

NATALIA PLOTNIKOVA

MANUSCRIPT VERSIONS OF NIKOLAY DILETSKIY'S CONCERTOS

QUESTIONS OF AUTHORSHIP

In 2012, I made a fortuitous discovery: on the basis of two manuscripts from different archives in Russia (Novosibirsk and Moscow), it became possible to determine the authorship of 36 four-part concertos and the *Vechernya* (Vespers) by Nikolay Diletskiy (1630?-1690?), one of the best-known composers of the Russian baroque. These findings are described in my article in the journal *Muzikal'naya Akademiya*.¹

The newly-found manuscripts attributed to Diletskiy consist of separate voice parts. Because of this, my ongoing work has consisted in identifying complete sets of four parts, on the basis of which full scores could be reconstructed. In total, I have examined 30 manuscripts, from the State Historical Museum, the Russian State Library and the Glinka Museum of Musical Culture in Moscow, the Russian National Library and the manuscript department of the Library of the Academy of Sciences in St Petersburg, as well as the A. Sheptytskyi National Museum in Lviv (with the help of the Ukrainian musicologist, O. A. Shumilina). As of this day, 25 scores of previously unknown four-part concertos by Diletskiy have been reconstructed.

The reconstruction of the scores of various concertos has revealed different degrees of consistency in terms of their musical content. In some instances, a comparison of the parts from two different manuscripts, both attributed to Diletskiy, showed the textual and the musical content to be largely identical, but with some variation in individual notes, accidentals, or placement of lyrics. Other manuscripts, while containing material that is in many respects analogous, present differing versions of it. The changes may apply to only the initial part of the work, or its conclusion, or may occur at various points throughout the composition. In some cases, one may describe the result as two different versions of a single piece, while in other cases we are dealing with a new piece based on the motifs of the original, that is, in essence, with its "parody". The use of this particular term from the renaissance is applicable in connection with the music of Russian baroque, although the actual application of parody technique is somewhat different from what we encounter in the West European music of the 15th and 16th centuries.

1 Наталья Плотникова, "Творчество Николая Дилецкого. Новые открытия" ["The work of Nikolay Diletskiy. New discoveries"], *Музыкальная академия*, 2 (2013), 77–82.

I would like to emphasize that the practice of creating versions and parodies was first discussed by Nataliya Zabolotnaya.² According to Zabolotnaya, the phenomenon was related to the transitional status of composers at that time, moving from the predominant anonymity of Znamenny Chant to the recognition of creative individuality and the uniqueness of compositions in the *partesny* style. Zabolotnaya distinguishes three categories of manuscript material in terms of their closeness to one another: copies, versions, and parodies. She also defines certain parameters according to which one can distinguish between a version and a parody. In order to identify the invariable aspects of different versions, she suggested using the working term “plan-abstract” of a composition – i.e., certain areas where the most prominent and significant thematic material is concentrated and where the thickening of verbal and musical fabric occurs, serving as a kind of a “dotted line sketch” for versions and parodies. Between these “dotted lines” one finds connecting bridge passages that are characterized by varying degrees of innovation and development with regard to the outlined musical content.

While agreeing with many of Zabolotnaya's premises and employing her classification of manuscript copies, I would like to develop this topic further in relation to Diletskiy's concertos, complementing it with a number of additional questions and problems. In the process, I propose to:

1. apply these definitions not to anonymous compositions but to those whose authorship we know – works by Diletskiy – and to investigate by whom, when and why a version or a parody was created.
2. underline the difference between the originals and versions of them from the standpoint of their relative value, while Zabolotnaya considers them as equal and does not discuss the question of “primary and secondary” versions.
3. examine this question on the basis of different variants of four-part compositions, while Zabolotnaya concentrates on examples of expanding or condensing the choral voicing, i.e., predominantly of compositions for several choirs.
4. expand and define more clearly the various principles of creating the various versions and parodies on the basis of Diletskiy's concertos.

Let us begin with the simplest examples. The Easter concerto *Smerti prazdnuem umerschvleniye* begins with a solo passage for two voices on the word “smerti”, which is soon repeated; the same technique is used in the three-part kant-like refrain “prazdnuem, prazdnuyem umerschvleniye” – first in F major, then in B-flat major.

2 Наталья Заболотная, “Текстологические особенности крупной композиции партесного письма” [“Textological features of major partes compositions.”], *Проблемы русской музыкальной текстологии (По памятникам русской хоровой литературы XII–XVII вв.)*. Сост., отв. ред. А. С. Белоненко. Л.: ЛГК, 1983, 152–172.

