

## Adeena Karasick / bill bissett: A WRITING OUTSIDE WRITING

Through a re-politicization of socio-historic linguistic structures, bill bissett engages in a writing praxis which inscribes an unofficial, outlawed discourse. A discourse which is improper, contaminated and *out of control*. And though Frank Davey, Stephen Scobie, Karl Jirgens, Jack David and Len Early <sup>1</sup> have at various times labeled bissett's writing "metaphysical," "transcendental" and "idealistic," according to Derrida what is "metaphysical" is that which does not fit into a system, (excluded like voice, like semen, like vomit, like writing)<sup>2</sup>, and cannot be absorbed; what is "transcendental," is that which is heterogenous to all hermeneutic totalization; and what is "Ideal" is generated only *through* and *by* repetition (a repetition which brings with it an alterity that forbids the unity of the foundation it was supposed to insure, and thus re-presents nothing other than, in Derridean terms, **a production of difference**). Thus, bissett's writing must be reviewed as *metaphysical*, *transcendental* or *idealistic* only insofar as it is a differential productivity of effects; a range of discourses distinguished between disadjustments, promiscuity, syncretism, juxtaposition and integration, and refuses systematization.

Like Abraham Abulafia, a 13th C. mystic, who was convinced that through contemplation of the Hebrew alphabet, one could be free from *ordinary* perception engaged in a praxis he called, "the science of the combination of letters," bill bissett employs a schizop(oet)phrenic aesthetic whereby "particulariz[ing] and atomiz[ing] language into word, morpheme, syllable, vowel, letter and sound,"<sup>3</sup> text becomes "a continuum of letters," a network of echoes, traces; displaced in a palimpsestic process of rupture, supplementation and dis-ease. Writing "evn without th sentens or transitiv verb konstruks," bissett foregrounds the materiality/"pateriality" of language and thus inscribes a textual space where "langwanga collidz" into a "molekular dissolv," engendering an ever-expansive mode of meaning production.

So, as in *sa n th monkey* or *sa n th crystal ball*, **SA** as sublexical unit, signs and re-signs as Soul Arrow or “Savoir Absolu,” the trace of **SA** sacrificed, circumcised remains in avowal, as a sublime vocable, as trope or ellipsis that accumulates swells into “ciseaux, scie, si (if) si s’il [. . .] is put to work, ça, ci” <sup>4</sup> as **SA** salient, signifies, soars on the threshold of la sememe, the sublime circumscession of **SA** stretches, separates. Folds into a memory confessed as **SA** the signature signs, assigns between the signans/signatum; as enseign sein desseins designs and resigns dasein in a countersignative insignia resurrected on the skin of these syllables **SA** surges **SA**lved as **S** the story of [a] signs as cenere solace cinders in insignia seigneurie swill salus in sanguine sluice. **SA** stretched in the cinder of a sentence, in the idiom of an opening, **SA**’s **SA**ga seizes in liaison and striction comme *ça* or **A.S.A.** (acetylsalicylic acid), which as the Pharmakon, heals by making sick, [sic] as both the poison and the an(ec)tidote, **SA**, sal, sullies **SA**, as Sender/ Addresser questions *reading* as an intra-productive economy. **SA** as the sign of metaphorical reversal, where “a little **SA** sinning” <sup>5</sup> escarres, scars, carts, succours, **SA** supplements or stands in for what’s said in a **SA**id which cannot **SA**y its **SA**ying (essaying). As **SA** (*ça*) slips between languages and cultures. Between genders and legacies, **SA** as “immense and finite sponge pregnant like a memory” in the naked spectacle of wounds and witnesses, caresses swells into its lexicon savoured in **SA**ni.

*ç’est sa*

Further, through the infusion of “unreadable elemnts” <sup>6</sup> bissett questions any notion of what is spoken, what is written as oral and graphic lexemes bleed into an invaginated chiasmus of edges, folds, flaws, laws. “dansing dimesyuns byond re/hersals,” bissett foregrounds how writing “luxuriates” in the “ekstasee” of words, sounds, breath; bodies into an erotics of articulative textures where solypse slip in a ventriloquist kiss n ex-schize as “verokia” caresses lexica intersects. And though his pointallistic, lettristic, concrete work can be read as “notaysyun” it’s a notation for an orality that always exceeds itself.

Haunted by repetition, reproduction, a network of replacements and substitutions, it recreates a *transformance* that can never be transcribed:

. . . *sound* is huge element uv writing wanting/ 2 let th  
words on th surface tactile intaglio look as much/ as  
possibil as each *sound* in that pome in that place s/  
spelling th medium sew thers growing phonetik  
deepning/ wch can seem fairlee konistent n is thru ovr  
all allows/ inkonsistenseez as th mood flavour n th  
sound nuance/ emphasis itself changes evn within wun  
pome . . .”<sup>7</sup>

And if, according to Edmond Jabès, “identity is, but an assemblage of letters,” bill bissett *becomes* his writing. And in so doing, does not privilege lyrical realism at the expense of language; does not engender a Platonic schema (where writing is the parricidal son of the logos), but acknowledges that writing is always already a network of referrals inscribed in diversity **and** consistency, dispersion **and** gathering; repetition, absence, risk, loss, death, and produces a system of irreducible iterability. bissett rather, inscribes a “hypothet/ikul/ unavoidable present”; a present-non-present or resonant present “wher/evreething . . . alredee with us.”<sup>8</sup>

Simulacric of the “ecstatic” writing of Abulafia where the course of nature can be changed through the context of manipulating language, or how “changing the order of the letters . . . expresses a deleterious state in such a way that the form of a noun will have the effect of transforming reality,”<sup>9</sup> bissett’s texts foreground that what is “real” is only “reality producing.” Producing *effects* of the real. And as “the real” “is not inseparable from the idea of the idea (of the idealization of ideality) as effect of iterability”<sup>10</sup> what is “Real” is “irreal,” serial and [reels] in a complex flex of conflictual “fakts,” “kaleidoscopik ficksyuns.” And thus, bissett’s work acknowledges the fiction of its idiom, and inevitably foregrounds that *the world* and *language* are not two separate realms, but are inseparable from discursive structures and systems of signification. So, not only is “every letter a wor(l)d in itself,”<sup>11</sup> but “**we live inside language.**”



And though through letter combination, bissett interrogates traditional notions of orthography and models of spelling, “punktuayshyun,” he does not set up another standardized “offishul” colonial code; a new Order, a new Law, but with “the manee n varied language notaysyuns,”<sup>12</sup> language structures become simulacric of politico-cultural syncreticity; directly synechdochic of the gaps, caesuras, and silences which exist between language(s), cultures, codes.

wanting 2 bring/ 4 me th lettrs th words 2 theyr sound  
 oral textyur bite/ changing may help vivify th language  
 2 disrobe th bull/ shit inherent in th inheritid big  
 tennis game binaree/ konstrukts no wun is 2 blame 4  
 habit significans etset/ era say sew that egalitarian  
 societee can be evolving at/ leest 4 me in th writing sins  
 poetree is not a how 2 manual needing agreed upon  
 symbols ther is freedom 2 play in2 th growing.<sup>13</sup>

So, through “an accidental and graphically imperfect semiology”<sup>14</sup> (always in excess of itself), bissett’s work questions the metaphysical erection of *property* (inscribed in empirical notions of being, purity, autonomy). The *sens propre* (clean or proper sense) is *sans propre*, improper, inappropriate (impropriotous, riotous), depropriated, exappropriated and infects any notion of a pure, clean or “readable” text. And thus, as a hierogrammatic graphematrix of reproduction, diss/*emanation*, contamination, which engenders a hybridity of meaning, forbidden transparency and impossible univocity, bissett’s work not only interrogates a Eurocentric myth of Meaning, a regime of Truth, Authenticity and Representation; an apparatus of Power, and the gendered-political fallacy of genre purity, but foregrounds how language becomes the negotiation of contradictory and antagonistic instances that open up hybrid sites and objectives of struggle.

Sublimely extended — sucked up, thrown out to the “periferee” of a sentence, to the paraphrasis of a signature, “moon sweet/cedar smells . . . erth sun lakes kiyots woolvs and hot love bodeez howling loons . . .” elide in a simulacric economimesis effecting a *language event*, “a langwage xperience,” marked by exile, agonism; spasms in the rhythmized hiatus of a grammatological occlusion and becomes a theatrix, cicatrix of performative differance.

When a bill becomes an Act.

Further, with the infusion of multiple genres, codes, idioms, bissett's texts present themselves as *non-organic* discourses shrouded in anonymity, anachronism and incongruity. Not locked or bound within the idiom of existential analysis or the limits of order as determined by a socio-political condition of absolutism, determinism, Idealism, Metaphysics or Re-discovery, but as a "yuunyun" announced in fragments, a heteroglossic enunciation, a polymorphous activity which binds a range of differences and discriminations that inform the discursive and political practices of ethnic, gendered and cultural hierarchization.

. . . wanting 2 write in as manee wayze as poss/ibul  
spiritual metaphysikul narrativ politikul realism/ his her  
storikul konversaysyunal meditatif trance long/ n incisiv  
breef sound vizual songs chants lirik romantik/ erotik  
fusun or linguistik mewsik in wch a lot or all uv/ thees  
elements ar present in various n changing emphases vois  
narrator singul telling manee voices coinsiding . . . or  
konscious comments on soshio ekonomik/ hierarkikul  
strukshurs that present th inequitee problematiks/  
thees consideraysyuns . . . dramatik descriptiv/ epik or  
narrativ politikul his her storikul . . .<sup>15</sup>

So, just as the page as *decoupage*, *parages* destabilizes any notion of a fixed regularity, methodology, univocity, every letter becomes a subject, becomes simulacric of an apophatic network of radical indeterminacy. Through proliferating power, savagery, and contamination, letters as intermingling bodies breathe, caress, merge with, move *into*, displace and *enact* a reproductive process, which reproduces text as a sapirous reciprocity of paracitation, quotation, restoryation, appendices and resemblance: where each letter, each graphic unit, announces itself as the possibility of the relation to the other, of the gift, of affirmation, of prayer.

And if every letter is a signature, bissett foregrounds how even the trace of subjectivity can never present itself as a unified agency of emission, but as a Volosinian “clash of social accents,” a syncretic intersect of positions, acts, voices, s(tr)u(c)tures. Gathering into a “kaleidoskopik” spectrality, where subjectivity is dispersed, diaspersed through recontextualization, migration, translation: (“nd I was gone gone into th/ smell uv yu gone into a sea uv yu”).<sup>16</sup> And as the “pomes carree being,” bissett becomes a macrosyntactic signifying praxis; a negotiation of passages, links, bonds, where text/content elide and multiply difference. And difference remains “skreem/ing n vomitting n th crayzd scrambling.”

a private bill, a public bill, a true bill. A bill of Attainder, a bill of fare, of health, of pains and penalties. A bill of rights, of sale, of mortality; bills' receivable and exchanged.

Through “his/her sterikal” monomania, the signifier of reference slips, is “mis or mistr placed” through an extraintentional differential production of palimpsest and dissemination. Through crimes, perjuries, blasphemies, tropological subjectivity is blended with a legendary, complex and variable consanguinity, “his/herstorees,” “mytholojees,” positions, quarantines, s(tr)u(c)tures, codes. Thus, blurry, several, simultaneous, contaminated by “xtraordinaree n revelatoree hallusinaysyuns,” “or customaree vish/yuns,” “tangerine whisprs” or “raisin cookies n siphalis sores,” bill bissett gathers himself into a countersignative contract, which tracks and retracks, contracts into an ever expansive realm of possibility and enunciation.

billy: a policeman's staff which is a little bill or billet. A pocket handkerchief. The can in which Australian station-hands originally made tea and did their cooking. Possibly billa, a creek. Water. billy. Male as in billy goat. A goatee.



Thus, between socio-linguistic subjectivities, bissett puts into praxis a “life-writing,” a “politikul auto biography,” a biomythography or in Derridean terms an “auto-bio-thanato-hetero-graphical opus” — a “circumfession” that “*makes trewth*,” and *lives inside* a “pluralistik” hermeneutic p(a)lace of re-inscription, translation and meaning production.

“Trewth” then gets exiled into all the letters of the text; their shapes, combined and separated, swaddled letters, curved ones and crooked ones, superfluous and elliptic ones, minute and large ones and inverted, the calligraphy of the letters, and the open and the closed pericopes and the ordered ones . . .<sup>17</sup> and their “linguisteeek mewsik”. Fetishizing instability, nomadicism or in Benjaminian terms, “monadicism,” vagrancy, meaning travels (*travaillies*) from place to place [re-*plaised*], or splayed out in hyperspatial interplays. Without static place, meaning or tropos, bissett’s texts foreground themselves as linguistically diasporic; inscribed in fragmentation, rupture and aban*donnement*. Between “vankovr” and “venusland,” “th karibou,” “kingstonia,” “castanets n kiyots.” Between “chalottetown,” “centralia,” “adjektiv windows” or “labial [] glotis n tonguing minds,” bissett moves as his text. Writes himself through a complex of codes, texts, borders; through an exilic reason crept into by detour.

And as a paracritical passage, ellipsis eclipse in the lapsus, bissett re-posita a repast of a past which postulates as a resonant present sends, irrepresentable, and foregrounds how *exile* is not ejective, but introjective, not exclusionary, but engenders a palimpsestic historicity, of promiscuity and possibility.

However, though bissett’s texts are inscribed in exile, migration, nomadicism, they *do not become* a “liberating free play,” a loss of limits — an amorphous circulation of signification or get dissolved into an indeterminate miscellany of inscription, as his texts are always articulated from a specific historical-socio-institutional, ethico-political position (*in discourse*).

we go in2 th dansing find our/ place s 4 ths time in *our*  
society is evr n thn in 2 th biggr/ pickshur s 4 othr  
rendrings intrsekting cross th seksyun weev/ ing thru th  
biggr powr konstruks . . .<sup>18</sup>

As Derrida points out, "there is no pleasure (or meaning) without stricture";<sup>19</sup> *meaning* production can only happen through "separasyuns and konstraints," limitation, bands, *contraband*. Thus, through a process of contraction (and therefore expansion), through a negotiation of varying "sir madame cumstances," processes, privileges, drives and thresholds, what is authoritative, what is accessory synnexes in the nexus, collapses into a surplus space of resonant sense, a consensus of since or *sensucht* (desire).

Yet, as an ensemble of specific discursive practices, as the outgrowth of a determinant mode of production, bissett's texts do not position themselves as a non-hierarchic celebration of opacity as incoherence, but recognize the intensity of ever-firing fibres, fluids as a series of "limit experiences," "possibiliteez," "opsyuns," a "relaysyunal n kontekstual" intersequential circulation of semiological slippage and semantic subterfuge (where "[we find] ourselves in ar curving").<sup>20</sup> So, even in *blur street*, bissett foregrounds that what is outside of a border is not absented and therefore cannot be an experience of lack, effacement, erasure, closure and silence, but "full uv echoez . . . clattring suddenlee" or in "th moistyur murmerings" where "rippuling shine swet dripping" borders become a series of traces, echoes, cinders inscribed in spectral economy of exile, rupture, movement and uncertainty.

Though bissett's texts assault traditional concepts of subjectivity, he never erases the possibility of a potent agency of political action, he never privileges textuality at the expense of the "real world." For bissett, the *world* and *language* are not two separate realms, but are inseparable from discursive structures and systems of signification. It rather works AGAINST a politics that sets itself up as an empirical or pre-political *real* (where domination is invisible), and challenges a hierarchic binary system of exclusions that eradicates difference and leads to totalitarian regimes which ground its prescriptive judgments *outside* signifying practices.



... ium verree aware/ uv th needs 4 pluralism acceptans  
 4 evreeun without monopoliz/ ing cultural identitee  
 spred ovr a geographikul area like mayo . . . th greatest  
 storee is th serch 4 egalitarian societee within n/ without  
 no powr sways uv th rite wing fundamentalist retorik/  
 destroying in th name uv creat ing . . .<sup>21</sup>

So, whether he's writing about "th militaree," "th mountees," drug busts or "toxik" blobs; "mass xecusyuns," "spektakular klass strugguls n abusive rest homes," "death n direleksyun" or the horror of AIDS: "th pain uv so manee peopul dying n th sexual prsonal frustraysyun,"<sup>22</sup> of the slow deterioration of his friends, the "xklusun/ . . . th bellee swelling with cramping/ tortur uv bakteria infeksyun burden,"<sup>23</sup> or being gay and male, living outside the limits of the law, bissett explores the relation between law and inscription. Taking a position *in the work of analysis* (and thus *is never separate* from a political institution), his texts seek new investigations of responsibility, investigations which question the codes inherited from *ethics* and *politics*. So, it never establishes itself as a limitless discursivization of the political which suspends reference (because not only is there reference for his texts, but the effects of reference (or referents) remain *and the referent is textual*. Though inscribed in a "langwage" that is in (in)initely "raging," "[t]ekstatik," the political is not given up to indeterminate play, to a vacuous relativism but, between justice and injustice (through "a star studdid gathring uv th judgd n th judging"<sup>24</sup>), it acknowledges that choices *are not* made from a position of transcendent subjectivity that precedes or stands outside the judgments it makes. In a continual process of slippage and deferral, the subject is not erased, absented, but displaced in indeterminacy, ambiguity, plurality.

thr is / no essenshul storee/ so manee view points/ so  
 manee views/ approximaysyuns<sup>25</sup>

Thus, the subject is reinscribed as a political agency with an ethical subject, *a subject of ethics*, which practices a justice that cannot be "justified" and thus, necessitates "full" responsibility. A subject that asks:

wch memoree wch judg wch storee wch impatiens  
 burning burst/ ing out uv anee mould clasping ending  
 finding turbulent being . . . whos ordr <sup>26</sup>

And performs not an ethics based on morality, but amplitude, thresholds, capacities, arrangements and combinations, variations, relations, transformations. And thus, bissett's writing does not become a tranquilizer in the service of gorgetting "daytime" atrocities but rather, the political is re-inscribed *in* the poetical; in a differential production of language traces (which are not simply traces of traces but refer to an origin escaping the text in the act of grounding it), and secures the text against the madness of permanent dissemination. Thus, bissett's writing can never be reduced to an a-political, non-committal or irresponsible escapist strategy, but rather questions "how our lives can b defin'd/ sew much by opposisyunal arketypal konstruks . . . th/ feers from th inventid universalisms . . ." <sup>27</sup> interrogating Phallogocentric, "oligarkikul" notions of Truth, Authenticity, Legitimacy, Reason, Meaning or Closure.

So, even to say "we live inside language" is not enclosing text in a prison-house of language, but opens language to the *Other* in general — returns as the singularities which, by remarking their singularity, explode the received limits of a law which never presents itself. Thus, bissett's texts acknowledge that "what happened" cannot be grounded in irrefutable certainty, but in radical translation, which is NOT *Idealistic*, *Transcendental* or grounded in chaos, but as "there is no law in general except of a repetition and there is no repetition that is not subjected to a law," <sup>28</sup> he inscribes a law that cannot be contained.

Through a series of trials and re-trials, *travaillies*, entrails, bissett questions how can "the Law" be defined when "the law is incomprehensible; when it plays itself out between an undesirable, unverifiable, indecisive absence, and a presence which is not a presence but promise, appeal . . . (emitting) its radiations from the point of its imperceptibility" <sup>29</sup>? And if according to Saussure, "language is always received, like the law," and according to Derrida, "every law finally communicates with an absolute out-law, which would be in a 'transcendental position' with respect to any given legality, and which we have called

the gift of the law of the promise,"<sup>30</sup> bissett (as out-law or bi-law) acts as law (*in the being-law of the law*) and exceeds the law, or in Cixousian terms, "blow[s] up the Law . . . tears the law apart,"<sup>31</sup> re-marks a law that is before the law and exceeds the law; a law which allows itself to bind itself maintain itself while dividing itself in the process, and *becomes* the letter of the law that is never given, but is always already analytically entailed by the force of repetition, contamination, difference.

So not a "Writing *Outside* the Law" or as McCaffery might say, a "Writing *Outside* Writing," but if according to Derrida, *ousia* is "spectral presence," bissett must be seen as not *Outside* but OUSIDE Writing, OUSIDE the Law. Ousted *out of* and *into* a political economy of parasitism, grafting and divisibility. Introducing an absolute heterogeneity in the modality of the possible, bissett maintains the trace of a passage through an irreducible iterability, an undecidability, where meaning and truth are constituted contingently, indeterminably, like "daily fashyun n fushyun n fushyas blooming." And in substitution and exchange produces a paratactic sacrifice apostrophized in a liminal toponymy of textatic accumulation, where to the letter of the law, every letter a law.



## ENDNOTES

1. Frank Davey in his 1972 critique of *Nobody Owns the Earth* asserts that bissett writes "of an unqualified, pure, archetypal, visionary world — a world distinguished from ours by its lack of pluralities, multiplicities, divergencies." (*The Canadian Forum*, July/August 1972, p.45). Karl Jirgens account of bill bissett in *Canadian Writers and Their Works*, reports how bissett "attempts to instate an "idyllic myth" (p.49), "embraces a timeless transcendental philosophy" (p.73), and whose "various signifiers ultimately refer to a single cosmic union" (p.75). (*Canadian Writers and their Works*. eds. Robert Lecker, Jack David, Ellen Quigley. ECW: Toronto, 1992).
2. This concept of the "metaphysical" is explored in *Jacques Derrida*, Glas, trans. John P. Leavey, Jr., and Richard Rand (Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1986), as well as in Jacques Derrida, "Violence and Metaphysics" in *Writing and Difference*, trans. Alan Bass. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978).
3. bpNichol, "Passwords: The Bissett Papers" in *Brick*, No.23 (Winter 1985), p.15.
4. Jacques Derrida and Geoffrey Bennington, *Jacques Derrida*, trans. Geoffrey Bennington (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), p.212.
5. Jacques Derrida and Geoffrey Bennington, *Jacques Derrida*, p.101.
6. Similarly, through incorporation of extralexical inscription through assemblage such as "The Fields Ar Gold," where antithetical elements from outside traditional forms of painting and sculpture are incorporated, bissett effects a contaminated polyphony of hys/hersterikal texture, where the "Field" opens into an antiabsorptive interdisciplinary s/cite. Becomes "a field of blood," "of fire," "of

force," "of footsteps;" a "field of vision," "allowance." And so far afield, must be seen as a savage field, of conflict, of discourse, of struggle.

7. bill bissett, personal correspondence to Adeena Karasick. Toronto-Malawi, Jan. 1997. This point is further articulated in that "n gale reserch vol 19 contem/ poraree authors detroit 1994 th editors who we wun/drful 2 work with themselvs did a translayisyun in2/ 'korrekt' english ther wch they placed following my own/ text 4 me that was interesting in that th nuances uv/ th words lost sum xistens vizual textyur part uv saing/ n uv kours de accenshuating th sound itselvs th eye hope/ theyr intrvensyun helpd sum reedrds journee phrases in/ langwages have oftn bin usd 2 prevent xperiences manip/ ulate peopul imprison sew 4 me writing can b a drilling/ thru thos obfuskaysyuns or letting ordr s go n playing/ in hopefulee mor opn spaces espeshulee as indikatid/ in th poetiks in s th story I to blewointment 1971 n/ 'poetree is 4 komunikaysyun' in *what we have* Talon/books 1988".

8. bill bissett, "Let th watr sit 4 a day n th chloreen evaporates" in *Carnival: A Scream in High Park Reader*, ed. Peter McPhee (Toronto: Insomniac Press, 1996).

9. Moshe Idel, *Hasidism: Between Ecstasy and Magic* (New York: State University of New York Press, 1995), p.26.

10. Jacques Derrida, *Aporias*, trans. Thomas Dutoit, eds. Werner Hamacher and David E. Wellerby (California: Stanford University Press, 1993), p.8.

11. Abraham Abulafia recited in *Moshe Idel, Kabbalah: New Perspectives* (London: Yale University Press, 1988), p.81.

12. bill bissett, "(no tay syun) pome time pome staysyun" in *Open Letter*. Fifth Series, No. 2, 1982.

13. bill bissett, personal correspondence to Adeena Karasick. Toronto-Malawi, Jan. 1997.

14. Steve McCaffery, "Bill Bissett: A Writing Outside Writing" in *North of Intention: Critical Writings 1973-1986* (Toronto: Nightwood Editions, 1986), p.195.
15. bill bissett, personal correspondence to Adeena Karasick. Toronto-Malawi, Jan. 1997.
16. bill bissett, *RUSH what fukin thery* (Toronto: gronk press, 1972).
17. Sefer ha-Yihud, cited in *Moshe Idel, Kabbalah: New Perspectives*, p.189.
18. bill bissett, personal correspondence to Adeena Karasick. Toronto-Malawi, Jan. 1997.
19. Jacques Derrida, *The Truth in Painting*, trans. Geoff Bennington and Ian McLeod (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), p.43.
20. bill bissett, "mistr n ms wintr" in *loving without being vulnerabul* (Vancouver: Talonbooks, 1997).
21. bill bissett, personal correspondence to Adeena Karasick, Toronto-Malawi, Jan. 1997.
22. bill bissett, "blur street II" in *the last photo uv th human soul* (Talonbooks: Vancouver, 1993).
23. bill bissett, "much 2 celebrate unemployment n hungrs th esteemd committee sd gud nite" in *loving without being vulnrabul*.
24. bill bissett, "from th memorabul gala at orangevilee n neepor landing" from *the upcoming, scars on th seehors marvara text fragments*.
25. bill bissett, "(no tay syun) pome time pome staysyun" in *Open Letter*. Fifth Series, No. 2, 1982.



26. bill bissett, personal correspondence to Adeena Karasick. Toronto-Malawi, Jan. 1997.
27. bill bissett, personal correspondence to Adeena Karasick, Toronto-Malawi, Jan. 1997.
28. Jacques Derrida, "Difference" in *Critical Theory Since 1965*, eds. Hazard Adams and Leroy Searle, p.123.
29. Hélène Cixous, *Coming to Writing and Other Essays*, trans. Sarah Cornell, Deborah Jenson, Ann Liddle, Susan Sellers, ed. Deborah Jenson (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991), p.151.
30. Geoffrey Bennington and Jacques Derrida, *Jacques Derrida*, pp.282-3.
31. Hélène Cixous, "Laugh of Medusa" in *Critical Theory Since 1965*, p.316.