

MACHINIC ASSEMBLAGES IN TANPINAR'S POETICS AND NARRATIVES: BETWEEN CONSTRAINT AND CREATIVITY*

Fatih ALTUĞ**

Abstract: This article investigates Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's persistent en—gagement with machinic imagery and concepts, illuminating the interplay between human creativity, technological structures, and societal systems. Drawing on Deleuze and Guattari's notion of assemblage, it argues that Tanpınar's portrayal of machines transcends metaphor, functioning as dynamic systems of heterogeneous interactions that transform poetic, narrative, and social processes. His works conceptualize poetry as a "fluid alloy" of interconnected elements, resembling an organism where rhythm, atmosphere, and coherence emerge through assemblages of words, emotions, and images. Similarly, the short story and the novel become machinic spaces where fragmentary flows are recombined to generate narrative and subjective transformation. Tanpınar's critique of mechanization balances this creative vision with an awareness of its constraints. Molar machines, exemplified by rigid societal and institutional systems, impose standardization and suppress individual agency, as seen in his depictions of automaton-like characters and bureaucratic life. Yet, molecular flows —fluid, transformative forces within machinic assemblages— offer moments of aesthetic and existential innovation, highlighting the tension between stability and creativity. By situating Tanpınar's vision of machinery within Deleuze and Guattari's framework, this study reexamines his contribution to Turkish modernism, revealing literature as a site of perpetual negotiation between mechanized control and creative potential. Through this lens, Tanpınar's works underscore how assemblages mediate identity, culture, and artistic production, positioning the machine as both a site of constraint and a catalyst for transformation.

Keywords: Tanpınar, machinic, assemblage, Turkish modernism, creativity, Deleuze and Guattari, rhythm, molar and molecular dynamics

Tanpınar'ın Şiir ve Anlatılarında Makinesel Terkipler: Sınırlama ve Yaratıcılık Arasında

Öz: Bu makale, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar'ın makine imgeleri ve kavramlarına yönelik yoğun ilgisini insan yaratıcılığı, teknolojik yapılar ve toplumsal sistemler arasındaki etkileşimi odağa alarak incelemektedir. Deleuze ve Guattari'nin "terkip" (assemblage) kavramından hareketle, Tanpınar'ın makineleri yalnızca birer metafor olarak ele almadığını, aksine şiirsel, anlatısal ve toplumsal süreçleri dönüştüren heterojen etkileşim

* This study is conducted within the scope of the project titled *The Literary Republic of More Than Humans: Entangled Relationship Networks of Humans, Animals, Plants, and Objects in Turkish Literature (1923–2023)*, supported by TÜBİTAK (Project No: 124K480).

** Associate Professor, Boğaziçi University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Department of Turkish Language and Literature, Istanbul/TÜRKİYE, Email: fatih.altug@bogazici.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-8007-0169.

sistemleri olarak kurguladığını öne sürmektedir. Onun eserlerinde şiir, kelimeler, duygular ve imgeler arasındaki ilişkilerden doğan bir bütünlük içinde, ritim ve atmosferin örgütlendiği “seyyal bir halita” olarak tasavvur edilir. Benzer şekilde, öykü ve roman da parçalı akışların yeniden düzenlenerek anlatısal ve öznel dönüşümlere imkân tanıdığı makinesel mekânlara dönüşmektedir. Tanpınar'ın makineleşmeye dair eleştirisi ise bu yaratıcı imkânı, mekanizmanın sınırlarına dair bir farkındalıkla dengelemektedir. Katı toplumsal ve kurumsal sistemler tarafından temsil edilen molar makineler, standartlaşmayı dayatarak bireysel edimi bastırırken, otomat benzeri karakterler ve bürokratik yaşamın betimlemelerinde bu dinamik açıkça gözlemlenmektedir. Öte yandan, moleküler akışlar, yani makinesel terkiplere içkin akışkan ve dönüştürücü güçler, estetik ve varoluşsal yenilenme anlarına zemin hazırlar ve istikrar ile yaratıcılık arasındaki gerilimi görünür kılar. Tanpınar'ın makine tasavvurunu Deleuze ve Guattari'nin çerçevesi içinde konumlandıran bu çalışma, onun Türk modernizmine katkılarını yeniden değerlendirme imkânı vermektedir. Edebiyatın, makineleşmiş denetim ile yaratıcı potansiyel arasındaki sürekli müzakere alanı olarak işlediğini göstererek, Tanpınar'ın eserlerinde terkiplerin kimlik, kültür ve sanatsal üretimi nasıl biçimlendirdiğini ortaya koymaktadır. Böylece, makine hem bir sınırlandırma alanı hem de dönüşümün tetikleyicisi olarak konumlanmaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Tanpınar, makinesellik, terkip, Türk modernizmi, yaratıcılık, Deleuze ve Guattari, ritim, molar ve moleküler dinamikler

Introduction

Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's writings inhabit a world where machinery —both literal and metaphorical— operates as a fundamental principle guiding creative processes, subjective transformations, and social organization. In poems, short stories, and novels alike, he assigns the machine a dynamic role that transcends merely technical or decorative uses. By weaving images of gears, rhythms, automata, bureaucracies, and inventive contraptions into his literary and critical oeuvre, Tanpınar foregrounds the paradoxical nature of the machinic. On the one hand, machines serve as powerful catalysts of poetic and narrative production, enabling continuous processes of assemblage, fluid recombination, and imaginative transposition. On the other hand, these very same machines impose structural constraints, standardizing identities and constraining individual agency within inflexible social systems.

In exploring this paradox, the present study draws on Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari's notion of assemblage as a lens through which to interpret Tanpınar's consistent use of machinic imagery. Deleuze and Guattari conceptualize machines not simply as mechanical objects but as composite, relational processes—arrangements of heterogeneous elements that become charged with meaning, power, and affect. (Deleuze & Guattari, 2005, p. 90) This theoretical framework invites us to see Tanpınar's “poetic machines,” “language machines,” and “social machines” as interactive fields of tensions between creative becoming and regimenting order.¹ Tanpınar's concept of the poetic

¹ While all of Deleuze's major works—including his collaborations with Guattari—were published after Tanpınar's death in 1961, this study does not seek to retroactively inscribe Tanpınar into a Deleuzian philosophical lineage or reduce his literary vision to concepts that emerged later. Rather, it treats Deleuze and Guattari's vocabulary as a heuristic framework that enables a renewed interpretation of Tanpınar's aesthetics, thematics, and poetics. The aim is to construct a critical

“atmosphere” as a “fluid alloy,” for instance, demonstrates how the poem emerges from an ongoing interplay of words, emotions, and images—assemblages that forge unity through rhythmic heterogeneity. Yet elsewhere, he depicts molar machines — bureaucratic hierarchies, institutional structures, and social codes— that rigidly overcode the very flows that the poetic or narrative machine might unleash.

Over the course of this article, I shall trace the figure of the machine across Tanpınar’s oeuvre—from his essays on poetry’s elusive “spiritual self,” to the short stories that humorously highlight infinite modifications of everyday objects, to novels such as *Huzur* and *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü*, where machinic regimes threaten to reduce human lives to clockwork mechanisms. I will interrogate how Tanpınar’s texts repeatedly stage the conflict between mechanical constraints —uniformity, repetition, and bureaucratic precision— and molecular forces of transformation—fluidity, creative invention, and the disruptive potential of artistic expression. Special emphasis will fall on Tanpınar’s automaton figures, characters whose repetitive gestures and organizational roles exemplify the ways large-scale social machines mold individual existence. Yet this tension also emerges in more playful or liberating contexts: the “workshop” of poetic or inventive creation can become a site of productive recombination, exposing the machine’s capacity to forge novel connections and surprising insights.

By situating Tanpınar’s multifaceted approach to machinery within the broader field of Turkish modernism, this essay illuminates how his work underscores the constant negotiation between mechanization and creativity, control and improvisation. Ultimately, reading Tanpınar through the conceptual filter of Deleuze and Guattari reveals a writer who is acutely attentive to how subjectivity, culture, and literature themselves materialize in machinic assemblages—alive with the possibility of both constraint and transcendence. This dual vision not only enriches our understanding of Tanpınar’s place in modern Turkish letters but also resonates with larger debates on the place of technology and systemic order in literary form and human experience.

The twentieth century, particularly from its early decades and intensifying after World War II, witnessed a profound transformation in everyday life driven by machines

dialogue between literary and philosophical practices that, though historically asynchronous, share a common concern with the interplay of form, structure, affect, and transformation. This approach thus foregrounds the potential of transversal readings across literature and theory, not to claim predictive affinity but to generate interpretive resonance.

Another reason this study places Tanpınar in conversation with Deleuze and Guattari lies in their strikingly similar intellectual itineraries. Both writers return, again and again, to the modern figures who meditate on duration, sensation, and becoming. At the philosophical core stands Henri Bergson, whose conception of *durée* informs Tanpınar’s rhythmic poetics just as decisively as it shapes Deleuze’s account of creative differentiation. A comparable affinity emerges in their shared engagement with the symbolist constellation of Baudelaire, Mallarmé, and Valéry: Tanpınar makes these poets the touchstones of his reflections on craft, while Deleuze draws on their notions of “violent beauty” and psychic automata to theorize aesthetic experience. Nietzsche, too, becomes a mutual interlocutor—offering Tanpınar a language for circular temporality and providing Deleuze with a model for affirmative becoming. Finally, both thinkers cultivate a deep fascination with Proust and Kafka, treating each as a paradigmatic “literary machine” whose texts open onto new configurations of time, affect, and form. Such intersecting reading lists do not suggest direct influence; rather, they reveal a shared ambition to understand literature as a field in which temporal multiplicity, affective intensity, and machinic composition converge. It is this convergent ambition that renders a transhistorical dialogue between Tanpınar and Deleuze-Guattari both plausible and illuminating for the present inquiry.

and mechanization. This shift not only reshaped societal structures but also deeply influenced the arts, especially literature, creating new thematic concerns and formal possibilities. As Stephen Kern (1983) detailed in *The Culture of Time and Space, 1880-1918*, the proliferation of new technologies such as the telegraph, telephone, bicycle, automobile, and cinema in the early twentieth century radically altered perceptions of time, space, and speed. This new "time-space" culture, combined with the societal changes brought by industrialization and urbanization, challenged traditional forms in art and literature, fostering an environment where fragmented narratives, explorations of inner temporality, and stream of consciousness became prominent. The individual's place within this new, rapidly changing, and often alienating "mechanized reality" became a central theme of modernist art. Lewis Mumford (1934), in *Technics and Civilization*, argued that the history of mechanization, through different technological phases (eotechnic, paleotechnic, neotechnic), continuously redefined humanity's relationship with nature, production, and its own values. Mumford emphasized that the clock, by abstracting and quantifying time, laid the groundwork for modern industrial life and capitalist order, while also stressing that the trajectory of technology is shaped by societal and moral choices, not blind determinism. In this context, art and literature became crucial arenas for interrogating both the promises and the human and social costs of mechanization.

Walter Benjamin (1968 [1936]), in his seminal essay "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," pointed out how mechanical reproduction techniques like photography and cinema divested the artwork of its traditional "aura"—its uniqueness and embeddedness in ritual—shifting its social function from ritual to politics and revolutionizing mass perception. While the democratization of art offered new potentials, it also carried the risk of its co-optation into the "culture industry." These processes accelerated after World War II, as the atomic age, the dawn of cybernetic thought and computer technology, and the power of mass media like television further complicated the impact of mechanization and technology on the individual, society, and culture. Literature during this period continued to explore the potential for progress and transformation offered by technology while also critically examining themes of control, alienation, and the problematic of identity and subjectivity in this new technological universe, deepening its inquiry into humanity's search for meaning. This intellectual and artistic landscape, marked by profound philosophical, cultural, and aesthetic debates sparked by mechanization and its reshaping of human understanding of self, time, life, and art, forms an essential backdrop for understanding Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's complex, metaphorical, and critical engagement with the "machine"—be it as a clock, a bureaucratic apparatus, a social structure, or a mental process—and how his explorations of time, memory, dreams, civilization, and the creative act resonate with the major questions and intellectual pursuits of his era.

1. Machine-Based Concepts and Assemblage in Tanpınar's Poetics of Creation

In this section, I explore how Tanpınar's literary production persistently invokes the notion of the machine, forming connections that illuminate the machine-based aspects of poetry, the short story, and the novel. Drawing on Deleuze and Guattari's concept of assemblage, I argue that this framework offers an invaluable lens through which to understand Tanpınar's machine-based conceptualization of creative processes in multiple genres. Furthermore, I show that Tanpınar extends this perspective beyond

literature, as evidenced by his reflections on air travel, which also involve a complex assemblage of human, machine, and environment. In doing so, this section demonstrates how Tanpınar's engagement with machine-based concepts contributes to a broader theoretical discourse on creation, perception, and the dynamic interplay between embodied experience and technological mediation.

Tanpınar delves into the atmosphere that constitutes the essence of poetry in his essay "Şiir Hakkında II," which was published in *Görüş* in July 1930, defining it as its "spiritual self." It is not words, images, meanings, or concepts that render poetry unique, but an atmosphere that serves as its defining quality. Here, Tanpınar underscores that this characteristic is not reducible to a mere musical quality or any other single factor. This notion suggests a mechanism irreducible to a simple expression like the music of poetry. The "atmosphere," described as "the transference of the shadowy air of a state of soul into language," is further characterized as a "fluid alloy [halita] that cannot be reduced to any essence" (Tanpınar, 2011k, p. 19). It neither originates from a singular source nor is homogenous; rather, it is a dynamic, heterogeneous amalgamation. Through this multifaceted conception, poetry achieves autonomy.

Tanpınar analogizes the pursuit of poetry's "miracle" outside of poetry to seeking the source of vitality that animates an organism [uzviyet] beyond its own boundaries. Once all elements of poetry begin to breathe within a shared atmosphere, poetry transforms into a living entity, explicable and self-sufficient. Drawing on the analogy of the organism as a harmonious yet complex mechanism,² Tanpınar emphasizes the interconnected processes sustaining the whole. Each element contributes to a dynamic totality, producing coherence and transformation simultaneously.

While poetry and the organism are comparable in their mechanical operations, the atmosphere and breath unify and harmonize these intricate mechanisms. Although the atmosphere is fluid, maintaining the balance and coherence of the text and the human body remains paramount. Each part must operate in concert, sustaining unity without disrupting the whole. In this sense, the parallel processes of poetry, the organism, and the creation mechanisms align in their functionality. The atmosphere functions as the unifying force of poetry, producing vitality and coherence through an assemblage of interacting elements while resisting reduction to any singular or deterministic framework.

The essay "Hayal Şehir," written on Yahya Kemal's poem of the same title and published in *Cumhuriyet* on July 19, 1947, highlights the mechanical dimensions of poetic creation even more prominently. Tanpınar's artist is not "a machine of excitement" that merely "sweats out moments of the soul as they are." Similarly, in "Şiir Hakkında II," the poet does not seek to "stimulate the affective [teessür] apparatus we are all naturally equipped with" (Tanpınar, 2011k, p. 19). Rejecting a simplistic mechanical conception that directly externalizes or triggers emotions and sensations, Tanpınar foregrounds a dynamic process that transforms, transmits, and processes the states of the

² As Özgür Taburoğlu notes, Tanpınar's concept of the machine is never limited to mechanical assemblage; it is imbued with psychic states and metaphysical transitions. Machines are animated by moods, failures, desires, and rhythms — they may falter when melancholic, generate meaning through repetition, and articulate individuality while being absorbed into larger systems. Tanpınar's literary universe, Taburoğlu argues, is filled with such machinic dynamics, where the line between spirit and mechanism blurs, and where malfunction can paradoxically create space for personal expression and freedom (Taburoğlu, 2019, pp. 143–151).

soul: “[This apparatus] carries these moments in entirely different directions, expands, amplifies, and alters them, transposing them into distinct planes through hidden concordances among objects, extending relationships to their utmost, thereby making each moment a separate universe unto itself” (Tanpınar, 2011g, p. 329).

Here, the poetic process functions by multiplying and transforming perspectives, prioritizing concordances and relationships, and transferring these into novel contexts. The poetic realm becomes a dynamic totality where potentialities are reshaped and activated. Consequently, the emergence of poetry cannot be attributed to inspiration, nor can the soul be envisioned as “a vessel filling and emptying with scattered impressions.” Poetry does not arise from a singular origin; any point of existence can serve as a beginning. The poetic soul operates like a weaving mechanism: “A mechanism that perpetually processes its entire being, transitioning from the abstract to the concrete and vice versa, weaving the universe anew amid sensations and perceptions” (Tanpınar, 2011g, p. 329). By emphasizing this weaving image, Tanpınar underscores the productive interplay of heterogeneity and coherence in poetic creation. Disparate elements converge to produce new worlds and perspectives.

Tanpınar draws a parallel between Yahya Kemal and Paul Valéry in his article “Andre Gide ve Nobel Mükâfatı,” published in *Cumhuriyet* on January 6, 1948, shortly after “Hayal Şehir.” Just as Yahya Kemal’s soul functions as a weaving mechanism, Valéry locates the essence of humanity and art in “the operation of consciousness,” which he likens to “that intangible machine” (Tanpınar, 2011d, p. 477). While consciousness replaces the soul in this framework, the notion of dynamic operation persists. Tanpınar contends that Yahya Kemal’s poetic process “operates with remembrance, the most poetic aspect of mental mechanisms” (Tanpınar, 2011i, p. 355) in his article “Kendi Gök Kubbemiz,” published in *Varlık* in 1961. Additionally, the mind becomes a device mediating between the poet and their material in the article “Yahya Kemal ve Şiirimiz,” published in *Cumhuriyet* on December 2, 1949: “The one who reflects on the material they use, turning their mind into its apparatus. In my view, this is the hallmark of a great artist. For grasping the full potential of material is synonymous with grasping the essence of humanity itself” (Tanpınar, 2011o, p. 337).

In order to better comprehend Tanpınar’s engagement with the formation and production of poetry through a discourse grounded in the idea of the machine, I propose that the concept of assemblage offers a valuable analytical framework. In Deleuze and Guattari’s conceptualization, assemblage refers to a dynamic composition of heterogeneous elements —objects, actions, affects, and expressions— brought together through processes of interaction and transformation. It emphasizes *becoming*³ over static being, functioning as a network of relationships that continuously create and dissolve connections. Assemblages operate along two axes: territorialization, which stabilizes and organizes components into a coherent whole, and deterritorialization, which disrupts these relations, enabling new configurations and possibilities. Rather than being defined

³ By *becoming*, I refer to the Deleuzian concept of a dynamic, non-teleological process of transformation, in which subjects and entities are continuously formed through their relations and encounters. Rather than moving toward a fixed identity or state, *becoming* emphasizes fluidity, multiplicity, and the assemblage of heterogeneous elements. It denotes a mode of existence that resists essentialism and privileges movement, affect, and contingency.

by their intrinsic properties, assemblages are understood through their capacity to generate effects, transform relations, and produce meaning. They exhibit fluidity and adaptability by integrating elements from diverse contexts into functional multiplicities. As machinic entities, assemblages operate through energy, matter, and signification flows, eschewing hierarchical or deterministic structures. Additionally, they encompass semiotic dimensions, linking material processes to signs and expressions, thereby bridging the abstract and the concrete. (Deleuze & Guattari, 2005, pp. 36, 73, 88, 90, 504, 587)

Seen in this light, Tanpınar's conceptualization of poetry, rhythm, and narrative mirrors Deleuze and Guattari's assemblage as a dynamic system of heterogeneous interactions. His idea of poetry's "atmosphere" as a "fluid alloy" captures the interplay of diverse elements —words, images, and emotions— forming a cohesive yet evolving whole. This atmosphere emerges relationally, producing autonomy through interconnected processes rather than from singular origins.⁴

Similarly, Tanpınar's analogy of poetry to an organism underscores its machinic quality, where coherence arises from the interactivity of parts within a living, dynamic system. The poetic soul as a "weaving mechanism" reflects the productive multiplicity of assemblages, continually reshaping relations and creating new contexts. Furthermore, his emphasis on rhythm as a transformative force aligns with the assemblage's ability to organize flows of affect, movement, and meaning, crafting dynamic territories.

The machinic dimension, however, is not confined to poetic production. Tanpınar explores the rhythmic qualities of the short story in "Bir Kadının Jurnalından," an article critiquing Yunus Kâzım Köni's work of the same title, published in *Cumhuriyet* on May 6, 1949. For him, rhythm lies at the genre's core, embodying an intensely subjective [enfûsi] sense of time that transforms events and expressions into an independent duration. By highlighting these transformations, Tanpınar indicates that rhythm's interplay with time unfolds through processes and transformations: "Wherever rhythm is discussed, there is an intervention in time, a transformation so potent it approaches the nature of an operation" (Tanpınar, 2011e, p. 431).

Rhythm is conceived as a dynamic force, reshaping the flow of time and weaving it into the fabric of the narrative. It connects disparate elements —time, emotions, expressions— into a cohesive yet fluid system. Thus, this rhythmic dimension enables narratives to transcend linear representation, producing a pulsating, affective duration that transforms the story and its reception.

⁴ Several of Tanpınar's poems reflect the same inner structures and dynamic tensions that this article explores in his prose. In "Ne İçindeyim Zamanın," the speaker describes his mind as a "boundless mill that grinds silence", suggesting a circular motion that breaks experience into rhythmic units. In "Eşik," the self moves within a "same circle", pointing to a closed loop where perception, memory, and emotion circulate. Similarly, in "Gül," dawn stretches across a "wheel of a thousand torments", turning affect into something strained and mechanical. In "Dolap," a "creaking cupboard" makes a sound that travels "far away, without end", creating a background rhythm that shapes the space around it. Tanpınar's poem "Raks" presents the body as moved by a "wide wind of rhythm", transforming into shifting forms like "sail, rose, wing". And in "Rıhtımda Uyuyan Gemi," a moored ship is imagined as a sleeping engine, waiting for the "morning hour" to awaken, much like the latent energy of machines in his fiction. These poems suggest that Tanpınar thought of rhythm, selfhood, and literary form not as static structures, but as shifting arrangements of forces, pauses, and movements—comparable to how machines function and transform (Tanpınar, 2017).

Moreover, this transformation transfers the organization of time into the structure of our organs, into "our nervous apparatus":

Just as, in poetry, great musical phrases and cycles align with our respiratory system, so too must the short story contain cycles that embody our excitement and attention. Words, events, emotions, and our patience, attention, and capacity to endure life's tragedies should rise and fall like pulses, maintaining a rhythmic flow. Thus, we transition from an ordered sequence of thoughts or words into the organic movements of interconnected actions, as seen in dance (Tanpınar, 2011e, p. 431).

In the foreword to *Mahur Beste*, serialized in *Ülkü* beginning in January 1944 and left unfinished, Mehmet Kaplan frames the novel as the result of an assemblage [terkip] of temperament, time, and objects —described as "mysterious mechanisms" (Tanpınar, 1999, p. 7)— that weave the fabric of life. Kaplan's framing situates the novel as a dynamic entity, a system in which temperament, time, and objects interact actively, generating new narrative and meaning forms.

At the novel's conclusion, through a letter addressed to Behçet Bey, the protagonist, Tanpınar offers another perspective on the interplay between fiction and machinery. While Behçet Bey's story remains incomplete, the letter serves as a metafictional closure, presenting the transformation of a person into a narrative as a process of self-awareness. By becoming a fictional character, Behçet Bey gains an external perspective on himself, fostering deeper self-understanding. Through *Mahur Beste*, a mirror held to him, Behçet Bey begins to discern the role of himself, others, and creation in what he previously deemed random occurrences. Once perceived as chaotic, fortune acquires a discernible determinacy [muayyeniyet]. Thus, he encounters "a multitude of mechanisms at work within himself" (Tanpınar, 1999, p. 194).

In this way, the act of fictionalization becomes a means of reconfiguring perception and understanding, enabling the protagonist to perceive the contingent, constructed nature of his experiences. The novel's metafictional elements further highlight the productive tension between randomness and determinacy, where narrative and subjectivity emerge through transformative processes, creating spaces for self-awareness and new meanings.

In *Mahur Beste*, the narrative becomes an assemblage of temperament, time, and objects, embodying the machinic interplay of elements. Through fictionalization, the protagonist gains self-awareness, revealing how assemblages reshape perception and highlight the constructed, contingent nature of experience. This interplay of deterritorialization and reterritorialization underscores the transformative potential of both narrative and assemblages, where meaning emerges from interconnected relationships.

Tanpınar's essay "Bir Uçak Yolculuğundan Notlar," published in *Varlık* on January 1, 1958, provides an insightful exploration of his engagement with the discourse on machines, particularly through the subjective experience of air travel. In the essay, the passenger's sense of self is described as fragmented, perceived as "a series of interruptions" (Tanpınar, 1970a, p. 205), as though the airplane's propeller disperses not only air but also the passenger's being. This fragmentation encapsulates how machinic assemblages reorganize identities, perceptions, and spaces, revealing the airplane's role as more than a mere tool for transportation. It becomes an active agent in this assemblage, reshaping the passenger's perception of space, self, and time.

Tanpınar likens the aerial view generated by the airplane's movement to a space oscillating between Cubism and abstract art, rendering the airplane itself an artist. He even compares the plane's descent onto the tarmac to the conclusion of a cinematic experience. This aesthetic framing demonstrates how machines generate new sensory and perceptual frameworks, reshaping how humans interpret their surroundings. In other words, the airplane reorganizes spatial and temporal relations, turning fragmented perceptions into a machine-mediated experience that creates new ways of seeing and being in the world.

Within this framework, the passenger becomes a "machine of idle attentions and thoughts suspended in the void" (Tanpınar, 1970a, p. 210), transforming the journey into a distinctly cinematic phenomenon. This process exemplifies how assemblages redistribute agency, often subordinating individual elements to the system's overall operation. The airplane-passenger dynamic highlights how human agency is absorbed into the larger mechanism, leaving the passenger as a passive participant in the machine's rhythms and flows.

Significantly, the brevity and speed of air travel preclude the introspective practices characterizing other forms of travel. The airplane, Tanpınar observes, "does not allow the psychological mechanisms of old journeys to operate" (Tanpınar, 1970a, p. 212). While passengers experience fragmented selfhood and aesthetic impressions from a largely passive stance, subjectivity and agency reside solely with the pilot. The pilot integrates with the machine to form a synchronized unit of operation, while the passengers remain detached, unable to engage physically or psychologically with the machine. The absence of direct interaction creates a hierarchical structure where participation and control are limited to specific components of the assemblage.

Tanpınar highlights this dynamic through a conversation with a pilot, who states: "At that moment, I become liberated with the machine; our pulses merge, but on a very different plane. I am confronted with a multitude of challenges that I must overcome" (Tanpınar, 1970a, p. 206). The pilot's account illustrates the mutual constitution of human and machine within the assemblage, where agency and subjectivity⁵ are shared and amplified through synchronization. This dynamic reveals how machines and humans form systems extending beyond individual capacities, creating new forms of agency and interaction. However, from the passenger's perspective, the exclusivity of this integration underscores the limited role of others aboard, who remain on the periphery of this collaborative process.

For Tanpınar, this interplay evokes the archetypal relationship between a rider and a horse, underscoring a deep synchronization between human and machine. However, this dynamic is unavailable to the airplane passenger. Unlike car passengers, who can engage physically and psychologically with the machine, airplane passengers lack such interaction. Tanpınar elaborates:

On a plane, the only truly living being is the pilot. In other forms of travel, almost everyone retains some degree of agency, but in a plane, only the pilot possesses it. He thinks, hesitates, decides, and even truly fears, for only he experiences the

⁵ By *subjectivity*, I refer to the Deleuzian-Guattarian understanding of subject-formation as a distributed, dynamic process constituted through assemblages, affects, and machinic flows, rather than a unified or stable interior self. Subjectivity is not given but produced—always in flux, always relational—emerging through interactions between bodies, signs, technologies, and environments. It is thus a mode of becoming, shaped by forces both human and nonhuman.

psychological conditions that activate the mechanism of fear. In a car, for instance, the proximity of the ground and the possibilities of stopping the vehicle, opening the door, and jumping out allow you to consider interrupting the driver's actions. You might think, 'I'll open the door and jump; the rest is up to fate.' These possibilities excite the imagination, giving rise to fear itself. Moreover, a car passenger mimics the movements of the car, participating in its motion. At high speeds, we all unconsciously imitate the car—we lean left and right with it, adopting stances to face danger alongside it. In air travel, such possibilities, and the voluntary engagement they foster, do not exist. Neither does any physical participation in the machine's motion. The dangers, moreover, are often of a kind we do not recognize or understand. No, the airplane passenger is merely a part of the airplane, entirely subject to the pilot's command (Tanpinar, 1970a, pp. 207-208).

Thus, the passenger is reduced to an extension of the machine, stripped of agency and engagement, while the pilot embodies the human subjectivity required to master the human-machine interface. The airplane-machine assemblage thus territorializes its components into distinct roles, organizing their capacities and interactions within the system.

Tanpinar's reflections on air travel reveal how this experience reconfigures traditional relationships between machines, the self, and perception. The airplane assemblage not only alters spatial and temporal perception but also redefines human roles within its system, emphasizing the transformative potential of machines to generate new configurations of agency, identity, and experience.

By foregrounding Tanpinar's machine-based concepts and their resonance with the notion of assemblage, this section has demonstrated the multifaceted ways in which poetry, the short story, and the novel—alongside the embodied experience of air travel—may all be understood as dynamic systems of interaction and transformation. In each case, Tanpinar's vision underscores the interdependence of material, emotional, and conceptual elements, revealing an ongoing negotiation between coherence and heterogeneity. Yet these insights also invite a broader inquiry into how larger-scale structures constrain, direct, or otherwise reconfigure such interactions. Moving forward, an exploration of Deleuze and Guattari's distinction between molar and molecular machines will further clarify how these expansive, stabilizing systems interface with the fluid, creative forces at work in Tanpinar's assemblages.

2.Molar and Molecular Tensions

In Deleuze and Guattari's framework, the molar machine refers to large-scale systems of organization that impose structure, hierarchy, and stability on dynamic processes. These machines operate through overcoding, territorialization, and centralization, unifying diverse elements into cohesive, often stratified structures. While they provide stability and efficiency, molar machines can suppress creativity and fluidity by prioritizing control and standardization. In contrast, the molecular machine functions at a micro level, characterized by fluidity, variability, and resistance to stratification. Molecular processes involve decentralized flows of creativity and transformation, challenging molar systems and enabling moments of innovation and subversion. (Deleuze & Guattari, 2000, pp. 251, 281, 286, 340; 2005, pp. 35, 212-217, 223)

This tension between molar and molecular machines finds vivid expression in Tanpınar's works, where he often juxtaposes mechanization with creativity. For example, Tanpınar critiques the "American-style production [istihsal] machine," which prioritizes quantity over quality and represents the rigid standardization of molar machines, in his article "Yahya Kemal'e Hürmet," published in *Ana Yurt* in 1934. Against this mechanized production, Yahya Kemal's art embodies the vitality of molecular processes—meticulous craftsmanship and evocative beauty that defy sterile repetition. Tanpınar highlights Yahya Kemal's work as an assemblage where creativity and precision resist the homogenizing tendencies of large-scale systems.

This critique deepens in Tanpınar's article "Hayat Karşısında Romancı," published in *Ülkü* in 1943, where he laments the decline of craftsmanship in the novel. He describes contemporary literature as dominated by a "mechanized skill," a molar machine that reduces novels to formulaic products. This overcoding tendency suppresses the creative flows that characterize molecular assemblages, where mastery and originality flourish. Tanpınar sees accomplished novelists as rare figures who disrupt the rigid norms of literary production, embodying the molecular potential to reconfigure and invigorate the literary field.

Further illustrating these dynamics, Tanpınar's weariness with mechanized narratives appears in his critique of Russian novels and short stories, which he likens to a "clockwork mechanism." These works, I suggest, can be read as reflecting what Deleuze and Guattari would later theorize as a literary molar machine—so rigidly overcoded that it drains characters of vitality and emotional depth. Their despair and madness become predictable, reduced to the mechanical operation of a "nerve-wracking spring." In this context, the molar machine imposes a rigid determinism that stifles the open-ended creativity necessary for compelling literary production.

Through these critiques, Tanpınar underscores the broader tension between molar and molecular machines. While molar machines organize and standardize, ensuring efficiency and reproducibility, they risk sterilizing the generative potential of literary assemblages. In contrast, molecular flows represent the dynamic creativity of artistry and imagination, which resists mechanized repetition and allows for the emergence of nuanced, evocative works. Tanpınar's vision of the literary machine embraces this molecular vitality, advocating for a transformative approach to art that preserves the richness and unpredictability of human creativity.

This theme of mechanization surfaces again in "Evin Sahibi," serialized in *Ülkü* between January and March 1943. However, here, the narrative shifts to examine how standardizing and reductive machinality functions as a form of self-escape. The narrator, living in a household plagued by an uncanny snake and the calamities of the time, finds fleeting solace in perceiving himself as part of a larger mechanism. He describes the "peculiar comfort of being a cog in the military mechanism" during the war (Tanpınar, 2011f, p. 130). This comfort aligns with what Deleuze and Guattari term machinic subjectivity, where an individual's sense of self is produced not as a fixed identity but as the result of interactions within a broader machinic assemblage. (Deleuze & Guattari, 2005, pp. 36-37) By integrating himself into the war machine, the narrator experiences both anonymity and a paradoxical sense of self-reflection, highlighting how subjectivity emerges from the interplay of individual and collective processes.

The narrator's sense of therapeutic relief through participation in mechanical order reveals the molar tendencies in mechanization. The military mechanism operates as a

molar machine, providing stability and a clear framework for his fragmented psyche. By subjecting himself to the discipline and order of this system, he temporarily alleviates the psychological turmoil rooted in what he calls a "hereditary hysteria" stemming from his family and society. The molar machine imposes a rigid structure that overcodes the chaos of his life, offering a reprieve but at the cost of individuality and creative freedom. This reflects the dual nature of molar machines in Deleuze and Guattari's framework: while they stabilize and organize, they suppress molecular flows of desire and transformation, reducing the narrator to a functional component in the larger system.

The story also illustrates how mechanization can suppress molecular flows of affect and relationality, particularly in the narrator's interactions with his wife, Zeynep. After losing all his loved ones to the uncanny snake, madness, and various calamities, the narrator becomes consumed by a fear of losing Zeynep. This obsession, deeply tied to his past traumas, culminates in a climactic moment of delusion where he believes the snake is strangling her. In an effort to save her, he nearly suffocates her himself, an act that leads to his hospitalization. Before this catastrophic breakdown, the couple finds fleeting peace in their shared machinal tasks:

I truly began to live oppressive and cruel days: I could hardly speak to her. Each of us would invent a task that absolutely needed to be done at that moment and complete it like a machine; at times, when I thought she was entirely absorbed in the task, I would watch her, admiring and wretched (Tanpinar, 2011f, pp. 146-147).

This scene encapsulates the tension between molar and molecular forces within their relationship. The repetitive tasks they perform "like a machine" offer a temporary reprieve, reflecting the stabilizing role of molar systems. However, these mechanical routines suppress the molecular flows of emotional intimacy and creativity that could allow for a deeper connection. The narrator's admiration for Zeynep during these moments underscores his alienation, as their mechanical interactions reinforce distance rather than closeness.

Deleuze and Guattari's concept of machinic subjectivity sheds light on the narrator's complex relationship with mechanization. While the molar machine of military discipline provides him with temporary relief and structure, it also suppresses the molecular potentials for emotional and relational transformation. Similarly, the couple's mechanical routines stabilize their relationship momentarily but ultimately fail to address the underlying despair and alienation. The text thus engages with the dual nature of machinality, showing its capacity to produce both stability and suppression, self-awareness and alienation. Through these tensions, "Evin Sahibi" resonates with the broader dynamics of molar and molecular machines, illustrating how mechanization shapes subjectivity and relationality in both productive and reductive ways.

3. Automaton Figures, Mechanization, and the Erosion of Individuality

Building on these reflections in "Evin Sahibi," Tanpinar's broader portrayal of automaton-like characters similarly reveals how mechanization can impose rigid conditions on individual agency, often verging on alienation. In what follows, we turn to these figures across Tanpinar's works, examining how their repetitive, machine-like qualities accentuate the tension between creative potential and the erosion of individuality.

Mechanization manifests in Tanpınar's works through the depiction of automaton figures, understood here as entities capable of generating their own sense of being while operating within a self-contained logic. In Tanpınar's narratives, such figures embody a tension between autonomy and mechanical rigidity, suggesting a liminal state where individuality confronts external structures.

Abdullah Efendi compares a "dark-skinned man" at a nearby restaurant table to an automaton in the story "Abdullah Efendi'nin Rüyalari," serialized in *Tasvir-i Efkâr* in 1941. The man's mechanical movements, as he rhythmically leans toward and away from the table while eating pasta, mesmerize Abdullah Efendi (Tanpınar, 2011a, p. 13). This portrayal emphasizes a loss of organic vitality, capturing a state in which repetitive actions dominate individuality. Repetition signals a disconnection from a generative sense of self: rather than evoking creative potential, it highlights the rigidity and alienation that emerge from excessively mechanical patterns.

A similar motif appears in "Yaz Yağmuru," published in *Yeni İstanbul* in 1955. Sabri Bey's encounter with a rain-soaked woman in his garden triggers a cascade of possibilities, memories, and inner worlds. The narrator observes that the woman "activated many other devices" within Sabri Bey, linking her presence to an automaton-like existence (Tanpınar, 2011p, p. 193). Her halting speech, delicate movements, and the impression that she was "living in a completely separate time, unique to herself" transform her, in Sabri Bey's perception, into a puppet or automaton (Tanpınar, 2011p, p. 161). This transformation underscores her role as a figure existing at the edge of materiality and abstraction. Sabri Bey perceives her as evolving beyond physical substance, describing her as a puppet from a musical box or an ethereal expression that seems to move independently of its material form:

And this state transformed her delicate, beautiful existence as a woman, transferring her to another plane. She became a puppet emerging from one of those musical boxes once found in nearly every household, immediately captivating one with its startling automaton movements, accompanied by the pre-prepared sentimental tune within us. Soon, she turned into an old portrait, framed in gilt, continuing to live with poses and gazes chosen who knows how long ago. At times, she went even further, abandoning her entire material form and settling within one's soul with an expression that moved as if it had a life of its own (Tanpınar, 2011p, pp. 161–162).

Here, the depiction emphasizes the fragile boundary between the corporeal and the conceptual. While she possesses a certain evocative presence, there is also a melancholy sense of diminished individuality —her image and movements are subsumed by a mechanically predetermined logic that reduces spontaneous interaction.

The mechanistic imagery extends to Behçet Bey, the protagonist of *Mahur Beste* and a secondary character in *Sahnenin Dışındakiler*. Cemal's impressions of Behçet Bey highlight his automaton-like demeanor, describing him as a "short, unattractive man" with "old clothes, a pointed beard, invariably starched shirt, and automaton-like demeanor [otomat tavırlar]." Behçet Bey's rigid, puppet-like qualities mirror those of the woman in "Yaz Yağmuru," reinforcing the theme of mechanized existence: "This man (...) resembled a puppet and observed himself in at least thirty mirrors every day" (Tanpınar, 2011, pp. 108–109). Instead of suggesting untapped creative potential, his repetitive self-observation and constrained behavior underscore a dwindling vitality. The automaton figure here points to a narrower, more alienated mode of being.

Tanpınar's most sustained engagement with automaton imagery appears in *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü*, serialized in *Yeni İstanbul* from June 20 to September 30, 1954. Halit Ayarçı envisions the institute as a cohesive assemblage, modeled on the structure of a ship, comprising machinery, railings, cabins, crew, and passengers. The institute functions as both a machinic assemblage and a living organism, integrating all its elements—including redundant ones—into a unified whole (Tanpınar, 2008, p. 246). Although this overall design might initially seem creative, its cohesion imposes a uniformity that stifles individuality. For instance, Halit Ayarçı insists that personnel adopt a "uniform, pleasant, and measured" manner of speech, ensuring they "speak and move in perfect synchronization, like a clock" (Tanpınar, 2008, p. 248). He enthusiastically describes this as "a sort of automatism," likening the personnel to "record-player people": "People who talk and stop talking just like alarm clocks, right? Record-player people... Brilliant!" (Tanpınar, 2008, p. 249).

While this synchronized functioning might be read as a systematic potential for collective harmony, the emphasis on uniformity ultimately strips individuals of autonomy, reducing them to mechanical parts of a larger system.⁶ As Hayri İrdal rises in status, his wife Pakize's actions likewise come to symbolize mechanical repetition. Hayri perceives her as "a wound-up clock, an automaton" (Tanpınar, 2008, p. 288), reflecting the erosion of spontaneity in their relationship. Rather than a liberating coordination, it is a stifling adherence to routine. When meaningful connections fail to develop, relationships in Tanpınar's work risk collapsing into repetitive mechanisms, blurring the boundaries between human agency and mechanical operation.⁷

Such depictions point to the broader contrast between the possible creative dimensions of synchronized processes and the alienation that occurs when they become rigidly overcoded. In Tanpınar's view, automaton figures underscore how restrictive structures suppress human complexity by insisting on repetitive, mechanical behaviors. Whether in the regimented synchronization of *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü*, the puppet-like movements in "Yaz Yağmuru" or the detached rigidity of Behçet Bey, these characters illustrate how large-scale systems can impose fixed identities and routines. While such systems may offer stability, they also risk undermining the flows of creativity, desire, and transformation that would allow individuality to thrive. Through these depictions, Tanpınar critiques the alienation inherent in mechanization, highlighting the loss of spontaneity and vitality when human agency is subsumed into a predetermined logic.

⁶ This reduction to "mechanical parts" through imposed uniformity is precisely what Özen Nergis Dolcerocca (2017) identifies as a target of Tanpınar's modernist critique in *The Time Regulation Institute*. She argues that Tanpınar portrays the Institute's "drive for synchronization" and other "calibrating forms of temporal order" as deeply "oppressive to the subject's inner temporal flow." Consequently, the novel's exploration of "plural temporal experiences," the inherent "aksak rhythm" (limping, irregular temporality) of its characters, and the presence of "free spirited clocks" function as intrinsic challenges to such mechanizing and standardizing efforts. (Dolcerocca, 2017).

⁷ Abdurrahman Saygılı identifies the Institute as an "*absürt bürokrasi*"—an organisation that fulfils every Weberian requirement of modern administration while simultaneously exposing the emptiness of those very forms. Through concepts such as "rational-irrationality" and "parodic institution (*şaka-kurum*)," he connects Tanpınar's satire to Kafka's vision of bureaucratic futility and to Turkey's own rhetoric of technical progress (Saygılı, 2018, pp. 348-359).

4. The Social Machine and Tanpınar's Critique of Mechanized Control

Building on the exploration of automaton figures and mechanized subjectivities in the previous section, we now turn to a broader perspective on how social machine operates as all-encompassing mechanisms. In doing so, we once again encounter Deleuze and Guattari's theoretical framework, which helps illuminate the coding, regulation, and suppression of individuality in Tanpınar's narratives.

Deleuze and Guattari define the social machine not as a metaphor but as a literal system integrating humans, institutions, and technical mechanisms into a cohesive network of production and regulation. It operates by coding flows—labor, desire, goods, and meaning—within a specific societal structure, ensuring that these flows align with dominant modes of power and production. This coding process is fundamental to organizing social order, as it assigns roles, values, and limits to maintain stability. However, it is also repressive, restricting alternative configurations and expressions. In precapitalist societies, the social machine tightly bound flows within kinship systems and rituals. In capitalism, flows are largely decoded, abstracted into forms like money and market exchange. This shift introduces instability, requiring constant reterritorialization to reintegrate liberated flows into new systems of control. The social machine thus sustains itself through the perpetual interplay of decoding and reterritorialization, continually adapting and reorganizing. (Deleuze & Guattari, 2000, pp. 33, 141-142, 148-149, 194, 245, 262-263; 2005, pp. 434-435, 456-458)

Tanpınar's narratives resonate with this framework, depicting how individual and collective lives are shaped, constrained, and animated by the invisible operations of the social machine. Through images of coding, mechanization, and systemic control, his works probe the tension between personal agency and the overarching mechanisms of societal regulation.

In the story "Teslim," the bureaucrat Emin Bey, visiting a small town for inspection, becomes acutely aware of the social machine's workings. The subtlety of the townspeople's quiet conversations, ambiguous behaviors, and intricate movements captivate him, placing him at a pivotal intersection between the abstract governance of his bureaucratic career and the tangible, coded politics of the town. Politics here is not a contest of ideas or grand narratives but is embedded in the daily gestures and actions of local power figures. This is reflected in the "neglected" mansions of the town's gentry and in its shops and stores, which resemble remnants of a disaster (Tanpınar, 2011, p. 216). These dynamics are communicated through conversations, silences, speaking styles, and body language, forming a network of coded interactions that organize the social and economic flows of the town. Emin Bey describes these interactions as "codes decipherable only by those familiar with them" (Tanpınar, 2011, p. 217). However, he finds this code paradoxical; it is essential for engaging with the town yet offers little insight into the hidden passions and causes driving these interactions: "Because the great apparatus beneath this commotion, the passions and causes driving it, were things you were entirely unfamiliar with" (Tanpınar, 2011, p. 217).

Contrasted with the spontaneity and fluidity of urban life, the rhythm of this town is governed by a rigid program. Marriages, resource allocations, intimacy, distance, crises, scandals, memories, and oblivion all unfold within a tightly controlled framework. Terms such as "code," "apparatus," and "program" highlight the mechanized nature of the town's social structure, which Emin Bey recognizes as a "life machine" (Tanpınar, 2011,

p. 217), a system that organizes social relations and dictates individual behaviors.⁸ As he begins to understand and partially immerse himself in this social machine, he realizes that transformation is nearly impossible outside of its mechanisms. The structure is so entrenched that submission is inevitable, and the totalizing machine automates the roles of individuals, allowing only minor variations that the system swiftly neutralizes. This deterministic vision shows how the social machine not only shapes the town's outward operations but also restricts the scope for human interaction and resistance. By suppressing alternatives and neutralizing differences, it sustains itself through a mix of organization and repression.

In *Sahnenin Dışındakiler*, the narrative provides another view of this social machine, operating both in personal lives and within the broader context of occupied Istanbul. For Sabiha and Cemal, traditional structures like family and school —normally sources of stability— become sites of unease and mechanized oppression. Familial discord and illness activate what Sabiha calls “a host of dangerous mechanisms” (Tanpınar, 2011, p. 26), fueling her fear of emotional volatility. She expresses this to Cemal by way of the machine metaphor: “What I truly fear (...) is resembling my mother, becoming a complaint machine of her kind...” (Tanpınar, 2011, p. 40). Similarly, Cemal experiences his school years as being trapped in “the teeth of a machine through which he was forced to pass due to this interminable childhood” (Tanpınar, 2011, pp. 46-47). Though not overtly oppressive, this institutional machine is relentless and exhausting. Above all, the “crushing and altering fear of the social machine” (Tanpınar, 2011, p. 50) continues to overshadow any hope of refuge.

Yet the streets temporarily offer Cemal and his friends a respite, a chance for more genuine encounters away from the strict codes of institutional life. Over time, however, Cemal's estrangement from this environment sharpens his awareness of the machine's omnipresence. Feeling “flung out of the assemblage [*terkip*]” (Tanpınar, 2011, p. 210), he envisions society as a torrent pulling oppressors and oppressed together. From this vantage point, he labels it “the game in its stark reality, the terrifying and infinite machine with every part operating separately” (211). Despite any superficial alterations, its fundamental dynamics remain constant, prioritizing “the whole against the individual” (Tanpınar, 2011, p. 211). By the novel's conclusion, Sabiha stands as a tragic figure caught “between the teeth of that dreadful machine called life” (Tanpınar, 2011, p. 296), her energy and hope drained by a system committed to its own continuity.

The machine metaphor expands further to encompass broader societal mechanisms, particularly in the figure of İhsan, who joins the resistance movement against the occupation. In his view, the occupiers and their collaborators form a “mechanism” (Tanpınar, 2011, p. 213, p. 214) that must be dismantled, a goal he considers more critical than participating solely in frontline combat. Cemal echoes this notion while investigating a falsely accused man who is reduced to “a small, pitiful, frightened

⁸ What Emin Bey recognizes as a “life machine” organizing the town is explored by Emrah Efe Khayyat (2014) through Tanpınar's phrase, the “machine underneath this swarm” (p. 224). Khayyat identifies this as the engine of the town's “perfectly functional order of life” (p. 223) and its distinct “real form of politics” (p. 225), a system fueled by local “passions and causes” (p. 224) rather than abstract ideals. This potent, self-contained machinery, intertwined with the earth and market, is what Emin Bey confronts, leading to his eventual “submission” (pp. 230-232) to its operational logic.

creature” (Tanpınar, 2011, p. 243) by the “mechanism” of an unjust judicial system. Referring to it as a “justice machine,” Cemal underscores how institutional processes codify and wield power at the expense of personal agency. Thus, the social machine emerges as both omnipresent and multifaceted, shaping individual lives through personal interactions and institutional mechanisms. On the one hand, it maintains social order; on the other, it exhausts those caught up in its unrelenting gears, stressing the complexities of resistance and survival under the weight of mechanized power.

In *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü*, Seyit Lûtfullah’s alchemical experiments intersect with his vision of the justice machine—a construct that, while idiosyncratically Tanpınar’s, can be retrospectively understood in light of what Deleuze and Guattari would later theorize as the systematized operations of control permeating all aspects of life. For Lûtfullah, justice is not an abstract principle, but something deeply tied to mechanical processes of balance and order.⁹ As Hayri İrdal notes, “This strange man had a sense of justice and injustice that operated almost like an independent apparatus, sometimes even constituting his primary personality through the peculiar, mechanical movements he performed from within” (Tanpınar, 2008, pp. 48-49). Rather than an exalted value, justice here is presented as embedded in methodical processes, reflecting how the social machine permeates moral structures.

Hayri himself struggles with external mechanisms’ overwhelming influence in his personal life. His second marriage to Pakize unfolds under the metaphor of an external machine delivering commands:

The machine was set up outside, operating with commands coming from the exterior. At times, it accelerated; at others, it slowed down or even stopped. In those moments, neither the saw, nor the knife, nor anything else was functioning. Fear immediately replaced distress and agony. It was the fear of what we referred to as ‘a little later’ (Tanpınar, 2008, p. 174).

This image conveys profound helplessness, illustrating how external systems subsume personal choices and emotions.

Mechanistic imagery also appears when Hayri observes his future son-in-law playing a game in a coffeehouse. Here, the sense of control feels internalized, as if the young man’s body is animated by an autonomous mechanism. “The game wasn’t an action he performed outwardly; it had entered his body, activating every part of it separately, pecking and tearing at things from within” (Tanpınar, 2008, p. 184). His limbs and expressions operate like independent machine parts — “His right foot... moved like the pedal of a sewing machine under the table. His throat relentlessly launched itself at the surroundings; his fingers, hooked like claws, constantly gripped onto and hung from

⁹ Emre Ayvaz, in his essay “Sonradan Gelenin Tanıklığı”, argues that Tanpınar’s use of the term *cihaz* (device/mechanism) signifies an obsolete, dysfunctional apparatus that mediates subjectivity and historical perception. Ayvaz interprets this “device” as a Freudian-surrealist mechanism operating independently of its host, generating grotesque, anachronistic effects. In *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü*, Seyit Lûtfullah embodies this “independent device” (müstakil cihaz), which classifies reality through irrational logics akin to a “Surrealist installation.” For Ayvaz, Tanpınar’s *cihaz* reflects a tension between defunct systems (e.g., İbnülemin’s outdated worldview) and modernity’s disorienting demands, where the device’s failure to function produces humor, alienation, and a “naive” aesthetic. Ayvaz suggests Tanpınar’s implicit engagement with Freudian concepts—repression, displacement, and the uncanny—reveals how these mechanisms mediate self-deception and historical dissonance (Ayvaz, 2006, pp. 153–163).

things..." (Tanpınar, 2008, p. 184)—dramatizing the tension between external control and internal fragmentation in shaping human behavior.

These motifs illustrate the subtle yet forceful manner in which unseen systems mold the individual. Whether through external pressures or internal habits, body and mind come under the sway of forces far beyond immediate perception, hinting at the complex interdependence of human agency and systematic power.

Finally, in *Aydaki Kadın*, Tanpınar continues to explore the interplay between societal structures and individual psychology—a dynamic that can be illuminatingly read through the lens of Deleuze and Guattari's later ideas on how machines, both literal and metaphorical, mediate experience. Selim's exam room, with its exaggerated kindness from teachers and examiners, appears "a futile machine with all its parts operating externally, whose purpose he could not grasp" (Tanpınar, 1987, p. 63). The elaborate yet detached systems surrounding him deepen his sense of alienation. Later, his "mechanized steps" on the island and inability to carry any thought to its conclusion (Tanpınar, 1987, p. 85) suggest that he has internalized these mechanical forces, operating almost programmatically rather than autonomously.

Atif's role highlights the suffocating aspect of political engagement; he speaks of feeling trapped in "a strange, terrifying machine" (Tanpınar, 1987, p. 97), underscoring how grand systems of power can overwhelm individuals. Once he and Selim part ways, Selim describes his mental weariness as a machine needing external inputs to function: "his mental machine needed something to consume" (Tanpınar, 1987, p. 99). Here, the mind itself becomes a processing apparatus, subordinated to external events rather than genuine self-reflection.

Selim's emotional turmoil is likewise presented in mechanical terms. During an encounter with Leyla, his feelings—ranging from jealousy and compassion to fear of loss—are "like the switches of an electric power station" (Tanpınar, 1987, pp. 120-121), waiting to be activated by external triggers. Leyla, in turn, disparages "psychological machines," calling Adrienne a "machine of suffering" and rejecting "the calculating machines, the thinking machines, not even the memory machines" (Tanpınar, 1987, pp. 188-189). Her words highlight the alienation caused when human behavior becomes automated and deprived of introspection.

Taken together, the characters in *Aydaki Kadın* demonstrate how both external structures and internal processes can become mechanized, eclipsing individuality and spontaneity. In line with Deleuze and Guattari's social machine, Tanpınar's vision highlights the pervasive intrusion of mechanization into every facet of life, revealing the deep complexity and entrenchment of power.

These textual examples reveal how Tanpınar's narrative landscapes vividly embody the workings of a social machine as conceived by Deleuze and Guattari. Rather than functioning merely as a metaphor, this machine organizes human behavior, relationships, and thought processes through coding, repression, and the ever-present need for reterritorialization. Tanpınar's fictions thus illustrate how individuals—whether bureaucrats, students, or those caught in personal or political upheaval—become enmeshed in broader systems that shape their desires, actions, and identities. The result is a tension between fleeting moments of freedom or insight and the pervasive machinery

of social control, underscoring Tanpınar's nuanced critique of how power is maintained and reproduced across both internal and external domains.

5. Constructive Machinic Dimensions in Tanpınar

Building on the preceding exploration of how social machines can constrain individuals and societies, we now turn to another facet of Tanpınar's machine-based concept, one that underscores not only oppressive or automaton-like structures but also their productive and transformative capacities.

The concept of the machine in Tanpınar's works, often linked to oppressive or automaton-like mechanisms, also carries a celebratory dimension, highlighting its potential for creation and continuity. While this duality resonates with broader debates about the machinic as both a source of constraint and creativity, Tanpınar characteristically emphasizes the constructive and stabilizing role of the machine within the literary field. This affirmative outlook is particularly evident in his treatment of key figures in Turkish literature, whom he portrays as master builders of enduring literary systems grounded in language, form, and tradition.

Tanpınar, praises Nazım Hikmet as "one of those who built a good and robust language machine" (Tanpınar, 2011m, p. 113). This highlights the constructive potential of language, where artistic labor produces cohesive and influential structures. At the same time, the focus on solidity and durability can overshadow the fluid, unpredictable forces capable of unsettling established forms. Consequently, while Tanpınar acknowledges the transformative potential of such language machines, he remains firmly anchored in a discernible tradition.

In the essay "Türk Edebiyatında Cereyanlar," Tanpınar likewise characterizes Halid Ziya's novels as a "realist-aspiring style machine" (Tanpınar, 2011m, p. 119). Here, the machine functions as a vehicle for stylistic sophistication and cultural ambition, reinforcing established norms while propelling literary evolution. Yet, describing it as "realist-aspiring" reflects a propensity to reinforce existing paradigms rather than break or exceed them, a stance that diverges from views that treat instability and divergence as equally valid forms of literary creation.

Tanpınar also observes that many of Sait Faik's characters are "people who had either been flung out of the intricate social machine or had never experienced being part of it" (Tanpınar, 2011m, p. 123). This observation introduces a tension in his machinic perspective: systems that regulate and stratify society may exclude certain individuals, leaving them on its margins. Their separation from the "intricate social machine" could represent either a degree of freedom or a state of alienation; however, Tanpınar presents this condition not as a spark of creative rupture but rather as a form of disconnection that may invite reintegration or signify loss.

Similarly, in "Ahmed Cemil ile Mülâkat" (*Ana Yurt*, 1933), a fictional interview with the protagonist of *Mai ve Siyah*, Tanpınar explains to Ahmet Cemil that Yahya Kemal constructed "a magnificent language machine" (Tanpınar, 2011c, p. 274). This portrayal elevates literary creation to a practice of meticulous precision and grandeur, celebrating the ability to build something monumental and lasting. Nevertheless, the emphasis on magnificence and structural coherence reveals a preference for mastery and unity over more deconstructive or experimental literary impulses.

This perspective draws on the influence of Paul Valéry, whom Tanpınar cites in his article "Paul Valéry," published in *Görüş* in 1930: "Writing, above all, is constructing

the most solid and authentic language machine” (Tanpınar, 2011j, p. 453). Valéry’s impact underscores a shared admiration for craftsmanship and the architectonic nature of literary production. Yet, prioritizing solidity and authenticity can overshadow the more volatile, transformative potentials of linguistic assemblages that might disrupt or subvert inherited orders.

Consequently, while Tanpınar’s machine-based concept celebrates the creative labor of literary construction, it remains anchored in a vision of stability, mastery, and tradition. Notably absent is an extended interrogation of fluidity and unpredictability, forces that might challenge or destabilize these systems from within. By conceiving of the machine primarily as a means of refinement and endurance, Tanpınar offers a compelling contrast to perspectives that embrace the machinic as a site of rupture, reinvention, and perpetual transformation.

6. Machinic Transformations, Subjectivity, and the Transfer Principle

Building on the previous discussion of Tanpınar’s constructive vision of the machine, this section turns to a more fluid and disorienting facet of his machinic concept. Here, Tanpınar foregrounds fragmentation, multiplicity, and transformation rather than mastery and stability.

Language and style machines, as Tanpınar envisions them, process existing elements, relationships, and connections to enable transfers and transformations. This machinic principle extends beyond language and style in works like “Abdullah Efendi’nin Rüyaları”, where it guides the construction of events and psychological states. The machine in this context is not merely a concept but a framework for navigating the fractured, multifaceted modern self, emphasizing continuous flux over unity. In this story, Abdullah Efendi’s experience at a restaurant becomes a gateway into disorientation and change. Even as he attempts to enjoy himself with friends, a second self within him remains watchful, preventing him from fully losing himself in the moment. This doubling encapsulates the machinic notion of simultaneous multiplicities: Abdullah Efendi is both actor and observer at once. Surveying the other customers, he finds that the boundary between ordinary and extraordinary dissolves, leading him on a mental expedition “at the borders of reason” (Tanpınar, 2011a, p. 20). His perceptions mutate: he watches a beautiful woman at his table lose the coherence of her body—her legs and lips take on independent existence— and another woman’s body vanishes mid-conversation, leaving behind only moving clothes.¹⁰

Unlike earlier representations that stress a unity between organism and machine, this story focuses on the organism’s fragmentation, with organs gaining independence from

¹⁰ As Murat Gülsoy emphasizes, “Abdullah Efendi’nin Rüyaları” traces the descent of a “mystic without God,” whose experiences unfold not through transcendence but via the inner workings of a restless psyche. For Gülsoy, the protagonist is caught in a labyrinth of dream logic and perceptual instability, where doubling, hallucination, and self-fragmentation reflect an internal mechanism of disintegration rather than spiritual awakening. Drawing on Nerval’s *Aurélia*, Gülsoy interprets Tanpınar’s story as a modern, secularized mysticism that dramatizes the psyche’s attempt to narrate itself in the absence of metaphysical anchoring. Especially in the scenes where bodies dissolve or the protagonist imagines delivering his own funeral oration, Gülsoy reads these moments as symptoms of a “soul machine” that processes emotion, memory, and perception through recursive loops and psychic excess (Gülsoy, 2018, pp. 66–67).

the body. Rather than depicting a smoothly functioning unit, this fragmentation unsettles perception and imbues the parts with fluid interrelationships. As Abdullah Efendi, under the influence of alcohol, entertains the idea of objects' potential mutability, his reliance on their stability begins to crumble. The usual sense of connectedness dissolves; objects, organs, and parts take on a flexible complexity. Normally, his mind operates "like a calculator," systematically crunching the day's numbers until they reduce to 1, a symbol of unity [*vahdet*] and divine oneness [*vahdaniyet*]. Yet in the restaurant, his attention fixates on the number 2, signified by the two bottles on the table, which he reads as a foreboding sign of coming trouble. This move from unity to duality marks a fracture in the machinic ideal of coherence, favoring instead a multifaceted interplay of elements.

Such dualities intensify throughout the story, beginning with Abdullah Efendi himself:

It was as if a multitude of curtains and barriers had been lifted. But it didn't stop there; an exceptional depth emerged in his gaze, altering his usual perceptions of distance and identity. This depth, like two mirrors placed opposite each other, multiplied everything his gaze encountered into infinity. Undoubtedly due to this feature, he now saw himself standing three steps ahead, repeatedly performing hesitant movements and trying to discern which of his double identities was the true one (Tanpınar, 2011a, p. 22).

At this juncture, Abdullah Efendi perceives himself as "a changed, solidified, very rusty machine" (Tanpınar, 2011a, p. 22), transitioning from the calculator's rationality to a more chaotic machinic state. The machine now ceases to be purely productive; marked by rust and rigidity, it underscores the tensions inherent in machinic processes of subjectivity. He wants to see and think through the eyes of his shadow or double, realizing that to achieve this, his senses must first operate within that shadow, followed by his mind. He likens this to moving objects and habits from one house to another, believing it will allow him to "perceive the universe with an entirely new apparatus" (Tanpınar, 2011a, p. 23). In the end, through "slow but steady and patient work," he succeeds in transferring himself, suggesting that machinic processes have the power to reshape perception and subjectivity alike.

As previously discussed, when Tanpınar explores these machinic operations of poetry, his use of the term *nakil* (transfer) emerges as particularly significant. Phrases such as "the transfer of the shadowy air of a state of soul into language" and "transposing hidden concordances among objects into different planes" link the machinic directly to the act of transfer. This motif also carries over into *Abdullah Efendi'nin Rüyaları*, where *nakil*, machine, and device permeate the protagonist's experiences, particularly the phenomenon of doubling. Machinicity in this context inherently entails transfer processes, yet, in contrast to conventional mechanical transmissions, these processes possess subjective and metaphysical profundity.

One version of Abdullah Efendi attempts to transfer its experiences to the "real" Abdullah Efendi seated in the restaurant. As this roaming double traverses the city's streets and houses, the prospect of reuniting with its essential self persists. Yet every time it seems close to achieving this integration, a fire interrupts the process, prompting him to imagine the original Abdullah Efendi perishing in the flames. He then envisions himself delivering a funeral oration for this "true" self, articulating Abdullah Efendi's essence to others. Concluding this imagined eulogy, the machinic metaphor surfaces again, as his twin self envisions him as:

This complex [*mudil*] soul machine's most significant aspect was a feeling of disgust. Abdullah was a great mystic, a mystic without God. Love had become the goal of his mysticism. But Abdullah had idealized love to such an extent that he could no longer endure its reality... He was the man bitten to death by the serpent of disgust at his heel. This was the second tragedy of his life (Tanpınar, 2011a, p. 37).

The label "a mystic without God" spotlights a realm of ceaseless transformations in which the oneness of God (*vahdaniyet*) has been lost. Within this sphere, a machine generates multiple Abdullah Efendis, blurring the line between essence (*asıl*) and image (*suret*). Rather than composing a harmonious assemblage, these images break free from a stable core, continually shifting from one state to another as desires and experiences pivot.

Excluded from the unifying core of any totalizing machinic system, Abdullah Efendi instead inhabits the story's fragmented, often fantastical universe, where fresh subjectivities and encounters proliferate. In this sense, the machine acts as a mechanism for dissolving binaries such as essence versus image, revealing a modern subjectivity defined by perpetual transition and fragmentation. Such fluidity not only recasts the role of the machine in Tanpınar's work but also broadens the meaning of *machinic* as an ongoing process of transformation rather than a strictly ordered construct.

7. Innovation, Modification, and the Machinic Vision in "Acıbadem'deki Köşk"

Having previously examined Tanpınar's perspective on machinery, which encompasses processes of subjective fragmentation and transformation in "Abdullah Efendi'nin Rüyaları," we proceed to a more lighthearted yet equally illustrative exploration of machinery in another short story. In this narrative, Tanpınar highlights the creative potential and the comedic consequences of perpetual innovation and reinvention.

The short story "Acıbadem'deki Köşk", published in *Aile* magazine in Fall 1949, revolves around themes of transformation and alteration, shifting attention from essence and image to objects, tools, and the processes of invention, improvement, and modification. This new emphasis underscores a broader machinic vision, in which objects and systems remain in continual flux, reconfigured to assume new meanings and functions. The narrator presents a humorous portrayal of machinery through the inventive—if often unfeasible—contraptions designed by his uncle, Sani Bey, a former naval engineer who resides in a mansion in Acıbadem.

Detailing his bond with a horse named Derviş, "stuck midway through the evolution from horse to human—imprisoned in a horse's organism but with a human psychology" (Tanpınar, 2011b, p. 230), and describing the mansion's odd layout with its disconnected rooms and floors, the narrator highlights how his own "mental curiosity mechanism" (Tanpınar, 2011b, p. 231) was productively stimulated by this eccentric environment. Here, machinery functions not merely as a technical entity but as a conceptual apparatus for interpreting transformation and creativity.

The mansion's most intriguing space for the narrator is Sani Bey's workshop, where his uncle—"always pensive and perpetually lost in the onslaught of a new idea" (Tanpınar, 2011b, p. 232)—pursues his inventive projects:

This was truly a chaos of broken and scattered tools. My uncle, a former naval engineer with a deep love for machinery and invention, brought here any useful or useless machine part he found along the way, at marketplaces, in Haydarpaşa station workshops, auctions, docks, or scrap metal vendors. Broken ship rudder parts, shattered propeller shafts, fragments of blades, gears, pipes, nuts, hoods, large nails, metal plates, rusted pistons, steel boilers, and countless other items whose names I do not know were all collected here (Tanpınar, 2011b, p. 232).

This workshop exemplifies a machinic assemblage, where disparate parts and fragments coalesce into a zone of potential transformation.¹¹ Sani Bey's inventive impetus stems from his belief in the three fundamental functions of the human mind: invention (*icat*), improvement (*ıslah*), and modification (*tadil*). Inspired by an old mechanics treatise, he crafted an amateur philosophy that viewed these processes collectively and individually, tying them to a mystically grounded ideal of progress:

In the universe, everything could change in function and essence. Such work was essential for serving universal happiness. Invention was a necessity; this was the core idea. But there was no need to despair if one could not invent. Humanity had already made numerous inventions. Now, it was time to enter the phase of improving and modifying these inventions (Tanpınar, 2011b, pp. 234-235).

This philosophy highlights the machinic potential of reorganization and revision: originality here arises not by creating something entirely new, but by altering, refining, or repurposing existing structures. For Sani Bey, invention does not always entail starting from zero; rather, it draws on existing elements for improvement or modification. Examples include transforming a sewing machine into a knife-sharpening device or fusing a meat grinder with a coffee mill. However, his disdain for simplicity and inability to sustain focus often led to overly complex or unfinished undertakings.

Perhaps his most remarkable creation was the mansion's bathroom, a complex system comprising machinery and parts collected from workshops and ships. Intended to ensure bathing comfort by meticulously controlling water temperature, pressure, and steam in all conditions, the system was plagued by practical issues. This combination of mechanical ambition and whimsical creativity often produced hazardous or laughable results. Ultimately, his wife installed a simple stove beside the bathroom to heat water, allowing the household to bathe safely: "In this way, with the imagined automatism of a great machine replaced by the secure simplicity of using a stove, water pot, and soap — unchanged since the dawn of their invention— the household would bathe" (Tanpınar, 2011b, p. 237). By contrasting the machinic drive toward elaborate systems with the enduring simplicity of manual processes, the story underscores the tension between innovation and usability.

Another of Sani Bey's "successes" was his reinvention of the horse-drawn carriage via a series of alterations to a bicycle. Frustrated by the bicycle's limited size and

¹¹ Sibel Irzik's (2017) exploration of Tanpınar's "unruly objects" (p. 198) provides a resonant lens for such material assemblages, particularly regarding the accumulation of parts and their impact on subjectivity. Discussing Behçet Bey's room in *Mahur Beste*—a space emerging "piece by piece" from "material objects and discarded life fragments" (p. 208)—Irzik examines how characters' "impotence" in relation to objects that "spin out of control" (p. 198) can manifest as a "crisis of personhood." This view highlights how such collections of disparate elements, much like Sani Bey's workshop, can form potent, sometimes overwhelming, assemblages where the human-object boundary becomes fraught. (Irzik, 2017, pp. 198, 208).

openness, he enlarged and enclosed it into a coupé carriage. When it proved too heavy for pedal power, he added a horse to pull it. His wife dismissed the contraption as just another horse-drawn carriage, but Sani Bey passionately defended his work:

It's the same thing. But I didn't reach it with the same logic or mentality. Even if the result is the same, the process is different. And that's what matters. You dismiss my work by saying the result is identical! You consider me unsuccessful. Yet I succeeded. I gave the world a new invention. I transformed the bicycle. I modified, improved, completed, and organized it (Tanpınar, 2011b, p. 239).

This emphasis on the process rather than the outcome reflects a machinic philosophy that values constant transformation and the flows that sustain invention, irrespective of the final product. When Sani Bey later observes a motorcycle and hears it described as “an evolved form of the bicycle,” he rejects the idea, arguing that its source of propulsion makes it more akin to a small automobile than a bicycle.

Through Sani Bey's character, Tanpınar offers a lively, often comedic vision of machinic thinking. The ceaseless cycle of improvement, modification, and repurposing merges untapped potential with inventive ideas, driving the unending production of machines. In this regard, “Acıbadem'deki Köşk” contrasts human-driven inventiveness—where trial, error, and quirks abound—with the grander, more impersonal forces of machinic organization.

Sani Bey's workshop and his obsessive tinkering exemplify a *machinic assemblage* in its fullest sense: a constellation of heterogeneous elements—metal fragments, obsolete parts, half-formed ideas, personal obsessions—assembled not toward a fixed function or totality, but as a zone of continuous becoming, invention, and reconfiguration. Rather than subordinating all components to a predetermined system, the machinic here operates through processes of coupling, breakdown, diversion, and unexpected productivity. In this sense, Tanpınar's story resonates with Deleuze and Guattari's notion of the machine not as a closed system but as a generative network of flows and partial connections, where creativity emerges not from coherence or control, but from movement, failure, and transformation.

8. The Machinic Condition in *Huzur*

While “Acıbadem'deki Köşk” offers a comedic yet revealing perspective on invention and mechanization, *Huzur* shifts toward a more layered exploration of machinic forces in shaping human experience. In this novel, serialized in Cumhuriyet from February 22 to June 2, 1948, and published as a book in 1949, various dimensions of machinality intersect, highlighting both unity and fragmentation as defining aspects of modern existence.

Within its mechanistic framework, the narrative depicts the human condition as simultaneously molded and restricted by systemic and internalized operations. *Huzur* oscillates between life's interconnected flows and the rigid mechanisms that characterize the modern era. For Mümtaz, the universe unfolds according to “unified and absolute time” (68), yet human perception breaks this continuity into poles of life and death. Humanity, by imposing its “complex mathematics into very simple things” (Tanpınar, 2010, p. 68), creates a pendulum-like mental swing, a motion that recalls “the pendulum of a clock between these two poles” (Tanpınar, 2010, p. 68). This separation from the seamless flow of being turns humans into “machines of suffering,” reflecting a

mechanistic break from unity and adopting the rigidity of a coded identity. As life accelerates, the pendulum movement intensifies, deepening the accompanying distress. The clock's relentless precision thus becomes a metaphor for lost fluidity and the pressures of mechanized temporality.¹²

The narrator likens humanity to the mythical Homunculus, trapped by the "small guiding lamp" of reason, "a device capable only of perceiving shadow and darkness, capable of turning them into a prison" (Tanpınar, 2010, p. 68). Unlike the Homunculus, which accepts transformation despite its limits, humans cling to a false sense of autonomy and ultimately succumb to systemic constraints: "Having parted from the great river, it was like water filling the first hollow it encountered. In that hollow, it would become the victim of every obstacle, most of all its own desire for autonomy" (Tanpınar, 2010, pp. 68-69). This rupture from unity mirrors the machinic condition, in which fragmented flow and the pursuit of independence lead to dysfunctions within the "machine of suffering." *Huzur* thus interrogates the confines of human agency amid larger systems.

In a discussion about the prospect of war, Suat and İhsan express differing views on how machines, humans, and nature relate. While Mümtaz interprets the human machine as an offshoot of humanity's detachment from the universe, İhsan proposes that culture serves to dismantle and refine this machine. Once humans sever connections, he argues, they become "wound-up machines" akin to "those deaf and insensible forces of nature" (Tanpınar, 2010, p. 93). For İhsan, culture reterritorializes the flows disrupted by mechanized life, restraining the destructive impulses arising from unchecked autonomy.

Huzur examines machinality both broadly and in concrete instances. Nuran's daughter Fatma, for example, is labeled a "tactical machine" (*tabiye makinesi*, Tanpınar, 2010, p. 85), indicating a calculated, mechanical orientation toward her environment. Sabih likens his wife Adile to an automobile:

Over time, he had grown accustomed to his wife as one does to an old car whose flaws they know well. It would stop where it wanted, sometimes refuse to brake, shift gears on its own, and occasionally hurtle forward recklessly. Sabih's task was to prevent this old machine from causing an accident. She was, after all, a good woman, and he was comfortable with her. Life with her was easy (Tanpınar, 2010, p. 95).

Here, human relationships emerge as systems of function and dysfunction, with affection tied to the predictability of mechanical processes. Similarly, Fahir conceives of his lover Emma as a "pleasure machine": "He tried not to see Emma's teeth, her robust body, her wide chest that defied masculine strength, all those first-class components of a pleasure machine that once drove him mad with desire, and now with impatience and even anger" (Tanpınar, 2010, p. 97). Even Emma's teeth take on a mechanistic character:

¹² This experience of "mechanized temporality" and its inherent pressures is a key concern in Tanpınar's work, as Özen Nergis Dolcerocca elaborates in her study of his engagement with Istanbul. Dolcerocca explores how Tanpınar identifies "alternative temporalities" that emerge in resistance to modern, linear progression, particularly through "little squares" and "run-down quarters." These sites, embodying a "second time" distinct from clock-time, allow collective memory and "residues" of a forgotten past to challenge the "myth of progressive history," functioning as "dialectical images" that offer moments of awakening from urban transformation's homogenizing effects and the broader crisis of time in modernity. (Dolcerocca, 2015).

Emma's teeth had frightened Fahir ever since his return to Istanbul. Immaculate, pearly white, nestled in an exaggerated chassis for her face, they resembled a perfectly functioning device, leaving him with the impression of a mill capable of grinding anything it encountered (Tanpınar, 2010, pp. 97-98).

Such portrayals capture the mechanization of desire, reducing bodies to functional elements within larger operative systems.

Machinic imagery also appears in Mümtaz's reflection on Sabih's repetitive newspaper analyses, likening them to a digestive apparatus:

'If our digestive system worked this way, what would become of us?' (...) If those who ate carrots turned orange, those who ate beets turned red, and lovers of rice, milk, or fried mussels bore the scent, color, or other characteristics of these foods like a vivid hallmark, it would create something akin to the concoction of Sabih's endless analyses (Tanpınar, 2010, p. 145).

This satire critiques the reduction of intellectual engagement to mechanical processing, echoing the broader tension between organic flow and mechanized repetition.

In *Huzur*, the body itself appears more frequently as a collection of separate organs than as a unified entity. Nuran's relative Yaşar, for instance, is consumed by his "body machine" (Tanpınar, 2010, p. 156), conceiving it as a set of independently functioning parts:

One could say that, for Yaşar Bey, the integrity we call the body had vanished, replaced by an assembly of independently operating organs, a peculiar council where each minister, seated in their own chair, belonged to a different party and mentality (Tanpınar, 2010, p. 158).

While Yaşar obsessively orchestrates his fragmented body like a prime minister handling a dysfunctional cabinet, Macide, İhsan's wife, uses her ear like a specialized device: "Her ear would detach itself, like one of those specialized instruments used to locate objects or measure the potential of the nervous system" (Tanpınar, 2010, p. 192). Jealousy, too, is depicted as a machinic system: "In mere minutes, jealousy had built its mad, colossal machine of delusion and torment within him. It was as though a spider was endlessly spinning its web of steel threads" (Tanpınar, 2010, p. 311).

By intertwining themes of fragmentation, unity, individual agency, and systemic limits, Tanpınar deepens his portrayal of machinic imagery in *Huzur*. Depicting machinality at both a personal and societal scale, the novel offers a critical perspective on how rigid structures shape and constrain human life in modernity. These reflections echo broader philosophical discussions on the interplay between human will and machinic forces, suggesting that true autonomy remains elusive within the mechanized infrastructures of contemporary existence.

Conclusion

Throughout these interconnected analyses, Tanpınar's use of the machine—whether conceptualized as an atmosphere in poetry, an assemblage of rhythmic processes in the short story, a structuring force in the novel, or an external mechanism reshaping human perception—emerges as a central thread uniting his diverse literary and critical output. Viewed in light of Deleuze and Guattari's notion of assemblage, this machine-based

perspective illuminates how Tanpınar approaches creation, subjective experience, and social organization in both liberating and constraining ways.

On one hand, Tanpınar's "machinic" language underscores the generative qualities of artistic production. By invoking images of weaving and fluid alloys, he captures how poetry and narrative become dynamic systems in which discrete elements (words, images, emotions) collide, coalesce, and give rise to ever-new configurations. These assemblages are sites of creativity, vitalizing literature with the capacity to generate meaning, foster transformation, and provoke self-awareness. From the "fluid alloy" of poetry's atmosphere to the intricate transpositions of hidden concordances, Tanpınar repeatedly stresses that art's essence lies in its capacity to reconfigure experience and open up fresh perspectives.

Simultaneously, this machinic framework reveals the tensions inherent in modernity. Molar machines—such as rigid social systems, mechanized production, and institutional constraints—impose hierarchy, uniformity, and determinism. In "Evin Sahibi" and *Huzur*, Tanpınar illustrates how such systems can erode individuality, limit spontaneity, and suppress emotional or creative depth. Even seemingly innocuous routines (like household tasks or habitual readings of the newspaper) acquire a mechanized quality, reducing complex human relations to clockwork routines. Characters caught in these systems—be they bureaucrats, soldiers, or artists—must negotiate the interplay between imposed structure and the molecular potential for newness and subversion.

Moreover, Tanpınar's automaton figures and depictions of bodies fragmented into specialized "devices" amplify the idea that modern existence, at both social and personal levels, can become an alienating machinery. Yet even these scenarios contain pockets of possibility, as creativity, affect, and poetic invention hint at a molecular dimension capable of challenging the overarching system. Through comedic invention in "Acıbadem'deki Köşk," the luminous reorganization of self in "Abdullah Efendi'nin Rüyaları", or the pilot's alignment with the airplane in "Bir Uçak Yolculuğundan Notlar," Tanpınar reveals that machinery is not merely oppressive or inert: it can be harnessed, recombined, and repurposed in ways that yield both continuity and invention.

Tanpınar's multifaceted notion of the machine traverses a spectrum of meanings, from the fluid rhythms of poetic atmospheres to the regimented logic of large-scale social mechanisms. Whether highlighting the machinic properties of literary creation, the complex negotiations of subjectivity, or the codification of social life, his works demonstrate a persistent concern with how structure and spontaneity collide. By situating these questions within Deleuze and Guattari's framework of assemblage, we see Tanpınar's vision of machinery as at once stabilizing and transformative, rooted in tradition yet opening pathways to innovation. His writings thus challenge us to recognize the tensions, potentials, and perpetual renegotiations at play whenever human beings and their material or symbolic environments interact in machinic ways.

References

- Ayvaz, E. (2006). Sonradan gelenin tanıklığı. *Tophumbilim: Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar special issue*, (20), 153–163.
- Benjamin, W. (1969). The work of art in the age of mechanical reproduction. In H. Arendt (Ed.), *Illuminations* (H. Zohn, Trans., pp. 217–251). New York: Schocken Books.

- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (2000). *Anti-Oedipus* (R. Hurley, M. Seem, & H. R. Lane, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (2005). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia* (B. Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Dolcerocca, Ö. N. (2015). Chronometrics in the modern metropolis: The city, the past and collective memory in A. H. Tanpınar. *MLN*, 130(5), 1156–1175.
- Dolcerocca, Ö. N. (2017). Foreword. In *Beyond world literature: Reading Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar today* (pp. 127–132). *Middle Eastern Literatures*, 20(2).
- Efe, E. K. (2014). *Muslim literature, world literature, Tanpınar* [Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University].
- Irzık, S. (2017). “What if one day things go mad?”: The unruly objects of Tanpınar’s modernism. *Middle Eastern Literatures*, 20(2), 198–214.
- Kern, S. (1983). *The culture of time and space, 1880–1918*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Mumford, L. (1934). *Technics and civilization*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Saygılı, A. (2018). Tanpınar’ın saklı dünyası: Arayışlar–keşifler–yorumlar üzerine. In J. Rentzsch & İ. Şahin (Eds.), *Tanpınar’ın saklı dünyası: Arayışlar–keşifler–yorumlar* (pp. 351–360). Ankara: Doğu Batı Yayınları.
- Taburoğlu, Ö. (2019). *Tanpınar sözlüğü: Şahsî bir masalın simgeleri*. Ankara: Doğu Batı Yayınları.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (1970a). Bir uçak yolculuğundan notlar. In *Yaşadığımız gibi* (pp. 205–214). İstanbul: Türkiye Kültür Enstitüsü Yayınları.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (1970b). İstanbul’un mevsimleri ve sanatlarımız. In *Yaşadığımız gibi* (pp. 98–117). İstanbul: Türkiye Kültür Enstitüsü Yayınları.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (1987). *Aydaki kadın*. İstanbul: Adam Yayınları.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (1999). *Mahur beste*. İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (2008). *Saatleri ayarlama enstitüsü*. İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (2010). *Huzur*. İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (2011). *Sahnenin dışındakiler*. İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (2011a). Abdullah Efendi’nin rüyaları. In *Hikâyeler* (pp. 11–51). İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (2011b). Acıbadem’deki köşk. In *Hikâyeler* (pp. 229–241). İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (2011c). Ahmed Cemil ile mülâkat. In *Edebiyat üzerine makaleler* (pp. 270–274). İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (2011d). Andre Gide ve Nobel mükâfatı. In *Edebiyat üzerine makaleler* (pp. 476–479). İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (2011e). Bir kadının jurnalından. In *Edebiyat üzerine makaleler* (pp. 429–433). İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (2011f). Evin sahibi. In *Hikâyeler* (pp. 102–150). İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.

- Tanpınar, A. H. (2011g). Hayal şehir. In *Edebiyat üzerine makaleler* (pp. 327-331). İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (2011h). Hayat karşısında romancı. In *Edebiyat üzerine makaleler* (pp. 53-55). İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (2011i). Kendi gök kubbemiz. In *Edebiyat üzerine makaleler* (pp. 352-359). İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (2011j). Paul Valery. In *Edebiyat üzerine makaleler* (pp. 451-458). İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (2011k). Şiir hakkında II. In *Edebiyat üzerine makaleler* (pp. 18-20). İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (2011l). Teslim. In *Hikâyeler* (pp. 214-228). İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (2011m). Türk edebiyatında cereyanlar. In *Edebiyat üzerine makaleler* (pp. 101-127). İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (2011n). Yahya Kemal'e hürmet. In *Edebiyat üzerine makaleler* (pp. 299-301). İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (2011o). Yahya Kemal ve şiirimiz. In *Edebiyat üzerine makaleler* (pp. 335-338). İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (2011p). Yaz yağmuru. In *Hikâyeler* (pp. 153-213). İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (2017). *Bütün şiirleri*. İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.