University of Arts in Belgrade, Serbia

Miloš Zatkalik

Musical Communication between Niklas Luhmann and Gilles Deleuze, or How Djuro Zivkovic Melts the Walls

Abstract. Commenting on his composition *On the Guarding of the Heart*, the Serbian-Swedish composer Djuro Zivkovic demands that at the end of the piece "the sound must melt the walls in the hall." While this statement communicates something about the composition, one might ask what and how the composition itself, and especially this wall-melting gesture, communicates.

In the attempt to answer this question, the present article relies on certain concepts of the social systems theorist Niklas Luhmann, and philosophers Adorno and Deleuze. First, I will indicate various aspects of communication in art. Moving beyond the simplistic view of art as intersubjective communication between the creator and the recipient we need to consider how a work of art communicates with its creator, with other works of art, how art communicates with itself through analysis, and more.

Communication is understood as autopoietic (the inability of communication to directly produce or receive perceptions), and autotelic (concerned with its own reproduction), *structurally coupled* with other systems. Autopoiesis imparts qualities of the monad to a work (as already suggested by Adorno). A monad only unfolds what is folded in it. I will suppose, however that the intensity of this internal development can reach some critical threshold, sufficient to explode the monad from within.

That is what happens at the end of Zivkovic's composition: barriers against the world are down. The walls melt; *lines of flight*—the expression borrowed from Deleuze and Guattari—allow us to communicate with the cosmos.

Communication then attains a paradoxical state. It reaches outward toward the infinite, but the molten walls are also the ones between the listener's inner and outer worlds. Communication is then directed inward, toward our inner world. But if this appears to be the ultimate level of communication, it also collapses the internal and external, subject and object, and no structural coupling is possible. At such rare moments, the self-reproducing communicative operations lead toward self-annihilation.

Keywords: communication, Djuro Zivkovic, Niklas Luhmann, Gilles Deleuze, monad.

1. Art and/as Communication

Commenting on his Grawemeyer Award-winning composition *On the Guarding of the Heart*, for chamber orchestra and piano, the Serbian-Swedish composer Djuro Zivkovic demands that at the end of the piece, "the sound must melt the walls in the hall" (Zivkovic n.d.). While this statement, with significant ontological, psychological, and even (in light of the composer's own spiritual leanings) theological implications communicates something about the composition, one might ask what and how does the composition itself, and especially this wall-melting gesture, communicate? This is what the present paper sets to explore, relying to some extent on some basic concept of information and communication theories, and to a considerable extent on the ideas of the social systems theorist Niklas Luhmann, and philosophers Theodor Adorno and Gilles Deleuze. A significant portion of the paper will be devoted not to this specific composition, but to broader issues of communication in the context of artistic creation and reception. For now, the Zivkovic quotation serves as a teaser, but those patient enough to burrow through this article, might in the end be rewarded with answers to the opening question.

That the work of art is produced for the purpose of communication is hardly an overstatement. This immediately raises the question of its relation with the primary means of human communication, namely language. We can speak of art as language only loosely, or in a specific technical sense as when we talk about tonal musical language and the like. But being charged with the function of communication, it becomes a functional equivalent of language.[1]

Having established its communicative function, we proceed with the observation that art accomplishes this communicative goal or fails to do so by facing the usual, and perhaps even increased, risks involved in all communication. Wherefrom these "perhaps increased" risks? First, as Luhmann reminds us, art communicates by using perceptions contrary to their primary purpose (Luhmann 2000, 23). Art seeks a different kind of relationship between perception and communication—one that is irritating and defies normality (24). Next, artistic communication is less predictable. As part of this observation, art not only fulfills the basic condition for information in virtue of this unpredictability (27)—it also must communicate in such a way as to suggest that everything could be done differently (27). To elaborate this, I will invoke

---

[1] In that respect, the way language and music relate with each other is especially striking. While this topic has been discussed for centuries (perhaps millennia), I would especially like to recommend two recent studies by Gary Tomlinson (2015; 2018) that provide a compelling account of the common origin, and co-evolution, of language and music.

George Spencer-Brown's *Laws of Form* (1973), on which Luhmann significantly relies, whereby form draws a distinction between the marked space of the work, and the unmarked space of everything else. We make a distinction, we indicate the work, which exists within/against the external world; but once we have acknowledged the fact that that world exists, we do not observe it any longer: what we see/hear is the work (as a world unto) itself, including the act of distinguishing that grants its autonomy. We then make distinctions within the work. This is especially clear in music and other so-called temporal arts. With the distinctions we make, we not only indicate certain portions of music, but we also indicate what we are subsequently going to indicate. The process is recursive. Possibly, outside the realm of arts, this distinction renders the unmarked invisible. The work of art, on the contrary, "always promises something else without defining it; it dissolves the homogeneity of the unmarked space into a space replete with suggestions" (Luhmann 2000, 30). In other words, this space beyond the boundaries defined by the form is invisible and homogeneous in its invisibility, but the work of art opens communication paths precisely with this unmarked space created by the very same work of art; it renders accessible what is invisible without it. This brings to mind Deleuze who, following Paul Klee, tasks painting with rendering invisible forces visible, and music with making inaudible forces audible. There is a difference, however, since Luhmann and Spencer-Brown talk about the world outside (the world created by) the work, whereas Deleuze—as will be discussed later—has in mind the field of intensive forces in which the work of art crystallizes as an extensive (meaning also audible or visible) entity.

In arts unfolding in time, being "replete with suggestions", and suggesting that "everything could have been done differently" means that at each moment there is a surplus: a surplus of references to the possibilities that cannot be realized all at once (or at all); something that goes beyond what is actualized at the moment. This is basically how Luhmann discusses meaning: via this continual realization of potentialities, and the distinction between actuality and potentiality (Luhmann 1995, 65). Of course, meaning is most closely related to communication: we could, somewhat awkwardly, formulate that the meaningfulness of meaning is communication. And what must be communicated, then, is (to take music as an example), a) the capacity of everything we are hearing to be integrated with the previously heard; b) the implication of continuation (or a lack thereof); c) inscribing such capacities on the ensuing events; and, crucially for art, d) the surplus of potentialities.[2]

There are other and numerous ways that set artistic communication apart from the "ordinary" one. Artistic communication must go beyond any lived or even livable experience. (Note that "beyond" does not mean that it denies non-musical experience, stands totally outside of it, or that it does not establish any kind of relations with it). In music it may be relatively clear, as music's relation to that sort of experience is oblique and ambiguous, but it is no less true in other modes of artistic expression, literature or painting, for instance, where we sometimes (mistakenly) expect representation of the world. Next, "works of art must be constructed with an orientation toward time … they distinguish themselves from everything that has been done before." What the work of art must communicate is precisely the fact that "demand for novelty means not only that no two things are the same but also that the difference between them motivates both the work's production and the interest of the beholder" (Luhmann 2000, 44–45).

2. Aspects of Artistic Communication

Starting from such premises, I will first indicate several aspects or modes of communication in art. The simple view of communication as a one-way affair between the creator and the perceiving subject is a concept not altogether wrong, but it is oversimplified to the point where its usefulness becomes doubtful. Luhmann's systems theory addresses communication as a system of its own, independent from but running simultaneously with the system of consciousness. He challenges some of the most fundamental propositions about communication: first, the principle of a unified, autonomous subject (this rhymes well with Deleuze and Guattari); second, communication as an interaction between subjects; third, communication as a transmission of mental contents between separate consciousnesses, and finally, he insists that understanding does

---

[2]   We could elaborate this by saying that "any meaningful or meaning-producing distinction disappears as soon as it appears; leads to a permanent production of new distinctions … by selecting new actualities from the potentiality of a previous distinction … A new kernel of actuality then takes the place of the former, which, in turn, opens its horizon of possibilities from which the next 'actuality' will be selected" (Stäheli 2012, 107). This further connects with Edmund Husserl's idea that presentation is always surrounded by *Appräsentationen*, i.e., that which is not visible, but constitutes the horizon of an actuality.

not require an accurate reconstruction of the creator's "true" intentions. Concerning this last one, Adorno's comparison with the message in a bottle is certainly worth remembering. Or to make it more up to date, a message dispatched to some presumed extraterrestrial intelligence.

Once we move beyond the view of art as intersubjective unidirectional communication between the creator and the recipient, the field of communicative possibilities presents itself in its complexity. The many modes and facets of artistic communication deserve a separate study each, but for my present purpose, by way of a brief survey, I will first point to art as communication across generations, or between different cultures.

Furthermore, analysis, while being inherent in any meaningful reception of art, has its own specific domain, and the specific purpose of making art aware of itself *qua* art; in other words, via analysis, a work of art communicates not only with the recipient (who is also an analyst), but also with itself in its emancipatory movement toward constituting itself as an autonomous system, and securing its place astraddle the social and psychic spheres. Here we can think of Adorno's idea that the only art aware of itself is an analyzed art. As a corollary to this observation, occupying a place at the boundary between social and psychic systems (Luhmann 2000, 49), art may be seen as communication between the two.

Communication is also established within the listeners themselves, particularly in the way art conjures the archaic, unconscious mental states: creative regression or "regression in the service of the ego" (Kris 1952; Knafo 2002; Zatkalik and Kontić 2018). It facilitates the discharge of unconscious primordial affects: "vitality affects" according to Daniel Stern (1998).[3] This amounts to communication between various layers of human psyche, between the conscious and the unconscious mind; primary and secondary processes in Freudian terminology. Arguably, music, being closest to the unconscious, goes the furthest in achieving this.

In a certain sense, artistic products communicate among themselves: it could be said that, for example, the introduction to Beethoven's First Symphony—with its slow tempo, lack of distinct thematicism and the grand opening orchestral tutti gesture—enters into a kind of dialogue back with comparable gestures from Haydn's symphonies (e.g., No. 105), and at the same time—owing to the destabilizing harmony at its inception—forward with romantic symphonic introductions, such as Tchaikovsky's Sixth Symphony. And there is even communication *within* a work of art. The whole, while not necessarily totalizing and unifying, still brings together heterogeneous elements and enables them to function together: it makes possible a system of communication among these elements that in themselves do not communicate (Smith 2012, 198). Perhaps it is the principle problem in the arts to establish such a system.

The foregoing discussion suggests that works of art can be properly understood if granted a degree of autonomy even from their creators, resulting in communication between the creator and his or her own work. Luhmann says "Most of the time, artists are in no position to provide a satisfactory account of their intentions … The first impulse is never the artist's 'own' intention … but something one attributes to the artist as intention when observing the work … Even the artist can see what he wanted only upon realizing what he has done. He is involved in the creation of the work primarily as observer or, physically, as a skilled handyman" (Luhmann 2000, 25). Apparently, some pre-individual, non-personal forces must be at work. This is seconded by the Deleuzian scholar Simon O'Sullivan: "The work of art speaks back to the artist, or appears to come 'from somewhere else'" (O'Sullivan 2006, 68). This "somewhere else" opens, in its turn, complex ontological questions, which I approach via certain concepts of Deleuze or Deleuze-Guattari, especially as refracted through the lens of the Mexican-American philosopher Manuel Delanda (2002). The latter interprets Deleuzian ontology through the ontological dimensions of the virtual (chaotic), the intensive, and the extensive or actual. To begin with, art, science, and philosophy confront chaos. "Art takes a bit of chaos and puts it into frame in order to form a composed chaos that becomes sensory" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 206). Chaos is, however, "not a nothingness but a *virtual* containing all possible particles and drawing out all possible forms;" not absolute disorder, but rather "a plethora of orders," (Grosz 2008, 5) alongside or superimposed on each other. It is sheer virtuality; an infinite number of particles, moving at infinite speed, vanishing as soon as created. Parenthetically, I will venture a conjecture that this is precisely what stifles communication within that dimension. It is then the task of the scientist, philosopher and artist to "stretch a sieve over chaos" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 43) in order to "extract vibratory rhythms" from chaos; to "find resonance, harmonious

---

[3]   Having concluded that they "do not fit into our existing lexicon or taxonomy of affects," Stern, very significantly, tries to capture "their elusive qualities by dynamic, kinetic terms such as 'surging,' 'fading away,' 'fleeting,' 'explosive,' '*crescendo*,' '*decrescendo*' [italic mine], 'bursting,' 'drawn out' … (Stern 1998, 54). For further discussion see Nagel 2008; Zatkalik and Kontić 2019.

vibration; extract oscillation from the fluctuating self-differentiating structure of the universe" (Grosz 2008, 5), and thereby, I would add, to liberate communication. The field of intensities arises, with its intensive properties like velocity and heat. This is where the philosopher's concepts, the scientist's states of affairs, and the artist's affects and percepts take shape. And let us also be reminded: Deleuze's affects and percepts are pre-personal, independent of the state of those who experience them (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 164).

Out of this nonmetric, virtual, intensive continuum, the individual work of art is actualized through the condensation of discontinuous, metric, extensive structures (Delanda 2002, 51 and passim). In other words, the composition, as extensive, takes a measurable amount of time; the number of beats, bars, etc. is countable; the frequency of the pitches employed can be determined with accuracy; the very space in which the music is performed can be measured and so on. Such actualization probably occurs in every composition. It may well be that a traditional classical composition absorbs the first two dimensions. The final product is one of relatively stable entities, of measurable, extensive space-time of the score: striated space as Deleuze and Guattari call it in *A Thousand Plateaus*. Contrariwise, in *The Guarding of the Heart* the intensive flux does not solidify completely, it does not produce musical objects that are too rigid: "molar" if we use terminology from *Plateaus*. This may be the first part of the answer to the question: What does this composition communicate? What Zivkovic's composition communicates—for reasons that can be properly understood only if we listen to the entire piece—are not solid, fully formed discrete entities, such as themes, phrases, tonal centers, rhythmic patterns, and the like. Instead of the actualized, it presents the very process of actualization. It could be an account of how these ontological dimensions communicate among themselves.

This survey of communicative channels in music closes with an observation that music is music not only because it is a string of sounds, but also there must be a human agent who will imbue that string of sounds with a musical meaning. As a necessary, but not the sufficient condition, there is an agreement between a significant number of human subjects that something is music, meaning that there must be a way of human subjects, the creator included, *communicating* musical experience. As much as the sender produces a message, it could be said that the process of communication itself produces the sender, the message and generally, all elements included in the well-known Shannon-Weaver model of communication. So, instead of simply transferring certain information from one subject to another, they are all caught in an intricate communicative web, with innumerable feedback loops. Ultimately, it is not about a sender conveying a message to the receiver, or subjects communicating with one another, but they all become enmeshed in this complexity. The Deleuzian rhizome comes to mind here: the net has neither a beginning nor an end; no fixed communication channels, and any point can be connected to any other. It presupposes living beings capable of consciousness but is irreducible to any one of these beings, not even to all of them taken together (Luhmann 2000, 9–10).

All this effectively renders communication pre-personal and self-referential. In accordance with the aforementioned Deleuzian ontological dimensions, "the individual is established first of all around a certain number of local singularities" (Deleuze 1993, 23). This means that the process of actualization reaches certain singular points or critical thresholds, and thereby the individual and the extensive is condensed out of the field of intensities. In our final consideration we will return to this idea of singularity in its extreme form.

3. Communicative Autopoiesis

Albeit offering different formulations and relying on different sources, Luhmann basically follows a similar line of thinking when he challenges the traditional understanding of communication, as mentioned in section 2. Instead, communication is for him an autopoietic and autotelic system. Autopoiesis—the concept he adopts and adapts from Chilean biologists and philosophers Humberto Maturana and Francisco Varela (1980; 1987)—implies inaccessibility of subjectivity, and inability of communication to directly produce or receive perceptions. We cannot really communicate subjectivity: it remains inaccessible, not only to the social sphere of language and communication, but even to its own introspective desire (Knodt 1995, xxv). The relationships between these different systems, consciousness and communication, are defined as *structural coupling*. This is how Maturana and Varela describe the relationships between an organism and its environment, generalizing it also as interaction between an entity in a general sense, and its medium, triggering in each other structural changes. The environment can perturb the system, but the system will still operate on itself; the perturbation affects the system, but cannot specify the exact changes that will be produced. The structurally coupled systems rely on each other's complexity in order to build their own complexity. We can

think of it as two black boxes that make their own behavior contingent upon the behavior of the other (Knodt 1995, xxix). Art cannot overcome the separation between psychic and social systems. Both types of system remain operatively inaccessible to each other. Disparate systems operate simultaneously (are synchronized) and constrain one another's freedom.

Like any autopoietic system, communication is autotelic, primarily concerned with its own self-reproduction. (Nowhere is it clearer than in art).[4] Communication recursively recalls and anticipates further communications, and solely within the network of self-created communications can it produce communications as the operative elements of its own system. From this, as we have already indicated in section 2, Luhmann infers that understanding neither requires an accurate reconstruction of the sender's "true" intention, nor excludes the possibility of misunderstanding. This apparently contradicts the postulate of information theory whereby we presume that there is correspondence between the string of sounds emitted at one end, and the succession of events that is perceived at the other end of the communication channel. Yet, this discrepancy could be negotiated, first, if we take an actual communicative situation as opposed to the ideally conceived, and second, a wider gap between the two ends of the channel may be one of the things that set artistic communication apart from other types of communication. This granted, the mere fact that the observational sequences that accompany the work's production necessarily differ from those that occur in the perception of the finished work ensures that there can never be a genuine agreement between the two (Luhmann 2000, 53). Again, we need to recall Adorno's message in the bottle, or even the attempts to search for extraterrestrial intelligence.

4. Enter Leibniz. Deleuze Following

Now that we have come up with psychic systems, and social systems, with communication existing as a system in its own right, at the boundary between the two, all systems operationally closed yet related through structural coupling, we cannot but sense certain Leibnizian overtones. Leibniz refers to both Gottfried Leibniz the philosopher and also Leibniz as Deleuze's *conceptual persona* in his book *The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque* (1993). Autopoiesis imparts qualities of the monad to works of art, as was suggested by Adorno (1976, 211).

Leibniz's monads are closed, mutually inaccessible, yet functioning together in pre-established harmony. A monad only unfolds what is folded in it, in its "dark background" (*sombre fond* as per Deleuze). Furthermore, the entire world is folded into a monad, but each monad expresses some facet of the world with special clarity, having its specific "enlightened region." This Zivkovic indeed does, folding into his work a plethora of both musical and extramusical references, Eastern Orthodox mysticism, Greek philosophers-mathematicians Pythagoras and Archytas, Serbian folklore, cutting-edge contemporary compositional techniques, and more (Zivkovic 2015; Zatkalik 2020), as though trying to express the entire world, all things musical and non-musical.[5] In his treatment, they are not so much separate entities as one folded innumerable times. It is here that Deleuze's fold enters into the picture. This concept has been defined as the "doubling the outside with its co-extensive inside" or "the creation of a topology by which inner and outer spaces are in contact [and why not take a step further and say *communicate*] with each other" (Deleuze 1993, 23). Folds enable us to think of difference without entailing separation. And it is through this concept of the fold that we hope to provide the next part of the answer to the initial question. This composition communicates not so much about all these aforementioned sources of inspiration, but about the very *possibility* of their folding together, and the *process* of folding together. The material world and spiritual worlds folded together. Not the dualism of Descartes, not a transcendence, rather folds on the plane of immanence.

---

[4]   Some 200 years ago, Novalis discovered this, when he wrote "One can only marvel at the ridiculous mistake that people make when they think that they speak for the sake of things. The particular quality of language, the fact that it is concerned only with itself, is known to no one" (Novalis 1997, 82). In his turn, Martin Heidegger uses this statement as the starting point in his study on language. It is the language itself that speaks (*Sprach spricht*, Heidegger 1985, 10 and passim); and "to undergo an experience with language, then, means to let ourselves be properly concerned by the claim of language by entering into it and submitting to it" (Heidegger 1982, 57). The same applies in art: "the artist is the origin of the work. The work is the origin of the artist.… In themselves and in their interrelations artist and work *are* each of them in virtue of a third thing which is prior to both, namely … art" (Heidegger 1971, 17).

[5]   I discuss that aspect of Zivkovic's work at some length in Zatkalik 2020, and Zatkalik forthcoming.

5. Monads Opening. Walls Melt

This brings us to the final step we need to take. Suppose that the development within the monad reaches a singular point where the process breaks down; the usual operations become inapplicable, the monad ceases to "behave" according to the expected protocol. Even to open, pace Leibniz? As a matter of fact, at the end of Deleuze's book, monads do open after all. The stage for this may have already been set with the assertion that the clear and distinguished zone of the monad is not unchanging, but "has a tendency to vary for each monad …. The privileged zone offers spatial vectors and temporal tensors of augmentation or diminution" (Deleuze 1993, 127). What if there is a critical threshold of augmentation? Deleuze recognizes that closer to our time, "something has changed in the situations of monads …. Leibniz's monads submit to two conditions, one of closure and the other of selection. On the one hand, they include an entire world that does not exist outside of them; on the other, this world takes for granted a first selection, of convergence, since it is distinguished from other possible but divergent worlds." What he has in mind is, of course, Leibniz's idea of God choosing the best of all possible worlds in which pre-established harmony exists between *compossible* monads. But, Deleuze proceeds, this selection "tends to be disappearing …. When the monad is in tune with *divergent* series that belong to incompossible monads, then … the monad, astraddle over several worlds, is kept half open as if by a pair of pliers" (Deleuze 1993, 136). Significantly, it is precisely in this context that Deleuze specifically invokes modern music (Stockhausen, Boulez…).

This is how I interpret the end of Zivkovic's composition. The intensity of this internal development reaches a critical threshold, sufficient to explode the monad from within (and— since monads are indestructible—to re-create it with each performance). Heat—an intensive property—is applied, the said critical threshold (singularity; the point of dissolution of the system) is reached, and the walls melt. All barriers, barriers between the audience and the world, between the listener's inner and outer worlds are obliterated. Deleuzian *lines of flight* (as they are called in *A Thousand Plateaus*) allow us to communicate with the cosmos.

Communication then attains a paradoxical state. It reaches outward toward the infinite. But at the same time, the molten walls are also the ones between the listener's inner and outer worlds. Communication is then directed inward, toward our inner (unconscious?) world. But if this bi- or polydirectionality appears to be the ultimate point of any communicative situation, it also collapses the distinction between the internal and external; between the subject and object. No structural coupling is possible. At such rare moments, that can plausibly be equated with the phenomenon of aesthetic peak experience (as described by Roberto Panzarella 1980), the self-reproducing communicative operations lead toward self-annihilation.

References

Adorno, Theodor W. 1976/1962. *Introduction to the Sociology of Music*. New York: Seabury Press.

Delanda, Manuel. 2002. *Intensive Science and Virtual Philosophy*. London and New York: Continuum.

Deleuze, Gilles. 1993. *Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque*. Translated by Tom Conley. London: The Athlone Press.

Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari. 1987/1980. *A Thousand Plateaus*. Translated by Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari. 1994/1991. *What is Philosophy*. Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell. New York: Columbia University Press.

Grosz, Elizabeth. 2008. *Chaos, Territory, Art: Deleuze and the Framing of the Earth*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Heidegger, Martin. 1971/1950. "On the origin of the work of art." In *Poetry, Language, Thought*, translated by Albert Hofstadter, 15–86. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Heidegger, Martin. 1982/1959. *On the Way to Language*. Translated by Peter Hertz. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Heidegger, Martin. 1985/1959. *Unterwegs zu Sprache*. Frankfurt: Vittorio Klostermann.

Knodt, Eva. 1995. "Postmodern predicament." Foreword to *Social Systems*, by Niklas Luhmann. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Knafo, Danielle. 2002. "Revisiting Ernst Kris's concept of *Regression in the service of the ego* in art." *Psychoanalytic Psychology* 19, No. 1: 24–49.

Kris, Ernst. 1952. *Psychoanalytic Explorations in Art*. New York: International Universities Press.

Luhmann, Niklas. 1995. *Social Systems*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Luhmann, Niklas. 2000. *Art as a Social System*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Maturana, Humberto and Francisco Varela. 1980/1972. *Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living*. Dordrecht and Boston: G. Reidel Publishing Company.

Maturana, Humberto and Francisco Varela. 1987. *The Tree of Knowledge: The Biological Roots of Human Understanding*. Translated by Roberto Paolucci. Boston: Shambhala Publications.

Nagel, Julie Jaffe. 2008. "Psychoanalytic perspectives on music: An intersection on the oral and aural road." *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 77, No. 2: 507–529.

Novalis. 1997/n.d. *Philosophical Writing.* Translated and edited by Margaret Mahony Stoljar. New York: State University of New York Press.

Panzarella, Robert. 1980. "The phenomenology of aesthetic peak experiences." *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* 20, No. 1: 69–85.

Smith, Daniel. 2012. *Essays on Deleuze.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Spencer-Brown, George. 1973. *Laws of Form.* New York: E. P. Dutton.

Stäheli, Urs. 2012. "The hegemony of meaning: Is there an exit to meaning in Niklas Luhmann's systems theory?" *Revue internationale de philosophie* 259: 105–122.

Stern, Daniel. 1998/1985. *The Interpersonal World of the Infant: A View from Psychoanalysis and Developmental Psychology.* London: Karnac.

Tomlinson, Gary. 2015. *A Million Years of Music: The Emergence of Human Modernity.* New York: Zone Books.

Tomlinson, Gary. 2018. *Culture and the Course of Human Evolution.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Zatkalik, Miloš. 2020. "Microtonal music in Serbia: A newly (re)discovered resource." In *Microtonality in Central and Eastern Europe—Historical Outlines and Current Practices*, edited by Rūta Stanevičiūtė and Leon Stefanija, 115–156. Ljubljana: Univerzitet u Ljubljani.

Zatkalik, Miloš (forthcoming). The sound that melts the walls: Djuro Zivkovic between Nikiphoros the Monk and Gilles Deleuze.

Zatkalik, Miloš and Aleksandar Kontić. 2018. "Regression in music or how to communicate the ineffable." *Principles of Music Composing* XVII: 25–32.

Zatkalik, Miloš and Aleksandar Kontić. 2019. "Are there 'musical affects': An inquiry into the realm of the forgotten word." In *Musica movet: affectus, ludus, corpus*, edited by Milena Medić, 47–54. Belgrade: Faculty of Music.

Zivkovic, Djuro. n.d. *How to Perform ON THE GUARDING OF THE HEART.* Behind sounds—by Djuro Zivkovic. MusicoPedia. Accessed February 26, 2023 from https://mega.nz/folder/MNhggboS#KaHSHhJt2NDw83v5DhNPqg.

Zivkovic, Djuro, Daniel Mayer, and Gerhard Nierhaus. 2015. "Difference tones." In *Patterns of Intuition: Musical Creativity in the Light of Algorithmic Composition*, edited by Gerhard Nierhaus, 231–55. New York, London: Springer.

Muzikinė komunikacija tarp Niklaso Luhmanno ir Gilles'io Deleuze'o, arba Kaip Djuro Živkovičius tirpdo sienas

Santrauka

Kalbėdamas apie Grawemeyerio apdovanojimą pelniusią savo kompoziciją *On the Guarding of the Heart* („Apie širdies saugojimą"), serbų ir švedų kompozitorius Djuro Živkovičius teigia, kad kūrinio pabaigoje „garsas turi ištirpdyti salės sienas". Kadangi šis teiginys šį tą pasako apie kūrinį, galima paklausti: ką ir kaip komunikuoja kompozicija, ypač tas muzikinis gestas, nuo kurio tirpsta sienos?

Meno kūrinys kuriamas veikiausiai siekiant komunikacijos, nors, pasak socialinių sistemų teoretiko Niklaso Luhmanno, menas komunikuoja pasitelkdamas suvokimą, prieštaraujantį jo pirminei paskirčiai, o jo siekiamas santykis tarp suvokimo ir komunikacijos erzina ir prieštarauja normalumo sampratai.

Remdamiesi tokiomis prielaidomis, šiame straipsnyje pirmiausia nurodome keletą būdų, kaip galėtume suvokti komunikaciją mene. Neapsiribodami supaprastintu požiūriu į meną kaip intersubjektyvią kūrėjo ir priėmėjo komunikaciją, turime apsvarstyti, kaip meno kūrinys komunikuoja su savo kūrėju, su kitais meno kūriniais, kaip menas komunikuoja su pačiu savimi per analizę ir kt. Be to, būdamas ties socialinės ir psichinės sistemų riba, jis daro poveikį ir jų komunikacijai.

Ypač svarbus yra Luhmanno požiūris į komunikaciją kaip *autopoezinę* ir *autotelinę* sistemą, kuri pirmiausia rūpinasi savęs reprodukavimu (tai niekur kitur nėra taip aišku, kaip mene). Kvestionuodamas kai kuriuos fundamentalius teiginius apie komunikaciją (pvz., komunikacija kaip vientisas, autonomiškas subjektas; komunikacija kaip subjektų sąveika; komunikacija kaip psichinio turinio perdavimas tarp atskirų sąmonių), jis tvirtina, kad supratimas nereikalauja tiksliai atkurti *tikrųjų* kūrėjo intencijų.

Autopoiesis – subjektyvumo neprieinamumas ir komunikacijos negebėjimas tiesiogiai kurti ar priimti percepcijas; šią sąvoką Luhmannas adaptuoja iš biologijos (Humberto Maturana, Francisco Varela). Ryšiai tarp skirtingų sistemų suprantami kaip struktūrinis susiejimas. *Autopoiesis* suteikia kūriniui monados savybių (kaip jau siūlė Theodoras Adorno). Monada išskleidžia tik tai, kas joje sudėta (tai „operacinis uždarumas", pasak Luhmanno). Tačiau straipsnyje daroma prielaida, kad vidinio vystymosi intensyvumas gali pasiekti tam tikrą kritinę ribą, kuri yra pakankama monadai sprogti iš vidaus (kaip ir atsinaujinti su kiekvienu atlikimu).

Taip interpretuojame Živkovičiaus kompozicijos pabaigą. Pasaulio barjerai sugriaunami. Čia remiamės tam tikromis Gilles'io Deleuze'o ir Félixo Guattari sąvokomis iš veikalų *Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque* („Klostė: Leibnizas ir barokas") ir *A Thousand Plateaus* („Tūkstantis plokštikalnių"). „Monada, besidriekianti per kelis pasaulius, laikoma pusiau atvira, tarsi replės." Sienos ištirpsta; *pabėgimo linijos* leidžia mums bendrauti su kosmosu.

Tada komunikacija pasiekia paradoksalią būseną. Ji yra nukreipta į išorę begalybės link, bet ištirpusios sienos taip pat skiria klausytojo vidinį ir išorinį pasaulius. Komunikacija nukreipiama ir į vidų, į mūsų vidinį pasaulį. Tačiau jei tai atrodo kaip aukščiausias komunikacijos lygmuo, jis taip pat suardo ryšius tarp vidinės ir išorinės plotmių, tarp subjekto ir objekto, ir joks struktūrinis ryšys tampa neįmanomas. Tokiomis retomis akimirkomis (estetinės patirties viršūnės atvejais) atsikuriančios komunikacinės operacijos veda susinaikinimo link.