The aim of this paper is to apply the deconstructive method when analysing the poems by Alan Davies. The analysis should also cover the host theme, that is the parasite-host theme as introduced by Hillis Miller. The deconstructive readings of both Derrida and Paul de Man are blended together with the parasite theme in this article, resulting in findings relating both to the content and the structure of the poems. What is more, the analysis also focuses on the unity and the impossibility of the unity of the three poems. Results show that the Poem, as a whole, and the poems taken separately are parasitic, both in terms of structure and meaning. The structure is revealed to be parasitic when considering the titles and the verses, whereas the meaning is revealed as parasitic through Derridian play and supplementarity.
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1. Introduction

As being the basis for the forthcoming analysis, the academic theoretical attitudes of Hillis Miller in relation to the theme of host will be examined. Host is the term that encompasses both the parasite (guest) and the host as terms belonging to the binary opposition. And each term, when leaving the binary opposition starts to reveal the division in itself, with the division being in itself, again, the inner binary opposition of parasite and host. Miller starts with the question of whether the quotation is a parasite (intruder) in the text or whether it is the other way around. The parasite lives on its host, and the intruder can even be deadly to its host. However bleak this may sound, there are cases when the parasite is actually a necessary medicine for the host. Applying this to the field of literature, Miller thinks of a clear and unambiguous interpretation of a host, whereas deconstructive layers of interpretation he sees as parasites. The prefix para- has a double-fold meaning,
referring to similarities, as well as differences, inner as well as outer, inside and outside, primary and secondary, superior and inferior. Thus, the para-prefix is only a border or frontier that both connects and divides outside form the inside space. The deconstruction, as Miller presents it, is not only about the binary opposition, but about the third element as well. These are the triangular relations, and there is no central element because every element has either one that precedes it or one that follows it. Thus, it is a neverending chain of relations. It is an everlasting chain, because there is always some trace that starts the deconstruction, the dispersion of meanings. (Miller 1995)

Mentioning deconstruction, traces and the dispersion of meaning equals mentioning Derrida, in the first place. For that purpose Derrida’s essay “Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences”, as well as Ebrams’ article and Milic’s book will suffice. By thinking about Derrida, Ebrams informs readers that the play of indeterminate meaning is limitless. So the play of signifying goes indefinite. The literary works are readable, but not necessarily comprehensible since the texts do not have a specific meaning to convey. And although the texts create effects of some definite meaning, it is possible to deconstruct them to the point of semantic indeterminacy. The deconstructive strategy is actually comprised of two-way writing. This means that the hierarchy between the elements of binary oppositions is disrupted, that the inferior element is being placed out of the opposition, and that the new element (which creates the double effects), the so-called pseudoterm, is produced. These double results are discerned in the readability of the texts, as well as in the transformations through which new effects are made. The term that is used by Derrida for such a situation is differAnce. By differAnce it is implied that the signs are easily differentiated because they have different and specific meanings, but also the fact that the specificity of the signs is constantly delayed through infinite movement of meaning from one sign to the other. Thus, Derrida speaks of non-words that are used for non-meanings, dispersions of meaning that are used instead of specific meanings. Non-words, here, again have the same two-fold function as the pseudoterm mentioned earlier. Derrida uses this technique of his in the following way: he writes the word and then he crosses it out, so simultaneously the word is there, readable, and also erased. The problem with deconstruction is that the words themselves are elements that deconstruct the text, so they are borrowed from the language and then returned to the language. Derrida’s other thought is that everything is a text, and that there is nothing outside the text. It could be understood as either that the text is a whole, and no one can ever reach out of it, or that everything in the world, as we know it, is
actually a text, even the readers. Thus the reader becomes just another interpretation, and the reading becomes intertextuality. (Ebrams: 1994)

Continuing on Derrida’s deconstruction, his essay “Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences” is called for reference. Derrida explains the field of play as a place where the changes of signs keep happening (till) to the end of time. Nevertheless, there is something strange about it. The field of play lacks a centre, and it now becomes clear that everlasting change is made possible by the lack of centre and its origin. This movement of play is entitled supplementarity. And the play is the break in the presence of the centre. It is the play of presence and absence. He mentions two ways in which the difference between the signifier and the signified can be erased: 1) by diminishing the signifier or by erasing it from the opposition, 2) by questioning the system where the previous rule applies. (Derrida: 1970, Internet)

Speaking of Derrida and Paul de Man, Novica Milic insists that describing the process of deconstruction, the elements of resistance in the text, such as ambiguities and difficulties, should be allowed to play their role in the text. It is this resistance, this play, that gives the text something new, productive, and different (Milic 1998: 11-13). And it is through these perspectives that the poems by Alan Davies are to be analysed.

2. P.S. Contribution to the Language Poets

Born in 1951 in Canada, Alan Davies grew up to become one of the most influential language poets. This kind of poetry emerged in 1971 with the magazine This, leading to the magazine L=A=N=G=U=A=G=E in 1978. The poems written in this style are based on the theories of Lacan, Foucault, and Barthes. (Holcombe, Internet) The poems focus on the possibilities of meaning, and moreover, on the possibilities of deriving and producing meaning. The authors are in essence dealing with construction, as well as deconstruction while creating the poems. (Hartley 1989, Internet) This is why a deconstructive analysis is applicable to the poems to be analysed. Furthermore, Hartley has this to say about language poetry:

“Such writing is seen to be constructive in its demolition of the conventional relationship between the active (dictatorial) writer and the passive (victimised) reader. Language writing is often posed as an attempt to draw the reader into the production process by leaving the connections between various elements open, thus allowing the reader to produce the connections between those elements. In this way, presumably, the reader recognises his or her part in the social
process of production. But just as important, the ambiguity of the structure of many of these poems should remind the reader that any connections drawn are arbitrary” (1989, Internet).

What David Melnick inscribed in the first issue of \textit{L=A=N=G=U=A=G=E} magazine is also essential for the forthcoming analysis, and is as follows:

“The poems are made of what look like words and phrases but are not ... What can such poems do for you? You are a spider struggling in your own web, suffocated by meaning. You ask to be freed by these poems from the intolerable burden of trying to understand. The world of meaning: is it too large for you? too small? It doesn’t fit. Too bad. It’s no contest. You keep on trying. So do I”. ("L=A=N=G=U=A=G=E P=O=E=T=R=Y", Internet).

All this is meant to be an introduction into what will be dealt with throughout this paper. That is, this type of poetry aims at readers and their way of understanding poetry, stating that the process of understanding the poetry is a neverending process, never fully understood, as well as never absolutely true. The reader sees blank spaces that he/she himself/herself has to fulfil, making his/her own role active in the reading/creating process. But whatever meanings he/she grasps, they are just subjective ones. What Alan Davies himself applied in the poems that ensue is ‘play’ not only with words, and the spaces, but also with the texts, intertexts and paratexts placing the concluding statements, that is the dedication notes, at the beginning of the poems, which should bear the referential note to the entitlement of this section of the paper as P.S.

3. Deconstruction through the Parasite-Host Relationship

Hillis Miller started with the prefix para- stating that since it represents a double-fold meaning, implying both differences and similarities, inner and outer, closeness and distance, superior and inferior (Miller 1995: 83), the sentence that contains the word with the para- prefix becomes dubious. Such a parasitic word is, then, considered an intruder to the previous stability of the sentence. Having this as a premise, a conclusion can be drawn to include specific words and structures as parasitic. In the following sections, the parasitic elements will be inspected both in relation to individual poems and in relation to the Poem (i.e. the three poems considered as one poem).
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Here then, are Davies’s poems¹, written probably for the n\textsuperscript{th} time and deconstructed possibly for the n times.

By Inference,
for my closest friends

There must be at that level some instruction or is it just instinct

the way the moth tries so hard and rhythmically to free itself from the web.

For me I just knew where the place was even though I had no idea what the word meant

or if in any way it could be limited.

Don’t we already understand the sides of the driveway?

You’re forced to assume a persona in your job. Which part of it writes for you? How Big is it?

What did you bring it up for? Why do you rub it in?

Almost the only thing you can discover in that state are the elements of new forms.

Literature, so boyish really, and a little silly.

¹The sequence, structure and the wording of these poems although ascribed to Alan Davies are taken from the anthology edited by Jerome McGann (McGann 1990:14, Internet). Thus any irregularities, if there are any, are ascribed to the editor and are considered irrelevant for the following analysis.
This leaf is death.
It’s not nothing.
It’s an illusion.
And in your case it’s trapped in a thought.

3.1. The Parasite in Each Poem’s Content

Starting with the first of the poems, the words functioning as intruders could be those that are broken or split in three different ways. The first two words are broken in a way that the first and the second broken parts have a specific meaning. Those four elements are: instruct + ion, and rhythm + ically. Instruct can be considered both as a noun and as a verb, and it has a specific meaning, and ion is a morphological form for making nouns. Rhythm is also a meaningful word representing a noun, and ically is a morphological form for making adverbs (this can be broken down furthermore to show adjectival form and adverbial form, respectively). Then another pair of broken words can be discerned: mea + nt, and ev + en. Mea and ev do not have a specific meaning, and are not words like the previous pairs of words. But nt and en are of a different kind. They carry the meaning of morphological forms for the past and perfect tenses, and, what is more, both of them can work as morphological forms for making nouns. The fifth word how is divided in the following way: h + ow, which means that the first part is no longer either a word or a syllable, but a single sound or a single letter, and the second part is no longer either a morphological form for making nouns or tenses, but an exclamation form, or a diphtong. This can be represented in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language word</th>
<th>Parts of speech suffixes</th>
<th>syllables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R  E  D  U  C  T  I  O  N</td>
<td>instruct</td>
<td>ion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rhythm</td>
<td>ically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ev</td>
<td>en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mea</td>
<td>nt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h</td>
<td>ow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sign</td>
<td>diphtong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first part of the broken words should not be disregarded, either. The poems starts with breaking the words so that the first part be a noun. And that is the case with the first two examples. The next two examples show how the poem reduces the
first broken parts so as not to represent any kind of parts of speech, but a syllable. The reduction, nevertheless, does not stop here, because the final example of how far the poem can go is actually a letter or a sound. The point should be made, however, about the nature of this letter. The letter H is not just a letter, but also a pure semiotic sign, used as a symbol for hospital.

What is more, the first broken elements can also have different endings, resulting also in different parts of speech:
- instruct: instructor, instructive, instruction, instructional
- rhythm: rhythmic, rhythmical, rhythmically, rhythmics, rhythmize
- ev: evening, event, evil, evident, evidence, evacuate, evadable
- mea: meat, meal, meagre, meal, meadow
- h: hello, hi, however, hive, halt.

The same applies to the ending of these words, that is to say, even the endings can have many different beginnings. Thus,
- ion: absorption, evaluation, definition, deduction
- ically: basically, academically, musically
- en: alien, women, beaten, fifteen, frighten
- nt: abolishment, abundant, accent, appoint, decent
- ow: allow, anyhow, arrow, below, meow, now.

---

2 This is to name just a few. However, there are numerous endings to these beginnings, and many more parts of speech that are created by the possible endings. The following site http://www.morewords.com/starts-with/instruct/, gives 17 words starting with instruct, 16 with rhythm, 244 with ev, 108 with mea, and more than 4,000 starting with h.

3 The same site elicits the beginnings to the endings of the words given in the poem. Thus, for the ending ion, the site reveals about 3,000 different beginnings, for ically about 1,000, almost 2,000 for ev, 1,970 beginnings for the ending nt, and 210 for ow.
De/Con x Struction = 0.3 (By Inference, Literature so boyish, The Leaf Is Death)

The meaning of the broken words could also be described by using the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language word</th>
<th>Parts of speech suffixes, endings one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R E D U C T I O N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruct</td>
<td>ion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rhythm</td>
<td>ically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cv</td>
<td>en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mea</td>
<td>nt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>ow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sign</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What this table reveals is somewhat different from the first one in that the second row shows growth instead of reduction. This means that the first suffix -ion is used only for ending the nouns, -ically only for the end of adverbs. Suffix -en is used for infinitive, for past and perfect tenses, as well as for nouns, pronouns, adjectives, numbers, and conjunctions. Suffix -nt is used for past and perfect tenses, as well as for nouns, and adjectives. However, suffix -ow, if it could be called this, is used for making all of the parts of speech. By stating how these endings can have different beginnings from those used in the poem, and showing how the beginnings that combined with the endings slide through many parts of speech, the parasitic feature of the broken elements is shown. And since the poem is comprised of these broken words, the poem’s stability is put under question.

Having broken down the words in two parts in such a way that one part ends the verse, and the other starts another line, Alan Davies made the first step in deconstruction. What he did was break the words in two, by which he created, so to say, a binary opposition. He also made possible the third element to come in between. However, by making it possible to add so many different endings to the broken beginnings, and so many different beginnings to the broken endings, and even multiplying this with the number of different parts of speech that each possibility makes possible, Alan Davies introduced not just one more element to the binary opposition, but many more, making this poem an example of neverending
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Deridian play, which haplessly searches for the definite meaning, the definite word, the definite phrase, and the definite centre.

By breaking the words in two, Davies also achieved a numerous number of signifiers comparing to the number of signified. For instance, in the poem, mea, nt, ev, en, h, ow are considered signifiers but do not copy themselves on any signified. Those broken words are simultaneous signs of many parts of speech, referring to both abstract and common nouns, for instance. They can represent both of them because they are neither one nor the other, but a pure symbol able to address any symbolic content. These words do not carry any meaning, and at the same time they fight against the lack of meaning since they combine with other words to carry out the meaning. Derrida mentioned two ways to erase the difference between the signifier and the signified (Derrida 1970: 3, Internet). According to the first one, the signifier should be diminished or erased, and the second one is to question the system where the erasing of the sign functions properly. It could be said that Davies tried to erase the difference between the signifier and the signified by diminishing the signifier, that is by breaking down the words. But it could also be stated that he achieved the increase in the number of signifiers since by dividing them across the lines he doubled them, or even multiplied them, since not just two but many more signifiers, in terms of possible parts of words, whole words, or even phrases, were created.

The game of dispersed (indeterminate) meanings and the game of signifying know no limits. The texts are readable, but not necessarily understandable since they do not emit any specific meaning. Although some texts create effects of specific meaning, they can be deconstructed to semantic indeterminacy. The deconstructive strategy implies that the hierarchical relation between the opposite elements is destroyed in such a way that the inferior element is displaced from the opposition. A new pseudo-term is given instead. And it is this pseudo-term that helps a text convey both a specific meaning and dispersed, deconstructive meanings. This is what Derrida means when using the term differAnece. (Ebrams 1994: 103) In Davies's Poem, differAnece is made visible by the use of broken words that create a specific meaning as well as a wide range of other possible meanings. Davies's broken words are Derrida’s non-words, and Davies’s instruct/ion, rhythm/ically, ev/en, mea/nt, h/ow are Derrida’s non-entities. Thus, instead of words, there are morphological elements such as ically, ion, en, nt, graphemes and symbols as in h(bow). And instead of specific meanings there are dispersions of meanings. Those non-words are bi-functional since they make the text readable, as well as deconstructed as they seek the previous and all-present but never attainable meaning (Ebrams 1994: 103).
Thinking of the meaning as being both present and absent equals the term supplement which is a sign of both the presence and the absence. The rule “and-and, neither-nor” (Milic 1998: 33) can evidently be put to work where broken words are. It would look like this: mea... nt as parts of the broken word would still be there, but something would be put between it/them. It could be a third part of the broken word that would come between it/them, or some endings for the first, and beginnings for the second part and maybe some intermediate word between it/them. For instance, meagre meant, meal used to mean, meat was used for medicament, etc. The chain of change like this can go till infinity. The rule applied here would mean that there are and-and relations in the presence of the broken parts, and neither-nor relations in the sense that the new expressions do not have the same meaning. Here, with the same examples, another Derrida term can be examined. It is the iterability of the sign (Milic 1998: 36). The sign like the word meant separates itself from its origin and makes itself usable in another contexts (meagre meant, meal used to mean, meat was used for medicament...), and its new effects cannot be limited or thought of in advance since it is not known with what other signs it will come in contact with. The sign happens to be carrying his own intention which he projects to the other sign in the author’s absence, combining it with the intention of that other sign. Nevertheless, the primary sign bears a trace of the primary presence, and combines itself with the other presence as a trace (Milic 1998: 37). These traces of signs that combine with each other are a basis for polisemny, and ambiguity, which are a basis for dispersions of signs and meanings through their differences. This is also called dissemination (Milic 1998: 38), meaning that the dispersions of meaning are not limited. The iterability, then, means that a sign can be used again and again but only with the trace of intention being the same in all its appearances while combining with the traces of other signs. And these differences that come into existence through a combination of traces and intentions, these traces of difference are essential elements for the sign.

The sign used in the written language, especially in poetry, lacks its author, and thus no control is possible, so that the distance between the writing and the reading bears many changes and intermediaries, intentional or unintentional misreadings (Milic 1998: 21). Applying this notion to the Davies's poems implies that, first, there were Davies's original poems that may have been misread before they acquired their place in the anthology. And, then, we have another distance and another misreading that rests between the anthology and the reader. So in the author’s absence, everything that is or was written could be misinterpreted (Milic 1998: 21).
3.2. The Parasite in Each Poem’s Structure

Looking at the poems, one would think this is just one poem, a poem with no title. Thus, the first of the facts becomes quite obvious – there is no title. To surprise (or to delude) the readers even more, the anthology presents to its readers not one but three of Alan Davies’s poems. So it is not the case that one poem does not have a title. Quite the contrary, three poems are not given their titles. But how does one know that there are three poems instead of one? Well, the answer lures in the contents section of the anthology. On page 14, as the contents informs the readers, one will find the following poems: "By Inference", "Literature, so boyish", and "The leaf is death". These poems are to be found on the respective page, preceded by another poem called "The New Sentience". This poem, located on page 13, by way of contrast, does have a title given in uppercase letters, and even the name of the author. The following analysis will firstly address the parasitic structure of the title.

The titles being left out means that there was a try to unite the poems into one. But that try was put down by the machine touch that destroys, though not so obviously, the imaginary and imagined unity. That machine touch is the double-enter that sets one poem apart from the other, and serves as a title. But the double-enter is not so apparent as is the case with the bold and uppercase title. It could be said that the non-existence of the title reflects both its absence and its presence, that is the presence of its absence, so that the title is both present and absent from its usual place. What is more, it is present through its mechanical function – the double-enter, and absent in its regular form. The third parasitic structure, so to say, is the fact that the title is moved both upwards - to the contents section, and downwards – to the first line of each poem. This is one more way the title is both present in the poem itself and absent from it. It could also be stated that the first lines of the poems are the borders that set the poems apart. The absence and the presence of the titles, the first lines of the poems, even the content section are frontiers that distinguish one poem from the other. So the content section is put between the poems, welcomed there, being not just the paratext because it is on the periphery, but also an intertext. Such an interpretation is possible because, according to Derrida, everything is a text. That is how the content section, and the first lines become part of the parasitic structure. With the machine touch and the content section be gone, would then the poems be united, the first lines being considered as titles, the traces of titles? The answer would still be no, because the parasitic structure is evident in the three poems transmitting one idea, as well as in the absence of titles either for each of the poems or for them as a unity. That unity that is searched for stays three-fold. And in that three-fold structure one can see that
the deconstruction is not about two opposite elements, but about three elements minimum, because those elements are in a neverending row (Miller 1995: 85).

Continuing with the title, it should be mentioned that the hierarchical relation between the title and the poem is devastated in this context resulting in the superior element (i.e. the title) being moved, or better said, copied to two locations: to the first stanza of the poem and to the content section of the book. These pseudo-terms of titles make the poems readable but also serve as a means for transformations and deconstructive meanings. The titles although in this case superior, not inferior as Derrida explains, are made both inferior (as they become part of the poem), and even more superior (as they are moved to the content section of the book), i.e. to the beginning of the anthology) by displacement. In the hierarchical relation of the newly formed poem, that is the relation title-pseudoterm – poem, now the inferior element (the poem) is moved so as to make one whole with the other two poems. This newly formed Poem does not have its superior element like a title either just above the Poem or in the content section. However, it has inferior elements (the poems) that are in a constant change and search for meaning.

When Derrida used ordinary language to present the results of deconstructed texts, he borrowed ordinary words and crossed them so that at the same time they were both present and absent, both readable and impossible to be read (Ebrams 1994: 103). Davies used the similar technique of presenting the deconstructed variants. He wrote the words and then broke them up, thus, making them both readable as the intended words, readable as many other words or expressions, and non-existent since the form of the intended words were not fulfilled. Words are fragmented, and stanzas and strophes are broken and fragmented, too. This leads to the lines and the strophes being readable and fragmented.

Derrida’s thought that there is nothing outside the text, Ebrams interpreted in two ways: either 1) as a fact that the text is a whole and that one cannot escape from it, and that everything inside the text, even the author himself, is a product of the inner differAnce, or 2) as a fact that everything in the world is the text, that people experience not the thing-by-itself, but only the interpretation of that thing, and that even the readers are a product of interpretation, and the reading process is a kind of intertextuality. If this is true, then people are also texts, readers are texts. (Ebrams 1994: 104) Also, if everything is a text, then even the content section can be regarded as a text on its own regardless of it being part of the bigger whole. And by this, one should consider the use of the contents section as a kind of intertextuality, the content section being the intertext not the paratext. And since every reading is a kind of intertextuality because different people have different
texts and associations in mind while reading, it must be said that the intertextuality appears here in the form of relating the Poem to Davies’s speech “Language/Mind/Writing”, as well as calling content section and titles inscribed there for help. This Poem’s referring itself to the edge (the contents section), to the margin, means that the Poem moves itself to the edge, referring to something outside, beyond itself, but something that is, at the same time, a part of the bigger whole (e.g. a book).

When it comes to Derrida, margins are necessary as a means for dispersion and dissemination. That is so because the centre that was always displaced, was moved to margins, and margins were those that commanded the centre, not the other way round (Milic 1998: 50). Transferred to the Poem, it means that the titles (not to forget the contents section, as well) and the double-enter command the poems. For Paul de Man, on the other hand, the system itself bears in its centre the basis for dissemination, so no margins are needed (Milic 1998: 50). Applied to the Davies’s poems it means that the poems have a dissemination possibility in themselves, or the Poem is disseminated by its poems, the poems which are the reason for its dissemination. The Poem and the poems should focus on themselves and see if they are deconstructive in themselves, because they in themselves bear the possibility for misinterpretation. Actually, the Poem faces itself by reflecting autoreferentially onto its first and second poems stating it is just literature as made by predetermined rules, with some aspect gradually and slowly changing, which ultimately leads to death and illusion, to a mind’s trap.

Coherence of such a Poem is paradoxical since it depends on the game of its different meanings that save the trace of their differences. It applies to the differences in broken words that can have numerous meanings.

These Davies’s poems can be read in several ways:

1) metaphorical – since the three poems can be read as one because there are no titles,

2) metonymical – since the poems are separated by the mechanic touch,

3) the title should be outside the poem but also inside it (because it stands for the content of the poem), and the title, then, is on the edge judging by its topological value. That would be the case if the title was just above the poem itself. However, here the title is on the periphery, that is beyond the edge, as well as inside the poem, that is in the first stanza,

4) the titles are also inside the Poem if one considers the first lines as being an adequate replacement for the titles, and if one thinks of the three poems as a whole,
De/Con x Struction = 0.3 (By Inference, Literature so boyish, The Leaf Is Death)

5) The title of the first poem starts with a concluding statement. By inference is an expression used at the end of a sentence, and it also implies the existence of premises before it. This poem, however, does not reveal any of the premises, and the expression is applied to the very beginning of the stanza.

6) The difference in title presented in the content section and the one given in the first stanza (the leaf is death – this leaf is death) requires the poem once again to refer to its origin, its source in the content section. It has, however, another function as well. It serves as autoreferential for the other poems inside the poem speaking of them and their content as death, and specifying which leaf and which content it refers to. Moreover, this change marks the transition from the meaning of the only one, and the specific one, to an even more specific and deictic element. It is important to mention that the author used allegory because this leaf is given to mean (the poem, its content) literature in general, thus transporting itself from the singular and materialistic, to the abstract level.

It must be said that there is no meta-level for these different readings, that is there is no common ground for these differences in interpretations (Milic 1998: 56), and what is more, this list does not pretend to be finite. This means that even if the author’s poems were different in structure or the content from the one presented in this anthology, it would exclude the meta-level as well because that would mean that the poem in the anthology is nothing more but an interpretation (maybe misread) or (un)intentional change, that is (un)intentional deconstruction. If that were the case, then this interpretation would be the deconstruction squared.

Considering the structure of each of the poems, the lines should also be taken into consideration. Speaking of the parasite-host relation, the poems are also parasites since they both expand and limit the meaning of the broken words and sentences. Those broken words could not make a whole (Miller 1995: 92), could not unite into one word. And, thus, those breaks in words’ structures led to differences in meaning. By breaking the words, the relation between the signifier and the signified is also broken. Dispersed elements of the words and sentences become traces that make possible new processes of breaking the words and dispersing their meaning (Miller 1995: 88, 89), even the new process of making poetry by making new poems.

The first of the poems starts with the conclusion, not referring to any of the premises, and addressing the poem to the author’s closest friends. This dedication could be referred to as a parasite since it is usually used for letters, thankful notes,
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dedications before the poems, or in the title, and not as a mere content of the work itself. Here, the mixing of the genres is evidently parasitic. The breaking down of the words ensues, but it starts from breaking the words into meaningful elements to elements without specific meaning, but elements which bear traces that combined with the traces of other elements can reveal a new meaning not intended and not grasped by the author himself (Miller 1995: 88). The first poem ends in the way it started, that is without broken words, which means that applying the process of breaking the words could not result in reaching the language, the thought, and the mind Davies himself talked so much about (Davies: 2013). The broken words bear no meaning relevant to the author and the reader and so the poem collapses, its unity collapses.

The second poem is a parasite to the first, and the third is a parasite to both the second and the first. This is so because every poem is a parasite to the previous one; it eats the previous one(s) (Miller 1995: 85). However, they are not just parasites, but also hosts, since every poem is both a host and a parasite to the previous one(s). Every poem welcomes previous poems, uses them and eats them, that is annihilates them so as to be different and new. This can be graphically represented as follows:

![Diagram](picture 1)
De/Construction = 0.3 (By Inference, Literature so boyish, The Leaf Is Death)

This graph is also adequate when considering the fact that the second poem continues the first one in terms of thematic building, and the third is a continuation of the second. The first poem discusses the determined or predetermined, but, nonetheless, acquired state of literature and writers as they are. The second poem characterises that type of literature as boyish, with a slight silliness, whereas in the third poem everything that was said about literature evaporates in death, illusion and thought. What is missing here, after the thought, is, according to Davies, language itself and mind.

3.3. The Parasite in the Poem (Content and Structure Included)

After the analysis of the three poems as separate entities, one can now focus on the Poem as a whole. The Poem could be considered as a parasite because it feeds itself upon the content of Davies’s speech about language, mind, and writing. It bears a reference to that text, it uses it, but in order to be original and to differentiate itself from the speech, it annihilates the speech by using figural language, allegories, verses. The Poem is also a parasite towards other poems in the anthology, as well as towards other Davies’s poems, other poets, and, even, readers.

The parasitic pattern of the structure of the Poem is evident even in the impossibility of the unity of the three poems. And that impossibility leads to the destruction of all individual poems. However, something is left behind, and it is this trace that starts a new process, the process of creating poetry, language and thoughts. As Derrida would say, the three poems cannot unite because no unity ever existed (Miller 1995: 91).

A parasite is like a virus that replicates itself in such a way that he transforms the host into himself, that is into the parasite (Miller 1995: 84). The first poem expands itself onto the second, and the second onto the third, so that the first one makes all the other poems replicate its message, and finish its idea. That process can continue so as to travel from thoughts to subconscious, to collective subconscious, to mind, to ∞. This process never ends since, there, in infinity, the new process starts all over again, and now it is from ∞, through the mind, collective consciousness, individual subconsciousness, through language, thoughts, and poets, to the poems.

In deconstruction, relations between elements are always formed among the three elements, inside a triangle, and not between the binary opposition. Thus, there is always the third element which is either between the opposite elements or before them (Miller 1995: 85). The possible relations are infinite, because whichever element one is to face, it is either preceded or followed by another element. Thus, it should not be a surprise that the Poem is comprised of three poems, the poems that
can have either the one that precedes them or the one that follows them. What is more, the relation between the two elements is always full of both love and hatred (Miller 1995: 85). And this applies to the contents of each poem, to the poems inside the Poem, and to the Poem inside the anthology.

Since the poems do not have titles, the borders between them are also annulled, as well as between them as a Poem and other poems. Thus the Poem is attacked from the outside, but also from the inside by the three of its poems. And that is how the parasitic structure annihilates the borders of the text it entered. And that is how it reveals that it has always been inside the Poem's structure, and not that it was forced from the outside. The parasitic structure is not a new element, but an intruder present since the structure was conceived.

4. Conclusion

In his essay “Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences”, Derrida emphasised the notion of supplementarity (Derrida 1970: 10, Internet). By that he means the moving of the play because the centre and the origin are missing. The centre of Davies's poem is the title and it is missing. The centre of the poem is missing, since it is not where it should be. However, there is a sign that replaces the centre, and in this case it is the machine touch that establishes the plain borders between the poems. When applying the supplement principle to the Poem, one can see its double effect. Firstly, the titles in the poems can be regarded as additional, which is the case with titles from the contents, and as a complement, which is the case with titles in the first lines. Secondly, the poems inside the Poem are both additional and complementary elements, since they give each other complementary meaning in terms of comprehending literature as it is, and additional since they always give each other the meaning that transcends the one present in each of them separately.

Through such a Poem, that is through three poems, Davies tries to draw the writing path, but the three poems are just not enough. The first poem starts with a conclusion implying that the premises were mentioned somewhere earlier, and the third poem ends with a thought which does not represent the final stage of writing. This implies that the artistry path cannot be drawn either by one or by three poems.

By addressing the reader, the author transgresses the borders of the poem(s) and applies a dramatic technique. He free from the borders of the Poem, the structure of the Poem but he nevertheless fails to free out of the artistry path that begins in
$\infty$ and ends in $\infty$. And that failure of the poet is also the parasitic structure (Miller 1995: 91,92).

The poems are divided by horizontal lines comprised of different levels, those being the realistic level as well as the levels of literature evolving to illusion, trap and thought. But the poems are also divided vertically (Miller 1995: 89), which means that they are united in referring to the same idea of describing the artistry path. The broken words are the author’s try at trespassing the language, the limits of language and to reach thought. He even uses the absence of titles, jumps over horizontal levels, even the vertical one, and directly addresses the reader, but all in vain. He can not succeed in such an intention because he still uses words to express himself, and words are traces. Thus he can only think in words or at least it is there that he ends the Poem.

Even the words broken down to such a level that represent only the pure semiotic sign (sign for the hospital) show that language can not reduce itself to that extent as to show thoughts and mind, but that the language always bears in itself something of its signified, some sort of materialisation of its material, because the sign cannot exist without its signified, and therefore, the game of change happening in language cannot be pure or ideal.

Sensing the poems’ construction through destruction, leads us to the inability to read the poems. This inability means that the poems are open to many different readings but also that interpretations know no limit, that is that the number of possible interpretations is not limited to a preconceived number, but open to as many interpretations as $\infty$. Thus de Man’s idea about the poem’s inability to be read is all about the non existence of the meta-level at which all the interpretations would come together under one common language of interpretation. And the meta-level, if it exists (if that would be the original author’s poem), would be just one of the levels of interpretation, just one of the levels where the new process of deconstruction begins. If this limitless number of possible readings be equalised with the resistance to reading which is essential for the construction of the poem, the deconstruction would then be considered as finding the resistance which is hidden in the poem, the resistance which is a poem’s strength in that it does not allow for any finite, final or closed reading. And this hidden element of resistance can be revealed only through reading.
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DE/KON x STRUKCIJA = 0.3 (ZAKLJUČUJEM, KNJIŽEVNOST DEČAČKA, PAPIR JE SMRT)

Rezime

Cilj ovog rada je primena dekonstrukcionističke metode pri analizi pesama Alena Dejvisa. Pri tumačenju ovih pesama, uzima se u obzir i tema uljeza, odnosno relacija parazit–domaćin prema odredbama Hilisa Milera. Dekonstrukcionističke postavke Deride i Pola de Mana, zajedno sa temom parazita u delu, vode zaključcima koji se tiču i strukture i sadržaja pesama. Štaviše, tumačenjem se otkriva i jedinstvo, odnosno nemogućnost jedinstva ovih pesama. Rezultati
De/Con x Struction = 0.3 (By Inference, Literature so boyish, The Leaf Is Death)

pokazuju da su Pesma (uzeta kao jedinstvo pesama) i pesme (shvaćene zasebno) parazitske i u smislu sadržaja i u smislu strukture. Struktura se otkriva parazitskom kada se proučavaju naslovi i stihovi, dok se značenje reči spoznaje kao parazitsko kroz termine igre i suplementarnosti, onakvim kakvim ih definiše Derida.
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