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General Guidelines

- Use the 8th edition of MLA.
- Use font *Times New Roman* or *Garamond*, size 12.
- Single-space header, single-space epigraph (if used), double-space essay, single-space Works Cited with no indenting the overflow line(s), adding an extra space between each entry. See example below.
- Use one space after periods (rather than two).
- Use ragged right alignment.
- Use em dashes—that is, the long dash—between words, with no spaces on either side of the dash (ctrl, alt, minus).
- Use an en dash between number ranges, such as 4–6 or 1945–1950, with no spaces (ctrl, minus).
- Use hyphens to join words, such as “poem-as-fire.”
- Indent long quotes 1 inch using the indent tool (highlight text, then click the indent icon twice).
- Place periods and commas inside “quotation marks,” but place question and exclamation marks on “the outside”!
- The first time you mention an author, use their full professional name, such as W. S. Merwin; afterwards, just use the last name, in this case, Merwin.
- Place your last name and page number in the top-right corner; have them begin appearing on the second page.

In-Text Citation

Parenthetical References

- The in-text citation appears in parentheses and corresponds directly to an entry on the “Works Cited” page.
- The author’s last name and the page number are usually enough to indicate the location of the source. If there is no author, use a shortened version of the title that points clearly to the source.
- If the author’s name is used in the sentence of the quote, or if it is clear by the context what the source is, then omit the author’s name from the citation. One exception: if the source has no page numbers, then you still include the last name as the only item in the parentheses.
- If the works cited contains more than one work by the author, add the cited title in a shortened form after the author’s last name.
  (Kafka, *Stories* 444)
  (Kafka, *Octavo Notebooks* 99)
- The first time you mention the title of a poem, include the in-text citation of the page number(s) of that poem (Hillman 24–26). Then, when citing words from actual lines, cite the line number(s) of those lines (ln 2, 3–5).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author’s name in text</th>
<th>Alexie compares Jimi Hendrix to a “snowplow” (28).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grounding a statement in source</td>
<td>Alexie’s depiction of Native Americans is controversial among readers (see Castillo 9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple authors/editors of a work</td>
<td>African American literature begins with the vernacular tradition (Gates and Smith 12).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two locations</td>
<td>Hillman revisits the trope of fire in several poems (22, 32–34, 66, 99).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two works cited</td>
<td>(Anzaldúa 33; Lorde 125)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation from multiple volumes, with volume first, then page number</td>
<td>William Carlos Williams’ famous poem actually has no title in its initial publication (1: 224).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with no author, citing shortened title instead</td>
<td>(“Poetics” 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two, Three, then More Authors</td>
<td>(Gates and Smith 32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Melson, Bradshaw, and Smith 245)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Wheeler et al. 42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quoting a quote from another work (i.e. Morrison’s word “rememory” is quoted on page 567 in the second volume of Gates and Smith’s work)</td>
<td>Morrison delves deeply into what she calls “rememory” (qtd. in Gates and Smith 2:567).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines of poetry (only add page number and/or last name if it is unclear in the given context)</td>
<td>(ln 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Hillman 34, lns 3–5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(lns 3, 6, 8–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines of a play, from, for instance, the third scene of the second act</td>
<td>(II.iii.34–37)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Omissions**

- Do not include ellipsis at the beginning or end of the quote.
- When omitting words from the middle of the quote, place three dots in brackets:
  
  It has to do with agency: “Whether animals can be said to have languages is controversial [. . .] but there is no doubt that animals communicate among their own species; *what is in doubt is the extent of their intentionality and consciousness* of sending and receiving messages and the resulting question of whether some animals have a sense of self and of mental individuality” (Kennedy 6, italics added).

- For quotations containing an ellipsis in the original, three periods, without brackets, are used . . . but go “space dot space dot space dot space” as exemplified in this sentence.
- If you end one of your sentences with ellipses, then use four dots, with the first acting as the end mark. . . So, as you see, you don’t have a space after the last word and the end mark! . . . The devil is, indeed, in the details.
Basic Guidelines

- Single space the Works Cited entries, but double space between the entries.
- Do not indent the overflow lines. Why? It makes it difficult to cut and paste into online spaces, such as portfolios.
- It is ok to begin the Works Cited following your essay, with a slight buffer; if your last page of the essay is 2/3 full, consider starting the Works Cited on the next page.
- Arrange entries alphabetically, starting with the last name of the author. If no author, then alphabetize by the title.
- Italicize the titles of long works, such as books, movies, plays, and long poems.
- Place the titles of shorter works in quotes, such as short stories, short poems, T.V. shows.
- If you have two entries by the same author, in the second one, replace the name with three connected em dashes, followed by the period: ———.
- Pay attention to page-range details: not 45–48 but 45–8.

In what follows, I have used, at times, the explicit language from *The OWL at Purdue*. For further examples, see their “MLA Formatting and Style Guide” at [https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/747/01/](https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/747/01/).

The basic template for all sources is as follows:

**Author. Title of source. Title of container, Other contributors, Version, Number, Publisher, Publication date, location.**

If you have the additional information, you add it. If not, you omit it.

Basic Books

[Note: One beautiful facet of the 8th edition of MLA is that you choose which contributors to highlight. It is customary to include the editor in all cases; however, if your argument does not discuss the translation, you can leave out the translator(s). If, though, you discuss the translation, you should include the translators and list them first. See the Kafka entries below.]


Introduction, Foreword, or Preface to a Book


Work from an Anthology or Chapter from Edited Collection


An Article in a Scholarly Journal (Print & Online Examples)

[Note: If it is an online article, you can change the title of the source to a hyperlink, add the name of the digital library, and/or add the doi (first choice) or url number (second choice).]


Online Essay


Online Video (YouTube is the “Container” in first example, iirazz is the uploading contributor)


See Full Works Cited Example on the Following Page
Works Cited


Cummings’ Urban Ecology: An Exploration of *EIMI*, *No Thanks*,

& the Cultivation of the Ecological Self

*And whether we are a store-clerk or a bus-conductor, we can still choose between the living universe of Pan, and the mechanical conquered universe of modern humanity. The machine has no windows. But even the most mechanized human being has only got his windows nailed up, or bricked in.*

D. H. Lawrence

from “Remembering Pan”

*EIMI* is the individual again, a more complex individual, a more enormous room.

E. E. Cummings

D. H. Lawrence, in his recapitulation of the death and rebirth of Pan, argues that though Pan was turned from a god encompassing all of nature into an old, senile, lascivious satyr, “He is still alive [. . .] because, when all is said and done, life itself consists in a live relatedness between man and his universe: sun, moon, stars, earth, trees, flowers, birds, animals, men, everything” (72). Lawrence articulates the essence of ecology: “live relatedness.” The root of “eco” (“oikos”) means house. One way to understand ecology, therefore, is that it explores the “live relatedness” within the enormous house of the earth. Lawrence’s point is that we have a choice between isolation and relatedness, between shutting ourselves in and opening ourselves up to the innumerable life-forms existing around us. And if a person lives in a city, it is no excuse. The metaphorical “bricks” and “nailed-up windows” that obstruct a person’s identification with nature must simply open.

E. E. Cummings’ travelogue *EIMI* and his subsequent book of poems *No Thanks* deepen these . . .

---

1 For the capitalization of Cummings’ name, see Norman Friedman’s “Not ‘e. e. cummings’” and “Not ’e. e. cummings’ Revisited.”
We have four basic patterns of integrating direct quotes: The sprinkle quote; setting up a short quote; setting up a long quote; conversational integration. I am providing an excerpt of a published essay that demonstrates these basic patterns in action.

Toward a Zoopolis: Animal Poiesis and the Poetry of Emily Dickinson and Brenda Hillman

this is the door (opening it I think things which were supposed to be out of my reach, they are like jam on the shelf everybody guessed was too high)

from a poem on seeing a bat

E. E. Cummings

The canon wars remain a stark reminder of the stakes surrounding literary studies. I recall many years ago reading Ishmael Reed’s introduction to his multicultural anthology *From Totem Poles to Hip-hop*, and specifically, his foregrounding of reading practices that generate the “Ogre with One Eye” who fixates on the old canon of the Euro-American literary tradition (xviii–xix). The figure haunts: a hybrid monstrosity; not quite human, but not quite beast; a powerful, clumsy creature whose tunnel-vision eclipses other writers, stories, poems, cultures.

Though the ogre has extended its scope of the human sphere in numerous ways since Reed’s anthology, a new awakening is underway, a tremendous shift within the humanities to turn its gaze toward the nonhuman animals living amongst and beyond humans. The now familiar work of Cary Wolfe, Jacques Derrida, and Donna Haraway provided impetus for the shift, and many other thinkers from interdisciplinary fields contribute ongoing momentum. In the 2011 *Zoopolis: A Political Theory of Animal Rights*, Sue Donaldson and Will Kymlicka provide a provocative theory that has far reaching implications. “Our aim in this book,” they foreground, “is to offer a new framework, one that takes the ‘animal question’ as a central issue for how we theorize the nature of our political community,” and they hope to “shift the debate” surrounding animal rights from “applied ethics to a question of political theory.” To do so, they include nonhuman animals within categories once reserved for humans alone: domestic animals become co-citizens; wild animals assume sovereignty; and liminal animals become denizens. Donaldson and Kymlicka address many of the daunting challenges of such a shift, and even though it may seem insurmountable, the theory plants radical seeds for seeing human-animal interactions in new and productive ways. They connect animal rights theory “to broader political theories of justice and citizenship,” which can “identify more clearly potential models of animal-human relationships” (1, 12, 23).

Later in their argument Donaldson and Kymlicka acknowledge the “enormous uncharted territory” that opens up as a result of an applied political theory. “Integrating [. . .] animals into the polis,” they suggest, “involves rethinking
our shared spaces on multiple levels” (121, 131). The tradition of poetry is one territory that can benefit from such a rethinking, but it is important to recognize that, within the tradition of American poetry, Emily Dickinson already began such work. One-and-a-half centuries later, Brenda Hillman continues it.

Many of the animals Dickinson and Hillman include in their poems are not domesticated, nor are they fully wild; rather, they inhabit an “in-between” space epitomizing Donaldson and Kymlicka’s category of “liminal animals” who live in “our cities, and indeed our backyards and homes” (213). Depending on one’s bioregion, liminal animals may include sparrows, finches, hawks, blackbirds, owls; grasshoppers, spiders, praying mantises, butterflies, roly-polies, ants, termites; turtles, lizards, snakes; frogs and salamanders; foxes, deer, raccoons, prairie dogs, squirrels—and many more species. Liminal animals are “visible when they become a problem”—or, I add, when a poet celebrates their presence—but are “invisible as ubiquitous members of the community” (Donaldson and Kymlicka 68).

To carve out space for animal denizenship, Donaldson and Kymlicka first establish what denizenship looks like in the human sphere. Many humans living amongst the citizens of a country assume the category of denizenship: people who opt out of citizenship rights by not voting, by homeschooling their children, or by wholeheartedly refusing to participate in citizenship. Other examples include migrant denizenship, green-card workers (231–40). Crucially, Donaldson and Kymlicka move beyond “human liminality as metaphor” and toward the “actual ways models of denizenship can be used to accommodate a fuller range of diversity in society, and to bring those perceived as deviant, foreign, second class, undesirable, or dangerous into just relations within the body politic” (216). Concerning nonhuman animals, many species living amongst urban, suburban, and rural areas are either opportunists, niche specialists, introduced exotics, or feral animals (219–26). The innumerable liminal animals are often overlooked in animal rights theory and in the imagination of the polis where emphasis is placed upon domesticated animals and upon the shrinking habitat of wild animals and their coming extinction. Even when one sees liminal animals in the category of denizenship, it is a slippery, “hybrid status, with fewer clear fixed points of reference” (251).

Perhaps this is why poets gravitate towards such animals.

In what follows, I foreground the liminal animals in Emily Dickinson and Brenda Hillman’s poetry. Dickinson helps anchor the move within the American poetic tradition to see animals as part of the polis. She also provides a foundation for such inclusion. For Dickinson and many other poets, animals are makers. They participate in the act of poiesis, and they impact the making of human poetry. I argue that this perspective—animal-as-maker—made an animal’s integral presence within the polis self-evident to Dickinson. Roughly a century-and-a-half later, Brenda Hillman continues Dickinson’s work as animal poiesis and a multispecies polis permeate the last two books she published, Practical Water (2009) and Seasonal Works with Letters on Fire (2013). Dickinson’s poetry contains seeds for the zoopolis in the American poetic tradition, and Hillman pushes readers towards the implications of those seeds in the context of today’s urgent times.

**Liminal Animals, Zoopoetics, and the Multispecies Polis in Emily Dickinson’s Poetry**

Often, when Dickinson folds liminal animals into her work, she sees their political status as self-evident. When discussing lizards and butterflies in a letter, she provokes, “Are not those your Countrymen?” (Letters 2:412). For Dickinson, these liminal animals surpass denizenship and attain the status of co-citizenship. They are countrymen, a status that carries with it certain relational duties from humans. In “His Bill is locked - his Eye estranged,” Dickinson’s speaker vociferates on behalf of a bird. The atrocity leads to a deeper valuation of seeing an animal in the context of political theory.

**His Bill is locked - his Eye estranged**
His Feathers wilted low -
The Claws that clung, like lifeless Gloves
Indifferent hanging now -
The joy that in his happy Throat

Commented [AM6]: More sprinkle quotes.
Commented [AM7]: I consider this still a “sprinkle quote,” even though it is longer. Remember, it is poor form to “sprinkle” in quotes that have complete sentences. If you are quoting more than a phrase or one sentence, it is crucial to set it up with a colon.

Commented [AM8]: I set up a long quote by giving the reader something to look for, that is, I set it up with an analytical statement, an insight, that I hope the reader will take with them and look for as they venture into the quote.
Was waiting to be poured
Gored through and through with Death, to be
Assassin of a Bird
Resembles to my outraged mind
The firing in Heaven,
On Angels - squandering for you
Their Miracles of Tune - (Poem 1126)

The poem turns at “to be / Assassin of a Bird.” This line break suggests a bewildering silence in which the speaker grapples for the right words: “to be . . . Assassin.” No other word fits. This bird has not been killed or murdered—two terms that skirt political implications. Written in 1866, the shadow of President Lincoln’s 1865 assassination haunts the poem. Regular people are murdered. People with political clout are assassinated. Dickinson’s perspective that other species have political status emerges, therefore, in her choice of assassin. The assassination stirs an indignation in the poem’s speaker, so much so that she enters the state of an “outraged mind.” In order to articulate her rage, she climbs the divine hierarchy. Though the bird may have begun as an “animal,” he ascends to a political status in the human sphere and then to an angelic status in the divine sphere. Dickinson, though, envisions a mass “firing” of angels in a divine space, and it is difficult to read those lines in today’s world without thinking of the shootings in schools. Such shootings violate places that are sacrosanct. The last line draws readers back to earth: the angels’ “Miracles of Tune” becomes a trope for the bird’s now silent song. For as the earlier lines of the poem establish, “Death” has “gored” the bird’s throat “through and through,” violating the sacrosanct place where the species undergoes a portion of his poiesis, his makings. The makings have been silenced, for the “Bill is locked.”

Herein lies the seed for the speaker’s rage. The bird is a maker who undergoes his own poiesis. A bond exists across species lines, from the human maker to the animal maker. One reason why this bond is strong between Dickinson and nonhuman animals is because Dickinson made breakthroughs in her own craft through attentively engaging the material-semiotics of other animal makers. Elsewhere, I have called this process zoopoetics, and though the term suggests many facets, I begin with the word’s etymology: poiesis, from the Greek meaning animal, and poiesis, from the Greek meaning to make.1 Zoopoetics has a close kinship to what Scott Knickerbocker terms “sensuous poiesis”: the “process of rematerializing language specifically as a response to nonhuman nature” (2). One of Knickerbocker’s early examples explores Gerard Manley Hopkins’ “The Windhover,” and he focuses on the ways that the falcon’s ways-of-being contributed to the innovations found in the materiality (sound, rhythm, form) of the poem (13–14). This epitomizes what I call zoopoetics. Zoopoetics is a needed category—or subset—of ecopoetics, for there is an added energy when species meet that is different from the human animal’s engagement with plants, streams, mountains, deserts. Furthermore, many species—including humans—are makers, and the process of making is often bound up with an attentive engagement with another species’ way-of-being. It goes two ways. As Donna Haraway observes, both species undergo an “ontological and semiotic invention” through the “inventive potency of play” (232, 237)—and when a poet enters that ecotone where and when species meet, the “potency of play” involves poiesis:

1 In Zoopoetics: Animals and the Making of Poetry, I provide a thorough foundation for the zoopoetic process, and I trace it in the oeuvre of the American poets Walt Whitman, E. E. Cummings, W. S. Merwin, Brenda Hillman—as well as in the gestures and vocalizations of other animal makers such as beluga whales, elephants, and mimic octopi. Concerning Hillman, the monograph is limited to her 2009 Practical Water, while this article engages her 2013 Seasonal Works with Letters on Fire in which Hillman, in many ways, provides new insights into the animal presences within human poiesis and political activism.

2 I see Donna Haraway’s When Species Meet to be consanguineous with Donaldson and Kymlicka’s Zoopolis. From the first paragraph onward, Haraway frames her argument in terms of an “anti-monopolization”—“other globalization”—that is a multispecies event. This coexistence of species occurs in the polis through “retying some of the knots of ordinary multispecies living on earth” (5). Donaldson and Kymlicka retie those knots through an application of political theory to nonhuman animals.