

M. K. Čiurlionis' Unrecognized Cycle (1907, Druskininkai-Warsaw)

Introduction

A cyclic thinking characteristic of Mikalojus Konstantinas Čiurlionis, the great Lithuanian composer, is witnessed by a wealth of cycle-based paintings. His rather copious piano works, however, do not distinguish themselves by cyclic references. The things that one cannot help noticing are a great number of untitled works and their seeming incompleteness as we shall later see for ourselves. This vein of writing music – without marking and completing works – greatly reminds of a spontaneous writing idiom, moreover that it is partly witnessed by “flashes” of dating his works and “scattered” autographs.

The composer, judging from the reminiscences of his contemporaries, was a highly consistent and integral personality devoted to creative work. It is reasonable to ask, therefore, whether his piano works hide a more profound and integral content than their outer “inventory” shape. An attempt will be made to answer this question in the present study.

The analysis is based on five piano works written by the composer in the summer and autumn months of 1907 in Druskininkai and Warsaw (VL 309–313).

The sections of the study are projected employing special methods in order to define the features characteristic of the cycle, i. e. for probability – prognostic, a cyclic form – structural, the full reading of the text – intentional, and for the marking of the boundaries of the work – identification method.

A great many musicologists and art historians point out aspirations of Čiurlionis' genius to reach an organic integrity and a cyclic thinking, which has a tendency to turn almost all his work into a cycle (V. Landsbergis, D. Kučinskas)¹. Furthermore, nearly each Čiurlioniana text, whatever it may deal with, more or less touches upon the topicalities of the cycle – a musical text, genre, form, style peculiarities, painting, verbal texts, world perception and the like. However, despite dozens of hints, Čiurlionis' spontaneous musical cycles have not been disclosed. Nobody has ever made a suggestion about the composer's similar works and their articulation.

And what is more, the composer's works are very often artificially grouped by editors in the collections of the composer's works (JČKF, VLKF).

Prognosis of the Cycle

It is worthwhile to start this section with the review of the grouping of the works – objects of our interest – by editors in their collections (Scheme No 1):

Scheme No 1

VL	309	312	310	311	313
JČKF: <i>Four Preludes</i> , Op. 26			No 3	No 4	
<i>Four Preludes</i> , Op. 27	No 2	No 3			
VLKF: <i>Storms and Depts</i>	VII	VI	V	I	VIII

Both in the opuses compiled by Jadvyga Čiurlionytė and the cycle formed by Vytautas Landsbergis a slight attention is paid to chronology. However, when grouping works, they are selected modelling a certain cyclic character reminiscent of a key plan as well as contrasting the tempos and texture of the works. The primary works belonging to the supposed cycle can be found in *Four Preludes* grouped by J. Čiurlionytė (Op. 27, No 2, 3). This opus is noted for its key plan which rather brings to mind the model of a melody-filled passage after a leap (B-flat m-F-Gm-Am).

Two more works are included in another opus (Op. 26) whose model of the key plan is akin to a recitative at an interval of a third (Dm-Dm-Dm-Bm). All the works in the supposed cycle can be found in the eight-work group *Storms and Depths* (VII, VI, V, I, VIII) formed by V. Landsbergis.

Both Čiurlionytė's Op. 26 and Landsbergis' eight-work cycle stand out for their analogous key-based model of the sequence of works – a leap (Am-B-flat m and Fm-Dm) and a filling (Am-B-flat m-Dm-Bm). Having in mind the composer's spontaneous character of creative process, this kind of grouping works into cycles does look not enough natural. It was easy to notice that the same works were included in different groups compiled by the editors. It provokes one, therefore, to search for more solid criteria legalizing the composer's spontaneous cycle. One of them – a thorough motivation of the chronology of works. That is why the dates indicated by the composer and the place of authographs in manuscript books alike should be taken into consideration.

The below-presented scheme specifies more detailed chronologies of the works in question (Scheme No 2):

Scheme No 2

	I	II	III	IV	V
JČ:	Op. 27/2	Op. 27/3	Op. 26/3	Op. 26/4	Op. 27/4
KJŽ:	649	650	645	646	651
VL:	309	312	310	311	313
DK:	239	245	240	243	246
Čm21:	246	247	234–235	240–242 _{1–2}	248–250
			unfinished	unfinished	unfinished
	19 m.	13 m.	26 m.	27 m.	42 m.
Author:	1907 Drusk.	1907 Warsz.	Warsz., 1907; C	Warsz., 1907; C	–
Dates (DK):	1907.07	Autumn of 1907	Autumn of 1907	Autumn of 1907	Autumn of 1907
	Druskininkai	Warsaw	Warsaw	Warsaw	Warsaw

In the scheme, the works are indicated in the supposed cyclic's order (I–V). It is easy to notice that all the known chronologies (JČ, KJŽ, VL, DK) of the composer's works do not consistently conform to the sequence of the supposed cycle of works. The composer's manuscripts, therefore, are of paramount importance here.

The works belonging to the unrecognized cycle find their reflection in the composer's manuscript book (Čm 21). This 260-page book, as D. Kučinskas notes, includes the compositions written in the period between 1896 to 1908. The pages contain 12 staves². The cycle under investigation is written down on some of these pages (Scheme No 3):

Scheme No 3

	233	– Prelude in F-sharp m, DK 226
(III)	234–235	– Prelude in G m, DK 240 (VL 310)
	234 ₇	– Unidentified work in C, DK 240
	236–237	– <i>The Sea</i> for piano, DK 265 (VL 317)
	238 _{1–8}	– Unidentified work in C, DK 240
	238 _{9–12} –239 _{6–7}	– Sketch, DK 242
	239	– Sketch, DK 241
(IV)	240–242 _{1–2}	– Prelude in Am, DK 243 (VL 311)
	242 _{3–10}	– Prelude in F, DK 244
	242 _{11–12} –243 _{11–12}	– Harmony exercise in Am, DK 1.2.53
	243	– Fughetta in Am, DK 263 (VL 316)
	244	– Prelude in Dm, DK 238 (VL 308)
	245	– Fughetta, DK 264 (VL 315)
(I)	246	– Prelude in Dm, DK 239 (VL 309)
(II)	247	– Prelude in Dm, DK 245 (VL 312)
(V)	248–250	– Prelude in Bm, DK 246 (VL 313)
	251–252 _{1–8}	– <i>The Sea</i> for piano, DK 265 (VL 317)
	252 _{9–12} –253	– <i>The Sea</i> for piano, DK 265 (VL 317)
	254	– Prelude in Gm, DK 266

The works presented in the extract from the manuscript book were written in the period between 1906 to 1908. When selecting essential autographs (I–V) of the cycle, the dates indicated by the composer should be considered as a primary criterion. The composer, as we have noticed, had indicated the dates of the works which are the objects of our present interest (I–IV). The fifth work is undated, but its chronology can be established according to the position of the manuscript in respect of other dated works. Thus Prelude in Bm (DK 246, p. 248–250) immediately follows Prelude in Dm (DK 245, p. 247). The position of the autograph is considered an important criterion judging about the most probable chronological sequence of the works, however, it does not necessarily coincide with movements of the supposed cycle. One can judge from the extract taken from the book contents that later dated autographs find themselves on the earlier pages of the book, comp. DK 243 (Warszawa 1907, C) with DK 239 (1907 Druskininkai). Even a more evident interchange of the manuscript pages and dates can be noticed among other works – DK 265, 263 (both autographs bear the date: Vilno 1908). Subsequent pages are of interest due to the autographs bearing earlier dates (DK 244 – 1907 Lipiec, Druskieniki, similarly others – 239, 245). It is, therefore, reasonable to assert that the composer wrote his works without observing a pedantic sequence of the manuscript pages and the dates of his works. A similar “scattering” of works among the manuscript pages can speak of the following two things.

First – the composer writing some work would leave some blank pages most likely intending to continue and complete it, and second – to write down other pieces on blank pages (possibly lacking music paper “at hand!”). The manuscript scheme shows that among the works of the supposed cycle as well as those written prior and after them rank quite a number of “inserted” works, the greater part of which are undated (DK 204–242, 244, 264 and 226 as well as 265–266 and others).

The analysis of the placement peculiarities of the manuscript autographs leads to the conclusion that the sequence of the cycle's works cannot be principally based on the peculiarities of the chronology of the works. Still, a chronological analysis enables one to perceive a certain possibility of the existence of the supposed cycle. Primarily it is witnessed by a rather systematic dating of the works by the composer himself, embracing even four out of five works from the supposed cycle. Whereas the manuscript book partly helps to define the position of the undated work (V) and the possibility of its belonging to a cyclic system. On the other hand, the manuscript book also presupposes the question whether the composer's all dated works make up an integral cycle and whether there rank no works among them belonging to some other cyclic system. An extract from the manuscript autographs contains a dated work (DK 238) which looks particularly unexpected. A further structural analysis of the works belonging to the cycle should most likely facilitate the solution of this collision.

Structural Character of the Cycle

The most evident community of all the movement of the cycle seems to disclose itself through a two-directional (rising and falling) intonation of seconds. One second can be separated from another by a narrower or wider interval (Example 1). In movement I these intonations at the beginning sound simultaneously in the melody and the bass (here their shapes are indicated: in the original – O and the inversion – I). In the middle movements (II and III) similar intonations can be also observed from the very beginning in the melody (II O) and the bass (III I). They manifest themselves slightly different in movement IV. Now the melodized original sounds in the bass (IV:O), and in movement V this intonation bearing a retrograde shape is woven into the melody (V:R).

Of interest is the expression of these two-directional seconds undergoing intoning inside the movements. The shapes of intonations or their registers get inverted when the section of the golden proportion of a separate movement is reached. In movement I the golden section (GS) falls on measure 12 (Example 2). Here intonational shapes are inverted in respect of the register – what was characteristic of the melody now sounds in the bass (O), and in the melody we can notice only retro-inversion (RI) under modification. In movement II intonations get inverted in the primary one third of the form (Example 3: GS, m. 5–6). And so we can state that the primary original of the movement turned into RI. This shape particularly catches one's eye due to secret slides of seconds in measure 6. In movement III one notices intonational replacement of the melody and the bass

Example 1

Musical notation for Example 1, showing two staves with notes and accidentals. Roman numerals I O, II O, IV O are above the top staff, and I I, III I, V, R are above the bottom staff.

Example 2

Musical notation for Example 2, showing two staves with notes and accidentals. Roman numerals M, R, RI are above the top staff, and M, M, O are above the bottom staff. Measure numbers I, t. 8, 11, 12 and GS are below.

Example 3

Musical notation for Example 3, showing a single staff with notes and accidentals. Roman numerals M, RI, RI are above the staff. Measure numbers II, t. 3, 5, 6 and GS are below.

Example 4

Musical notation for Example 4, showing two staves with notes and accidentals. Roman numerals M, I are above the top staff, and I, M are above the bottom staff. Measure numbers III, t. 1, 17 and GS are below.

Example 5

Musical notation for Example 5, showing a single staff with notes and accidentals. Roman numerals M, M, RI are above the staff. Measure numbers IV, t. 13-15, 20, 21 and GS are below.

Example 6

Musical notation for Example 6, showing two staves with notes and accidentals. Roman numerals RI, M, I are above the top staff, and V, t. 1, 39, 41 and GS are below.

(Example 4: GS, m. 17. I). In movement V after the golden section, the intonation of retro-inversion is woven into a melodic line instead of the known original in the bass at the beginning of the movement (Example 5: RI, m. 21). Finally, at the end of movement V an inversion sounds in the bass (Example 6: I, m. 41). After movement V, as we shall make sure, a return of movement I follows, and the marked measure (m. 41) will coincide with the golden proportion.

The noticed inversions of characteristic intonations, comparing their shapes at the beginnings of the movements and within the limits of the golden section, are also accompanied by another regularity namely, intonations are inverted, as a rule, through the mediation of mixed intonation (M) marked by one-way sequence of intervals. The basic shapes of mixed intonations are also reflected in previous examples (Examples 2–6).

The presented intonational outline of the cycles' movements has not much in common with other beside written authographs in the manuscript (DK 238, 266). The first of them is noted for its one-way intonations of seconds and forms another cyclic system with two other works³. The second authograph both in respect of its character and intonations highly reminds of Čiurlionis' early period of work. Whereas other intervening positions of the manuscript authographs (DK 241, 242, 244 and others) do not stand out for any two-directional intonations of the seconds. Thus one can be sure enough that the works under discussion and only those among them, do belong to the supposed cycle.

Another, no less pressing issue, is to establish a succession of works in order to form a cyclic form.

The key plan could serve for the primary criterion of the sequence of the cycle's movements. Then they would logically follow the below-indicated order (Scheme No 4):

Scheme No 4

I (VL 309)	II (VL 312)	III (VL 310)	IV (VL 311)	V (VL 313)	VI (VL 309)
Dm	Am	Gm	Am	Bm	Dm

This sequence of the members of the key plan is mostly motivated by the ends of the supposed unfinished works (III–V). The latter are marked by the leading or semitone attraction of the phenomena to the tonic of the next movement or its initial chord. For example, movement III ends in a chord (E-flat-B-flat-c²-a-flat², m. 26) all sounds of which potentially distance themselves at a semitone from the initial chord sounds of movement IV (B-D-G). Here it is not important whether these semitones interrelate being distanced at one or more octaves. It is common knowledge that in a harmonic system it is an octave equivalent of sounds that is effective. It is noteworthy to stress that all the tones of the final chord in movement III are also oriented through an oppositional attraction of semitones to the tonics of the next movement (a-c-e, m. 1, second half). The common tone G makes the only exception. Similarly the end of movement IV "moves" to movement V, i. e. the final chord (C-E-G-B-flat, m. 27) as if resolves in the tonic of the next movement (B-D-F-sharp, m. 1). The following sounds interrelate at a semitone: C and B, G and F-sharp, E-flat and B, but E and D make an exception. Movement V is also not traditionally finished. Alike other movements, it does not possess a conventional cadence. However, its final chord (G-D-B-flat) is marked by a functional attraction of the subdominant to the basic key of the cycle of D minor. On the basis of the attraction analogy of the earlier supposed unfinished works one can presuppose an obligatory return of movement I at the end of the cycle.

Motivating the key plan of the cyclic movements, it is necessary to specify the indicated key of the second work in the chronologies worked out by musicologists. In the opinion of J. Čiurlionytė, the latter work is written in D minor. She, as the editor, even indicates the key signature of D minor (JČKF). V. Landsbergis, taking into consideration an authograph, does not indicate key signature at all.

The key of the second work is supposed to be A minor. It is explicitly witnessed both by the opening and closing tonic (a, A) of the work and an evident expression of the basic functions of the harmony (of the dominant and subdominant). On the other hand, the key of this movement is closely associated in a cyclic way with the key of D minor in movement I, the traces of which are also felt in movement II.

The most telling mark of this trace – the emergence of the Phrygian subdominant after the dominant harmony (II, m. 3–5, 9). Hence, the key plan distinguishes itself by certain features of the cyclic nature. The first two movements interrelate through an opposite relationship between the tonic and dominant keys characteristic of sonata-form expositions. Other two movements (III and IV) are notable for their key functions typical of development division. As usual, development begins with the subdominant key (it echoes G minor of movement III) and ends in a dominant preitux (A minor of movement IV). The recapitulation of the cycle (V–IV) modifies the dominant relationship of the first two keys (Dm-Am) to subdominant one (Bm-Dm).

This logic of the key plan is further detailed by the relationships of each movement. On the whole, the latter are marked by the alternation of opposite major and minor keys. This alternation on the most general scale, having in mind the largest sections of separate movements of the cycle, is illustrated by the following scheme (Scheme No 5):

Scheme No 5

I	Dm – F
m.	1 5
II	Am – A
m.	1 13
III	Gm – C G – Cm
m.	1 10 18 24
IV	Am – Em (S)
m.	1 18
V–VI	Bm – D Dm – F
m.	1 14 1 5

In separate movements, as one can notice, function various types of minor and major keys: parallel (I: Dm-F, V: Bm-D), one-name (II: Am-A) and fifth-fourth (III: Gm-C or G-Cm). The system of later relationships also peculiar to the keys of movement IV (Am-Em). Finally, the second division of movement V interrelates with the beginning of movement VI (the return of movement I is kept in mind) through one-name keys (D major). Our analysis shows that the inner content of these keys is based on the cycles of major and minor thirds. Thus, all the movements of the cycles disclose a certain integral principle in the alternation of major and minor keys, basing a slightly lower “mega” level of the cycle’s key plan. This level is of interest due to the fact that it continues penetrating through its logical branches, touching even the smallest levels of the cycle’s harmonic system.

For the sake of evidence it is reasonable to compare more detailed schemes of movement III and movement IV (Scheme No 6 and 7):

Scheme No 6

Movement III

Section I:	Gm - Bm - Gm - [B-flat m - F-sharp m - Dm]
m.:	3 6 7 8
Section II:	C [- G - E - C-sharp A-
	- E - C-sharp- A- F-sharp-
	- C-sharp- A-sharp- F-sharp- D-sharp]- Dm
m.:	10 12-----16 17
Section III:	G - C Cm - Gm
m.:	18 21 24 25

Scheme No 7

Movement IV

Section I:	Am - Cm - Am - Cm - Am - Cm - E-flat m - F-sharp m
m.:	1 5 7 13 15 16 17
Section II:	Am, <u>Em</u> - B [C - D - E], <u>Em</u> - Am - B - [A-flat - B-flat - C]
m.:	18 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

The harmonic-key logic in movement III brings out even three sections of form (m. 1–9, m. 10–17 and m. 18–26) and in movement IV – two (m. 1–17 and m. 18–27).

The first section of movement III represents the cycle of key relationships between major thirds from sound B-flat, whereas the second – those of the minor ones. The latter is marked by the chains of sequences at minor thirds downwards (from the sounds G, E and C-sharp). Here opposite details of relationships come to the fore. The cycle of major thirds descends by way of minor keys (Bm-F-sharp m-Dm, 1st section) and *vice versa* – by minor thirds those of major (G-E-C-sharp-A – and the like, 2nd section). An opposite exposition of the key relationship, i.e. of the cycles of major and minor thirds could recall, as it is peculiar to a sonata form, the arrangement of the principal and subordinate theme on the plane of harmony. The key logic of the third section does not contradict this prerequisite. Here one can discern the digest of the harmonic-key development of the entire movement transforming modes of each keys. The movement, starting in the key of G minor (1st section) and later exposing C major (2nd section, here it is worth to notice the culminating D minor of this section), ends in a modal modification of its previous keys (G-Cm, m. 18, 24). Thus the two sections of the recapitulation (this is how the 3rd division can be called) stand out for the inversion of their major and minor keys in comparison with the basic keys of the exposition. Besides, the modal continuity of these keys is also worth of thinking (G-C and Cm-Gm) over.

Movement IV seems to be a consecutive continuation of the previous harmonic-key development. The first section of this movement realizes the cycle of minor thirds but differently from previous movement. Now the minor thirds serve for the raising of minor keys (Am-Cm-E-flat m-F-sharp m). Whereas the second division fills up the cycle of major thirds with major seconds (C-D-E and A-flat-B-flat-C). In these positions (at least marginal) filled with seconds, the cycle of the ascending major thirds becomes apparent (C-E and As-C). The ascending cycle of major intervals is represented by major keys. Hence, both cycles in respect of the previous (III) movement are not only replaced (here the previous is of minor thirds and there – of major ones), but also ascending. Furthermore. The keys are represented differently. Now the cycle of minor thirds is represented by minor keys (in the previous – major) and that of major by major (there – minor). It leads to the conclusion that movement III and IV are not only an organic continuation of the harmonic development but also can inverse addition to each other. Following a harmonic logic, the key plan of movement III is particularly close to sonata-form (without development) principles. Movement IV, however, would mostly recall the compensated development division for the previous movement (III). As it is known, the development episodes are usually opposite to expositional ones.

Here are presented some more noteworthy details before finishing the comparison of the keys in both movements.

The second section of movement IV is composed in the basic key of E minor which reinforces itself due to the subdominant and dominant keys. The first sequential progression of the major keys along the major seconds (C-D-E) ends in a rather ambiguous way. Here the marked tonic in the key of E major is principally represented by one of the possible members of the major thirds cycle, i.e. by E major six-chord from E (other members of this chain are six-chords from C and G-sharp). This first inversion of the chord, however, in respect of the basic key of E minor, interpreting traditionally, is E minor tonic with a sixth (E-G-C). The ambivalency of the first inversion of the chord (member of a major sequence or a minor tonic with a sixth) connects the basic key and its functional satellites with the cycle of the major intervals and the major keys.

The opposite character of the key-harmonic development (transpositions of the cycles, directions of the intervals and modal transformations) seen in the middle movements (III–IV) forms a kind of a concentric axis for the entire cycle. The rest movements in respect of their harmony and keys reflect and continue the mentioned symmetry. Movements I and II reflect movements V and VI in a reverse order. In a word, the lateral pairs of the movements compose an arch of concentric symmetry. In a traditional aspect it is somewhat reminiscing the mirror of the themes in the recapitulation. Whereas movement V is marked by two sections (m. 1–13 and m. 14–42). Each of them possesses their individual key plan (Scheme No 8):

Scheme No 8**Movement V**

Section I: Bm – F-sharp m – Em – Bm
 m.: 1 5 7 12

Section II: D(VI) – Am – F – Am – C
 m.: 13 20 22 24 30

The first section of this movement distinguishes itself by a controversial functional sequence of the keys – the subdominant key (Em) follows the dominant (F-sharp m) one. A similar controversy has been noticed in movement II (there E and Dm, m. 3–5) which linked the latter with the key of the opening movement. A functional controversy of movement V links the latter with movement VI in a similar way. Having in mind the importance of the major and minor harmony for the composition of the cycle, it is easy to perceive a constructive link of the F-sharp minor tonic with the tonic in the final movement (D-F-A). The sound F-sharp in respect of the latter potentially becomes a major variant of the minor tonic. It is evident, therefore, that both final movements are interdependent due to a kinship of their keys. Still, differently from the initial movements, which were bound together by the subdominant key (Dm) of movement II, the final ones are linked by the dominant (F-sharp m) of movement V.

The following section of movement V is noted for its synthesized expansion of the key plan (section II). Now slowly, by way of a diatonic chain of the thirds in the major and minor keys, ascent is made until the very culmination of the cycle (D-Am-F-Am-C). It is worthy of mention that this chain of thirds contains neither purified nor key cycles and separate keys. Here seems to be a mixed case which harmoniously tunes up the opposite harmonic-key peculiarities of this expansion. One more detail should be also mentioned here. The direction of the keys is ascending. And where is its descending position? Its descending position can be traced in the climax of the movement (m. 37–39). Here the descending slide of harmonies displays itself at its end by shape "tone-semitone" scale in melody (m. 39). It is this modus (also called the Rimsky-Korsakov scale or the second modus of Messiaen) that fills the cycle of minor thirds with seconds and in this way finishes that what was performed in movement IV, filling major thirds in a similar way. The end of the culminating passage is resuming. Here we can notice a functional controversy of harmonies (F-sharp m-Em, m., end of 39–40) directing to the final movement (VI) of the cycle. The preparation of the discussed culminating episode is also noteworthy (m. 35–36). The bass line is structured by means of the ascending sequence – the chromatically filled cycle of major thirds articulated by the *arpeggio* of major thirds. Therefore, the last section of movement V can be considered as a kind of the finish of the previous movements, i.e. – the fillings at seconds of the cycles in major thirds with the trajectories of not yet exploited directions, the mixing of the relationship between the opposite modal key and that of the thirds, and the like.

On the other hand, the second section in question preserves certain initial features of the cycle's movements namely, a parallel relationship of the keys, intervening into a diatonic chain of thirds (Am-C). But on the scale of the whole movement this relationship articulates its both main sections (Bm-D). Movements I and VI are also marked by a parallel relationship of its inner keys (Dm-F).

Intentionality of the Cycle

It is known that Čiurlionis usually marked only notes⁴. It stands to reason, therefore, that giving arguments for the entirety of the cycle it is necessary to discover motives which could fill up this gap. Alike the supposedly unfinished works are characteristic of Čiurlionis' heritage, similarly the unmarked tempo, dynamics, phrasing, and other parameters of his works can be principally conditioned by intentional motives of the cycle. Here we employ the term "intentionality" for the parameters unmarked by the composer but inseparable from the entirety of the cycle. The glance of intentionality makes possible to frame a hypothesis that this method of notation practiced by the composer is an original economical quality of writing, therefore, a researcher's task should be only to guess the unmarked values of musical parameters.

There is no doubt that the multimovement entirety of the cycle cannot be imagined without proportions. Thus, a particular attention should be paid to the establishment of the correct tempos of individual movements.

Let us have a look at the references of tempos fixed by the editors of the composer's works. For the sake of thoroughness, the below-presented scheme also shows the metres and keys of the works (Scheme No 9):

Scheme No 9

Movements of the cycle	Tempos (VLKF)	Tempos (JČKF)	Metres	Keys
I (VL 309)	<i>Andante espressivo</i>	<i>Andante espressivo</i> M.M. ♩ = 76	4/4	Dm
II (VL 312)	<i>Allegro risoluto</i>	<i>Presto</i> M.M. ♩ = 112–116	4/4	Am
III (VL 310)	<i>Andante</i>	<i>Andante</i> M.M. ♩ = 77–86	4/4	Gm
IV (VL 311)	<i>Molto agitato</i>	<i>Molto agitato</i> M.M. ♩ = 66–69	8/2	Am
V (VL 313)	<i>Tempestoso</i>	<i>Con brio</i> M.M. ♩ = 82	3/4	Bm
VI (VL 309)	(I)	(I)	(I)	(I)

The scheme witnesses that the tempos marked by J. Čiurlionytė (JČKF) and V. Landsbergis (VLKF) only slightly differ (II: *Presto* or *Allegro risoluto*; *Con brio* or *Tempestoso*). The musicologists "contrived" these and other tempos of the works at their own discretion on the basis of the autonomy of each work, i.e. independence from the cyclic system. Considering every work as a potential movement of the cycle, a problem concerning proportions of the cycle arises and requires intentional motives for the counterbalance of the cycle. As we have noticed, the golden section proportion is particularly characteristic of separate parts of the cycle. It is therefore reasonable to think that the whole cycle should be also marked by an analogous golden section, because a proportional integrity of the cycle usually displays itself by way of an organic interrelation between the whole and part.

The structural analysis disclosed that the cycle's recapitulation coincides with the beginning of movement V. The emergence of recapitulations is usually linked with the principal proportions of the work, therefore, in case of the cycle in question it is logical to base oneself on this motive. A proportionality motive of the cycle makes possible to slightly make the tempos marked by the editors more exact in order to keep proper proportions of the cycle and reach a break of the cyclic form, i.e. the section of the golden proportion (GS).

Here we present one of the models showing possible tempos of the cycle's movements (Scheme No 10):

Scheme No 10

Movement of the cycle:	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Number of measures:	19	13	26	27	42	(I)
Metres:	4/4	4/4	4/4	8/2	3/4	(I)
Total:	76	52	104	216	126	(I)
M.M. ♩:	66	132	66	160	84	(I)
Duration time-value:	= 1,151	= 0,3963	= 1,575	= 1,350	= 1,500	(= 1,151)

The duration time-value of the whole cycle and the golden section: $7.120 \times 6,18 = 4,400$ (here 0,618 – coefficient of proportionality). The received value – 4,400 practically equals the duration time-value of the golden section coinciding with the recapitulation of the cycle – 4,469 (I + II + III + IV, i.e. $1,15 + 0,393 + 1,575 + 1,350$).

The establishment of the optimal tempos of the movements opens a possibility to appreciate a proportional equilibrium between the two final movements (movement V is not marked by an independent golden section). Therefore, $V (1,500) + VI (1,515) = 2,651 \times 0,618 = 1,638$. The received duration time-value is close enough to the culminating zone of the recapitulation, i.e. V, m. 40 (here one should also have in mind a possible slackened transition of last two measures to the final movement of the cycle).

The establishment of the proportions of the cycle enables one to intentionally cast a glance at possible values of other musical parameters. There is every reason to believe that the composer, leaving a great many other musical parameters without notational signs, synchronized the latter with the leading ones such as the harmonic-key plan and proportions. Incidentally, the proportions of the cycle also seem to be intentionally linked with the supposed incompleteness of the movements of the cycle. It is witnessed by the golden sections of the latter.

The key and tempo plan of the cycle give a possibility to appreciate each of the movements on the most general scale in respect of their dynamics and even articulation. The rapid, impetuous tempos induce one to think about a synchronically displaying itself growth of the intensity of the work and compare it with its slow and less dynamically unfolded movements. The following reference scheme can prove useful here (Scheme No 11):

Scheme No 11

Movements of cycle:	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Dynamics:	<i>p</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>p</i>

This generalizing scheme of dynamics is acceptable to intentionally initiate the basic strokes and characters of individual movements of the cycle. However, a detailed realization of the scheme depends on an individual discretion of the performers of the cycle.

Identification of the Cycle

An attempt to identify Čiurlionis' five works under investigation as an integral cycle necessitates to turn back to certain known cyclic form models. The analogies of the supposed cycle and its regularities with the known cycles of tonal music – classical complete sonata-form and romantic suite-form – can undoubtedly help to make the identity of the boundaries of the work more exact and define it.

One of the most significant criteria witnessing a cyclic character of tonal music – the key plan of the cycle's movements. The functional logic of the key plan usually structures the architecture of the entirety of the cycle.

It is noteworthy that the key plan of the movements seems to echo the most general regularities of the tonal composition and the cycle (Scheme No 12):

Scheme No 12

Movements of cycle:	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Keys:	<u>Dm</u>	<u>Am</u>	<u>Gm</u>	<u>Am</u>	<u>Bm</u>	<u>Dm</u>
Division of cyclic form:	Eksposition		Development		Recapitulation	

Here we can see a dominant relationship between the keys traditional to expositions (particularly characteristic of the sonata-form), which is peculiar to movements I and II (d-a). The development separates itself from the exposition through a common subdominant key function (III:Gm), whereas the second half of the development clearly reminds of a dominant preitus function (IV:a). Eventually, the keys of movements V and VI slightly modify a recapitulation stereotype of their integral key (V-VI: B-flat m-Dm). In this case, however, one finds easy to notice an additional function of a coda – the development related to movement V, which is marked by the augmented 6th degree key (thus a subdominant in a wider sense) in respect of the basic one (i.e. Bm).

It is, therefore, self-evident that the scheme of the keys of the movements of the cycle articulate divisions of sonata-form by means of a rather typical relationship (on condition that it is carried out not on an integral but cyclic form scale). Thus, it follows that each functional sonata-form

section, for example, movement I echoes the principal theme, movement II – subordinate, movements III and IV – the development and its preitxus, and movement V and VI – recapitulation – coda.

The presented most general cyclic form scheme is also supported by its thematic – intonational outline, which has been pointed out earlier. Let us compare the cores of the initial thematic intonations of the largest divisions of the cycle (Scheme No 13):

Scheme No 13

Division of cyclic form:	Eksposition	Development	Recapitulation	
Nucleus of intonation:	O (A-B-flat-f-e)	I (E-flat-D-G-A)	RI (G-A-flat-G-F-sharp)	

It is evident that the two final movements of the cycle are not only inverse to the two initial ones in respect of their key relationships (I–II: T–D, V–VI: S–T) but also the thematic one (O and RI, exposition and recapitulation).

Another, no less significant, cyclic form criterion is the representation of one of the movements in sonata form. A conventional sonata form between the movements of the cycle cannot be noticed, but the two middle movements can be most likely perceived as a sonata-form subcycle. Its essence – a transfer of the sonata-form development episode to the next movement. In this way movement III would coincide with an abridged sonata form with the exposition and recapitulation, but without development. In its turn, the lack of the development is compensated by an independent movement IV. The abridged sonata form (III) of the subcycle is first of all substantiated by the distribution of the keys (Scheme No 14):

Scheme No 14

The III movement of cycle

Sonata-form sections:	Eksposition		Recapitulation	
Themes (principal, subordinate):	PT	ST	ST	PT
Keys:	Gm	C	G	Cm
Measures:	1	10	18	24

Here one can easily notice the so-called "mirror" recapitulation at least in respect of major and minor key relationships. However, the sonata form is also articulated by thematics. The melody of the principal theme is mostly marked by falling chromatic slides (m. 1–14), whereas the marginal top voice of subordinate theme is continuously rising to the culmination by means of wide intervals. The melodies of both themes embrace (and even overstep) a two-octave range. In the second half of the subordinate theme (from m. 13) one can see a developmental passage usual on the exposition scale. Here the direction of the keys undergoing assimilation is typical of the principal theme (see falling sequential chains). The passage ends, as one could have hoped, in the climax in the dominant key (D minor, m. 17). The latter prepares a recapitulation.

The lacking section of the sonata-form development, as mentioned before, is compensated by movement IV. Differently from the ostinato formula of movement III, which expressed the intonation of the cycle I, now the ostinato expresses O, besides, in its two different shapes – in very widely separated (B-C-sharp and D-C-sharp) and particularly compact (A-B and C-B, Ex. 1; IV O) seconds. It is an additional argument dividing the beginning of the cycle from its development not only in respect of the key (Gm and Am) but also thematic intonations (I and O).

It goes without saying that one can ask why the composer decided to segment sonata-form parts into a subcycle movements. Did he want to make the cycle compact and intensive? The synchronization of the development episode of the subcycle (coincides with IV) with the development phase of the entire cycle's system enabled him to avoid possible recurrences of functional divisions in favour of the whole of the cycle.

The idea of synchronic superposition of the divisions (mega-macro) seems to be more convincing having in mind the peculiarities of the realized recapitulation on the scale of the cycle. The second section of movement V seems to continue the previous development (IV). In consideration

that a minor is the culminating key of the development (IV, whereas the second section of this movement is in E minor), then the episode in D major section of movement V proves to be useful in respect of the key as an additional second development, because, as it is usually characteristic of codas, here the function of the subdominant key marks itself.

The following scheme illustrates how the development marks itself both on the scale of the cycle and the subcycle (Scheme No 15):

Scheme No 15

Development profil of cycle: Episodes and functions: Keys:	Movement III Phase 1 Gm	Movement IV sections I, II Phase 2 Am, Em	Movement V sections I Phase 3 D
Developmental profil of the subcycle and the functions of form: Keys:	Movement III Exposition and recapitulation Gm, G	Movement IV section I Development Am	

It follows that the composer besides employing sonata-form between the movements of the cycle also segmented it, composing a subcycle on a smaller scale.

The central position of the subcycle in the whole system of the cycle expresses the latter as a certain axis orienting to the pairs of marginal movements through concentric symmetry. In this way, the known regularity of the cyclic form is originally solved, when individual movements reflect the whole cycle, i.e. macro – is innerly based at a mega-level.

The carried out identifications make possible to state that Čiurlionis' works in question principally make up a musical cycle which has been not studied and noticed. Its whole structure can be briefly characterized as follows: a concentrically oriented sonata-form structure whose individual functional divisions are represented by separate movements of the cycle. Besides, the representation of the cycle is materialized at two levels – as a sonata-form cycle (I–VI) and a sonata-form subcycle (III–IV)⁴.

Conclusions

The main conclusion of the research is as follows: M. K. Čiurlionis' five works written in Druskininkai and Warsaw in 1907 (VL 309–313) form a spontaneous musical cycle untitled by the composer and unnoticed by musicologists. It is reasonable to call this multimovement work as an unrecognized cycle.

Probability features, witnessing the cyclic character of the works, manifest themselves by consequent dates of autographs and their positions in the manuscript book.

All the works belonging to the cycle are united by a two-directional intonation at seconds, displaying itself in different shapes (O, I, R, RI, M).

The sequence of the movements is regulated by the key plan and the ends of formally unfinished works.

The key plan of the cycle resounds the relationship of the inner keys of separate movements. The latter are particularly developed in the middle movements of the cycle (III–IV). Both movements are united and separated by the key chains of the relationships of the thirds. The inversion of the key chains cycles, the alternated directions of intervals and the transformation of modes, which displayed themselves in the mentioned movements of the cycle, turn them into central in respect of the concentric whole of the cycle.

Of supreme importance for the establishment of musical parameters – tempos, dynamics and articulation – unmarked by the composer are intentional proportions of the cycle. The establishment both of individual movements and the golden section of the whole cycle makes possible to motivate the alternation of the slow and rapid, the intensive and moderate movements of the cycle.

The key plan of the movements, which is close to sonata-form key relationships, is particularly important for the identification of the cyclic form. Due to the mentioned relationships, the

functions of the cyclic form become distinct: exposition (I–II), development (III–IV) and recapitulation (V–VI). These functions are also supported by a thematic-intonational outline of the cycle.

The sonata-form, resounding a cyclic form criteria, was used between the movements of the cycle, however, it was realized segmentally between two middle movements, forming a sonata-form subcycle at a lower level.

Hence, the cyclic form of the work is principally a concentrically oriented sonata form whose inner divisions are realized through individual movements of the cycle.

Abbreviations

- JČKF – Čiurlionis M. K. *Kūriniai fortepijonui* (Works for piano, ed. by J. Čiurlionytė). Vilnius: Vaga, 1957.
 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.
 DK – M. K. Čiurlionis. *Muzika. Katalogas* (Music. Catalogue, ed. by D. Kučinskas). Kaunas: Technologija, 2006.
 KJŽ – Čiurlionytė-Karužienė V., Juodis S. E., Žukas V. *Mikalojus Konstantinas Čiurlionis. Bibliografija* (Bibliography). Vilnius: Vaga, 1970.
 Čm – The list of M. K. Čiurlionis' autographs introduced in the State M. K. Čiurlionis Museum of Arts since 1990th.

References

- ¹ Landsbergis V. *Čiurlionio muzika*, Vilnius, 1986, p. 117; Kučinskas D. *M. K. Čiurlionio fortepijoninės muzikos tekstas (Genezės aspektas)*. [The text of M. K. Čiurlionis' piano music (Genesis' aspect)] Abstract of Doct. Diss. Vilnius, 2002, p. 13, 21.
² DK, p. 8.
³ See for more: Janeliauskas R. Unrecognized M. K. Čiurlionis' cycles for piano (1907 07, Druskininkai). Principles of Music Composing. Aspects of Historical Dispersion. IV. Vilnius, 2004.
⁴ For the notes see: VLKF or JČKF.

Santrauka

M. K. Čiurlionio Neatpažintas ciklas (1907, Druskininkai–Varšuva)

Didžiajam lietuvių kompozitoriui M. K. Čiurlioniui būdingas cikliškas mąstymas – tai matome iš daugybės jo paveikslų ciklų. Tačiau palyginti gausioje fortepijoninėje kūryboje cikliškumo nuorodų nedaug. Į akis krinta kūrinių pavadinimų stoka, tariamas jų neišbaigtumas. Tokia kūrybos maniera – nepažymėti, neužbaigti kūrinių – labai primena spontanišką kūrybos būdą, tai atspindi ir jo kūrinių datų „pliūpsniai“, „išmėtyti“ autografa.

Šio tyrimo objektas – 5 kūriniai fortepijonui, sukurti 1907 m. vasarą ir rudenį Druskininkuose bei Varšuvoje (VL 309–313).

Susipažinus su rankraščio autografų išdėstymu, galima teigti, kad ciklo kūrinių seka negali būti pagrįsta kūrinių chronologija. Tačiau chronologinis tyrimas leidžia išvelgti tam tikrą numanomo ciklo tikimybę. Visų pirma tai rodo paties kompozitoriaus atliktas kūrinių datavimas, apimantis net keturis iš penkių numanomo ciklo kūrinių. O rankraščių knyga padeda spręsti apie nedatuoto kūrinių (V) vietą ir jo galimą priklausymą ciklui.

Regis, pats akivaizdžiausias struktūrinis visų ciklo dalių bendrumas pasireiškia dvikrypte (kylančia ir krintančia) sekundų intonacija. Vieną sekundą nuo kitos gali skirti siauresnis arba platesnis intervalas (1 pvz.). Pirmojoje dalyje (I) šios intonacijos iš pradžių skamba vienu metu melodijoje ir bose (čia pažymimi jų pavidalai: originalas – O ir inversija – I). Vidurinėse ciklo dalyse (II ir III) panašios intonacijos taip pat pastebimos nuo pat pradžių melodijoje (II O) ir bose (III I). Kiek kitaip jos pasireiškia ketvirtojoje dalyje. Ten melodizuotas originalas skamba bose (IV:O), o penktojoje dalyje ši intonacija retrogradiniu pavidalu įausta į melodiją (V:R). Be to, rasime ir mišrų intonacijos pavidalą (M).

Ciklo dalių sekos kriterijus – tonacinis planas, kurio narių slinkti labiausiai motyvuoja tariamai neužbaigtų kūrinių (III–V) pabaigos. Pastarosioms būdinga vedamųjų arba pustoninių fenomenų trauka į būsimosios dalies toniką arba jos pirmąjį akordą. Remdamiesi tariamai neužbaigtų kūrinių traukos analogija, galime numanyti būtiną I dalies pakartojimą ciklo pabaigoje.

Taigi tonacinis planas pasižymi tam tikrais cikliškuoju požymiais. Pirmosios dvi dalys santykinai alternatyviu tonikinės ir dominantinės tonacijų santykiu, būdingu sonatų ekspozicijoms. Kitos dvi dalys (III ir IV) pasižymi plėtros padalai būdingomis tonacijų funkcijomis. Kaip įprasta, plėtra prasideda subdominantės tonacija (tai atlieptą III dalies *g-moll*), o baigiasi dominantiniu preiktu (IV dalies *a-moll*). Reprizinė ciklo fazė (V–VI) modifikuoja dominantinį pirmųjų dviejų tonacijų santykį į subdominantinį.

Kaip rodo struktūrinė analizė, ciklo repriza sutampa su V dalies pradžia. Reprizų pasirodymas paprastai siejamas su principinėmis kūrinio proporcijomis, tad ir analizuojamo ciklo atveju logiška remtis šiuo motyvu.

Ciklo proporcijų nustatymas leidžia intencionaliai pažvelgti į galimas kitų muzikos parametru reikšmes. Logiška manyti, kad kompozitorius, nepažymėdamas daugelio kitų muzikos parametru, juos sinchronizavo su vedančiaisiais (harmoniniu-tonaciniu planu, proporcijomis). Beje, ciklo proporcijos, regis, taip pat intencionaliai susietos su ciklo dalių tariamu neužbaigtumu. Tai patvirtina pastarųjų „aukso pjūviai“.

Kitu nemažiau reikšmingu ciklinės formos kriterijumi pripažįstamas vienos iš ciklo dalių reprezentavimas sonatos forma. Įprastos sonatos formos ciklo dalyse nematome, tačiau dvi vidurinės ciklo dalys gali būti suvokiamos kaip sonatos formos subciklas. Jo esmę sudaro sonatos formos plėtros epizodo nukėlimas į tolesnę dalį. Tokiu būdu III ciklo dalis sutaptų su sutrumpinta sonatos forma (tik su ekspozicija ir repriza), tačiau be plėtros. O plėtros epizodo stoka kompensuojama savarankiška IV dalimi. Subciklo sutrumpintą sonatos formą (III) pirmiausia pagrindžia tonacijų išsidėstymas.

Išėitų, kad kompozitorius ne tik panaudojo tarp ciklo dalių sonatos formą, bet ją susegmentavo, sudarydamas mažesnio lygmens subciklą.

Centrinė subciklo padėtis viso ciklo sistemoje įprasmina pastarąjį kaip tam tikrą ašį, koncentrinės simetrijos būdu orientuojančią į kraštinių dalių poras. Tokiu būdu savitai išsprendžiamas žinomas ciklinės formos dėsningumas, kai atskiros dalys atspindi visą ciklą, t. y. megalygmeniu pagrindžiamas makrolygmuo.

Pagrindinė tyrimo išvada: penki M. K. Čiurlionio kūriniai fortepijonui, sukurti 1907 m. Druskininkuose ir Varšuvoje (VL 309–313), yra kompozitoriaus neįvardytas ir muzikologų nepastebėtas spontaniškas muzikos ciklas. Šį daugiadalį kūrinių tiktų vadinti Neatpažintu ciklu.