lating effects of the normal discrepancies, gave me the impression that there existed after all a relationship, however elusive, between the drunken pianist's soliloquies and the dramas before my eyes—a relationship which I considered perfect because of its accidental nature and its indeterminacy. I never heard a more fitting accompaniment.<sup>34</sup>

Gino Stefani lists fourteen possible ways for his five semiotic code levels to interact, to be heard. He emphasizes the importance of considering music-analytic, psychological, and sociological hearings. In stating that "semiotics of music is the discipline whose object is musical competence as we have defined it," he is implying that not meaning, or a way of meaning, but all those things multiplied are the proper objects of the discipline.<sup>35</sup>

As already noted, Rick Altman has said that "meaning . . . is never something that words or texts have, but always something that is *made* in a four-party meaning-situation. An *author* . . . circulates a *text* . . . to an *audience* . . . whose perception is partly dependent on the *interpretive community* to which its members belong."<sup>36</sup>

Interpretive communities can present a certain homogeneity, an inclination to dominant responses. Indeed, this is the source idea of, for instance, the Frankfurt School pessimism (Adorno et al.) that we have also considered. But I contend that communities are not inherently thus, and that it is precisely attention to the cracks and variables enumerated here that reveals the fact. Essentially, the community from which an individual reader comes will not be monolithic, just as that reader can never be an unconflicted, predictably reacting constant.

Altman discusses a first level of language and communication which operates with respect to the generator's intent, along with the many factors and determinants which inflect and deflect it. A second level, where what was formerly characterized as the message goes out to its receivers, increases geometrically.<sup>37</sup>

Milton Babbitt maintains that music is the same. Common musical practice (tonality) was just one set of rational choices out of an infinite domain of possibilities. His demanding music explores roads not taken, and draws as much upon mathematics as music, upon the permutations and possibilities of the form. The