

Deconstruction in Music  
The Jacques Derrida – Gerd Zacher Encounter<sup>i</sup>

Marcel Cobussen

*'It is necessary to read and reread those in whose lines I mark out and read a text simultaneously almost identical and entirely other' (Derrida, Positions, p.4).*

*'A masterpiece always moves, by definition, in the manner of a ghost' (Derrida, Specters, 18).*

*'I had already thought for a long time to explore a musical work from the past from the inside: a creative exploration, which is at the same time an analysis' (Luciano Berio in reference to Sinfonia)*

## I

Let's talk music ... Wandering about/along/with music ... And deconstruction ... Deconstruction *in* music ... However, I am not primarily interested in deconstruction as applied to the writing about music, or to a direct application of philosophical concepts to musical practices. What I have in mind is a deconstruction of music *by* music(ians) ... I aim to focus on the workings of deconstruction in the field of musical utterance, that is, the relationship of music towards music. As 'new musicologist' Susan McClary states: 'For the study of music, music itself remains the best indicator'.<sup>ii</sup> In other words, I aim to delve into the question as to whether music, while 'reading' itself, realizes this in a deconstructive way. For this reason, I will speak of deconstruction *in* music and *by* music(ians).<sup>iii</sup>

This is my point of departure: The German organist and composer Gerd Zacher calls one of his projects from 1968 *Die Kunst einer Fuge*. Zacher plays the 'Contrapunctus I' from Bach's *Die Kunst der Fuge* ten times in succession in ten different ways. On church organ. Without changing a single note of the original text. (Only once does Zacher deviate from the original score. Towards the end of the seventh variation he plays F - E - G - F# instead of the prescribed F - E - G - F, an allusion to the musical spelling B-A-C-H.) Zacher's first interpretation follows Bach's 'text' as accurately as possible, a 'close reading'. Next, Zacher takes the 'Contrapunctus I' on a journey through the history of music and re-reads it nine times. Each time a different analysis. Nine times an allusion to already existing compositions. Nine times dedicated to a different composer. After the 'Quatuor' for Bach, follows 'Crescendo', dedicated to Robert Schumann, 'Alt-Rhapsodie', dedicated to Johannes Brahms, 'Harmonies', dedicated to György Ligeti, 'Timbres-durées', dedicated to Olivier Messiaen, 'Interferenser', dedicated to Bengt Hambraeus, 'Improvisation ajoutée', dedicated to Mauricio Kagel, 'Density 1,2,3,4' dedicated to Edgard Varèse, 'Sons brisés' dedicated to Juan Allende-Blin, and 'No (-) Music', dedicated to Dieter Schnebel.

## II

This essay will demonstrate how deconstruction works (is at work) in musical praxis, in the practice of composing and making music, using Zacher's musical reflection on one of Bach's most famous compositions. This entails a different approach than that of many musicologists who try to connect deconstruction to music. More often than not, musicologists apply deconstruction in a way that sheds a different light on historical musical compositions. They apply a deconstructive strategy that is predominantly aimed at assigning a new interpretation to existing music. My objective, by contrast, is to show that deconstruction is and has always already been part of a musical praxis, without it ever having been expressed in any such (philosophical) terminology.

Zacher's project is an attempt to comment on a musical praxis - not by means of a theoretical statement, as many musicologists have sought to do, but within the very language upon which it is commenting, music. In my view, Zacher's musical commentary can be regarded as deconstructive.

Deconstruction. A practice that can be found anywhere. But it is not (merely) the conscious activity of a subject.<sup>iv</sup> Therefore, it cannot simply be said that it is Zacher who deconstructs 'Contrapunctus I'. Whenever a deconstructive strategy is put into practice, it activates a dissemination that is already inscribed into the text itself. In a sense, Zacher has translated the musical deconstruction into sounds. He points us to it. He makes it audible. However, the textuality of a text is what first enables the deconstructive practice. The textuality of a text cannot be locked into one single interpretation. A text always has cracks and fissures by which it is unavoidably exposed to the outside; it is open to another reader, to ever changing interpretations. So, it should be clear already that *Die Kunst einer Fuge* is not so much about a multiplicity referring to several different interpretations, a pluralism of signifieds, as it is about the irreducible plurality of signifiers.

Conflicts *within* a text seem to be reproduced as conflicts *in* and *between* readings of that text. Analytical readings transform the difference 'within' into a difference 'between' mutually exclusive positions. A deconstructive strategy is rather directed towards 'a careful teasing out of warring forces of signification *within* a text'.<sup>v</sup> Could it be that Zacher's project aims to question some of the presuppositions and decisions by which a complex pattern of internal differences is translated into alternative positions or interpretations? Could it be that it emphasizes that the differences between interpretations are based on a repression of differences within a text, the way in which a text differs from itself.

Which interpretation is the best? The desire to come to a decision is precisely what is in question: our inclination to exclude possibilities that are manifestly raised by the musical text in order to arrive at clear and coherent positions, but that nonetheless pose a problem.<sup>vi</sup> Deconstruction attends to structures within a text that resist the reduction of a text to a coherent scheme. This is also where the ethical implications of deconstruction arise. They consist in a concern for what must be suppressed in a text in order for the analysis to achieve some kind of 'validity'. Methods have developed or evolved in ways that (systematically) obscure, deny or disavow the heterogeneity of the musical text. The result is that music comes to mean only what (privileged) methods allow it to mean.<sup>vii</sup>

Deconstruction, by contrast, allows the heterogeneity of a text to come to the forefront without again absorbing it in a coordinating, all-inclusive discourse.

### III

In *The Interpretation of Music*, analytical philosophers of music Michael Krausz and Jerrold Levinson distinguish between interpretation and performance. According to Krausz, numerous performances may embody a single interpretation, understood as the explanatory analysis that precedes a performance.<sup>viii</sup> Levinson elaborates this point by arguing that a performance is never a fully transparent reproduction of an interpretation. Furthermore, he observes that the reverse may also be true. One performance may lead to several interpretations; performances may trigger the formulation of interpretations. Levinson states that interpretations aim to explain (or elucidate) the meaning or structure of a work, while performances at best highlight these.<sup>ix</sup> So what both authors advocate is that several singular events may converge, connect, and concentrate at the same point of departure. (This point then becomes the same and an other at the same time.) Levinson further stresses the more neutral nature of a performance. 'Performers provide us with access to discourse we do not have access to otherwise'. In this, he compares them with another kind of interpreter, namely translators. According to Levinson, both transmit rather than explain.<sup>x</sup> In the same book, Göran Hermerén agrees with him on this. 'The purpose of a P-interpretation [performance, MC] is to present the work, or rather a version of the work, to the listener. This is different from the purpose of explaining the work, of showing what the common, unifying theme or thesis (if any) of the work is, of relating this work to other works, of placing it in a literary, social, and political context, and so forth'. Furthermore, a performer cannot be selective; he has to play all the notes. An interpreter of (musical) texts, on the other hand, has no need to comment on each line in the text.<sup>xi</sup>

Would Zacher's project be an interpretation or a performance? One thing to consider is its neutral nature (cf. Levinson). One can hardly say that *Die Kunst einer Fuge* serves only to transmit; Zacher certainly does not intend to create the most neutral intermediary for Bach's work. The ten different versions of 'Contrapunctus I' are also ten analyses of the composition. Every time, a different aspect of the work is elucidated; every time, a different angle presents a new thesis; every time, the work encounters other works. These analyses, however, do not precede the played versions. Rather, interpretation and performance coincide.

I will briefly turn to textual interpretations and analyses. According to the philosophers discussed above, an analysis is situated *hors-d'oeuvre*, outside the work. There is a clear distinction between an analysis that operates as an external (meta)language and the work that it describes. But the authority of each analysis (or interpretation) depends, in large part on the discourse at work within the work. Analysts feel secure and in control when they succeed in showing that the work actually features elements that present the views they are defending. The border between inside and outside becomes problematic here. Each analysis prolongs and develops a discourse that is authorized by the text. So its external authority is derived from its place inside. It can always be read as a part of the

work rather than as a description of it.<sup>xii</sup> The analysis is at once outside and inside the work.

Is this also the case when we speak about music? Or about *Die Kunst einer Fuge*? As noted before, it is difficult to draw a line here between interpretation and performance. It is not a case of interpretation in the sense of explanation or pure transmission. It is (also) an analysis, albeit not in a scholarly way. Does a musical interpretation, an analysis *in music*, a performance, reside outside or inside the work? What, then, is the work? These are some of the questions that are raised by Zacher's project. *Die Kunst einer Fuge* asks for all of these concepts to be re-evaluated. These questions follow us. They persecute *Die Kunst einer Fuge*. As though they are specters. Arrivants. Revenants.

And, there is still more. The border between interpretation/performance/analysis and composition fades in *Die Kunst einer Fuge*. By citing Bach and using associations with works of other composers, a new composition, so to speak, is generated. More so than in the case of Derrida's texts, the border between one's own contribution and the work of someone else gets blurred. It no longer seems possible to make a clear distinction between 'Zacher's' and 'someone else's'. The border between interpretation (citation) and autonomous composition shifts. The 'original' text remains intact; Bach remains present. Titles, dedications and musical means refer to other composers. However, the combination also clearly indicates Zacher's presence. His signature can be heard throughout the work, without having the effect of absolute domination over the musical material. The individuality of the other composers sounds strange in this work, as though it originates from another context. Zacher's individuality sounds strange in this work, as though it originates from another context. Bach's individuality sounds strange in this work, as though it originates from another context. Presence dissolves in absence. Presence dissolves in presence.

*Die Kunst einer Fuge* is not an interpretation in the traditional sense of the word. The difference is that Zacher is not interpreting in one direction in order to establish the one true interpretation of 'Contrapunctus I'. Nor does he intend to expose an (original) meaning that would reside outside of Bach's text. Zacher does not even intend to reproduce a polysemic web. His interpretations are not an explanation or a hermeneutic quest for the deeper layers in Bach's composition that would lead to a fundamentally finite gamut of possibilities; neither do they intend to determine understanding (Verstehen) or meaning. Rather, there is dispersion and multiplicity (due to numerous connotations) in *Die Kunst einer Fuge*; there are multiple readings, attention to material properties (cf. for example, the fifth interpretation, entitled 'Timbres-durées', where the length of the notes determines the composition, and also the whole idea of *intermusicality*<sup>xiii</sup> that is active in *Die Kunst einer Fuge*) and undecidability. Dissemination. No 'vouloir-dire', not a quest for the meaning, the intention or the truth of a text. Zacher makes the *multiphony* of the text audible. His readings are snapshots in time, a temporary fixation in an ongoing process of structuralization, never the last word. *Die Kunst einer Fuge* not only offers a critique of the interpretation cult (of authenticity) within Western culture, but implicitly sets up an encounter between this culture and alternative views.

Zacher seems not to be seeking the most adequate, correct, or best interpretation of 'Contrapunctus I'. He seems much more focused on (intrigued by) the infinite multiplicity of Bach's text, on opening unknown listening perspectives, on the confrontation between this and other texts or methods of composition. In doing so, he exceeds the accepted conventions of the interpretation praxis. But then, the ten versions of *Die Kunst einer Fuge* are not a deliberate deviation from 'Contrapunctus I'. Zacher does not change a single note in the score. No reharmonizations, no excisions, no interpolations. (He adds something without adding something!) Despite his taking advantage of the absence of detail and specifications regarding instrumentation, dynamic markings, etc., his work cannot be understood as a play between the incompleteness of the score and the resulting possible multiplicity of interpretation practices. This can sooner be heard when various performances, for example, performances for string quartet or harpsichord, are compared. Neither can we say that Zacher's project consists of several arrangements or adaptations of 'Contrapunctus I'. Again, none of the notes have been altered. *Die Kunst einer Fuge* involves an exploration of the limits and supplements to Bach's composition. However, it not only delimits, it also introduces the possibility of opening new areas of listening experience. To deconstruct 'Contrapunctus I' is to search for the inaudible within the audible. Zacher deconstructs when examining musical traces, marks, and differences as they occur during composition and as they are inscribed on the musical text. Although Zacher speaks about 'this series of interpretations' of 'Contrapunctus I', it is important to note that the idea of interpretation can no longer be viewed in the traditional sense. Perhaps, in this respect it would be better to speak of encounters, invitations, play.

#### IV

*Die Kunst einer Fuge*: a tenfold reading. In the first reading, 'Quatuor', 'the voice of the same' repeats Bach; it is a commentary that lets us hear how Bach's work sounds. It counts on a very strong probability of consensus regarding the performance of the score. It seems to unveil, reflect or reproduce the text, a performance without any risky initiative. Nevertheless, such a 'repetition' already causes a dislocation, a shifting or transference, a heterogeneity since it always takes place in a particular context. (With regard to this first version, Zacher writes in an explanation: 'Although still at home, he is already on his way'.) This commentary is already an interpretation. Already, an alterity opens in the repetition; repetition *and* first time. Each time it is the event itself. The readings that follow reveal the voices of others. These voices say something different than Bach and let us hear, so to speak, how the work does *not* sound. In a sense, the nine interpretations following 'Quatuor' violate the repetition and the commentary of the first reading. Upon listening to these versions, the listener who is familiar with Bach's music, feels alienated and deprived. Zacher remains loyal to Bach's work in that he doesn't change a single note. At the same time, however, Bach is very far away during some of the extremely radical deviating interpretations. Zacher's rendering, therefore, remains inside and outside the composition at the same time. He starts out by playing the fugue recognizably enough to make an audience feel comfortable to a high degree with the result that the following nine interpretations undoubtedly induce an equal degree of discomfort. The familiar suddenly becomes disconcertingly alien; what seemed close turns out to be infinitely distant. This is because

the text is dislocated (deconstructed) *from the inside*. With all his respect for the 'original' text, Zacher nonetheless breaks in unabashedly, reforms it and puts it in contexts whose differences result in a maximum distance. Zacher accurately follows different paths and ways out, labyrinthine roads that present themselves in and out of the text, the 'Contrapunctus I'. He makes connections that are 'literally in the text' but that disconnect its conventional ties. He does not bring the text to its ultimate fulfilment (if that is at all possible in music), but rather, to an abyss, to a space where the other can be met.

In the explanatory notes of the CD recording of *Die Kunst einer Fuge*, Zacher justifies his method to a degree. 'Bach specified nothing further regarding *The Art of Fugue* - neither details of instrumentation, dynamic markings (which were a concern of the next generation), the system of tuning (equal temperament is merely a supposition), articulation, nor many other factors affecting the music. He put together ('composed') only the naked structure. Putting together implies comparison, which can give rise to another, unforeseeable result'.

Zacher makes optimal use of the possibilities offered to him by the score, precisely lacking added information. Where Bach's inheritance is unspecified, Zacher adds 'his own' commentary. What is omitted by Bach is the condition allowing *Die Kunst einer Fuge* to be realized by Zacher. What is missing in Bach's delivery of the score propels a multiplicity of possible interpretations. Multiplicity tied to an absence.

Zacher's project inscribes certain 'remarks' that touch upon Bach's text in the angles and corners of 'Contrapunctus I', both within it and outside it. But what is the status of its relation to the first piece of *The Art of Fugue*? What does it believe to be adding to 'that' text? *Die Kunst einer Fuge* is not a simple commentary on 'Contrapunctus I': it is *in* 'Contrapunctus I'. It engages the listener in the process of textuality - in the play of meanings. It is not so much demonstrating textuality as it is inviting the listener to playfully enter the either/or between several readings (the ten interpretations) or texts (the confrontation of 'Contrapunctus I' with a specific work by one of the composers used by Zacher). (Viewed from the (traditional) linear history of music, it becomes less important to categorize Bach, Brahms, Kagel, Schnebel, etc. It is no longer about designating a space to any of these composers; I want to stress the notion of a continuous shifting (différance). It is about the possibility of having two (or more) spaces or times connecting with each other. ('Time is out of joint'.) Bach's 'Contrapunctus I' occupies a space that is independent of, for example, Messiaen's or Schnebel's work but the conjunction opens up an non-chronological musical logic. With that, *Die Kunst einer Fuge* is a good example of intermusicality.<sup>xiv</sup>) The result of *Die Kunst einer Fuge* is not a new unified reading or an alternative unity. The different positions (commentaries, interpretations) are not just alternatives, as a pluralistic view would have it, but are interrelated and embedded. The difference between polysemy and dissemination.

Zacher leaves the score intact, but lets hear how the musical language allows for dislocation, admits the other or has to admit the other, on account of its nature and textuality, while staying close to the score. (He does so in ten different ways but there could undoubtedly have been a hundred, which is a further indication of the fundamental openness of a text as well as an illustration of the idea that no text can ever fully be deconstructed. *Die Kunst einer Fuge* presents and pretends no closeness, but a *peut-etre*, a 'can be' or a 'may be'. The suggested possibilities offer a proposal. They are an open

corpus, always lacking conclusion.) There is here a remarkable agreement with a statement in Derrida's text, 'At This Very Moment In This Work Here I Am'. Derrida indicates that the method of dislocating should be 'in such a way that the text holds together, but also that the interruptions 'remain' numerous (one alone is never enough). One sole interruption in a discourse does not do its work and thus allows itself to be immediately re-appropriated'.<sup>xv</sup> It is precisely the multiplicity of readings that makes us understand the functioning of textuality, the impossibility of fixing meaning, the lapsing of a dominant discourse. Zacher offers a range of interpretations, which together have the advantage of not fixing the music in one interpretation, thereby in effect warranting dissemination. Instead of searching for unity, attention is shifted to the plurality of the text; there is no question of attempting to present any kind of unity. Each reading is partial by definition. It is an investigation of a part of the inexhaustible possibilities of each text (*texte pluriel*).

The heterogeneity of a text originates in re-reading, in repetition. Being capable of iterability is a property of every text. However, an active effort on the part of the reader (the listener, the performer) is required, who needs to see the other in the repetition and to participate in the act of alteration. An interaction needs to take place between text and reader during which the difference of the text *from itself* becomes apparent in the reading. Not a difference *between* (several interpretations), but a difference *within* (one text). In other words, this difference is not what distinguishes one identity from another. Far from constituting a text's identity, it is rather what subverts the very idea of identity, infinitely deferring the possibility of adding up the sum of a text's past or meanings and reaching a totalized, integrated whole. Difference is what makes all totalization of the identity of a self or the meaning of a text impossible.

## V

The nine interpretations that follow 'Quatuor' (the version dedicated to Bach) may be violating this first reading. Let's call them 'contaminations', the stain or poisoning by the contagion of some improper body (bodies). But how can Zacher make the other (in this case, the language of other composers) resound in Bach's music without violating the text (the score)? A possible answer might reside in the functioning of the text itself. The other can only resound when the text is unbound and, on that account, open to the other in such a way that it is not so much a matter of rising above the text as it is a different approach to it from within its own possibilities.<sup>xvi</sup>

The thoughts or self-expression of a composer never completely correspond with the score he ultimately writes down or the resulting sounding notes. The musical language is never a transparent representation of his thoughts; it escapes his control to a certain degree. For example, his music appears in a different context each time. The suggestiveness of music, music as an uncertain sign, makes this unavoidable, but it is precisely what bestows vigor upon music. Because Bach expresses himself in musical language (*has to* express himself in some kind of language), his work partially escapes his thoughts. Trying to follow him loyally in an attempt to reconstruct his 'true intentions' necessarily means being disloyal to the medium Bach used to express himself. The heteronomy of the musical language enables a composition to appear in ever-changing contexts and adopt new meanings. Would Bach have expressed himself in music if he

had been seeking a completely adequate and transparent expression of his thoughts?  
Could he?

(Musical) language itself is always already open to the other. However, it is up to the reader (the performer, the listener) to make this otherness visible, audible and palpable. Derrida on this: 'Your reading is thus no longer merely a simple reading that deciphers the sense of what is already found in the text; it has a limitless (ethical) initiative'.<sup>xvii</sup> Derrida immediately adds two asides to this statement. Even if one cannot read beyond the dominant interpretation, a certain dislocation will still have taken place because the context will be different with each reading ('although still at home, he is already on his way'). Besides, the responsibility of the reader does not imply any autonomy in any way. The reader is always bound to the text he is reading. It is the heterogeneity of the text that enables different readings.

*Die Kunst der Fuge* already harbors the other. The musical language already bears an opening to the other. Still, (or all the more so), Derrida makes an ethical appeal on the reader (the performer) to invoke the other in the act of reading. Is Zacher opening our ears for 'the other' in 'Contrapunctus I' through his ten different interpretations? The signifier - 'Contrapunctus I', here - remains the same throughout, but a choice for one interpretation would unjustifiably neutralize its textuality, its heterogeneity as text. To want to hold on to one single meaning is both violent and impotent: it destroys the heterogeneity while at the same time prohibiting entrance into that very heterogeneity.<sup>xviii</sup> *Die Kunst einer Fuge* offers the opportunity for exploring new listening perspectives with specific attention to the melodic (for example, 'Alt-Rhapsodie' and 'Improvisation ajoutée'), the harmonic ('Harmonies' and 'Interferenser') or the rhythmical ('Timbres-durées' and 'Density 1,2,3,4'). (Zacher in the explanatory notes: 'It is thus not a question of arrangements: none of the original text has been altered. Rather have the techniques of interpretation been employed: division among the departments of the organ, registration, articulation, tempo, voicing - even if sometimes they are developed to the point of extreme clarity'). Zacher presents his project as an exploratory expedition: 'Entdecken heisst, die Decke wegnehmen vor den Augen und Ohren' ['To discover means taking away the covers before the eyes and ears'].

Is it not deconstruction's aim, its effect, to reveal the heterophony of a text, and is this not precisely what Zacher is doing? He calls upon *Psalms*, chapter 62, verse 12: 'Once God has spoken; twice have I heard this'. Zacher refers to the Jewish principle that is embedded in the verse. The word of God is (perhaps) univocal; however, every text is open to multiple (maybe unlimited) interpretations. Especially in his early work Derrida shows that words are caught in chains of words (homophony) or chains of meanings (homonymy) that cannot not go beyond the author's intention. An author may overlook or ignore certain meanings or associations that do function in the text or in the act of reading; he does not control the language. But are these resounding 'new' meanings or word associations within or outside of the text? Derrida implicitly raises the question of whether such limits can be drawn at all. 'In a word, we do not believe that there exists, in all rigor, a ... text, closed upon itself, complete with its inside and outside'.<sup>xix</sup> The lack of the system is not to blame here. It is precisely the condition of a text as text to enable an opening to other texts, words, etc. Once written, a text becomes irrevocably exposed to a



never ending play of meanings, a grafting of pieces of the text onto other texts, making connections that the author did not actually intend, changing of context, implanting other texts, etc.

Analogous to Derrida's philosophy, Zacher's work causes us to experience how 'Contrapunctus I' can lead us into a labyrinth of an (in principle) infinite series of references to compositions and specific composing techniques, as well as to philosophy and theoretical discussions about interpretation (*Die Kunst einer Fuge* is dedicated to Adorno and particularly follows his text 'Bach defended against his Devotees'), to poetry and from poetry on to Chile (*Die Kunst einer Fuge* contains a reference to Chilean poet Pablo Neruda). Roughly, two paths can, therefore, be distinguished along which the dissemination in *Die Kunst einer Fuge* takes place; a musical and a discursive path which, however, are only distinguished analytically here for the sake of convenience. The heterophony is first of all a property of the text itself, (the score of) Bach's 'Contrapunctus I'. But Zacher makes the heterophony heard by having the specters of other composers haunt him. Zacher's *Die Kunst einer Fuge* 'is constituted by specters of which it becomes the host and which it assembles in the haunted community of a single body'.<sup>xx</sup>

## VI

*Die Kunst einer Fuge ... Gerd Zacher ... Haunted by so many specters ... Bach, Adorno, Schnebel, Kagel, Messiaen, Neruda, etc. ... And Derrida ... Deconstruction in music ... Deconstruction at work in a musical praxis ... (Inter)musical deconstructions ...*

Deconstruction always already is and has been a part of the musical praxis. In many instances of its development, music has related towards itself in a deconstructive way, although this has not always been explicitly articulated. By making this relation between music and deconstruction somewhat more explicit (and, of course, this can only be done in and through singularities), I hope to initiate an other (culturally broader) discourse on music. And (by that!) an other music.

---

<sup>i</sup> This essay is a summary, remix and rewrite of the chapter 'Specters of Bach' in my 'interactive' Ph.D. dissertation *Deconstruction in Music* ([www.deconstructioninmusic.com](http://www.deconstructioninmusic.com)). Rotterdam, the Netherlands, 2002).

<sup>ii</sup> McClary, S.; *Feminine Endings. Music, Gender, and Sexuality*. Minnesota, 1991.

<sup>iii</sup> I want to thank Professor Veselinović-Hofman for putting my thoughts on this track. Cf. Veselinović-Hofman, M.; 'Music and Deconstruction (An Inscription on the Margins of Derrida's Theory)', in: Šuvaković, M. (ed); *Exclusivity and Coexistence*. Belgrade, 1997, p.12.

<sup>iv</sup> Derrida, J.; 'Letter to a Japanese Friend', in: Wood, D. and Bernasconi, R.; *Derrida and Différance*. Evanston, 1988.

<sup>v</sup> Barbara Johnson, cited in Culler, J.; *On Deconstruction. Theory and Criticism after Structuralism*. New York, 1982, p.213.

<sup>vi</sup> *ibid*, p.247.

<sup>vii</sup> cf. Ferrara, L.; *Philosophy and the Analysis of Music. Bridges to Musical Sound, Form and Reference*. Bryn Mawr, 1991.

<sup>viii</sup> Krausz, M. (ed); *The Interpretation of Music. Philosophical Essays*. Oxford, 1993, p.76.

<sup>ix</sup> *ibid*, p.38.

<sup>x</sup> *ibid*, p.37.

<sup>xi</sup> *ibid*, p.19.

<sup>xii</sup> cf. Culler, J.; *On Deconstruction*, p.199.

---

<sup>xiii</sup> In following with Misko Suvakovic, I distinguish three possible meanings of intermusicality: (a) A relation between 'extra-musical' (linguistic) texts and musical texts; (b) the relation between a musical text and music as a cultural, historic institution; and (c) the exchanges, referentialities, (dis)placements, inscriptions, or mutual coverings of two (or more) musical texts (cf. Suvakovic, M. (ed); *Exclusivity and Coexistence*. Belgrade, 1997, p.36).

<sup>xiv</sup> cf. note xiii.

<sup>xv</sup> Derrida, J.; 'At This Very Moment In This Work Here I Am', in: Bernasconi, R. & Critchley, S. (ed); *Re-reading Levinas*. Indianapolis, 1991, p.28.

<sup>xvi</sup> *ibid*, p.27.

<sup>xvii</sup> *ibid*, p.25.

<sup>xviii</sup> Derrida, J.; *Dissemination*. Chicago, 1981, p.98-99.

<sup>xix</sup> *ibid*, p.130.

<sup>xx</sup> Derrida, J.; *Specters of Marx*. New York, 1994, p.133.