

A Generalized Mapping of LIMITED FORK POETICS

by (these days pretty much always by her side) **Thylia Moss**

is a maker-based platform for understanding interacting language systems (including poetry) as complex adaptive or dynamic system(s). Such systems are not new; they are and have been active from the beginning in processes that share responsibility for shaping and reshaping universe(s) on all scales. The newness is in recognition of how reconfiguring poetry as a complex adaptive or dynamic system transforms what is possible to make from interactions within language systems, the reasons for making the products in whatever forms the products take on, and transforms how the products are understood, those understandings leading to both formal and informal remakings, all of which are (sub)systems that can lead to more (sub)systems. Limited Fork Poetics organizes activities of language systems into a tool for understanding both what already occurs, and for discovering what can occur. It is a form of (corrective) lens; it is a contextual tool that offers alternatives to existing platforms for making and interpreting products of language systems.

What follows is an unfolding overview sensitive to complex adaptive systems generally being locations of interactions that tend to occur on all scales simultaneously, with feedback from those interactions shaping and reshaping the temporary forms that structures occupy within the system and subsystems on all scales (including time scales) simultaneously. This is a generalized mapping of both what already occurs and what can occur in LFP events.

The structures formed by complex adaptive systems, even when they occur within bounded or regular spaces, tend toward manifestation (especially over time) of irregularities and unpredictable details (a kind of raggedness) possible within the limits of the boundaries (that are [or become, for some interval of time] generally fixed though not infallible or immutable or without signs of wear, signs of consequences of existing) of dynamic events. Clouds, and trees with their bifurcating root and branch systems at either end of a comparatively linear trunk, are both examples of complex adaptive systems and products of complex adaptive systems. Clouds tend to form within the boundaries of clouds though the precise details of each cloud formation as it appears at various times from various angles are not predictable. The same is true of the human body and of most natural objects and natural systems.

Poetry, the example of interacting language systems considered here, is a product dynamically conceived in thoughts that are complex systems produced in a brain that is a complex system, a status that allows poetry, once reconfigured as a complex adaptive system, to meaningfully embrace information from any area. Even machine generated poetry begins as programmed language whose

source usually is (someone's) idea. The host(s) of occasions and circumstances that give rise to poetic events tend(s) to be dynamic.

The initial (probably also primary) manifestation of a "poem" is not necessarily a print object, but often is the location of the idea(s) or some other form of force(s) responsible for an act of making (such as when a tornado spins through an act of making, writing a twisted language, to which some readers say *F2*, or *F3*, for example).

There is no particular necessity for location of the *product of the act of making* (**poam**) to be any location other than "somewhere" to indicate that some form of space at some moment is involved. The product may (attempt to) exist anywhere. There is no preference for paper in LFP, and no exclusion of paper either. There is, at this time, belief that to exist requires some form of occupancy no matter how brief or how partial, or whether or not the occupancy is detectable (at a particular time). "Page" is the location of (some part of) a poetic event. "Page" is wherever occupancy occurs.

The **products of an act of making** are either *Poams* (**boundary products of an act of making**) or *poams* (**contained products of an act of making**). All Poams become poams as distance is increased from the epicenter(s) of a poetic event, toward some SuperBoundary Poam (UBERPOAM) beyond which there is nothing. All poams become Poams as distance is decreased from the epicenter(s) of a poetic event toward some irreducible unit. Toward tiniest essence. To be both host and hosted is the usual state of Poams and poams except for the one Poam at the limit of containing, UBERPOAM or UmbrellaPoam, both the great UP, and the one poam at the limit of being contained: the RIB, *reduzierbaren Iota des Bestehens* or irreducible iota of existence. Exactly what happens at those strange locations, one next to nothing larger, the other next to nothing smaller, even how terminal status is maintained, is not yet known. Nothing else is like them, and they have not been discovered. Their existence at this time is theoretical only. Imagination will have to construct possibilities. The possible existence of these limits does not compromise certain notions of infinities as many LFP infinities already occur within limits.

Poams and poams may occupy multiple forms of page on some scale(s) simultaneously. Forms of page are predicted for which there are not yet means of detection, interpretation, or implementation. LFP is also the science of the impossible, the art of failure, and the zone of imaginary consequence where explorations not allowed elsewhere, for sake of different understandings of structural integrity, for instance, become necessary. Collapse may be desirable in LFP no matter what is collapsing. Conceptual navigation can negotiate the impossible and the unlikely; LFP landscapes are parallel landscapes and universes, alternative neighborhoods and universes, entangled landscapes and

universes, and they are located inside and outside, under, above, between, at the heart of other landscapes and universes; LFP landscapes can function as the oases, convenient oases, essential oases, relevant and irrelevant (maybe the most needed) oases.

To maintain certain forms of structural integrity in LFP is to maintain models of dynamic systems and not actual dynamic systems. To maintain certain other forms of structural integrity in LFP is to maintain stability so static, the system (in that form) dies, and is taken over by systems of death which may be dynamic and complex.

Each time (an event) of (part of) a product of an act of making (P[p]oam) is encountered, there is another act of (re)making as the interaction reshapes some constituent(s) of the product of an act of making (P[p]oam) into a different poam (and simultaneously, a different Poam). Each encounter causes at least one of the subsequent generations of some form (or part) of the P(p)oam to exist on some form of page that occupies some form of space (such as the mind). The person known as "reader" in other understandings of poetry is (also) a maker and/or remaker in LFP as a consequence of reading LFP landscapes. The person known as "poet" in other understandings of poetry is a maker and/or remaker in LFP. Since what is made is not necessarily well-served by reference to the products(s) as "poems," though the products can exist within the boundaries of "poem" once the products are interacting with those boundaries, LFP does not feel compelled to refer to the makers of the products as *poets* since *poems* are what *poets* tend to make, and LFP makers may not make poems at all. Calling a *maker* a *poet* does not demote the maker.

Revision in LFP is a system to activate a generation of the Poam (larger boundary) or the poam (some part of Poam). It is not necessary to activate the generations chronologically or fully or coherently though they may be so activated. There may be attempts to activate any of the poam or Poam's antecedents or descendants.

The lifespan of any particular Poam or poam may be any unit or combinations of units or fraction(s) of units of measuring lifespan on some scale(s).

It is appropriate to refer to the location of the event(s) of Poam and/or poam and the interactions within Poam and/or poam as *landscape* or *neighborhood* or *address* or *occupancy*, *habitat*, and so forth. This is what has been occurring in the landscape of this position statement.

The Poam and poam as landscape with some form of dimensionality exposes areas for consideration for possible residency of interacting language systems

that Poems or poems need not acknowledge. As the interacting language systems take on density and occupy more than one dimension, each dimension reveals additional possibilities of occupancy, including possibilities of occupancy in transitional areas between dimensions (boundaries) and possibilities of occupancy that straddle multiple dimensions. As a third dimension is added, for instance, there is also added the possibility of volume as a location for Poams and poems and within Poams and poems. The Poam and poem as complex adaptive systems include shadows cast by Poams and poems, reflections of Poams and poems, understudies of Poams and Poams, masks of Poams and poems, parasites of Poams and poems, clones of Poams and poems, ghosts of Poams and poems, and other echoes, other resonances, etc.

The Poam(s) and/or poem(s) at one end of metaphor is (are) not the same Poam(s) and/or poem(s) at the other end even if the same entity(ies) is(are) used to name the destination(s) and departure(s). Metaphor is a vehicle (and is also a form of equation) that supports instantaneous travel between multiple locations in LFP landscapes, environments, habitats on some scale(s). Instantaneous linking creates loops of omitted distance (bring together two [or more] locations on a string) that may be thought of as occupying the volume inside the structure of access (lost time, lost distance, even lost logic or coherence). Multiple loops of omission (including loops within loops) form blossoms of omission, bouquets of omission, gardens of omission, worlds of omission, universes of omission, infinities of omission, possibly within a single instance of instantaneous travel in LFP landscapes. Poams and poems may explore omission as well as inclusion and more ambiguous forms of occupancy and partial occupancies. Multiple areas of multiple forms of activity (including organized, stable, disordered, incoherent, imperceptible forms) may exist on all scales simultaneously within the LFP landscape, contained and/or boundary LFP landscape.

Navigational metaphor is not limited to the linking of only two entities. Either end of metaphor may split into n number of entities, which may exist on n number of planes or on n number of strings, etc. The details of what happens within LFP metaphor require much further study, including the use of rapid prototyping techniques that could result in the making of objects (with 3D printers) that expose the interim states that are visited (no matter how briefly) as a becomes b in an LFP metaphor. The outcomes of reversal of LFP metaphors need much further study as well to determine whether or not beginning with b will necessarily lead to (some form of) a . Given the sensitivity to initial conditions that forming and reforming LFP structures tend to exhibit, it seems likely that the destination accessed in LFP metaphor using b as a point of departure will not be a but will instead be a different form of a or will be (some form of) c or even some form of b , etc.

A way of considering the activity in any location of the LFP landscape is suggested by the maker's (of the assessment) assessment of interactions of subsystems in the landscape locations being considered. The direction of the activity, toward or away from order can not likely be determined with certainty, and the assessor's assessment itself may help steer the activity differently, even toward possibilities other than order or disorder. Indeed, once the assessor is actively assessing, a new poam and/or Poam is activated, one that is sensitive to new possibilities/boundaries that are contributed by the assessing maker of this fork or branch or tine in the LFP landscape. Once this branch is activated, the branch that gave rise to this new generation of tine ($tine_n$) continues as $tine_0$, and should the assessor terminate the $tine_n$ encounter session, any additional session activates another form (mutation) of $tine_n$.

As bifurcation progresses, as the folding and unfolding and refolding of activity continues, subsequent generations (g_n) may retain memory of prior creases, memory that itself spawns generations, so that an increasingly (likely) distant ancestry nevertheless leaves some degree of evidence that may or may not survive encounters with variables that may enter any (portion of) interacting systems at any time on any scale, creating another form of the generation (g_{n-1}), a form which may be temporary (as in the example of a virus for the common cold that is eventually overcome), but a form that may nudge the host structure toward an at first subtle variation that over time may become more profound if that nudge is experienced by neighboring areas whose collective response is great enough to markedly alter some generation of the (sub)system that was just nudged at some time on some scale. To cut out the crease may approximate amnesiac LFP. To cut out or along the memory fold emphasizes the influence of the crease: it becomes guide, and crease particles are intensely dense with crease. Some crease particles may collapse on themselves and suck prey into the collapse; former neighbors of crease matter might be particularly susceptible if there's some amount of memory of having held hands, or having slept with crease matter. The persistence of some form of Memory of Prior Activity, or MOPA, is a limiting factor in LFP, one that reduces the range of possible LFP outcomes; there may still be an infinity of possibilities within the reduced range, a MOPA infinity. Multiple MOPAs may be at work in any LFP outcome.

As the art of failure, LFP has more at stake in attempt than in execution, because impact may not be possible to assess at any given moment, and a dead end becomes a useful contributor to the appearance of the host structure or boundary (that of a tree, for instance) of the bifurcating (an evolutionary tree) or active subsystems of the tree. The tree may bear fruit, may not; may become diseased, may be struck by lightning, may be cut down, etc., may dry up, may be a sap maker, may produce crippled blooms. To know the situation of tree at any given

moment permits a range of assumptions, some more likely than others to be actualized on some scale. The more generalized the assumption, the better the assumption's chance to be applicable to the particular tree and to other trees. It is an assumption that all systems began and through interaction came into being, but there is no proof in that the existence of an initial source or host from which all else derives, when tracing the ancestry of any LFP component to its source, could not derive in the same way that other components derived, so contradicts the insistence upon direct interaction to give rise to a sub-component. This is a critical contradiction because an understanding of that source host's ability to activate reverberates (impacts in some way, subtly or profoundly – a MOPA effect) the subsequent generations of LFP occupancy.

LFP delights in the unavailability of certain kinds of certainty, for lapses in certainty, for gaps in uncertainty, and for the presence of contradiction and the limitations of accessing, even with (the limits of) devices that extend the (incredibly limited) range of human senses (which exist within specific variations within the human range according to individual sensory compromises), activity that is occurring in some form on all scales simultaneously. LFP tries to consider the impact of simultaneity of the range of human perception and the range of possible (even likely) compromises to individual senses. The LFP outcome itself, the Poam or poam, is what anchors the subPoams and subpoams; each LFP outcome functions as an epicenter of an LFP universe. Much contact of various forms is possible among LFP epicenters, and it is also possible to have nonintersecting LFP epicenters. Both intersecting and nonintersecting LFP epicenters may exist simultaneously.

Activity that is occurring in some form on all scales simultaneously interacts with imagination in such a way that imagination in the LFP environment is fueled and invited – compelled – to explore any scenarios that imagination can spawn, free from having as purpose of the explorations certain forms of accuracy that cannot exist without accounting accurately for the apparently static and *just there* Source of sources that did not become the Source of sources until the Source became activated and in turn activated sub-sources. Imagination in LFP environments is mitigated by MOPA effects; what is possible for an imaginer to imagine is shaped by prior experiences with that which is suggested to the imaginer by what the imaginer thinks the imaginer has found in the LFP environment.

The stab at accurately capturing some part of the *what-has-been/is/will/might be/have been* so far remains unresolved. Because contradiction is at the source, bridges without structural integrity, that cannot support the weight of what would traverse them; bridges that collapse on some scale, on multiple scales

simultaneously are quite consistent with knowledge that collapses when it approaches the Source to pin that knowledge on it, or when it departs from source to pin what seems to be consistent with what is assumed about Source on other things that, unlike Source, seem verifiably derived so are/remain/become unpinable – as unpinable as Source.

LFP explores these interacting zones of certainty, uncertainty, clear and fuzzy contradiction, meaning, error, conflicting and contradicting iterations of hope, mediation, fullness, emptiness, inadequacy, and everything that LFP explores in the many ways in which exploration has occurred, occurs, and will occur (except for in those times and locations unexplored and unexplorable), seeking not the meaning of interactions (though sometimes what may be considered meanings emerge), not the forcing of interactions to verify assumptions (though that happens, is happening through my assumptions that LFP itself fulfills), but instead **LFP wants so much** (I say as Source of LFP, an understanding that is Source now that I have been able to derive it as a self-sustaining intellectual entity from other sources with which I interacted in order to form ideas that at some moment had accumulated so many connections and so much feedback that they gave rise to LFP) **to make bridge after bridge (some in the form of ladder) through a hunt for linked pockets of interacting activity**, this hunt via language systems, **that** since they are bridges **have, even when they collapse, the possibility of access, the possibility of holding for some interval of time**. LFP moves the maker from one level of knowing to another

– but when these bridges of connection collapse, if I've crossed them: how thrilling, for I cannot go back to where I was – I cannot make poems nor can I teach the making of poems anymore (right now, it's poem or Poem or nothing for me),

and when these bridges of connection collapse, right under me, and I fall into something I didn't intend to go to: how thrilling; what a fine opportunity to explore something I was trying to omit – it might be good, might not, to fall into a pit of omission, but how else to fall into one, how else to access it that way? To fall into it, not leap, not be thrown, pushed, etc. In some ways, on some scale, I fell into LFP, the expansion of it, implication of it, consequence of it – I didn't know the LFP rules and predictions (governed by the rules) when I fell into them as a consequence of my trying to leap out of certain understandings becoming dead ends for me (I may have killed them), and I wanted to remain a maker, so I had to leap off the dead end that wasn't supporting what I perceived to be weight, and here I am: still on an edge, still on a surface, this one infinite (as was the other, but for me that infinity had become an infinite stability or a static infinity that is as large as the LFP infinity which surrounds the static infinity of

other understandings of poetry in a way that allows awareness of, existence of that island of static infinity and many other infinities without that static infinity of the understanding of poems being aware of the LFP infinity which may be understood as the UberBoundary of static infinities of understandings of poetry).

Those static islands are areas active within themselves and infinities so intense that these islands may not be able to assess their location within a larger system that is behaving according to a different understanding outside of what is possible within the systems of understanding governing the static or fixed islands.

That the static islands exist of course seems verifiable to me.

That activity and interaction occur on the static islands within the boundaries of the static islands of course seems verifiable to me also.

That the static islands exist as small (though perhaps infinite within the small boundary) – perhaps even *vital* sub-areas – within the concept of LFP may not be a possibility that the island occupants can or want to understand at this moment during which LFP thinks about them (*understanding* – necessarily a form of embrace, for I acknowledge them without expecting reciprocal acknowledgment). The static islands, assuming their existence (I want to assume it), and their way of layering their understandings of poetry, stacking them as Babel was stacked only to collapse eventually, should not be able to understand LFP (immediately), should not be able to embrace it (immediately), to entertain it (immediately), for to do so, is to be influenced by it, even if LFP is then rejected; there will be MOPA effects, memory of having been folded into LFP, a wrinkle that remains even as the static islands resume their non-LFP activities – awareness itself exerts some influence, sponsors some feedback whether or not it is measurable/detectable at this moment within the boundaries of measure/detection.

Too many makers spoil only a certain kind of broth, nourishing to those who depend on that broth in that form for nourishment, a taste for it, for the drug of it; the multitude of makers enable many more broths, some of them nasty, some of them toxic, some of them elegant, and so forth, but all of them can't be tasted. I can just hope that as I interact with various subsystems, I access, however briefly, some broth I find new, nutritious, and delicious, but I'm not necessarily seeking that delicious new soup, because I like how some cups of it are attracting these incredible acrobats with compound eyes. I don't taste

the soup at all. Some of the incredible acrobats even seem like suicide bombers because that kind of beeline into murk seems so certain that self-powered reversal becomes impossible (within that certainty); I could extract it, but why? To do what with it? I'd rather capture a living acrobat, but not now, maybe if it can get back some generation, some evolution of my wanting to get back and some generation, some evolution of the living buzzing acrobat. That's what I've done, I think, found the preference for the living buzzing acrobat delicious. Find myself thinking of the living buzzing acrobatic cloud as particles of adulterated broth that acquired the density, the agency to flee the cup and hang here in what is a black-specked atmosphere they make, that I can lean my chin into, my living buzzing acrobatic stubble

— why go here? why not get here via the ways of the static island that one day — — the punctuation alone from all the documents could manage this degeneration — — might disintegrate into particles that either take on agency or get blown about and voilà: acrobatic stubble of debris. Isn't this a bit tangential? Off the (beaten) track? I hope so. And isn't everything tangential in regards to something in the LFP landscape? Perpendicular to. Tangent of. Cosigner of. I attach a hook here: *acrobat* and here *spatial configuration of a Limited Fork Poetics landscape in which there are multiple areas of activity beginning to interact in the form of interaction that is convergence, not collision, so that to acknowledge the acrobat is necessary and also responsible for a lead to consideration of forms of interaction, something that otherwise may have been omitted.*

Some Nudging in the form of a form of recap:

(this ultra bold line above this line was here before the arrival of the acrobat, and could go on as it was before the arrival, but awareness of that arrival (a MOPA effect), now that the nudging follows so may be assessed as occurring in the context of the acrobat's arrival, even derived from the arrival of the acrobat whose arrival is exerting so much feedback, it begins to seem a planned arrival even as I admit that it isn't while simultaneously admitting the plausibility of that assessment though most — assuming this product of an act of making interacts with other remakers — remakers probably won't care unless it is for insight into an LFP thread, to figure out [probably without placing a bet — nothing to gamble on, nothing worth gambling on —] whether the LFP acrobatic thread is raveling or unraveling, entangling or unraveling, congealing or unraveling; **awareness of the arrival of the acrobat** now sends me₄ to return to the bold line and tinker, here, not where that line, changed — into a source₂ — as

it was already source of what followed it before this parenthetical arrived on the wing of acrobat to separate [wedge] the nudger from the nudged – impossible, for the nudged can't be nudged without nudger, and nudger can't be nudger without an object for the act of nudging, the previous nudged now being handed off to this iteration of nudger:

Some Nudging in the form pushed further by the arrival of an acrobat of a form of recap:

A Poam is event and a poam is event; they occur in time, and in their unlikely attainable totality would include all versions, all drafts, all dread ends, dead ends, all revisions, all versions, all generations, iterations, hybrids, reunions, collaborations, sampling : all cadences : all thoughts connected on some scale to the Poam or poam and activity within the mind(s) of maker(s) or remaker(s), mental activity which may be linked to events (including objects that exist in time) outside the poam or Poam but which become part of Poam_n and poam_n. Any inhabitant of interacting systems may be source and derivative (or generation) on some scale simultaneously. **The Cadence Factor of Bifurcation.** CFBs and MOPAs often occur simultaneously.

A Poam or poam is a system of occupancy of a Page or page, so (shifting) interactions between the subsystems (all that the Poam or poam contains) is essential for (mutable) meanings (cadences) : possible directions.

A complex adaptive Poam or poam hosts interacting language systems (including sonic, aural, tactile, olfactory, and visual forms besides/in addition to/instead of text). Whatever says something in some way, whatever may be read in some way is hosted as well.

The activity of interacting systems takes place on all scales simultaneously (acts of cadence).

The landscape of a single Poam or poam can include multiple areas of constituents of the Poam or poam taking shape in multiple forms (including sonic, aural, tactile, olfactory, and visual forms besides/in addition to/instead of text) simultaneously, in varying degrees of stability (forms of accessibility/coherence, etc.) and instability (forms of inaccessibility/incoherence, etc.).

There is no definitive beginning or ending. A portion (or portions) of a Poam or poam is joined in progress, is left in progress.

Interactions at a given time help determine the observable stability or instability (and the perceived direction[s] of the activity [each split, each dip, buckle, splice; each bifurcation]).

Metaphor is a tool of navigation that can enable instantaneous access to other event locations on any scale --akin to navigating wormholes. The journeys to and from what is considered the same metaphorical events may not be identical.

There are many more possibilities for even the paper page or Page than are presently being fulfilled.

There is not yet a poetic event that LFP cannot approach through considerations of interactions. Approaching poems (especially poems in formal forms and formats) with LFP (forking them) causes startling reconfigurations and unleashes myriad possibilities. The reconfiguration of poems into LFP products can allow the imagination successful in reconfiguring poems to also reconfigure (almost) anything into a product of an act of making.

LFP will attempt to assert itself wherever LFP landscapes come into existence. An LFP landscape can come into existence in any location on any scale (*expertise* of makers/remakers is an iteration of scale. *Awareness* is another iteration) at any time (in any direction) in any field of study and in (hybrid) fields of inquiry that emerge as a result of LFP interactions. LFP can live anywhere, and tends to thrive in technology-enriched landscapes that (can) take advantage of active simultaneity (including simultaneous interactions from multiple makers/remakers on some scale[s]). 3D LFP models love display, and may occupy any space that sculpture, canvas, and architecture occupy. 2D LFP models love display, and may occupy any space that accommodates flat display, including digital space, libraries, bookstores, homes, schools, places of worship.

Because of the beautiful raggedness that can refer to assessments of the structure of activity and the structure of the also-changing (on some scale) boundary of LFP events and LFP boundaries (human skin, boundary of the body, is an example of a changing or active LFP boundary or host), purposes of making LFP Poams and poems does not have to be the same as purposes for making poems. More intense activity tends to fill the comparatively more stable hosts (boundaries) of LFP events. The reverse situation is not yet as well investigated, and investigation of the more well-known configuration of boundary-fill in LFP landscapes and LFP boundary is only an opening salvo of an investigative

attempt. Understanding LFP hosts and LFP boundary-fill is compromised by the lack of existence of depth within LFP landscapes; each act of assessing, noticing, interacting with occupant(s) of the LFP landscape occurs on the surface of the connection itself; exposed surfaces of activity interact. If any part of the LFP environment is cut into, what is exposed is more surface. The dive is into the surfaces with which the dive interacts as it progresses. LFP can mean the death of depth as conventionally conceived. The surface is seldom exhausted, and contains infinities, yet frequently, students are instructed not to examine (*only*) the surface. In LFP, the surface must be examined, the surface is all that is available for examination, and is dynamic. In LFP, it is likely that *only* the surface can be studied, and not *all* of it.

Some of what is necessary in LFP is not yet possible elsewhere. *Skewing* and *warping* in LFP environments are fascinating behaviors that are not going to be pursued in this location at this time. Nor is: the *hierarchy of infinities*.

Any component of an LFP landscape, including LFP itself, may be nudged. The skill of that which, the success of that which, the motivation of that which nudges, that which becomes a profound or otherwise impressive acrobat varies widely.

With small enough increment, the one that would like to miss nothing, the measurement of the perimeter of one of the wing's of the acrobat becomes infinite, impossible to complete, so the one trying to miss nothing, misses even more profoundly, failing so beautifully it is almost divine failure (which would need to be infinite)

by
Thylas Moss,

beside
Thylas Moss,

over
Thylas Moss,

under
Thylas Moss

between
Thylas Moss,

behind
Thylia Moss

besides
Thylia Moss

instead of
Thylia Moss

through
Thylia Moss

there is access to

Limited Fork Poetics
by Thylia Moss