

**ISTANBUL BILGI UNIVERSITY**  
**INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS**  
**PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIAL THOUGHT MASTER'S DEGREE PROGRAM**

**A BAKHTINIAN ANALYSIS OF MINOR LITERATURE**

**Gürsel OTLU**

**118679015**

**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ferda KESKİN**

**ISTANBUL**

**2022**

## A Bakhtinian Analysis of Minor Literature

### Minör Edebiyatın Bakhtinci Bir İncelemesi

Gürsel OTLU

118679015

**Tez Danışmanı:** Doç. Dr. Ferda Keskin

(İmza).....

İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi

**Jüri Üyesi:** Doç. Dr. Üyesi Zeynep Talay Turner

(İmza).....

İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi

**Jüri Üyesi:** Prof. Dr. Sibel Yardımcı Yalçınan

(İmza).....

Mimar Sinan Güzel Sanatlar Üniversitesi

Tezin Onaylandığı Tarih: 07.02.2022

Toplam Sayfa Sayısı: 90

#### Anahtar Kelimeler (Türkçe)

- 1) Heteroglossia
- 2) Diyaloji
- 3) Polifoni
- 4) Minör Edebiyat
- 5) Yersizyurtlaşma

#### Anahtar Kelimeler (İngilizce)

- 1) Heteroglossia
- 2) Dialogism
- 3) Polyphony
- 4) Minor Literature
- 5) Deterritorialization

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank my thesis advisor, Assoc. Prof. Ferda KESKİN, who helped me to gain new perspectives that I am sure will affect me positively throughout my life.

I would also like to thank my committee members, Prof. Dr. Sibel YARDIMCI YALÇINTAN and Assoc. Prof. Zeynep TALAY TURNER for their brilliant comments and suggestions.

I would like to thank my teachers and professors, Assoc. Prof. Saime TUĞRUL, Assoc. Prof. Zeynep TALAY TURNER, Kaan ATALAY and Ferhat TAYLAN, who attended my classes during my graduate education and whom I was honored to meet.

I would like to thank my friend Dr. Dođuhan TAŞCI, who has accompanied me for 25 years in my journey of thought with his deep knowledge.

Finally, I would like to express my love and thanks to my dear wife, Dr. Zeynep PARLAKGÜNEŞ OTLU, not only for helping my thesis work, but also for making my whole life meaningful.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS.....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>ABSTRACT.....</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>ÖZET.....</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>FIRST CHAPTER .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1. MIKHAIL BAKHTIN AND THE NOVEL AS A GENRE.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1.1. MIKHAIL BAKHTIN.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1.2. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NOVEL GENRE.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>1.2.1. The Fall of the Epic Distance.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>1.2.2. Serio-comical.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>1.2.3. Carnival.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>1.3. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>1.3.1. Dialogism.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>1.3.2. Heteroglossia.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>1.3.3. Polyphony.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>1.3.4. Chronotope.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>SECOND CHAPTER .....</b>	<b>31</b>

<b>2. MINOR LITERATURE.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>2.1. GILLES DELEUZE AND FELIX GUATTARI.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>2.2. MINOR PHILOSOPHY.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>2.2.1. Becoming Nomadic.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>2.2.2. Deterritorialization.....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>2.2.2. Line of Flight.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>2.2.2. Rhizome.....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>2.3. WHAT IS MINOR LITERATURE? .....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>2.3.1. Deterritorialization of Language.....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>2.3.2. The Connection of the Individual to a Political Immediacy.....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>2.3.3. The Collective Assembly of Enunciation.....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>2.4.1. Kafka: An Expression Machine.....</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>2.4.2. Assemblage.....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>THIRD CHAPTER .....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>3. A BAKHTINIAN ANALYSIS OF MINOR LITERATURE.....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>3.1. CHRONOTOPE FEATURES OF MINOR LITERATURE .....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>3.2. AGAINST THE CANON: HETEROGLOSSIA AND THE DETERRITORIALIZATION OF LANGUAGE.....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>3.3. THE PATH TO THE POLITICIZATION OF EVERYTHING: DIALOGISM.....</b>	<b>65</b>

<b>3.4. CARNIVAL, ASSEMBLAGES AND POLITICS.....</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>3.5. IS POLYPHONIC AND COLLECTIVE ENUNCIATION POSSIBLE?.....</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>79</b>



## ABSTRACT

In this thesis, an analysis of minor literature, framed by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, will be presented from a Bakhtian perspective. Although Deleuze and Guattari focused on the literature of minorities in the major language by focusing on Franz Kafka and his works, they eventually developed a technical, political and social theory of literature. Bakhtin's literary analysis, on the other hand, has the competence to form the basis of all literary theories that will be put forward after him, with the time period in which it is revealed chronologically and the political discourse that he articulates to the novel (which he defines as a genre whose existence has not yet been completed). The aim of this study will be to conduct a research on the Bakhtian roots of minor literary concepts.

In the first part of the study, the concepts of heteroglossia, dialogue, polyphony, carnivalesque and chronotope, which are sources of Bakhtin's idea of language and theory of the novel, will be examined in detail. The second part will be devoted to minor literature and its three main features, the deterritorialization of language, the connection of the individual to a political immediacy, and the collective assembly of enunciation. In the third and last part, the features of minor literature will be analyzed comparatively with Bakhtian concepts.

## ÖZET

Bu tez çalışmasında Gilles Deleuze ve Félix Guattari tarafından çerçevesi çizilen minör edebiyatın Bakhtinci bir bakış açısıyla değerlendirildiği bir inceleme sunulacaktır. Deleuze ve Guattari, Franz Kafka ve onun eserlerini merkeze alarak azınlıkların majör dilde yaptıkları edebiyata yoğunlaşmış olsalar da sonuç olarak teknik, politik ve toplumsal bir edebiyat teorisi geliştirmişlerdir. Bakhtin'in edebiyat analizi ise gerek kronolojik olarak ortaya koyuldu zaman dilimi gerekse de henüz sınırları net olarak çizilmemiş, varoluşu tamamlanmamış olarak tanımladığı romana ve bu yöne meyleden tüm sanatsal düz yazılara eklemelendirildiği politik söylem ile kendinden sonra öne sürülecek tüm edebiyat teorilerine temel teşkil edebilecek bir yetkinliğe sahiptir. Bu çalışmanın amacı minör edebiyat kavramların Bakhtinci köklerine yönelik bir araştırma yapmak olacaktır.

Çalışmanın ilk bölümünde Bakhtin'in dil fikrine ve roman teorisine kaynaklık eden heteroglossia, diyaloji, polifoni, karnavalesk ve kronotop kavramları ayrıntılı olarak incelenecektir. İkinci bölüm, minör edebiyata ve onun üç ana özelliği olan dilin yersizyurtsuzlaşması, bireyselin dolaysız-siyasal olana bağlanması ve sözcelemin kolektif düzenlenişine ayrılacaktır. Üçüncü ve son bölümde ise minör edebiyatın özellikleri karşılaştırmalı olarak Bakhtinci kavramlarla birlikte analiz edilecektir.

## INTRODUCTION

This thesis includes an effort to explore the correlations between the analyzes in literature of Mikhail Bakhtin, Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, who did not build their philosophies on a single problem and did not build their studies in a single field, but developed theories in a wide spectrum from philosophy to linguistics, from ethics to anthropology, and were productive in inventing original concepts while presenting them. The corpus of these authors, which have influenced the 20th century thought history from many different points, has been narrowed down by considering the limitations of the thesis topic. So much so that the Russian cultural and literary theorist Bakhtin, who has produced very important works in the fields of grammar, philology and aesthetics, especially his theories about the novel as a genre has been determined as the field to harvest the relations of the study. Bakhtin's ideas for novel and novel criticism formed an important basis for overcoming the limits of structuralism in the sixties. His works have been a source of theoretical citation for post-structuralist approaches, especially after his death. Therefore, the first part of the thesis will be devoted to Bakhtin. First of all, the development of the novel genre in Bakhtin, and then different concepts of Bakhtin such as dialogism, heteroglossia, polyphony, chronotope and carnival will be examined.

In the second part of the study, the concept of minor literature that emerged and gained strength from the political and collective aspects of Kafka's language, which was put forward by Deleuze and Guattari in their works published in French under the name *Kafka: Pour une Littérature Mineure*<sup>1</sup> in 1975, will be discussed. Minor literature is not just a pure literary theory, but stands out with the strength of its political and social propositions. In this respect, it will not be sufficient to subject them to grammatical, semiotic and morphological studies in order to understand the deterritorialization of language, the connection of the individual to a political

---

<sup>1</sup> It was translated into English by Dana Polan in 1986 as *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*.

immediacy, and the collective assembly of enunciation, which are listed by Deleuze and Guattari as the three main features of minor literature.<sup>2</sup> For this reason, the philosophical and social aspects of these features will be tried to be clarified.

We can explain the conditions that make such a thesis possible, that is, a Bakhtinian analysis for minor literature, on three levels. The first is the temporal plane. Both Bakhtin's works and the fields of study of the works prioritize minor literature chronologically. While examining the development of the novel genre, Bakhtin goes back to Ancient Greece, where he stated that the genre did not exist yet.<sup>3</sup> In this period, the Socratic dialogues were found notable by Bakhtin for providing the destruction of the epic distance with their contemporary reality, and the Menippean satire as a serio-comical genre, containing the basic features of the works that would later become the prototypes of the European novel. Later, he focused on the works of Rabelais, who had a privileged place in 16th century French literature as the original source of the novel genre. According to him, Rabelais played an important role in the articulation of laughter into prose, which is universalist, libertarian, and most importantly connecting people with informal truth.<sup>4</sup> But ultimately, he finds the thoughts he conceptualized about the novel genre in the most crystallized form in the works of Dostoyevsky, whom he sees as the creator of genuine polyphony with its solid plot, carnivalesque features and ideologue heroes.<sup>5</sup> In line with this analysis, it should be taken into consideration that Kafka, whom Deleuze and Guattari fully utilized for the idea of minor literature, produced works in a mature age of the novel or romance genres according to Bakhtin's work. However, it should be noted that this maturity is an unfinished maturity. Bakhtin underlines that this

---

<sup>2</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, trans. Dana Polan (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986), 16-17.

<sup>3</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin, University of Texas Press, 1981), 21-24.

<sup>4</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World*, trans. Helene Iswolsky (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984), 90.

<sup>5</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, trans. Caryl Emerson (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), 177-78.

novel is a genre that has not yet been completed and perhaps will not be completed.<sup>6</sup> This dynamic process is one of the structure blocks of our work. Similar to the authors whose works they analyzed, there is a gradient difference between Bakhtin, Deleuze, and Guattari, which can be considered consecutive between the academic environments in which they work. Bakhtin began his academic studies in the years when Saussure's objective and structuralist theory of language remained effective. However, he became one of the first thinkers to remove the artificial boundaries drawn by modernity between language, art and philosophy with the works he produced. On the other hand, Deleuze and Guattari produced their works at a time when French post-structuralism came to the fore academically. Another important point in the temporal plane is that the retrospective character of both theories is dominant. That is, both Bakhtin and Deleuze and Guattari built their literary theories on an already existing literature. This retrospective character of their analyzes makes it easy for us to make connections between them.

The second plane is the political plane. Bakhtin did not accept an abstract formal or an abstract ideological approach in his literary study, and he had already entered the political arena when he said that verbal discourse was purely social.<sup>7</sup> Because he did not see language as an abstract system of grammatical categories, on the contrary, he conceived language as full of ideology, as a world view, even as a concrete idea.<sup>8</sup> He argued that in this language-literature region, unitary language is a force that serves linguistic integration and political centralization. But he argued that in every utterance, there are decentralizing forces as well as these centripetal forces, and that these forces are included in the novel genre with a social and historical determination with heteroglossia, which we will define later.<sup>9</sup> To see the similarity between the construction process of the utterance in Bakhtin's novel

---

<sup>6</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 3.

<sup>7</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 259.

<sup>8</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 271.

<sup>9</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 272.

discourse, embodied by the act of a subject but responding to the stated historical and social requirements, and the deterministic role of historical, economic and social conditions, which Michel Foucault identifies as primary in the formation of the object and forms of expression in his discourse analysis<sup>10</sup>; being able to hear the political resonance of Foucault's studies on subjectivity, power and truth in Bakhtin's words, who has also studied subject and subjectivity, is important to determine the political axis of Bakhtin's works. Considering all the works of Deleuze and Guattari, it would not be wrong to say that they are not far from this political axis. In this context, it is not surprising that minor literature, which is defined by them as literature written by a minority in a major language<sup>11</sup>, not a minor language, is positioned purely in the political arena. So that "minor" now determines the *revolutionary conditions for every literature* in established literature.<sup>12</sup> Kafka does not make this possible with a simple critical literature, but on the contrary becomes dangerous by the power of non-criticality. Revolutionary conditions emerge with the mobilization of bureaucratic, legal and capitalist regulations in which both desire and law coexist.<sup>13</sup> In this mobility, *minor* gives the opportunity to create and find lines of flight in order to escape from any centralizing effect of dense regulation. Deleuze and Guattari argue that today, there is still a process in which the bureaucracy of the past and the future penetrate each other, and according to them, the first person to become conscious of the bipolar situation between these current functional archaisms and new formations as a historical problem is Kafka.<sup>14</sup> Kafka's work is fully integrated with the body of desire, concrete and abstract arrangements, and unlimited social space.<sup>15</sup> For this reason, in minor literature, the individual is directly articulated with the political.

---

<sup>10</sup> Michel Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge*, trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith (London: Routledge, 2002), 49-50.

<sup>11</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 16.

<sup>12</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 18.

<sup>13</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 60.

<sup>14</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 75-76.

<sup>15</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 87

The third and final plane is the formal plane. It can be said that this plane is the most limiting plane for both Bakhtin's and Deleuze and Guattari's concepts. All concepts have found value only in artistic and non-artistic prose, moreover, only to cover the European continent's understanding of thought and art. With the concepts of dialogism and heteroglossia, Bakhtin has positioned the novel genre completely against poetic discourse. For him, poetic discourse has the word of traditional morphology. This word only recognizes itself, it does not recognize any word outside its context.<sup>16</sup> This word encounters only the resistance of the object as it turns towards its object. This is the realm of unitary and singular language, which deprives the word of the enriching opposition of other words. In the discourse of the novel, on the other hand, words are now in interaction not only with their objects, but also with all other objects, words and subjects who have the act. The novel object in dialogic orientation is covered with common thoughts, perspectives, foreign value judgments and emphases.<sup>16</sup> In addition, the heteroglot structure in the discourse of the novel in which this object is found does not exist in the poetic discourse. Heteroglossia is articulated to the novel by the inclusion of different social/ideological thoughts in a single language, languages of different groups, dialects, different genres and even foreign languages. However, the poet prefers to invent his own language, his own words, rather than making such a statement.<sup>17</sup> Bakhtin argues that the poet is a poet insofar as he accepts the idea of a unitary language and a monologically closed utterance. This point of view creates a limitation for his theory, as it does not cover all poetic discourse and poets that existed until his time, and cannot predict that poetry, as a developing genre, will have a heteroglot structure over time. According to him, the characteristics of the novelistic discourse are transferred to other genres only when they enter the gravitational field of the novel<sup>18</sup>, and it is the only genre that continues to develop and is not yet fully completed. Minor literature, which is based entirely on Kafka's

---

<sup>16</sup>Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 276.

<sup>17</sup>Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 287-88.

<sup>18</sup>Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 33.

works as a field of study, is also surrounded by prose and has similar formal limitations. Deleuze and Guattari analyzed Kafka's works at three different levels as letters, stories and novels. Minor literature is not a form that can be represented in a single work by a single author, minor literature is an order of relations that can only be gathered from a network of works. One of the most important features of this order is that it does not include a symbolism and metaphorical expressions that are close to poetic discourse. Kafka deliberately kills all metaphor, symbolism, and naming. Instead of meaning there is a distribution of states, and things are the intensities of words in this distribution. On the way from word to image, there is neither literal meaning nor determination according to metaphor. The image is the path traveled on the scale of intensities.<sup>19</sup>

In the third part of the thesis, the propositions of minor literature will be analyzed in comparison with Bakhtin's concepts, within all the possibilities and limitations of the planes we have described. The purpose of this analysis will not be to try to collect minor literature from Bakhtin's theories. The aim will be to show whether the features that Bakhtin defined for the novel genre provide opportunities for the capacities and functions that Deleuze and Guattari ascribe to minor literature. In this respect, the analysis will not be limited in linguistic and semantic axis, and concepts that go beyond the limits of literature will be traced in the field of social thought.

---

<sup>19</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 20-22.

## FIRST CHAPTER

### MIKHAIL BAKHTIN AND THE NOVEL AS A GENRE

#### 1.1. MIKHAIL BAKHTIN

Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin, whose thoughts began to be influential in the West after the 70s, was born on November 16, 1895 in Orel, a medium-sized town south of Moscow.<sup>20</sup> Bakhtin succeeded in doing this in the years when interdisciplinary thinking was not a common method yet. He has produced original works that touch on many fields such as literature, philosophy, linguistics, Marxism, philology, anthropology. At the basis of his perspective in this interdisciplinary field of study, there is a criticism against the enlightened concept of universal mind and the monophonic worldview that is the result of this universal mind. Bakhtin defended this opposing view with his own unique concepts, such as dialogism, dialogic thinking, heteroglossia, decentralization, which will be explained in later chapters. Due to their diversity and inclusiveness, these concepts were attacked by citations, especially after the 1970s, when their English translations began. Many different thought systems, from liberal humanist criticism to Russian nationalism, from Marxism to anti-Marxism, wanted to benefit from Bakhtin's analysis. The reasons for the emergence of these different interpretations also include the difficulties of doing an academic study on Bakhtin. It is important to reveal these difficulties before moving on to Bakhtin's theory and conceptual analysis of the novel. There are specific limitations of doing academic studies on Bakhtin.

The primary limitation is that Bakhtin is often associated with thinkers who are called as Bakhtin Circle. Bakhtin's work should be evaluated together with the work of these thinkers. The Bakhtin Circle, which hosts names such as Matvei Isaevich Kagan (1889-1937), Pavel Nikolaevich Medvedev (1891-1938), Lev

---

<sup>20</sup> Alastair Renfrew, *Mikhail Bakhtin* (New York: Routledge, 2015), 1-2.

Vasilievich Pumpianskii (1891-1940), Ivan Ivanovich Sollertinskii (1902-1944), Valentin Nikolaevich Voloshinov (1895-1936), It was a 20th-century Russian school of thought that focused on the work of Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin. The Circle of Bakhtin dealt with the Russian Revolution and the issues of the cultural revolution of the Stalin era that followed, from a social and cultural perspective, philosophically. It has been claimed that the works of Voloshinov and Medvedev actually belong to Bakhtin. Although there is no evidence yet to show that these thinkers were not responsible for their own works, the main reason why these claims continue is that Bakhtin neither accepts nor explicitly rejects this claim. This point leads us to another limitation of Bakhtin's work. We do not have an accurate and consistent biography of Bakhtin. The fact that Bakhtin did not give an accurate biography of himself when he was alive is now accepted.<sup>21</sup> It is thought that the reason for this is that Bakhtin did not finish his education at Petrograd University and used the biography of his brother Nikolai Bakhtin, who graduated from the same school, to gain acceptance in academic circles.<sup>22</sup> The Bakhtin Circle fell apart after Bakhtin was arrested in 1928 and sentenced to 10 years on the Solovki Islands for his ties to the Voskresenie (Resurrection), a religious-philosophical, semi-Masonic community.<sup>23</sup>

Another limitation before examining Bakhtin's works and establishing the relations between them is that only three of his works were published during his lifetime, except for a few unrelated articles. Two of these works are *The Problems of Dostoevsky's Art* (1929) and *The Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (1963), one of which is a revised version of the other and brought great fame to its author. His other published work is *Rabelais and his World* (1965), which is also his doctoral thesis. Apart from these, dozens of works covering different periods of his career, which were written over a 50-year period, were first published in Russian after his

---

<sup>21</sup> Hirschkop, Ken, *Mikhail Bakhtin: An Aesthetic For Democracy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 111-116.

<sup>22</sup> Craig Brandist, *The Bakhtin Circle: Philosophy, Culture and Politics* (London: Pluto, 2002), 7.

<sup>23</sup> Craig Brandist, *The Bakhtin Circle: Philosophy, Culture and Politics*, 9.

death, and then translated into foreign languages. This corpus, most of which is compiled from drafts and lacks chronological connections, creates a significant limitation in following the development of Bakhtin's concepts.

He spent his last years fighting serious diseases such as emphysema and osteomyelitis, but he did not quit his studies. Despite all the difficulties he faced, Bakhtin continued to think and write throughout his life. After he died on March 7, 1975 in Moscow, many of his works were published and his influence spread, first among Western scholars and then among intellectuals around the world, through his posthumous translations.<sup>24</sup>

## **1.2. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NOVEL GENRE**

Mikhail Bakhtin examined the characteristics and development of the novel genre in his two articles, *From The Prehistory Of Novelistic Discourse* (1940) and *Epic and Novel* (1941), published in Soviet Russia. These articles were only translated into English in 1981 with a compilation edited by Michael Holquist and began to attract attention in the West. Bakhtin underlines the delay in starting the analysis of the specific features of the novel genre. The novel was not yet considered as an independent genre in the 17th and 18th century literary circles. If it was to be classified, it was juxtaposed with mixed rhetorical genres. This indifference lasted until the middle of the 19th century. Since these dates, theories have begun to be produced on the novel, which has now become a dominant literary genre in Europe. However, these theories also dealt with composition and thematic issues rather than style. In the 1920s the situation changed, and studies began to be made on individual authors or individual styles. According to Bakhtin, these analyzes were also far from defining the specific stylistic features that would define the novel as a genre.<sup>25</sup> These stylistic studies include (1) isolating a certain part of a particular novel and subjecting it to poetic representation and expression studies, (2) grammatical

---

<sup>24</sup> Alastair Renfrew, *Mikhail Bakhtin*, 11.

<sup>25</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, "Walking," in *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 41.

investigation of a novelist's language instead of a holistic style of the novel, (3) revealing the character of a particular novelist's literary approach, (4) the reduction of the language of the novel to the individual style; and (5) the analysis of the language of the novel with rhetorical means.<sup>26</sup> Bakhtin was of the opinion that none of these efforts put the novel on specific foundations and did not clearly reveal its difference in other genres. In his own opinion, he stated three features that distinguish the novel from other genres as follows:

*“(1) its stylistic three-dimensionality, which is linked with the multi-languaged consciousness realized in the novel; (2) the radical change it effects in the temporal coordinates of the literary image; (3) the new zone opened by the novel for structuring literary images, namely, the zone of maximal contact with the present (with contemporary reality) in all its openedness.”<sup>27</sup>*

This definition of Bakhtin can be seen as an indicator of Eurocentrism, which we have mentioned as one of the limitations of his theory in the introduction to our study. So much so that Bakhtin stated that all of the above-mentioned and organically related features were affected by a special break in the history of European civilization. According to Bakhtin, the liberation of the socially isolated civilization from a semi-patriarchal social structure that is culturally closed to external influences and its entry into international and linguistic relations led to the development of the creative literary consciousness that would give the novel its first feature. The fact that different languages and cultures belonging to many different periods have become accessible to Europe has had a decisive effect on European thought. These effects and the polyglossia transferred to the literary field as a result of these effects are examined in detail in these two articles. In order to be faithful to the thesis, we will continue with three different points that Bakhtin emphasized in the emergence of the novel genre.

---

<sup>26</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 42.

<sup>27</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 11.

### 1.2.1 The Fall of the Epic Distance

Mikhail Bakhtin has studied the epic genre in detail in terms of being a representation of higher genres and being a basis for other high genres of classical antiquity and the middle ages. He mentions the three founding features of the epic.

*“(1) a national epic past-in Goethe's and Schiller's terminology the "absolute past"-serves as the subject for the epic;(2) national tradition (not personal experience and the free thought that “grows out of it) serves as the source for the epic; (3) an absolute epic distance separates the epic world from contemporary reality, that is, from the time in which the singer (the author and his audience) lives.”<sup>28</sup>*

In epic, this sacred 'absolute' past, completely isolated from narrator and listener, is monochronic and hierarchical. The absolute past, which is not open to any uncertainty or questioning, lives in the memory of the nation. This memory is the only creative source and power in ancient literature. Transcending the boundaries of this literature, which belongs to the past and a national memory, could only be possible with the destruction of the epic style. Even if the narratives that touch the individual began to appear even in the Hellenistic period, the epic style spread to all the "high" genres that followed and made its dominance felt in literature until the 19th century. For this reason, a narrative that is simultaneous against an unchangeable, absolute time, orienting to the future is characterized as the characteristic of a low literature. Likewise, the narrative that is based on individual experience and includes knowledge and practice, instead of a national and sacred memory, has been considered "low". The novel, on the other hand, has been able to overcome the epic distance by incorporating all genres that touch the world, life and time, regardless of the sacred or ordinary distinction.

---

<sup>28</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 13.

### 1.2.2 Serio-comical

Alongside this uncontactable past of the epic in Ancient Greece, narratives whose object was contemporaneity also appeared. Bakhtin suggested that the roots of the novel are this ancient literature in which this world, gods, demigods, heroes are represented on the same plane with contemporaneous life. This field of literature, as the ancients named it, spoudogeloin (This word is a combination of the Greek words spoudaion (σπουδαῖον)<sup>29</sup> meaning serious and gelegeloion (γελοῖον) meaning comic), that is serio-comical.

*“The weakly plotted mimes of Sophron, all the bucolic poems, the fable, early memoir literature (the Epidemiai of Ion of Chios, the Homilae of Critias), pamphlets all belong to this field; here the ancients themselves included the "Socratic dialogues" (as a genre), here belong Roman satire (Lucilius, Horace, Persius, Juvenal), the extensive literature of the "Symposia" and finally Menippean satire (as a genre) and dialogues of the Lucianic type.”<sup>30</sup>*

Although these genres are far from the solid plot and composition framework, which are expected features of the novel as a genre, Bakhtin is pointed out as the first and authentic basic steps in the evolution of the novel. According to him, this is because for the first time the literary object is represented without any distance, at the level of contemporary reality, in the zone of direct and crude contact.<sup>31</sup> He underlines that "laughing" is the biggest opportunity of these genres in the process of breaking the epic distance. In the absolute past of the epic, all non-contact images are serious. For an event to be comic, it must be zoomed in. The image drawn to a contemporary reality with folkloric laughter becomes the object of individual experience by getting rid of the hierarchical order of tradition and memory. Bakhtin

---

<sup>29</sup> Jennifer L. Ferriss-Hill, *Roman Satire and the Old Comic Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 15.

<sup>30</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 21-22.

<sup>31</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 23.

takes the roots of the concept of carnival, which has an important place in the theory of the novel, in literature, to these genres. These genres are in contact with carnivalesque folklore. They had the effect of changing the understanding of the world that belonged to the carnival. Three external features of serious semi-comical genres are characteristic.<sup>32</sup> The first feature, as we mentioned above, is a serious change in the time-value zone in these genres. The subject and image are cut off from the absolute past of the epic and brought into contact with the living present. The second feature is that the image is rescued from epic memory like epic time. Sacred memory leaves its place to the power of experience and free creation. The third essential feature derives from the new relationship with the word, which is the building block for literature. Representation is stripped of the formal integrity of epic tragedy, high rhetoric and has a polymorphic and heterophonic nature. These genres combine the high and the low, the serious and the comic, interweaving many genres, including parodies of the higher genres. As a result of these emerging opportunities, there is a weakening in the one-sided *seriousness, rationality, singular meaning* and *dogmatism* of rhetoric.<sup>33</sup> Among the genres that enable this potential to emerge, Bakhtin highlights two types: Socratic dialogues and Menippean satire. In Socratic dialogues, we encounter the image of Socrates as a prototype of the heroes of the novel genres. Socrates is very different from epic heroes. The conversations that form the main line of the stories are as close to the popular spoken language as classical Greek allows. Dialogues take place in a contemporary reality, between living people in this reality, with ironic Socratic laughter and a system of metaphors and comparisons borrowed from ordinary life. These conditions bring the world closer. They make the world familiarize for it to be investigated *fearlessly* and *freely*.<sup>34</sup> The second type is the Menippean satire, in which the intimidating effect of laughter is much more pronounced. The term Menippean satire was first used by the Roman writer Varro to describe his own

---

<sup>32</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 108.

<sup>33</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 107.

<sup>34</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 25.

works. By the way, the source of reference is the Greek Cynic Menippus, whose works have not survived. It is now described as a genre of ancient literature that includes Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*, Lucian's dialogues, Petronius' *Satyricon*, and Apuleius' *Golden Donkey*.<sup>35</sup> There is a fantastic plot in this genre that serves to test ideas and ideologues. In order to achieve this goal, an uncontrolled provocative style is often adopted.<sup>36</sup>

### 1.2.3 Carnival

Bakhtin continued his search for the roots of the novel genre, which we examined in the previous two chapters, in Ancient Greek literature, in serio-comical folkloric genres, on the axis of laughter. Bakhtin, who examined the medieval and Renaissance culture in detail, placed the European carnival culture in a privileged place for the development of the novel genre. In 1945, he presented his work in which he studied the carnivalization of literature and the works of François Rabelais, where this articulation was most evident, under the name "Rabelais in the History of Realism". Later, this thesis was translated into a book and published in Russian in 1965. Bakhtin focused on two features of the carnival in particular. The first feature is that the carnival is in a position against formality and seriousness. We mentioned that Bakhtin analyzed the function of laughter and sarcastic dialogue in breaking down the wall of fear and opening it up to free thought. At the carnival, all hierarchies are turned upside down. The consciousness of the peoples manifests itself as the carnival's celebration of blasphemy, obscenity, humiliation, and all the excesses of bodily appetites.<sup>37</sup> The second interesting feature of the carnival for Bakhtin is its collective nature. There are no sharp boundaries between performers and participants in the carnival. Everyone involved in the carnival is an active part of the carnival. There is no stage, no audience, not even a performer. All that exists

---

<sup>35</sup>Jonathan Greenberg , *Introduction to Satire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,2019), 69.

<sup>36</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 26.

<sup>37</sup> Katerina Clark and Michael Holquist, *Mikhail Bakhtin* (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press,1984), 296-298.

is life, but an unusual life, a world turned upside down. The inverted world of carnival, its atmosphere of collective action and informal spirit also carnivalize literature.

*“Literature that was influenced—directly and without mediation, or indirectly, through a series of intermediate links—by one or another variant of carnivalistic folklore (ancient or medieval) we shall call carnivalized literature. The entire realm of the serio-comical constitutes the first example of such literature. In our opinion the problem of carnivalized literature is one of the very important problems in historical poetics, and in particular of the poetics of genre.”*<sup>38</sup>

### **1.3. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

#### **1.3.1 Dialogism**

Dialogism is a concept that Bakhtin produced and is not only important for literary theory, but has spread to his entire philosophy. However, it is difficult to define this concept fully. This is mainly because the term has been used by Bakhtin in different contexts in different texts. But these contexts have one thing in common; it is the mutual interaction that is inherent in the dialogue. Dialogue, which literally means conversation between two people, is a method to reach the truth in Plato, and a dialectical principle to reach synthesis in Hegel, has a much more comprehensive characteristic in Bakhtin. The main axis of this extensive content is between living agents, concrete acts and words. In order to understand this, it is important to note that Bakhtin states the difference of dialogism from dialectic:

*“Dialogue and dialectics. Take a dialogue and remove the voices (the partitioning of voices), remove the intonations (emotional and individualizing ones), carve out abstract concepts and judgments from*

---

<sup>38</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 107.

*living words and responses, cram everything into one abstract consciousness-- and that's how you get dialectics.*"<sup>39</sup>

This lively axis of dialogism touches Bakhtin's philosophy from three basic points. If we examine these contacts chronologically in Bakhtin's works, we first see the aesthetic core. Bakhtin argues that two distinct axiological positions are required for aesthetic effectiveness. According to him, aesthetic activity is not reflexive. Since I will not take another axiological position without adopting another singular position, I enter into a necessary relationship with the other in order to complete my self-image.<sup>40</sup> Bakhtin continues this line in his early works. He argues that art cannot come into contact with a direct reality, but can be opposed to what is seen from a certain axiological position, that is, to objects and judgments that have already been evaluated and have become the product of the cultural world.<sup>41</sup> The nature of the aesthetic core of dialogism theory encompasses these propositions. At the second point of contact, Bakhtin goes one step beyond aesthetics and directly targets the subject. It brings the 'me' and the 'other' into a necessary and permanent dialogue in the creation of subjectivity. 'Me' is not simply an object submitted to the evaluation of an other to a different axiological position from me. Moreover, this is not just a mutual empathy, a kind of subjectivity exchange of subjects. 'I' - itself - exists with this evaluation. *To be means to be for another, and through the other, for oneself. A person has no internal sovereign territory, he is wholly and always on the boundary.*<sup>42</sup> In this area, Bakhtin invents yet another new concept; outsideness (*vnenakhodimost*). In his work "Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity", in which he examines the relationship between the author and the hero, the self-other relationship has entered the field of existence by exceeding the aesthetic dimension.

---

<sup>39</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, trans. Vern McGee (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1987), 147.

<sup>40</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays*, trans. Vadim Liapunov (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1990), 115-116.

<sup>41</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays*, 300-303.

<sup>42</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 287.

*“ ‘Cognition’ surmounts this concrete outsideness of me myself and the outsideness-for-me of all other human beings, as well as the excess of my seeing in relation to each one of them, which is founded in that position of outsideness. Cognition constructs a unitary and universally valid world, a world independent in every respect from that concrete and unique position which is occupied by this or that individual. For cognition, there is no absolutely inconvertible relationship of / and all others; for cognition, “I and the other” inasmuch as they are being thought, constitute a relationship that is relative and convertible, since the cognitive ‘subiectum’ as such does not occupy any determinate, concrete place in being.”<sup>43</sup>*

The last point of contact of dialogism in Bakhtin's philosophy is the word. Dialogue finds the opportunity to penetrate from word to utterance and from utterance to novel. According to Bakhtin, no living word establishes a single and unchanging relationship with the object to which it is directed.

*“Between the word and its object, between the word and the speaking subject, there exists an elastic environment of other, alien words about the same object, the same theme, and this is an environment that it is often difficult to penetrate. It is precisely in the process of living interaction with this specific environment that the word may be individualized and given stylistic shape.”<sup>44</sup>*

The object-oriented utterance enters into a dialogic relationship with all the other words, value judgments, perspectives, dialects, accents, foreign languages that leak into this environment. In these relations, reconciliations, mergers, ruptures and disappearances are inevitable. However, as a result of mutual interactions in this lively and tense environment, the word can attain its object. The utterance, that is, the concrete discourse, is much more than just a set of words that respond to the

---

<sup>43</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays*, 23.

<sup>44</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 276.

requirements of its own language and grammar. Every utterance participates, determines, affects language in an environment where the social and historical determination of centralizing and decentralizing forces is active.<sup>45</sup> We will discuss this environment in the next section with the term heteroglossia. As a result of the dialogic relations of words and utterances with other words and utterances, discourse gains a new and important artistic potential. The novel genre, which can use this potential most effectively and deeply, has come to the fore as a new and distinctive prose art. Bakhtin states that the novel has phenomena that reveal its dialogic character. These phenomena are stylization, parody, skaz, and dialogue. According to Bakhtin, the common feature shared by these phenomena is that their discourse has a bidirectional orientation. In these phenomena, the discourse is both directed to the referent object of speech, as in ordinary discourse, and to someone else's discourse, to someone else's speech.<sup>46</sup> It is important for this thesis to be able to clearly define the dialogic discourse features of these artistic speech phenomena. Because the discursive competencies of these phenomena are closely related to the propositions of minor literature, as we will analyze in the third chapter. Bakhtin argues that these phenomena cannot be evaluated within the limits of classical linguistics, which was the dominant view of his time. All his life, he advocated the necessity of constructing a *metalinguistic* analysis for this evaluation. Classical linguistics and stylistics can only examine and classify monological utterances that contain signs directly directed to their object, and cannot recognize utterances that enter into dialogic relationship. So how was Bakhtin able to describe these dialogic phenomena? To understand this, it is necessary to analyze the three discursive types that exist in prose that he describes. First type; *unmediated, direct, fully signifying discourse is directed toward its referential object and constitutes the ultimate semantic authority within the limits of a given context.*<sup>47</sup> This type is designed for

---

<sup>45</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 272.

<sup>46</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 185.

<sup>47</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 189.

naming, informing, expressing, representing. The second type is represented, objectified discourse. This type also tends towards its own object. But it is also the object of another, the object of the author's intention.

*“(...)this other intention does not penetrate inside the objectified discourse, it takes it as a whole and, without changing its meaning or tone, subordinates it to its own tasks. It does not invest it with another referential meaning. Discourse that has become an object is, as it were, itself unaware of the fact, like the person who goes about his business unaware that he is being watched; objectified discourse sounds as if it were direct single-voiced discourse. Discourses of both the first and second type have in fact only one voice each. These are single-voiced discourses.”<sup>47</sup>*

The third type of discourse is the type in which the dialogical relationship begins. Here, in the discourse type, the author can use another's discourse for his own purposes by adding a new semantic intent to a discourse that has and maintains his own intention.<sup>47</sup> If we look at it from this perspective, there are now two different purposes in a single discourse. Two voices emerge with different semantic intentions. The phenomena that we have mentioned above as special for the novel genre are in this dialogic discourse area. The object of stylization is the first type of discourse. That is, the referential intent of one semantic authority forces another (author) to serve their own intentions. Here, although the discourse does not turn into a pure object, it is only indirectly objectified because it serves someone else's point of view. It is in this conditional space that dialogism takes place. However, the character's purely objectified speech is not conditional, it is monologic. The author cannot penetrate this monologic speech. Stylization is the capture of this direct and unconditional discourse from the outside and making it serve new purposes. In order to better understand what makes stylization dialogic and the thin and fragile border between stylization and an unconditional speech, Bakhtin's sentences explaining the difference between stylization and imitation are important.

*“Imitation does not render a form conditional, for it takes the imitated material seriously, makes it its own, directly appropriates to itself someone else's discourse. What happens in that case is a complete merging of voices, and if we do hear another's voice, then it is certainly not one that had figured in to the imitator's plan.”<sup>48</sup>*

Similar to stylization in parody, the author is involved in another's discourse, but there is a distinct conflict situation here. The other discourse, which is included in the host discourse, strongly imposes its own purpose and gives an opposite meaning to the primary discourse. Discourse now serves the author's individual and specific intentions. Parody can be a genre on its own, or it can infiltrate any discourse.

*“Parodistic discourse can be extremely diverse. One can parody another person's style as a style; one can parody another's socially typical or individually characterological manner of seeing, thinking, and speaking. The depth of the parody may also vary: one can parody merely superficial verbal forms, but one can also parody the very deepest principles governing another's discourse.”<sup>49</sup>*

Another dialogic phenomenon in the novel is skaz. Caryl Emerson, who translated *The Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* into English, stated that skaz has no exact equivalent in English and used the term skaz throughout the translation. In the footnote, he defined skaz as a narrative technique or style that imitates the oral speech of a single narrator.<sup>50</sup> What is added to the work with skaz is an ordinary person who tells a story, is not a literary man, and is often from the lower class. In this way, the author adds the perspectives and evaluations he needs to his work with a socially different voice.

*“A strict distinction in skaz between an orientation toward another person's discourse and an orientation toward oral speech is absolutely*

---

<sup>48</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 190.

<sup>49</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 194.

<sup>50</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 8.

*To see in skaz only oral speech is to miss the main point. What is more, a whole series of intonational, syntactic, and other language phenomena in skaz (when the author is oriented toward another person's speech) can be explained precisely by its double-voicedness, by the intersection within it of two voices and two accents.*"<sup>51</sup>

In Bakhtin's analysis, the last phenomenon that brings the dialogic possibility to the novel genre is dialogue. In this phenomenon, dialogue reveals itself through what Bakhtin calls 'hidden dialogue' and 'hidden polemic'. These phenomena deepen the way the dialogue in the novel is perceived as merely a conversation between two people. According to Bakhtin, polemic discourse is quite common, it is frequently encountered in everyday conversations; all the words and all the sarcastic remarks that make digs at others in everyday speech, the self-denying and self-deprecating exaggerated speech, have a stylistic significance in polemical discourse.<sup>52</sup> In open polemic, two people are in mutual dialogue and discussion. The author objectifies the discourse of the other, directly turns to the sign object and tries to refute it. In this phenomenon, it is not possible to enter into a semantic dialogue. Ideas, intentions do not interact, discourse and meaning are one-sided. According to Bakhtin, the real dialogical possibility is found in the hidden polemic. There are no two subjects arguing with each other in hidden polemics. A person enters into a discussion with different discourses directed towards an object without an interlocutor.

*"In a hidden polemic the author's discourse is directed toward its own referential object, as is any other discourse, but at the same time every statement about the object is constructed in such a way that, apart from its referential meaning, a polemical blow is struck at the other's discourse on the same theme, at the other's statement about the same object. A word,*

---

<sup>51</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 192.

<sup>52</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 196.

<sup>53</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 195.

*directed toward its referential object, clashes with another's word within the very object itself. The other's discourse is not itself reproduced, it is merely implied, but the entire structure of speech would be completely different if there were not this reaction to another person's implied words.*"<sup>53</sup>

One of the main factors that distinguishes hidden polemic from hidden dialogue is its hostile attitude. The discourse of the other is strongly opposed, and this deliberate hostility produces a new meaning beyond the referential meaning of the discourse. If this meaning is ignored and only the direct referential meaning is taken into account, the dialogic nature of the discourse cannot be grasped, and its semantic intent is missed. For all other purposes, hidden dialogue is a meaningful and important phenomenon.

*"Imagine a dialogue of two persons in which the statements of the second speaker are omitted, but in such a way that the general sense is not at all violated. The second speaker is present invisibly, his words are not there, but deep traces left by these words have a determining influence on all the present and visible words of the first speaker. We sense that this is a conversation, although only one person is speaking, and it is a conversation of the most intense kind, for each present, uttered word responds and reacts with its every fiber to the invisible speaker, points to something outside itself, beyond its own limits, to the unspoken words of another person."*<sup>54</sup>

### **1.3.2 Heteroglossia**

Heteroglossia has a key role in Bakhtin's theory of the novel. Dialogue in the novel develops only with the possibilities of the language layered with heteroglossia. Bakhtin coined this term by combining two words borrowed from Greek, "hetero" with different meanings and "glossia" with the meaning of sound/language, and

---

<sup>54</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 197.

defined it in his article *Discourse in the Novel* published in 1934. In Bakhtin's analysis, heteroglossia is positioned against the language homogenized by traditional linguistics and stylistics. Language actually enters into another relationship at any moment of historical existence and is socially and individually stratified. Transferring these layers to the text is a prerequisite for the novel.

*“The internal stratification of any single national language into social dialects, characteristic group behavior, professional jargons, generic languages, languages of generations and age groups, tendentious languages, languages of the authorities, of various circles and of passing fashions, languages that serve the specific sociopolitical purposes of the day, even of the hour (each day has its own slogan, its own vocabulary, its own emphases)-this internal stratification present in every language at any given moment of its historical existence is the indispensable prerequisite for the novel as a genre.”<sup>55</sup>*

In his article *Prehistory of Romance Discourse*, Bakhtin states that this stratification is not an inherent feature of language, but has developed historically. According to him, monoglossia reigned in Ancient Greece. In other words, there was a socially shared common language and ideological integrity. But with the Roman Empire and the Middle Ages, a period in which natural languages and folk languages coexisted began with Latin. In this period, languages developed the opportunity to see themselves through the eyes of other languages. Bakhtin defines the medium as polyglossia. In the post-Renaissance modern society, an integration took place at the level of natural languages and national languages, as well as differentiations at the level of genres and styles, and heteroglossia was born.<sup>56</sup>

In the social stratification that brings about heteroglossia, the differences appear

---

<sup>55</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 262-263.

<sup>56</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 66-71.

<sup>57</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 290.

primarily in the forms used to convey meaning. Different thought systems, different belief styles, different lifestyles create different meaning planes. On these planes, the words and forms of the language occupy specific trajectories that serve different purposes and become alienated from other tendencies, parties, artistic structures and individuals.<sup>57</sup> The intersection of discourses that are alienated from each other on the same planes and entering into semantic relations with each other creates a dialogic possibility. As an artistic genre, the novel hosts all these languages, planes, intersections.

*“In actual fact, however, there does exist a common plane that methodologically justifies our juxtaposing them: all languages of heteroglossia, whatever the principle underlying them and making each unique, are specific points of view on the world, forms for conceptualizing the world in words, specific world views, each characterized by its own objects, meanings and values. As such they all may be juxtaposed to one another, mutually supplement one another, contradict one another and be interrelated dialogically. As such they encounter one another and co-exist in the consciousness of real people-first and foremost, in the creative consciousness of people who write novels.”<sup>58</sup>*

When stratification and heteroglossia occur, it does not exhibit a fixed existence within the language, but also determines the dynamics of the language. As long as language develops, stratification continues, inter-layer relations deepen, heteroglossia expands. At this point, Bakhtin defends the existence of forces that constantly interact with each other in this living environment. Centripetal forces want to preserve the monologic structure of language. It works to shape a linguistic-ideological structure by making a unitary language dominant. Centrifugal forces, on the other hand, stratify language, establish heteroglossia, bring different

---

<sup>58</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 291-292.

perspectives into account, and enable social dialogue. Every word, every utterance and every discourse are actively involved in this interaction.

*“Alongside the centripetal forces, the centrifugal forces of language carry on their uninterrupted work; alongside verbal-ideological centralization and unification, the uninterrupted processes of decentralization and disunification go forward. (...) Every utterance participates in the "unitary language" (in its centripetal forces and tendencies) and at the same time partakes of social and historical heteroglossia (the centrifugal, stratifying forces). Such is the fleeting language of a day, of an epoch, a social group, a genre, a school and so forth. It is possible to give a concrete and detailed analysis of any utterance, once having exposed it as a contradiction-ridden, tension-filled unity of two embattled tendencies in the life of language.”<sup>59</sup>*

This point seems appropriate to evaluate Bakhtin's philosophy from a Foucauldian perspective. Bakhtin argued that discourse has a multi-layered social determination and is historically variable. For Bakhtin the word-object relation was never direct. As soon as the word turned to its object, it entered the web of various social relations and could reach it with the influence of different forces. Neither word nor discourse was exempt from this determination. Like Foucault, he saw that every historical period has the power to reveal not what is said but what can be said.

### **1.3.3 Polyphony**

Polyphony, a term Bakhtin borrowed from musicology and added to the theory of the novel, generally refers to the simultaneous playing of more than one musical melody. It is a term that has become widespread today and is in use in a wide range from philosophy to architecture. It points out that the parts, each of which has its own logic, come together to form a complex whole that exceeds their sum. Wherever it is, it is the expression of the opposite of singularity and allows the expansion of polyphonic thought. According to Bakhtin, the creator of the

---

<sup>59</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 272-273.

polyphonic novel is Dostoevsky; Dostoevsky's novel does not fit into the literary schemes of works that were evaluated under the novel genre in Europe of the time.<sup>60</sup> His characters are not merely a plurality of different destinies, reflecting the author's point of view in an objective world that is the work of the author's consciousness. In his novels, there is a plurality of independent and unfused consciousnesses and the voices of those consciousnesses. The characters exist in their own world, in their own objectivity, they intersect, unite, enter into dialogue within the event, but they do not merge completely. This is authentic polyphony.

*“Dostoevsky's major heroes are, by the very nature of his creative design, not only objects of authorial discourse but also subjects of their own directly signifying discourse. In no way, then, can a character's discourse be exhausted by the usual functions of characterization and plot development, nor does it serve as a vehicle for the author's own ideological position. The consciousness of a character is given as someone else's consciousness, another consciousness, yet at the same time it is not turned into an object, is not closed, does not become a simple object of the author's consciousness. In this sense the image of a character in Dostoevsky is not the usual objectified image of a hero in the traditional novel.”<sup>60</sup>*

Bakhtin stated three features that distinguish the polyphonic novel from the monophonic novel.<sup>61</sup> The first feature of the polyphonic novel is that the author creates living beings that are identical, independent of himself. Here the emphasis is on the self-consciousness that Dostoevsky bestows on his characters. The fact that self-conscious characters are aware of their own existence distinguishes the polyphonic novel from the monophonic novel.

*“Self-consciousness, as the artistic dominant in the construction of the hero's image, is by itself sufficient to break down the monologic unity of an artistic world—but only on condition that the hero, as self-consciousness, is*

---

<sup>60</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 6-7.

<sup>61</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 284-286.

*really represented and not merely expressed, that is, does not fuse with the author, does not become the mouthpiece for his voice; only on condition, consequently, that accents of the hero's self-consciousness are really objectified and that the work itself observes a distance between the hero and the author. If the umbilical cord uniting the hero to his creator is not cut, then what we have is not a work of art but a personal document.*"<sup>62</sup>

The second feature of the polyphonic novel is that the idea becomes the object of artistic creation, not through a system or a paradigm, but without separating the human from the hero through an event. Each voice embodies an idea, a worldview. In Dostoevsky's novels, each utterance has its own point of view, with its meaning, with the object to which it is directed, with its own objectivity. Dostoevsky discovered the meaningful relationship between these discourses and perspectives and brought them to the novel.

*"Dostoevsky thought not in thoughts but in points of view, consciousnesses, voices. He tried to perceive and formulate each thought in such a way that a whole person was expressed and began to sound in it; this, in condensed form, is his entire worldview, from alpha to omega. Only that idea which compressed in itself an entire spiritual orientation could Dostoevsky accept as an element of his artistic worldview; for him it was an indivisible unit; out of such units emerged not a system, united through a world of objects, but a concrete event made up of organized human orientations and voices."*<sup>63</sup>

The third feature that Bakhtin has identified is the dialogism that turns into a special type of interaction between independent consciousnesses that reveal their own discourse in an autonomous field that we tried to define above. Dialogism has a signifying power in relation to the object of the utterance. The relationship between

---

<sup>62</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 51.

<sup>63</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 93.

these consciousnesses and between them and the author is completely dialogic in character. These analyzes made by Bakhtin are essentially in the same direction and have spread both in content and form in Dostoevsky's novel.

### 1.3.4 Chronotope

We have mentioned that Bakhtin is productive in inventing new concepts, and his feature of incorporating terms from other fields into his own analysis. Chronotope also takes its place in Bakhtin's analysis of the novel as a term originally belonging to the positive sciences. It is formed by combining the Greek words *kronos* and *topos*, meaning time and place. Bakhtin noted that he borrowed the term from Einstein's theory of relativity and used it as a metaphor in his analysis, referring to the inherent connection of temporal and spatial relations.<sup>64</sup> But he did not give a systematic definition for its use in literature. Thus, in the post-Bakhtin period, this broad term spread to other narrative genres. The reason for not having a systemic definition may be that Bakhtin does not see time-space as a functional element in the text. Time and space take place in the analysis with their constitutive role rather than functionality. This inseparable founding role of time and space in the novel also determines its formal feature.

*“What is the significance of all these chronotopes? What is most obvious is their meaning for narrative. They are the organizing centers for the fundamental narrative events of the novel. The chronotope is the place where the knots of narrative are tied and untied. It can be said without qualification that to them belongs the meaning that shapes narrative. We cannot help but be strongly impressed by the representational importance of the chronotope. Time becomes, in effect, palpable and visible; the chronotope makes narrative events concrete, makes them take on flesh, causes blood to flow in their veins.”<sup>65</sup>*

---

<sup>64</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 84.

<sup>65</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 250.

As the chronotope is established in a narrative, life is reproduced at all levels. In each design, the word-object relationship is re-established, meanings and things search and find themselves in this chronotope. Chronotope is not just a static structure in which events are staged. Social and historical facts infiltrate this field. No text can exclude itself from society and history. Representation in this field is not only possible with tangible assets. It is embodied and represented in the chronotope scene in abstract images.

*“Thus the chronotope, functioning as the primary means for materializing time in space, emerges as a center for concretizing representation, as a force giving body to the entire novel. All the novel's abstract elements—philosophical and social generalizations, ideas, analyses of cause and effect—gravitate toward the chronotope and through it take on flesh and blood, permitting the imaging power of art to do its work. Such is the representational significance of the chronotope.”<sup>66</sup>*

The chronotope in the text not only provides the opportunity to display the events in the flow, but also all values and emotions are included in the narrative through the chronotope. Events are represented in time and space with all the meanings, emotions and values they carry. Bakhtin described different chronotopes such as road chronotope, encounter chronotope, threshold chronotope, castle chronotope and stated that chronotopes can be multiplied indefinitely. The dividing, multiplying chronotopes interact with each other, some intertwining, while others can completely replace the other. They can support each other or come into conflict. This interaction makes a great contribution to the dialogic architecture of the novel.

A similarity can be observed between the chronotope as described above and the motif that enables the narrators to continue the narrative tradition in oral narratives. The term motif has been transferred to the creative arts and social sciences as a result of its broad meaning, and has created its own sphere of influence in many

---

<sup>66</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 250.

branches from music to painting, from sculpture to cinema, from art history to archeology. However, there is another axis in the chronotope that is not seen in motifs, and that is the reader's axis. The time-space of the narrator, the time-space of the narrative and the time-space of the reader are in interaction.

*“The relationships themselves that exist among chronotopes cannot enter into any of the relationships contained within chronotopes. The general characteristic of these interactions is that they are dialogical (in the broadest use of the word). But this dialogue cannot enter into the world represented in the work, nor into any of the chronotopes represented in it; it is outside the world represented, although not outside the work as a whole. It (this dialogue) enters the world of the author, of the performer, and the world of the listeners and readers. And all these worlds are chronotopic as well.”<sup>67</sup>*

Chronotope will be a potential that we will frequently touch upon while analyzing the part in which Deleuze and Guattari examine the formal features in Kafka's novel in the third part of our study, with its constitutive feature that we tried to explain above and its stylistic effect on the text.

---

<sup>67</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 252.

## SECOND CHAPTER

### MINOR LITERATURE

#### 2.1. GILLES DELEUZE AND FELIX GUATTARI

When the paths of the philosopher Gilles Deleuze and the psychoanalyst, political activist Felix Guattari crossed in 1969, a productive union was born that would be the source of deep and influential works. Gilles Deleuze, who was born in 1925, attended Carnot High School in Paris, studied philosophy at the Sorbonne in the 1940s, and passed the agrégation exam in 1949, was already a well-known and accepted philosopher in France when the couple met. His first philosophical attitude was against the rigid rational thinking he encountered in his student life. In the *Dialogues* he says for those days:

*“At the Liberation we were still strangely stuck in the history of philosophy. We simply plunged into Hegel, Husserl and Heidegger; we threw ourselves like puppies into a scholasticism worse than that of the Middle Ages.”*<sup>68</sup>

Therefore, as soon as he left school, he began to work on writers who did not conform to academic rationalism, post-war Hegelian, existential, or phenomenological philosophy.<sup>69</sup> His work was on *writers who seemed to be part of the history of philosophy, but who escaped from it in one respect.*<sup>70</sup> Lucretius, He studied the philosophies of Spinoza, Hume, Nietzsche, Bergson and turned to the anti-rationalist tradition they contained. Deleuze incorporated the radical and staggering aspects of the structuralist movement that prevailed in the 1960s into his system of thought, but he opposed their claims to scientific objectivity and questioned the epistemological status of impersonal structures that regulate

---

<sup>68</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, *Dialogues*, trans. Hugh Tomlison (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977), 12.

<sup>69</sup> Ronald Bogue, *Deleuze and Guattari* (London: Routledge: 1989), 2.

<sup>70</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, *Dialogues*, 14.

subjectivity.<sup>71</sup> Throughout the 1960s, he concentrated on difference, a philosophy of difference, which cannot be reduced to the concepts of identity and representation. Deleuze found this inspiration in Nietzsche and studied different aspects of the philosophy of difference and presented his detailed analysis of the philosophy of difference in *Difference and Repetition* (1968) and *The Logic of Sense* (1969).

Guattari, who has been active in the Marxist movements since his youth, was born in 1930. He grew up in the working-class suburbs of Paris. He joined various Communist youth groups, first as a high school student and later as a college student. He has spent his life taking an active role in ecological and leftist groups that are critical of the mainstream leftist movement. He played an important role in the preparation for the events of May 1968, while he was active in the *Opposition de Gauche* (union of non-Party leftists). Guattari received his training in psychoanalysis by working with Jacques Lacan for seven years; From 1953 to 1992 he worked at La Borde Clinique, a psychiatric clinic. This experience enabled him to examine patient-employee relations and, based on this analysis, develop a collective analysis of the power relations that actively exist in society.<sup>72</sup>

Both Deleuze and Guattari took a position against the concept of postmodernity. Both of them despised the concepts that post-modernity brought into the life of thought. They had the hope that society could change, be transformed through collective action. At the core of their common thought lies the possibility of restructuring the society and the environment with the possibilities of human relations. *The liberation that Deleuze and Guattari's thought brings is less a liberation from social expectations than a liberation to enter into social relations.*<sup>73</sup>

Deleuze and Guattari published *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* in 1972, which was particularly critical of Lacanian psychoanalytic

---

<sup>71</sup> Ronald Bogue, *Deleuze and Guattari*, 3.

<sup>72</sup> Philip Goodchild, *Deleuze and Guattari: An Introduction to the Politics of Desire* (London: SAGE Publications, 1996), 2-3.

<sup>73</sup> Philip Goodchild, *Deleuze and Guattari: An Introduction to the Politics of Desire*, 2.

teachings. At the time of its publication, psychoanalysis was a very popular topic among French intellectuals. The book soon became the focus of much controversy and gained great fame. The duo, who developed common arguments and concepts with a common form and style, later followed Kafka: Towards a Minor Literature (1975), A Thousand Plateaus (1980) and What is Philosophy? (1991) published his books.

## **2.2. MINOR PHILOSOPHY**

It is very difficult to say that the minor literature of Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari is a systematic literary theory that can be easily analyzed. Minor literature is considered as a reflection of the original theories developed by the duo in the fields of thought, philosophy and politics over a quarter of a century, in the field of literature. It is not possible to reach minor literature without following the main lines of a minor philosophy that laid the groundwork for it, and to grasp its propositions properly. Therefore, before trying to define minor literature, we will look at the concepts that are important in Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy and that will facilitate the analysis of minor literature. But of course, we will limit the framework to the scope of our thesis topic. Otherwise, it may cause us to lose our way in Deleuze and Guattari's philosophies in which they analyze the social unconscious on the axis of multiplicity, creation and desire.

### **2.2.1 Becoming Nomadic**

Nomadism is an important phenomenon studied by Deleuze and Guattari, from which they produced a critical philosophy. In becoming a nomad, an attitude towards the entrenched both in the field of thought and in human activities is inherently present. In this state, the symbolic nomadism, which is in everyone's mind, entered philosophy by Deleuze and Guattari and became the focus of attention. The concept of nomadism, which is a critical field in their philosophy, firstly against the established system of thought and then against the state, which is the source of this system, first appears in the works titled *Difference and Repetition*

and the *Logic of Sense*, published by Deleuze. In *Difference and Repetition*, nomadism is positioned as a distribution, opposite the *logos* as *nomos*.

*“Then there is a completely other distribution which must be called nomadic, a nomad nomos, without property, enclosure or measure. Here, there is no longer a division of that which is distributed but rather a division among those who distribute themselves in an open space - a space which is unlimited, or at least without precise limits. Nothing pertains or belongs to any person, but all persons are arrayed here and there in such a manner as to cover the largest possible space.”<sup>74</sup>*

Deleuze drew attention to the difference between the establishment of a field with *logos*, settled mind, and the established regulations of the state and the movements of nomads. This difference of openness – closure and sharing – random distribution between these two attitudes was frequently invoked by Deleuze as a critical argument against established/dogmatic thinking.

*“The unique cast is a chaos, each throw of which is a fragment. Each throw operates a distribution of singularities, a constellation. But instead of dividing a closed space between fixed results which correspond to hypotheses, the mobile results are distributed in the open space of the unique and undivided cast. This is a nomadic and non-sedentary distribution, wherein each system of singularities communicates and resonates with the others, being at once implicated by the others and implicating them in the most important cast.”<sup>75</sup>*

The duo takes the concept of nomadism into the field of study mainly in the works of *Anti-Oedipus* and especially in *A Thousand Plateaus*. In these works, the concept expands and deepens, plays a dominant role in the state thesis put forward by

---

<sup>74</sup> Gilles Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, trans. Paul Patton (New York:Columbia University Press,1995), 36.

<sup>75</sup> Gilles Deleuze, *The Logic of Sense*, trans. Mark Lester (London:The Athlone Press,1990), 60.

Deleuze and Guattari. They analyzed the relationship between nomadism and nomadic thought, which they placed against the dogmatic image under the control of the state and the state, based on Indo-European mythology. The state apparatus (with a more inclusive concept, apparatus of capture) based on confining the system to a certain area, can be based on the two-headed monarchy structure seen in Indo-European mythologies. The political dominance of the magician king and the lawyer priest, who are opposed to each other like two poles in mythology, actually complement each other.

*“It is a double articulation that makes the State apparatus into a stratum. It will be noted that war is not contained within this apparatus. Either the State has at its disposal a violence that is not channeled through war—either it uses police officers and jailers in place of warriors, has no arms and no need of them, operates by immediate, magical capture, “seizes” and “binds,” preventing all combat—or, the State acquires an army, but in a way that presupposes a juridical integration of war and the organization of a military function.”<sup>76</sup>*

War is not inside these structures. For them, the formation outside this field, which cannot be reduced to the state apparatus, is nomadism. They define nomadism, which is outside the domination of the apparatus of capture and precedes its law, as a war machine.<sup>76</sup> Deleuze and Guattari compare the apparatus of capture and the war machine in terms of their use of space, relations between their units and the game of chess and go, which have different perspectives. The game of the state apparatus is chess.

*“Chess pieces are coded; they have an internal nature and intrinsic properties from which their movements, situations, and confrontations derive. they have qualities; a knight remains a knight, a pawn a pawn,*

---

<sup>76</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988), 352.

*a bishop a bishop. Each is like a subject of the statement endowed with a relative power, and these relative powers combine in a subject of enunciation, that is, the chess player or the game's form of interiority.*"<sup>77</sup>

The war machine is represented by the game go. In the game of Go, the units are identical, their functions are anonymous and collective. Each is an element of an unsubjective machinic arrangement. They exist not with their internal properties, but only with their state at a certain time. Against the well-defined space of chess, its ordered, predictable functions, and its hierarchical relationship between its individuals, go has a homogeneous slippery space and variable functions according to the spatial conditions of equal individuals.

*"Within their milieu of interiority, chess pieces entertain biunivocal relations with one another, and with the adversary's pieces: their functioning is structural. On the other hand, a Go piece has only a milieu of exteriority, or extrinsic relations with nebulas or constellations, according to which it fulfills functions of insertion or situation, such as bordering, encircling, shattering. All by itself, a Go piece can destroy an entire constellation synchronically; a chess piece cannot (or can do so diachronically only). Chess is indeed a war, but an institutionalized, regulated, coded war, with a front, a rear, battles. But what is proper to Go is war without battle lines, with neither confrontation nor retreat, without battles even: pure strategy, whereas chess is a semiology. Finally, the space is not at all the same: in chess, it is a question of arranging a closed space for oneself, thus of going from one point to another, of occupying the maximum number of squares with the minimum number of pieces. In Go, it is a question of arraying oneself in an open space, of holding space, of maintaining the possibility of springing up at any point: the movement is not from one point to another, but becomes perpetual, without aim or*

---

<sup>77</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, 352.

*destination, without departure or arrival. The "smooth" space of Go, as against the "striated" space of chess. The nomos of Go against the State of chess, nomos against polls. The difference is that chess codes and decodes space, whereas Go proceeds altogether differently, territorializing or deterritorializing it."*<sup>78</sup>

### **2.2.1 Deterritorialization**

Deterritorialization is a concept invented by Deleuze and Guattari. The word with a special meaning does not appear in French dictionaries. The word deterritorialization derives from the French word *territoire*. The concept encompasses much more than a geographical change inherent in place and homeland, a one-way, singular and limited change. In this state, like Bakhtin's concepts, it has spread rapidly in the life of thought, has been used and analyzed in various branches of art from social sciences. Together with the phenomenon of nomadism, it determines the main axis of the political philosophies of Deleuze and Guattari.

*"Sedentary space is striated, by walls, enclosures, and roads between enclosures, while nomad space is smooth, marked only by "traits" that are effaced and displaced with the trajectory. Even the lamellae of the desert slide over each other, producing an inimitable sound. The nomad distributes himself in a smooth space; he occupies, inhabits, holds that space; that is his territorial principle."*<sup>79</sup>

The deterritorialization of the nomad is a dynamic process of becoming that is not fixed in one place. Deterritorialization is always an expression of plurality. The nomad occupies a space, becomes deterritorialized, but becomes territorial again with all the relations there. Space also changes, differentiates, becomes deterritorialized with the nomad, but is not owned by the nomad. In this fluid

---

<sup>78</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, 353.

<sup>79</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, 381.

exchange, every person, every object, every thought, every relationship exists as a becoming rather than a fixed singularity. Becoming destroys the self-other relationship, traverses the space between the two and does not allow integration and fixation. Then the place is abandoned again. Differentiation continues, becoming continues to change and exist. Economy, politics and language are also subject to formation in this field. Lines of flight, each of which is a vector from one place/home to another and from there to another, can continue to form.

### 2.2.3 Line of Flight

As a carrier of deterritorialization, the line of flight makes it possible to create new images, make new connections, and ultimately connect to another line of flight. What emerges never turns into a singular existence, becomings that internally own both escape and evasion are created and transformed and destroyed each time. What is called the line of flight is the minor, the molecular, the flexible, which is put against the major, the molar, the solid by Deleuze and Guattari. The problems that flight lines harbor are also what make them possible. The first problem is the singular character of each line. For them, micro arrangements versus macro are erroneously viewed as symbolic or imaginary. However, the flexible is as real as the rigid. In fact, the reality of the micro precedes the reality of the macro. They are the active carriers of reality.

*“Lines of flight, for their part, never consist in running away from the world but rather in causing runoffs, as when you drill a hole in a pipe; there is no social system that does not leak from all directions, even if it makes its segments increasingly rigid in order to seal the lines of flight. There is nothing imaginary, nothing symbolic, about a line of flight. There is nothing more active than a line of flight, among animals or humans.”<sup>80</sup>*

The second problem is the sequential importance of the lines against each other.

---

<sup>80</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, 204.

Solid lines will be easy to identify because they are stable, non-slippery entities. But the lines of flight involve a constant opposition to each other. They enter and exit the rhizome, the multiple and non-hierarchical structures of knowledge, from different points, the concept that we will explore in the next section. They are never in the same line and in harmony. While a line of flight may displace a being from one rhizome and deterritorialize it in another rhizome, another line may block this path and reterritorialize it where it is. *Supple segmentarity, then, is only a kind of compromise operating by relative deterritorializations and permitting reterritorializations that cause blockages and reversions to the rigid line.*<sup>81</sup>

The third problem is the mutualistic immanence of the lines. Each appears to be different from the other, but it is not always possible to separate them. They exist in each other, one carries the existence of the other, as a result there is an explosion of immanence that is intertwined. *Supple segmentarity continually dismantles the concretions of rigid segmentarity, but everything that it dismantles it reassembles on its own level: micro-Oedipuses, microformations of power, microfascisms.*<sup>81</sup> These reciprocal immanences raise the last and most tedious problem, the specific dangers borne by each line. Within this complex network, lines of flight from one rhizome to another and from one to another, lines that break stable, solid structures, but slippery structures that can solidify again at every point... Despite the promise of happiness it contains, each line of flight is also a door to despair.<sup>82</sup> Everything is always threatened with extinction or meaningless.

#### **2.2.4 Rhizome**

Another concept that Deleuze and Guattari created together is rhizome. Rhizome is actually a botanical term used to describe the stem of underground plants that are noxious, sending new roots and new shoots horizontally from their nodes. In the philosophy of Deleuze and Guattari, on the other hand, rhizome is a search for a

---

<sup>81</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, 205.

<sup>82</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, 206.

suggestion/proposition, a manifesto, a paradigm rather than a pure concept. It was developed against the established tree motif arrangement of the western thought system, that is, the hierarchical order that separates from a trunk and branches. It has been put forward as an alternative to the understanding of thought that accepts the existence of a root and an end point and spreads to all of the reality of the West, from all kinds of disciplines (from botany to biology, from anatomy to gnoseology, from theology to ontology). It can be defined as a thought model that is organized horizontally, based on a very active being rather than a fixed being, on plurality rather than singularity, and what is essential is difference rather than identity.<sup>83</sup> In this model, the multiplicity includes a mobile existence that can be fixed in the subject or object, but does not enter into hierarchical relations, does not provide unity, and does not have integrity. Rhizomes that are not in a detectable, predictable, systematic, homogeneous structure can easily relate to other subjects, other objects, other rhizomes. It can be broken as a result of these relations, but it reproduces from the place where it was broken, changes and differentiates while multiplying.<sup>84</sup> This network of connections allows for creative happenings.

*“There are lines which do not amount to the path of a point, which break free from structure -lines of flight, becomings, without future or past, without memory, which resist the binary machine -woman-becoming which is neither man nor woman, animal-becoming which is neither beast nor man. Non-parallel evolutions, which do not proceed by differentiation, but which leap from one line to another, between completely heterogeneous beings; cracks, imperceptible ruptures, which break the lines even if they resume elsewhere, leaping over significant breaks... The rhizome is all this. Thinking in things, among things - this is producing a rhizome and not a root, producing the line and not the point. Producing population in a desert*

---

<sup>83</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, 18.

<sup>84</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *On The Line*, trans. John Johnston (New York: Autonomedia 1983), 17.

*and not species and genres in a forest.*"<sup>85</sup>

What rhizomes predict is neither uniqueness nor majority. The multitude cannot be reduced to the majority. Because there is no single line that will unite the singularities and reach the same goal and the same result. Multiplicity can only be achieved after a struggle. It cannot exist by itself. Rhizomes are not parallel to each other, overlapping lines connect, limit each other, multiply each other.<sup>86</sup> From this point of view, if a multitude that does not turn into a majority is possible, the concept of minority will have no meaning other than an external, non-immanent definition. Few and many have no axiological value in the philosophy of Deleuze and Guattari. Maybe they turned to literature as a reflection of the network formed by rhizomes or simply as a field where they could study all these concepts they created. Without branching into a minor philosophy and connected by many non-parallel lines, they developed a discourse that was certainly a part of it but could never be reduced to it; minor literature...

### **2.3. WHAT IS MINOR LITERATURE?**

Kafka: For a Minor Literature, published by Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari in France in 1975, is the work that transposes the social and political propositions and philosophical concepts they have put forward into the field of literature. It includes a secondary way, a minor way, of research efforts, of thinking and writing, even living, on Kafka's works. They analyzed the preference of being minor (immanent and critical, not bound by rules and order, but being creative and productive) to major becoming (being a plurality, being a canon) without external destruction, by operating similar pathways from within. This is why they defined minor literature not as the literature of a minor language, but as literature made by a minority in a major language. Their books begin with the chapter on content and expression, and of course this literature is not free from grammar and morphology for analysis, but

---

<sup>85</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, *Dialogues*, 26.

<sup>86</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, 8.

their answer to the question of what is minor literature transcends the boundaries of both disciplines. Just as Bakhtin was in search of a meta-linguistics that he deemed necessary for the analysis of texts throughout his life, words, utterances and discourses in minor literature go beyond literal meanings and enter into social and historical relations. Every relationship, every interaction is seen as an opportunity to displace the established. The existing regulations of the canon are broken, new connections are made from the wreckage and fearlessly pitted against the major. Its fearlessness is not due to his courage, it does not fight the major, nor does it have the desire to become a major, it just wants to turn the major into minor. '*Minor*' no longer designates specific literatures but the revolutionary conditions for every literature within the heart of what is called great (or established) literature.<sup>87</sup> Deleuze and Guattari list three main features of this revolutionary literature as follows; deterritorialization of language, the connection of the individual to a political immediacy, and the collective assembly of enunciation.

### 2.3.1 Deterritorialization of Language

Deterritorialization, which is an important axis for Deleuze and Guattari's political and philosophical thought planes, is also the main feature of minor literature. In minor literature, *language is affected with a high coefficient of deterritorialization.*<sup>88</sup> Deleuze and Guattari illustrate the multi-layered deterritorialization in Kafka's literature by quoting the following sentence that Kafka wrote to his friend Max Brod (1884-1968, German writer and journalist of Jewish origin who wrote his biography after Kafka's death and did not fulfill Kafka's will<sup>89</sup>) : *the impossibility of not writing, the impossibility of writing German, the impossibility of writing differently...* It is important to see the larger

---

<sup>87</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 18.

<sup>88</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 16.

<sup>89</sup> *Dearest Max, My last request: Everything I leave behind me . . . in the way of notebooks, manuscripts, letters, my own and other people's, sketches and so on, is to be burned unread and to the last page, as well as all writings of mine or notes which either you may have or other people, from whom you are to beg them in my name. Letters which are not handed over to you should at least be faithfully burned by those who have them.*

version of the excerpt, to illuminate the authors' analysis, to understand why Prague German is suitable for minor use.

*“Psychoanalysis lays stress on the father-complex and many find the concept intellectually fruitful. In this case I prefer another version, where the issue revolves not around the innocent father but around the father’s Jewishness. Most young Jews who began to write German wanted to leave Jewishness behind them, and their fathers approved of this, but vaguely (this vagueness was what was outrageous to them). But with their posterior legs they were still glued to their father’s Jewishness and with their waving anterior legs they found no new ground. The ensuing despair became their inspiration. An inspiration as honorable as any other, but on closer examination showing certain sad peculiarities. First of all, the product of their despair could not be German literature, though outwardly it seemed to be so. They existed among three impossibilities, which I just happen to call linguistic impossibilities. It is simplest to call them that. But they might also be called something entirely different. These are: The impossibility of not writing, the impossibility of writing German, the impossibility of writing differently.”<sup>90</sup>*

At this point, the first thing Deleuze and Guattari emphasize is national consciousness. Even under pressure, national consciousness passes through literature. Admittedly, the writers did not see it as a war. However, legitimizing the national consciousness as a function of writing was a necessity. This necessity pointed to the impossibility of not writing. But overcoming this necessity by writing in German led to two different deterritorializations coming from opposite directions and intersecting. Not only did Prague Jews lose their Czech homeland, but the Germans, who brought their language as an oppressive minority in the region, their literal language to the point of being artificial, were deterritorializing the German

---

<sup>90</sup> Franz Kafa, *Letters to Friends, Family and Editors*, trans: Richard Winston (London: Oneworld Press, 2011),

population themselves. Jews who wrote in German were part of this minority, but were also ostracized by this oppressive minority, as were the *gypsies who have stolen a German child from its crib*.<sup>91</sup> These were the conditions that allowed the deterritorialization of language. Deleuze and Guattari explored these conditions in the works of a Jewish Czech Kafka who wrote in German, but they also pointed to other contexts, such as works by Blacks in the American language or by Uzbeks in Russian.<sup>92</sup> For them, what makes marginal literature possible, what establishes it from the inside, is the minor use of language, even if it is written in a major language. Deleuze and Guattari write, "*Writing like a dog digging a hole, a rat digging its burrow*."<sup>92</sup> What would have made this possible was not abandoning one's being, undergoing an internal change for what was seen above, or raising one's own being entirely. Being a minor was possible only in one's own conditions of existence, in one's own country mouth, in one's own third world. Whatever one had to find was at one's own point of underdevelopment, one's own desert to seek. They indicate that Kafka had two options before him, either that he would artificially enrich the given book language, German, as the Prague School did. Like them, he would see Zionism as the only political solution and move away from the people, but hopelessly re-territorialized with a rich symbolic language. Or he would discover something new.

*"He will opt for the German language of Prague as it is and in its very poverty. Go always farther in the direction of deterritorialization, to the point of sobriety. Since the language is arid, make it vibrate with a new intensity. Oppose a purely intensive usage of language to all symbolic or even significant or simply signifying usages of it. Arrive at a perfect and unformed expression, a materially intense expression."*<sup>93</sup>

According to Deleuze and Guattari, as a result of this language, which entered into

---

<sup>91</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 17.

<sup>92</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 18.

<sup>93</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 19.

a relationship of deterritorialization in many ways, Kafka became a *narrative machine*. But as we mentioned earlier, minor literature can be fully understood by the conceptual richness of the philosophy behind it. The definition of a *machine* occupies an important place in the philosophy of Deleuze and Guattari. Readings without understanding this specialized usage, that is, by thinking of the machine as a senseless, desireless capitalist toy, will actually cause us to fall in the opposite direction of what is intended to be revealed. In Deleuze and Guattari, the machine is stripped of its technological and instrumental context and pulled into a new ontological plane. The machine is now a power, a power of production, a power of differentiation, with all the molecular connections and capacities it contains.

*“For the machine's diverse registers, there is no univocal subjectivity based on cut, lack or suture, but there are ontologically heterogeneous modes of subjectivity, constellations of incorporeal Universes of reference which take the position of partial enunciators in multiple domains of alterity, or more precisely, domains of alterification.”<sup>94</sup>*

In this new ontology, machines neither recognize nor define any major feature. Major structures, inflexible rigid molar structure, are not the source of production and power. It is the lower-level, molecular relationships that bring the machine to life. Each of the molecular connections is the door to difference from the machine world, to be different, to think minor, to write minor, and finally to a minor becoming. What enables minor literature is to be able to turn into a non-instrumental expression machine. Language gets rid of its imaginary, abstract connections, goes down to the ground, to the bottom, and uses all the capacity of being minor, that is, all kinds of deterritorialization. It follows the lines of flight in the concrete and living form of the language. This follow-up extends to the tongue and coincides with all its functions.

*“Rich or poor, each language always implies a deterritorialization of the*

---

<sup>94</sup> Félix Guattari, *Chaosmosis*, trans. Paul Bains (Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1992), 45.

*mouth, the tongue, and the teeth. The mouth, tongue, and teeth find their primitive territoriality in food. In giving themselves over to the articulation of sounds, the mouth, tongue, and teeth deterritorialize. Thus, there is a certain disjunction between eating and speaking, and even more, despite all appearances, between eating and writing. Undoubtedly, one can write while eating more easily than one can speak while eating, but writing goes further in transforming words into things capable of competing with food.”<sup>95</sup>*

At first glance, this narrative may seem symbolic. But it actually shows the dual working possibilities of the language that is, that is, the concrete and physical possibilities of deterritorialization and reterritorialization. The tongue ceases to be a sense organ of digestion, becomes the carrier of meaning. “Meaning” is literally just the naming of sounds. What happens here is not just a spiritual reterritorialization, thought becomes sound. Meaning becomes not only a component of language, but also a component of utterance subject integrated with sound. Meaning undergoes a physical reterritorialization. But the homeland of the tongue is digestion. This is reflected in Kafka's texts with the separation in content and expression. Fasting is a theme often brought up in Kafka. *To speak, and above all to write, is to fast.*<sup>95</sup>

### **2.3.2 The Connection of the Individual to a Political Immediacy**

In major literature, the space is quite wide. In this large space, the communal area is used as a decor. It is individual problems that are actually staged, social relations run in the background, and none of them are indispensable or necessary. Things change in minor literature. Space shrinks and narrows. It is impossible for the individual not to touch the social, the political. Moreover, the narrow space creates a magnifying glass effect, even a small contact is enlarged, the relationships that are overlooked/ignored in major literature will inevitably come to the fore here.

---

<sup>95</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 20.

*“There is universal delight in the literary treatment of petty themes whose scope is not permitted to exceed the capacity of small enthusiasms and which are sustained by their polemical possibilities. Insults, intended as literature, roll back and forth. What in great literature goes on down below, constituting a not indispensable cellar of the structure, here takes place in the full light of day, what is there a matter of passing interest for a few, here absorbs everyone no less than as a matter of life and death.”<sup>96</sup>*

It is misleading to see Kafka as a solitary writer in his room. He actually has what brings him politics even in his room, a pair of poles from which he can constantly create new lines of flight. The resulting current causes a productive activity in the Kafka machine. At one end of the pole are the real arrangements to which Kafka connects. Kafka is always tied to bureaucracy, state mechanisms, socialism, anarchism, social movements. But at the other end of the pole is his writing, such that the Kafka text embodies its own-micro-politics above laws and regimes. What his texts prioritize is the coexistence of enunciation and desire. Enunciation is always historical, political and social. This is exactly what happens in minor literature. It is the meeting of enunciation with micro-politics by opposing all established mechanisms (regime politically or bureaucracy as the source of oppression). The meeting of micro-politics with desire. For Deleuze and Guattari, desire is an important part of the social subconscious, and unless we see desire from their perspective, it will be difficult to understand how the individual can escape from established politics and build its own micro-politics in minor literature. In the framework of a minor becoming, desire opposes the ontology of "is" that produces the metaphysics of presence. It presents the ontology of "and" and enables creative connections.

*“The real empiricist world is thereby laid out for the first time to the fullest: it is a world of exteriority, a world in which thought itself exists in a fundamental relationship with the Outside, a world in which terms are*

---

<sup>96</sup> Franz Kafka, *The Diaries of Franz Kafka*, trans: Joseph Kresh (London: Secker & Warbur, 1948), 194.

*veritable atoms and relations veritable external passages; a world in which the conjunction "and" dethrones the interiority of the verb "is"; a harlequin world of multicolored patterns and non-totalizable fragments where communication takes place through external relations.*"<sup>97</sup>

The politics of desire traces the lines of flight between the established thoughts and images of the representation world, focusing on the moving and slippery ground between subjects and objects, not solid blocks. It should not be considered with the verb "is", which is a metaphysics of being, but with the conjunction "and", which is a revolutionary philosophy. The politics of desire operates in a smooth, slippery geography that lacks hierarchical organization. He looks for molecular and minor forms of subjectivity rather than molar and major forms of subjectivity. Desire and politics develop a machinic bond that multiplies and produces with the conjunction "and" in a minor occurrence; seeks the doors of new concepts and new ways of thinking to the subjects. It does all this without falling into the trap of being a major, without building its own fascist machine, not by reconciliation, not with the plurality, but along non-parallel, intersecting and conflicting lines along rhizomes.

### **2.3.3 The Collective Assembly of Enunciation**

In being minor, everything has a collective value, not just the enunciation. Because otherwise it is not possible. Living on slippery ground, in a narrow space, requires a joint effort, even if individuals disagree. In the broad area of the major, the collective consciousness is dispersed, the national consciousness is diluted, the great masters of the great literatures take the stage and pass on their individualized enunciations. There are no masters in the minor field, but minor literature, which positively assumes the collective political and revolutionary function of enunciation.<sup>98</sup> Although Kafka initially thought of traditional subject categories (author and hero, narrator and person, dreamer and dreamed), he eventually rejected the master literature and switched to collective pluralism. Instead of the subject, it

---

<sup>97</sup> Gilles Deleuze, *Pure Immanence: Essays on A Life*, trans: Anne Boyman (New York: Zone Books, 2001), 38.

gives place to collective enunciation arrangements that promise what is not given outside, and which will prepare the revolutionary conditions for literature.

*“Kafka's solitude opens him up to everything going on in history today. The letter K no longer designates a narrator or a character but an assemblage that becomes all the more machine-like, an agent that becomes all the more collective because an individual is locked into it in his or her solitude (it is only in connection to a subject that something individual would be separable from the collective and would lead its own life).”<sup>98</sup>*

Kafka often includes in his narratives the characters (such as servants and low-ranking officials) who transform and deterritorialize the bureaucracy the most when they are involved. The language of these quiet and obedient people who do not hesitate to do what is expected of them is neither meaningful nor reflective of Kafka's formality, but they have what he desires, the possibility of being part of a common arrangement without being the subject of enunciation.

*“(…)it is that sound born of silence, which Kafka looked for everywhere, where the utterance is already part of a collective assemblage, a collective complaint, without a subject of enunciation that hides itself or deforms. A pure, moving material of expression. From this comes their quality as minor characters, all the more open to treatment by literary creation.”<sup>99</sup>*

So how did Kafka invent this writing machine, the collective enunciation? How did he combine the arrangement of social desire and the arrangement of collective enunciation in the same mechanical arrangement? The answer to these questions is that he is on the border. At the border of the old and the new bureaucracy, where the technical machine and the legal utterance articulate. He experiences what is on the borderline, melting them all in the same pot so that they can be part of a single arrangement. The fact that he is intertwined with work accidents, the safety of

---

<sup>98</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 17-18.

<sup>99</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 65.

machines, boss-worker conflicts, that is, with the technical machine, enables he to find the content, the content form that corresponds to the whole social field. His legal existence, his legal utterance, spreads to all other utterances and becomes a valid form of expression for all of them. *What is essential in Kafka is that machine, statement, and desire form part of one and the same assemblage that gives the novel its unlimited motor force and its objects.*<sup>100</sup> In our opinion, this is the key to minor writing, collective enunciation is only possible when the writing machine integrates with social desire. In order to write in minor, it is necessary to be on the border like Kafka, not a master.

#### **2.4.1. Kafka: An Expression Machine**

Deleuze and Guattari define the expression machine as an action capable of disrupting original forms and content patterns to release pure content.<sup>101</sup> According to them, content forms and forms of expression turn into a single item by condensing for a single narrative, a single substance. Pure contents can only be revealed by the expression machine. In literature, which they see as established or major, this concentration takes place vectorially from content to expression. What the major does is to find the appropriate form of expression for the content form taken as data. *That which conceptualizes well expresses itself.*<sup>101</sup> But in minor literature the vector is in the opposite direction of this operation. Revolutionary literature first utters. It sees and designs behind the enunciation.

*“Expression must break forms, encourage ruptures and new sproutings. When a form is broken, one must reconstruct the content that will necessarily be part of a rupture in the order of things. To take over, to anticipate, the material.”<sup>101</sup>*

In this context, Deleuze and Guattari analyzed Kafka's texts as different components of expression at three levels. Undoubtedly, as a result of this

---

<sup>100</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 83.

<sup>101</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 28.

examination, an outline of minor literature does not emerge. It is an analysis of a literature that only reveals a minor narrative. The clustering of texts in Kafka, the arrangement of each cluster with different expression and content styles, and the creation of a network of connections between them made his narrative unique. This original narrative has turned into a literary theory for minor thought, with a whole corpus reading by Deleuze and Guattari. It would be misleading to think that this is an outline for those who want to write a minor. Every writer or every subject who wants to speak must contact the major from his own juridical, political and bureaucratic (or his own axiological with a Bakhtinian vocabulary) position and his own rhizome if he wants to construct a minor narrative. He should create its own unique narrative components with the escape possibilities unique to that moment in history. We will present these three layers to complete our analysis and to make our comparisons clearer in the third section.

In Kafka, letters form the first component of the expression. According to Deleuze and Guattari, it is clear that the purpose of writing the letters was not their publication.<sup>102</sup> They follow the urge, the desire to write letters in Kafka, and emphasize the importance of the relation of these texts with the whole, which came out of a literary machine, even if it was not intended to be published. Letters have functions in Kafka, such that letters that turn into *a rhizome, a network, a spider's web* create lines of flight for Kafka (like deterritorializing love and replacing the contract of marriage with letters), nourishing him, bringing him the blood he needs.<sup>103</sup> The first function that provides him with this *diabolical use* of literature is the duality of the subject: the separation of the subject of enunciation that writes the letter and the a subject of the statement that the letter refers to.<sup>103</sup> The possibilities of this duality on the enunciation subject promise him a minor becoming, and the letter turns into a letter of desire as a genre in the minor expression.

---

<sup>102</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 29.

<sup>103</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 30.

*“Given their generic nature, the desire of the letters thus consists of the following: it transfers movement onto the subject of the statement; it gives the subject of the statement an apparent movement, an unreal movement, that spares the subject of enunciation all need for a real movement.”<sup>104</sup>*

The second function of this desire is to reveal the *topography of obstacles* while the deepest horrors of subject of enunciation are transferred to subject of the statement. Subject of enunciation is blocked because it has no movement and cannot take responsibility for what is revealed. Even if the subject of the statement struggles with his life for the desire entrusted to him, the deepest horror will always remain an external obstacle. But his effort will be a token of his innocence. In this topography, there is a triple (subject of enunciation, subject of the statement and receiver) innocence. According to Deleuze and Guattari, this is the method that succeeds; that everyone is innocent. It's worse for everyone to be innocent.

*“The "Letter to the Father" is the exorcism of Oedipus and the family by the writing machine, just as the letters to Felice are the exorcism of conjugality. To make a map of Thebes instead of performing Sophocles, to make a topography of obstacles instead of fighting against destiny (to substitute a destined addressee for destiny).”<sup>105</sup>*

With this content and form of expression, letters are part of a whole expression machine. This unity is not because they are the source of some themes. They can even be part of the machine, even if they are non-work. The important thing is to know and accept that they all belong to the writing. Already this natural form of correspondence could become a part of artistic prose as a genre. Heteroglossia, which Bakhtin states as an inherent genre characteristic of the novel, also provides

---

<sup>104</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 31.

<sup>105</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 32.

these possibilities. As a result of this immanence; *Extraliterary utterances and their boundaries (rejoinders, letters, diaries, inner speech, and so forth) transferred into a literary work (for example, into a novel). Here their total sense changes.*<sup>106</sup>

The second component of expression in Kafka is stories. The dual arrangement of the subject presented by the letters constitutes a rhizome for the expression but does not offer a line of flight. On the contrary, it carries the danger of imprisoning the triple structure, the enunciation subject, the utterance subject and the receiver, into the expression. The plane on which escape possibilities are created in Kafka's texts is stories. Although not in all stories, the animal is the perfect escape object in the stories; *to try to find a way out, to trace a line of escape.*<sup>107</sup> The endless stream of letters carries the blood that gives the expression machine the power to act. Becoming-animal is the deterritorialization of man. Deleuze and Guattari claim that there is no metaphor, symbolism or allegory in animal becoming. Transformation is not an area of freedom obtained as a result of a search. Nor is it an attempt to attack what exists. It is just an exit, a non-representational exit, a living line of escape.

*“It is a creative line of escape that says nothing other than what it is. In contrast to the letters, the becoming-animal lets nothing remain of the duality of a subject of enunciation and a subject of the statement; rather, it constitutes a single process, a unique method that replaces subjectivity.”*<sup>108</sup>

Whatever its literary success, there are two poles to which animal becomings are doomed to incapacity as a machine of expression. The novel, which is the last component of the expression in Kafka, is one of these poles. The first pole is the perfect design and ending of the story. This will lead them to the same danger as the letters, to self-concealment. Just as at the border of the letter is the retreat of the

---

<sup>106</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, 114.

<sup>107</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 34.

<sup>108</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 36.

subject of enunciation, at the border of the stories is the deadlock of becoming-animal, of a line of escape. At the end of the story, everything deterritorialized desperately encounters an anthropocentric becoming again.

*“In short, the animalist stories are a component of the machine of expression, but distinct from the letters, since they no longer operate within a superficial movement or within the distinction of two subjects. Grasping the real, writing themselves within the real itself, they are caught up in the tension between two opposing poles or realities. The becoming-animal effectively shows a way out, traces a line of escape but is incapable of following it or making it its own.”<sup>109</sup>*

The other pole that stories can reach is to turn into a novel. An endless novel that opens up to something else that can be continuously improved. Yet the novels, the last component of Kafka's expression machine, made little reference to animals. The negative pole of animal becoming has been neutralized, and the positive pole has migrated to another place. The attachments, the branchings, which the animal-becoming does not have enough are abandoned. It migrates to a machine, an arrangement. This is what distinguishes Kafka's novel from the genres of novels that directly or symbolically incorporate the modern world, the mechanisms of bureaucracy into a romantic expression, which we would encounter in the realistic or idealistic Prague School.<sup>110</sup>

*“The machine is no longer mechanical and reified; instead, it is incarnated in very complicated social assemblages that, through the employment of human personnel, through the use of human parts and cogs, realize effects of inhuman violence and desire that are infinitely stronger than those one can obtain with animals or with isolated mechanisms.”<sup>110</sup>*

---

<sup>109</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 37.

<sup>110</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 38-39.

### 2.4.2. Assemblage

The concept of assemblage occupies a privileged place in Deleuze and Guattari's literary theory and is given as a genre feature for the novel. The assemblage is a novel object with two different faces, the collective assemblage of utterance and the mechanical assemblage of desire. Minor literature is concerned with separating these two faces. According to them, the first person to achieve this was Kafka. The machine, as a concept, enters the field of literature after making considerable progress in the philosophy of both Deleuze and Guattari. The link between technique and philosophy also has a long history. Guattari explains the purpose of the technique by quoting Aristotle; *goal of techne was to create what nature found impossible to accomplish*.<sup>111</sup> According to Deleuze and Guattari, the machine is a material flow.<sup>112</sup> It is the potential and visible state of desire in this continuum. Despite interruptions, it is life itself. In this respect, the concept of machine is not a metaphor in their philosophy. Life is full of machines that produce desire. Connections between machines are existential properties of machines. There is no machine that does not connect with another machine. In this broader context, the body is a machine, and so are social groups. Life and the world are full of theory and knowledge machines.<sup>113</sup> They are all part of the social assemblage. The novel is all about the assemblage of these machines. The technical machine, the juridical machine, the bureaucratic machine are in fact the mechanical organization of desire, all interconnected.<sup>114</sup>

*“There is no machinic assemblage that is not a social assemblage of desire, no social assemblage of desire that is not a collective assemblage of enunciation.”<sup>114</sup>*

What makes Kafka's novel important is its ability to reduce the integrated,

---

<sup>111</sup> Félix Guattari, *Chaosmosis*, 33.

<sup>112</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Capitalism and Schizophrenia: AntiOedipus*, trans. Robert Hurley (London: Continuum, 2008), 38.

<sup>113</sup> Félix Guattari, *Chaosmosis*, 39.

<sup>114</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 82.

indistinguishable utterance and desire onto a single plane. Statement, desire and machine all descend on the same plane, which is what gives the novel its subject and motivation. But Kafka is not concerned with the establishment of machinic assemblages as novel objects. The value of regulation does not lie in the fact that it is an abstract or mysterious machine. It is not caused by the fact that it is a mechanism that has been established or has lost its function. The assemblage gains its value from the *dismantling (démontage)* it performs either directly on the machine or simply on the representation.<sup>115</sup>



---

<sup>115</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 48.

### THIRD CHAPTER

#### A BAKHTINIAN ANALYSIS OF MINOR LITERATURE

##### 3.1 CHRONOTOPE FEATURES OF MINOR LITERATURE

Chronotope is perhaps the most difficult concept in Bakhtin's theory to reduce to the formal, social or cultural area. We will also evaluate this formally constitutive concept for minor literature in the text before investigating the social and political relevances for our analysis. According to Bakhtin, *art and literature are shot through with chronotopic values of varying degree and scope*.<sup>116</sup> He also named these chronotope values with different degrees and scopes as different chronotopes and analyzed them. Encounter, road, hall, castle, threshold are some of these chronotopes. Only their naming makes you feel the formal intensity of the concept. But of course, these chronotopes are not just formal intensities, they each have different meanings for the narrative. Chronotopes organize narratives centrally and give the novel its formal character as a genre. Narrative knots are tied and unified at these chronotope centers.<sup>117</sup> Chronotopes also have an epistemological value. In addition to being the founding actor of the form, it also provides the opportunity to convey an event within the narrative. The event becomes concrete, materializes and turns into knowledge in the chronotopic field. The transformation of the event into knowledge depends on its ability to be represented. The chronotopes in the narratives provide the necessary background for this representation. Spatial field alone is not sufficient for representation without establishing a chronotope. However, if it concentrates in time, it finds the opportunity to represent.

*“Thus the chronotope, functioning as the primary means for materializing time in space, emerges as a center for concretizing representation, as a force giving body to the entire novel. All the novel's abstract elements—philosophical and social generalizations, ideas, analyses of cause and effect—gravitate toward the chronotope and through it take on flesh and*

---

<sup>116</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 243.

*blood, permitting the imaging power of art to do its work. Such is the representational significance of the chronotope.”<sup>117</sup>*

Bakhtin studied the major chronotopes, mainly the most common and basic chronotopes in literature. But he did not claim that these are solid, unchanging, terminated motifs. On the contrary, he stated that any chronotope in a narrative can contain an unlimited number of small chronotopes, and that any motif can only have a chronotope of its own.<sup>118</sup> In this direction, we will analyze the formal and constitutive features of the chronotope area in which minor literature and minor narrative take place. We will name the chronotope that is the subject of our analysis as the minor chronotope, and we will first highlight its distinctive feature from all chronotopes described by Bakhtin. In Bakhtin's chronotopes, the constitutive feature of space first appears with a naming. A road, a room, a building, a threshold... Space is included in the narrative with its social and historical heterogeneity, or in other words, it embodies the social and historical heterogeneity in the narrative. It incorporates the set of values that constitute the event in its own territory into the narrative. The minor space, on the other hand, draws the same event that would take place in any other space into its own meaning, its axiological position. No matter how high the narrative, how wide or major, the minor chronotope lowers and narrows the space. Contraction is only possible with unconditional change and transformation. All subjects and objects included in the minor space participate in this transformation. In a minor space, none of them can exist unchanged. So, we can say that the two most important features of space in the minor chronotope are contraction and transformation. In the contracting and transforming space, nothing can be overlooked anymore. A detail that seems unimportant in the major space turns into a matter of life and death in the minor space. Space becomes smaller, but relationships grow. Then we can talk about the

---

<sup>117</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 250.

<sup>118</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 252.

magnifying effect as a third feature of the space in this chronotope. Abstract relationships that remain in the background in a large space become visible in the minor space and are caught in the magnifying lens.

Minor narration creates a chronotope in which temporality does not weigh as much in the text as the determination of space. Historical, biographical and ordinary time is visible in the narrative without entering into a hierarchical relationship. Here, we would like to highlight two features of minor literature related to content and form, which, although not counted among the main features, strengthen the revolutionary character of the space with a temporal arrangement: acceleration of movement and proliferation of series. Minor narration creates a chronotope in which temporality does not weigh as much in the text as the determination of space. Historical, biographical and ordinary time is visible in the narrative without entering into a hierarchical relationship. Here, we would like to highlight two features of minor literature related to content and form, which, although not counted among the main features, strengthen the revolutionary character of the space with a temporal arrangement: acceleration of movement and proliferation of series. Acceleration of movement, according to Deleuze and Guattari, provides a mechanism of dismantling that replaces criticism in Kafka's works. Kafka was not concerned with the mechanisms that make up social arrangements, connect the parts. Instead, he maintains relations and movements in the social sphere. He accelerates them and allows to dissolve.

*“The assemblage appears not in a still encoded and territorial criticism but in a decoding, in a deterritorialization, and in the novelistic acceleration of this decoding and this deterritorialization.”<sup>119</sup>*

Double and triple series are established and proliferated rapidly. Series are groups of familial or bureaucratic subjects. They get involved in the movement, transform,

---

<sup>119</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 48.

mix and multiply without allowing the narrative to be fixed. This complex narrative form is not without purpose. Without turning into a completely representative narrative, double and triple series enter into oppositional relations with each other, try to penetrate each other, and show that some possibilities remain blocked.

*“By making triangles transform until they become unlimited, by proliferating doubles until they become indefinite, Kafka opens up a field of immanence that will function as a dismantling, an analysis, a prognostics of social forces and currents, of the forces that in his epoch are only beginning to knock on the door (literature has a sense only if the machine of expression precedes and anticipates contents).”<sup>120</sup>*

It is seen that the contact, interconnection and conflict of concrete and social relations at all levels, which cannot be confined to a representative space or abstract planes, turns into an immanent character of the minor narrative. Proliferation and acceleration form the temporal axis of this character. All these possibilities build the most important feature of the minor chronotope: individual events are always structured together with social relations. In this way, the individual is connected to the political in every cell. In fact, the individual's gaining a collective character and each contact turning into a political cycle are among the dominant features of minor literature, which we will focus on in the next chapters.

### **3.2. AGAINST THE CANON: HETEROGLOSSIA AND THE DETERRITORIALIZATION OF LANGUAGE**

Canon is a word that has a long adventure and its roots go back to Semitic languages<sup>121</sup>. This long adventure deepened the meaning of the word, moved it from concrete areas to abstract areas, and engraved it in the memory of the society. The axis of the meaning of the word is its usage in Hebrew and Greek. When the word

---

<sup>120</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 55.

<sup>121</sup> It means “qāneh” in Hebrew, “qanu” in Assyrian, “qn” in Ugaritic, “qanja” in Aramaic, “gin” in Sumerian.

denoting a stick<sup>122</sup> used for measure in Hebrew is translated into Greek, it gains the meanings of measure, rule, law. These two meanings are inextricably linked<sup>123</sup> and throughout its adventure, it diversifies and enriches by being used in different languages in different disciplines from architecture to sculpture, from music to philosophy. In time, the instrumental meaning of the concept of canon remained in the background, and its normative meaning came to the fore, especially after it was widely used by the Church to indicate basic principles and laws.<sup>124</sup> In the end, it turned into a social consensus, a voluntary acceptance that had power over those *who accepted its verdict*.<sup>125</sup> In literature, rules on the basis of a genre accepted and socially approved within the framework of a certain thought, and as a whole of works on the basis of an individual author. In our study, we will use the term canon, which transforms from a concrete state of existence into a normative criterion and extends from religion to art, literature and society, in three meaning axis. The first axis of meaning is the characteristics of each genre that have established themselves in the field of literature and are assumed to be unchangeable; the second axis of meaning, an effort by the forces trying to centralize power to make the hierarchical order dominate in literature, to immobilize genre and language; The third axis of meaning is the function and desire to be a major, to be dominant, to be in power, to be a mainstream in all kinds of social, political and artistic ways. If this can be evaluated from a broad perspective, it will be seen more clearly that the main goal of Bakhtin's theory of the novel and Deleuze and Guattari's minor literature is the same, and that the constructed theory is not just a matter of grammar, morphology, and simple semantics. They almost present their theory as a Marxian approach that explores the relations of production on which the juridical and political order rises. They built their theory on the effort to analyze and identify the infrastructure that determines the relationships that make up literature (text in a narrow frame, artistic

---

<sup>122</sup>Gregory Jusdanis, *Belated Modernity and Aesthetic Culture* (Minneapolis:University of Minnesota Press,1991), 53.

<sup>123</sup> Jan Assmann,*Cultural Memory and Early Civilization Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination* (Cambridge:Cambridge University Press,2011),103-104.

<sup>124</sup> Jan Assmann,*Cultural Memory and Early Civilization Writing*,106.

<sup>125</sup>Gregory Jusdanis, *Belated Modernity and Aesthetic Culture*, 55.

prose in a narrower frame).

In its most comprehensive definition, heteroglossia is the stratification of all styles and all types of speech in a national language. From this point of view, it is the situation where the subject is surrounded by countless answers that he can give no matter where he is. The world is a purely informal conglomerate of humming languages, each with its own distinctive markers.<sup>126</sup> In this moving and living mass, stratification cannot take place on an inert plane. Each layer is formed as a result of mutual conflicts. As we mentioned in the first chapter, heteroglossia has been integrated with the novel genre as a result of its own special development process in Bakhtin's theory, but heteroglossia can be mentioned in every situation where language exists. Language has a two-way flow of power. One direction is towards unitary language. The unitary language is central, representing a non-stratified national language. The other direction is outward from this center. Language becomes stratified as it moves away from the centre. This is the region where language is socially and historically determined. But no flow is one-way and static. Every utterance has both tendencies, and the meaning is determined by a dynamic process, with a bidirectional flow.

*“Such is the fleeting language of a day, of an epoch, a social group, a genre, a school and so forth. It is possible to give a concrete and detailed analysis of any utterance, once having exposed it as a contradiction-ridden, tension-filled unity of two embattled tendencies in the life of language.”<sup>127</sup>*

Within the scope of our thesis, we consider minor literature as one of the possibilities mentioned by Bakhtin above. It is such a possibility that these two tendencies of the language contain dynamics that liberate the utterance from the unitary discourse that decentralizes it and confines the meaning to monological relations. The direction of dynamic vectors is compatible with heteroglossia. Both

---

<sup>126</sup> Michael Holquist, *Dialogism: Bakhtin and his World* (London: Routledge, 2002), 67.

<sup>127</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 272.

activate centrifugal forces in the language. The reason for the existence of heteroglossia in the genre of novel is to ensure that the novel takes place against the canonized genres that serve the unitary language. To enable it to lead to change and the future as a non-canonical genre. In the same direction, the reason for the existence of minor literature is to liberate the utterance from the monopoly of the national language, the major and the politically dominant, and to reveal its revolutionary capacity by re-establishing literature with the major language but with minor relations.

Deterritorialization is not a concept that Deleuze and Guattari created for minor literature or just language. The concept that emerged in the struggle of the state apparatus as an apparatus of capture in the establishment of the space and the nomadic thought as a war machine later expanded in a way that could not be reduced to space, place, and homeland. It expresses a common attitude towards all code systems that are formed in a transcendental structure, fix meaning and restrict movement. In this context, it takes a position against structuralism, transcendental philosophies, psychoanalysis, classical linguistics and semiotics. Deterritorialization as an act is the breaking of signs and codes from their hierarchical order in established Western thought and putting them into new relations through rhizomes. Every act, every concept, every word, every utterance, whose ties are cut and separated from its fixed meaning, moves away from its fixed meaning, follows the lines of escape and gains new meanings in new rhizomes. It establishes new ties and makes a home again. This reterritorialization does not gain a transcendental unity in the code system in the sense. On the contrary, this process is constantly repeated and internal meanings and codes multiply by differentiation. If we can look at it from this perspective, every act of deterritorialization results in the acquisition of a new place, but at the same time it is the deterritorialization of this new place (the occupied place). Therefore, deterritorialization as a form of action is a process in which the production of meanings and values is at the forefront. There is no repetition of the same-identity in this production process. What is produced is the production of continuous rotation, which is the repetition

of difference in itself. This broad and deep concept can be put against capitalist logic and capitalist development processes as a real production model without ideology<sup>128</sup>, or it can be reduced to language as in minor literature. This perspective can enable us to see the possibility of counter-movement inherent in the deterritorialization of language. All major uses of language can have their fair share of countermovement. Folk dialect, street language can be put in front of a high-pitched and artistic discourse. Grammar provision can be suspended, syntax can be rearranged. Uppercase letters can be replaced by lowercase letters, and lowercase letters can be replaced by uppercase letters. Even the slightest opportunity cannot be missed, all the possibilities of the major can be used against the major. *Writing like a dog digging a hole, a rat digging its burrow.*<sup>129</sup> Minor writing is not just a minority issue. It is alienation in its own unitary language, in its major language, in the canon of a genre, in its own place. *That's why there is nothing that is major or revolutionary except the minor.*<sup>130</sup>

*“Even when it is unique, a language remains a mixture, a schizophrenic melange, a Harlequin costume in which very different functions of language and distinct centers of power are played out, blurring what can be said and what can't be said; one function will be played off against the other, all the degrees of territoriality and relative deterritorialization will be played out. Even when major, a language is open to an intensive utilization that makes it take flight along creative lines of escape which, no matter how slowly, no matter how cautiously, can now form an absolute deterritorialization. All this inventiveness, not only lexically, since the lexical matters little, but sober syntactical invention, simply to write like a dog.”*<sup>130</sup>

---

<sup>128</sup> Felix Guattari and Antonio Negri, *Communists Like Us*, trans. Michael Ryan (New York: Autonomedia, 1990) 20-23.

<sup>129</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 18.

<sup>130</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 26

### 3.3. THE PATH TO THE POLITICIZATION OF EVERYTHING: DIALOGISM

It is an important feature of minor literature that everything is political, that the individual is linked directly to the political, without turning around, hiding it in the background. As an indicator of this; In Kafka's texts, family relations are linked to commercial, bureaucratic and juridical relations, and even father-son conflict takes place as part of a political program, not an *oedipal phantasma*.<sup>131</sup> Deleuze and Guattari attributed this to space, the narrow space of minor literature. We have mentioned that the arrangement of space has always played a dominant role in their philosophy. Opposite the scaled, rough, solid space of the state, apparatus of capture, they put the smooth and slippery space of the nomads, the apparatus of war. A rough space possesses, encourages and stabilizes possession. It fixes not only the subject and objects, but also all kinds of relations and distributions between the signifier and the sign. Being is reduced to taking place in time and space. In slippery space, on the other hand, existence is handled together with change, interaction and productivity and turns into becoming. The major field in literature is the space of the apparatus of capture. Undoubtedly, the narrative of major literature is also exhibited in the social and political sphere. But only as a background. The story circulates from the right to the left of the political, it does not change even if it comes into contact, the main thing is again individual problems and they continue their existence in this relationship in a solid state. The place where this is impossible is the space of minor literature. Smooth, slippery and tight... The slightest contact cannot be overlooked, it is full of danger and movement, becomings are quickly connected. It would be useful to see the social content of politics in Deleuze and Guattari before discussing the political capacity of interaction/communication possibilities, which is a result of this narrow and slippery space, together with Bakhtin's concept of dialogism.

There are many points in Deleuze and Guattari's system of thought where political

---

<sup>131</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 17.

concepts do not agree with those in Anglo-American political theory. Concepts of power and freedom can serve as examples for these points. In Deleuze and Guattari, the understanding of power is closer to the idea of the capacity to act directly, rather than a normative concept that negatively affects the capacity of others to act. Concepts of freedom, on the other hand, cannot be explained by both negative or positive ideas of freedom. In them, freedom appears as a concept close to Nietzsche's ideal of self-transcendence.<sup>132</sup> Analyzing the political thought of Deleuze and Guattari is, of course, a thesis in itself. We just want to underline that in their social theories and analyzes of individual subjectivity, they hold a political view that privileges creative processes of transformation and lines of flight in which individuals or groups are transformed into something different from what they were before, rather than attributions to issues such as notions of contract or consent, individual freedom or autonomy. Perhaps in this way, we can consider Deleuze and Guattari's propositions that "everything is political" and "politics precedes existence" as an extension of Marx's handling of revolutionary politics on a social level rather than a purely political content.<sup>133,134</sup> They argued that if contemporary politics are to be a meaningful central axis, it must be desire, not power. Before publishing *Anti-Oedipus*, Deleuze argued in an interview with Foucault that the manifestations and workings of power are self-evident. According to him, it was necessary to focus on problems of desire rather than power. What was not clear was why we collectively tolerated these reflections of power.<sup>135</sup> In this context, Deleuze and Guattari were concerned not with the legitimacy of power, but with changes in the realm of self and the other, in ways in which society differs or divides so much from the relations and possibilities that hold it together. They made the politics of lines, moving slippery processes, desire, not dots, static solidity, power.

---

<sup>132</sup> Paul Patton, *Deleuze and the Political* (London: Routledge, 2000), 2.

<sup>133</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, 203-213.

<sup>134</sup> Karl Marx and F. Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (Beijing: Foreign Languages Press, 1973), 12.

<sup>135</sup> Nicholas Thoburn and Ian Buchanan, *Deleuze and Politics* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008), 14.

So, what position did politics occupy in Bakhtin's philosophy and literary theory? When he said that verbal discourse is a social phenomenon, and that all its components, from the image of the sound to the abstract meaning, are social from top to bottom,<sup>136</sup> was he only seeking a middle way that would combine stylistic and ideological approaches to literature, or was he after a political escape line that would open stylistics to society? The answer to these questions is hidden in Bakhtin's perspective on language. What Bakhtin insisted upon was the concrete character of language. He did not see language as a system of abstract grammatical categories.

*“We are taking language not as a system of abstract grammatical categories, but rather language conceived as ideologically saturated, language as a world view, even as a concrete opinion, insuring a maximum of mutual understanding in all spheres of ideological life. Thus a unitary language gives expression to forces working toward concrete verbal and ideological unification and centralization, which develop in vital connection with the processes of sociopolitical and cultural centralization.”<sup>137</sup>*

Thus, we have determined our first common point in the relationship of minor literature and Bakhtin's literary theory with politics. Both embrace a concrete and practice-based understanding of both language and politics. Neither the contact of the individual with the social sphere through language nor the contact with the political sphere through space arises from abstract, completed and immobile relations. Every contact takes place actively in the social and political sphere and is open-ended, reciprocal. Every meaning is produced as a result of the axiological positions of the agent and society, worldviews and dialogic relations of self and other.

We know that the term dialogism (and monologism) was used by Georg

---

<sup>136</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 259.

<sup>137</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 271.

Lukacs before Bakhtin. But its use had a rather limited depth. In a passage in which he examines tragic and dramatic loneliness, he states that tragic loneliness is absolute and monological, whereas in dramatic narrative form, loneliness is dialogic. As a result of these dialogues, spiritual union takes place between solitudes and becomes deeper, more emphatic and more complex than absolute loneliness.<sup>138</sup> However, in Bakhtin, dialogism is a basic concept that is in close contact with truth, knowledge and historicity. A sentence or, with a more functional definition, a proposition is formed with grammatical possibilities and turns into an utterance with its semantic relationship with its referents. But discourse is constituted only by the expression of the axiological position of the enunciation subject. More importantly, it is established as a result of an open-ended and multi-faceted interaction (dialogue) process in which the subject enters with other possible axiological positions. Dialogue can only be possible with the historically determined sign-referential relations at a certain point of the truth. If it is necessary to express these terms in draft form in order to make the distinction between utterance/statement, enunciation and discourse clearer; Enunciation is a production process and as a result of its activity, language turns into discourse. Utterance is an intermediate product of the language phenomenon in this production process. Language is a resource that provides some possibilities to the speaker/author/subject before utterance, but after utterance it turns into the discourse of the speaker/author/subject. To see how meaning is conveyed in discourse, we can look at Roland Barthes's statement in *Fragments of a Love Discourse*.

*“In the manner of what happens in singing, in the proffering of I-love-you, desire is neither repressed (as in what is uttered) nor recognized (where we did not expect it: as in the uttering itself) but simply: released, as an orgasm. Orgasm is not spoken, but it speaks and it says: I-love-you.”*<sup>139</sup>

---

<sup>138</sup> Georg Lukacs, *The Theory of The Novel*, trans. Anna Bostock (Berlin: The Merlin Press, 1971), 44.

<sup>139</sup> Roland Barthes, *A Lover's Discourse*, trans. Richard Howard (New York: Hill and Wang, 1978), 149.

Here, the conditions that make up the discourse turn it into a machine that constantly establishes political relations in the narrow and slippery space of the minor, at the point where the dialogism puts the truth to the test. This machine has the productive character of Deleuze and Guattari's machines. That is, a given social relation cannot be confined to a certain time and only enter this machine with the given possibilities and turn into a political referent as an output (or result). Moreover, it does not contain any endings. This is why Bakhtin suggested the concept of dialogism instead of dialectics. The dialogue process cannot be reduced to single carriers and abstract concepts. However, it takes place under practical conditions with multiple agents and the process is not focused on a specific goal (or end). This structure of the dialogism is strikingly similar to the fact that the target of the lines of escape that cut and pierce the rhizomes cannot be an established meaning, but only create a potential for new escapes, new productions.

*“A rhizome, a burrow, yes—but not an ivory tower. A line of escape, yes—but not a refuge. The creative line of escape vacuums up in its movement all politics, all economy, all bureaucracy, all judiciary.”<sup>140</sup>*

### **3.4. Carnival, Assemblages and Politics**

In Bakhtin's literary theory, we stated in the first chapter that European carnival culture is an important phenomenon for the novel to gain its genre characteristics, and in the second chapter, in minor literature, an important feature as a genre is assemblages. Now we want to investigate the relationship between these two on the social and political plane. For Bakhtin, Rabelais' works were texts in which carnival crystallized into prose as a function. In fact, in the chronotope that he analyzed with reference to Rabelais (Rabelaisian Chronotope), he stated that the spatio-temporal world he used in his narrative assumed a historical task.<sup>141</sup> His task was to ensure the cultural rehabilitation of the society caught between the new and the old world.

---

<sup>140</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 41.

<sup>141</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 205-209.

Bakhtin included Engels' own statements in his text to describe the historical conditions of the world at that time. *The frames of the old orbis terrarum had been broken; only now, precisely now, was the earth opened up...*<sup>142</sup> Rabelais' task is two-legged. These legs constituted a negative and positive task. The negative task also consisted of two stages in itself. In the first stage, the remnants of the transcendental worldview that persists in the spatial and temporal world are cleansed (antiphysis). In the second stage, the vertical world is cleared of hierarchical and symbolic interpretations (kenosis). This task targets established and false connections between things and thoughts. It breaks down the hierarchy of values. For this reason, while the upper and lower ones are brought closer to each other, the values-symbols system is purged of false associations and the hierarchy is turned inside out. Rabelais' other task, namely his positive task, is to develop a new understanding of time-space. These new forms of communication, which have been developed, restore harmony between the people of the new age and the new world, and integrity is established. Objects liberated by negative duty will enter into new relationships and form wholes in accordance with their nature.<sup>143</sup>

*“Rabelais opposes human corporeality (and the surrounding world that is in a direct zone of contact with the body) not only to medieval, ascetic other-worldly ideology, but to the licentiousness and coarseness of medieval practice as well. He wants to return both a language and a meaning to the body, return to it the idealized quality it had in ancient times, and simultaneously return a reality, a materiality, to language and to meaning.”*<sup>143</sup>

Deleuze and Guattari also give Kafka the same frontier task as Bakhtin ascribes to Rabelais, with meanings that were redistributed at a different time, misconnected connections, and to reorder (perhaps further disperse) all this.

---

<sup>142</sup>Frederick Engels, *Dialectics of Nature*, trans. Clemens Dutt (Edinburgh:Photo-Litho Printers,1946), 2.

<sup>143</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*, 168-171.

*“Kafka himself is at the border. Not only is he at the turning point between two bureaucracies, the old and the new, but he is between the technical machine and the juridical statement. He has experienced their reunion in a single assemblage. (...) And certainly, in Kafka's work, it is not only a question of technical machines in themselves or of the juridical statement in itself; rather, the technical machine furnishes the model of a form of content that is applicable to the whole social field, whereas the juridical statement furnishes the model for a form of expression applicable to any statement.”*<sup>144</sup>

Bakhtin, in *The Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, defines carnival as a spectacle without a predetermined and delimited stage. In this show, there is no separation between the participants and the audience, everything is displayed in a simultaneous and ritual-like manner. Bakhtin points to the agricultural society for the origin of the carnival phenomenon, which has these features.<sup>145</sup> He assumes a special form of consecration in agricultural society. Two different poles are tried to be reconciled by means of consecration; the destructive power of nature on the one hand and regenerative on the other... All effort takes place in a communal formation in which people organize themselves. In this area, a political function peculiar to carnival emerges. The transformative power of nature is removed from being an object of fear as a result of artistic reproduction in a collective space. Power is removed from the temporal realm of the singular and given to the permanent *great body of humanity*, subordinate to nature. As a human activity, carnival has transferred this political value from age to age. It has become a means of taking a stand against everything (king/church/master) trying to establish individual and singular power over the world. The phenomenon of carnival, with all this historical development, eventually gave birth to a prose art with carnivalesque features. All the assemblages of the carnival, all the machines, continue to live in the novel as an opportunity for a collective production against all kinds of power efforts and an escape against a

---

<sup>144</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 82-83.

<sup>145</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 122-123.

unitary language. It is not surprising to see that minor literature has inherited this legacy, or at least the political attitude. It is such an attitude that the nature-human relationship of the agricultural society, the church-king-power conflict of the middle age, passed from the determinist-positivist world view of the enlightenment and reached the capitalist, socialist, fascist, bureaucratic regulations of the 20th century. Minor narrative operates in the domain of these arrangements and the machines of desire that keep them all alive and together. A minor writer begins by introducing social representations. From these representations it deduces assemblages of enunciation and assemblages of machinics, and finally takes on the obligation to dismantle these assemblages.<sup>146</sup>

*“Writing for Kafka, the primacy of writing, signifies only one thing: not a form of literature alone, the enunciation forms a unity with desire, beyond laws, states, regimes. Yet the enunciation is always historical, political, and social. A micropolitics, a politics of desire that questions all situations. Never has there been a more comic and joyous author from the point of view of desire; never has there been a more political and social author from the point of view of enunciation.”<sup>147</sup>*

### **3.5. Is Polyphonic and Collective Enunciation Possible?**

Contrary to the previous sections, this section includes the analysis of two contradictory propositions at first glance, not two parallel concepts that easily complement each other. In this analysis, it will be investigated whether minor literature (-Individuality giving its place to collectivity for the sake of a revolutionary function. -Author's rejection of traditional narrator categories. - Assumption of the predicate as the constitutive role of the subject.) can mask the polyphonic character of the text. The distinction between existence and essence

---

<sup>146</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 46.

<sup>147</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 41-42.

disappears in Deleuze and Guattari's search for the subject, they reject the existence of these two different perspectives on becoming. According to them, what is important, or what we need, is a *philosophy of difference* as difference, which cannot be reduced to the concept of identity and representation, unlike the one established in Western metaphysics.<sup>148</sup>

*“It (nomad thought) does not ally itself with a universal thinking subject but, on the contrary, with a singular race; and it does not ground itself in an all-encompassing totality but is on the contrary deployed in a horizonless milieu that is a smooth space, steppe, desert, or sea.”*<sup>149</sup>

This line of thought, which covers all the philosophical and political views of Deleuze and Guattari, continued in Kafka analyzes and a literary theory with a dominant collective character emerged.

*“There isn't a subject; there are only collective assemblages of enunciation, and literature expresses these acts insofar as they're not imposed from without and insofar as they exist only as diabolical powers to come or revolutionary forces to be constructed.”*<sup>150</sup>

That is, he rejects the literature of the masters for the sake of a collective enunciation. Minor literature does not need talented people. The discourse constructed by a single person is already the product of a common action. The lack of agreement with others does not exclude the author from this partnership or overshadow the political nature of what he is saying. The political and social sphere is necessarily entangled in all kinds of utterances that arise within it. So how can an utterance constructed by a solitary singularity be collective in every sense and at all times? Deleuze and Guattari point out that this is because, in a minor narrative, the utterance never refers to its subject.<sup>151</sup> The two existing subjects in a narrative, the

---

<sup>148</sup> Ronald Bogue, *Deleuze and Guattari*, 2.

<sup>149</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, 379.

<sup>150</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 18.

<sup>151</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 83.

subject of enunciation as a cause and the subject of utterance/statement as a function, are both exempt from reference. There is neither a subject who spreads the utterance nor a subject to whom the utterance spreads. What they believe is that an utterance cannot be attached to a subject, regardless of the way it is conceived. The problem of minor literature is not in the utterance-subject relationship, the problem of minor literature is the production of new utterances. When the artist produces a new utterance, an originality, it is born with national, political and social connections, although the objective social conditions are not given outside the utterance. Deleuze and Guattari's Kafka thesis rests almost entirely on this premise. *The most individual enunciation is a particular case of collective enunciation.*<sup>151</sup> This is a definition of literature for them. An utterance is literary only if it is produced by an author who takes responsibility for the collective conditions of the enunciation. Could such a literature, then, contain the polyphonic features that Bakhtin found in Dostoevsky's works and regarded as a genre characteristic for the novel? Can characters who have a unique perspective towards the world, living things and objects, who can interpret the external reality, who can evaluate themselves in all these connections, and who are *ideologues*, take part in the collective organization of the enunciation? Or does it imprison us in a major narrative, an individual arrangement in which the social sphere remains in the background? We think that this obstacle can be overcome with dialogism, as Bakhtin stated. Polyphony, based on the principles of a multiplicity of irreducibly different voices that cannot be harmonized in a chorus or incorporated into the author's utterance, is not merely the sounds heard, or a transition from simultaneity to diachronic.<sup>152</sup> Polyphony articulates with dialogism not only at the level of the author-hero, but also in many layers of subjectivity.

*“Thus the new artistic position of the author with regard to the hero in Dostoevsky's polyphonic novel is a fully realized and thoroughly consistent*

---

<sup>152</sup> Daphna Erdinast-Vulcan, *Between Philosophy And Literature: Bakhtin And The Question Of The Subject* (California: Stanford University Press, 2013), 124

<sup>153</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 63.

*dialogic position, one that affirms the independence, internal freedom, unfinalizability, and indeterminacy of the hero.*"<sup>153</sup>

Ultimately, the characters and their words (everything produced by the enunciation subject) are objects of an authorial attitude. The discourses put forward by the characters definitely intersect with the author's attitude on one level. This plane provides an opportunity for the realization of dialogic relations.<sup>154</sup> The dialogic contexts of utterances in the text may be fundamentally different from the author's discourse. A character exists as a whole with the ideology of the temporality of the work, through the dialogues depicted in the work. But the author gets a real place on the dialogic plane. Even though the author's discourse is not directly involved in the text, every utterance of the character has to be tested and shaped by the social and historical determination of the author's discourse. In summary, an ideologue is not entirely free from being part of a social order. Perhaps this is why Bakhtin was so insistent on polyphony. We do not hear voices, in other words, discourse is not just about voices. What we hear is a set of dialogic relationships behind the sounds. In this respect, it can be said that the existence of the subject in sound and dialogic discourse stands in opposition to the rejecting attitude of the post-60s Western world towards metaphorical existences, as Derrida mentions in the first part of *Dissemination* that the act of speaking deepens the illusion that the subject has a direct presence<sup>155</sup> (or can reach this presence through his utterance). On the other hand, Bakhtin's ability to make tangible the presence of autonomous subjects in the text, which cannot be reduced to the author's interventionist and homogenizing existence, may be an opportunity against the postmodern erasure of the subject.<sup>156</sup> Based on this point for our thesis, we think that we can make a transition from the existence of the subject in the text to the social collectivity. The utterance subject

---

<sup>154</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, 116-117.

<sup>155</sup> Jacques Derrida, 'Plato's Pharmacy', in *Dissemination*, trans. Barbara Johnson (London: Athlone Press, 1981), 61-171.

<sup>156</sup> Alastair Renfrew, *Mikhail Bakhtin*, 82.

carries the social field to the text as a result of the dialogic relations it enters with the utterance subject. A minor text turns into a collective utterance using this possibility.

*“K will not be a subject but will be a general function that proliferates and of The that doesn't cease to segment and to spread over all the segments.”<sup>157</sup>*

According to Deleuze and Guattari, K is not a general function undertaken by a person or an author. It exists as the *functioning of a polyvalent assemblage*.<sup>158</sup> It approaches another piece or another assemblage as an ascetic part of the assemblage. The subject that moves through the assemblages that produces the desire, which is the desire itself, turns into a collective enunciation in the text, this is the point our analysis has reached. Bakhtin's ideological polyphony gains a collective value in minor literature with its social and historical dialogue and continues on its way as the polyphony of desires.

*“Desire is fundamentally polyvocal, and its polyvocality makes of it a single and unique desire that flows over everything.”<sup>159</sup>*

---

<sup>157</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 84.

<sup>158</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 85.

<sup>159</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 5.

## CONCLUSION

When Bakhtin presented his literary theory, the Saussurean understanding of language had not lost its prevalence. There was an understanding of literature in which the works were centered, the meaning of which was closed, a systematic and abstract grammar, and a purely formal semiotics. Bakhtin, on the other hand, took the meaning out of the triangle of author, utterance and work and threw it into a multi-faceted, historical and social dialogue. Although his views were not widespread in his own time and geography, he became a reference source in the poststructuralist literature analyzes that came to the fore in the 60s. The analyzes it originates can be followed on two lines. The first line starts from the formal features of his theory. It can be said that this line has two starting points. Dialogism, as the first starting point, has extended to intertextuality<sup>160</sup> with its possibilities in the production of meaning and utterance, and therefore in the construction of the literary text. Another starting point, heteroglossia, extended to the multi-layered novel style after structuralism, with the social languages, stratifications, dialects, and genres it included in artistic prose, such as speech and letter. The second line is the political propositions of his theory. The forms of discourse that try to save the language from the monopoly of power against unitary language and national grammar continue to be the mainstay for anti-power (anti-mainstream) texts in literature in the 21st century. Especially after the 90s, a considerable Bakhtinian feminist corpus was formed.<sup>161,162</sup> Minor literature, on the other hand, which Deleuze and Guattari outlined in their work published in French under the name *Kafka: Pour une Littérature Mineure* in 1975, has created a field of study for minority literatures all over the world. Many minority literatures such as the

---

<sup>160</sup> David Duff, "Intertextuality versus Genre Theory: Bakhtin, Kristeva and the Question of Genre." *Paragraph* 25, no. 1 (2002): 54–73.

<sup>161</sup> Dale Bauer and Jaret McKinstrey, *Feminism, Bakhtin, and the Dialogic* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1991)

<sup>162</sup> Karen Hohne and Helen Wussow(eds), *A Dialogue of Voices: Feminist Literary Theory and Bakhtin*. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994)

Spanish literature of the Basques<sup>163</sup>, the Italian literature of the Somali immigrants<sup>164</sup>, the literature written by the Kurds and Armenians in Turkish<sup>165</sup> have been examined in terms of the possibilities of minor literature. However, minor literature offers much more than the literature made by minorities in major languages, with its social and political dynamics. For this reason, the possibilities and propositions of minor literature have extended to minor writing<sup>166</sup> in a whole field of literature, and even to minor thinking by going beyond the limits of literature.

In this thesis, we tried to analyze two literary theories that evaluate literature as a whole with its social and political connections. Instead of seeing literature as a closed system of symbols, we evaluated it as a process that can illuminate existing power relations with its social and historical stratification. In this respect, we believe that Bakhtin's theory of the novel, which contains a centrifugal force in the face of centralizing forces, is also a revolutionary and innovative attitude in minor literature, which provides an escape from the established, oppressive regulations. We anticipate that both theories will continue to be valued in the future, not only in literature, but also in the field of art and social thought, with these opportunities.

---

<sup>163</sup> Frederik Verbeke, "A View from Basque Literature: The Historian Who Mistook His Literature for an Island." *A Comparative History of Literatures in the Iberian Peninsula*, no.2 (2016):605-610

<sup>164</sup> Simone Brioni, *The Somali Within Language, Race and Belonging in 'Minor' Italian Literature* (New York: Routledge, 2015)

<sup>165</sup> Alparslan Nas, "*Between National And Minor Literature in Turkey: Modes Of Resistance in The Works Of Mehmed Uzun And Mıgırdıç Margosyan*" (Ma Thesis, Sabancı University , 2011)

<sup>166</sup> Ronald Bogue, "Minor Writing and Minor Literature." *Symplokē* 5, no. 1/2 (1997): 99–118

## REFERENCES

- Assmann, Jan. *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Bakhtin, M. Mikhail. *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays*. Translated by Vadim Liapunov. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1990.
- Bakhtin, M. Mikhail. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, Translated by Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
- Bakhtin, M. Mikhail. *Rabelais and His World*. Translated by Helene Iswolsky. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.
- Bakhtin, M. Mikhail. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Translated by Vern McGee. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1987.
- Bakhtin, M. Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*. Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.
- Barthes, Roland. *A Lover's Discourse*, Translated by Richard Howard. New York: Hill and Wang, 1978.
- Bauer, Dale, and Jaret McKinstrey. *Feminism, Bakhtin, and the Dialogic*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1991.
- Brandist, Craig. *The Bakhtin Circle: Philosophy, Culture and Politics*. London: Pluto Press, 2002.
- Bogue, Ronald. *Deleuze and Guattari*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- Bogue, Ronald. "Minor Writing and Minor Literature." *Symplokē* 5, no. 1/2 (1997): 99–118.

Brioni, Simone. *The Somali Within Language, Race and Belonging in 'Minor' Italian Literature*. New York: Routledge, 2015.

Clark, Katerina, and Michael Holquist. *Mikhail Bakhtin*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1984.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Difference and Repetition*. Translated by Paul Patton. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Pure Immanence: Essays on a Life*. Translated by Anne Boyman. New York: Zone Books, 2001.

Deleuze, Gilles. *The Logic of Sense*. Translated by Mark Lester. London: The Athlone Press, 1990.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Claire Parnet. *Dialogues*. Translated by Hugh Tomlison. New York: Columbia University Press, 1977.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *Capitalism and Schizophrenia: AntiOedipus*. Translated by Robert Hurley. London: Continuum, 2008.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*. Translated by Dana Polan. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *On the Line*. Translated by John Johnston. New York: Autonomedia 1983.

Derrida, Jacques. *Dissemination*. Translated by Barbara Johnson. London: Athlone Press, 1981.

Duff, David. "Intertextuality versus Genre Theory: Bakhtin, Kristeva and the Question of Genre." *Paragraph* 25, no. 1 (2002): 54–73.

Engels, Frederick. *Dialectics of Nature*, Translated by Clemens Dutt. Edinburgh:Photo-Litho Printers,1946.

Erdinast-Vulcan, Daphna. *Between Philosophy and Literature: Bakhtin and the Question of the Subject*. California: Stanford University Press, 2013.

Foucault, Michel. *Archaeology of Knowledge*. Translated by A. M. Sheridan Smith. London: Routledge, 2002.

Goodchild, Philip. *Deleuze and Guattari: An Introduction to the Politics of Desire*. London: SAGE Publications, 1996.

Greenberg, Jonathan. *Introduction to Satire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,2019.

Guattari, Félix. *Chaosmosis*, Translated by Paul Bains. Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1992.

Guattari Felix, and Antonio Negri. *Communists Like Us*, Translated by Michael Ryan. New York: Autonomedia, 1990.

Hirschkop, Ken. *Mikhail Bakhtin: An Aesthetic for Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Hohne, Karen, and Helen Wussow(eds). *A Dialogue of Voices: Feminist Literary Theory and Bakhtin*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.

Holquist, Michael. *Dialogism: Bakhtin and his World*. London: Routledge,2002.

Jusdanis, Gregory. *Belated Modernity and Aesthetic Culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press,1991.

Kafka, Franz. *Letters to Friends, Family and Editors*. Translated by Richard Winston. London: Oneworld Press, 2011.

Kafka, Franz. *The Diaries of Franz Kafka*. Translated by Joseph Kresh. London: Secker&Warbur, 1948.

Lukacs, Georg. *The Theory of the Novel*. Translated by Anna Bostock. Berlin: The Merlin Press, 1971.

Marx, Karl, and F. Engels. *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. Beijing: Foreign Languages Press, 1973.

Nas, Alparslan. “*Between National and Minor Literature in Turkey: Modes of Resistance in the Works of Mehmed Uzun and Mıgırdıç Margosyan*” (Ma Thesis, Sabancı University , 2011)

Patton, Paul. *Deleuze and the Political*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Renfrew, Alastair. *Mikhail Bakhtin*. New York: Routledge, 2015.

Thoburn, Nicholas, and Ian Buchanan. *Deleuze and Politics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008.