TRISTRAM SHANDY AS AN ANTI OEDIPUS

FIGURE

Melisa GENÇ
Master Thesis
Department of English Language and
Literature
Adviser: Prof.Tatiana GOLBAN

2021

ANTİ ODİPUS FİGÜR OLARAK TRISTRAM SHANDY

Melisa GENÇ

Yüksek Lisans Tezi
İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı
Danışman: Prof. Dr. Tatiana GOLBAN

2021

T.C.
TEKIRDAG NAMIK KEMAL UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND
LITERATURE
MASTER THESIS

TRISTRAM SHANDY AS AN ANTI OEDIPUS FIGURE

Melisa GENÇ

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND

LITERATURE

ADVISER: PROF. TATIANA GOLBAN

TEKIRDAG-2021

T.C.
TEKİRDAĞ NAMIK KEMAL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI
YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

ANTİ ODİPUS FİGÜR OLARAK TRISTRAM SHANDY

Melisa GENÇ

İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI

DANIŞMAN: PROF. DR. TATİANA GOLBAN

TEKİRDAĞ-2021

SCIENTIFIC ETHICS STATEMENT

I undertake that I comply with scientific ethics and academic rules at all stages of my Master's Thesis, that I refer to every quotation I use directly or indirectly in the study, that the works I benefit from are those shown in the bibliography, and that my writing is in accordance with the institute's writing guide.

24 / 06 / 2021

Melisa GENÇ

BİLİMSEL ETİK BİLDİRİMİ

Hazırladığım Yüksek Lisans Tezinin bütün aşamalarında bilimsel etiğe ve akademik kurallara riayet ettiğimi, çalışmada doğrudan veya dolaylı olarak kullandığım her alıntıya kaynak gösterdiğimi ve yararlandığım eserlerin kaynakçada gösterilenlerden oluştuğunu, yazımda enstitü yazım kılavuzuna uygun davranıldığını taahhüt ederim.

24 / 06 / 2021

Melisa GENÇ

ÖZET

Kurum, Enstitü, ABD	: Tekirdağ Namık Kemal Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, : İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı
Tez Başlığı	: Anti Odipus Figür olarak Tristram Shandy
Tez Yazarı	: Melisa GENÇ
Tez Danışmanı	: Prof. Dr. Tatiana GOLBAN
Tez Türü,Yılı	: Yüksek Lisans Tezi, 2021
Sayfa Sayısı	: 82

Tristram Shandy, yazıldığı günden bu yana İngiliz edebiyatında en çok tartışılan edebiyat eserlerinden biridir. Örneğin, İngiliz edebiyatının en seçkin isimlerinden biri olan Samuel Johnson, yazıldığı sırada bu esere şüpheyle bakıyordu. "Tuhaf olan hiçbir şeyin kalıcı olmayacağını" düşündü. Benzer şekilde, Sterne'nin çağdaş eleştirmenleri eseri alışılmadık anlatı teknikleri açısından garip, sıra dışı ve başarısız buldu. Buna karşılık, Tristram Shandy, yazıldığı günden bu yana iki yüzyıldan fazla süre geçmesine rağmen hala birçok edebi teoriye, post-modern anlatı tekniğine ve anti-kahraman örneklerine ilham veriyor. Postmodern edebi eleştiriden çok önce Sterne, mimetik gerçekliği, bütünlük mitini, doğrusallığı ve odipal kahramanın mirasa, Baba'nın yasasına ve fallusa ulaşmak için tamamladığı kahramanın yolculuğu arke tipini sorunsallaştırdı. Başarılı bir parodi sundu. Don Kişot ve diğer bildungsroman kahraman parodilerini kullanarak hicivsel bir kolaj sundu. Bu eserde Sterne, Baba'nın bütünlük ve mükemmellik takıntısına karşı kahramanın grotesk beden imajını, benlik ötesindeki yeğinlik alanlarını ve organsız bedenini yüceltir. Bu bağlamda Tristram Shandy, eksiklik, kayıp ve özlem ile disipline edilmiyor, tam tersine, kurgusal gerçekliğinin farkında olan ve meta-refleksif bir kahraman olarak hiç tereddüt etmeden kurgusallığını deşifre ediyor. Sonuç olarak, Tristram Shandy bir parodidir, nesneleştirmenin, suçluluk ve odipal ideallerin yükü altında olan kahraman-özne kavramına karşı anti-odipal bir kahramandır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Tristram Shandy, Sterne, Anti-odipal, postmodern edebiyat.

ABSTRACT

Tristram Shandy is one of the most discussed novels in English language literature since the day it was written. For instance, at the time of its writing; Samuel Johnson, one of the most distinguished names in English literature, was skeptical of this work. He thought that nothing awkard would be permanent. Similarly, contemporary critics of Sterne found his novel to be strange, unusual, and unsuccessful in terms of unconventional narrative techniques. In contrast, Tristram Shandy has still inspired many literary theories, post-modern narrative technique and anti-hero examples, despite more than two centuries since the day it was written. Long before postmodern literary criticism, Sterne problematized the mimetic reality, the myth of integrity, linearity, and the archetype of the hero's journey that the odipal hero completes to reach inheritance, law, and phallus. He has presented a successful parody. Using Don Quixote and other bildungsroman hero parodies, he presented a satirical collage. He glorified the hero's grotesque image of the body, the plane of immanence beyond the self, and the body without organs against the Father's obsession with completeness and perfection. In this context, Tristram Shandy is not disciplined by imperfection, loss, and lack, on the contrary, as a meta-reflexive hero who is aware of his fictional reality, he without hesitation deciphering his fictionality. As a result, Tristram Shandy is a parody, an anti-odipal hero who has been against the concept of hero-subject under the burden of objectification and of guilt and odipal ideals.

Keywords: Tristram Shandy, Sterne, Anti-odipal, postmodern literary.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CONTENT

INTRODUCTION

Literature and social sciences have always been in mutual interaction. Especially the emerging scientific literary criticism, which marked the 19th century Victorian paradigm, revealed the close relationship of literature and social sciences with positivist and historical facts. Whether the origin of literature is historical or sociological, the aim of this study will be to investigate the organic relationship between literature and social theories over the concept of time over Bergson's concept of durée and the interaction between the two. According to Bergon, time exists with consciousness rather than a mathematical calculation process. So time; it is intertwined with psychology and consciousness rather than being a linear, cumulative and progressive concept. Bergson replaced the static and objective understanding of time with the structural and subjective creativity of the duration. According to the philosophy of duration time is directly related to being, becoming and life, so the solid walls between past, present and future disappear in the heterogeneous spontaneous time. Likewise, Bakhtin examines experience time in Rabelais's and Dostoyevsky's writings in terms of kairological open-endedness of time as opposed to the reified geometry of the chronology. In other words; time and construction of experience is re-conceptualized in this study as the past determining the future by joining the present, the future is in fusion with the past at the moment of experience. Similarly, T.S Eliot emphasizes the historical intuition of literature in his essay "Tradition and Individual Talent" to emphasize the importance of tradition. According to the author, tradition is a simultaneous intertextuality. Since the literary tradition is a living organism, the relation of tradition with time is in the form of mutual ongoing dialogues. According to Eliot, time and tradition are in a simultaneous interaction that continues like a spiral model. Therefore, although the past is displaced by the present, it continues to be shaped by the past at the moment. In this context, the relationship between literature and social theory is based on the simultaneous and interdisciplinary interaction model. For example, many concepts of Deleuze and Guattari, one of the philosophical geniuses of our time, resonate in literature. Especially Sterne's literary philosophy gains a new dimension with the contributions of Deleuze's and Guattari's philosophical criticism but at the same time

the contemporary cultural and literary theories is open to a new approach under the light of Sterne's unconventional narrative discourse. The aim of this study will be to examine the traces of the radical philosophy of Deleuze and Guattari in Sterne's the most outlandish novel of his time; The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman, to identify relevant intersections. For this purpose, the academic concepts that Deleuze and Guattari bring to the social sciences will be examined; In particular, the Oedipus complex, rhizome philosophy, the line of flight and non-odipal forms of self and desire will be discussed in the context of the study. In addition to this, the Russian intellectuals like Viktor Shklovsky and Mikhail Bakhtin will be mentioned with regards to de-familiarization technique, unfinalizability and open-ended becoming in Sterne's novel.

CHAPTER I

THE INFLUENCE OF DELEUZE AND GUATTARI IN CULTURAL AND SOCIAL STUDIES

Deleuze and Guattari are one the most influential academic names in the history of philosophy, cultural studies and literary criticism. Especially, they marked the post-structural studies of literature, history, politics and psychoanalysis. Their significance relies on the spirit of the 68' era which gives rise to a new epoch in academy in general, cultural studies, humanity sciences and theoretical criticism in specific. However, their success in philosophy results from the fail of the 68' so they want to transform breakdowns to breakthroughs (Buchanan, 2008, p. 38, 39, 56). Namely, they witness decline of the 68 era which stimulates them for rethinking and regenerating the idea of revolution. Having perceived failure of the 68 events, they are provided a new insight of perspective to investigate modes of entrapment of desire, freedom and becoming. It can be said that Deleuze and Guattari initiate metamorphosis in the realm of resistance against hegemony of grand-meta narratives, traditional organization of power and power dynamics which is not only referring to the authority but also already made revolution. They want to envisage the lines of flight to follow becoming and to destroy pre-formative identification apparatus. On the contrary to the grand closure of individuals in which the concept of subjectiveness is a form of objectification and stratification of obedience, Deleuze and Guattari attempt to formulate radical philosophy of decoding, non-hiearchization and becoming. In this sense, they borrow from Artaud and declare war against articulated-stratified subjectivity assembled by linguistic, platonic logic of identity. Instead, they extol the body without organs which extricates itself from articulation and record of the despot. They imagine an alternative model of being, desiring and becoming which is based on deconstruction of traditional order of things, lack-oriented desire and linguistic law that is inscribed on the tissue of identity and subjectivity (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 21).

In their terms, they liken the stratification of social organization of hierarchical model to swampy-muddy water which absorbs and engulfs any possibility of authenticity and subjectiveness, instead they prefer tangential surface of patch-work introduced in "A Thousand Plateaus". For example, they create an

experimental model of organisation introduced in "A Thousand Plateaus", in which relations are characterized by lateral, tangential and nomad connections. In there, the bodies are not castrated by oedipal sunder from the maternal fulfilment; instead, the bodies exist in nomadology of the body without organs (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980, p. 19, 27, 33, 45, 47, 68)

They also redefine the very concept of desire and unconscious in terms of denouncing Oedipus signified that foils and humiliates desire. Instead, they extricate unconscious desires from the burden of omnipresent oedipal territorialisation which barrens desire. On the contrary Deleuze and Guattari assert that unconscious is a productive mode of desiring-machine, ceaselessly producing and proliferating unlike barren and unproductive singularity of oedipal desire. All in all, they want to release "bricolage" of becoming against domestication and pacification strategies of closure (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p.7).

1.1 The Influence of Strauss, Derrida

Bricolage is a term famous with Strauss and Derrida within the context of post-structural decoding process of originality, absolutism and heterogeneity. In this respect bricolage allows new states of relations, proliferations and transcreations (Johnson, 2012, p. 357, 358). On the other side, the theory of closure is explained by Deleuze in the way that it is a stratification of myriad of heterogeneous articulations. In this closure of articulation, bodies are coded according to hierarchy of order; it is a particular mode of gathering codes, statements enunciations and forms of content. It is achieved through different modes of articulation like the law of the Father which is compensated by the linguistic law and "proper repression" (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 339, 363). It means that entrapment of subjectivity starts in language continues as proper repression in confrontation with symbolic order and fabricates docile subjects for the continuation of domestication. To be able to understand the proper repression which is fore closuring becoming and proliferation, the relation between representation and repression must be exposed with regards to the platonic logic of negation.

1.2 The origin of The Platonic Negation of Desire, Becoming and the Signifier.

In the history of philosophy there are two branches of attitude; one is affirming desire, becoming and proliferation, the other is ceasing desiring production and the lines of flight (Goodchild, 2005, p. 46, 52). The latter emanates with Plato and defines identity with deprivation, lack and absence. In other words, platonic logic of existence is haunted by forfeited ideal of integrity so it reiterates the burden of loss, disjunction and sunder in the search of lost, idealized unity. The roots of tarnishing existence, desire and identity as a symptom of loss derives from Plato's dialogues (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 25, 338). In "Symposion" as Plato cites, genesis of humanity is stained by the curse upon ancestors of humans. According to Plato, androgynous is a complete existence with two heads, two genitals, four arms and legs but Zeus punished them by splitting them in to two so the existence of human-being comes from the act of sunder, disjunction. As a result disunited body is deprived of the forfeited, lost part of the ideal unity (Solmaz, 2019, p. 147). The half part yearns for the other. This platonic concept of deprivation gives rise to oedipal subjectivity because the subject is tarnished by lack of phallus, wailing for he lost object (Solmaz, 2019, p. 148, 149). In this case phallus is also not attainable, cannot be presented in the sign system because it is beyond linguistic signifiers. In contrast with penis which men do have while women are deprived of, phallus is acquired by neither men nor women so phallus evocates and reiterates the loss of sensible, attainable, reachable meaning and desire. In other words, phallus is the cause of cessations in meaning-making and desire-producing process. As the subject speaks he or she involves absence of totally grasped, comprehended meaning and desire so the subject enters the system of signs in which once authentic signified is presented with metonymies and metaphors of the real (Goodchild, 2005, p.136, 137).

1.3 The Repressing Nature of Representation of the Signified

According to Deleuze and Guattari the relation between representation and repression stems from the system of metonymy and metaphor in signifying system. In this respect, representing the signified through its insufficient signifiers, replaces reality with its metaphor. However, as Deleuze and Guattari note, the act of

replacement sets disfigured, distorted signifier instead of the authentic signified (Holland, 2012, p.313, 317). Namely, the act of representing turns into initial repression by distorting, disfiguring the signified. As a result, the real or ideal signified is replicated by its metonymies. To illustrate, the signifier is a result of repression due to the representation of the signified because it indicates distorted image of the real. Therefore, the sign system is reifiying flow of meanings and of proliferation of language. In other words, it is oedipalizing to demarcate becoming in language and in unconscious which is structured as language (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 343).

1.4 Oedipus Tragedy as a distorted Image of the Unconscious Signified

In terms of presentation and manifestation of the unconscious via fictitious materials like Oedipus complex, guilt, burden and incest-murder desire, snares the real signified in unconscious and replaces its distorted, disfigured signifiers along with guilt complex and troublesome conscience. Namely, unconscious is structured in terms of baleful system of sign and signifiers which snares and traps the real signified of desire by inscribing murderous hatred and fictitious incest desire on the signifier of the real (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 46, 47, 53). In doing so, unconscious is repressed in the matter of representing the unconscious signified via distorted images and immoral desires.

"...But, Deleuze and Guattari say, psychoanalysis draws two false conclusions from this initial premise. First, that the agency in question can be discerned on the flipside of the displaced represented; and second, that this agency is a nonrepresented representative (or 'lack') obtruding in the sphere of representation. For Deleuze and Guattari, the locus classicus of this particular error is the assumption that one can deduce the nature of desire from what is prohibited. As we saw in the case of incest the prohibition is a way of dishonouring desire, a way of trapping it with a false image" (Buchanan, 2008, p. 118).

In the quotation above, Buchanan explains Deleuze and Guattaris's objection towards dishonouring the unconscious desire in terms of Oedipal guilt.

Finally, the signifier Oedipus becomes metaphor for unconscious which is perceived as a reservoir of repressed fantasies, guilt and burden. Oedipus becomes emblematic signifier to snare real desire residing in the uncodable, non-signified unconscious (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 97, 108).

All in all, twice repression or repression proper as Freud cites occurs in the way that distorted signifier of the real desire is perceived as abominable, nasty and hideous by the social order. In other words, Deleuze and Guattari decipher the displacing agency behind the transaction between the signifier and the signified. The Oedipus signifier is a displaced and disfigured representation of the fake unconscious which is constituted by castration complex, oedipal guilt and repressive materials. In doing so, not only the unconscious is repressed by social bliefs but also desiring-production is displaced by its false repserentation. (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 313).

1.5 Repression Proper or Secondary Repression

Moreover, repugnancy towards the unconscious desire which is already repressed by its disfigured signifier is backed by myths and oracles. Namely, the signifier of unconscious desire which has been already entrapped, foiled and humiliated by the Oedipus signifier is twice repressed by culture and social system. As a result, the bogus signifier of the unconscious becomes the universal image of the real desire at the hands of language and sign system with regards to representation and repression relation. In this sense, the unconscious is structured by the universal law of forbidden desire and murderous hatred towards the family signifier. In this process, Oedipus is doubled in terms of twice repression. To illustrate, it is not only snaring and repressing the real signified desire by presenting it in the form of Oedipus but also Oedipus signifier becomes a universal instrument to humiliate and disgrace desire (Deleuze, Guatari, 1972, p. 115, 117, 118). Fiction veils instincts. In this respect, the real desire is articulated in the service of sign system of social order. The flow of unconscious is not codable and able to be articulated; therefore, it besets and threatens oedipal identities and galvanise proliferation of becoming. In fact the unconscious which cannot be grasped and reduced in to a reified and a univocal image operates in constant de-territorialisation

and re-territorialisation of proliferating and becoming as language as a living organism. However, sign and signifying system demarcates the flow of becoming in language and desire.

Finally, Deleuze and Guattari criticize high structuralism of psychoanalysis and linguistic theories to reduce modes of expressions and becoming in to historically contingent translations, signifiers and archetypes. They offer a criticism of representation strategies to release flow of desire and expression. They also underline fallacy of understanding the real signified via translated and contingent signifiers:

"But an unconscious understood only in terms of repressed material would be completely unreliable, and would offer only a distorted image of the unconscious itself, falsified by the inevitably partial and contingent representations of it available to consciousness" (Holland, 2012, p. 313).

In the quotation above Holland explains the semiotic analysis of the unconscious in the way that the signified of unconscious desire is falsified by the disfigured signifier. As a result the false referent constitutes the basis of repression. Demarcation of desire and of proliferation by repression proper fabricates oedipalized subjectivity for enduring domestication and confinement (Buchanan, 2008, p. 66, 67).

1.6 Twice Castration of the Self as a Speaking and Desiring Subject

Subject is being castrated twice in terms of being cut off from real referent of desire and meaning (Zizek, 2006, p. 3, 6). According to Lacan, the unconscious is structured like a language which proves the twice obscuration of the signified. First, in language the real referent is obscured by its signifiers replacing the real with metaphors and metonymies, secondly, desire is signified via its distorted and disfigured image in the name of Oedipus. Namely, the subject is prohibited to attain the real in language and also in the unconscious. In response to this, Deleuze and Guattari envisage the lines of flight to attain becoming and proliferating by destroying major-language and major-identity. They want to offer an alternative way to extricate being from capture, closure and social repression. Deleuze and Guattari's

challenging philosophy aims at flourishing new modes and types of being and desiring unlike the present form of subjectivity which is a symptom of oedipal castration in desire and language (Goodchild, 2005, p. 172, 176). Today's subjectivity is a signifier of lack of phallus, deprivation of phallus-signified. The phallus does not have a proper equivalent (Holland, 2012, p.328, 330). Therefore it does not exist in exchange system of language that makes it unattainable and unreachable. The phallus cannot be substituted in the sign system of signifying. Hereby, speaking subject who exists in the exchange system of substitutions incorporates with the inherent lack of phallus (Zizek, 2006, p.68, 69). Both men and women confront the law of phallus which is mediated through Name of the Father, and acquire the unconscious knowledge of lack, deprivation and deficiency. Namely, a unified ego is an illusion that has to be challenged by becoming and open ended dialogicism (Holland, 2012, p.328).

The subject has to endure the impossibility of total satisfaction or complete fulfilment in language and desiring. His or her real signified desire and intention of thought is filtered and distorted in the exchange system of substitutions. The subject is torn between two extreme, either he/she obeys the Law of the father which makes the subject a symptom of lack, castration and deprivation of satiation, or the subject involves dismemberment of schizophrenia; a loss of reality and identity. In this paper, the lines of flight provided by revolutionary breakdowns to breakthroughs of schizophrenia will be discussed with regards to literature, language and desire-politics.

1.7 Schizophrenic Literature as Opposed to Oedipalized Authorial Discourse

Deleuze and Guattari always appreciate the organic tie between literature and breakthroughs of schizophrenia; furthermore, they believe the schizophrenic potency of literature in the matter of using minor-language, crossing the lines and de-territorializing mimetic despotism in literature. They criticize mimetic obligation in literature to appeal the real, to express the proper, instead they argue flow and becoming in literature by destructing grammatical and syntactic rules (Buchanan, 2008, p.32, 78). They encourage minor literature as a possibility of the line of flight.

In response, literature as a writing machine can demonstrate countless modes of expression.. In this sense, literature becomes a schizophrenic experience of writing, a state of delirium with regards to becoming

"As if the great voices, which were capable of performing a breakthrough in grammar and syntax, and of making all language a desire, were not speaking from the depths of psychosis, and as if they were not demonstrating for our benefit an eminently psychotic and revolutionary means of escape." (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p.134).

For instance Deleuze and Guattari favour several writers such as Hardy, Ginsberg and Kerouac, in American literature in the matter of transgressing limits of mimesis, manifesting becoming and decentralization, and destructing oedipal immersion of capitalistic ideals. Namely, these writers experience schizophrenic flows and moves from breakdowns to breakthroughs (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p.15). They extricate literature from neurotic ideals of the state ideology.

Yet, Deleuze and Guattari also take attention to oedipalization of literature in terms of impression anxiety of the author as well as commoditisation of literary works in the market place. According to them, literature is being reduced in to an object of commodity, gratifying reader's expectations, maintaining mimetic slavery and repressing representation of flow of becoming in literature. Namely, oedipalized literature comforts established social order by transferring the state ideology within the fiction (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p.113, 133).

Another aspect of oedipalization of literature is castration complex of the author by anxiety of influence. The author-ego is threatened by successful and masterful precursors. In other words, as Bloom underlines, father son conflict turns in to strong male author and his rivalry with paternal author as a critic or a more successful paternal master (Barzilai, 1991, p.303).

In response to this, Deleuze and Guattari contribute to literary philosophy with the term; rhizome. They are influenced by Artaud, Brecht and Proust in terms of the possibility in literature to attain becoming, proliferation and body without organs. Deleuze and Guattari consider literature as a mode of schizophrenic writing so they adapt the theory of rhizome to literature to demonstrate root-free potency in literature (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p.133).

First of all, rhizome is a philosophical concept improved by Deleuze and Guattari within the context of radicalization of the lines of flight in politics, literature, language and philosophy. They further study the concept in their famous book "A Thousand Plateaus" (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980, p. 25, 37). In the first place they borrow the concept of rhizome from botanic discourse and improve it in terms of philosophy of becoming, proliferation and decentralization. It becomes a radicalized theory allowing non-hierarchical project of becoming as an opposed to articulated model of genealogy of identity, knowledge, and truth. In other words, the concept of rhizome challenges arborescent, totalizing model of organizations (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980, p. 39, 54). Rhizome allows possibility of planar, spontaneous and non-hierarchical relations and connections whereas the arborescent model is based on tree-like, root-based stratification of things. All the same, Deleuze and Guattari act upon the oedipal genealogy of desire and language in the matter of paternal law of Name of the Father which is the signifier of minatory phallus. They attempt to extricate desire and meaning from the despotic record of Oedipus by using a particular mode of thinking and desiring which expresses free thrust of non-oedipal genealogy (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980, p. 78). For this reason, rhizome becomes a radical model for the reconstruction of culture and literature. To illustrate, the arborescent mode of thinking and writing fabricates and reiterates chronology, mimesis and platonic logic of family romance to map and to capture the subject. Deleuze and Guattari criticize the repeating archetype in the tradition of literature which is the identity formation with a culmination point of familial or social culmination point (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980, p. 43).

1.8 Rhizome in Literature

On the contrary, rhizome is non-chronological, it is lateral and planar. It allows ceaselessly flowing connections and relations. In this respect, the rhizomic networks in literature avoid of narrating history, instead the rhizomic literature presents things as an array of autonomous connections (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980, p. 27, 28, 30, 33, 35). It also denies determinism of foundation, essentialism and consummation. It repudiates the holy story of the bildungsromans that idealizes acquiring fortune, identity or a righful surname. Instead, it promotes the process of

becoming. For instance, we can observe that the necessity of chronological order in literature decreases with the rise of planar and rhizomic modes of writing. Besides, the rhizomic act of writing decentralizes the stratification of the self favoring super-ego. It should be noted that the super-ego transaction is characterized by the Oedipus complex which is literary before being a psychoanalytic signifier (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 95, 106). Moreover, the oedipalization of literature is not only related to the author's super-ego suffering from the castration complex due to the anxiety of influence but also commoditization of literature (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 134). As a result, literature-machine enslaves both the author and the reader. In this sense, Deleuze and Guattari attempt to liberate literature from the burden of complex and oedipalization (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980, p. 126). For instance, literature may become expressive device of schizophrenic aberrations from the arborescent principles. To illustrate according to Deleuze and Guattari, schizophrenic mode of writing and literary becoming during the textualization might allow literature to cross the limits and frontiers of pre-established society.

CHAPTER II

LANGUAGE AND PSYCHOANALYSIS

In this chapter, Saussurian linguistic will be discussed in terms of Lacanian psychoanalysis to extend theoretical arguments on obscurity of desire and meaning which were forfeited in the exchange system of substitutions. In this respect, Artaud's use of language as a performative act of communication which aims at decentralizing Platonic logic of representation and objectification will be discussed to assert the potency of body without organs in language and literature (Cull, 2009, p. 250, 251, 253, 255).

2.1 Saussure and Socio-Linguistic System of Language

First of all, according to Saussure, language is a system of substitutions constituted by an arbitrary relation between the signified and the signifiers. Therefore, the complex communication system among individuals is based on primal fallacy of representation or substitution. In this respect, Saussure's efforts to structure language as a proper system gives rise to structuralism and post-structuralism stating the crisis of language and communication. Especially, post-structuralists point out playfulness, arbitrariness and unreliability in the substitution system of language. In other words, language is constituted by units of sign substituting the real signified with its metaphors and metonymies. To illustrate, the linguistic operation consists of two units as the signified and the signifier. The first is the concept or intact idea of the real. For a particular signified, there would be several signifiers. In this sense, the second unit; the signifier is the substitution of the real in the exchange system of signs (Lacan, 1981, p. 55, 67, 68).

2.1.1. Lacan's Interpretation of the Unconscious in Terms of Its Linguistic Structure

Lacan borrows from Saussure and improves the idea that human behaviours, concepts and experiences are determined by psycho-linguistic structure. Then, he comes up with his most conspicuous statement that "the unconscious is structured

like a language." He believes that the unconscious is the reservoir of unattainable desires which are beyond substitution system of language (Kirshner, 2005, p. 8, 9, 12). Therefore, the speaking subject can only desire metonym and metaphor of the real desire exactly like the act of speaking which is an illusion of exchange and substitution because in the sign system of language, the signified is also unattainable (Goodchild, 2005, p.180, 181). Lacan asserts that the source of the signified is the phallus which articulates desire and meaning as a constant state of slippage from one signifier to another because the phallus prohibits and obscures fulfilment and equivalence. Namely, the signified residing in the unconscious is coded and encrypted, it manifest itself through language plays, puns, tongue twists and ruptures:

"Lacan's famous dictum, 'the unconscious is structured like language', means that the signifiers of the unconscious in their troubled association with consciousness are ordered in their own signifying system, often articulated in a network of metonymy and metaphor. "This is shown by analysis of the formations of the unconscious: dreams, symptoms, forgetting of names, etc.," (Lemaire, 1977, p.7).

However, the unconscious language which is basically imaginary cannot be assimilated in the conscious language of a text. The unconscious language therefore would be showing itself in the play, ruptures and relations between signifiers. In other words, the imaginary constitution of the unconscious makes the unconscious discourse inaccessible to consciousness (Kirshner, 2005, p.15, 16). The unconscious discourse is additionally complicated in the way that in its imaginary structure hides the kernel of the real, which is impossible to be accommodated on the signifier (Lacan, 1981, p. 124).

2.2 The Lost Object of Desire and Language

According to Lacan, desire is a symptom of forfeited, irremediable object which was lost when the subject confronts with the law of phallus and castration anxiety. Therefore, real desire for the forfeited object is beyond signs and signifiers. In this sense the understanding of desire inevitably incorporates lack-oriented negation. In other words in Lacanian psychoanalysis, Saussurian linguistic sign functions as a metaphor of the real signified or the symptom of irremediable lack

(Coles 2018, p. 4, 5, 6). The signifier constantly overshadows the signified. The unconscious desire is transferred in to the conscious system via linguistic correlative as the system of metaphoricity (Kirshner, 2005, p. 2, 10, 18). It evokes platonic logic of representation which also points out lack-oriented incompetence of forms compared to superiority of ideas. In other words, the platonic negation towards literature not only stems from the matter of efficiency or utility of literature but platonic denouncement targeting at literature derives from incompetence of representing the signified because the ideas are unattainable and cannot be mediated in the substitution system of the world of forms. In this context, existence becomes a symptom of primal, inheritably rooted insufficiency and deficiency due to lack, loss and forfeited signified. As a result, in this constant state of disintegration, the self is exposure to unstitched, chaotic and arbitrary semblances of reality in the meaning making process. The speaking subject is torn between conscious and unconscious in terms of attaining fulfilled meaning or wholly graspable object of desire, instead both of them are encrypted in the unconscious. According to Lacan, the unconscious holds unknowable signified (Goodchild, 2005, p. 137, 138). The signified is articulated and preserved by language and linked to the metaphors and metonymies to be represented in the conscious system (Zizek, 2006, p.72, 73, 75).

2.3 The confrontation of The Subject with The name of The Father as a Signifier of the Phallus

First of all, satiation of desires involves exchange system of substitutions, therefore, the speaking subject can only imagine desire generated by language and exchanged through the signifiers. However, confrontation of the subject with discourse and language inscribes the grammatical, linguistic law of the father. Name-of-the-Father is a linguistic discourse before symbolic. In doing so the speaking subject enters the exchange system of signifiers and filtered by language with a bitter awareness that he or she can never attain wholly interpretable signified and desire because both are penetrated by the phallus. The phallus is represented by the name of The Father also reminds inherited lack and loss complex. In this sense, as long as the subject speaks in terms of linguistic laws and grammatical order of substitution, the self can never attain the signified; the lost, forfeited object of desire. The Name of

the Father signifies the phallus and runs the system of culture, language and law in order to order and domesticate the self (Deleuze, Guattari, 1972, p. 59).

2.4 Objections to the Linguistic Unconscious

Kristeva argues abjection of the other which is beyond language, the symbolic and the phallus. It is mystical, archaic and odd. She envisages disintegration in language between pre-sign and trans-meaning with regards to semiotics rather than linguistic (Barzilai, 1991, p. 294).

Deleuze and Guattari also oppose Lacanian structure of unconscious like language; instead, they argue that the unconscious is structured like a machine which constantly proliferates and producing without lack-oriented territorialisation of desire and meaning which are reduced in to symptom of irremediable loss. Also Deleuze and Guattari add that the unconscious is not inevitably linguistic but semiotic which gives rise to the potency beyond language and linguistic signs. Here, in the quotation below, Holland expresses the semiotic structure of the unconscious. He asserts that the unconscious might be constructed by pictograms and apperances:

"First of all, the structure of the unconscious is semiotic without being strictly linguistic: the chains of this semiotic system are a-signifying, and are said to "resemble … a succession of characters from different alphabets in which an ideogram, a pictogram, a tiny image of an elephant passing by, or a rising sun may suddenly make its appearance"; a semiotic system containing pictograms and images of elephants cannot be purely differential in the way a (phonetic) linguistic system is." (Holland, 2012, p. 328).

Deleuze and Guattari denounce the concept of signifier because it reveals the irremediable void between the signified and the signifier. According to them Saussurian linguistic operates as objectification of signifiers which are vulnerable to manipulation and control. In addition, Lyotard also criticizes language-oriented semantics and he tries to extricate meaning or being from the burden of language. He underlines the void between world and language (Solmaz, 2019, p.153, 154).

Another counter-attitude against structural linguistic theory is the criticism of negative-differential signifying system of language. Lyotard takes attention to

emanation of a signifier as a result of negative dialectic in the sign system. For instance, the concept of a table emerges not because it is self-contained and self – contingent but because it differentiates from other units of signs in language. In this sense the kernel of a signifying signifier is not self-structured but it emerges as differentiating from other signifiers. Therefore, the act of speaking substitutes a constant differentiating negation (Solmaz, 2019, p.154, 155). In response to this, Lyotard and Kristeva attempt to designate a new potency in semantic beyond language and linguistic (Barzilai, 1991, p.296, 297).

In terms of negative differentiation, Deleuze and Guattari borrow from Nietzsche's concept of eternal recurrence to designate an affirmative differentiation theory. The eternal recurrence plays a significant role in DeleuzoGuattarian philosophy of immanence and becoming. The eternal recurrence inspires affirmative ontology of difference which is further studied in "Difference and Repetition". Deleuze expresses that being is a process of repetition of difference. Nietzsche writes about the potency of the eternal recurrence to eliminate decadence and to preserve will power (Williams, 2003, p.11, 12, 33). He believes that the eternal cycle of being engulfs all the singularities and offers elimination of deficiency with regards to survival of the succession. Thus, the eternal return shouldn't be perceived as a ceaseless repetition of the same; instead the eternal recurrence produces difference and differentiation. Moreover, the eternal return is a selection of succession and becoming. In this respect, the eternal return selects affirmative forces and discriminates reified, absolute and univocal identities. All in all, Deleuze and Guattari challenge Saussurian linguistic system of signs in terms of inadequacy of exchange system in language inheriting the void between the signifier and signified, and of inscribing negation of difference which is not affirmative and self-contingent.

2.5 Emptying the Linguistic Signifiers With Regards To Dialogicism

Namely, several thinkers attempt to overcome prerogative position of connective signifier such as reason, Name of the Father or genealogy which reifying floating signifiers, and try to bring about body without organs, ever floating proliferations and becoming in minor language. To illustrate, Kristeva demonstrates

Lacan's fallacy with regard to his overemphasis on language and discourse (Barzilai, 1991, p. 298, 300). On the contrary she enunciates disintegration in linguistic articulations most commonly seen in borderline discourse. The borderline discourse emerges when something irreducible to language appears. In this case, heterogeneity of meaning constituted by well-structured exchange system of the signifier and the signified relation collapses and dissolves (Barzilai, 1991, p. 300, 301). This can appear in art, poetic and abjection. Kristeva criticizes Lacan for paying too much attention to linguistic structure of the unconscious. As a result of this, he denies other possibilities of experience residing in the unconscious. Therefore, Kristeva's sense of semiotic of unconscious is far beyond Freud's and Lacan's perception of the unconscious which is structured by language and topological in the matter of the territory of language run by the other, the phallus etc. In this respect, Kristeva's semiotic interrupts the symbolic order constituted by the phallus, language and the law. Kristeva points out something ineffable and irreducible to the articulation of language, in the realm of the unconscious (Barzilai, 1991, p. 297).

In doing so Kristeva also points out pre-mirror stage before the closure of ego by the illusion of elaboration of unity that we postulate to gain in the mirror stage, instead it is incorporation with the symbolic order. As a result, she denounces the illusion of a unified ego which veils the irremediable lack, castration anxiety and deprivation of the signified. She builds an analogy between the signifier which is sundered from the signified and an infant who is also cut off from the ideal unity with his or her mother. Especially, the name of The Father which is the signifier of the phallus cuts off all the signs and organizes them in a particular discourse which can be called as territorialisation:

"When Lacan posits the name of The Father as the keystone to all sign, meaning, and discourse, he points to the necessary condition of one and only one process of the signifying unit, albeit a constitutive one" (Barzilai, 1991, p. 299).

Yet, Kristeva attempts to unveil the grand-structure of Name of the father by emphasizing disintegration in the sign system of language when the substitution system falls apart with dissolution of the signifiers. She affirms the state of abjection as a loss of totalizing function of language. For Kristeva abjection appears to threaten pre-established identity, well-structured system of order. It besets the borders and

crosses the limits. The state of abjection is desementiztation of the sign system, emptying the well-ordered signifiers (Barzilai, 1991, p. 300, 301). Therefore, abjection is marked by fragmentation and discontinuity because in the state of abjection the paternal function of constructing the signifiers, filling the emptiness and arbitrariness of the signifiers breaks down (Rizq, 2013, p. 1280, 1281). In this context, Kristeva promotes the abject language of perversity and heretics:

"The writer, fascinated by the abject, imagines its logic, projects himself into it, introjects it, and as a consequence perverts language—style and content." (Kristeva, 1982, p. 16).

Namely, the abject discourse stands against the mimetic function of language in literature whose ultimate function is to get rid of impurity and leads the reader to the final purification. On the contrary the abject language is a source of differentiation and something which is ineffable. It deranges, differs and differentiates (Kristeva, 1982, p. 28).

2.6 Minor Language and Making language BwO

Deleuze and Guattari also promote breakdown in linguistic system and extrication of flow of signifiers and meanings in an open-ended, multi-dimensional system. In this sense they adapt the theory rhizome to language and literature. According to them, language ceases the free-floating oscillation of the signifiers. They criticize language for being static and vulnerable to manipulation and discipline. In this respect, language is perceived as a type of capture, enclosure that articulating the arborescent discourse (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980, p. 61, 64). As a result, all the signifiers existing in this discourse remind and reiterate the symbolic order which is constantly teasing the self. Therefore, they try to designate minor language that allows the one to be polyvocal and dialogic (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980, p. 122, 123,125).

2.7 The Influence of Artaud's Use of Language as BwO

For instance, Deleuze and Guattari pay special attention to Artaud and The Theatre of Cruelty. Artaud a man of mental illnesses, deliriums and schizophrenic breakdowns, marks literature and drama with minor language of de-territorialisation. He repudiates text-oriented drama and pioneers post-dramatic theatre. He is inspired by alienation effect of Brechtian Theatre whose ultimate aim is to stimulate the spectator. Artaud like Brecht wants his spectator to be dazed, provoked and reeling so that under the escalation of dramatic shock doctrine, they can improve awareness (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980, p. 171, 179). Artaud performs and practices theory of body without organs in drama by disposing the representational signifiers, instead in his dramatic potency of body without organs; he releases the flow of becoming and ever-floating singularities. Namely, in his theatrical movement nothing can be reduced in to stock identities. The main reason why Artaud repudiates using well-structured grammatical rules is that grammar oriented syntactic units give rise to linguistic hegemony. In response to this, he attempts to de-territorialise language, the sign system of representation (Buchanan, 2008, p. 153). Deleuze and Guattari appreciate post-linguistic endeavours of Artaud. They also prove that as long as language moulds the phenomenon, no one can extricate himself from anxiety, deprivation and cessation because language is based on representation of stock signifiers in contrast to non-organizational becoming which allows dissolution of any absolute sign.

Deleuze and Guattari also praise Artaud's deconstruction of mimetic drama which imposes particular semblances of reality resulting voyeuristic role of the spectator. In the mimetic drama, the spectator is reduced in to a passive voyeur, totally being captured by the signifying system (Cull, 2009, p. 245). Instead, Artaud comes up with non-organizational flows of occurrence on the stage. In doing so, he denounces Platonic dialogue tradition in drama. In Artaud's dramatic performances, text-oriented, articulated language dissolves in to stimulating lighting, vociferous sound effects, exclamations, rhythms and choreography (Uzunlar, 2017, p. 197, 198). In doings so, Artaud aims at proliferating a new, minor language of difference and dismemberment. Like Kristeva, Artaud also emphasizes abjection of minor language which crosses the borders and threatens linguistically structured identity. Similarly, according to Deleuze and Guattari schizophrenic use of language which eliminates

grammar and lexical articulations allows a new horizon beyond linguistic borders. In Artaud's dramatic movement, instead of text-oriented representations, the philosophy of immanence and intensity is performed on the stage through costumes, dancing, jests, mimics and becoming (Uzunlar, 2017, p. 198, 200, 2001). Artaud challenges fixed intensities and pre-established structure of linguistic norms in language and he wants to provide free-floating potency of body without organs in literature. Thus, he uses performative acts of breathing, exclamation, gazing to overcome text-oriented, prerogative position of Platonic dialogue tradition. In other words, Artaud practices what Deleuze and Guattari call as schizophrenic use of language, or Kristeva's abjection which besets the identity, the structure and the border. Artaud revolutionarizes the body, the speech, jest and mimics for pulling of the signifier and the signified relation (Uzunlar, 2017, p. 206, 207).

2.8 De-Territorialisation of Text-Oriented Majorative Representations

Artaud also refers to pre-ego state of singularities before the articulation of language by allowing dissolution of language in to non-organizational singularities. He wants to release the stage performance from determination and articulation of language over the phenomenon. Like Brecht, he intends to appeal to the unconsciousness of the spectator, to galvanize them by stimulating. In this context, Artaud deconstructs mimesis in the Western dramatic tradition and he wages war against the idea of representability. It is important to underline that the most conspicuous characteristic of western epistemology and ontology is the binarism between speech and word, so the Theatre of Cruelty as a performative mode of body without organs demonstrates the possibility of violating, overdosing of the limits of linguistic structuralism. For Deleuze and Guattari, language functions as a structure of capture and articulation coding the subjects according to categories (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980, p. 28, 99). Finally, all appreciate polyvocal, dialogic disjunction of major language in to minor potencies. Especially, Deleuze and Guattari pay particular attention to minor language and step up to extend the limits of minor-language, alienation in language to eternity. The universal representation system of transcendence of language gets pulverized, crumbled and diverges in to bifurcations.

In this respect minor language inspires minor literature as well, which not only challenges linguistic norms of the universal transcendence of language but also releases fixed and stable intensities to achieve becoming, proliferation, the lines of flight (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980, p. 34, 58). Deleuze values several writers who wields minor language as a challenge against universality and absolutism of major language, and so provides us new possibilities in absurdity, nonsense, bifurcations and minorization (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 132, 133).

"In order to declare absolutely that Artaud's language is that of a schizophrenic; the psychotic produces an involuntary discourse, fettered and subjugated: therefore in all respects the contrary of textual writing." But what is this enormous textual archaism, the signifier that subjects literature to the mark of castration and sanctifies the two aspects of its oedipal form? And who told this shrewd critic that the discourse of the psychotic was "involuntary, fettered, and subjugated"? Not that it is more nearly the opposite, thank God. But these very oppositions are singularly lacking in relevance. Artaud makes a shambles of psychiatry, precisely because he is schizophrenic and not because he is not. Artaud is the fulfilment of literature, precisely because he is schizophrenic and not because he is not. It has been a long time since he broke down the wall of thesignifier: Artaud the Schizo."(Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 135).

In the quotation above, Deleuze and Guattari demonstrate how Artaud's schizophrenic discourse surpasses text-oriented representations. They appreciate the involuntary, immanent and post-dramatic discourse of Artaud's language opposed to despotic signifiers. Finally, what Deleuze and Guattari most appreciate in Artaud's dramatic movement is de-territorialisation of fixed identities and his emphasis on emanation of becoming-other.

2.9 The Lines of Flight from Oedipal Literature and Psychoanalysis

Deleuze and Guattari's major endeavour is to rift the well-structured surface of literature and find out the lines of flight in minor literature pledging extrication from stratification, articulation and recording of the capture. They want to

designate the lines of becoming-other as a potency of liberation, freedom from aberration apparatus of the capture which is enslaving not only using objective violence, coercion and punishment but also designing the self by using language, representation strategies and psychology. Especially, psychoanalysis is one of the most cooperative tools of the capture to fabricate docile, despondent and subversive individuals (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 361). In response to this, Deleuze and Guattari promote schizophrenic aberrations, perversion and loss of reality which are so called mental illness. Instead, they approach transgression of limits, ambiguity blurring the borders. In this sense, they break up with conventional understanding of language, desire and the unconscious (Goodchild, 2005, p. 39, 84).

2.10 Criticism of the Oedipus Tragedy

They charge Freudian psychoanalysis which will be later espoused and advanced by Lacan, for fabricating subjugated subjectivity haunted by the Oedipus signifier. According to Deleuze and Guattari, Oedipus is not just a psychological state but rather it is a universal domain of production of subjectivity. Oedipus is a theatre of the unconsciousness based on platonic logic of representation which is incorporated with inevitable repression. In this sense, just like mimetic dramatic tradition which is strictly based on verisimilitude, interpretation and substitution of the signified in the exchange system of the signifiers, Oedipus myth also ceases flows of becoming, production of desire in the unconsciousness; and reduces them in one and only metonym; the Oedipus complex. It is extended to literature, linguistic, politics, and anthropology and so on (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 363). Thus, the signifier of Oedipus extends and colonizes territory of intensities, it sickens the self, stupefies desire. According to Deleuze and Guattari the signified of desire is ineffable to the conscious state of linguistic signs and substitution, thus, any possible signifier of desire, in fact, signifies lack and impossible (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 310).

In this context, the Oedipus complex is not only wielded to interpret a particular psychological state, instead it is a tool of repression and univocalization of desire which is attached to lack and castration. In contrast with the theatre of unconsciousness which is constituted by mimetic representations, Deleuze and Guattari state that the unconscious is not a theatre which can easily be represented

and univocalized. On the contrary, DeleuzoGuattarian unconscious is a factory, more like a machine which ceaselessly produces and fabricated countless forms of desire (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 24, 55). Namely, instead of the signifier of Oedipus which in one and only tragic hero of the the unconscious, Deleuze and Guattari envisage neither structural nor figurative description of the unconscious. They repel all the territories such as the Oedipus myth, castration complex, lack and absence to map the unconscious desire, instead Deleuze and Guattari are on the side of production of desire. Here, the metaphor of machine is important to decipher because machines do not need essence or origin to produce. Therefore, the production of a machine is an excellent example of rhizomic mode of proliferation.

CHAPTER III

CRITICISM OF THE OEDIPUS COMPLEX IN THE WESTERN PHILOSOPHY

In the history of philosophy, there have been numerous attempts to discover source of desire. Freud, in his "Civilization and Discontents" explains an ongoing conflict between culture and satiety. He expresses that culture is based on collective, mutual consensus in term of rehabilitation of egoistical desires, egotism and anti-social behaviours. Moreover, he points out that myths, rituals and cultural artefacts serve to maintain the proper repression which can be explained as secondary repression in addition to representing repression. The proper repression occurs as historically and culturally contingent suppression. The whole psychoanalytical tradition whose major aspect is represented by Freud is based on the idea that there are intolerable, anti-social and savage fantasies and desires residing in the unconscious. For the continuation of peace and balance in the state of culture, those fantasies, sexual drives and hidden, dark motives should be repressed and censored (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 118, 172). According to the psychoanalytical theory, the major goal of sublimation and idealization of repression is to channel the unconscious energy and potency in to socially acceptable and efficient occupations. In this respect, Freud asserts that all the cultural artefacts like art, literature, science etc, can be perceived as a displacement of the unconscious energy with more efficient sublimation as repression. In this process namely, it is a process of blocking latent, unconscious thoughts and motives (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 117, 167).

After a while the act of repressing which is idealized and exalted in culture, myths and rituals becomes repressing for the sake of repression (Holland, 2012, p. 313, 314). Namely, repression proper emerges as an archetype in the conscious which reminds us the intolerable and irrational unconscious desires. Namely, repression becomes the signifier of the real unconscious desires (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 30).

3.1 The Psychological Origins of Desire for Repression

Similarly, Reich also underlines the crucial point that the masses demand their own repression so voluntarily and enthusiastically that no one doubts that it is in

fact a desire for repression (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 29, 30, 112). As we have just seen, repression becomes the most dignified ideal of the culture and supported by myths, artistic and cultural endeavours as a displacement of the unconscious energy. After a certain moment, as Reich emphasized, it ends up with one's struggle for his own enslavement:

"Even the most repressive and the most deadly forms of social reproduction are produced by desire within the organization that is the consequence of such production under various conditions that we must analyze. That is why the fundamental problem of political philosophy is still precisely the one that Spinoza saw so clearly, and that Wilhelm Reich rediscovered: "Why do men fight for their servitude as stubbornly as though it were their salvation?" (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 29).

In the quotation above, Deleuze and Guattari explain opression of the unconscious energy by the sublimation of repression and suspension. Consequently, enslavement and punishment become the most sublimated ideals of culture.

3.2 A Survey to the History of Desire and Repression

In fact, in the history of philosophy there are two major attitudes toward desire and the unconscious. The first one starting with Plato and ends up with Freud and Lacan. They negate desire and the unconscious production by inventing tools of censorship, blocking and substituting (Buchanan, 2008, p. 4, 31). It is a tradition of replacement and displacement in the way that the signified is distorted by its signifier. This tradition of negation renders desire as a symptom of deprivation, lack and absence. Especially, the idea of absence plays a major role in Lacanian psychoanalysis with regard to linguistic arbitrariness rule.

The psychoanalytical approach which belongs to the tradition of negation maintains the romance of in the search of lost object, forfeited unity. Thus, it reiterates a constant withdraw to a problematic origin, the Oedipus history; thus blocks and prevents proliferations and becoming. The psychoanalytical approach is haunted and hooked by a gothic romance of loss and absence because in the first place the psychoanalysis postulates that desire derives from deprivation of the primal

ideal. The obsession of psychoanalytical approach with the irremediable object of desire stems from the platonic logic of desire as an acquisition. Plato idealizes desire by describing it as an acquisition, therefore; desire becomes a signifier, a symptom of deprivation of the idealized desire. It is perceived as something transcendental which must be acquired. In other words, desire is not immanent; it is something beyond the immanence this is why it must be acquired.

Moreover, the psychoanalytical approach is congruent and contingent with root-oriented, tree-like methodology of the western philosophical thought system. Tree-like, root-oriented thought system is based on the grand story of origin which is inscribing itself through hierarchical structure extending from root to leaves (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980, p. 160, 175). To illustrate, the unconscious is oedipalized by negation of desire as a metonym of lack. Moreover, the unconscious is interpreted as the source of oedipal desire for the irremediable, impossible mother. In this respect, the unconscious becomes the unconscious of Oedipus.

3.3 Freud's Discovery of the Oedipal Subjectivity

First of all, Freud is the first one who meticulously studies and then transcribes the myth of Oedipus to the psychoanalytical realm. Freudian psychiatry first institutionalizes the Oedipus complex which is used to explain the psycho-sexual stages of bodily transactions from the pleasure principle, polyphony of becoming gender to the reality principle constructed by the sign of phallus, language and the symbolic (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 13, 23). He expresses the complex as an ambivalent anxiety of guilt and burden caused by an incestuous desire for the mother and murderous hatred towards the father. In his sense, the complex of Oedipus becomes the universal representation of the unconscious like a mimetic tragedy to discipline and determine desire:

" ...Oedipus: we have evolved in Oedipus, we have been structured in Oedipus, and under the neutral and benevolent eye of the substitute, we have learned the song of castration, the lack-of-being-that-is-life; "yes it is through castration/that we gain access/to Deeeeesire." What one calls the disappearance of Oedipus is Oedipus become an idea." (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 312).

In other words, the signifier Oedipus becomes one and only presupposition of beginning and origin. Freudian psychoanalysis interprets all the signs and symptoms according to the eyes of the Oedipus.

3.3.1 The Oedipal Orthodoxy

Freudian psychoanalysis which elucidates everything with Oedipus performs orthodoxy of the Church which used the same methodology as is called scholasticism. Namely, the signifier Oedipus colonizes and invents as one and only form of subjectivity that is trapped within the triangular confinement. The psychoanalytical approach is programmed to map and record all phenomena on the oedipal terrain as a well structured coding system to capture and articulate the self. In other words, psychoanalysis naturalizes inevitability of the Oedipus complex by coding and articulating everything according to the overemphasis on the Oedipus (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 171, 174). The Oedipus complex is sublimation for de-sexualisation mechanism backed by myths, culture and rituals (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 311). However, it is important to remember that repression system has a dual binding operation. To illustrate, the first, repression occurs as the representation of the productive unconscious via one and only deputy as the Oedipus complex which is a substitution of imponderable unconscious in the exchange system of the signifiers. Namely, in the first place the unconscious is repressed by its distorted signifier; the metaphor Oedipus. Secondly, the repression proper appears as a social censorship and blockage for removing the threat of intolerable and irrational oedipal desires for the sake of maintaining balance and order in the community (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 24).

3.4 Confinement of Desire in the Oedipal Family Romance

In doing so, the productive and prolific unconscious which is bifurcating, ramifying in to endless possibilities and proliferations is being enchained by tripartite demarcation of the oedipal desire as "daddy-mommy-me" (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 51). In other words, the unconscious signified is reduced in to an oversimplified sign as the incestuous desire for the mother and the murderous hatred

towards the father. The oedipal triangulation incarcerates by imposing guilt, burden and fear of castration. The Oedipus complex becomes one and only, omnipresent figure of familial triangulation. Deleuze and Guattari describe the complex as a dogma of new brand idealism of psychoanalysis. They also append that Freudian psychoanalysis turns out to be a family romance finding and discovering the signs of the Oedipus complex anytime and anywhere. Therefore, the psychoanalytical method is mostly based on the oedipal triangulation in which all signs and signifiers are reduced in to an oedipal history and family representations so the psychoanalytical discourse performs regressive and reactionary method which in historically contingent with the platonic logic of desire.

Another aspect of the Freudian approach which is mostly criticized is that the Oedipus-based, lack-oriented psychoanalytical theory overemphasizes male-sexuality (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 112). The Oedipus complex is based on the father-image so it inscribes the magnitude of the phallus through castration anxiety which is caused from the fear of being castrated by the father:

"Castration is at once the common lot—that is, the prevalent and transcendent Phallus and the exclusive distribution that presents itself in girls as desire for the penis, and in boys as fear of losing it or refusal of a passive attitude." (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 59).

Psychoanalysis which is historically contingent with tree-like, root-oriented thought system perceives desire in its most reactionary form as oedipal desire and related this form of desire with absence, lack and castration. In other words, the origin of desire which is structured in terms of father image is inevitably negative, nihilistic and suffers from an original loss of the forfeited object. In this context, the oedipal desire is the substitution of the unconscious desire and it is explained through deprivation of the irremediable mother and fear from the inhibitory father. The oedipal desire is confined within the familial triangulation of daddy-mommy-me (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 78, 143, 265).

3.5 The Double-Binding Synthesis of the Oedipal Penetration

In addition to this as Deleuze and Guattari underline, the Oedipus complex double penetrates in the matter of double reduction of Freudian psychoanalysis. To illustrate, a child's reluctance or willingness towards his parents is necessarily negated in both cases. While negating that if the child desires his parent, he should not desire; when he does not want to, he is negated as he should. Both forms of negation are performed on the basis of omnipresence of the Oedipus. Because of such oedipal childhood obsession, psychoanalysis cannot extricate itself from the backward orientation to the origin to explain problems, as in transcendental thinking. Psychoanalysis explains all unconscious processes by the law of the father. This law is separating the child from the mother by the father or restricting the communication of the child with the mother. Thus, the desire formed in the family searches for what is forbidden by the law of the father. Elucidation of desire with this prohibition law also explains desire with a transcendental signifier (Holland, 2012, p. 313, 314).

Namely, Freudian psychoanalytical tradition negates desire and explains it according to oedipal deprivation and the lack. In this sense, desire is enchained by the law of the Father. In addition, desire is territorialised on guilt, shame and castration anxiety. In addition to this, the Oedipus complex which is double-binding is not only signifying prohibition of desire, but also the Oedipus complex as a universal representation of the unconscious, emphasizes desire through the prohibitive Formula. "'The law tells us: You will not marry your mother, and you will not kill your father. And we docile subjects say to ourselves: so that's what I wanted." (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 114). In other words, the prohibition becomes the secret of innermost desire. In terms of the double penetration of the Oedipus, it both penetrates intrafamilial desire in regards to the fact that there shouldn't be such an incestuous desire and also it penetrates non-oedipal desire by oedipalizing it in the way that there should be the Oedipus everywhere.

3.6 Lacan's Approach Towards the Symbolic Order

Lacan, another psychoanalyst, explains the suppression of desire as the child enters the symbolic order of the language representing the father. While the element that explains the unconscious for Freud is the Oedipus complex, for Lacan it is the language formed by the grammatical rules of the father that constitutes the unconscious (Lacan, 1981, p. 83). In this sense, Lacan reiterates lack oriented explanation of desire. To illustrate, in Lacanian psychoanalysis, desire is again built upon the original lack. Without the irremediable absence, desire wouldn't exist. Lacan associates grammatical law of the father with prohibition of desire because linguistic laws constitute the father's symbolic order. The symbolic order is always bound up with a transcendental idea; the phallus. There is no desire without the law of suppression, prohibition, thus; in Lacanian psychoanalysis desire is again false represented and bounded up with lack-oriented negation. In addition to this, if all desires and requests must emanate within the border of language, then one can only desire the signs which can be exchanged in the substitution system of language. In doing so the self submits to the grammatical laws of language which represent the symbolic order of the father. For Lacan, even the submission to the symbolic order of language is oedipal itself (Goodchild, 2005, p. 138, 153). According to Lacan, the unconscious is structured by signs, just like a language. Each sign residing in the unconscious makes a constant slippage from one sign to another. Therefore, it is impossible to reach the original signified. For this reason, the unconscious can be reached by representations or structured with unconscious symbols. Thus desire can exist only through its representations (Goodchild, 2005, p. 202, 203).

All in all, Lacan reconceptualises Freud's Oedipus complex with regards to language and linguistic studies. Likewise Freud, Lacan also defines desire through lack and deprivation. However, unlike, Freud, he believes that the unconscious is constituted not by the myth of Oedipus but the system of metaphors, metonymies, puns and play of signs. In Lacanian psychoanalysis, the burden of the self doesn't come from the oedipal guilt but from the inaccessibility of the individual to grasp desire, the unconscious and the other (Goodchild, 2005, p. 240, 242).

He points out that the unconscious signifiers are unreliable and not static, instead the latent desire in the unconscious jumps from one signifier to another. In

other words, it is a ceaseless mode of slippage because the unconscious can only be partially known and expressed through sliding signifiers. In addition, Lacan re-evaluates Freud's concept of penis envy and declares that the phallus in not longer just a penis but it is something symbolic and articulated with language (Goodchild, 2005, p. 137, 138). While penis is something that males do have and females doesn't; the phallus is beyond penis; neither males nor females posses it (Goodchild, 2005, p. 272). Therefore, according to Lacan, the phallus is a symbol of an irremediable lack and deprivation of the other who is postulated to have the symbolic order of the phallus. In this respect, also in Lacanian psychoanalysis, the unconscious is interrupted by the Other (Goodchild, 2005, p. 101).

3.7 Criticism of the De-Individualization of Desire

Another criticism towards the psychoanalytical tradition is about group characteristic of individual desire. In other words the individual desire is occupied by the group fantasy (Goodchild, 2005, p. 229). To illustrate, in Freudian psychoanalysis, desire is represented by the oedipal signifier which inevitably emanates within the nuclear family. The most conspicuous characteristic of the oedipal desire is that it has been prohibited and beset by the law. In this sense, the oedipal desire is coexisting with the law and the prohibition so the desire is perceived as the symptom of the transcendental father image. It ruptures from immanence of individual productive desire and becomes the desire of the other. More clearly, individuals desire the symptom of the social-paternal law as if it is their own, innermost desire. Therefore, desire has never been immanent but it has been occupied by repression proper operating on the level of social order, myths, rituals etc.

In terms of Lacanian psychoanalysis, the group characteristic of fantasy is bound up with the speaking other in the oedipal unconscious which is structured by linguistic and grammatical rules that constituting omnipresence of the phallus and the other. The speaking other in the oedipal unconscious prevails and dominates the consciousness by inscribing the burden of guilt, absence and disgrace (Goodchild, 2005, p. 253, 287).

3.8 The Pan's Labyrinth of The Oedipal Unconscious

Oedipus is the beginning of the social historical investment determined by the father. The major function of psychoanalysis is to capture and to map the self and make him locate in the tragedy of the oedipal unconscious. Oedipus and the unconscious are constituted by the fear of castration and regression. Psychoanalysis says that it is impossible to escape from either Oedipus or language. In this respect, Oedipus and the symbolic order lay under the basis of every possible differentiation (Goodchild, 2005, p. 86, 191). Each difference signifies the same oedipal process which means that Oedipus penetrates as double-impasse through escape and capture. In other words, the oedipal desire has come to represent and replace the unconscious desires, but at the same time it is obliterated in the relationship between the child and the parent (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 127, 215).

According to psychoanalysis the only counter-attitude against the Oedipus complex is committing incestuous desire or murderous act of killing the father. It shows us the double-binding arborescence of the psychoanalysis that escaping from or challenging the Oedipus reinforces the capture (Buchanan, 2008, p. 69).

All in all, the psychoanalytical approach with Freudian and Lacanian theories is congruent with the tradition of negative desire. Double penetration and double-binding of the psychoanalytical theories plug up the lines of flight.

3.9 Fabrication of Self-Hatred and Oedipal Grudge

More recent criticism towards the psychoanalytical approach derives from the anology between the psychoanalytical penetration and social repression that are coextensive in terms of fabrication of docile and submissive subjectivity. Especially, Deleuze and Guattari underline double impasse of the psychoanalytical theory which is twice binding the subject by oedipalizing desire and naturalizing the oedipal unconscious. According to Deleuze and Guattari, the psychoanalytical approach stems from the platonic logic of desire so the main characteristic of psychoanalysis is to depreciate desire and make it identical with need or fantasy because both need and

fantasy derive from lack and absence (Goodchild, 2005, p. 26, 27, 47). In doing so psychoanalysis fabricates and controls obedient subjects essential for the state ideology. They emphasize the fact that the traditional psychoanalytical approach designates convenient background for continuation of enslavement. Moreover, the psychoanalytical overemphasis on the oedipal prohibition is responsible for alienation and hostility, malevolence in community because the oedipal unconscious which is suffering from the castration anxiety, lack and loss becomes the major archetype in the social conscious. Thus, the individuals who are sharing the same social unconscious accuse the social structure for their loss and pain. (Reich, 1973, p. 300, 301) One bears hatred and grudge against the other thinking that the other is responsible for his prevented desires and wants to prevent the other's desire. Therefore, each subject becomes a symptom of prohibition, reiterates prevention and foreclosure towards the other (Goodchild, 2005, p. 241). Then, the social structure becomes repetition of prohibition and repression. In this sense, the act of repression and prevention of individual desires constitute consciousness as a social unconscious and shapes it with images, myths and archetypes.

Deleuze and Guattari also criticize obsession of the psychoanalysis with nuclear family. The nuclear family is a merely capitalist artefact. The nuclear family here is the final form of the patriarchal capitalism, the holy family consisting of parents and children:

"Oedipus Complex depends entirely on the historically contingent institution of the nuclear family, and that it is critical to understand the nuclear family in turn as a strictly capitalist institution." (Holland, 2012, p. 314).

Thus, Deleuze and Guattari criticize Freudian psychoanalysis for reinforcing oedipal and familial subjectivity which is essential for the capitalist subjugation. According to Deleuze and Guattari, in capitalist society, in addition to bureaucracy and the state ideology, the nuclear family operates with the capitalist subjugation. The nuclear family obliges desire to be imprisoned in a certain place, humiliated and denigrated, and it does so through the Oedipus complex. In this sense, the nuclear family becomes a miniature of the capitalist objectification (Goodchild, 2005, p. 183, 201).

3.10 Criticism of The Nuclear Family

The oedipal desire emerging in the nuclear family exhausts and engulfs the subjectivity by reinforcing self-hatred, differentiation, oscillation and ambivalence perfectly suitable for the capitalist fabrication of identity. In other words, the nuclear family is the structure which results in arrangement of desire in one way or another.

The first reason why the family inhibits sexual desires is to prevent the sexual energy from being wasted. The sexual energies of individuals should not be wasted unnecessarily, because the production system requires a mass of laborers to work effectively, so the production of the population must be secured (Holland, 2012, p. 319).

The second reason for prevention of sexuality is for maintaining the substitute-workforce. The logic behind the necessity for reserve labour is that it is necessary to create competition among them. In this sense the rivalry archetype operates first in the realm of nuclear family as father and son competition for the mother's attention and then in the large-scale of capitalist economy as professional rivalry among the individual for goods and prestige (Reich, 1973, p. 78, 79).

The final reason for repression and regression of sexual desires is to impose the asceticism of the existing system. Docile and submissive individuals are essential in order for the current order to be accepted, and the first place where auto-censorship and obedience is inscribed is the family (Reich, 1973, p. 194, 197). Individuals' acceptance of obedience depends on their willingness to suppress their desires and wills, which is first learnt in the family. As a result, the process of oedipalization haunts and occupies the subjects and records them on the stratified terrain of the regression of Oedipus. Similarly, capitalism also articulates social codes and relations in terms of oedipal suppression.

All in all the oedipalized individuality is essential for capitalism in the way that the ascetic subject is taught to enjoy enslavement and servitude to the Other because in the first place the oedipal desire appears as the other's desire. The nuclear family, in which the oedipalized self emanates, is the delegation of the capitalist reinforcement of subjectivity as objectification. In this sense the primal repression and repression proper cooperate in terms of the group (social) characteristic of the oedipal desire (Reich, 1973, p. 204, 231). To illustrate, the oedipal desire cuts off the

individualistic desire of immanence, and then records in on the social level of consciousness. Desire reveres in to repression.

3.11 DeleuzoGuattarian Schizoid Unconscious As Opposed To Freudian-Oedipal Unconscious

Deleuze and Guattari detect several paralogisms of the oedipal psychoanalysis (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 73, 74). They criticize Freudian idealization of the Oedipus complex as a form of metaphysic. According to them, the principal mistake of the psychoanalytical approach is to explain the unconscious through dreams, symptoms, tragedy and romance. In doing so the unconscious is disguised and transformed in to a structural model. The structure of unconscious is created by a desire for the prohibited which is associated with the murderous act of killing towards the father so in both cases, desire is represented by its distorted and stupefied image (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 106, 120).

In this context, Deleuze and Guattari diverge from the psychoanalytical approach with regards to the recognition and definition of the unconscious. According to Freudian psychoanalysis, the unconscious is a reservoir of censored ideas, intolerable sexual fantasies and anti-social drives, motivations (Buchanan, 2008, p. 29). Therefore, Freudian psychiatry clarifies the suppressed unconscious through the mediation of conscious archetypes and images such as The Oedipus, castration, lack and problematic origin. In this sense, the psychoanalytical approach cannot extricate itself from constant regression to the reactionary past; the state of childhood.

On the contrary, Deleuze and Guattari perceive the unconscious as a machine which is ceaselessly producing and proliferating without recess of disjunction and conjunction. Namely, the DelezoGuattarian unconscious is not mediated through the Theatre of Tragedy; instead, it is ineffable in the constant mode of differentiation, transfiguration and proliferation. In the psychoanalytic approach the oedipalized desire is beset and beleaguered by the holy family which is the delegated institution for reinforcement of the capitalist subjectivity and docility. Therefore, the oedipal desire is territorialised in familial crisis. Also, the

oedipalization process captures any aberration from the oedipal triangulation. Therefore, it is a double-binding process which eventually occupies the escape and capture to prevail its mechanism.

3.12 The Machine-like Unconscious

In response to this, the machinic unconscious that Deleuze and Guattari envisage, doesn't need conjunctive consummation such as the oedipal desire and the family romance; instead the machinic characteristic of the unconscious for Deleuze and Guattari allows flow of desire and destroys the theatrical representation of the oedipal unconscious. The reason they use machine desiring is that the machine-like unconscious constantly produces without an essence. This production is the eternal production, flow of desire. Deleuze and Guattari declare that the unconscious is machinic rather than mechanic (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 124, 142, 188).

Here they emphasize that the oedipal unconscious is mechanic because it repeats and reiterates the same oedipal structure. In contrast, the machinic unconscious that Deleuze and Guattari characterize is in constant motion of eternal recurrence and what it produces through endless and ceaseless repetition is difference. Accordingly, mechanical repetition is the repetition of the same structure without any changes. Yet, the machinic unconscious achieves the production of difference by repeating differentiation from reified and consummated structures. To illustrate, the machinical characteristic of desire demonstrate that the parts of a machine aiming at production are connected to each other, each attachment is cut from the previous and articulated to a new one (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 271). Therefore, the machinic unconscious describes the ontology of schizoid desire which escapes from the dogmatic image of oedipal theories created by common sense and guilty conscience. This schizoid desire machines constantly work with new chains of links (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 277, 278).

3.13 Anti-Oedipal Orphan Disinherited from the Oedipal Symbols

While Freudian psychoanalysis explains the unconscious desire through the mediation of latent structures like tragedy, dreams and images, Deleuze and Guattari declare orphanhood of the unconscious in terms of salvation from the oedipal triangulation of family, the burden of guilt, shame and loss. Deleuze and Guattari enunciate that the unconscious cannot be expressed through the oedipal obsession with the past; instead the unconscious is able to create new patterns, relations and transfigurations. Thus, the DelezoGuattarian unconscious cannot be straitjacketed in the structural and symbolic orders which are both alluding to the name of The Father (Goodchild, 2005, p. 130, 138).

They insist on a new brand understanding of desire which is not lack or castrated but strolling around endless connections growing in immanence of multiple intensities. In this sense, the unconscious that Deleuze and Guattari extricate from the oedipal burden targets at destructing nightmare of Freudian neurosis (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 318, 321). In this respect, Deleuze and Guattari de familiarize the unconscious which is automatized with well-structured, oedipal images. Namely, experiencing the unconscious through stock and fixed images authomatizes the unconscious desire. All in all, the unconscious becomes the reservoir of dull and regressive images.

In response to this, Deleuze and Guattari estrange the unconscious by introducing its schizoid transfigurations. In contrast to well-established material and archetypes that haunt and articulate the unconscious, the schizophrenic unconscious is free from the original story of oedipal romance. Since the schizophrenic unconscious repudiated the story of beginning, it is neither a beginning nor an end; it is the production of desire as a multiplicity of infinite numbers of connections from an indeterminate point. The productive unconscious always produces and fabricates new connections and flourishing possibilities because the flow of desire is not interrupted by the oedipal triangulation; thus unlike the oedipal unconscious which operates with repression and regression; the DeleuzoGuattarian unconscious de-territorializes social and formative codes.

Here desire is not the desire for something Oedipal or something that is lost or forfeited, but rather the production of positive creativity by establishing new connections. Moreover, the schizoid machines off desire shouldn't be understood in relation to subjectivity since the machines don't have a subjectificated essence (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 322). Here Deleuze and Guattari underline that subjectivity is a cloak of docility and objectification because the subject discovers himself or herself in the realm of oedipal triangulation first in the family, then in the large scale of social repression. As a result, they are willing to replace subjectivity with becoming. To illustrate, the oedipal desire of the self appears in proper territories such as school, culture, church and mediates itself through trimmed and neurotic identities that are the ones constituted and structured by fear, loss, deprivation and anxiety. In short, the schizoid unconscious deconstructs and dismembers the Oedipal unconscious which is reinforced by reactionary and repressive images.

On the contrary, the DeleuzoGuattarian unconscious experience affirmation, becoming and production. Thus, the main goal of the schizoid unconscious is to challenge and demolish Freudian nightmare of desire that unceasingly reiterates the fact that there is no emancipation from the burden of guilty unconscious of the childhood. The schizoid flow of unconscious achieves to release from the oedipal consummation by emptying the idea of consummation because goal-oriented motivation; satisfactory drives are indeed production of the oedipal unconscious which is suffering from loss so craving for fulfilment and satiety (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980, p. 51, 55, 64). The aim of Deleuze and Guattari is to dislocate desiring consummation and make it as a continuous flow of deterritorialization. Freudian psychoanalysis binds all the psychological states to the problematic familial history so the problem is always located in to triangulation of oedipal family.

In contrast, the schizophrenic unconscious is an orphan, repudiated the name of The Father. Therefore, the DeleuzoGuattarian unconscious challenges the transcendental idealism of the oedipal family. Since schizoid unconscious does not work with the deprivation and the negation it causes, schizoid sexuality instead of identifying with a certain symbol, it produces sexualities that can reproduce with as much difference as possible. In this context, the schizophrenic unconscious is

associated with multiple sexualities and connections that extricate from imposed codes and destroy stratification strategies.

The last difference between Freudian unconscious and the DeleuzoGuattarian schizoid unconscious derives from the understanding of function of desire. To illustrate, according to Deleuze and Guattari, Freud misunderstands the logic of unconscious operation. He perceives the function of desire as production of fantasies, drives and motivations because he formulates desire in terms of consummation and satisfaction. In this sense, the function of unconscious is subjected to external stimuli or an exogenous force. On the contrary, Deleuze and Guattari declare that the unconscious is productive in its own right so it doesn't need to be stimulated by need or fantasy of something which is not acquired. The schizoid unconscious is operating and proliferating for the sake of itself. It is another counter-attitude towards the long history of origin-oriented essentialism (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 27, 33).

"But, they imply, psychoanalysis has totally misunderstood desire's actual function, which is not at all the production of fantasies, which is merely a secondary operation, but the production of production itself." (Buchanan, 2008, p. 49).

Finally the critical perspective of Deleuze and Guattari is not only targeting at Freudian psychoanalysis in particular, more extensively, they denounce tree-like, root-oriented essentialism of whole Western philosophy. In doing so they diverge from the Platonic generation which negates desire and becoming. In contrast, the generation Deleuze and Guattari belong, affirms and extols spontaneity of new connection, bricolage and transfigurations. In this respect, Deleuze and Guattari can be incorporated in the post-structural studied with regards to conceptual anology between deconstruction and de-territorialisation.

CHAPTER IV

SCHIZO-ANALYSIS AND POST-STRUCTURAL
CRITICISM OF HIGH-STRUCTURALISM

In this chapter, I will try to demonstrate the fact that Deleuze and Guattari contribute to the literary and philosophical criticism of the contemporary era in terms of radical deconstruction towards meta-narratives. G. Deleuze and F. Guattari are one of the most prolific names in the post-structuralist French philosophy, studied in a wide range of fields from politics to sociology, from psychiatry to cinema. It should be underlined that, Deleuze and Guattari cannot be separated from the post-structural movements and trends in the post-modern era (Buchanan, 2008, p. 34). Post-structuralism uses the post-modern methodologies such as deconstruction, differentiation and estrangement against metaphysical residues of modernism. All customary and institutional presentations of grand-meta narratives are subjected to de-centralization and dismantle. Totalizing state ideology and hegemony disintegrate in to trivial, trifle pieces. Here, the post-structural approach intends to disclose arbitrariness behind the transactions of closure. In other words, the post-modern approach obliterates so called validity and reliability of grand-meta narratives by showing that the power of hegemony relies on the illusion of representation. In contrast, the post-modern criticism denies all possible modes of representation in term of self-sabotage and self-repressing in the act of representing. The classical representation strategies which produce hierarchy and power structure, are repudiated and they loss reputation.

4.1 The Philosophy of Schizoid Immanence

Deleuze and Guattari introduce a new philosophy of immanence which promotes immanent singularities and intensities as an opposed to the ideal of integrity and identification with the transcendental idea. Especially, they further develop the deconstructive methodology and promote the bricolage of the "schizo" who strays from totalizing and despotic kind of living ruptures and bifurcates at the hands of differentiation (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980, p. 171, 175). These schizo intensities and singularities of constant differentiation and transfiguration cannot be

captured and articulated neither by the market, nor the state.

Namely, Deleuze and Guattari propose a radicalized form of subjectivity by repelling the despotic desiring-machines. The main purpose of their academic studies has been to find out the mutual effect between their experimental philosophy and a new brand of thinking, desiring and becoming. In this aspect, they have examined the lines of flight in terms of de-territorialisation and deconstruction. Therefore, the main emphasis of DeleuzoGuattarian philosophy has been on minor literature, minor language and minor identity. Their philosophy affirms desire and multiplication of connections and includes pluralisation of truth, repudiation of totalizing meta-narratives of the western thought (Goodchild, 2005, p. 254, 256). They introduce a new thought system based on singularities and rhizome. In response to the fallacy of tree-like structure of the western thought system, they extend their academic criticism and gather under the name of "Capitalism and Schizophrenia; Anti-Oedipus". Especially, "Anti-Oedipus" blows in like an intellectual explosive to dismantle well-structured idealism of psychoanalysis and oedipal politics (Buchanan, 2008, p. 21). In this study they borrow from Nietzsche, Spinoza and Bergson. In this context, they promote a new counter-philosophy inspired by those names. The common feature of almost all philosophers who drew their attention is that they have diverged from the history of philosophy and tried to produce a counter-attitude.

4.2 The Influence of Nietzsche, Spinoza and Bergson

Deleuze and Guattaris's contemporary counter-philosophy is constituted by Nietzsche's will power, Spinoza's immanence of body and Bergson's concept of duration with regards to becoming. The end synthesis appears as schizo-analysis that Deleuze and Guattari put against the psychoanalytic unconscious moulded by negation of desire. In addition to this, DeleuzoGuattarian philosophy can be perceived as an intellectual war against Hegelian dialectics, structuralism and metaphysical fallacy of the whole Western philosophy (Goodchild, 2005, p. 64, 65). Especially, Hegel's dialectics, Freudian metaphysics of oedipal unconscious and Lacan's structural psychoanalysis stand against the new brand contributions of Deleuze and Guattari such as rhizome, schizoid unconscious and bricolage.

In this respect, they exclude dialectics and binarism since binary logic of dualist dialectic constantly produces binary oppositions and bind one to another. As a result, the dialectic binarism creates arborescent articulations. To illustrate, female must rely on male as well as the East is depend on the West or the void between signified and the signifier. Deleuze and Guattari attempt to overcome this binary logic of dualism.

They introduce free-stray of rhizomic intensities or schizoid singularities which don't belong to the representation system. Thus, since this philosophy of immanence repudiates to reside in the classical structure of representation, it dissolves the binary logic of oppositions which is based on integrity and dialectics. In contrast with regulated and articulated identities which are captured by the binary logic of arborescence, rhizomes arise as each communicating with the other but maintaining its own independent singularity. Static structures like language, the oedipal unconscious and binary oppositions are vulnerable to manipulation and control, yet, dynamic singularities flow in constant motion of becoming so they can auto-create. In short, Deleuze and Guattari's contemporary philosophy can be understood as counter-creativity, affirmation of minor singularities and prolific becoming as an opposed to dialectical and metaphysical systems trying to cut off the creative connections (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 42, 44, 50).

They emphasize differentiation, difference and transfiguration instead of integrity. They formulate the lines of flight which is based on actions and productive creativity that form rhizomes with new connections, which cannot be fixed and cannot be confined to a specific place. Therefore, their new brand philosophy overcomes the fallacy of the binary logic of dialectic. In this respect, minor identities are promoted because minority is a situation of being bilingual and polyvocal even within a single language. To illustrate, "polyvocalism" remains not static and cannot be reduced in to representation thus can escape from the control of the power that operates through language (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 101, 105, 110). In this context, one of the most eccentric concepts that Deleuze and Guattari contribute to the contemporary philosophy is rhizome. The rhizomic thinking is congruent with multitude and enrichment. To illustrate, because the rhizome intensities have not a fixed structure and territory, they can easily connect and create plurality. It gives stem where it is broken and cut off so the idea of root-orientation in the tree-like

thought system is challenged by the philosophy of becoming (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980, p. 26). Here the validity of origin and heterogeneity is replaced with bifurcation of rhizomes. This multiplicity cannot be reduced in to one and absolute unity. Namely, Deleuze and Guattari introduce becoming-minor against major and absolute identities. They fragment the illusion of consummated identity in to bits and pieces. Their philosophy is a revelation of anti essentialism and anti formalism that promote orphans' disinheritance from the name of The Father which operates behind all the identity-making process.

4.3 Self-Reflexivity in DeleuzoGuattarian Philosophy

Therefore, the philosophy of Deleuze and Guattari is a self-reflexive and laying its own devices in the way that the DeleuzoGuattarian schizophrenia complements and corresponds to becoming and rhizome in practice. In doing so Deleuze and Guattari enunciate that it is possible to overcome the existing transcendental organizations and the fabricated subjectivity by differentiating and repeating the difference. According to them becoming derives from neither an absolute origin nor goal-oriented consummation. Instead, it exists in the middle without the story of beginning and the end. The becoming is enriched and proliferated with unexpected and imponderable minor possibilities. As a self-reflexive philosophy, Deleuzian theory also starts in the middle which can be perceived as an intellectual space where is away from structured and formalist ideas such as the origin, genealogy or the idea of completion, fulfilment. Thus, Deleuze and Guattari improve the rhizomic philosophy and historiography emanating from the idea that life is a becoming, flowing and floating from one territory to another that tramples down the tree-like manner of traditional philosophy (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980, p. 33, 39, 232).

4.4 The Body without Organs as the Unfinalized Body

In this respect, Deleuze and Guattari introduce their one of the best known theories which is extended to a wide-range of fields from politics to cinema studies. It is "the body without organs" that performs de-territorialisation of power-structures

and of articulation of consummation. The body without organs is the opposite of the ideal of perfection, accomplishment and identification. Thus, the concept of the body without organs allows us to notice how body-identities are fabricated and organized in a certain way of any power structure. At the same time, the study of body without organs provides to understand the operation behind language which is reduced in to a specific use with the grammatical and verbal laws and how language works with the structural patterns. It is constructing, homogenising a world full of pre-individual, pre-subject singularities into molar communities (Cull, 2009, p. 247, 250). However, Deleuze also underlines that every stratification and identification process includes its own body without organs as a potentiality of transfiguration and differentiation. Such a discovery will provide us new organizations to produce minor forms, dislocation and becoming under the organized and stratified bodies.

"Desiring-machines make us an organism; but at the very heart of this production, within the very production of this production, the body suffers from being organized in this way, from not having some other sort of organization, or no organization at all."An incomprehensible, absolutely rigid stasis" in the very midst of process, as a third stage: "No mouth. No tongue. No teeth. No larynx. No esophagus. No belly. No anus." The automata stop dead and set free the unorganized mass they once served to articulate. The full body without organs is the unproductive, the sterile, the unengendered, and the unconsumable. Antonin Artaud discovered this one day, finding himself with no shape or form whatsoever, right there where he was at that moment." (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 8).

In the quatation above, Deleuze and Guattari underline amorphous, distorted abjection of the body without organs which threaten the perfection of rigid statis of the ideal body.

However, it should be also noted that the body without organs is not an expression of lost of totality and integrity. According to Deleuze, the body without organs releases rigid images and identities constituted by language, the symbolic order and consummation with the name of The Father. In this sense, the body without organs exists in a constant conflict with the rigid body which is stratified and articulated by the power structures (Cull, 2009, p. 252, 253). Instead, the body without organs is always in motion of constant and uninterrupted, ceaseless slippery

and flow (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 9, 10, 11).

   More importantly, with regards to Deleuze and Guattari's intellectual endeavours to overcome the oedipal triangulation inscribed on the body, the body without organs demonstrates self-production. In other words, unlike fabrication and organization of subjectivity by the oedipal laws, the body without organs demonstrates self-production and self-engendering.

   Namely, the body without organs also provides a possibility to scramble the oedipal codes to confine the unconscious desire (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 15) In doing so, it refers to pre-oedipal undetermination. Here, Deleuze likens the body without organs to an egg in terms of gradient destinations against predestinated zones and consummation (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980, p. 174, 185, 186). In order to demonstrate vitality before this representation, Deleuze uses the egg as a biological model in many of his works. To illustrate the egg does not have organs; rather it is defined only by its gradients, regions, thresholds, latitudes, occurrence and transitions. The egg is an organism existing in the intermediary state of pure intensity. In this respect, Deleuze and Guattari's body without organs is the territory, in their terms smooth space where formless and unstable substances spread, independent and non-reducible intensity and nomadic singularities come and pass. Here, as we notice, the main emphasis is on difference and differentiation that constitute the plane of immanence, gradient zones without destination (Thanem, 2004, p. 5, 6).

   Deleuze in his "Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation" further improves the body without organs in terms of Bacon's figural immanence in his paintings that illustrates pre-individual intensities. According to Deleuze, Bacon portrays figural bodies without organs against verisimilitude and representation; instead, he depicts organ as fragmented and disoriented parts by breaking down the the concentrated body unity (Deleuze, 1982, p. 28, 33, 36, 40, 41). In this sense, what Deleuze highly emphasizes in Bacon's painting style is the fragmentation of the absolute and ideal body in to immanent fragments and the de-familiarization of the verisimilitude concept of human. Deleuze points out that Bacon releases the parts and fragments under the rigidity and confinement of the absolute body so he performs the body without organs in his paintings. Here, what Bacon performs is the search for a figural

body instead of finalized and consummated organization, consisting only of immanent forces, rhizomic becoming which does not point to any border or limit (Uzunlar, 2012, p. 201, 202).

Finally Deleuze looks for total disintegration from the illusion of consummation of the body and the identity. Instead of the platonic logic of substantiality which requires identification with a transcendental idea, not an immanent substance, Deleuze tries to envisage the plane of consistency in relation with the fragmentation. To illustrate, the plane of consistency is a term used by Deleuze and Guattari to overcome dualistic and idealistic understanding of substance. According to Deleuze and Guattari, both dualism and idealism oblige the substance to depend on an exterior counterpart or a transcendental idea.

On the contrary, the plane of consistency expresses the immanence without consummation, foundation and opposition (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980, p. 180, 184, 186). In this respect, the plane of consistency gives rise to intellectual concepts of Deleuze and Guattari such as a plateau, becoming and schizo-flows.

"A plateau is always in the middle, not at the beginning or the end. A rhizome is made of plateaus" (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980, p. 42).

4.5 Schizophrenia and Becoming

For Deleuze, schizophrenia is more than just a clinical condition but, it demonstrates new and experimental modes of thinking and desiring. Therefore, schizophrenia should be taken in to consideration as a self-alienation from the symbolic structure of all stratifications and articulations. In this sense, for Deleuze, schizophrenia is a state of delirium. Deleuze approaches the schizophrenic delirium as a de-familiarization of pre-established codes to discover differentiation, difference and becoming underneath well-structured organizations. Schizophrenia is directly related to becoming-minor and overdosing the limits:

"A very good schizo dream. To be fully a part of the crowd and at the same time completely outside it, removed from it: to be on the edge, to take a walk like Virginia Woolf (never again will I say, "I am this, I am that")." (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980, p. 50).

It is also important to note that, Deleuze and Guattari are inspired by the schizo-desire while presenting the revolutionary theory of desire based on the eternal recurrence of difference in the production of desire. In addition, the schizophrenic flow of desire overcomes and goes beyond the familial location of the oedipal desire. Therefore, the schizophrenic delirium fractures the strata of the well-structured oedipal desire and power relations:

"Revolution for Deleuze and Guattari means schizophrenizing the existing power structure, making it vibrate to a new rhythm, making it change from within, without at the same time becoming a schizophrenic" (Buchanan, 2008, p. 10).

Here, Buchanan points out the similarities between the concept of revolution and the schizoid desire in terms of de-stratification for Deleuze and Guattari. In addition to this, Deleuze and Guattari state that the schizophrenic flow out of stroll demonstrate the true model of desiring. To illustrate:

"Essentially, what Deleuze and Guattari want to demonstrate is this: the schizophrenic, in the full flight of delirium, reveals to us the true nature of desire as a synthetic process. The schizophrenic process, then, is Deleuze and Guattari's model of how desire works." (Buchanan, 2008, p. 40)

It should be underlined that the intellectual aim of Deleuze and Guattari is not to romanticize the schizophrenic process; indeed, they examine the schizophrenic delirium as an inspiration to approach how the unconscious works as opposed to the oedipal imprisonment and confinement. In this sense, the schizophrenic delirium offers a new brand mode of bricolage.

First of all, the term bricolage is used by Claude Levi-Strauss to indicate how the savage mind works. It is a metaphor used to demonstrate the free play of mythical consciousness which fragments and disarrays the chronological order of things (Johnson, 2012, p. 359, 360). The mythical thought re-arranges and re-deploys fragments to create new combinations. On the contrary to this, Strauss criticizes discursive system of the Western thought which is highly structural and totalising. Strauss asserts that the mythical thought operates with free associations, fragmentation like a bricoleur whereas the Western thought imitates the systemic works of an engineer (Johnson, 2012, p. 361, 364). Therefore, he states that the new brand idea of bricolage provides a new and experimental thought system without

high structuralism of any discourse. It escapes from stable and structured models and opposes the classification methods of the Western thought system (Johnson, 2012, p. 367, 368). Similiarly, the schizophrenic delirium as a self-alienation and self-de-familiarization interrupts the engineer-like organization of things, threatens high structuralism of order by producing new connections and fragmentations. In this respect, Deleuze and Guattari define the schizophrenic bricolage as the limit of the society because it is intolerable and impregnable for the rest of the community (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 34, 35).

In this sense, the schizo is the protagonist of DeleuzoGuattarian Anti-Oedipus. To illustrate, the schizophrenic psyche unlike the oedipal unconscious which is trapped by the Freudian psychoanalysis, demonstrates self-reflexive criticism of oedipal and subjugated consummation that finds an ideal completion with an exterior, a transcendental idea. In this respect, the schizophrenic psyche refuses to identify with stable and well-structured identification marks and repudiates superiority of the Other. Instead, the schizophrenic defilement of the consummated ego remains unstable, impregnable and temporal in constant fluctuation. Therefore, schizoanalysis as a critique of representation targeting at the substitution and exchange system of oedipal psychoanalysis through distorted images of the real signified. Similarly, capitalism also traps desire by reducing it to stable, distorted and deceptive representations. In this respect the oedipal desire itself becomes a means of suppression. All in all, schizoanalysis provides an alternative way to discover immanent and productive characteristic of the unconsciousness without falling in to regressive and reactionary fallacies of the oedipal psychoanalysis (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 75, 81, 98, 105).

CHAPTER V

THE GROTESQUE AND THE ANTI OEDIPUS IN
STERNE'S NOVEL

In the light of new brand literary and philosophical theory of Deleuze and Guattari, the main consideration of this study; "The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman will be analyzed and approached. The novel is written by Laurence Sterne during the period between 1759 and 1767. According to the critics, the novel is the most outlandish of its time in terms of use of language, formal and informal elements, and plot structure. It is commonly thought that the technical and structural elements of the novel demonstrate the writer's intention to diverge from the formalistic characteristics of the 18th century British novel genre.

Briefly, Sterne's novel reflects philosophical and self-reflexive narrative of the protagonist. Tristram Shandy is a strange character compared to decent, docile and oedipalized bildunsroman protagonists presented in the canon of 18th century novel. Technically, the structure of the novel complements to the grotesque reality of the plot in terms of digressive-progressive narrative strategies, meta-conscious level of its fictionality and the anti-theological self engendered textuality. The novel can be also conceived as an experimental performance of becoming in that the plot structure and the unfinalizibity of the protagonist build parallelism with DeleuzoGuattarian immanence philosophy. Sterne's diction also bands Bakhtin and Deleuze-Guattari together with regards to laughter, ridiculing solemnity and bawdy humour. As for the theme and fiction, the novel consists of several chapters without chronological organization. Each chapter presents a glimpse of Tristram's becoming anti-Oedipus. In the beginning, the narrator mocks with his birth tragedy and christening misfortune. Then, he mentions another unfortunate, bawdy and pitiful member of Shandy Family; Uncle Toby. In the following chapters, the narrator is occupied with Uncle Toby's hobby-horsical obsession with fortification. Here, the reader is given a clue about self-reflexivity of the novel in the way that just like Uncle Toby's hobby - horsical occupation with performing the war through fortification, Tristram Shandy plays with experimental fictionality of reality through the text. In the next chapter, he presents a parody of Walter Shandy's obsession with perfection of name, nose and phallus in order to guaranty the rightful position of son. On the contrary to this,

Tristram Shandy, himself is a mockery of the name of the Father both bodily and intellectually because he is the decadent version of what his father expects him to be. At the end of the novel, he finishes with the end of Uncle Toby's love story. Yet, it is not an ordinary love story for the narrator. He mocks with the ideal, platonic love which is supposed to be de-sexualised, sublime and solemn. The narrator plays with word and puns by using folk-erotic manner in order to eroticize the love story of Uncle Toby. He narrates the story like a Shakespearean comedy wrought with puns, erotic indications and obscenity. Namely, he ends with vulgarizing the ideal, the sublime. He praises bawdiness, profanity instead of ethical principles

It is important to underline that during the 18th century in which Sterne published his outlandish novel, the most popular genre was the bildungsroman which is historically and ideologically contingent with the spirit of the era. First of all, the bildungsroman is used to refer the literary genre also known as the novel of education and improvement (Golban, 2017, p. 139). In this sense, the bildungsroman is historically congruent with the scientific and cultural belief in human progress via education, programme and development. To illustrate, the most conspicuous characteristic of the bildungsroman is the protagonist who progress and improves from early childhood to maturity in the course of identity formation in the novel (Golban, 2017, p. 118). Especially, the origin of the British bildungsroman derives from the picaresque tradition and the 18th century English novel of the verisimilitude (Golban, 2017, p. 119, 120). Therefore, the identity formation process in the literary narrativization of the bildungsroman is constituted by consummation, experience and attainment. In other words, the becoming in this type of narrative is subjected to identification with an either transcendental or an external culmination point.

The bildungsroman incorporates with the platonic postulation that lack, absence and deprivation prevail. For Bakhtin, the identity formation in the bildungsroman is "the image of man in the process of becoming" (Golban, 2017, p. 117). Namely, Bakhtin considers the bildungsroman is a genre of the becoming and appearance of the self in a literary narrative. Hereby, the emanation of the self and the fabrication of subjectivity correspond to the same period. In this sense, the genre cannot be separated from the developmentalism of the era. For instance, Bakhtin states that the identity formation or consummation of the hero requires intellectual, social and cultural growth which complements to the neoclassic promise in human

progress. Another characteristic element of the bildungsroman tradition is the prevalent literary pattern of verisimilitude with regards to construction of time and experience (Golban, 2017, p. 113, 114, 115). The representation of spatio-temporal elements in the British novel as a precursor of the bildungsroman follows the verisimilitude and imitates correctness, credibility with the real time. It is also related to construction of memory and experience in terms of historicity. In the British novel tradition and following bildungsromans genre, the construction of chronotope is congruent with the image of hero/protagonist in time and space.

In addition, the structure of experience and memory complements the advancement of becoming in the course of the novel. To illustrate, there are certain stages for the protagonist to overcome to be able to attain consummation and complementation. More clearly, adulthood or accomplishment is constructed through the binary structure between childhood and maturity, naivety and experience inner and outer struggles. It can be asserted that essentialism and complementation are the most characteristics of the bildungsroman with regards to the construction of time, space and the image of the protagonist.

5.1 Dialogicism and Becoming in Meta-Language of the Novel

According to Bakhtin, literature especially meta-linguistic self-reflexive narratives such as bildungroman is thinking society and the self through language so he emphasizes certain literary genres that project self-reflexiveness and laying devices (Rule, 2015, p. 29, 41). Therefore, dialogue or dialogism is a very important concern for Bakhtin in terms of construction of reality within discourse.

He emphasizes open-endedness and unfinalized becoming. In other words, the dialogic nature of becoming which is in constant fluctuation and transfiguration cannot be reduced or reified in to stable, materialised forms. It opposes the endeavours of engineer-like thought system of Western philosophy which aims to finalize the identity and the becoming through the final consummation. Instead, Bakhtin extols self-developmental or artistic fusion which is irreducible to a solid, stable and finalized idea. For Bakhtin, dialogicism or the dialogic nature of symposium rather than reified discourse is very vital with regards to expression of authenticity. Open-ended, unfinalized dialogue is the only suitable form that

expresses the authentic expression of human life. Becoming means involving in a dialogue.

In this respect, Bakhtin exemplifies Dostoevsky's novels for incorporating with the dialogic nature of language and allowing polyphony of plural, polyvocal voices so the characters in Dostoevsky's novels are not finalizable instead they emerge in dialogue and becoming. Bahktin pays attention to the bricolage of a new subjectivity existing in a polyphonic, polyvocal discourse as opposed to the isolated, predetermined and consummated ego of the Western rationalism and monologicism.

5.2 Similarities between DeleuzoGuattarian Lines of Flight and Bakhtinian Unfinalizability

Another aspect of Bakhtinian novel as a dialogic discourse is that it pledges a promising vision for the future (Bakhtin, 1984, p. 43, 49). According to Bakhtin, the grotesque reality appears when the current state is dissolving however the future hasn't come yet. In this moment of hovering between present and future, the grotesque emerges and stimulates a different way of thinking like a bricoleur's new brand fragments and combinations (Atmaca, 2020, p. 95, 97, 98). Therefore, Bakthinian novel announces the coming of new approach, extrication from the monolithic, totalizing discourse of the present. In the world of fathers the prerogative discourse is always attached to the past. Therefore, the present is haunted by the ghost of the forfeited, glorious and ideal past. In other words, the present is always being stupefied and depreciated under the shadow of the past. The present is castrated by the past's phallus because the past is constructed as an unattainable, inaccessible chronotope of an idealized glory and consummation. As a result, the present is designated as a moment of agony and aspiration for the forfeited desire residing in the past. Likewise, Freud asserts the same nostalgia in terms of his concept of the unconscious which is located in the past. As opposed to this, Bakhtin promotes the open-ended, self-reflexive discourse in the novel which is not static and stabilized in the past but constantly produces new contexts and dialogues (Bakhtin, 1984, p. 130). Therefore, the Bahktinian novel provides as alternative way or the line of flight to reach joviality and playfulness because the addressee of its discourse points to the present, not the past.

Bakhtin can be easily approached through DeleuzoGuattarian philosophy of becoming, the lines of flight and the plane of consistency; the immanence. In other words, literature is not only a matter of linguistic issue for Bakhtin; instead he emphasizes meta-linguistic dimension of open-endedness and self-reflectivity of the novel. Therefore, the dialogic nature of the novel directly interferes with immanent discourse. Namely, Both Bakhtin and Deleuze and Guattari wage war against the totalizing discourses over life, becoming and laughter. They affirm multiplicity and joviality against solemnity of transcendental and theological concepts. In this sense, both Bakhtin and Deleuze-Guattari emphasize the counter-philosophy which releases centrifugal forces and intensities against the totalizing, monophonic forces of capture and reification. They both promote dialogue and polyphony as opposed to authoritarian discourse which is called as arborescence by Deleuze and Guattari. To illustrate, polyphony, dialogue, becoming and the lines of flight are the notions coined by those philosophers to undermine absolute and monotonous organizations which are inscribing one and only, a single truth. In response to this, a new brand becoming provides an alternative temporality and open-ended experience instead of suspended past hauntology. For this reason, the philosophy of becoming is the antagonist of all completed and consummated projects of identity; instead the becoming appears in an open-ended chronotope which is contingent with the lines of flight. In other words, chronological and linear advancement of time and place is deconstructed by unstable and imponderable fluidity of becoming chronotope. Namely, both Bakhtin and Deleuze-Guattari aim at constructing an alternative form of temporality and minority against theological and progressive, consummation-oriented historicity. The chronological history inscribes a single truth which is contingent with historicity that finalizes multitude and becoming. Even, the term; becoming, envisages ever-floating fluctuation of new possibilities, intensities and transfigurations.

All in all, they prefers experience-time which is called duration as opposed to the linear and chronological time of the monophonic discourse. More clearly, they discuss the durational time of experience as a moment of opportunity and intervening unlike the chronological time which imposes itself as a necessity. The durational time of experience interrupts consummated determinacy of the chronological time so it provides an alternative vision to recognize things in another way. It can be also

said that, Baktin's and DeleuzoGuattarian approach to the subjectivity differs from the construction of ego through time, space and language. Instead, they underline open-ended, unaccomplished and not-consummated becoming in the dialogic nature (Atmaca, 2020, p. 93, 100). Especially, the minor language that those philosophers handle, is a very crucial to understand dialogicism against univocal discourses. For Bakhtin, language is something beyond fixed and reified units of sign system which are predetermined; on the contrary, he asserts that language is something dynamic bound up to change and transfigurations (Bakhtin, 1999, p. 122, 157). Therefore, language is dialogic and open to minor ramifications in its nature. In this sense, it is only possible to overcome the domination of the monologic discourse over the present and the future through dialogue because dialogue stretches out the stratified rigidity of the univocal discourse.

5.3 Fabrication and Narrativization of the Oedipal Subjectivity in the 18th Century Novel

In this approach, the 18th century novel against which Sterne opposes embodies the formation of hero through construction of identity, consummation and linear progression of chronological time. In other words, the formation of hero in the 18th novel appears in historically contingent chronotope. As mentioned above, the chronotope must correspond to correctness and concreteness of the real time and space to achieve the verisimilitude (Golban, 2017, p. 120, 121). Therefore, the becoming of the hero is interrupted by the monologic, monophonic-univocal ex parte of reality principle.

Another aspect of the 18th century novel as an expression of ordeal of miserable subjectivity is the initiatory test to attain identity, to consummate with the family inheritance, to unity with an ideal-partner or to incorporate with adventure or career. Namely the protagonist is designated to be lack and absent, deprived of something already lost, in the first place and during the formation of hero journey. The protagonist deals with various test, ordeal and challenge to reach the final destination of consummation with an external-ideal which can be a fortune, a proper surname, an ideal partner or prestige in society. In this sense, the hero's becoming in the novel is structured by a larger social framework. The novel incorporates with the

verisimilitude to conform social and moral concerns. In other words, the verisimilitude is textualized in the 18th novel along with the appearance of the protagonist whose individuation process is constructed by monologic marks.

Another ordeal of the protagonist in the 18th century novel is the hauntology of guilt, redemption, burden of the past (Golban, 2017, p. 124). In this sense, the protagonist is haunted by the past and devalued accordingly. His or her becoming process is interrupted by the shadow of the past retribution. In this context, the maturation of the protagonist in the 18th century novel tradition is again obsessed with past experiences, lost unity, childhood traumas; thus, the novel fabricates and textualises the oedipal subjectivity in need of complementation. To illustrate the most known protagonist of the 18th century novel like Tom Jones, Moll Flanders, Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship by Goethe, especially Gothean family romance and later Jane Eyre, David Copperfield; all the protagonists are described in the state of an oedipal struggle for accomplishment and consummation. Deleuze and Guattari severely criticize the Goethian family romance in terms of literary construction of the Oedipus as textualisation of neurosis (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 55).

For instance, Goethe's the most famous protagonist; Wilhelm can be easily approached as an oedipal neurotic in terms of his formation of identity reified, in Bakhtinian sense, by complementation in a suitable marriage which is an imitation of the oedipal family law, and acceptance in the society as another oedipal ideal in the social context. "Striving for self development accompanied by a quest for a suitable vocation and role in the community" (Golban, 2017, p. 130). In this sense, Goethe's bildungromance pattern which is the precursor of the novel tradition that Sterne tries to challenge is bound up to idealism and interdependence with the social and milieu determination. Even the emphasis on apprenticeship imposes maturation and professionalization in progress and advancement which reifies becoming and open-endedness in immanence; however, in the plane of consistency; the immanent becoming doesn't require accomplishment and consummation; it has been already congruent and contingent in itself.

Unfortunately, in the 18th century novel, becoming is reduced in to devotion, maturation and progress; as a result the hero's dialogic nature is castrated by incumbencies to attain identity. Namely, this new fictional pattern reiterates and

imitates the oedipal subjectivity in terms of the overemphasis on maturity as reification of experience, monologic ideals such as accomplishment in profession or attaining social recognition and suspension of the past. Moreover, the novel makes the subject oedipalized through the neoclassic ideals in the 18th century. To illustrate, during the neoclassical period in which the novel emerges as a new brand literary genre, such principles as reason, rationalism, collectiveness, moral and social codes are prior to the individual's becoming so the subject is governed by the grand discourse which interrupts the dialogic nature. More specifically, the realist diction in the literary representation strategies presents the character as being determined by the societal norms and didactic rules which signify the law of the Father. Therefore, the novel present reified reality constructed by chronological, linear time, monologic language and oedipalized characterisation.

5.4 The Lines of Flight in Sterne's Counter-Narrative

In response to this, Sterne's novel; The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman, deviates to just the opposite path and incorporates with Bakhtin's dialogicism, open-endedness, becoming and DeleuzoGuattarian de-territorialisation. In this sense, the protagonist of the novel, Tristram Shandy can be approached as the Anti-Oedipus in terms of Deleuze and Guattari's schizoid unconscious which deconstructs straight and stable codes, monophonic meaning and reification (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 321, 322). In this respect, Sterne's novel seems to be an open-ended journey without a proper beginning or a theological end. Namely, the protagonist offers the reader a collection of fragments, bricolage and prolific dialogues. In addition to this, in contrast with the construction of reality in the 18th century novel via verisimilitude and rationalism, in Sterne's novel reality is a constant mode of de-territorialisation, open to new connections, ramifications and bifurcations in the matter of polyvocal discourse of the narrator. In terms of language, the novel can be seen as a 600 pages performance of deconstruction of the signifying system of language based on the exchange system and substitution. In the novel, it is impossible to detect direct reference between the word and the thing, the signified and the signifier. There is no longer the name of The Father as a signifier of the phallus which guarantees the referential balance between the signified and he

signifier (Thomiéres, 2012, p. 2, 7, 10). In this respect, Sterne's novel seems to be a sunder from the literary tradition of the 18th century novel:

Together with the structure of language, the construction of time and experience, the novel achieves grotesque reality in terms of ordering things in alternative way. It uses the grotesque reality which provides an opportunity to look at the order of things with a new and an experimental perspective to realize the dialogic and connective nature of things. Thus, it helps to build new bricolage to relate things completely different from the way they were (Bakhtin, 1984, p. 44, 48). Therefore, in Sterne's novel the construction of reality is dismantled by dialogic nature of language, duration of time and the becoming of Tristram Shandy as opposed to the oedipal, consummated subjectivity. Unlike his contemporaries such as "Tom Jones" of Fielding, Sterne's novel represents an open-ended quest which is always in the middle. To illustrate, Tristram Shandy never attains a rightful name, a family inheritance or strives for an ideal marriage for recognition in the society. Instead, Tristram Shandy emerges in a complete crisis without proper essence, trustful foundation or possessed identity. It can be said that, the 18th century novel reiterates the platonic logic of orginal absence in the matter of ordeal of the protagonist to quest for consummation with phallus, to fulfil his or her wound, essence; but Tristram Shandy projects just the opposite. It is a kind of abjection, a total break down from the one and only ideal of phallus which guarantees the order of things, the balance between the signifier and the signified. (Thomiéres, 2012, p. 6, 7).

In this sense, Sterne characterizes Tristram Shandy in the crisis of becoming; on the brink of beginning and the end. Namely, Tristram Shandy differs from the protagonist of the bildungsroman genre who is craving for a proper identity:

"In a sense, Tristram Shandy is the complete opposite of Tom Jones, to limit ourselves to a single example. Tom possesses an essence and Fielding's novel relates the discovery of that essence. Its hero perceives — correctly or not — situations, obstacles, and then he reacts to them, and thus acts. What matters is always what is achieved next. Indeed, the plot of the novel lists a series of items Tom lacks, and, at the end of the book, he is in full possession of his rightful name, identity, house, fortune, etc. He also enjoys social recognition and of course he has gained a wife, love, and happiness. It also goes without saying that his children will perpetuate his

name." (Thomiéres, 2012, p. 3).

Unlike a proper hero, Tristram Shandy does not discover anything at the end of the novel nor does he achieve identity formation. Instead, the novel remains an open-ended possibility at the middle of things. All in all, Sterne undermines essentialism and foundationalism in both thematic and structural pattern.

5.5 The Influence of Locke and Rabelais

To give brief information about the novel, it is important to mention by whom Sterne was inspired in terms of technique, style and structure. First of all, the most influential source that Sterne regards is Locke's "An Essay Concerning Human Understanding". Sterne constantly alludes to Locke's essay, especially the experimental relation between the object and the idea, the signifier and the signified regards to Locke's theories on human understanding and experience. Just like Locke who repudiates innate ideas and nativism with Tabula Rasta, Sterne also denies to follow pre-established, well structured foundation for human experience which is reified by the inherited monophonic, monologic discourse; instead he destabilizes the reality to release open-ended possibilities and becoming. Sterne is again inspired by Locke with regards to "Abuse of Words". Locke discusses about loose and arbitrary nature of language to signify reality. Yet, Sterne abuses the use of words, the signifiers and the substitution system of language to play with reality. In other words, Sterne parodizes Locke's theory of associationism.

Another inspiration that Sterne is influenced is Rabelais with regards to humours writing and ridiculous solemnity. Sterne is also familiar to Rabelais in the matter of grotesque reality. Bakhtin examines Rabelais's works and asserts that Rabelais is better understood according to humour, differentiation and ridiculing the gravitas (Bakhtin, 1984, p. 418). For Bakhtin, Rabelais is a writer of laughter, joviality and folk parodies against the coercive solemnity. Bakhtin explores the grotesque reality in Rabelais's works especially bodily images, degradation and shocking effects (Bakhtin, 1984, p. 418, 419, 420, 423). Especially, the grotesque bodily image preoccupies a great importance in both Bakhtin's and Sterne's literary perspective. In doing so the grotesque body which is obscene and uncanny, almost

abjection threatens the proper-consummated identity. It ridicules the gravitas of subjectivity by provoking corporeality, alienation and humorous spectacle. In addition to the grotesque body of Bahktin from which Sterne was considerably influenced, the laughter and creativity emerging in the carnival spirit inspire the comic elements, absurdity and exaggeration in the novel. In this context the grotesque and carnivalesque appear in Sterne's novel as degradation of idealistic-consummated bodily unity, dissolution of essentialism. Also, the identity is never given but it is an open process of becoming. As for he language, it reflects the playfulness and arbitrariness through puns, metaphors, tongue twists etc. All in all, Sterne's novel complements and corresponds to counter-attitude in literature against gravitas and verisimilitude principle.

5.6 De-familiarization and Difference in Sterne's Counter-Narrative

In this respect, the structural and thematic de-familiarization technique that Sterne mostly used differentiates the novel from the 18th century novel and the protagonist from the hero's emerging in the oedipal context of the bildungsroman. First of all, to be able to understand the novel with regards to differentiation in language, time and structure, Shklovsky's concept of de-familiarization should be mentioned. (Harper, 1954, p. 93, 95). Shklovsky is one of the pioneers of the Russian Formalism, studying literariness and artistic reception of the poetry using the device; de-familiarization. The main purpose of making reality strange and baffling is to prevent automatic perception and mass adoption. Russian Formalists in general, Shklovsky in particular, aim to stimulate literariness through de-familiarization and differentiation to overcome banalities of automatization. In this sense, Sterne's novel is open to be discussed within the context of de-familiarizing the reality as well as the schizoid literature in DeleuzoGuattarian sense of de-territorialisation and loss of reality (Harper, 1954, p. 95, 96, 98, 99).

Especially, one of the most conspicuous characteristics of Sterne's novel; constant motion of digression and progression is an example of whimsical becoming in the novel as a self-reflexive meta-narrative frees itself from chronological linearity of time and language. Time and language stabilise the open-ended potency of

becoming and reduce in to one-dimensional, monophonic identity. To illustrate, language and time complement to each other in terms of construction of experience straitjacketed by the borders.

According to Bergson time is a fabricated discourse which is homogenous and geometrically divisible whereas duration which is experience time is rhizomic, existing in dialogic nature of experience (Restrepo, 2015, p. 51, 52). For instance, in the novel, Tristram Shandy's father; Walter Shandy is obsessed with clock-time, fixing them to arrange homogenous unity. On the contrary, Sterne performs non-chronological disarrangement and derangement in his novel as opposed to the illusion of wholeness, unity and linearity. To illustrate, Tristram Shandy talks about the term "Ab Ovo" used by Horace in "Ars Poetica". In literature, Ab Ovo is used to point the earliest chronological event but starting with medias res which means beginning in the middle of things. In the novel, Tristram Shandy refuses to follow Horace's practice of tracing backward to the earliest point in the chronology because he destabilizes the linearity of chronological time in the course of narrative:

"I find it necessary to consult everyone a little in his turn; and therefore must beg pardon for going on a little further…I have begun the history of myself in the way I have done…I shall confine myself neither to his rules, nor to any man's rules that ever lived." (Sterne, 1759-1767, p. 8).

Namely, in the quatation above, the narrator states that unlike Ab Ovo; tracing the earliest original cause, he will follow his whimsical desire strolling out of order. Therefore, Tristram Shandy leaves various fragments unfinished and unstitched. Fragmentariness and self-reflexiveness dominate the novel rather than a decent story of realist novel. Here the metaphor of "Ab Ovo" can be approached in two ways. First of all, with regards to the use of term in literature as the oldest original cause implies a total breakdown in chronological structure of time in Sterne's novel. Sterne repudiates to give a story of origin, the beginning or consummation with a theological end. Instead, he remains in the middle and constantly moves backwards and forwards. In doings so, he extricates himself and his novel from territorialisation of time. In this sense, Sterne resembles the schizo's stroll outdoors. Deleuze and Guattari demonstrate the schizo's free walk which de-territorializes the neurotic's rigid statis:

"A schizophrenic out for a walk is a better model than a neurotic lying on the analyst's couch... While taking a stroll outdoors, on the other hand, he is in the mountains, amid falling snowfiakes, with other gods or without any gods at all, without a family, without a father or a mother, with nature. "What does my father want? Can he offer me more than that? Impossible. Leave me in peace." (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 2).

Here, we see that Tristram Shandy as an anti-oedipal protagonist is similiar to DeleuzoGuattarian schzio in many ways. To illustrate, likewise the schizo's stroll outdoors, Tristram Shandy disintegrates during the process of becoming.

5.7 Tristram Shandy as an Anti-Oedipus

In this respect, Sterne, by constantly moving in the course of time through digressions and progressions, protects himself from being a victim of chronological time. Therefore, Tristram Shandy who denounces Homer-like structure of writing starting with a proper beginning to reach to the theological end also refers to the eternal recurrence of being and becoming against straight-line of chronological time. Similar to Bakhtin, who approaches grotesque time in the carnivalesque atmosphere of Rabelais's writings, Sterne always remains in the middle of events, never follows the straight-linearity of clock time:

"By this contrivance the machinery of my work is of a species by itself; two contrary motions are introduced into it, and reconciled, which were thought to be at variance with each other. In a word, my work is digressive, and it is progressive too, and at the same time." (Sterne, 1759-1767, p. 63)

Another reference related to "Ab Ovo" stems from the meaning of the term in Latin which is "from the egg". In the consideration of Deleuze's the egg metaphor and Tristram's homunculus, "Ab Ovo" gains another dimension within the context of the novel. First of all, Deleuze states that the body without organs is an egg (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 19). He emphasizes open-ended gradients of the body without organs. An egg incorporates with endless possibilities of becoming, transitions and destinations. Nothing has been reified or consummated here; an egg involves the plane of immanence in which each gradient is open to a new becoming. Namely,

Deleuze approaches the body without organs in the matter of schizoid re-territorialisation in terms of dissolution of rigid zones and axes. The becoming in an egg measures off predestined gradients (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 158, 355). In this respect, Deleuze and Guattari familiarize the plane of immanence in an egg to the schizophrenic loss of identity to discover unstitched intensities in his or her body. Secondly, the narrator of the novel; Tristram Shandy talks about his image as a diminutive form of being before his birth, when he exists as pre-formation in his father's sperms. He explains the theory of homunculus with the ridiculous solemnity:

"The HOMUNCULUS, Sir, in how-ever low and ludicrous a light he may appear, in this age of levity, to the eye of folly or prejudice;—to the eye of reason in scientifick research, he stands confess'd—a BEING guarded and circumscribed with rights: ——The minutest philosophers, who, by the bye, have the most enlarged understandings, (their souls being inversely as their enquiries) shew us incontestably, That the HOMUNCULUS is created by the same hand,—engender'd in the same course of nature,—endowed with the same loco-motive powers and faculties with us:——That he consists, as we do, of skin, hair, fat, flesh, veins, arteries, ligaments, nerves, cartileges, bones, marrow, brains, glands, genitals, humours, and articulations; ——is a Being of as much activity,——and, in all senses of the word, as much and as truly our fellow-creature as my Lord Chancellor of England" (Sterne, 1759-1767, p. 6).

Unlike the seriousness of this medical discourse, Tristram Shandy mocks with Walter Shandy's obsession with obstetrics and his efforts for guarantying the smooth journey of his sperms carrying the homunculus to Mrs. Shandy's womb. Yet, as the narrator cites, Mrs. Shandy disturbs her husband with a silly question about winding up the clock so she disturbs and distracts her husband's serious efforts to transfer his sperms successfully. In this sense, Tristram's misfortune starts before his birth. In other words, his identity is tarnished before he is given a chance to accomplish his identity formation. In this respect, Tristram's grotesque misfortune can be read as a criticism in terms of his pre-destination or pre-formation before coming in to existence, towards the myth of progress and human advancement through science and experience. As a result, the protagonist remains totally orphan, disinherited by any origin. He is un-engendered and non-complementary:

"But I was begot and born to misfortunes" (Sterne, 1759-1767, p. 38)

Also, Sterne's literary intention in characterizing Tristram Shandy as an inheritably wounded, fragmented and tarnished subject can be interpreted as a subtle parody of the picaresque hero of bildungsroman who achieves his identity formation step by step in the course of chronology of his life. On the contrary, Tristram's ordeal begins before he emerges as a hero as he said:

5.8 Narrative is Borne Simultaneously with The Protagonist

In this sense, the chronological, clock-time of bildungsroman is challenged in Sterne's novel, rather, he presents dialogic time in which each moment is influencing and also being influenced by the past and the future. Within this context, we understand that the digressive and progressive structure of the novel is not only a formal element but also self-reflexive characteristic of the form (Özün, 2012, p. 83, 85, 87). In other words, the novel is about itself projecting becoming of the form. Unlike "Ab Ovo" and "homunculus" the form is borne in the course of dialogic and open-ended becoming in the novel. Taking Tristram's refusal of "Ab Ovo" also his repudiation of giving the story of origin, he narrates the narrative of narrative. In other words, Sterne's novel is the narrative of its own birth both as a form and as an anti-oedipal character; Tristram Shandy. In addition to this, it is the novel of discontinuity and ordeal. In the novel the act of narrating becomes self-reflexive and meta-narrative device of becoming the form, the birth of narration itself (Özün, 2012, p. 83, 84, 84).

To illustrate, Gerard Genette in his classic "Narrative Discourse", introduces three modes of narrative. First one is recit which means narrative compromising telling a story or a chain of events accompanied by a plot, sjuzet. Secondly he defines Histoire which takes events in to consideration rather than the way of telling. "The re'cit is the signifier of the narrative text, and the histoire then aligns with the signified of the narrative" The third form is narrating about the narrative. Sterne's novel exemplifies the third act. In the novel, Sterne narrates textualisation of self-reflexive narrative (Gerard, 1980, p. 214, 215, 222). In this sense both Tristram Shandy and the form are borne by laying bare of their own devices.

Likewise, the birth of Tristram Shandy in the course of becoming can be interpreted as anti-oedipal self-creation as opposed to oedipal essentialism and foundationalism. To illustrate anti Oedipus never asked to be borne. The introduction of "Anti-Oedipus" starts with a quotation from Henry Miller:

"We must die as egos and be born again in the swarm, not separate and self-hypnotized, but individual and related." (Miller, 1942, p. 152).

Deleuze and Guattari state that the anti-Oedipus is a schizophrenic protagonist who destroys the oedipal subjectivity by refusing to be borne, escaping from the circle of reification. In response to this, Deleuze and Guattari approach the process of becoming as a ceaseless motion of transfiguration nullifying already begotten, reified forms of subjectivity:

"Phenomena of individualization and sexualization are produced within these fields. We pass from one field to another by crossing thresholds: we never stop migrating, we become other individuals as well as other sexes, and departing becomes as easy as being born or dying". (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 85).

To illustrate, in the beginning of the novel, Tristram Shandy mocks with the gravitas of reproduction in theological and social discourse and the protagonist displays absurdity and nonsense against it. In addition, he asked never to be borne:

"I Wish either my father or my mother, or indeed both of them, as they were in duty both equally bound to it, had minded what they were about when they begot me; had they duly consider'd how much depended upon what they were then doing;—that not only the production of a rational Being was concern'd in it, but that possibly the happy formation and temperature of his body, perhaps his genius and the very cast of his mind;—and, for aught they knew to the contrary, even the fortunes of his whole house might take their turn from the humours and dispositions which were then uppermost" (Sterne, 1759-1767, p. 5).

All in all the structural laying bare and thematic anti-oedipal devices are used by Sterne to avoid off oedipalization and reification imposed by mono-logic and univocal discourse. In doing so, Sterne through Tristram character reflects and projects fictive nature of pre-established notions and associations in front of the readers. As opposed to the conventional narrative strategies giving the illusion of meaning-creating God-Father role, Sterne deliberately reveals fictionality of his

work. As a result, his novel reaches meta-cognition as an act of narrating itself rather than representing mimetic fictions (Özün, 2012, p. 76, 77, 78). Finally, Sterne's novel is not dealing with representing what happens in a mimetic matter, but it follows becoming process during the act of narrating (Özün, 2012, p. 87). For instance, in this chapter, he deliberately reveals fictional reality of his work in a self-reflexive manner:

"I would, therefore, desire him to consider that it is but poor eight miles from Shandy-Hall to Dr. Slop, the man-midwife's house;—and that whilst Obadiah has been going those said miles and back, I have brought my uncle Toby from Namur, quite across all Flanders, into England: - - - That I have had him ill upon my hands near four years; - - - and have since travelled him and Corporal Trim, in a chariot and four, a journey of near two hundred miles down into Yorkshire;—all which put together, must have prepared the reader's imagination for the enterance of Dr. Slop upon the stage,——as much, at least, (I hope) as a dance, a song, or a concerto between the acts." (Sterne, 1759-1767, p. 92).

In the quotation above, the narrator deliberately discloses the fictive nature of his narrative. He plays with the construction of time by using fictious and arbitrary organization of sequence of events. As a result, the narrator sets off himself as a self-reflexive, meta-cognitive hero.

5.9 The Use of Language and The Construction of Identity

Likewise, his use of language breaks off traditional arrangement of the signified and the signifier substitution, instead, Sterne plays with the pattern of language and achieves literariness of meta-linguistic. Indeed, there is no ultimate truth in the novel so the signifiers are emptied and undermined because there exists neither God, nor Father, Phallus guarantying the stable connection between the signifier and the signified. To illustrate, he misguides the reader by obscuring the real referent and forces his reader to decipher the hidden meaning:

"For by the word Nose, throughout all this long chapter of noses, and in every other part of my work, where the word Nose occurs,—I declare, by that word I mean a Nose, and nothing more, or less." (Sterne, 1759-1767, p. 197)

There are only temporary associations getting actualized and virtualized in the course of the novel. The narrator; Tristram Shandy is quite different from the conventional narrator that we see in the 18th century novel, who authorizes himself as meaning-creating God or Father. On the contrary, Tristram Shandy is borne simultaneously with the form:

"In Book IX, Chapter 8, Tristram builds an analogy between pen and his life by saying "life follows my pen." He is aware of the fact that what he is creating is a linguistic world." (Özün, 2012, p. 78).

In this respect, Tristram Shandy is one of the most heretic, unorthodox protagonists in the history of literature in terms of undermining the absolute referent produced by God-author. The conventional manner of narrating is defined by construction of reality through linguistic verisimilitude. In other words, the use of language and signs imitates the reality. However, in Sterne's novel, the narrative discourse projects the awareness of fiction and fictive reality. In doing so, the use of language dissolves the pre-established association between the signified and the signifiers.

"I hate set dissertations, ---- and above all things in the world, "tis one of the silliest things in one of them, to darken your hypothesis by placing a number of tall, opake words, one before another, in a right line, betwixt your own and your readers conception." (Sterne, 1759-1767, p. 180).

In this sense, Sterne performs literary de-familiarisation not only through the construction of time as digressive and progressive plot structure but also using meta-linguistic level of language. In addition to this, the stylistic arrangement of the book and page format disturbs the linearity of conventional reading process. Namely, the form also complements to the thematic de-familiarisation and alienation effect to interrupt the automatization of reading. On the contrary, Sterne includes his reader in the reading process by creating dialogic language directly addressing to the reader. In this sense, he deconstructs the conventional plot organisation and narrative strategies. Before Barthes, Sterne introduces us the birth of the reader by playing with the construction of God-Author role who is guarantying the mimetic world of the literary signifiers which are expected to imitate the real, identically. Nevertheless, Sterne is like a scriptor borne simultaneously with becoming of the text, thus he dissolves

theological codes and messages:

"...In complete contrast, the modem scriptor is born simultaneously with the text, is in no way equipped with a being preceding or exceeding the writing, is not the subject with the book as predicate; there is no other time than that of the enunciation and every text is eternally written here and now." (Barthes, 1977, p. 145).

All in all, Sterne uses literature as an art of self-expression and obfuscates the conventional meaning-creating process by revealing difficulty and ordeal of writing.

5.10 Tristram's Disinheritance From the Phallus, The Name of the Father and Consummation

As for the description of the protagonist, the characterisation process, it is also congruent with the unconventionality of the plot and the form itself. Moreover, the protagonist's unaccomplished, unfinished consummation corresponds to the meta-narrative level of the form opposing to reification of the conventional narrative strategies. In other words, the bodily grotesque of Tristram Shandy whose corporeality is disintegrating and dissolving during the process of becoming is complementing to the stylistic and thematic differentiating in the novel. Tristram Shandy is just the opposite of the rightful hero of the bildungsroman. To illustrate, in the conventional bildungsroman the protagonist achieves his identity formation by accomplishing his social and individual ordeal step by step. On the contrary, in the course of Sterne' novel, Tristram Shandy discovers nothing, gains neither social recognition nor a proper name; instead, the protagonist remains unfinished and unstitched.

Consequently, his bodily disintegration continues as an act of particide of the wholeness of the name of the Father. To illustrate, even before his baptize ceremony, during his upbringing, his nose is "castrated by" the doctor's forceps. Here the emphasis is on nose is important to decipher the signifier of the phallus in the novel. In other words, Tristram is castrated in this time from his nose which is a phallic signifier of Shandy Family's phallic grandeur. He is wounded by mistaken

during the birth in spite of Walter Shandy's almost obsessive hobbyhorse on obstetrics. In this respect, Tristram Shandy is borne as a parody of his father's phallic obsession. He is disinherited by the wholeness and consummation with the phallus. Here, it is important to extend the discussion on Nose to decipher the hidden referent in the novel. As the narrator cites:

"For three generations at least, this tenet in favour of long noses had gradually been taking root in our family.——TRADITION was all along on its side, and INTEREST was every half year stepping in to strengthen it; so that the whimsicality of my father's brain was far from having the whole honour of this, as it had of almost all his other strange notions.—For in a great measure he might be said to have suck'd this in, with his mother's milk. He did his part however.——If education planted the mistake, (in case it was one) my father watered it, and ripened it to perfection." (Sterne, 1759-1767, p. 199)

However, as a parody of Walter Shandy's obsession with perfection Tristram's nose is smashed by mistaken during his upbringing which adds another misfortune to this grotesque existence:

"——THIS unfortunate draw-bridge of yours, quoth my father—God bless your honour, cried Trim, 'tis a bridge for master's nose.——In bringing him into the world with his vile instruments, he has crush'd his nose, Susannah says, as flat as a pancake to his face, and he is making a false bridge with a piece of cotton and a thin piece of whalebone out of Susannah's stays, to raise it up." (Sterne, 1759-1767, p. 193).

As a result of this, Walter Shandy is devastated for realizing the curse of little nose upon his son with whose perfection he is obsessed. Especially, Nose is one of the most preoccupying hobby horses of Walter Shandy insomuch that he treats noses with regards to size, extend, form, shape, bone and cartilage and finally theorizes to comfort nourishing the nose which appears to be an almost as a grandeur phallus:

"but that in case of the flaccidity and softness of the nurse or mother's breast,—by sinking into it, quoth Paræus, as into so much butter, the nose was comforted, nourish'd, plump'd up, refresh'd, refocillated, and set a growing forever." (Sterne, 1759-1767, p. 210).

In this respect, the nose signifier carries out the conjunctive synthesis of the phallus. Zizek argues about the function of the shark; "Jaws" in cinema studies (Buchanan, 2008, p. 75, 76). He asserts that the shark has been misunderstood so far, indeed the true function of Jaws is to connect ever-floating signifiers. In the introductory chapter of the film, the Amity Island is depicted as a place of multiplicity in which irrelevant and indifferent disorganisations exist. Zizek claims that the shark symbolizes the meaning-giver phallus for the members of the Amity Island. They are collected and re-articulated on the preoccupying symbol of the shark which refers to the phallus:

"As Zizek puts it, the shark is a perfect example of 'what Lacan calls a "point de caption": the emergence of the shark as symbol does not add any new meaning, it simply reorganises meanings which were already there by binding them to the same signifier'." (Buchanan, 2008, p. 75).

Likewise, the story of "Slawkenbergıus" mentioned in Sterne's novel can be approached as an earlier arrival of the Jaws in the form of "the stranger with the fringe, spectacular and brazen nose. According to the story, one day a stranger comes from the promontory of Noses to go to Frankfort. He accommodates a couple of days in Strasburg. Yet, his coming completely changes almost terrorizes the members of the town. Just like the Jaws, the appearance of the stranger with the fringe nose binds the townspeople to his phallic presence. Again, he doesn't carry out a new message or meaning but re-articulates the townsfolk on his phallic signifier. His nose preoccupies the community; everyone in the community is engulfed by the awkwardness of the stranger's fringe nose. In this respect, the nose is a representation of conjunctive synthesis of the phallus or the phallic signifier in the novel. The whole community from the watchman to the burgomaster's wife are gathered together on the same signifier:

"At the very time that this dispute was maintaining by the centinel and the drummer—was the same point debating betwixt a trumpeter and a trumpeter's wife, who were just then coming up, and had stopped to see the stranger pass by. Benedicity!——What a nose! 'tis as long, said the trumpeter's wife, as a trumpet. And of the same mettle, said the trumpeter, as you hear by its sneezing.

—'Tis as soft as a flute, said she.

—'Tis brass, said the trumpeter.

—'Tis a pudding's end—said his wife.

I tell thee again, said the trumpeter, 'tis a brazen nose." (Sterne, 1759-1767, p. 223).

As a conclusion, the nose is not only a referent to the breathing organ; on the contrary, it refers to multidimensional layers of the phallic signifier which points to different signified. Yet, our protagonist, Tristram Shandy, is deprived of the phallus because his nose is smashed by the doctor's forceps. As a result, Walter Shandy breaks down when he learns the ongoing misfortune of his lovely son. He understands that Tristram Shandy will never truly embody the rightful inheritance of the history of Shandy family's phallic glory and grandeur. Then, he aims to guaranty the rightful transmission of the name of The Father to his son, but he again devastates:

"Now, my dear brother, said my father, replacing his forefinger, as he was coming closer to the point,—had my child arrived safe into the world, unmartyr'd in that precious part of him—fanciful and extravagant as I may appear to the world in my opinion of christian names, and of that magic bias which good or bad names irresistably impress upon our characters and conducts—heaven is witness! that in the warmest transports of my wishes for the prosperity of my child, I never once wished to crown his head with more glory and honour, than what "George or Edward" would have spread around it. But alas! continued my father, as the greatest evil has befallen him—I must counteract and undo it with the greatest good.

-He shall be christened Trismegistus, brother" (Sterne, 1759-1767, p. 251, 252)

However, Tristram Shandy's failure in embodying the rightful Shandian identity continues as well as his bodily disintegration and grotesque corporeality. In other words, his bodily identity decomposes rather than being consummated by social or individual accomplishment. The wound which engulfs Tristram's physical and psychological state is a parody of Walter Shandy's obsession. As we know, Walter Shandy desires to name his son as Trismegistus the name of the Egyptian Thoth who is thrice hero. He is obsessed with name pre-formation theory in the way that special names pre-destinate one's rightful status in the world. In the novel Walter

Shandy represents the paternal history constructed by language, phallic and narrative discourse. Therefore, he pays particular attention to his son's rightful name. It can be approached as the rightful inheritance of the Father's name which promises the power, consummation and whole meaning incorporated with the phallus. The phallus is transferred in the matter of the Father's name. In this sense, Walter Shandy's desire to praise his son by giving him a phallic-signifier name; Trismegistus is a miniature of the Oedipalized history of family. The name of The Father is a dual-binding force of castration. To illustrate, it is oedipalizing and castrating as one and only signifier of the phallus; thus, the only way to embody the phallus is being culminated by the name of The Father. Yet, obeying the name of The Father is again oedipal.

Tristram's bodily disintegration which can be approached as de-familiarisation of wholeness of corporeality undermines the oedipal complementation with the phallic. To illustrate, although his father's attention is to praise him as Trismegistus who is a thrice hero Egyptian Thoth, the protagonist is baptized as Tristram; a shortened, disintegrated version of the whole-name. Also, the Egyptian Thoth, Trismegistus stands for absolute truth and knowledge as an embodiment of whole reality; therefore, Tristram as a grotesque version of the original intention represents loss of reified reality which gives rise to open-ended becoming and schizoid de-territorialisation. Namely, Tristram Shandy who is thrice ridiculed instead of embodying the name of The Father achieves artistic alienation in terms of his grotesque corporeality. He has been never identified by inherited origin because he has been already lost the decency of his Father's biological inheritance due to the interruption of Mrs. And Mr. Shandy's copulation. Secondly, he is again ridiculed as being named Tristram instead of embodying the full-proper name. He narrates his nominal misfortune by using the ridiculous solemnity:

"—There is no gistus to it, noodle!—'tis my own name, replied the curate, dipping his hand as he spoke into the bason— Tristram! said he, &c. &c. &c. &c. so Tristram was I called, and Tristram shall I be to the day of my death." (Sterne, 1759-1767, p. 258)

Shortly after, the narrator quotes his father's shriek with a severe awareness of his son's inadequacy and defective presence in the world:

"... I see it plainly, that either for my own sins, brother Toby, or the sins and follies of the Shandy-family, heaven has thought fit to draw forth the heaviest of its artillery against me; and that the prosperity of my child is the point upon which the whole force of it is directed to play

——Such a thing would batter the whole universe about our ears, brother Shandy, said my uncle Toby,—if it was so— Unhappy Tristram! child of wrath! child of decrepitude! interruption! mistake! and discontent! What one misfortune or disaster in the book of embryotic evils, that could unmechanize thy frame, or entangle thy filaments! which has not fallen upon thy head, or ever thou camest into the world—what evils in thy passage into it!—What evils since!—produced into being, in the decline of thy father's days—when the powers of his imagination and of his body were waxing feeble——"(Sterne, 1759-1767, p. 266).

After a while, when Tristram Shandy is only 5 years old, he is again castrated by mistake in the way that his penis is squeezed by the sash window which is unhanded accidentally by the chambermaid Susannah. Ultimately, all the phallic signifiers disintegrate in Tristram's corporeal identity. Yet, it also allows him to reach the body without organs, the phallus without the phallic signifiers because Tristram Shandy is borne as an Anti-Oedipus. Namely, Tristram Shandy's grotesque body shatters the certainty of unity and wholeness. He is totally detached from the grand system of signs and exchange of phallic symbols, instead; he invents new, meta-conscious connections and associations As a result, his fragmentariness allows him to reach the plane of consistency. In other words, Tristram's fragmentariness and bodily disintegration as grotesque dismemberment de-territorialize phallic organs and oedipalized body. According to Deleuze and Guattari, the body without organs as the grotesque body extricates the intensities of body from rigid stratifications. Here, Deleuze and Guattari's emphasis on bodily stasis is identical with Bakhtin's concept of reification as materialisation of open-ended possibilities.

"The full body without organs is the unproductive, the sterile, the unengendered, the unconsumable" (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 8).

Finally, Tristram Shandy invents him as the anti-oedipus by self-producing himself in the course of the meta-narrative narrative. He sets himself independent from any kind of identification marks. Oedipal codes of bodily determination are

scrambled by Tristram's becoming as body without organs or the grotesque body. Moreover his anti-oedipal becoming emanates during his disintegration and break with the signifiers of the name of The Father (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 275) Namely, Tristram Shandy stands as an anti-oedipal protagonist in the history of literary criticism. He is one of the most heretic, deterritorialized and schizoid character in terms of his bodily disintegration, unorthodox culmination and meta-cognitive awareness. As for the identity formation of the hero, Tristram Shandy mock with wholeness, unity and consummation with the Name of The Father, as a parody of oedipal bildungsroman protagonist.

CONCLUSION

As a conclusion, the Oedipal subject is trapped in certain territories such as family, guilty desire, self-hatred etc. The oedipalization of subjectivity operates in a large scale of recording and articulation systems extending from language to politics. Especially the fabrication of oedipal and neurotic subjectivity has had wide range history beginning with the Platonic denigration of the conflict between the idea and the form, continuing as negation of desire and of unattainable, impossible unconscious. Therefore, the subject is designed to be twice castrated by first the nuclear family which totalizes and confines the authenticity of gender becoming, polyphony of desires and then by the secondary repression or repression proper as the social unconscious constructed by myths, the phallus and the name of The Father. Language and desire are under the same pressure of reification and finalized in to univocal and mono-phonic representations. Also, the act of representation which Deleuze and Guattari severely criticize in terms of the paralogicism of high structuralism is based on repression of the signified and replacement of the referent with its distorted image. The signified is obscured in the act of speaking and desiring. As a result the twice castrated subject can only desire the distorted equivalent of the real signified which is substituted with its inadequate signifier in the exchange system of the language. Similarly, the unconscious desires are also totalized and finalized by the distortion of the Oedipus signifier. To illustrate, the tragedy of Oedipus preoccupies all forms of subjectivity and at the end fabricates one and only form of oedipal ego constructed by the symbolic order. Deleuze and Guattari underline that the Oedipus complex operates as double-binding process of escape and capture. Even, escaping from the Oedipus means committing the Oedipal guilt of incestuous desire towards mother and murderous hatred toward father. In fact the Oedipal tragedy emerges as a paternal paranoia so committing the Oedipus crime or consummating with the paternal ideal are both oedipalizing. Thus, Deleuze and Guattari provide a model for Anti-Oedipal becoming without finalized and reified concepts of paternal destinations. In this context, the concept of schizoid orphan emerges in terms of strolling out of oedipal territories. The schizo or the orphan is disinherited from the name of The Father which is a set of symbols, archetypes and linguistic-grammatical rules that constructing the oedipal subject by using castration

75

anxiety, neurotic desires and deprivation and absence. Absence and lack play a significant role in Lacanian psychoanalysis in terms of explanation of the unconscious and the other. According to Lacan, the speaking subject cannot attain wholly graspable knowledge, desire and meaning as long as he is speaking and desiring by using metaphors and metonymies of the real signified. Thus, the subject has been always suffering from the absence of the signified residing in the unconscious. Moreover, the subject is also tortured by the lack of phallus because the phallus is hidden by the Other with whom it is impossible to confront. As a result, the subject is approached in terms of wound, deprivation and illusion of unity.

In literature, the oedipal subjectivity continues to exist especially in the form of the immature and inexperienced protagonist of the 18th century novel who comforts the expectations of the moral and social codes. For instance, the bildungsroman genre reiterates the family romance and the oedipal hero in terms of characterization of the protagonist who is fighting for a proper surname, gaining social prestige or attaining paternal inheritance. Namely, in the bildungromans genre the protagonist emerges as originally lack and deprived subject who is searching for a proper identity or consummation with the name of The Father. Becoming of the protagonist in the bildungsroman genre is reified and finalized in to the oedipal subjectivity. Hereby, the construction of time, the use of language and emerging of experience is confined and demarcated by the conventional narrative strategies.

In contrast to this; Tristram Shandy is a migrant, wandering from one place to another, in a constant mode of de-territorialisation following his whimsical pen. Sterne characterizes Tristram Shandy by using unconventional characterisation strategies and narrative techniques. The most conspicuous aspect of Tristram Shandy as a self-reflexive protagonist is his meta-conscious level of fictionality and of meta-narrative. In this sense, Tristram Shandy as an Anti-Oedipal protagonist and the novel as a meta-conscious narrative are borne simultaneously with the form which is narrative about the narrative. As a result, unlike the conventional narrative techniques and characterisation strategies in which the hero's becoming is constructed by linearity of time, mimetic experiences and oedipal formation with social and moral consummation, Sterne's novel breaks off from the oedipal contexts of the bildungromans genre.

For example, Tristram Shandy is a patricide of the paternal ideals such as unity, wholeness and certainty. Instead, he is in complete fragmentariness and dissolution. Even, he disintegrates in addition to his grotesque identity. As a parody of Walter Shandy's obsession with perfection, his son; Tristram Shandy fragments in to grotesque laughter. To illustrate, unlike the Egyptian god Thoth, Trismegistus who is thrice-greatest hero, Tristram Shandy as a shortened, parodic and trivial counter-version of the greatest Trismegistus, our protagonist is thrice castrated and sunders from the Name of The Father. First, the most precious part of human being which is the nose according to Shandy Family is smashed by the doctor's forceps during the birth of Tristram Shandy. Later, his grotesque identity continues to dissolve in the way that during his baptize ceremony, Susannah misspells the full-proper name and instead of Trismegistus, the protagonist is named as Tristram as a castrated and shortened version of the rightful name of The Father. Finally, Tristram Shandy loses the last part of his phallic signifier which is penis when Susannah accidentally unhands the smash window. Namely, the protagonist is characterized by fragmentariness, dismemberment and body without organs

As for use of language, the narrator reveals fictionality of his narrative; he empties the referential point between the signifier and the signified. Thus, he annihilates the Name of The Father and the symbolic order of the phallus which guarantee emerging of the historically and socially contingent meaning between the signified and the signifier. The narrator emphasizes fictionality of his reality and meta-conscious level of self-reflexivity. Namely, he plays with the mimetic function of language. He uses de-familiarization technique to interrupt the automatic perception of mimetic reality in the 18th century novel. On the contrary, the narrator plays with the expectations of the reader, disguises the real to be deciphered and disturbs the conventional strategies of substituting the signifier with the signified in the exchange system of language. In doings so, he includes the reader in to the meaning-creating process rather than emplacing himself as a meaning-giver God-Author position.

All in all, Tristram Shandy is the protagonist of Anti-Oedipus with regards to his fragmentation, bodily disintegration and open-ended becoming. He is not suffering from disinheritance from the name of The Father and the phallic consummation, on the contrary, it allows him to interrupt oedipalized subjectivity and self-create his own becoming. He extricates himself from the burden of the ego constructed by phallic language, reification of body and neurotic identity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Atmaca. M. (2020). *Mikhail Bakhtin's Utopic Materialism: A Conceptualization of Kairologic Time in the Context of Carnivale and Dialogue*. Kilikya Journal Of Philosophy Vol: 1, 91-101. April 2020.

Bakhtin. M. (1999). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics (Trans. Caryl Emerson).* University of Minnesota Press. London.

Bakhtin. M. (1984). *Rabelais and His World (Trans. Helene Iswolsky).* Indiana University Press. Bloomington.

Barthes. R. (1977). *The Death of Author (Trans. S Health).* Fontana. London.

Barzilia. S. (1991). *Borders of Language: Kristeva's Critique of Lacan.* Modern Language Association Vol: 116, 294-305. March 1991.

Berlina. A. (2015). *Art as Device.* Duke University Press Poetics Today Vol: 36/3. September 2015.

Buchanan. I. (2008). *Deleuze and Guattari's Anti Oedipus.* Continuum Publishing. London.

Coles. C. (2018). *Against The Psychoanalytic Unconscious: Deleuze and Guattari, and Desire As a Heuristic for Self Regulating Bio politics.* Western Washington University Press Vol: 8, 1-8. 2018.

Cull. L. (2009). *How Do You Make Yourself Theatre Without Organs? Deleuze, Artaud and the Concept of Differential Presence.* Theatre Research International Vol: 34 243-255. 2019

Deleuze. G. (1964). *Proust and Signs. (Trans. Richard Howard).* University of Minnesota Press 1983. London.

Deleuze. G., Guattari. F. (1972). *Anti-Oedipus Capitalism And Schizophrenia. (Trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane).* University of Minnesota Press 1983. London.

Deleuze. G., Guattari. F. (1980). *A Thousand Plateaus Capitalism And Schizophrenia. (Trans. Brian Massumi).* University of Minnesota Press 1983. London.

Deleuze. G. (1981). *Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation (Trans. Daniel W. Smith).* Continuum 2003. London.

Er. E. S. (2011). *Gilles Deleuze's Philosophy of Difference: The Reading of Bergson, Nietzsche and Spinoza.* Ataturk University Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Erzurum. 2011.

Freud. S. (1930). *Civilization and Its Discontent (Trans. Christopher Hitchens).* W. W. Norton & Company 2010. London.

Genette. G. (1980). *Narrative Discourse an Essay in Method (Trans. Jane E. Lewin).* Cornell University Press. New York.

Golban. P. (2017). *An Attempt to Establish a Bildungsroman Development History: Nurturing The Rise of a Subgenre From Ancient Beginnings to Romanticism.* Humanitas International Journal of Social Sciences Vol: 5/10, 111-141. 2017.

Goodchild. P. (2005). *Arzu Politikasına Giriş. (Trans. Rahmi G. Öğdül).* Ayrıntı Yayınları. İstanbul.

Harper. K. E. (1954). *A Russian Critic and Tristram Shandy.* The Univesity of Chicago Press Journals Vol: 52 92-99. November 1954.

Holland. E. W. (1999). *Deleuze and Guattari's Anti-Oedipus.* Routledge. London.

Holland. E. (2012). *Deleuze and Psychoanalysis.* Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Jonshon. C. (2012). *Bricoleour and Bricolage: From Metaphor to Universal Concept.* Edinburgh University Press Vol: 35, 355-372. November 2012.

Kesselman. T. (2009). *The Abject, the Object, and the Thing.* Styles Of Communication Vol:1. 2009.

Kılıç. S. (2013). *Deleuze-Guattari: Deterritorialization of Oedipal Unconscious on the Plain of Schizoanalytic Ontology.* Uludag University Faculty of Arts and Sciences Journal of Philosophy Vol: 21, 1303-4251. Fall 2013.

Kirshner. L. A. (2005). *Rethinking Desire: The Objet Petit A in Lacan Theory.* Journal Of The American Psychoanalytic Association Vol: 53/1. February 2005.

Kirsteva. J. (1982). *Powers of Horror, An Essay on Abjection (Trans. Leon Roudiez).* Columbia University Press. New York.

Lacan. J. (1981). *The Function of Language in Psychoanaysis. (Trans. Anthony Wilden).* John Hopkins University Press. Baltimore.

Lemair. A. (1977). *Jacques Lacan, Forward by Jacques Lacan. (Trans. David*

Macy). Routledge. London.

Mehlman. J. (1972). *The "Floating Signifier": From Lévi-Strauss to Lacan.* Yale University Press Vol: 48, 10-37. 1972.

Miller. H. (1942). *Sexus.* Grove Press / Atlantic Monthly Press 1994. New York.

Özün. Ş. O. (2012). *Self-Reflexive Metafictional Games in the Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy.* Cankaya University Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Vol: 9/1, 75-88. May 2012.

Reich. W. (1973). *The Function of the Orgasm (Trans. Vincent Carfagno).* Farrar Strauss and Giroux. New York.

Restrepo. J. A. (2015). *Duree and Temporality: A Defense of Bergson's Conception of Time.* University of Caldas, Colombia Philosophy Journal Vol: 16, 49-61. December 2015.

Rizq. R. (2013). *States of Abjection.* Organization Studies Vol: 34/9, 1277-1297. September 2013.

Rule. P. (2015). *Mikhail Bakhtin and Ideological Becoming.* Dialogue and Boundary Learning Vol: 3, 29-41. 2015.

Shklovsky. V. (1990). *Theory of Prose* (*Benjamin Sher).* Dalkey Archive Press. London.

Solmaz. M. (2019). *The Relationship of Capitalism and Desire With Reference to Desire Understanding of Reich, Deleuze and Guattari and Lyotard.* Gaziantep University Journal and Social Sciences Vol: 18, 140-161. January 2019.

Sterne. L. (1759-1767). *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman.* Oxford University Press 2009. Oxford.

Sutter. L. (2011). *The Law in Laurence Sterne's Tristram Shandy.* Taylor &Francis Group Law and Literature Vol: 23, 224-240. Summer 2011.

Thanem. T. (2004). *The Body Without Organs: Nonorganizational Desire in Organizational Life.* Culture and Organization Vol: 10, 203-217. September 2004.

Thomieres. D. (2012). *Time and Wound in Tristram Shandy: The Sense of Quest.* The Criterion International Journal Vol:3. March 2012.

Uzunlar. B. (2017). *Deleuze's Search For Immanent Life in His Reading of Artoud.* Uludag University Faculty of Arts and Sciences Journal of Philosophy Vol: 29, 196-214. 2017.

Williams. J. (2003). *Gilles Deleuze's Difference and Repetition: A Critical Introduction and Guide.* Edinburgh University Press. Edinburgh.

Williams. J. (1990). *Narrative of Narrative (Tristram Shandy).* The John Hopkins University Press Vol: 105, 1032-1045. December 1990.

Wilson. M. (1986). *And Let Me Go On: Tristram Shandy, Lacanian Theory, and the Dialectic Desire.* Psychoanalysis And Contemporary Thought Vol:9. 1986.

Young. E. B., Genosko. G. and Watson.J. (2013). *The Deleuze and Guattari Dictionary.* Bloomsbury. London.

Zizek. S. (2006). *How To Read Lacan.* W.W. Norton & Company. London.