APPENDIX 1

SURVEY ON MEANING POTENTIAL IN EXPERIMENTAL POETRY

A survey was conducted to gain some further insight into the effect of experimental poetry on the listening audience. My purpose was to test the theory of multimodal discourse theory and whether listeners recognise meaning from the internal structure of a work and beyond to make external reference. The responses taken from those surveyed proves that meaning exists for listeners.

I conducted the survey at home in my lounge room with twenty people (10 males and 10 female) present. Eighteen of those attending were in Tagg's terms 'codally competent' (Tagg, 1997:11) while the other two had no experience of the genre but enough musical interest to appreciate the work. The eighteen codally competent were more representative of the type of audience attending performances of experimental poetry and purchasing the CD. It was my feeling that those unfamiliar with the genre might also have an interesting response to it. And I was hoping to determine if prior understanding of the genre was a pre-requisite for acquiring meaning potential.

Questions were given to the audience before listening. This was because as trained listeners they are familiar with listening for structures and techniques and effect. The questions given beforehand merely focussed this active listening. They responded in written form to one listening of the works. I am aware that the audience of these performers often purchase the CD which enables repeated listening. Subsequent listening is of course encouraged for the rewarding and enriching experience of the different elements the listener hears each time. I asked simple general questions to avoid directing the listener too much.

Chris Mann's work was played first, followed by lunch and then the work of Stewart, Walwicz and Smith. The responses gained were anecdotal as the listeners were not given further listenings. My intention with this survey was to test the foundations of multimodal theory, accounting for meaning within the structure and relationship between elements of the work and reference to external symbolic meaning. Multimodal theory
also considers the way continuing modes might create new codes. It was not my purpose to consider the different responses according to gender, musical knowledge, philosophical theory knowledge, ethnicity, education, political affiliation, etc. These are all possible variables impacting on the way people interpret and in many ways are inherent in the responses gained. Such variations in the knowledge of listeners will obviously result in different levels of meaning. It was not my aim in this survey to show differences between a male listener and female listener in interpreting Stewart’s work for example. It was also not my intention to have listeners, after one hearing, make assertions about how this work is subversive and what sort of new meaning space it creates. They were not given time to contemplate such issues and nor did I expect them to focus on this. A weakness of the survey was the inability to engage with the complete multimodal experience as visual elements were absent. At the time of the live performances this study was in its initial stages and there have been no performances of any of the works since. I encouraged listeners to refrain from writing while the works were playing but some felt the need, particularly during Mann’s recording, to make a few notes.

I asked three questions. The questions were designed to allow the listener to respond without leading them into my own conclusions. Question 1 was designed to gain some first impressions. Question 2 contained a list to prompt the listeners but focussed on seeking any meaning potential and whether this was located through internal relationships or by external reference. Question 3 was included to gain a sense of whether listeners recognised any common features across the works. In Tagg’s terms, this is a measure of intersubjective response (Tagg, 1999:33).
Copy of actual survey questions

Listening survey into the meaning potential of experimental poetry

Listen to the work and answer the following questions.

1. What is your immediate response to the work? This may be a comment or question.

2. In what way did you find the piece meaningful?

   Mode – speech, song, musical instrument, electronic sound

   Structure – unifying elements such as repeated elements, disjunct isolated components, relationships between performers.

   Musical elements – melody, texture, dynamics, rhythm

   Text – male voice, female voice

   Sound – musical, noise

   Text-sound

   Other

3. Did you hear any common features across all of the works? To be completed at the end of the survey.
Responses

The survey drew a variety of responses as different elements of the works appealed to different people. All 20 participants were able to respond to all questions. Those I had assumed were 'codally incompetent', actually had most insightful comments to make. I have interpreted the results according to the structural/functional features that emerge in the participant's responses and I have summarised the responses to each question here. The responses have been used in my study to validate the use of multimodal theory and the use of a functional model to analyse the performances. The particular areas of interest raised by the listeners have been addressed in my analyses. The lack of depth in the responses gained means my analyses could only use these comments as a starting place and I have relied on my own interpretation of the works based on multiple listenings, according to the practice of musicologists.

Responses to On Second Thoughts

1. What is your immediate response to the work? This may be a comment or question.

This question drew a variety of responses that could be divided into those who immediately engaged with structural and/or functional aspects of the work, mechanics and emotive responses.

Those immediately struck by the mechanics of the performance included one listener who was interested in the scoring and wanted to know how much was scored or improvised. Two participants questioned the need for the male voice to deliver the material so fast. Of those engaging an immediate emotive response, one thought the whole work was too confusing. Two felt frustrated by the sounds over the voice. One asked 'What do you call this?' One thought it was anarchy and one thought the poet was being deliberately obtuse. Interestingly these responses represent a reaction to the
subversive elements of the work and suggest appreciation of another form of expression outside the dominant discourses operating here. Those engaging in structural features saw the voice in relation to the other performers. One wanted to hear the male voice in isolation from the other performers so as to appreciate the text. One felt the text needed to be studied before listening. Of the six commenting on the complicated text, two identified a conversation going on between the performers.

2. In what way was the piece meaningful to you?

The responses to this question identified the variety of musical and textual features of the work that had appeal. The responses were marked by engagement with both internal structural features and identification of individual elements and the relationship of these elements both internally and to an outside context. The majority of the listeners found the male vocalist to be the most meaningful for different reasons. Three comments were focussed on the speed of the delivery engaging with the mechanics of the delivery and the vocal facility and the way this speed was marked by slower sections creating an erratic mood. Of those engaging with the content of the male voice, two identified the embedded phrases as a source of their interest and their listening came to be occupied by following these threads. They both identified the fields of economics in the text. Another four engaging with Mann’s voice identified the variety in the vocal timbre as an interesting detail as they engaged with the prosodic features of his intonation. One of those commenting on intonation identified the Australian accent as a feature of the persona. Three others considered the most meaningful element of the male voice as the way it interacted with other performers structurally and sonically through intonation.

Two identified Stewart’s interjections and gave the impression they were fascinated by how her mood swings from anger to passivity. This points to an appreciation of internal structure and external reference and context. Two identified a conflict in tone and purpose between the male and female voice. Two indicated an interest in the sound without qualification. One of two I believed to be codally incompetent commented that the emotive use of dynamics and speed made the work interesting. This was a surprise.
as it indicated an insightful knowledge of technical language and appreciation of structural elements. The other listener I believed to be codally incompetent commented that the whole experience was new and found enjoyment from the conflicting acoustic and electronic instrumentation. I was interested that neither of the two unfamiliar with the genre commented on the voice specifically and wondered if one requires this familiarity to understand the voice.

The responses to this question identified numerous messages ranging from messages about identity and chaos regarding the content, to post-modernism and experimentation in its form. The majority (twelve) of listeners responded in musicological terms here. Their responses were based on an overall sensory experience. Ten of those surveyed identified a sense of play with language and sound as part of the message. Seven noted that this play created a unique experience that could be mostly explained as sensory. One identified the message in the linguistic variation and the creation of a language beyond immediate understanding that created tension between the performer’s knowledge of the text and the listener’s understanding of that text. Two felt there was some competition going on between the vocalists and other performers to produce a radical form of sonic communication. Such comments, I felt, suggested they took away from the performance a sense of the subject’s construction of a new form of subversive expression. The other two who responded musically felt that the sonic layers creating polyphony and texture created a tension that reflected the behaviour of modern society.

Of the eight who found meaning in the vocal parts, one identified the work as ‘a philosophical text book crossing language theories of chaos with their musical representation’. I felt this was an insightful comment recognising how both text and sound dialogue. Another expressed the work as an exploration of communicative forms including new technologies, popular media and philosophy. Two felt the work was about language and music and identified the reflexive elements of the work. The other four were concerned with how the voice constructed a discourse, described by one listener as ‘meaningful meaninglessness’.
Responses to \#

1. What is your immediate response to the work? This may be a comment or question?

The responses to Stewart's work were much less complex than those to Mann. This is due to the prominence of the voice. Immediate responses to \# focussed on the mechanics of the performance and feminist discourse. Four of the twenty people wanted to see a score and know how the work was constructed. Those listeners also commented on the vocal facility. Ten identified the emotions such as anger in the vocalist and six identified an element of madness in the vocal play. I pursued the relevance of hysterical speech in my analysis. The immediate response was therefore a strong acknowledgement that both the sounds and words refer beyond the structural play within the work.

2. In what way was the piece meaningful to you?

The audience commented on both internal structural meaning and external meaning. Seventeen of the listeners identified the vocal statements as the most meaningful. Eleven of these listeners noted the feminist nature of the statements, three of whom identified the intertextual referencing to feminist theory. Four focussed on the vocal texture and that the vocal polyphony created some interesting sonic play pointing to an understanding to the dialogic relations operating between the voices and a sense that the performed words alter the semantic potential of the words. Two others identified the way statements became a rhythmic chant as a creative way of fore-fronting the issues of feminism. The three who identified the linguistic distortions as meaningful associated them with madness or emotive outbursts. One person identified the repetitive motif 'it' as an exploration of subjectivity. It seemed sonic elements were neglected by most listeners in the initial listening as the semantic elements of the text were so strong. All listeners responded that this work was sending a feminist message. Four identified an aggressive
'anti-male' feeling. One suggested this was a rebellion against patriarchal language by using fragmentation.

Overall the responses were briefer but more coherent than those to On Second Thoughts, suggesting the listeners did not struggle to respond.

Responses to soft

1. What is your immediate response to the work? This may be a comment or question.

Immediate responses to this work focussed on the persona created by the speaker. The softness of the whispering voice struck most listeners while others commented on the confusing text.

2. In what way was the piece meaningful to you?

The answers to this question were not detailed. Some people recognised a feature but they could not always identify how it had meaning for them. Listeners found meaning in the internal relations between sound and recognised an external dialogue was operating. Of the four making meaning from the soft sounds of the words only one tied this to the mood of the speaker. Of those recognising the dialogic qualities of the speaker, two identified she was having a conversation with someone else and felt as though they were overhearing it. Four felt she was speaking to her audience about her fears, about her lounge room, about her sexual needs and about going on a date with a 'mystery man'. Ten listeners commented on the foreign accent, five identifying the mood swings between weak and strong, three thought it was a stream of consciousness, one felt the fragmented English evoked sympathy for the woman and another felt the fragmented English evoked humour. Two listeners felt the work was about a little girl in need, five used emotive words such as 'soft', 'peaceful', 'quiet', 'gently' and 'sing/song' to explain a sensory mood. Four thought it was about growing up or coming of age and one felt it
was a form of female explanation but they did not qualify the comment with further detail.

Responses to Poet Without Language

1. What is your immediate response to the work? This may be a comment or question.

Immediate responses to Poet Without Language ranged from focus on the strength and attractiveness of Smith’s accent including her vocal facility, her use of electronic sounds and variety of vocal and musical techniques. As it was the final piece to be played, four said it was the easiest to understand without clarification of how this was achieved. Three felt it was more musical than the other works and this added to its appeal. One audience member was interested in the scoring and number of performers. Others commented on the irony of the title and topics of race and women.

2. In what way was the work meaningful to you?

The comments to this question ranged in attention to the internal structural elements and the way word and sound made external reference. Many understood the text’s semantic function. Six saw the work as an attack on patriarchy. Two saw the work as an attack on racism and the relevance it has to the detention of refugees in Australia. One saw it as an attack on science and rationalism. Structural features included one identification of the relationship between the two voices in the content. Two identified certain alliterative qualities that emphasised the words and two thought the ostinato effect of repeated ‘poet without language’ cleverly complemented the second voice, thus pointing to an appreciation of the dialogic qualities of the texts. Two audience members thought repetition of vocal sections made more sense when repeated. Three commented on switching between statements and questions as confronting.
Intersubjective analysis: Responses to question 4

Did you hear any common features across all of the works? Answer this question after all recordings are complete.

The responses to all works recognised some generic features of experimental poetry and the meaning potential of multimodality. The common feature identified among all listeners was the use of unconventional grammar. Two listeners noted that the use of experimental language as a way of generating and propelling sound was common to all works. The use of overlapping or multivoicing was also recognised as a common feature. The word 'play' was used by twelve listeners to describe the use of texts and sounds. The prominence of the speaker's engagements with audience members points to dialogic features. Self-conscious reference to philosophical theory was also noted.

Summary of results

1. Prior understanding of the genre was not absolutely necessary to appreciate or gain meaning from the works but it enhanced the listener's ability to respond.
2. Listeners made comments about meaningful elements occurring structurally within the work in relation to each other and with external reference, pointing to the need for an analytical model encompassing these functions of meaning potential.
3. The works made strong impressions on the listeners.
4. Listeners had an appreciation of multimodality.
5. Listeners often struggled to use metalanguage to describe what was occurring. There was mention of textual, interpersonal and experiential features of the performance without recognition of these terms and full realisation of the meaning potential of the works.
## APPENDIX 2 PHONEMIC SYMBOLS

### Vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Sample Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/i/</td>
<td>bit, lick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/e/</td>
<td>head, bet, wreck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/æ/</td>
<td>had, bat, lack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ʌ/</td>
<td>thud, but, luck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ɒ/</td>
<td>rod, pot, lock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ʊ/</td>
<td>hood, put, look</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Long

| /i/   | heed, beat, bee |
| /ʊ/   | heard, pert, burr |
| /ɑː/  | hard, part, bar |
| /ɔː/  | hoard, bought, pore, poor, |
| /uː/  | food, boot, boo |

#### Diphongs

| /æi/ /eɪ/ | fade, bait, bay |
| /ai/ /aɪ/ | hide, bite, buy |
| /ɔɪ/ /oɪ/ | void, quoit, boy |
| /ou/ /oʊ/ | hoed, boat, dough |
| /aw/ /aʊ/ | loud, bout, bough |
| /aʊ/ /oʊ/ | feared, beard, beer |
| /eə/ /ɛə/ | fared, bared, bare, bear |
| /ɛə/ /eə/ | toured, lure |
| /ju/ /ju/ | cute, due, dew, few |

**Indeterminate** (only in unstressed syllables)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/ə/</th>
<th>first syllable of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>above, parade, correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>second syllable of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>China, better, carrot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consonants

Table shows initial, medial and final consonants

Voiceless plosives

/p/
peer, paw,
leper, rapid
rip, loop

/t/
tier, tore
tier, tore

/d/
letter, baton
writ, loot

Voiceless affricative

/ʃ/
cheer, chore
lecher, catcher

Voiced plosives

/b/
beer, bore
pebble, rabid
rib, cube

/d/
dear, door
redder, idol
rid, rude

/g/
gear, gore
beggar, eagle

Voiceless fricatives

/f/
fear, four
heifer, offer
whiff, roof

/th/
thaw, theme
method, Ethel

/l/
myth, tooth

/s/
sear, saw
lesser, acid
miss, loose
/ʃ/  
sheer, shore  
pressure, ration  
dish, gauche

/h/  
hear, hoar

*Voiced fricatives*

/ʋ/  
veer, vaunt  
ever, liver  
live, move

/ð/  
there, thy  
leather, other  
lithe, soothe

/z/  
zeal, zone  
resin, dozen  
fizz

/ʒ/  
measure, closure

*Nasals*

/m/  
mere, more  
lemon, simmer  
rim, room

/n/  
ear, nor  
venom, sinner  
win, spoon

/ŋ/  
hanger, singer  
ring, lose

*Approximates*

/l/  
leer, law  
melon, miller  
will, rule

/ɹ/  
rear, raw,  
heron, mirror

/w/  
weir, war  
away, bewilder

/ʃ/ /ɹ/  
year, your  
beyond

(Clark and Yallop, 1995: 427-428)
APPENDIX 3   Scores

On Second Thoughts  Chris Mann

(Intstrumental sections indicated between text)

Track

Introduction – MFMS performers

1   On that which is required for definition: Price (an example) is that structural violence where a system in a state of self-replacement (knowledge) is equivalent to one. It entertains a contradiction, a factored surplus (price outnumbers process), a non-viable luxury (a composite first commodity (value (a ratio which satisfies the conditions of production)), capital) where any variables can only exceed their possible equations thereby enabling said systems to move. (Truth - a context-free anecdote (the outskirts of collateral) - is that semiotic euphemism (a resistance) that agrees. It takes shares out in the economy. A plastic fractal tax. Of standards. It domesticates a practice as an a theory, a little the (where one is that transparent number that owns up. To (stutter is that multiple of zero that makes itself) a maximum of one solution. Per.). (One, of course, retains it’s rights as medium, a given. And sells itself in the style of real solutions. Oh.) A rank algebra of a priors with plus or minus one-to-ones (a standard self (a debt)), a suffixed prick that does negations got stuck up. Wet. (A loop that mimes forgets, tough, change is that ethics of understanding that requires a cost, a negative industry (as an instrument of credit, labour of course fails to be an economy - repetition is intolerably expensive. It distributes forms.,)) Therefore logic requires the self-consciousness-of-sorts-th method of ambiguity, needs (He did it.) please.

Section 1a - MFMS performers

21   Impatience and the too-much fetish (dunks (a saint of hesitants)) (objects and the virtuoso exploitation of time): the possible defrauds the ignorant (playing two-up the other side of knowns (a my-my the justified (Do you mind.)))): there can be no belief in pain for the simple reason that pain does not exist outside a present. No merit can therefore attach to either suffering or fear of suffering. Neither can merit attach to non-suffering, the superstitious humility of theft (a lie is it’s own proof), a shadow of it’s former self:

Section 2a - MFMS performers

29   Words, a mechanism for distinguishing thought from other practices, a relative interval (in something of a state (a psychology of reference (subs))) waited on experience hand and glove. And smiled. Did you know (ignorance is one of those bizarre dimensions that apologises every time it looks) Suzie?

Section 3a - MFMS performers 3
I mean I'm not just saying I don't understand - learning (what is not the case (form (a communicated caricature of thinking (and when I say Understand you'd bloody well better)))) (this mechanism doubts but then again it doesn't work), a symptom of expects (if not of action) where purpose is a particular experience. Of ornaments:

Section 4a - MFMS performers

The myth of symbolism (two parts): 1. haunts explanation, 2. Admits replacement (Intention measures up to use (it seemed like (usurped a) was)): noise is internal to any system by virtue of the fact (mnemonic) that noise is internal to any system. And in what sense could it mean anything to discover that this only looks like language? (Language, a prototypical event, is always in excess of experience.) Like all that is required to distinguish facts from concepts is to conceive of a politics of the stupid. (Hope is here a dubious disease of thought.) Learning only looks like thinking from the front. (In red. (An empirical expression.)) It anticipates the real. (It is a minimal condition of sense that it be arbitrarily produced. An example (false phenomena) who whats etceteras.) I say I say.

Section 5a - MFMS performers

The parrot that pretends to dream in narrative offers as a portrait of an event the fact Chairs don't think:

Section 6a - MFMS performers

Facts transfer experience and are generally thereby criterion. The propositions they involve are a priori (look-ma-no-hands a proof):

Section 7a - MFMS performers

The object experiences the first person singular as expression, the third person as information (less than one percent of the world's languages are european). Is the object therefore wrong?

Section 8a - MFMS performers

Behaviour models memory, passive therapy. Knowledge, attending to a bank thatedness, only imitates experience. The verb future is not required to explain it's use:

Section 9a - MFMS performers

Function follows the rules of evidence. (That it is is logical. But it also therefore figures.) It does not confess to sympathy (a limit of thought). Irony, of course, only rhymes:

Section 10a - MFMS performers

Logic - prosthetic action, a formal not-yet - explains description. It is jealous of the attempt. Memory is only evidence for a maths of limited liability. It recites verification (the subject goes mock for the beginning of a sentence (it uses addition as a proof of numbers));
Section 11a - MFMS performers

68 A fact (what has no self) defines it's pragmatism by obtaining an observer.
69 Such agents (the object is sometimes not a subject) are not languages -
70 like not all predicates (charnal matter) are cause or art (knowledge (a
71 relational category) may of course be real) - and though a thought or state
72 may be self-conscious, self-consciousness is not a theory, nor theory yet a
73 status quo. (Knowledge modifies those states for which it is synonymous.
74 Reason sees to it.)

Section 12a - MFMS performers

75 A name has great predictive function (it has the property of a fact) (the
76 obvious takes pity (on a) (to be be buggered) as the relevant event) - it
77 likes. To object (Addition sticks cause on to effect - it distracts (pays by
78 result) - and blames (choice) the as of propositions for the that things is.) -
79 thought never knows how long to look: knowledge is bad karma, a
80 substitute dimension, hex. It answers to Hey you (the echo, a
81 reductionist, of ain't). And this, a sceptical noun-to-be, recommends the
82 idea of self to explanation: the mind, being it's own action, retains the
83 pest as cute idea: a pseudo use - languages of special purpose - begs the
84 question: either-or (the parasite), the pathos of the split infinitive, price.
85 Fit fact foot, knowing is an inarticulate sense (it does not derive) - only in
86 matters of doubt is addition considered a condition of truth. (As a form of
87 explanation, Greek ain't much chop, though a mutually specious present,
88 could easily represent a list.) Profit is proof. It shadows tic. To utter IOUs.

Section 13a - MFMS performers

89 True enough. Entropy, the moralist's not yet, always intended to do the
90 dishes - only in one dimension is a model called a demonstration (I mean
91 like death is more than an argument against mutation). But not all
92 variations are to be understood as fractals of doubt - paranoia is the ideal
93 expert system. (Economics was a controlled experiment introducing chaos
94 into natural languages - it does the past as cure.) Otherwise, as to memory
95 being an out of body experience (on eating your words (using self to
96 transmit consciousness)), addition is a vaguely curdled value-dark
97 dimension, a sticky habit. Not too bad.

Section 14a - MFMS performers

98 And that which is not unconscious (problems are only theoretically logical
99 (only in theory does action require understanding)), the fallacy of
100 composition: tip-toply tautegorical, the knowing subject is ideal (a
101 process with no subject concealed about some rational transparency: 102 sometimes everything passes through matter). Belief, of course, is the
103 least possible rational decision - particularly belief in reason - it brings a
104 cargo cult of baggage which intends consciousness (domestic proof, a
105 hubric ad amnesium (Technology is perhaps most usefully understood as
106 the reason of duration)), plot. The hybrid in question (failure smuggles
107 here into a now) (on defining irony): and (the yes-men) the work myth,
108 proceeds as though exclusively intended for knowledge, a pain as witness,
109 ends. But fuck induction - any luck 'll find it stuffed. With sentimental
110 norms - isits - and other viral homologies (I anticipates.), an economics.
Section 15a - MFMS performers

111 An indifferent jingo, content-defined context, a name is that dimension called a subject. But coz time is a rentable pathology doesn't mean it's conscious. Or a nag. I mean what I like about matter is that it thinks me very well. And I remember it. (On being a practice of thought (a piece is understood to be a system of content (help and the quasies)): both - only in dictionaries is object not a measure of objection. (As an anti-past, work of course implies. Nice. Device. Pozzie. A la real estate.)) An aggregate of cynics pitches in - a limit is the second form, material: t-t-term. Trace. And, lotsa lolly, factoid predicates, is outside cause - ie a predicate is not a name: I describes. The nominally numb, an ain't (zero is extremely thing, a think (with legs up to the arse)) is an all sorts rubber bum type thought. An agent much (or what's a metaphor?) is but a pink tautology of object nexts what won't was what then it is - egos have the distinct advantage of being absent (joining any two objects by absence is more ideal than chance (it also suggests itself as being more objective.)) Behaviour it seems comes in soluble symptoms of not. A fessed empirical. To. The if effect. Ofing. A flip flap fetish of sensible shoes, a generously allergic description of dull imperatives, ta ta automata, damn.

Section 16a - MFMS performers

129 Access - from the point of view of thought - testifies as before (it is disqualified from prosecution (the punctuation of is hinges on the say so romance of evidence, ouch, a wimpy same)) (boredom, the means of reason, an obvious souvenir, is ikon such):

Section 17a - MFMS performers

133 Use, a fatalist in slops, owns up to: sceptic was the 'ssumption shows practice as opinion (- anyway who says you know what same is? (mitigating here is a quality adjective - on being so tactful that tactful ain't the word:)), learning is that cheap aesthetic used by those catalyst chaps to tacit cats. As habit. So?

Section 18a - MFMS performers

138 Nouns and the sums of parts, more meres than plausible (perjury and the status quo:) - jealous betters repetition, balls benign (the forgery of reductionists (a taxonomy of rather clumsy doubt), wry (and unassuming), relative, intent). Exhausting those in fact usefully false distinctions between what we are talking about and what is actually being said and disguising them as propositions asserts a somewhat jerky faith in the threat of incoherence. I mean, really - a pragmatist would quote any stimuli an alibi, a correspondent. Analysis analogous to means seems quite alright - it ghosts the couldabeens - so much (transcendent) so that suggest if-then and you can watch excluded middles answer back: a story is a limp, signs up experience and impersonates the prejudice of fused events. It does not suspect. The fallibilist puts up a guarantee (the drug of like) and calls them in. (Only in allegories is agreement classed a repetition, a part of data and is so explained away.) But nudge nudge say no more, cause is a (lock) needlessly cheap effect, a formerly-meaning-is-only-tautologically-predictive theory parasitic of agreement, a closet threat. Like, all things being equal, the dialectic is hostage to an each way bet on coz, a there there hypnotic adequacy of adoptions where yourse intuits use. (A
156 functionalist has two versions of backward causation: local optimums and
157 yea and nea, a consolation.) And doing things with words, in a manner of
158 speaking, mining (wife’s) identity to do a yellow form of knowing, a
159 semantic perjury, pads the determinists with, you know, (indifferent)
160 model rules. I do.

Section 19a - MFMS performers

161 And running out of things to say, we invented selves, a context - paranoia,
162 imitating the late narcissists took being for a ride (grammatical illusions,
163 represents) an all-fours dogmatism of saved facts. A cartel of exemplars
164 constitute this apparently salaried medium, a conceit of proxies and
165 catatonia, polite, and mortgage the look-like to a generally instrumental
166 expediency. English, but, has certain rights (including no, a manoeuvre
167 on account, a longed for lick syllable of cautionaries) - associative things
168 those little pitties. A flatter favour, a motto mug of ostentatious envies, a
169 facetious list indicates via an ingeniously biddable ditto the very which
170 from which it did (patiently) tolerate indifference. Oh, mister (the
171 autopsy broods and hums as it comes to).

Section 20a - MFMS performers

172 As a category on it’s last legs, identity is sorely tried and means the
173 general (off of) is only right work is whafs not logic, and though thinking
174 be a (bit) pious act, the idea itself is not that good. (I and the end own
175 up:) Change is that resource officers refer to as semantic, a trivially
176 predictable A-B-A-and-B-neither-A-nor-B structure, an utter such that
177 claims to be transparent, a possibility. (The beautifully mute induction,
178 an assume, mutually irreducible, a fickle dharmic gin got done for vag.)
179 And the pussy um-type numbers? (Experience is a heaven. It grows
180 tautologies.) And only almosts in time on. A doe-ray-me-tar fraud.

Section 21a - MFMS performers

181 De ja vu has double standards - knowledge comes in mines: me and
182 maybe, fiction meres, pack vanity on hooks of ones (empirically they’re
183 fines) so now the plural won’t seem too dear (- when like is liked it gets
184 to be another word) - the prognosis is a promise with a lean, a jail bait
185 illuded by puns on property, an I know I know reduced to reconcile. And
186 poses roles, diagnosis by subscription, the reproduction of the lent
187 dilemma, her more or less et ceteras: a subject is not an alias of
188 consciousness, the is-too paradigm, but rather's (pic) logic a know-all oops
189 neurosis on the turn - walk-don’t-walk is the address, one.

Section 22a - MFMS performers

190 A story here is superstitious. And like analysis it has no present. Just some
191 ambivalent urgency, fancy fat chance (narrative, I mean, is a hopeless
192 maximalist (slip slop slanders tete-a-tete, does perpetrates), thick
193 contradicts). And once, the fond as-ifists bought bovver as a squeeze -
194 action is that reaction that would, like, prefer to be a site for words.
195 (Intuition - the practical mastery of a system that has not been
196 theoretically mastered - therefore suggests knowledge be a case.) Now you
197 tell me.
Section 23a - MFMS performers

Psychology - an aesthetics of time (time is the nominative of experience, a self-identifying object, the cliché of the ideal cynic separating role and model) possessed of a pale inflation - is held in evidence against a self, exhibit B, an obligation (it rents egos as accessories and skites (that only egos dream)); (A dildo is that which collapses the distinction between doing and having), gift. Fuck the facts, run. The example and the not-yet express a musty codependence, a difference that'd piss itself if it ever got the gag (. the Dorothy Dixer, a mute ambivalence gives a sorry third degree (it dummies up)): similarity (a disorder of meaning) is a symptom (cash a reasonable mime) of (as in a swab of) dags. I beg your pardon. I mean (truth function) a guileless moody hunch of shruggy subtles, lunch, and news, a substance, lurks around some dumb suss then sums it up: poor mental little shit.

Section 24a - MFMS performers

Instructions: Don't. (Where we (a working hypothesis) agree what reference (being a form of similitude (boo)) is.)

Section 25a - MFMS performers

(It'll do, the migraine, says the use of any tool is a haemorrhaging (mute) product of the amount of time spent not using it. Pragmatics talks therefore (reductive description) of objects as unsayable, the too better art of conversation - the third person singular of trivial - and betrays a physical continuity which is no longer same (it proves objects to be bored hypnotical amnesiacs (boredom is a composite event (events are made up of closed, non-empty questions))), a mouth-as-bimbo sort of causal politics. You don't say.)

Section 26a - MFMS performers

Things at night just look like words - proof is a form of euthanasia. It's only polite for the English to resent English.

Section 27a - MFMS performers

Goods that have had it in the privates - a bit of moot point on the side - decide: a fetish is a (copy (fit flu ontology of predicates)) moralist on spec. As such, an accomplice, it is immune to crucifixion.

Section 28a - MFMS performers

Words, being the (ideal) sum of all earlier words, recall the proxy (an itchy limbo (things I would like to have said)): kitsch (it) comes dressed as motive, motive's doing fine, fine has got a lipstick and lives with an historian, who writes: Dear John.

Section 29a - MFMS performers

And as for a sentimental montage of guarantees, a grazing formalist that fats in fads like (swap) whatsoname, relax, the crack were flat, revenge was mere a tragedy, for tax - fact fascists axe, by fallacies. That's bad.
Section 30a - MFMS performers

233 (Debt, as a form of analysis, polices those commodiously ideal
234 arrangements the death of history costed by the box, ie repetition. (Mingy
235 bloody screw wouldn't recognise a tip off even it were there. Square.))
236 (The poor of course own up to using banks for propaganda - they franchise
237 scabs as governments and cough by selling reason to the real - I mean use
238 as truth dobs in percentages (being ain't meaning, cept you is.) And do
239 you know that one (risk) about narrative transcending absence, a macabre
240 slapstick of adding one to others to make a one, you know.

Section 31a - MFMS performers

241 Testing testing one two one two: coz no was short arm long back, pull
242 tail watchm crack, two ones giggles in the pee, three be home so lookin
243 telly - them all lot wanter same lot, sugar in tea wtn teas in pot. I n e n
244 you be doin gimme in a queue sumpns up, watchn got feel up a shop
245 whatja gunna buy? Eye t eye a lie n bed, go on lovee come, white tongue
246 black seed, doodle finger watchm read (your gob only talks bout me (the
247 very idea)) be ell you ess sich um bang
# Amanda Stewart (performance score)
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4

objects are like

there are one e a

subject to like

there is e a

5

one conception of the

rules of use

(suck teeth)

wooooo

(chattering)

(sharp breath in)

6
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(Object 1)

i you ing this ah ing

obj ect o ac a do

sa sa subject makes the object

when the object subjects end
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e a h
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ect ma obj c is d s

ubja ect

a word

is its use

e a (suck teeth)

(sighing then chattering)

yha? don

intersubject e c tive

ha hon' apart

in difference

m m m m c h t s s s p

air

ism but
(subject 2)

7

subject um

to throw under
subservience liable exposed
under the power of another
one under the allegiance to a
sovereign
that on which any operation
is performed
that which is treated or handled
that a dead body for dissection
that which it is the object
of the artist to express
that of which anything is said
to subdue to enslave

8

subject t t t to

tuned tongues ah

a symmetry of things

9

coz coz coz because

coz coz coz because

coz coz coz because

coz coz coz because

coz coz coz because

coz coz coz because

coz coz coz because

the self existing as
one self only as it
opposes a self
as object to itself
as subject
and immediately denies
and transcends that opposition

10

huh ha huh

ha huh

ha huh

ha huh

ha huh e a

huh huh

huh huh
was an individual
and an attempt at generalisation
I was a you/I despite what I
say object of to is relation
through it and self and you I
lish pluralistic
on the face of things
holes full of bright blue absence
why a straight line
a plurality of these
and I the father the one the
subject
icons of spattals

you know what I know what I know
what I known's a known's a known's
a noun is a noun is a noun is a
noun is I know what I know what I
known whatcha mean.

breath
If you take the meditation out of sex you get body
If you take the body out of sex you get meditation

She
logos in drag beholds itself amazed

e she speech

she i ssss

gn s conduits of social semblance

syllables of culture
sh

she e like a likeness

a sign the ritual repeat
to focus becomes the object
is disappearing
birth need other god death and i

we here an unspeakable of there
tcha sh urgh
difference appears in a line

ma mater matrix matter materia
meter measure metre mere la mer
mater materia main maternal mather
mud muck mesurer martyr matrix
messen mother material mer la mere

ma misura matter martyr material
matrix mere la mer mesurer metre
mater meter ma ma matrix matriarch
madre mess mother mud muck messen
mater matter materia mer mere mere

the other is none other
than yourself
(subject 5)

sh
is it
sh e a
his

is
hi hi hi hi
huh huh huh huh
huh huh huh huh

(object 5)

sh
is a
sh da
is

sh the the the
th th th they
th th th they

wmen were the first objects
subjects out of context
used exchanged it defined
by exchanged use her ing ing

lower caste lower caste
lower race
colour status shape
objectified they the it
d the the they the it

lower lower lower
as if she was himself
projected on

herri

it was all going to change at the
turn of the twentieth the de de de
de decay of the object the western
body b b ob obj object the
but
things will be things
a particle on a stick a cold war a
picture of wave a vocabulary of
artifacts a privatisation of genes
space and information rats in kafka
psychological management systems
rats in kafka buying a duchamp

known chaos
First doing became a thing
and then thing was pronominalised

him itself he i
through object nature bbbb
but but po post
oh ah
post object objectification
use. decays into virtual nouns

you too can be
white and equal
decentralised domination
four dimensional vertical
integration
biological justifications
for economic determinism

data dressed to kill in the outline
of empires
the logistics of the norm

immaculate conceptions of
sacrificed its it its its it's
the one the way the white the master
the leader the judge the king the
father the law the one the word the

way the rrr

REAL
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mann? Mann huh? Mnnnnnn
when you're at the movies
you think you're there
and when you're there
you think you're at the movies

change ex.sh h ng

context overflows the object
the economics of e ^

b now b past

REAL

the other is none other than
sh himself
of owning of knowing of
meaning of being of owning of
knowing the its as of being the

REAL

na nah da? hmnnnnnnn

economies of binaries beating other
with time b we meet across time
in the field of absences sh ere
energy is matter

past
soft

Ania Walwicz

soft so shush tip me touch sit soft foam rubber in lay back pillow now rest cup hands cottonwool warm skirt touch cheek trees soft wave me to well too hot head ha hot head girl cough tablets swallow fly to sleep too quick hours go over my shoulder light not on hurt my eye negro armpit wet sheet change read too tired not think be good to me now be good to me don't go out stay turn over to warm now cold before now mmmm sheets clean comfort stick nightgown put clean one too hot laundry did my quiet shush hush take soft tissue tissue hot dryer tumble take off coat jumper soft too touch took my stockings boots off slid hold my finger my warm legs warm now it so cold breath vapour warm now smug jacket quilt got a cold now hot hot hot fever warm hot soft heater roll over now bed won't read my book just let think what forget see how how was when tell him look can't remember what next now what to say what what and what and what soft now soft newspaper too tired watch the fly so quiet everyone went can't hear walk crispy night moon white so soft snow first too cold shiver shiver box cold now better hotter fever heats my house hot corridor no damp dry soft soft just hold me jumper hold me jumper wool kiss me kiss me lay back soft ceiling to draw on with my big pencil but won't too weak so soft don't do much just rest write temperature soft head hot head ha hot girl tilt remember what what what was what worried that he that what what was it doesn't matter now forgot what already only here just in soft windy windy warm in hot bed curl twirl what nest shut door my room chocolate cough mixture take hours little measure how much before better hmmmmp pill one two but not milk don't feed it annoys apple eats too slow don't like frankfurts flush fever rouge cheeks reds tip finger touch this is my what not to care dissolve in soft fizz fizz fizz just what see now soft touch leg flannel so warm warm soft touch cheek warm soft such a hot that got soft let me just let me let in the bed two days lit fire in my head give me then better don't bad now soft good just shiver draught better light feather high heat touch my spot what turn soft toe suck wrap night around coat hand in soft me soft rubber black eyes shine bright fly bed don't know where yet the up and down is what side the up what next and what next just rock me rock me hot see soft lay back dark comes night soft hands fly birds bottle has mouth jump jump jump my hands cottonwool wrap soft
world now can't read touch head see how heat warms 
head buy soft drinks to cool wear a glitter dress a glitter 
dress lurex red red lurex nylon sweats wear dress sparkle 
heat got me see write my fever make fever this is soft put 
diamond earrings but lost one don't care giggle lovely 

things for me only soft me chocolate drink me bit by bit 
eat me all over again all over again laugh laugh laugh 
have you got a cold have you lost your shoe why is my 
feet bare under the sheet peek a boo foot hello it slid back 
goodbye then if you want my hot hand touches me and 
touches me and touches me snakes bite hide your foot 
under the blanket silly girl silly girl soft float fly around 
little rod hold hanger my coat don't be too metal with my 
skin eat a cake with almonds almondine a little pip lemon 
in my drink get out don't like him soft tip write soft relax 
take it easy fell asleep look my clock on my hot little hand 
tells time what tick soft five o'clock already take it rest not 
do any yet cosy cosy put a heater in my body to warm me 
was a cold now fire hot me hot me is there someone 
knocking on my door had such a good time last night a 
soft band just touch so soft in coat play now soft more 
soft don't be scared put on quilt cold night soft soft only 
want soft now start slow now heat bed fever tumble spin 
hold my not longer easier soft leather take it slow so 
shush so hush now get along just fine mmm fine yes ha 

now soft sing now quiet wait wear glitter hot head glow 
heat all warm relax relax relax softer soft now skin taut 
stretched to tip don't worry now won't harm week give 
me a rest lift me fly me to the moon my glasses have stars 
think about almond cakes and nothing else drink chocolate 
this puts me in the soft shower hot water hot as me never 
get colder soft soft pillow in my silk skin my glove silver long 
silver wear soft underwear cushion me cushion soft grey 
jumper soft me soft bed me soft flame don't freeze soft 
cocoa melt icing sugar stick to my finger lick me lick me
POET WITHOUT LANGUAGE
(Version 2)
By Hazel Smith and Roger Dean (1991)

Poet Without Language was commissioned by the Australian Broadcasting Corporation for ABC-FM. Version 1 (a preliminary version which is no longer available) for speaker and prerecorded speaker was premiered at Sydney Conservatorium of Music, Australia, in October 1991, by Hazel Smith in an ausatraLYSIS concert. Version 2 (for speaker, prerecorded speaker, and instruments) was first performed in the studio of the ABC in December 1991 by Hazel Smith (voice, violin) and Roger Dean (synthesizers, samplers).

Performing Instructions for Poet Without Language (version 2) by Hazel Smith and Roger Dean

Wherever there are notated words, the two voice parts are spoken rather than sung. It is preferred that both parts be spoken by the same person. Thus the minimum performing configuration for this piece is one speaker, one prerecorded synthesizer/sampler sounds and a prerecorded violin part, together with stereo sound projection.

The whole work may be performed live by 2 speakers, 2 keyboard players and a violinist; again with stereo sound projection. In the original performance (2 performers) the speaker was also the violinist.

Whatever the mode of performance, the instrumental resources required are:

1) violin.
2) 7 sampled text-sounds (as shown on the first page, section 1a of the score); the two long (2 –3 seconds) sampled percussive sounds produced directly on the strings of a grand piano (also shown on page 1 of the score) These samples need to be played on an instrument such as the EPS.
3) Sampled string section and percussion sounds (Western, Asian and African), such as are also available for the EPS.
4) An FM synthesizer such as the DX711FD providing an electric piano voice which can be programmed to be constant in volume as long as the key is held depressed. The use of click tracks in prerecording material is recommended.

The following approximate stereo configurations are needed. Voice 2: centred 75 degrees to right throughout; Voice 1: 85 degrees to left in Section 3. The instruments are placed as follows: violin 75 degrees to R; text and piano samples, 45 degrees to L; percussion sounds, 45 degrees to R; sustaining electric piano and string sounds, and acoustic piano at centre of stereo image, but apparently spread about 30 degrees to each side.
Section 1

Section 1a

Improvise gradually into rhythmic pulse, using samples and percussion.

Spacious

Continue improvising.

Sample: 1) Po(etc) 1a)Poet 2)Poet 3 Lan(pause) 4 Lan(pause 5 alea)(meter) 6 (alea)(meter 7 & 8 percussion(on inside pno)

Build up some rhythmic elements, as shown; intermittent

some improvised vocal sounds;

moving to:
Section 1b

Voice 1

post without language

post without language

post without language

post without language

post without language

post without language

DX7IIFD: 'open' continuous sustain sound, i.e., L2=40

post within process

post desrobes penspower

po popo popo po po

po po popo popo po po

po popo

po popo

po

po

po

po

po

po

po

po

po

po

po

po
it is met with wise words which rise and rebound rhythm recalls image per sian poet without lost language out rage left bagage world peace gauge
END of Section 1b
Section 1c

TACET

Readers, slowly move from previous rhythms to new. leads with hardly any break into Sect 2a
Section 2: What is a race?

Section 2a

what is a race? what is a racist? how were you raised? is thought a race - horse?

why follow fate? when is a form phased? can minds compute? are numbers place names?
what say the serbs? christ at the crossroads? which pain is place? pale composition?

who tore up time? are ghettos host grown? why were jews blamed? goal post or ghost goal?
why make believe? why crack Ouo tia? why worship signs? whose sacred sites stripped

is music text? does rhythm ride height which tribe is lost? can separate sounds mesh?
Why does race resist? Why is a curse concave? Why do our curves concave? Why do our words wear worn-out wishes?

...music notation...

Why do we want our words swept? Why do we worship woman sized? Why are we shipwrecked layered sound spills...
Section 2b

what is a race? what is a racist? how were you raised? is thought a race - horse?

what is a race? what is a racist? how were you raised? is thought a

why follow fate? when is a form phased? can minds comp-ete? are numbers place names?

racehorse? why follow fate? when is a form phased? can minds compete? are numbers
why make be lieve? why crack croa tia? why wor ship signs? whose sac r ed signs stripped
goal post or ghost goal? why make be lieve?

is mas ic text? does rhythm ride high? which tribe is lost? can sepa rate sounds mesh?

why crack cro a tia? why wor ship signs?
why does a race resist? why is a curse conserved? why do our curves conspire? why do our words wake worn-out wishes?

whose sacred sites stripped is music text? does rhythm ride high? which tribe is

why do we want our wordworlds windswept? why do we worship human size? why are we shipwrecked by some sound spills

why does a race resist? why is a curse conserved? why do our curves conspire? why do our words wake worn-out wishes?
etc to taste
Section 2d

Voice 1 alone:

race is a static thought mislays a racecourse follows fate whose forms unframe our minds dispute the names of foreign faces crowds at crossroads painted pale in confrontations torn up time tenacious echoes homeless Jewish jokes gyrate genetic ghosts who masturbate at sacred sites are serbs croatians music text regales a rhythmic tribal loss whose separate songs are meshed mutate in words wake women's shipwrecked speech spills dreams discharge as mucous seas soothe sabotage our streams of music menstruate in accusations aids whose answers point the gun at silent spaces set alight by poetry's wild and windswept pilgrims
mild fruit mixed marriage forms fin- x nature nurture fixed spring spills mi- ce common
32 Violin

section 3d follows
Section 3d

 harmonic improvisation,
 prerecorded or
 presequenced, with strings.

 Move from B minor material to
 more polytonal

 strings continue

 some rhythmic hints of
 section 4b
Section 4

Section 4a

Samples/multi-layers
Improvisation based on:

Voices tacet this section

Instruments

Synthesizer/orchestrating multi-phonic textures
For example, DX/NDP, see algorithm 3,
with fine pitch modification on carriers 1
and 4.

Percussion
why were jews blamed god's ghost or ghost gold memory massacre who tore up time token male meter
PIANO inside playing:
optional; if play, then
ggradually increase density of
across until 45

poco continue Brussels
counterpoint, getting denser

continue until 3. Be lar
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