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Abstract

Piano cycle Chagall Vitraux by Russian composer Alexey Khevelev was written in 1994, inspired by Mark Chagall’s stained-glass masterpiece Jerusalem Windows (1962). Khevelev’s work consists of twelve movements, each named after one of the twelve windows by Chagall, and could be analyzed as an ekphrastic composition. The term musical ekphrasis was introduced in the musicological discourse around two decades ago to describe compositions based on works from the sister arts. The aesthetic category of ekphrasis has existed for centuries and has its roots in Plato’s discussion of the Ideal Form and its consequent representations. As a musical phenomenon the concept was pioneered by German musicologist and pianist Siglind Bruhn, who argues the independence of the genre of musical ekphrasis from the broader concept of program music. However, the concept of musical ekphrasis is still underdeveloped and lacks a strong theoretical foundation. I demonstrate how an analysis of a musical composition inspired by a work created in another artistic medium benefits from the use of the models of image-music interrelationships developed in the field of multimedia studies. I argue that such musical compositions can be coupled with their original referential sources during a live performance, enabling a performer to construct a multimedia presentation.
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Lay Summary

Musical composition *Chagall Vitraux* by Russian composer Alexey Khevelev was written in 1994, inspired by Mark Chagall’s stained-glass work *Jerusalem Windows* (1962). Khevelev’s composition consists of twelve movements, each named after one of the twelve windows by Chagall, and could be categorized as an ekphrastic work. The term *musical ekphrasis* was introduced in the musicological discourse around two decades ago to describe compositions based on works from other art mediums. The aesthetic category of *ekphrasis* has existed for centuries and has its roots in Plato’s discussion of the Ideal Form and its consequent representations. A musical phenomenon of ekphrasis was pioneered by German musicologist and pianist Siglind Bruhn, who argues the independence of the genre of musical ekphrasis from the broader concept of program music. However, the concept of musical ekphrasis is still underdeveloped and lacks a strong theoretical foundation. I demonstrate how an analysis of a musical composition inspired by a work created in another artistic medium benefits from the use of multimedia models of image-music interrelationships. I argue that such musical compositions can be coupled with their original referential sources during a live performance, enabling a performer to construct a multimedia presentation.
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Preface

I was a first year student in piano performance at the Rostov State Rachmaninov Conservatory, Russia, when I first met composer Alexey Khevelev in 2007. He was teaching a computer technology class I was enrolled in, and it had little to do with performance practices or composition techniques, as it focused on music notation software. So, I was first attracted to Professor Khevelev by his witty character, his natural simplicity, and good humor. During the course of our professional relationship, I learned that Khevelev and my beloved piano professor at the time, Sofya Bugayan, had studied with the same teacher, Sergei Osipenko, and, as a consequence, we shared similar views on music and piano performance. By the time I first heard Khevelev’s compositions, I was completely charmed by his charismatic personality and friendly demeanour towards students. Since then, I attended several premiers of Khevelev’s works, including his first chamber opera *Russian Roulette* (2009) and a concerto for piano and orchestra *Judas and Christ* (2009). I was instantly moved by the idea of contradiction between kindness and evil, existing inside each one of us, which Khevelev developed in these works. The raw expression of this concept in his music that never sounded pretentious, the simple beauty of his musical themes developed by intricate harmonies seemed to reflect the composer’s personality, his familiar views on life and human relationships. During the course of my studies at the conservatory, I performed his piano cycle *Chagall Vitraux* (1994) at a local composition competition and was fortunate enough to consult with Professor Khevelev while learning the cycle. His performative remarks and explanations of the individual characters of each piece in the cycle informed my understanding and performance of this work, imbuing it with deeper meaning. Most of the time, performers do not have the
privilege to truly know composers’ intentions in the works they learn and present to the public, and it makes all the difference to have an opportunity to discuss the music with its creator.

Naturally, when I was searching for a topic for my future monograph, I thought of writing about Khevelev’s music in order to study it further and to promote his compositions. It was also a chance for me to collaborate with Professor Khevelev again, and to connect to my former conservatory almost six years after leaving Russia. Khevelev’s piano cycle *Chagall Vitraux* was an obvious choice for the case study, as it corresponded with the topic that had already interested me, a multimedia concert. *Chagall Vitraux* was written after Marc Chagall’s stained-glass *Jerusalem Windows* (1962), and as a result, is suitable for being performed alongside its referential work. I was always attracted to the descriptive musical compositions that reference other works of art, or provide some hints of a story to be told through music. This personal preference was reflected in the choices of repertoire for the recitals of my degree, which included several compositions that either suggest an extra-musical subject by their title, or actually reference other works of art (full programs are provided in Appendix D).

At the early stages of my research, I discovered that this branch of musical compositions, named musical ekphrasis, differed from the genre of program music that supplied some kind of a narrative script. The writing of this monograph deepened my belief in the interconnection between arts and in the importance of a well-rounded art education, which should include studies of the basic principles and masterworks of different art mediums. A creative impulse can touch an artist, be it a piano performer, a
painter, or a composer, anywhere at any time, and she or he should be ready to recognize it and translate it into one’s own medium.
Chapter One: Introduction

This monograph presents a study of the piano cycle *Chagall Vitraux* (1994) by Russian composer Alexey Khevelev (b.1979). This composition was inspired by the stained-glass masterpiece *Jerusalem Windows* (1962) created by Russian-French artist Mark Chagall (1887-1985). Khevelev’s piano cycle *Chagall Vitraux* consists of twelve movements, each named after one of the twelve stained-glass windows by Chagall that reference the Twelve Tribes of Israel, and represents an example of ekphrastic composition. In this study, I discuss the topic of musical ekphrasis and demonstrate how an analysis of a musical composition inspired by a work created in another artistic medium benefits from the use of the models of image-music interrelationships developed in the field of multimedia studies. Furthermore, I argue that such musical compositions can be coupled with their original referential sources during a live performance, enabling a performer to construct a multimedia presentation.

With the advancement of the media of television and the internet, people have become accustomed to receiving information via images, relying heavily on the sense of sight. Moreover, the recording and public access to the storage of music, pictures, and videos on various electronic devices opened a possibility of the simultaneous perception of music and visual art, becoming a popular mode of enjoying the two types of artistic stimuli in daily life.

As a result, the genre of multimedia concert is gaining popularity among the general public. The following section of this monograph investigates the current state of
multimedia concert development and the criticism it faces among musical critics and traditional audience members.

A multimedia concert is a live music event where musicians perform classical repertoire on traditional instruments accompanied by projections of images, video, or other form of visual media. This concert format typically attracts a wider audience than a conventional format, as younger listeners find it easier to absorb an abstract language of music by having a concrete visual reference to another art form: “Given that a strong visual component is now considered a normal part of entertainment, it is likely that younger generations would find the traditional instrumental music concert deficient in imagery, even in smaller venues where the musicians can be clearly seen.”¹

However, while multimedia concerts draw new audiences, they may simultaneously alienate those concert-goers who want to focus on music alone. One reason for this division in audiences’ response is the lack of congruency between music and accompanying visual material. Studies in audio-visual relationships demonstrate that when there is an agreement between the different media, the audience’s attention and memory are elevated.² Furthermore, similar research shows that observers’ aesthetic experience is intensified when visual content is accompanied by matching music.³

There is substantial evidence in research on film music proving that an audio track can stimulate viewers’ attention and arouse certain desirable emotions: “By using

music that evokes a mood similar to the visual story, a film director can heighten the emotional impact of a particular scene and its effects upon listeners.” Analogous results were reported in studies on collaboration between static image and music, indicating the expressive dominance and “natural emotional ‘superiority’ of music.”

The objective of a multimedia concert rests on the same principles as in audiovisual collaboration in film. In a multimedia concert, it is the visual content that alters the perception of music by directing listeners’ attention to particular qualities of a musical composition, such as tempo, dynamics, and instrumentation, enhancing audiences’ emotional engagement with music. For instance, if the visual medium illustrates a slow moving action, the observer will most likely concentrate on the slow tempo of the music.

Consequently, performers and music directors utilize multimedia concert format more frequently, realizing its potential benefits. Still, while there are certainly many examples of successful multimedia concerts, for instance, the ones introduced by the Australian Chamber Orchestra and its Artistic Director Richard Tognetti, there are nonetheless many more that leave some members of an audience bemused and exhausted from the overwhelming amount of conflicting audio-visual information.

---

The lack of conformity between media may put emotional pressure on an audience, reducing the focus on music and leading to a disappointing cultural experience. All the advantages that audio-visual combination has to deliver are lost if there is a disagreement between different media. It is proven that vision tends to dominate over audition in case of conflicting multimedia arrangement: “When perception biases those sonic qualities that help visual apprehension, it subordinates other qualities such as timbre, texture, vibration, and the nuances of the performer’s expression. The wealth of multilayered relations between the sounds themselves becomes lost for conscious awareness.”

Currently, there are no well-established criteria for choosing accompanying visual material for multimedia concerts, and their structure is determined entirely by a director or performer’s subjective point of view, which inevitably excludes some parts of an audience. Meghan Stevens in her book, *Music and Image in Concert*, notes:

> Because people who are knowledgeable in an area can process information faster than those who have little knowledge, the problems associated with exceeding mental processing capacity during a concert may not be apparent to those involved in creating the image. This may apply to artistic director and image creator, who due to their knowledge, expertise and familiarity with a material, may not experience this information overload.

As a performer, I believe that we should be innovative and seek new ways of introducing academic music to a broader public along with generating new ideas to develop the music concert genre, and multimedia format provides many opportunities for

---

9 Stevens, *Music and Image in Concert*, 41.
creating new material. Nevertheless, one should constantly consider and respect the intersectionality of her or his audience in order to avoid making assumptions about listeners’ familiarity with the subject of images and music.

Therefore, how can a performer experiment with multimedia concert format without alienating a traditional audience and being respectful towards the musical ideas envisioned by a composer? This monograph focuses on one aspect of an effective multimedia concert— the musical repertoire. It is my strong belief that not all musical compositions are adaptable to music-image collaboration; a parallel with the studies in film music can be drawn, as not all film categories benefit from the use of musical background. Ernest Lindgren in his book on the aesthetics of film observes that the record films, which are made in one continuous frontal shot, as if each scene had been acted on a theatre stage, are self-contained and should only utilize naturalistic sounds, while abstract movies certainly benefit from the use of musical tracks, as music provides necessary formal structure and clarifies emotional content.10

The same can be argued about musical compositions: baroque and classical repertoire may not need visual commentary, while music written in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, with its elusive meaning and at times ambiguous structure, may sometimes be coupled with a visual medium to engage a contemporary listener. Certainly, this is true for ekphrastic musical works, inspired by masterpieces created in other art forms, which lend themselves to being performed in a multimedia concert. By analysing the ekphrastic musical composition Chagall Vitraux alongside its referential

visual work, this monograph provides a tool for performers in choosing visual content for a multimedia concert.

1.1 Overview of Musical Ekphrasis

The term *musical ekphrasis* was introduced in the musicological discourse around two decades ago to describe compositions based on the works from the sister arts.\(^{11}\) However, the aesthetic category of *ekphrasis* has existed for centuries and has its roots in Plato’s theory of the Ideal Form and its consequent representations.

Plato was among the first philosophers to label the arts, particularly poetry and visual art, as imitative. From his dialogues in Book 10 of the *Republic*, came the haunting description of the arts as being mimetic and simply mirroring the world with its objects, pretending to show the truth. Plato diminishes the importance of works by poets and painters to the third degree from the truth, since they merely reflect the surrounding world creating appearances of objects and not the true things:

> God makes the Form [of the bed], the craftsman makes the particular bed, but we cannot describe the artist as making a bed. What he does is to imitate what the others have made. Moreover it is not in fact the products of the craftsman that he imitates, and he imitates these not as they are but as they appear. Imitation, then, is concerned with appearances, the artist is an imitator, and his work is at the third remove from reality.\(^{12}\)

Since Plato’s reflections, the critical view of art and artists has undergone a significant evolution, and, nowadays, his writings on art do not stir academic debates.

---


Nonetheless, the core of his argument gave the origin to the rhetorical tool of ekphrasis, which was used in antiquity to present a vivid description of a scene or an object. Later this rhetorical device was borrowed by the literary genres and faced many definitions from being a verbal description of visual objects, to a more restricted description of the works of visual art. For some time, the standard definition of literary ekphrasis was the one given by James Heffernan, who proposed the wider characterization of ekphrasis as “the verbal representation of the visual representation.”

However, recent research indicates that the changes in the amount of visual information available for multimedia projects and the accessibility of images expand the territory of ekphrasis, as “the mere mention of an iconic image ensures shared visualization.” Thus, the simpler and more encompassing definition of ekphrasis was proposed, meaning “a literary response to a visual image or visual images.”

As a musical phenomenon the concept of ekphrasis was pioneered by German musicologist and pianist Siglind Bruhn, who argues the independence of the genre of musical ekphrasis from the broader concept of program music. Bruhn borrows the model of a literary ekphrasis in order to establish criteria for a musical equivalent: “what must be present in every case of what I will refer to as musical ekphrasis is (1) a real or fictitious scene or story, (2) its representation in a visual or a verbal text, and (3) a

---

16 Ibid., 227.
rendering of that representation in musical language.” Bruhn’s ultimate goal is to
determine “what it may mean if composers claim to be inspired by a poem or painting, a
drama or sculpture, to such a degree that they set out to transform the essence of this art
work’s features and message, including their personal reaction to it, into their own
medium: the musical language.”

The relationship between visual arts and music has been extensively studied,
particularly the period from the beginning of the nineteenth century, which faced the shift
of artistic focus to music and a continuing emancipation of composers and musicians
from the courts of the nobility, followed by independence of instrumental music and the
growing culture of public concerts.

The mutual influence of visual arts and music became apparent in the nineteenth
century with painters and composers being inspired by each others’ works. Thus far, the
most comprehensive study on the relationship between paintings and musical
compositions has been done by Monika Fink at the Institute of Musicology Innsbruck,
who maintains the database of compositions related to works of fine arts.

There is an abundance of musical compositions referencing various paintings that
are easily accessible online. For the purpose of this study I cite only a few works written

---

18 Ibid., 8.
19 Ibid., xix.
   and Peter L. Schmunk, *The Arts Entwined: Music and Painting in the Nineteenth Century*
21 Along with numerous articles, most of which are in German, Monica Fink’s archive of
ekphrastic works can be accessed at the Institute of Musicology of Innsbruck University
   at [www.musiknachbildern.at](http://www.musiknachbildern.at).
particularly for a solo piano, which include *Sposalizio* from Franz Liszt’s second book of *Années de Pèlerinage* (1858) after the artist Raphael’s painting *Lo Sposalizio* (1504). It is significant that Liszt insisted that a copy of the painting be published together with the music to stress a connection between the two works.\(^{22}\)

Liszt was the first composer to write works referencing visual art. He constantly promoted the potential of having extra-musical content and “aggressively sought to elevate the intellectual status of music through borrowings from other arts…”\(^{23}\) Claude Debussy was another notable composer to seek artistic stimuli in sister arts; in his piano piece *L’Isle Joyeuse* (1904) after Jean-Antoine Watteau’s painting *L’Embarquement pour Cythère* (1717), Debussy colourfully illustrates through intricate harmonic relationships the journey to the sensual island of Cythera that Watteau encoded in his painting.\(^{24}\)

Certainly, one of the most famous examples of ekphrastic musical composition in the solo piano genre is Modest Mussorgsky’s *Pictures at an Exhibition* (1874), which references several works by the artist, architect, and designer Viktor Hartmann (1834-1873). This piano cycle is remarkable in many ways: in being the most famous of a small number of Mussorgsky’s compositions for solo piano and, arguably the most familiar work of his whole oeuvre, in carrying the message of Russian culture and society, but most importantly, in preserving Hartman’s creative works as he died prematurely at the age of thirty nine. As Michael Russ perceptively remarks: “If it were not for *Pictures at

---


Hartman would now be almost completely forgotten. Little if any of his architectural work now remains, and his work as a painter, illustrator and designer is ephemeral.”25

However, all of the above mentioned piano compositions were instantaneously categorized as program music, and were not differentiated from the works that had a supplied narrative or a mild reference to collective works of art. Even in current academic research the concept of musical ekphrasis is rarely addressed in detail in relation to referential musical compositions, and it is still underdeveloped and lacks a strong theoretical foundation.26 I argue that an analysis of an ekphrastic musical composition, Chagall Vitraux, with the use of models of image-music interrelationships demonstrates the independence of genre of musical ekphrasis from the broader concept of program music.

1.2 Models of Music-Image Interrelationships

As a basis for my analysis of Khevelev’s piano cycle Chagall Vitraux I borrow the models of music-image interrelationships developed by British musicologist Nicholas Cook. In his book, Analyzing Musical Multimedia, Cook proposes models of conformance, contest, complementation, and metaphor in order to demonstrate how constituent media relate to each other in a multimedia work.27

---

The model of conformance is the one of complete consonance, where “each medium… is congruent with each of the others; it embodies the same spiritual content.” Cook admits that examples of conformance are rare, since most of the multimedia works exhibit inconsistency in the media interactions during the course of a whole work.

The model that stands opposite to conformance is contest, where the constituent media are always in opposition to each other, revealing new meanings in one another and enriching the overall experience of a multimedia work: “different media are, so to speak, vying for the same terrain, each attempting to impose its own characteristics upon the other.”

The next model of complementation enables different media to find gaps in one another, expressing what the other media cannot and, as a result, complementing each other. This model is most common for film music that is often added by a composer to an existing video in order to enhance the narrative and overall effect on the audience.

The last one, the metaphor model, is most applicable to those multimedia works that employ static image and music. Cook explains the metaphor as a comparison of two terms opposing each other, thus transferring their own qualities to one another: “the very fact of juxtaposing image and music has the effect of drawing attention to the properties that they share, and in this way constructing a new experience of each; the interpretation is in this sense emergent.”

---

28 Ibid., 100-101.
29 Ibid., 103.
30 Ibid., 73.
For the purpose of this monograph I use the models of complementation and contest in examining the selected movements from Khevelev’s piano cycle Chagall Vitraux. The analytical application of these two models demonstrates the connections and shared attributes between Khevelev’s composition and Chagall’s stained-glass work Jerusalem Windows, therefore justifying the combination of this music and its referential source in one multimedia concert.

Somewhat similar analysis was done by Claudia Gorbman in relation to film music and its collaboration with video content.31 In her article “Aesthetics and Rhetoric” Gorbman examines models of music-image interrelationships, proposed by Cook, to show how the models of complementation and contest are utilized by film-makers. One of her examples of complementation model is Hitchcock’s movie Psycho (1960), which demonstrates how music intensifies the meaning of a silent scene, identifying the character’s mental state otherwise vague without clear narrative. Likewise, to explain the model of contest, Gorbman refers to another movie segment from Kurosawa’s Rhapsody in August (1991), showing how music and imagery in their opposition can “evoke loneliness and profound sadness…”32

The models of conformance and contest were also investigated in detail by Kritsachai Somsaman in relation to an emotional perception of three different multimedia projects.33 However, Somsaman’s study does not address particular compositions

---

32 Ibid., 22.
inspired by the works of visual art, but more generally researches the observers’ response to contrasting multimedia combinations, the ones where information is congruent between two media and others with opposing contents of two media.

1.3 Scholarship on Musical Compositions Referencing Visual Artworks

Apart from the already mentioned studies, the most relevant sources for this monograph include two dissertations on the subject of Chagall’s Jerusalem Windows and musical compositions inspired by it. Paula Swartz, in her study on Petr Eben’s Okna (1976) for trumpet and organ, investigates the influence of Chagall’s Jerusalem Windows on Eben’s composition, demonstrating some of the compositional choices in relation to Chagall’s imagery, colours, and religious message. Moreover, there are many narrative suggestions, informed by the windows’ content, which would be useful for performers of Eben’s work.

The same musical work was one of the case studies of John Bryant’s dissertation on similar subject. Additionally, he examines two other compositions referencing visual artworks, Anthony Plog’s Four Themes on Paintings of Edward Munch (1986) and Jennifer Mitchell’s Spomeniks (2012). The latter composition was commissioned and first performed by Bryant, which promises valuable performative insights. The first section of his dissertation is of particular interest, as it explores the concepts of mimesis and anti-mimesis in art with their opposing foundations of whether art imitates life or vice versa.

Another important dissertation on the subject of relationships between music and visual art was written by Thijs Vroegh. Apart from comprehensive overview of historical relationship between music and visual art, this study provides the list of musical and visual works relating and inspired by each other. The section examining different versions of Arnold Böcklin’s painting *Die Toteninsel* (1880) and its transpositions in music and film is particularly valuable to the present study. Vroegh discusses several musical adaptations of this painting, including symphonic poem by Sergei Rachmaninov, *Isle of the Dead* (1908), offering an interesting narrative analysis for the music in parallel with the content of the painting.

The following Chapter Two consists of four sections: the first overviews the artist Marc Chagall’s biography, the second describes the background of Chagall’s stained-glass *Jerusalem Windows*, the third overviews the life of the composer Alexey Khevelev, and lastly, the fourth section provides an outline of Khevelev’s compositional input. Chapter Three examines three movements from Khevelev’s piano cycle *Chagall Vitraux* using the models of music-image interrelationships. Finally, Chapter Four concludes the monograph by reiterating the main arguments presented in the Introduction Chapter.

---


37 Here and further in the text, the last names’ endings of composers Rachmaninov and Prokofiev are spelled with letter ‘v’, according to the Russian spelling, instead of more commonly used North American spelling ‘ff’.
Chapter Two: Mark Chagall and Alexey Khevelev

2.1 Mark Chagall’s Biographical Overview

The notion of interrelationships between different forms of art was central to Chagall’s aesthetics, and the idea of being an artist as destined by God rather than as a chosen profession was always present in Chagall’s philosophy. In his autobiography he reminisced about his early fascination with different forms of art regardless of professional level or content; it was the essence of the art that moved him, the simple act of expressing oneself rather than the form and mastery of that expression, and he was instantly inspired to become an artist, no matter the medium.38 Praised by his relatives and neighbours for his budding artistic skills, such as singing at a synagogue or scraping a little tune on a violin, dancing at weddings or trying to write verses, young Chagall dreamed: “I’ll be a singer, a cantor, I’ll go to the Conservatory… I’ll be a violinist, I’ll go to the Conservatory… I’ll be a dancer, I’ll go to… I didn’t know where… I’ll be a poet, I’ll go to… I no longer knew where to let myself go.”39

Chagall was born in 1887 in Liozna, Belarus, spending his younger years in a nearby provincial market city of Vitebsk, Belarus, then a territory of the Russian Empire. He was born to a Jewish Hassidic family at a time when the Jews in Russia could not travel and work freely outside the so-called Pale of Settlement, which in reality was a ghetto designated by the government for Jewish communities: “Under the Czars Alexander III and Nicolas II in the late nineteenth century, the Jews were treated as

39 Ibid., 41.
inferiors both politically and legally, and indeed were persecuted.”⁴⁰ Consequently, Chagall was denied many educational opportunities growing up, but still, his was a happy childhood as the family spirit was supported by the Hassidic religion that encouraged obliviousness to material existence in the name of joy and happiness: “Hassidism encourages an intuitive relationship with the Creator and devotion to Him– made possible by freeing oneself from sadness– and promotes universal love towards all beings.”⁴¹

Discovering his inclination to paint at an early age, Chagall defied his father’s refusal to sponsor his son’s art education, because becoming a painter in a family of strict religious order was not an easy or respectable occupation. The city of Vitebsk was populated by two distinct groups of people: peasants rooted in earth, and craftsmen and shopkeepers, with Chagall’s family belonging to the latter. Both groups accepted artistic occupation only as a hobby, a way of making some small side income, or as a means of escaping the harsh reality of everyday life. Therefore, it was problematic to find a thoughtful, knowledgeable teacher. However, Chagall admitted that the problems in his early education, or rather lack thereof, did not only stem from the differences between his ideas of art and the content of lessons in his first teacher’s studio: “I feel instinctively that this artist’s method is not mine…,”⁴² but also from his general indisposition towards formal learning: “The fact is, I’m not capable of learning. Or rather, I can’t be taught… I was a bad pupil in elementary school. I grasp nothing except by instinct… And scholastic

⁴² Chagall, My Life, 60.
theory has no hold on me.” In fact, he seemed to be opposed to the idea of formal art education in general, stating: “…those schools are no more than formal trappings. Primitive art already possessed the techniqual perfection that present generations strive for, juggling and even sinking into stylization.”

With the help of his childhood friend and fellow art studio classmate, Victor Mekler, who saw the uniqueness of his friend’s talent, Chagall moved to Saint Petersburg to further his studies. But the difficulties he faced with the special permits, which allowed the Jews to live in the capitals of Moscow and Saint Petersburg, did not let him formally attend any academic school, and he mostly learned from studying many famous paintings in private collections of his wealthy patrons’ homes. After struggling financially for some time, Chagall eventually managed to move to Paris with the encouragement of his teacher Léon Bakst (1866-1924), who later would be known for his collaboration with Diaghilev’s Ballets Russes.

Chagall’s time in Paris between 1910 and 1914 was a crucial period in his artistic and personal evolution: “It was no small thing to be part of a group of artists and writers in the Paris of the early twentieth century who felt themselves engaged in a great adventure, in the discovery of new worlds in art, revolutionizing poetry and painting.”

In his autobiography, Chagall described how for the first time he breathed in the fresh air of pure creativity, unrestricted by academic formalism and political censorship. Chagall

43 Ibid., 92.
44 Ibid., 113.
47 Chagall, My Life, 101.
discovered the colour he desperately searched for in Russia, and above all, he blossomed in the circle of like-minded artists pursuing raw expression of emotions: “I had the feeling we are still only skimming over the surface of matter, that we are afraid of plunging into chaos, of breaking up the familiar ground under our feet and turning it over.”48

Influenced by many avant-garde artists, Chagall advocated for bringing all the arts together, while his friend and ally, French poet Guillaume Apollinaire (1880-1918) proposed a “synthesis of the arts– music, painting, and literature.”49 Chagall later realized this ideal in the Musée National Marc Chagall in Nice, inaugurated in 1973, the first museum in France devoted to an artist during his lifetime, which incorporated a cycle of paintings and stained-glass windows in a concert hall.50

In 1914, just as his career gained speed after the first successful solo exhibition in Berlin, Chagall’s dreams and ambitions were crushed by the First World War. He had to return to Russia and stayed there for eight years, briefly occupying an official position of Commissar for the Arts after the 1917 October Revolution. Regrettably, Chagall was unable to make any change in art education, as he encountered similar restrictions under the new regime. The Soviet government’s unwillingness to provide freedom of expression eliminated any semblance of individualism, which was fatal to Chagall’s unconventional approach to visual art.

48 Ibid., 101-02.
In 1922, already having a family, Chagall was struggling to provide for his wife and young daughter, and, as many others during those turbulent years of the newly-formed Soviet Union, his family fled their homeland in search for a better life. In Europe, Chagall discovered to his horror that all of his works and supplies left in Berlin and Paris before the war were lost or sold for money made worthless by inflation. At that point he began his lifelong work of recreating his earlier lost paintings.

The next two decades were filled by constant work, experiments with new art mediums, and eventual worldwide recognition and well-deserved success. The particular highlight of those years was Chagall’s first trip to Palestine in 1931 after receiving a commission to illustrate the Bible.51 This was a revealing experience for the artist, as he felt the urge “to breathe the air of Holy Land and to view for himself its scenery and light.”52

In 1941, Chagall once again found his family unsafe in the wake of another war, and left for the United States, where he lived for the next seven years. His life was shattered by the loss of his beloved wife Bella (Rosenfeld, 1895-1944), who died abruptly after contracting a virus infection. Chagall’s son-in-law, Franz Meyer, later wrote: “Her death, absurd and brutal, brought an end to the existence of an admirable woman, full of finesse and of gifts, who was entirely devoted to Chagall.”53

---

He stopped working for almost nine months, but then a new love saved him from this stagnation. Virginia Haggard (1915-2006) became his partner and a mother to their son, but was rarely recognized by many of Chagall’s biographers during his lifetime, evidently for the reason that the affair ended abruptly when Haggard left Chagall for another man, taking their child with her. Chagall deliberately avoided talking about her and their son. This strained relationship was aggravated after his hasty marriage to Valentina ‘Vava’ Brodsky (1905-1993), considered by some biographers to be more of a business arrangement than a romantic relationship, at least at the outset, with Brodsky taking care of Chagall, managing his business arrangements, and conducting his correspondence.54

The last decades of his life were filled with many commissions, travels, and experiments in tried and new mediums, such as stained glass, costume sets and designs, frescoes, and others. Marc Chagall overcame too many difficulties destined for one life, doing so with everlasting hope for a brighter future. His unwillingness to mourn lost opportunities motivated him to cultivate his craftsmanship with the means he had, and to accept eventual success without losing his purpose and artistic mission. At ninety-years old, Chagall pronounced: “I am not pessimistic, because my motto has always been to look for love. Only love interests me and I am only in contact with things that revolve around love…”55 He died in 1985 at the age of ninety-eight.

Being exposed to diverse evolving art movements at the beginning of the twentieth century, Chagall nonetheless emerged with his own highly distinctive style, remarkable for its sense of fairy-tale fantasy. Throughout his long and fruitful artistic career he was interested in great timeless themes, such as birth and death, and love and marriage, which he interpreted in his own unique way. His works were dominated by two rich sources of imagery: memories of his childhood and the Bible.

### 2.2 Historical Background of Chagall’s *Jerusalem Windows*

The *Jerusalem Windows* was arguably the pinnacle of Chagall’s artistic evolution, allowing him to celebrate the glory of God in one of the most mysterious and sacred artistic mediums, stained glass. The medium itself articulated the essence of Chagall’s art: the light and the colour. Chagall believed that stained glass might indeed be a form of painting in light. As he once expressed: “Stained glass looks quite simple: the material is light itself… The light is that of heaven, that is what gives the color!”56

In 1959, Dr. Miriam Freund, the National President of Hadassah, the American Zionist women’s organization in the United States, and Josef Neufeld, the architect of the Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center in Jerusalem, attended a Paris exhibition of Chagall’s windows created for the Metz Cathedral. Soon afterwards, they commissioned Chagall to design and execute twelve windows for the small basement synagogue of the newly opened Hadassah Medical Center at Ein Karem, the neighbourhood in southwest Jerusalem. Chagall was moved by the prospect of adorning a Jewish place of worship in

---

56 Marc Chagall, quoted in Sorlier, ed., *Chagall by Chagall*, 212.
the Holy Land, and started working on initial sketches right away, putting aside all other projects.\footnote{Kagan, \textit{Marc Chagall}, 87.}

The work was completed over a two-year span, and was first exhibited in Paris at a specially constructed pavilion in a wing of the Louvre. Then “each piece of glass was taken out of its lead frame, packed as carefully as an egg and as tenderly as a flower”\footnote{Miriam K. Freund, \textit{Jewels for a Crown: The Story of the Chagall Windows} (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963), 14.} to be flown to New York for an exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art, from where the twelve windows were finally sent to Israel to be permanently installed at the Abbell Synagogue in 1962. As with all of his commissions destined for Israel, the \textit{Jerusalem Windows} were donated by Chagall to the young state.\footnote{Gauthier and Meyer, \textit{Chagall and Music}, 68.} However, he did not approve of the size and structure of the building, as the windows were positioned on the ground level prone to blows, hail, and stones:

When his stained glass windows of the Twelve Tribes of Israel were installed in the small underground room of the Hadassah Medical Center synagogue—hardly the size of a cathedral—Chagall was furious, broke chairs..., and took a long time to calm down. However, he had been well aware of the synagogue dimensions in advance, and designed the windows to almost cover the whole walls.\footnote{Marc Chagall, quoted in Benjamin Harshav, \textit{Marc Chagall and His Times} (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004), 920.}

Even after the inauguration of the windows, Chagall’s wife, Vava, expressed his worries on the safety of the windows in one of her letters: “It is not too bad, but not altogether satisfying either. What to do with people who don’t know anything about art!”\footnote{Vava Chagall, quoted in Harshav, \textit{Marc Chagall and His Times}, 888.}
Stained glass was a relatively new format for Chagall, with this commission being a first project of such a large scale. Yet, all the problems related to the site dimensions and its remoteness, as well as the lack of experience with stained glass, did not discourage the seventy-two-year-old master from embarking on this journey. If anything, Chagall was inspired by the challenge of the unexplored medium and artistic possibilities it promised: “Stained glass, the ideal enclosure for a house of God, does in fact transform light and, by its nature and function, incarnates sacred mystery.”

As with all of his compositions in stained glass, Chagall collaborated on this project with Brigitte Simon Marq (1926-2009) and her husband Charles Marq (1923-2006), the owners of Jacques Simon Glass Works in Reims, which was established in 1640 and to this day continues the tradition of crafting stained glass. The Marqs created ideal working conditions for Chagall to execute his marvellous works in this complex and unfamiliar medium in an atmosphere of mutual trust, respect, and affection. Chagall provided them with sketches, and together they discussed intricate colour variations, discovering new ways of producing a multitude of shades to translate Chagall’s unique colour palette into glass. Benoît Marq remembered Chagall at work at his parents’ studio: “…the artist was working with extraordinary energy, tirelessly inventive, sometimes full of questions, occasionally worried and then newly inspired after taking advice from Brigitte and Charles.”

---

Additionally, the Marqs travelled to Jerusalem to study the light as it filtered through coloured glass:

They spent hours watching the light change as the sun rose into the sky and then descended as the day grew long and darkness began to fall. They worked out plans for how thick or thin to make top layer of color so that the light could come through and create the desired tone. For this is the key to making stained glass— to keep the color layer thin enough...65

Furthermore, the Marqs supervised the two exhibitions and the final installation of the windows in 1962. Five years later, they made a trip to Israel to temporarily remove the windows in the wake of the Six-Day War.66

In his book on Chagall, Werner Haftmann described the Jerusalem Windows as follows: “The stained glass crowning the Hadassah synagogue is filled with pictures of a deep inner joyfulness, which includes the worship of love and all kinds of droll humor, such as we find running so charmingly throughout Chagall’s works.”67

These magnificent 11 by 8 feet windows symbolize the history of Jewish people through the Twelve Tribes of Israel: Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Dan, Naphtali, Gad, Asher, Issachar, Zebulun, Joseph, and Benjamin. The tribes received their names after the twelve sons of the Patriarch of Israelites, Jacob, with his two wives and two concubines. The tribes were blessed by Jacob and Moses in the verses of Genesis and Deuteronomy, the first and fifth books of the Bible. In lyric verses from Genesis, dying Jacob addresses his twelve sons, revealing each one’s nature and destiny.68 In the book of Deuteronomy,

65 Freund, Jewels for a Crown, 14.
66 Harshav, Marc Chagall and His Times, 918.
Moses, finally bringing Israelites to the Promised Land after forty years of wandering in the desert, repeats Jacob’s solemn act and blesses the tribes at their entrance to the Holy Land.\(^69\)

Consequently, the choice of the topic for the windows was dictated by the circumstance of the commission: “The gathering of all the tribes of Israel represents Zionist dream of the ‘ingathering of the exiles’ and the exhilarating experience of the young state of Israel that, indeed, all Jewish tribes from the ends of the world are coming back to their ancestral land.”\(^70\)

For these windows Chagall borrowed many images from his traditional iconography and created a kingdom of stars, elements, and animals, following Judaism’s injunction against depicting human images. Chagall was aware at the time of the commission that artworks designed for a place of worship could not portray any human features according to Mosaic Law, but yet again this was a welcome challenge and Chagall filled his windows with myriad of themes of nature, sketches of towns, religious subjects, and Hebrew writings.

Still, beyond the imagery, these windows are a radiant display of Chagall’s distinctive glowing colour, intensified by the hot Jerusalem sun: “Words do not have the power to describe Chagall’s color, its spirituality, its singing quality, its dazzling

\(^{70}\) Benjamin Harshav, *Marc Chagall and the Lost Jewish World* (New York: Rizzoli, 2006), 244.
luminosity, its ever more subtle flow, and its sensitivity to the inflections of the soul and the transports of the imagination.”

2.3 Alexey Khevelev’s Life and Works

Alexey Khevelev was born in 1979 in the city of Rostov-on-Don, Russia, to a family of mathematicians. His mother, Irina Aleksandrovna (1951-2012), in her youth was a talented violinist, and at the time of her graduation from a music school was advised to continue studying music, but instead decided to pursue a career in mathematics. Khevelev’s maternal grandfather was a director of a music school and his grandmother was an opera singer. The composer himself credits his achievements to his musical genes and to his mother for being the key in his becoming as a musician and a person, always enforcing discipline with love and affection.

From his early age, Irina Aleksandrovna was devoted to her son’s education, travelling with him each summer to central Russia to visit museums and to attend concerts. Back at home, they were studying the art of great painters, reading the Bible, and listening to music. So it was no surprise when, after hearing a recording of Bach’s Toccata and Fugue in D-minor, six-year-old Alexey told his mother that he wanted to become a composer: “It [Bach’s music] made an absolutely ineffaceable impression on

---

72 Many biographical details were shared by Khevelev with the author in several personal interviews, for which the Ethics Approval was granted by the Western University Non-Medical Research Ethics Board, provided in Appendix C. All further quotes and titles of the Russian sources were translated by the author.
me, and then I decided not just to learn how to play an instrument, but exactly how to compose music. I was shocked that such music could exist at all.”

Yet, his mother explained to him that in order to compose, he needed to study piano and to learn the foundations of music first. However, after being interviewed at a local music school, he and his mother received unflattering feedback from a piano teacher that the boy’s fingers were short, fatty, and “the size of a quarter of a sausage” and nothing musically worthy would become of him. Intelligent and thoughtful, Irina Aleksandrovna replied that technical abilities were not as important as the fact that her son “had music in his heart.”

Contrary to the initial prediction, young Alexey made enormous progress in a preliminary year and successfully entered first grade at an elementary music school. He was quickly gaining the reputation of a child prodigy for his compositions and performances. Nowadays, he praises his first piano teacher, Olga Gavrish, for teaching him the meaning of music and the purpose of playing piano. In her class, Khevelev came to realize that it was better not to play piano at all if one’s performance did not move anyone, if nothing meaningful was conveyed to a listener. In one of his interviews, Khevelev stated that:

---


74 Alexey Khevelev, Interview with the author, January 11, 2019.


76 Alexey Khevelev, Interview with the author, January 11, 2019.
To understand music means that when you listen to a musical composition and you have goosebumps, not only on your hands but also on your head. To sense music, to treat it not like a piece of interior, but as something that crashes your life and changes it forever. This is, in my opinion, the understanding of music, and not only academic music…

At the same time that he started piano lessons, Alexey began studying composition and made rapid progress, demonstrating strong hearing abilities in harmony and polyphony. As well, Khevelev admitted that none of his early achievements would have been possible without the help of his first composition teacher, Anetta Kabalskitte, who played an integral part in his early musical development, shaping him into a knowledgeable young composer and instructing him in writing contemporary music for children.

In 1989, the first vinyl record of Khevelev’s music was produced in Moscow; the following year he received a letter from organizers of the Prokofiev Centennial Music Festival (to be held in 1991) inviting him to perform his music in Scotland. Impressively, eleven-year-old Alexey gave ten concerts during twenty days, and was awarded a Gold Medal from Sviatoslav and Oleg Prokofiev for continuing their father’s compositional tradition.

Consequently, Irina Aleksandrovnna was instantly concerned about the negative effect such fast public acclaim could have on her young son. She worried about him

78 Shapovalova, “Alexey Khevelev.”
79 Front page, “Scottish Audiences May Scoop the Rest of Britain in Discovering a New Mozart…,” Soviet Weekly No.2553 (February, 1991).
developing unhealthy “vanity, pride, and narcissism.”\textsuperscript{80} Today, being a mentor to young students himself, Khevelev agrees that: “The most dangerous thing that can happen to a talented child is to become convinced that he\textsuperscript{81} is a genius.”\textsuperscript{82}

In 1990, Irina Aleksandrovna was diagnosed with cancer, and that changed all of their family’s lives. Being a single mother, she was constantly concerned about her children’s future.\textsuperscript{83} In one of her interviews, Irina Aleksandrovna remembered how she was teaching her two young sons to cook meals, to do laundry, and to pay bills, preparing them “to live without a mother.”\textsuperscript{84} She could not afford surgery on a teacher’s salary, but her fifth-grade son, Alexey, organized a charity concert, playing at his local school to raise money for his mother’s medical expenses. Thanks to her children fighting for her life, Irina Aleksandrovna still lived for more than two decades after receiving a terminal diagnosis, and provided constant support, encouragement, and inspiration to her family.

In 1992, Khevelev entered the newly opened Special Music College at the Rostov State Rachmaninov Conservatory in his home town of Rostov-on-Don. The purpose of this school is to provide an elite music education for children with extraordinary musical

\textsuperscript{81} Because nouns in the Russian language are assigned a gender, here and further in my translation of Russian quotes I use corresponding gender-specific pronouns.
\textsuperscript{83} Khevelev’s father left the family at the time when Alexey was born. There was a complication during the birth, and Alexey’s heart stopped beating for six minutes. His mother was praying while doctors were pronouncing him dead. The fact that the infant’s heart started beating again, and there were no any lasting health impacts, was considered a miracle by a medical staff.
\textsuperscript{84} Panfilovskaia, “Music that Saves the Life.”
abilities. The general subjects, covering primary and secondary school curriculums, are taught parallel to music subjects, such as instrumental performance, theory, harmony, orchestra, etc. This type of educational music institution exists in several Russian conservatories, and is based on the example of the Central Music School at the Moscow Conservatory, which was established in 1935 being the first of its kind. The teaching staff of these schools consists of conservatory professors, who supply high quality music education. After graduation, most of the students continue their studies at the conservatory with the same teachers. Many distinguished alumni of special music schools in Russian conservatories, such as pianist Vladimir Ashkenazy, cellist Mischa Maisky, and violinist Maxim Vengerov, exemplify the advantages of this type of early musical training.85

Yehudi Menuhin (1916-1999), an American violinist, conductor, and pedagogue, founded a similar special music school in Stoke d’Aberon, England, in 1963, basing it on the model of the Moscow Central Music School. In his autobiography, Menuhin described his observations of the school environment after visiting it on several occasions:

I was tremendously impressed by the quality of real performance shared by all these neatly turned out, eager, healthy children. Even the youngest, playing simple exercises, had an aplomb, a feeling for shape and presentation, that suggested they were performing at Carnegie Hall. It was not difficult to deduce the solidarity, the security, the attention to detail of the Russian methods. Nothing was hurried or glossed over; only mastery of stage one allowed a child to approach stage two, and if at, say, stage seven a student failed to do something perfectly which belonged to stage three,

85 For a detailed description of music education system in Russia, which mostly developed during the Soviet Union years, see Alberta Lowe and Harold S. Pryor, “Music Education in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,” Music Educators Journal 45, no. 6 (June 1959).
back he went to climb the ladder again. And all had to climb the ladder: talent or flair or genius was not sufficient reason to miss a rung.  

At the Special Music College in the Rostov Conservatory, Alexey Khevelev studied composition with Leonid Klinichev (b.1938) and piano performance with Sergei Osipenko (b.1953). Professor Klinichev, a celebrated Russian composer, whose symphonic music is often heard in many concert halls across the country, was instrumental in developing Khevelev’s individual style, and in training him to differentiate between improvisation and composition. Klinichev’s teaching philosophy resonated with Khevelev’s growing conviction that the mastery of a composer lies in the ability to captivate the audience with the beauty of sound, harmonic intricacies, and a clarity of melodic motives. As Klinichev expressed: “I, like most people, prefer music that touches the heart strings, not the strings of the mind. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries music was sensitive and harmonic. It is that music we hear most often from the stage of any musical theater.” This statement may seem controversial, but Klinichev certainly is not alone in his assumptions, as his words echo Rachmaninov’s confession from his private correspondence seventy years before: “The new kind of music seems to come, not from the heart, but from the head. Its composers think rather than feel. They have not the capacity to make their works “exult”… They meditate, protest, analyze, reason, calculate, and brood– but they do not exult.”

---

After graduating from the Music College in 1995, Khevelev was accepted to the Rostov State Rachmaninov Conservatory, majoring in both composition and piano performance. The crucial influence on Khevelev’s artistic development during his studies at the College and at the Conservatory was his piano teacher, a renowned Russian pedagogue, Sergei Osipenko, who raised many internationally acclaimed concert pianists, and successfully prepared Khevelev for several piano competitions, including the 1998 International Piano Competition in Israel, where Khevelev won the Second Prize. A graduate of the Moscow Conservatory, Osipenko inherits the finest traditions of the Russian school of piano playing, which he says are rooted in “the beauty of the sound—the vocal tone. That’s not so very easy to achieve on the percussion keyboard instrument we call the piano. The ability to sing on the piano forms the heart of Russian tradition.” Osipenko’s philosophy prompted Khevelev to be, first and foremost, concerned with the quality of pianistic touch and with engaging the audience, which synchronized perfectly with his compositional goals. Khevelev remembers the years in Osipenko’s studio as “the brightest page of my life.”

During his conservatory years, Khevelev participated in several international music festivals, both as a composer and a performer. His academic achievements were

recognized by the mayor of Rostov-on-Don, who awarded the young musician a “Student of the Year” honour. Twice Khevelev became a recipient of the scholarships by Dmitri Shostakovich and Mstislav Rostropovich foundations. Khevelev revealed that he was fortunate enough to meet the great cellist himself, and to this day fondly remembers how Rostropovich conducted himself around young musicians with kindness and ease, rarely encountered among the artists of his caliber.92

By the age of twenty-two, Khevelev had graduated from the conservatory and was an accomplished artist, giving tours as a composer and a pianist in Russia, Israel, Canada, Finland, and the UK. Around this time, he formed a music band in collaboration with his older brother Sergei, whom Khevelev considers a father figure and a close friend. Khevelev became a drummer and later a keyboardist, performing music in genres of indie and alternative rock. Recently, the band rebranded itself into a group named X-Brothers producing three albums. Khevelev acknowledges that this is more of a hobby to him, the chance to play and to share non-academic music with close friends and respected colleagues.93

After his graduation, Khevelev declined offers to relocate to the Russian capitals and abroad to facilitate his successfully developing career, and chose to stay at his home town in order to take care of his ailing mother. Today, he resides in Rostov-on-Don with his beloved wife Ekaterina, and works as an Assistant Professor at the Rostov State Rachmaninov Conservatory, instructing composition and piano classes; he also serves as the Dean of Special Music College with the Conservatory, and teaches composition and

92 Alexey Khevelev, Interview with the author, January 11, 2019.
93 Ibid.
piano at the Prokofiev Music School No.10 in Rostov-on-Don. Furthermore, he is an active adjudicator at piano and composition competitions across Russia and a co-organizer of the piano competition Don Grand Piano, children composition competition Musical Vitraux, and a festival of contemporary classical music One-Eighth.

Since 2016, Khevelev has occupied the post of the Dean of Music College in Rostov-on-Don, designed for children with special musical abilities, the same College from which he himself graduated. During his tenure, Khevelev encountered many responsibilities and developed his own educational philosophy, helping his students to succeed by treating them with respect and listening to their concerns without being judgmental. Having had an attentive mother who studied with her children at home, in addition to school curriculum, Khevelev states: “You [a parent] need to provide a child with various education and knowledge, and he himself will decide what to take. But it is you who needs to offer that knowledge.”94 Being extremely humble about his musical successes and always crediting them to his great pedagogues, Khevelev strives to awake in his own students “compassion, love, the understanding that a musician must give a gift of kindness to other people through the sounds, this is the most important, and everything else is trivia.”95

95 Andoian, “Alexey Khevelev.”
2.4 Khevelev’s Compositions and Style

Khevelev has composed music in many genres, including piano sonatas, piano cycles, concertos for piano and orchestra, operas, and others. In his writing, he is concerned about harmonic and melodic clarity without being afraid of sounding ‘old-fashioned’. Many composers whose life span fell in between two different musical epochs were criticized for not being progressive enough; one of the examples is Sergei Rachmaninov, whose music was proclaimed as being “trapped in the late Romantic mode of the nineteenth century.” Being a contemporary composer, Khevelev has never felt obliged to follow the contemporary techniques of composition, and developed his love of harmony and melody, mostly influenced by the nineteenth- and twentieth-century composers.

Khevelev admitted to imitating many famous composers in his childhood pieces, including his favourite Rachmaninov, and even presently, he believes that any composer who writes ‘traditional’ music, to a certain extent, borrows material from somebody else: “As a matter of fact, all academic music had been written, and what is being composed nowadays is just a commentary on how a particular composer views one or the other period in music history.”

From an early age, his greatest inspirations came from works by Mussorgsky, Prokofiev, Rachmaninov, Scriabin, Shostakovich, and Schnittke, whose music always

96 A full list of Khevelev’s compositions is provided in Appendix A. The recordings of his music can be accessed at https://soundcloud.com/alexey-khevelev.
98 Shapovalova, “Alexey Khevelev.”
resonated with Khevelev. He has been inspired by Schnittke’s bold innovations and mixture of different styles, and admits that his music constantly offers some original and unexpected features from which to learn.99 One of Khevelev’s biggest regrets is that he never met the great master, though they had an arranged meeting in Moscow in late 1980s that never took place due to Schnittke’s deteriorating health.100

Khevelev composes most often at the piano, but says that the musical ideas might come to him in various places and situations:

…it might happen when you are on a train, and the rails start to sing because of a small irregularity between them. And there are two of them, and they sing on different notes. Then, at a certain low speed, sounds appear in the second octave, and they begin to live. For example, this ‘railway music’ might be represented by a choir. And all you need to do is just listen and write this music down.101

Many artists of different art mediums share certain tendencies, and the conviction that the talent is assigned by a higher power, be it the God or the Universe, is one of those common beliefs. Dutch painter Piet Mondrian (1872-1944) insightfully remarked: “The position of the artist is humble. He is essentially a channel.”102 Similarly, Khevelev believes that the music comes to him from God. He modestly admits that he has little to do with this process, as creative ideas may come to him in any place and at any time: in a grocery store or in his sleep, when the need to transcribe those sounds on paper awakens

---

99 Alexey Khevelev, Interview with the author, January 22, 2019.
100 Ibid.
101 Shapovalova, “Alexey Khevelev.”
102 Louise Nelstrop and Helen Appleton, ed. Art and Mysticism: Interfaces in the Medieval and Modern Periods (Boca Raton: Routledge, 2018), 42.
him. Though he acknowledges that these moments of inspiration are only a first phase followed by the hard daily work of crafting and developing his musical material.

One of the most distinctive features of Khevelev’s style is the use of extra-musical references in his works. He argues that “the title of the work, in any art medium, is thirty percent of its future success,”\textsuperscript{103} and, consequently, it has always been of high importance to him to stimulate listener’s creative thinking by alluding to different subject matters in the titles of his compositions. He is meticulous in choosing names for his works, carefully evaluating how a particular title and its connotations might affect the reception of the music. Even in his earliest pieces, which were published in 2008 under a collective name “Children’s Album,”\textsuperscript{104} the evidence of extra-musical references is clear from the titles: “The Nighttime Fairy-Tale,” “The Joyful Train,” etc.

The biggest triggers for Khevelev to compose come from the events in his personal life, both happy and sorrowful. One of his recent cycles of fourteen preludes for piano, \textit{October 33rd} (2015), is another example of a work with an intriguing title, and was greatly affected by substantial changes in his personal life. The composer himself, while being discreet about the stimulus’s particulars, contends that this work was inspired by the developments in his life that occurred throughout October and led to a significant event on November 2nd. This cycle’s music could be described as minimalistic in a sense that each prelude has minimal evolving material. Instead, the composer creates a feeling of deep immersion into the wealth of sounds and harmonies, freeing a listener to simply enjoy an emotional state of each prelude. Khevelev acknowledges that this cycle led him

\textsuperscript{103} Alexey Khevelev, Interview with Vladimir Dobrizkii.
\textsuperscript{104} Alexey Khevelev, \textit{Children’s Album} (Rostov-on-Don: Phoenix, 2008).
to experiment with a new compositional technique, and that this music is unusually simple as “a glass of water, an apple, or a first love… This cycle opened for me some earlier unknown ways of perceiving the world and the ability to share feelings.”

As a spiritual person, whose religion plays an important part in his life, Khevelev has always been interested in exploring the depths of human nature. The recurring themes of many of his compositions revolve around some of the core tenets of Christianity, such as the fight between God and Satan residing in every human’s soul, the opposition of Love and Death, and the unknown realms of the afterlife, which he explores in many of his works, for instance, a cycle of piano preludes _Russian Roulette_ (2006) and a chamber opera _X_ (2014).

A piano cycle _Russian Roulette_ was a foundation for Khevelev’s first chamber opera with the same title, written in 2009. In this opera, the composer explores the reasons, or lack thereof, to continue living, and humans’ belief in the ownership of their own lives. The plot of the opera unfolds in a train compartment on the first of January, where six people with completely different lives meet by chance. They have been gloomily celebrating New Year’s Eve, when one of them, named the Composer, becomes tired of drinking and challenges his companions to a game of Russian Roulette, revealing a loaded revolver. The feverish music, imitating a moving train, is filled with an unrelenting rhythmic pulsation of an orchestra; suspenseful moments of silence,

---

introducing each character’s musical episode, are full of nervous anticipation of senseless death.

Khevelev’s second chamber opera $X$ further develops the idea of human’s hardship in accepting God’s forgiveness. The letter ‘X’ is a symbol of the unknown; in Russian spelling, it is the first letter of Jesus Christ’s name (Христос) and of Khevelev’s last name (Хевелев). All of these connotations were important for the composer in his desire to stir viewers’ thinking. This opera is written in the genre of monodrama, featuring only one character who struggles to explain his sinful life in a last attempt to save his soul from perishing in hell. After the opera’s successful production in 2017, Khevelev admitted to working on a third chamber opera, which would eventually form the three-act drama together with Russian Roulette and $X$. In one of his interviews, the composer explains his fascination with the topics that will connect all three operas: a fine line between life and death, the infernal suffering, and the afterlife:

Essentially, a person’s birth and death are irrational. This is an eternal topic. So the symbolism of the opera $X$ represents two intersecting lines, two roads, and a letter of two alphabets signifying the unknown. I would very much like the listener to reflect on the title’s meaning. The first opera [Russian Roulette] is about human foolishness, the second one [$X$] is about the desire of a person to fix everything in the moment when he finds himself in a purgatory after death. The third opera will be about the human soul— the afterlife. This is the concept of the triptych.\footnote{Igor Koryabin, “Alexey Khevelev: ‘I Will Write Music’,” Belcanto.ru (February, 2018) http://www.belcanto.ru/18021701.html (accessed January 8, 2019).}

Another work that rethinks these complex subjects is Judas and Christ (2009), a one-movement concerto for piano and orchestra, which was inspired by Russian priest
Anatolii Zhurakovskii’s essay *Judas* (1923).\footnote{Anatolii Zhurakovskii, *Judas* (Kiev: Center of Theological Research, 2004).} In this work, Zhurakovskii introduced Judas Iscariot as an ordinary person, who led a simple life filled with daily chores, hoping one day to have a family. Everything changed for him when he met Jesus. He followed his Teacher everywhere, longing to devote his heart completely to him, but at the end not being able to renounce the earthly life with its simple pleasures. The piano concerto was premiered by the composer in 2011 in Rostov-on-Don to great public success.\footnote{Alexey Khevelev, *Judas and Christ*, Rostov Symphony Orchestra conducted by Alexander Goncharov, Video Recording, 12:27 (November, 2011) \url{https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z0gBJRYR00I} (accessed January 22, 2019).}

Being an exemplary pianist with an expressive yet measured manner of playing, Khevelev actively performs his own works. One of the compositions that occupies a stable place in his concert repertoire is Piano Sonata No.3 (2003), which is arguably one of his most technically demanding pieces. Khevelev dedicated this work to his older brother Sergei, and incorporated excerpts from his songs written for their music band X-Brothers. The idea of quoting Sergei’s music was a meaningful way to preserve his brother’s compositions and to view them through a different light of academic music. Khevelev always praised his brother as a talented musician and a poet who also wrote a libretto for his opera *Russian Roulette*. Currently, Khevelev works on several projects, including a volume of Valses for piano and his First Symphony.

The present chapter overviewed the lives and works of the artist Mark Chagall and the composer Alexey Khevelev. The background and general structure of Chagall’s *Jerusalem Windows* were discussed in detail as well as Khevelev’s compositional oeuvre with the focus on the works with extra-musical meaning. The following Chapter Three...
concentrates on Khelev’s piano cycle *Chagall Vitraux*, providing its background and examining three selected movements from the cycle. Each of the three sections compares music with a corresponding Chagall’s window, and provides a musical analysis using the two models of music-image interrelationships developed by Cook, namely, complementation and contest, discussed in Chapter One.
Chapter Three: Analysis of Three Movements from *Chagall Vitraux*

3.1 Background and Overview of *Chagall Vitraux*

Alexey Khevelev is not alone in referencing Chagall’s majestic *Jerusalem Windows* in his music; Jacob Gilboa’s *The Twelve Jerusalem Chagall Windows* (1966), John McCabe’s *The Chagall Windows* (1974), and Petr Eben’s *Okna* (1976) were all inspired by Chagall’s stained-glass masterpiece. Khevelev’s composition differs from the above works by being written for a solo instrument as well as by following all the twelve windows in a clearly defined order.

Though, McCabe’s orchestral composition *The Chagall Windows* observes the succession of the windows, its through-composed form makes it difficult to discern the borders of each movement. However, by means of a non-sectional form, McCabe “manages to convey, in the temporal medium of music, a sense of the same circularity that we find in the windows of the synagogue’s lantern.” Another feature that distinguishes this composition from Khevelev’s as well as Chagall’s designs is its three-movement structure. McCabe assembled the twelve tribes into three groups of four, using the gong strokes at the end of each section, thus contradicting Chagall’s structure of three tribes on each of the four walls.

---

109 For further discussion of Gilboa and McCabe’s works, see Bruhn, *Musical Ekphrasis*, 269-360; for an analysis of Eben’s *Okna*, see Swartz, “Time Versus Space.”

While Gilboa’s *The Twelve Jerusalem Chagall Windows* is written for various orchestral instruments as well, it also calls for a vocal soloist and five ensemble singers. This composition consists of twenty-four instrumental miniatures, which frame the twelve vocal pieces. The biblical texts, cited in Hebrew, English, and German, are loosely fitted to the musical lines, aiming to evoke shared knowledge rather than to act as lyrics. Gilboa’s music neither observes Chagall’s nor the biblical order of the tribes, and follows the composer’s own design, attempting “an interpretation in sound of the impression created by the colourful evocative art of Chagall as lingering in an individual composer’s mind and heart.”

Eben’s *Okna* for trumpet and organ consists of four movements: “Modré Okno,” “Zelené Okno,” “Cervené Okno,” and “Zlaté Okno” (Blue Window, Green Window, Blood-Red Window, and Golden Window). The movements were inspired respectively by four of Chagall’s windows: “Rueben,” “Issachar,” “Zebulun,” and “Levi.” The uniqueness of this work is in the fact that Eben had not seen the windows in their synagogue setting before composing the music. According to him, the work was conceived of while looking at the printed reproductions of the windows, which he then translated into music. Thus, it may be assumed that Eben’s work focuses more on colours and iconography of the specific four windows rather than their spatial representation at the synagogue in connection with other windows.

---

At the age of fourteen, while in Jerusalem on a piano tour, Khevelev visited the Hadassah Medical Center synagogue, where he first saw the *Jerusalem Windows* by Chagall. The young composer was so moved by Chagall’s art that he felt an urge to communicate his deep impressions through music: “I entered [the synagogue] and was astounded by what I saw. Like Michelangelo’s Sistine Chapel ceiling or Notre-Dame Cathedral in Paris, there are these art masterworks that everyone should see in their lifetime.”

In order to fully interpret Chagall’s message of love for his people, the young composer conducted extensive research of Jewish music, studying the recordings of singing prayers in a synagogue— the traditional mode of religious singing, known as *hazzanut* and translated as cantorial music. It is a style of florid melodious intonation that requires great vocal and emotional ranges. The second musical source for Khevelev’s research was the recordings of folk music of the State of Israel. The musical culture of Israel was largely formed by immigrants who inhabited the land in the second half of the twentieth century, bringing various musical traditions with them. The blend of different musical styles led to a struggle over the nature of the new and cohesive musical culture that would reflect the rebirth of the young state and be embraced by all. Eventually, Israeli composers adopted Jewish Oriental and Arab tunes and rhythms in writing original melodies, avoiding major and minor scales and conventional harmony. Instead, they often utilised the Dorian, Phrygian, and Mixolydian medieval modes, associating distinct repeated melodic patterns with each mode, and employing all kinds of syncopations and

---

113 Alexey Khevelev, Interview with the author, January 22, 2019.
asymmetric meters. As the following musical analysis demonstrates, Khevelev integrated the wealth and diversity of the land’s musical culture in his composition.

Piano cycle *Chagall Vitraux* was composed in six months, and was first performed by Khevelev at the entrance exam for the conservatory composition faculty. A full performance of the cycle takes approximately twenty-five minutes, and it must be noted that Khevelev himself did not plan for this work to be performed alongside the windows; however, he agreed that his music would be effective in helping the audience to understand Chagall’s masterpiece.

*Chagall Vitraux* consists of the twelve movements corresponding to Chagall’s twelve windows. In writing this cycle, Khevelev was following Mussorgsky’s tradition, and modeled this work on the glorious *Pictures at an Exhibition*, in which every movement represents an entirely different character or scene. Initially, Khevelev had written around forty pieces that were ‘cleansed’ into the final twelve movements to capture the quintessential mood of each window. The composer acknowledged the importance of screening written material in one of his interviews, claiming that it was better to select less material, but make it more interesting. When I asked Khevelev what criteria he followed in selecting the appropriate musical numbers, his answer was

---

115 The piano cycle *Chagall Vitraux* is unpublished and is distributed by the composer in its manuscript version. The French title of the work was adapted during an International Music Festival, Plug, in Glasgow in 2009.
116 Alexey Khevelev, Interview with the author, November 29, 2018.
118 Shapovalova, “Alexey Khevelev.”
simple: “They were either good or bad.” His response reminded me of Chagall’s statement about the worth of every new work: “When I am finishing a picture, I hold some God-made object up to it— a rock, a flower, the branch of a tree in my hand— as a final test. If the painting stands up beside a thing man cannot make, the painting is authentic. If there’s a clash between the two, it’s bad art.”

It was Khevelev’s deliberate decision not to investigate the windows’ biblical reference to the Tribes of Israel prior to composing the music, as he wished to express his personal understanding of Chagall’s creation: “I spent about two hours at the synagogue and not just studying [the windows], I began to live in them, with them.” Arnold Schoenberg similarly described how he was inspired by the essence of the work of art rather than by its cause in an essay on a relationship with the text in art songs:

I had absolutely no idea what was going on in the poems on which they were based. But when I had read the poems it became clear to me that I had gained absolutely nothing for the understanding of the songs thereby, since the poems did not make it necessary for me to change my conception of the musical interpretation in the slightest degree. On the contrary, it appeared that, without knowing the poem, I had grasped the content, the real content, perhaps even more profoundly than if I had clung to the surface of the mere thoughts expressed in words.

For my musical analysis I selected three movements from the cycle, which best exemplify Nicholas Cook’s models of complementation and contest. Each section
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compares the music with the coordinating Chagall’s window, describing its content and a biblical reference, followed by a musical analysis that was informed by my performance experience of this piano cycle. The choice of movements presented in this study was affected, first of all, by my personal preferences as a performer of this work, second, by the significance of certain movements, and, third, by the various placements of the corresponding synagogue windows. It may be argued that a work of visual art is an end product, fixed in its appearance, which an observer comprehends as a whole at once, while a performance of a musical composition unfolds in time and is nonphysical. However, stained-glass art has a similar degree of temporality, as the light coming through the windows continuously alters the colours, enlivens them with various nuances, and shifts the focus of a glass painting. Chagall acknowledged this aspect of a stained-glass medium and its uniqueness among other visual art forms:

A stained glass window has a different fate from a painting. Because of the setting, the eye does not look at it in the same way as a collection of paintings. The eye of a man at prayer is simply part of his heart… Stained Glass has to be serious and passionate. It is something elevating and exhilarating. It has to live through the perception of light.124

3.2 Analysis of Selected Movements from Chagall Vitraux

“Zebulun”

124 Marc Chagall, quoted in Benjamin Harshav, Marc Chagall on Art and Culture (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003), 145.
I start my analysis with the second movement “Zebulun,” which references the middle window on the southern wall at the synagogue. It is the only movement in the cycle that Khevelev intentionally placed contrary to Chagall’s order: “…this window is a red card, it is saturated with certain moments, as I saw it, reflecting human life on this earth. From the start of the life till the departure, it associates with blood, and it seemed to me that this moment must be extracted from an order Chagall put the windows in, it seemed right to me to do so.”

In this window Chagall referred to the verses from the Book of Genesis that describe Jacob’s prediction of prosperity for his tenth son: “Zebulun shall dwell by the seashore; he will be a haven for ships, and his flank shall rest on Sidon.” Zebulun was the last son of Jacob and his first wife, Leah, and is often associated with his older brother, Issachar, as they both were born after many years of their mother’s barrenness. In the Book of Deuteronomy, Moses gave the two brothers a joined blessing, prophesying a prosperous destiny for their tribes: “Rejoice, Zebulun, in your expeditions, exult, Issachar, in your tents!” Zebulun financially supported Issachar’s studies of the Torah, and, in turn, Issachar’s spiritual activity guaranteed his brother’s commercial success.

---

125 A diagram of Chagall’s Jerusalem Windows and the corresponding movements from Khevelev’s Chagall Vitraux is provided in Appendix B. For further discussion of Chagall’s Jerusalem Windows, see Leymarie, The Jerusalem Windows; Harshav, Marc Chagall and the Lost Jewish World.

126 Alexey Khevelev, Interview with the author, November 29, 2018.


128 Deuteronomy 33:18.

The ship that Chagall depicted in the lower left part of the window was indeed a symbol of Zebulun. There is a smaller upside down boat, positioned on the left from the ship, which may represent Zebulun’s younger brother, Issachar, and their close connection. Despite Zebulun’s symbolic association with the sea, historically, his land occupied a continental territory crossed by many commercial routes, which warranted the tribe’s wealth. The dominant brilliant red colour of this window provides a contrasting background for the two fish in the centre of the composition, Hebrew characters of Zebulun’s name on the top, and other symbols of the sea illuminated by the setting sun in the lower central part. Zebulun’s majestic window with its multilayered iconography, so prevalent in Chagall’s art, ensures continuous discovery of previously unseen details.
Fig. 3.1: Chagall, “Zebulun” from the *Jerusalem Windows*\textsuperscript{130}

\textsuperscript{130} Leymarie, *The Jerusalem Windows*, 81.
The corresponding musical piece “Zebulun” creates a dichotomy of night and day by interpreting the red sun both as setting on a background of the window and as rising from the sea bed. The table of Fig. 3.2 illustrates the form of the piece, and shows how two musical motives (labelled $x$ and $y$) representing the two contrasting images are juxtaposed through the course of the movement. The images of the nightfall’s thickening darkness are set against the images of the dawn with its clearing rays. In my opinion, this music is in contest (using Cook’s terminology) with Chagall’s idea of prosperity and simplicity of Zebulun’s tribe. Meaning that the two media, the stained glass and the music, are in opposition to each other. Chagall depicted a ship, steadily claiming the sea and its wealth, as a sign of Zebulun’s commercial success, with the radiant red colour expressing the power and prestige of Zebulun’s tribe. On the contrary, Khevelev viewed the intense red colour of this window as a symbol of blood pulsating in a human body from the birth till the end of life. Although his music relies on the window’s colours and iconography, it paints a different picture of an opposition between darkness and light, and has a degree of fearful apprehension, which, in my opinion, Chagall did not intend to convey in this window.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Sectional Subdivisions</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Tonal Plan</th>
<th>Tempo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction (A)</strong></td>
<td>Motive x</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>F minor</td>
<td><strong>Moderato</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st sequence of x</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>B♭ minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motive y</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>B♭ major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd sequence of x</td>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Section (B)</strong></td>
<td>Motive x/1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>C minor</td>
<td><strong>Allegro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sequence of x/1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>F minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bell motive z</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>F/C 5ths and 4ths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ab/E♭ 5ths and 4ths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motive y/1</td>
<td>14-21</td>
<td>A minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>Ab major/A minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>B♭ dim. triad/A dim. triad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>A minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bell motive z/1</td>
<td>31-32</td>
<td>Ab/E♭ 5th and 4th, D minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motive x/1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>F minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transition (A1)</strong></td>
<td>Motive x</td>
<td>34-36</td>
<td>F minor</td>
<td><strong>Ritenuto</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st sequence of x</td>
<td>36-39</td>
<td>B♭ minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd sequence of x</td>
<td>39-41</td>
<td>E♭ minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Section (B1)</strong></td>
<td>Motive y/1</td>
<td>42-51</td>
<td>F minor</td>
<td><strong>Andante</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bell motive z/1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Ab/E♭ 4ths and 5ths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motive y/1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>F minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bell motive z/1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Db/Ab 4ths and 5ths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motive y/1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>F minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Section (C)</strong></td>
<td>Bell motive z /Motive y/1</td>
<td>56-57</td>
<td>F minor</td>
<td><strong>Allegro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Eb major, Db major chords</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>D major, E major chords</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60-61</td>
<td>F minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motive x/1 with sequences</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>C minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>F minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Descending motive from D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Descending motive from E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culmination (built on bell motive z)</td>
<td>66-75</td>
<td>F♯ major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusion (motives x and y)</td>
<td>76-79</td>
<td>C minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3.2: Form of “Zebulun” from Khelev’s Chagall Vitraux
The musical example in Fig. 3.3 demonstrates how the first five measures create an atmosphere of twilight with its mysterious shadows. Slowly unfolding first motive $x$ in F minor is followed by a rhythmically modified sequence in B♭ minor. The next measure (m. 6) introduces contrasting second motive $y$ in B♭ major. A higher register and harmonized texture of this measure contribute to an image of the sunlight expressed by this motive. However, the major mode does not establish itself, and a second sequence of motive $x$ (mm. 7-9), this time in G minor, brings back the night’s hidden danger, its dominance is increased by a *mezzo forte* dynamic. An apparent contradiction of two motivic subjects is intensified by their registral placements. Motive $x$, dense with doubling octaves in the left hand, occupies a keyboard’s lower register, while motive $y$ shines higher above it, not daring to enter first motive’s territory. Furthermore, the composer takes advantage of dynamic markings indicating *crescendo-diminuendo* hairpins to emphasize the melodic tritone in mm. 2 and 8 (marked in yellow in Fig. 3.3), increasing an anticipation of something unknown and frightening. In contrast, the presence of daylight in B♭ major in m. 6 is weakened by a *piano* dynamic.

---

131 All musical examples are printed with the permission of Alexey Khevelev.
The first section (Fig. 3.4) changes the tempo from a meditative *moderato* to an agitated *allegro*. First motive of this section (m. 10, labelled *x1* in the table of Fig. 3.2) originates in motive *x* of the introduction (mm. 1-3). Following its sequence (m. 11), the next two measures (mm. 12-13) introduce bell motive *z*, which consists of F/C and A♭/E♭ fifth and fourth melodic intervals. It leads to motive *y1* (m. 14) that changes meter to 7/8 to establish the dance-like character of this episode. Motive *y1* contains rhythmic and melodic elements of the introduction’s motive *y* (m. 6, Fig. 3.3), and, because it is written in a natural A minor mode, it shares the colour of its relative C major tonality, thus providing a contrast to its opposing character of motive *x1* (m. 10). The rising melodic perfect fourth of the melody in m. 18 (marked in yellow in Fig. 3.4) and a lively rhythm mark a considerable change of atmosphere, while the *staccato* articulation may suggest a playful dance of fish in the glittering water in Chagall’s window. The rhythmic variety,
syncopations, and asymmetric meter illustrate Khevelev’s adaptation of the Israeli folk music idiom.\textsuperscript{132}

A threatening reminder of motive $x$ (shown in Fig. 3.3) appears in m. 24 in a form of the two harmonic diminished triads\textsuperscript{133} (marked in yellow in Fig. 3.5), but it is easily dismissed by a returning dance-like figure of motive $y_1$ in m. 25. Fig. 3.5 demonstrates how the musical material of motive $y_1$ moves down an octave, leaving its ‘safe’ place in a higher part of a keyboard (mm. 25-30). In the next two measures (mm. 31-32), bell

\textsuperscript{132} Shiloah, \textit{Jewish Musical Traditions}, 230.

\textsuperscript{133} In a top voice of the left hand chord, E enharmonically equals F\textsubscript{b} (marked in red in Fig. 3.5).
motive \( zI \) (a transposition of \( z \), shown in Fig. 3.4) enters the registral territory of the introduction’s motive \( x \). This intrusion prompts the character of the darkness to reclaim its authority in m. 33 by reiterating motive \( xI \) (m. 10, Fig. 3.4), this time at a dynamic level of *fortissimo*.

The next eight measures (mm. 34-41, Fig. 3.6) act as a transition, and consist of the introduction’s motive \( x \) and its two sequences (shown in Fig. 3.3). This time motive \( x \) appears an octave higher (mm. 34-36, Fig. 3.6), at the registral placement of its opposing motive \( y \) (m. 6, Fig. 3.3). This registral change follows an example of the first section’s motive \( yI \), which attempted to claim the lower register (mm. 25-30, Fig. 3.5). However, this seemingly insignificant modification changes the dark, threatening character of the introductory material, endowing it instead with a new, nostalgic colour. Furthermore, now the composer omits contrasting motive \( y \), which represents the character of the morning light. This choice may be caused by a different function of motive \( x \) here: in the
introduction, this motive represented the opposing image of darkness, while this time, in the transition, it loses its contradictory quality. Fig. 3.6 illustrates how slight changes in rhythm, gradually decreasing dynamic level, and decelerating of the motion anticipate the Second Section (B1). The E♭ minor key of the second sequence of motive x in this transitional section\(^{134}\) (mm. 39-41) differs from the G minor key of the second sequence of x in the introduction (mm. 7-9, Fig. 3.3). The change of key prepares a new harmony of F minor that opens the second section of the piece in m. 42 (Fig. 3.7). This transition (mm. 34-41) may reflect the darkness being subdued by the rising sun, which is still weak to bring the warmth but visible in its light.

![Motive x in F minor](image)

As can be observed in Fig. 3.7, the second section develops the first section’s motive y/ (introduced in Fig. 3.4). However, the absence of the persistent staccato

\(^{134}\) In m. 40, F♯ enharmonically equals G♭, becoming a mediant of E♭ minor (marked in red in Fig. 3.6).
articulation, new softer dynamics, the use of a damper pedal, and a change of tempo allow the melody in the left hand to glide smoothly through the waves of an accompaniment, as if embodying the ship drawn by Chagall in the window.

Fig. 3.7: Khevelev, “Zebulun” from Chagall Vitraux, mm. 42-51, beginning of Second Section (B1)

Fig. 3.8 illustrates how the calmness of the sea is suddenly disturbed at mm. 52 and 54 by bell motive $z1$ (introduced in Fig. 3.5). The fourth and fifth intervals move lower and become louder, signifying an unavoidable change. The recurrence of this section’s main musical material (motive $y1$, mm. 53, 55), interposed between bell motives, is too weak to withstand the impendent energy of the coming allegro section.
A continuous F minor chord connects the tranquil *andante* section to the third and the last section of the piece, which begins in m. 56 (Fig. 3.9). Pressured by a stirring figure in the left hand, the F minor chord progresses an octave higher through a succession of E♭ major, D♭ major, D major, and E major chords\(^{135}\) (mm. 58-59, marked in yellow in Fig. 3.9), suggesting the character of an approaching storm and its refusal to be ruled by the human power. In the first six measures of this last section (mm. 56-61), Khevelev unites two motives that were developed in the first and second sections, namely bell motive $z$ (in the left hand) and motive $y1$ (in the right hand). A long crescendo then leads to a return of motive $x1$ (m. 62), which instigates a final confrontation of the two characters.

---

\(^{135}\) In the second chord of m. 59, A♭ enharmonically equals G♯, becoming a mediant of E major (marked in red in Fig. 3.9).
In m. 68, an overwhelming climax of the piece arises with the bells of perfect fourths, at last announcing a confident F♯ major (marked in yellow in Fig. 3.9), a key area not heard before in the piece. A final attempt to question a dominance of the daylight appears in m. 78. Nevertheless, the heavy chords, built on the introduction’s motive $x$, are conquered by the perfect fourth of motive $y$ (introduced in m. 6, Fig. 3.3) in the last measure of the piece (marked in yellow in Fig. 3.9).
Fig. 3.10: Khevelev, “Zebulun” from Chagall Vitraux, mm. 66-80, ending of movement

As this study of “Zebulun” demonstrates, an analytical application of Cook’s model of contest, where the two media are in opposition to each other, shines a new light on an otherwise straightforward musical composition. Thinking of Khevelev’s portrayal of “Zebulun” with its contrasting images of night and day in relation to Chagall’s peaceful window and its portrayal of power and wealth of Zebulun’s tribe, instigates a new performative treatment of the musical piece. A comparative analysis of the two works reveals a new subtext in the relationship between two contrasting motives $x$ and $y$ (shown in Fig. 3.3). One of the possible emerging interpretations is that the mutually beneficial relationship between the two brothers, Zebulun and Issachar, are similar to the relationship of night and day, where one will not survive without the other. Such an
understanding of the musical work will lead a performer to search for a more nuanced contrast between two main musical motives, looking for ways to show their similarities, their interdependence, instead of emphasizing their differences; for example, the Transition Section A1 (Fig. 3.6) may be interpreted as softly changing cycle of night and day, instead of more obvious aggressive counterpart. At the ending (mm. 78-80, Fig. 3.10), where two motives are shown for the last time, an obvious choice for a performer would be to emphasize two motives’ different registral colours, and even delay the downbeat of m. 79 to define a clear border between them. However, the awareness of Zebulun and Issachar’s connection may be translated instead into linking two motives and moving smoothly from one to the other through a continuous ritenuto, indicated by the composer in m. 78.

“Simeon”

The third movement of Chagall Vitraux, “Simeon,” corresponds to the middle window on the eastern wall of the synagogue. Chagall based the window’s iconography on the verses from the Book of Genesis, in which Jacob addressed his second son, Simeon, prophesying dispersal of his tribe as a punishment for his violent actions. Simeon’s cruelty was precipitated when Jacob’s only known daughter, Dinah, was abducted and violated by the prince Shechem, who consequently fell in love with her and asked Jacob for her hand in marriage. Jacob agreed to the union on a condition that Shechem and his people convert to Jacob’s religion. Oblivious to their father’s will, Simeon and his brother Levi invaded the city of Shechem and slaughtered all its men, capturing women, children, livestock, and destroying everything on their way in revenge
for their sister’s dishonour.\textsuperscript{136} Jacob condemned his sons’ vindictiveness, and divided their inherited lands between the other brothers: “Let not my person enter their council, or my honor be joined with their company; for in their fury they killed men, at their whim they maimed oxen. Cursed be their fury so fierce, and their rage so cruel! I will scatter them in Jacob, disperse them throughout Israel.”\textsuperscript{137} The tribe of Simeon never played a significant role in the history of the Jewish people, gradually decreasing in size, and eventually disseminating among the other tribes. In the Book of Deuteronomy, Simeon’s tribe is noticeably absent from the blessings of Moses, which signifies its early decline.

Chagall’s window of Simeon depicts animals flying away from the earth in the light of the fading sun. A row of houses under the two watchful eyes in the lower left part of a composition may allude to Simeon’s fatal decision to ruin the city of Shechem. The images of a donkey at the right side and a horse at the top may represent the fleeing livestock of the destroyed city. The yellow disk in the top right curve contains Simeon’s name in Hebrew letters, while the rest of Jacob’s prophesy is cited in Hebrew at the bottom. The two wounded doves (shown by the contrasting red blood on the white birds) above and below the yellow disk contrast the dominant colour of somber blue, and may symbolize the two brothers’ shattered destinies. The dark blue hues of this window surround a sphere representing the earth in the lower central part, divided into the day and night, and establish “a grave and nocturnal atmosphere.”\textsuperscript{138}

\textsuperscript{136} Genesis 34.  
\textsuperscript{137} Genesis 49:6-7.  
\textsuperscript{138} Leymarie, \textit{The Jerusalem Windows}, 41-42.
Fig. 3.11: Chagall, “Simeon” from the Jerusalem Windows\textsuperscript{139}

\textsuperscript{139} Ibid., 45.
In my view, Khevelev’s musical setting falls into Cook’s category of complementation, enhancing the meaning of the window and guiding in understanding the destiny of Simeon’s tribe. It is one of the shortest pieces in the cycle, consisting of twenty-nine measures of sorrow and nostalgia. The sinister character of the music mirrors the dominant somber blue colour of the window, and leaves the listener to grieve for Simeon’s lost soul that once possessed beauty and bravery. It seems to me that in this window Chagall relieved Simeon of his historical aggressiveness, instead mourning the young man’s unforgivable sins. In the same manner, Khevelev’s music acknowledges the deplorable nature of Simeon’s actions, but looks deeper inside his fragile soul in an attempt to understand the reasons behind his cruelty. The table in Fig. 3.12 illustrates how the simple A-B-A1 form of the piece is utilized to convey this idea, with the sections A and A1 representing Simeon’s disgrace and decline of power, and the contrasting middle section B containing his inner thoughts. Simeon was still in his teenage years when he avenged his sister by killing the man who violated her, for Simeon it was an honourable and the only acceptable action in these circumstances. That is why he replied to his father’s condemnation: “Should our sister be treated like a prostitute?”

140 Genesis 34:31.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Sectional Subdivisions</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Tonal Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Motive $a$</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>Perfect 5th/tritone chords (left hand) + chromatic motive B-B♭-A-A♭ (right hand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repeat of motive $a$</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>A minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Motive $b$</td>
<td>11-16</td>
<td>A minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motive $c$</td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>F-B♭-F-A-F-A bass + major and minor 3rd (right hand), 11 notes of 12-tone set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motive $c'l$</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repeat of motive $c'l$</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>F♯ as the last note of 12-tone set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Motive $a$</td>
<td>24-26</td>
<td>Chromatic motive B-B♭-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motive $c2$</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>G minor, C minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28-29</td>
<td>B minor (left hand) + B♭/Db (right hand)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3.12: Form of “Simeon” from Khelev’s Chagall Vitraux

The first section of “Simeon” (labelled A in Fig. 3.13) opens with motive $a$ (mm. 1-8). Wide registral placement of the left and right hand parts, slow tempo, pianissimo dynamic, and dissonant chords in a lower part, all contribute to the creation of a threatening and suspenseful character. The chords in the left hand (mm. 1-4) consist of perfect fifth and tritone, providing a resonant accompaniment for a hidden chromatic line in the right hand B-B♭-A-A♭ (marked in blue in Fig. 3.13). In the following four measures (mm. 5-8), the same chords in the left hand part unfold melodically in a motion mirroring the right hand part, as if symbolizing the roving people of Simeon’s tribe, divided by his fate.
The next two measures (mm. 9-10, Fig. 3.14) link a misty introductory music to the B section (m. 11, marked in red in Fig. 3.14) that may illustrate Simeon’s vulnerable emotional state. The two parts meet in the middle of a keyboard, making the music more intimate, as if zooming in on the protagonist to tell his story. The captivating melody (m. 11, labelled motive \( b \) in the table of Fig. 3.12), reinforced in parallel thirds, is unambiguous, and forms a three-measure phrase. A contrapuntal chromatic line in the left hand (marked in blue in Fig. 3.14) provides a matching background for a lamenting character of motive \( b \) in the right hand, and presents a link with the hidden chromatic line in Section A (marked in blue in Fig. 3.13). The fragility and simplicity of the melody
may be interpreted as the lonely planet in the centre of the window, or as one of the fleeing doves with injured wings in the upper half of Chagall’s composition.

![Transition and Motive b](image)

Fig. 3.14: Khevelev, “Simeon” from *Chagall Vitraux*, mm. 9-13, ending of Section A and beginning of Section B

The following musical unit (Fig. 3.15) develops motive b (mm. 10-13, Fig. 3.14), at first reiterating it with a denser accompaniment in the left hand at an increased dynamic level (mm. 14-16), as though to encourage Simeon to find his voice. The next six measures (mm. 17-22) bring a change to an A minor harmony of motive b, and gradually introduce all twelve tones of a chromatic scale (marked in blue in Fig. 3.15) with an exception of F#, which is finally reached in m. 23. It is peculiar to note that the composer completes a full twelve-tone set in the last measure of the B section, which then links it to the concluding A1 section. However, the collection of the twelve tones does not make this episode sound atonal. The consonant major and minor third intervals
(some of them written enharmonically as fourths and seconds), which form the melody in the right hand, and consistent bass line F-Bb-F-A-F-A ensure tonal stability. This section of the movement (mm. 17-22) again exhibits Khevelev’s knowledge of Israeli folk music, in which the distinctive melody usually moves “within a small orbit around a pivotal note, its progression generally diatonic, with few jumps.”141 Furthermore, Fig. 3.15 demonstrates that this episode is divided into three short motives that each form a two-measure phrase. First motive $c$ (mm. 17-18) asks a question that is followed by second motive $c1$ (mm. 19-20), which mirrors the top voice of motive $c$ and repeats itself once (mm. 21-22). The terraced dynamic of three motives ($mf$- $mp$- $p$) creates an effect of a question and an echo, rather than a question and an answer. It invites us to imagine Simeon in his last attempt to explain his actions, only to realize that nobody is listening and the question remains unanswered.

---

The following A1 section (Fig. 3.16) begins with a *subito forte* dynamic, and is built on material of the introduction’s motive *a* (shown in Fig. 3.13). An increased dynamic level and tremolos with *sforzandi* in a left hand (mm. 24-26) are employed as expressive devices to mark a decisive point for Simeon and his final outburst at the injustice of fate. The concluding measures (mm. 27-29) consist of motive *c2*, which moves down to the lowest register of a keyboard with a *subito piano* and *diminuendo* dynamics. It is built on motives *c* and *c1* (shown in Fig. 3.15) that represented Simeon’s inner thoughts in the middle section. Gradually decelerating, motive *c2* stops on almost inaudible B in the bass, accompanied by a minor third B♭/D♭ in the right hand. Following the proposed interpretation, this ending may symbolize Simeon, who, unwilling to repent
his sins, descends into the darkness. Despite the dissonant nature of the final chord (B♭-Bb-Db), concluding motive c2 (mm. 27-29) evolves through a clear G minor-C minor-B minor harmonic progression (shown in Fig. 3.16), in contrast with the tonal ambiguity of motives a (mm. 1-4), c (mm. 17-18), and c1 (mm. 19-20).

![Motive a](image)

![Motive c2](image)

![Harmonic Progression](image)

Fig. 3.16: Khelev, “Simeon” from Chagall Vitraux, mm. 24-29, Section A1

An application of Cook’s complementation model to a musical analysis of “Simeon” enriches the perception of the seemingly uncomplicated development of this piece. A study of the music in relation to its referential source informs the interpretation of the whole movement and the performative choices of particular phrases. For instance, motive b (mm. 11-13, Fig. 3.14), which represents the young Simeon’s loneliness, may
seem an ordinary parallel third progression, but the examination of Simeon’s story, the choice he made, and Chagall’s interpretation of it in a somber blue colour enhances the significance of the motive’s simplicity and purity. Another example of a refined interpretation is the beginning of Section A1 (mm. 24-26, Fig. 3.16), where chromatic motive B-B♭-A acts as a link to the ending, and may prompt a performer to move evenly through the base line. Instead, the understanding of Simeon’s unacceptance of his punishment gives these three measures a dramatic resistance, which should be translated in delayed downbeats to create a suspension of the motion.

“The story of Simeon and Levi is rich with meaning. The two sons of Jacob committed a grave sin, which caused a great deal of conflict and division within the family. The blessing given to Judah by Jacob is one of the longest, and it clearly indicates the special place that Judah holds in Jacob’s family. The blessing states: “You, Judah, shall your brothers praise— your hand on the neck of your enemies; the sons of your father shall bow down to you… The scepter shall never depart from Judah, or the mace from between his feet, until tribute comes to him, and he receives the people’s obedience.”

Following his father’s prophecy, Judah established the tribe of leaders, which played a decisive role in the history of the Jewish people, and united the other eleven

142 Jacob’s firstborn son, Reuben, betrayed his father by seducing one of Jacob’s concubines, Bilhah. She would later become the mother of Jacob’s two sons, Dan and Naphtali. For a discussion of Simeon and Levi, please refer to “Simeon” section above.
143 Genesis 49:8,10.
tribes into one nation. King David was a descendant of Judah’s tribe. He conquered the

city of Jerusalem, pronouncing it the capital of the United Kingdom of Israel and

Judah. Later, his son, King Solomon, glorified Jerusalem by building the Temple that

housed the Ark of the Covenant, forever confirming Jerusalem as the Holy City.

In the lower part of the window, Chagall depicted a resting lion, which is a

symbol of Judah, and above it Jacob’s hands holding a crown: “Judah is a lion’s cub, you

have grown up on prey, my son. He crouches, lies down like a lion, like a lioness— who

would dare rouse him?” The dominant crimson colour of this window implies “power,

the blood of battles, and the ‘blood of grapes,’” which is in agreement with Jacob’s

blessing: “He tethers his donkey to the vine, his donkey’s foal to the choicest stem. In

wine he washes his garments, his robe in the blood of grapes. His eyes are darker than

wine, and his teeth are whiter than milk.” The images of the houses and stone walls

surrounding the lion are interpreted by some researchers as “the walled city of

Jerusalem.” It may be argued, however, that these houses represent Chagall’s native

city of Vitebsk, which was a recurring element in his iconography. As the artist expressed

in his speech at the inauguration of the Jerusalem Windows: “How is it that the air and

earth of Vitebsk, my birthplace, and of thousands of years of exile, find themselves

mingled in the air and earth of Jerusalem?”

145 According to biblical writings, the Ark of the Covenant was the golden chest that

contained the stone tablets of the Ten Commandments given to Moses by God.
146 Genesis 49:9.
147 Leymarie, The Jerusalem Windows, 66.
148 Genesis 49:11-12.
150 Marc Chagall, quoted in Harshav, Marc Chagall on Art and Culture, 145.
Fig. 3.17: Chagall, “Judah” from the Jerusalem Windows$^{151}$

$^{151}$ Leymarie, The Jerusalem Windows, 69.
In my view, the corresponding musical number is in contest (using Cook’s terminology) with the meaning of the window, as its idea goes against the biblical writing. This opinion is supported by the fact that Khevelev interpreted the name Judah differently from Chagall. Khevelev employed the meaning of the name Judas Iscariot, one of the twelve disciples of Jesus Christ who betrayed him, as in Russian translation ‘Judah’ and ‘Judas’ are the same name. Khevelev revealed that this movement was the central and the most important one in the cycle, signifying an excruciating period in his life. Around the time of its composition, Khevelev’s mother had another surgery related to her cancer, and he expressed in “Judah” his distress and incomprehension of her undeserved suffering, feeling that she was betrayed by fate. A juxtaposition of the Old Testament (The Tribe of Judah intended by Chagall) with the New Testament (Judas Iscariot in Khevelev’s interpretation) further extends the philosophical meaning of this movement. According to the New Testament, Jesus Christ came from the tribe of Judah, and therefore by extension, Judah is associated with Christ’s characteristics of love and forgiveness. But the clash of these attributes of Chagall’s window with Khevelev’s portrayal of Judas Iscariot creates a personal feeling of deep loneliness and sorrow caused by betrayal.

In the beginning of “Judah,” Khevelev provides a key signature of four flats, which, however, does not determine a key for the movement. Despite the lack of key signatures in the “Zebulun” and “Simeon” movements studied above, these movements showed clear tonal sections and areas with traditional harmonic progressions. In

152 Alexey Khevelev, Interview with the author, January 22, 2019.
153 Ibid.
comparison, the table in Fig. 3.18 shows that “Judah” is built around a B♭ tonal centre that appears in the beginning of each section. I would argue that, despite the ambiguity of harmonic relationships and an extensive use of chromaticism and dissonant melodic intervals, the music of this movement is centred in the key area of B♭ minor.
Section A of “Judah” (Fig. 3.19) depicts a character of an ominous march heard at a distance. The first two measures introduce an ostinato motive, consisting of a B♭ pedal point and a chromatic line F-F♭-E♭-F-E♭. The dotted rhythmic pattern of this motive establishes a military marching beat, while the first melodic interval of the opening, perfect fifth B♭/F (m. 1, marked in green in Fig. 3.19), reinforces the sense of B♭ as tonal.
centre. The theme, entering at the end of the second measure, consists of seven statements of a primary rhythmic motive (marked in yellow in Fig. 3.19). The first four statements are grouped in two pairs of ascending-descending melodic pattern, while the next three motives progress higher in register until the theme reaches Ab in m. 6, from where it descends chromatically down an octave. These three distinct groups of seven statements of a primary motive (2+2+3) conceal a hidden melodic line in the right hand part Gb-Eb-Bb-G-Db-Gb-Ab (marked in blue in Fig. 3.19). A major third F/Ab formed by the last notes in the parts of both hands in m. 6 resolves to the Bb bass at the downbeat of m. 7 (marked in green in Fig. 3.19), again emphasizing Bb as tonal centre, and reinstating the introductory ostinato motive. A crisp articulation of the theme (slurs followed by staccati) and a long crescendo from mm. 3-6 contribute to a sense of growing apprehension created by the march.155 Following Khevelev’s New Testament interpretation, the intense music of this introductory section may suggest an image of an angry crowd led by Judas, coming to arrest Jesus Christ.

155 The tense feeling conveyed by this introductory section is similar to the one Shostakovich portrays in a march at the end of the first movement’s exposition in his Symphony No.7. There, a distant drum roll, accompanying a primitive melody by pizzicato strings, appears harmless at first, but its impendent advance finally explodes into a vile dance of invaders. I would argue that “Judah” develops in a similar manner, with the introduction being a grain of the whole movement’s dramatic and structural build-up.
The last statement of a primary motive of Section A (mm. 5-7, Fig. 3.19) leads to Section A1. Fig. 3.20 demonstrates how in the following measures (mm. 7-10) both the theme in the right hand and the accompaniment in the left hand are enhanced with octaves, which makes a threat of a military attack visible. The theme (entering in m. 7) reiterates six statements of a primary motive that was introduced in mm. 2-5 in Fig. 3.19 (marked in yellow in Fig. 3.20). However, the seventh statement, which was a descending chromatic scale from A♭ in Section A (mm. 5-7, Fig. 3.19), now in Section A1 transforms to an ascending chromatic motive A♭-A♮-B♭ (mm. 10-11, shown in green in Fig. 3.20), marking a culmination of the movement. The following four measures (mm. 11-14) introduce a contrasting rhythmic profile with an even quarter-note rhythm in a
bass line (mm. 11-13) and even eighth-note (mm. 11-12) and sixteenth-note (mm. 13-14) rhythm in the right hand. Additionally, the composer exploits a fortissimo dynamic and wider registral placement of the parts in order to generate an effect of a predator encircling on its target. Following this interpretation, this climactic moment may symbolize the pivotal event in Christianity, the kiss of Judas that revealed the identity of Jesus to the soldiers who had come to capture him. This reading explains m. 14, which is suddenly stripped of a powerful accompaniment of preceding section, inviting us to imagine an image of Judas reaching out of the crowd for his Teacher. The leading tone A♮ (m. 14, marked in green in Fig. 3.20) resolves this suspenseful moment to the B♭ downbeat of m. 15 at a triple forte dynamic level, returning the ostinato motive of the introduction.
Fig. 3.20: Khevelev, “Judah” from Chagall Vitraux, mm. 7-15, Section A1

In the following Section A2 (Fig. 3.21), the two parts exchange roles, with the theme in the left hand now dominating over the accompanimental ostinato motive in the right hand. The intensity of this section’s music is increased by an addition of major second intervals to the top voice of the right hand (marked in blue in Fig. 3.21): A♭ to a B♭ octave (mm. 15-18), A♮ to a B♮ octave, and D♭ to an E♭ octave (m. 19). The resulting dissonant chords in the right hand, wide registral placement of the two parts, and a forte dynamic further develop an image of a foreign threat, which was approaching at a distance in Section A, increasing in power in Section A1, and now reaching its full
supremacy in Section A2. The theme’s seventh statement of a primary motive (a
descending chromatic scale from Ab, introduced in mm. 5-7, Fig. 3.19), now in the left
hand (mm. 19-22, marked in yellow in Fig. 3.21), descends to the lowest register of a
keyboard. A different dynamic level of this motive in Section A suggests its altered
dramatic role. Whereas in Section A the descending chromatic scale from Ab (mm. 5-7,
Fig. 3.19) continues a crescendo that starts at the beginning of the theme (mm. 3-6, Fig.
3.19), now, in Section A2, the final statement of a primary motive of the theme (mm. 19-
22, Fig. 3.21) comes to a sforzando at the downbeat of m. 20, and stays at a subito
pianissimo dynamic level for the reminder of the descending chromatic scale. This time,
after culmination with its representation of the kiss of Judas and a consequent capture of
Jesus, this chromatic descent may suggest an image of Judas crawling away after
betraying his Teacher.
Concluding Section A3 (Fig. 3.22) consists of an altered ostinato motive in the left hand, which circles around a B♭ tone, but now, the recurring chromatic line F-Fb-Eb-Fb-Eb with a dotted marching rhythm is replaced by a C-C♯-B♭-A♯ motive in even sixteenth notes. The modified theme in the right hand (entering in m. 22) now consists of only three statements of a primary motive (marked in yellow in Fig. 3.22), gradually subsiding to a triple piano dynamic level. The persistent leading tone A♯ together with the theme’s hidden melodic line Gb-Db-Gb-Bb (marked in blue in Fig. 3.22) reaffirm B♭ minor as a key area for the movement. The basic motive C-Db-Gb in the right hand (mm.
22-23) is transposed up by fourth to become F-Gb-D♭ (mm. 23-24) and then transposed by fifth to return again to C-Db-G♭ an octave higher (mm. 24-25). The marching drum beat loses its ostinato rhythmic pattern, gradually coming to an end in the last measures (mm. 26-28). This change of rhythmic consistency in the left hand, the shortened theme in the right hand, and a long crescendo dynamic marking (from mm. 22-27) create an image of a retreating army of soldiers after the arrest of Jesus. The final chord B♭/A♭/B♭ erupts at a subito triple forte in the last measure, as if symbolizing the composer’s resentment of Christ’s unjust fate.

Fig. 3.22: Khelev, “Judah” from Chagall Vitraux, mm. 22-28, Section A3
In the case of “Judah,” an analytical application of Cook’s model of contest offers an elaborate understanding of the contradiction between the window’s content and the composition’s idea. Without the knowledge of Khevelev’s dramatic concept of this piece, a performer could try to recreate Chagall’s image of Judah with its connotations of power and prestige. For example, the ostinato motive of the introduction (mm. 1-2), which recurs throughout the movement, may be interpreted as representing the royal image of kings of Judah’s tribe, translated in a heavy articulation. On the contrary, the musical content, symbolizing Judas and the crowd who came to arrest Jesus Christ, dictates sharper staccati articulation in both hands to create a threatening and suspenseful character. Furthermore, an awareness of the personal characterization of Khevelev’s interpretation of Chagall’s art would help to create an intimate performative version, as it may be easier for a performer to identify with grief, experienced by the composer, and the resulting bitterness expressed in this music, than to interpret the complex iconography of Chagall’s window.
Chapter Four: Conclusion

As this monograph demonstrates, musical ekphrasis differs from program music, and deserves to be studied as a separate genre. The case study for this monograph proves that the musical composition inspired by a work from another artistic medium, in this case, stained glass, may be analyzed in parallel with its respective stimulus.

The discussion of the biblical context of Chagall’s windows in three movements from Khevelev’s *Chagall Vitraux* in Chapter Three reveals the profound effect of an extra-musical content on the understanding of the analyzed movements. The intense dark blues of Chagall’s “Simeon,” expressing the devastation of Simeon’s tribe brought by his unrecognized vengeance, together with Khevelev’s melancholic music create a new meaning, which is emergent through a comparative analysis of the window and its corresponding musical piece. The tragedy of a young man blinded by an urge to defend his sister’s honour is illuminated by the fragile and mournful musical motive. In the case of “Zebulun” and “Judah,” a contradiction between the content of the windows and their corresponding musical pieces allows the construction of a new narrative, which would be unexplored without the joined study of the corresponding works.

Nicholas Cook’s proposed models of interrelationships between diverse media in a multimedia work provide a useful theoretical framework for an analysis of ekphrastic compositions; and, although, musical ekphrasis does not fall in the category of multimedia, the growing popularity of the genre of multimedia concerts supports the application of Cook’s models to the analysis of monomedia ekphrastic work. As Chapter One observes, rapid technological advances and wider access to computer technology
facilitate the development of multimedia music concerts, where a performer utilizes various visual media to accompany her or his musical performance. All too often, performers do not take enough care to assess the appropriateness of visual media and a compatibility of audio and visual content. Despite an intention to heighten a musical performance and strengthen its effect on an audience, the results may be quite opposite, because of a performer or director’s assumption of a shared knowledge and experience. In today’s age of multiculturalism, where music is arguably one of the art forms that unites people of various backgrounds, the use of conflicting visual media, which do not support the musical content, may oppose an idea of inclusivity of all the people in an audience.

It is important to note that this monograph offers only one possible way to create a compelling multimedia concert by pairing the music with its referential work from another medium in visual art. However, in many instances, composers were inspired to create musical works by the events in their lives, and a study of historical background of the musical compositions may guide a performer in selecting an accompanying visual media. Further research may include an analysis of the relationships between a proposed visual work for a multimedia concert and a form and motivic development of an accompanying musical piece; a colour scheme of an image or a painting in its relation to a tonal plan and key areas of the music; a visual artwork in relation to a dramatic content of a composition.

Furthermore, the importance of bringing the work of a contemporary Russian composer to the North American public makes this monograph valuable to those who study music of the school of Russian composition. Unfortunately, not many
contemporary composers that inherit the wealth of musical tradition set by Russian composers of the past are known outside the country. The biographical overview of Alexey Khevelev, provided in Chapter Two, describes the difficult choices he faced in building his career, and how, despite his international success, he remained in Russia. However, I chose not to discuss the declining state of the culture of my native country, and the many obstacles musicians and artists confront there.\textsuperscript{156} The lack of familiarity with contemporary Russian music abroad partially comes from the weak governmental support of the arts.\textsuperscript{157} The financial struggles encountered by musicians and artists in Russia are in many ways similar to the ones Chagall faced living in the Russian Empire and later in the Soviet Union. Sadly, despite the rich tradition of musical education and culture in Russia, native contemporary composers and musicians are still fighting the governmental indifference towards the musical art. My hope is that this study will attract further research on contemporary Russian music and its dependence on the political state of the country, and increase the awareness of prolific young Russian composers, including Alexey Khevelev.
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Appendix A: List of Compositions by Alexey Khevelev

Music for Solo Piano:
- 1990 Sonata No.1
- 1990 Suite *Old Rus’*
- 1991-1993 Four Piano Cycles
- 1994 Piano Cycle *Chagall Vitraux*
- 1995 Sonata No.2
- 1999-2000 Two Volumes of Piano Preludes
- 2003 Sonata No.3
- 2006 Piano Cycle *Russian Roulette*
- 2008 Children’s Album (Collective Volume of the Early Piano Pieces)
- 2010 Piano Cycle *Mini Lines*
- 2014 Piano Cycle *Last days of Christ*
- 2015 Piano Cycle *October 33rd*
- 2018 Piano Cycle *Life of Ilya Popov*

Chamber Music:
- 1990 Quintet No.1 for Bassoon and Strings
- 1992 String Quartet No.1
- 1994 Quintet *From Dusk Till Dawn* for Flute, Vibraphone, Violin, Cello, and Piano
- 1994 String Quartet *D*
- 1996 Piano Trio
- 1997 Quintet No.2 for Bassoon and Strings
- 1998 Sonata for Violin and Piano
- 2001 String Quartet No.2
- 2002 Poem *SOS* for Viola and String Orchestra
- 2003 Quintet *Two* for Flute, Vibraphone, Violin, Cello, and Piano
- 2006 Quintet *Three* for Flute, Vibraphone, Violin, Cello, and Piano
- 2019 Concert Piece *Love and Death* for Dombra and Russian Accordion
Symphonic and Vocal Music, Operas, Music for Stage:

- 1993 Concerto No.1 for Piano and Orchestra
- 1996 Choir Cycle on Poems by Russian Poets
- 2001 Double Concerto *Faces of Rus’* for Violin, Piano, and Orchestra
- 2002 Symphonic Suite *Shishkin. Hall No. 25*
- 2005 Musical *Snow Queen*
- 2009 Chamber Opera *Russian Roulette*
- 2009 Concerto *Judas and Christ* for Piano and Orchestra
- 2011 Musical *Romeo and Juliette*
- 2014 Chamber Opera *X*

Music for Documentaries:

- 2008 *Rostov that I Love*, directed by Eduard Kechedjian
- 2010 *Russian Century of Baron Falz-Fein*, directed by Ruslan Kechedjian
- 2013 *Criminal Father*, directed by Vladimir Ruzanov
- 2013 *Crossroad*, directed by Michail Maksimov
- 2013 *Stanichnyi Sviashennik*, directed by Ruslan Kechedjian
- 2014 *Hands*, directed by Ruslan Kechedjian
- 2016 *Raskazachennye*, directed by Vladimir Schevchuk
Appendix B: Diagram of Chagall’s *Jerusalem Windows* and Khevelev’s *Chagall Vitraux*

Chagall’s *Jerusalem Windows*:

- **Eastern wall:**
  1. Reuben (light-blue)
  2. Simeon (dark-blue)
  3. Levi (clear-yellow)

- **Southern wall:**
  4. Judah (garnet-red)
  5. Zebulun (vermilion)
  6. Issachar (soft green)

- **Western wall:**
  7. Dan (blue)
  8. Gad (dark-green)
  9. Asher (soft-green)

- **Northern wall:**
  10. Naphtali (lemon yellow)
  11. Joseph (golden yellow)
  12. Benjamin (bright-blue)

Khevelev’s *Chagall Vitraux*:

- **Eastern wall:**
  1. Reuben

- **Southern wall:**
  4. Levi

- **Western wall:**
  7. Dan

- **Northern wall:**
  10. Naphtali
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Appendix D-1: Recital Program May 2015

May 28, 2015
6 p.m., von Kuster Hall
Natalia Skomorokhova, piano

Partita no.4 in D major, BWV 828  J.S. Bach
(1685-1750)

Mazurkas, Op.33  F. Chopin
(1810-1849)

-Intermission-

Two Fairytales, Op.20 no.1, Op.51 no.3  N. Medtner
(1880-1951)

Sonata no.7 in B flat major, Op.83  S. Prokofiev
(1898-1937)

This recital is presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Musical Arts degree.
Appendix D-2: Recital Program May 2017

May 20, 2017,
3 p.m., von Kuster Hall
Natalia Skomorokhova, piano

Le Tombeau de Couperin
  Prélude
  Fugue
  Fortane
  Rigaudon
  Menuet
  Toccata

M. Ravel
(1875-1937)

-Intermission-

Pictures at an Exhibition
  Promenade
  The Gnome [Gnomus]
  Promenade
  The Old Castle [Il vecchio castello]
  Promenade
  Dispute between children at play [Tuileries]
  The Ox-Cart [Bydlo]
  Promenade
  Ballet of the unhatched chicks
  Samuel Goldenberg and Schmuyle
  Promenade
  The Market at Limoges [Limoges, le marché]
  The Catacombs [Sepulchrum Romanum]
  Cum mortuis in lingua mortua
  Baba-Yaga [La cabane sur des pattes de poules]
  The Great Gate of Kiev

M. Mussorgsky
(1839-1881)

This recital is presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctoral of Musical Arts in Performance degree.
Appendix D-3: Recital Program February 2018

February 10, 2018
4 p.m., von Kuster Hall
Natalia Skomorokhova, piano

Songs and Dances of Death
  M. Mussorgsky
  (1839-1881)
  Lullaby
  Serenade
  Trepak
  Commander-in-Chief

Chad Louwerse, voice
Natalia Skomorokhova, piano

-Intermission-

Piano Quartet no.3 in C-minor, op.60
  J. Brahms
  (1833-1897)
  Allegro non troppo
  Scherzo: Allegro
  Andante
  Finale: Allegro comodo

Ori Solomon, violin
Katie McBean, viola
Daniel Dennis, cello
Natalia Skomorokhova, piano

This recital is presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctoral of Musical Arts in Performance degree.
Appendix D-4: Recital Program August 2018

Lecture Recital
August 25, 2018
1.15 p.m., von Kuster Hall
Natalia Skomorokhova, piano

Musical Ekphrasis in Concert: Alexey Khevelev’s Chagall Vitraux

Chagall Vitraux
Reuben
Zebulun
Simeon
Levi
Judah
Issachar
Dan
Gad
Asher
Naphtali
Joseph
Benjamin

A. Khevelev
(b. 1979)

This recital is presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctoral of Musical Arts in Performance degree.
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