

Creative fragments: The subjunctive spaces of e-literature

Rebecca Luce-Kapler
Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario

ABSTRACT: This paper considers some of the benefits of reading and writing e-literature, including its influences on prints texts, challenges to the imagination, and attention to metafictional devices and processes. The less cohesive, more fragmented quality of e-literature creates a subjunctive space for creation where writers can consider interesting pathways and diversions since the digital form supports multidirectional structures. Using data from a digital literacy study with an eleventh grade English class as well as her own writing of fiction and poetry, the author suggests that the fragmented nature of e-literature offers benefits for learning in school that complement rather than replace more traditional forms of literature.

KEYWORDS: E-literature, writing, hypertext, digital literacy, metafiction.

In the autumn of 2005, my research team spent a week in an advanced, eleventh-grade English class introducing them to e-literature. We chose to use Shelley Jackson's (1995) *Patchwork Girl: A modern monster*, which is a satirical rewriting about the experiences of Frankenstein's female monster created in Mary Shelley's original tale. We chose this hypertext because the class focussed on women writers, and all but two of the students were female. Furthermore, *Patchwork Girl* is an interesting exploration of both textual and female identity, which we felt would suit our readers.

While the class was intrigued by the idea of reading e-literature and equally as interested by the homunculus-like female on the opening page, their enthusiasm quickly waned. Partly this response reflected the fact that they had just finished an engaging and extensive reading of *Jane Eyre*, but these technologically-skilled students were also finding the shift to a literary hypertext more challenging than they expected. The verbal montage created from their interview responses below reveals the character of their reactions to *Patchwork Girl*:

Disjointed.
The monster's really trying to figure out who she is.
It's hard when there's so many bits and pieces of other people.
It's so fragmented because the perspective keeps changing,
like the narrative voice keeps changing.
If it was a book it would probably have a more straightforward narrative.
Like you wouldn't be able to skip ahead and think back;
there would be things presented in a certain order.
I don't know if I'll ever finish it though because it just seems
like there's many places in it that you could go
you don't know if you've been to them all.
You're getting an image, but it's kind of convoluted.
Patchwork Girl is all...Patchworky.
The fragments kind of make sense with the girl
because the story is as hard to understand as perhaps the character.

It forces you to pay attention to how it's being constructed.

I first thought that such responses were not a good thing: the students were uncomfortable; they were resisting the text; they did not understand it. My former English teacher self wanted to put the pieces together and lead them to find some enjoyment and meaning. But then I reminded myself that they had just read a Victorian novel and none of them had experienced this type of e-literature before. Furthermore, what they were saying was less about discomfort and more about their experience of learning something new. For instance, consider the last lines of the montage:

The fragments kind of make sense with the girl
because the story is as hard to understand as perhaps the character.
It forces you to pay attention to how it's being constructed.

They were beginning to see that the fragments – that is the small pieces of narrative, image and poem – were important and that there was something meaningful to be learned by paying attention to the form of the e-literature.

In school we generally see fragments as negative qualities, much as the OED describes them: “A part broken off or otherwise detached from the whole; an extant portion of writing or composition, which as a whole is lost; hence a part of any unfinished whole or incomplete design.” Perhaps it was the expectation of seeing the whole that led to the students’ discomfort with a seeming lack of design. I remembered that my initial experience with *Patchwork Girl*, one of the first examples of e-literature I read seven years ago, had been similar. In the time since, I have read a number of other hypertexts as well as worked with software programs such as *Storyspace* with which you can create hypertexts. Over time, I have become more comfortable with being less certain about envisaging the whole and have learned to appreciate the emergent process of working in fragments. The strongest influence of these experiences is revealed in my fiction and poetry writing where I enjoy the generative possibilities of working with fragments. Fragments, as I am thinking of them in this context, include snippets of text, images, sound and a variety of genres that are brought into relationship through links – either hyperlinks as one would find in e-literature or through symbols, themes, images and words in a print-based text. Such fragments, I am arguing in this paper, are fruitful opportunities for learning. In particular, the fragmented nature of e-literature engages the imagination and creates opportunities for subjunctive exploration, which opens possibilities rather than settles for certainties (Bruner, 1986), influencing readers and writers not only in digital spaces but also in print texts.

IMAGINATION AND THE SUBJUNCTIVE SPACE

When engaging with e-literature, readers must actively construct meaning by choosing and clicking on a matrix of links that connect numerous media such as text, image and sound. Because of this array of alternatives, writers must anticipate and include possibilities that they may have discarded in the past, broadening the nooks and crannies of the subjunctive space as more fragments are kept in play.

In previous work (Luce-Kapler, 2004), I posited that the subjunctive space was a useful term for understanding the importance of writing for women in describing and understanding previous

experience and emerging options. The subjunctive space acknowledges that language is an open structure that one can transgress and which continually produces change and renewal through discursive practices (Kristeva, 1980). In spite of efforts by different powers to control meaning and police interpretation, individuals are able to develop codes, hidden meanings and subtexts that subvert such attempts to determine language (Bakhtin, 1981). A powerful example of the dynamic of language can be seen in secondary schools where students use expressions that arise from teenage culture, including the influence of digital communication, to shut out adults and respond subversively to the “official language” of school.

Forms such as genres, which arise from our use of language, also become subjunctive spaces. Jerome Bruner (1986) noted how using narrative creates a subjunctive reality; that is, it denotes an action or state as imagined and can express a contingent, hypothetical or prospective event. While Bruner focussed on narrative, I suggested that the subjunctive is important for most genres in the literary realm such as fiction, poetry, autobiography and memoir.

Writing, then, becomes a site of possibility, a place of “as if” that works in multiple ways with, through, and beyond the text. For the writer and for the reader, they write and read *as if* the text can describe the reality of an event, an imagining, or a feeling; *as if* language did not remove us a step from it. Such contingencies broaden the possibilities for experiencing, acting, understanding, and creating (Luce-Kapler, 2004, p. 88).

However, in my work with digital texts since, I have come to believe that not only does one need to see language as open and meaning as emergent, but that the role of genre needs to be reconsidered to make it less transparent. For instance, when I taught writing to my junior high classes, they explored the possibilities of numerous genres and forms; however, I was keenly aware that much of their writing did not alert them to deeply entrenched cultural patterns nor did it challenge their preconceptions. Many of the girls were happy to replicate the fairy tale princess stories while the boys turned to more violent or science fiction genres. They were complacent and comfortable in their fantasies, which did not make them work very hard nor demand much of their imagination.

Jeanette Winterson, in her essay “Imagination and reality”, suggests this less demanding nature of fantasy as she describes her mother’s attempts to create a sitting room filled with objects that were symbols of a higher class. Winterson writes: “When she sat in her dreadful parlour with a china cup and a bought biscuit, she felt like a lady. The parlour, full of objects unseen but hard won, was a fantasy chamber, a reflecting mirror” (1995, p. 144). In contrast, Winterson goes on to describe the importance of a highly developed imaginative capacity that consists of both invention and discernment. Invention as she describes it is “the shaping spirit that re-forms fragments into new wholes, so that even what has been familiar can be seen fresh. Discernment is to know how to test the true and the false and to reveal objects, emotions, ideas in their own coherence” (1995, p. 146).

The women writers and the junior high classes I worked with were able to explore new ideas and play with different identities through their writing, but the history and practice of focusing on one genre significantly affected their possibilities for invention and discernment. As I learned in the writing project I will describe next, the subjunctive space becomes much richer when one can play fragments through different genres that float in juxtaposition.

COMPOSING

Some years ago I tried to write a novel about the first woman to have a photographic studio on the Canadian prairies in the 1890s – Geraldine Moodie. Geraldine also happened to be the granddaughter of Susanna Moodie who was known for her book about pioneering in Canada. The story, *Roughing it in the bush*, was one that inspired Margaret Atwood’s collection of poetry, *The journals of Susanna Moodie*. While my novel was eventually written, it was not very evocative and it did not capture the complexity of what I imagined Geraldine’s life to be. However, lately, I have resurrected the story and it is emerging in a new form – fragments of genre and text entitled *Composing*. Several of these fragments follow to offer some context for my later discussion.

Wildflower

She does not know how to think about where she has landed. Three days by train to Winnipeg, a long ride in the cart that J.D. procured. Two small babies crying in the nests she made from blankets. This is not Ottawa where only a few days ago Agnes came over every day to help with the children. She thinks of her elegant mother in the hub of social life, a gifted artist in the midst of Ottawa society. A woman who engages in an interesting life. She, on the other hand, has been taken up with the enthusiasm of J.D. and his father. When they talked about “homesteading,” she remembered the stories of Grandmother and Aunt Catherine embracing the wilderness with just a touch of civility. On this dusty trail away from Brandon, she feels more like her life is unwinding as she loses friends and close contact with her mother. The land here is emptier than she imagined. There are no large stands of ancient hardwood of her Grandmother’s telling, only miles of grasses and the sweep of fall sky, endlessly blue with the clarity of early September light.

One night she dreams about working in her mother’s dining room. The sunlight is mottled by lace curtains, but is bright enough for painting. She is thirteen again, tongue slid between her teeth as she, Maime and Alice help her mother paint five thousand lithographs. Her hands ache as she shades the stems in green over and over, starting again, starting.

Geraldine sits up in the moonlit night of the silent prairie. She wraps a cloak around her nightgown and digs for the sketchbook that she belatedly stashed in her satchel the day she left Ottawa. She hastens away from the small shack that J.D. has knocked together toward the large rock in the northwest corner of their land where the unbroken ground still nurtures the last plants of summer. The air is chilly with the promise of coming frost and by the time she reaches it, the hem of her gown is sodden. But there, in the moonlight, she can see the spiky blooms of the plant she noticed yesterday, what she remembers Agnes calling a painted cup. Geraldine scrambles onto the rock, twists the wet of her nightgown away from her and turns to a fresh page. In the last of the gloom she sketches the shape of the plant with her soft pencil – the contours of the stem and its branches, the leaves. As light begins to glow on the horizon, she fills in the details – the fiery tongues of colour at the end of each stalk that rise up to meet the sun. She is so lost in her drawing that J.D. touching her shoulder startles her. Douglas is crying for your milk, he says, sliding suspenders over his shoulders. Come to the house. Geraldine lifts her pencil.

Evening Primrose

moon catches the white vein
of blossom, draws the eye
to the centre of golden seed
beneath which lies the heart
invisible in darkness

nest in the prairie grass
for a time and you will see
a quiet call to the moth
from the pink glow of flower
behind the moonlight, the place
where the real work begins

The Explorer

John Palliser, the first white man to cross this land, writes home to his wife: *Having received my provisions from the store, consisting of pemmican, a little dried buffalo meat, with a small stock of tea and sugar, we started by crossing the river at 10 a.m. The track at once leaves the Saskatchewan, and does not meet it again till at the mountain fort. After four miles along a track cut through dense thickets, we came to the White Mud Creek, on the west side of which there is a high conical hill of the same name, after passing which we get into more open pasturage, in which the vetch grew with great luxuriance.*

She dreams that night of a place where the moonlight shines the ground silver, where she camps in the thickets, the warm breezes belying the need for clothing. She can feel the vetch brush against her bare legs as she runs through the field, imagines it looks like soft brushes, does not know about the violet flowers. Runs until she reaches the creek to smooth the white mud upon her body; then disappears into the landscape and though John calls and calls, he can not find her. She is used to being alone, to being free.

The text continues like this – there are short narratives – both imagined and quoted from other places such as newspapers, history books and archives. There are photographs and there are poems that sometimes represent photographs. There are a series of fragments – over forty at last count. While the narrative I initially wrote for the novel worked very well to create a single line out of a multiplicity of alternatives, it was ultimately dissatisfying because it shut down the more complex and plural nature of Geraldine’s experience. What is possible with the new structure is the ability to more easily represent multiple perspectives of Geraldine in a way that Margaret Laurence (1983) identified as the complexity of character. Laurence wrote:

The time which is present in any story . . . must – by implication at least – include not only the totality of the character’s lives but also the inherited time of perhaps two or even three past generations, in terms of parents’ and grandparents’ recollections, and the much much longer past which has become legend, the past of a collective cultural memory (p. 155).

Great writers have always been able to represent such complexity of course, but what interested me is that this shift became possible for me through my engagement with digital forms of

writing. The Geraldine work began first with some experimenting in *Storyspace*. This program opens textboxes for the creator to insert text, image, or sound. Textboxes link together in whatever pattern the author chooses. As I played with this program, I recognized that I thought differently about my writing as indicated in this excerpt from my journal:

I am struck by the interplay of the metonymic and metaphoric. On the one hand, I think about the small piece that I am working on, but then I have to think about how it fits into the whole, where it should be connected and how it might contribute to that whole. I am very interested in this interplay of thinking – back and forth. Small details, larger picture. I am finding that working in *Storyspace* is giving me a structure in which to think about my writing even though I am also creating the structure. It is causing me to think about relationships among ideas and the overall shape of the piece in a way that I have not done before when working on a novel.

About the same time as the *Storyspace* experiment mentioned above, a colleague and I began using wikis for writing with undergraduate students and adolescents. Many readers will be familiar with wiki software from the online, ever-evolving dictionary, Wikipedia. That site is a location where anyone can click on a page to revise, add to or refute the ideas associated with a dictionary entry. Or, if a topic does not yet have a page, begin a new entry. While there is some monitoring of the site by administrators, essentially Wikipedia is a collective project where the interested community maintains the credibility of the entries. The policy section is summed up by this statement: “Those who edit in good faith, show civility, seek consensus, and work towards the goal of creating a great encyclopedia should find a welcoming environment. Wikipedia greatly appreciates additions that help all people” (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Policies_and_guidelines). “Wiki” is the Hawaiian word for quick and, as the Wikipedia instance illustrates, the software allows for one to participate in the creation with little previous knowledge about the web pages or preparation.

Working in wikis can feel very disconcerting, especially since most of them have open access and are not guarded by passwords. Anyone with an internet connection can click on “edit text of this page” and erase or revise your story. Of course she or he can also make links to it. I find wiki writing to be surprising. For the project with my colleague, I would write a page of text or add an image, and it would spur her to make a connection that I would not have anticipated. As our story grew, there was an energy about the creating that would not have been possible had I been working alone. With my work on *Composing*, I have noticed that I am creating structures that try to develop the same element of serendipity and surprise. I have no structured plan for how this text is developing – I attend to words that spark my attention. I watch for other ideas and images in my reading that send me off in another direction. Occasionally I stop to gather together the texts and see the connections and interpret the emerging patterns – this includes pruning, adding text and rearranging pieces. My sense of this writing is like “seeing an interlaced gif assemble itself, passing from an unintelligible array of diffuse shapes into a fully coherent representation” (Ulmer, 1997, p. 4), echoing the response Greg Ulmer gave to his reading of Michael Joyce’s hypertext, *Twelve blue*.

The work I have been doing is breaking me out of typical narrative structures and my usual thinking about texts. I do, of course, like all writers, consider and discard numerous possibilities, but this time, the space seems bigger with more room for alternatives. I move between crafting a fragment and seeing it as contributing meaning without being concerned that one design is

emerging or that all the loose ends are tied up. I have to remain more ambiguous and open to what is emerging as the fragments build, influencing one another and shaping my understanding of what this project is about. And I as write with other people in wiki and Flash spaces, I recognize that thinking in fragments is leaving the text open enough that stories emerge in directions that none of us could have anticipated.

While I have long thought about the importance of interrupting structures, I have not thought about the creative possibilities of thinking in fragments. In her feminist essay, “Spaces like stairs”, Gail Scott notes that she needed to interrupt the tidy narrative for herself. She writes: “to reflect our difference these fragments have to be pierced by new conceptions (collectively worked out) of time, space and continuity” (1989, p. 75). She explains that breaking patriarchal mythologies into fragments allows us to question the syntax and content. Canadian poet Di Brant (1996), too, has described the importance of lines of prose syntax crumbling into poetry and the necessity for discontinuous narratives to not only interrupt stories but to make room for new perspectives.

When we become bound by familiar imaginings and set storylines, interruptions can become fragments available for reinterpretation, taking us from a place where we know the answers to thinking of new possibilities. While I certainly acknowledge the work of feminist writers in helping me learn to question my language and think carefully about form, it was working with digital texts that led me to a structure where I could create a more open text through an interplay of fragments whether electronically or on paper. The interplay of the digital and print in my writing has challenged the familiar and sharpens discernment, offering new opportunities for invention.

Joseph Tabbi (2002), in his book *Cognitive fictions*, suggests that he sees the direction of American fiction influenced by electronic mediations; what he describes as “toward an ecological realism aware of the many cognitive environments but capable of holding onto its own literary autonomy” (p. xxv). His point is an important one, I think. While we play in various genres, we sometimes forget that they exist in larger contexts of literature and the wider understanding of cultural stories and mythologies. The fragments of language, image and shape float to other places for cross-fertilization, creating sometimes surprising results. Such interactions trouble our notions of art, authorship and attribution but remind us that at any given moment, we are contributing to emerging stories. But how might such troubling play out in school where the importance of individuals replicating the known continues to be privileged?

FRAGMENTS IN SCHOOL

After a somewhat challenging beginning to our e-literature classes with the eleventh grade students, we introduced them to wiki writing and to *Storyspace* to see how they would respond to writing hypertexts in comparison to their reading of *Patchwork Girl*. We started with wikis and simply asked them to review their reading of Jackson’s text by working in pairs and creating some interesting images, phrases and links to other pages. When we introduced *Storyspace*, we first taught them how to create textboxes (an easy process in the program) and then had them create five in which they wrote a response to *Patchwork Girl* using the commonly identified

senses – one for each box. We then asked them to make meaningful links among the boxes, encouraging them to share ideas and work together as they learned how to manoeuvre in the software. Once that basic task was accomplished, we encouraged the students to continue developing the space they had started by branching out in new directions and expanding their text.

While they recognized that *Patchwork Girl* was unlike any text they had read in school, it was not until they had the opportunity to write in *Storyspace* that most participants were able to more clearly articulate the differences and to appreciate the value of the genre. However, this was not true for everyone and the experience for a few demonstrated how important they believed the common structures of schooling were for their learning. For instance, Doreen, was solidly committed to using outlines for her writing and she saw hypertexts as disjointed with no continuity. She admitted that it might be useful for writing poems or journal entries or even to create an outline or play with ideas. but that it had no value for writing that had “full paragraphs that connect”. She told us that “it would just make no sense to me to have a paragraph [and] have it connect to this paragraph that’s different....It would just be like writing out a page of paragraphs.” Emery, on the other hand, had this perspective:

I guess it was hard in that in school we’re taught to introduce an idea and develop it and conclude it because there’s a format that you learn in school and this was very different from that....This is the one thing that I thought would be interesting as a school assignment just in the way that it’s easier to allow students to have their creativity showing and have whatever they want to express – it’s a lot easier to express your ideas.

Georgia was more direct in her assessment. She told us the hypertext work was fun and interesting because it was different from the everyday work of school. “It gets boring after awhile....After all your years of high school and elementary school you always do the same things over and over again. [Hypertext] changes your ideas.”

As Emery suggested and as other students noticed, they sensed creative possibilities in hypertext writing that were not necessarily available in other ways in school. Eugenia told us she liked *Storyspace* because when she writes she always has a “million ideas” in her head and that “unexplained and unquestioned avenues open up”. She felt hypertext writing allowed her to really explore the possibilities offered by her thinking. Nicola also recognized that the fragmentary possibilities of hypertext “represents your thinking more....I don’t know what the right word is. It’s just that it’s easier to put your thinking into like some sort of form. I think it is closer to the way you would think.” She remarked how when writing (presumably she meant the type of writing she was doing previously in school) one had to just continue onward in a singular direction but that *Storyspace* encouraged movement in other directions.

What interested me about the interviews was that most of the students moved from either cautious interest or outright dislike of *Patchwork Girl* to at least an appreciation for the possibilities and challenges of the form. A longer term study would be able to observe the effects of e-literature engagement over time. Would the students change some of their writing practices such as moving away from a rigid essay format to structure their thinking in a more multigenre approach? Would they begin to consider other media besides print as having interpretive powers for their work? Would they find their imaginations challenged and familiar structures questioned

as they worked with more fragmentary and ambiguous structures? I believe, based on my experience as a writer, that interesting changes could occur to deepen their skills of discernment and encourage broader invention, the two markers that Winterson (1995) identifies with imaginative capacity.

In my enthusiasm for the generative possibility of fragments, however, it is important to note that fragments can just as easily be so diverse or so challenging that they obfuscate rather than encourage imaginative engagement, as in the example of Doreen's experience above. Marie-Laure Ryan (2004) explains that "it is simply not possible to construct a coherent story out of every permutation of a set of textual fragments, because fragments are implicitly ordered by relations of presupposition, material causality, psychological motivation, and temporal sequence" (p. 341). In other words there must exist or be the potential for relationships among the fragments that link in meaningful pathways. Ryan helpfully provides the metaphor of a jigsaw puzzle, which reflects Ulmer's analogy of the gif. She describes the process of readers [and writers] constructing a narrative image from the fragments as they fit the pieces into a pattern that slowly takes shape over time. The fragmentary nature of e-literature, Ryan suggests, encourages a metafictional stance toward reading rather than encouraging immersion into a literary world.

Metafiction is a form of fictional writing that deliberately and self-consciously draws attention to the working of texts, the meanings created, and the relationship between fiction and reality (Waugh, 1984; McCallum, 1996). While examples of metafiction have existed since the beginning of literary publishing (and earlier in some devices of oral storytelling), these practices have become more widespread with the development of poststructural theory and the influence of digital media on textual production. Attention to the metafictional was central to *Patchwork Girl*. Indeed, one of the character strands is the text talking about itself as in this excerpt:

I am not predictable, but neither am I random. I might very well be in the cafe predicted, and am – sitting in white light, espresso souring my mouth, jazz piano tinkling over a slurred bass line, as I read fragments of flyers taped to the walls – but could equally be anywhere else, so if you think you're going to follow me, you'll have to learn to move the way I do, think the way I think; there's just no way around it. And then, my pursuers, when you are thinking my thoughts, my battle is almost won, because you'll begin to have trouble telling me apart from yourself, you too will start lifting the flyers to look for hidden mikes, and when you see me, you'll wonder if I'm chasing you (think me).

The attention needed to read the text meant being aware of the writer's clues and remaining attentive to the structures and linkages possible. Such awareness is likely why reading the e-literature influenced the writing and in turn why the writing enabled a greater understanding of the reading. When one is aware of an author's techniques and processes in creating a fictive text, she can later adopt such an approach in her own work whether she is writing a hypertext or working in more traditional genres.

A metafictional sensitivity also highlights the connections to other texts, what Kristeva (1986) identified as "intertextuality", a type of dialogue within the text that takes place among three sources: the writer, the addressee (whether outside or inside the work), and the historical and cultural context (Guillén, 1993). This context includes other texts, not only those in print but also

multimedia presentations of information and story. In the creation of e-literature, as writers develop links and form relationships among images, sounds and ideas understanding the importance of the relationships among texts, they are able to more deeply realize the social and historical contexts of literature. This knowledge readers and writers can bring to both print and digital texts.

Instead of worrying about how e-literature threatens the continued existence of books, I think it is more important to consider how this form expands the space of the possible for both digital and print forms. Each offers different kinds of learning and each influences the other. As author Kristjana Gunnars (2004) notes, opting for multiplicity and multivalency at the expense of ease and comfort can avoid literature that serves as “a kind of inducement to narcosis”. She suggests that, “We can qualify our descriptions, make strange the ordinary, fragment narrative texture. We can produce unexpected intimacies, allow for authorial intervention, open up avenues of interaction between the fiction itself and the real world in which it exists” (p. 64).

Playing with fragments of e-literature can take us beyond the subjunctive spaces of language into imagining new forms and creating new ways of understanding. If we want our students to do more than fantasize in genres, we need to offer them the tools that will help them design different imaginings. Writing and reading e-literature is one way to begin.

REFERENCES

- Atwood, M. (1970). *The journals of Susanna Moodie: Poems*. Toronto, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Brant, D. (1996). *Dancing naked: Narrative strategies for writing across centuries*. Stratford, ON: The Mercury Press.
- Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Guillén, C. (1993). *The challenge of comparative literature*, (C. Franzen, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gunnars, K. (2004). *Stranger at the door: Writers and the act of writing*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier University Press.
- Jackson, S. (1995). *Patchwork Girl: A modern monster*. [Hypertextsoftware]. Waterton, MA: Eastgate Systems, <http://www.eastgate.com>
- Joyce, M. (1996). *Twelve blue*. [Hypertext software]. Waterton, MA: Eastgate Systems, <http://www.eastgate.com/TwelveBlue/>
- Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in language: A semiotic approach to art and literature* (L. Roudiez, Ed; T. Gora, A. Jardine, & L. Roudiez, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kristeva, J. (1986). Word, dialogue and the novel. In T. Moi (Ed.) *The Kristeva reader* (pp. 34-61). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Laurence, M. (1983). Time and the narrative voice. In G. Woodcock (Ed.). *A place to stand on: Essays by and about Margaret Laurence* (pp. 155-159). Edmonton, AB: NeWest Press.
- Luce-Kapler, R. (2004). *Writing with, through, and beyond the text: An ecology of language*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- McCallum, R. (1996). Metafictions and experimental work. In P. Hunt (Eds.), *International companion encyclopedia of children's literature* (pp. 397-404). New York: Routledge.
- Moodie, S. (1974). *Roughing it in the bush: Or, forest life in Canada* (3rd ed). Toronto, ON: Coles Publishing.
- Ryan, M-L. (2004). Will new media produce new narratives? In M-L. Ryan (Ed.). *Narrative across media: The language of storytelling* (pp. 337-360). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Scott, G. (1989). *Spaces like stairs*. Toronto: Women's Press.
- Storyspace. [Computer software]. Massachusetts: Eastgate Systems, <http://www.eastgate.com>
- Tabbi, J. (2002). *Cognitive fictions*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ulmer, G. (1997). A response to *Twelve Blue* by Michael Joyce. *Postmodern Culture*, 8(8). See http://muse.jhu.edu/cgi-bin/access.cgi?uri=/journals/postmodern_culture/v008/8.1ulmer.html for details on how to access this article.
- Waugh, P. (1984). *Metafiction: The theory and practice of self-conscious fiction*. New York: Methuen.
- Wikipedia (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/>)
- Winterson, J. (1995). *Art objects: Essays on ecstasy and effrontery*. Toronto, ON: Alfred Knopf.

Manuscript received: May 18, 2006

Revision received: June 10, 2006

Accepted: September 11, 2006