

Manuel Baumbach (Ed.)

Cento-Texts in the Making

Aesthetics and Poetics of Cento-Techniques
from Homer to *Zong!*

BAC

Bochumer
Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium

Begründet von
Gerhard Binder und Bernd Effe

Herausgegeben von
Manuel Baumbach, Reinhold F. Glej,
Claudia Klodt, Theodor Lindken

Band 109

Manuel Baumbach (Ed.)

Cento-Texts in the Making

Aesthetics and Poetics of Cento-Techniques
from Homer to *Zong!*

 Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier

Baumbach, Manuel (Ed.):

Cento-Texts in the Making. Aesthetics and Poetics
of Cento-Techniques from Homer to *Zong!* .

Edited by Manuel Baumbach.-

Trier : WVT Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2022

(Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium; Band 109)

ISBN 978-3-86821-945-6

Umschlaggestaltung: Brigitta Disseldorf

© WVT Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2022

ISBN 978-3-86821-945-6

Alle Rechte vorbehalten.

Nachdruck oder Vervielfältigung nur mit
ausdrücklicher Genehmigung des Verlags.

WVT Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier

Bergstraße 27, 54295 Trier

Postfach 4005, 54230 Trier

Tel.: (0651) 41503, Fax: (0651) 41504

Internet: <http://www.wvttrier.de>

E-Mail: wvt@wvttrier.de

www.facebook.com/wvttrier

BAC im Internet: [http://www.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/
klass-phil/Projekte/Bac/bac_hp.html#BOCHUM](http://www.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/klass-phil/Projekte/Bac/bac_hp.html#BOCHUM)

Preface

The present volume focusses on different cento-techniques as forms of writing. Such forms are not only characteristic of texts that have been labelled *centones* according to a specific (historical) definition of cento as a piece of literature (mostly a poem), which is composed either wholly or in most parts of quotations from the literary tradition. They can be also found in all literary genres, inasmuch smaller parts of texts are composed by way of weaving together pieces from other works.

The focus on different cento-techniques from Antiquity to the present day allows us to concentrate on the *poiesis* of the texts discussed as well as on poetological reflections, which are often linked with or even inscribed in the usage of cento-techniques. All contributions discuss ways of selection and combination of quotations in order to learn more about the specific form of intertextual writing in cento-texts. How far does it differ from other forms of intertextuality given that all texts are in constant dialogue with the (spoken and) literary tradition as described by Michail Bachtin and Julia Kristeva? Are there other literary theories that can be discussed with regard to cento-techniques? As the 'new' cento-text alters the texts (and contexts) of the pieces used there is a special focus on aspects of parody, travesty and allusion. Furthermore, cento-techniques are closely linked to the concepts of collecting (*λέγειν*, *légein*) and weaving (*texere*, *textum*), which are at the core of composing (and reflecting upon) literature from Antiquity onwards. We ask which metaphors or concepts are used to describe cento-techniques (e.g. bees, weaving, hooking, bricolage), we raise questions of authorship and authorization, and we take a look at the question how cento-techniques stress certain parts, verses, intertextual links as important for intertextual analysis. The interdisciplinary approach of this volume enables us to compare different cultural traditions and helps to approach cento-techniques from an aesthetical point of view. Can we speak of an aesthetics of imperfection or absence as there is always something missing or hidden, which has not been selected?

The present volume stems from an international conference held in Bochum from 13.11.2020 to 14.11.2020. It contains revised versions of the papers presented at the conference as well as additional contributions inspired by the discussions. The arrangement of the contributions is 'centonic' insofar they are neither ordered chronologically nor according to specific topics. Rather, they form a patchwork, which invites the reader to compare different methodological approaches of reading cento-texts.

I would like to thank all contributors for most stimulating discussions. The conference and the publication of this volume was funded by the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* (DFG) as part of the project on '*Christus Patiens* and the Greek Cento poetry', which is hosted at the Ruhr-University Bochum. For their assistance with the publication and their guidance in the editing process I am indebted to Anna Wheeler and especially to Theo Lindken.

Table of Contents

<i>Manuel Baumbach</i> Selecting, Cutting and Weaving Texts: The Poiesis of Cento-Writings	9
<i>Rowena Fowler</i> Ezra Pound's Rag-Bag: The <i>Cantos</i> as Cento	21
<i>Timo Christian</i> Homerische Glossen und Rezeptionsniveaus in den <i>Homerozentones</i>	41
<i>Julia Heideklang</i> <i>Hos Centones</i> : Otto Brunfels' <i>Herbarum vivae eicones</i> (1530) and <i>Contrafayt Krütterbuch</i> (1532)	63
<i>Mali Skotheim</i> Reading Environmental Devastation through Vergil's <i>Eclogues</i> in 18th-Century Mexico: Don Bruno Francisco Larrañaga's <i>La America Socorrida</i> (1786)	89
<i>Johanna-Charlotte Horst</i> "I prefer not to... say it myself": On Georges Perec's Composite Work <i>Un homme qui dort</i>	103
<i>Linda Simonis</i> Cento Techniques in Pierre de Ronsard's <i>Franciad</i>	115
<i>Sally Baumann, Lukas Spielhofer</i> Intertextual and Metapoetic Aspects in Ausonius's <i>Cento nuptialis</i> (<i>Cent. nupt.</i> 12-32; 57-66)	135
<i>Maurice Parussel</i> Ein Cento im intertextuellen Gewebe: Zur Schreibweise des Reisebriefes Konrads von Querfurt	157
<i>Mark A. McCutcheon</i> Paratextual and "Sampladelic" Techniques for "Committing Centonism" in Contemporary Poetry Published in Canada	175
<i>Sina Dell'Anno</i> „Der Philolog redet nicht selbst“ – Zur Cento-Technik Johann Georg Hamanns	201
<i>Moritz Rauchhaus</i> Unity through Intertextuality: The Portrayal of Giovanni da Procida in the Cento-Novel <i>Aventuroso Ciciliano</i> (ca. 1333)	219

Maria Teresa Galli

Cento Technique in Lelio Capilupi's Patchwork Poem for Cristoforo Madruzzo ... 231

Emanuela Ferragamo

Morgensterns Cento: Eine Analyse des Essays *Nietzsche, der Erzieher* (1896) 241

Jodok Trösch

Cento, Quodlibet, or Compilation?

Combinatorial Techniques of Citation in Fischart's *Geschichtklitterung* 265

List of Contributors 291

Mark A. McCutcheon

Paratextual and “Sampladelic” Techniques for “Committing Centonism” in Contemporary Poetry Published in Canada

Anybody can now become both author and publisher. Take any books on any subject and custom-make your own book by simple xeroxing a chapter from this one, a chapter from that one – instant steal! (McLuhan/Fiore 2001:123)

Marshall McLuhan’s 1967 book *The Medium Is the Massage*, in two short pages (McLuhan/Fiore 2001:122-123), anticipates and encapsulates more recent scholarly accounts of the historically emergence of both professional authorship and intellectual property (IP) law as conjoined effects of “the advent of print technology” (122): “The invention of print did away with anonymity, fostering ideas of literary fame and the habit of considering intellectual effort as private property” (122). McLuhan’s theorization of photocopying as user-driven “instant publishing” (123) intimates a practice of radical, print-based appropriation that reflects ironically on the very book in which it appears. Several of McLuhan’s books depend formally on other people’s IP in this way; and as it happens, his first book, *The Mechanical Bride* (1951), had to be pulled from circulation:

He reproduced a lot of ads, from soap companies and cigarette companies and everything. He showed the actual ad, and then he would do an analysis of them. And it is very funny. But the companies whose ads they were took exception. Copyright issues. And he had to pull the book. But he had them in his cellar and if you had contact you could purchase one out of the back window of Marshall McLuhan’s house – so *The Mechanical Bride*, a piece of genius. (Atwood 2011:¶175-176)

Were books like *The Mechanical Bride* and *The Medium Is the Massage* to be produced today, one wonders whether a publisher would even consider accepting them, given the intensive – and expensive – work of permissions clearance and licensing that would be required for such a surfeit of appropriated content. Then again, there are recent and current publications that do take shape, extensively or entirely, as compositions of other people’s recontextualized works: for instance, *Reality Hunger*, David Shields’ 2010 manifesto for more robust appropriation (and even plagiarism) in literary production, whose end-matter list of sources opens with the author’s apology for the list’s existence (which he blames on the publisher’s legal counsel) and his invitation to find scissors and cut the list out of the book in order “to restore this book to the form in which I intended it to be read” (Shields 2010:209).

Prolix! Prolix! There’s nothing a pair of scissors can’t fix. (Cave)

Shields’ argument that “your uncertainty about whose words you’ve just read is not a bug but a feature” (Shields 2010:209) represents one side in a current debate over the ethics of acknowledgment in appropriation-based art. On the other side, writers like

Jacob Wren argue that “taking things without giving credit always relates to a history of colonialism” (qtd. in McCutcheon 2019:77), and this is the side I take – as do many other poets working in Canada, to judge by the assiduous and detailed end matter found in contemporary poetry books.

Said end matter will preoccupy this chapter, which attempts to model a twofold method for reading centos – poems composed wholly of excerpts from other works – in relation to intellectual property (IP) law, in the context of contemporary poetry published in Canada. The method proceeds by inference, in the reading of published poetry’s paratextual matter, and by analogy, in the relating of cento-writing technique to DJ technics of mixing and sampling recorded music. This chapter’s form also tries to model its proposed method, in that a plethora of sometimes extensive quotations composes a fair deal of the argument that follows (in this, I adopt a practice of re-mixing one’s own work that is also found in contemporary poetry, as in Natalee Caple’s “Mayhem Remix” [2019:42-43] and Liz Howard’s “Ring Sample: Addendum” [Howard 2015:87]). This proposed interpretive approach illuminates how contemporary cento production navigates copyright law and suggests how an understanding of DJ practice enriches the reception and criticism of centos and related found-poetry forms and techniques. Moreover, this interpretive approach shows how authors and publishers need the users’ rights afforded under Canadian copyright law no less than users and consumers do. The public debate over copyright in Canada has been largely shaped in the media by copyright maximalist interests (see Levy 2018 and “What is –”; cf. Geist 2018) as a confrontation between piratical educators and impoverished “creators” (overdetermined, affective terms that mystify the corporate not authorial ownership of many intellectual properties). My argument here essays a critical intervention in that debate by showing how certain creators – poets and the presses that publish their work – exploit the same users’ rights that industry organizations (and some publishers) persistently lobby against extending to educators.

In the process, this twofold interpretive method opens a critical theorization of techniques for committing *centonism* as read in works of contemporary poetry, published in Canada (reading the verb *to commit* here in a peculiarly Canadian context, where the word not only suggests unlawful activity but was infamously used by a former Prime Minister who spoke dismissively of “committing sociology” in comments vilifying higher education [Fitzpatrick 2013:¶4]). In such works, these techniques articulate (among other things) radical critiques of institutions such as colonialism and capitalism, patriarchy and property.

To better grasp the significance of the cento’s relation to and implications for Canadian copyright, let us first outline this poetry subgenre’s complex cultural history:

The cento is a genre with roots in antiquity (Okáčová 1). The Roman poet Ausonius formalized rules for composing a cento in the fourth century, establishing the genre as a form of poetry: lines lifted from Homer, Virgil, and the Bible and reworked as sacred Christian verse or as bawdy satire. The cento variously pays homage to, parodies, and/or perverts its source texts, recontextualizing its borrowings by finding new connections for them with equally recontextualized lines from other works. Wholly intertextual and struc-

turally ironic – expecting its readers to recognize its sources and delight in their *détournement* – a traditional cento is its own generic mash-up: it looks like a lyric, but the apparent identity of its voice masks its technically dramatic or dialogic composition as a collage of different voices. In its ancient and early modern career it was widely read as a poetic form of satire; in the eighteenth century, both its forms and its functions became more varied. As a strictly intertextual collage form, the cento prefigures the visual collages of Victorian and Dada artists, the “cut-up” poetry of Dada and Beat poets, the dub and remix processes of DJ culture (among other “prospects of recording,” as Glenn Gould mused [331]), and the sample-saturated digital mediascape of mash-ups and aggregators. (McCutcheon 2012:79)

Strictly intertextual and radically deproertizing in its treatment of *tout le monde du texte* as tradition, as *commons* (and as “teamwork succeed[ing] private effort” [McLuhan et al 2001:123]), the cento has weathered a literary and cultural history of vicissitudes of reputation and reception, an acute one arising amidst the “assimilation of literature to private enterprise” (Frye 1957:96-97) that commenced with the emergence of print capitalism (Anderson 1991:39) and the corresponding commoditization of writing and professionalization of authorship (McLuhan/Fiore 2001:122, Rose 1993:91).

“The derivative nature of the cento is all too obvious,” writes Zoja Pavlovskis; “what is not obvious is that the act of composing a cento is strikingly original” (71). Contemporary legal support for this view recently arose at the Supreme Court of Canada (which has ruled consistently to keep an appropriate balance in copyright), in its 2011 hearing of a fair dealing case, which included a discussion of appropriation in the creative process. As Michael Geist reports, Chief Justice McLachlin “noted that works often involve bringing together several other works into a new whole. When counsel responded that this was a compilation, the Chief Justice replied that it might actually be an entirely new work, bringing the issue of remix and transformative works to the Supreme Court of Canada” (“The Supreme Court”). (McCutcheon 2012:85)

As the above quotation suggests, the first two decades of the twenty-first century have witnessed both rapid technological change (especially in digital media) and – more surprisingly – a significant rebalancing of Canadian copyright law. In a global context, copyright law has tended, since the early nineteenth century, increasingly to favour and defend the interests of copyright owners (rights holders) over and against the interests of users and consumers of copyright-protected works (McCutcheon 2012:74; cf. St Clair 2004:55). But both the Supreme Court and, more recently, the Government of Canada have bucked that centuries-long trend to strengthen protections for rights holders with case decisions that have, instead, strengthened protections for users and consumers.

This chapter thus aims to illuminate how contemporary cento production navigates copyright law and suggests how an understanding of DJ practice enriches the reception and criticism of centos; in the process, this method facilitates a critical theorization of techniques for committing centonism with particular reference to contemporary Canadian literary production in Canada today. In a broader context, this chapter also develops my ongoing research into (and writing of) cento poetry as a form of literary production (and reception) that, in Canada, is particularly fraught with

current controversies over copyright law's imbalance of rights (favouring rights holders over users); over the ethics of acknowledgment in literary citation and appropriation; and (more abstractly) over the politics of authenticity versus artifice in cultural expression. My 2012 article "The DJ as Critic" establishes the interpretive method I'm here calling "sampladelic" in a comparison of postmodern DJ technics to pre-modern cento techniques (McCutcheon 2015). And in my talk at the Universität Bochum's 2020 workshop that has occasioned the present volume, I introduced the interpretive method I here call "paratextual": a close reading of the front and end matter in published poetry books. (For other analyses of paratext in this volume, see chapters by Heideklang, Simonis, and Rauchhaus.) I have proposed this method in an attempt to bridge the supposed divide, in Canada's public and polarized copyright debate, between interests simplistically depicted as "struggling creators" versus "piratical teachers," when, instead,

[t]his system does not have to be conceived of as a battle between cultural workers and consumers. We all play various different roles with respect to copyright works, especially in an era in which we are so easily enabled by technology to cut and paste, whether we do so for artistic purposes, for financial gain, for work, for play, for school, or for some combination of reasons...Canadians should be just as familiar with the idea of fair dealing as they are with the idea of copyright infringement. (Murray/Trosow 2013:73)

This is also to say: *creators are teachers and vice versa*, and share common interests before property law as before other repressive state apparatus; "no less than users or readers do, authors need fair dealing too" (McCutcheon in press). Exhibit A (in this case neither made by a lawyer nor comprising legal counsel of any kind): the cento, with its distinctive links to literary pedagogy and copyright law.

The cento is absolutely having a revival. (Caple qtd. in Caple/Starnino 2016:¶11)

The specific works to be read according to my proposed twofold threefold method can be categorized in two main groups: book-length works that are predominantly or wholly intertextual in form; and centos, whether named or implied as such, in single-authored books of poetry. The first category includes Mary Dalton's *Hooking*, Jordan Abel's *Injun* and *Un/Inhabited*, M. NourbeSe Philip's *Zong!* and Jonathan Locke Hart's *Unforgetting Private Charles Smith*. The second category includes centos appearing in Nancy Dembowski's *Ninety-seven Posts with the Heads of Dead Men*, Ken Babstock's *On Malice*, Paul Vermeersch's *Don't Let It End Like This Tell Them I Said Something*, Sina Queyras' *My Ariel*, Natalee Caple's *The Semiconducting Dictionary (Our Strindberg)* and *Love in the Chthulucene (Cthulhucene)*, Liz Howard's *Infinite Citizen of the Shaking Tent*, Susan Elmslie's *I, Nadja*, Jennifer Zilm's *Waiting Room*, and Joshua Whitehead's *full-metal indigiqueer*. The paratextual matter and sampling practices in these works show how contemporary writing, in extending aesthetic traditions that long predate the modern, globalized regime of intellectual property regulation must, in the process, navigate that regime – which is ill-disposed to accommodate (never mind cultivate) such traditions.

What emerges among these works are not only networks of relationship and practice among poets working in Canada – arguably a niche enough scene that the preceding catalogue can serve, however provisionally, as synecdoche for poetry published in Canada (precise materialist wording I prefer to the more presumptuously nationalist “Canadian poetry”) – but also certain premises and preoccupations they appear to share: specifically, feminist premises and anti-capitalist preoccupations. Both concerns are interrelated, and both bear metacritically on works that deal in the appropriation and transformation of others’ intellectual property in pursuit of speaking truth to power, which here entails critiquing the discourse of property – partly by appropriating discourse.

To contextualize a discussion of these three groups of specific works, let us now outline how “the legal institution of creative authorship” has become codified in Canadian copyright law – and, moreover, how that law has recently changed to establish important users’ rights that have rebalanced a copyright regime historically favourable to rights holders between the interests of rights-holders (who are not always the creators). Having outlined an introduction to fundamentals of Canadian copyright law in this chapter’s companion article, (see McCutcheon in press), I will quote it at length here:

Copyright law ... treat[s] original intellectual and artistic works as a kind of property vested by both private and public interests. The private interest is that of the author, creator, or another designated “rights-holder,” whom copyright affords a kind of limited monopoly on whether and how their work may be reproduced and distributed, in order to optimize the return they can get on their work; the public interest arises in the limitations on this monopoly, limitations that allow the work to be used by others as a resource for the development of future works (Galin 10). Copyright protects original expressions that have been given fixed material form – not ideas or facts, only material works: literary, dramatic, musical, and artistic products, performances, recordings, and broadcasts. In addition, copyright only protects works that demonstrate “originality” beyond a minimal, necessarily vague threshold: a work must be more than a copy, but it need not be novel or unique (Murray and Trosow 42). And while copyright protects only original expressions given fixed material form, its protection requires no registration; protection applies automatically, as soon as a work is produced, and lasts whether or not the interest is actively defended (36-37).

But copyright doesn’t last in perpetuity, only for a specified length of time: in Canada, the term during which a work is protected by copyright lasts from the moment of its material production until fifty years after the year in which its author dies. After a work’s copyright expires, the work joins the public domain: “the realm of all works which can be exploited by everybody without any authorization, mostly because of the expiration of the term of protection” (WIPO qtd. in Nair, “Towards” 8). The public domain is widely understood as the total corpus of works whose copyright terms have expired. “Think of copyright term as a moving wall between today’s creators and a shared heritage,” write Trosow and Murray: “the constant renewal of the public domain ensures that creators have a growing mass of resources with which they can work freely – in both senses of the word” (49).

In addition to works whose copyrights have lapsed, the public domain also “includes copyright-protected material that, by virtue of law, may be used without seeking authoriza-

tion or making payment” (Craig 80, Nair, “Towards” 9). That is, “when copyright-protected material is used in accordance with statutory exceptions ... the work becomes part of the public domain” (Nair 8). The “statutory exceptions” allowing unauthorized use of works are known as *fair dealing* (the analogous statute in the USA is *fair use*). The Supreme Court’s 2002 *Théberge* case decision links fair dealing to the public domain thus: “the exceptions to copyright infringement enumerated in ss. 29 to 32.2 ... seek to protect the public domain in traditional ways such as fair dealing” (*Théberge* 32).

Fair dealing is a users’ right in copyright law that provides for certain circumstances in which one may use or reproduce a copyrighted work without needing permission from or payment to the rights holder to do so: for instance, the quotation of excerpts from a work for purposes of criticism, study, or parody (73). Through landmark legal rulings (e.g. *Théberge* in 2002, *CCH* in 2004) and amendments made in 2012 to Canadian copyright law, fair dealing has become ensconced enshrined as a users’ right; but it is still commonly understood as a legal defence against infringement allegations.

Fair dealing and the public domain represent vital checks against copyright’s insistent overreach; joining these checks, a counter-discourse of Indigenous cultural property has emerged to contest copyright law’s premises in Eurocentric discourses of property and its “imposition of colonial regimes” (Nicholas 219). As explained by Gregory Younging, “Traditional Knowledge and Oral Traditions [are] Indigenous cultural property, owned by Indigenous Peoples and over which Indigenous Peoples exert control. This recognition has bearing on permission and copyright, and applies even when non-Indigenous laws do not require it” (Younging 100). Murray and Trosow flag the cultural and legal differences arising in Indigenous cultural property’s community-grounded concern with reputation – “not the author’s, but rather that of the ... culture, or nation. And indeed, many Indigenous people emphasize that the ‘author’ of a specific expression is a tradition-bearer, not an originator. ... Thus, while alienability is foundational to Western ideas of property and intellectual property ... Indigenous ownership, as many explain it, is based on ideas of custodianship, community, and responsibility” (231-232).

Copyright, then, may be a “pretence,” as Frye says (96), that art is invention – but it is a pretence with teeth. (McCutcheon in press)

One way in which copyright law bares its teeth, asserting its enforceability as the regulatory infrastructure policing and framing virtually all cultural production, is the copyright page in any published book: a component of a book’s front matter, most often presented as the verso of the title page, the copyright page constitutes paratext articulating legal obligations and consequences. This fact of publishing brings me to the first of my two interpretive devices, the paratextual close reading method:

I hold that *permissions* language (typically but not only found in front matter like the copyright page) constitutes evidence of authorized, paid licensing, while *notes* (typically but not only found in end matter like acknowledgments and bibliography) comprise evidence of fair dealing’s *de facto* exercise, whether or not such use is intended or defended as such. If copyright applies automatically, then its user provisions should too; perhaps producing cultural works, in general, according to the premise that users’ rights apply automatically may suggest one way to strengthen the ties between users’ rights and broader Charter rights, as Bita Amani calls for: “Rather than assume that the Charter is redundant because of existing internal copyright limits and safeguards such as the defence of fair dealing, we must acknowledge and embrace Charter compliance as a check on copy-

right’s public reach.” Charter analysis is a principled method for reconciling rights of expression with allegations of infringement, providing some normative content for the user’s right side of the social balance that copyright is meant to accomplish (51). According to Amani, Canadian copyright jurisprudence has tended not to consider free speech protections, but it is a “legal imperative,” she writes, to “embrace Charter compliance as a check on copyright’s public reach” (50-1). The reading methodology that I propose seeks to strengthen the relationship between expressive freedoms and users’ rights. (McCutcheon in press)

In my personal library of sixty-three single-authored poetry books published in Canada, only six include permissions language that acknowledges the rights of any author other than the poet (curiously, two books include permissions language for reproducing their own authors’ other works: Leonard Cohen’s retrospective collection *Stranger Music* [Cohen 1993:n.p.] and Dennis Lee’s *Alligator Pie* [Lee 2001:4]). In stark contrast, forty-four of these sixty-three titles include notes and acknowledgments language about their source materials. One such title, Esta Spalding’s *Anchoress*, supplements its end-matter notes with a legalistic disclaimer that “[e]very reasonable effort has been made to contact the holders of copyright for materials quoted in this work” (Spalding 1997:126). And of these sixty-three books, only three books include both permissions and notes (Brand 2006:103; Brandt 2018:75; Ondaatje 1970:3).

If such a collection may serve as an anecdotal sample, its paratextual evidence suggests that notes are something of a citational norm, and permissions something of an exception, in contemporary poetry published in Canada. Given the expense of permissions, it makes economic sense for Canadian publishers of poetry – a genre that typically represents loss, not profit, for publishers (McLaren 2018:14) – to eschew permissions and instead rely on fair dealing. In this context, a copyright page that names only the author, rather than including permissions language to acknowledge the licensing of other authors’ works – usually, if ironically, worded as a “courtesy of” the quoted rights holder – makes its own implied assertion of fair dealing, a tacit recognition of the author’s creative liberty to transformatively rework other texts. Similarly, end-matter notes that scrupulously document a book’s cited sources – but do not use permissions language – make an explicit assertion of fair dealing, an overt recognition of the author’s research and reading practices and, thus, of the structural and systemic intertextuality of the text (itself “a tissue of quotations,” in Roland Barthes’ words [Barthes 1977:146]).

This paratextual reading method, then, affords us a means to interpret a book’s front and end matter towards understanding the book’s conditions of production and relations to the regulatory infrastructure of copyright. In complementary fashion, the sampladelic reading method affords a means to interpret how these conditions and relations play out in the poetry itself, the writing bookended by the front and end matter.

So now let us cue the sampladelic approach:

The basic techniques of DJ performance consist of selecting and organizing sequences of recorded music and sound: “The essence of the DJ’s craft is selecting which records to play and in what order” (17). Equipped with one’s selection of tracks – whether a crate

of 12-inch vinyl singles or a laptop full of mp3s – the performing dj plays one track after another, and often blended together, in a mix called a “set,” usually improvised for the occasion. Dance DJs tend to strive for a “seamless” mix, in which two or more tracks match beats and mix melodies, one track ending while the next starts. By “beat-matching” the two tracks, switching between them (“crossfading”), and tweaking their signal levels on the fly (“EQing”), the DJ produces a mix of continuous, uninterrupted music. As with rap, some of the techno genres structured more by breakbeat samples (drum solos excerpted from old funk records) combine “seamless” mixing with abrupt “crossfades”: quick transitions between beat-matched tracks, rather than their gradual and sustained overlap. In addition to mixing and beat-matching tracks, a DJ performance may also include samples and sound effects from other sources (for example, a DJ may mix in a sample or even a beat from a third track; alternately, some mixers feature built-in effects and filters). (McCutcheon 2015:108)

Since a DJ’s materials are extant, pre-recorded texts, a DJ’s own style is distinguished by play with genre expectations, taste, and *kairos*: a term from classical rhetoric that might be summarized as contextually contingent knowledge of the opportune moment, “a sense of the present and timely action” (Sutton 413). ... a DJ articulates taste and *kairos* in the selecting and sequencing of tracks, which build a rapport with the audience, making the performance a more collaborative improvisation. Cueing (preparing the next track to mix with that being played) and monitoring (listening to both the playback signal on the pa and the cue signal in the headphones) perform selectivity and timing in the structuring of the mix: a kind of conducting in the placement and orchestration of different tracks either together or in sequence. Cueing and monitoring also enact a kind of surveillance that we also must recognize in commentary, as a practice of explicating a primary text that also announces its subjection to scrutiny and judgment. Cross-fading (cutting from one track or signal to another) enacts the DJ’s critical recontextualization of the original materials, as does the application of looping, sound effects, and scratching. These recontextualizing practices also might be said to represent something like the DJ’s own style or voice. (McCutcheon 2015:109-110)

This approach can be dubbed “sampladelic” for several reasons. For starters, it’s a portmanteau coined by another writer, the music critic Simon Reynolds, so borrowing it seems apt for adapting to the analysis of centos and found poetry more generally. Reynolds introduces the word in his 1998 book *Generation Ecstasy* (titled *Energy Flash* in its original UK edition) to discuss how rap, techno, and related genres work as “disorienting, perception-warping music created using the sampler and other forms of digital technology” (Reynolds 1998:41). Reynolds continues with comments on music that also apply to the kinds of poetry discussed in this chapter and book:

Sampling breaks with traditional ideas of “musicality”... so I’m using “sampladelia” as a general rubric for electronic dance’ music’s revolutionary implications: its radical break with the ideals of real-time interactive playing and natural acoustic space. ... Critiques of sampling focused on the regurgitative, referential nature of the practice, the gleeful disregard for conventional musical skill, and the fact that these records were brazen extravaganzas of sonic larceny. Enthusiasts promptly seized these accusations and turned them around into proof of sampling’s subversiveness: its transgression of copyright, its punk-style democratization of music-making. (Reynolds 1998:41-42)

Further reasons I adopt the term *sampladelic* here include its connotation of the de-familiarizing capacity and largely still illegal – *unlicensed* – status of hallucinogenic drugs; its connection of excerpting and quotation to legibility and openness, since the “delos” in *-delic* derives from the Greek word for clarity or manifest presence; and its provenance as a term coined to describe the intertextual character of digitally based music forms, which resonates with the intertextual character of found poetic forms, especially works that quote – sample – popular music.

The parallels between the cento and the DJ mix are thus formal, ideological, and aesthetic: in the major treatise on cento poetics, the fourth-century rhetorician Ausonius “emphasi[zes] the neat coalescence of the individual ... verse units, the linkage of which should become virtually invisible so that the piece could give the impression of an organic whole” (Okáčová 2009:3). The seamless and surprising mix is a classical ideal for centos and DJ sets alike. (McCutcheon 2015:111)

Having established some background context concerning both the cento and Canadian copyright law, and having outlined my argument’s two complementary interpretive methods, let us now apply those methods to the aforementioned two groups of poetry books, starting with book-length works that are wholly or extensively intertextual in form: Mary Dalton’s *Hooking*, Jordan Abel’s *Injun* and *Un/Inhabited*, M. NourbeSe Philip’s *Zong!* and Jonathan Locke Hart’s *Unforgetting Private Charles Smith*. Dalton’s *Hooking* is a book of centos composed of excerpts from hundreds of other poems, including both copyright-protected works and works now in the public domain. Abel’s *Injun* and *Un/Inhabited* are books of poetry composed wholly from excerpts of ninety-one public-domain Western novels. Philip’s *Zong!* is “the dismemberment of a legal decision,” as Rachel Galvin writes, “which she breaks down to the phonemic level, yet includes in an appendix in its original form” (Galvin 2014:34); the decision, *Gregson v. Gilbert* (1783), “documented the drowning of 150 slaves by the captain so that the ship’s owners would collect insurance monies” (45). Hart’s *Unforgetting Private Charles Smith* transforms an unknown Canadian soldier’s World War One diary into a long found poem. These book-length works employ different found-poetry techniques: Dalton, whose work among these is most traditional as centonism (and is the only work in this group to describe its contents as centos), excerpts and rearranges lines; Hart mainly transforms his source text through Abel collages and erases his sources; Philip also excerpts and collages, but goes far further than the others in this group in exploding and atomizing her source text, breaking it down into words and even parts of words, and mining her source text’s words for other words they contain.

On the subject of paratext, in these five books – all composed extensively or wholly of others’ words – the copyright page names only the book’s author as the work’s rights holder. Abel’s books’ copyright pages both include fairly standard “courtesy paratexts” (Nair 2018:¶10) warning that “no part of this book may be reproduced...without the prior written consent of the publisher or a license” (*Injun* n.p.). While Nair rightly shows how such paratext too often imbues legal “overreach” with “a hue of legality” (2018:¶5) – “limitations/exceptions to copyright are always an

option” (§26) as Abel himself vigorously exercises – but in the context of Indigenous cultural property, this paratext and its consequence read differently.

One other fascinating detail found among these works’ copyright pages and other paratext is how Philip supplements her own status as author by attributing her work neither to her source text nor to herself but rather to one Setaey Adamu Boateng. The copyright page names only Philip as the rights holder, but the title page and covers name the author as “M. Nourbese Philip as told to the author by Setaey Adamu Boateng”; the book spine names “Philip / Boateng.” Philip’s notes say nothing about Boateng; her prefatory acknowledgments include thanks to her ancestors “for bestowing the responsibility of this work” on her (Philip 2008:xii); and the only explication of this additional authorial credit is on the back cover’s note on the author, which mentions first Philip and then Boateng, who, we learn, “is the voice of the ancestors revealing the submerged stories of all who were on board the *Zong*.” Philip’s subordination of her own authorship to that of an African ancestor can be read to signify several different things; like her wholly intertextual poetry itself, the acknowledgment of ancestral authorship foregrounds issues of propriety and appropriation of voice and points to a collectivized, intergenerational understanding of authority and responsibility that is radically different from white patriarchal capitalism’s institution of individual authorship with its monopoly on intellectual property.

In contrast to their spare copyright pages, all of these books except one (which is Hart’s) feature extensive and detailed notes to acknowledge and discuss their source materials and the books’ own procedures for reusing said sources. Dalton’s end-matter notes list hundreds of poems by dozens of poets; she lists her citations in the order in which they appear in each poem – a convenience for the reader who likes to track down and compare sources – and she prefaces her citations with a description of her book’s particular procedure: “Each of the centos in this collection is made of lines which occur at the same point in the linear structure of the poems they are excised from. Thus, ‘Cloth,’ the opening poem, consists of the seventh line of eighteen poems” (Dalton 2013:67). Dalton’s assiduously compiled bibliography – which also furnishes a kind of map of her work – occupies roughly a third of the books’ total pages.

Both of Abel’s books not only document but emphasize his process: *Un/Inhabited* includes a Sources list and an Index that is itself a poem, in that it indexes a list of land formation words (e.g. Arroyo, Butte, Coulee), some of which do not occur in the book. *Injun* practically parodies the archive fever of end matter and notes: the long poem *Injun* occupies not quite thirty of the book’s eighty-six pages; after the poem follow sections titled Notes (sets of poetically rendered sentences extracted from Abel’s source novels), Appendix (a compilation of all source novels’ sentences that mention the word “injun,” here erased throughout), Sources (a bibliography of all novels used), and Process (a short note explaining Abel’s procedure). While Abel’s notes in both books describe his work’s processes and cite all his sources, he does not identify specific sources for specific lines. As a result, the words he uses read more as if they speak on behalf of a genre – the pulp Western – than as unique books (in an ironic inversion of the ambas-

sadorial, “representative” role often foisted on minoritized or racialized authors). Philip’s *Zong!* includes extensive notes, including a glossary (Philip 2008:183-184); a detailed, diaristic reflection on how she learned of the *Gregson v. Gilbert* decision and how she developed her approach to transforming it into poetry (189-207); bibliographic endnotes (208-209); and the full text of said decision itself (210-211).

The aforementioned exception here, Hart’s *Unforgetting Private Charles Smith*, contains no notes, although it does preface the long poem it has wrought from a soldier’s war diary with an extended critical reflection; in it, Hart provides a citation for his source text (2019:5) and he recounts both how he discovered Smith’s writings and how he made of them – or, as he puts it, found in them – a poem. “I did not set out to appropriate the prosaic words of an ordinary soldier and elevate them to status of poetry,” Hart writes. “There was no need: they were already poetry” (32). In Hart’s book, the entirety of Smith’s short, impressionistic diary gets enjambed and spaced into poetic form:

The first night here. The weather was good.
Noticed the striking difference between here
And Sanctuary Wood. Here all green
There all shell strewn and battered up. (63)

In the context of sampladelic strategies, then, Hart’s found long poem might be considered a kind of remastered mix of the original text: he uses the whole diary, rather than excerpting samples from it; and he retains the source text’s original sequence, its chronological ordering of diary entries. The remastering emerges in Hart’s enjambements and spacings, and more broadly in his recirculation and redeployment of a “lost” or “unknown” text, which his book gives new currency and new form (typed up, turned into poetry, and published in print and Open Access digital formats).

all interpretation is a use of violence and caprice against a text (Calvino 1981:69)

Philip and Abel, in contrast, transform their sources more in the manner of the remix, which rearranges and recontextualizes the components of the original in a different order. Both Philip’s and Abel’s books might be further characterized as remixes or dub versions of their source works, since both Philip and Abel work intensively with white space (understood with all its racialized undertones), textual spacing, and erasure as poetic strategies. Both *Zong!* and Abel’s *Injun* enact a movement from initial sections whose textual arrangements resemble traditional poetry – lines enjambed and tightly grouped in stanzas – towards later sections that look more like concrete or visual poetry – words, word fragments, and letters spread and strewn across pages, like flotsam or bodies adrift on the ocean’s surface. Throughout *Zong!*, Philip not only rearranges her source text’s words but breaks those words apart, prising open space among and within them, as in this self-reflexive excerpt from the chapter titled Ferrum:

ifà can if ifà can
 if only i
 fa can all that rema
 ins are
 words i do not ow n they t
 read water (129)

Philip's spacings break open "words i do...not ow...n" and wrest words from within words – "read" from "tread," "ow" from "own." Philip's procedure, theorized as violence done to the letter of that law which sanctions the violence done to people deemed property, atomizes *Gregson v. Gilbert's* language and draws from the nebula a choir of "utterances [that] become a constellation of stuttering, drowning cries" (Galvin 2014:45). As Philip explains in her book's detailed notes (titled Notanda),

Law and poetry both share an inexorable concern with language...precision of expression is the goal shared by both. ... My intent is to use the text of the legal decision as a word store; to lock myself into this particular and peculiar discursive landscape in the belief that the story of these African men, women, and children thrown overboard in an attempt to collect insurance monies, the story that can only be told by not telling, is locked in this text. ... I would lock myself in this text in the same way men, women, and children were locked in the holds of the slave ship *Zong*. (2008:191)

She also mines her English source text for words from African languages: the excerpt above repeats "ifà," a Yoruba word meaning divination. Elsewhere in the work she draws from the decision's word "property" the words poet, pope, troy, and trope (87). And Philip even recombines words drawn from only the *Gregson* decision into quotations of other works, as in this passage alluding to Shakespeare's *Tempest*: "...where the...bee suc...ks there...do the s...ums" (135).

Zong! is an exhaustive, poetic and visual deconstruction of one short text; in contrast, Abel's *Un/Inhabited* and *Injun* – which, like *Zong!*, both pursue a similar movement from relatively traditional to more experimentally visual poetry – are books that each work with a massive archive of ninety-one old Western novels, now in the public domain, in digital editions housed at Project Gutenberg. Abel copied and pasted the full texts of all ninety-one novels into a single, master text file, then searched them for specific keywords: in *Un/Inhabited*, the multiple search terms pertain to land; in *Injun*, the single main search term is the eponymous racist epithet. In *Un/Inhabited's* first section, *Pioneering*,

[h]is approach is systematic: find a line with the search term, copy and paste the sentence into a narrow column of text, delete the search term and leave a blank in its place, then repeat until all the sentences containing the word have been sourced. The findings appear in the same order in which they were found. No other alterations are made. (Ritter 2020: xii-xiii)

This somewhat randomized process reveals an ambiguous curiosity: the repetition of certain passages, not only between different poems (wherein passages may recur if they contain more than one of Abel's search words) but also within poems; for example, a passage about "wave[s] of emigration" recurs in "pioneer" (Abel 2020:72; cf. 79). Either

Abel is reusing the same passage, suggesting his process is less random and more curatorial, or that passage was reused in different Western pulp fictions, suggesting the formulaic – and *derivative* – character of some genre writing. Abel’s sequencing process also yields some serendipitous rhymes, rhythms, and juxtapositions; for example, consider this sequence of two sentences in the poem “frontier,” which incidentally establishes a telling avian metaphor for religious figures of colonialism:

If what these smen asserted was true, then the ministers’ zeal had struck them blind. Jim never saw one of these carrion birds soaring overhead but his thoughts instantly reverted to the ruffian and his horrible craving. (Abel 2020:107)

In *Un/Inhabited*’s subsequent, more visual sections, Cartography and Extracted, Abel’s search results are compiled and run together to work more as tone and texture than as vocabulary: in Cartography, the source text and white space together form map-like silhouette images of bodies of land and water; in Extracted, the source text is subjected to overlap, creating dark columns of dense, unreadable words, and to vertical columns of white space that strike through increasingly wide swaths of text until the concluding pages are simply blank: “Abel extracts the text in the way that resources are mined from the land, until nothing is left” (Ritter 2020:xiv).

As Kathleen Ritter writes,

Abel’s use of appropriation as a methodology is classic: he takes a source text and, without changing any of the words, subjects it to a number of processes that ultimately recontextualize and politicize it in a way that the original authors could never have imagined. ... The irony of these novels existing in the public domain is not lost on Abel. By reworking the texts into poetry he rescripts their relationships to publics, public domain and public lands. (Ritter 2020:xvi-xvii).

For example, consider this passage from *Un/Inhabited*’s long poem “territory”: “Why not turn the tables and annex a part of the vast stolen from her by the octopus arms of our capitalist class?” (Abel 2020:46-7). This excerpt encapsulates the book’s ironic self-reflection on Abel’s own appropriative process and the laws of property – including intellectual property – that it navigates and interrogates.

Abel composed *Injun* in much the same way; having compiled all sentences containing the titular word “injun” into a 26-page document,

I then cut up each page into a section of a long poem. Sometimes I would cut up a page into three- to five-word clusters. Sometimes I would cut up a page without looking. Sometimes I would rearrange the pieces until something sounded right. Sometimes I would just write down how the pieces fell together. (Abel 2016:83)

If *Un/Inhabited* exhibits a documentary style – partly erased sentences compiled in the order in which those sentences were found in the master file – then *Injun* exhibits a more curatorial style, in its more varied treatments and transformations of its search results:

all day for a dollar
 mixing mineral land¹⁵
 with the real thing (Abel 2016:14, note in original)

Both *Un/Inhabited* and *Injun*, then, employ both paratextual and sampladelic techniques in works of “literary reappropriation” (Weaver 2018) that extensively exploit Western “public” property and transform it into Indigenous cultural property, in the process both leveraging and critiquing intellectual property law as a weapon of colonialism and cultural imperialism.

More like Abel’s work than like Philip’s or Hart’s in its use of a myriad sources, Dalton’s *Hooking* mixes together lines of poetry, drawn liberally from public-domain and protected works alike, to form new poems. Her book exhibits similarities less with remastering or remixing than with the cut-and-mix composition of hip hop, dancehall, or turntablist tracks, in which an array of sound and music samples are concatenated to form entirely new songs (musical examples include Grandmaster Flash’s “Adventures on the Wheels of Steel,” MAARS’ “Pump Up the Volume,” and more or less the entirety of the Beastie Boys’ second album, *Paul’s Boutique*, which samples over a hundred major popular records [Shields 2010:97]). Dalton’s method of selecting and sequencing dozens of discrete lines from different poems also has a legal function; as I write elsewhere, “[t]his procedure thus prevents any cento from using more than one line from a source poem (the amount used from a given work is a key factor in weighing fair dealing); and the Source Lists section specifies which line number every cento uses...some poets’ names recur but very few individual poems are cited more than once” (McCutcheon in press).

Like the other books discussed here, Dalton’s poems harbour many suggestive lines that reflect on her appropriative composition process. “Language all her life is a second language,” says the persona in Dalton’s poem “Threaded,” in a line quoting Sharon Thesen (Dalton 2013:13, cf. 93). Her book’s very title exhibits the adoption of one specific metaphor to frame the whole work. “Hooking” is the term for “a traditional Newfoundland craft...hooked rug[-making from] strips of fabric cut from old clothes” (back cover). As rug-hooking mixes together heterogeneous materials to form new works, so do Dalton’s aleatory, unsettling centos model an arts-and-crafts kind of patchwork (as many texts discussed in this volume evoke textile metaphors; cf. Fowler, Galli, and Trösch). Dalton’s adaptation of the cento’s ancient poetic procedure here evokes folksy tradition, grapples with modern IP law, and, in so doing, also self-consciously comments on its own process of “turn[ing] up fragments of poems” (Layton qtd. in Dalton 2013:58; cf. 68). “Filaments” reprints Langston Hughes’ line “Let me repeat” and points to permissions via Anne Sexton’s line “I give you permission” (28; cf. 78).

The tone and texture of Dalton’s centos vary considerably, although many adopt similar forms; for instance, all stanzas of all poems in Part One are tercets. Dalton’s enjambments and their corresponding transitions of voice often function like DJ-style cross-fading, disrupting or redirecting the reader’s attention or line of thought; line breaks become precipitous abductions, lines of flight between often dramatically different scenes, images, and questions. In these ways, Dalton’s samples and their sequencing in her poems articulate not just an artisanal affinity with textile craft but also a dis-

tinctly sampladelic poetics, characterized by steady rhythm–*beat-matching*, in DJ parlance – in line and stanza, paired with surprise juxtaposition – *cross-fading* – in image and tone.

Another way in which paratext relates to sampling in largely or wholly intertextual poetry is in how the poet chooses to present their notes for readers’ reference. Dalton’s notes assiduously link literally every line in her book to its specific source poem, identified by author and title. Philip provides her book’s source text in full as an appendix. Hart’s work consists of its source material, to which his authorial contributions are mainly enjambment and spacing. Abel’s notes, in both *Un/Inhabited* and *Injun*, list all of his source novels, grouped under their authors’ names in alphabetical order. *Injun*’s Notes section (capitalized here to distinguish it from end-matter notes) features excerpted lines from source novels, lines that have been justified, truncated, and formatted in lightface, except for the keyword in question, in order to make that keyword a vertical column of type; for instance, the superscript note “15” in the above-quoted excerpt from *Injun* directs the reader to Note 15, whose third and fourth lines read:

p—and that there makes mineral **land** of it, and as such, open to entr
ut of covering up valuable mineral **land** on purpose. And he says that the la (2016:45)

These collected excerpts let the reader glimpse something of the keyword’s original context in the novel from which it is extracted, but neither *Un/Inhabited* nor *Injun* provide detailed citations that would allow for easy or convenient comparison of source text and appropriated excerpt. Paratexts’ varied forms signal distinctive poetics and politics, as we also see when we turn to our second group of works, centos that are individual poems not book-length works.

Selections representing this group appear in these poetry books: Nancy Dembowski’s *Ninety-seven Posts with the Heads of Dead Men*, Ken Babstock’s *On Malice*, Paul Vermeersch’s *Don’t Let It End Like This Tell Them I Said Something*, Sina Queyras’ *My Ariel*, Natalee Caple’s *The Semiconducting Dictionary (Our Strindberg)* and *Love in the Chthulucene (Cthulhucene)*, Liz Howard’s *Infinite Citizen of the Shaking Tent*, Susan Elmslie’s *I, Nadja*, Jennifer Zilm’s *Waiting Room*, and Joshua Whitehead’s *full-metal indigiqueer*. As in the book-length works discussed above, the books in which shorter-form centos appear include no paratextual permissions language. The most striking copyright page among the works in this group belongs to Queyras’ *My Ariel*, an extensively intertextual homage to Sylvia Plath, whose oeuvre joined Canada’s public domain in 2014 (but remains copyright-protected in the USA). Queyras’ book includes detailed notes (Queyras 2017:155-158) – and, on the copyright page, an unusual disclaimer: “Please note: these poems offer an engagement with the life and work of Sylvia Plath and Ted Hughes; they do not claim to be the truth of their lives, only the truth of my own engagement” (4). Queyras’ disclaimer both asserts the poet’s rights and acknowledges the rights of her source authors. This is pointedly not permissions language; if anything, it is more the language of moral not economic rights: the right of attribution and the right to the work’s integrity. Furthermore, to assert “the truth of my own engagement” is also to imply a link between moral rights and users’

rights, sets of rights that might seem opposed, insofar as the right to a work's integrity would seem at odds with the right to creatively adapt it, "to read against the grain" (Ritter 2020:xvi).

In lieu of any permissions language (for textual content, that is, not for design elements like cover art, credit for which often appears on a copyright page, e.g. Whitehead n.p.), the books featuring these shorter-form centos, like the book-length works discussed above, all include notes, some of which are extensive and detailed.

Dembowski's notes include bibliographic lists of sources for her poems, but she lists sources alphabetically, not in order of appearance. Similarly, for the centos or cento-like found poems in their respective books, Queyras and Caple append notes that name all these poems' sources but not in any immediately discernible order; Caple credits six poets with the lines she uses to compose the poem "I," but she leaves unspecified which lines are whose. Babstock's centos each work with one source text, named in his notes. Zilm's note about the sole cento in her 2016 book *Waiting Room* document her sources in other contemporary poets and her particular renderings – or, in some cases, serendipitous misprisions – of their lines (Zilm 2016:97). Vermeersch and Whitehead share notes for their centos that list their sources more or less in order of appearance, not strictly so. Elmslie's notes name the archive she works with but not the specific texts (2006:142). Such differences among these books' citational strategies place correspondingly different expectations on the reader, especially in terms of how much or how little work the reader must do to consult source texts and compare adaptations to originals.

Relatedly, how or whether the poet cites centonism as such partakes of this paratextual poetics and politics, too. Babstock, Dembowski, Whitehead, Elmslie, and Caple (in her works, not her commentaries) refrain from mentioning centonism by name, however demonstrably their poems commit it. Babstock's notes describe his appropriations as the "sourc[ing]" and "min[ing]" of "vocabulary" and "language" from his sources (2014:93), clarifying their character as centos although not naming them as such. Queyras' notes describe the poem "Tulips" as "composed of images and phrases" from a range of poets past and present (2017:156); "Tulips" is thus implied to be a cento, not acknowledged as one, as. Vermeersch explicitly identifies the poems in his Rubble suite (2016:99-110) as centos (114), and Zilm spotlights the form, subtitled her poem "S.elective S.oothing R.adiant I.nventory" (a title that quotes Christopher Dewdney's 1988 poetry book *Radiant Inventory*) as a cento (2016:90).

Some of these works' bibliographic approaches appear ironically to both invite and thwart seeking recourse to quoted sources; for Caple to credit Dionne Brand as a source for unspecified lines in "I" is – all at once – to give credit where it's due, to appeal to the reader's trust (given the citation's incapacity to let the reader easily verify the source), to stand in for the source, and thus both to reproduce and deconstruct the discourse of citational acknowledgment, which is also a discourse of origins and of authenticity.

As Shields argues, the excerpting of other works in a new work both amplifies and undercuts the new work’s aura of authenticity (as Rowena Fowler shows in her paper on Ezra Pound’s poetry). Quoting and sampling lend a work a documentary aesthetic that augments its authenticity, while the foregrounding of intertextual relations entailed by such appropriations (partly via paratext) at the same time imparts a heightened sense of the work’s artifice. Encapsulating this contradiction, Shields quotes the eighteenth-century novelist Laurence Sterne: “stolen property is the soul” (100).

Just as the letters of our language are metaphors for specific sounds, and words are metaphors for specific ideas, shards of the culture itself now form a language the most everyone knows how to speak. Artists don’t have to spell things out; it’s much faster to go straight to the existing material – film footage, library research, wet newspapers, vinyl records, etc. It’s the artist’s job to mix (edit) the fragments together and, if needed, generate original fragments to fill in the gaps. (Shields 2010:96)

Shields’ theorization of appropriation in cultural production brings a myriad such practices across different genres and media into conversation with one another, much as this chapter essays a bringing together of legal (paratextual) and intermedial (sampladelic) methods. The chapter including the above-quoted discussion, a chapter titled “hip hop,” relates such considerations of authenticity and artifice to matters of copyright law (Shields 2010:100, 103). “Copyright laws,” Shields writes, “mak[e] the sampling of popular music virtually impossible” (100); insofar as the law has demonstrably changed how music like hip hop is produced, he’s not wrong: in the 1990s, landmark legal “decisions sent a chill through the rap music industry and encouraged producers to be less ambitious in their use of sampled materials” (Starr/Waterman 2007: 434; cf. George 95). The sharply punitive enforcement of copyright in recorded music makes the sampling practices of the poetry discussed here seem all the more radical for the legal risks they take with large and liberal quotation practices.

Babstock’s *On Malice*, in its investigation of implications of digital media, includes critical considerations of taking (Babstock 2014:67) and copying (57), about the classified (71) and the commons (61, 64), considerations about “trying to form sense from a shrinking common” (64). As articulated in the cento-esque long poem “Perfect Blue Distant Objects,” which overdubs lines from Hazlitt’s 1822 essay “Why Distant Objects Please” with digital vocabulary (e.g. “cables,” “packet,” “streaming” [63], and “bugs” [68]), these considerations of property and propriety then reverberate in the subsequent long poem “Five Eyes” (81-3) – which “restricts itself to vocabulary mined from John Donne’s essay ‘Biathanatos’” (93) – as meditations on “the imperial vastness of the law of distribution” (Babstock 2014:82):

I give incitatory words to my masters
 who require them
 under law. ... (87)

Babstock makes use of one protected work, a recent translation of Walter Benjamin (93); in sharp contrast, Whitehead’s *full-metal indigiqueer* deals extensively and transformatively in samples drawn from protected sources including popular Hollywood

franchises like *Seinfeld*, *The Simpsons*, *The Terminator*, and *The Godfather* (Whitehead 2017:117, 119); transmedia brands like Marvel and DC comic-book characters (119); and global pop stars from The Beatles to Justin Bieber (117) – all of which are massively profitable, fiercely protected (see Downes 2015-2016), and practically impossible for poetry press budgets to accommodate licensing. Whitehead also heavily uses public-domain sources. The second part of Whitehead’s “You Tell Me You Love Me...” is subtitled “write about your<sel[ves]>” and consists of excerpts from Shakespeare, James Baldwin, Zora Neale Hurston, and fellow Indigenous writers like Leanne Betasamosake Simpson and Richard Van Camp (118). Whitehead transforms his sources more drastically than others in subjecting them to new enjambments and to his book’s distinctive typographic and diacritical style; for instance, lines from Shakespeare’s *Tempest* appear in lower-case with ampersands in lieu of “and”:

“the isle is full of noises
sounds & sweet airs that give delight & hurt not –” (80)

This half of Whitehead’s poetic diptych imparts both irony and authenticity in its subtitle – “write about your<sel[ves]>” – suggesting the intertextual, derivative, and – significantly – split or multiple character of one’s unique, lived subjectivity. In enlisting major protected sources and public-domain works to “write” these “sel[ves],” Whitehead is putting a kind of money where his mouth is.

Similarly, Vermeersch’s “Rubble #1” (Vermeersch 2016:101) uses only tag lines from Hollywood blockbusters, collaged together and conjoined by enjambments to form a cento whose cogency owes something to the formulaic character of Hollywood advertising: “Pray for the last man alive because / he’s not alone. No child has been born / for 18 years...” (101; cf. 114). Vermeersch also works with popular music recordings, which as Shields points out are jealously protected and policed. “Rubble #8” consists entirely of “backmasked messages” in famous records (i.e. audio tracks that become comprehensible when played backwards) by major artists like Pink Floyd, the Beatles, the B-52s and Moby: “Please send your answer to Old Pink, care of / the funny farm, Chalfont/ Oh no, you’re playing / the record backwards. Watch out, you might / ruin your needle...” (108; cf. 117).

Elmslie’s “Chez Graff” is composed of private correspondence by the woman known to André Breton as “Nadja”: “André, I want my notebook!” implores the poem’s persona (Elmslie 2006:79). Elmslie’s “I, Nadja” suite in her eponymous book also draws on Breton’s own work, and this suite was published in 2006, over a decade before Breton’s work entered Canada’s public domain. Dembowski’s book, published in 1998, includes several numbered poems that borrow largely and liberally from works including some major properties still copyright-protected today, like Pound’s *Cantos*, Oliver Sacks, and Bram Stoker’s *Dracula* – now a public domain work but one that enjoys what Daniel Downes calls the “transpropriated” protection of overlapping trademark and publicity rights (Downes 2015-2016:¶2).

A few poems in Liz Howard’s *Infinite Citizen of the Shaking Tent* adapt cento techniques, as we learn in the author’s notes: “‘Ring Sample: Addendum’ is a recom-

binative sonnet that constitutes a dendrochronology of language pulled from the first 14 poems of the book” (Howard 2015:96; cf. 87). With reference to the repurposing of others’ works, Howard uses an explicitly sampladelic vocabulary: “Words from Longfellow’s epic are sampled and remixed” (95). Similar explicitly “remix” techniques, including the transformative cannibalization of one’s own work in cento-esque form, also occurs in Natalee Caple’s *Love in the Cthulucene (Cthulucene)*: Caple follows one poem, “Mayhem Sonnet” (2019:41) with a spaced-out and erased “remix” of it (42-43) – a dub version, a cento based on the author’s own other poetry. Additionally, two poems are collages of cut-up photos, prints, and book pages, and like the poem preceding them, “Let us compare ecologies,” a variation on Leonard Cohen’s *Let Us Compare Mythologies*, the first cut-up collage is titled with a nod to canonical CanLit: “Wilderness Tips” (echoing Margaret Atwood). Like the lengthy Derrida epigraph with which she titles another poem [71], these CanLit nods signal IP savvy: titles aren’t copyrightable.

Caple’s two books discussed here don’t represent the most extensive commitment of centonism among the works discussed here, but, together with Philip’s and Abel’s, Caple’s work, especially *Love in the Cthulucene (Cthulucene)*, poses some of the most radical, challenging questions enabled by appropriative techniques and intertextual forms. In *Love*, Caple’s notes explain that her poems are all composed as gifts, “externalizations” of other people’s and texts’ effects on her work (106) arising from poetic practice and procedure in which “reading and writing together become part of a fluent exchange outside of capitalist economics” (106). Like Dembowski’s book, Caple’s book – like Dembowski’s, which Caple edited (Dembowski 1998:64; cf. Caple/Starnino 2016:¶11) – makes feminist arguments, both in the poems and in their notes, for literature to become more of a gift economy. And yet Caple is critically cognizant of the capitalist contradictions – and obligations – in which such arguments are caught up. Anticipating Eli McLaren’s more recent argument for transforming the economics of poetry publishing in Canada (i.e. by increasing public funding for grants and awards, by strengthening fair dealing, and by simply encouraging the purchase of poetry books [2018:24-25]), Caple reflects:

I think part of supporting community is contributing to economies around Canlit. That means buying books. (Caple qtd. in Caple/Starnino 2016:¶7)

In *Love*, Caple’s notes explain how she gave most poems to their dedicatees, in advance of publication, to ask their permission for dedication; and she credits several feminist scholars and poets with concepts that inform the framework and ethos of her project as an anti- or at least a-capitalist “way of acknowledging that we make each other and that we must think about how to ‘be’ together” (Caple 2019:106). Interestingly, in the context of copyright and users’ rights, Caple emphasizes permission – a lynchpin of the decidedly capitalist institution that is copyright – but does so to advance an “ongoing practice” that is “outside of capitalist economics” (106).

As these two groups of poetry published in Canada suggest, then, several major poetry books take shape around copying, intertextuality, and, more specifically, poet

Margaret Christakos' theory and pedagogy of "influency" (see Caple 2019:106, Philip 2018:xii), which "thematizes and enjoins poetic influence, persuasion, argument, imitation and iteration, even as it cultivates fluency across and between multiple poetic tongues" (Salah 2012:2). Furthermore, these books do so in order to critique colonialism, capitalism (Boon 2013:8), patriarchy, and other systems of oppression, including property laws that underwrite and reinforce said systems. "Poems written under constraint and composed of recombined, appropriated text," writes Rachel Galvin, "at times thematize the activity of appropriation itself as endemic to capitalism" (Galvin 2014:41).

The research conducted for this chapter suggests, additionally, that committing centonism is fairly widespread and (more significantly, given the cento's historical changes in reputation) legitimate poetic practice among poets working in Canada. To make its particular case for the recognition and exercise of users' rights in cultural production, this study has focused on centos published in print books, where the practice seems common enough. But this study also points to a need for further research on poetry that employs cento-esque, sampladelic techniques and paratextual strategies to exploit and repurpose intellectual properties that would be too prohibitively expensive for poetry presses to license: properties like Hollywood films and popular music recordings. Examples of such techniques in works relevant to but beyond the scope of this chapter can be found in Christopher Doda's *Glutton for Punishment*, a book of *glosas* structured around whole verses from rock songs; in Sonnet L'Abbé's *Sonnet's Shakespeare*, a collection of prose poems that are also palimpsests, integrating and subsuming – or "aggrocultur[ing]" – all of Shakespeare's sonnets (L'Abbé 2019:43); Jennica Harper's 2008 *What It Feels Like For A Girl*, a collection citing Madonna and other pop lyrics; and individual poems, which quote but don't license pop music lyrics, in books by Dionne Brand and Di Brandt, among others. And if we were to widen the focus further, to include centos published online (see MacDonald 2015) and centos published in scholarly forums (see Holbrook 2005), I strongly suspect such an expanded study might yield at least a tentative conclusion that committing centonism is more rule than exception in contemporary poetry published in Canada.

By attending to the paratextual and sampladelic strategies used by contemporary poets to commit centonism – and, relatedly, by theorizing cento and DJ techniques' disruptions and redefinitions of authorship, authority, and authenticity – we can better understand how copyright law impacts DJ work – and vice versa.

For writers and artists who came of age amid mountains of cultural artifacts and debris: all of this is part of their lives, but much of it is off-limits for artistic expression because someone "owns" it. (Shields 2010:102)

As book history scholar Hannah McGregor suggested (during a discussion at Canada's 2016 Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences), users' rights like fair dealing must also be recognized as accessories to the entrenchment and legitimization of copyright as a privilege and luxury enjoyed mainly by big corporations. Not to understate the import and value of users' rights like fair dealing and the public domain – especially given their creative affordances as demonstrated in poetry – but from another

angle, the heated controversy over the extent of users’ rights does at times feel a lot like the externality of a corporate divide-and-conquer strategy that strategically pits interests oversimplified as “creators” versus “teachers” against each other in a skirmish over scraps. “Copyright laws that contain narrow and rigid fair dealing provisions not only make it difficult to read, write, learn, and create,” write Rosemary J. Coombe and her co-editors of *Dynamic Fair Dealing*, “they make it impossible for our culture to evolve in a fashion that respects the work we do as creators, students, scholars, consumers, and citizens. They serve primarily to protect corporate investments rather than public interests” (2014:39). Recognizing “the emerging culture of copyright” as one “of exclusive proprietary rights,” Amani says that “to counter this development, we must embrace our freedoms of expression as part of a rights framework that legitimates a wider range of reproductive activities as acts of cultural fair dealing. Money talks, but justice should be more widely affordable” (2014:54-55).

The poetry works discussed in this chapter may creatively and critically leverage and exploit the important users’ rights now enshrined in Canadian copyright law, but they also, like Coombe et al.’s commentary above, point up how limited and limiting those rights can be. An overarching legal irony worth noting here is that, while centos transfer a fair deal of literary property to the public domain, they still enjoy the same copyright protection as any other published work. In this respect, centos resemble popular songs – prominent especially in rock, rap, and techno genres – that amplify anti-commercialism by ironically recognizing their own commodity status (e.g. Nirvana’s “Radio friendly unit shifter,” Public Enemy’s “Leave This Off Your Fu*kin Charts,” Shut Up and Dance’s “Sued For a Sample,” and more or less everything by Rage Against the Machine). Bristling and railing against consumerist capitalism, such works essentially protest their own conditions of production.

Even so, the contemporary cento’s metacritical, critical-legal poetics articulate a politics against property *per se*, and such a project makes quibbles over copyright law’s meagre rationings – whether teachers’ rights or authors’ royalties – seem pretty small beer. From this angle, centos start to look more like a launching point for a far more radically expansive vision of culture as an openly accessible, equitable, and inclusive common wealth, a more meaningfully public domain that would be more appropriate to a media environment that, amidst the ongoing digital transformation of the social, can be characterized more by abundance than scarcity.

The very concept of money – regarded by the Culture as a crude, over-complicated, and inefficient form of rationing – was irrelevant within the society itself. (Banks 1990:451)

Works like the poetry books discussed here exercise users’ rights, in part, to illustrate the pervasive reach and chilling effects of the global intellectual property regime, and the very limited allowances afforded by users’ rights. Such works thus also argue for much bigger social and economic transformations: transformations of the practices and politics of authenticity; transformations of the social relations of production and patriarchy. As Marcus Boon writes in his book *In Praise of Copying*, “One possible and provisional answer to many of the problems that plague humanity today,” he con-

cludes (with now uncannily apt wording), “particularly those predicated on scarcity, is simply to make more copies and distribute them freely” (Boon 2013:246).

If this chapter, then, seeks to enrich the critical vocabulary for both the study of centos and their production, it also seeks to develop further the critical-legal case for resituating users’ rights in closer connection – even mutual constitution – with free speech rights and similar expressive freedoms, and thus with a radical, hopeful vision of a rejuvenated cultural commons, one enriched by relationality and community, not “impoverish[ed] with money” (Banks 1990:149).

In the spirit – and in the material pursuit – of such a commons, let us close these arguments by committing some centonism of our “own.”

Remix praxis

Give to the dreams you have forgotten	(Breton/Eluard 1990)
the necessity of finding an equivalent to that sentence in	(Bataille 1987)
the living negation of the commodity society and	(Rosemont 2001)
rawness and wildness, the colors, the scents, passion, events	(Acker 1989)
I don’t know what to do about	(Acker 1993)
while legions of winged squids (at a distance resembling crows)	(Lautreamont 1994)
cross the spheres into broad daylight	(Romano 2001)
I slept your sleep last night	(Glennon 2000)
launched on a much more adventurous investigation	(Balakian 1986)
to win the energies of intoxication for the revolution	(Benjamin 1979)
as if a time-wind blows out of our eyes	(Dewdney 1993)
striking at the authors of evil	(Marcuse 2001)
fragments of bliss & roses	(Thesen 1984)
decorating your fists	(Thesen 1984)

Acknowledgments

The author thanks Athabasca University and the Athabasca University Faculty Association for research funds enabling the purchase of the poetry books discussed in this chapter.

Works Cited

- ABEL (2016) = J. Abel, *Injun*, Vancouver 2016.
 ABEL (2020) = J. Abel, *Un/Inhabited* (2014), 2nd ed, Vancouver 2020.
 ACKER (1989) = K. Acker, *Blood and Guts in High School*, New York 1989.
 ACKER (1993) = K. Acker, *My Mother: Demonology*, New York 1993.
 AMANI (2014) = B. Amani, “Copyright and Freedom of Expression: Fair Dealing between Work and Play”, in: R.J. Coombe et al. (eds.), *Dynamic Fair Dealing: Creating Canadian Culture Online*, Toronto 2014, 43-55.

- ANDERSON (1991) = B. Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (1983), London 1991.
- ATWOOD (2011) = M. Atwood, “Margaret Atwood, uncensored.” *The Globe and Mail*, 29 Apr. 2011, <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/globe-debate/editorials/margaret-atwood-uncensored/article578234/?page=all>.
- BABSTOCK (2014) = K. Babstock, *On Malice*, Toronto 2014.
- BALAKIAN (1986) = A. Balakian, *Surrealism: The Road to the Absolute*, Chicago 1986.
- BANKS (1990) = I.B. Banks, *Consider Phlebas* (1987), London 1990.
- BARTHES (1977) = R. Barthes, *Image – Music – Text*, translated by Stephen Heath, New York 1977.
- BATAILLE (1987) = G. Bataille, *Story of the Eye* (1928), translated by Joachim Neugroschel, San Francisco 1987.
- BENJAMIN (1979) = W. Benjamin, “Surrealism: Last Snapshot of the European Intellects” (1929), in: *One-Way Street and Other Writings*, translated by Edmund Jephcott and Kingsley Shorter, London 1979, 225-239.
- BOON (2013) = M. Boon, *In Praise of Copying*, Cambridge, Mass. 2013, <https://www.hup.harvard.edu/features/boon/>.
- BRAND (2006) = D. Brand, *Inventory*, Toronto 2006.
- BRANDT (2018) = D. Brandt, *Glitter and Fall*, Winnipeg 2018.
- BRETON et al. (2011) = A. Breton / P. Éluard, *The Immaculate Conception* (1930), translated by Jon Graham, London 1990.
- CALVINO (1981) = I. Calvino, *If On a Winter’s Night a Traveler* (1979), translated by William Weaver, New York, 1981.
- CANADA (2012) = Canada, *Bill C-11: An Act to Amend the Copyright Act*. 29 Jun. 2012, <https://www.parl.ca/DocumentViewer/en/41-1/bill/c-11/royal-assent/page-45#7>.
- CANADA (1985) = *Copyright Act*, 1985, <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-42/FullText.html>.
- Canadian Copyright Licensing Agency v. York University*, FC 669, 2017, <https://canlii.ca/t/h4s07>.
- CAPLE (2019) = N. Caple, *Love in the Cthulucene (Cthulucene)*, Hamilton 2019.
- CAPLE/STARNINO (2016) = N. Caple / C. Starnino, “The Pitch: Natalee Caple,” in: *Partisan Magazine*, 31 Mar. 2016, <http://www.partisanmagazine.com/the-algonquin/2016/3/14/eo2iq36j0z90z136olyh1m6djp1sti>.
- CAVE (2008) = Nick Cave and the Bad Seeds, “We Call Upon the Author to Explain”, in: *Dig, Lazarus, Dig!!!*, Mute 2008.
- COHEN (1993) = L. Cohen, *Stranger Music: Selected Poems and Songs*, Toronto 1993.
- COOMBE et al. (2014) = R.J. Coombe / D. Wershler / M. Zeilinger (eds.), *Dynamic Fair Dealing: Creating Canadian Culture Online*, Toronto 2014.
- DALTON (2012) = M. Dalton, *Hooking*, Montreal 2013.
- DEMBOWSKI (1998) = N. Dembowski, *Ninety-seven Posts with the Heads of Dead Men*, Toronto 1998.
- DEWDNEY (1993) = C. Dewdney, *The Secular Grail: Paradigms of Perception*, Toronto 1993.
- DODA (2017) = C. Doda, *Glutton for Punishment*, Toronto 2017.

- DOWNES (2015-16) = D. Downes, "Transproperty: Intellectual property and the ideal form," in: M.A. McCutcheon (ed.), *New Fronts in the Copyfight: Multidisciplinary Directions in Critical Copyright Studies*, Part 2, Spec. issue of *Digital Studies / Le champ numérique*, vol. 6, 2015-16, <https://www.digitalstudies.org/articles/10.16995/dscn.22/>.
- ELMSLIE (2006) = S. Elmslie, *I, Nadja, and Other Poems*, Kingston 2006.
- FITZPATRICK (2013) = M. Fitzpatrick, "Harper on terror arrests: Not a time for 'sociology'," in: *CBC News*, 25 Apr. 2013, <https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/harper-on-terror-arrests-not-a-time-for-sociology-1.1413502>.
- FRYE (1957) = N. Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*, Princeton 1957.
- GALVIN (2014) = R. Galvin, "Poetry Is Theft," in: *Comparative Literature Studies*, vol. 51, no. 1, 2014, 18-54.
- GEIST (2018) = M. Geist, "Misleading on Fair Dealing, Part 1: Access Copyright's Inconsistent Claims on the Legal Effect of the 2012 Fair Dealing Reforms," in: *MichaelGeist.ca* [blog], 18 Nov. 2018, <http://www.michaelgeist.ca/2018/11/misleading-on-fair-dealing-part-1/>
- GLENNON (2000) = P. Glennon, *How Did You Sleep?*, Erin 2000.
- HARPER (2008) = J. Harper, *What It Feels Like For a Girl*, Vancouver 2008.
- HART (2019) = J.L. Hart, *Unforgetting Private Charles Smith*, Athabasca 2019, <https://www.aupress.ca/books/120283-unforgetting-private-charles-smith/>.
- HOLBROOK (2005) = S. Holbrook, "Constance Rooke, author of *The Clear Path: A Guide to Writing English Essays*, and Home Inspection consultant Brad LaBute converse, with rude interruptions by Walt Whitman," in: *Open Letter*, vol. 12, no. 5, 2005, 67-70, <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/creativepub/16>.
- HOWARD (2015) = L. Howard, *Infinite Citizen of the Shaking Tent*, Toronto 2015.
- L'ABBÉ (2019) = S. L'Abbé, *Sonnet's Shakespeare*, Toronto 2019.
- LAUTREAMONT (1994) = Comte de Lautréamont, *Les Chants de Maldoror* (1869), trans. Alexis Lykiard, Cambridge, Mass. 1994.
- LEE (2001) = D. Lee, *Alligator Pie* (1974), New York 2001.
- LEVY (2018) = R. Levy, Evidence statement. Committee Meeting 116, Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology, Government of Canada, 22 May 2018, <https://www.ourcommons.ca/DocumentViewer/en/42-1/INDU/meeting-116/evidence#Int-10139484>.
- MACDONALD (2015) = T. MacDonald, "Cherish: A Cento" and "Laurel: A Cento Elegy," in: *Lemon Hound*, 30 Mar. 2015, <https://lemonhound.com/2015/03/30/tanis-macdonald-two-poems/>.
- MCCUTCHEON (2012) = M.A. McCutcheon, "The cento, Romanticism, and copyright," in: *English Studies in Canada*, vol. 38, no. 2, 2012, 71-101.
- MCCUTCHEON (2015) = M.A. McCutcheon, "The DJ is a Critic, 'Constructing a Kind of Argument'," in: *English Studies in Canada*, vol. 41, no. 4, 2015, 93-124.
- MCCUTCHEON (2019) = M.A. McCutcheon, *Shape Your Eyes By Shutting Them: Poems*, Athabasca 2019, <https://www.aupress.ca/books/120287-shape-your-eyes-by-shutting-them/>.

- MCCUTCHEON (in press) = M.A. McCutcheon, “Reading Poetry and Its Paratexts for Evidence of Fair Dealing”, in: *Studies in Canadian Literature / Études en littérature canadienne*.
- MCLAREN (2018) = E. McLaren, “Copyright and Poetry in Twenty-First-Century Canada: Poets’ Incomes and Fair Dealing,” in: *Canadian Literature*, no. 233, 2018, 10-27.
- MCLUHAN/FIORE (2001) = M. McLuhan / Q. Fiore, *The Medium Is the Massage: An Inventory of Effects* (1967), produced by Jerome Agel, Berkeley 2001.
- MARCUSE (2001) = H. Marcuse, “Interview with the Surrealist Journal L’Archibras” (1966), in: R. Sakolsky (ed.), *Surrealism in the USA*, special issue of *Race Traitor*, no. 13-14, 2001, 149-150.
- MURRAY/TROSOW (2013) = L.J. MURRAY / S.E. Trosow, *Canadian Copyright: A Citizen’s Guide*, 2nd ed., Toronto 2013.
- NAIR (2018) = M. Nair, “V.S. Naipaul and Copyright”, in: *Fair Duty* [blog], 5 Sept. 2018, <https://fairduty.wordpress.com/2018/09/05/v-s-naipaul-and-copyright/>.
- OKÁČOVÁ (2009) = M. Okáčová, “Centones: Recycled Art or the Embodiment of Absolute Intertextuality?”, in: *Kakanien Revisited*, 2009, http://www.kakanien-revisited.at/beitr/graeca_latina/MOKacova1.pdf.
- ONDAATJE (1970) = M. Ondaatje, *The Collected Works of Billy the Kid*, Toronto 1970.
- ORR (2011) = D. Orr, “When Quoting Verse, One Must Be Terse”, in: *New York Times*, 8 Sept. 2011, <https://www.nytimes.com/2011/09/09/opinion/when-quoting-verse-one-must-be-terse.html>.
- PACHECO (2021) = P. Pacheco, “Canadian Artists Testify on the Dire Need for Basic Income”, in: *The Tye*, 2 Feb. 2021, <https://thetyee.ca/Culture/2021/02/02/Canadian-Artists-Testify-Dire-Need-Basic-Income/>.
- PHILIP (2008) = M. NourbeSe Philip, *Zong! as told to the author by Setaey Adamu Boateng*, Middletown 2008.
- QUEYRAS (2017) = S. Queyras, *My Ariel*, Toronto 2017.
- REYNOLDS (1998) = R. Reynolds, *Generation Ecstasy: Into the World of Techno and Rave Culture*, Boston 1998.
- RITTER (2020) = K. Ritter, “CTRL+F: Reterritorializing the Canon”, in: J. Abel, *Un/Inhabited*, Vancouver 2020, vii-xix.
- ROMANO (2001) = L. Romano, “Response to ‘Inquiry: Surrealist Subversion in Everyday Life’”, in: R. Sakolsky (ed.), *Surrealism in the USA*, special issue of *Race Traitor*, no. 13-14, 2001, 208.
- ROSE (1993) = M. Rose, *Authors and Owners: The Invention of Copyright*, Cambridge, Mass. 1993.
- ROSEMONT (2001) = P. Rosemont, P “Response to ‘Inquiry: Surrealist Subversion in Everyday Life’ ”, in: R. Sakolsky (ed.), *Surrealism in the USA*, special issue of *Race Traitor*, no. 13-14, 2001, 210-12.
- SALAH (2012) = T. Salah, “Influency”, in: *LitLive.ca: Canadian Review of Literature in Performance*, ca. 2012, <http://www.litlive.ca/story/427>.
- SHIELDS (2010) = D. Shields, *Reality Hunger: A Manifesto*, New York 2010.
- SPALDING (1997) = E. Spalding, *Anchoress: A Poem*, Toronto 1997.

- ST CLAIR (2004) = W. St Clair, *The Reading Nation in the Romantic Period*, Cambridge 2004.
- STARR/WATERMAN (2007) = L. Starr / C. Waterman, *American Popular Music*, Oxford 2007.
- THESEN (1984) = S. Thesen, "Praxis", in: K. Norris (ed.), *Canadian Poetry Now: 20 Poets of the '80's*, Toronto 1984, 252.
- VERMEERSCH (2016) = P. Vermeersch, *Don't Let It End Like This Tell Them I Said Something*, Toronto 2016.
- WEAVER (2018) = A. Weaver, "From *Maximus* to *Injun*: *mise-en-page* as spatial politics in the poetry of Charles Olson and Jordan Abel", Association of Canadian College and University Teachers of English conference, Congress, U of Regina, 27 May 2018.
- "What is – and isn't – fair dealing?" The Writers' Union of Canada, n.d., <https://www.writersunion.ca/what-and-isn-t-fair-dealing>.
- WHITEHEAD (2017) = J. Whitehead, *Full-Metal Indigiqueer*, Vancouver 2017.
- YOUNGING (2018) = G. Younging, *Elements of Indigenous Style: A Guide for Writing By and About Indigenous Peoples*, Edmonton 2018.
- ZILM (2016) = J. Zilm, *Waiting Room*, Toronto 2016.

List of Contributors

Sally Baumann studied Classics and Spanish Studies at the University of Potsdam (Germany) and at the University of Costa Rica (Costa Rica). Currently, she is a PhD candidate in Classics at the University of Graz (Austria), her research project focuses on the detailed and visually appealing descriptions in the political works of Claudius Claudianus. Her research activities concern Late Latin Poetry, narratology, intermediality and intertextuality, they include a forthcoming publication on Claudian's *Bellum Geticum* (Per te namque unum – *Stilicho, ein irdisches numen? Zu einem Aspekt der Darstellung Stilichos in Claudians Bellum Geticum*).

Email: sally.baumann@uni-graz.at

Manuel Baumbach is Professor of Classics at the Ruhr-University Bochum. His research focuses on Hellenistic Poetry, the Second Sophistic, Ancient Greek epigram and the history of reception. He has published books on Lucian of Samosata and Chariton of Aphrodisias and he is the co-editor of *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus* (2004), *Quintus Smyrnaeus: Transforming Homer in Second Sophistic Epic* (2007), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram. Contextualisation and Literarisation* (2010), and of *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Epyllion and its Reception* (2012). His current research projects include a monograph on Ancient Greek Cento-poetry, a commentary on (ps.-)Euripides' *Rhesus* and a digital edition of the eclogues of Calpurnius Siculus.

Email: manuel.baumbach@ruhr-uni-bochum.de

Timo Christian is a research assistant in Classics at Johann Wolfgang Goethe-University, Frankfurt am Main. Having studied in Frankfurt and Cambridge, he wrote his dissertation on Greek metrical inscriptions (*Gebildete Steine. Zur Rezeption literarischer Techniken in den Versinschriften seit dem Hellenismus*, Göttingen 2015). He was a post-doctoral member of the research training group "Value and Equivalence", and a member of the "Byzantine Legal Sources Research Center" of the Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. He has published various articles on Greek epigram and the *Homocentones*.

Email: t.christian@em.uni-frankfurt.de

Sina Dell'Anno studied Latin and German philology in Basel and Freiburg i.Br. and has been an assistant at the German Department of the University of Basel since April 2017. As part of the research project "Theorie der Prosa" ("Theory of Prose", funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation), she is writing her dissertation on *satura* (satire) in antiquity and around 1800. In addition to ancient and modern satire, her research interests include theories of humour and comic, the theory of literary form(s), the poetics of the ancient and modern novel, encyclopaedic poetry, poetics, rhetoric, aesthetics (and their relationship), 20th-century literary theory and the theory of philo-

logy. She is co-editor of the online journal *Bildbruch – Beobachtungen an Metaphern* (Observations on Metaphors). Published or forthcoming are (among others) papers on Arno Schmidt, Jean Paul, Johann Georg Hamann, on Petronius and the theory of the novel in the 18th century and on the voracious poetics of *satura*.

Email: sina.dellanno@unibas.ch

Emanuela Ferragamo is an Italian scholar of German Literature. She achieved her PhD within a joint PhD program at the Universities of Genoa, Turin and Basel. Her topic was Christian Morgenstern's parodic poetry (*Paradies Parodie. Christian Morgensterns parodistische Poetik*, 2021). She had already researched on Morgenstern during her master (*Due studi sulla poetica di Christian Morgenstern*, 2015) and has researched above all his philosophical humour ("À la guerre comme à la guerre", in: S. Hüscher / S. Singh (eds.), *Literatur als philosophisches Erkenntnismodell*, 2016), and his authorial strategies ("Selbstporträt mit Rilkeanischen Sternen", in: F. Jacob / S. Ebert (eds.), *Reicher Geist – Armes Leben*, 2020). She is currently a Post-Doc-Scholar at the University of Turin, where she researches the literary representation of utopic landscape.

Email: ferragamo.emanuela@gmail.com

Rowena Fowler. After an academic career at the University of Bristol Rowena Fowler is now an independent scholar. She has edited Robert Browning and Edward Lear and published widely on Victorian literature. She is interested in the relationship of modern English literature to Ancient and Modern Greece, writing on Virginia Woolf, T.S. Eliot, James Joyce, Elizabeth Taylor and Seamus Heaney. Other published work in classical reception explores the myth of Daphne and Apollo, the presence of Virgil in English poetry and the contribution of Penguin editions to the survival of Classics in the twentieth century. Her most recent essay is on Heaney and Hesiod. Current projects include Ezra Pound's Classics in the Great War, Classics in the literature of the Second World War and modern receptions of Herodotus and Pindar.

Email: rowena.fowler@gmail.com

Maria Teresa Galli is Teaching Assistant at Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore (Milan). During her studies at Scuola Normale Superiore (Pisa), she dealt with ancient Greek drama and its reception in T.S. Eliot's dramas. She concluded her PhD with a thesis on Geta's *Medea* (Göttingen 2017). As a Post-doc Research Fellow at Trento University she developed a project about eight Latin centos of the Latin Anthology. She published a critical edition with commentary on the *Vergiliocentones minores* (Firenze 2014) and co-organised the International Conference "*Sparsa colligere et integrare lacerata*. Centoni, *pastiches* e la tradizione greco-latina del reimpiego testuale" (Proceedings in *Labirinti*, Trento 2014). Firstly as Fellow at the Boltzmann Institute of Neo-Latin Studies of Innsbruck and then as Research Fellow at Innsbruck University she has focused on cento production in Neo-Latin, and in particular on Lelio Capilupi's centos.

Email: mariateresa.galli1@unicatt.it

Julia Heideklang (M.A./M.Ed.) is doctoral candidate at the DFG graduate school 2190 “Literary and Epistemic History of Small Forms”, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin. After her studies in biology and classical philology she is currently working on her doctoral thesis “Botanics in the Making (1500-1700): Communication and Construction of the Botanical Science in Early Modern Europe”. The project investigates the paratexts of early modern botanical works and the central role they played in the emergence of botanical practices and the formation of a scientific community in the botanical field. Together with Urte Stobbe she edited *Kleine Formen für den Unterricht: Historische Kontexte, Analysen, Perspektiven* (2019). Furthermore, she is currently engaged in the translation and commentary of Hermann von Helmholtz’ doctoral thesis *De Fabrica Systematis nervosi Evertibratorum* (1842).

Email: julia.heideklang@staff.hu-berlin.de

Johanna-Charlotte Horst ist Wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiterin am Institut für Allgemeine und Vergleichende Literaturwissenschaft an der LMU München. Sie studierte Allgemeine und Vergleichende Literaturwissenschaft und Kunstgeschichte sowie Nordische Philologie in München und Paris. Sie promovierte in München zu “Produktion und Poetik. Georges Perecs literarisches Engagement”. Sie arbeitet zur Zeit an ihrer Habilitation zu “Literaturen des Alltäglichen”. Zuletzt ist von ihr erschienen: “Stilleben (Harun Farocki)”, in: H. Sohns / J. Ungelenk (eds.), *Berühren Lesen*. Zu ihren Forschungsschwerpunkten gehören Gattungstheorien, feministische Theorien sowie Formen der Geschichtsschreibung.

Email: johanna-charlotte.horst@lrz.uni-muenchen.de

Mark A. McCutcheon is Professor of Literary Studies and Chair of the Centre for Humanities at Athabasca University. He researches popular culture and copyright; he also writes poetry. His first poetry book, *Shape Your Eyes By Shutting Them*, includes centos and was published in 2019; he is also the author of *The Medium Is the Monster: Canadian Adaptations of Frankenstein and the Discourse of Technology* (2018). Both books are openly accessible online from AUPress.ca. Mark’s literary criticism on centos has also appeared in scholarly journals like *English Studies in Canada* (see “The DJ is a critic” [2015] and “The Cento, Romanticism, and Copyright” [2012]). Mark’s on Twitter and Mixcloud as @sonicfiction.

Email: mccutcheon@athabascau.ca

Maurice Parussel is a research assistant at the Department of Classics at the Ruhr-University Bochum. He studied Classics and History in Bochum and is currently working on his dissertation on the reception of the Cento drama *Christus patiens* in the early modern Europe as part of the DFG project “Der *Christus patiens* und die Poiesis der Griechischen Cento-Dichtungen”. In addition to his studies on text edition, his research focuses in particular on the Second Sophistic (“Argument Schemes Related to Popular Science in the Second Sophistic”, 2020) and on the history of reception of ancient texts (“Die Text-Bild-Korrelation der Odyssee-Nacherzählung in den Ausgaben

von Gustav Schwabs *Die schönsten Sagen des klassischen Alterthums im Wandel der Zeit*“, 2021). He is currently focusing on digital editions of the *Christus patiens* and the Eclogues of Calpurnius Siculus.

Email: Maurice.Parussel@ruhr-uni-bochum.de

Moritz Rauchhaus has recently finished his PhD with a dissertation titled “Hagiographie für Notare – Über die spätmittelalterliche Legende und ihr Verhältnis zur Novelle”. He studied German literature, philosophy and European literatures in Berlin, Rome and Bordeaux. His research focuses on the Italian Trecento, hagiographic writing, Mediterranean identities and the history of printing. He has published several books, for example on the language and evolution of gastronomic menus (*Wohl bekam’s – In hundert Menüs durch die Weltgeschichte*, 2018) and on leaflets and camouflaged publications of the Second World War (*Feindflugblätter des Zweiten Weltkriegs*, 2020; both with Tobias Roth). His most recent publication is a translation of Boccaccio’s *Trattatello in laude di Dante* (*Büchlein zum Lob Dantes*, 2021).

Email: moritz.rauchhaus@posteo.de

Linda Simonis is Professor of Comparative Literature at the Ruhr-University Bochum. Her research interests include marginal and apocryphal writings, inscriptions and epigrams, renewals of epic poetry in early modern literature, and speech acts of commitment in literature. She is co-editor of *Figures of Antiquity and their Reception in Art, Literature and Music* (2016) and *Poetik der Inschrift* (2019). Currently she is preparing a project on metaphors of everyday life in texts by Cusanus and Melanchthon.

Email: Linda.Simonis@ruhr-uni-bochum.de

Mali Skotheim is an Assistant Professor of English at Ashoka University in Sonapat, India. Her work concerns Greek poetry, drama, and dance in the Roman Empire. She has published articles and chapters on actors of the Roman era, satyr drama, festival culture in Philostratus’ *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, and imperial policy towards the Greek festivals. Currently, she is working on a monograph on the Greek dramatic festivals of the Roman era, and a project on the cultural and intellectual history of pantomime dance from ancient Rome to 18th-century England.

Email: mali.skotheim@gmail.com

Lukas Spielhofer is a research assistant and a DOC Fellow of the Austrian Academy of Sciences at the University of Graz (Institute of Classics). His research interests include the Greek and Latin literature of the Imperial Age, especially ancient fable collections, the poetology of ancient texts, the poetry of Late Antiquity and the role of digital media in teaching classical languages. He has published a series of articles on the fables of Aesop and Babrius (2019-2020) as well as on the “Graz Repository of ancient Fables” (GRaF) (2020). For his PhD dissertation, he is preparing an interpretational commentary on the Greek verse fables of Babrius with studies on the composition and poetic programme of the collection.

Email: lukas.spielhofer@uni-graz.at

Jodok Trösch is a research assistant in German literature at the University of Basel. As a member of the research project “Theory of Prose”, he writes a dissertation on non-regular forms of translation. The thesis *Wild Translation. On the theory of a literary technique* is supervised by Prof. Dr. Ralf Simon (Basel) and Prof. Dr. Nicola Kaminski (Bochum). His research interests lie in semiotics, (historical) language and translation theory, multilingual literature, literary theory, and poetics. Jodok Trösch received his Master’s degree with honors from the University of Basel with a thesis on the use of semiotics in narration in Gottfried’s von Strassburg *Tristan* while working as a student assistant at the chair of Older German Literature. Among others, he has presented or published papers on Johann Fischart and Arno Schmidt.

Email: jodok.troesch@unibas.ch



Aktuelle Bände:

- 108 Manuel Baumbach, Arnold Bärtschi (Hg.): **Unheimliche Antike. Bedrohliche Texte, verunsicherte Rezipienten, verstörende Lektüren**
ISBN 978-3-86821-914-2, 208 S., 2 Abb., kt., € 32,50 (2021)
- 107 Lorenzo di Maggio: **Virgilius redivivus. Einführung, Kommentar und Übersetzung zu Virgilius Maro Grammaticus**
ISBN 3-86821-881-7, 556 S., kt., € 63,50 (2021)
- 106 Gerhard Binder: **P. Vergilius Maro. Aeneis. Ein Kommentar. Band 3: Kommentar zu Aeneis 7-12**
ISBN 3-86821-786-5, 682 S., geb., € 72,50 (2019)
- 105 Gerhard Binder: **P. Vergilius Maro. Aeneis. Ein Kommentar. Band 2: Kommentar zu Aeneis 1-6**
ISBN 3-86821-785-8, 648 S., geb., € 69,50 (2019)
- 104 Gerhard Binder: **P. Vergilius Maro. Aeneis. Ein Kommentar. Band 1: Einleitung, Zentrale Themen, Literatur, Indices**
ISBN 3-86821-784-1, 430 S., 7 Abb., geb., € 49,50 (2019)
- 103 Georgios P. Tsomis: **Quintus Smyrnaeus: Originalität und Rezeption im zehnten Buch der *Posthomeric*. Ein Kommentar**
ISBN 3-86821-752-0, 354 S., kt., € 45,00 (2018)
- 102 Nina Tomaszewski: **Walter Charleton's *The Ephesian Matron / Matrona Ephesia*. Contextual studies, bilingual edition and commentary**
ISBN 3-86821-748-3, 648 S., 7 Abb., kt., € 65,00 (2018)
- 101 Nicole Nina Schmid-Dümmeler: **Achilleus Tatios, *Leukippe und Kleitophon*. Rhetorik im Dienst der Verführung**
ISBN 3-86821-747-6, 454 S., 13 Abb., kt., € 49,50 (2018)

Alle Bände der Reihe mit ausführlicher Beschreibung finden Sie auch unter
www.wvttrier.de