad. Sciences. Vol. 1. [in Russian]
3. Vytvitsky, V. (1974). Maxim Berezovsky: Life and creativity. Jersey City: View of M. P. Kots. [in Ukrainian]
4. The history of Russian music in music samples: ed. S.L. Ginsburg (1968). Moscow: Music. Vol. 1. [in Russian]
5. Lebedeva-Emelina, A.V. (2004). Russian spiritual music of the era of classicism (1760 – 1825): Catalog of works. Moscow: The Composer. [in Russian]
6. Rytsareva, M. (1983). Composer M.S. Berezovsky: Life and work. Leningrad: Music. [in Russian]

Література

1. Березовский М. Хоровые произведения / Сост., ред., вступ. статья М. Юрченко. К. : Музична Україна, 1989. 112 с.
2. Биографический очерк графа Владимира Григорьевича Орлова, составлен внуком его, графом Владимиром Орловым-Давыдовым. Т. 1. СПб.: Тип. Имп. Акад. наук, 1878. 328 с.
3. Витвицький В. Максим Березовський: Життя і творчість. Джерсі Сіті: Вид-во М.П.Коць, 1974. 96 с.
4. История русской музыки в нотных образцах / под ред. С.Л. Гинзбург. 2-е изд. Т. 1. М.: Музыка, 1968. 500 с.

5. Лебедева-Емелина А.В. Русская духовная музыка эпохи классицизма (1760 – 1825): Каталог произведений. Москва: Композитор, 2004. 656 с.
6. Рыцарева М. Композитор М. С. Березовский: Жизнь и творчество. Ленинград: Музыка, 1983. 144 с.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 06.06.2019 р.

Прийнято до публікації 18.07.2019 р.

Яковець Інна Олександрівна

доктор мистецтвознавства, доцент

професор кафедри дизайну

Черкаського державного технологічного
університету

ORCID 0000-0001-5069-5857

innayakovets@ukr.net

УДК 069.7.161.1+045.312

DOI: [https://doi.org/10.32461/2226-](https://doi.org/10.32461/2226-3209.4.2019.191340)

3209.4.2019.191340

КОНЦЕПТ «МИСТЕЦЬКИЙ ПАТЕРН ХУДОЖНЬОГО МУЗЕЮ»

Мета роботи. Провести ґрунтовний аналіз концепту «мистецький патерн художнього музею» та запропонувати власну трактовку даного визначення. Довести, що внаслідок сприйняття сучасного музею вже не тільки як зберігача минулого, але і як творця майбутнього, як центру актуальної інформації та активної комунікації, виникає потреба в нових формах організації музейної діяльності і всього музейного та навіколомузейного простору, і особливе значення при цьому набуває образ, архітектура музейної будівлі — музейна будівля має бути твором мистецтва. **Методологія** дослідження проявляється у міждисциплінарності та ґрунтується на системі загальнонаукових та спеціальних методах, що, в свою чергу, відображають системний метод, культурологічний та мистецтвознавчий підходи до вивчення музейної форми, інформаційний та фрактальний підхід, термінологічний аналіз. **Наукова новизна** полягає у тому, що вперше запропоновано та сформульовано визначення концепту «мистецький патерн художнього музею». Доведено, що сучасний художній музей не тільки репрезентує сучасне і традиційне мистецтво, а і сама споруда музею являє собою твір мистецтва, дизайну; спостерігається значне розширення музейного та культурного простору. **Висновки.** Художній музей позиціоновано як мистецький амбівалентний патерн. Доведено, що архітектура виконує не тільки функцію інструменту загальнокультурної комунікації, а і внутрішньої комунікації музею, оскільки архітектурно-дизайнерське вирішення його екстер'єру та навіколомузейний простір задають параметри сприйняття, алгоритми поведінки в усьому музейному просторі, занурюють відвідувача у світ художньої культури.

Ключові слова: культура, мистецтво, архітектура, дизайн, художній музей, мистецький патерн художнього музею, фрактал, патерн, музейний простір.

Яковець Інна Александровна, доктор искусствоведения, доцент, профессор кафедры дизайна Черкасский государственный технологический университет

Концепт «патерн искусства художественного музея»

Цель работы. Провести основательный анализ концепта «паттерн искусства художественного музея» и предложить собственную трактовку данного определения. Доказать, что в результате восприятия современного музея уже не только как хранителя прошлого, но и как создателя будущего, как центра актуальной информации и активной коммуникации, возникает потребность в новых формах организации музейной деятельности и всего музейного и околomuзейного пространства, и особое значение при этом приобретает образ, архитектура музейного здания — музейная здание должно быть произведением искусства. **Методология** исследования проявляется в междисциплинарности и основывается на системе общенаучных и специальных методах, что, в свою очередь, отражают системный метод, культурологический и искусствоведческий подходы изучения музейной формы, информационный и фрактальный подход, терминологический анализ. **Научная новизна** заключается в том, что впервые предложено и сформулировано определение концепта «паттерн искусства художественного музея». Показано, что современный художественный музей не только представляет современное и традиционное искусство, а и само здание музея представляет собой произведение искусства, дизайна; наблюдается значительное расширение музейного и культурного пространства. **Выводы.** Художественный музей позиционирован как художественный амбивалентный паттерн. Доказано, что архитектура выполняет не только функцию инструмента общекультурной коммуникации, а и внутренней коммуникации музея, поскольку архитектурно-дизайнерское решение его экстер'єра и околomuзейное пространство задают параметры восприятия, алгоритмы поведения во всем музейном пространстве, погружают посетителя в мир художественной культуры.

Ключевые слова: культура, искусство, архитектура, дизайн, художественный музей, паттерн искусства художественного музея, фрактал, паттерн, музейное пространство.

Yakovets Inna, Doctor of Sciences, Associate Professor, Professor of the Department of Design, Cherkasy State Technological University

The concept "artistic pattern of an art museum"

Purpose of the article. To undertake a thorough analysis of the concept of the "artistic pattern of an art museum" and propose your interpretation of this definition. To prove that due to the perception of the modern museum, not only as of the custodian of the past but also as the creator of the future, as a center of up-to-date information and active communication, there is a need for new forms of organization of museum activity and the entire museum and near-museum space. In this way, the image, museum building architecture becomes especially essential — a museum building should be a work of art. **The methodology** of the research manifests itself in interdisciplinary. It is based on a system of