

Prognostic Criteria of M. K. Čiurlionis’ Spontaneous Musical Cycle

The composer’s ability to a priori know the sequence of the cycle’s movements makes his oeuvre particularly enigmatic in a psychological respect. Here topical is not only the expediency of the sequence of separate pieces but also their volumes and relative proportions. Incidentally, every composer faces similar things, the solutions, however, are found by different ways. Following the types of creative activities, some composers slowly mature an idea of the cycle’s next movement (“generate”), others discover it “mounting pieces” (“making”) or simply act according to a certain preliminary project and “fill it up” with notes (“imitate form”).

Čiurlionis’ cycles would often get realized as if spontaneously, writing down a piece (movement) day after day. V. Landsbergis writes: “In respect of a creative psychology it is of paramount importance to have in mind the dates of Čiurlionis’ manuscripts. Čiurlionis did not compose at any time or successively, every day. He would have possibly never recognized this kind of compulsory daily routine – to write music without inspiration. However, his creative potential, most likely his specific ideas, seem to have been continually accumulated and would burst out at particularly prolific periods”¹. The musicologist indicates the composer’s several creative outbursts, namely:

- “summer 1908 in Palanga or the early 1909 in Petersburg – in both latter cases his work was inspired by the love of his close friend Sophie”.
- In May-July and later September 1901 about 20 piano works and sketches were dated in Druskininkai.
- In February 1909 he wrote and sketched 8 piano works (alongside painted “Rex” and possibly composed “Jūratė”);
- within five days in March, also in Druskininkai, he wrote even some three, four pieces,
- within a week in May, again in Druskininkai (in April Čiurlionis stayed in Vilnius, organized the third exhibition of Lithuanian art, gave concerts, etc.) – seven preludes, the composer’s last master pieces...²

It is easy to notice that the composer’s creative elan would last merely a week or so. Such, a period or outburst of creative inspiration, taking into account its intensity, duration, geography and the results of work, can be conditionally nuanced as a gust, a rush, etc.

From a methodological point of view, it is most likely not very important whether a creative elan would manifest itself as the result of “a continuous accumulation of a creative potential or possibly some specific idea”³ or the composer would be carried away by a certain particular state or experiences, or simply, upon his return for holidays to Druskininkai he was less busy and could devote more time to music. It is important to perceive that the composer intensively wrote music.

Let us compare some typical outbreaks or intensities (Table I):

Table I

Outburst date	In all	Works	Intensity
24 11–01 12 1899 Druskininkai	8	6 (DK 31–35, 37)	≈1 (8 : 6)
10–15 06 1903 Druskininkai	6	6 (DK 134.2–8)	≈ 1 (6 : 7)
01–02 10 1906 Druskininkai	2	3 (DK 242–244)	≈ 1 (2 : 3)
12–14 10 1908 Peterburgas	5	4 (DK 288–290)	≈ 1 (5 : 4)
15–21 05 1909 Druskininkai	7	8 (DK 301–307, 316) 309, 311, 308, 314–315, 318–319, 313	≈ 1 (7 : 8)

¹ Landsbergis V. Čiurlionio muzika. Vilnius, 1986, p. 134.

² Ibid., p. 134–135.

³ Ibid., p. 134.

Here we can see some outbreaks from different periods. Their peculiar feature is a limited duration of time (3–8 d.) in the course of which the composer writes on average one piece a day. This regularity can slightly vary when two pieces (1:2) or vice versa (2:1) are written a day. If he writes two pieces a day, a two-day interval can emerge (1903). Hence it is logical to compare the intensity of a typical outbreak or gust to the figure of one (1≈7:8 or 6:7, etc.).

Sometimes an outbreak seems to be overlong and the intensity half as much, thus we shall it a creative gust (Table II):

Table II

09–20 06 1901 Druskininkai	12	6 (DK 87–92)	≈ 2 (12 : 6)
-------------------------------	----	--------------	--------------

The creative gust lasts about a fortnight, and the composer writes on average a piece in two days. This regularity, however, is not a rule but only a certain average. In the course of a gust, the composer usually writes rather unevenly (1:2–5:1), therefore, even several-day intervals can follow.

Creative gusts can be partly articulated even lacking more thorough chronological data, when an exact month and date of the written work are unknown (Table III):

Table III

10? 1904 Warsaw	?	4 (DK 149–150, 152–153)	≈ 1
06? 1905? Druskininkai	?	3 (DK 180–182)	≈ 1
28 05–? 06 1906 Druskininkai	?	5 (DK 236–240)	≈ 1
?–22 03 1909 Druskininkai	?	4 (DK 308–311)	≈ 1

The indicated outbursts are articulated by a limited number of works (3–5) and a permanent place. Here a typical intensity of the gust is also implied (2:1).

The third type of creative intensity stands out for its inner determinant. This type is not related to some definite outer circumstances of time and place. It can be particularly lengthy in respect of duration (even up to several months) with a variable geographical locality (Table IV):

Table IV

02–09?12 1905 Druskininkai – Warsaw – ?	Approx. 4 months	6 (DK 183, 184.1–4–185)	?
22 07–19 09 1908?? ? – Palanga, Kurklėnai	?	3 (DK 282–284)	?

Since a determinant of the work is alienated from a physical factor and acts as a kind of a constantly returning recollection (A. Šliogeris would say “the eternal present”⁴), it is expedient to call this creative intensity as “here and now”. Thus the type of creative intensity “here and now” can be only partly articulated on the basis of a consistent chronology of works and taking into consideration the fact that other intensive outbursts did not emerge throughout a longer period.

The absence of chronological data can give rise to the ambiguity of the articulation of outbursts (Table V):

Table V

1904 ? ? ?	?	5 (DK 142–146)	?
1906 ? ? ?	?	3 (DK 245–247)	?

⁴ Šliogeris A. *Transcendencijos tyla*. Vilnius, 1996, p. 154–155.

Here both typical and “here and now” outbursts can be noticed on account of the absence of the marked date of the month and place.

Various articulation criteria, such as the chronological sequence, regularity, the quantitative volumes of works, the change of place and the absence of intensive outbursts make possible to bring out the probability of spontaneous cycles.

As it has been indicated, a great intensity is typical of a creative gust seldom lasting more than a week. The first evident gust, which lasted mere few days, can be found in the composer’s biography in 1899. Six untitled pieces the majority of which are unfinished were written in the period between November 24 and December 1. The composer’s creative gust in his last summer is marked by an extraordinary intensity.

The psychology of the “gust” presents interest due to the fact that it witnesses a certain isomorphism of the composer’s activities and their results. The multitude of the works coincides with the number of the movements of the spontaneous cycle. Therefore, a possibility offers itself juxtapose the structure of the spontaneous cycle with the cycle of the composer’s activities (gusts) and to make an attempt (at least outwardly) to get a deeper insight into those psychological mechanisms which “arrayed” the movements of the spontaneous cycle.

The below analyzed structure of the creative gust is reflected in part by the sequence of the works and the dates complemented by various chronologies of the composer’s work (VL, DK, KJČ and ČDM) (Table VI):

Table VI

Works I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
Druskininkai, 15 05 1909	16	17	17	17–30?	19	20	19–20, according to the autogr. 21
Aut.: 15)(1909	16)(1909 Druskeniki	17)(1909	17)(1909 Drusk.	Autogr. Before DK314	19 Dr.	20)(Dr.	21)(Dr.
DK: 314	316	318	319	313	322	323	324
VL:338	339	340	341	337a	342	343	344 (344a)
KJŽ: 660	661	662	588	765	663	664	665
R 1.1.48; p. 18–21	24–29	32–37	38–40				
R 1.1.46, p.				1–2	6–8	13–17	10–12
R 2.1.11, p.							6–7

The table illustrates that the “gust” lasted mere few days (May 15–21) in the course of which 8 pieces were composed⁵. Sometimes two works were written down a day [Autogr. 17 (1909)]. The date of fragment V can be inferred from the place of the autograph of the work written before May 19 (DK 322). Work VII has two editions, the first of which (in graphite pencil with a rubbed off but discernible part of the right hand) is dated May 19–20 according to the features of the autograph. The specified chronology of the works (DK 313–314, 316, 318–319, 322–324) shows that the composer did not write any other works in the course of the gust. Besides, the closest works to “before” and “after” the gust bear markedly more distant dates (DK 311: March 1909, Druskininkai and DK 293, ed II: November 1909, Petersburg). Thus the structure of the gust is intensive, continuous and integral.

The changes in the characters of the works (let us compare their tempo and character marks, see: JČKF and VLKF) can be to a certain extent isomorphically associated not only with specific gust days but also psychological relived states of the composer writing the spontaneous cycle. In this respect the spontaneous cycle therefore seems to be the diary of the composer’s relived psychological elan at the same time fixing the cycle of fluctuating states and moods. Such a cycle of states is of interest due to the fact that in its side positions (beginning and end of the gust) it always discloses a contrast (light idyllic with dark restless), moving to the epicentre of the creativeness (May 17 – the most prolific!). Hence, undisclosed psychological secrets of Čiurlionis’ oeuvre, leading to the unfolding of the spontaneous cycle, and its more thorough elucidation, rest in the structure of a creative gust more than elsewhere.

⁵ See abbreviations.

More data on the creative gusts and a possibility to prognosticate spontaneous cycles can be obtained from the analysis of the placement of autographs in the composer's manuscript books.

Worthy of mention are several correlation cases of the dates of autographs and the metrics of pages.

The simplest seems to be the case when later dated autographs embrace the rest pages of the book. This kind of synchrony however is found seldom. The below presented extract from a manuscript book (following the catalogue drawn up by D. Kučinskas) facilitates to prognosticate a probable Unrecognized cycle.

- R 1.1.47: 1–3 – [Prelude] A major DK 309 (20 03 1909, Druskininkai)
 4–6 – [Prelude] A minor DK 310 (22 03 1909)
 7–11 – blank pages
 (For more see: NC XIV analysis).

A synchrony rule of dates and pages sometimes makes possible to specify a chronological sequence of autographs and strengthens prognostic possibilities of the Unrecognized cycle.

- R 1.1.43: 5–7 – [Prelude] D minor DK 288 (12–14 10 1908, Petersburg)
 8–9 – [Canon] D minor DK 289 (12–14 10 1908, Petersburg)
 10–13 – [Prelude] C minor DK 290 (14 10 1908, Petersburg)
 (See also: NC XII)

A similar synchrony rather often helps to infer the dates of unmarked autographs according to their position in the metrics of the pages. It also makes possible to more exactly determine the volume of the “gust” works.

This method often used by the compilers of chronologies can turn out to be greatly effective when several dated works succeed each other. All the mentioned factors give a possibility to more exactly prognosticate the volume of works:

- R 1.1.16: 162–163 – [Prelude] DK 242 (01 10 1906, Druskininkai)
 164–165₁₋₂ – [Prelude] C major DK 243 (02 10 1906, Druskininkai)
 165₃₋₁₂ – [Prelude] DK 244 (?)
 (See: NC VII)

The manifesting itself dominant of the metrics of the pages can continue even in respect of several autographs, the dates of which are unknown:

- R 1.1.16: 166–170 – Poem C major DK 254
 171 – the page has bar-lines but is not notated
 172 – [Impromptu] D minor DK 245
 173 – blank page
 174 – [Prelude] G minor/E flat major DK 246
 175 – not MKČ manuscript – Fugue A minor DKK 2.1.23
 176 – [Prelude] A minor DK 247

The lack of chronological markings in this case does not prevent from perceiving the volumes of the gust and prognosticating the Unrecognized cycle.

The prognostics of the Unrecognized cycle is motivated by a mixed link of autographs on the one hand as well as close dates and pages, on the other:

- R 1.1.16: 130–131 – [Prelude] B minor DK 250 (03 07 1907, Druskininkai)
 132 – [Prelude] F minor DK 251
 244 – [Prelude] D minor DK 252 (07 1907, Druskininkai)

Here one of the dated autographs is essentially detached from the metrics of pages, another, undated, written down beside the dated one. It is possible thus to “couple” the movements of the cycle through close pages or dates. A similar, but a more complicated case is as follows:

- R 1.1.3: 00421 – Prelude D minor DK 236 (28 05 1906, Druskininkai)
 R 1.1.16: 229 – Prelude D minor DK 237 (01 06 1906, Druskininkai)
 230 – [Prelude D minor] DK 238 (?)
 231 – [Prelude D minor] DK 239 (?)
 232 – [Prelude] D major DK 240 (?)

Here are only two dated autographs out of five. The first is in another book (R 1.1.3). Besides, the metrics of the undated autographs only partly reflect the sequence of the cycle's works. In spite of it, it is rather easy to prognosticate a creative outburst.

A chronological "coupling" of the cycle's movements can be partly reflected due to a common work in different fair copies:

R 2.1.6 (Jonas Čiurlionis' copy):

- 3 – Prelude DK 282 (?)
 4 – Prelude DK 292 (1908-1909, Petersburg)
 5 – blank page
 6–7 – [Prelude] C major DK 283 (22 07 1908, Palanga)
 8 – E. Morawski, Unidentified Work (DKK 2.1.25; 1909)
 9–10 – blank pages
 11 – F. Chopin, Prelude H minor op. 28 Nr. 6 (DKK 2.1.26; 1909)
 12–13 – Fughetta H minor (DK 178a; Druskininkai, 1904)
 14–15 – Mazurka H minor (DK 125; Warsaw, 1902)
 16–28 – blank pages

 R 1.1.11 (M. K. Čiurlionis' fair copy):

- 00665 – Prelude C major DK 283 (22 07 1908, Palanga)
 00666–00667 – Prelude D minor DK 284 (19 08 1908, Kurklėnai)

The work (DK 291, ed. I) copied into a fair copy once by the composer, another time by his brother Jonas, together with other nearby written works (DK 290) or (DK 10) enable one to prognosticate a cycle. Besides, blank pages of the fair copy left by Jonas Čiurlionis (as if more works were expected?) are also worth of attention. Writing down later dated autographs on the succeeding pages of the manuscript book, the composer would sometimes leave one or a few blank pages. After some time, he would fill up those blank spaces of his manuscript books with later composed musical pieces. This manner is explicitly demonstrated by his intention to write but unfinished cycle in the keys arrayed by the ring of the fifths.

- R 1.1.3: 00370–00371₁₋₂ – Postliudija C major DK 134.1 (31 05 1903, Warsaw)
 00371₅₋₁₄ – [Prelude] A minor DK 134.2 (10 06 1903, Warsaw)
 00372–00373 – [Lullaby] DK 134.3 (10 06 1903, Druskininkai)
 00374–33375 – Presto E minor DK 134.4 (12 06 1903). Unpublished
 00376₁₋₄ – Dance E major DK 166
 00376₇₋₁₄ – Fugue E minor DK 167
 00377 – [Prelude] G minor DK 142 (1904?)
 00378₁₋₈ – Prelude C major DK 168
 00378₉₋₁₄ – Prelude A flat major DK 169
 00379₁₋₈ – [Piece] D major DK 134.5 (05 13). Unpublished
 00379₉₋₁₁ – Variation on the theme "Sefaa esec" DK 154
 00380–00382 – [Piece] H minor DK 134.6 (06 14). Unpublished
 00383 – Adagio A major DK 134.7 (15 06 1903)
 00384₁₋₅ – [Prelude] T sharp minor DK 134.8. Unpublished

The works in this cycle are numbered DK 134.1–134.8; the rest autographs are in a chronological aspect distinctly set at some distance DK 142, DK 154, DK 166–9.

Similar insertions can seriously complicate the prognostication of the Unrecognized cycle. Therefore, conjecturing a cycle, it is expedient to base oneself on biographical or chronological references or, if possible, to discern individual possible symptoms of the cycle. The intervening episodes of music can be not only later written new works but also "working" sketches related to a conjectured cycle:

R 1.1.48: 16–17	– Blank pages
18–21	– [Prelude] G major DK 314 (15 05 1909, Druskininkai)
22–23	– [Prelude] H minor DK 315
24–29	– [Prelude] DK 316 (16 05 1909, Druskininkai)
30–31	– [Prelude] H minor DK 317
32–37	– [Prelude] D minor DK 318 (17 09 1909, Druskininkai)
38–40	– [Prelude] C minor DK 319 (17 05 1909, Druskininkai)
R 1.1.46: 1–2	– [Prelude] DK 313 (“Whit Sunday Prelude”)
3	
4	– [Prelude] DK 320 (in chemical pencil)
5	– [Duet] DK 321 (rubbed off)
6–8	– [Prelude] G minor DK 322 (19 05 1909, Druskininkai)
9	
10–12	– [Prelude] D minor, DK 324 (20–21 05 1909, Druskininkai)
13–17	– [Prelude] G minor DK 323 (20 05 1909, Druskininkai)
18–24	– Blank pages

The above presented works prove that the sequence of the dated autographs principally corresponds to the metrics of the pages, still quite a number of them are written in another book (R 1.1.46). Some short undated sketches, in respect of intonation close to the pieces of the cycle, intervene in earlier dated works (DK 315, 317). Similar insertions in another book, not necessarily related to the nomenclature of the cycle, can be established by the comparison of the means and character of writing (in chemical pencil instead of graphite, DK 320, in another place rubbed off, but legible – DK 321).

It is logical to judge about real movements of the cycle on the basis of the dates of the autographs marked by the composer himself, except “Whit Sunday Prelude” (DK 313). The importance of the latter and its belonging to a cyclic system is indirectly symptomatically witnessed by the position of the autograph at the beginning of the manuscript book (on initial pages of the book).

No less problematic aspects prognosticating the UC are related to asynchronous rotation of the dates and pages of autographs, i. e. when later dated autographs are written down on the preceding pages of the book:

R 1.1.3: 00301	– [Prelude] A minor DK 118.6 (24 06 1902, Leipzig, Nr. 6)
00302	– [Prelude] C major DK 118.5 (20 06 1902, Leipzig, Nr. 5)

The evidence of this case, besides the asynchronous rotation of the dates and pages, is also confirmed by the movements of the cycle numbered by the composer (No 6 and No 5, DK 118.6–118–5). Unfortunately, there is nothing known about the initial movements of the cycle (No_{1–4}). One can just guess whether the autographs of the first four movements of the cycle were lost or it was only the composer’s fancy to compose a 6-movement cycle first of all writing (even asynchronously) the final movements. Among asynchronous and synchronic cases of the dates and pages a kind of mixed one can be noticed, when the autographs dated alike are marked on different pages of the book:

R 1.1.3: 00408 _{7–14} –00409	– [Prelude] D minor DK 180
00410–00411 _{1–6}	– [Basso ostinato] DK 181 (06 1905, Druskininkai)
00411 _{9–12}	– Musical Monogram DK 195
00412 _{1–8}	– [Nightingale] DK 182 (06 1905, Druskininkai)

Here two autographs (DK 181 and 182) are marked by the same date (06 1905, Druskininkai). If in known synchrony cases works are notated in sequence, in synchrony it is logical to expect one marking in front of another. Therefore, the incorporation of the undated Prelude (DK 180) into the gust does not seem to be unacceptable. Besides, in the structure of the gust works one can notice an intervening episode (the written musical alphabet here is called a monogram DK 195) which is greatly distanced from adjacent works by the compiler of the chronology.

Having in mind that the works of the gust in question form a cycle based on the monogram BACH (see the UC IV)⁶, the marking of the mentioned alphabet does not look accidental and should be chronologically separated (D. Kučinskas dates the latter? 01 1906). Here seems to be the case, when the composer forming a cycle writes down working schemes on adjacent pages.

One of the most evident features speaking of M. K. Čiurlionis' creative spontaneity seems to be his untitled works which are most characteristic of his later period of work. In one of his letters to S. Kymantaitė (15 10 1908), he writes: "I've written three pieces (Lith. *gabalus*) for piano"⁷ (Čiurlionis, 1960, p. 220). This message in a semantic respect is not symptomatic. First, the word "gabalus" is from a natural speech vocabulary. In Lithuanian it means no musical term. Second, the meaning of this word – "a separate part of a thing"⁸. The message "I've written three pieces" witnesses in part that the composer did not plan his work in advance. With its emergence however it was necessary (at least outwardly, in connection with the message) to entitle the born "stranger". And he called it spontaneously, without any long consideration, attaching no particular importance but naturally and spontaneously, however, with an unerring intuition. As we shall see later, the "three written pieces" form an integral three-movement cycle. Therefore, the used conception "unrecognized cycle" has a much profound meaning in comparison with the fact that the cycle has not been identified up to now. First of all this conception witnesses the spontaneity and intuitiveness of the composer's creative process. The present titles of the works given by the editors later seem to have emerged "pressed" by the necessity to somehow entitle the "strangers". Thus the border ones of the "three written pieces" are called preludes (ČKF) and the medial Fugue XVII (ČPF), or a Canon (VL)⁹. The motives for entitling seem rather inert. J. Čiurlionytė in her "Explications" writes: "The majority of the works written in the latest periods are left untitled. Since they have a typical form and mood of preludes, the editor entitled them "preludes", and in the case of some doubt – "piece"¹⁰. The titles of the works seem to partly "smother" the spontaneous character of a creative process as well as the composer's genuine intentions and results.

This anonymity in search of Unrecognized cycles seems to have a much deeper sense than a somewhat artificial discovery of the missing titles. Leaving his pieces untitled, the composer as if instinctively leaves space for them to group into bigger cycles by themselves. Such an incentive can be partly explained by the composer's particular concentration the priority of which was always an artistic wholeness. It was an aspiration for the latter that would decide the cyclic character of his works. Having reached an artistic result, the composer seems to have been no longer interested in cycles, because he made no attempts to properly entitle them and his works. The composer's creative thought took wing conquering new horizons. Here it is particularly important to perceive the tension of a creative process which eventually determined the absence of (anonymity) the titles.

Composers usually designate their works entitling them, marking genre, form or cycle. It was not the case with Čiurlionis. After the canons and fugues written during his studies in Leipzig, the composer would more and more seldom entitle his works. It is unlikely that it can be justified only by the haste of the composer's activities. By no means. It is rather a psychological circumstance, obligating to no genre, form, commission, etc., but enabling the composer to freely compose and improvise within unrestricted limits.

The lack of the titles of works can be rather easily motivated from a physiological point of view – susceptible to spontaneous alteration of moods and states the composer did not associate himself in advance with any conventions of genre, form and the title of work. It seems that in this way he enjoys his freedom more. Incidentally, due to this manner of writing music the boundaries between what should be considered a finished and unfinished piece fade out.

⁶ There are identified 16 Unrecognized cycle for piano (UC). Each cycles contain this autographs:

UC I: VL 184–189.	UC IX: VL306–308.
UC II: VL 248–249, 252, 257.	UC X: VL 309–313.
UC III: VL 253–254, 259–260.	UC XI: VL 304, 318–319.
UC IV: VL 266–268.	UC XII: VL 322–324.
UC V: VL 269–272, 271a–272a.	UC XIII: VL 330–333.
UC VI: VL 294–297, 305.	UC XIV: VL 335–336.
UC VII: VL 300–302.	UC XV: VL 338–344, 337a.
UC VIII: VL 298–299, 305.	UC XVI: VL 325, 328, 345.

⁷ Čiurlionis M. K. Apie muziką. In: M. K. Čiurlionis. Apie muziką ir daile. Vilnius, 1960, p. 220.

⁸ DLKŽ – Dabartinis lietuvių kalbos žodynas (Contemporary Dictionary of Lithuanian language). Vilnius, 1972, p. 157.

⁹ See abbreviations: ČKF, ČPF, VL.

¹⁰ ČKF – Čiurlionis M. K. Kūriniai fortepijonui (ed. J. Čiurlionytė). Vilnius: Vaga, 1957, p. 222.

In order to better perceive the importance of these circumstances (“title” and “incompleteness”) it is logical to analyse one of his creative outbursts (03–08 09 1901, Druskininkai) during which the composer wrote several marked mazurkas in succession. Worthy of mention in the non-continuity of the completeness of this potential cycle. The two first mazurkas are expanded and complete, by the way, written during one day (DK 67, 68). As to the third one, only the first two episodes were finished (DK 69). The rest mazurkas have only the notation of the parts for the right hand. The melodies of the mazurkas disclose the reasons for non-continuity. The motifs of the first two mazurkas are alternative (one trochaic, the other iambic), besides, the works are written in contrasting keys (e flat, G flat). Further, the synthesis of motives was expected, unfortunately, nothing of the kind happened. The rest, slightly varying, failed to escape from the influence of the motif of the first mazurka. The composer seemed to have made an attempt to do it the fifth mazurka (DK 71). The melody of the latter is distinctly different, but it is not a mazurka (the composer did not entitle it). Thus a potential cycle (it is evidently witnessed by the balanced key plan of the work: e flat-G flat-d-fsharp-D flat-e flat) was principally left unrealized. The reason is very simple – the canonic clichés of the mazurka restrained the composer’s tuneful-melodic and textural inventfulness and became an impediment to form a consistent, continuous cycle. And more. A canonic character of mazurkas strikingly discloses even slight aspects of incompleteness in the accompaniment of melodic-rhythmic periods and form. It is again a serious hindrance for a continuous course of the cycle.

The placement of autographs in the manuscript book is also worthy of attention:

R 1.1.3:	00303–00304	– Mazurka E flat minor DK 67 (03 09 1901, Druskininkai)
	00304–00306	– Mazurka G flat major DK 68 (03 09 1901, Druskininkai)
	00307–00308 _{1–10}	– Mazurka D minor DK 69 (06 09 1901, Druskininkai)
	00308 _{11–14} –00311	– Preliudas F minor DK 72 (14 09 1901, Druskininkai)
	00312	– Mazurka F sharp minor DK 70 (08 09 1901, Druskininkai)
	00313 _{1–6}	– [Melodija] D-dur DK 71 (after 08 09 1901, Druskininkai)
	00313 _{7–11}	– Prelude F major DK 160 (for organ; 12 1904, Druskininkai)
	00313 ₁₃	– stave blank
	00313 ₁₄	– Fragmentas H minor DKK 1.7.5 (Istebna, summer 1906)
	00314	– Mazurka E flat DK 73 (15? 09 1901, Druskininkai)
	00315 _{1–10}	– Fugette G minor DK 161 (for organ; 12 1904, Druskininkai)
	00315 _{11–14}	– Fugette C minor DK 162 (for organ; 12 1904, Druskininkai)
	00316 _{1–10}	– Mazurka E minor DK 74 (16 09 1901, Druskininkai)
	00316 _{11–14} –00317 1–10	– Mazurka B major DK 75 (after 16 09 1901, Druskininkai)

Here we can see an asynchronous rotation of dates and pages – the Prelude composed at least a week later is written down, and some left (DK 72) blank pages are filled with later composed pieces for organ (DK 160–2). The succession of the pages in the book illustrates that the undated (DK 69) and not fully dated (DK 73) autographs logically find their proper places within the limits of the outburst. Some later written mazurkas (DK 74, 75) should be considered to have overstepped the limits of the outburst.

Writing preludes the composer enjoyed his freedom more. During one of his early creative gusts (19–20 06 1901, Druskininkai) the composer wrote even 6 pieces and entitled them as preludes. All the mentioned works are formally finished. Worthy of mention is the fact that the works embracing this gust are not called preludes. One of them – Nocturne C sharp (30 05), the other – Polonaise B flat (01 07). The differences in these titles help to articulate the boundaries of the gust:

R 1.1.3:	00281–00281	– Prelude F sharp major DK 57 (27 05, 10 06 1901, Druskininkai)
	00283–00286	– Nocturne C sharp minor DK 58 (30 05 1901)
	00287	– Prelude F sharp minor DK 59 (09 06 1901, Druskininkai)
	00288–00289	– Prelude B major DK 60 (13 06 1901)
	00290	– Prelude D flat major DK 61, I red. (20 06 1902, Druskininkai)
	00291–00292 _{1–9}	– Prelude C minor DK 63 (20 06 1902, Druskininkai)
	00292 _{9–12}	– [Canon] G minor DK 119 (26 06 1901, Leipzig)
	00292 _{13–14}	– staves blank
	00293	– Prelude A minor DK 62 (15 06 1901, Druskininkai)
	00294 _{1–6}	– Fugette A minor DK 157 (for organ)
	00294 _{7–12}	– Prelude C major DK 158 (for organ)
	00294 _{11–14}	– Prelude G minor DK 159 (for organ)
	00295–00296 _{1–6}	– Polonaise B minor DK 64 (01 07 1901, Druskininkai)

The cycle of preludes was written in about 10 days. Of interest is the fact that after writing Prelude F sharp (09 06), the composer corrected Prelude F flat composed before some time. The composer seems to have groped a cycle. Now one prelude follows another (10, 13, 15, 20 d.). The last two preludes (DK 63, 62) are asynchronously rotated in respect of their dates and pages. The latter circumstance can be partly motivated by blank pages left before and after Prelude A minor (the blank pages were later filled with other works (DK 119, 157–159). The blank pages symptomatically witness that the composer groped the final prelude of the cycle prior to the formation of a dramaturgie line of the preludes in the cycle.

The composing of typologically characteristic spontaneous cycles can be considered as such only in the cases when the composer wrote pieces without titles. This kind of creative work began and lasted for some ten years (1899–1909). During this period the composer wrote more than 10 untitled works.

The below presented table illustrates one of the earliest outbursts of untitled anonymous works:

R 1.1.16:	118 ₉₋₁₂	– Mazurka E flat minor DK 29 (12 10 1899, Druskininkai)
	119 ₁₋₄	– [Musical Moment] DK 31 (24 11 1899, Druskininkai)
	119 ₅₋₁₂	– [Musical Moment] DK 32 (25 11 25, Druskininkai, unfinished)
	120–121 ₁₋₆	– [Prelude] F minor DK 33 (26 11 1988, Druskininkai, unfinished)
	121 ₇₋₁₂	– [Prelude] F sharp minor DK 35 (29 11 1899, Druskininkai, unfinished)
	122–123	– [Fantasia] E flat DK 34 (27–28 11 1899, Drusk., unfinished)
	124	– Mazurka B minor DK 37 (01 12 1899, Druskininkai)

The outburst is obviously articulated by the composer's entitled works – Mazurka E minor and B minor (DK 29, 37). The outburst embraces five untitled works. One of them is undated. Here, however, of great use is a consecutive metrics of the pages and the fact that the work can be included into the volume of the gust due to its anonymity. It seems to be a rather typical case of the gust. Moreover that the two last works asynchronously rotate dates and pages. In part, it symptomatically marks the composer's cyclic intentions, at least his intention to finish a series of sketches with an expanded virtuoso piece.

The gust works in the fair copy are written in brown ink (R 1.1.16). The latter circumstance is exclusive. There are no more spontaneous cycles (except the last UC XVI) written on a fair copy. Another circumstance evidently witnesses not in favour of the cycle, i. e. four unfinished works out of five. Thus even the finale of the cycle seems to be unfinished!

Besides, it can be mentioned that there are no particular structural features of the cyclic character among the works, i. e. neither distinct thematic intonational recapitulations among the sketches nor a constructive key plan as well as harmonious and single-type proportions.

The comparison of the first gust of anonymous works with the cycle of Preludes created some two not full years later evidently witnesses a great break made by the composer on the plane of a cyclic thinking.

The anonymity of the titles of autographs can be considered a general rule of unrecognized cycles, except solitary cases.

In the absence of titles, other references by the composer can sometimes symptomatically be of service, namely the numbering of the movements (DK 118.5–6), biographical references (“I have written three pieces”) or dedicative markings of the works. For example, the composer dedicated to his student Halina Wolman several autographs marked “to Halka”. All of them bear the date 1905 (UC V: DK 184. 1–4). Dedications are not basic criteria for the establishment either of an outburst or a cycle, however, similar works stimulate to check a probability of a cycle. It is worthy of mention that four works dedicated to H. Wolman's mother Bronislawa Wolman (“to B”), dated 1906, enter two unrecognized cycles (UC VI, VIII). The inclusion of the dedicated sketches in different cyclic systems urges one to think about the ambiguity of similar criteria.

Hence the anonymity of titles is an important symptom articulating the volume of a creative outburst and of an unrecognized cycle. But it happens in the case, when untitled works are surrounded by the titled ones.

It should be mentioned that the absence of titles can be functional and can partly serve for them. To put it briefly, the anonymity of the title is also a title, still in an opposite meaning.

The anonymity of works is a significant indicator of the spontaneity of the cycle, and it indirectly witnesses the absence of reflection in the would – be cycle. Worthy of mention are the following levels speaking of the anonymity of the work: an unmarked genre of the work, a title, a structure and partly the composer proper, because the authorship is motivated only by the phenomenon of spontaneity. All these levels of anonymity and respectively spontaneity can be easily noticed in the majority of unrecognized cycles.

Incomplete sketches without a formal cadence can also serve for the prognostics of an unrecognized cycle. Symptomatically, three aspects can be important. They are:

- 1) quantitative proportions of finished and unfinished works of the cycle (gust);
- 2) non-cadence finales of the works;
- 3) the factor of the finished final work.

Among 16 unrecognized cycles about 2/3 have unfinished works (movements) in their structure (i. e. 10 cycles). Each of the cycles stands out for a different relationship between finished and unfinished episodes. More often there are met the cycles containing more finished than unfinished episodes. Depending on the number of the movements, the relationship can be as follows (Scheme No 1):

Scheme No 1

Unfinished movements of the cycle	:	Finished movements of the cycle	
1	:	2	(UC IV, VII, IX)
2	:	3	(UC X)
3	:	4	(UC XV)

The scheme illustrates that the relationship between finished and unfinished movements yield to a harmonic proportion (1/2, 2/3, 3/4). Such a relationship of finished and unfinished movements can be one of the elements indicating the symptomatics of the cycle even in the case when the volume of the gust works is on the whole larger than that of the cycle's movements. For example, the gust 16–21 05 1909, Druskininkai embraces even 11 works, out of which only 7 correspond to the proportion of the finished and unfinished episodes of the movements of the cycle. The cycle "To Halka" makes a certain exception in this system of symptomatics (here respective movements correlate 1:4).

There are also some cycles which contain an equal number of finished and unfinished movements (Scheme No 2):

Scheme No 2

Unfinished movements of the cycle	:	Finished movements of the cycle	
1	:	1	(UC XIV)
2	:	2	(UC XIII)
3	:	3	(UC V)

In respect of symptomatics a reverse relationship between finished and unfinished movements makes a certain exception. In that case, the number of unfinished is greater than that of finished ones, for example, 3:1 (UC III).

The finales of unfinished works, particularly their final tones, spontaneously directing themselves to the next movement of the cycle, can just as well serve for the prognostics of the cycle.

In frequent cases "unfinished fragments", passing into the next movement, stand out not for their modal, harmonious or key-functional link or cadence but a much more complex acoustic or associative relation, which is wider known in the 20th-century music. Here texture and chords are of no great importance. Sometimes the sound of the final episode suffices in order to keep an interrelation between the movements. Several concrete cases of this relation are feasible. One of them reminds of the "leader's" semitone attraction to the initial chord and the key of the next movement. Such tones associating the "leader's attraction" can manifest themselves in several ways.

For the sake of evidence we present the following summary (Scheme No 3):

Scheme No 3

1. Semitones in one octave:
 - UC V : B – B flat
 - II → III
 - UC VIII: E – E flat
 - I → II
 - UC XIII: B flat – B
 - III → IV
2. Semitones in different octave:
 - UC IV: G sharp – A
 - III → IV
 - UC X: B flat – A
 - V → VI
 - UC II: B – B flat
 - III → IV
 - UC XV: E – E flat
 - V → VI

3. Double and triple semitones: UC X: C – B
 G – F sharp
 IV – V
 UC X: A flat – G
 I – V
 C – B
 B flat – B
 III → IV
 UC VIII: F – E
 E flat – E
 II → III
4. Semitones through intermediate notes: UC XIII: B flat (E-F-F sharp) – A
 I → II
 UC XIV: E flat (-A) – E
 I → II

In other cases is based on the link of a common tone (Scheme No 4):

Scheme No 4

- Link of a common tone in one octave: UC III B – B
 II → III
 UC V D – D
 V → VI
- Link of a common tone in different octaves: UC XV D – D
 IV → V

The finished movements of the cycle prognosticating a cycle can be connected by the links of a common tone and a semitone. For example (Scheme No 5):

Scheme No 5

- UC II D – D
 I → II
 C – B
 II → III
 B – B flat
 III → IV

The finales of unfinished works make possible to prognosticate the final movement of the cycle. The finale of the cycle is usually formally finished and has a concluding cadence. Several cycles end in this way (UC II, VIII, XIII). In the cases, when a directing end of the work cannot be realized by way of a separate finale, due to the absence of the finished final movements, one has to rely on reprise recapitulation of the first movement at the end of the cycle. Incidentally, semitone links are particularly typical (UC IV, V, X, XIV).

Thus the prognostics of the unrecognized cycle is based on three factors of a spontaneous origin, characteristic of the composer's oeuvre, namely a creative gust, chronology and the placement of autographs as well as directing finales of his works. The interrelated factors of symptomatics make possible to thoroughly diagnose a probability of the unrecognized cycle to a maximum.

Summing up it should be pointed out that F. Baron, a prominent specialist in the psychology of creative work, noticed that original and "creative people are more often unbalanced <...>, stand out for their energy, are able to "communicate" with the subconscious <...>". Besides, he comes to the conclusion that "an ability to connect everything is indeed a feature of a creative personality"¹¹.

Having in mind M. K. Čiurlionis' style to compose by means of outbursts, intensively and for short periods one can also perceive "top experiences" accompanying the composer. The famous psychologist A. Maslow characterizes the latter as "the passing moments of self-realization"¹².

¹¹ F. Barron's references (Barron F., 1957, Originality in Relation to Personality and Intellect. Journal of Personality. XXV. P. 736–742) here cited by Jankauskaitė-Karkockienė, 2003, Kūrybos psichologija. Vilnius: Logotipas, p. 43.

¹² A. Maslow's references (Maslow A. U., 1970, Religious, values and Peak-Experiences. New-York: Penguin Books) here cited by Trimakas K. A. 1996, Žmogaus aukščiausi skrydžiai. Kaunas: LKBTKK leidykla, p. 101–102.

The composer's creative power and top experiences enable one to perceive the paradoxicalness of the cyclic character and to clear up how this phenomenon is feasible.

First of all it is necessary to take heed of a noteworthy and paradoxical feature of the composer's creative process. On the one hand, the composer clearly perceived (knew) that he composed different pieces. It is evidenced by the dates of the manuscripts marked by the composer and the formal grammar of a musical text. However, on the other hand, he would not mark his works, and those notated pieces would more often remind of unfinished sketches. The latter circumstance hides the subconscious sides of a creative process and indirectly witnesses that "everything is united into one whole". Thus, the consciousness (knowing) and the subconscious (not finishing up), so to day, communicated.

The "communication" modus evidently had an influence on the pieces forming his cycles.

Abbreviations

VL – The list of M. K. Čiurlionis' works compiled by Vytautas Landsbergis (Landsbergis V., Čiurlionio muzika. Vilnius: Vaga, 1986, p. 223–296).

VLKF – Čiurlionis M. K. Kūriniai fortepijonui. Visuma. (Compositions for piano. Completed) Kaunas, 2004.

KJŽ – Čiurlionytė-Karužienė V., Juodis S. E., Žukas V. Mikalojus Konstantinas Čiurlionis. Bibliografija. (Bibliography) Vilnius: Vaga, 1970.

ČDM, Čm – New list of M. K. Čiurlionis' autographs introduced in the National M. K. Čiurlionis Museum of Art, since 1990. R – autographs.

JČKF – Čiurlionis M. K. Kūriniai fortepijonui (Works for piano, ed. by J. Čiurlionytė). Vilnius: Vaga, 1957.

Santrauka

Prognostiniai M. K. Čiurlionio savaiminio muzikos ciklo kriterijai

Kompozitoriaus spontaniškas kūrybos būdas, be abejonės, buvo esminė prielaida savaiminiams ciklams atsirasti. Todėl kompozitoriaus spontaniškos veiklos simptomai tampa reikšmingais savaiminių ciklų prognozavimo kriterijais.

Neatpažintų ciklų tikimybę išryškina įvairių tipų kūrybiniai protrūkiai. Pagal įvairius požymius – chronologinį kūrinių nuoseklumą, kūrinių apimtį, pastovios geografinės vietos keitimą, laikiną intensyvių protrūkių nebuvimą skiriami įvairaus intensyvumo kūrybiniai protrūkiai: šuoras, gūsis, tęstinis. Kūrybinio šuoro metu, kuris paprastai trukdavo apie dvi savaites, kompozitorius vidutiniškai sukurdavo po vieną kūrinį per dvi dienas. Kūrybinis gūsis pasižymi ypatingu intensyvumu. Paprastai jis trukdavo vos kelias dienas, kai kasdien būdavo vidutiniškai parašoma po vieną kūrinį. Gūσιο struktūra itin intensyvi, tolydi ir vientisa. Jo metu sukurtų kūrinių chronologija neretai izomorfiškai atspindi dalių sekos tvarką.

Trečiasis kūrybinio intensyvumo tipas pasižymi vidine determinante. Šis tipas nėra susijęs su apibrėžtomis išorinėmis laiko bei vietos aplinkybėmis. Jis gali būti ypač išstęstas (net iki kelių mėnesių), gali keistis geografinė vieta. Kūrybos determinantė atitrūkusi nuo fizinio veiksnio ir veikia tarsi nuolat sugrįžtantis prisiminimas („amžinoji dabartis“, kaip pasakytų A. Šliogeris).

Kūrybinių protrūkių tipus padeda artikuliuoti bent keli autografų datų bei rankraščių puslapių metrikos koreliavimo atvejai. Pažymėtos datos ir rankraščių puslapių metrika gali tarpusavyje neprieštarauti (sinchronika) ar prieštarauti (asinchronika). Be to, gali išryškėti datų arba puslapių dominantės.

Autografų pavadinimų anonimiškumas laikytinas bendra neatpažintų ciklų prognozavimo taisykle, išskyrus tik retas išimtis. Šis prognostinis kriterijus ypač reikšmingas artikuliuojant kūrybinio protrūkio bei neatpažinto ciklo apimtį. Pavadinimo anonimiškumas Čiurlionio kūryboje yra funkcionalus ir atstoja kūrinio įvardijimą. Ypač pažymėtini tie atvejai, kai neįvardytų kūrinių grupę chronologiškai supa kūriniai, turintys pavadinimus.

Kompozitoriaus kūrinių bei eskizų formalus neužbaigtumas taip pat yra reikšmingas neatpažintų ciklų prognostinis kriterijus, juolab kad bent 10 ciklų iš 16 savyje turi neužbaigtų kūrinių (dalių). Prognozuojant ciklą ypač svarbu pastebėti užbaigtų ir neužbaigtų kūrinių proporcijas, nekadencines kūrinių pabaigas bei paskutinio ciklo kūrinio formalų užbaigtumą. Labai dažnai paskutiniai neužbaigtų kūrinių tonai leidžia prognozuoti ciklo kūrinių (dalių) seką. Paprastai pabaigos tonai, *attacca* būdu nukreipiantys į tolesnę dalį, pasižymi ne harmonine jungtimi, bet asociatyviu akustiniu („vedamojo tono“) ryšiu.