

Deleuze: The Literary Machine Against the Sado-Masochistic Syndrome

Deleuze: Sado-Mazoşist Sendroma Karşı Edebi Makine

GÜL TURANLI 

Mersin University

Received: 16.11.2021 | Accepted: 29.12.2025

Abstract: Deleuze, drawing on the relationship between matter and form, undertakes an analysis within the philosophy-art context in the section where he addresses the bodiless body as the intensity defining productive thought in art. To liberate collectivity from the personal management of memory and the collective ideal of remembrance, he focuses on conceptualising fragments and particles within flows, based on contexts of transformation and change, as opposed to a mental and linear process within a specific temporality. For this reason the author invents a new, almost, a foreign language within the language. In What is Philosophy, Deleuze dwells upon the relationship between philosophy and literature in a conceptual contextuality and connectivity with art while describing inventing as “the power to produce” and “to create”. This observation not only questions the logistics of existence in terms of movement, but also demonstrates a genuine admiration for the subjects and objects of life in his writings, while providing a source for his own propositions concerning vitalism. Most of the time, this source manifests itself through Deleuze’s philosophical, psychological, and scientific reinterpretation of names and texts selected from the history of philosophy: Spinoza versus Descartes, Nietzsche versus Kant, Sacher-Masoch versus Sade.

Keywords: Literature, philosophy, psychology, sado-masochistic syndrome, minor-literature, writing, language.



Introduction

In the issue of unification, Deleuze, proceeding from the relationship between matter and form, addresses the bodiless body as the intensity defining productive thought in art, and in this section he undertakes an analysis within the philosophy-art context. He develops a number of arguments by involving D. Lawrence in the issue. The issue is not about two texts, two people or two fields of opinion; it is entirely about two completely different issues. In *Critique and Clinic*, Deleuze addresses these two distinct problems through a comparison of the Bible and Revelation. Firstly, the Bible is symbolic, individualistic, loving, aristocratic and sufficiently cultured. In contrast, Revelation is collective, vulgar, uncultured and savage. According to Lawrence, everyone who remains in this life is his Book of Revelation. In fact, here Deleuze addresses an opposition through Lawrence, but a collective spirit emerges in this opposition. The collective spirit desires power that seeps into every pore of the administration and seeks to multiply its numbers across the universe. unity, individuality, universality the cosmos must be destroyed so that vital symbols and the connections of life can be liberated from being personal-superior. The way to liberate all this collectivity from the personal management of memory and the collective ideal of remembrance lies in grasping the fragments and particles within flows, based on contextualities of transformation and change, as opposed to a mental and linear process within a specific temporality. It is precisely because English and American literature fully embody every kind of destruction that draws people in that Deleuze maps out the dynamic paths through which these literatures examine the delirium on the escape line via the allegory of the child.

Roadmaps form the basis for psychic activity. Even Freud thought it was inevitable to bring a map into the picture. The appeal to the clinical is an effect of the role played by literature in naming deviance, along with the different problems and different designs in question. In Deleuze's words, the names of Sade and Masoch, which are tremendous examples of literature's influence, are where psychic activity is linked to literature when naming two fundamental perversions. (Deleuze, 2007, s. 17) According to Deleuze, the philosopher of the future is also an artist and a physician, and in this context, the artist-philosopher who critiques the senses and values is



an individual who embodies the creative and healing functions of art and medicine. In his Introduction to Sacher-Masoch, Deleuze brings art and medicine together in a more specific way and considers Leopold Ritter von Sacher-Masoch's novels as both literary works and clinical studies on masochism. (Deleuze ve Sacher-Masoch, 1991) It frames the Deleuze debate from a critical (literary sense) and clinical (medical sense) perspective. Masoch's name, much like Sade's association with sadism, became linked to the psychological phenomenon of masochism, and Deleuze finds an unquestioned assumption implicit in this association of writers and deviants, that their works are merely unconscious manifestations of psychological disorders. However, Deleuze claims that Masoch and Sade were both great clinicians and great writers. Perhaps they were suffering from the conditions they analysed. However, whether they are patients or clinicians, Sade and Masoch are also great anthropologists. They are great artists who create a completely new and distinct language in the style of those who know how to create forms of feeling and thinking, and in terms of expressing certain views about people, culture and nature. The subjects of Masoch and Sade's analyses, then, are not merely peculiar and isolated pathologies. As Deleuze explains in *The Logic of Meaning*, artists are clinicians. However, it is not clinicians who deal with individual cases, but rather the clinicians of civilisation. (Bogue, 2003, s. 15) (Deleuze, 2015)

Deleuze distinguishes between the concepts of symptom and syndrome through the names of Masoch and Sade, who prompted him to ask what literature is for. Symptoms although they are characteristic indicators of the disease, syndromes are intersecting entities that refer to different contextualities. So, within the context of which concept will art be evaluated? Deleuze's answer to this question would be symptomatology. Art is always symptomatology. Because symptoms are subject to both linguistic and semiotic movements in terms of their naming. So what does the combination of violence and sexuality mean in the language of Sade and Masoch? Sade's language is paradoxical in that it is the language of a victim. In this case, there are two types of flow: the first is the victim of violence, the second is the perpetrator of violence. The perpetrator of violence uses the language of a power that grants them the right to do so and legitimises it. Here, a secondary position is evident. He is forced into silence because he



uses the language of the torturing regime. The torturer, deceived as if it were part of the game, lays the groundwork for a paradoxical discourse in Sade's language that rejects deception and turns to other people. Masoch, on the other hand, raises the question of whether he uses a paradoxical language in the position of the torturer who inflicts torture upon himself. Deleuze evaluates both Sade's and Masoch's language as discourses that gain value through sensory pleasures. Therefore, Sade or Masoch, is primarily neither a figure of psychoanalysis nor of sexuality. He is more of a writer, a work of art, than a patient. He makes a diagnosis, but the diagnosis he makes is about the world. Sacher-Masoch presents himself as a character study in which Deleuze assigns a clinical function to an artistic creation and, along with this, Sade as a writer and Masoch as a literary method in the art of the novel.

The connection between literature and healing emerges in the positive experiential effects of art in life. Here, the point that needs to be emphasized, especially from Deleuze's perspective, is that literature is not behind sadism or masochism, but rather that literature is primary, and that the effects of sadism or masochism are found in novels. Literature thus becomes aware of the imaginary testimony of a real state of perversion. What is the relationship between texts and images in Deleuze's understanding of art? One way to answer this question is to examine the conceptual motif that is of particular importance in *A Thousand Plateaus*, discussed in the articles in *Critics and Clinics*, and which returns to prominence in *What is Philosophy?»: the face, the mirror-image, sensation, perceptions, effects, narration. Although motif was initially introduced in A Thousand Plateaus as part of the face-landscape confusion and painting debate, in other arts, particularly architecture, sculpture, cinema, music, and literature, the conceptual motif reflects the tensions between speech and vision, between texts and images, as a non-linguistic dimension of Deleuze's understanding of literature.*

Method

Deleuze devotes a large portion of his published works to literary criticism, in which he expresses his interest in art and literature from a philosophical perspective. His approach to utilising texts also allows us to understand his philosophical concepts. He employs a comparative method



throughout his works, which we see applied to art and literature from a philosophical perspective, in a style connected to the realm of experience and reality, including reviews that sometimes directly address art and literature and sometimes lie outside these subjects.

Discussion

Gilles Deleuze, who attempts to investigate thought socially and historically, creates a field of literary criticism against the individual history of the subject, the notion of the coded family or the social coded by the abstract machine, together with Félix Guattari, while using the machine against the signifier. While expressing that the subject is historical, political and mechanical, they respond, through literary texts, to the names on the stage of history who seek analysis in the realm of the unconscious. In the field of literary criticism, since they especially define the minor literary text as a machine, they ignore symbolic structure forms, imaginary dreams and structural forms, and the spiritual analytical interpretation that dominates the literary criticism of linguistics-inspired formal discourse. (Sauvagnargues, 2010, s. 105) Instead, they suggest the events within the content and narrative in the experientiality of an informal political context. Because a major or established literature follows a vector from content to expression. Once a content is given, one must find, explore, or see the appropriate form of expression in a particular way. What is clear in the mind is spoken later, but minor or revolutionary literature begins by speaking and only then sees and grasps. Expression should break up forms by pointing to breakpoints and new branches. When a form breaks down, the contents that have necessarily been distorted in the order of everything must be reconstructed. To sweep the material, to avoid. Art is sometimes a mirror that goes fast like a clock. In Kafka's case, what are the components of this literary machine, or writing or expression machine? (Deleuze ve Guattari, 1985, s. 591) Deleuze and Guattari, who asked the question, open multiple entries to Kafka's works. "The principle of plural entries only prevents the entry of the enemy, the Signifier, and also prevents the attempts to interpret a work that actually presents itself to nothing but experience." (Deleuze ve Guattari, 2008, s. 7) As Başaran also stated, a series of exits and escapes from a house but entrances that are homecomings (Bkz. Başaran, 2004) as well are machines. This machine produces real effects of a vital



nature against the structure. Deleuze and Guattari, further developing the concept of the machine, treat Kafka's entire work as a literary machine, a writing machine, or an expression machine. About Kafka, however, Deleuze focuses not on the problem of the transverse unity of the multitude, but on the problem of the literary machine's effect in reality.

Kafka is, according to Deleuze and Guattari's claim, a practitioner of "minor literature". Minor literature is a social and political literature. It is heavily influenced by linguistic deterritorialization and is a collective expression marker. Kafka's literary machine is a minor machine that contains diaries, letters, short stories, and novels, whose function reveals "future evil forces or revolutionary forces to be built." It is also a desire machine, which has a non-intellectual but actual (edimsel) mechanism that transmits proliferating sequences, blocks, flows, and densities and produces the real effects of movements. (Ronauld Bogue, 2003, s. 59) In this respect, Deleuze, based on Kafka's works, explains the plural entries at the point where the "bowed-head" content style and the "portrait-photography" expression style come into contact with each other. Particularly by avoiding interpretation, he speaks of the integrating technique of a power apparatus, a being, a judgmental and condemning desire in the functionality of coming together.

The bowed-head image may be a portrait or photograph of an bowed-headed man, a girl with a ribbed hair, appearing in a photograph of an Oedipusian childhood memory. The "moment in a photograph inhibits desire, makes copies, cuts down on layers, cuts off all connections." For Deleuze, this is a dead end. But even in this impasse, the image of the vertical head, which is straighten up by raising the bowed-head, puts childhood memory as a childhood block into plural connections and transfers it to densities by displacing the desire and sometimes by deterritorialising it. There is no longer just a visual memory. There is a sound block as opposed to the visual memory. The vocal block is associated with holding the head upright. For example, Gregor's waking up as an insect one morning, that is, after losing his social position, he can no longer speak and only makes strange noises. Deleuze introduces two new forms: vertical head as a form of content, musical sound as a form of expression. (Deleuze & Guattari, 2008, s. 8)



Bowed head	Inhibited desire, obedient or overpowering, inactivated, minimally connected childhood memory
Portrait-Photogrsaphy	Territorialisation ya da re-territorilisation.
Vertical head	A desire that is straightened up or escape and is opened up to new connections
Musical sound	Childhood block or animal block, deterritorialisation

Table 1 (Deleuze & Guattari, 2008, s. 10)1

The part that concerns Deleuze is where the sound is against the portrait in the narration, and the vertical head against the bowed-head in the content. It is a state of being an outrageous, limitless scream that escapes determination and moves away from regulations. So much so that since sound, the unformed narrative material, is literally a machine in the face of acting in accordance with the patterns of the abstract machine, sometimes it is about a lone victim who interacts with eroticism, sometimes with an inhuman mechanism, and yet its function is strictly social and political. The function of machines is to create synthesis, to generate flows through binary connections, inclusive separations, and nomadic connectors. For Kafka, the problem is to create a writing machine that synthesizes the desiring production streams, creates multiple connections, separations, and unions, and thus produces and sustains movement. In *Anti-Oedipus*, Deleuze and Guattari describe the low-level movement of desire, and while talking about ways in which movement is thwarted, flows are restricted, regulated, coded, and channelled into circuits that are limited in their connection, they relate the relation of a minor art to the social sphere and subject to language in literature. (Bogue, 2003, s. 74) Deleuze sets a non-subjective criterion within the texts he depersonalises - that is, a text which is not dependent on a transcendent subject. The literary machine, therefore, is at the source of neither a linguistic, subjective nor a political structuring. Rather, it connects to the field of the linguistic, subjective and

¹ Deleuze's equations have been tabulated by me.



political by making an intense change with breaks, twists and lines of flight. A writer is therefore not just a writer, he is “a political person, a man-machine.” (Deleuze & Guattari, 2008, s. 13)

(thus, the ape ceases to be a human in order to be a beetle, to be a dog or a mouse, to be an animal, to be inhuman because in fact it is possible to become animal with sound, with a style; and, of course, with the power of frugality). Thus, the Kafka machine consists of unformed substances that enter the machine, exit the machine, and pass through all states as well as contents and expressions shaped in different scales. Entering the machine, exiting, being in the machine, moving along the machine, approaching the machine, all these are still being part of the machine: These are states of desire, regardless of any interpretation. The line of flight is part of the machine. Inside or outside, the animal is part of the nest-machine. The problem is definitely not being free, but finding an exit, an entrance, an edge, a passage, an end point, etc. (Deleuze & Guattari, 2008, s. 13)

Interested in finding an entrance, exit, edge, or passage, Deleuze is concerned with how language is used rather than how it stands in minor literature. However, this usage is not the literature of a minor language, it is the literature of the downsizing that takes place within a major language. While he shows us this process, he establishes a connection that has a political orientation but is not subjective. Alternatively, in the rhizomatic, experiential, nomadic thought zone, he poses the problem of expression with those who write in minor literary style such as Kafka, so that the determination of the value of everything involved in the political sphere can come to light. Even when faced with an oppressive minority, a political-dependent typing machine continues to write as a part of the minority and also as an excluded element. Because literary war tends to determine the value and place of art in the political context by making itself visible in every medium. In line with this tendency, it is important to determine the place of the minority dependent on the political field. Deleuze and Guattari set *A Thousand Plateaus* on the major and minor distinction from beginning to end. For them, minority and major are ways to draw distinctions, and so the major style presents the opposition by basing it on a given and privileged term. For example, human is a major form and this concept belonging to the general realm of beings is then classified into racial, sexual



or cultural local variations. It is a major contrast in the opposition between man and woman. Because we think of women as the other in a different position from the man. However, the minor difference does not base the distinction on a privileged term, nor does it regard this distinction as a pre-given order. Deleuze and Guattari define women or feminization as the minority not because women are a minority but mostly because there are no standards or norms for those above it. If we really accept the possibility of being something, like being a woman, then we really accept that it is something other than a man, that is, human life is not defined by men as ideals of reason, power, domination and action. Ultimately, woman, which is the equivalent of the term minority, appears as a concept open to new possibilities. Therefore, literature is always minor when it fully expands its power to be literature. The reason why Deleuze and Guattari regard Kafka as one of the great writers of minor literature is not that he captured the unrepresented spirit of the Czechs but that he wrote Czechs only without a standard human concept. (Colebrook, 2009, ss. 144-145) In another context, the minority is always a deterritorialized language. Deleuze emphasizes the odd minor uses of Prague German when expressing the minority language. The evaluation of Prague German on the concept of deterritorialization makes it necessary to consider the literary theme in a political context.

The literary machine increasingly replaces the revolutionary anarchist machine in Deleuze, which now gives the impression that the problem of expression must be solved not in a universal form of abstraction, but with literatures called minor. However, the use of the minor instead of the major should not be understood as a substitute for the major. The minor is the subject to change, the one who alters, the transformer. It is not possible to talk about the existence of a minor without a major. Minor literature, which comes to life with the presence of the major, wants to change linguistic and formal literatures in a functional framework with its political connections. In fact, it tries to move content away from the language and exist only in the field of expression. This is exactly what Kafka tries to do while his letters, as well as his stories and novels, by removing all content factors from the law, revealing what it is like to live according to the law. Before the nature of concepts such as law and justice, how we live is an



important question. However, in the major discourse the situation suggests otherwise. Moral and political problems come after the determination of the epistemological field. Whereas Kafka reveals the complexity and corrupt institutions of authority and bureaucracy in both *The Castle* and *The Trial* with a certain moral and political value of expression, he rejects the content in which the major discourse refers to objects, persons and meanings. The marginalized K., the protagonist of *The Castle*, is expected to act according to the determined status quo, in the disciplinary structure of a kind of forming, in the village where he was sent for duty. In spite of all his efforts, K.'s inability to reach neither the administrative unit of the village, the Castle, nor the person he will address in the Castle, is also an expression of the formality of the major on nature and society. (See also, Kafka, 2016b) (See also, Man, 2008) The expression of this kind of forming that transcends discourse is only a style, a syntax.

Deleuze says the following about the components of discourse that Foucault calls propositions:

In any case, it all starts as in a story of Gogol (rather than Kafka). The new archivist declares that he will no longer consider anything but utterances. He will not be concerned with what the archivists who preceded him dealt with a thousand different ways: propositions and sentences. He does not take into account the vertical hierarchy of propositions stacked on top of each other, neither the horizontality in which each sentence appears to respond to one another. Instead, he will locate himself in motion and in some kind of diagonal that previously could not be grasped and also makes utterances readable. Are we going to call this atonal logic? It is normal to be anxious here, as this archivist does not give an example in particular. He thinks that he had always given examples before, even at that time he did not know that they were examples. Now, however, the only real example he analyses is particularly concerning: A string of letters that I randomly typed or copied as they were on a typewriter keyboard. "The keyboard of the typewriter is not an utterance; but this same string of letters, A, Z, E, R, T, listed in a typewriter manual, is the utterance for the alphabetical order adopted by French typewriters." Such multiplicities have no regular linguistic structure but still constitute utterance. (Deleuze, 2004, ss. 23-24)



These utterances establish their own objects, concepts, and areas of subjective enunciation. The impossibility to write or the impossibility of writing in German due to established and formed functions may create lines of flight from this field and produce itself by existing together with the oppressive representation of the literary field. In the story of Kafka, who created an escape route in a minor language like the speaking subject in Prague, or in *The Trial* novel, Joseph K. learning that he was the defendant with a knock on his door one morning, tries to learn why he was guilty in the order of human language propositions even if the contents of the law were never declared or ultimately inferred. In both works of Kafka, the unknown name of the protagonist and the network of relationships based on absurdities are given together with the struggles of incomprehensible signs in psychological situations. (Bkz. Kafka, 2016a) Surrounded by the apparatus of the state such as desire, language, and law, it is unlikely that man will find a real outlet at the level of content. Hence Deleuze, while investigating the schizophrenic journey of an anarchist nomad, cites examples from English, American, German literature, including writers such as Lawrence, Melville, Beckett, or Kafka, preferring American literature among them. However, in contrast to French literature, he prefers American and English literature. (Deleuze & Parnet, 2016, ss. 51-69) Because, rather than the language fiction that is suitable for the literary product, he is interested in the minor works of people in a field belonging to the diversity and changes of the way of existence that can use many languages. Because Deleuze's approach to literature in parallel with his approach to the history of philosophy is based on the act of reading. He poses an answer to the question of what is literature through the acts of reading he performs on Kafka, Beckett, Lawrence, Melville and so on. However, in Deleuze's philosophy, most of the minor literature part covers Kafka readings. These readings are connected to a new field on the basis of experiential, by separating minor literary works from the formal field.

Since the minor literature meant by Deleuze carries a collective value, this new field leaves behind the major transparency of thought by separating from individualized utterances. It connects what the author says with the political so that the theoretical creation of the concepts can be resolved by an experimentality. Marriage in major literatures or individual



problems of family join together with other individual problems to form a block. According to Deleuze, none of the Oedipusian problems are indispensable or necessary, but since they all form a block together, they address the formal aspect of concepts. (Deleuze & Guattari, 2008, s. 26) On the other hand, a minor philosophy, by using its style of expression as the theoretical creation of concepts, ensures that all kinds of individual problems are connected to politics. Avoiding an Oedipusian phantasm, minor literature seeks to create a new entry way of existence by following its own lines, distinctions and forms. Joseph K., in the besieged lost despair of his existence, draws himself a new way of being, with breaks and twists in the absurdity of the litigation at the beginning of the process. He changes and transforms the connection of the patterns determined by the society to the place-homeland with the artistic diffusion of the theoretical creation of concepts.

Deleuze explains this with the great ambiguous formula of Bartleby, who was the clerk in the attorney's office in the Critical and Clinical. The formula is: I would prefer NOT to do it. The formula has indefinite variables that sometimes leave the conditional aside, and sometimes persist every time. With this formula, we actually arrive at the ultimate form of the theoretical impasse. While Deleuze describes the ten major situations in which the formula is applied, he evaluates the so-called grammatical contradiction within the limits of his style of expression. Every regular expression would have a limit. "This would not be a suitcase-word as found in Lewis Carroll, but a 'suitcase-structure', a breathing structure, a boundary or a tensioner." (Deleuze, 2007, s. 89) Bartleby's repetition of the same formula eventually consumes the expression and causes unusual words to settle, disrupting the language of others. The main motif under Bartleby's suggesting this formula is his refusal to copy. Ceaselessly copying texts like a machine, Bartleby chooses not to do it anymore. However, when we turn our attention only to the style of expression, all content and meaning becomes dull. Bartleby only passed the stage of choosing not to do it. Until the sixth stage, he just said he preferred not to do it, but continued to copy. However, after the sixth stage, he realized a delayed conclusion in the statement. He makes what he is doing impossible on the plane of external relations, abstract lines and concepts. He empties all the content and



therefore it remains unimaginable and imperceptible. A minor literature is performed in a narrow space, but this space has made the concepts deterritorialized.

This is what the importance of studies based on Numbers, Letters and their cryptic meanings are resulted from. It is as if three processes are listed: processing the language in a certain way; the result of this process as a creation of a first language within the language; and the effect of taking the whole expression away, kidnapping it, and with reference, pushing the language to its limit in order to discover the Outside, silence or music. So much so that a great book is always the backside of another book written only in the soul, in silence or blood... Language (becomes) an incomprehensible murmur. (Deleuze, 2007, s. 93)

The formula stops any speech act and carries out the destruction of the expression. It breaks down the presuppositions of expression which is the system of double references of speech acts that refer to subjective and objective meanings. When the formula ceases the speak act, Bartleby becomes an entity excluded by society. In the context of social relations, Bartleby's hopes are shattered, just as Kafka's hopes for existence were. He turns into a lone victim interacting with a non-human machine against the network of social relations operated by a logic of presuppositions waiting to be obeyed. In this respect, the Penal Colony in *Anti-Oedipus* serves Deleuze and Guattari as a useful example of torture or a desire machine. Concerning a solitary victim interacting with a non-human mechanism, the function of this situation is strictly social and political. In Kafka, however, the torture device is only one of the machines Deleuze and Guattari studied, and they argue that it is not Kafka's most successful machine, at least in terms of production and continuation of the desire for celibacy. As a result, anomalies are very easily assimilated into an oedipal structure such as father and son, victim. (Bogue, 2003, s. 74) Actually, Bartleby presents a mechanical work here. He examines the hope of the emergence of a new type of human expected from the mechanized man of the future in the events taking place in the social unconscious to which the concepts refer. However, despite the major's assimilation works of this kind, a minor literature crosses the threshold of deterritorialization of the field to which



concepts are referenced with vitality. He reveals his concepts by being other-being, extra-human or extra-natural.

As soon as the concepts exceed the threshold of deterritorialization, they arise in another problem that concerns the expression style of the other person in the minor concept, without the need for oedipal meanings. Conceptual production taking place along the lines of real forces in a Nietzschean eternal repetition creates lines of flight in different mechanical processes. Thus, the reality of a possible world is verified by language.

Here again, the face, the three components of the possible world and the language can reterritorialize their place in the major meanings of the other, like the incomprehensible Chinese face with the strange tones of the spoken language, expressing the mystery of the East. But the components can be elevated to an absolute threshold of deterritorialization, following a line of flight until they lose all the meaning: the Possible world does not exist outside the face that expresses it; as long as a language is spoken, the head turns into a mere face; and language, on the other hand, is distinguished from sound only insofar as it speaks of a possible world. Each component of the concept forms the others in mutual assumptions. There are no longer transcendental, hidden or fixed assumptions; and the concept can be affected and change its meaning when it encounters other problems and other components. After crossing the threshold of absolute deterritorialization, concepts no longer refer to their primary meaning: the concept of “a Possible world” no longer refers to China or elsewhere. Instead, concepts represent pure events in thought. (Goodchild, 2005, s. 99)

Therefore, the fact that everything in minor literature has a connection with politics as well as having a collective value is related to the fact that the concepts, which are the assumptions that shape the meaning, show collective events in thought. For Deleuze, showing collective events never means taking refuge in literature because of its weakness or powerlessness. That Kafka creates lines of flight as he opposes life and writing should not be taken in the sense of taking refuge in a rhizome or a home. “The creative line of flight brings with it all politics, the whole economy, all bureaucracy and law: it sucks them like vampires to enable them to form the yet unknown voices of the near future — fascism, Stalinism,



Americanism, evil forces knocking on the door. Because narration precedes the content and drags it after.” (Deleuze & Guattari, 2008, s. 61)

Concepts in the changing political world can be separated from collective enunciation through the discovery of new problems, new images of thought, and new conceptual personalities. Many images in novels or stories are elements that provide the revolutionary function of collective enunciation. Since only literature can produce effective solidarity, the author is also a potential community-building machine. However, references are lost in this creation process. Deleuze starts the story of a formation with images or portraits under the paternal function in Melville's novels. The formation here begins with the image of the father as a sculpture or painting. In fact, Deleuze continues his words in *Critical and Clinic* as follows:

Even Moby Dick primarily gathers information, from the dark painting in the inn, to shape the whale and create an image from it. Bartleby also obeys the rule; the two officers are like reverse symmetrical paper images, and the attorney acts such a father that you have trouble believing that you are in New York. It all starts like an English novel by Dickens set in London. But each time something so strange happens that the image becomes blurry, a fundamental uncertainty flops down on it, it is prevented from "taking" a form, but at the same time the subject breaks down, goes astray, and the entire paternal function disappears. Things start to get interesting only at this point. The statue of the father is replaced by a much more ambiguous portrait, and then another portrait of anyone or nobody. References are lost and human formation is replaced by an unknown new element, the mystery of a formless, inhuman life, a Squid. (Deleuze, 2007, s. 99)

Deleuze also uses the function of other forces, replacing the disappearing indeterminate forces for minor literati, who are subject to act of reading like the fabric of the patchwork. Minor concepts, together with other forces that replace uncertain ones, are political in that they are intertwined with relations of domination, classification, naming.

In *Kafka In A Minor Literature*, Deleuze associates with each other the three characteristics of minor literature in the context of the direct attachment of the individual to the political sphere, the collective arrangement



of utterance, and the deterritorialization of language, in a revolutionary character that positions itself as it comes into being. This association process, which is effective and affirmative, creating alternate lines, breaks, entrances, points to a field of formation. In this field, expression and content mutually influence each other and become indistinguishable. The way of existence of the individual makes himself deterritorialized in this intertwinement and then gains his own meaning by reterritorializing himself again. Minor literature thus draws a simple map of the paths to enter or avoid. It's like being K., the winding geodesist of a road that neither becomes far, nor approaches, as in the Castle. (Deleuze & Guattari, 2008, s. 51) The mode of existence of a person, then, does not belong to the empirical level of functional mechanical aggregations, nor to the transcendent level of lines that have become deterritorialized and dysfunctional. It belongs to the plane that these lines come across. (Goodchild, 2005, s. 102) It is the vitalist power of inorganic life that can be in a pattern, music, writing or cinema line. It is also an inherent plane of the network of events that stammer, create, resist and draw the organic blocks a way out to life.

Conclusion

The clinical function of art in Deleuze's works is seen as both the experiment and the clinic of vital conditions. The fact that art and life are so intertwined attempts to rediscover vital processes again and again through such descriptions, without leaving out the incomplete, anomalous, or broken. During this exploration, a particular type of writer emerges. Sacher-Masoch presents himself as a character study where Deleuze assigns a clinical function to an artistic creation, while simultaneously showcasing Sade as a writer and Masoch as an example of literary technique in the art of the novel. The connection between literature and healing emerges in the positive experiential effects of art in life.

Here, the point to emphasize, particularly from Deleuze's perspective, is that literature does not lie behind sadism or masochism, but rather that literature finds the effects of sadism or masochism in novels, where literature is at the forefront. Literature thus becomes privy to the imaginative testimony of a real state of deviance.



References

- Başaran, M. (2004). *Gıyabında, Yerineler*. İstanbul: Pradigma Yayınları.
- Bogue, R. (2003). *Deleuze on Literature*. New York: Routledge.
- Colebrook, C. (2009). *Gilles Deleuze*. (Çev. Cem Soydemir). İstanbul: Doğu Batı Yayınları.
- Deleuze, G. (2015). *Anlamanın Mantiğı*. (Hakan Yücefer). İstanbul: Norgunk Yayıncılık.
- Deleuze, G. and Sacher-Masoch, L. V. (1991). *Coldness and Cruelty, Venüs in Furs*. New York: Zone Books.
- Deleuze, G. (2004). *Foucault* (Çev. Burcu Yalım, Emre Koyuncu). İstanbul: Norgunk Yayıncılık.
- Deleuze, G. (2007). *Kritik ve Klinik* (Çev. İnci Uysal). İstanbul: Norgunk Yayıncılık.
- Deleuze, G. (2007). *Sacher-Masoch'un Takdimi*, (Çev. İnci Uysal), İstanbul: Norgunk Yayıncılık.
- Deleuze, G. ve Parnet, C. (2016). *Diyaloglar* (Çev. Ali Akay). İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (2008). *Kafka: Minör Bir Edebiyat İçin* (Çev. Özgür Uçkan-Işık Ergüden). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Deleuz, G. and Guattari, F. (1985). *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature: The Components of Expression: C. Vol. 16*. New Literary History.
- Goodchild, P. (2005). *Deleuze & Guattari: Arzu Politikasına Giriş* (Çev. Rahmi G. Öğdül). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Kafka, F. (2016a). *Dava* (Çev. Ahmet Cemal). İstanbul: Can Yayınları.
- Kafka, F. (2016b). *Şato* (Çev. Regaip Minareci). İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Man, P.D. (2008). *Okuma Alegorileri: Rousseau, Nietzsche, Rilke ve Proust'ta Figürel Dil* (Çev. Mustafa Zeki Çıraklı). İstanbul: Paradigma Yayınları.
- Sauvagnargues, A. (2010). *Deleuze ve Sanat* (Çev. Nurten Sarıca). Ankara: De Ki Basım Yayım Ltd. Şti.



Öz: Deleuze madde ve biçim arasındaki ilişkiden hareketle organsız bedeni sanattaki üretici düşüncüyü tanımlayan yoğunluk olarak ele aldığı kısımda felsefe-sanat bağlamında bir çözümlemeye girişir. Kolektifliği belleğin kişisel yönetiminden ve anmanın kolektif idealinden kurtarmak için dönüşüme ve değişime dayalı bağlamsallıkları, belli bir zamansallıktaki zihinsel ve doğrusal sürecin aksine, parçaları ve parçacıkları akışlar içinde kavramaya odaklanır. Bundan dolayı yazar dil içinde yeni bir dil, adeta yabancı bir dil icat eder. Felsefe Nedir’de Deleuze, felsefe ve edebiyat arasındaki ilişkiyi kavramsal bir bağlamsallıkta ve sanatla olan bağlantısallığında ele alırken icat etmeyi, “üretme” ve “yaratma gücü” olarak nitelendirir. Bu saptama varoluşun lojistiğini hareket açısından sorgulamakla kalmaz, aynı zamanda yazıları, yaşamın özneleri ve nesnelere olan gerçek hayranlığını gösterirken dirimselcilik ile ilgili kendi önermelerine kaynak oluşturur. Çoğu zaman bu kaynak Deleuze’ün, felsefe tarihinden seçmiş olduğu isimler ve metinler üzerinden felsefi, psikolojik ve bilimsel yeniden bir okuma edimi ile belirir: Descartes’a karşı Spinoza, Kant’a karşı Nietzsche, Sade’a karşı Sacher-Masoch.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Edebiyat, felsefe, psikoloji, sado-mazoşist sendrom, minör-edebiyat, yazma edimi, dil.

