

Chapter 19

(Re)constructing Medieval Rus' in Kastalsky's *Furnace Rite*

David Salkowski

The idea of “synthesis of the arts” embraced a multitude of concerns during the Russian Silver Age, the three decades of experimental and often mystically charged artistic activity before the Bolshevik Revolution (1890–1917). Richard Wagner’s concept of *Gesamtkunstwerk*, paired with the early writings of Friedrich Nietzsche, was enormously influential for musicians and aesthetic theorists alike, and this popularity was due in part to a preexisting network of resonant ideas in Russia.¹ Nietzsche, for one, had a homegrown counterpart in the anthropologist Alexander Veselovsky, whose early studies of myth popularized the idea in Russia that ritual had been the “cradle of the arts.”² And while Alexander Scriabin’s plans for a grand artistic synthesis were often understood in his time as a continuation of Wagner’s project,³ another, deeper substrate ran through this discourse. This was the ubiquity of the rituals and imagery of Russian Orthodoxy, which was in the midst of its own revival at the turn of the century.

Viacheslav Ivanov, a leading Symbolist theorist and poet, writes of synthesis of the arts as the chief goal of the modern artist. “That this synthesis can only be liturgical,” he states, “both the creator of the act [*deistvo*] about Parsifal and Scriabin understood.”⁴ They understood that it was in liturgy that the arts found their “natural axes,” and that this synthesis would lead the “collective consciousness” to “the highest goal of art, namely, the Mystery [*Misteria*].” He continues: “The problem of this synthesis is the universal problem of the coming Mystery. And the problem of the coming Mystery is the problem of religious life of the future.”⁵ Pavel Florensky, a priest and religious philosopher with a modernist orientation, wrote similarly that the “highest goal of the arts, their ultimate synthesis,” for which Scriabin thirsted, was already intimated by the “church ritual” [*khramovoedeistvo*]. Florensky describes the “art of fire,” “the art of smoke,” the “plastic, rhythmic

movements of the officiating priests, as when they swing the censer, the play and modulation of folds in the precious fabrics, the aroma, the particular fiery waftings of the atmosphere, ionized by thousands of burning flames,” as a “musical drama” and “primordial unifying activity.”⁶ Embedded in these musings is a crucial belief to crystalize during the Silver Age: artistic synthesis and social unification have an intrinsic, even inevitable connection to one another.

It is no accident that both theorists refer to this synthesis with designations such as *deistvo* (act; plural, *deistva*) and *misteriia* (mystery). These terms appear not only in the titles of Scriabin’s unrealized final works—the *Prefatory Act* [Predvaritel’noe deistvo] and *Mysterium* [Misteriia]—but they also describe two forms of medieval liturgical drama, the Slavic *deistvo* and the Western *mysteria*, or mystery play. While Ivanov, a trained classicist, often dwelt upon the ancients in his musings on theater as Nietzsche had earlier,⁷ a boom of scholarly and creative interest in the medieval liturgical drama was also underway. More specifically to Russia, which had neither a classical past nor the European Renaissance to constitute a “Middle Ages,” scholars were busy examining the religious traditions of pre-Petrine Russia, including Kievan and Muscovite Rus’. In this age of “elective antiquities,”⁸ this was the pre-modern past that was closest to hand, as many of the traditions of Russian Orthodoxy had been spared innovation for centuries. But one element that had fallen away from this living history—thus appearing particularly enchanting—was that of the *deistvo*. By the time Ivanov and Florensky wrote of it, the idea of the *deistvo* was widespread among modernist circles; in addition to Scriabin’s *Prefatory Act*, the musical press in 1915 referred to Stravinsky’s early plans for *Svadebka* (Les noces) as a *deistvo*.⁹

This chapter will trace the scholarly rediscovery of the medieval *deistvo* over the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, which provided a conceptual model for modernists seeking a “new and specifically Russian type of spectacle,” as the critic Vladimir Derzhanovsky put it.¹⁰ It was the very *old* type of spectacle of liturgical drama that would help the Silver Age imagination bridge the gap between artistic synthesis and social harmony. I then focus on one attempt to resurrect the *deistvo*: Alexander Kastalsky’s 1907 *The Furnace Rite*. The work’s premiere at an open session of the Moscow Commission for the Study of Church Antiquities occupied a middle ground between concert, liturgy, and scholarly presentation. It was performed by the Synodal Choir, and a bishop participated as he would in liturgy, though the event was held in the concert hall of the Synodal College, rather than in a church. Kastalsky, the most institutionally supported and stylistically representative composer of the so-called “New Direction of Russian Church Music” that flowered in this period,¹¹ presented the work as “reconstruction,” though in truth, almost all the music was newly composed, while only

the texts were archaic. In minimizing his own creative hand in the work, I argue, Kastalsky acted as an often-invisible intermediary between positivist academic enterprises, the rituals of the Orthodox Church, and the broader currents of Silver Age culture. The liturgical aesthetics of the *deistvo*, in turn, became ripe for appropriation by modernists seeking an alternative to theatrical conventions.

THE FURNACE RITE IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY SCHOLARSHIP

Most famous among the *deistva* was the Furnace Rite (*Peshchnoedeistvo*), a biblical story from the book of Daniel in which three youths—Ananiia, Azariia, and Misail—are thrown into a flaming furnace by King Nebuchadnezzar after refusing to bow before his idols.¹² The youths are unscathed by the fire, and an angel appears to rescue them. The rite originated in Byzantium and is thought to have developed from the daily morning service (*orthros*, similar to the Western Matins).¹³ In the service, the hymnodic genre of the *kanon* elaborates on the biblical canticles, which include both the “Prayer of the Three Children” and the “Song of the Three Children.” The Furnace Rite likely grew from these two odes of the *kanon*, and in the Slavic practice it was performed between them.¹⁴ In the Byzantine rite, the only “characters” are the youths themselves, while the Slavs added to the performance two “Chaldeans,” servants of the Babylonian king, who lead the youths into the furnace and perform a spoken dialogue.¹⁵ This was the only part of the rite that was not sung. The Furnace Rite came to Rus' as early as the fourteenth century and fell out of practice in the mid-seventeenth century. There are several possible reasons for its disappearance, ranging from official prohibition (under Swedish rule in Novgorod or by the Tsar in Muscovy) to lack of popular interest as the rite's relationship to the liturgical cycle became less apparent.¹⁶

Until the late nineteenth century, the *deistvo* aroused only marginal interest. In an 1857 tract titled *Mystery Plays and Old Theater in Russia*, the literary scholar Pyotr Pekarsky dwells briefly upon the Furnace Rite but assigns to it a primarily transitional value. Like scholars of the Western Middle Ages working deep into the twentieth century,¹⁷ scholars of Pekarsky's generation saw the liturgical drama as a way station in a teleology that began in ancient Greece and climaxed in Shakespeare.¹⁸ Pekarsky classified the Furnace Rite as a mystery play, eager to join it to the tradition of Western drama at the moment of transition from liturgy to secular theater. The Furnace Rite, he writes, contained the “embryo [. . .] of mystery plays and religious dialogues and after that drama as well, in the sense that we now understand the word.”¹⁹

That Pekarsky is defining drama in modern, theatrical terms is made even clearer by what he considers ancillary, as opposed to essential, to the development of drama. He writes, “it is apparent that here, *if we exclude the liturgy and the ordinary hymns*, of the dramatic essentially remain the dialogue of the Chaldeans and their leading of the children into the fire.”²⁰ In Pekarsky’s idea of drama—working backward from secular, European theater—liturgy and hymnody are an externality, while spoken dialogue and movement are essential.

Toward the end of the century, priorities shifted. Consistent with the widespread turn inward to the traditions of early Rus’ under the reign of Alexander III and boosted by the development of the scholarly field of liturgics, the next generation reexamined the Furnace Rite.²¹ Prominent liturgists such as Konstantin Nikolsky and Alexei Dmitrievsky rejected the Western genealogy Pekarsky had proposed. Though they seldom engaged with secular theater or the Western medieval mystery plays themselves, these scholars often found them useful as foils, allowing *deistva* to stand out within a clearly Russo-Byzantine history and distinctly liturgical dramatic system. Dmitrievsky articulates this reframing by shifting attention away from the dialogues of the Chaldeans, which he regards as *less* essential to the substance of the Furnace Rite, because they were a later addition, introduced under Polish influence.²² More importantly, to treat these dialogues as the sole bearer of dramatic sensibility is to ignore the fact that the liturgy itself is highly dramatic in a more sophisticated way than the dialogues.²³ Both Pekarsky and Dmitrievsky were interested in an archeology of origins and honoring Russia’s place in a larger cultural lineage, but whereas the litterateurs of the mid-nineteenth century were concerned specifically with the history of theater, the liturgists of the following generation saw liturgy as an alternative world of drama apart from theatrical aesthetics.

The key to this alternative dramatic world, in which theology and aesthetics intertwine, is a representational practice that highlights symbolic action and spiritual participation over verisimilitude and spectatorship. The thirteenth-century bishop and theologian Symeon of Thessaloniki served as a guide for both Dmitrievsky and Nikolsky in outlining this practice. Symeon writes that while the Byzantines used icons to depict events, such as the angel rescuing the youths from the furnace, the Latins used people and “took care that the person was not symbolic, not figurative, but represented themselves as God, the Mother of God, and the Saints with great resemblance.”²⁴ Nikolsky likewise accuses the Latins of visual trickery, claiming that they wished to deceive naive viewers who “might be carried away in their minds” and “forget that they see a representation,” believing the mystery play in front of them to be a real repetition of a sacred event.²⁵ Symeon decried the Latin practice as contrary both to “the holy images” and “even more to the mysteries of

Christ.”²⁶ For a Byzantine witness such as Symeon, icons, with their highly ritualized mode of production, were the only acceptable form of visual representation for the divine. To dress up humans to realistically represent sacred events was to place undue emphasis on external, material characteristics at the expense of a symbolic connection to the divine.²⁷ Icons were a material representation that bore the imprint of divine energy; theatrical performance was merely an “illusion.”²⁸

In drawing heavily upon Symeon of Thessaloniki, these nineteenth-century scholars highlighted the Byzantine roots of the Furnace Rite, a largely indisputable legacy, contra Pekarsky's Western genealogy. Nevertheless, the weight given to Symeon, not only as a historical witness, but also as a doctrinal authority, puts Russian liturgists in a slightly awkward position: evidence suggests Russian performances of the Furnace Rite as early as the sixteenth century did in fact enhance symbolic representation with a handful of special effects and dramatic imitation, bringing it somewhere in between Byzantine and Latin performative conventions. The Russian service used a more elaborate, three-dimensional angel, rather than an icon; they used a real fire in a constructed furnace; and they added the Chaldeans, who even intermittently cast gunpowder into the fire for added effect.²⁹

Despite the added spectacle, Dmitrievsky and Nikolsky emphasized that the fundamental symbolic system of the rite and its “organic” connection to the liturgy set it apart from the mystery plays and their supposed theatrical heirs.³⁰ While Pekarsky had considered the youths and Chaldeans “*dramatis personae*,”³¹ Nikolsky's analysis highlights that both groups step out of the story and into the framing ritual, singing narrative and doxological hymns with the choir and presenting themselves to the hierarch for blessing. Nikolsky elsewhere points out that in ordinary services, the deacon and the priest frequently stand in for Christ, and everyone understands that this is figurative.³² While the hierarch here is not “in character,” the frequency of such figurative portrayal in the liturgy adds a layer of symbolic complexity—even Nikolsky does not explain whether the individuals playing the youths and Chaldeans are given benedictions or the Youths and Chaldeans themselves are being blessed. Put another way, the notion of symbolic representation suggests a line of demarcation between a sign and its referent, but the role of the bishop resides above this distinction, both intruding into a symbolic reenactment and giving a real blessing. Dmitrievsky also provides evidence that the Youths and Chaldeans took part throughout the services of the feast day on which the Furnace Rite was performed, and various liturgical readings were given from the “furnace,” further integrating the *deistvo* into the broader symbolic system of the liturgy.³³

These distinctions extend to the basic formal characteristics of the music. The hymn of praise after the rescue of the youths is sung in a

responsorial fashion common to liturgical hymns, a sort of “triple antiphony,” as Velimirovic calls it,³⁴ demonstrating that this is, indeed a “church service,” as Nikolsky writes.³⁵ Since Nikolsky is primarily interested in distinguishing liturgy from theater, he does not elaborate on the aesthetic ramifications of this formal indicator. The effect, however, is that concentric circles of participants are integrated into the drama, even as the drama loses its claim to self-enclosed spectacle. As Derek Kruger has written, such formal devices are crucial for the formation of liturgical community, as the subject position written into hymns models to the worshipper the appropriate response to sacred events.³⁶ Hymns of praise, such as this, are particularly powerful, for they not only constitute a collective activity, but they also present a moment of linguistic dovetailing. They simultaneously *command* and *perform* a liturgical act in formulas such as “praise the Lord,” making the singers participants not only in a symbolic but also literal sacred activity.³⁷

Finally, Nikolsky points to a frequent device both in liturgical hymnody and biblical exegesis, that of typology. The brief mention of the “Christian God” in the hymn of praise fits in with the larger interpretation that the (Old Testament) saving of the youths, who came unscathed from the furnace, is a prefiguration of Christ’s birth from Mary, unsullied by a “sinful” human womb. The association is enhanced by the imagery of several Marian hymns, which refer to the Israelite youths or the Babylonian furnace, and the rite’s placement in the week before Christmas would have heightened awareness of this link.³⁸ Furthermore, the furnace as protective womb is part of what Vera Shevzov calls a “broader Marian-centered culture in Russia” that “identified Mary with the sacred collective, the ecclesial community.” In the liturgical tradition, the furnace is joined by “the Old Testament Ark of the Covenant, the Tabernacle, and the Jerusalem Temple—the sites of divine manifestation and presence in the midst of Israel.”³⁹ The mixing of Old and New Testament, then, did not only fracture the theatrical value of “unity of time” against which Nikolsky implicitly argues; it also appeals to a deep belief in unity among believers across time and space. In contrast to the special effects in Latin mystery plays (or at least the Orthodox straw-man descriptions of them), this is a type of “realism” that does not hinge upon visual verisimilitude, but rather on the mundane symbolism perceptible to ordinary believers: they were themselves safely enclosed in the church as were the youths in the furnace and Christ in the womb.

These aspects of social integration and chronological collapse were particularly alluring to the Silver Age mind. In 1912, Bishop Trifon wrote a highly romanticized description of the rite in the lavishly illustrated journal *Svetil’nik*. Trifon imagines the experience of attending the Furnace Rite in the mid-seventeenth century from the point of view of a peasant. He evocatively describes the feeling of standing in the quiet church for All-Night Vigil at the

end of a long fast: as the service nears its end, before rolling into the morning service that will feature the Furnace Rite, light begins to glimmer on the icons as the sun begins to come through the windows—the “quiet, bright” frost mirrors the placid state of the soul.⁴⁰ He describes the sense of wonder at not being able to see from where the angel descends in the packed church. But the greatest excitement comes not from the spectacle of the angel or pyrotechnics, but rather from the spectacle of political and ecclesial hierarchy merging. As the All-Night Vigil wears on and excitement builds,

A rumor is carried among the people: the Father himself, the most serene Tsar, Aleksei Mikhailovich, will be at the morning service today with his wife, Nataliia Kirillovna; and with even greater impatience the worshipers await the beginning of liturgy. And indeed, in the royal palace, the Tsar and Tsaritsa each in their own quarters, prepare to walk in the church of God.⁴¹

The nostalgia for pre-modern social structures reframes the drama of the Furnace Rite: the image of Tsar and peasant worshipping together in Uspensky Cathedral within the Kremlin is as salient for the late imperial imagination as the rite itself.⁴² Trifon did not only paint this picture for readers of *Svetil'nik*, however. He himself had taken part in it as the hierarch leading the 1907 performances of Kastalsky's “reconstruction” of the Furnace Rite.

KASTALSKY'S FURNACE RITE: REVIVAL AND RECONSTRUCTION

Bishop Trifon's outlook was a conservative one, in a broad cultural and political sense. Kastalsky's *Furnace Rite*, however, is more difficult to characterize. Though the work expresses the same longing for pre-modern unity in the church, Kastalsky was surprisingly cavalier with his sources, and the performance of the *Furnace Rite* made use of visual elements by both Viktor Vasnetsov and Nikolai Roerich, artists with their own distinctly modern ways of engaging with the medieval past. Furthermore, Kastalsky's reconstruction was commissioned by Alexander Ivanovich Uspensky of the Moscow Commission for the Study of Monuments of Church Antiquity, giving it a veneer of scholarly positivism.⁴³ In her study of this moment in the visual arts, Maria Taroutina charts this tangle of commitments diachronically. She writes that, “although initially born of an academic, historicist, and imperialist impulse, the Russo-Byzantine revival rapidly evolved into a crucial catalyst for modernist experimentation and a means of articulating avant-garde theory and aesthetics.”⁴⁴ Irina Shevelenko has put a finer point on these distinctions, particularly in the period of Kastalsky's *deistvo* and Stravinsky's plans for his

own. Shevelenko considers Kastalsky a “revivalist,” who essentially wanted to “restore tradition, accommodating it to contemporary taste,” as opposed to the true modernist Stravinsky who sought its “experimental transformation.”⁴⁵

Kastalsky’s *Furnace Rite*, with its visual and dramatic elements, is noteworthy because it was legible to both the revivalist likes of Trifon and the readers of the modernist journal *Golden Fleece*, which announced its performance.⁴⁶ Put within Taroutina’s chronological narrative, Kastalsky’s “reconstruction” rests just between the academic—the boom of manuscript discovery, study, and editing among Kastalsky’s peers—and the experimental—the stylishly archaic works by Stravinsky (*Rite of Spring*, *Svadebka*) and others that have made a more lasting impact on music historiography. *The Furnace Rite* demonstrates just how this transformation was achieved and how such mediating agents as Kastalsky transferred the knowledge gleaned from Imperially funded academic enterprises to the modernist imagination.

The collection of “antiquities” had become a national pastime in nineteenth-century Russia. The Moscow Commission for the Study of Monuments of Church Antiquity, under Uspensky’s leadership, was one of many societies dedicated to this work. This particular commission, following Uspensky’s own expertise, was primarily invested in studies of painting and architecture,⁴⁷ which makes the handwritten score of Kastalsky’s *Furnace Rite* stand out as something of an anomaly in the published proceedings of the commission.⁴⁸ Vasily Metallov’s historical sketch on the *Furnace Rite*, the text of a lecture he delivered before the premiere of Kastalsky’s work, also accompanied the score. Metallov’s lecture was also published a few years later in *Svetil’nik*, the very journal that printed Trifon’s imagining of the medieval rite, though neither author acknowledged their connection to Kastalsky’s reconstruction.⁴⁹ If Metallov’s reticence to reference his colleague’s score casts doubt on its scholarly value, its premiere and publication were not met with the same reservation from reviewers; even the renowned medievalist Dmitrii Razumovsky published an excerpt from it as an example in a historical survey.⁵⁰

The music of the *Furnace Rite*, however, is purely the product of Kastalsky’s imagination. Polina Terent’eva, in her recent study of the medieval rite, notes that only the *heirmos* “On the Field of Prayer” (Na pole molebne), part of the seventh ode of the *kanon*, could lay any claim to authenticity in the modern sense of the word.⁵¹ On the one hand, within the milieu of antiquities research, few would have had the musical expertise to critique Kastalsky’s “reconstruction,” and those who did, have it found it advantageous not to. As Marina Frolova-Walker has argued, experts such as Stepan Smolensky readily encouraged “reconstructions” that likened medieval chant to contemporary folksong.⁵² The claim in the published edition of Kastalsky’s score that it was “laid out according to the chants preserved in

manuscripts” certainly muddies the waters for scholars seeking information on the medieval sources.⁵³

On the other hand, Kastalsky was quick to admit that historical authenticity was not a particularly urgent concern when he approached the task of “reconstruction.” Beginning in 1903, he published a series of “restorations” titled *From Bygone Ages*, featuring segments devoted to the music of ancient Egypt and ancient Greece, among others. Kastalsky mined published collections of melodies by others and described his goal as such: “I wished, in defiance of the historians, to prove the clear existence of non-unison music from the most ancient times and its striving toward expression, illustration [*zhivopisnost'*], and so on, from ancient times.”⁵⁴ Though Kastalsky’s efforts are seldom held in high esteem today, Boris Asafiev considered them quite successful at the time, praising Kastalsky’s ability “to track down what is most characteristic and develop the hidden musical content in one passage or another. To develop it using the harmonic, contrapuntal and coloristic possibilities enclosed in the very construction of a given melody using purely external means and not to simply work it out technically.”⁵⁵ Asafiev’s comment encapsulates Kastalsky’s project on both a technical and conceptual level. The absence of manuscript evidence for the music of the Furnace Rite gave Kastalsky the freedom to bring out the musical dramaturgy that he believed to be latent in the textual record of the rite, “restoring” not what was lost, but rather what the Silver Age imagination believed could have been.

Kastalsky’s score comprises three types of music. For “On the Field of Prayer” and for the concluding “On the Rivers of Babylon” he employs simple hymnody with very minimal harmonization. At the very end of the rite, there is a hymn known as the “mnogoletie,” or “many years,” which honors the tsar, written in three-part, homophonic harmony. The middle section “Blessed are you, God our Father” (*Blagosloven esi Gospodi Bozhe otets nashikh*) is where the drama happens. The singers are split into three groups: the *otroki* (“youths”), singing close, four-part harmony; the *protodiakon* (“proto-deacon”), a bass solo singer occasionally joined by an *oktavist* (a low bass who doubles the melody down an octave); and the *d'iaki* (“deacons”), another small group of bass-baritone singers who sing in octaves, unison, and occasional two- or three-part harmony. The groups occasionally support one another, but more frequently alternate with one another, shifting between dialogic and choral constructions. And though they come close to suggesting character groupings, the part of the youths cautions against too close a correlation: the three youths are represented by a chorus that splits into as many as four parts at times.

The way this dramatic section is bookended by hymnody and the way “characters” and choirs go in and out of view suggest a somewhat fragmentary performance. The circumstances of the premiere amplify this point:

Metallov showed slides on a “magic lantern” of illuminations of “On the Rivers of Babylon” and excerpts from manuscripts.⁵⁶ The collection of fragments is typical of the Silver Age nostalgia for the Middle Ages—such fragmentation represented for moderns a lost whole. Without smoothing the edges too much, one of Kastalsky’s strategies for recapturing this “lost unity” is precisely the technique singled out by Asafiev, that of creating an external artifice based on a brief snatch of melody. Kastalsky does just this by extracting a cell from “On the field of prayer”—the one authentic melody of the work—and echoing it throughout the counterpoint of the internal dramatic section (see figure 19.1).

The harmonic syntax of the interior section of the work is similar to the style Kastalsky had been developing over the previous decade as part of a broader revival of sacred music. Heptatonic modes create a simulacrum of medieval practice, but they are harmonized triadically, contrasting with the distinctly linear polyphony seen in Terent’eva’s reconstruction, in which any triads are strictly incidental. Kastalsky draws out the narrative element of the drama through a constant and progressive movement through modal areas.

a. “On the field of prayer,” melodic cell, mm. 1–3



b. “Blessed are you, God our Father,” mm. 7–8 (Protodiakon part)



c. “Blessed are you, God our Father,” mm. 14–15 (Protodiakon part)



d. “Blessed are you, God our Father,” mm. 37–39 (Protodiakon part)



Figure 19.1 (a–d): Kastalsky, *The Furnace Rite*, “On the field of prayer” Melodic Cell and Its Variations in the *protodiakon* Part of “Blessed are you, God our Father.” Source: A[leksandr] Kastal’skii, *Peschchnoedeistvo (starinyitserkovnyi obriad)*, Choir and bass solo (Moscow: Iurgenson, 1909), 5–9. A[leksandr] Kastal’skii, *Peschchnoedeistvo (starinyitserkovnyi obriad)*, Choir and bass solo (Moscow: Iurgenson, 1909), 5–9.

He combines these modal shifts with a musical division of labor—the *d'iaki*, *protodiaki*, and youths are not fully distinguished as characters, but their vocal parts, register, and prosody are distinct enough to create the impression of oppositional forces. The bass *protodiaki* typically begin sections with a recitative style, while the youths respond, conveying most harmonic interest, and the *d'iaki* alternatively finish the *protodiaki*'s lines and provide harmonic support for the youths. Such opposing musical roles are Kastalsky's innovation, but the kernel of this principle is found in the medieval rite, in which the youths, their "teacher," and the left and right choirs sing in alternation.⁵⁷ These roles, in fact, graft easily onto standard performance practices in Byzantine and early Slavic liturgies. The result is a form of drama that lies somewhere between a discernible narrative arc and ordinary liturgical antiphony. The successive modal episodes provide a continuous sense of motion without clear direction, and the interspersed praise refrains within the narrative text makes it clear that the climax—the angel rescuing the youths—is a foregone conclusion. The dramatic interest is generated formally, rather, by the way the opposing musical forces lead one another into new modal areas.

Take, for example, the section leading up to the youths' rescue by the angel (figure 19.2). The score proceeds from F-mixolydian (mm. 22-24) to B-Phrygian (mm. 24-34) to G-Ionian areas (mm. 34-38). These modal areas correspond to blocks of the youths' text, led each time by the unison (or octave-doubled) parts of the *protodiakon* which introduce pitches outside the modal area previously inhabited by the youths. Here, they also echo the melodic cell from "On the field of prayer." These chromatic pitches are then picked up by the youths and become part of their new modal area. The most dramatic movement is from F-mixolydian to B-Phrygian, a root motion of a tritone, achieved by an accented, syncopated half-step motion from G to F# in the octave-doubled part of *protodiakon* at measure 25 (on the words "And the flame grew hot upon the furnace and also burned all around" [*iraspalias hesiaplamen'nadpeshchiiuiobydeipozhzhe*]). Then, at the appearance of the angel, the mode brightens and the harmony rests on a G-major triad before the second dialogue of the Chaldeans commences (see figure 19.2).

The way the recitative parts lead the choral parts from one modal area to another establishes a musical dramaturgy that fits the overall aesthetic of the *deistvo*. There is some agency to "characters," as the Chaldeans and the angel alternatively lead the youths to and from the furnace. But while there is a sense of movement, the direction of this movement is considerably looser. The action of the interior section is infused with frequent exclamations of praise, a continuous look outward from the narrative of the youths to the liturgical frame. After the dialogues and Kastalsky's dramatic polyphony conclude, the hymn "On the Rivers of Babylon" reflects on the action, integrating at once the drama into worship and the congregation into the drama.

22 *s oktavistom.* *f* *On the field of prayer" cell*
 Protodiakon *f* i ras-pa-*lia*-she-sia pla-men nad pe-shchi-tu i o -
 Otroki i dazhd' s³ta -vu i me-ni Tvo - e - mu Gos - po - di.
 D'iaki

26 *f*
 by-de i po zhche.
 i ras-pa - lia - she-sia pla-men' nad pe - shchi-tu i o by-de i po-zhche, ikh zhe ob - re - te ok-rest pe-shchi khal-dei-ski -
pp

30
 An - gel zhe Gos - po - den' sni - de kupno s³yushchimi, so Azerieiu v peshch' - i ot - ria - se pla-men' og-nenn' ii - ot
 - ia

34 *f* pe - shchi (Zdes' pristikhodil dialog mezhdu khaldcaimi.)
 i so-tvo - ri sred-ne-e pe - shchi, ia - ko dukh ro - sy shu - mlashch, i ne pri - kos - nu - sta ikh ot - niud' - - ogn'.

Figure 19.2 Kastalsky, *The Furnace Rite*, “Blessed are you, God our Father,” mm. 24-38. Source: A[leksandr] Kastal’skii, *Peschchnoedeistvo (starinytserkovnyi obriad)*, Choir and bass solo (Moscow: Iurgenson, 1909), 8-9. A[leksandr] Kastal’skii, *Peschchnoedeistvo (starinytserkovnyi obriad)*, Choir and bass solo (Moscow: Iurgenson, 1909), 8-9.

VASNETSOV IN MUSIC: THE REVIVALIST/ MODERNIST SLIPPAGE

The fantasies of social harmony among scholars of the *deistvo* were partially reenacted at the 1907 premiere of Kastalsky’s *Furnace Rite*. According to a review in the *Moscow Bulletin*, not only was Bishop Trifon

present as a participant, but so were several other high-ranking bishops, as well as Grand Duke Dimitrii Pavlovich and Grand Duchess Maria Pavlovna, Vladimir Dzhunkovsky, the Governor of Moscow, and, among other notables, Viktor Mikhailovich Vasnetsov.⁵⁸ The artist Vasnetsov was more than a famous attendee, however. In a memoir, Kastalsky writes that his *Furnace Rite* was performed several times with “the proper scenery, with the costumes of the Youths and the Chaldeans, [and] with the demonstration of the burning furnace.”⁵⁹ The *Moscow Bulletin* review refers to “the singers [. . .] in their beautiful tunics with red and green wax candles in their hands.”⁶⁰ According to another review these “costumes” were designed by Vasnetsov himself.⁶¹

If Vasnetsov did design these costumes, as seems likely, this would be fitting: Kastalsky was often referred to as a “Vasnetsov in music.”⁶² Vasnetsov, like Kastalsky, was a revivalist who occupied an ambiguous cultural position. Some of his most enduringly popular works are paintings based on fairytales, but most of Vasnetsov’s renown at the time owed to his church interiors, particularly at St. Vladimir’s Cathedral in Kiev and the chapels at Abramtsevo where the railroad tycoon Savva Mamontov had established an artists’ colony.⁶³ Politically, Vasnetsov was descended from the Slavophiles, sharing the view of “official nationality” that linked “orthodoxy, autocracy, and nationality,” and he enjoyed the support of members of the royal family.⁶⁴ Aesthetically, he drew upon both the conventions of icon-painting and nineteenth-century realism,⁶⁵ as well as the spatial techniques of the theater.⁶⁶

Like the *Furnace Rite*, it was Vasnetsov’s adaptation of liturgical representational paradigms that appealed to emergent modernist aesthetics. One of the most evocative concepts to arise in Silver Age theatrical criticism was that of *uslovnost’* or “conventionality,” which the Symbolist writer Valerii Briusov announced as the antidote to the “unnecessary truth” of theatrical realism.⁶⁷ For modernists like Briusov, this translated to a sort of stylized, conscious adoption of convention in the manner of “ancient” or “folk” theater, providing the break with naturalism needed to point toward a “higher reality.”⁶⁸ It was this very trait that also drew critics to Vasnetsov’s “Mystery of the Eucharist” panels in St. Vladimir’s Cathedral in Kiev, which makes use of Byzantine and early Slavic perspectival convention. “Such poems of higher conventionality [*uslovnost’*],” one critic writes, “compel us to forget the conventionality of naturalism to which we are accustomed.”⁶⁹ In turn, “deep but forgotten feelings” would arise in simple worshippers and urbane visitors as well, compelling them to engage spiritually with the work.⁷⁰

One of the painters to take Vasnetsov’s revivalist aesthetic and adapt it to modernism was Nikolai Roerich. At the premiere of Kastalsky’s *Furnace Rite*, this transition happened in real time. During his scholarly presentation

accompanying the musical performance, Metallov showed slides on a projector not only of manuscript illuminations and chant paleography, but also of Roerich's own painting entitled "The Furnace Rite," which drew simultaneously upon both the aesthetics of medieval icons and contemporary decadent symbolism.⁷¹ While Roerich is often remembered for the eclectic esotericism in which he was engaged later in his long career,⁷² Michael Kunichika has demonstrated that his aesthetics were deeply indebted to his early involvement in archeology, working with organizations similar to the one that commissioned *The Furnace Rite*.⁷³

Roerich's archaicizing impulse found its most famous outlet not in the painting that accompanied Kastalsky's *Furnace Rite*, but rather in the costumes that were created for Stravinsky's *Rite of Spring*. In both, the details of biblical legend and pagan myth were meant to provide a whiff of the primordial, rather than an item for religious devotion or historical contemplation. As Shevelenko writes of both Stravinsky's music and Roerich's decorations for *The Rite of Spring*, "the archaic in general was the background onto which was peppered—blending some in, setting some aside—the specific, 'ethnic' substrate."⁷⁴ The *Rite of Spring*, like *Svadebka* two years later, was referred to in the press as a *deistvo*, but Stravinsky was quick to separate himself from the old revivalist camp; it was meant as a slight when he referred to not Kastalsky, but his old teacher, Rimsky-Korsakov, as a "Vasnetsov in music."⁷⁵ The presence of Roerich's work in *The Furnace Rite* suggests that the aesthetics of revivalism and those of archaic modernism were prone to just the slippages and associations Stravinsky hoped to avoid.

The reception of Kastalsky's *Furnace Rite* is indicative of how the work, modestly experimental but presented as a scholarly reconstruction, proved mutually legible to modernists and antiquarians alike. Prior to the performance, Uspensky's commission generated broad enough interest to earn mention in one of the leading Symbolist journals, *Golden Fleece*.⁷⁶ The generally conservative religious newspaper *The Bell* reviewed a 1909 performance of the *deistvo* as at once a scholarly and religious gathering, which, like the premiere, enjoyed the attendance of several aristocratic notables.⁷⁷ When the published score of *The Furnace Rite* appeared, the trade journal *Choral and Regents' Affairs* lauded the work as a reconstruction, noting that Kastalsky in particular was a composer "who knows how to preserve the most typical traits of our old Russian singing in his 'arrangements.'"⁷⁸ This review was written for an expert audience if there ever was one; that Kastalsky's original music was accepted as a "reconstruction" was at once a testament to how successful he had been in establishing a style that captured an imagined essence of medieval Muscovy and an indication that the authors of the journal were party to similar stylistic inclinations.

THE AFTERLIFE OF THE *DEISTVO*

Kastalsky himself must have been pleased with the result, as he continued his series of “restorations,” *From Bygone Ages*, over the next several years, and imbued them with an increasingly dramatic character. The fragmentary works were presented in something of a skeleton score; most were for small vocal ensemble with intermittent accompaniment for piano and cues for various instruments inspired by the locales depicted, which ranged from ancient Egypt to India and China. Kastalsky defended this property in correspondence with Sergei Rachmaninov, who delicately notified the composer of the publisher Edition Russe’s refusal to publish a subsequent “reconstruction.”⁷⁹ The fragmentary aesthetic of the volumes also has its contemporary champions; Svetlana Zvereva has argued that the quality is an anticipation of modernist cinematography.⁸⁰ Boris Gasparov (albeit without mentioning Kastalsky) credits a traditional “Russianness” of these traits with Russian composers’ international success at the advent of modernism, arguing that the “strategic shift in aesthetic values” at the onset of the twentieth century “led to the cultivation of deliberately awkward discourses roughly pasted together, replete with narrative incongruities and stylistic rough edges.”⁸¹ Gasparov has in mind Prokofiev’s early piano sonatas and Stravinsky’s *The Rite of Spring* and *Svadebka*, but the rough edges are certainly shared by Kastalsky’s “reconstructions.”

The most compelling commentary on Kastalsky’s reconstructions, however, comes from an enthusiastic young Boris Asafiev.⁸² The third volume of *From Bygone Ages*—the one purporting to represent early Christian ritual in “the catacombs”—sparked the most interest in Asafiev and returned him to the concept of the *deistvo*. He juxtaposes the *deistvo* with tragedy and comedy, which satisfy contemporary pathos. “The ‘*deistvo*’ does not provide this,” he writes,

it only restores and reproduces past, beautiful forms, taken in a frozen state (idealized, of course, since there have always been struggles) and, as a result of this, demonstrates the religious foundation of everyday life and ritual, as well as the beauty of lost unity and wholeness of worldview.⁸³

While the fragmentariness of Stravinsky’s balletic tableaux may have been an aesthetic end in and of itself in a modernist context, Asafiev puts his finger on the revivalist longing for wholeness and unity. Furthermore, Asafiev sees the *deistvo* as a rejoinder against, not fodder for the inventions of modernity, calling it “a reaction directed against the hubbub, the vanity and cinematographic flashing.”⁸⁴

In his review praising Kastalsky's *deistva*, Asafiev looks to Stravinsky to "resolve" the question of the genre's meaning for modernity in the planned *Svadebka* (Les noces) eight years before the work's premiere. And there are intriguing parallels between Kastalsky's *Furnace Rite* and Stravinsky's wedding rite, such as the lack of association between characters and voice parts. But while Kastalsky was seeking to breathe warmth back into an extinct ritual, Stravinsky, as Taruskin has argued, was making a living tradition cool, inhuman, and mechanistic.⁸⁵ By the time of *Svadebka*'s premiere, the revivalist moment of Kastalsky and Vasnetsov had passed. So too had the moment when the Stravinskian and Kastalskian modes of archaicism could be mistaken for one another.

It is possible that Stravinsky knew Kastalsky's work, and it is probable that he would have denied any influence from the lesser-known composer. What is undeniable, however, is that the work of artists such as Kastalsky contributed to a broader interest in a synthetic artwork based on medieval drama and ritual. Kastalsky's *Furnace Rite* was important in distilling the work of scholars such as Nikolsky, Dmitrievsky, and Metallov for a general public; and, in obscuring his own role in its authorship, Kastalsky further contributed to an imagined medieval aesthetic that was perceived as found, authorless, and original. In this way, the work is representative of Kastalsky's larger output, in which he often presents himself as an arranger or "stylist,"⁸⁶ rather than author, an often-invisible mediator between archeology and the avant-garde.

NOTES

1. See M.V. Pashchenko, *Siuzhet Dlia Misterii: Parsifal' - Kitez' - Zolotoi Petushok: Istoricheskaia Poetika Opery v Kanun Moderna* (Moscow: Tsentrumanitarnykhinitiatiiv, 2018), 33–41 and 213–306; Rebecca Mitchell, "How Russian was Wagner? Russian Campaigns to Defend or Destroy the German Composer During the Great War (1914–1918)," in *Wagner in Russia, Poland, and the Czech Lands*, ed. Stephen Muir and Anastasia Belina-Johnson (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2013); Rosamund Bartlett, *Wagner and Russia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 126–30; and Morrison's response in Simon Morrison, "Review: Bartlett, Rosamund. *Wagner and Russia*," *Cambridge Opera Journal* 8, no. 1 (1996): 83–92. All translations from Russian are my own unless otherwise noted.

2. Viacheslav Ivanov, "Chiurlianis i problema sinteza iskusstv," in *Sobranie sochinenii*, ed. D. V. Ivanov and O. Deshart, Vol. 3 (Brussels: Foyer Oriental Chrétien, 1979), 167, and Pashchenko, *Siuzhet dlia misterii*, 19–23.

3. Rebecca Mitchell, *Nietzsche's Orphans: Music, Metaphysics, and the Twilight of the Russian Empire* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016), 78 and 91.

4. Ivanov, "Chiurlianis i problema sinteza iskusstv," 167.

5. *Ibid.*

6. Pavel Florensky, "The Church Ritual as a Synthesis of the Arts," in *Beyond Vision: Essays on the Perception of Art*, ed. Nicoletta Misler and trans. Wendy Salmond (London: Reaktion, 2002), 108–109 and 111.

7. Judith E. Kalb, *Russia's Rome: Imperial Visions, Messianic Dreams, 1890–1940* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2008), 129–32.

8. Michael Kunichika, *Our Native Antiquity: Archaeology and Aesthetics in the Culture of Russian Modernism* (Boston, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2015), 19.

9. Irina Shevelenko, *Modernizm kak arkhazim: natsionalizm i poiski modernistskoi estetiki v Rossii* (Moscow: Novoeliteraturnoeobozrenie, 2017), 254.

10. *Ibid.*, 256.

11. For a useful survey of the New Direction, see Marina Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 265–300.

12. To distinguish between the medieval Furnace Rite and Kastalsky's work, I italicize only when referring to Kastalsky's *Furnace Rite*.

13. Alexander Lingas, "Late Byzantine Cathedral Liturgy and the *Service of the Furnace*," in *Approaching the Holy Mountain*, ed. Sharon E. J. Gerstel and Robert S. Nelson (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2010), 188–90.

14. Milos Velimirovic, "Liturgical Drama in Byzantium and Russia," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 16 (1962): 371.

15. *Ibid.*, 365 and Swoboda, Marina. "The Furnace Play and the Development of Liturgical Drama in Russia," *The Russian Review* 60 (April 2002): 225. The term "Chaldeans" comes from the Book of Daniel and also appears in some hymns. A. A. Dmitrievskii, "Chin peshchnago deistva. Istoriko-arkheologicheskii etiid," *Vizantiiskii vremennik* 1 (1894): 594–95. Modern English Bibles sometimes render it as "astrologers." Russians at the time of the appearance of the Furnace Rite would have associated these characters with the pagans at Nebuchadnezzar's court, rather than with the contemporary or historical Chaldean people.

16. On Swedish prohibition, see Swoboda, "The Furnace Play," 224; on the attitudes of the Tsar Aleksei and Patriarch Joseph toward drama and music in church, see, respectively, Swoboda, 231, and Velimirovic, "Liturgical Drama," 375; and on the organic disappearance, see Dmitrievskii, "Chin peshchnagodeistva," 599.

17. See John Parker, "Who's Afraid of Darwin? Revisiting Chambers and Hardison... And Nietzsche," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 40, no. 1 (January 2010): 7–35.

18. P[etr] Pekariskii, *Misterii i starinnyi teatr v rossi* (St. Petersburg: Tipografiia glavnago shtaba ego imperatorskago velichestva po voenno-uchebnym zavedeniam, 1857), 5–6.

19. *Ibid.*, 16.

20. *Ibid.*, emphasis added.

21. On the resurgence of interest in early Rus', see Richard Wortman, *Scenarios of Power: Myth and Ceremony in Russian Monarchy from Peter the Great to the Abdication of Nicholas II*, new ed. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006), 287–92.

22. Dmitrievskii, "Chin peshchnago deistva," 553–54.

23. Ibid.
24. Konstantin Nikol'skii, *O sluzhbakh russkoi tserkvi, byvshikh v prezhnikh pechatnykh bogoslužhebnykh knigakh*, St. Petersburg, 1885, 179.
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid.
27. See White's excellent explication of Symeon's *Dialogue in Christ* in Andrew Walker White, *Performing Orthodox Ritual in Byzantium* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 242–47. On iconophile theology, see Andrew Louth, *St. John Damascene: Tradition and Originality in Byzantine Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 194–221.
28. Dmitrievskii, "Chin peshchnogo deistva," 554. For a discussion of the interaction between Latin drama and Byzantine image theory, see also Henry Maguire, "Medieval Art in Southern Italy: Latin Drama and the Greek Literary Imagination," in *Image and Imagination in Byzantine Art* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007), 227–28.
29. Velimirovic, "Liturgical Drama," 368–73 and White, *Performing Orthodoxy Ritual*, 372 n.4.
30. Nikol'skii, *O sluzhbakh*, 180 and Dmitrievskii, "Chin peshchnogo deistva," 590.
31. Pekarskii, *Misterii i starinnyi teatr*, 16.
32. Nikol'skii, *O sluzhbakh*, 179.
33. Dmitrievskii, "Chin peshchnogo deistva," 596 and 570.
34. Velimirovic, "Liturgical Drama," 372.
35. Nikol'skii, *O sluzhbakh*, 180.
36. Derek Krueger, *Liturgical Subjects: Christian Ritual, Biblical Narrative and the Formation of Self in Byzantium* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014), 72–73.
37. For a survey of applications of speech-act theory in liturgical studies, see Aad de Jong, "Liturgical Action from a Language Perspective: About Performance and Performatives in Liturgy," in *Discourse in Ritual Studies*, ed. Hans Schilderman (Boston: Brill, 2007), 111–45.
38. Nikol'skii, "O sluzhbakh," 169–70.
39. Vera Shevzov, *Russian Orthodoxy on the Eve of Revolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 217.
40. Episkop Trifon (Dmitrovskii), "K istorii drevne-russkago tserkovnogo obriada 'Peshchnoe deistvo,'" *Svetil'nik* 4–5 (May-June 1913): 20.
41. Ibid., 21.
42. Tsar Nicholas II himself actively cultivated this idea through political pagantry and religious celebrations. His celebration of the Passion Week at the Moscow Kremlin particularly resonates with the discourse surrounding the Furnace Rite. See Wortman, *Scenarios of Power*, 347–50.
43. Svetlana Zvereva, ed., *Aleksandr Kastal'skii. Stat'i, materialy, vospominaniia, perepiska*, Vol. 5 of *Russkaia dukhovnaia muzyka v dokumentakh i materiakh*, ed. A. A. Naumov, M. P. Rakhmanova, and S. G. Zvereva (Moscow: Znak, 2006), 66 n. 29.
44. Maria Taroutina, *The Icon and the Square: Russian Modernism and the Russo-Byzantine Revival* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2018), 5.

45. Shevelenko, *Modernizm kak arkhazim*, 262–63.
46. “Vesti otovsiudu,” *Zolotoe runo* 11–12 (1906): 149–52.
47. N. G. Korshunova, “Aleksandr Ivanovich Uspenskii (arkhivist, istorik iskusstva, prosvetitel’),” Website Azbuka very, https://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Aleksandr_Uspenskij/aleksandr-ivanovich-uspenskij-arhivist-istorik-iskusstva-prosvetitel/.
48. A. I. Uspenskii, ed. *Trudy komissii po osmotru izucheniiu pamiatnikov tserkovnoi stariny g. Moskvy i Moskovskoi Eparkhii*, Vol. 4 (Moscow: Pechatnia A. I. Snigireva, 1911).
49. V[asilii] Metallov, “Na pamiat’ o peshchnom deistve,” *Svetil’nik* 4 (1914): 1–6.
50. This reference, in turn, was cited in Velimirovic, “Liturgical Drama,” 373–74. Velimirovic would have been able to spot the anachronistic harmonization, but lacking access to the score, he does not question its status as a restoration.
51. Polina Terent’eva, *Peshchnoe deistvo. Sostavlenie, rekonstruktsiia gimnografii i stat’i Poliny Terent’evoi* (Moscow: Sport ikul’tura, 2015), 8.
52. Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 281.
53. A[leksandr] Kastal’skii, *Peshchnoe deistvo (stariny tserkovnyi obriad)*, Choir and bass solo (Moscow: Iurgenson, 1909).
54. Aleksandr Kastal’skii, “O moei muzykal’noi kar’ere i moi mysli o tserkovnoi muzyke,” *Muzykal’nyi sovremennik*, no. 2 (June–July 1915): 31–45, reprinted in Zvereva, ed. *Aleksandr Kastal’skii*, 57.
55. Igor’ Glebov [Bris Asaf’ev], “Ot ‘opytov’ k novym dostizheniiam (Po povodu muzykal’nykh ‘restavratsii’ Kastal’skogo),” *Muzyka* 228 (1915): 412–17, reprinted in Zvereva ed., *Aleksandr Kastal’skii*, 266.
56. S. B-v, “Peshchnoe deistvo,” *Moskovskie vedomosti* 65 (20 March–2 April 1907), 4.
57. Metallov, “O peshchnom deistve,” 2.
58. B-v, “Peshchnoe deistvo,” 4.
59. Kastal’skii, “O moei muzykal’noi kar’ere,” 57.
60. B-v, “Peshchnoe deistvo,” 4.
61. I. D., “Iz moskovskoi tserkovnoi zhizni. Peshchnoe deistva,” *Kolokol* 932 (15 April 1909): 3.
62. I. V. Lipaev, “Sinodal’noe uchilishche, ego idealisty, khor. G-n Kastal’skii,” *Russkaia muzykal’naia gazeta* No. 4 (1898): 339–401, reprinted in Zvereva, ed., *Aleksandr Kastal’skii*, 239.
63. See Louise Hardiman, Ludmila Pipers-Hofmann, and Maria Taroutina, eds., “Abrantsevo and Its Legacies,” Special Issue, *Experiment* 25, no. 1 (30 September 2019).
64. Oleg Tarasov, *Modern i drevnie ikony: ot sviatyni k shedevru* (Moscow: Indirk, 2016), 16.
65. Wendy Salmond, “Viktor Vasnetsov’s New Icons.” *Experiment* 25, no. 1 (2019): 132.
66. Tarasov, *Modern i drevnie ikony*, 57–60.
67. Valerii Briusov, “Nenuzhnaia pravda. (Po povodu Moskovskago khudozhestvennago teatra),” *Mir iskusstva* 4 (1902): 67–74.
68. *Ibid.*, 74.

69. A. I. Uspenskii, *Viktor Mikhailovich Vasnetsov* (Moscow: Universetskaia tipografiia, 1906), 64–65.
70. *Ibid.*, 82.
71. B-v, “Peshchnoe deistvo,” 4. A photograph of the painting can be seen on the website of the Siberian Roerich Society. “N. K. Rerikh. Peshchnoe deistvo.1907,” *Sibirskoe Rerikhovskoe Obshchestvo*, accessed October 21, 2021, <https://sibro.ru/photo/roerich-legends/n-k-rerikh-peshchnoe-deystvo-1907/>.
72. See Maria Carlson, *No Religion Higher than Truth: A History of the Theosophical Movement in Russia, 1875–1922* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993), 193–97; and John McCannon, “Passageways to Wisdom: Nicholas Roerich, the Dramas of Maurice Maeterlinck, and Symbols of Spiritual Enlightenment,” *The Russian Review* 64 (July 2004): 449–78.
73. Kunichika, *Our Native Antiquity*, 98–99.
74. Shevelenko, *Modernizm kak arkhazim*, 248.
75. *Ibid.*
76. “Muzykal’naia zhizn’ Peterburga,” *Zolotoe runo*, 152.
77. D., “Peschchnoe deistvo,” 3.
78. “Novyia knigi i muzykal’nyia sochineniia. Peshchnoe deistvo (starinnyi tserkovyi obriad). Dlia khora i basa-solo. Izlozhenno po sokhranivshimsia v rukopisakh A. Kastal’skim,” *Khorovoe i regentskoe delo* 10 (October 1909): 262.
79. Zvereva, *Alexander Kastalsky*, 158–161.
80. Ashley Holdsworth, “Finding Kastalsky. Interview with Co-Founders of Russkaya Capella Svetlana Zvereva and Stuart Campbell,” *Russian Art + Culture* (blog), posted on 21 July 2017, <https://www.russianartandculture.com/finding-kastalsky-interview-co-founders-russkaya-capella-svetlana-zvereva-stuart-campbell/>.
81. Boris Gasparov, *Five Operas and a Symphony: Word and Music in Russian Culture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 19.
82. Asafiev would later become one of the founding figures of Soviet musicology. Though his enthusiasm for religious music may seem incompatible with his later dedication to Marxism, his commitment to the idea that art should be related to the “real life” of the “people” is a constant in his thinking, both before and after the Revolution. See Olga Panteleeva, “How Soviet Musicology Became Marxist,” *The Slavonic and East European Review* 97, no. 1 (January 2019): 103–106.
83. Glebov, “Ot ‘opytov’ k novym dostizheniiam,” 269.
84. *Ibid.*, 268.
85. Richard Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically: Historical and Hermeneutical Essays* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997), 390.
86. Kastal’skii, “O moei muzykal’noi kar’ere,” 57.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bartlett, Rosamund. *Wagner and Russia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- B-v, S. “Peshchnodeistvo.” *Moskovskie vedomosti* 65 (20 March–2 April 1907): 4.

- D., I. "Iz moskov skoi tserkovnoi zhizni. Peshchnodeistva." *Kolokol* 932 (15 April 1909): 3.
- de Jong, Aad. "Liturgical Action From a Language Perspective: About Performance and Performatives in Liturgy." In *Discourse in Ritual Studies*, edited by Hans Schilderman, 111–145. Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Carlson, Maria. *No Religion Higher than Truth: A History of the Theosophical Movement in Russia, 1875–1922*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Dmitrievskii, A. A. "Chin peshchnagodeistva. Istoriko-arkheologicheskii etiudl." *Vizantiiskii vremennik* 1 (1894): 553–600.
- Florensky, Pavel. "The Church Ritual as a Synthesis of the Arts." In *Beyond Vision: Essays on the Perception of Art*, edited by Nicoletta Misler, Pavel Florensky, and translated by Wendy Salmond, 101–111. London: Reaktion, 2002.
- Frolova-Walker, Marina. *Russian Music and Nationalism From Glinka to Stalin*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Gasparov, Boris. *Five Operas and a Symphony: Word and Music in Russian Culture*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.
- Glebov, Igor' [Asaf'ev, Boris]. "Ot'opytov' k novym dostizheniiam (Po povodu muzykal'nykh 'restavratsii' Kastal'skogo)." *Muzyka* 228 (1915): 412–417. Reprinted in *Aleksandr Kastal'skii. Stat'i, materialy, vospominaniia, perepiska*, edited by Svetlana Zvereva, 266–271. Vol. 5 of *Russkaia dukhovnaia muzyka v dokumentakh i materialakh*. Moscow: Znak, 2006.
- Hardiman, Louise, Ludmila Piters-Hofmann, and Maria Taroutina, eds. "Abrantsevo and Its Legacies." Special Issue, *Experiment* 25, no. 1 (30 September 2019).
- Holdsworth, Ashley. "Finding Kastalsky. Interview With Co-Founders of Russkaya Capella Svetlana Zvereva and Stuart Campbell." *Russian Art+Culture* (blog). Posted on 21 July 2017. <https://www.russianartandculture.com/finding-kastalsky-interview-co-founders-russkaya-capella-svetlana-zvereva-stuart-campbell/>.
- Ivanov, Viacheslav. "Chiurlianis i problema sinteza iskusstv." In *Sobranie sochinenii*, edited by D. V. Ivanov and O. Deshart, 147–170. Vol. 3. Brussels: Foyer Oriental Chrétien, 1979.
- Kalb, Judith E. *Russia's Rome: Imperial Visions, Messianic Dreams, 1890–1940*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2008.
- Kastal'skii, Aleksandr. "O moei muzykal'noi kar'ere i moi mysli o tserkovnoi muzyke." *Muzykal'nyi sovremennik* 2 (June–July 1915): 31–45. Reprinted in Zvereva, Svetlana, ed. *Aleksandr Kastal'skii. Stat'i, materialy, vospominaniia, perepiska*. Vol. 5 of *Russkaia dukhovnaia muzyka v dokumentakh i materliakh*, edited by A. A. Naumov, M. P. Rakhmanova, and S. G. Zvereva, 49–68. Moscow: Znak, 2006.
- . *Peshchnoe deistvo (starinyi tserkovnyi obriad)*. Choir and bass solo. Moscow: Iurgenson, 1909.
- Korshunova, N. G. "Aleksandr Ivanovich Uspenskii (arkhivist, istorikiskusstva, prosvetitel')." Website Azbukavery. https://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Aleksandr_Uspenskij/aleksandr-ivanovich-uspenskij-arhivist-istorik-iskusstva-prosvetitel/.
- Krueger, Derek. *Liturgical Subjects: Christian Ritual, Biblical Narrative and the Formation of Self in Byzantium*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014.

- Kunichika, Michael. *Our Native Antiquity: Archaeology and Aesthetics in the Culture of Russian Modernism*. Boston, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2015.
- Lingas, Alexander. "Late Byzantine Cathedral Liturgy and the *Service of the Furnace*." In *Approaching the Holy Mountain*, edited by Sharon E. J. Gerstel and Robert S. Nelson, 179–230. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2010.
- Lipaev, I. V. "Sinodal'noe uchilishche, ego idealisty, khor. G-n Kastal'skii." *Russkaia muzykal'naia gazeta* 4 (1898): 339–401. Reprinted in *Aleksandr Kastal'skii. Stat'i, materialy, vospominaniia, perepiska*, edited by Svetlana Zvereva, 239–241. Vol. 5 of *Russkaia dukhovnaia muzyka v dokumentakh i materialakh*. Moscow: Znakh, 2006.
- Louth, Andrew. *St. John Damascene: Tradition and Originality in Byzantine Theology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Maguire, Henry. "Medieval Art in Southern Italy: Latin Drama and the Greek Literary Imagination." In *Image and Imagination in Byzantine Art*, 219–239. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007.
- McCannon, John. "Passageways to Wisdom: Nicholas Roerich, the Dramas of Maurice Maeterlinck, and Symbols of Spiritual Enlightenment." *The Russian Review* 64 (July 2004): 449–478.
- Metallov, V[asilii]. "Na pamiat' o peshchnomdeistve." *Svetil'nik* 4 (1914): 1–6.
- Mitchell, Rebecca. "How Russian was Wagner? Russian Campaigns to Defend or Destroy the German Composer During the Great War (1914–1918)." In *Wagner in Russia, Poland, and the Czech Lands*, edited by Stephen Muir and Anastasia Belina-Johnson, 49–69. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2013.
- . *Nietzsche's Orphans: Music, Metaphysics, and the Twilight of the Russian Empire*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2016.
- Morrison, Simon. "Review: Bartlett, Rosamund. *Wagner and Russia*." *Cambridge Opera Journal* 8, no. 1 (1996): 83–92.
- Nikol'skii, Konstantin. *O sluzhbach russkoi tserkvi, byvshikh v prezhnikh pechatnykh bogoslužhebnykh knigakh*. St. Petersburg, 1885.
- "Novyia knigi i muzykal'nyia sochineniia. Peshchnoe deistvo (starinnyi tserkovyi obriad). Dlia khora i basa-solo. Izložheno po sokhranivshimsia v rukopisiakh A. Kastal'skim." *Khorovoe i regentskoe delo* 10 (October 1909): 262.
- Panteleeva, Olga. "How Soviet Musicology Became Marxist." *The Slavonic and East European Review* 97, no. 1 (January 2019): 73–109.
- Parker, John. "Who's Afraid of Darwin? Revisiting Chambers and Hardison. . . And Nietzsche." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 40, no. 1 (January 2010): 7–35.
- Pashchenko, M. V. *Siuzhet Dlia Misterii: Parsifal' - Kitez' - Zolotoi Petushok: Istoricheskaia Poetika Opery v Kanun Moderna*. Moscow: Tsent' gumanitarnykh initsiativ, 2018.
- Pekarskii, P[etr]. *Misterii i starinnyi teatr v rossi*. St. Petersburg: Tipografiia glavnago shtaba ego imperatorskago velichestva po voenno-uchebnym zavedeniiam, 1857.
- Salmond, Wendy. "Viktor Vasnetsov's New Icons." *Experiment* 25, no. 1 (2019): 131–144.
- Shevelenko, Irina. *Modernizm kak arkhazm: natsionalizm i poiski modernistskoi estetiki v Rossii*. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2017.

- Shevzov, Vera. *Russian Orthodoxy on the Eve of Revolution*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Sibirskoe Rerikhovskoe Obshchestvo. "N. K. Rerikh. Peshchnoedeistvo. 1907." Accessed October 21, 2021. <https://sibro.ru/photo/roerich-legends/n-k-rerikh-peshchnoe-deystvo-1907/>.
- Swoboda, Marina. "The Furnace Play and the Development of Liturgical Drama in Russia." *The Russian Review* 60 (April 2002): 220–234.
- Tarasov, Oleg. *Modern idrevnieikony: otsviatyni k shedevru*. Moscow: Indirk, 2016.
- Taroutina, Maria. *The Icon and the Square: Russian Modernism and the Russo-Byzantine Revival*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2018.
- Taruskin, Richard. *Defining Russia Musically: Historical and Hermeneutical Essays*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Terent'eva, Polina. *Peshchnoe deistvo. Sostavlenie, rekonstruktsiia gimnografii i stat'i Poliny Terent'evoi*. Moscow: Sport ikul'tura, 2015.
- Trifon (Dmitrovskii), Episkop. "K istorii drevne-russkago tserkovnago obriada 'Peshchnoe deistvo.'" *Svetil'nik* 4–5 (May–June 1913): 19–24.
- Uspenskii, A. I., ed. *Trudy kommissii po osmotru i izucheniiu pamiatnikov tserkovnoi starini g. Moskvy i Moskovskoi Eparkhii*, Vol. 4. Moscow: Pechatnia A. I. Snigireva, 1911.
- . I. Viktor Mikhailovich Vasnetsov. Moscow: Universetskaiatipografia, 1906.
- Velimirovic, Milos. "Liturgical Drama in Byzantium and Russia." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 16 (1962): 349–385.
- "Vestiotovsiudu." *Zolotoeruno* 11–12 (1906): 149–152.
- White, Andrew Walker. *Performing Orthodox Ritual in Byzantium*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Wortman, Richard. *Scenarios of Power: Myth and Ceremony in Russian Monarchy From Peter the Great to the Abdication of Nicholas II*. New ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006.
- Zvereva, Svetlana. *Alexander Kastalsky: His Life and Music*. Translated by Stuart Campbell. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003.
- , ed. *Aleksandr Kastal'skii. Stat'i, materialy, vospominaniia, perepiska*. Vol. 5 of *Russkaia dukhovnaia muzyka v dokumentakh i materliakh*, edited by A. A. Naumov, M. P. Rakhmanova, and S. G. Zvereva. Moscow: Znakh, 2006.

