



İstanbul Hukuk Mecmuası

Başvuru: 19.11.2023
Revizyon Talebi: 21.06.2024
Son Revizyon Tarihi: 27.06.2024
Kabul: 27.06.2024

ARAŞTIRMA MAKALESİ / RESEARCH ARTICLE

Naming, Order and Power: She Unnames Them All of Ursula & Lord of the Rings of Tolkien

O. Vahdet İşsevenler*

Abstract

One of the two points that establishes a relationship between law and literature is the legal themes in literary works, and the other is the literary character of law itself. More fundamentally, the ontological kinship between law and literature is that both construct a second world with words or names. In general, names are the mediums through which human beings construct a second world called culture. In this regard, language is a feature of the human condition. Arendt conceptualised this condition as *vita activa* and defined the categories of work, labour and action. This article analyzes the conceptions of power and order in two literary works by focusing on this condition of human beings called naming. Ursula's work deals with the theme of naming, based on the claim that naming is a masculine activity that is only useful to humans. By refusing to replace names, the character who returns names manifests a form of divine violence. Tolkien's work, on the other hand, distinguishes between correct and incorrect naming. In this conception, misnaming is to ignore the nature of the object and to name it to instrumentalize it. The correct naming, on the other hand, is not to rule the object but to take care of it as a gardener takes care of flowers. In this context, Ursula gives an anarchist, de-ordering message, and at the same time she rejects the potential of human beings to establish a legal-political order because she excludes the category of action that is only possible through names. Tolkien, on the other hand, while criticising domination and instrumental reason, also proposes a remedy that does not require a total rejection of human potential. His work, which finds its main idea in the motto "power corrupts", makes us think that law is not necessarily an instrument of domination but, can also be an antidote to arbitrariness.

Keywords

Naming, Power, Order, Lord of the Rings, Tolkien, Ursula L. Guin, Literature and Law, Instrumental Reason

Adlandırma, düzen ve iktidar: Tolkien Yüzüklerin Efendisi & Ursula She Unnames Them All

Öz

Hukuk hem edebi metinlerdeki hukuki temalar hem de kendisinin nihayetinde bir metin olması hasebiyle edebiyatla ilişkilendirilir. Hukuk ve edebiyatın ontolojik akrabalığı ise kelimelerle ikinci bir dünya inşa etmeleridir. Kelimeler genel olarak insanın kültür adı verilen ikinci bir dünya inşa etmesini sağlar. Bu yönüyle, lisan, insanlık koşulunun bir özelliğidir. Arendt bu durumu *vita activa* olarak kavramsallaştırmış, iş, emek ve eylem kategorilerini tanımlamıştır. Makale adlandırma olarak ifade edilen bu özelliği merkeze alarak iki edebi eserdeki iktidar ve düzen kavrayışlarını tahlil etmektedir. Ursula'nın eseri adlandırmanın eril bir faaliyet olduğu ve sadece insanın işine yaradığı iddiasına dayanarak adsızlaştırma temasını işler. Adları iade eden karakter yerlerine yenisini koymamak suretiyle ilahi şiddetin bir türünü sergilemiş olur. Tolkien'in eseri ise doğru ve yanlış adlandırma arasında bir ayırım yapar. Nesnenin doğasını gözetmemek ve nesneyi araçsallaştırmak üzere adlandırmak yanlış adlandırmaktır. Doğru adlandırma ise nesneyi yönetmek değil onunla bir bahçıvanın çiçeklerle ilgileniği gibi ilgilenmektir. Bu bağlamda Ursula anarşist, düzen kaldıracı bir mesaj verirken yine ancak adlarla mümkün olan eylem kategorisini dışladığı için insanın hukuki-siyasi düzen kurma potansiyelini de reddetmiş olur. Tolkien ise

* **Sorumlu Yazar:** O. Vahdet İşsevenler (Assoc. Prof.), Yalova University Faculty of Law Department of Philosophy of Law, Yalova, Türkiye. E-mail: vahdetissevenler@hotmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0003-0287-0686

Atf: İşsevenler OV, "Naming, Order and Power: She Unnames Them All of Ursula & Lord of the Rings of Tolkien" (2024) 82(2) İstanbul Hukuk Mecmuası 671. <https://doi.org/10.26650/mecmua.2024.82.2.0010>



tahakkümün ve araçsal aklın eleştirisini yaparken insan potansiyelini tümenden reddetmeyi gerektirmeyen bir çare de önerir. Güç yozlaştırır mottosunda ana fikrini bulan eser, hukukun zorunlu olarak tahakküm aracı olmadığını bilakis keyfiyete karşı bir panzehir de olabileceğini düşündürür

Anahtar Kelimeler

Adlandırma, Düzen, İktidar, Yüzüklerin Efendisi, Ursula L. Guin, Hukuk ve Edebiyat, Araçsal Akıl

Extended Summary

One of the common features of law and literature is world-building with names. Ursula le Guin's *She Unnames Them All* can be read as a text that considers the order-making function of names and challenges masculine character of naming. *She*, the main character of story, detaches things from their names, in a way approaching the divine violence of Benjamin's conceptualization. She purifies nature from culture and returns it to its original state. This move to undo the established order can be considered as an anarchist attitude. Because, in line with Benjamin's description of divine violence, main character of story does not replace names with new ones, she just unnames them. In the story, the justification for this is that names are not useful to non-humans anyway, and that living things are a homogeneous unity when stripped of their names. It is implied that nature is good in itself. While the association of names with usefulness meets the categories of labor and work, which Arendt presents as human conditions, it excludes the category of action. By using names, humans make designs that will ensure their survival, but beyond that, names make it possible for humans to think universals such as justice and beauty and to act in accordance with these universals. In other words, language makes it possible not only to make means but also to assign ends. Thus, the abandonment of universals is not only the abandonment of the means of human survival, but also the abandonment of freedom as a political end and justice as a legal end. So, the detachment of names from action means the rejection of law, which can be characterized as political naming. On the other hand, another fictional character, Tom Bombadil from *The Lord of the Rings*, does not turn his back on names while maintaining the implication that nature is good in itself. Another Tolkien character, the elves, who, like Tom Bombadil, are good with names, not only build a world with names but also resist evil. They defend peace, plurality and heterogeneity in Middle-earth by taking into account the balance of power. In the *Lord of the Rings* universe, it is not naming that is evil, but rule through naming. There are three types of use of names in the *Lord of the Rings* universe. Natural names representing pure science like Bombadil's, names that are the product of conscious design like the elves', and misnomers of evil characters like Sauron and Saruman. Different uses of names correspond to different forms of the reason. Misnaming refers to the subject's manipulation and destruction of the nature of the object for its own purposes. In this sense, misnaming corresponds to instrumental reason. The villains are characters who not only instrumentalize nature but also dominate the people. On the other hand, elves, or wizards like Gandalf, that is, those who give things a name that corresponds to their nature, are characters who do not destroy nature while making use of it, and who take care of nature like a gardener. In this context, the gardener is the symbol of the right ruler. The struggle against evil characters, those who want power for domination, is also a struggle against the substitution of means for ends. The symmetry of Ursula's anarchist attitude in Tolkien

is the maxim “power corrupts”. In this statement, which is the essence of the concept of checks and balances embodied in American constitutionalism, law is seen not as a form of domination but as an antidote to arbitrariness. It is no coincidence that gardener hobbit, a representative of the natural law principle of protecting harmony in nature, and his employer are assigned the task of destroying the ring of power. This is because these two are from the Shire, which offers an example of an unstratified society.

I. Introduction

As is well known, the relationship between law and literature is essentially based on two points: Legal themes in literary texts and law as literature. Creating a world by words is a common feature of law and literature, and this feature also involves stated links to the relationship between law and literature. Literary fiction approximates the law of creating a second world in the reader's imagination. Of course, the text of a novel limits the possibilities of interpretation, but ultimately, each reader subjectively creates the story in their own imagination. Law, on the contrary, establishes objective names valid for the entire political community, which neutralise the subjective naming of individuals. Yet, at this point, law still shows a literary features.

Names, as universals, allow us to clothe the naked reality with a spectacle of values and make sense of the world. Robert Cover, after emphasising that legal interpretation is a reconstruction of social reality, an intervention in the meaning-making process of the person to whom legal coercion is applied, reminds us that the sounds made by the sufferer belong to a pre-linguistic phase and quote that torture, the ultimate stage of infliction, is aimed at destroying one's set of values and surrendering to the torture¹. Names make meaning possible and provide humans with a justification for taking action. Law, in turn, determines the objective limits, that is, the objective meaning of the actions of those who live within the legal-political borders in which it is valid.

However, the nature of naming itself has been the subject of theology and philosophy. Ursula's short story, *She Unnames Them All*², deals with the issue of naming with theological references and takes a refusing attitude. Her position calls into question the possibility of praxis, which can be defined as the human condition. Praxis appears as morality on a personal level and law and politics on a collective level. Therefore, the consequences of her rejection, of the anarchist attitude, are legal, political, and anthropological. Below, taking into account the fiction of the story, the nature of naming, naming and violence, and naming and law-politics relations will be emphasised in parallel with the analysis of the story. In the following section, the same theme is discussed compared with *The Lord of the Rings*³, exemplifying how different philosophical positions on naming lead to different legal consequences.

II. She Unnames Them All

Ursula K. Le Guin's short story, *She Unnames Them All*, deals with the ancient issue of naming in a clear and simple way. This short story, which deals with the process of unnamings, manages to make a point without extending the contest by targeting the opponent's joints.

¹ Robert M. Cover, 'Violence and Word', (1986), 95 Yale Law Journal, 1602 et seq.

² Ursula K. Le Guin, 'She Unnames Them All', *The New Yorker* (21 January 1985) 27.

³ J.R.R. Tolkien, *Yüzüklerin Efendisi*, (Bülent Somay çev, Metis 2012).

At the very beginning of the story, when it is explained that animals easily give up their names, priority is given to sea creatures. In this way, the purpose of the unnamng is expressed from the very beginning. Sea creatures are prioritised because their element is water: As is generally known, water is privileged in creation mythologies. For example, in the Altai creation myth, God is above the water and, in the sky before, giving form to things through his word⁴. In other words, there is water when there is nothing. In this myth, the fact that water is the primary substance, confirming Thales, and that God gives form to things through his word are remarkable points for the philosophical tradition, but the main issue in the context of our interest is the homogeneous structure of water. Whether you take a glass of water from the shore or from the depths of the ocean, it will be filled with h₂o. Moreover, for the human eye looking from the outside, the water surrounding sea creatures, like the air surrounding terrestrial creatures on land, provides a powerful metaphor for the expression of wholeness, completeness and anonymity.

Then, the first message of the story is about distancing function of naming. Name functions to separate things from each other, and definition is made possible by limits. It refers to a boundary. However, one may think that this boundary exists through human eyes. It is not easy to say that beings other than humans are aware of this boundary, because this requirement requires, other living beings to have consciousness as observed in human beings. In this context, even if it is controversial to discuss an experience of living beings other than humans, we can state that they lead an unmediated life. Other living beings do what their nature requires without the need for mediation. Human beings, on the other hand, fulfil the requirements of their nature, but they do so through culture, not directly. A flower spontaneously turns its face to sunlight. On the other hand, humans should make calculation to benefit from the sun; that is, they act rationally rather than instinctively⁵. It is the names that enable human to make these calculations. Indeed, in the story, when pets learn that they can keep their own names, they have no problem rejecting the Linnaean classification and species names, which have only a cognitive function and, more importantly for the message of the text, categorise them.

The main function of names is to set boundaries. Aquatic creatures are described “with particular alacrity” because homogeneity evokes anonymity. Anonymity means a return to nature. Dastur states that nature (*natura, physis*), unlike living things in nature, refers to a process of becoming and passing away that is not individualised,

⁴ “At the beginning when there is nothing but water...” Barbara C. Sproul, Yaratılış Mitleri, (Ali Bucak çev. Hil Yayınları 2018), 288.

⁵ When it comes to the difference of human beings from other creatures, the history of philosophy often refers to bees in the syllogism. As it is known, Aristotle (Politika, 1253a) explained the potential of human beings for political organization with their capacity to possess access to moral universals through language, as opposed to the self-organizing abilities of bees. Dastur quotes Marx after noting that human beings make use of nature through names, “but what distinguishes the worst architect from the most expert bee is that the architect builds the building in his mind before he actually builds it.” François Dastur, ‘İnsan Sesi’, *Ölümle Yüzleşmek*, (çev. Adem Beyaz, Pinhan 2019) 85 et seq.

unnamed, or unnameable, whereas those who have a name have a boundary, a form, a separate existence, and that the name separates. It also reminds us that in some cultures, newborns are not immediately given names so that they do not have difficulty in returning to nature⁶.

Limitation to, set boundaries implies separation and, distancing. This aspect, which finds its story in human beings' leaving from the immortal paradise life, expresses the limited, incomplete nature of human beings and their need for knowledge, which is possible through names, to fulfil this limitation. The apple offered by evil as the key to immortality is understood as the fruit of knowledge: Limitation requires transcending the limits; human beings need knowledge; in other words, humans need to set limits by naming reality to overcome their limitations. The act of knowing by setting limits makes it possible to transcend these limits. Therefore, we can say the following: Naming is a strategy of separation and integration. Naming something means separating it from others. Giving the right name to something indicates its place in the whole. As is known, in terms of the theory of correspondence, giving the right name to a thing requires taking into account the difference between that thing and others and, its relationship with others and, taking care of the correspondence between the name and the object⁷. For this reason, it is also possible to misname. Misnaming corresponds to evil on the ground of axiology. As a matter of fact, the Garden of Eden narrative, in which naming is also a subject, continues in this vein. It would be a mistake to think that this archetypal narrative, which is common in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, despite differences in interpretation depending on religion, is unique to the particular tradition. Again, we can give an example from the Altai creation myth:

"...God asked man to bring earth again. But this time he had made up his mind to keep some for himself, so he brought a piece with each hand. He gave one palm to God and kept the other in his mouth to create a world of his own."⁸

In the continuation of the myth, God's act of creation makes the earth grow, and man becomes suffocated because of the earth he hides in his mouth. He is forced to ask for God's help, and he spits out what is in his mouth after confession. Thus the bad places in the world are created⁹. As can be seen, the word is again endowed with a formative capacity, and this potential is also the potential for man to become sinful. The limit also, then, causes the possibility of moral action. Adam and Eve saw their private parts after eating the apple. In short, the state of being separate, of being limited, and of knowing and transcending the limits define the human being. In

⁶ ibid s.85.

⁷ That is, the name of the thing is true to the extent that it is corresponding to the thing itself and establishes the harmony of that thing with other things.

⁸ Sproul, Yaratılış Mitleri, (n 4), 288.

⁹ ibid 288.

other words, what is surplus in human beings, that is, the virtue of human beings, is the possession of reason, as expressed in the Socratic tradition. While other creatures survive in a direct manner, human beings must use their own reason. However, names are not only a way of dealing with the problem of survival but also, as Aristotle says, they provide the possibility of living well and, engaging in political activities¹⁰. This means a meaningful life. As we will see below, in the aforementioned story Ursula equates two activities, survival and self-realisation, both of which are possible for human beings by virtue of names.

Overall, the second function of the limitation feature of names, which we mentioned above with reference to Dastur, is that of separating, which also makes being individual possible. Every subjective naming of a subject is part of the subject's interpretive activity¹¹. In other words, the subject's experience makes a unique story possible through these names, and it is this story that the subject ultimately lives. Having a unique voice and the possibility of a unique interpretation of the subject make the subject an individual. In this way, human beings differ from herd animals that produce monotonous sounds. Therefore, the absence of names means the erasure of borders. Therefore, in the story, while sea creatures abandon names with particular alacrity and become anonymous, parrots and parakeets, which display a human-like skill in the use of sound, do not show the same enthusiasm.

Another group that hesitates to abandon names is the Tibetan yaks. This hesitation of the yaks allows the author to manoeuvre at two points. The first is to emphasise the role of females in eliminating hesitation. The second is useful function of names.

Due to the structure of English, the very title implies from that unnamings is a feminine activity. The main character of the story is a human being. But apart from that, we have no other information about her. She is the narrator of the story. The title refers to her only as *she*. The identity of this mysterious woman is revealed as the story unfolds. But at this point in the story, it is not her identity but her feminine character that is important. Of course, the main character's name is never mentioned in the story. In this way, the character evokes the personification of the nameless nature. In addition with this emphasis, the masculine nature of naming and the femininity of nature are implied. The issue of femininity has also been the subject of feminist analysis¹². My preference is, on the other hand, perhaps more like the perspective of Jung, for psycho-mythological analysis. In this context, naming or culture, for example agriculture, is a masculine, derivative act¹³. That means to

¹⁰ Aristoteles, *Politika*, (Özgüç Orhan çev, Pinhan Yayıncılık 2018) 1253a, 1254b.

¹¹ M. Bilgin Saydam, *Deli Dumrul'un Bilinci*, (Metis 2017) 42.

¹² Sultan Komut Bakıncı, 'The reinvention of humanity: Language, power and rebellion in Le Guin's "She Unnames Them"', (2021) 9 *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, passim.

¹³ Campbell states that it is a common imaginary of both hunter-gatherer and gatherer societies that nature, which gives birth and nourishes, is seen as motherly and the plowing of the field as paternal. (qtd: Saydam, *Deli Dumrul'un Bilinci*, 103, 104.)

intervene in the nature, to fertilising it. The female element describes nature, that is, the principle. The woman is the principle, that gives birth; consciousness, on the other hand, is the masculine, the derivative, such as the daughter of the mother, at the culture that derives from nature¹⁴. Regarding consciousness, the masculine principle is characterised by a separating and, defining function, and the feminine principle by a unifying function¹⁵. In the story, it is the councils of elderly *females* that remove the hesitation of the yaks, just as it is the *She* who *unnamed them all*.

Hesitation was ruled out by the argument that name is useful for people, not yaks. In fact, the name is useless to yaks. It is people, not yaks, who need the meaning of this name. The emphasis on usefulness is repeated in the rest of the story: When the *She* returns her name at the end of the story, she says that it is very useful but no longer fits. There are two judgments about naming in this statement. One of them is a misnomer in the context of the correspondence theory mentioned above. As we return below, the correct naming option is not emphasised in the story. The second judgement is about the function of naming. At this point, it is appropriate to recall Hannah Arendt's term *vita activa*. The term is used to refer to three human activities: labor, by which man sustains the biological existence of himself and his species; work, by which he creates artifact, and action, by which he takes place between people without the mediation of things and establishes political structures¹⁶.

Work is the name of the activity in which human beings design tools and build a second world using such tools. What makes designing possible are, of course, names. Again, when acting, human beings act in relation to names; they tend to realise universals/values. In this context, action implies praxis. When read together with this schema, we find that Ursula's hero, like Bergson, tends to define human beings not as *homo sapiens* but as *homo fabers*¹⁷. It seems that according, to *She*, the only function of names is to be useful. Hence, what human beings do through naming is ultimately no more than just to sustain their lives. There is only surviving capacity here, neither virtue nor action. As a matter of fact, when *She* returns her name, her address is busy with something, even at this dramatic moment. He does not care about abandonment; he does not look up from his work. Again, this scene is significant in two ways. As expected, the person to whom the name is returned is Adam. According to *She*, it was Adam and God who gave her the name. Adam does not look up from his work in response to Eve's great gesture. The fact that all Adam did was working reveals the nature of his work. What is work that is so important? What had Adam devoted his life to? What is hidden behind the name Adam? We learn the answer from her last words: "Well, goodbye, dear. I hope the garden key turns up." It is seen that

¹⁴ ibid 104 et seq.

¹⁵ ibid (n 11), 84.

¹⁶ Hannah Arendt, *İnsanlık Durumu*, (Bahadır Sina Şener çev, İletişim 2013) 35-37.

¹⁷ Dastur, 'İnsan Sesi', (n 5), 81.

Adam is trying to open the door to the Garden of Eden with names. In the context of the story, this means the construction of paradise on earth through culture/names¹⁸. However, Eve, while returning her name, mentions that it has not been fitting lately. At this point, we recall the Platonic theory of correspondence mentioned above. As is known, according to Plato, every object has a true name corresponds to its nature. For example, the philosopher should be a ruler because he knows these names. In other words, philosophers should be kings, or kings should be philosophers since the knowledge of these names can be gained through philosophy. The world that humans build can only be just if it correspondence with true nature of things, for example. Eve, on the other hand, mentions that her name has not fitted her lately. And she unnames herself. The order implies that each object has its own place. Again, as is well known, the Platonic definition of justice is that everyone should be engaged in the work that fits them. By returning the names, Eve removes the boundaries that express order and anonymizes existence like water. It is implied that the only cost of this anonymization is the abolition of the category of work. However, in addition to work, action is also abolished.

As a result, Adam's not lifting his head from his work does not give her the opportunity to negotiate. She already thinks that they cannot get anywhere by communicating. Therefore, we can also assume that the woman has no faith in communicative rationality. In other words, neither the realist nor the conventional existence of names, universals, i.e., ends, is recognised by *She*. This point makes it obvious that the critique of means is related to the rejection of ends. Naming itself is an order-establishing activity. To the extent that naming something means limiting it, it is considered as a violence. The other side of the coin is that of ends. If there are true names, limitations can be justified to the extent that it is correspond with these true names. In other words, even if violence is characterised as a means, achieving the right ends, i.e. the right names, is understood as the criterion for justifying the use of violence. It was once said by Benjamin:

*"If natural law can judge all existing law only in criticizing its ends, then positive law can judge all evolving law only in criticizing its means. If justice is the criterion of ends, legality is that of means. Natural law attempts, by justness of ends, to "justify" the means, positive law "guarantee" the justness of the ends through the justification of means."*¹⁹

One meaning of the state is the monopoly on violence. In other words, the categorical rejection of naming means the denial of the *raison d'être* of the state, which justifies itself by being composed of objective names (law). Although legal

¹⁸ In the context of the story, this means the building of heaven on earth. A possible meaning would be to lead a righteous life, that is, to deserve paradise, thanks to the correct use of names. However, this possibility is out of the question in the context of the story since the story only states that the names are useful, in other words, it excludes the possibility of moral action.

¹⁹ Walter Benjamin, 'Critique of Violence', *Selected Writings*, ed. Marcus Bullock and Michael W. Jennings, (Harvard University Press 2004), 237.

positivism regards the legitimacy of means as sufficient, legality assumes that there can be right ends in the first place. In other words, if there are no right ends, it is not possible to achieve the right ends using any means. Therefore, if right ends are categorically excluded, then there is no possibility of right means legitimising the ends. In an ordinary trial, when the punishment is considered to be just, the coercion applied to the accused is considered legitimate, and through this coercion, the judge and the accused meet in the same world of values²⁰. As such, coercion through the law must assume that what is being done is just, both in the application of each individual laws and for the law as a whole. It can also be argued that violence itself is evil, regardless of the value it seeks to realise. In this case, again, the potential for politics is denied²¹. In this context, the fact that *She* returns the names and does not replace them with more appropriate names gives us the right to label this act as divine violence:

*“If mythic violence is law making, divine violence is law-destroying; if former sets boundaries, the latter boundlessly destroy them; if mythic violence brings at once guilt and retribution, divine power only expiates; if the former threatens, the latter strikes; if the former is bloody, the latter is lethal without spilling blood.”*²²

What *She* ignores is the relationship of names to death and, by extension, life. Being alive makes death possible. In other words, life starts after leaving the life of paradise. The homogeneity after the absence of the names as follows:

“They seemed far closer than when their names had stood between myself and them like a clear barrier: so close that my fear of them and their fear of me became one same fear... and the hunter could not be told from the hunted, nor the eater from the food.”

Everyone has become one. The multitude had disappeared. It seems that *She* shares Blanchot's comment that *“The meaning of the word requires, before any word is spoken, a kind of colossal massacre, a preliminary deluge that would submerge the whole creation in a total immersion.”*²³. *She* unnamed the animals and moved them to their position on Noah's ark. In that ark, a pair of each animal species keeps until the day they touch the earth again. As the story implies, they are not eaten and cannot be eaten. However, they remain as saved, hidden, and preserved. In other words, they only have a potential, potential existence there. In this respect, Noah's Ark, which is hidden in water, is similar to Ursula's feminine principle; both are wombs such

²⁰ Cover, 'Violence and Word', (n 1), 1608 et seq.

²¹ At this point we could remember Benjamin: *“Nor of course -unless one is prepared to proclaim a quite childish anarchism- is it achieved by refusing to acknowledge any constraint toward persons and by declaring, 'What pleases is permitted'. Such a maxim merely excludes reflection on the moral and historical spheres, and thereby on any meaning in action, and beyond this on any meaning in reality itself, which cannot be constituted if 'action' is removed from its sphere.”* (Benjamin, 'Critique of Violence', (n19) 241.). It deserves to be considered whether Benjamin would accept aforementioned argument also against divine violence. In any case, it can be argued that the meaning attributed to politics (Aristotle-Arendt) would be disabled by the rejection of names, which to some extent coincides with Benjamin's point of view.

²² *ibid* 249.

²³ Dastur, 'İnsan Sesi', (n 5), 86.

paradise. She undoes the dissociation; she returns the subject to the state of the baby in the womb, a state that does not need to take steps to overcome its deficiencies because its every need is already met by its medium²⁴. The guests on Noah's ark also do not become hunt, they do not get hungry, but as a kind of a cost they could not come into being even if they wanted to. They do not live like themselves, they do not mate, etc²⁵. Once the names are out of the way, there is a return to the water phase of the Altai creation myth, that is, to paradise. Therefore, one may say this is not a real existence because, they do not actualise themselves. They are like an image in Demiurge's mind.

It is through names that human beings actualise themselves; it is also through names that they establish institutions in the world. This is exactly why Arendt concludes *On Revolution* by quoting Sophocles: "Not to be born prevails over all meaning uttered in words; by far the second-best for life, once it has appeared, is to go as swiftly as possible whence it came." Arendt concludes by stating that man can bear the burden of life through the *polis*, which is composed of free deeds and living words²⁶. The meaning of being human in this thought is to be oneself among equals, that is, to be able to perform praxis, to constitute a legal-political unity, to resist by building institutions. What makes this possible, in other words, the medium in which this happens, is law. If it were possible to live together without violent conflicts, we would not resort to law, just as law would be useless if it were not possible to overcome violence through institutions based on social meanings²⁷.

III. Lord of The Rings

The Lord of the Rings successfully provides a contrast for Ursula's story. Both authors give names and naming an important place in the fantasy world they create; both are them care about nature and both authors do not shy away from the political motif. The meaning attached to names and naming, the positive relationship with nature and, taking a political position- these three points are where *The Lord of the Rings* can provide a contrast to Ursula's story.

As I mentioned above, according to the She, names are only useful. In the story, it is not the names but the act of naming that is political. The fact that human beings can think universals and act according to them thanks to their ability to have language is not taken into account. Ultimately thanks to human language humans can engage in political activity. Therefore, it is questionable whether it is actually a political attitude

²⁴ Saydam, Deli Dumrul'un Bilinci, (n 11), 76-78.

²⁵ Same theme could be found in Sumerian mythology. Mark Daniels, *Bir Nefeste Dünya Mitolojisi*, (Pınar Üstel çev Maya Kitap 2014), 47.

²⁶ Hannah Arendt, *On Revolution*, (Penguin 1990), 281.

²⁷ Cover, 'Violence and Word', (n 1), 1613.

in the true sense, because even though the struggling parties in the story seem to be Adam and Eve, the ontological position of human beings is actually discussed. In the person of Adam, man makes nature useful by giving names to nature. By returning the names, She abolishes this order that is useful to man. She leaves nature to itself. The reader is presented with the sense that nature is already good in its own state, indifferent to human affairs. On the other hand, in *The Lord of the Rings*, it is the folks of Middle Earth who are in struggle. In this sense, the struggle is political rather than ontological.

The character we can point to as neutral is Tom Bombadil. So much so that even in the struggle against the power that corrupts the world, the sages do not expect Bombadil to take sides and stand with them against evil. In this respect, Bombadil is a suitable character to portray the indifference of nature. It can even be said that this is Bombadil's function in the story. While this character, who does not contribute to the fiction of the main story, represents those who stand outside the power struggle in Middle-earth, commentators have also considered that Bombadil is the personification of nature²⁸. As stated above, nature is that which cannot be named. When asked who Tom Bombadil is, the answer "he is" is meaningful at this point²⁹. Indeed, Tolkien himself has pointed out that this answer points to a problem of naming, since Bombadil does not belong to a species³⁰. Hargrove, however, objects to Bombadil being referred to as a nature spirit. But we do not need to identify him with nature to see him in the sense of the feminine principle, as a kind of personification of nature, as nature standing on its two feet. As will be remembered, at the end of the book, after everything is over, Gandalf visited Bombadil. Gandalf had mentioned that while he has constantly on the move, whereas Bombadil has remained still and mossy. Bombadil is fixed like an anchor in the pure, potential form of the principle of legitimacy, and Gandalf is the user of the principle, the actualization of the principle, the opponent of Sauron. Bombadil deliberately does not go beyond the boundaries of his territory, representing the natural neutrality of nature, while at the same time showing the inadequacy of the potential. To continue our inference from Ursula's story, one may say Bombadil's staying within his self-appointed boundaries is akin to hiding in Noah's ark until the flood has passed³¹. On the other hand, Bombadil's pacifist attitude may be a continuation of another story: Bombadil's life in this

²⁸ Gene Hargrove, 'Who is Tom Bombadil?', (1986), 13 *Mythlore*, 20, 21.; Gordon E. Slethaug, 'Tolkien, Tom Bombadil, and Creative Imagination', (1978) 4 (3) *English Studies in Canada*, 341.

²⁹ Bombadil is mentioned three times in *LOTR*: "'oldest and fatherless', 'his own master', 'he is, he is have you seen him, he is the master wood, water, and hill'." (Dani Inkpen, 'Tom Bombadil and Spirit of Objectivity', (2020), 39, *Mythlore*, 117.) Especially the expression 'he is' reminds one of the Old Testament expression of 'I am'. Tolkien, in the presence of this similarity, only states that Bombadil is the master of his own world. (Inkpen, *Tom Bombadil and Spirit of Objectivity*, 118) Therefore, this similarity expresses Bombadil's being unnamable. For example, because there is more than one god in a pantheon it is possible to name even though gods.

³⁰ Hargrove, 'Who is Tom Bombadil?', (n 28), 21-22.

³¹ Hargrove quoted remarkable interpretation: "Bombadil is not alive, just as Nazgul are not dead." (qtd. Hargrove, "Who is Tom Bombadil?", (n 28) 22.

garden with defined borders, indifferent to domination and human knowledge and his innocence allows him to be seen as an allegory of Adam, who abstained from apple³². This interpretation further emphasizes in-betweenness of Ursula's character. To exist as an extension of nature, as in the Garden of Eden, is to be outside the political *topos*. Theologians will recall at this stage that in the Qur'anic scene of the descent from paradise, Adam is not only told that henceforth he will live on earth only in his labor, but also that he is told to 'descend as enemies to each other'³³. In other words, action is also a feature of human condition as well as labor in the new life of humans which start after the end of the paradise life. So, one may say that the political attitude of Ursula's character leads to the categorical rejection of politics. This consolidates the idea that Benjamin and Ursula share the same anarchist attitude.

However, even if Tom Bombadil is unconcerned about the historical order in the middle-earth but is not completely uninterested in the creatures in his own garden. What makes it possible for him to do this successfully is his knowledge of names. To put it more accurately, he knows how to sing. As is well known, in the beginning of Tolkien's cosmogony there was music³⁴. This music is like a Pythagorean interpretation of the "Word" of the Testament. Bombadil knows singing and that is why, alone or with others, he does not speak but sings, does not walk but dances. In other words, the primary function of Bombadil's language is not to inform but to create. Singing is a way of naming³⁵. Taken together, this contrast suggests that naming and the related order-building activity does not necessarily result in corruption. But there is a warning to be made: This only saves the naming itself. Even though Bombadil knows names, he is still neutral, like nature. So, there is nothing moral or political about him. Commentators have even stated that the ring of power does not affect him because he has no will³⁶. To put it more appropriately, we can say that Bombadil knows names rather than naming. Therefore, in the context of our topic, namely the human dimension of naming, which is the moral and political context, it says nothing directly. But indirectly it points to a line on the cosmic positions of good and evil. Nature is good in itself. Bombadil also illustrates Tolkien's moral ideals³⁷. But as such, nature is only good in itself, not for itself. It is therefore not political. Bombadil could not wield a sword but guides the swordsman. Bombadil's life in his personal garden of Eden does not offer a model for Middle-earth, yes, Bombadil's preoccupation

³² Slethaug, 'Tolkien, Tom Bombadil, and Creative Imagination', (n 28), *passim*.

³³ Kur'an Yolu (22 10 2023) Bakara/36.

³⁴ In the beginning Eru created the Ainur out of thought and they played a great music. Eru turned the song of the Ainur into a visible vision. The world was given life by this music. Tolkien, *Silmarion*, (Berna Akkıyal çev, İthaki 2011), 65.

³⁵ Let us remember that Treebeard's voice also sounded to Merry and Pippin's ears as a kind of melodic singing rather than a human speech. And remember that Treebeard did not tell the halflings his name, because in his ancient language a name tells the story of a thing, and that would take time.

³⁶ Hargrove, Who is Tom Bombadil?, (n 28), 24. Hargrove argues justifiably that this indifference to impartiality, to dominion and to property, should be read as great virtues in themselves.

³⁷ Hargrove, Who is Tom Bombadil?, (n 28), 24.

with maintaining the balance in nature offers a supra-historical principle of natural law, but when we return to history we are forced to build institutions, to take sides in conflict³⁸. Even the life of the elves, the wise race of Middle-earth, is not well for humans, in the same way they only point to the principle of righteous living, it is not possible for humans to live a celestial life like them and be detached from the earth, in the end, it is stated as the reason for the fall of Gondor that its rulers withdrew from the world like the elves and gave themselves to knowledge³⁹. Indeed, in *The Lord of the Rings*, not even the trees are willing to be neutral.

The good state of nature in itself and the political nature of naming require us to consider two more characters. The elves and Saruman. There is no doubt that Saruman, a wizard, knows names and that the elves take sides in the political struggle. Elves are also another type of character who know and use names. On the other hand, elves not only know names but also take sides in the political struggle. Their poetry, unlike Tom Bombadil's, is the product of conscious design⁴⁰. In the eyes of the other peoples of Middle-earth, this skill of the elves is inconceivable, in other words, magical. Tolkien implies the creative function of names when he mentions that both Tom and the elves, with their songs, create a second world into which both the singer and the listener enter⁴¹. We have already mentioned that there is music at the beginning of Tolkien's cosmogony; the instruments of this music correspond to a different element in nature, and it is the magic of this music that embodies the archaic function of the middle world, giving form to fire⁴². In fact, Ursula does not take a differing position when considering her writings in general: For her, naming is ultimately magic, and effective magic must use true names⁴³. In this context, naming refers to a power relationship, and in mythological consciousness the name of a thing corresponds to its essence⁴⁴. Thus, Bombadil influences whatever he sings about because he speaks to the true nature of things; that is, he uses true names⁴⁵. To name something that is called magic, then, is to distinguish it from others⁴⁶. Traditionally, magic is not meant in a completely different context: For example, it is stated that the knowledge

³⁸ Slethaug, 'Tolkien, Tom Bombadil, and Creative Imagination', (n 28), 349.

³⁹ Kevin Kambo, 'Platonic Tripartition and the Peoples of Middle-Earth', (2022) *Journal for Transcultural Presences & Diachronic Identities from Antiquity to Date*, 110.

⁴⁰ Slethaug, 'Tolkien, Tom Bombadil, and Creative Imagination', (n 28), 346.

⁴¹ ibid 347. Perhaps we can mention a different mythology, the Aborigines, to make this clearer. Aborigines believe that before creation there was a different universe. When they need help, they try to create what will help them in that universe with songs and prayers. Daniels, *Bir Nefeste Dünya Mitolojisi*, (n 25), 16.

⁴² Muhammed Alpaslan Tandırcı, "Tolkien Legendarium'unun Çevre Tarihi Perspektifinden Eko-Eleştirel Analizi", Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Anabilim Dalı Kentleşme ve Çevre Sorunları Bilim Dalı, 2022, 71 vd.

⁴³ Ursula Le Guin, "Hepimizin Aklında Takımadalar Var", (2004) 71, Virgül, (<https://www.metiskitap.com/catalog/interview/2893>)

⁴⁴ Janet Brennan Croft, 'Naming the Evil One: Onomastic Strategies in Tolkien and Rowling', (2009) 28 (1) *Mythlore*, 150.

⁴⁵ Inkpen, 'Tom Bombadil and Spirit of Objectivity', (n 29), 124.

⁴⁶ Janet Brennan Croft 'Noms de Guerre: The Power of Naming in War and Conflict in Middle-earth', (2015) 34 *Mythlore*, 105.

of letters extends from the knowledge of eternal essences to the knowledge of the names of things, and that this knowledge allows one to manipulate things in a way that is called magic because of the correspondence between name and essence⁴⁷. The belief that there is an identity between the object and its name was the basic law of magical practices in the time of Plato, who can be considered as the thinker who first put forward the theory of correspondence mentioned above, and the theory of correspondence argues that the name given to the object should take into account the nature of the object, and that the name given to the object will be correct only if it corresponds to this nature; therefore, whoever knows the name of a thing knows that thing, and it is possible to have an effect on that thing by using the name of a thing⁴⁸.

Now that we know that what the people of Middle-earth call magic is the use of proper names, we need to address an additional issue in order to discuss the political message of the novel. This intermediate issue is important for understanding the theological/cosmic value system of *The Lord of the Rings*. Indeed, the political struggle in which the elves take sides makes sense according to this value system.

In this value system, the state of nature in itself points to goodness, not neutrality. It is possible to capture this in the twist of the wizard, a character who also knows names. Saruman's twists exemplify two different uses of names. While Saruman is a sage, he uses names like elves. He respects growing things. But when he sides with Sauron, he uses names to transform nature. Saruman the wizard is the third level in the chain of command of evil. Above him is Sauron, Melkor's deputy. Melkor is the bearer of evil in Tolkien cosmogony. In narratives that centre on naming, evil already corresponds to arbitrary naming: This is the case in the Altai cosmogony as well as in Tolkien's cosmogony, the *Silmarion*. Melkor, like man in the Altaic cosmogony, tried to add his own melodies to the music of the beginning. We have already mentioned that Bombadil is anti-domination. It is noteworthy in this context that Melkor, despite Iluvatar's warning that "no tune can be played that does not find its ultimate source in me, and my music cannot be changed against my will", desired sovereignty and said "This will be my kingdom and I will name it myself!" and tried to make it real with naming himself such as "King of the World" and "Lord of Middle-earth"⁴⁹. In short, the definition of evil is the use of names for sovereignty that are not in correspondence with the source, that is, names that do not take into account the nature of the object.

Hence, names and nature are tools for Saruman as well. Saruman's turn away from the sage and siding with Sauron represents instrumental reason attempting to substitute traditional wisdom⁵⁰. After this change of allegiance, Saruman turns

⁴⁷ Rene Guenon, *Mukaddes İlmin Sembolleri*, (Filiz Karaküçük, çev, Ketebe 2022), 86.

⁴⁸ Guthrie W.K.C., *İlkçağ Felsefesi Tarihi*, (Ahmet Cevizci çev, Gündoğan 1999), 19-20.

⁴⁹ Croft, "Naming the Evil One: Onomastic Strategies in Tolkien and Rowling", (n 46), 152.

⁵⁰ Max Horkheimer, *Akıl Tutulması*, (Orhan Koçak çev, Metis 2013), 55 et seq.

his knowledge towards industry, loses interest in growing things, and becomes preoccupied with machines. In other words, he abandoned the principle of harmony with nature and instead turned to dominate nature and use it⁵¹. He abandoned the boundaries of the sage and followed the Baconian line of knowledge is power. Like Bacon, it is Saruman's share to dismantle nature, to manipulate natural processes and structures, to intervene in nature, to force nature to reveal its secrets for the sake of building an artificial world⁵². Treebeard's words of complain about Saruman are worth remembering: He has a mind made of metal and wheels; he only pays attention to growing things for a moment, when they are of use to him. Making tools and instrumentalizing nature. This is precisely what Ursula's *She* was fundamentally opposed to. Indeed, even after the destruction of the ring of power, Saruman cuts down the trees of the Shire in revenge and builds a mill that leaves the land in filth. Bombadil, on the other hand, is interested in what growing things and shepherds them. Tolkien refers to his knowledge, his music, as pure science; this knowledge is pure because it is not interested in controlling nature, in exploiting nature: Tolkien refers to Bombadil as one of a kind, free from fear, possession and desire to dominate, and after stating that the correct answer to the question of "who Bombadil is?" is that "he is", he reveals the answer to the question of what he is: an allegory of pure science⁵³. He is interested only in knowing, not in possessing and ruling it through this knowledge.

As a result, being in harmony with nature is good for humans and other peoples of Middle-earth. Unlike Saruman's headquarters, which resembles a massive factory, the habitats of the elves are so in harmony with nature as to inspire ecologist architects, almost indistinguishable in the forest. In this context, the elves' leaving of Middle-earth can be seen as an allegory for the disenchantment of our world and the erasure of natural law with modernity⁵⁴. Mordor, the home of new master of Sauron, is an industrial area with iron forges and dark skies full of smoke⁵⁵. And after Saruman's twist, his place Isengard also became the industrial headquarters of capital⁵⁶.

After all, even Tom Bombadil does not stand in totally different place from the others: Although he is not directly involved in the struggle, by instilling this wisdom

⁵¹ Dwarves too often make this mistake: Once they are driven out of their homeland by the Balrog, who comes out from under the mountains they have dug up to their roots to access precious metals. And another time they are driven out of by the dragon, who share the same desire for the metals. Tolkien's reaction to the instrumentalization of nature through industrial means instead of respecting and being in harmony with it can also be seen in this example. (Tandırcı, "Tolkien Legendarium'unun Çevre Tarihi Perspektifinden Eko-Eleştirel Analizi", (n 42), 106.)

⁵² İnkpın, "Tom Bombadil and Spirit of Objectivity", (n 29), 120, 121.

⁵³ Letter 153 to Peter Hastings (draft): Tolkien, *The Letters of J. R. R. Tolkien*, ed. Humphrey Carpenter, William Morrow, (2000).

⁵⁴ William MacNeil, 'One Recht to Rule Them All! Law's Empire In The Age Of Empire', *An Aesthetics Of Law And Culture: Texts, Images, Screens*, Ed. Andrew T. Kenyon & Peter D. Rush, (Elsevier 2004), 281.

⁵⁵ Tandırcı, "Tolkien Legendarium'unun Çevre Tarihi Perspektifinden Eko-Eleştirel Analizi", (n 42), 112 et seq.

⁵⁶ MacNeil, 'One Recht to Rule Them All! Law's Empire In The Age Of Empire', (n 54) 287.

in Frodo, he prevents him from slipping and grants him the compass to find the right path⁵⁷. The wisdom that Bombadil teaches Frodo is the message *She* wants to convey. Bombadil is not seduced by the ring of power because he is indifferent to politics, but he fights against not political but ontological evil, that is, disharmony against nature, so even though he cannot directly become the bearer of the ring, he can pass on the wisdom that will prevent the bearer of the ring from being crushed under the weight of the ring, the wisdom of cosmic harmony in which every living thing is friendly with each other⁵⁸. As we can see, unity is established here not through namelessness but through correct naming.

Not wanting power for the sake of having power is in sync with Tolkien's own political position. Tolkien describes his position in terms of anarchy or unconstitutional monarchy, two terms that political philosophers would struggle to put together, although it is more likely that what Tolkien means by unconstitutional is uninstitutionalized power rather than limitless, unconditional power⁵⁹. This would be more in the spirit of both England's constitutional experience and *The Lord of the Rings*. While institutionalization may seem to be a necessary condition of modernity, it is a fact that Middle-earth is not modern. In fact, as we stated above, it is the villain who attempts to bring it closer to the modern industrialized world. In such a plan, the concrete balance of power and the moral capacities of the agents become politically decisive. The influence of the ruler is much lower in an institutionalized polity. This is a virtue of the rule of law. Conversely, a good ruler will not be able to make a big difference in an institutionalized administration. Especially if the institutions are corrupt. Tolkien must have found the possibility of corruption of institutions to be high because he prefers anarchy. We can also update the picture as follows. As we know, in *The Republic*, the rule of the philosopher king is preferred, while in *The Laws*, the function of ensuring justice is given to laws, which are taken from man. This is precisely a substitution between the subject, who knows the justice and laws enacted according to justice. This case, it can be thought that Tolkien believes that virtuous people do not need laws. Therefore, one may say that in the *Lord of the Rings* universe, where the value system of the traditional world is adopted, the focus is on the moral capacities of the subjects not institutions. And the more a system of governance leaves subjects to their own will, the better. As a matter of fact, it can be observed that there is a parallel between the scale of good and evil of the countries in *The Lord of the Rings* and the people's interaction with the government; while the Shire is an example of an unclassified society, Mordor, the land of evil, has a strict hierarchical structure⁶⁰. The contrasts of a leaderless political-legal structure in

⁵⁷ Slethaug, 'Tolkien, Tom Bombadil, and Creative Imagination', (n 28), 348.

⁵⁸ *ibid* (n 28), 349.

⁵⁹ Dominic J. Nardi, Jr., 'Political Institutions in J.R.R. Tolkien's Middle-earth: Or, How I Learned to Stop Worrying About the Lack of Democracy', (2014), 33, *Mythlore*, 107.

⁶⁰ Nardi, Jr., 'Political Institutions in J.R.R. Tolkien's Middle-earth: Or, How I Learned to Stop Worrying About the Lack of

harmony with nature, bordering on anarchism, on the one hand, and an industrialized, hierarchical structure on the other, are also seen in between the anarchic societies of the wood elves versus Melkor's smoky, factory-like lands⁶¹.

The purpose of Mordor, with its strict hierarchical structure, is to establish dominance. As we have explained above, in Tolkien's universe, ignoring the nature of things and dominating them by giving them arbitrary names is the definition of evil. In this context, there is no doubt that the main theme of *The Lord of the Rings* trilogy is power and novel shares the idea behind the famous motto "power corrupts, absolute power corrupts absolutely". It is no coincidence that Tolkien refers to the character of Sam as the chief hero's⁶² and gives this gardener, whose job it is to take care of growing things, the name Wise. Faramir also praises the Shire, saying 'your home should be a place of peace, a place where gardeners are respected', and Frodo agrees with him about the respect due to gardeners. Many characters are tested by the ring. Powerful people like Galadriel and Gandalf, who are on the side of good, could very well have been ring bearers, but as Galadriel says, they would have fallen into the trap of using the ring for good. This is the trap that good can be achieved through the possession of power. At some stage the possibility to bear the ring had appeared for Sam also, and even did so for a short time, but when the time came, he returned the ring to the one chosen for the task. And finally, when Frodo, the ring-bearer, has exhausted, Sam did not carry ring but Frodo. Like other wise men, he knows his place. He had this potential from the beginning, after all Sam was a gardener, so he knew the principle of how to treat growing things. Remember, Bombadil was the master of his land, but all the creatures in that land were their own masters. So Bombadil was the gardener of his personal garden of Eden, not the master. Clues can be found also in the way of Gandalf opposes the steward of Gondor when he chooses the relative interest of Gondor over the future of Middle-earth. Gandalf had pointed out that he himself is a kind of steward, and that if even a single fruit-bearing tree could survive these dark days, then he cannot be considered unsuccessful in his stewardship. Here we learn the principle of stewardship/ruling from *The White Rider*. Ruler should act like a gardener and should care and protect not dominate whose live in polity. Sam the gardener could therefore be trusted not to make the mistake of wanting the ring for himself. And so it happened. He did not want the power ring for himself, even for a seemingly good reason. In this way Sam Wise proved that he had the strength to resist the power ring. Because it is limited power it is not force but authority. He

Democracy', (n 59), 109.

⁶¹ Tandırcı, 'Tolkien Legendarium'unun Çevre Tarihi Perspektifinden Eko-Eleştirel Analizi', (n 42), 80, 85.

⁶² Letter 131. Letter 184 was written to someone whose name was indeed Sam Gamgee: "You can imagine my astonishment, when I saw your signature! I can only say, for your comfort I hope, that the 'Sam Gamgee' of my story is a most heroic character, now widely beloved by many readers, even though his origins are rustic." According to letter 246, Sam's wisdom is rustic. For Tolkien, Sam is the bearer of rustic vulgarity. Without his fascination with elven work and the education he received from Bilbo, he would have been an ordinary hobbit villager, but his love for Frodo made him march the path and made him a hero. Finally, above all, it should not be forgotten that the book, the whole story, ends with Sam.

did what he had to do, not what he wanted or might to do. This authority derives not from a rule of positive law but from a principle: Ruler should act like a gardener. This principle describes Tolkien's power conception: Everything has their own purpose, so everything has their own *potentia*. Ruler is only a servant of their potential.

The belief in the moral acts of subjects can be pointed out as is one of feature of Tolkien's understanding of law and politics. We can say that Tolkien relies on the actual acts of subjects rather than the normative existence of institutions. After all, institutions are names, and the connection between names and what they signify can be weakened. The ability of subjects to have a say over their own lives without intermediation of institutions can be likened to the federal principal Arendt uses to describe the American Revolution⁶³. The closest approximation to the ideal can be seen in the Shire, where power is truly in the hands of the people in this sense, who can be content with minimal institutionalization. But when it comes to law and constitution, we need to turn our attention elsewhere. It could be argued that law derives from principles that can be seen as the knowledge of a cosmogonic value system. These principles include respect for growing things, harmony with nature, and not wanting dominion, that is, not wanting power for the sake of having power. This last one is particularly important as it reveals Tolkien's understanding of power. And the parallelism of this principle with the mechanism that ensures the separation of powers, which Arendt presents as the American contribution to political science⁶⁴, is obvious. In this context, the line of Galadriel during the forging of the three elven rings is remarkable: "One will always corrupt, two will divide, but with three, there's balance." The correspondence of this line in the series, to the motto "power corrupts" and the main idea of the trilogy is obvious; ultimately the whole struggle is against Sauron, who wants Middle-earth for himself, not to take care of it like a gardener, but to rule it. Eventually whole test against the ring is about not losing yourself to the lust for power like Sauron.

The tripartite has always been on the stage of political history and philosophy. The British constitutional experience offers an unwritten but actual manifestation of the tripartite mixed constitution. The mixed constitution which based on the institutional representation of three class is the ancestor of what is today described as the separation of (three) powers or the system of checks and balances. Rome became a republic with the same structure. Philosophers from Aristotle to Cicero described this tripartite structure as the ideal government. And before Aristotle, Plato had described ideal state with three parts. Some even interpret Plato's three classes as the three folks of Middle-earth: The wise elves, who loves the truth; the brave warriors, men, who seek glory; and the craftsman dwarves, who are interested in metals such as gold and

⁶³ Vahdet İşsevenler, Kurucu İktidarın Eleştirisi, (Pinhan 2019), 162 et seq.

⁶⁴ Arendt, On Revolution, (n 26) 238.

the Hobbits and their Shire, who have no place in this plan, correspond to Tolkien's anarchist side⁶⁵. When the mission to destroy the ring is completed and the hobbits return to the Shire, they find the village stratified, the trees cut down, the wheels set in motion, and the people complaining that 'everything has been reduced, except the rules'. Of course, hobbits dismantle the hierarchical order and the occupation instead of taking control of new regime. And Tolkien, of course, has given the role of ring bearer to these people who are not interested in ruling.

IV. Conclusion

Nature, which is given, feminine, spontaneously vital and alive not only in its constituents but also in itself as a whole, is portrayed in both texts I have discussed as something precious, something to be protected and respected. Ursula's story implies that human, masculine intervention only benefits humans and puts the elements of nature in competition, rendering the harmony in nature invisible. LOTR, on the other hand, recognizes the naming nature of human as part of nature and suggests that naming can be either good or evil, depending on human choices. Accordingly, nature, including its bipedal inhabitants, should not be seen as an object to be used and destroyed in order to fulfil certain purposes, but as a whole whose harmony is to be preserved and whose inhabitants are to be allowed to be themselves. In other words, while the first text rejects the masculine act of naming, that is, the act of establishing order, the second text opposes the performance of this act for the purpose of domination. In this context, the first text is based on the claim that harmony can be established through the act of unnamings, and the second through correct names. Both naming and unnamings are ultimately an act. In other words, as a conscious act it is a choice. It means to say that this option is right and the other is wrong. In this case, naming and acting on a ground of right and wrong is not optional for humans, it is a condition. Recognizing this condition, Tolkien's narrative offers a coherent suggestion about what we can do in this situation. He makes an impressive critique of instrumental reason, which can be called as misnaming.

Peer-review: Externally peer-reviewed.

Conflict of Interest: The author has no conflict of interest to declare.

Grant Support: The author declared that this study has received no financial support.

Acknowledgements: I am grateful to Françoise Dastur and the authors of Mythlore for reminding me the original story.

Bibliyografya/Bibliography

Arendt H, On Revolution (Penguin 1990).

Arendt H, İnsanlık Durumu (Bahadır Sina Şener tr, İletişim 2013).

Aristoteles, Politika (Özgüç Orhan tr, Pinhan Yayıncılık 2018).

⁶⁵ Kambo, "Platonic Tripartition and the Peoples of Middle-Earth", (n 39), 90 et seq.

- Benjamin W, 'Critique of Violence' in Marcus Bullock and Michael W. Jennings (eds), *Selected Writings* (Harvard University Press 2004).
- Komut Bakınç S, 'The reinvention of humanity: Language, power and rebellion in Le Guin's "She Unnames Them"' (2021) *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* 229-237.
- Croft JB, 'Naming the Evil One: Onomastic Strategies in Tolkien and Rowling' (2009) 28(1) *Mythlore* 149-163.
- Cover RM, 'Violence and Word' (1986) 95 *Yale Law Journal* 1601-1629.
- Daniels M, *Bir Nefeste Dünya Mitolojisi* (Pınar Üstel tr, Maya Kitap 2014).
- Dastur F, 'İnsan Sesi' in Adem Beyaz tr, *Ölümlü Yüzleşmek* (Pinhan 2019).
- Guthrie WKC, *İlkçağ Felsefesi Tarihi* (Ahmet Cevizci tr, Gündoğan 1999).
- Guenon R, *Mukaddes İlimin Sembolleri* (Filiz Karaküçük tr, Ketebe 2022).
- Hargrove G, 'Who is Tom Bombadil?' (1986) 13 *Mythlore* 20-24.
- Horkheimer M., *Akıl Tutulması*, trans. Orhan Koçak, (Metis 2013).
- Inkpen D, "Tom Bombadil and Spirit of Objectivity", (2020) 39 *Mythlore* 117-132.
- İşsevenler V, *Kurucu İktidarın Eleştirisi* (Pinhan 2019).
- Kambo K, 'Platonic Tripartition and the Peoples of Middle-Earth' (2022) *Journal for Transcultural Presences & Diachronic Identities from Antiquity to Date* 90-122.
- Kur'an Yolu <https://kuran.diyaret.gov.tr> accessed: 12/9/2023.
- MacNeil W, 'One Recht to Rule Them All! Law's Empire In The Age Of Empire' in Andrew T. Kenyon & Peter D. Rush (eds), *An Aesthetics of Law And Culture: Texts, Images, Screens* (Elsevier 2004) 279-303.
- Nardi DJ Jr, 'Political Institutions in J.R.R. Tolkien's Middle-earth: Or, How I Learned to Stop Worrying About the Lack of Democracy' (2014) 33 *Mythlore* 101-123.
- Saydam MB, *Deli Dumrul'un Bilinci* (Metis 2017).
- Sproul Barbara C, *Yaratılış Mitleri* (Ali Bucak tr, Hil Yayın 2018).
- Slethaug GE, 'Tolkien, Tom Bombadil, and Creative Imagination' (1978) 4 (3) *English Studies in Canada* 341-350.
- Tandırıcı MA, 'Tolkien Legendarium'unun Çevre Tarihi Perspektifinden Eko-Eleştirel Analizi', (Thss. Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Anabilim Dalı Kentleşme ve Çevre Sorunları Bilim Dalı, 2022)
- Tolkien J, *The Letters Of J. R. R. Tolkien* (Humphrey Carpenter ed, William Morrow 2000).
- Tolkien J, *Silmarion* (Berna Akkıyal tr, İthaki 2011).
- Tolkien J, *Yüzüklerin Efendisi* (Bülent Somay tr, Metis 2012).
- Ursula Le G, *She Unnames Them All* (The New Yorker 21 January 1985). <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/1985/01/21/she-unnames-them>
- Ursula Le G, 'Hepimizin Aklında Takımadalar Var' (2004) 71 *Virgöl*.
<https://www.metiskitap.com/catalog/interview/2893> accessed: 9/9/2023.