

some thoughts & questions on
Diverging, converging, morphing

As this is a discussion (non-evaluative) round, I decided to organize my contributions not as a unified new proposal, but as a collection of thoughts and questions regarding the two proposals we have, their merging, and their possibilities. Nonetheless, my opening considerations do offer a model for merging both (thus, complying with the task), while the following are more in the nature of open questions or suggestions.

§1 While the idea of *deviation* may be applied either to a single note (or two instruments in unison, perceived as a continuous single event) or to a single element of a complex, the ideas of *anamorphosis* and *metamorphosis* find their strongest potential only when applied to a complex. One can argue that to change proportion (*anamorphosis*), at least three elements are required:

** ≈ * * ≈ * * **versus** *** ≈ * * * ≠ * * *

I propose we take advantage of this distinction, applying *deviation* and *convergence* as a continuous process throughout the piece, and the more complex *anamorphosis*, *metamorphosis*, *paramorphosis* more sparingly, and only after structures of at least three components have been formed.

§2 Nonetheless, some processes (*anamorphosis*, *metamorphosis*) can be applied to a single element. Therefore, we do not have a binary opposition of two groups (*divergence/convergence X anamorphosis, metamorphosis, paramorphosis*), but a continuum of processes, with *paramorphosis* standing at the connection. Thus:

divergence/convergence : can be applied to a single element (either isolated or from a complex). continuous and gradual application throughout. mostly slow, gradual process.

paramorphosis : can be applied either to single elements or to complexes. application throughout piece, but not continuously. gradual process, not necessarily slow.

metamorphosis : can be applied to single elements, but is better applied to complexes. punctual application, throughout piece. rather abrupt (perceivable) transformations.

anamorphosis : can only be applied to complexes. punctual application, starting only after complexes have been established. gradual process, not necessarily slow.

It is not a uni-linear continuum: *metamorphosis* is at the end of the spectrum regarding abruptness of change; *anamorphosis*, regarding dependence on complexes.

§3 It seems to me that our project has an inherent risk: that the resulting music will be interesting in the process, but arbitrary regarding duration and overall form. This is not necessarily a problem, but rather a characteristic. Alas, one shared with much of the music composed nowadays (an in the last half century). This bothers me, but I acknowledge there is no easy solution without resorting to perhaps outdated concepts of form and directionality. Should we discuss this further?

§4 The notions of *regularity/irregularity* have not been yet addressed. They can of course be only another dimension in which to vary the processes, but this seems to me a waste, as the result will be a continuous change in which all parameters operate on the micro/medium level. Perhaps this final opposing pole could act not as a *creative layer*, but as a *regulation layer*: either (a) planned a-priori, or (b) applied later to the whole composition. With this dimension we could once more *distort* (or *rectify*) greater areas of the composition, in order to address the macro-form.