Agata Krawczyk

Differences and Similarities in Approach to Teleology in Symphony No. 1 and Symphony No. 3 by Hanna Kulenty

Abstract. In the binary distinction between *a composition as a state* versus *a composition as a process*, the works of Kulenty may generally be classified as the latter. However, the musical language of Kulenty since her debut in the eighties has been evolving, developing and undergoing various modifications that have been affecting also the composer's approach to teleology. The dates of creation of the two works presented in the following paper, Symphony No. 1 and Symphony No. 3, are separated by 12–14 years, and therefore fall under two different periods in Kulenty's artistic evolution. Symphony No. 1 is one of the pieces of the early period and is an example of Kulenty's predominant teleological strategy at the time. It is based on an individual technique named by the composer herself as "the polyphony of arcs", the stylistic results of the technique being constant tension, high level of dramatic expression and continuous forward movement in pursuit of the culmination. Symphony No. 3 was composed in the middle period, the style of which the composer herself called "European trance music." Kulenty's style of that time includes a turn towards stasis and repetitiveness, derived from Eastern and minimalistic influences. The following paper's objective is to determine the degree of difference and resemblance exemplified by those two symphonies in terms of approach to teleology. The theoretical framework for this research is 1) the concepts of Jonathan D. Kramer (1988) and Dorota Krawczyk (2007), however, it should be pointed out, that it is Kramer's view, with its emphasis on the coexistence of linearity and nonlinearity (as opposed to Krawczyk's clear distinction between "process-compositions" and "state-compositions") that is particularly adequate for the analysis of Kulenty's music.

Keywords: teleology, Hanna Kulenty, symphony, linearity, nonlinearity, process.

1. Introduction

Hanna Kulenty, a Polish composer born in 1961, is considered one of the most interesting artistic personalities among the composers of her generation. Having debuted in the second half of the 1980s, she instantly gained recognition not only in Poland but also abroad. Since then, she has built a very successful artistic career. Her compositions have been performed at numerous concerts and festivals, mostly in Poland and in the Netherlands, which are the two countries considered by the composer as her home, but also in other European countries, as well as in the USA and Australia. Her musical language is considered strongly individualistic and its most recognizable characteristics are the pervasiveness of strong dramatic tension, the "sharpness" or "coarseness" of orchestral timbres (especially in the early works), often due to the use of tone-clusters, the density of multi-layered texture and the repetitiveness of rhythm.

As is the case of virtually every composer, the music of Kulenty is not homogenous in terms of style and compositional techniques, and it has been evolving throughout the years since the composer's debut in the eighties. This evolution has impacted also a change in the teleological aspect of the discussed compositions. Two compositions that are discussed in this paper—Symphony No. 1 (1998) and Symphony No. 3 (1998–2000)—represent two different periods of Kulenty's artistic evolution. This paper explores these two symphonies in terms of their differences, resulting from this stylistic change, and similarities, stemming from their common idiomatic ground.

2. The style and compositional techniques in Symphony No. 1 and Symphony No. 3

There are three distinct phases in the evolution of Kulenty's style and compositional technique:
1) early phase—ca. 1984 to 1993–1994—"polyphony of arcs";
2) middle phase—ca. 1993–1994 to 2001—"trance in European music";
3) late phase–after 2001—"polyphony of time dimensions" (Trochimczyk 2003)[1].

Thus, Symphony No. 1 belongs to the early period, while Symphony No. 3 is one of the final works of the middle period.

It is significant that this periodization, as well as the terms applying to each phase, is proposed by the composer herself. Kulenty belongs to those artists who have formulated a comprehensive reflection upon their work. Since the very beginning, she has developed a strong interest in the issue of time and parallel temporalities. As a result, the polyphony of arcs technique was born. The technique is based on the superimposition of

---

[1] Since 2016, Kulenty has been using a new term for her music—*musique surrealistique*; however, it is still too soon to tell whether or not this should be considered the beginning of a new phase.

several arcs, which are distributed within a multi-layered texture and each of them is developing separately and independently.

An arc is a "structure of emotions", in Kulenty's own words, and it is constructed in such a way that it might, at least in theory, have the potential to constitute an independent musical piece (Kulenty 1992: 24). It should be thus understood rather as a layer developing in parallel to other simultaneous layers, than as a separate formal unit being a part of sequential order, however, a succession of arcs is also possible. The arcs may begin (or end) at any point of their trajectory and proceed at various paces (Trochimczyk 2003). The overlapping and the superimposing of arcs, with their climaxes occurring non-synchronously, cause the effect of a "permanent culmination", as explained in the following description of the technique provided by Dorota Szwarcman (Szwarcman 2007: 83):

> … each consecutive arc is beginning while the previous one has not decreased yet, various events are overlapping, and, since what is the most perceptible are the climaxes, the listener may get the impression that the piece is a continuous, uninterrupted culmination[2].

In its middle phase, Kulenty's musical language evolved in what the composer called "trance in European music" or just "trance music". The seeds of "trance" aesthetics had been present already in early compositions, those that were based on polyphony of arcs.

The following questions served as a starting point for the new stylistic phase: what would happen if the multiplicity of layers were left behind, and what remained as a focus were just one, two, three arcs expanded to the limits of perception? The exploration of this idea resulted in a significant textural simplification, reduction of the number of layers, and therefore, the reduction of the number of arcs. One of the characteristics of Kulenty's music in its middle phase is the rhythm based on ostinato pulsations, meant to put the audience into trance and to cause a cathartic effect. It is mostly this kind of rhythm that is the reason Kulenty's music is sometimes considered post-minimalist. However, those minimalist elements are not traced to American minimalists, but rather to the music of some non-European cultures, especially Indian and African music (Trochimczyk 2003; Kulenty 2000: 8).

Despite the ostensible stasis, the music of Kulenty, created in the middle phase, has still retained a relatively high extent of dramatic expression, which seems to be an idiomatic characteristic of her musical language, regardless of a particular phase, or technical details.

Discussing her style during this phase, Kulenty noted,

> My pieces are now simpler in structure, more "ear-friendly" and suspenseful. I have always had this objective of creating an impression of trance through my music. I think that now, after many years of experiments, I have achieved that goal (Kulenty 2000: 8)[3].

3. Composition as a process versus composition as state

Dorota Krawczyk (2007), classified Kulenty among composers, whose works represent what the author calls a *composition as a process*, as opposed to a *composition as a state*[4]. Krawczyk's study develops the idea of opposition to those two types of musical temporalities.

The author defines a *process–composition* as

> a situation in which the subsequent phases of the composition, due to the specific construction of the music matter (events) build the dramaturgy of the piece (action) which is characterized by a clear time-frame set by the beginning and the end of the composition (striving) (Krawczyk 2007: 69)[5].

---

[2] "… kolejny łuk rozpoczyna się w momencie, gdy jeszcze nie opadł poprzedni, różne zdarzenia nakładają się na siebie, a ponieważ kulminacje są najbardziej zauważalne, słuchacz może odnosić wrażenie, że utwór jest jedną ciągłą nieprzewaną kulminacją." Translated by Agata Krawczyk. See also notes 3 and 5 etc.

[3] "Moje utwory są teraz prostsze w strukturze, bardziej «dla ucha» i trzymające w napięciu. Celem, jaki zawsze sobie stawiałam, było stworzenie poprzez muzykę wrażenia transu. Sądzę, że po wielu latach eksperymentów udało mi się to osiągnąć." Translated by Agata Krawczyk.

[4] As those literal translations of the original Polish terms *kompozycja jako proces* and *kompozycja jako stan* don't sound equally smooth in translation, synonymic variants of the terms: *a process-composition* and a *state-composition* will be used interchangeably.

[5] "Kompozycja-proces jest wielofazowa, zaś kolejne fazy „poprzez określoną konstrukcję materii dźwiękowej (zdarzenia) budują sens dramaturgiczny dzieła (akcja) o wyraźnych ramach czasowych wyznaczonych przez początek i koniec kompozycji (dążenie)." Translated by Agata Krawczyk.

A specific feature of *process–compositions* according to the author, are the phases following each other consecutively, one leading to another in terms of musical logic and dramaticism:

The melodies, the themes, the notes are sounding because they have come into being, they have emerged from non-existence—therefore they have appeared from the future. But as soon as they become a being, they go by, leaving the scene of the present and giving way to new melodies, new themes, new notes (ibid.: 70)[6].

Although one may argue that this characteristic may apply to nearly all Western music, from the earliest historical periods to the present times, it should be considered that the author uses this term in a particular circumstance, namely in reference to specific styles, techniques and individual idioms that are present in the output of some 20th-century composers. The purpose is to distinguish them from the tendencies of the opposite nature (such as attempts at the disruption of linearity or even avoidance of linearity), which became a significant part of artistic experiments and explorations in the music of the 20th century.

On the contrary, a *state–composition* is defined as a

… Situation, in which the repetitiveness (circularity) of the musical material is constituting an un-dramatized, lasting existence, through an act of contemplation evoking the feeling of timeless being (122)[7].

While experiencing this kind of music, the listener does not feel any kind of striving towards a goal. The point of a *state–composition* is not a pursuit of a goal, but "just being for us and in us" (122). This kind of music is "conflict-less, non-dialectic, un-dramatized and non-teleological":

This kind of music is unfamiliar with any relationship with time whatsoever – neither conflict nor compatibility. This music is ungrateful, so to speak, as being born from time, it kind of ignores it. However, this is an illusion … As a matter of fact, this music does not negate the time, it just discovers another truth about it—it denies the linearity, finiteness and tripartite structure of time, whereas it defines time as an eternal present (155)[8].

Interchangeably with the terms a *process–composition* and a *state–composition*, some other expressions are used by the author. A *process–composition* may also be referred to as *processual music* or *progressive music*, while a *state–composition* is related to a *periodic* or *circular* concept of time and may also be called *circular music*.

The differences between those two types of music may be considered in several aspects: form, material, structure, energy, movement and perception (see Table 1).

	Composition as a process	**Composition as a state**
Form	closure fulfillment defined timeframe (beginning and ending) irreversible internal order	open internal structure superficial role of the beginning and the ending
Material	variability multiplicity diversity	homogeneity or limited diversity
Structure	variation transformations contrast	repetitiveness reprise limited contrast
Energy	increasing – culmination – fading out	lack of tension homogeneity
Movement	motion event process	lack of events or processes
Perception	memory expectation passing	liberation from the forms of time consciousness (memory, expectation, passing) contemplativeness

Table 1. The characteristics of *a composition as a process* and *a composition as a state*

---

6 "Melodie, tematy, dźwięki, rozbrzmiewają dlatego, że powstały, że wyłoniły się z niebytu, przyszły – a więc zjawiły się z przyszłości. Lecz zaledwie stały się bytem przechodzą, schodzą ze sceny teraźniejszości, ustępując miejsca nowym melodiom, nowym tematom, nowym dźwiękom." Translated by Agata Krawczyk.

7 "sytuacja, w której powtarzalność (kolistość) materiału muzycznego konstytuuje od dramatyzowane trwanie, wywołując w akcie jego kontemplacji poczucie bezczasowego istnienia". Translated by Agata Krawczyk.

8 "Takiej muzyce obcy jest w ogóle jakikolwiek stosunek do czasu – walka, czy zgodność. Jest – można by powiedzieć – niewdzięczna, bowiem będąc z czasu zrodzoną, jakby go wcale nie zauważa. Lecz złudny to pogląd […]. W rzeczywistości muzyka ta nie neguje czasu, lecz odkrywa inną prawdę o nim – zaprzecza jego linearności, skończoności i trójdzielności, a mówi, że jest on wieczną teraźniejszością." Translated by Agata Krawczyk.

The distinction between a *composition as a process* and a *composition as a state* bears some resemblance to the concept of Jonathan D. Kramer and his classification of musical time built around the question of linearity and nonlinearity. However, according to Kramer, the term process should not be identified only with linearity; he points out one specific kind of music maintaining nonlinear time (namely vertical time), which is based on process and therefore tends to be considered linear. This kind of ostensible linearity can be found in minimal music (Kramer 1988: 55).

As Kramer has strongly emphasized, although the term nonlinearity seems to be a direct opposition to linearity these two terms do not negate each other. According to Kramer, nonlinearity should not be understood just as a "lack of linearity", since it is an independent constructional force, operating on its premises and being capable—just like linearity—of generating its own rules and tendencies. Therefore, there is a difference between the ideas of Kramer and Dorota Krawczyk as to how their typologies function in musical works. Kramer states that linearity and nonlinearity coexist in every musical piece to different extents, in different ways and different proportions. Krawczyk, on the other hand, tends to treat *processuality* and *circularity* as different concepts of music that hardly ever can be observed within the same piece and illustrates those concepts with examples from two different sets of composers, among which she also includes Hanna Kulenty.

And, while the classification of Kulenty's compositions under the category of processual music is well-founded, it does not cover all the subtleties of their teleological aspect, especially since the composer's approach to time and its perception has undergone some changes throughout the years of her artistic evolution. It should not be overlooked that not only linearity but also nonlinearity has a significant impact on the teleological aspect of Kulenty's works, especially those from the middle phase. Therefore, Kramer's approach, with its emphasis on the coexistence of linearity and nonlinearity within one musical work provides an adequate framework for the analysis of Kulenty's music.

4. *Processual* versus *circular* in Symphony No. 1 and Symphony No. 3

In Symphony No. 1, just like in other compositions of Kulenty from the early period, the succession of increase, climax and decrease, regarding any musical parameter (sometimes without the phase of decrease, or instead without the phase of increase) is the basic structural unit. The overall impression projected by this music is one of an uninterrupted continuum, with no internal sections. Internal divisions are observable only on the level of macro-form and perceived as phases rather than sections, as they evolve smoothly from one to another (as opposed to the succession of separate entities). The boundaries of subsequent phases tend to blur, as what often seems to be the ending of one phase serves as the beginning of the next phase. This kind of "chain" approach to relations within the musical form has a strong impact on the sense of linearity. Although there is no doubt that this music "feels" linear, the goals towards which the music is proceeding are difficult to determine. This difficulty is due to the fact that, as observed by Kramer (Kramer 1988: 33–40), the concept of goal is related mostly to cadences—even if those cadences were contextual, rather than a harmonic construct. The lack of cadences and closure at the end of structural units results in the "loss" of the sense of goal arrival, even if the preceding musical processes imply the existence of a goal.

What strongly suggests that Symphony No. 1 belongs to the type of *process–composition* in terms of musical form, is a clearly defined timeframe. The beginning and the ending of the piece are strongly emphasized, the former through a high level of energy as if the piece was starting from a culmination (a typical feature of early works of Kulenty), the latter by the long fade-out phase. The other characteristics of a *process–composition*, like closure and goal arrival, are weakened by the lack of cadences and ambiguity of borders of structural units, however, they are still present to some extent due to several clearly outlined global culminations.

The internal structure within the phases, as a result of the superimposition of multiple asynchronous layers, tends to be ambiguous. The layers, coexisting within a specific phase, are spread over wide time spans, and their structure shows little to no subdivisions. Therefore, within the phases, a tendency to uniformity is observable. There are no gestures, no distinct motifs, no internal structure, just the endless continua, proceeding each at their own pace. As the layers' beginnings and endings are asynchronous, on this micro-formal level, the internal structure becomes more obscure, and the sense of fulfillment/closure more difficult to perceive. The diversity of musical material within a specific layer and the timeframe of a

specific phase are strictly limited. Although the coexistence of multiple contrasting types of material is not excluded, it occurs in the vertical dimension, that is, between different simultaneous layers. However, what prevails inside one layer is mostly homogeneity and repetitiveness, although, not without some level of variability or transformation. Then, it may be concluded that, in this work, the characteristics of the *processual music* and the *circular music* are well-balanced in terms of the musical material.

In the absence of phrases and their potential relationships, including some kind of cadences, it is the organization of material in its contextual parameters that becomes the carrier of linearity and processuality. The sense of directionality, development and progress is achieved by organizing various musical parameters including pitch, rhythm, loudness and tempo through what I propose to call a "gradual process".

A very simple example of a gradual process regarding the pitch is a melodic movement based on an ascending (or descending) scale. As noted by Kramer (1988: 173), a stepwise melodic movement is an important means of linear progression, especially in non-tonal compositions that are lacking a goal-oriented harmony. It provides a sense of progress and direction, even if the ultimate goal is yet unknown.

The gradual way of organization may nevertheless concern not only the pitch but also other musical parameters, like loudness or rhythm or tempo. If the changes applied to the parameter sustain the same direction (e.g. "louder and louder", "faster and faster" etc.), it provides the overall sense of directionality just as much as in the case of stepwise movement in melody.

The substantial role of this kind of organization in Symphony No. 1 results from the basic premise of the compositional technique found in this, as well as other Kulenty's early works: the features of the arc itself, both as a geometric shape and as a concept, involve the linear change. In Symphony No. 1, gradual processes concerning the pitch element assume the form of ascending or descending passages of several types:
 • based on the chromatic scale,
 • based on different, including composer's original, scales,
 • based on a microtonal scale,
 • based on glissandi.

Regarding the rhythmic aspect of the piece, the "value" prone to the gradual change is not a single duration, which would make the rhythmical structure almost impossible to recreate for the performers, but the density. The process involved is, therefore, one of the rhythmic "thickening" or "thinning."

As mentioned before, the lack of distinct rhythmical motifs, models or groups is typical of the rhythmical structure of Kulenty's music. Instead, the rhythm is based on ostinatos and repetitive pulsations. The irregular divisions—mostly triplets, quintuplets and sextuplets—create a wide range of densities that would provide steps for the gradual process.

The balance between the material's uniformity and variability is usually achieved by combining homogeneity for one parameter and a gradual processing for another parameter (for instance, a succession of thickening rhythmical densities performed on the same pitch, or an ascending melody with rhythm, based on a single-duration ostinato).

The third structural dimension, superimposed over pitch and rhythm, is dynamics. It is the parameter that plays a significant role in exposing linear features in the aspect of energy. The dynamics is one of the most important factors in creating tension, building up to a culmination and providing a fade-out afterward. The loudness changes in Symphony No. 1 are achieved both by detailed specifications of dynamic levels for each group of instruments and by the instrumentation factor, e.g. by a "textural crescendo" achieved by adding more and more instruments. Again, to create as many as possible "steps" for the gradual process, the orchestral instruments are treated almost as solo instruments, and with large use of divisi in the string section. Having the instruments joining in one by one allows to approximate full linearity much closer than adding whole groups. A typical use of this procedure is in cluster chords in the strings that are introduced gradually through the "textural crescendo" mentioned above, "filling in" up to a full cluster— also demonstrating how gradual processes may operate harmonically and timbrally.

The intriguing aspect of Symphony No. 1, as well as of some other works from the early period, is the aspect of tempo. Throughout the piece, several subsequent tempo changes are introduced (see Table 2).

Bars	Tempo (verbal instructions)	Tempo – MM (quarter-note related)	Direction of change (in relation to previous tempo)
t. 1–37	[no indication]	66	
t. 38–66	Più mosso	80	↑
t. 67–98	Più mosso	92	↑
t. 99–102	Meno mosso	80	↓
t. 103–118	Più mosso	96	↑
t. 119–160	Più mosso	108	↑
t. 161–190	Più mosso	126	↑
t. 191–199	Più mosso	132	↑
t. 200–217	Meno mosso	108	↓
t. 218–293	Più mosso	126	↑
t. 294–340	Più mosso	132	↑
t. 341–354	Meno mosso	66	↓
t. 355–383	Meno mosso	48	↓

Table 2. Distribution of tempo in Symphony No. 1

Those tempo changes are rather small; in most cases, the difference in metronome units (MM) is between 8 and 24. Perceptively, this would translate into the impression that the basic metric pulse is gradually thickening or thinning. The thickening or thinning of this primary, a tempo-related pulse may be viewed as another "temporal layer" superimposed over the thickening or thinning of the rhythmic pulsations.

At the same time, tempo fluctuations provide an ultimate, overall arc for the entire musical form. Although those fluctuations involve changes in both directions (from slower to a faster tempo as well as the opposite) and in detail, their succession may resemble a sine curve, an overall tendency, prevailing in the whole work, may also be observed: throughout the first half of the composition, the tempo is generally increasing, then having reached the climax, it experiences a temporary setback only to establish the climax again. After the second climax, the tempo drops down abruptly. However, the impact of this arc is blurred by the rhythmical pulsations in the foreground, which are disrupting its perception.

The tempo-governing processes are the most striking embodiment of teleological thinking in Symphony No. 1, as the goal of all this development is clearly defined: it occurs at a tempo of 132 MM, the fastest tempo used in the piece. The unambiguity of this goal is the result of the fact that the tempo is prevalent in all simultaneous layers. This arc-like model of tempo succession speaks to the irreversible order of the musical form, which is precisely a characteristic of *process*-compositions.

For the gradual processes operating within other musical parameters, the recognition of goals is not that simple. Despite what might be anticipated from the direction in which the process is going, the ending point does not always conform to the predictions. Goals may change in the making; what seemed to be a goal while a particular gradual process was unfolding, may eventually turn into a starting point for a new gradual process, especially if a different musical element takes over. Moreover, for many processes, a clear goal–moment never arrives.

This kind of linearity, with its ambiguity of goals and, at the same time, a clear sense of direction in which the music is proceeding, may be called, after Kramer, nondirected linearity (Kramer 1988: 46). This term signifies the absence of unequivocal and clearly perceptible goal–moments, but not the lack of direction during the process.

Symphony No. 3, composed in 1998–2000, consists of three movements (as opposed to Symphony No. 1, which is a single–movement composition). Its first movement, composed in 1998, was published separately and performed under the title Part One.

The clearest exemplification of the difference between this piece and the previously described Symphony No. 1 is the organization of tempo. While Symphony No. 1 contains a sequence of tempo changes, Symphony No. 3 displays a more traditional approach, where the tempo is constant within each movement. The only exception is the third movement, which involves a tempo change, however, the character of this change, from a slower tempo in the introductory phase to the actual, faster tempo is also well-rooted in musical tradition, even more specifically in symphonic tradition.

The stability of the primary, tempo-related pulsation showcases the general premise of this composition—simplicity. The fact, that the complex multi-layered structure has been avoided—or at the very least, strictly limited—has a great impact on the clarity in terms of structure and dramaticism, since it makes any fluctuations of dramatic tension much more perceptible and easier to follow.

Along with the simplification of texture comes the simplification of rhythm in the vertical dimension. Again, the abandonment of polyphony has significantly restricted the polyrhythmic tendencies. Once there is no need to differentiate simultaneous layers by their rhythmical qualities, the pulsation may serve a new purpose, which is putting the audience into a trance. The trance-evoking role of rhythm determines the rhythmical features in horizontal dimension—the repetitiveness within large timespans, the preference for ostinatos and the limited range of rhythmical durations in use, without duplets. It is particularly prominent in the middle movement, with its extreme extent of rhythmic simplicity and uniformity. It is wholly pervaded by homogeneous quarter-note pulsation. This characteristic positions this movement closest to the specifics of *a composition as a state*, even if not in regard to the whole form, then at least within some local timespans, especially those, where there is no melodic movement and the pitch organization is based on repetitions as well.

Although gradual processes have very little impact on rhythm, they still operate in melody to some extent, especially in the first part, where ascending and descending melodic passages still play an important role. Just like in Symphony No. 1, in Symphony No. 3 there are no motifs, no phrases or cadences. The structure of this music is based rather on the succession of continua, coming to life and passing without leaving a distinct image in the listener's memory. It is consistent with the aesthetics and the philosophy of trance, as the essence of this experience is a result of liberation from time consciousness and memory, and being only "here and now". The exception occurs in the last movement, where Kulenty utilizes a distinguishable motif with evident melodic qualities, although, still minimalistic in nature. The motif initializes a canon, which is gradually building up, leading to the culmination, thus representing the composer's linear approach to musical form.

Furthermore, the form of this symphonic cycle may be interpreted as a symptom of linear thinking. The three-movement structure involves tempo relations reminding those typical of the traditional fast-slow-fast model of the symphony. This kind of symphonic form demonstrates the characteristics of *process-compositions*—a clearly defined timeframe and irreversible internal order.

5. Differences and similarities between Symphonies No. 1 and No. 3 in terms of approach to teleology

The comparison of the two symphonies presented above leads to the conclusion that, as for their teleological aspect, both differences and similarities may be observed.

In Symphony No. 1 the gradual processes govern the construction of the composition, both on a general level and levels of micro-form, whereas in Symphony No. 3 the impact of gradual processes is limited, and dominance is given to trance-evoking repetitiveness, especially regarding rhythm. Therefore, if the typology of *a composition as a process* and *a composition as a state* were to be treated as a spectrum, Symphony No. 1 would be placed on this spectrum much closer to the former than Symphony No. 3. Symphony No. 3 displays some clear characteristics of the second type, *composition as state*—repetitiveness, a tendency to homogeneity, some moments of stasis.

As Symphony No. 1 is the one that is a product of a "culmination-oriented" technique, the next conclusion may seem a little bit ironic: due to multi-layered texture, the directions in which the music is proceeding and the placement of the goal–moments (if present at all) is sometimes unclear to the listener due to the dominance of, in Kramer's terms, nondirected linearity. On the other hand, in Symphony No. 3, any symptoms of striving towards a goal are very clearly noticeable due to the more transparent texture, in which a goal-oriented process may develop without the competition of other simultaneous processes. For that reason, the distribution of tensions throughout the piece feels much more defined.

Nevertheless, the teleological characteristics of those two symphonies are not completely different. Although more prone to stasis, Symphony No. 3 to some extent shows the linear, goal-oriented even, dramaturgy as well. On the other hand, an overall tendency to trance-evoking repetitiveness is also common to both symphonies. While in Symphony No. 3 the repetitiveness is rather apparent, in Symphony No. 1 it is hidden, concealed by the dominance of gradual processes and, therefore, linearity. But it still may be sought on another level. The constant motion constitutes an underlying stasis. In fact, Symphony No. 1 may be more static than one might predict from the premises of the polyphony of arcs technique.

This only proves that the juxtaposition of *a composition as a state* versus *a composition as a process* should be treated as a spectrum rather than as a binary opposition. The music of Hanna Kulenty is a perfect example of the problem described by Jonathan Kramer when linearity and nonlinearity coexist in one musical piece, and they both have a significant impact on its temporal structure.

References

Kramer, Jonathan D. (1988). *The Time of Music: New meanings, new temporalities, new listening strategies*. London: Gollier Macmillan Publishers, Schirmer Books.

Krawczyk, Dorota (2007). *Czas i muzyka: koncepcje czasu i ich wpływ na kształtowanie formy w muzyce współczesnej* [Time and Music: the time concepts and their form-shaping influences in the contemporary music]. Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza Łośgraf.

Kulenty, Hanna (1992). Hanna Kulenty About Her Writing Technique. In: *Polish Music*, No. 27/1–2: 22–25.

Kulenty, Hanna (2000). *Inspiruje mnie życie* [I am inspired by life]. Interviewed by Ewa Cichoń. In: *Kwarta*, No. 6: 7–8.

Kulenty, Hanna (2010). Muzyka jak schizofrenia [Music like schizophrenia]. Interviewed by Monika Pasiecznik. In: *Ruch Muzyczny*, No. 13: 28–29.

Szwarcman, Dorota (2007). *Czas Warszawskich Jesieni. O muzyce polskiej 1945–2007* [The Time of the Warsaw Autumn Festivals. On Polish Music from 1945 to 2007]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Stentor.

Trochimczyk, Maja (2003). *The music of Hanna Kulenty.* Accessed 10.11.2020 from https://www.hannakulenty.com/06.1_texts.html

Teleologinių sprendimų panašumai ir skirtumai
tarp Hannos Kulenty Simfonijos Nr. 1 ir Simfonijos Nr. 3

Santrauka

Hanna Kulenty (1961) – lenkų kompozitorė, laikoma viena iš unikaliausių savo kartos kompozitorių asmenybių. Jos karjera nuo pat debiuto 1980-ųjų antroje pusėje buvo itin sėkminga ir kompozitorė pelnė tarptautinį pripažinimą.

Dvi šiame straipsnyje aptariamos kompozicijos – Simfonija Nr. 1 ir Simfonija Nr. 2 – yra parašytos atitinkamai 1986 ir 1998–2000 metais. Jos reprezentuoja du skirtingus Kulenty kūrybinės raidos etapus. Per šiuos metus Kulenty kūryboje įvykę kompozicinių technikų, stilistinių ir estetinių prioritetų pokyčiai neaplenkė ir teleologinio aptariamų kompozicijų aspekto.

Simfonija Nr. 1 atspindi ankstyvąją Kulenty kūrybinės raidos fazę, kai kompozitorė ištobulino individualią komponavimo techniką, kurią pati vadina „arkų polifonija". Simfonija Nr. 3 iliustruoja raidos vidurinį periodą, tuomet kompozitorė pasinėrė į naują, pasak jos, „europietiškos transo muzikos" stilistiką.

Dorotos Krawczyk muzikinio laiko studijoje (2007) Kulenty muzika buvo įvardyta kaip *kompozicija kaip procesas* (priešpriešinant sąvokai *kompozicija kaip būsena*). Pagrindinė *kompozicijos kaip proceso* charakteristika – į tikslą nukreiptas progresyvumas, giminingas žmogiškam laiko tėkmės pojūčiui. *Kompozicija kaip būsena* yra apibūdinama kaip „neteleologiška, nedramaturgiška egzistencija", esanti „amžinoje dabartyje". Šios dichotomijos kontrastai turi nemažai panašumų su Johnathano D. Kramerio (1988) *linearumo* ir *nelinearumo* koncepcija.

Linearumo pojūtį Simfonijoje Nr. 1 užtikrina arkų polifonija, nes ši Kulenty technika yra paremta individualių muzikinių arkų sluoksniavimu. Nesant aiškių linearų koherentiškumą įprasminančių formos padalų, frazių struktūrų ar kadencijų, pagrindiniais linearumo „nešėjais" tampa aukštis, ritmas ir tempas. Linearumo pojūtį čia sukuria siaurų melodinių slinkčių, nuoseklaus ritminio tankio, garsumo ir kitų parametrų kaita.

Nepaisant visų *kompozicijai kaip procesui* būdingų charakteristikų, Simfonija Nr. 1 turi ir *kompozicijai kaip būsenai* būdingų savybių – repetityvumą ir ostinatinę ritminę struktūrą.

Simfonijoje Nr. 3 būtent melodijos ir ritmo repetityvumas yra pagrindiniai „transo" estetikos nešėjai. Paprastas ostinatinis ritmas sukelia sąstingio įspūdį, nors melodijoje yra ir tam tikrų nuoseklių procesų. Be to, tam tikrų linearaus mąstymo pėdsakų galime aptikti ir struktūriniame kūrinio lygmenyje.

Taigi šių dviejų simfonijų teleologijos turi ir panašumų, ir skirtumų. Abiejų kūrinių muzikinę struktūrą valdo tiek dinaminės, tiek statinės tendencijos. Skirtumus lemia tik tai, kokios apimties dinaminės (pasireiškiančios nuosekliais procesais) ar statinės (pasireiškiančios repetityvumu) jėgos veikia muzikoje. Taigi *kompozicijos kaip proceso* ir *kompozicijos kaip būsenos* supriešinimas turėtų būti traktuojamas kaip spektras, o ne kaip binarinė opozicija. Šiame spektre Simfonija Nr. 1 būtų arčiau pirmojo, o Simfonija Nr. 3 – arčiau antrojo kraštutinio taško. Ši išvada sutampa su Kramerio požiūriu, anot kurio, *linearumas* ir *nelinearumas* koegzistuoja viename muzikiniame kūrinyje, ir tiek vienas, tiek kitas daro reikšmingą įtaką jo struktūrai laike.