

[Transcriptions of handwritten notes]

I am sympathetic to those who have been trying to characterize music in terms of narrative structure but it seems problematic to try to explain something by means of something which is even less well understood. Better I think to explain the ontology of a literary phenomenon by analogy with music – that is, by discerning the nonverbal meanings which are the force and effect of significant encounters with significant composed verbal compositions such as poems, novels, etc. or the writings of JK Randall.

The experiential ontology of a poem is an extraverbal phenomenon indissolubly tied to the words discerned as those of the poemtext. The experiential ontology of music is an extramusical phenomenon inextricably tied to the [something] particulars discerned as the musictext.

*

Imagine a world where the only relationships between people happened as between the personae of the parts they were playing in a drama. Imagine actors whose only emotional relationship is with others onstage.

*

Music is a field where the only vegetation known are hothouse plants.

*

How can you know in advance precisely speculating on what X needs rather than being there and knowing on the spot? To do at that moment on that day

*

Being anesthetized by your disorientation you perceive things even more sharply and clearly than you recall having done before.

*

If you are afraid, reduce yourself to the size of the universe.

*

Most of the bad things that people do to one another in the civilized world come from the fear of abandonment.

*

We create an ontology of qualities which are intersubjective on the order of green, and then talk about music as the composition of these qualities; there are even people who teach themselves, or are taught by others, to hear music in this countersubjective way.

But – just like compositions of verbal language – music composed this way can alchemize under intense compositional pressure, and heard under intense listening-compositional pressure to materialize as, yet again, an extra intersubjective phenomenon, a subjectively

experiential ontological structure, transcendent of its assertible means, and encompassed by its designable references.

*

People have mystical experiences.

People have trances.

These phenomena can be explained as to their cause and correct significations and references.

But what is their ontology? That is to say, what is their character and being as experienced, rather than as being explained in causal or referential terms?

*