



BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Wourm, Nathalie (2018) Architects and poets: Vannina Maestri, Nathalie Quintane, Jean-Michel Espitallier, and the poetry of buildings. *L'Esprit Createur* 58 (3), pp. 103-113. ISSN 0014-0767.

Downloaded from: <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/24038/>

Usage Guidelines:

Please refer to usage guidelines at <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/policies.html> or alternatively contact lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk.

Architects and Poets: Vannina Maestri, Nathalie Quintane, Jean-Michel Espittallier, and the Poetry of Buildings

Nathalie Wourm

Now Odysseus approached Alcinous' splendid dwelling [...] A kind of radiance, like that of the sun or moon, played upon the high-roofed halls of the great King. Bronze walls, topped by a frieze of dark-blue enamel, ran round to left and right from the portals to the back of the court.¹

Interdisciplinarity in the arts is far from a new phenomenon, even if it is nowadays often regarded as a characteristic of postmodernity. Umberto Eco famously argued that postmodern art is akin to art in the Middle Ages: "An art not systematic but additive and compositive, ours and that of the Middle Ages [...] with interchanges and borrowings, reciprocal and continuous; and the evident Byzantinism, the mad taste for collecting, lists, assemblage, amassing of disparate things."² Eco refers to the cathedral as a typical medieval work of art (Eco 83). It is a composite production, and it is interdisciplinary because it combines architecture with various forms of pictorial representation (stained glass, mosaic, painted, sculpted). Interdisciplinarity, however, is also common before the Middle Ages, and one of its earliest manifestations is the bringing together of architecture and poetry. Ancient Greek poets such as Homer and Apollonios of Rhodes were making use of architecture to produce meaning in their works. In her study of domestic architecture in Ancient Greek poetry, Sylvie Rougier-Blanc argues that buildings were often described then as generating strong emotions in the beholder, whose glance the reader or listener followed, guided by the poet.³ She explains that, in the above quotation, a simple description of the architecture Odysseus encounters upon his arrival at Alcinous' palace is at play, but then the poetic glance widens beyond that of the protagonist to a more animated spatial scene. One may add that description here is functional, meant to convey strong impressions, and not merely gratuitous. This type of representation is probably the most common manifestation of interdisciplinarity in works that blend the arts of poetry and architecture. In his essay "The Poetry of Architecture," John Hollander indicates that architecture can, in this manner, be the fictional scene of poetry, but that it can also—in the form of theatres or arenas for instance—be the very structure in which poetry is performed: "Framed in all that physical structure, language is given a particular significance with regard to the matter of contingent illusion."⁴ And indeed, the coming together of poetry and buildings can be particularly congruent, as in the case of Olivier Cadiot's stage adaptation of his poetic novel *Un mage en été* at the Avignon Opera in 2010. Florence March describes in detail how the baroque aesthetics of this theatrical space had the effect of illuminating, or revealing Cadiot's text.⁵ In the same way, there was something mesmerising about his two-hour solo reading in the Cour d'honneur du Palais des papes, late at night that same summer, according to Anne Portugal.⁶

Another connection between architecture and poetry, according to Hollander, is to be found in the many parallelisms that it is possible to establish between the two disciplines. Hollander refers to Kant, A. W. Schlegel, and other thinkers who have drawn figurative comparisons between them, but also to the analogous terminology that is used in both arts (Hollander 19-21). This parallelism is encountered in a video interview with French architect Rudy Ricciotti, who makes repeated use of literary terms to represent his vision of the architect's work. He speaks of the way "the narration prints its requirements on the formal system," of "the story, and the dreamscape," of the "architectural linguistics," the "linguistic revolution" operated by a beam, of the "strictly carnal story of the reality specific to the material."⁷ Conversely, contemporary French poet Vannina Maestri speaks of the "architecture" of the poetry that

she writes. She explains that in her volume *Débris d'endroits* she wanted to create a new form, to offer the reader “une architecture des mots, des fragments, des narrations extérieures à moi en apparence.” She adds that in all of her books she uses diagrams, plans, maps to produce a *montage* that reorganises the textual chaos that surrounds us.⁸ It is therefore particularly apposite that Ricciotti and Maestri have collaborated on a piece of work that connects the art of the architect and that of the poet. Ricciotti combined his architectural practice with the role of commissioning editor for the poetry publishing house Al Dante. In 2009, he started a new collection entitled *Édifices*, aiming to ask poets, philosophers, and writers to compose a piece of work based on an “architectural gesture.”⁹ Poets Jean-Michel Espitallier, Nathalie Quintane, and Maestri featured amongst the contributors. These three figures of recent contemporary experimental French poetry are no strangers to each other. Espitallier and Maestri were editors (with Jacques Sivan) of the experimental poetry journal *Java* in the 1990s and early 2000s, and they published Quintane amongst other ultra-contemporary practitioners. They are all part of a nebula of poets influenced by poststructuralism and sometimes referred to as “post-poets.”¹⁰ Three books were based on a piece of architecture, with texts, pictures, sketches, notes, and models by the architects themselves: Maestri’s is entitled *A Stazzona* and celebrates the radical Corsican theatre conceived by Jean-Michel Battesti and Dominique Villa;¹¹ Quintane’s is *Le viaduc Le Corbusier*, a book in honour of architect François Deslaugiers’ viaduct in Lille, which links the old railway station of Lille-Flandres to the architecturally modern Lille-Europe station;¹² and Espitallier’s is entitled *Z5*, and is based on the sports complex in Aix-en-Provence, designed by architect Christophe Gulizzi.¹³ In these books, architecture and poetry are intricately woven to create hybrid pieces of work. This interweaving is representative of a trend in French postmodern poetry that Jean-Michel Espitallier calls “deterritorialised” and “impure” (Wourm 54), a poetry that is also something other than itself.

While the bringing together of poetry with the other arts has a long history in France and elsewhere, it can be considered a largely poststructuralist programme in the contemporary branch of innovative poetry that surrounded the publication of the first volume of the *Revue de littérature générale* by Pierre Alferi and Olivier Cadiot in 1995.¹⁴ In an interview, Cadiot argues that the influential introductory essay, “La mécanique lyrique,” was misunderstood as an invitation to transdisciplinarity (Wourm 32-33). Cadiot refers to Deleuze’s idea of “connecting flows,” claiming that poets embraced the concept in their poetic practice, connecting “everything with anything” (Wourm 32, 35). Deleuze considered that the principle of creativity, the source of multiplicity, occurred when elements were combined, in their in-betweenness: “It is not the elements or the sets which define the multiplicity. What defines it is the AND, as something which has its place between the elements or between the sets.”¹⁵ In a lecture on Leibniz, for instance, Deleuze spoke of “connecting flows in such a way that a creation is drawn or made around certain singularities extracted from flows.”¹⁶ And with Guattari in *Mille plateaux*, he enjoins the reader to: “Conjuguer les flux déterritorialisés.”¹⁷ The idea was to attempt all manner of connections between elements. These elements were referred to as “flows” partly because Deleuze and Guattari regarded all things as being in motion, in development, in a state of becoming. Various flows were to be “deterritorialised,” taken out of their usual contexts, placed in different situations. In terms of poetry, this could mean moving it outside the book, away from the white page, towards other disciplines, and linking it to other types of creations, connecting it with other arts. As for Alferi and Cadiot, they were similarly calling for the manufacturing of poems “nés dans le chaos, d’un amalgame” and “très hétérogènes.” The idea was to create “objets verbaux non-identifiés” (Alferi and Cadiot 5-6), or in other words, new forms of poetry that were not recognizable as such. It is therefore hardly surprising that a group of poets who had read Deleuze and Guattari widely (Wourm 2-3), felt encouraged by “La mécanique lyrique” to carry on with their interdisciplinary experiments, or to attempt them for the first time. Poststructuralism challenges essentialism and traditional constructs, the idea of the immutability of concepts and definitions, of set truths. In that sense, poetry, and indeed the other arts, lose their fixity, lose their boundaries, acquire porosity. Thus, a generation of poets who had absorbed poststructuralist theory, largely because it was part of the *zeitgeist* in France during their formative years (Wourm 6), was open to experimentation with other arts or other disciplines, to create new forms, or simply new objects emerging in between various elements, to deterritorialise the poem, and re-energise poetic practice. From

the porosity, the impurity of poetry, multiplicity could manifest itself. Espitallier, Maestri, and Quintane are among these poets. It is in this context that their encounters with architecture as part of the *Édifices* collection is to be considered. In each case, the questions that arise relate to how the disciplines interact and what happens at their juncture. The architectural element in the assemblages is largely conveyed through the medium of photography, creating a complex intermeshing of art forms. Do the photographs illustrate the text or does the text illustrate the photographs, or does neither have an illustrative function?

In *Le viaduc Le Corbusier* and *A Stazzona*, photography is supplemented by extracts of text written by the architects, as well as maps, sketches, and plans. What is striking in both cases is the fact that some of this text is presented in short lines reminiscent of verse, blurring the boundary between the poetic and the technical. In *A Stazzona*, Maestri's reference to writing as architecture acquires all its significance. She makes use of horizontal and vertical lines, and blocks of text variously positioned on the page, which could easily remind one of an architect's notebook. This graphism, of which her books *Mobiles* and *Mobiles 2*, for instance, make extensive use, is characteristic of Maestri's style.¹⁸ Ellipses, squares, lines, arrows, boxes, and speech bubbles act as spatial support on the page for fragments of text in various fonts, through the use of various types of typographical emphasis. These devices energize the text, give it movement and speed, the mobility to which their title refers.

This energizing is seen especially in the case of arrows and lines that direct the eye to move rapidly to the next portion of text, while the act of reading slows down the rhythm. In *A Stazzona*, her poem entitled "Cappella," which represents the opening section of the book, appears to be more static, if still concerned with organising the space of the page. Lines and arrows are fewer, and they are always either vertical or horizontal, never diagonal. They can be seen as representing the building that they refer to, as on page 14 where, underneath the line "coupe dans le sens de la longueur" there is a dotted vertical line (perhaps representing the slats), underneath which the line "du bâtiment" appears. This use of graphism in itself would not be ground-breaking, were it not for the fact that it becomes clear quite early on in the poem that Maestri is using her description of the building to explain her poetic art. The text itself is a cut-up, which corresponds to Maestri's main composition technique. She commonly collects textual material from advertising, politics, television series, newspaper articles, in short, what she calls the "chaos de textes dans lequel nous mouvons depuis l'enfance, textes lus cent fois et que nous ne voyons plus vraiment."¹⁹ Her goal, she explains, is to question the established social order at the level of language, the syntax that is imposed on us, and the dictatorship of the narrative thread (Wourm 109). In other words, she tries to expose the fictions that are woven by society, and her cut-ups represent their unweaving or deconstruction. The cut-up goes against linearity, against the narrative thread, and is therefore an ideal tool for her project. "Cappella" presents itself as such, but there are nevertheless two apparent themes in place, one that relates to the architecture of the building, and one about Maestri's particular vision of her own writing. The Corsican theatre is an imposing, though not very tall, rectangular block made with wooden slats, containing a few slim horizontal windows, built in greenery near the mountains that surround the small commune of Pioggiola. Maestri alludes to it as "un bâtiment bas / un bateau flottant / troublant ouvert sur un grand jardin éparpillé porté / le verre le bois" (*A Stazzona* 7-8). She expounds further: "le matériau est plus que ça / les forces sont dictées par le lieu" (*A Stazzona* 9). But this is followed by remarks on the part of the poet regarding the issue of representation, of description, which becomes relevant to her own art: "un simple récit dont on sautera des passages / à son gré / ça creuse les questions de la représentation----- / - l'idéologie bourgeoise fonctionne / en montrant comme réel / ce qu'elle produit comme fiction ☺" (*A Stazzona* 9). Here, Maestri is demonstrating why she is reluctant to produce a linear representation of the building, which could only fail to convey its reality because it could only be a fiction, and therefore would conform to a bourgeois ethos. This is why on page 14 the vertical dotted line is to be understood as representing both the view of the inside of the building lengthwise ("coupe dans le sens de la longueur") and ruptures in the narrative, or, in other words, the principle of the cut-up. "Cappella" is about the theory of the spatial and material composition of the theatre. It is also about the poem that presents it. It is a theory within a theory in an effect of *mise en abîme*. This effect becomes even more meaningful in the second part of the book which is made up of text

by the architects of the theatre, Villa and Battesti, and of photographs taken by them and by Lisa Ricciotti. (There are also plans and maps that provide an extremely detailed overview of the building). Indeed, on the first page of that section, text is presented in verse form, made of lines and containing alliteration:

A stazzona (la forge) est située à l'écart...

Répondre à l'austérité, à la puissance du site

par un édifice aux lignes ascétiques.²⁰

This is followed by more technical descriptions in prose form of how the building was constructed and of the building's relation to the site, with many photographs. The prose, however, verges on the poetic in several instances, with the use of images and metaphors: "Ces châtaigniers sont des acteurs immobiles, / passeurs silencieux du site"; "À la couleur sobre des troncs des châtaigniers, au rigorisme dépouillé du lieu répondra la nudité de la peau" (*A Stazzona* 31, 35). In that sense, *A Stazzona* blurs the boundaries between the poetic and the technical, between matters of poetry and architecture, creating a book that is neither fully poetry nor fully architecture, but something in between. This endeavour is very much a Deleuzo-Guattarian one in the case of Maestri, who is fully aware of the process of deterritorialisation and deconstruction that her works instigate (Wourm 110). She takes poetry outside its conventional territory by importing it into a book about the architecture of a newly-built Corsican theatre, but she refuses to use her poetry as a purely descriptive tool to convey her vision of the building and its conception. She rejects the idea of creating a linear narrative around its architecture, using the space of the poem to explain the political motivation behind the form that she adopts.

Quintane and Espitallier share the same political concern as Maestri, regarding the destabilisation of systemic language as fundamental to their writing. However, they both use humour as a way of deflating the pretensions of conventional language. They also both write predominantly in prose form, which makes them less recognisable as poets, especially Quintane who is mainly interested in narrative. They are, like Cadiot, part of the nebula of experimental "post-poets" engaging in the work of deconstruction through their art. They are not recognisable as poets according to traditional definitions of poetry, and they are not recognisable as novelists in the standard sense either. These boundaries have also become blurred, and indeed "La mécanique lyrique" was calling for an end to the artificial division created by these labels (*Revue de littérature générale* 4). What is important is that they both attempt to create unidentified verbal objects in the sense that Cadiot and Alferi summarise in that same essay (*Revue de littérature générale* 5-7). Quintane plays on the ambiguity between the concepts of prose and poetry in her section of *Le viaduc Le Corbusier*: "J'explique, car la poésie (ici, tout de suite) consiste à expliquer. La ponctuation propre à la prose (ici, la mienne) peut-être point-virgule (;) ou virgule (,) ou point (.). Mais la ponctuation propre à la poésie ici la mienne est deux points (:)" (*Le viaduc Le Corbusier* 27). Here, she mocks the absurdity of rules and injunctions relating to the art of writing using one form or another. The humoristic tone is at play throughout her text on the Lille viaduct, a bridge built in 1994 to link the city centre and the business area called Euralille. At the same time, the bridge represents a route between the two railway stations, Lille-Flandres and Lille-Europe. Deslaugiers was the architect, while Rem Koolhaas was the project manager. In *Le viaduc Le Corbusier*, Quintane's opening section is followed by various fragments of text by Deslaugiers explaining the conception of the viaduct. The idea was to create an impression of lightness and fluidity: "Ainsi il n'y a plus de pont, mais une 'rue en l'air', légère, / flottante, comme posée sur des vagues, qui s'envole de la ville / pour pénétrer dans la gare" (*Le viaduc Le Corbusier* 45). This section is followed by an afterword by François Chaslin about Deslaugiers, who passed away shortly before the book was published. Quintane's piece is made up of four parts, each featuring a real or

fictional character and each taking place in the vicinity of the bridge. She integrates this specific cityscape into the stories that she tells, and unlike the poem by Maestri, her text is accompanied by a number of photographs of the local architectural artefacts. Photographs are often used as illustrations for text, but in this case the text is also illustrative of the photographs, and in particular of the constructions that they show. In the part entitled “Martine,” a semi-veiled allusion to Martine Aubry, the socialist mayor of Lille, the narrator harangues the passersby, asking them to reveal to her their own vision of the cityscape: “[O]ffre-moi la tour autrement que comme une photographie de tour, le pont autrement qu’en photo de pont” (*Le viaduc Le Corbusier* 12). And this is what Quintane herself does, using text to offer a different vision of the architecture of the bridge from that of the photographs, based on the impressions of the locals. As in Maestri’s poem, Quintane refers to the act of writing about the buildings. To Martine, who presumably attempts to give her the socialist party card, she replies, “[É]coutez, je ne prendrai pas votre carte, je suis là uniquement pour les tours et tout ça, pour l’architecture [...] pour écrire un petit texte, un poème vous voyez, un poème moderne” (*Le viaduc Le Corbusier* 14). Therefore, there is a double effect of *mise en abîme* at play in Quintane’s piece. On the one hand she conveys a vision of the local architecture while asking passersby to do the same for her, and on the other hand she writes a text about writing a text on the towers and bridge. A similar situation occurs in the following part entitled “Charles,” which refers undoubtedly to Lille poet Charles Pennequin. The narrator takes advantage of her presence in the city to get in touch with Charles by phone and ask him how he would describe the Euralille bridge: “Il me dit le pont quel pont” (*Le viaduc Le Corbusier* 25). His reaction is comical because it denotes a gap between the locals’ perception of the importance of the bridge and its significance as a work of art. It also implies that the bridge is so well integrated within the scenery that its presence is not overwhelming. In the same way, the bridge appears as a fully functional piece of architecture rather than as an object to be admired: “Alors Charles dit qu’il est allé dessous mais pas dessus,” “Je préfère le métro parce que la place, sous le pont, y a beaucoup de vent” (*Le viaduc Le Corbusier* 25, 26). Quintane’s piece is about her quest to find something to write on the bridge, and she accomplishes this by providing us with an experiential description of the bridge at a local level, of the way it lives within the city. The following section is composed of notes and sketches by Deslaugiers that complement this vision of the bridge by providing a detailed rendering of its architectural intricacies, of the nature of the original project and of the history of its creation. It emerges that the bridge was intended to be functional and discreet: “[F]i de l’ouvrage d’art, hors de propos dans / ce plan essentiellement urbain. / Préserver la transparence,” “Faire d’un ouvrage d’art un lieu de vie” (38, 41). It is interesting to note that Deslaugiers’ text is presented as free verse, and, at the beginning of the section, part of his conference paper appears like a graphic poem (37). This creates a link between the literary quality of Quintane’s piece and the technicality of Deslaugiers’, as it blurs the boundaries between the two genres, exactly as was the case in *A Stazzona*. Poetry and architecture are intermeshed to create a book that is not only about writing and about architecture, but also about the blurring of disciplines. Architecture and poetry flow freely into one another, as if the bridge was both the means of, and an image for, their porosity.

Espitallier, like Maestri, is interested in the Deleuzo-Guattarian concept of deterritorialisation (Wourm 54). He attempts to move poetry away from its traditional structures and supports, its territory or space, by mixing the arts, or by facilitating interactions between poetry and non-artistic disciplines, such as philosophy, logics, mathematics, and politics.²¹ He sees this hybridisation as a means to “résister aux vieilles lunes de la pureté générique de l’âge classique et à la hiérarchisation des arts.”²² Humour, and particularly black humour, is for him a way to counteract the pomposity of poetry, but also to bring doubt into language, to put the dominant language or discourse into question (Wourm 61, 62). In *Z5*, he constructs an “historical” fiction to coincide with pictures of the Z5 sports complex, built in Aix-en-Provence in 2011 and also called the “Zidane complex.” Zinedine Zidane, two of his brothers, and a fourth person are credited in the book as project managers, while the architect is Gulizzi. Boxed comments by Gulizzi come together with the piece by Espitallier, in the margins, and are linked by arrows to highlighted sections of the text. They expand on Espitallier’s discourse with concrete details, lending it credibility in spite of its obvious nonsensicality. This is supplemented by a number of full-page artistic photographs by Lisa Ricciotti of the building from many angles and under various types of natural

lighting. Espitallier offers a fictional chronology of the events that have led to the final creation of a stadium named after Zidane: the invention of running, performance, racing, the first Olympic games, the stadium, terraces, supporters, stardom (which leads him to expand on the musicality of Zinedine Zidane's name), football, and finally the stadium as a venue for rock concerts. Espitallier's text is autonomous. Unlike Maestri's and Quintane's it does not refer to the architectural building with which it is associated. The connection with architecture is present mainly through the arrows that link the poet's words to the architect's. Gulizzi begins his story in 2009, and he unfolds it in parallel with the fictional piece that goes back to prehistory. He presents his understanding of the role of architecture and, in particular, his social vision for the space that he was commissioned to develop. Technical considerations are introduced with a strong sense of their intended effects on the future users: "Le projet est implanté suivant une mise en scène spécifique, son approche, sa découverte est une initiation, un préalable au partage des émotions". There are, however, points of connection between the two texts. For instance, Gulizzi expands on the idea of the sporting complex as a tool for social integration. Espitallier remarks on the difficulties of underprivileged youths: "S'il dispose de zéro thune, il ne lui reste pas grand-chose depuis qu'on a liquidé les flippers [...] Au fond, l'ennui est l'ennemi public numéro un de la jeunesse de France." Similarly, Espitallier's observations on Zidane echo Gulizzi's comment that the project is intended to "matérialiser l'aura de Zinedine Zidane." Thus, through a subtle contrapuntal interplay, the two texts come together, while the photographs of the building reinforce the notion of it as a place of dreams ("Entrer dans l'univers Z5, c'est enlacer un rêve").²³ The reflection of the sun on the walls or the floor of the building gives them a glistening appearance, and they seem in turn to reflect the sky and clouds. The idea this creates is that these walls are more than just walls, that there is something ethereal about the concrete. In that sense, an interweaving of the arts is also at play in *Z5*, where photography is more than just a way of showcasing the architecture; it is also a way of giving it meaning, of providing it with a narrative as purveyor of dreams.

Interdisciplinarity in the arts has a long history, but since poststructuralism and the advent of anti-essentialist thought, it has acquired a further dimension. It is not just that the arts speak of each other, that they draw parallels between one another, while retaining their integrity as a set form. It is that they become porous, that they lose their identity, their purity, to become something other than themselves. Deleuze and Guattari famously describe this concept of becoming with the example of the orchid and the wasp. The orchid deterritorialises itself by adopting the shape of a wasp, while the wasp reterritorialises itself by being drawn to that image. It then deterritorialises itself by becoming part of the orchid's reproductive system, while the orchid becomes reterritorialised by having its pollen carried away by the wasp. In that sense, the orchid and the wasp form a rhizome. There appears to be imitation on the part of the orchid which reproduces the image of the wasp, but there is more to it: there is the becoming-wasp of the orchid and the becoming-orchid of the wasp (*Mille plateaux* 17). In the same way, the three books by poets on an architectural artefact are rhizomatic. Poetry deterritorialises itself to convey a vision of the architecture of a building (this is especially obvious in the case of Maestri and her dotted vertical line), while architecture reterritorialises itself in the poem. It then deterritorialises itself by adopting the shape of poetry, which reterritorialises itself in the sections about architecture. They are therefore examples of the becoming-architecture of poetry and the becoming-poetry of architecture. To this one must add the becoming-architecture and the becoming-poetry of photography, as photography is the prism through which architecture is conveyed in the three books. These are therefore multidimensional, multifaceted works, where the creativity of the photographer impinges on the reader's experience.

Birkbeck, University of London

Notes

1. Homer, *The Odyssey*, E. V. Rieu, trans., D. C. H. Rieu, ed. (London: Penguin Classics, 2003), 87.
2. Umberto Eco, *Travels in Hyperreality: Essays*, William Weaver, trans. (New York: Harcourt, 1986), 83.
3. Sylvie Rougier-Blanc, "Le regard des poètes sur l'architecture domestique dans la poésie grecque d'Homère à Apollonios de Rhodes: Remarques sur une 'poétique de la maison,'" *Pallas*, 92 (2013): 4.
4. John Hollander, "The Poetry of Architecture," *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 49:5 (1996): 18.
5. Florence March, "'Je suis dans une phrase qui bouge': Les vertiges baroques d'*Un mage en été* d'Olivier Cadiot, mis en scène par Ludovic Lagarde," *L'Annuaire théâtral*, 58 (2015): 19.
6. Nathalie Wourm, *Poètes français du 21e siècle: Entretiens* (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 23.
7. "Ricciotti Builder—Ricciotti Constructeur," <http://rudyr Ricciotti.com/biographie>.
8. "Vannina Maestri: Montage et minage (Création et politique 5)," <https://z.umn.edu/3mkr>.
9. <http://rudyr Ricciotti.com/ouvrage/le-pont-du-diable>.
10. Jean-Marie Gleize, "Un pied contre mon cœur," *Modernités*, 8 (1996): 272.
11. Vannina Maestri, Dominique Villa, and Jean-Michel Battesti, *A Stazzona* (Marseille: Al Dante, 2011).
12. Nathalie Quintane and François Deslaugiers, *Le viaduc Le Corbusier* (Marseille: Al Dante, 2009).
13. Jean-Michel Espitallier, Christophe Gulizzi, and Lisa Ricciotti, *Z5* (Marseille: Al Dante, 2012).
14. Pierre Alferi and Olivier Cadiot, *Revue de littérature générale* (Paris: P.O.L, 1995).
15. Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, *Dialogues II*, Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam, trans. (New York: Columbia U P), 34.
16. Gilles Deleuze, "Vincennes Session of April 15, 1980, Leibniz Seminar," Charles J. Stivale, trans., *Discourse*, 20:3 (1998): 78.
17. Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Mille plateaux* (Paris: Minuit, 1980), 19.
18. Vannina Maestri, *Mobiles* (Marseille: Al Dante, 2006) and *Mobiles 2* (Marseille: Al Dante, 2010).
19. "Vannina Maestri: Montage et minage (Création et politique 5)." In a book chapter on Maestri's *Débris d'endroits* and *Vie et aventures de Norton*, Jérôme Game describes the various voices Maestri deals with in her cut-ups: "formules toutes faites, novlangue politico-économique des médias et du pouvoir pris chez ses représentants officiels ou officieux, langage ordinaire et irréflecti de la vie quotidienne, énoncés publicitaires, langue savante, historique, théorique ou mythique." Jérôme Game, "D'un sujet constructiviste chez Vannina Maestri," in *Sens et présence du sujet poétique*, Michael Brophy and Mary Gallagher, eds. (New York: Rodopi, 2006), 133.
20. *A Stazzona*, 27. My underlining.
21. See his *Tractatus logo mechanicus* (Marseille: Al Dante, 2006), *Le théorème d'Espitallier* (Paris: Flammarion, 2003) or *En guerre* (Paris: Inventaire/Invention, 2004).
22. Jean-Michel Espitallier, *Caisse à outils: Un panorama de la poésie française aujourd'hui* (Paris: Pocket, 2006), 46.
23. Unless otherwise stated, quotations in this paragraph are from *Z5*, which contains no page numbers.