

Speculative Taxonomies

HELEN PALMER

ABSTRACT: Why might alternative taxonomies be needed in contemporary life, and how might the notion of categorisation or anti-categorisation be thought speculatively? This essay considers some of the ways that life and matter have been historically divided and segmented and asks how this might be rendered mobile, offering new divisions and definitions for those who exist outside hegemonic segments or scales.

KEY WORDS: synaesthesia, category, speculate

SPECUFABULA—fabulating; ficting; conventional taxonomical division

SPECUPHYLA—transversality; intersectionality; superdiversity

SPECULUDA—zoology; cryptozoology; dendrology; oenology

SPECQUANTA—afrofuturism; quantum reality

SPECULEXIA—neology; gyne-cology; crone-ology; word webs

SPECTAXA—eyes; hormones; vowels; interstices; spectra; streaks; exoskeleta; ridges; whorls

SPECUFABULA

The context for this discussion is a speculative taxonomy itself. The entry you are currently reading is part of a special issue, which forms a kind of glossary of new materialist concepts: a taxonomy of sorts.¹ Spawned from the same weird SF taxonomy—speculative fabulation, speculative feminism, science fiction, speculative fiction, science fact, science fantasy, string figures—promulgated by Donna Haraway (2013) and others, a speculative taxonomy of taxonomies must reject disciplinary segregation and conceptual termina. It must think transversally and toposophically, with a series (or taxonomy) of: alogisms, neologisms, fictemes, matterphors and pataphors.² A speculative taxonomy is not

just autopoietic but is also transversal as well as homeorrhetic. It is neological. It is a rhizome adrift in a river.

“Taxonomists often confuse the invention of a name with the solution of a problem” (Gould 1988: 188). Perhaps the invention of a name does not purport to be the solution of a problem but the creation of one. This is a problem in the Deleuzian sense, beyond the dualism of questions and answers or truth and falsehood: “the affirmation of a problematic register” (Wasser 2017: 50). The need for new taxonomies is clear: the world is messy and complex. As Elizabeth Grosz says, “A new humanities becomes possible once the human is placed in its properly inhuman context. And a humanities that remains connected not only to the open varieties of human life (open in terms of gender, sex, class, race, ethnicity, nationality, religion and so on) but also to the open varieties of life (its animal and plant forms) is needed, one that opens itself to ethologies and generates critical ecologies” (Grosz 2011: 21). The speculative element is required because the operation of *ficting*, as we might want to classify it, requires the creation of other worlds, or a type of wording, worlding or wor(l)ding (see Haraway 2016; Le Guin 1989).³ In terms of a taxonomy that is speculative, the juxtaposition of the unstable and sometimes ludic operation of *speculating* with the seemingly serious operation of *classifying* may appear incongruous, but the incongruity of taxonomy itself becomes clear as soon as historical examples are consulted.

Historically taxa may be organised in various shapes and forms: they may be arborescent, circular, cladistic, genealogical, mereological, rhizomatic, scalar, serial, tabular, or a combination of these. The ways that these taxonomies could be classified may be through (but not limited by) the ways that the similarities relate to the differences; their relative mobility or staticity and consequently their relationship to time; their respective representations or articulations whether visual, linguistic or otherwise; the geometric or alphanumeric systems used to express them. In Peter Burke’s *Social History of Knowledge* (2000) a number of varying knowledge systems and distinctions are discussed: *scientia* and *ars*, public and private knowledge; legitimate and forbidden knowledge; higher and lower knowledge; liberal and useful knowledge; “book-learning” and the “knowledge of things”; quantitative and qualitative knowledge; assorted types of knowledge trees from Ramon Lull’s *Arbor Scientiae* (c.1300), trees of logic (e.g., the “Tree of Porphyry”), trees of consanguinity, trees of grammar, trees of love, trees of battles, even a tree of Jesuits; and then, as Burke points out, 350 years before Foucault, an archaeology of knowledge dreamed up by Johann Heinrich Alsted (Burke 2000: 87). Burke enumerates a historically tripartite system or “tripod” of knowledge systems composed of three subsystems: curricula, libraries, and encyclopaedias. The Renaissance curriculum subdivides into the *trivium* (grammar, logic, and rhetoric) and the more advanced *quadrivium* (arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music). This differs from the equivalent in Islam where the “foreign sciences”

of arithmetic and natural philosophy were distinguished from the “Islamic sciences” of the Quran (*hadith*), Muslim law (*fiqh*), theology, poetry and the Arabic language (Burke 2000: 92). The cataloguing and classification of items in libraries is understood within the field as *bibliographic control* and its tools have three basic functions: identifying or finding items, collocating or gathering items, and evaluating or selecting items (Taylor 2000: 6–7). Encyclopaedias are generally alphabetically ordered lists giving information on subjects or aspects of subjects. It is interesting to note that traditionally the encyclopaedia does not distinguish between fiction or myth and contemporarily accepted facts. As Umberto Eco notes through studying Pliny, “the encyclopedia does not claim to register what really exists but what people traditionally believe exists—and hence everything that an educated person should know, not simply to have knowledge of the world, but also to understand discourses about the world” (Eco 2009: 26).

SPECUPHYLA

The most often-cited historical taxonomies are Pliny’s *Natural History* (c. 1 A.D.) and Linnaeus’s *Systema Naturae* (1764), both of which are often quoted nowadays as examples of paradoxical attempts to classify the unclassifiable (as in the Borges/Foucault example quoted later in this piece). The main points to draw from these historical taxonomies are that they are conceived of as ahistorical, transcendental, and static. Static categories cannot support or express difference, which presupposes the need for categorisation that is both multiple and dynamic.

The perception of insufficiency in existing classificatory systems to account for the complexity and plurality of becomings and doings is a problem that cuts across disciplines. We might perceive intersectionality and superdiversity as two systems of classifying social lived experience, and these could be opposed, diffracted, or simultaneously affirmed. Grosz describes the process of identifying intersections as a classifying system thus: “This merging and multiplication of forms of oppression is always understood as the accretion, accumulation, and complication of readily definable and separable processes of oppression” (Grosz 2011: 92). Grosz criticises the classificatory framework of intersectionality because it still has recourse to sameness. As she states, intersectionality “actually attempts to generate forms of sameness, similar modes of access to social resources, through the compensation for socially specific modes of marginalization (for migrants, access to translation services; for battered wives, access to shelters, and so on). . . . No voice ever represents a group, category, or people without dissent; and no categories are so clear-cut and unambiguous that they can be applied willy-nilly, without respect for the specific objects of their investigation” (Grosz 2011: 94). Not only is intersectionality too static in Grosz’s summation, but it is also forbids both fuzziness and movement within and between intersections.

A recent Special Issue of the *Dutch Journal for Gender Studies* (Geerts et al. 2018) discusses the intersectionality/superdiversity debate. Faten Khazaei cites the work of Candace West and Sarah Fenstermaker in their critique of intersectionality due to its perception of power relations as static and ahistorical, and that it “does not consider the continuous reformulation and situatedness of gender, class, and race” (Khazaei 2018: 10). Khazaei discusses superdiversity (a term introduced by Steven Vertovec in 2007) as accommodating of variations in aspects such as migration patterns, education, work skills, and experiences. As Khazaei states, “the potential of superdiversity to name the heterogeneity within the multiple axes of differentiation is the key to establishing a dialogue with intersectionality” (Khazaei 2018: 13). Khazaei concludes by suggesting that the two frameworks can inform one another. This suggests that the concept of one framework’s struggle for dominance over another is redundant, and the diffraction of them together will not only bear more fruit but is necessary to accommodate for the complexities of difference in the world.

To counter the risks of reterritorialization or essentialism a speculative taxonomy must be affirmative and transversal. What this means in terms of method, according to Rosi Braidotti, is to “create transversal links between the categories, while facing the ‘ethical vertigo’ that is the sign of change” (Braidotti 2006: 123). To speculate is always to create transversal links between categories. Rick Dolphijn and Iris van der Tuin affirm the transversality of new materialism, citing Braidotti who describes new materialism as “creating the conditions for the implementation of transversality” (Dolphijn and Van der Tuin 2010; Braidotti 2006: 213). The significance of transversality for new materialism has also recently been highlighted in the new materialism online almanac entry for the term. “Just as the word itself signifies in terms of the type of line you might draw when writing by hand, transversality opposes both verticality (in the sense of hierarchies and leaders) and horizontality, the sense of groups of people organising themselves within a particular ‘section’ or compartment” (Palmer and Panayotov 2016). It focuses on the production of the new as well as processes of becoming, cutting across both text and matter and undoing this polarity as well as dualisms such as social/biological. According to Colin Gardner and Patricia MacCormack, Guattarian transversality is vital in the challenging of universal truths in favour of diverse epistemes.

The dissipation of a universal truth addressed and reified by diverse epistemes that aspire to confirm the same ideological goals is not a dissipation of lived reality but an address to the in-between and the ablated in history and contemporary life. It multiplies speakers and speech so the singular content is unsustainable and new spaces for speech are available, new modes of expression, new openings for liberty, rather than an alternate content which fits within accepted discourse and can thus be argued against or assimilated

depending on the augmentive quality it offers to dominant paradigms.
(Gardner and MacCormack 2018: 3)

The power of a transversal methodology for thought and activism is extremely palpable here. Gardner and MacCormack demonstrate that the oft-heard accusations of post-structuralism as being fire to the flame of the so-called “post-truth” relativism of contemporary life relies on precisely the arboreal epistemic discretion that post-structuralism aims to dismantle.

SPECULUDA

In *The Celestial Emporium of Benevolent Knowledge*, the fictional Chinese encyclopaedia discussed in Jorge Luis Borges’ text “The Analytical Language of John Wilkins” and famously quoted in Michael Foucault’s *The Order of Things*, animals are divided into the following: “(a) belonging to the emperor, (b) embalmed, (c) tame, (d) sucking pigs, (e) sirens, (f) fabulous, (g) stray dogs, (h) included in the present classification, (i) frenzied, (j) innumerable, (k) drawn with a very fine camelhair brush, (l) et cetera, (m) having just broken the water pitcher, (n) that from a long way off look like flies” (Borges 1975). This list has amused and inspired various readers in various ways, rightly resulting in a proliferation of new ludic taxa. For example, David Byrne’s *Arboretum* (2006) is a series of assorted taxonomies, many of which are arborescent in shape, yet the nature of their linkages is speculative or at best irreverent. For example, his “Möbius Structure of Relationships” depicts a cyclical series of “doings” which follow the Möbius band: “Disliking Ignoring Forgetting Discovering Meeting Approaching Liking Loving Devouring Ingesting Consuming Destroying Pitying Dismissing” and then back to “Disliking” (Byrne 2006: 76). Another example, Byrne’s graph “Gustatory Rainbow” makes use of a Cartesian coordinate system to depict a synaesthetic entanglement of tastes, temperatures and variables of light, wherein the vertical axis runs from “Cool” (left) to “Warm” (right) and from Light (down) to Dark (up). On the vertical axis are colours, objects, foods, and liquids. The words that are plotted in each of the four sections of the graph vary in their levels of specificity, from “Oil” (somewhere between “Cool” and “Light”) and two different types of “Puce”—one North American and one European—plotted at different places in the section between “Warm” and “Light” (Byrne 2006: 18). The sense here is the absurd nature of using a universal type of classificatory diagram to map a singular worldview. Rather than the suggestion of a prescriptive taxonomy, Byrne’s diagrams are clearly intended as one of an infinite number of taxonomies. Byrne is not stating that this topological shape is the definitive structure of human relationships; neither is he suggesting that the series of verbs constitute every relationship. It is rather the suggestion that

through the presentation of one particular and perhaps arbitrary taxonomy, an infinite number of alternatives may be spawned.

There are far too many examples of speculative taxonomies engaging with the ludic in order to present alternative classificatory systems to mention any but one or two more very briefly. Alphabetisation is a common organising principle and lends a semblance of order which may not be reflected in its contents. Caspar Henderson's *Book of Barely Imagined Beings: A 21st Century Bestiary* (2013), again inspired by Borges, lists organisms alphabetically with the contents page listing thus: "Axolotl . . . Barrel Sponge . . . Crown of Thorns Starfish . . . Dolphin . . . Eel . . . Flatworm . . . Gonodactylus . . . Human . . . Iridogorgia . . . Japanese Macaque . . . Kirip^háo, the Honey Badger . . . Leatherback . . . Mystaceus . . . Nautilus . . . Octopus . . . Pufferfish . . . Quetzalcoatlus . . . Right Whale . . . Sea Butterfly . . . Thorny Devil . . . 'Unicorn'—the Goblin Shark . . . Venus's Girdle . . . Waterbear . . . Xenoglaux . . . Xenophyophore . . . Yeti Crab . . . Zebra Fish." The book's inspiration is derived from the author's feeling that "many real animals are stranger than imaginary ones, and it is our knowledge and understanding that are too cramped and fragmentary to accommodate them" (Henderson 2013: x). Bestiaries are medieval concepts, and Henderson is keen to present a contemporary version of this. Inspiration is definitely derived from Pliny's *Natural History*, an originary taxonomy if ever there was one. In *Why Read the Classics?* Italo Calvino selects a section of Pliny's fish taxonomy which is at least as arbitrary as the Borges example: "Fish that have a pebble in their heads; Fish that hide in winter; Fish that feel the influence of stars; Extraordinary prices paid for certain fish" (Pliny the Elder c. AD 1; cited in Calvino 2013: 37).

The proposition of absurdities in taxonomical division is often an attempt to highlight the absurdity of the divisions that exist and purport to be utterly logical. A *reductio* of taxonomical rigidity is a speculative taxonomy itself. For a veritably vinous example, Gardner uses Deleuze and Guattari's transversal lines of flight to think about flights of wine, retaxonomising wine taxa in order to combat the strict rules of organisations responsible for the categorisation of wines such as France's A.O.C. (*appellation d'origine contrôlée*). "In many ways, attempting to keep varietals and terroir safely contained within Deleuze's metaphorical closed vessels is much like our childhood practice of making sure that each component of a meal is limited to a discrete geographical region of the dinner plate, lest, horror of horrors, the carrots might actually touch the peas and the potatoes come into contact with the meat" (Gardner 2014: 146). Against this segregation Gardner champions certain French winemakers who have set up viticultural methodologies in California, where, free from the jurisdiction of the A.O.C. "winemakers are free to zig-zag transversally across and between these otherwise closed vessels of production and consumption to create hybrid assemblages that defy the laws of their habitual blending" (Gardner 2014: 146, 147). Whether this is speculative

taxonomy, libatory hybridity, oeneological whimsy or perhaps all three is another question, but the drive to upset the rigidity of classification in favour of dynamic assemblages of vintnery is in the same lib(er)atory spirit as the other examples included in the current speculative classification.

SPECQUANTA

The creation of transversal links between different or previously opposing epistemological traditions is a powerful tool within a speculative taxonomy. In 2015 Rasheedah Phillips of the Black Quantum Futurism Collective produced a “BQF Correspondence Chart” which maps certain quantum phenomena onto physical descriptions, African spiritual or religious phenomena, and then a real-world correspondence. Wave-particle dualism, superposition, wave-function collapse, non-locality and entanglement, time symmetry and retrocausality, Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle/quantum uncertainty are described in short paragraphs then mapped onto African spiritual or religious phenomena and then a taxonomy of assorted “real world” phenomena. For example, wave-particle dualism is mapped onto the Ancient Egyptian concept of the *Tuat*, *Ka* and *Qeb*, sourced from Nur A. Amen’s work in texts such *The Ankh: African Origin of Electromagnetism* (2011). This is then mapped onto the following correspondences: optical illusions; mind-body duality; figure-background duality taking descriptions from David Grandy’s *Everyday Quantum Reality* (2010) and double consciousness from W. E. B. Du Bois’s *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903). This particular linkage—between double consciousness and wave-particle dualism—highlights the inherently political project of linking up quantum theory, African lore, physical descriptions, and sociological race theory. This (transversal) traversal of disciplines is obvious and performs a number of functions. It forces the reader to think of scientific theories, sociological theories, and spiritual beliefs as qualitatively comparable entities, but rather than leading to a kind of relativistic torpor the newly coined speculative links raise each epistemological level to a new plane altogether. This new plane is derived from the affirmation of not only transhistorical but perhaps panchronous equivocation. The speculative nature of the quantum theories discussed is what makes them particularly applicable to the other “narratives” included; it is the apprehension of scientific discovery as creation which allows for alternative futures and pasts to be welcomed. Phillips’s visionary chart is part of a speculative collection of works with the aim of “experiencing reality by way of the manipulation of space-time in order to see into possible futures, and/or collapse space/time into a desired future in order to bring about that future’s reality” (Phillips 2015: back cover).

SPECULEXIA

Linguists and lexicographers have much to say about classificatory systems and taxa, particularly about the blind spots and problems encountered with phenomena such as fuzzy sets and polysemy. One solution to these issues is to create new speculative dictionaries or thesauri, which are paradigmatic linguistic taxonomies operating according to the creator's particular agenda or whim. Leaving aside the extremist and reactionary aspects of Mary Daly's essentialist feminism (see Gatens 1991 for a pertinent critique of Daly's *Gyn/Ecology*), what is interesting for us here is her *Wickedary* (1987), a speculative network of what she calls Word Webs. Words are twisted, reshuffled, reordered, and re-spelled; they are endowed with new meanings, characters, and narratives. This is of course part of a broader project of the feminist reappropriation of sexist terms, but the difference here is that Daly creates neologisms and rearranges spellings rather than just attributing a new sense to an old term.

Rather than following a scheme, the *Wickedary* follows a "skein," which means both a loosely coiled length of yarn or thread but also a flock of certain birds in flight. The seemingly aleatory nature of the skein is celebrated: "The labyrinthine design of the *Wickedary* may appear twisted and contorted to those accustomed only to linear patterns such as graphs and charts. In fact, its order is organic and purposeful, and it can be compared to a flock of Wild fowl in flight" (Daly 1987: xvi). The *Wickedary* is in fact organised by a series of interconnecting webs, which present us with a seemingly logical order. The first preliminary webs cover technical aspects such as history, spelling, grammar, and pronunciation; there are then Word-Webs (of Elemental Philosophical Words) and Appendicular Webs. The presentation follows the conventions of the regular dictionary but spellings and definitions are radically new. The capitalization of common nouns is a deliberate act of linguistic deformation with an assortment of reasons, mainly denoting new meanings of pre-existing words. Other entries are neologisms or portmanteaus:

Gyn/Ecology is created by a slash in the old word gyne-cology, an oppressive word used to designate a gynocidal branch of murderous modern medicine . . . In a double sense, then, the use of the double ax to create this word wrenches back Weird Word-power to cast Spells on the malignant medicine men and polluters who prey upon women and nature. (Daly 1987: 14)

The splicing of words and the concept of the "double ax" is quite reminiscent of the deconstructive terminology that flourished in the 1990s, and it is interesting that Daly's deployment of this idea comes earlier, as her *Gyn/Ecology* was published in 1978. The use of the slash to split up a word from its negatory prefix in order to denote a word's conjoining or encompassing of its opposite perhaps dates this text along with its elements of problematic essentialism, but as an example of speculexical taxonomy *The Wickedary* is an innovative and entertaining resource.

dusty burning flamelike simian bumpy waxy citrus orb. U a vessel catching lukewarm pools of yellow flooding over.

Fourth square: interstices. The variegated materiality of the bits that join. In regular brickwork the interstices are cement, a gritty churning sludge which hardens and becomes concrete. In dry stone walling the interstices are small chinks of air. Visually: flashes of field and sky. In the body, the interstitium can be found nearly everywhere, just under the skin's surface. Vinculum. In the Western Ionian scale, the interstices are the spaces between two notes. Intervals. Chords: rope or string. It is not space but something stretched tightly. The major second is an almost-uncomfortable vibrating touch. It is so close and sensitive it hurts and twangs. It is the tight string or cleft of a sexual organ. It is a bilabial fricative sound. Two lips humming a vibration. Halfway between orgasm and pain. A major third is a church sound. Round and comfortable and conservative. Ho ho, O yes, it chortles, round and rotund and aproned and floury from an afternoon baking scones. A fourth is a stag leap. Angular. A series of them, skittering into the woods off the road in the dark. Uneasy. A fifth is detective-dangerous. Faraway unknowable unplaceable ungraspable. The semitone interval hurts even more than the second. Think about what touching is for a second. Touching too close is flaying. One note plucks and pulls and flays the other. Pitch proximity as abrasive texture: sandpaper against flesh. Impossible to exist within this space.

Fifth square: spectra. Colours invite you into their respective parlours. One for each hexagon of the honeycomb head. The impossible object. Clavecin oculaire. Red is overdetermined and hyperbolic. Yellow offers you bright porcelain in the creamy pool of a morning. Green tiptoes through a delicate glade. Brown is rich and viscous composite. Black is textured and infinite. Orange is always elsewhere. Purple is haunted and scented. Blue is aeons of itself. Pink is sugared. The intact surface of human skin is pitted by the orifices of sweat glands and hair follicles, and is furrowed by intersecting lines that delineate their own idiosyncratic patterns. Reading the ridges and grooves of the palms and the sole, the stretches of sand. Grooves and ridges. Reading the hills and reading the palms.

Sixth square: streaks. If a trajectory can create a streak of energy, of colour, of sensation, that streak itself could also be a tendril or a tentacle. Tending, intending, tendrilling in order to grab or grasp. Vector lovers. Streaks are nothing but lines or marks differing in substance or colour from their surroundings. Streaking the surface whilst stroking the surface. Whilst tentacles usually operate as suckered limbs around the mouth of sea-borne invertebrates, tentacles on some carnivorous plants are complex, highly touch-sensitive glandular hairs which move towards prey in order to secrete digestive enzymes. Streaks of sensitivity just like our hormonal pathways. To streak: to move quickly in a specified direction, sometimes while naked. Streaks of life, streaks of sound, streaks of vomit, streaks of piss.

Seventh square: speculexoskeleta. Networks and fretworks. Spindlework on show. Pins out. The leg of a pier. Barnacle encrusted, rusted and old. Look across at the ridged sand. Individuation and dermatoglyphics. Reading the future through particles of the past. A dramatization of the transition from duality to delinquency via the vying arts of palmistry and dermatoglyphics. Crystalline hopes shored up. Whorls and geomorphology. Splicing between fingerprints and sandbanks. The ridge details thereon will present differently to any other ridge details in any other possible world.

Kingston University

NOTES

1. See Monika Rogowska-Stangret's entry in this issue for a detailed discussion of six recently published glossaries, lexicons, and almanacs in this field
2. "Matterphor" is Fred Botting's term, in a vampyric context, forthcoming in a chapter called "Dark Materialism: Object, Commodity, Thing." For more on pataphors, see Schie 2008; for more on alogisms see Firtich 2004.
3. The operation of ficting and the unit of the ficteme is found in Charlie Blake's paper "Of Mirrors and Unicorns: Ficting in the *Lichtung* of Analytic Philosophy." For wor(l)ding, see Palmer 2019.

REFERENCES

- Amen, Nur Ankh. 2011. *The Ankh: African Origin of Electromagnetism*. New York: A&B Publisher Group.
- Askin, R., F. Beckman and D. Rudrum, eds. 2019. *New Directions in Philosophy and Literature*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Blake, Charlie. n.d. "Of Mirrors and Unicorns: Ficting in the *Lichtung* of Analytic Philosophy." Unpublished manuscript.
- Borges, Jorge Luis. 1975. *Other Inquisitions, 1937–1952*. Texas: University of Texas Press. First published 1952.
- Botting, Fred. Forthcoming. "Dark Materialism: Object, Commodity, Thing." In *Gothic and Theory*, edited by Jerrold E. Hogle and Robert Miles. Edinburgh University Press.
- Braidotti, Rosi. 2006. *Transpositions: On Nomadic Ethics*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Burke, Peter. 2000. *A Social History of Knowledge: From Gutenberg to Diderot*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Byrne, David. 2006. *Arboretum*. San Francisco: McSweeney's.
- Calvino, Italo. 2013. *Why Read the Classics?* Translated by Martin McLaughlin. London: Penguin. First published 1991.

- Daly, Mary. 1979. *Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism*. London: Women's Press. First published 1978.
- Daly, Mary, and Jane Caputi. 1988. *Websters' First New Intergalactic Wickedary of the English Language*. London: Women's Press. First published 1987.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. 1986. *Nomadology: The War Machine*. Translated by Brian Massumi. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. 2007. *The Souls of Black Folk*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. First published 1903.
- Eco, Umberto. 2009. *The Infinity of Lists*. Translated by Alastair McEwen. London: MacLehose Press. First published 1988.
- Firtich, Nikolai. 2004. "Worldbackwards: Lewis Carroll, Aleksei Kruchenykh and Russian Alogism." *The Slavic and East European Journal* 48(4) (Winter 2004): 593–606.
- Foucault, Michel. (1966) 2005. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. London: Routledge. First published 1966.
- Gardner, Colin. 2014. "Transversality, Deterritorialization, and the A.O.C.: Constructing Lines of Flight from Flights of Wine." *Contemporary French and Francophone Studies* 18(2): 142–49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17409292.2014.900923>
- Gatens, Moira. 1991. *Feminism and Philosophy: Perspectives on Difference and Equality*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Geerts, Evelien, An van Raemdonck, Nella van den Brandt, Lieke Schrijvers, and Mariecke van den Berg. 2018. "Superdiversity: A Critical Intersectional Investigation." *Tijdschrift voor Genderstudies* 21(1): 81–104. <https://doi.org/10.5117/TVGN2018.1.GEER>
- Gould, Stephen J. 2006. *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: Norton. First published 1980.
- Grosz, Elizabeth. 2011. *Becoming Undone: Darwinian Reflections on Life, Politics, and Art*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822394433>
- Haraway, Donna. 2013. "S.F. Science Fiction, Speculative Fabulation, String Figures, So Far." *Ada: A Journal of Gender, New Media, and Technology* (3). DOI: 10:7264/N3KH0K81.
- Henderson, Caspar. 2013. *The Book of Barely Imagined Beings: A 21st Century Bestiary*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226044842.001.0001>
- Hogle, Jerrold E., and Robert Miles, eds. Forthcoming. *Gothic and Theory*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Le Guin, Ursula K. 1989. *Dancing at the Edge of the World: Thoughts on Words, Women, Places*. London: Victor Gollancz.
- Linnaeus, Carl. 1964. *Systema Naturae*. Nieuwkoop: B. de Graaf. First published 1735.
- Khazaei, Faten. 2018. "Grounds for Dialogue: Intersectionality and Superdiversity." *Tijdschrift voor Genderstudies* 21(1): 7–25. <https://doi.org/10.5117/TVGN2018.1.KHAZ>
- Palmer, Helen. 2019. "A Field of Heteronyms and Homonyms: New Materialism, Speculative Fabulation and Wor(l)ding." In *New Directions in Literature and Philosophy*, edited by R. Askin, F. Beckman and D. Rudrum, 215–33. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- Palmer, Helen, and Stanimir Panayotov. 2016. "Transversality." *New Materialism Almanac*. www.newmaterialism.eu/almanac/t/transversality.
- Pliny the Elder. 2004. *Natural History*. Translated by John F. Healy. London: Penguin. First published c. 1 A.D.
- Schie, Hidde van. 2008. *Pataphor*. Rotterdam: Veenman.
- Serres, Michel. 1982. *Hermes: Literature, Science, Philosophy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Van der Tuin, Iris, and Rick Dolphijn. 2010. "The Transversality of New Materialism." *Women: A Cultural Review* 21(2): 153–71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09574042.2010.488377>
- Vertovec, Steven. 2007. "Super-Diversity and Its Implications." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30(6): 1024–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870701599465>
- Wasser, Audrey. 2017. "How Do We Recognise Problems?" *Deleuze Studies* 11(1): 48–67. <https://doi.org/10.3366/dls.2017.0251>