

**Başlık/ Title:** In Deleuze and Guattari: What is the Minor Writing? from the Perspective of Difference and the Minor Literature

**Yazar/ Author**

Sinan Kılıç

**ORCID ID**

0000-0003-2396-3603

**Bu makaleye atıf için:** Sinan Kılıç, Deleuze ve Guattari için Minör Yazmak nedir? Minör Edebiyat ve Fark Perspektifinden, *KARE, Özel Sayı (2021):* 133-149.

**To cite this article:** Sinan Kılıç, In Deleuze and Guattari: What is the Minor Writing? from the Perspective of Difference and the Minor Literature, *KARE, Special Issue (2021):* 133-149.

**Makale Türü / Type of Article:** Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article

**Yayın Geliş Tarihi / Submission Date:** 31 Ocak / Jan 2021

**Yayına Kabul Tarihi / Acceptance Date:** 29 Temmuz / July 2021

**Yayın Tarihi / Date Published:** 30 Temmuz / July 2021

**Web Sitesi:** <https://karedergi.erciyes.edu.tr/>

**Makale göndermek için / Submit an Article:** <http://dergipark.gov.tr/kare>

Uluslararası İndeksler/International Indexes

INDEX  COPERNICUS  
I N T E R N A T I O N A L

  
DRJI

  
EuroPub

  
MLA  
International  
Bibliography

**Index Copernicus:** Indexed in the ICI Journal Master List 2018 Kabul Tarihi /Acceptance Date: 11 Dec 2019

**MLA International Bibliography:** Kabul Tarihi /Acceptance Date : 28 Oct 2019

**DRJI Directory of Research Journals Indexing:** Kabul Tarihi /Acceptance Date: 14 Oct 2019

**EuroPub Database:** Kabul Tarihi /Acceptance Date: 26 Nov 2019



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

## DELEUZE VE GUATTARİ İÇİN MİNÖR YAZMAK NEDİR? MİNÖR EDEBİYAT VE FARK PERSPEKTİFİNDEN

**Özet:** Bu çalışmada, minör yazmanın ne olduğu Deleuze ve Guattari tarafından yazılan *Kafka: Minör Bir Edebiyat İçin* ve fark felsefesi perspektifinden açıklanacaktır. Deleuze'e göre yazmanın problemi minör ve majör dil olarak adlandırılan dilin bir problemidir. Bu perspektiften, şu söylenebilir ki yazmanın iki türü vardır: minör yazmak ve majör yazmak. Minör yazmak, yaratıcı düşünme ve felsefe ile ilgiliyken; majör yazmak, hafıza, temsil ve Freud psikanalizi ile ilgilidir. Fakat, Deleuze ve Guattari için yazmanın amacı bazı kişisel olayları, hafızaları, arzuları; bazı öznel olayları veya psikolojik problemleri temsil etmek değildir; yazmanın amacı yeni kavramlar yaratmaktır. Bu nedenle, minör yazmanın amacı majör dilin gramer kurallarını değiştirmektir; oysa, majör yazmanın amacı önceden gerçekleşmiş şeyleri ve olayları temsil etmektir. Sonuç olarak, bu çalışmada "minör yazmanın ne olduğu?", "minör yazmanın üç parçasının ne olduğu?", "kimin minör yazar olduğu?" tartışılacaktır. Kısaca şu ifade edilebilir ki, minör yazmak felsefi okuma ve yazmanın bir türüdür.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Minör Yazmak, Minör Edebiyat, Gilles Deleuze, Majör Yazmak, Fark.

## IN DELEUZE AND GUATTARİ: WHAT IS THE MINOR WRITING? FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF DIFFERENCE AND THE MINOR LITERATURE

**Abstract:** In this article, what the minor writing is will be explained from the perspective of philosophy of difference, and *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, which is written by Deleuze and Guattari. For Deleuze, the problem of writing is the matter of language which can be called as the minor, and the major language. In this perspective, it can be said that there are two kinds of writing: the minor writing and the major writing. Whereas the minor writing is related to creative thinking, writing and philosophy, the major writing is related to memory, representation and Freudian psychoanalysis. But, Deleuze and Guattari say that the aim of writing is not to represent some personal events, memories, desires, but to create the new concepts that do not represent some personal events, or psychological problems. So, while the aim of the minor writing is to change the rules of grammar of the major language, the aim of the major writing is to represent things, events that have occurred before. As a result, in this article "what the minor writing is," "what three parts of the minor writing are," "who is a minor writer?" will be discussed. Shortly, it should be said that the minor writing is a kind of philosophical writing and reading.

**Keywords:** Minor Writing, Minor Literature, Gilles Deleuze, Major Writing, Difference.

### Introduction

The term minor is one of the main terms of Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy which influences discussions that have existed since the second term of 20<sup>th</sup> century in philosophy. The term minor means not to be major that is transcendence; therefore, the term is related to differences as immanence. Minor is to be different, and being different is to be opposed to the general laws, the rules in thinking and the language. In other words, difference and minor are identical because without becoming different, anything cannot be minor. In this mean, minor means to change the rules of major structure in

<sup>1</sup> Assoc Prof. Erciyes University, Faculty of Letters, Kayseri, E-Mail: [sinankilic@erciyes.edu.tr](mailto:sinankilic@erciyes.edu.tr), ORCID: 0000-0003-2396-3603

language with creative thinking and writing. Since the difference between minor and major is not related to quantity, a small group can be major, and a big group in terms of quantity can be minor; therefore, the problem is not related to quantity, instead, the determination thing, which one minor is, and which one major is, is the law. A major group can be small regarding the quantity but it can be effective as the law. Therefore, minority is against the law of majority which determines what good and bad are. In other words, minor is against the tyranny of major by means of the law. For this reason, minor, or the minor thinking, attacks the regime of tyranny or majority that is built up by the law. *Tyrants are created by the law alone: they flourish by virtue of the law.*<sup>2</sup> The minor thinking hates from tyranny, and from the tyrant structure in the language and writing. In other words, *it is rather that which a minority constructs within a major language.*<sup>3</sup> The minor writing is the counter to the language of tyranny, or the tyranny of the major law in language and writing. It pushes language to agrammatical limits. Henceforth, a writer should create a minor language within the major language that exists. This creation is necessary both in philosophy and in literature. The important thing is that writers and philosophers create their own style and language within the major language by creating new terms and rules in language. By this way, the minor writers and the philosophers liberate the life which is not free from oedipal or personal passions. On the other hand, Deleuze says that life is not a personal thing, in contrast to the self, life is impersonal.<sup>4</sup> So, the minor writing is related to life that is made up of events and individualities.

The minor writing is to write by using a minor language in literature and in philosophy because everything occurs by way of the language. Therefore, for Deleuze, literature and philosophy are much close to each other, and they cannot be easily separated from each other;<sup>5</sup> because both minor philosophy and minor literature are related to becoming and immanence; also, literature and philosophy are a matter of becoming, not transcendence. So, from the perspective of the minor philosophy that is immanence to life, not transcendence, Deleuze and Guattari consider what writing is, and what the purpose of writing is. For them, *Writing is a question of becoming, always in the*

---

<sup>2</sup> Gilles Deleuze, *Coldness and Cruelty*, translated by Jean McNeil-Aude Willm, (New York: Zone Books, 1999), 86.

<sup>3</sup> Stanly Corngold, *Kafka and the Dialect of Minor Literature*, Vol. 21, No. 1 (Feb., 1994): 97.

<sup>4</sup> Gilles Deleuze, *Pure Immanence, Essays on A Life*, translated by Anne Boyman, (New York: Zone Books, 2001), 8.

<sup>5</sup> John Marks, *Gilles Deleuze-Vitalism and Multiplicity, The Literary Machine*, (London: Pluto Press, 1998), 123.

*midst of being formed, and goes beyond the matter of any livable or lived experiences.*<sup>6</sup> They evaluate this problem in a lot of works, but they evaluate especially this problem in *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, and in *Difference and Repetition*, in *The Logic of Sense*, in *Dialogues*, in *What is Philosophy?* The main work about the minor writing among these works is *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*. In this work, Deleuze and Guattari discuss what the minor writing is by creating and thinking with some important terms like the rhizome, Oedipus, the desire, becoming, the machine, the law etc. The aim of them is to create a new style of writing and thinking by staying in an immanent philosophical structure. Therefore, from the view of them, since writing is related to a creative philosophical perspective, writing is a philosophical event, not a psychological event, because writing always has an aim like changing something, creating, evaluating etc. Henceforth, writing is made from the perspective of a purpose. Good writers who write from the perspective of an aim try to change some ideas, values, laws by creating some new terms and ideas. Therefore, the minor writing does not mean to represent some old terms and ideas. The minor writing is to create and to write from the immanent philosophy.

For Deleuze and Guattari, writing is not related to a psychiatric problem like Oedipus; writing is a minor event that changes major ideas like Oedipus, the law of father, the rules of grammar etc. In contrast, a psychoanalytic interpretation misses the main point in writing,<sup>7</sup> because psychiatry evaluates everything from the law of Oedipus. In contrast, writing is not a problem of Oedipus, since the problem of writing is not to represent the problem of the father and the child, rather the problem of writing is to create new thoughts. For Deleuze, *writing like a dog digging a hole, a rat digging its burrow.*<sup>8</sup> In this view, it can be said that minor writing is a new way of writing and thinking within the law of a major language. From this idea, Deleuze and Guattari are known to invent a new form of philosophical writing both in literature and in philosophy. For Deleuze, literature is a schizophrenic writing, or event; it is not a goal, it is a production, not an expression.<sup>9</sup>

The minor writing is to write from the perspective of philosophy that relates to multiplicities and differentials. Therefore, in minor thinking that means to be different, a work is written, and read from the perspective of

<sup>6</sup> John Marks, *Gilles Deleuze-Vitalism and Multiplicity*, 125.

<sup>7</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, translated by Dana Polan, (London: University of Minnesota Press, 1986), ix.

<sup>8</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 18.

<sup>9</sup> Charles J. Stivale, "Gilles Deleuze&Felix Guattari: Schizoanalysis&Literary Discourse", *Substance*, 1980. Vol. 9, No. 4, Issue 29 (1980): 48.

philosophy, not from psychoanalysis because writing is not a personal matter in Deleuzian philosophy. For Deleuze, the aim of writing is to change life by creating new images and concepts. Life is impersonal, and writing is not a personal thing. So, both literature and philosophy should create the new ways of life by changing transcendental ideas. Deleuze says that: *Every literary work implies a way of living, a form of life, and must be evaluated not only critically but also clinically.*<sup>10</sup>

The minor writing is a new style of writing that gives a new perspective to philosophical and literary works. In this new perspective, there is no dualism, and psychoanalytic interpretations. Instead of dualism or binary machines,<sup>11</sup> its language is minor or rhizome which is dependent on becoming. The reason for not being dualism, and the psychoanalytic interpretation of the minor writing is that the language of dualism and psychoanalysis is a representation that is dependent on the personal things. In contrast, Deleuze says that writing is not about personal issues, and not a solution to individual psychological problems. Writing is to create individuals or singular problems that cannot be solved. Because the minor writing deterritorializes the structure of grammar and rules of the major language, it has a revolutionary character. For example, when a Czech Jew writes in German, or an Ouzbekian writes in Russia, it can be said that they write via the rules of the minor writing.

When we look at writing from this perspective, the minor writing is grown every day a lot, in the structure of the world of today because a lot of people are nowadays migrants. Since they go from their own country to a foreign country, these people learn another language that becomes different from their native language. Therefore, the minor writing will grow in every country because a lot of people do not speak their native language; when they write in another language, they will write with the minor writing inasmuch as they make the rules of the major languages changed by using different structure in sentence, like Kafka, who writes in German language as a Czech. Today, a lot of people cannot write in their native language, even if they can speak their native language; for this reason, this reality will cause some important changes in the major languages. In terms of Deleuze and Guattari, this new

---

<sup>10</sup> Daniel W. Smith, "A Life of Pure Immanence," *Essays Critical and Clinical\_Deleuze*, translated by Daniel W. Smith and Michael a. Greco, (New York: Verso, 1998), xv.

<sup>11</sup> Binary machines produce two choices, and questions that always ask which one you prefer. Do you prefer wine or beer? Do you love your mother or father? Psychoanalytic writing is to write by this double structure. Therefore, psychoanalysis creates binary machines in writing and thinking. In a binary machine, you are a woman or a man; if you are not one of them, then you are transvestite, and then it says that you are sick.

situation in the world causes very positive things in order to change the rules of major languages. Especially, the children of immigrants will write in terms of the minor writings, they will use a different structure in writing. Therefore, the immigrants are very important because they will make the structure of the major language deterritorialized. In other words, the immigrants will create a new language in major languages.<sup>12</sup> While the immigrants write, they can change grammar; and as they speak, they can change sounds and pronunciations of the major language. In today's world, since many people do not use their own language, they are forced to use another language. This is a problem of minority, and a problem of the minor writing and literature. If any writer writes in an unusual way, then it can be said that this kind of writing is the minor writing. *The benefits of literary activity are significant even when that literature is minor.*<sup>13</sup>

In this perspective, the first example of the minor writing is Kafka, who is a Czech. Kafka is read as a minor thinker by Deleuze and Guattari from the perspective of philosophy, not from Oedipus' view. *Deleuze and Guattari reject the idea that Kafka's work has a straightforward psychoanalytic, oedipal drive.*<sup>14</sup> When Kafka is read from the view of Oedipus, everything in Kafka's writing is seen as the father problem. This kind of reading is a psychoanalytic interpretation which represents his works from the father and the mother problems. Deleuze and Guattari think that this kind of reading is not creative, it is representative and majority. For example, *the castle is god, the world of the father, power that cannot be grasped; the cockroach is anxiety, castration, the dreamworld and its multiple metamorphoses, and so forth.*<sup>15</sup> In contrast, from the view of the minor writing, Kafka creates a new style of writing that is called as the minor writing or the minor literature which means a revolution. In this view, the works of Kafka are revolutionary because they make the style of writing changed by deterritorializing binary structures. Therefore, Kafka's works are not imaginary or symbolic. Instead, he desires to escape from a binary machine, this escaping is called as the line of flight that is to escape from a hierarchical structure or thinking. The line of flight is to create new statement regimes, these new statement regimes are possible by via of the minor writing. Deleuze and Guattari say that there are three characters of the minor writing. The first character is a deterritorialization movement, the

---

<sup>12</sup> T. Hugh Crawford, "The Paterson Plateau: Deleuze, Guattari and William Carlos Williams," *Deleuze and Literature*, (Edinburg: Edinburg University Press, 2000), 65-66.

<sup>13</sup> Stanly Corngold, *Kafka and the Dialect of Minor Literature*, 91.

<sup>14</sup> John Marks, *Gilles Deleuze-Vitalism and Multiplicity*, 137.

<sup>15</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, x.

second is a political movement, and the last one is a collective enunciation movement.

### **1. Deterritorialization**

The first character of the minor writing is a movement of deterritorialization of a major language. Deleuze and Guattari say that *a minor literature does not come from a minor language*.<sup>16</sup> For example, Kafka's language is a minor language that comes from the inside of the major language, which is German, because his language invents a minor use of the major language. On the other hand, for Deleuze and Guattari, every language is essentially minor because of its heterogenetic structure. Inside of a major language, a minor language is heterogeny, a rhizome, and a creative language. It can be said that a minor language occurs in a major language and makes some structure of the major language change. Therefore, the aim of the minor writing is to create a new language in a major language, which is dominant, homogenized, centralized, and standardized. At the same time, the writing of this kind is called as a rhizomatic movement.

#### **1.1. The Rhizome**

The rhizome is another important term in the minor writing; henceforth, Deleuze mentions it a lot of times in his works. The rhizome that is nonhierarchical, against to be centered is a regime of multiplicities.<sup>17</sup> Since a rhizome opposes the writing of the tree structure that begins from one point and finishes at another point. A rhizome does not have any beginning and finish point, it has a lot of entrances, and at the same time, every entrance is independent from another. It is like a network, or a spider's web. This kind of writing diminishes the hierarchical thinking in life. For this reason, the rhizome is to see things from a new perspective by producing new ideas or words that are not hierarchical or diabolical; therefore, the rhizomatic writing is a creative thinking. In this perspective, Deleuze and Guattari say that *philosophy is the discipline that involves creating concepts*. And *the object of philosophy is to create concepts that are always new*.<sup>18</sup> In this sense, philosophy is a rhizomatic thinking as becoming. The rhizome is connected with the figure of becoming because it is proliferated by new connections, not rooted structure. Any point of it can connect to other points of a rhizome, this is very different from a tree or a root because a root and a tree have a point, an order;

---

<sup>16</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 16.

<sup>17</sup> Charles J. Stivale, "Gilles Deleuze & Felix Guattari: Schizoanalysis & Literary Discourse", *Substance*, 53.

<sup>18</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *What is Philosophy?* Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), 5.



but since the rhizome has not any point or an order, it can go to great distances. For this reason, to consider the rhizome in literature and writing is very important due to two reasons. Firstly, literature is not a representative activity, and an attempt to interpret,<sup>19</sup> it is a creative thinking, and creative thinking can be accomplished like a rhizomatic movement by producing endlessly new connections. Secondly the rhizome makes it possible to the flight line and becoming.<sup>20</sup>

The rhizome is the line of flight from hierarchical structures, and laws, and so the minor writing seeks what the essence of the law in the language and the life is and tries to escape from the major structure in the language by creating new concepts from the perspective of multiplicity and the rhizome. In minor thinking, the main reason of your personal problems is not your father, and depending on this idea, the subject of writing is not your personal fantasy or dreams, the subject of writing is creative thinking; therefore, a minor writer creates a way of escaping from the law of the father, from usual rules that belongs to society. This escaping is the line of flight. So, *the question of the father is not how to become free in relation to him (an oedipal question), but how to find a path there where he did not find any.*<sup>21</sup>

In addition, the rhizome is a metamorphosis movement that is like an egg, which can become an animal, or become an animal pole and properly familial one. In that vein, the rhizome is to escape from a major structure in writing by creating new views. But, *the first sort of creation is the metamorphosis.*<sup>22</sup> Metamorphosis is not a metaphor, and a symbol, and an allegory. It is a rhizomatic movement because of changing the form of things. Therefore, *metamorphosis is a map of intensities. It is an ensemble of states, each distinct from the other. It is a creative line of escaping that says nothing other than what it is.*<sup>23</sup> In the rhizomatic writing, since there is not a hierarchical structure, a reader can start to read a book from wherever he/she wishes. For this reason, the minor writing is not hierarchical, it is a creative movement, and contrast to the bureaucratic thinking that is produced by hierarchical, diabolical structures. The diabolical writing produces fascism, Stalinism, and Americanism. However, the rhizomatic thought diminishes diabolical structures. For example, Kafka is a rhizomatic writer, *writing for Kafka, the primacy of writing, signifies only one thing: not a form of literature alone, the enunciation forms a unity*

<sup>19</sup> Gilles Deleuze, *Desert Islands and Other Texts*, translated by Michael Taomina, (New York: Semiotext(e) 2002), 12.

<sup>20</sup> Mary Bryden, *Gilles Deleuze: Travels in Literature*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillian 2007), 5-6.

<sup>21</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 10.

<sup>22</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 35.

<sup>23</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 36.

with desire, beyond laws, states, regimes. Yet the enunciation is always historical, political and social. A micropolitics, a politics of desire that questions all situations.<sup>24</sup> The rhizomatic writing is connected to desire that is called as the schizoid desire in writing, not the oedipal desire.

## **1.2. The Desire**

While psychoanalysis evaluates desire in terms of Oedipus that means to be lacking, the rhizome as the minor writing evaluates desire from creative thinking or new desires. For Deleuze and Guattari, since desire is not to lack from something, desire is to create new connections in life. Desire is creative unconscious, in contrast, psychoanalysis diminishes, and destroys unconscious because unconscious which psychoanalysis understands as negatively is not true. Instead of this negative idea, Deleuze and Guattari say that the unconscious is a productive machine or a fabric that is not a theatre. It is immanence to life, not transcendental. In this perspective, unconscious is a productive writing machine; since psychoanalysis diminishes unconscious by evaluating from the perspective of Oedipus. For Deleuze and Guattari, unconscious should be taken from psychoanalysis; otherwise, it can destroy unconscious because for psychoanalysis, unconscious is an enemy; but for Deleuze, *unconscious is a substance to be manufactured, to get flowing-a social and political space to be conquered.*<sup>25</sup> In other words, unconscious is not an enemy that should be destroyed, unconscious is a revolutionary power; but psychoanalysis hates from unconscious, and from creating desires.

From this perspective, it can be said that there is always an important relation between desire and the law. In this relation, as different from Freud, Deleuze and Guattari say that desire does not depend on oedipal law; conversely, the law depends on desire that becomes productive; so, since there is desire, there is the oedipal law, not opposed. The desire of the minor writing is to create new ideas and concepts as opposed to hierarchical and dualistic structures. Therefore, the desire of minor writing is to produce new views to change life. This kind of desire is called as schizoid desire as opposed to oedipal desire which says that desire is created by the law of the father. In the perspective of Oedipus, your desire does not belong to you, your desire is your father's desire. In terms of Oedipus, the law is the desire of your father that represents guilt that is produced by the law of the father. Since psychoanalysis depends on this Oedipal law, it evaluates everything from the desire of the father who produces feelings of guilt or innocence. *Everything*

---

<sup>24</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 41.

<sup>25</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, *Dialogues*, translated by H. Tomlinson and B. Habberjam, (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007), 78

is the father's fault: if I have sexual problems, if I don't get married, if I cannot write, if I lower my head in public, if I have had to construct an alternate, infinitely or barren world.<sup>26</sup> In this interpretation, the name of the father represents the essence of the law. However, the schizoid desire does not belong to your father's law. Desire is the essence of life and nature.

In other words, in the minor writing, *the whole line is desire*.<sup>27</sup> Since this kind of desire does not depend on oedipal desire, it is not desire for power, in contrast, it is power itself that is desire. Desire does not lack, but desire as a plenitude, exercise, and functioning. So, *Desire is fundamentally polyvocal, and its polyvocality makes of it a single and unique desire that flows over everything*.<sup>28</sup> In this perspective, there are different kinds of desire: capitalist desire in America, bureaucratic desire in Russia, fascist desire in Germany. All of these desires of the law interrupt the desire of flight. For example, the bureaucratic desire interrupts the flow of the segments, and becoming.

On the other hand, desire that means to start from the middle is becoming. Since desire always starts from in the middle, it is everywhere, in sleeping, in walking, in reading and in writing, etc., even the death is itself a desire. Put it differently, desire is becoming-woman, becoming-animal, becoming-machine etc. All of these desires lead to two different laws: the paranoiac transcendental law, and the immanent schizo-law. Because the transcendental desire causes double segments, but other desires cause different segments as becoming.

### 1.3. Becoming

Becoming that means not to write hierarchical or dualistic is another concept of the minor writing, and the minor literature. Therefore, it has not a history that has beginning and end; in addition, it is neither regression nor progression. Becoming inherited from the past, the present and the future at the same time. Becoming is related to simulacrum. *Pure becoming, the unlimited, is the matter of the simulacrum...*<sup>29</sup> All of the things in the simulacra are reversed from hot to cold, from small to big. This is the principle of the simulacra to reverse the meaning. All identities have disappeared from the perspective of simulacra that means to create new views, and ideas. Because simulacra is not related to represent things, it is not a copy of a copy. Deleuze says that *the simulacrum is an image without resemblance*.<sup>30</sup> It is related to

<sup>26</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 9.

<sup>27</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 56.

<sup>28</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 57.

<sup>29</sup> Gilles Deleuze, *The Logic of Sense*, translated by Mark Lester with Charles Stivale, (London: The Athlone Press, 1990), 2.

<sup>30</sup> Gilles Deleuze, *The Logic of Sense*, 257.

becoming and individual events. The simulacra and becoming are together both in writing and in life.

From this point of view, becoming means to be between or in the middle of life as individual and singular. Since becoming is an individual, immanence, and singular event, not common, it cannot be imitated by any other person. For this reason, becoming is to think by the infinitives that refer to limitless events; to walk, to write, to think etc., are the limitless events. From this perspective, *true novels operate with indefinites which are not indeterminate, infinitives which are not undifferentiated proper names which are not persons.*<sup>31</sup> The infinitives are bodies of individual events. It should be said that although the minor writing is related to becoming, every becoming is not related to the minor writing. In this idea, it should be said that in order to belong to the minor writing of any writing, it should be a rhizomatic writing like Kafka's writings.

In other words, since becoming means to be rhizome, *becoming is its mode of being.*<sup>32</sup> What is being? *Beings are multiple and different,*<sup>33</sup> they are always produced by the rhizome; henceforth, there is always a new becoming: becoming-woman, becoming-animal, becoming-machine etc. Becoming an animal is one option to become-other.<sup>34</sup> On the other hand, becoming-woman does not become like a woman, becoming-animal does not resemble an animal, because becoming is a kind of political perspective that is against major political structure. It is a movement of an absolute deterritorialization like writing in both literature and philosophy. In this sense, *becomings are anti-historical in the sense that they are always forward-bound trajectories, spending, dissolving, and transforming rather than saving, consolidating, and preserving.*<sup>35</sup>

From this idea, the purpose of writing is not to be a writer, the purpose of writing is to resist binary machines with the minor writing. In the rhizomatic thinking, *there is no doubt that trees are planted in our heads: the tree of life, the tree of knowledge, etc.*<sup>36</sup> While an arborecent is always the desire of power, the rhizome is the desire of multiplicity and the minor politic. For a long time, both writing and thinking has been built up in the structure of arborescent that has a beginning, and an end. This kind of writing starts between two points. In contrast, the rhizomatic writing is like nomads that are always in

---

<sup>31</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, *Dialogues*, 64.

<sup>32</sup> Philip Goodchild, "Why is philosophy so compromised with God," *Deleuze and Religion*, edited by Mary Bryden, (London: Routledge, 2001), 161.

<sup>33</sup> Gilles Deleuze, *The Logic of Sense*, 179.

<sup>34</sup> Mary Bryden, *Gilles Deleuze: Travels in Literature*, 2.

<sup>35</sup> Mary Bryden, *Gilles Deleuze: Travels in Literature*, 4.

<sup>36</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, *Dialogues*, 25.

the middle.<sup>37</sup> This kind of writing is called as the minor politics, or the simulacrum. In this perspective, the second character of the minor writing is politic.

## II. Political Character

The second character of the minor writing is the political character that is called the minor. In the minor writing, everything is political because it endeavors to change the structure of the major language. From this idea, it can be said that Deleuze and Guattari politicize literature, and writing.<sup>38</sup> In the major language, the main reason for the individual problems is the law of the father that is produced by Oedipal desire. Therefore, in terms of the major or hierarchical political structure, the main reason of individual problems is not politic, instead, individual problems are related to psychological matters that depend on oedipal desire. However, in terms of the minor writing, the main reason of every individual problem is politic because in life everything is politic. Since the law and politics are identical in the minor thought, the law is everywhere. In this perspective, it can be said that there are two kinds of the law: the major law and the minor law. Whereas the desire is resulted from the law in the major law, in the minor law, the law is resulted from the desire. Therefore, in the minor view, every law is stamped from a desire, not opposed. Henceforth, the minor writing is to create the new desires by writing, and since desire is politic, what kind of desire is legal or not is dependent on politics. Therefore, Deleuze says that every desire is politic. On the other hand, every problem too is politic because the problems of individuals cannot be thought of as independent from the politic ideas. Since every individual matter is a political problem, it can be changed when the structure of the major languages is changed by the minor language. In addition, every problem is connected to other problems in the minor thought. For example, *the family triangle connects to triangles, commercial, economic, bureaucratic, juridical-that determine its values.*<sup>39</sup>

Since the minor writing is politic and tries to create the new desires to change the major forms of life, it creates conflicts between the father and the son, the law and the desire. Because this kind of writing is the minor politic, it creates new perspectives of life by deconstructing old values, ideas. This purpose depends on freedom, so the essence of the minor politic can be

---

<sup>37</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, *Dialogues*, 31.

<sup>38</sup> If you want to extra knowledge about this perspective, you can look at this article: Corngold Stanly, *Kafka and the Dialect of Minor Literature*.

<sup>39</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 17.

explained on freedom: *Freedom is not what I wanted. Only a way out; right or left, or in any direction; I made no other demand.*<sup>40</sup>

In terms of the minor politic, since the essence of the language is politic, the language has a politic structure, but the linguistic science does not want to see this way of the language. The politic structure of the language is called as the major language that depends on the structures and the rules; in addition, the major language teaches people how they speak, think, and write. In contrast, the minor writing breaks these teachings of the major languages with the rhizomatic writing. The structure of the major language is broken by the minor language that is mixture and schizophrenic, or rhizomatic. Deleuze and Guattari say that the minor language is to use or to write like a stranger language in your own language, because in the minor thought, a writer is like a stranger in his own mother language. This means to be bilingual in a single language, or to be multilingual. Prosu's idea about this matter is very important, Proust says that *the great literature is written a sort of foreign language.*<sup>41</sup>

In addition, the language of the minor writing is not representative, therefore, the writer should create his/her own voices, and terms, and sounds because thinking is not to represent the events or the objects in language, thinking is to create new ideas. Therefore, writing is not to represent the events that have happened before, like the major writing. Deleuze and Guattari say that *language stops being representative in order to move toward its extremities or its limits.*<sup>42</sup> Therefore, in the language of the minor writing, the terms and the sounds are not representative.

Writing with the minor language is to think from inside of a new language that breaks the structure of the major language, this language is a minor politic language. In this structure, the reason for writing is to escape from the political structure of the major politic language that ignores the different uses of the language because writing in the major language is to express the official propaganda, not your ideas. In other words, writing by using the major grammar structure and rules is to think with a bureaucratic political structure. As against this kind of major political structure in a language, the minor writing uses the deterritorializing writing that creates the new ideas that become immanence, not transcendence. So, the minor political movement depends on the creative thinking which creates the new ideas, and the new perspectives by deterritorializing the old ideas and the philosophical

---

<sup>40</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 13.

<sup>41</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, *Dialogues*, 5.

<sup>42</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 23.

perspectives. For example, in terms of Deleuze, Sade and Masoch are the great writers, since they create the new forms of thinking and expression. They discover a new way of thinking, a feeling in their original language.<sup>43</sup> In this perspective, there are great writers who do not use the language of authority.

On the other hand, there are three politic segments that are to represent freedom: freedom of movement, freedom of statement, freedom of desire.<sup>44</sup> When it is said by Deleuze-Guattari desire is politic, it means that desire is a provocative idea that does not mean to lack like Oedipal desire. Desire is the law, and therefore, every politic regime creates the objects of its own desire. Henceforth, since the essence of desire depends on the politic regime, when the politic regime changes, and depending on this changing, the desire of people changes. In this sense, every writing represents a political regime of desire, or your father. Therefore, you should destroy the desire of your father or the politic regime, instead of your father law, or desire, you should create your productive desire, so the minor writer deterritorialize the major politic regime's desire that is represented by the father's desire or the law. For this reason, Deleuze and Guattari say that a good writer creates new desires that diminishes the major politic desires. In this sense, the minor writing is a micro-politic desire, which means to escape from the major politic desire, like Oedipal desire which means to be lack of something. Since Oedipal desire is a kind of the law which interprets everything from the perspective of lack or the father. The reason for lack is the law of the father because in hierarchical structure that what can be desired is determined by the transcendental law.

In this structure, the law is built up on the binary machine that produces some problems in the life of human beings. Deleuze thinks that the essence of the law is transcendence, not immanence because the law determines what you have to obey or not. Therefore, the law is everywhere and everyone encounters it everywhere. For Deleuze, the law is desire that represents the desire which causes the law. The law creates binary thinking, and every law causes the guilty and the innocent. Therefore, the law and the guilty are dependent on each other in hierarchical, and transcendental thinking. In this perspective, the feature of the transcendence of the law is hidden by the law and the guilt. Henceforth, everything in human life is dependent on this transcendental law that decides what the truth is or what the guilt is. Deleuze considers that the structure of the law is not related to Oedipus complex that describes the law with lack. For Deleuze, the essence of law is determined by

---

<sup>43</sup> Gilles Deleuze, *Coldness and Cruelty*, 16.

<sup>44</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 65.

politic structure that depends on desire. So, the law is desire that is a politic problem. The law cannot be considered as dependent on Good and desire, in contrast, what good is depends on itself of the law that is desire.

If there is the law, then as compulsory there is the guilt because they depend on each other. In the major writing that is hierarchical, everything depends on the law; therefore, every desire is produced by the law. In this metaphysical structure, there is a deep connection between the law and the guilt. The law is a priori and transcendental, so people have to obey the law. Therefore, the law is a statement that is directly inscribed on the real, on the body, and on the flesh.<sup>45</sup> Since the law is a priori and transcendental in the major literature, it cannot be seen directly in writing, but it is there. In contrast, in the minor writing, every a priori law of this kind is deterritorialized by the writer. Kafka saw it everywhere: *It is always in the office next door, or behind the door, or on the infinity.*<sup>46</sup> By virtue of the minor literature, this kind of law is interrogated in terms of the structure of the language, the bureaucracy. It is deterritorializing movement that creates the new perspectives with the new concepts. Therefore, the minor writing is the flight line from the major political structure in thinking, society, and writing.

### **2.1. The Flight Line**

The flight line is another important concept to understand what the minor writing is. The flight line is an active disorganization of expressions that have not the same sound, the tonality, and the same desire. Via the flight line, a lot of things are changed in the political expression of the language. *We find ourselves not in front of a structural correspondence between two sorts of forms, forms of content, forms of expression, but rather in front of an expression machine capable of disorganizing its own forms, and of disorganizing its forms of contents, in order to liberate pure contents that mix with expression in a single intense matter.*<sup>47</sup> However, in the major writing, expressions are constructed by collection of expressions that go from one expression to another which is organized by major laws like rules of grammar. Henceforth, in the major writing the flight line is not possible because of grammar rules of language as grammar that is organized by political structure before does not allow to go from one expression to another expression by changing the rules of language. On the other hand, in the minor writing, the flight line can become because the minor writing has a revolutionary language which seeks new expressions and

---

<sup>45</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 45.

<sup>46</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 45.

<sup>47</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 27.



concepts in order to escape from the major politic expressions. *A concept traces a line flight, or process of becoming, which can easily become blocked or interrupted.*<sup>48</sup>

Since there are not fixed rules, attributes, properties, and functions in the minor writing, the flight line is possible in the minor writing. *To write is to trace lines of flight which are not imaginary, and which one is indeed forced to follow, because in reality writing involves us there, draws us in there. To write is to become but has nothing to do with becoming a writer.*<sup>49</sup> The flight line is becoming something -like becoming woman, becoming machine etc.- by escaping from the social group, and from the major politic structure. That's way, writing is becoming something else or returning to a different thing. For example, when Greagor Samsa woke up in one morning, he found himself returned to a cockroach. This becoming is a flight line according to Deleuze's view. Deleuze says that writing is becoming-woman, becoming-machine, becoming-animal, which does not imitate the animal, the woman, or the machine. Becoming or becoming minor is possible by the flight line. Becoming-minor means that writing is always to encounter a new AND, meaning the flight line. On the other hand, the flight line becomes a traitor like becoming-woman. For example, writing as becoming-woman is to become a traitor of one's sex, to one's class, to one's majority. It should be said that becoming a traitor is not easy, because, in order to become a traitor, a writer needs to have a creative thinking that diminishes old values by producing new ideas, and concepts. Therefore, Deleuze says that *writing has no other end than to lose one's face, to jump over, or pierce through the wall, to plane down the wall very patiently.*<sup>50</sup> The flight line is a kind of travel, and the aim of this travel is to encounter new expressions of writing, with new kinds of life, with different places, with different experiences.<sup>51</sup> And also, this kind of travel as the flight line is becoming itself. In this perspective, each work is a journey.<sup>52</sup>

In addition, in the minor writing, a writer is neither untalented nor extravagantly talented. For this reason, the minor writing is related to creative intelligence, it is not to interpret something from the perspective of Freudian psychoanalysis because in the interpretation there is not creative thinking, but the flight line means to betray the oedipal law. Because of the flight line in writing, writing thinking as a personal thing is a great mistake because life is not a personal thing. So, *the aim of writing is to carry the life to the state of non-*

---

<sup>48</sup> Gregg Lambert, *Who's Afraid of Deleuze and Guattari?* (London: Continuum, 2206), 3.

<sup>49</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, *Dialogues*, 43.

<sup>50</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, *Dialogues*, 45.

<sup>51</sup> Mary Bryden, *Gilles Deleuze-Travels in Literature*, 2.

<sup>52</sup> Mary Bryden, *Gilles Deleuze-Travels in Literature*, 10.

personal power.<sup>53</sup> Since writing is not a personal activity, literature is not persons' dreams, fantasy or experiences, or our personal sufferings, and opinions. In this perspective, the function of writing is not to describe the world,<sup>54</sup> but the aim of writing is to create new ideas, perspectives to change life or the world. Therefore, Deleuze says that when you read a book, *the only question is how does it work for you? If it doesn't work for you, if nothing comes through, you try another book.*<sup>55</sup> This is possible with the flight line and via collective enunciation that means to escape from the major structure. Therefore, writers should create their styles, voices, faces, and enunciations. The purpose of writing is to combine one flux to another flux that is something intensive, a creation and a destruction. As a result of all of these creations, the collective enunciation occurred in the minor writing. To put it in a different way, writing is always collective by inventing new events and ideas, minor peoples, and the collective enunciations. The minor writers like Kafka, and Melville, Sade, Masoch create new events, persons, and collective enunciations in their works. For Deleuze, since English writers write as becoming-minor,<sup>56</sup> they create new collective enunciations. Consequently, the collective enunciation is another important concept in the minor writing.

### **III. The Collective Enunciation**

The collective enunciation is the third character of the minor writing. The essence of the collective enunciation is that *there is not a subject; there are only collective assemblages of enunciation.*<sup>57</sup> In this view, as it has been mentioned before in this study, writing is to invent new forms of life in order to improve new collective enunciations in writing. Collective enunciations are like a rhizome, not a tree because life is not a tree. It is grass that starts from the middle, and grass is to flight from the tree structure, and the structure of the binary writing. The collective enunciation is to start from the middle, which does not mean to be in the center, but it means to transmit between extremities that can be called as schizophrenic situation.

In this sense, the minor writing is a schizophrenic, and philosophical activity, vocation; not psychiatric. Therefore, *literary machine is an apparatus capable of creating these effects, producing signs of different orders, and thus capable of functioning effectively.*<sup>58</sup> From this perspective, as writing is collective

---

<sup>53</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, *Dialogues*, 50.

<sup>54</sup> Gilles Deleuze, *Coldness and Cruelty*, 37.

<sup>55</sup> Bruce Baugh, "How Deleuze can help us make Literature work," *Deleuze and Literature*, (Edinburg: Edinburg University Press, 2000), 36.

<sup>56</sup> John Marks, *Gilles Deleuze-Vitalism and Multiplicity*, 127.

<sup>57</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Parnet, *Dialogues*, 45.

<sup>58</sup> Daniel W. Smith, "A Life of Pure Immanence," *Essays Critical and Clinical Deleuze*, xxii.

enunciation and becoming, it is travelling; not a destination. In this view, writing is a flow, a flowing of life; it is immanence, not transcendence. Because of immanent, a concept can be easily changed by the writer with another concept, they can be replaced with each other whenever they want. If any word is not suitable for your enunciation, it can be replaced with another enunciation; if nothing of words does not suit for meaning, the writer can change it with another suitable word. In this way, writing means to create new concepts from old concepts. So, *there is no question of difficulty or understanding: concepts are exactly like sounds, colors or images, they are intensities which suit you or not, which are acceptable or are not acceptable.*<sup>59</sup> So, writing is a collective assemblage, an assemblage of words; in other words, writing is to throw off the dice. This means that the writer cannot estimate what to happen to his/her words after being created by them. Maybe, they will be popular, or may be not. Henceforth, writing is a kind of becoming, and like throwing the dice.

*Writing is a question of becoming, always incomplete, always in the midst of being formed, and goes beyond the matter of any livable or lived experience.*<sup>60</sup> Therefore, writing is not related to memories, or travels. Instead of this kind personal thing, the writer should create new enunciations of things by producing new collective enunciations, or new forms of thinking. On the other hand, writing is a schizophrenic delirium, which is not a disease, that is related to the creative unconscious, like in Kafka's works. If a writer writes about his or her personal feelings, adventures, then the writer has a passive thinking because s/he does not create any new idea, instead, represents some events that happened before.

In other words, the writer should produce new events in order to change the hierarchical structure in life. Deleuze says that writing is not hierarchical, and transcendental thing, but it is a kind of the event like to die, to love. What is an event? The event is not a concept; they are true entities; so, writing can produce new events with new concepts that can produce becoming. Because every event is becoming and every becoming is an event, events are endless. The essence of an event relates to actual and virtual that is two important terms in the minor writing. While the virtual is the plane of the minor writing, the actual is the plane of the major writing which occurs as transcendence that is the root of everything in the arborescent structure. When events get

---

<sup>59</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, *Dialogues*, 4.

<sup>60</sup> Gilles Deleuze, *Essays Critical and Clinical*, translated by Daniel W. Smith and Michael a. Greco, (New York: Verso, 1998), 1.

assembled, the collective enunciation is produced in writing, and the collective enunciation is becoming with the assemblage.

### **3.1. The Assemblage**

The assemblage is related to collective enunciations because writing is a kind of the assemblage. In this perspective, since the assemblage is a social political investigation, at the same time, the law is the assemblage. In addition, the assemblage is desire, or assemblage of desires. *The highest desire desires both to be alone and to be connected to all the machines of desire.*<sup>61</sup> In the minor writing, since everything is connected with desire, the assemblage is explained with desire. Desire is a machine as an assemblage of desire because it always makes new connections with other desires or desire machines. This kind of desire is called as the assemblage. The machinic assemblage of desire is also the collective assemblage of enunciation.<sup>62</sup> The parts of assemblage are the machine, the statement and the desire. Because the assemblage is not diabolical, and hierarchical, it is immanence, not transcendence, and since it is not hierarchical, it does not have two sides only. While diabolical constructions are connected to fascist, socialist, capitalist, and revolutionary, assemblages are immanence because they cannot be described by any transcendental diabolical ideas. They are related to unlimited social fields that is called as multiplicities. *Writing has a double function: to translate everything into assemblages and to dismantle the assemblages.*<sup>63</sup>

In this way, the writer creates new assemblages by going from one multiplicity to another multiplicity, or the writer creates a new world that is built up from multiplicity of ideas. Any multiplicity at least has three components.<sup>64</sup> Therefore, the minor writing is to make or to create connections between assemblages or multiplicities that occurred because of concepts, terms, and events from external relations which every term gets to connect to another term, not by itself. In this kind of writing, every relation between terms is external to their words. For example, all of becoming-woman, becoming-animal, becoming-machine is external relations that begin in the middle, because they don't know when or where they start or finish. Every new connection between multiple ideas causes a new relation endlessly. Therefore, the assemblage is multiplicity because where it starts or finishes cannot be found. The assemblage does not sign the whole, the totality. It refers to individual terms that create new ideas in writing. For example, Kafka's law

---

<sup>61</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 71.

<sup>62</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, 82.

<sup>63</sup> John Marks, *Gilles Deleuze-Vitalism and Multiplicity*, 136.

<sup>64</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *What is Philosophy?*, 16.

refers to a new idea about the major law, and it causes the new assemblage in writing about the law.

Therefore, it can be said that the minor writing is the assemblage of utterances, which are content to describe corresponding states of things. Writing with assemblages is becoming from one thing to another thing, and writing with assemblages is not about human beings or one's dog, one's cat etc. As we have seen before, it is not a personal thing, writing is to change the life by producing new assemblages. The assemblage is becoming-multiplicity, becoming-woman, becoming-animals, becoming-desire machine. The assemblage is to become an abstract line, a bloc, a sound. In this sense, *every assemblage is collective, since it is made up from several fluxes which carry along the characters and things, and which are only to be divided or reassembled as multiplicities.*<sup>65</sup>

In contrast, since a segmentary that opposed to an assemblage is made of structures, and hierarchies, it is not endless and multiplicity. The segmentary has a starting and finishing point, for this reason, in a segmentary structure, a person goes firstly to school, and after, to a university, and to the army, and to a factory, and retirement. The whole of this structure is segmentary, in contrast, the assemblage is not segmentary. When both society and writing consist of this kind of structure, it produces organized fascist structures. In this perspective, life is segments: rich-poor, young-old, success-loss of success, health-sickness, creativity-sterility. Firstly, segments depend on the binary machines that are social classes, like man-woman, black-white. In major structure, one of them should be chosen always. Secondly, since each segment has a power relation, they are devices of power that mean a code territory. Thirdly, each segment is overcode.

However, an assemblage is multiplicity that is on the plane of immanence. In this perspective, becoming a marginal is becoming a part of any segment or to build up a new segment because marginal groups are another kind of fascism that is called as micro fascist groups. On the other hand, marginals do not create new lines of flight. Actually, they are reactive groups which do not produce any new things. In contrast, the minor writing is to destroy this kind of micro fascist groups by creating new assemblages as multiplicity. Assemblages are multiplicities that means to be explained with different words, which is not transcendental to other terms.

### **3.2. Multiplicity**

---

<sup>65</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, *Dialogues*, 121.

Multiplicity is the result of assemblages. The minor writing is a virtual multiplicity that is called an abstract multiplicity.<sup>66</sup> Since assemblages are multiplicities that can be explained by different words, they are not transcendent to others. Therefore, in multiplicity, states of things are not one; since they can be stated with different ways, each state of things is itself multiple. *In a multiplicity what counts are not the terms or the elements, but what there is between, the between, a set of relations which are not the separable from each other.*<sup>67</sup> For this reason, in multiplicity, there are at least three different points that are not hierarchical because if there are two different points then it must be diabolical and hierarchical, but if any term or point has three different points, then it cannot be diabolical, and hierarchical. For example, the rhizome cannot be described with only two points because of not having two points only. From this perspective, multiplicities have not a starting and an end point, they always start growing in the middle; therefore, every multiplicity starts from the middle endlessly. The minor writing is writing with multiplicity of ideas because it begins from the middle. Works of this kind can be read by starting from in the middle that means becoming. So, *multiplicities are made up of becoming, without history, of individuation, without subject.*<sup>68</sup>

On the other hand, multiplicity is a creative thinking that does not start from one point, instead, it connects endlessly one point to another point. This kind of thinking is possible by writing by difference as becoming. Multiplicities are differences as eternal return that means to create a new thing in every repetition. In this sense, multiplicity is an abstract line, and a metaphysical idea. They are related to ideas, intelligence, problems that are created by philosophers. If ideas, or problems are ready before, then there is no creative thinking in writing. It is known that a writer should create his own problems and ideas. The problems of the minor writing are not true or false, the problem is whether it is a new idea or not. Therefore, *you should not try to find whether an idea is just or correct. You should look for completely different ideas, elsewhere, in another area, so that something passes between the two which is neither one nor the other.*<sup>69</sup> In multiplicity, there are no longer binary machines: masculine-feminine, man-animal etc.

Multiplicity as the abstract power of relation establishes or creates relations between singularities. In this view, in a novel, a character can have

---

<sup>66</sup> Keith Ansell Pearson, "Deleuze, Philosophy, and Immanence," *Deleuze and Religion*, edited by Mary Bryden, (London: Routledge, 2001), 147.

<sup>67</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, *Dialogues*, viii.

<sup>68</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, *Dialogues*, viii.

<sup>69</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, *Dialogues*, 10.

some singular identity, and the writer should produce new ideas by creating new relations between them. In a novel, a character has some singular identity; s/he is not only a man or a woman, at the same time, s/he can be a father or a mother, a teacher, or a doctor etc. All of these attributions are singular, and they consist of multiplicity of singularities. In this kind of writing, there is not a center, there are only borders where it enters into relations with the other multiplicities, and changes nature, transforms itself, follows the line of flight. In this structure, the identity of a subject is dissolved by multiplicities, because none of subjects has one identity in life, to have one identity in life is not possible. There is always another connection between singular identity. Therefore, Deleuze says that multiplicity is AND as endlessly.

### 3.3. AND

Deleuze writes that the minor writing is to write with AND because AND means to be in the middle of the writing. In contrast, the writing with copula is to write with a starting and a finish point, and it is to write by the major structure. In contrast, writing with AND is like the rhizome, not a tree because it can extend endlessly because of possible adding to a new AND always. Therefore, a writer can put a new AND, and continue writing endlessly. In addition, AND is a creative way of thinking. Depending on this perspective, Deleuze makes a separation between an ironist who writes with copula, and a humour who writes with AND. As an ironist considers substance in terms of the first reason, a humour considers substance in terms of AND, and multiplicity. Henceforth, a humour does not seek what the first principle is, s/he considers in terms of minority, becoming, and multiplicity, and encounter. *Humor is the triumph of the ego over the superego...*<sup>70</sup>

At the same time, writing with AND is to encounter new ideas. Encounter is to create AND in writing instead of recognizing, remembering, and finding. In major writing or thinking there is to remember, to recognize that does not cause new things. Therefore, it is known that recognizing, and encountering is opposed to each other. Encountering causes new questions to be asked about an encountered thing. Since recognizing is to know something before, when you meet with it which you recognize, like this is my book, a cat, or a dog etc. So, there is not a creative thinking in recognizing. Therefore, *recognizing is the opposite of encounter.*<sup>71</sup> In this perspective, *just ideas: this is encounter, the becoming, the theft, the nuptials, this between-two of solitudes.*<sup>72</sup>

<sup>70</sup> Gilles Deleuze, *Coldness and Cruelty*, 125.

<sup>71</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, *Dialogues*, 8.

<sup>72</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, *Dialogues*, 9.

Writing of this kind is micro politic called as minor that is to write by starting in the middle by new encounters. The encounter forces the mind to think new things, and forces the mind to seek the truth.<sup>73</sup>

The minor writing as encounter is becoming that means going from becoming to becoming without making any plan. For this reason, *to encounter is to find, to capture, to steal, but there is no method for finding other than a long preparation.*<sup>74</sup> Encounter is everywhere, and there are good encounters and bad encounters in writing. If any encounter causes new ideas in our intelligence, if it increases our power of intellect, the encounter is good. If it does not increase the power of our intellect, it is a bad encounter.

### **Consequently**

The minor writing is used to describe to the minor perspective in philosophy. This perspective is a new approach in writing. The minor writing means to change the major structure that is called as a diabolical or a tree structure. In this mean, it is a kind of the creative thinking. The minor writing is against to rules of the major languages. Therefore, a minor writer creates a new language in the major language by changing the structure of the major language. For this reason, if any writer deterritorializes the rules of the major language, it can be said that s/he is a minor writer. Since the minor writer creates his style, and terms, the aim of the minor writing is to produce a new style of thinking and writing in the major language. For example, Kafka created a new style in German language by using differently to German language. Therefore, Kafka deterritorialized German language in his works. Since the minor writing is related to creating and changing something in the language, the aim of the minor writer does not represent the life in writing, the aim is to change the life that is hierarchical or diabolical. It is to write from the perspective of philosophy, not psychiatry. The minor writing is related to becoming that means to be between, or in the middle of something: becoming-woman, becoming-animal, becoming-desire etc. As a result, the minor writing means to create new forms of the life and writing. In other words, the minor writing is to create another world, another life, or another thought.

---

<sup>73</sup> John Marks, *Gilles Deleuze-Vitalism and Multiplicity*, 132.

<sup>74</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, *Dialogues*, 7.



## References

- Bryden M. *Gilles Deleuze-Travels in Literature*, New York: Palgrave Macmillian, 2007.
- Charles J. S. "Gilles Deleuze & Felix Guattari: Schizoanalysis & Literary Discourse", *Substance*, 1980. Vol. 9, No. 4, Issue 29 (1980), pp. 46-57. <http://www.jstor.com/stable/3684040> (Erişim Tarihi 15.01.2021)
- Baugh B. "How Deleuze can help us make Literature work," *Deleuze and Literature*, Edinburg: Edinburg University Press, 2000, pp. 34-56.
- Crawford, T. H, "The Paterson Plateau: Deleuze, Guattari and William Carlos Williams," *Deleuze and Literature*, Edinburg: Edinburg University Press, 2000, pp. 57-79.
- Corngold, S. "Kafka and the Dialect of Minor Literature," *College Literature*, Vol. 21, No. 1 (Feb., 1994), pp. 89-101. <http://www.jstor.com/stable/25112084> (Erişim Tarihi 15.01.2021)
- Deleuze, G. *Essays Critical and Clinical*, translated by Daniel W. Smith and Michael a. Greco, New York: Verso, 1998.
- Deleuze, G., *Pure Immanence, Essays on A Life*, translated by Anne Boyman, New York: Zone Books, 2001.
- Deleuze, G. *Coldness and Cruelty*, translated by Jean Mcneil-Aude Willm, New York: Zone Books, 1999.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. *Kafka Toward a Minor Literature*, translated by Dana Polan, London: University of Minnesota Press, 1986.
- Deleuze, G. *The Logic of Sense*, translated by Mark Lester with Charles Stivale, London: The Athlone Press, 1990.
- Deleuze, G. *Desert Islands and Other Texts*, translated by Michael Taomina, New York: Semiotext(e) 2002.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. *What is Philosophy?* Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell, New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.
- Deleuze, G. and Parnet, C. *Dialogues*, translated by H. Tomlinson and B. Habberjam, New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.
- Smith, D. W. "A Life of Pure Immanence," *Essays Critical and Clinical Deleuze*, translated by Daniel W. Smith and Michael a. Greco, New York: Verso, 1998.
- Goodchild, P. "Why is philosophy so compromised with God," *Deleuze and Religion*, edited by Mary Bryden, London: Routledge, 2001, pp.156-166.
- Lambert, G. *Who's Afraid of Deleuze and Guattari?* London: Continuum, 2206.
- Marks, J. *Gilles Deleuze-Vitalism and Multiplicity*, (London: Pluto Press, 1998) pp.123-139.
- Pearson, K. A. "Deleuze, Philosophy, and Immanence," *Deleuze and Religion*, edited by Mary Bryden, London: Routledge, 2001, pp.141-155.