

## After Poetry's Voice: What Next?

Today I am going to do something I have never done before anywhere. I am going to talk about my own work. I must say that doing this makes me uncomfortable. It seems embarrassingly self-promoting and narcissistic... But, it also seems like the best and easiest way for me to talk about my perspective on Ottoman literature, on the study of Ottoman literature, and on the place of Ottoman literature in the world today.

Beyond this I am hoping a critique of my own work will provide a context for understanding some of the crazier things I have said, will say, and am going to say right now. And if you think I am being somehow falsely modest when I say "crazy," just you wait! I am going to confess to some ideas today that I have never before expressed this bluntly in public. ~~But I also want to make clear, before I get in too deep, that my topic has most to do with studying Ottoman literature and, more specifically Ottoman poetry, in North America and has very little to say about what goes on in Turkey.~~

Everything I am going to say about *Poetry's Voice* and everything that follows from it for me will cluster more or less about four points:

1. What brought me to writing *Poetry's Voice* in the first place;
2. What I thought I was doing when I researched and wrote it;
3. What I think now about what I was doing *then*. (What I've learned from it.)
4. What comes after *Poetry's Voice*.

So what *did* bring me to writing *Poetry's Voice*? Well...scholarly books—like all forms of writing—are complex things. This is a simple fact that has taken me a long time to learn and appreciate. Very, very few

people really know what this means ~~and I'll be in a better position~~. There are things about living one's life, raising one's children, and eating, and having a decent place to live: A person likes to write; he writes better than he talks; he has been teaching a lot and writing too little and he needs some time off; people will give you money to stay home and write if you can pose as an "authority" or future authority on some subject; publish and be promoted. And there are more global things: In the early years of the 1980s the study of Turkish literature in North America was not doing well and the study of Ottoman literature was all but dead. Colleges, universities, departments, programs were all cutting back and Ottoman literature, although far from the cutting edge, was always at the edge of being cut. The study of Ottoman literature was going nowhere. American students were not terribly interested and those talented few who were interested had little or no chance of making a career of it. Even the Turkish community—in North America and Turkey and everywhere else—had little interest in Ottoman literature. To me the prospect of ending up the only frog in a very dried-up pond seemed quite likely. It was a time of despair that brought me face to face with ~~the~~ <sup>my</sup> enemy—an enemy with whom I still wrestle in my mind and in my practice.

From where I stand now, I would describe the enemy like this (although I would probably have come up with a different description in 1980): to me the enemy is a belief, the belief that all we need is to know more about Ottoman literature, that all we need is to have more texts, to do more reading, to understand more words. It is the belief that, even though we do not know everything—~~for example, about Ottoman poetry~~—we *do* know everything we need to know about how to *think* about Ottoman

interpretation." However, the result—I hope—is an assault (a sneaky assault) on the usual sense of "interpretation," the idea that a poem has "an interpretation," <sup>a</sup> ~~a~~ central core of meaning that can be revealed by analysis. What I actually intended to present are a multiplicity of ~~interpretations~~ <sup>experimental interpretations</sup>, none of which is primary, no ordering of which forms a hierarchy, no combination of which can form a unit.

In the beginning, a major focus of *Poetry's Voice* was simply to present the outline of a typology for Ottoman divan poetry, to foreground those features that seemed to be common to most Ottoman divan poems and then relate them to features of societal context. I chose to do this in a very "scientific" and conservative manner, counting words, for example, formulating the rules of a syntax, and including analyses that do not much differ (formally) from ~~the~~ traditional <sup>(exegesis) -</sup> ~~serh~~ of Turkish academics. I had no models for this within the field and I was unsure of my audience and their reception of my work, so the result is rather crude and naive, especially if one compares it, for example, with Victoria Holbrook's work on Şeyh Galip, which appeared only 9 years later. Nonetheless working on *Poetry's Voice* had a profound impact on my thinking. For all its hesitation and restraint, writing it and later thinking about what I had written radically changed me and my views in ways that are only hinted at by some of the things that bubble up in the final chapter. Looking back, I think it captured a stream of thought (in North America at least), something we all felt to some degree: the notions that something was very wrong in our thinking about Ottoman literature and that it was necessary to think actively about how we were thinking. These days, the matter of critiquing how we think about literature and poems, and the literature and poems of Ottomans and

"difference" rather than "identity." At the base of such thinking is "thinking in AND", or thinking "between." For them AND (written in capital letters), is the term of pure relation, not just a "conjunction," something that joins two things, but an "inclusive disjunction," a territory of relation, "like a stream running between two banks" or "grass between the paving stones of accepted concepts." I could have described the work of *Poetry's Voice* much better if I had encountered Deleuze and Guattari before I wrote it—because *Poetry's Voice* ended up being a book of AND. What I try to say in it, again and again, is that a divan poem is not either secular or religious, either religious or bound to the power of the state, either a captive of power relations or a function of social interactions. It is the one AND the other AND the other AND the other and what is important is the space of relations between these, the space of the AND, the space *between*.

When one starts thinking in AND, the shape of thought changes. Usually when we think of a poem, we conceive of it as a unary object that stands in contrast to other such objects (it is not a novel, it is not prose, it is not an archival document). Using Deleuze and Guattari's imagery, the object usually comes to us as if it were a whole in the shape of a tree: it has roots (the history and origins of the poem, its predecessors, its influences, its author and the author's experiences), it has a stem (its presence, its existence as a unified object, what it means, the "poem itself"), it has branches (its readings, audiences, rewritings, imitators, criticisms, analyses, etc.). This is how we are accustomed to think—in trees—~~just think of yourself; there are the root you, the baby, child, adolescent, there is the main you (right here and now), and the many branches of possible future~~

"difference" rather than "identity." At the base of such thinking is "thinking in AND", or thinking "between." For them AND (written in capital letters), is the term of pure relation, not just a "conjunction," something that joins two things, but an "inclusive disjunction," a territory of relation, "like a stream running between two banks" or "grass between the paving stones of accepted concepts." I could have described the work of *Poetry's Voice* much better if I had encountered Deleuze and Guattari before I wrote it—because *Poetry's Voice* ended up being a book of AND. What I try to say in it, again and again, is that a divan poem is not either secular or religious, either religious or bound to the power of the state, either a captive of power relations or a function of social interactions. It is the one AND the other AND the other AND the other and what is important is the space of relations between these, the space of the AND, the space *between*.

When one starts thinking in AND, the shape of thought changes. Usually when we think of a poem, we conceive of it as a unary object that stands in contrast to other such objects (it is not a novel, it is not prose, it is not an archival document). Using Deleuze and Guattari's imagery, the object usually comes to us as if it were a whole in the shape of a tree: it has roots (the history and origins of the poem, its predecessors, its influences, its author and the author's experiences), it has a stem (its presence, its existence as a unified object, what it means, the "poem itself"), it has branches (its readings, audiences, rewritings, imitators, criticisms, analyses, etc.). This is how we are accustomed to think—in trees—~~just think of yourself; there are the root you, the baby, child, adolescent, there is the main you (right here and now), and the many branches of possible future~~

~~you~~. But thinking in AND—"instead of *is*"—demands another image, it is a kind of thinking that does violence to our comfortable habits of thought. It is, as Deleuze says, a kind of "delirium" (<sup>crazy thinking</sup> *deli-rium*). The image particular to "thinking between" is that of grass and the rhizome. As you ~~probably~~ already know, grass does not grow from roots, it grows from rhizomes which are nodes or points of connection for networks of rootlets emanating from other rhizomes. Every rhizome connects horizontally, along a surface, to many other rhizomes but no one of them is basic or primary. There is no verticality, no hierarchy, no "tree-structure". Connections are horizontal, on a plain of relations, intersections, linkages, off-shoots and shootings off. What we conceptualize as "units" or "organisms" or "wholes" ("the poem", "I", "you," "the beloved") are actually horizontal clusters of such intersections, plains or plateaus of consistency, irreducible multiplicities.

~~At this point of talking in abstractions I usually begin losing my audience. It always happens. A few theory-minded people are still trying to stay with me, but even their brows have begun to furrow. Others are drifting off, thinking, "I could be spending this time doing something useful, reading a book, writing an article, taking a nap."~~ <sup>This is very abstract</sup> So instead of going on to go much deeper into Deleuze and Guattari's "re-thinking"—and there is far more—I <sup>will</sup> progress toward giving a few specific examples of how this perspective might change the way we think of Ottoman divan poetry.

ream

First of all you need to go along with me for a moment in a thought experiment. Try to let go of your scholarly skepticism, your counter-arguments, your questions for just a moment—you can have them back

when I am done. Now, try to let go of your mental image of the poem as a singularity, a unitary, whole, organic object produced by an equally whole and organized subject: what we visualize in the sentence "I wrote a poem." Replace that poem-image with the image of a horizontal plane or plateau of a multiplicity of rhizome-like connections: connection to a node of language, to other poems, to a society, to an economic system, to various ~~manifestations of time~~ <sup>becomings</sup>, to a writer... None of these can be singled out as a center or origin or root; they are all equally points of arrival and points of departure. There is no particular direction of growth (as in the case of the tree), there is no starting point and no ending point. Every node (including the subject/author) is also itself a multiplicity, a plane of connections. The poem, then, is not constituted by a subject-object relation (an "I wrote the poem" relation) but, on the one hand, by lines of connection or articulation that create territories, segmentations, patterns (here is where the poem is located, here is what <sup>for us</sup> separates a divan poem from a tekke poem or a folk poem, this is the shape and structure of the poem)—all the things that enable us to talk about the poem as if it were a unit, a whole. On the other hand, the poem is constituted also by lines of flight, escapes, flyings-off from territory, segmentation, pattern. Interpretation is the process of capturing lines of flight, territorializing them, segmenting them, reducing them to a center, to a tree-structure. The alternative to interpretation, the pragmatist, empiricist alternative, is experimentation, examining lines of segmentation and flight on the basis of what is there—the multiplicity, the segments, the assemblage of molecular particles—without seeking to create or pre-suppose a foundational unifying center. *The question is not "what is the interpretation and is it true" but "who is interpreting for what purpose."*

From this perspective, *Poetry's Voice* engages in the task of identifying a line and its segments: God, the despot, the beloved, the *seyh/baba*, the friend, the assembly of friends, the palace, the party, the quarter, the empire... that exists on the plane of the poem and generates relations in a way that captures, organizes, unifies (interprets) the poem in support of a certain distribution of power. Where I said, or indicated, that these things are the "context" of the poem, I was wrong. They *are* the poem as much as anything else. The "poem-context" binary is as misleading and non-productive as the "subject-object" binary. This is very important because it keeps the door open to examining all the things I left out of that particular "experiment." For example, we certainly need to consider how an economic system, a legal system, forms of land ownership, guild organization, the economy of patronage, etc. fit into this assemblage. I made a small gesture in this direction in an article on the Ottoman kaside, but there is much more to be done. And then there is the political dimension: both the politics of power in the palace, and the micro-politics of individual interactions, including the micro-politics of sexuality.

Among the things I did *not* do in *Poetry's Voice* were, on the one hand, to examine lines of flight or escape and, on the other hand, to treat the lines, links, and intersections that bind Ottoman divan poetry to the present. I took up the first of these—examining lines of flight—and, *incidentally*, began exploring Deleuze and Guattari for the first time, in an article published in the *Yale Journal of Criticism*, an article that, I must say, was suggested to me by Victoria Holbrook. In this article, I identify two apparent lines of flight from the imperial/despotic over-coding of the relations that constitute divan poetry. The first of these is a subjectivity-

Politics are  
Primary  
and  
Pervasive

Potential



destroying flight into madness or delirium, which I named the *Mecnun function* ("I am so crazed, abandoned to passion that *self* and the preservation of self ~~don't~~<sup>don't</sup> meaning anything to me anymore"). The second is a process of releasing terms from their capture by dominant formulations, what Deleuze and Guattari call "deterritorialization," and I called the *melamî function* (which problematizes the apparent and *despotic* links between signifier and signified, "What you call 'morality', 'religious duty', 'proper behavior' all change their referents and don't mean the same things anymore").

The second project—examining the intersections between Ottoman poetry and the assemblages and lines of the present—actually begins in *Poetry's Voice* but it is never realized there in practice. However, this is where the focus of much of my interest lies today. So let me tell you why I am so interested.

If we are thinking in trees and unitary objects, there is always a prior existence, a history ~~at the ground of which is~~<sup>that grounds</sup> the object. The seed and the roots and the trunk and the branches are ordered in such a way that the seed and the branches do not exist simultaneously in a mutually dependent relation. There must be a seed before there can be roots, roots before can be a stem, etc. An Ottoman poem, in this view, belongs to or depends on the prior existence of a unary object located in an Ottoman history and its relations with the present are only very very peripherally a subject of scholarly interest.

From the perspective of the rhizome, however, the Ottoman poem is constituted fully as much by its relations in the present as it is by relations that existed in the past. There is no hierarchical distinction between past

and present. Obviously a poem that has no links at all to the present does not exist for us, or at least we have no possibility of an encounter with it. Less obviously, everything we know about Ottoman poems, all of the distinctions that identify an Ottoman poem are ideas of the present, they are caught up in present-day assemblages, things that are meaningful to people right now: politics, social structures, codes, territories, voids, gaps...

Let me give you an example of how this works, a simple and unusually clear example, one I have touched upon briefly elsewhere (including *Poetry's Voice*) but in a different context.

In 1928 Mehmet Fuad Köprülü published a book entitled *Millî Edebiyat Cereyanının İlk Mübeşşirleri ve Divan-i Türkî-i Basit* (The First Glad Heralds of the National Literature Movement and the Divan of Simple Turkish ). This book contains a short monograph on the National Literature Movement (Millî Edebiyat Cereyanı) and a *divan* by the poet Nazmî of Edirne, who was a devotee of poetry from a janissary background during the time of Sultan Süleyman. I am sure many of you know of this work. The *divan* Köprülü presented was a collection of 269 mostly short poems (one of which is actually a group of individual lines) in Perso-Turkic forms and rhythms but using no Arabic or Persian vocabulary. In the monograph Köprülü links Nazmî's "divan" to similar reported efforts (for example, some poems by Tatavlı Mahremî mentioned in the *tezkeres*) and from this evidence proposes the existence of a "national" (millî) literature movement. In Deleuzoguattarian terms this is already a "deterritorialization", extracting some poems out of the assemblages they inhabit, and a "reterritorialization" or creating a new assemblage by producing a line segment called "national" literature, obviously based on, or "over-coded," by a use of the term "millî"

peculiar to the semiotic regime of 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century European modernism and nationalism.

But the situation is even more extreme than it appears. As Kemal Silay points out in a footnote to his book on Nedim, there was, in fact, no such thing as a *Divan-i Turkî-yi Basit* until Köprülü invented it. The actual situation is this: Nazmî has a huge *divan* of more than 3,000 poems, among which are scattered a number of poems in "simple/pure" Turkish which were extracted and published as a "divan". Köprülü's "deterritorialization", therefore, was ~~not just an~~ <sup>active</sup> an ~~actual~~ process of "cutting" in which the line of nationalist/modernist segmentation cuts across Nazmî's assemblage and creates a new territory of "national language," which then allows scattered poems to be collected into a "divan," ~~(which also reterritorializes and recodes the term "divan" to include collections or sub-~~ [omit] ~~collections or selections made hundreds of years after the poet's death)]~~

In order to map Nazmî's work onto the territory segmented by "national" lines or assemblages, one must void the fact that Nazmî, in his *divan* included numerous examples of every kind of "skill-test" that one could perform with a traditional poem. There were, <sup>apparently</sup> ~~for example~~, poems written only in letters with no dots, only in letters with dots, poems in alternating lines of Arabic, Persian, and Turkish, examples of every possible rhetorical figure—and among these, some poems written in Turkish with no Arabic and Persian words.

"Skill test" or "national movement"...? This is a more difficult distinction to make than it seems from this example. The kind of segmentation that Köprülü makes is not a naive error on the part of a brilliant scholar, it is grounded in segmentations and accumulations that

unconscious

because they are <sup>13</sup>productive of  
the present

seem to us natural and acceptable without question! These segmentations articulate with other segmentations (that is, they move about in a connected, linked state—like a joint) to exert tremendous power over our thinking. How often do we question that there is a national language, a "grammar" of Turkish, a people, a nation, a culture, a national territory? What Nazmî may or may not be doing is bound to the present and, in the present, to exactly these kinds of concepts and to the ways in which they are useful to us in our political and social lives. It is striking in this regard (~~at least, to me~~) that after having revealed Köprülü's project and its unmistakable connections to the phrase regime of the present, Silay goes on to base a sweeping literary historical argument about "national language" on Köprülü's "national language movement" as if it were <sup>only</sup> a historical datum, as if the near-contemporary *creation* of the *divan* (and the "movement") were a trivial point. (Creation of a Tree-Structure for Turkish)  
~~In terms of modernist segmentation, the "movement" must pre-exist its creation by Köprülü because "the modern" as a tree-structure must have "roots" in the past in order to ground the story of the present.~~

Up to now, you have been patient (I hope you have been patient) with my abstractions and the Deleuzoguattarian terminology. So now let us take some more concrete examples from Turkish language and literature and see if we can cut through some of the airiness of theory. What I want to do is to take you on a speculative tour through the history of Ottoman poetry—by which I mean "poetry written in Turkish during the Ottoman period" and not just what we call "divan poetry." The purpose of the tour is to outline for you where my thinking has been going since *Poetry's Voice*. It will include some things I have been working on a lot, some conclusions

I am beginning to draw from other peoples' work, and some things I ~~don't know enough about yet,~~  
~~believe need further exploration.~~

We must be careful to understand—and excuse me for repeating myself—that thinking of language as a rhizome means that we no longer think in terms of a history of origins: the language is not at any point determined primarily by its development from the past. It is not the object of historical linguistics. It is also neither a grammar nor a vocabulary. This means that the Turkish language of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, for example, is a molecular assemblage subsuming a broad range of vocabularies, styles, rhetorics, tropes, etc. in which the distinctions we are accustomed to make—the "Ottoman" dialect, "common Turkish," and even "the Persian language" or "Arabic"—are only retrospective reifications or segmentations of temporary and shifting alliances constituted for purposes of control, for grounding exclusions, inclusions, and so on, ~~Such distinctions are, for the most part, grounded~~ <sup>which are located</sup> in the present and enable us to say things now that advance present-day programs. But that much said, on with the tour.

time?  
?

becoming  
lack

SINCE PVSS

It has been my contention that in the late fifteenth-early sixteenth centuries, the vocabulary of literature coalesces about a few basic tropes; the rules of composition are rather firmly fixed within the bounds of particular rhetorical figures; the presumed connections (context) of a poem becomes broadly understandable. This describes an Ottoman poetic interpretive synthesis in which culture at all levels participates. This, as I have pointed out over and over again, would mean that the "two parallel but separate cultures" (a "simple Turkish and complex Ottoman culture" *divan edebiyatı-halk edebiyatı*) binary view of the Ottoman period is no longer

viable, nor is the view that Ottoman divan literature was so "difficult" that it could not have had much of an impact on the society at large. There is a lot of evidence that contradicts such views, right out there in plain sight. It seems no more reasonable to believe that there were "two separate literatures" than to believe that there could be two separate economies, that the economy of the palace had no vital links to the economy of nomadic shepherders, or village farmers.

It seems evident that in the late 15<sup>th</sup> and early 16<sup>th</sup> centuries the "Ottoman" language of the court and court literature converges substantially with the common language to the point where the most critical biographers (Latifi is a prime example) point out that almost anyone could write some kind of poetry and shop-boy beloveds in the bazaar could be the ~~recipients~~ <sup>objects</sup> of eloquent and refined verses by poets of the court. Things went together in a way that transcended syntax. The metaphoric universe was coded in a way that bound the erotic and spiritual to the figure of the sultan and the sultan and his court reinforced this synthesis by generously supporting literature.

In the later 16<sup>th</sup> century, beginning approximately with the death of Ibrahim Paşa, the pattern of relations ~~begins to change slowly~~ <sup>changes</sup>. By the 17<sup>th</sup> century alliances have shifted dramatically. The palace and its adherents no longer support literature to the same degree and the poetic language of the now disgruntled elites re-centers itself in the urban *tekke* and its mystical rhetoric and in the more esoteric "Indian style" (*sebk-i hindî*). As Walter Feldman's work is beginning to show, the Turkish version of the "Indian Style" subverts or rejects the rhetorical synthesis that had made poetry broadly understandable and had connected the ruler directly to a

cosmic order. The language of the erotic/mystical axis and the cultural synthesis moves away from the disgruntled elites to a position somewhere between an Aşık Ömer (<sup>or Geyikçi</sup> representing an articulation between elite and popular erotic/mysticism) and, perhaps, a Karacaoğlu (representing a popular erotic/<sup>mystical</sup> subversive style). I would suggest, <sup>even</sup> ~~despite the incredulity~~ <sup>omit</sup> ~~and outright derision that might accompany the suggestion in some circles,~~ that the connection between the language (rhizomes) of the 16<sup>th</sup> century court poet/mystic Hayalî (identified by his contemporaries as "a dervish") and Aşık Ömer (<sup>or Geyikçi</sup> ~~and the Karacaoğlu~~) of the 17<sup>th</sup> century <sup>in many ways</sup> are as strong or stronger than the links between Hayalî and the 17<sup>th</sup> century elite mystical *sebk-i hindi* poets, Cevrî, Na'îlî, and Neşâtî. [Walls - reading together]

In Deleuzoguattarian terms, if we think of Ottoman poetry in the 17<sup>th</sup> century as taking a line of flight or escape from the line that links it rigidly to the palace, we can see that it <sup>tends to</sup> ~~has~~ become "de-territorialized." This is to say that previously the poetry was mapped onto the palace. It was coded to be read in relation to the palace. Simply put, there had been a rigid line linking "the beloved in the garden with friends" to "the sultan in the palace with power-holders." Desire or uncoded libidinal energy (that is, pure *unconscious* desire that is not "desire *for* something") was interpreted and directed according to this mapping (that is, it was converted into a "desire *for*..." which ultimately benefited the program of the palace).

My suspicion is that one day we <sup>might</sup> ~~will~~ see the late 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries as a revolutionary time for Turkish culture, a time when cultural energies are ~~not~~ intense at nodes that resist despotic over-coding by the "state." On the one hand, a substantial degree of poetic force or power shifts in the direction of the minstrel poets, the *saz şairleri* or *aşıks*, who

literally "wander," who are not bound by a territory, whose movement over the face of the poetic world is, in Deleuzoguattarian terms, NOMADIC—which is to say, in part, that they have no "garden" and no "palace" that maps, restrains or "territorializes" them. On the other hand, the "Indian style" subverts the metaphoric synthesis by shattering accepted relationships into multiple shards that cannot be restored to simple unities. From the point of view of a rhetoric and metaphors, Indian style poetry is also NOMADIC insofar as it ~~avoids~~ <sup>tends to avoid</sup> re-territorialization by means of interpretation. It resists stabilizing about a single, organic interpretation and, instead, invites constant experimentation with meaning.

Rushing through some final stops on our experimental tour, I would suggest there is a convergence in the 18<sup>th</sup> century that represents a conservative attempt to re-territorialize poetry by reconstructing the palace, ~~populace,~~ poetry synthesis of the 16<sup>th</sup> century. We might consider that uses of popular language in elite poetry (usually typified by some of the poetry of Nedim) could be understood as an attempt by the palace and its dependents to <sup>deteritorialize,</sup> recapture and reterritorialize the poetry of the *Aşıks*. Early in the century, there is considerable evidence of an appeal to broader and less-elite audiences: for example, in addition to Nedim's popular lyrics, the burgeoning of a literary and artistic soft-core pornography industry [e. g. the popularity of the *Zenan-name* and *Huban-name* of Fāzil Enderunī], the illustrations of those works, the paintings of Levnī, the feminization of the beloved and the increasingly visible and public nature of the garden and garden-party (*Sa'dabad*).] If we are "thinking in AND," it becomes easier to see how a Nedim can be *both* a force in the conservative recapture of poetic codes for the benefit of a despotic order AND—reterritorialized in a



modernist/nationalist assemblage—as the precursor of a democratic movement to liberate the Turkish masses and their language from domination by despotic elites.

Whereas Nedim and the culture of the *Lale Devri* can be seen as an attempt to recapture an erotic synthesis and re-code it on the sultan and his court, the intense interest that the palace shows in Şeyh Galip (and the interest Şeyh Galip shows in the palace) at the end of the century, might well be viewed as an attempt to recapture a mystical synthesis (the "beloved-sultan-God" coding of the 16<sup>th</sup> century) and to tame the more disintegrative, nomadic possibilities of the Indian style.

Does the mystical/erotic in Turkish culture always have a "nomadic" tendency, a tendency to launch a line of flight from despotic over-coding? Certainly this tendency is picked up on by the several "flights" taken using the character of Şeyh Bedreddin of Simavna—from Nazim Hikmet to Attilâ İlhan and Hilmi Yavuz. I would also suggest that the discourse of "modernity" not only occludes the connection of such flights and flights in the Ottoman past but it creates gaps and voids that make invisible such lines of assemblage or relation as that between the mysticism of Leskofçali Galip and the language of Namık Kemal, between *tanzimat* notions of "modernity" and the subversive rhetoric of Ottoman mysticism. I would ask you to consider that there may be lines, now over-coded by the term "modernity," which are productive of a uniquely Turkish "modernity" or "contemporary consciousness" visible as early as the late 16<sup>th</sup> century with significant links and connections other than and in addition to those relating to the vocabulary and practices of the European modern. The gaps and blockages caused by the discourse of modernity seem clearly to have

~~destroyed~~  
 prevented Turkish/Ottoman literature from "reinventing" itself in a positive way ~~a reinvention that is said to be a fundamental characteristic of "great" literatures.~~

Therefore, it seems to me a mistake either to exclude the present from our study of the past or to exclude the past from our understanding of the present. I am not sure anymore whether it is possible to be a good Ottomanist without also being in some manner a "modernist." For example, I don't believe I really understood the "party" and its synthesis of eroticism, food, drink, music until I began working with the poetry of Attilâ İlhan. I find the subversive, confounding, anguished sensibility of Na'ilî, Neşatî, and the Indian style in the poems of Hilmi Yavuz and profound connection to a spiritual/erotic node in Seza'i Karakoç. Victoria Holbrook's *Unreadable Shores* is as much about Turkey of the last 80 years as it is about Şeyh Galip and *Beauty and Love*. These and others have opened up Ottoman poetry for me in a way that more study of more Ottoman texts never could have done. **[LACK - BECOMING (Persian)] HISTORY**

**GENERAL**  
 With that our tour is over. What was it for? Well, I suppose it was mostly to demonstrate a way of thinking. For me this is what comes after *Poetry's Voice*. This way of thinking constantly whispers in my ear and what it says to me is this:

Be suspicious of rigid segmentations, including the ways we divide up the objects of our study and the methods of our study in academia. The more obvious and natural the segmentation the more suspicion. When someone presents you with a unary object and an interpretation or global theory, ask yourself, who benefits by reducing this multiplicity to a unity and fixing it in an interpretation? Think in multiplicities; experiment don't

interpret; think *between*, think in AND. Think in terms of difference rather than identity. Engage in dialogues and avoid questions and answers. Be a specialist in relations, <sup>and negation or opposition, be active not reactive.</sup> learn everything, <sup>and affirmation</sup> be an Ottomanist by being a modernist and the reverse, <sup>?</sup> be a literature specialist by being a historian, economist, anthropologist, sociologist, zoologist, physicist, psychologist, mathematician, philosopher...

I am not usually this blunt about my own thinking. I prefer simply to experiment aloud or in writing and let people draw their own conclusions. But I believe that right now, in this university, in this land you have a unique and precious opportunity, so <sup>can not</sup> I can't help myself. From my perspective—and we must be aware of my own tendency to romanticize here—many of the things that appear to us or are sold to us as problems that are especially acute for Turks and Turkey are themselves consequences of circumstances that, on the contrary, hold tremendous promise. In my view Turkey somehow, and despite its own efforts, <sup>tends to resist</sup> ~~resists~~ the rigid segmentations and reductions that have "organized" and re-territorialized the world in this past century. Turkey is both physically and conceptually <sup>accept her, in part</sup> ~~between:~~ Europe is reluctant to ~~admit her to its union~~ because she calls into question the rigid segmentations that territorialize Europe, segmentations that are shaky at best these days and are defended in direct proportion to their shakiness. Neither is she Asian, this is obvious; she exists *between*, in ~~the space of AND and the inclusive disjunction.~~ <sup>the space of AND and the inclusive disjunction.</sup> If she trembles from struggles to re-territorialize her on one or another pattern: the Kemalist state, the modernist state, the capitalist state, the Islamic state, the European power, the Asian power...; if Turks seem in a constant crisis of identity, <sup>this is good</sup> these are because Turkey is still open to her own irreducible multiplicity; <sup>ENEMY</sup>

she is ever and always 'becoming':

creating lack is the art of the dominant class  
socialize / read / libidinalize marx

[tendency of capitalism is deterritorialization]

Oedipus complex concentrates human desire in the nuclear family and hence individualizes it — leaving only a residual "commodified" desire to the social domain, which is regulated by the economic relations of capital.

Subjected group:

- Enforces traditional roles, concepts, hierarchies
- 'Perpetual struggle against the inscription of 'nonsense'
- group fantasy around an 'institutional object' granting parasitic immortality (eternal church, eternal Army, eternal academia)

Group subject:

- opens to its finitude
- questions its goals
- attempts to articulate new significations
- forms new modes of interaction

== -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- ==

# Management Plans

$$17 \times 365 = 6205$$

$$7 \times 365 = 2555$$

$$20 = 7300$$

$$90 = 32,850$$

آقای

publish, exposed  
فیل

dumping out  
suddenly starting  
غول

simplicity  
فوق

Force. to be harnessed  
(to something)

closed, vague, absolute =  
prohibited

humility = ذلت

امان = security

قاپ = 1. waiting

2. back of neck  
person  
slave

نمس = chief (minister)

نمس = Iron nail  
(tower)

دستار = handkerchief / Turban cloth

دستار = 1965

اعتدال = equality, moderation

چرخ = who points to rights

فکر = Thought

Bilkent: fri.

Same - unchanging - an O.L. that  
is identical w/ itself throughout

Event: (Grammar, vocab. - subject-  
verb)

History of Lack, voids, deficiencies  
[territorializations, appropriations]  
[not parallel to political history]  
[modernity's hijacking, terms change]

"lots of larvae in a book"

creating new possibilities for life.

Positive, affirmative, active program

Active thought resists the rancorous  
oppositional spirit (resentment)

[Being always exists in the form of  
becoming:]

Negation is opposed to affirmation;  
Affirmation is different from  
Negation

Not a 'textualists' a 'physics' -  
Difference in forces.