THE LANGUAGE OF EXPERIENCE:

A SOCIAL ANALYSIS OF THE SECOND NEW POETRY

MUHAMMET ELYESA KOYTAK

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2017

THE LANGUAGE OF EXPERIENCE:

A SOCIAL ANALYSIS OF THE SECOND NEW POETRY

Thesis submitted to the

Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences

in a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Sociology

by

Muhammet Elyesa Koytak

Boğaziçi University

2017

The Language of Experience:

A Social Analysis of the Second New Poetry

The thesis of Muhammet Elyesa Koytak

has been approved by:

Assist. Prof. Bülent Küçük
(Thesis Advisor)

Assist. Prof. Olcay Akyıldız
(Thesis Co-Advisor)

Assoc. Prof. Ayfer Bartu Candan

Assoc. Prof. Lütfi Sunar
(External Member)

Assoc. Prof. Ayşe Akalın
(External Member)

June 2017

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Muhammet Elyesa Koytak, certify that

- I am the sole author of this thesis and that I have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution;
- this thesis contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other educational institution;
- this is a true copy of the thesis approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Boğaziçi University, including final revisions required by them.

Signature.....

Date 13.06.2017

ABSTRACT

The Language of Experience: A Social Analysis of the Second New Poetry

The Second New is the movement of innovation in the form of language in Turkish poetry in the second half of the 1950s. Acommon feature among the poets from different social backgrounds was their use of the technique of transforming of reality into an abstracted and obscure poetic diction. The Second New movement intersected with the social changes born of urbanization in the 1950s. However, the sociology in Turkey has not developed methodological tools ortheoretical frameworks which would allow objectifying the Second New phenomenon. This study makes a sociological contribution to that topic in the case of Cemal Süreya, a prominent poet of the movement. This study therefore focuses on the confrontation between the poet's subjective dispositions and the objective conditions of the Turkish poetry field to explain the socio-genesis of the formal innovation in the poetic language. With this outlook, the inner development in Süreya's poetry isanalyzed throughout his changing relationships with his external social world. The analysis showsthat the transformation of language as an innovation arose when the objective limits of the existing poetic capabilities of Turkish poetry did not allow Süreya to express his subjective dispositions, which are marked by harsh state policies and segregation from the established social order.It also showsthat the Second New is a response to the past, the reality and the context of which forced the poet to reinvent himself in the poetry within the major language.

ÖZET

Deneyimin Dili: İkinci Yeni Şiirinin Toplumsal Analizi

İkinci Yeni, 1950'lerin ikinci yarısında şiir diline yenilik getiren bir akımdır. Akımın içinde bulunan ve çok farklı toplumsal arkaplanlardan gelen şairlerin ortak paydası, gerçekliği kapalı ve soyut bir şiir diline dönüştürme tekniğini kullanmalarıydı.İkinci Yeni akımı, 1950'lerdeki şehirleşme sürecinin doğurduğu toplumsal değişimlerle de kesişiyordu.Fakat Türkiye'de sosyoloji, İkinci Yeni fenomenini nesneleştirmeye yarayacak teorik çerçeveyi ve metodolojik araçları geliştirmiş değildir.Bu bakımdan bu çalışma, akımın önde gelen şairlerinden olan Cemal Süreya özelinde konuya katkıda bulunmayı amaçlamaktadır.Bu çalışma, şiir dilindeki biçimsel yeniliğin toplumsal doğuşunu açıklamak için, şairin öznel yatkınlıklarının Türk şiiri alanının nesnel koşullarıyla karşılaşmasına odaklanmaktadır.Bu çerçeve içinde Süreya'nin şiirinin içsel gelişimi, şairin dışsal toplumsal dünyayla ilişkilerindeki değişimler üzerinden analiz edilecektir. Analizlerin temel sonuçları, şiir alanındaki mevcut imkanların sınırları Süreya'ya, devletin sert politikaları ve mevcut toplumsal düzen tarafından darbe almış öznel yatkınlıklarını ifade etme fırsatı vermediğinde bir yenlik olarak dilin dönüştürülmesi tekniğinin keşfedildiği ve İkinci Yeni'nin, şairi kendini şiirde yeniden icat etmeye zorlayan geçmişine, gerçekliğine ve bağlamına karşı, majör dilin içinden bir cevap olarak yazıldığıdır.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my dear wife, Çiğdem Koytak, who deserves to be commended for her ever-supporting manner throughout the course of writing this thesis.

My dear fellows, Furkan Aktan, Malik Dursun, Ahmet Üzmez, Sercan Karadoğan and İsa Yılmaz, deserve to be mentioned here for their motivating friendship.

Also, I would like to thank my old friend Serkan Sönmezgil, who provided considerablesupport through his technical contributions.

Deepest gratitude goes to my thesis advisors, Assist. Prof. Bülent Küçük and Assist. Prof. Olcay Akyıldız, whose welcoming attitude and vital contributions lighted my way in overcoming theoretical and structural problems and deficienciesof the first draft.

Lastly, I would like to thank the library attendants of the Beyazıt Public Library and the Library of Center for Islamic Studies (ISAM), who quickly responded to my insistent demands. Without their efforts, I would not have been able to access the literary magazines of the 1950s.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION....8

CHAPTER 2: THE SOCIOLOGY OF LYRIC POETRY....16

CHAPTER 3: THE SOCIOGENESIS OF A NEW POETRY....28

3.1 Turkish poetry field before 1950....28

3.2 Mülkiye,compensation of the past and entry to the field....38

3.3 A generational struggle....45

CHAPTER 4: THE LANGUAGE OF EXPERIENCE....58

4.1 The humor of love....58

4.2 The abstraction of grief....64

4.3 The trans-formation of language....69

4.4 Image as self-image....78

CHAPTER 5: THE NOMAD'S HOUSE....90

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION....96

REFERENCES....99

APPENDIX: THE CHRONOLOGY OF MAGAZINES AND POEMS....104

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Sociological formula which is mostly employed when it comes to explain a literary phenomenon within the discipline is explaining a text through its social context. “The social” which has been the main emphasis for sociology since its foundation here indicates whole historical, economic and political conditions around literary work. Social context is considered to condition work; the latter is thought as causal expression of the former. Mostly based on the paradigm of the novel, sociology of literary forms has always defined aesthetic and intellectual works as “expression”, “extension”, “window”, “representation”, “reflection” or “description” of its social “background”. No matter in which degree the agency of author is recognized by different recent studies in the sociology of literature, there is always a unilateral “social” effect that comes from context and determines literary production.

The last movement of Turkish poetry in the second half of the 50s does not allow to be easily and directly explained by its social background. It was a radical break with from-reality relation in modern Turkish literature since the poets mostly wrote poems full of abstractions and deformation of the reality and language rather than directly expressing, i.e. representing their life-experience. Despite the poets did not write a collective manifesto in order to initiate such a movement, the common features among their poems were abstraction, imagism and deformation that were rarely existing in conventional poetry writing before 50s. Indeed, a new relation with language emerged with the Second New, which still influences successive generations of Turkish poetry today. However, this deformation of language as the common technique of the Second New cannot be explained by similarity of the

actors' social backgroundswhich are external and prior to their textual patterns, since the prominent poets such as Sezai Karakoç, Ülkü Tamer, Turgut Uyar, Cemal Süreya, Ece Ayhan, İlhan Berk and Edip Cansever are all from different, even antagonistic social origins, cultural capitals and class positions. For instance, whereas Karakoç comes from a rural family of Diyarbakır, Cansever has a high class family of İstanbul; however, they use same techniques of radical break with reality in their poems between 1955 and 1960. Whereas Cemal Süreya comes from an exiled family of Dersim, Turgut Uyar whose father was a respected Ottoman commander was a military officer likewise. The only common fact among them is in the form of their poems which is based on abstraction, imagism, deformation of ordinary language and rupture with the representative enunciation.

Therefore, on the one hand, considering wide historical conditions behind the actors of the Second New as the only and common explanatory principle for formal features of their texts will only repeat basic rhetoric of conventional sociological imagination. On the other hand, reducing the poets' formal innovation into merely aesthetic reasons that are rooted in the Turkish poetry's inner autonomous development would ignore the external historicity of context and isolate the poetic operation from the social world in which it existed. In order to overcome this dichotomy, a sociological study of poetic forms has to build a bridge between text and context, i.e. poetical and social. This bridge, in this study, is the experience of actor, the poet him/herself. However, the actor or the subject will not be considered as an intermediary tool to explain text by context, nor vice versa. Following Weberian approach of *Verstehen*, my aim is to understand the meaning of the action (poem, text) for the actor him/herself (poet) in the social context. The experience of the subject is not of secondary importance compared to textual production/freedom

and contextual determinants/necessity, it is the contingent locus that connects these two poles. Therefore my question is what the meaning of the deformation of language in poetry for the Second New poets in 1950s was. Following that general question, this study focuses on how a poet experienced his social context and how he/she constructed poems throughout his/her experiences of the social. Such a task requires then the reconstruction of the making of the poet in order to understand the relation between the social world in which his/her poetry is created and the poetic world/texthe/she creates.

In fact, such a general question requires a comprehensive study should encompass whole empirical data about poets, participants and comments of the Second New. Yet this seems impossible for two reasons: First, such a study on a crowded number of poets (Ülkü Tamer, İlhan Berk, Edip Cansever, Turgut Uyar, Sezai Karakoç, Cemal Süreya, Tevfik Akdağ, Gülten Akın, Ece Ayhan and so on) is beyond the limits and aims of a master thesis. Secondly, there are not enough primary sources for each poet: Some of them wrote neither memories nor personal journal; some of them left no trace except their poems and some anecdotes that are disseminated into various memories of others and interviews in magazine pages. Encompassing the wholeSecond Newas a social phenomenon requires a much more collective and long term research.

Therefore, I have to follow a more monographic way to objectify it.[1]It seems reasonable to choose a poet about whom I can find enough primary and secondary data sources. Cemal Süreya, one of the most read poets in Turkey since 50s presents an interesting case for two reasons: Firstly, the social background of Cemal Süreya is very significant in the sense that he comes from a rural region of the country and

[1] A good monographic study in the sociology of art is Norbert Elias' *Mozart* where the sociologist seek to discover the subjective meaning of the music for young Mozart in his social world (Elias, 2000).

lower class position, he then becomes scholarship boarding student during primary and secondary education years ("parasız yatılı"), he goes to Ankara Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi (Mülkiye), and then he becomes public servant in Ministry of Finance. From an exiled and lower class Dersim family to a reputed bureaucrat in Ankara, Süreya's life experience is a case of both spatial and social mobility. Secondly, although he comes from a Kurdish family, he becomes a well-known young poet in 50s and then a central figure in Turkish literature. His lyric poetry is mostly based on eroticism and love as themes, and he created initial and influential examples of the two formal techniques of the Second New, abstraction and deformation. His friendship with Sezai Karakoç, who was another disadvantaged individual from Kurdish region of the country, in undergraduate years intersects with the emergence of Second New in 50's and represents a significant collectivity for the rise of the new poetry. They are together in *Şiir Sanatı* and *Pazar Postası* magazines which were the central publications of the Second New between 1955 and 1958. The first book of Süreya, *Üvercinka*, is published in 1958 and a year after Karakoç published his first book, *Körfez*. Beside his poetry books, Süreya also wrote many literary criticisms, political essays, personal memories to which I have direct access. Yet my object is not Süreya as an intellectual but his poetry's development between 1950 and 1960, during the Second New's emergence. Otherwise this thesis would be a study in sociology of intellectuals rather than in sociology of poetry. Therefore my objectification does not include what Süreya did as social actor and what he wrote after 1959, the year the poet began to the military service for two years. Since my question is to understand the reason and meaning of the emergence of Süreya's poetry within the Second New, my thesis limits itself within the analysis of the rise of the formal innovation until 1960 in the case of Cemal Süreya.

To summarize, the task of this study is to objectify the emergence of Cemal Süreya's lyric poetry within the Second New in 50s. My aim is to explain the reasons that produced the combination of lyric and erotic themes with the new poetry writing style on the ground of the poet's experience of the social in the case of Süreya. The research question is what sort of relations existed between all Süreya's experiences and his poetry's development? How did lyric themes which has been the most written and read poetic themes both in Turkish poetry and the world literature intersect with a formal innovation in poetry writing style in 1950s? How did a most socially disadvantaged individual from Kurdish origin become a dominant Turkish poet? In other words, my study focuses on the *making* of Süreya as a lyric and Second New poet and the process in which his poetry resulted from the confrontation between his subjective dispositions structured in his childhood and objective conditions he experienced both in Ankara and more specifically in the Turkish poetry field.[2]

How to sociologically objectify the lyric poetry of Cemal Süreya? Unlike the literary theories from New Criticism and Russian Formalism to the Poststructural Marxism and New Historicism which all have different and developed schemas of analyses of poetic forms, the sociology canon that has been accumulated for more than a hundred years gives very few examples of the objectification of poetic texts as cultural forms. Whereas a sub-discipline that is called "sociology of literature" exists, it is very difficult to find a study which has focused on formal and textual patterns of poems as well as social context. Since my task is twofold, meaning that on the one side I have to elaborate the objective and historical conditions of the Turkish poetry

[2] I have to note here that such a monographic study has not been achieved so far on any of the Second New poets. Although Orhan Koçak's recent study focuses on the case of Turgut Uyar, it remains within the limits of literary criticism since it analyses merely the inner and aesthetic development of Uyar's poetry, without taking into account possible social and contextual reasons (Koçak, 2011).

in which Süreya as poet published his first poems in 50s, and on the other, the process of formation of Süreya's subjective relation with the language through his poetry, I will take support from two different theoretical approach to literary phenomena: In order to analyze the inner development and conditions of the Turkish poetry before and during the Second New's emergence, I will follow Pierre Bourdieu's theory of field and its main assumptions. Besides, I will follow and test Gilles Deleuze's theory of minor literature in the case of Süreya. Therefore, my theoretical and methodological assumptions will be based on a mix consideration of different theoreticians of literature. The reason why specifically Bourdieu and Deleuze are taken into account will be elaborated in the relevant chapter.

In order to elaborate my theoretical framework, in Chapter 2, I will try to initiate a discussion in the context-centered sociology canon. Here, I will evaluate Bourdieu's theory of field and Deleuze's minor literature in details. Although the use of Bourdieu's theory is because it offers an explanatory schema for inner development of cultural fields, the discussion I try to initiate with Deleuze aims to test it in the case of Süreya's poetry.

Chapter 3 will be on Süreya's trajectory in the objective structure of the poetry field throughout 1950s. First, the inner structure and historical composition of the Turkish poetry field until 1950 will be elaborated in the first part. In the light of the Bourdieu's theory of field, I will portray the main positions, movements and debates in the poetry since 1930s in order to discover on the one hand how far the poetry field was independent from the politics and on the other, what sort of poetry writing style Süreya confronted with in terms of form and content when he published his first poems. This chapter presents therefore a crucial ground to understand the innovation Süreya and the Second New achieved in the poetry. In the second part of

this chapter, I try to discover the social meaning of Mülkiye for Süreya and Karakoç and their entry to the poetry field in the early 50s. And in the last part, I will try to analyze the rise of the new poetry, i.e. the Second New in 1955, by these two young poets. I try to argue that Second New is a movement of generation which tries to manifest its subjectivity within brand new forms they had to create in order to break off with conventional language and identities assigned by the both literary and political establishment. I try to clarify why the Second New was a generational struggle, and Süreya and Karakoç were central figures of the moment. The relation between their strategies in the field once they were recognized as poet and their distance to major language of legitimacy will be analyzed here.

Chapter 4 is another core chapter in which I try to discover the development in the technical aspects of Süreya's poetry. Upon a detailed analyses of the relation between the poet's secondary experiences in their new social conditions and the formal development of his poetry, the analysis in the Chapter 4 will focus on the dialectic between Süreya's experiences in Ankara (his position among students, his private life, his marriage, his recognition among poets and polemics) and his poems in a chronological line.[3] Instead of taking only his published books into account, I will also examine the school magazines *Mülkiye* and *Kazgan* where Süreya published his first poems in 1953 and 1954. Although these early poems can not be considered in Second New, they include formal clues about the relation between poem and experience of the poet. I will also examine *Şiir Sanatı* and *Pazar Postası*,[4] the magazines Süreya published poems and writings between 1955 and 1959, in order to

[3] Table 2 in Appendix shows Süreya's poems from 1950 to 1958. Despite some lacks, this list has been prepared thanks to an exhaustive archival work on literary magazines of the period.
[4] Table 1 in Appendix shows detailed information about the magazines of the period. My data is based on the archival research in the Beyazıt Public Library and Library of Center for Islamic Studies (ISAM), where the concerning issues of *Mülkiye*, *Kazgan*, *Şiir Sanatı* and *Pazar Postası*(and also most of the indicated magazines) exist.

locate his presence and actions in the field. In this way, I hope to have the chance of reconstructing his poetry's development step by step within his context. Throughout the chronological analysis, my study requires also reading of other prominent poets, at least on exemplary level, from the field like Orhan Veli, Oktay Rifat, Attila İlhan, Cahit Külebi, Turgut Uyar, İlhan Berk and Sezai Karakoç in order to discover the convergences and divergences of the innovation Süreya made in the field. It is foreseeable that an analysis of poems may discompose sociological conventions since the sociologists are not used to closely focus on the poetic texts; however, what I will try to do is not a literary interpretation or criticism of the poems, but the elaboration of their objective patterns which are readable for all social scientists as well. In that sense, the use of poems as material aims only to understand the poet's experience. In Chapter 5, I try to interpret the subjective meaning of *Üvercinka* and the poetry itself for Süreya, with Weberian assumption that a social action should always be understood through the will of its actor.

Chapter 6 is the conclusion where I try to check my theoretical stance. Poetry is neither reflection of wide social and political formation of its time as vulgar and so-called sociological schematisms argue; nor the sublimation of pure subjectivity as psychological explanations defend. It is where the experience of confrontation between subjective dispositions and objective conditions speaks.

CHAPTER 2

THE SOCIOLOGY OF LYRIC POETRY

This chapter focuses on the theoretical framework in which I will try to discover how to objectify poetic forms within a sociological methodology. Despite the certain fact that the lack of a similar study within the discipline of sociology which would offer a tested theoretical and methodological framework makes my task more difficult, I try to traverse prominent sociological approaches to literary phenomena in order to find a ground on which I can objectify Cemal Süreya's poetry in the lens of the aforementioned main question.

In the history of sociology a sub-discipline of "sociology of literature" exists, however, it is strictly limited in the studies of novels rather than poetry. Two common features of studies insociology of literature so far are that they always choose the novel as their subject matter and explain the novel's textual patterns through social context (English, 2010). The latent presumption that novel is always the convenient object of sociological inquiry is a common idea in studies on cultural forms within the social sciences in Turkey as well: It is easy to discuss social dynamics and consequences of Ottoman-Turkish modernization process since 19th century through the social panorama, characters and dichotomies described in the novels of Recaizade Mahmut Ekrem, Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, Ahmet Hamid Tanpınar or Orhan Pamuk. In that sense, the novel is thought as the "expression" or "representation" of the social "reality" or "background". This is not surprising since the novel has been the rising form of the modern literature since 19th century: Balzac's monumental work, *The Human Comedy*, which consisted of 91 volumes were perfectly recording the social life of French bourgeoisy between 1816 and

1848. Thomas Mann, Charles Dickens, William Faulkner, Marcel Proust and James Joyce are other prominent writers whose works consisted of representing all that is external in the text. Stendhal defined novel as "a mirror carried along a road". Since 19th century, the novel has always been considered as witness, report or document of reality.

Therefore, the initial sociological interest on literary forms which came from Marx followed the same logic of representation. For him, Balzac's work was more instructive on the French society than any scientific study in economy and history (Marx & Engels, 1995, p. 65). In his *18th Brumaire*, Marx's main arguments were mostly based on Balzac's portrayal of society (Petrey, 1988). A Marxist critic of literature in the 20th century, György Lukacs writes later that "the novel is the representative art-form of our age since the structural categories of the novel constitutively coincide with the world as it is today" (Moretti, 2015). Consequently, Lukacs' masterpiece, *The Theory of the Novel*, locates the forms of novel in the developments and crises of capitalism (Lukacs, 1973). Likewise, Lukacs explains Goethe's ideas in his work with the rise of merchantilism in the 18th century (Lukacs, 2011). Despite his negative attitude towards Marxism, another founding sociologist, Georg Simmel also analysizes Goethe's ideas within the intellectual movements of the Enlightenment. In both studies, the formal patterns of Goethe's poetry is ignored (Orringer, 1977) and the focus of inquiry is on the intellectual convergences of the author with his time, society and other writers. With a similar look, Lucien Goldmann follows in his studies the same logic of explanation of text by its wider economic context. As a mix of Marxist and Durkheimian approaches to the social world, his theoretical argument consists of the homologies between the novel's inner world and the author's collective consciousness that is rooted in the group identity

(Goldmann, 1980, p. 24). What the author does, for Goldmann, is giving consistence to flowing ideas of his class consciousness. Goldmann thus defines the form of novel as representation of the external facts and dimensions (Goldmann, 1980, p. 29). Interestingly, Goldmann confesses the difficulty of applying his model to the poetry because of the latter's high subjectivity compared to novel (Goldmann, 1980, p. 141). In that sense, Goldmann writes that the concept of homology is too reductive for the subtle details of poetic form which is much more concentrated than novel (Goldmann, 1980, p. 155).

Apart from the Marxist line, the sociology of novel develops in other approaches as well. In France, Robert Escarpit published his book *Sociology of Literature* in 1958; in United Kingdom, Richard Hoggart initiates studies in literature in Center for Contemporary Cultural Studies after 1964. From that moment until 1990's, the sociology of novel is mostly based on the analysis of "organizations and markets, publishing conditions, networks of editor and booksellers, copyright laws and censorship norms, strategies of diffusion, reading habits of various groups and so on" (Ferguson & Desan & Griswold, 1988). Instead of building up its own methodology, this sociological interest in literary phenomenons disperses in media studies, feminism, postcolonial studies and ideology criticism since 90s (English, 2010). The same logic of Marxism is dominant among these studies: "explaining the work by its socio-economic context since the former reflects the latter" (Ferguson & Desan & Griswold, 1988, p. 427). The aim of sociology of literature always remains as "providing an account of literary texts and practices by reference to the social forces of their production, the social meanings of their formal particulars, and the social effects of their circulation and reception" (English, 2010). Therefore, the sociology of literature gives priorty to the contextual over the textual (Bennett,

2010). When it comes to study of poetic forms, the latter's reductive theoretical assumptions do not allow the sociologist to discover the subtle relations between the work's form, the creator-subject and the external world.

Additionally, the recent studies of Franco Moretti deepenes the emphasis on context in sociology of novel. Instead of using close-reading technique of the literary criticism, Moretti offers "distant reading" in order to measure the long-term changes in literature. His study aims to show the development of the novel by mathematical models, diagrams and graphs upon gigantic statistical databases (Moretti, 2007). Moretti argues that "literary history requires skills of sampling; statistics; works with series, titles, concordances, incipits" in order to discover the laws of the history of literature (Moretti, 2000, p. 208). Inspired by Fernand Braudel's idea of *longue durée*, Moretti widens the scope of analysis and does not focus on poetic texts' inner world.

In fact, it is understandable why aforementioned sociological studies of literary forms are mostly based on novel rather than poetry: Firstly, the poetry, especially the lyric poetryin the case of Süreya, is much more subjective, concentrated and formal than the novel genre. In contrast to novel, lyric poetry rarely directly reflects its social background, meaning that a sociologist aiming to explain a lyric poetic phenomenon does not find easy and ready clues and datas from the text in order to explain it by its context. In that sense, no matter how autobiographical a lyric poem's themes are, there exist always an epistemological gap between the poetic text and the poet's social being. Secondly, poetry is made upon the language itself rather than characters and chain of events as in novel. The poetry is produced in a very rapid process and it can be immediately read by another, meaning that it does not depend on its social organizations whereas other forms art like painture, music

and cinema are all depending on the external organization of production, circulation and reception (Becker, 1974). The only significant institution of poetry is journals and magazines that decide on which poem to publish or deny. It is therefore difficult to stalk a lyric poem's production, circulation and consumption process; it has always a very limited reader-audience. Thirdly, whereas a novel can present and represent social life through characters, long descriptions and events, lyric poetry offers a too little keyhole to his social background. Especially modern lyric poetry which consists of formal autonomy and deformation of language against reality complicates the task of sociologist since it has a semantic density which does not allow to reduce it to a symptome of an external factor (Eagleton, 2011, p. 259). Therefore, reducing the form of lyric poem to its social and external "background" as if the former is direct reflection, representation or extension of the latter does not give any explanation about the social meaning of the rise of a new poetic form. Whereas the context-centered logic of explanation may be useful in the study of novel which usually portrays a life or narrates events, it is inadequate for lyric poetry which often gives a limited and subjective meaning. These categorical differences between lyric poetry and novel genre prevent my study to adopt one of the ready-made sociological frameworks which emphasize the explanatory force of the wide contextual dynamics and consequently ignore the tight subjective relation between the text and the poet in the case of lyric poetry.

Therefore, in order to surpass the dichotomy of text and context as well as the inner criticsm and the sociologies of novel, I argue that a sociology of poetic forms has to bring three realms together: text, subject and context. The subject's experience of the context is expressed in the text in concentrated semantic ways. In other words, I suggest considering lyric poetry as result of the confrontation between the

subjectivity/innerside of the poet and the objective/external conditions of the social world around him/her.[5] Sociology of lyric poetry should therefore bring textual, individual and social patterns together rather than separating those dimensions as different realms of reality. My argument is that it is not the social which directly and necessarily determines the literary as it is considered in context-oriented approaches, yet it is the contingent experiences in the objective social world which guides reasons and ways in which poet lays his subjective relation with poetry. In that sense, I will take the Süreya's existence and experience as the anchor that links his poems and his contexts, in order to understand the meaning of emergence and invention of a new formal poetry writingstyle for the actor himself. By this way, my study aims to avoid the mistake of giving privilage to neither the social/historical nor the textual/particular. Instead of reducing the textual to a solely fictional or artificial secondary position against the reality as in the sociology of novel (Barrere & Martucelli, 2011), I will consider the textual, the subjective and the contextual in a flat and unitary ontology in order to discover the meaning in the articulation of these three components. In that sense, the term "context" will not be taken as the determining reality over the determined "text", but as the relations in which the subject fabricates formal patterns of poetry with the poetic materials he/she finds from its social world. Instead of explaining how the context is reflected in the text, I

[5] At this point, I have to state that I take subjective and objective as two synchronous ontological spheres of social human being: subjective means set of memory, intentions, practical dispositions, values, traumas, desires and habitus of a person; and objective means things, other persons' actions and interactions, processes, instiutions, rules and established latent doxas of the world. From that perspective, a social action (a poem or a practical daily behaviour) occurs in the border line between subjectivity and objectivity, man and world. The social is therefore not solely the most external and macro structures (like economical conditions) anymore, but it is the daily dialectic between these two constant ontological spheres.

will seek to discover why the subject-poet produced this or that formal and content patterns in changing conditions around him/her.[6]

Analyzing the articulation of text, subject and context requires an adequate method which would both cover the formation of subjectivity and the historicity of objective conditions in order to elaborate how the textual patterns resulted from the confrontation of these two. In that respect, I will take the field method developed by Pierre Bourdieu to analyse the cultural forms in modern society into account. Although French sociologist applies his method to Flaubert's novels in the French literary field of 19th century (Bourdieu, 2006), his theoretical assumptions behind his method offer a framework which is suitable for lyric poetry as well.[7] Bourdieu argues that the social conditions do not directly determine the literary form (Bourdieu, 1997, p. 55). Between text and context, there is the literary field which has its own rules and logic. The work of art results from neither the on-going wide political changes nor from the author's purelyinner creativity: it carries the inner development of the field as a intermediary level, in its form (Bourdieu, 1997, p. 64). In that sense, the literary field's relative autonomy translates and refracts the external political or economic effects into the terms, positions and struggles in the field. Each field (literary, economic, religious, artistic, bureaucracy and so on) has its own struggle of power and from of capital which resists to external determinations. In a cultural field, there are dominant and dominated positions and a struggle between gatekeepers who seek to maintain the established order and newcomers who seek to change the composition of the field in favor of themselves. The dispositions which

[6] In a sense, Benjamin's inspiring study on Baudelaire lacks such an analysis of formation of subjective dispositions and objective conditions: whereas Benjamin locates the poet in the political and social background of Paris, he never elaborates the history of the poet's personality since his childhood. What Benjamin does is taking a photograph of political events throughout the Paris commune, in which Baudelaire is sitting in the corner (Benjamin, 2014).

[7] Bourdieu also applies this field method to the case of Martin Heidegger in order to explain the philosopher's philosophical innovation through his position and position-takings in the German intellectual and university fields of 1930s (Bourdieu, 1991).

are structured throughout the primary experiences in family, school and peer groups, perpetuate as habitus, i.e. practical sense and schemas of action in the agent's subjectivity (Bourdieu, 1997, p. 224). For Bourdieu, sociologist has to reconstruct the relations between the objective conditions and the subjective dispositions of the agent in order to objectify a cultural form (Bourdieu, 1997, p. 102). In that sense, a writer's actions in the literary field have to be included in the analyse along with the formal patterns of his work. An artistic or intellectual work has to be put in the existing conflicts, changes and hierarchies in the field.

Bourdieu's field method will be helpful when it comes to locate Süreya's poetry in the Turkish poetry during 1950s. In the Chapter 3, first I try to consider the development of Turkish poetry from 1930s to 50s as a field of struggle among different positions, poetry writing styles and ideologies. By this way, I try to portray the possible poetry writing repertoires in terms of form and content that Süreya and his generation found ready both as possibility and limitations of poetry writing when they wrote their first poems in 50s. Therefore in that chapter, I try to describe objective conditions, i.e. possibilites, positions and main tensions, in the Turkish poetry by the Bourdieusian lens of field. After locating Süreya's personality duringand after his years in Mülkiye, my emphasize will be on the generation effect since Turkish poetry's history witnesses the emergence of every new style with a new generation. Unlike the economicfields, for instance, where the newcomers can be from the same generation with the gatekeepers, the Turkish poetry field from 30s to 60s has been stage for generational regenerations. However, two points need to be noted. Firstly, it is surprising that Bourdieu's theory lacks a methdological offer when it comes to analyze the poems. Although in a short passage Bourdieu applies his method to Charles Baudelaire in order to show the poet's position, strategies and

route in the French literary field (Bourdieu, 2006, p. 113), his study lacks formal analysis of chronological development Baudelaire's poems. This is the point where I try to accomplish what Bourdieu did not. While basing my first step (Chapter 3) on the elaboration of the objective structure of the poetry field, I will then take the textual development of Cemal Süreya's poetry into consideration in order to grasp the emergence of new poetry throughout the poet's experience in 1950s (Chapter 4). Secondly, Bourdieu's field method has been criticized of reducing the writers' social being into their positions in the field solely, meaning that the writer's actions, decisions and existence outside the field are largely ignored (Lahire, 2006, p. 43). In order to avoid Bourdieu's over-emphasis on the field conditions, I will take Cemal Süreya's life experiences into consideration as well. Afterall, my reference to Bourdieusian theory of field will be a restricted use rather than applying it totally to the case of Second New. The question of how far does the Bourdieusian theory suit to the emergence and development of different cultural fields (poetry, literature, journalism, cinema, university and so on) in the Republican era of Turkey requires a broader study.

The second theoretical reference of this study will be Deleuzian perspective of minor literature which is based on his and Felix Guattari's collective study on Franz Kafka's novels. According to the philosophers, Kafka's work should be considered as minor literature which defines literary production that a minority group achieves within the major dominant language (Deleuze & Guattari, 2015, p. 45). Kafka is a Jewish author who writes in Prag German rather than his vernacular language, Jewish. According to Deleuze, Kafka's language represents neither to a belonging to the dominant German culture nor to his already lost Jewish culture. Kafka is in a liminal and stranger position between the central legitimacy of German

language and the impossible return to his lost culture. Deleuze describes this liminal position as “deterritorialization” (p. 47) which refers to decontextualization of classic sets of relations between nature and culture, people and language, the real and the symbolic in Lacanian sense. This rupture from the organic, rural and consistent world puts the author to a nomad position within the new modern urban life and the major language. Having lost his Jewish maternal language, Kafka’s deterritorialized language therefore does not correspond to the established order of things and signs; consequently, instead of using the major language of representation and sygnifier, Kafka has to create his own logic of language which is not full of meaning but full of intensity (p. 50). The being nomad within a major culture pushes the deterritorialized to the limits of the major language, i.e. vehicular language in order to experience it rather than expressing himself through it. The representation or the logic of daily speech here is replaced by a vital invention of language since the representation follows the existing major rules, structures and dichotomies between things and signs (p. 58). According to Deleuze, Kafka deliberately kills all metaphor, all symbolism; all significations embedded in the major hierarchy of German language in order to break with on-going forms and uses of meanings and to invent a new experience of language for himself, i.e. a referential language by its own logic. Minor literature is a shift from representation to experience in terms of language-reality relation.

Deleuzian account of Kafka will be helpful to understand Süreya’s (poet) relation with poetry (text) in my study since his case offers a similarity with Kafka: the poet comes from rural Anatolian family and especially Alevi-Kurdish culture of Dersim and the obligatory exile he experienced in his childhood presents a forced deterritorialization and nomadicity in Ankara and Turkish poetry field. Süreya, having lost his maternal language, had to survive in the vehicular language of

Turkish which is the language of government, institutions, commerce and bureaucracy. However, the case of Süreya does not fit into Deleuzian schema for two aspects: Deleuzian definition of minor literature includes also politicization of all that is individual and collectivity of enunciation (p. 46). For him, Kafka's work offers a revolutionary link between the political and the particular and activates a collective linguistic apparatus for minority groups. At this point, my argument will be that Süreya's lyric poems do not offer any collective semantic stance for Kurdish-Alevi minority in Turkey; rather they perform a much more deeper political function by transforming the major language and its representative logic in order to reinvent thepoet's ownsubjectivity in the poetry. In other words, whereas Deleuze sees in Kafka's novel a political transformation of the language-reality relation, I see in Süreya's poetry anomadicreinvention of the self that results from the deformation of language. The political is in the language itself in Süreya. AlthoughSüreyalost his vernacular, maternal and territorial language because of the exile from Dersim like Kafka's deterritorialized position in German society, he also achieved to associate his own deterritorialization with the constriction of the objective possibilities and conditions of poetry writing styles in the Turkish poetry field in 50s since throughout his successful educational career his literary skills have been recognized by the agents of major culture, i.e. established order. In Ankara, Süreya found his being poet recognized in the middle of all that oppressed his minority. Paradoxically, the poetry was the only legitimate way in which he could seek the compensation of his traumatic deterritorialization.In that sense, I will argue that Süreya'searly engagement with Turkish poetry transformed his being-minority to a very legitimate position in the field and reterritorialized his subjectivity in anew poetic language itself. To do that, I will elaborate Cemal Süreya's primary experiences in his

childhood and youth until 1950, the year he began to Mülkiye and entered the poetry field. My sources will be Süreya's own writings in 1980s about his past and the reliable secondary biographies that record personal information, letters and memories about him.

After all, my aim is to bring the change in Süreya's poems by time, the subject's formation in his childhood and the context experiences he lived in Ankara together in order to locate and discover the meaning of his new poetry writing style in the Turkish poetry field context of 50s. Roland Barthes writes that the literary critics often fall in a dichotomy when it comes to the examination of literary forms: "on the one hand, there is the world of political, social, economic, ideological facts and phenomenons; on the other, the literary work in itself. Yet a real criticism has to combine these two autonomous and discrete continents" (Barthes, 1963, p. 145). I hope that my study will be a modest attempt to achieve such a task within the limits of sociology.

CHAPTER 3

THE SOCIOGENESIS OF A NEW POETRY

3.1 Turkish poetry field before 1950

This chapter will focus on the objective conditions of Turkish poetry field in the beginning of 1950s; the years Süreya published his first poems in several literary magazines and Süreya's position-takings during 50s in order to overcome the established style and hierarchy of the field.

From 1930s to 1950s, the poetry field witnessed several inner transformations and fragmentations. I will describe the inner development of the field and its relations within thewider political context.[8] Turkish poetry field was neither completely autonomous in itself nor totally determined by external effects; rather it was open to sudden and pivotal changes concerning very formal features and innovations of poetry writing style. Whereas several other cultural fields like education, journalism and religion were strictly taken under the control and determinations of the monopolized political power between 1925-1950, Turkish poetry's development, in spite of some homologies within wider development of cultural life, always took shape through contingent innovations and challenges that every new generation brought by its own subjective dispositions.

[8] The historical development of the Turkish poetry may be discovered from various informational sources. Each author has its own perspective and preferences in the historiography of poetry. For instance, whereas Metin Celal mentions Ahmet Haşim and Yahya Kemal as two prominent figures in the early Republican era and Necip Fazıl and Nazım Hikmet as the main poets after the former generation (Celal, 1998, p. 7), Memet Fuat who was the son of Nazım Hikmet locates Hikmet at the center of debates and movements from 30s to 60s (Fuat, 1992, p. 18). In that respect, I mainly follow Enis Batur's trajectory that follows the chronological line: the rise of the "national literature", Garip and the Second New (Batur & Ergülen, 2006, p. 10). Besides, Mehmet Doğan's anthology offers an inclusive account of poets from 1900 to 2000 (Doğan, 2001). Upon the primary and secondary sources, my aim in this part is to draw crucial debates, antagonisms and positions in terms of both form and content from 30s to 50s.

Main debate of 1930s among poets, intellectuals and critics was between old and new forms. The antagonism was between old *aruz* meter of Divan poetry and recently popularized syllabic verse. On the one hand some poets who were the last Ottoman generation like Yahya Kemal, Ahmet Haşim and Cenap Şahabettin defended aruz meter, on the other, younger poets like Behçet Kemal Çağlar, Ahmet Kutsi Tecer and Faruk Nafiz Çamlıbel argued that the syllabic verse is indispensable and richer than aruz. The debate was on formal structure of poetry but in fact it was a refracted effect of modernizing Republican cultural reforms which were based on a radical break with the Ottoman past. Behçet Kemal Çağlar argued that syllabic verse is "the only way to write a national poetry and it is a duty to write in syllables for an intellectual engaged with newreforms" (Kolcu, 1993, p. 83). A debate on whether which meter is more convenient to Turkish language spread to every literary group and magazine (Sazyek, 1996, p. 31). Divan poetry was criticized of not being purely "national". In 1933, a year after the foundation of Turkish Language Association which was charged to eliminate old Ottoman vocabulary of Arabic and Persian origin and to discover "pure" Anatolian Turkish, Çağlar and Çamlıbel wrote together the "March of the Tenth Year" of the Republic, which expresses the new secular nationalist ideology ofthe statewithin syllabic verses and quatrains. A new heroic poetry on Anatolian culture and based on folkloric structures of quatrain was thought to be in conformity with the new Republic's political and cultural ethos.

Along the ideological debate on formal structures of poetry, there existed also a thematic separation between contents: whereas Yahya Kemal wrote a deep feeling of nostalgia for the glorious Ottoman past like in his poem "Akıncılar", Faruk Nafiz Çamlıbel expressed his admiration for local Anatolian culture and folk poetry in his poem "Sanat". Ahmet Haşim's lyric poetry that elaborated mostly individual themes

within the classic form of aruz and rhyme was also in the background. Whereas Republican cultural reformism was refracted and translated into a debate between old and new forms, an alternative position potentially existed and emerged in the field: Nazım Hikmet. In his poems like "Açların Gözbebekleri", "Orkestra" and "Salkımsöğüt" written in 1920's under the influence of Russian poet Mayakovski, Hikmet used a genuine futurist verse structure which was based on a powerful discontinuous rhythm between lines of different meters. In this manner, poems' latent political messages were emphasized through form in both visual and audial terms:

Akar suyun sesi dindi
Gölgeler gölgelendi,
renkler silindi.
Siyah örtüler indi
mavi gözlerine,
Sarktı salkımsöğütler
sarı saçlarının
üzerine!

Ağlama salkımsöğüt
ağlama
Kara suyun aynasında el bağlama,
el bağlama
ağlama! (Hikmet, 2016, p. 14)

Hikmet's innovation in form had an obstacle rooted in content: he had been tried several times since 1925 and his books have been censored by the government because of his communist ideas. Therefore his first book, *Güneşi Yakanların Selamı* was published not in Turkey, but in Baku in 1928. Although his poetry embodied also nationalist ideas, the government did not allow any political poetry other than the accredited poets. Before leaving for Russia in 1950, he passed years in jail. His poems have been republished long after in 1966 meaning that the political power severed Hikmet's organic and close connection with the poetry field throughout 30's and 40's. Although his groundbreaking poetry had some followers like İlhami Bekir

Tez and Ercüment Behzat Lav among other poets, it was kept away from the main stream of the field.

In fact, Hikmet's verse structure that elongates into more than two lines had roots in the field's recent past: in 1890's Fikret contrived *serbest müstezat* as a formal capability of expressing political ideas in his poetry, which influenced Mehmet Akif, the poet of the Turkish national anthem, since 1910's as well. In this respect, the censures and exile Hikmet endured can also be interpreted as an impediment on the formal development of the political poetry. Therefore, Nazım Hikmet's innovation in form expanded slowly. Albeit syllabic verse which was supported by the political field became the dominant form towards the late 1930s, in 1936, Fazıl Hüsnü Dağlarca who was an acclaimed young poet in line with Necip Fazıl Kısakürek, began to break the meter in some of verses in poems like "Mazi", "Daireler" and "Bu Eller Miydi" (Sazyek, 1996, p. 25). Nevertheless, Dağlarca maintained the old structure of quatrains and his lines were constructed on conventional endings with rhymes:

> Kuçlar uçtu
> Kandan başaktan sonra
> Kapandı nedametin nur gibi kapıları
> Perişan yolculara(Dağlarca, 1957, p. 54)

A new form came with a new generation. Three young poets, Orhan Veli, Melih Cevdet and Oktay Rifat who followed syllabic verse in their first poems they published in *Varlık* magazine in 1930s, began to write in free verse in 1937. What was new in three young poets was both in form and content. Refusing any ideological load in poetry, which was dominant in Hikmet and also in folkloristic poems of 30's, they elaborated daily life of a lower and middle class people andthe vernacular speech in their poems. This was also a reaction to Ahmet Haşim and Yahya Kemal who wrote with an artful and synthetic vocabulary. For the first time in

Turkish poetry, lay people's ordinary experiences were being written with their own daily vocabulary and syntax. The young poets proposed a pure humanist and secular poetry with neither any pre-determined political dimension nor any relation with Anatolian rural cultural tradition. Although they did not claim manifestly any political stance, the photographic moments of urban life they expressed in poems were possible only in the conditions that were prepared by economic and cultural reforms of CHP government in 20's. What is expressed in their poems was the joy and modesty of rising public servant class' lifestyle:

Damlara bakan penceresinden
Liman görünürdü
Ve kilise çanları
Durmadan çalardı, bütün gün.
Tren sesi duyulurdu yatağından
Arada bir
Ve geceleri.
Bir de kız sevmeye başlamıştı
Karşı apartımanda.
Böyle olduğu halde
Bu şehri bırakıp
Başka şehre gitti. (Veli, 2015, p. 37)

Benim yarim iki dirhem bir çekirdek
Hoppa mı hoppa
Rakı içer
Kadeh kırar
Benim yarim sırasında benden hovarda
Kavuniçi mendil
Markalı çanta
Benim yarim çıtkırıldım
Beim yarim alafranga (Rifat, 2014, p. 49)

Balıklar için deniz lazım
Sevişmek için işsiz olmak
Ve geceleri yatakta
Duymamak için tabanların sızısını
Zengin olmak lazım

Oysa ıslık çalmak için
Bir şey lazım değil (Anday, 2005, p. 33)

In fact, content of those poems were in real conformity with the cultural preferences of the political powerbetween 1938 and 1950 which can be described as "humanist cultural policy" (Koçak, 2002).In 1941, Orhan Veli, Melih Cevdet and Oktay Rifat collected their poems and publish a book titled "Garip". Main thematic patterns among poems were simplicity of life, humor and narration of instantaneous daily experiences. Written with minimum number of words required, most of the poems were very short in form. Use of image and of classic figures of speech was very rare since they left aside all that is recognized as "poetical" (*şairane*). Harmony was achieved through plain and irregular rhymes, auditory associations and clause repetitions. This emergence of new short form as the vivid and concrete language of new middle class of Republic canceled the on-going debate between aruz meter and syllabic verse. As an alternative in the field, Garip or the First New emerged and surpassed the bipolar residuum of 1930s and opened a simple but totally new ground for poetry. Although many poets and writers criticized Garip from a traditional perspective, the new formal and content features became popular along 1940s and their poems were widely read as an inspiration source for younger generations (Sazyek, 1996, p. 351).

1940s were the golden years of Garip. Orhan Veli's collected poems became one of the bestselling poetry books since those years. However, when he died in 1950 suddenly, Garip poetry had already begun to fall in terms of innovation. Oktay Rifat's *Aşağı Yukarı* (1952) and *Karga ile Tilki* (1954) were simple variations of his early books in 40's. Rifat's poetry in the early 50's elaborates same themes in the conventional vocabulary patterns of folkloric vernacular speech. Likewise, Melih Cevdet's *Telgrafhane* (1952) can be interpreted as an extension of his *Rahatı Kaçan Ağaç* (1946). Besides, literary magazines of the time have been scene for replicas of

Garip's first poems sinceGarip's simplification was perceived by young poets as if anything could be poetized. In that sense, Orhan Veli's struggle democratized poetry and took lay people's life and language aspoet's primary vocabulary at the cost of abolishing borders between poetry and prose. Simplicity of form they brought to Turkish poetry ended with exhaustion of simple contents.

After all, Turkish poetry field as a limited but dynamic field of high cultural production witnessed a renewal of form in the late 30's and 40's with Garip movement.Yet a second position in poetry field existed soon after: In 1940s, a young generation of poets who share similar leftist ideology published their first poems in various magazines. The poets like Ahmed Arif, Attila İlhan, Hasan İzzettin Dinamo, Enver Gökçe and so on were called the 1940 generation and recognized by their political identity. Although they welcomed the disposal of old aruz meter I in terms of form, they criticized Garip of being apolitical and remaining indifferent to social problems in terms of content. The 1940 generation admired Nazım Hikmet; most of them were persecuted by the government likewise. Attila İlhan was a prominent figure of the generation, whose poem "Cebbaroğlu Mehemmed" was elected the second best poem in the literature contest organized by CHP in 1946. The winner was Cahit Sıtkı Tarancı with his famous poem "Otuz Beş Yaş" and the third poem was Fazıl Hüsnü Dağlarca's "Çakır Destanı". At the time, Attila İlhan was only 21. In 1948, he published his first book *Duvar* in which poems bring love and political attitude together in free verses and long stanzas with a high musicality and imagination:

> Yenikapı
> Denize çıkan bir sokak
> Sırtında yine yeşil elbisen
> Belinde kırmızı kuşak
> Enginde bir damla hürriyet gibi bembeyaz bir yelken
> Saçların güneşe karşı yine yıldızla örülmüş

Bir ispanyol şarkısı dağılıyor kıyıdaki kahveden
Ateşli ve oynak bir ispanyol şarkısı
Dalmışsın yine
Yine gözlerin büyümüş (İlhan, 1977, p. 122)

The rise of the 1940 generation fragmented the field into two sides: On the one side, there existed Garip and its followers who wrote simple, short poems of daily life, and on the other, there were those who wrote political and mostly dissident themes and positions. Therefore, the main debate in the field during 1940s was on content, not on form. İlhan severely accused Garip of being supported "officially" by CHP "dictatorship" (Sazyek, 1996, p. 302). For him, the government needed a new poetry which would generate an alternative to Nazım Hikmet in the literary field and which would also embody the lifestyle the modernizing reforms brought. Indeed, Yaşar Nabi Nayır who published Garip's poems in his magazine *Varlık* and critics like Sebahattin Eyüboğlu and Nurullah Ataç who supported Garip were all openly committed to the CHP government (Armağan, 2011, p. 98). Ataç praised Orhan Veli as of 1937 in his writings (Çağın, 2012, p. 260) and played the significant role of legitimizing Garip's innovation in the field by virtue of his good relationships with political power. Criticisms on Garip decreased throughout 40's but reemerged in 50's. When the literary magazine *Mavi* was founded in 1952 as an alternative central publication in the field, İlhan began to write serious critical essays on both Garip and those who supported them (İlhan, 2000). Despite his leftism, İlhan seemed to have a more traditional position regarding radical formal innovation of Garip. In an interview, whereas he mentioned Yahya Kemal, Nazım Hikmet, Necip Fazıl and Ahmet Muhip Dranas as "the most important poets since the foundation of Republic", he mentioned Orhan Veli as "the most detrimental person for Turkish poetry" (İlhan, 1959, p. 36).

Apart from these two prominent and opposite movements, there emerged also another but weak position in the fieldsince 1930s: Some independent poets like Necip Fazıl, Ahmet Muhip Dranas and Cahit Sıtkı Tarancı wrote individual themes in syllabic verses. Except Necip Fazıl who became an Islamist ideologist after 1934, they all elaborated the problems of the individual in changing urban and cultural conditions. Albeit they were influential poets of the field, they all had already written their best poems before 1940s and were deprived of chance to respond to the challenge of Garip. It was only Behçet Necatigil's poetry which managed to bring modern individual content and free verse form together in his *Kapalı Çarşı* (1945) and *Evler* (1953).

Finally, there existed Cahit Külebi and other folklorist poets whose position was in a balance between syllabic verse and free verse. Regarding content, Külebi's poem "Tokat'a Doğru" was one of the most important examples of humanist folklorism at the time (Koçak, 2012, p. 108). Young poets like İlhan Berk and Turgut Uyar followed Külebi in their first books until 1954: Berk published his fourth book *Türkiye Şarkısı* in 1953 and Uyar's second book *Türkiyem* was published in 1952. National folklorism perpetuated also in Külebi's *Atatürk Kurtuluş Savaşında* (1952) and Dağlarca's *Üç Şehitler Destanı* (1949) and *İstiklal Savaşı* (1951). In the books indicated above, the function of balance between syllabic verses and free verse was to ensure freedom of narration without losing auditory harmony and rhythm. It may be called semi-syllabic verse. Külebi, for instance, despite breaking the syllabic versestill used quatrains and rhymes:

> Şimdi bir rüzgar geçti buradan
> Koştum ama yetişemedim
> Nerelerde gezmiş tozmuş
> Öğrenemedim
>
> Besbelli denizden çıkıp

Kıyılan boyunca gitmiştir
Tuz kokusu, katran kokusu, ter kokusu
Yüreğini allak bullak etmiştir (Külebi, 2002, p. 59)

Having described the current rival positions in the Turkish poetry field towards 1950s, it seems possible now to say that albeit the poetry field did not reflect the same monopolistic structure as in the political field, the former witnessed some refracted effects rather than direct determinations of the latter. The effects of politics were translated into the poetry field's own subject matter and history. In 1930s, the government radicalized its cultural policies based on nationalist modernization which aimed to break with the Ottoman past and to return to imagined Anatolian origins; in a homologous manner, the poetry field witnessed the debate between aruz meter and syllabic verse as translation of imagined Ottoman-Anatolian dichotomy into poetry's formal jargon. In 1940s, the inner opposition of the field shifted on content rather than form since the regime's oppression was applied on the 1940 generation rather Garip and semi-syllabic folklorism which were uptrend, if not supported by the government directly.

At the end of all this, when the young Mülkiye student curious about poetry and literature, Cemal Süreya published his first poems in 1952-53, he found the field torn apart in terms of both form and content. Regarding content, there were three major options before him: Garip's instantaneousdaily life of middle class urban people; Attila İlhan's ideological romance; Külebi and other's folklorist and pastoral themes. Regarding form, there existed three samples as well: Garip's compendious and narrative free verse which was mostly based on ordinary colloquial language; Attila İlhan's harmonious free verse and long stanzas full of imagination; and lastly the folklorist poets' semi-syllabic verses with quatrains built on simple figures of speech. The objective conditions of the field in the early 50's demanded from

theyoung poeteither to follow one of the samples the former generations made possible, or to make a new innovation from the options above, in other words, a new poetry which should be newer than Garip in both from and content in order to be able to express his own subjectivity.

3.2 Mülkiye, compensation of the past and the entry to the field

In 1950, Süreya became boarding student in the department of finance in the Faculty of Political Sciences of Ankara University, also known historically as Mülkiye. It was the year the political field witnessed groundbreaking elections in the month of May. Democrat Party headed by former CHP deputies like Adnan Menderes, Refik Koraltan, Fuad Köprülü and Celal Bayar, ended the CHP's monopolistic regime of 27 years. Regarding political economy, the new government's policy was aiming to the integration within global markets: the Marshall Plan as an American initiative ensured industrialization of agriculture and construction of highways which triggered massive exodus from rural regions to big cities like İstanbul and Ankara. Soon after Turkey became full member of NATO in 1952. Regarding culture, DP's policy was a break with 1930s radical modernization and 1940s humanism: The first law enacted by the new parliament was allowing the Arabic original call for prayer which was banned by CHP.

Mülkiye was in middle of transformations for a long time. It was founded in İstanbul in 1859 as "Mekteb-i Mülkiye", an Ottoman institution which aimed to educate future administrators and civil bureaucrats the Empire needed in the turmoil of bureaucratic reforms. In 1935, the school was moved to the Cebeci district of Ankara by the decision of CHP government, under the name of "Siyasal Bilgiler Okulu". Atatürk himself sent a letter where he charged the institution with

"cultivating new minds for the Republican reforms" (*Milliyet*, 08.12.1933). In 1950, the school transformed into a faculty and was placed under the Ankara University which was the second university after the Istanbul University at the time. In a sense, first two period in the history of the school therefore corresponded to two periods in the Ottoman-Turkish modernization. Starting 1950, Mülkiye became the center of political tensions and growing opposition against the Democrat Party government. In 1954, the political magazine of *Forum* was founded by the professors of Mülkiye such as Turan Feyzioğlu, Bahri Savcı, Aydın Yalçın, and Yavuz Abadan. Most of the professors of law from Mülkiye who were recognized by their opposition to Democrat Party participated in the preparation of the Constitution of 1961 after the coup d'état against Democrat Party.

In 1950s the faculty was separated to three departments: Diplomacy, Administration and Finance. In pursuance of the aim of raising the future bureaucrats the state needed, half of the registered students were financed by state scholarship from Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Interior and the rectorate. In 1950, there existed 521 students of which 260 were in scholarship status (Çankaya, 1969, p. 641). There were only 17 women students at the time. Süreya was among the 55 incoming scholarship students and he lived in the faculty's dormitory for 4 years. By the second year, he and Sezai Karakoç, another scholarship student and poet of the Second New became desk-mates until the graduation.

The yearbook of 1954 graduation gives detailed information about the students and their parents' educational backgrounds and occupations and the students' occupational positions after Mülkiye (Çankaya, 1970, pp. 3535-3606). In the light of that source, it seems there existed two groups of students from different social origins: Whereas most of the scholarship students were from Anatolian regions

of the country like Trabzon, Kayseri, Gaziantep, Yozgat and so on, most of the non-scholarship students were graduates of İstanbul's respected high schools like Galatasaray, İstanbul Erkek and Darüşşafaka. Besides, whereas most of the students from Anatolian regions had parents having only primary education and working in modest occupations like public servant, farmer, fisher, trader and teacher in their own towns, the students from Istanbul and Ankara had parents having graduated from high schools, Mülkiye and Darülfünun and being in high occupational positions like colonel in Turkish military forces, manager in Ziraat Bank and retired officer from the Ministry of Finance. Most of the students from the second group chose to become administrator, scholar, diplomat or politician in their later life, which demanded high cultural and social capital inherited from family such as knowledge of foreign languages and good references for promotion.

In the light of aforementioned distinction among the students, it is possible to say that the social logic of Mülkiye was twofold: Whereas it served as reproduction process of economic and occupational advantages for some students from elite families of high cultural and social capital, it offered a social transition mechanism for those who came from disadvantaged social origins into more respected status and positions. What was common between two groups was the recognition of their success in high school and their potential as high bureaucrats since they were all destined to occupy high official positions of the state. Graduation from Mülkiye was sort of consecration of the new-comers' entrance into the state nobility and legitimacy. Süreya was among the disadvantaged group who, by passing the entry exam of Mülkiye, obtained chance to go beyond their familial origins in terms of both cultural and economic capital through graduation. As a result of the cultural segregation among students, he and his close friend Sezai Karakoç elected the

finance as their major, meaning that they followed the only possibility that the confrontation of their social origin with Mülkiye's melting pot conditioned them. They became bureaucrats in *Vergi Dairesi,* i.e. Tax Office under the Ministry of Finance after their graduation.

In fact, the close friendship between Süreya and Karakoç was not surprising. Their social backgrounds presented a significant similarity in terms of deterritorialization and social mobility. Born in 1931, Süreya was son of a Kurdish-Alevi family of Dersim who was exiled to Bilecik after the bloody policy of the CHP government in Dersim events in 1937-38. Although Süreya's family lived a standard life in Erzincan, they had some advantages compared to economic and social conditions of this small city in 1930: His father, Hüseyin was a greengrocery trader who used to bring goods from neighboring cities with his truck. They lived in a house with a big garden and they had a close relationship with the governor. Süreya's big uncle Memo was one of the very few persons who have graduated from secondary school in Erzincan (Perinçek & Duruel, 2008, p. 18). The family had a patriarchal culture and Cemal as the first boy who will hold family's surname in future has been held in a high esteem by men and women of the family. As "the prince of the family" (Süreya, 2015a, p. 103), he was allowed to give names to his sisters when he was only 5-6 years old. His uncle Memo taught him writing, reading and even drawing before school.

However, this initial local dignity has been shattered by 1937-38 events when Süreya was 7. At that time, Erzincan was a part of Dersim, the autonomous Kurdish region for decades where the feudal socio-economic life blended with Alevi culture was ruled by tribes. Most of the leading tribes were not willing to pay high taxes that newly established Republican regime demanded. In fact, Dersim was the only region

which had not been taken under the centralized administrative and cultural control of Ankara after the revolt of Şeyh Said in 1925. In 25 December 1935, Ankara government introduced a new law on taxes, settling rules and civil duties of citizens in Dersim. The name of the city changed to "Tunceli". Military operations have been initiated against the local tribes who did not agree with proposed high taxes and military service obligation. In September 1938, after bloody massacres against local civilians, Ankara government suppressed the so-called revolt. 13000 people killed by soldiers and more than 5000 people have been exiled to the western cities of the country such as Tekirdağ, Bilecik, Bursa, Aydın, Isparta and so on (Bilmez & Kayacan & Aslan, 2015, p. 99).

Süreya's individual past was marked by such a collective trauma. His father Hüseyin was not involved in events, yet when his brother Memo had been included in the exile list after a quarrel with a military officer, he also decided to leave with Memo since the family's tradition did not allow breaking apart. They lost their goods and properties in Erzincan. Being allowed to take too few stuff, the family was transported in a crowded dark train wagons under military surveillance to an unknown village of Bilecik. Years after, Süreya wrote in a personal letter to his wife that he never forgot the sense of fear that journey gave him (Süreya, 2005, p. 85). In 1988, he writes about his experience of exile:

> When I was little in 6-7 ages, I was separated from my place of birth, our house and our garden. My family endured catastrophes. My mother died soon and my father became poor. These left a mark in my artistic sensibility. They cannot be erased (Süreya, 2015a, p. 174).[9]

In the light of the above experience of exile, Süreya's position in Ankara, the symbolic city of the new Republican reforms crowded by middle class civil servant population and secular cultural lifestyle, was indeed a good example of forced

[9] My translation. All the following citations are my translations as well.

deterritorialization in Deleuzian terms. A second deterritorializing event has been the sudden death of his mother in the fourth month of exile. Having his family's local and rural dignity and economic advantages abolished by the state's harsh policy, Süreya met with the sense of a radical grief. Although he never cried after the funeral, he everyday visited the cemetery, prayed and then read Mawlid for his mother (Perinçek & Duruel, 2008, p. 26). The exile from Dersim and the sudden death of his mother caused an irrecoverable loss of Kurdish language as his vernacular language.

Similarly, Karakoç was coming from a modest family of Diyarbakır who was exposed to the new regime's harsh military policies. Although Karakoç's family did not participate in the events, his big uncle was charged with supporting the Şeyh Said revolt of 1925 which resulted with a bloody suppression, similar to Dersim events in 1937-38, by the government and serials of executions by the Independence Tribunals in 1925. Despite his big uncle was acquitted, the family was not allowed to take its old appellation "Leventoğulları" when the Surname Law was adopted in 1934. The surname "Karakoç" was selected from the list the government offered to citizen at that time (Karakoç, 1988, October 3, p. 10). In fact, the family's ancestors were all ranked soldiers in the Ottoman army (Karakoç, 1988, September 26, p. 10). Having lost its symbolic and traditional reputation in the region, the Karakoç family suffered also the economic stagnation in the region after 1925. Furthermore, Karakoç's conservative Sunni family was in opposition to the government's secular cultural reforms as well. The difference with Süreya was that when Karakoç met with Necip Fazıl's *Büyük Doğu* magazine in high school years, his cultural opposition against the modernizing Republican reforms became an ideological stance that continued until today.

Consequently, the friendship between Süreya and Karakoç in Mülkiye was marked by their forced deterritorialization and social degradation by the coercive hand of new Republican establishment. Meanwhile, Süreya and Karakoç found soon a channel by which they could reveal their subjectivities in the middle of the new Republic's capital. In February 1952, a monthly school magazine was founded by students with the support of the administration: *Mülkiye*. Subtitled as "the magazine of science, thought and art", the magazine became media of the faculty and most of the professors began to publish essays on political concepts, social problems and economy, includingalso literary essays, poems and stories of students. There were also translations on theatre, music and literature from Western writers. Above all, the magazine was in contact with the poetry field: Some dominant poets of the time such as Cahit Sıtkı Tarancı and Cahit Külebi published poems in *Mülkiye* (*Mülkiye*, *1*, pp. 8-9; *2*, pp. 10-11). Turgut Uyar's book *Türkiyem* that was published by Varlık Press was reviewed in an essay (*Mülkiye*, vol. 3, pp. 16-17). Along with the magazine, the school became a stage for events that brought some of the well-known poets and young poets among the students together: In March 21, an evening meeting of poetry was organized in the faculty of Law where famous poets like Oktay Rifat, Orhan Seyfi Orhan and Ziya Osman Saba participated and performed their poems. Some friends of Karakoç and Süreya, such as Gülten Akın and Muzaffer Uyguner began to publish their first poems in the magazine. Finally, Karakoç published his "Yağmur Duası" in July 1952 and Süreya published his "Şarkısı Beyaz" in January 1953. In the following months, Karakoç published 5 poems and Süreya published 6 poems, meaning that *Mülkiye* has been stage of entry into the poetry field until 1954.

To sum up this part, Cemal Süreya's experience of Mülkiye was of great importance in terms of social mobility: the school that was one of the few

universities in Turkey at that time represented the only way to compensate his loss of social reputation with the exile in 1938. In his everyday life in Ankara and conversations in school, he was compelled to speak the urban official Turkish or the vehicular language of the major culture as Deleuze defines. At this respect, he had no difference with Karakoç or any other prospective students from rural Anatolian origins, yet the poetry writing he shared with Karakoç meant an alternative way or a quest for expression of his subjectivity. He was in threshold of a choice: first option was to follow the social and linguistic transformation that the oppressive Republican establishment imposed him and to follow the former generation's poetry writing style and form. That would be the determination of social conditions on him. Second and difficult option was to seek his own re-formation in the poetry; in other words, emancipation.

3.3 A generational struggle

This part will focus on Süreya's struggle both in and against the Republican establishment in Ankara and specifically in the poetry field. My argument is that the Second New's initial move was rooted in the coincidence of two processes: In 1955, firstly, the friendship between Cemal Süreya and Sezai Karakoç resulted with a literary magazine *Şiir Sanatı*; and secondly, some of the young poems from the same generation broke with old style and form of poetry writing they inherited from Garip and folklorism. From *Şiir Sanatı* in 1955 to *Pazar Postası* in 1957, the rise of the Second New had been possible on the social ground of generational conflict between the older poets who benefited from the cultural sphere of the Republic, i.e. major language and the young poets who sought to invent their own autonomous style and form; i.e. referential language. In that sense, there is no linear causality between the

macro-political emancipation from the CHP monopoly by the 1950 elections and the rise of the Second New; rather one may say that there is a parallelism between the structural transformations of the political and poetic fields; a parallelism that roots in inevitable reaction to the linguistic and political establishment of the 40s.

Dissociation of Süreya and Karakoç from the older style of writing occurred too early for their age: in 1954, they introduced abstraction, deformation and imagism as new techniques of poetry.[10] They did not stay within the formal possibilities of the former generation for a long time and their style shifted from representing reality by the language to the reinvention of the language in poetry. It was Karakoç who first initiated a position-taking that would mark a point of struggle in the field bypublishing in a new magazine: *Şiir Sanatı*. This was a modest magazine on poetry, published in the January 1955, just after their graduation from Mülkiye. Along with him, his close friend Süreya, Gülten Akın, Orhan Duru, Seyfettin Başçıllar and Muzaffer Erdost who were close friends in Mülkiye years appeared with poems and essays in the magazine. Süreya's two poems, "Dalga" and "Cıgarayı Attım Denize" were published there. The magazine also included translations from Western poets and writers such as Georg Trakl, Jacques Prévert, Max Jacob, Apollinaire and Nietzsche. In the preface, Karakoç presented the aim of the magazine as "having role and responsibility in the development and regeneration of Turkish poetry" (Karakoç, 1955, p. 4). Besides, he wrote a long essay entitled "The Direction of the New Turkish Poetry" where he gave his perspective on the recent developments in poetry and his anticipations with a self-confident tone. The magazine also included a critical essay of Adnan Özkan on Attila İlhan's poetry.

[10] The question how this occured in Süreya's case poem by poem and the subjective meaning of these techniques for the poet will be answered in the relevant Chapter 4.

Lastly, in the last pages of the magazine there were Karakoç's comments on poems published in other magazines and poetry books (Karakoç, 1955, p. 28).

Şiir Sanatı was an interesting magazine since none of the essays made any reference to Karakoç's ideological relation with Necip Fazıl's *Büyük Doğu* where he published his first poems since high school years. The name of the magazine "Şiir Sanatı" (Art of poetry) implied a general and neutral claim about the content. Moreover, the magazine represented an attempt of bringing the young poets together since the names who participated were all between 22-24 years and students from Mülkiye. Karakoç's strategy was twofold: On the one hand, in his comments on other magazines, Karakoç praised Turgut Uyar's poem of "Geyikli Gece" which appeared a month ago and the poems that Seyfettin Başçıllar and Cemal Süreya recently published in other magazines (Karakoç, 1955, p. 30). On the other hand, Karakoç challenged to the former generation: he criticized *Varlık* magazine of being "incapable of an innovation in poetry", also Oktay Rifat's book *Karga ile Tilki*, Attila İlhan's *Sisler Bulvarı* and Cahit Külebi's *Yeşeren Otlar* which were all published in 1954. Karakoç's aim was obvious in his essay of "The Direction of the New Turkish Poetry": to build up a new position in the field which would represent their own generation. The targets of his criticism, Oktay Rifat, Cahit Külebi and Attila İlhan, were perfectly chosen since these names were the representatives of the former generation in the field. Karakoç's strategy was to trigger a conflict of generations in order to propound the new poetry of abstraction and deformation he and Süreya already began to write.

Indeed, Karakoç's plan was not pointless. 1955 was the year some young poets changed their own styles and forms. Turgut Uyar, after having followed Külebi's folklorist and syllabic verse poetry in his first books *Arz-ı Hal* (1949) and

Türkiyem (1952) (Koçak, 2011, p. 95), began to elaborate more individual themes within a more obscure language of free verses by the end of 1954, for instance in his poem of "Geyikli Gece". Edip Cansever who followed Garip poetry in his first two books, *İkindi Üstü* (1947) and *Dirlik Düzenlik* (1954) began to transform the regular colloquial syntax and vocabulary he inherited from the field, in his poems "Aşkın Radyoaktiviesi" and "Yerçekimli Karanfil" which were published in the same year. Together with them, İlhan Berk whose first five books were in line with syllabic verse and folklorist nationalist themes until 1955 began to elaborate urban themes in free verse towards the end of the year. Berk's latest book, *Köroğlu* which was published in 1954 was full of folklorism. What was common between those poets by 1955 was the use of abstraction and transformation as a way of creating the meaning rather than using the language to represent the reality. The change can be seen in two poems Berk and Uyar wrote, the first ones before 1955 and the second ones after 1955:

> Bir rüzgâr ilk başında belli
> Gökyüzünü çocukları büyütmüş
> Denizle kuşlarla evlerle var
> Dünyaya aşk diye hürlük diye
> En yavuz gerçek tohumlar ekmiş
> Bir rüzgâr yosunlar kadar eski ("Rüzgar", Berk, 2013, p. 153)

> Ben böyle bir deniz görmedim ne kadar seni düşündüm
> Gittim ne kadar bilmezsiniz ne türlü karanlık
> Baktım ki biri yok o kentlerin, hiç olmamışlar gördüm
> S bir kadın balkonunda baksam ne zaman olurdu
> E sesinde yüzlerce trenler yürüdü Galile'de
> Sizi bilmem ben galiba olmadım o dünyalarda
> Salt bir it karalık akşam üstü denizlere doğru
> Durmuş nasıl bu gökle bu yalnızlıklar yaşamada
> Ne yaşanmışsa görmemişiz yaşanmış o kentlerde
> Gittik gittik bizi bu surlar tuttu böyle kaldık ("Galile Denizi", Berk, 2013, p. 243)

> Küçücük pencerem bahçeye bakar
> Bademler, erikler geceye bakar
> Bir ışık dökülür yapraklardan şıkır şıkır

Filizler susmuş, tohumlar uyumuş;
Bir an durmuş, genişlemiş büyümüş
Bir eski şarkı, bir eski bahar, bir bildik deniz
Vakit nisan ortasında bir akşam... (Uyar, "Sevda Üstüne", 2014, p. 109)

Kan akıyor penceresi karanlık evlerden
Ölü kadınların üstüne tuğlaların üstüne
Denizse aydınlık ve incili mavili taşrada
Kana doğru ürkek en güzel yaban balıklar
Bu kandır akıttığımız sıkıntılı pazarlarda
Üst üste yergökyüzüne içki şişelerine (Uyar, "Kankentleri", 2014, p. 191)

The change is already obvious in the titles of poems after 1955, which does not signify any direct reality: "Galile Denizi" of Berk and "Kankentleri" of Uyar. Yet the titles they used before 1955 were clichés: "Rüzgar" and "Sevda Üstüne". That change implies a new relation with the language in poetry that emerged in 1955. The common shift among Berk, Uyar and Cansever in terms of form was from the regular syntax and colloquial language to an obscure, complicated and image-loaded poetic diction. In terms of content, rather than the joyful and naive perspective of the little man that Garip poetry took as ground, the poets began to elaborate the intricate aspects of confrontation between the individual's inner world and the developping urban realities. Main contextual reason behind this formal shift was spatial change in the poets' experience: after spending years as military officer in the eastern Anatolia, Uyar settled down in Ankara in 1954 and Berk in 1956. The rise of urban lifestyle in 50s functioned as a background of the rise of a new poetry. Nevertheless the poetic shift did not occur in a time but took a process from 1954 to 1956; each poet changed his own poetry in his own development.[11] What is worth to notice is the intersection of *Şiir Sanatı*, published in January, with the independent shifts that occurred throughout 1955. The use of abstraction as the technique of subjectivity in Cemal

[11] A comparative analyse of the change of formal features and technics before and after 1955 for each poet needs a broader study.

Süreya and Sezai Karakoç coincided with the formal development of the poets above and the strategy of *Şiir Sanatı* was to organize and transform those individual poetic changes into a generational movement. They were from the same generation but from different contexts: in 1955, Süreya was 24, Karakoç was 22, Uyar was 28 and Cansever was 27. Only Berk was over 30. Süreya and Karakoç were assistant inspectors at the time, Uyar was a military officer, Cansever was an antique dealer and Berk was high school teacher. The common feature among them was the necessity of a new language in poetry in order to express new urban experiences they lived in Ankara and İstanbul. As an expression of confronting with massive urbanization, Uyar writes the feeling of astonishment out of social change in 1950s:

> The reason why I changed my poetry was that I saw a change in my environment. A world in a city, neon glow lamps everywhere, big hotels and so on... these facts did not allow me write in Orhan Veli style anymore... When I came to Ankara for the first time I was in such a shock. I had to reconsider my poetry. Other poets should have to do the same (Uyar, 1985, p. 107).

However, Uyar, Cansever and Berk knew each other only through their published poems. It is not therefore surprising that a new poetry was defended by two young actors, Cemal Süreya and Sezai Karakoç who were together in the middle of the new urban conditions in Ankara. The reason why the first collective move of the new poetry, *Şiir Sanatı*, came from them is that, when compared with aforementioned poets, Karakoç and Süreya who were destined to reinvent themselves throughout Mülkiye years, had already begun to invent their subjectivity in the poetry by transforming the existing poetic diction; i.e. the major language itself. In that sense, Karakoç and Süreya were the poets whom the old formal and content patterns in the poetry field prevented from expressing their subjective dispositions in the new conditions the most. Whereas Uyar, Cansever and Berk followed the existing poetry writing styles until 1955, Karakoç and Süreya disapproved Garip's

poetry since their high school years and always maintained musicality and composition since the first poems in *Mülkiye*. Moreover, in contrast with Cansever, Uyar and Berk, they were both from peripheral social origins that were oppressed and deterritorialized by the state. It is therefore interesting to see that a new style in Turkish poetry waspioneered by two young poets from Kurdish origin, who lost their maternal language. Reinvention of their identity throughout the scholarship in primary education and Mülkiye years occurred along with the revelation and recognition of their literary disposition which transformed into the reinvention of language through abstraction and visual imagination. In that sense, Karakoç and Süreya applied the same operation they lived through educational route into the poetry: the compensation of the reality/past which was oppressed by the established order before. Just like they had chance to reinvent their social existence by graduation from Mülkiye, they applied their literary disposition to invent an autonomous poetic diction, i.e. a new referential language that allowed them to express their oppressed subjectivities within the Republican public sphere of Ankara and major language. Transformation of the individual's past throughout education resulted with deformation of reality within a new poetic language. In other words, in the case of Süreya and Karakoç, what is oppressed and deterritorialized returned back with a new form of poetry that consisted of deformation and abstraction in terms of writing style. They reterritorialized their subjectivity in the new poetic diction as an autonomous referential language against the major language.

The publication of *Şiir Sanatı* created a wide effect among the young generation. Karakoç met with Berk in the street where the magazine was published and he received Berk's compliments (Karakoç, 1989, August 18). Uyar and Ahmed Arif wrote long supporting letters to the magazine (Karakoç, 1989, August 25).

Karakoç soon organized a poetry soirée in order to meet with other young poets as well. On the other hand, *Şiir Sanatı* was criticized by two figures from former generation; Nurullah Ataç and Necip Fazıl (Karakoç, 1989, September 12). In fact, Ataç used to welcome young poets in the field since Garip movement; he also wrote a preface to Uyar's *Türkiyem* in 1952 (Çağın, 2012). Yet this time, he preferred not to support Karakoç's innovative attempt because of the latter's ideological commitment with Necip Fazıl. What is interesting is that Necip Fazıl also disapproved the magazine. Karakoç's move was discarded by the gatekeepers in both literature and ideology. After two issues, the magazine was closed due to the fact that Karakoç had to pay the debts that Necip Fazıl owned to the banks (Karakoç, 1989, October 19). Nevertheless, the magazine became a milestone in the development of the new poetry and caused a generational effect among the poets. As a consequence of the open struggle between former generation and young poets, Turgut Uyar who was introduced to the field by Nurullah Ataç's recognition before, wrote in November 1955 that "Ataç does not understand poetry" (Uyar, 2016, p. 357).

The meaning of the emergence of *Şiir Sanatı* in the field's power structure was significant. In 1955, the prominent magazines being published were ideologically fragmented:[12] *Varlık, Kaynak, Büyük Doğu*, *Hisar, Yeditepe, Pazar Postası, Yeni Ufuklar, Mavi, Türk Dili* (official printed medium of Turkish Language Association), *Yenilik* (see Appendix, Table 1). While *Varlık, Kaynak*, *Türk Dili* and *Yeditepe* as the central and widespread magazines followed Kemalist cultural doctrine, the other side of the field was composed of conservative periphery with *Hisar* and *Büyük Doğu* which was suspended for a while at the time. The central magazines published mostly poems in line with Garip and folklorism, while

[12] The information about the magazines is collected from Doğan's work (Doğan, 1997).

conservatives favored syllabic traditionalist forms.*Yeni Ufuklar* presented a socialist political stance and followed the 1940 generation; and *Pazar Postası* had not initiated literary pages yet. The only existing alternative to this ideologically and poetically divided field was *Yenilik* which indeed had been home for Turgut Uyar and Edip Cansever's early poems before the Second New momentum. Therefore, Süreya and most of the Second New poets sometimes have been seen in *Yenilik* until 1957. However, even *Yenilik* had published a special issue on Nurullah Ataç and been controlled by writers from former generation like Salah Birsel, Tarık Buğra, Behçet Necatigil (Doğan, 1997, p. 68). From that perspective, *Şiir Sanatı*'s unique position was that it belonged solely to new generation. Additionally, it is worth to note that neither Karakoç nor Süreya published any poem in *Varlık* which was the stronghold of the Republican humanist cultural policy of 1940s and cradle of the Garip poetry.

The struggle of the new generation that was initiated in *Şiir Sanatı* was soon undertaken by another magazine by 1956: *Pazar Postası*. Muzaffer Erdost who was the editor of art and literature pages of that weekly magazine published an essay entitled "İkinci Yeni" in 19 August 1956 and another essay entitled "Artı Bir" in 26 August. In those essays, Erdost mentioned Süreya, Uyar, Berk and some other poets from the same generation as the founders of a new poetry (Korkmaz, 2007, p. 1659). Erdost's aim was to bring together the young poets again in *Pazar Postası* (Erdost, 1997, pp. 20-44). Ece Ayhan published his first poems in the magazine in 1956. In August 1957, Sezai Karakoç and Cemal Süreya began to publish poems and essays; in September, Turgut Uyar and İlhan Berk participated to them. The common idea of the essays was that a new poetry which was being written by them wasnot identical with neither Garip poetry nor any other existing poetic style. The new poetry was

based on finding new wordings, expressions and syntaxes rather than realism (Erdost, 1997, p. 55). Although Erdost named it "Second New", the poets like Süreya, Berk, Uyar and Karakoç preferred to use "New Poetry" as the name. Meanwhile, Erdost frequently published interviews with Uyar, Süreya, Berk and Cansever in *Pazar Postası*. Due to the fact that *Pazar Postası* was weekly and there were poems, essays and interviews of the new generation in every issue, the magazine has been very dynamic and productive trench for the rise of the new generation between 1956 and 1959. The dynamism of the new poetry in *Pazar Postası* resulted with the rapid publications: in 1958, Süreya's first book *Üvercinka*, İlhan Berk's *Galile Denizi* and Edip Cansever's *Umutsuzlar Parkı* were published. A year later, Sezai Karakoç's first book *Körfez*, Turgut Uyar's *Dünyanın En Güzel Arabistanı* and Ece Ayhan's *Kınar Hanımın Denizleri* have been published. By these first books of the new style, the Second New generation became a rising position in the field.

Süreya was a prominent central figure in the struggle with his strategic writings against the former generation. In the article "Folklor Şiire Düşman" he published in *a* magazine in 1956, he criticized Oktay Rifat for being dependent to folkloric idioms and language (Süreya, 2015b, p. 192). The main argument of Süreya was that the new poetry consisted of the expression of personality through "deviations in the meanings of words" that were also common in Uyar, Berk and Cansever's recent poems. For Süreya, "the poetry should be written by words" meaning that the poet's duty is to find new relations between words instead of copying what he finds in the colloquial language (p. 193). He therefore criticized Oktay Rifat's *Karga ile Tilki*, which won the Yeditepe poetry prize in 1955, of being embedded in the old model of language. The article triggered an endless debate: two

months later, Melih Cevdet wrote an article in *Yeditepe* magazine to argue that what Süreya offered as the definition of poetry already existed in Orhan Veli's innovation (Anday, 2015). As a response to Anday, Erdost published two weeks later in 16 December 1956 an article which argued that the new poetry offers a new poetic language rather than using old vocabulary of vernacular speech of Garip (Korkmaz, 2007, p. 1251). In all other articles as well, Erdost always gave names of Ece Ayhan, Süreya, Berk, Uyar and Cansever as the precursors of the new poetry.

Moreover, Süreya engaged in a polemic with Attila İlhan by 1957. In September, he published a critical essay on İlhan's social realism (Süreya, 2015b, p. 204). İlhan replied with an article in *Dost* magazine (İlhan, 1996, p. 37). That initial friction has been followed by series of essays reciprocally (Süreya, 2015b, pp 209-228; İlhan, 1996, 42-60). The main debate was between content and form: whereas İlhan defended that it is content which determines poetry, Süreya argued that without form, content is anonymous and senseless. İlhan also accused the new generation of being indifferent to social problems like Garip's poetry. For him, Garip was a latent collaborator of the CHP "dictatorship" in 1940s and the Second New was the negative product of the oppressive policies of DP government in the 1950s likewise (İlhan, 1996, p. 92). In contrast with İlhan, Süreya insisted on the idea that "what generates poetry is the personal form" (Süreya, 2015b, p. 210). The same debate perpetuated between Memet Fuat's essays in *Varlık* and Turgut Uyar's essays in *Pazar Postası* until the end of 1958 (Uyar, 2016, p. 43). As a response to growing criticisms that charged the new generation of being too obscure and absurd in terms of form, Edip Cansever's essays defended the idea that the "obscure" may contain meanings that could not be expressed in the ordinary language (Cansever, 2009, p.

86). The fact that *Pazar Postası* was a weekly magazine accelerated and widened the debate among other poets, writers and critics.

After all, Süreya's strategy was similar with what Karakoç did in *Şiir Sanatı:* challenging the former generation in order to make space for their new generation. His attacks on the former generation were purely strategic in the sense that he chose two prominent and respected figures of the field, Oktay Rifat and Attila İlhan, in order to bring the new poetry he and his generation began to write since 1955 into the public attention of the field. Besides, his attacks on İlhan and Rifat were in convergence with the contrast between his social background and the latter's: Rifat was grandson of Enver Paşa, his father was the governor of Trabzon and his family was an aristocrat Ottoman family. In 1955, Rifat was a reputed lawyer. Similarly, Attila İlhan was coming from a bourgeois family of İzmir; his father was a public prosecutor and İlhan had the chance of having education in the most reputed schools. In this sense, the struggle of Süreya and Karakoç who both came from rural culture and lower economic conditions, against the former generation in the poetry field was rooted in the adverseness of their cultural capitals against the new Republic's elite class. Although Süreya softened his comments on İlhan and Rifat after 1966 (Süreya, 2015b, p. 338), his critical essays between 1956 and 1959 paved the way for the recognition of the new poetry in the field. When he began to publish his own magazine *Papirüs* in 1966, he managed to bring all central figures of his generation together as well as young poets like İsmet Özel, Refik Durbaş and Eray Canberk. With his special issues on their former generation like İlhan, Rifat, Orhan Veli, Dağlarca and so on, *Papirüs* became the central media of Turkish poetry until 1970. Having engaged in the struggle of the new poetry in his 20's, Süreya became a gatekeeper in the field after his 60's. This was a real success against all the social,

cultural and economic limitations he found himself in since his primary experiences. Just like he reterritoralized his subjectivity in the language of his poems, he achieved to transform his position-taking in the late 50s into the dominant position the poetry field as well.

CHAPTER 4

THE LANGUAGE OF EXPERIENCE

This chapter focuses on how Süreya's poetry formally changed and transformed from 1952 to 1958, the year his first book *Üvercinka* was published. In doing that, I will follow the chronological line of the poems not according to the date of publication, but to the year, or in some cases, the month that a poem was written by Süreya (see Appendix, Table 2). Therefore, having analyzed Süreya's trajectory as an actor within the objective structure field in the previous chapter, I will now discover the subjective development of text-actor and language-subject relations throughout the process of making of a new poet.

4.1 The humor of love

This part will focus on the first poems Cemal Süreya published until 1954. I will try to show that Süreya, in the beginning, elaborated his subjectivity in his first poems within the old formal patterns he found ready in the objective conditions of the poetry field for a very short time. In that sense, Süreya's interiorization of the formal patterns of the existing poetry writing allowed him to use humor as a way of both covering and expressing his primary experiences.

In his first years in Mülkiye, Süreya was a lonesome student who used to pass time in cafeteria rather than in study (Süreya, 2016, p. 39). In a small circle of friends with Sezai Karakoç, Hasan Basri Gültekin, Emin Bayar and Nihat Kemal Eren, he seemed indifferent to success in class and enjoyed a bohemian freedom in Ankara, without moral and institutional restrictions that existed in his high school years. Süreya writes in 1985 on his years in Mülkiye:

> It was the best times for me. We were free. We were strange. We were in the art and literature circles. There were poetry days. I did not show what I wrote to anyone. Yet I did not like the poems performed in poetry days. We used to translate poems from French. We had always poetry books in pocket. I often took walks in streets speaking loudly with myself (Süreya, 2015a, p. 107).

By the second year, he became desk-mate with Sezai Karakoç until the graduation. They used to follow main literary magazines like *Varlık, Yeditepe, Mavi* and *20. Asır*. They used to discuss on poetry and to walk in Ankara streets before the class hours. Instead of participating balls and events that demanded new clothes, Süreya and Karakoç passed their time by writing long poems in verse in the library (Perinçek & Duruel, 2008, p. 79). Süreya continued writing love letters to Seniha Nemli, his love in the primary school, nevertheless he also wrote letters to people he did not know: for instance, he wrote letters to a Turkish teacher in Diyarbakır (Süreya, 2016, p. 78). What is interesting is that he also wrote to women he was not acquainted with, imagining that they loved him (Perinçek & Duruel, 2008, p. 78). Love was the main theme of his early poems.

Süreya published his first poem "Şarkısı Beyaz" only in the third year in Mülkiye. Despite he was known as a poet by his friends, he had not found what he wrote well enough and tore up his early poems. The reason behind this was that he developed a fine poetic taste in his high school years: in Haydarpaşa High School, he learned aruz meter and so improved in the old style of poetry that he used to write poems in aruz by walking with his friends (Süreya, 2015a, p. 204). Nevertheless, he was not admiring old poetry; by a sense of underestimation, he used to improvise some tongue twisters full of slang words in aruz meter (Perinçek & Duruel, 2008, p. 62). In the annual humor journal of Mülkiye, *Kazgan* which was published by students, he had a poem named "Vezn-i Aruz" which narrated student life as content and sneers with aruz meter in aruz meter as form (Süreya, 1953, p. 5):

Dilberliği çektikçe dili vezn-i aruzun
Mefulü mefailü mefailü feulün
Günlerce inekhanede ben gözyaşı süzdüm
Bir tarz-ı kadim üzre mefailü feulün
Ol gözleri ahuya şiirler düzdüm

Taksitle ve zararsız sevgililer var
Derviş Yalım'ın ekseriya gittiği yerde
Derviş ki pazar günleri kızlar gibi parlar
Leb-kaydı tıraşlar ve mefailü feulün
Derviş ki toujours sırrını esbabına saklar

Although caricatured, main themes in the poem give clues about Süreya's relation with poetry: love, griefand poetry itself. What is dominant is humor. In the same *Kazgan*, he had also a humorous poem "Yedi Adet Sultan", written in *beyit*s which are the main formal unit of the Divan poetry (p. 12):

İş bu şiir üçüncü sınıfta yedi adet
Gönül fersa sultana hitab eder başlarken

Birinci adet sultan pek sayın Ülkü hanım
Açıklar mısın niçin yeşilaycı oldun sen

Biçare Asuman'a baktım kızarıyordu
Professor Gravı gözünü kırpıyorken

Fiy tarihinden beri insanları severmiş
En korkunç itirafı dinliyoruz Ülker'den

Haydi oradan haydi, bilmiyor muyuz sanki
Yani Suzan bu pozlar bu fiyaka neden?

Kanun-u medenice icra-yı aşka ehil
Necla malum sebepten her sabah gelir erken

Allah'ın bildiğini kuldan saklamasaydım
Tülbent hikayesini anlatırdım Neriman

Şiir burada biter ve lakin şu Muazzez
Bitmeyen bir şiirdir koridorda yürürken

Apparently, the early development of poetic taste and competence allowed him to express his interest in love within the well-worn forms. Süreya published in *Kazgan* two similar poems as well: "Mahpushane Çeşmesi" and "İnekname" which

elaborated themes of love and humor together on the ground of modern urban life conditions:

> Filimler gelir sinemalara
> Yeni sinemaya, Ulus sinemasına ve saire
> Lana Turner'in dudakları hışımlı
> Rüyalarda buseler var vacibül eda
> Ama ben o kızı konferansta gördüm ilk defa
> Hani bir gezi gösteri kolu var ya
> Başkanı da Erdoğan Nirun ya hani
> Işte ben o kızı konferansta gördüm ilk defa (p. 2)

> Herifçioğlu inek mi inek
> Bir gün her nasılsa sokağa çıktı
> Bir kıza rastladı kıyak mı kıyak
> Amanın kızın gözleri, amanın o boyun
> Vay kızın saçları vay vay da vay vay
> Kızın saçları uzun mu uzun (p. 3)

These humorous poems have two important features: regarding form, they are all written within a perfect formal composition in terms structure of rhyme and verse; regarding content, their themes are based on daily bohemian student life that Süreya himself experienced at the time. The formal competence of Süreya's first poems was rooted in his mastery of syllabic verse as well as aruz both in family and his school years before 1950. Alevi culture was a traditional oral culture full of tales and epic stories. Süreya listened legends of "Kerem and Aslı" and "War Stories of Ali" from his mother for numerous times. These were traditional stories written in classic verse from which Süreya obviously acquires his first poetic tastes from his family. In school, his oral taste transformed into a recognized literary disposition and triggered his desire of writing. Throughout his primary and secondary school years, he shined as a smart student who was able to read and write long before his classmates. In the second grade, he won a story-writing contest in Turkish class and received some children's magazines as the price (Süreya, 2015a, p. 226). What was praised by the teacher was Cemal's proper and good use a word, "canciğer". The word then became

popular among his classmates. His literary disposition being thus recognized for the first time apart from family, Süreya devoted himself to read and write more. Books and magazines began to fill his coffer in the house (Süreya, 2016, p. 301). With a friend, he prepared a hand-made magazine and sold it to girls in the class (Perinçek & Duruel, 2008, p. 39). In high school years, he read and memorized Ahmet Muhip Dranas, Fazıl Hüsnü Dağlarca, Necip Fazıl, Cahit Külebi and Özdemir Asaf's syllabic poems (Süreya, 2016, p. 191). His classmates called him by a nickname: "Üstad" which meant "reputable master" (Süreya, 2016, p. 328). He spent his weekends in the school's library; wrote diaries and letters to imagined girls and did his classmates'home works for literature lessons (Süreya, 2015a, p. 222). Besides, he disapproved Garip poetry and found Orhan Veli simplistic (Süreya, 2015a, p. 98). Nevertheless, the last poem he published, "Türkü", in *Kazgan* was in Garip's short form and colloquial language:

> Ben Aysel'im
> Kaşım kaş, gözüm göz benim
> Takunyalarla en güzel ben yürürüm
> Esmerliğime esmerim amma
> Eğer meyva olarak
> Dünyaya gelse idim
> Kavun olurdum (p. 6)

What is significant in the poems above is the expression of love with a subtle erotic imagination and humor. The contextual reason behind this textual pattern is twofold: first, he found himself in a modern urban life of Ankara where he had possibility of meeting with other women such in the school or outside; second, he found a legitimate social medium, the humor journal *Kazgan*, to express love through an objective form: poetry in aruz and syllabic forms he already mastered. But the subjective aspect of these poems needs to be explained. Love as the main theme of these early poems as well as Süreya's later poems through all 50s had a dispositional

origin in his subjectivity. Shortly after his mother's sudden death, he began to develop an interest in the opposite sex (Süreya, 2015a, p. 216). He often felt in love with more than one girl in the school (Duruel, 2003, p. 39). Süreya's interest in sexuality had pre-puberty roots as well: When he was five years old in Erzincan, he secretly watched a woman masturbating (Süreya, 2016, p. 138) and in those years his uncle draw figures of nude women while he was teaching him drawing (Duruel, 2003, p. 45). In secondary school years he masturbated many times in a day (Süreya, 2016, p. 160). When he was 15 years old, one of his letters to a girl, Seniha Nemli who will be his first wife in 1954 was caught by the school director and Süreya's grade in morality lesson was dropped down.

Although it is difficult to separate sexuality and love in Süreya's primary experiences, I have to avoid to easily explain this disposition by a psychological compensation of the loss of his mother with other women between his 9-18 ages. Indeed, what is important here is the simple elaboration of love with humor in the very early poems. *Kazgan* was a humor magazine which published jokes, funny artificial anecdotes about the professors and students, exaggerated illustrations of politicians and famous authors. It is reasonable to say that in his early poems, Süreya achieved to express the theme of love in modern urban life within classical forms of poetry thanks to his mastery of old meters in his family and throughout his school years. In that sense, his poems in *Kazgan* reflect his literary dispositions which were paradoxically rooted both in his oppressed Kurdish-Alevi cultural capital and in his successful studentship career in the educational system that was a part of oppressive state apparatus. Poetry for him was the locus of tensions since the very beginning.

4.2 The abstraction of grief

1953 is the year Cemal Süreya published "serious" poems as well. From January to June, "Şarkısı Beyaz", "Hafta Sekiz", "Di Gel", "Çıkmaz Sinir" and "Ölmüştük" appeared in *Mülkiye*. Same year, he also wrote "Hamza Süiti", "Adam", two poems entitled "Şiir", "Saat Beş", "Piyale" and "Sizin Hiç Babanız Öldü Mü" which wereall published in well-known literary magazines like *Mavi, Yeditepe, Yenilik* and *20. Asır*. In this part, I will try to show that, whereas humor was the way in which love could be indirectly expressed, the poet's discovery of abstraction as a narrative technique allowed him to fully express his primary experiences in poetry.

What is common in the poems of 1953 is their narrative maturity and composition in terms of form. Rhymes and harmony are always carefully structured. Most of them are written in regular stanzas of 4, 6 or 7 lines and in a colloquial daily language with simple and conventional syntax. It is obvious that in the beginning, Süreya and his desk mateKarakoçwho wrote poems in aruz meter in the high school likewise (Karakoç, 1989, March 27, p. 11) followed existing style of writing they already mastered. The first poems they wrote in 1953 represent a developed taste of musicality and capability of expression within the existing samples of the field:

> Peygamber çiçeğinin aydınlığında ara
> Sana doğru uzanan çaresiz ellerimi
> Sırrımı söylüyorum vefakar balıklara
> Yalnız onlar tutacak bu dünyada yerimi (Karakoç, 2011, p. 30)

> Karın yağdını görünce
> Kar tutan toprağı anlayacaksın
> Toprakta bir karış karı görünce
> Kar içinde yanan karı anlayacaksın
>
> Allah kar gibi gökten yağınca
> Karlar sıcak sıcak saçlarına değince
> Başını önüne eğince
> Benim bu şiirimi anlayacaksın (Karakoç, 2011, p. 35)

> Ben olanca kuvvetimle

Halatlara asılıyorum mafile
Ben ayrı düşmüşüm bir kere
Ayrı düşmüşüm insanlardan
Bu yıldız tutmaz mavilikte
Ne deniz ne köpük kar eder bana ("Şarkısı Beyaz", Süreya, 2014, p. 277, emphasis added)

Kaç turna sürüsü süzülüp gitti
Buğdaylar kaçıncı sarardı üstümüze
Ah! Umutsuz türküler yaktık, ağladık
Biz dayanamaz olduk gayri
Di gel gayri zalım ürüzger
Di gel ("Di Gel", Süreya, 2014, p. 280, emphasis added)

Daha bir dokunaklı gelir şarkı şarkıdan
Daha bir duygulu oluruz, ağlarız
Bulutlar geçmedeyken, beyazken gürültüsüz
Olan umudumuzla kalakalırız ortalıkta
Bizim bu insanca üzgünlüğümüz dillere destan ("Şiir", Süreya, 2014, p. 283, emphasis added)

Albeit Süreya's grief as a subjective disposition is expressed through the repetition of "crying" in the underlined lines above, the poems' ambiguous tone does not bear any personal indication concerning real experience and origin of that grief. Whereas "being far apart from people" implies indirectly Süreya's exile in his childhood, general tone of voice does not directly overlap with his concrete experiences. In form, these poems follownarrative and colloquial language.Being motivated by the publication of his first poems, Süreya wrote in the following months other poems which are much more developed in form and content:

Kadın saçlarını getirmedi uzakta tuttu
Umutsuzlukla dolu soyunuk uzakta
Düştüler karanlıkta aralık aralık
Düşüp ölenler oldu düştü öldüler

Kadın gözlerini koydu ortaya
Bir mavi bir gökyüzü aldı çevrelerini
Sevdiler sonsuz bir maviyle alıngan
Sevip yaşayanlar oldu sevdi yaşadılar ("Şiir", p. 22)

Yıldızlar kıyamet gibiydi kaldırımlarda
Çünkü biraz evvel yağmur yağmıştı
Adam bulut gibiydi hatırladı
Adamın ayaklarının altında

Yıldızların yıldız olduğu vardı
Adam yıldızlara basa basa yürüdü
Çünkü biraz önce yağmur yağmıştı (“Adam”, p. 15, emphasis added)

Büyük bir ihtimalle ölmüştük
Şehir kan kıyametti arkamızda
Gökyüzünü katlayıp bir köşeye koymuştuk
Yıldızlar kaldırımlara dökülmüştü bütün (“Hamza”, p. 27, emphasis added)

It is worth to notice common features of these poems. A sharp contrast between death and life, loneliness and woman, despair and love, darkness and light exists in the formal structures. Short and harmonious lines enhance rhythm and photographic effects. While using “we” or “they” as subjects of sentence, the description is vivid and dynamic. The objective background is urban place where a man and a woman can instantaneously fall in love and quickly became distant in the flow of daily circulation. Main dichotomy of narration seems to be between grief and love, yet it is projected onto anonym figures and objects the poet found out from his concrete context in student life in Ankara.

However, what seems new in the poems above is the use of abstraction: whereas in “Adam”, the poet describes the reality in lines like “Star were like doomsday in sidewalks / because it just rained”, he transforms the same reality into “we folded and put the sky aside / star fell all onto the sidewalks” in the poem “Hamza”. What he does here is transforming the phenomenon he sees in front of him into an image, without using the preposition of analogy “like”. This passage from analogy to visual abstraction shifts the language of poem from the representation of reality to a self-sufficient reality-making ground which recreates the reality in itself. In this sense, the poem “Hamza” signifies an early moment for Süreya’s poetry as it is no longer a developed from of existing samples of poetry writing in the field, but a new experience of language which renders itself more aesthetic and meaningful than the reality. On the one hand, the poet discovered and used abstraction as a way of

creating his own language; on the other hand, he did so within regular sentence form and narrative structure, meaning that Süreya began to surpass Garip's simplistic language deprived of imagination. In the last poem Süreya wrote in 1953, he used the transformation of reality into a visual image once more:

> Sizin hiç babanız öldü mü?
> *Benim bir kere öldü, kör oldum*
> Yıkadılar aldılar götürdüler
> Babamdan ummazdım bunu kör oldum
> Siz hiç hamama gittiniz mi?
> Ben gittim lambanın biri söndü
> Gözümün biri söndü kör oldum
> Tepede bir gökyüzü vardı yuvarlak
> Şöylelemesine maviydi kör oldum
> Taşlara gelince hamam taşlarına
> Taşlar pırıl pırıldı ayna gibiydi
> Taşlarda yüzümün yarısını gördüm
> Bir şey gibiydi bir şey gibi kötü
> Yüzümden ummazdım bunu kör oldum
> Siz hiç sabunluyken ağladınız mı? ("Sizin Hiç Babanız Öldü mü?", p. 26, emphasis added)

It is obvious that the poet still continued to maintain harmony and musicality through repetitions, rhymes and structures of lines which are mostly based on 9, 11, 12 syllables. In addition to those formal patterns which differ from Garip poetry, the grief of his father's death is abstracted in the line "my father once died, I went blind". However, Süreya's father died in June 1957, four years after the poem was written. What happened in 1953 was that Süreya wanted to get engaged with Seniha to whom he had written love letters since the primary school. Süreya visited his family in Bilecik in order to obtain approval for marriage but his father refused his request by arguing that he was so young for marriage and the girl's family was not prosperous (Perinçek & Duruel, 2008, p. 107). Despite his father refusal, Süreya went to Eskişehir where Seniha lived and they got married in 23rd November without presence of Süreya's family. Süreya returned back to Ankara in order to complete his last year in Mülkiye and visited Seniha in every chance until the summer. Therefore,

not only some lines but the poem itself is the abstraction of the tiff between him and his father during that period. In that sense, Süreya recreated his subjective experience at that time in the poetry by reforming the reality in an abstracted narrative language.

In conclusion of this part, two points need to be noted. Firstly, in 1953, Süreya entered into the Turkish poetry field by publishing poems in several literary magazines. He elaborated general themes like grief and love within the existing poetic forms and structures like harmony, aruz meter, syllabic verse and stanza he mastered until then. In a sense, so far he performed what the confrontation between his dispositions and the objective context of the poetry field required.

Secondly, in thematic patterns of poems, Süreya followed two strategies: love is accompanied by humor and grief is abstracted, meaning that the poet followed indirect mechanisms when it came to express his subjectivity. Whereas in his first poems like "Şarkısı Beyaz" the grief is expressed without any subjective reference, in the poem "Hamza" he discovered a technical innovation which is abstraction and transformation of reality into to visual images in order to be able to express grief without remaining within the limits of existing poetic language in the field. By this way, Süreya discovered first archetype of his style which could both cover and express the affects rooted in his deterritorialization. In the poem "Sizin Hiç Babanız Öldü Mü?", thanks to abstraction, he managed to express his feelings about his father without directly mentioning what was happened. Subjective experiences of the poet required a small but founding shift in the objective formal patterns of the poetry in order to be expressed. Poetry's language thus shifted from the mission of representing of reality into the reinvention of experience in the poem.

4.3 The trans-formation of language

As a recognized and productive young poet by the end of 1953, Cemal Süreya continued to publish 6 new poems until his graduation in June 1954. This part will focus on how he developed his initial discovery of abstraction within changing experiences. As it will be analyzed below, in the first half of 1954 Süreya finds himself in a tension between the ways in which he experiences love and the techniques by which he experiences language in poetry.

The poems Süreya wrote in the first months of 1954 are addressed to Seniha. In February, when Seniha's parents were away for a week, he came to Eskişehir and passed a week with Seniha in their house. They filled together a notebook with love poems, drawings and colorful writings (Perinçek & Duruel, 2008, p. 109). Süreya wrote a long poem he later never publishes elsewhere:

> Ben Seniha Seber Ben Cemal Seber
> Ben seni severim Ben de seni
> Ben soba yaktı Ben tavukları hatırladım
> Bulutlar güzel oluyor Beyaz da oluyor
> Benim gözlerim var Benim *mercimeğim* var
> Gözlerim iki tane *Mercimekler* yaşasın
> Ve yıldızlar Senin yıldızların
> Ve şiirler Benim şiirlerim
> Ve sen Evet ben
> Sen Ben (Perinçek & Duruel, 2008, p. 110, emphasis added).

The words "clouds" and "white" already existed in his former poems as symbols of freedom and love. The poem is clearly an ecstatic expression of coming together and representation of love that they experienced in the language itself. But a new experience joined to the theme of love: the words "lentils" imply sexual intercourse they lived in that happy week. When Süreya returned then to Ankara, he wrote poems full of joy and longing along with sexual connotations which refer to their early honeymoon in February:

Şimdi sen tam çağındasın yanına varılacak
Önünde durulacak tam elinden tutulacak
Hangi bir elinden güzelim hangi bir
Bir elinde kızlığın duruyor garip huysuz
Öbür elinde yetişkin bir günışığı
Daha öbür elinde de kilometrelerce hürlük
Çalışan insanlar için akşamlara kadar
Toz duman içinde
Bir elinle de boyuna ekmek kesiyorsun ("Cıgarayı Attım Denize", Süreya, 2014, p. 21, emphasis added)

Bak bunlar ellerin senin bunlar ayakların
Bunlar o kadar güzel ki artık o kadar olur
Bunlar da saçların işte akşamdan çözülü
Bak bu sensin çocuğum enine boyuna
Bu da yatak olduğuna göre altımızdaki
Sabahlara kadar koynumda yatmışsın
Bak bende yalan yok vallahi billahi
Sen o kadar güzelsin ki artık o kadar olur ("Güzelleme", p. 16, emphasis added)

Elaborating theme of sexual love within simple and colloquial language, the poems above consist of direct representations of reality rather than visual abstractions. Real and direct experience of love is directly expressed in a realistic style. In a fluent and dynamic syntax, the language functions as a mirror of the poet's mood of existence. What differs in those poems from the existing poetry in the field was eroticism which is obvious when compared with Cahit Külebi's poem "Güzelleme" which was based on conventional language of representation likewise:

Evinizin önünde dolaşsam
Seni bulamazdım
Sen gözlerinde bahçeler olan
Şimdi evimdeki karım
Senin kadar güzel olsun çocuklarım

Gökyüzü bugün ne kadar da çok
Yıldızlarla dolu avuçların (Külebi, 2002, p. 53)

In line with the poems above addressed to Seniha, Süreya also wrote "Aşk" and "Balzamin" in 1954, which are also based on the sense of astonishment of sexual love and written with conventional language of representation. The technique of abstraction he discovered a year before is out of sight on the ground of representation

love in the writing. However, in 1954, Süreya wrote three different poems "Önceleyin", "Şiir" and "Şu Da Var" which imply a forbidden liaison with other women:

> *İstanbullar geminin altında*
> *Kadınları*sorarsan onlar da öyle
> Şişeler de geminin altında, Güzin de
> Allah'tan beni kimsecikler görmüyor
> *Canımın istediğini yapıyorum*
> *Çırılçıplak sularda yıkanıyorum, utanıyorum*
> Güzin *utanmak* istiyor ama nerde
> Nasıl utanacak bu *boş şehirde* ("Şiir", p. 14, emphasis added)

> Bir de var sen koynumda yatıyorsun
> Güzelsin güzelliğin mutlak amenna
> Kızlığın masanın üzerinde
> Kocana saklıyorsun
>
> Oysa koca da ne, benim kollarım var
> Soy bir portakal yedir bana dilim dilim
> Ben Uzunminareliyimdir doğma büyüme
> Ne yapıp yapıp denizi görmek isterim ("Şu Da Var", p. 29)

Despite the fact that"Güzin" can be one of the girls whom Süreya loved in his first years in Mülkiye, what is important here is the return of the abstraction rather than who the mentioned women actually were. The first line opens with a double transformation of reality: "Istanbuls are under the ship". "Istanbul" is in plural and the relation between the city and the ship which is imagined in contrast with the reality. The poem has asurrealist background in which "the city is empty" and the subject "does whatever he wants". No matter if Süreya had an affair with a married woman or not, the second poem above is also based on the abstraction of a moment in bed with someone. Both poems are indirect expressions of sexuality rather than direct representations of what really happened. The use of imagination aims to give pleasure to readers in terms of form. In terms of content, the implication of affairs with other women aims to express the sexual experience the poet wants readers to think he had.

Therefore, these poems signify a second shift in Süreya's style. After having directly experienced love in marriage and direct style of writing in the first months of 1954, the poet now returns to three source of his poetry: Ankara as the urban place where he already met with freedom and bohemian lifestyle, his disposition of sexuality which already allowed him to fall in imaginary love with more than a woman before, and the technique of abstraction he already discovered in order to express his grief a year before. The application of the new technique (abstraction) in an old disposition (sexuality) results with ironic expression of the sense of shame "I, completely naked, bath in waters, I am ashamed".

In 1954, he wrote a much more developed poem which was entitled "Gül", and published it in June 1954 in *Yeditepe* magazine. The title was a reference to classic Divan poetry that was largely based on common theme of love within metaphors and symbols like rose, nightingale, separation and impossible union of lovers. Süreya's poem is structured by three stanzas of 5 lines and simple rhymes which provide rhythm and dynamism like in his former poems above. In this regard, its form is rooted in Süreya's developed taste of traditional forms but the poem's originality lays in its emphasis on personality and abstraction of love rather than symbolism and metaphors:

> Gülün tam ortasında ağlıyorum
> Her akşam sokak ortasında öldükçe
> Önümü arkamı bilmiyorum
> Azaldığını duyup duyup karanlıkta
> Beni ayakta tutan gözlerinin
>
> Ellerini alıyorum sabaha kadar seviyorum
> Ellerin beyaz tekrar beyaz tekrar beyaz
> Ellerinin bu kadar beyaz olmasından korkuyorum
> İstasyonda tiren oluyor biraz
> Ben bazan istasyonu bulamayan bir adamım
>
> Gülü alıyorum yüzüme sürüyorum
> Her nasılsa sokağa düşmüş

Kolumu kanadımı kırıyorum
Bir kan oluyor bir kıyamet bir çalgı
Ve zurnanın ucunda yepyeni bir çingene (Süreya, 2014, p. 12)

The poem opens with an aesthetic abstraction of the lover's mood of existence based on separation with the one he loves. Structural contrast is between whiteness and darkness, hope and death. The semantic emphasis is grief of separation from the loved. "Crying" was one of the main words in Süreya's first poems in *Mülkiye*. Whereas first and third stanzas imply separation, the second stanza refers to the peak moments of sexuality. Besides, that balance between love and separation is accompanied by a balance between the speaking persona and the body of the loved: on the one hand, the second stanza's emphasis is on "the hands" of the loved that are repeatedly mentioned; on the other, the subject of syntax is always the first person singular which expresses the poet himself. In that sense, the first line of the first stanza gives the program of the whole poem: The speaking-persona "is crying", meaning that he is writing poem, "in the middle of the rose", imagining the loved. By transforming the experience of the poet into a visual image, the poem itself becomes the signification of what it narrates just as it was in "Sizin Hiç Babanız Öldü Mü?". The poet creates an aesthetic effect by a successful combination of the technique (abstraction) and regular narrative syntax that drives from the existing samples in the field. In addition to that, dramatic visualizations like in the line "dying in the middle of the street every night" provide cinematography. The poem is clear and ambiguous, real and artificial at the same time. It operates as a self-sufficient aesthetic entity which offers its own vitality without depending on the reality.

It is worth to compare the poem of "Gül" with love poems that were written before by other poets in order to locate the innovation Süreya achieved in the field.

At this point, I will take Garip poetry and Attila İlhan as two prominent positions in the field before Süreya. Love has been perhaps the most perpetual and popular themes of Turkish poetry. Oktay Rifat and Orhan Veli wrote love poems which imply sexuality as well:

> Uzanıp yatıvermiş, sere serpe
> Entarisi sıyrılmış, hafiften
> Kolunu kaldırmış, koltuğu görünüyor
> Bir eliyle de göğsünü tutmuş
> İçinde kötülüğü yok biliyorum
> Yok, benim de yok ama
> Olmaz ki!
> Böyle de yatılmaz ki! (Veli, 2015, p. 106)

> Kızlar vardır kıvırcık salata gibi
> Ağızları burunları kıvır kıvır
> Bacak bacak üstüne vapurlarda
> Rüzgâr eser oraları buraları görünür
> Baktıkça fık fık eder adamın içi (Rifat, 1954, p. 46)

The dominant feature of these poems is that the language is used to represent the object of love and sexuality within its reality. The poet's role is solely observing and writing what he sees in fluent short lines by employing words with their ordinary meanings. In a sense, they put the reality into the common terms of language. On the contrary, Süreya's poem passes the reality through the poet's subjectivity and reinvents the experience of reality within aesthetic abstractions. Whereas Garip's poetic operation consists of translation of reality into the language, Süreya's operation is transformation of reality, i.e. a new perception of reality along with new relations between words. The articulation of balance between the persona and the loved, love and separation brings the text the poet's experience together: "I am worried about whiteness of your hands / I am sometimes a man who can't find the station". In this regard, the form of poem becomes unique voice of the poet's personality rather than a mere elaboration of the theme. The poem of "Gül" can thus be considered as the first significant example of a new poetic attitude in the field,

which is based on introduction of abstraction into the narration within musical composition of verses and stanzas.

Another poet who wrote love poems before Süreya is Attila İlhan. The latter's second book was published in 1954 and composed of the poems written in 1952-53. Süreya had certainly read the book since he was in touch with *Mavi* magazine where he published his poem "Piyale" in October 1954. What is much more certain is that Süreya's portrayal of "train stations", "sidewalks", "streets", "women", "ships", "bridges" and "Istanbuls" as a modern urban background for the theme of love, was already existing in İlhan's poems. In this regard, the title of İlhan's book was very significant: "Boulevard of mists". What was different in İlhan's case was that he was from an urban family rather than a deterritorialized existence like Süreya. The first four stanza of İlhan's long poem is as following:

> Elinin arkasında güneş duruyordu
> Aylardan kasımdı üşüyorduk
> Ağacın biri bulvarda ölüyordu
> Şehrin camları kaygısız gülüyordu
> Her köşe başında öpüşüyorduk
>
> Sisler bulvarı'na akşam çökmüştü
> Omuzlarımıza çoktan çökmüştü
> Kesik birer kol gibi yalnızdık
> Dağlarda ateşler yanmıyordu
> Deniz fenerleri sönmüştü
> Birbirimizin gözlerini arıyorduk
>
> Sisler Bulvarı'nda seni kaybettim
> Sokak lambaları öksürüyordu
> Yukarıda bulutlar yürüyordu
> Terkedilmiş bir çocuk gibiydim
> Dokunsanız ağlayacaktım
> Yenikapı'da bir tren vardı
>
> Sisler Bulvarı'nda öleceğim
> Sol kasığımdan vuracaklar
> Bulvar durağında düşeceğim
> Gözlüklerim kırılacaklar
> Sen rüyasını göreceksin
> Çığlık çığlığa uyanacaksın

Sabah kapını çalacaklar
Elinden tutup getirecekler
Beni görünce taş kesileceksin
Ağlamayacaksın! Ağlamayacaksın! (İlhan, 2016, p. 58)

İlhan uses the theme of love and the urban place as its background in other poems of "İstanbul Şehri Ağlıyor", "Liman", "Emperyal Oteli" and "Cinayet Saati" as well. However, his elaboration of love consists of two features: firstly, he never applies the abstraction of sexuality and always covers love within a narration of political adventures the subject of poem experiences in urban place. In that sense, love is a complementary theme for the expression of poet's persona which is the central focus of *Sisler Bulvarı*. Secondly, as a result of the use of love as an additional theme rather than taking it as the founding experience of language, İlhan's poetry narrates a story within conventional meanings, idioms and wordings, which results with a monotonous repetition of same rhymes and predicates at the end of each lines above. Consequently, İlhan remains in the rhetorical figures of speech: "they will knock the door in the morning / they will bring you to me / you will be petrified when you see me". Whereas Süreya concentrates his experience into his text and transformers the former in the cause ofthesubjectification of the latter; İlhan is similar to Garip poetry in the sense that he founds his poem on the colloquial daily language. In other words, what is personal in İlhan's poetry is what the persona says, whereas it is how the persona says in Süreya. Despite the fact that the intensive use of imagination in his poetry influenced Süreya in terms of content, İlhan's ideological tendency to adapt folkloristic language into social realist themes prevented him from developing a new relation with language.

The main difference was in the social origin; whereas Garip poets and İlhan were all from urban background and high social status, Süreya experienced the urban condition through a forced deterritorialization. Garip and İlhan did not have to invent

a new relation with the major language in which they were born. Therefore, Süreya's innovation does not only take urban place as background of love, but takes the language itself as the subject-matter of poetic operation: he does not *use* the existing language patterns in order to represent the reality in text. Süreya's poetic operation consists of breaking logical contexts of words in order to be able to reinvent his experiences in concentrated and abstracted textual patterns. In the poem "Gül", the personalization of expression through abstraction paves the way for an autonomous poetic diction, i.e. a new referential language in Deleuzian terms against the conventional major language. Whereas Süreya experienced same urban lifestyle and conditions with İlhan and Garip poets, he managed to take love and sexuality as the language-making ground of his poetry.

It is possible to find other inter-textual sources for the poem "Rose". Ahmet Muhip Dıranas whom Süreya read in his high school years, had already written a poem, "Rain, Rose and Hands", which consisted of the same themes of rose, love and separation. Furthermore, the repetition of "your hands" also existed in a poem Karakoç published in *Mülkiye,* "Monna Rosa" which means "Lady Rose" (Karakoç, 2011, p. 14). In that sense, Süreya's "Gül" can be interpreted also as a response to Karakoç's long poem in syllabic verses which became widely popular among students in 1953. Nevertheless, I am interested here in the social meaning of Süreya's formal innovation in poetry which was the result of the intersection between two factors: First, the limits of poetic capabilities of Garip, Külebi and İlhan which do not allow the theme of love and sexuality to be fully expressed; and secondly, the uncertainty of Süreya'sloverelationshipbetween his wife and other women when he returned to Ankara in 1954. In that sense, a textual innovation occurred when the existing poetry in the field did not allow the subject to fully express his nomadic

desire in and against his context. The poem of "Gül" is therefore the result of intersection between the history of the subject, the objective history of the poetry field and the existing condition in which the subject is located.

4.4 Image as self-image

This part focuses on the development of Süreya's poetry from 1955 to 1959. My analysis will oscillate between description of Süreya's experiences and reading of his poetry in order to show how his erotic imagism allowed him to express his subjective condition in the poetry. My argument in this part is that his new writing style allowed him to experience nomadic desire in the main poems of his book *Üvercinka*. In that sense, the book itself was an image of Süreya's subjectivity that he could reterritorialize in a new style of writing against the major and former poetic samples and positions of the field.

In 1955, Süreya was in Eskişehir where he was appointed as intern to the tax office since November 1954. The reason why he chose Eskişehir was that his wife Seniha lived there. It was the first time they began to live together. However, they soon began to quarrel about domestic chores. In the spring 1955, Süreya invited Hasan Basri, his close friend from Mülkiye, to Eskişehir and confessed him that he was in love with another woman from the office (Perinçek & Duruel, 2008, p. 115). In 3rd August 1955, Süreya's daughter Ayça was born. At the end of the summer, Süreya was appointed as assistant inspector of Minstry of Finance to İstanbul where he soon made acquaintance with other poets and writers such as Edip Cansever, Orhan Kemal, Özdemir Asaf, Ahmed Arif and Ülkü Tamer (Süreya, 2016, pp. 18-20; Feyiz, 2010, p. 73). His poem "Dalga" was included in the anthology of young poets prepared by Güngör Gençay. He also became acquinted with some gatekeepers in the

field, such as Hüsamettin Bozok, the owner of *Yeditepe* magazine and publishing house (Perinçek & Duruel, 2008, p. 118). Behçet Necatigil mentioned Süreya as "one of the most successful poets of the year" in *Varlık* magazine (Perinçek & Duruel, 2008, p. 120). Having said farewell to his forbidden love in Eskişehir, Süreya's life in İstanbul was torn between a disappointment of marriage and growing recognition in literary circles by the end of 1955.

This new condition Süreya experienced was obvious in his new poems such as "Dalga", "Üçgenler", "Gölge Oyunu", "Nehirler Boyunca Kadınlar Gördüm" and "Kesik" which were all written in 1955. In those poems, whereas he still continued toinvent a personalized language, he portrayed an objective world instead of directly elaborating his own mood of existence as the main ground of poem. For instance, "Nehirler Boyunca Kadınlar Gördüm" is a tribute to Anatolian women and "Üçgenler" is an ironic and abstracted description ofurban experiences with visual images. It is only in the poems of "Dalga" and "Kesik" that the theme of forbidden love is indirectly mentioned:

> İki gemiciynen Van Gogh'tan aşırılmış
> Bir kadının yüzü kaçıyordu yetişemedim
> *Ben ömrümde aşk nedir bilmedim*
> Süheyla'yı saymazsak ha ha ha ("Dalga", Süreya, 2014, p. 18, emphasis added)

> Ama ne var eskisi gibi değil
> Bir başına değil değil *aşk başka sevilere koşullu*
> Mesela barış arada bir gökyüzüyle
> Her şeyin gerçeği insanlıkla beraber
> Aşk ünlü güzellik ("Kesik", p. 287, emphasis added)

"Süheyla" was mentioned also in the poem "Üçgenler" as a woman in İstanbul, meaning that it is not the name of his flirt in Eskişehir. "Süheyla" was also a name that Orhan Veli mentioned in his poem "Dedikodu" as among the women Veli had affair with. In the poems above, the poet's turbulent private life is expressed

in the underlined lines in a very indirect manner. Apparently, Süreya's poetry was in tension between his private life and his recognition: on the one hand, he preferred hiding his real or imagined experiences with other women under the high abstractions, and on the other hand, he continued to develop his technique of transformation of reality within more harmonious structures which was the common feature of the poems in 1955. "Dalga", "Kesik", "Nehirler Boyunca Kadınlar Gördüm" and "Gölge Oyunu" are all composed of four stanzas and rhythmic repetitions of lines and wordings. In that sense, Süreya improved the use of abstracted images within formal geometry and musicality which were missing in Garip poetry. The peak of that development was represented by the last poem he wrote in 1955:

> Böylece bir kere daha boynunlayız sayılı yerlerinden
> En uzun boynun bu senin dayanmaya ya da umudu kesmemeye
> *Laleli'den dünyaya doğru giden bir tramvaydayız*
> Birden nasıl oluyor sen yüreğimi elliyorsun
> Ama nasıl oluyor sen yüreğimi eller ellemez
> Sevişmek bir kere daha yürürlüğe giriyor
> Bütün kara parçalarında
> Afrika dahil
>
> Aydınca düşünmeyi iyi biliyorsun eksik olma
> Yatakta yatmayı bildiğin kadar
> Sayın Tanrıya kalırsa seninle yatmak günah, daha neler
> Boşunaymış gibi bunca uzaması saçlarının
> Ben böyle canlı saç görmedim ömrümde
> Hertelinin içinde ayrı bir kalp çarpıyor
> Bütün kara parçaları için
> Afrika dahil ("Üvercinka", p. 28, emphasis added)

Far from both İlhan's impersonal portrayal of love and Garip's realist representation that lacks adornment, Süreya here improves what he did in the poem of "Gül". This poem is composed of five long stanzas meaning that it was the first time Süreya wrote such a long poem. By this way the poet created possibility to elaborate the themes in depth rather than giving instantaneous descriptions just like

in his former poems in 1954. Süreya radicalized theabstraction in the line of “we are in a tramway traveling from Laleli to the world”. This line can be interpreted as the declaration of new poetry since a surrealist imagination oscillates between Laleli and Africa as well as lyrism of the first stanza and irony of the second stanza. Karakoç wrote later that “the new poetry can be summarized in that line. Whereas Orhan Veli’s poetry travels from Laleli to Sirkeci, the new poetry focuses on the human being’s inner world” (Karakoç, 1986, p. 27). Moreover, the title “Üvercinka” was the transformed and aestheticized form of “Güvercin Kadın”, the nickname Süreya gave to his flirt in Eskişehir. In that sense, the transformation of language began with the personalization of the ordinary words in the title. The sexual images are employed in order to reinvent the aesthetic experience on the language itself. In line with the poem of “Gül”, the text claims its self-sufficient aesthetic entity where the subject grounds his experience rather than representing the reality.

The use of image as an output of aesthetic abstraction was the common formal development in the poems of 1956 as well. In “Hür Hamamlar Denizi”, “Türkü”, “TK”, “İngiliz” and “Elma” that Süreya wrote in 1956, the eroticism and the imagism intersected with each other in order to create a personalized and autonomous language against the major language and the established order. The urban background and the central elements like female body, birds, sky, streets and trains were elaborated within instantaneous and cinematographic descriptions by breaking logical and rhetoric rules:

> İstanbul'da bir duvar duvarda bir kilise
> Sen çırılçıplak elma yiyorsun
> Denizin ortasına kadar elma yiyorsun
> Yüreğimin ortasına kadar elma yiyorsun
> Bir yanda esaslı kederler içinde gençliğimiz
> Bir yanda Sirkeci'nin tiren dolu kadınları
> Adettir sadece ağızlarını öptürürler
> Ayaküstü işlerini görmek yerine (“Elma”, Süreya, 2014, p. 25)

The poet uses the same present continuous tense everywhere he elaborates the theme of love since the poem of "Gül". The ecstatic moments of sexual experiences are thereby reinvented in each poetic text. From 1954 on, the persona in poem is embedded in the present time where he expressed the enthusiasm of sexuality through the connotations of female body:

> Bir sürü *güvercin* havalan. Saçların
> Bunlar tıpkı senin sevilmedeki saçların
> *Kanatlarımdan* bellidir yeni açılmış sokaklarda
> Gülüm-mera gülüm-mera
> Bir güvercin akıntısında kesin güvercinler
> *Uçsuz bucaksız bana bakıyorsun* ("Türkü", p. 24, emphasis added)

The musicality the poet never left since his first poems contributes to the aesthetic effect of the text. The words and connotations of "sky", "pigeon" and "wings" which existed even in "Şarkısı Beyaz" in 1953 compose an abstracted image of sexuality and the sense of freedom that is rooted in the former. The reality does not matter anymore despite in some poems Süreya latently implies an experience in brothel:

> Sen kadınsın ya büsbütün soyunuyorsun
> Sana vergi, atılacak her şeyi kolayca çıkarıp atmak
> *Öptüğün gibi dünyanın bütün adamlarını bu arada beni*
> Uzanıp öpüyorsun yaatları çırılçıplak
> Ne oluyorsa işte o zaman oluyor ("TK", p. 36, emphasis added)

> Ben soluğu *Meryem'in sokağında* alıyorum
> Meryem'in diyorsam kolay Meryem'in, usulcacık Meryem'in
> Karanlık bastırmış üstümüzü külliyetli miktarda
> Alçak sesle konuşuyoruz korkudan değil
> …
>
> Ayakta duran kadınlar olur ya
> Meryem bunlardan
> Üç türlü ayakta duruşu var
> *Birini yalnız bana kullanıyor*
>
> – Güzel mi bari
> – Hem de nasıl ("İngiliz", p. 20, emphasis added)

It is possible to state that “Meryem” indicates here a prostitute that the persona wants to feel special for him. The short dialog at the end of the poem “İngiliz” gives clue about two men talking about the prostitute. The pluralization of sexual love as in the case of “Meryem” existed in the last lines of the poem “Elma” as well: “the women of Sirkeci full of train / used to let only their lips to be kissed / instead of doing their job on foot”. In the light of the fact that these poems implying an experience in brothel were written in the same context with the poems like “Türkü” and “TK” which were addressed to specific woman, renders love and sexuality identical in Süreya’s erotic imagination. The erotic images do not represent something behind, but mirrors the subject’s disposition of eroticism to himself. The poetry itself becomes an autonomous experience-making process apart from the ordinary languages and reality. Süreya’s last poem published in 1956 consists of the projection of eroticism to the external figures and events:

Kadınlar hamamında Güzin
Bacağının birini suya uzattı
Erkekler hamamında Süleyman
Uzandı bu bacağı bir güzel öptü
Öpsün bakalım

Kadın kısmı napar Güzin onu yapacak
Bacağını azıcık yukarı çekti
Süleyman yutar mı kaçın kurrası
Bu sefer biraz aşağıdan öptü
Hadi bakalım

Az daha biraz daha derken sonunda
O güzelim bacak sudan çıkacak
Bacakla beraber bir mesele önemli
Acap şimdi Süleyman nerden öpecek
Dur bakalım

Erkekler hamamında Süleyman
Az namussuz adam değilmiş hani
Kalkıp dosdoğru Eskişehire gitti
Geçirdiği gibi başına şapkasını
Enflasyon parasıyla otuz lira (“Hür Hamamlar Denizi”, p. 32)

This poem can be interpreted as the highest example of surpassing Garip's poetry and the technique of transformation. Süreya gives a narration on a love story. The wonder and sensation of the reader are incited through cinematic sequences and musical rhythm. The visuality is based on transformation of reality into surrealist images. The abstracted narration is sustained until the last stanza where the poet returns to concrete idioms and wordings in order to conclude the aesthetic taste the text offers in the first three stanzas. The questions whether Süleyman and Güzin are real persons and what happened actually between them are senseless since the text itself asserts its own inner context and unity. The transformed language is peculiar to the poet's himself. It is not the content which assures the poetic legitimacy of the text, but the discovery of new possible images beyond the ordinary limits of the language. In a sense, Süreya creates new images within existing colloquial syntax of speaking.

Süreya developed his poetry in the following years as well. Meanwhile, he became a popular figure in the literary circles of İstanbul. In February 1958, his first book Üvericnka was published by *Yeditepe* press and a year after the book won the Yeditepe poetry prize. In 1958 he met with Oktay Rifat and Melih Cevdet (Süreya, 2016, p. 128). Same year he met with Ümit Yaşar Oğuzcan as well (p. 27). In 1959, he met with Behçet Necatigil, Asım Bezirci and Metin Eloğlu (p. 416). But most importantly, by 1956 he began to write critical essays and publish poems in *Pazar Postası* which became the magazine of all prominent young poets like İlhan Berk, Turgut Uyar, Edip Cansever, Sezai Karakoç and Ece Ayhan until 1959. Those poets attacked to old forms of poetry and defended their generation in *Pazar Postası* which functioned as the new alternative center of gravity against *Varlık* magazine in the field as it is described in the previous part.

Along with the rapid recognition, Süreya's disappointment in his marriage deepened until 1959. He used to pass his time outside with friends from the literary circles. After a nervous breakdown towards the end of 1958, his wife Seniha burned all the books Süreya had. He and his wife disputed in every occasion, especially when Süreya wanted to bring his little sister Ayten to İstanbul. After every dispute, they moved in new houses in order to make a fresh start (Perinçek & Duruel, 2008, p. 127). In those years, Süreya had affair with other women as well. In October 1958, he wrote in a personal that he began to an affair with a woman in Nazilli where he was appointed as inspector (Süreya, 2008, p. 68). In December 1957, he flirted with the sister-in-law of one of his friends (p. 69). In May 1958, he lived an affair with a woman of 35 ages (p. 74). Meanwhile, he began to meet with a married woman, Meral, and they stayed in touch until June 1959 (p. 75). He never published some poems he wrote in that period (p. 73). It is clear that from the summer of 1955 on, having settled in İstanbul, Süreya had an eventful life until the 3rd July 1959, the date he began his compulsory military service.

On the ground of these torn conditions, Süreya's poetry has been stage of radical deformation of language in his poems "Bun", "Süveyş", "Aslan Heykelleri", "San" and "Yazmam Daha Aşk Şiiri" in 1957. Abstraction of love reaches to a level of ambiguity because of the break with any ordinary meaning between words and sentences:

> Yeni sözler buldum bir nice seni görmeyeli
> *Daha geniş bir gökyüzünde soluk aldıracak şiire*_
> Hadi bir de bunlarla çağır gelsin aslan heykelleri
> *Oldurmanın yıkmanın yeniden yapmanın* aslan heykelleri
> *Olduran yıkan yeniden yapan gözlerini* seviyorum kaç kişi
> Bir senin gözlerin var zaten daha yok
> Ya bu başını alıp gidiş boynundaki
> Modigliani oğlu Modigliani ("Aslan Heykelleri", Süreya, 2014, p. 31, emphasis added)

Elim geçiyor aptaldan
Kapital
Elim mi çiçek mi bilmiyorum
Bir elim bir çiçek mi açılan
Çekingen mahzun açılan bunu bilmiyorum
Ama üst üste yenildiğime göre
İskambil oynuyorum garanti
Max Jacob papazı ablasından ("Bun", p. 37)

The first poem refers to Modigliani, an Italian painter who always paints his wife's neck taller than normal. This reference is just an open allusion to the surrealist painting whichmight have influenced Süreya. Moreover, in 1957, he and Edip Cansever used to buy and examine the books on recent movements in European plastic arts. They were mostly interested in the abstract painting of Chagall and Klee (Süreya, 2016, p. 280). The poem of "Dalga" had an allusion to Van Gogh in 1955. His interest in painting is so passionate that in 1958, the signed copy of*Üvercinka*he gave to Mustafa Şerif Onaran was full of drawings of nude woman bodies with long necks, fishes in the water, minarets, umbrellas, star, moons, lions and lambs in strange positions (Onaran, 2008, p. 284). The subtitle Süreya gave to that copy was "sensuality". In the light of aforementioned informations, it seems possible to say that Süreya's visual imagination had also roots in the surrealist painting. In a sense, Süreya translated the colorful representation of eroticism in the surrealism into the poetry by transforming the logical and rhetorical meanings and uses of words. The second line of "Aslan Heykelleri" refers to that relation with surrealist painting which frequently uses the sky as a visual element likewise: "new words to make the poetry take a breath in a wider sky". The following lines also express Süreya's relation with the poetry: "the lion statues of making, destroying and remaking / I love your eyes that make, destroy and remake". The love as symbolized by the gaze of "eyes" is the ground for "destroying" and "remaking" of the language. Theaesthetic experience of writing is also expressed in the short poem he wrote in 1957:

Kırmızı bir kuştur soluğum
Kumral göklerinde saçlarının
Seni kucağıma alıyorum
Tarifsiz uzuyor bacakların

Kırmızı bir at oluyor soluğum
Yüzümün yanmasından anlıyorum
Yoksuluz gecelerimiz çok kısa
Dörtnala sevişmek lazım ("San", Süreya, 2014, p. 11)

Very close to the syllabic meter in form, the poem is itself a concentrated image of sexuality which brings all the erotic vocabulary of the poet together in short, concentrated and rhythmic lines: "red", "bird", "breath", "hairs", "legs", "horse" and "making love" itself. It is based on the verbs in present continuous tense, meaning thatthe speaking persona is always at the peak moment of sexuality in a wide limitless horizon of time and addressing to a "you" who is undefined. It is therefore understandable why Süreya put the poem in the first page of *Üvercinka*: as a programmatic core of the book, the poem contains all other poems' thematic and formal development. The addressed woman is undefined since what matters is not the objective and real identity of the loved, but her erotic image that mirrors Süreya's subjective disposition of sexuality. The poem – and all other poems in the book, is destined to offer a visual "sensuality" rather than representation of reality.

Whereas the book opens with aesthetic images of sexuality, the last poem is entitled "I Will Not Write Love Poem Anymore". Written in 1957 and composed of four rhythmic stanzas, the poem presents high abstractions about a woman's body through a complex use of words. Leaps of meaning and deformations of ordinary vocabulary are obvious:

En çok neresi mi ağzıydı elbet
Bütün duyarlıklara ayarlı
Öpüşlerinin türlüsünden elhamra
Sınırsız denizinde çarşafların
Bir gider bir gelirdi işlek ağzı

Ah şimdi benim gözlerim
Bir ağlamaktır tutturmuş gidiyor
Bir kadın gömleği üstümde
Günün maviliği ondan
Gecenin horozu ondan (p. 43)

This is one of the few passages that grief returns after 1956 with the word "crying". The title of the poem also implies a sense of despair. Just like the poem of "Rose" which combines the separation and the peak of sexuality, this poem describes grief of the persona and the moments of unity with the loved together. In that sense, Süreya comes nearly close to directly express his experience again. In a letter to Arif Damar in September 1958, he wrote that he was "so alone. After Üvercinka, it's all over. Perhaps I will not write poems anymore" (Perinçek & Duruel, 2008, p. 117). It is interesting that the mentioned "Üvercinka" in the letter refers both to the woman he flirted with in Eskişehir and his first book that appeared in February 1958. At that time, Süreya has completed his book *Üvercinka* which offered an aesthetic experience thanks to sensual abstractions, musicality in rhythmic compositions and visual imaginations for both the poet himself and the reader. In a sense, the aesthetic autonomy of the poetry he created mirrored his erotic subjectivity. Moreover, the book, or his self-image he created was also praised by the society in the field when he received the Yeditepe prize of poetry in 1959. The same prize was given to Oktay Rifat's *Karga ile Tilki* in 1955, to Dağlarca's *Asu* in 1956, to Behçet Necatigil's *Eski Toprak* in 1957 and to Edip Cansever's *Yerçekimli Karanfil*in 1958. Whereas these poets were already recognized in the field by their former books, Süreya was the youngest poet who won the prize with his first book. In that regard, *Üvercinka* was the ultimate accomplishment of Süreya's search for reterritorialization in a new referential language he created itself in both subjective and objective aspects.

Therefore, it is not surprising that he thought he could not write poem anymore after the book which symbolizes the realization of the subject in the object itself.

CHAPTER 5

THE NOMAD'S HOUSE

This last part of the chapter elaborates briefly Süreya's poetry after *Üvercinka*. My argument here is that Süreya's deterritorialized nomadic subjectivity has been compensated by his recognition as a major poet in the field. In that sense, Turkish poetry has been his new "house" in which he found a ground to reinvent his identity in the language.

After 1959, Süreya passed two years in military service, went to Paris in 1961 with the scholarship of the Ministry of Finance, and then traveled many Anatolian cities as tax inspector. He was promoted in 1963 and 1964 to a higher position in the Ministry. He then decided to resign from public service in 1965 with Sezai Karakoç in order to spend his time and effort to poetry. In 1966, he began to publish his magazine *Papirüs* regularly. Nevertheless, he returned to public service for couple of times. He translated more than 40 books from French and wrote in a wide range of newspapers and magazines. He also had been member of Turkish Language Association for 25 years. He therefore became a well-respected intellectual for all generations in the literary field.

Despite his statement that he would not write love poem anymore in the last poem in *Üvercinka,* he continued to write along 60's. His second book, *Göçebe* won the prize of Turkish Language Association in 1966. The title of the book referred to Süreya's never-ending mood of existence since his childhood: "Nomad". After the divorce from Seniha Nemli in 1962, he made four marriages until his death. Moreover, he moved his house for more than 30 times. He was nomad in terms of both marriage and residence. From Dersim to Bilecik, from Bilecik to İstanbul, from

Ankara to the several cities he was appointed as tax inspector, Süreya's deterritoralization has never ceased in terms of space.

The contiguity between his life and poetry became the main theme of his poems after 1959. The experience of exile became clearer and the dominant imagination in his poems began to elaborate a more historical and concrete contents. Primary experiences from the poet's past and the country's recent past are openly elaborated together. The introduction of history in both individual and universal sense into the poetry demanded new styles: Süreya's second book witnessed two long poems, "Ülke" and "Göçebe" which take six pages:

> Bilinir ne usta olduğum içlenmek zanaatında
> Canımla besliyorum şu hüznün kuşlarını
> Sen kalabalıkta bulup bulup kaybettiğim kimya
> Yokluğun gayri şuradan şuraya geldi
> Bir günler şölenlerle egemen ülkende
> Şimdi iri gagalı yalnızlıklar dönüyor ("Ülke", Süreya, 2014, p. 49)
>
> Biliyorsun ben hangi şehirdeysem
> Yalnızlığın başkenti orası
> Bir de yine sevgili çocuk
> *Biliyorsun kişi tutkularıyla*
> *Yalnızlığını adlandırıyor o kadar* ("Göçebe", p. 63, emphasis added)

In those poems, the poet seems to be conscious of his relation with poetry: mirroring his subjective dispositions rooted in the deterritoralized experience of exile. The lines of "you know man names his loneliness / by his passions" imply two key words: "loneliness" and "passion". If loneliness may refer to the deterritorialized nomadic existence of the poet in Ankara and the major language, passion refers to love and eroticism that are intertwined in his poems. Süreya calls the relation between loneliness and passion as "naming" which implies wording, expressing and uttering, in other words, all that poetry does. In that sense, here, in a much more direct manner compared to the abstracted style in his former poems, Süreya writes that he poeticized his nomadic existence through eroticism. The poetic operation he

managed in *Üvercinka* was therefore recovery of his primary experiences through erotic imagism in the poetic form. However, after 1959, the more Süreya elaborated historical themes, the more his poetry became unclouded reference to his primary experiences:

> Ben bir yük vagonunda açtım gözlerimi
> Firavun'un ekinlerini yöneten Yusuf da
> Arkadan yırtılmış gömleğiyle
> Kanatları dökülmüş kuşa benzerdi ("Kişe Kirazını Ve Göç, Mevsim", p. 81)
>
> Annem çok küçükken öldü
> Beni öp sonar doğur beni (p. 84)
>
> Hep alçak sesle konuşan
> Biri de vardı ki
> Kederini soylu kılmak için
> Yüreğindeki kurşun yarasında
> Aşktandır derdi (p. 91)

In the light of the aforementioned lines, it is possible to say that the rest of Süreya's poems he wrote after 1959 have an explanatory aspect for his relation with his first book, *Üvercinka*. After *Üvercinka*that was the symbolic success of the new poetry in the late 50s, instead of writing love poems to undefined women, Süreya openly addressed to the "country" as the loved. *Üvercinka* was the result of his initial confrontation with the field's changing conditions in 1950s; therefore it was loaded by images and abstractions that allowed him to express his grief and eroticism.Itwas a ground-breaking and founding milestone for both the field's inner development and Süreya's nomadic mood of existence among women, cities, homes and professions. Yet, once Süreya's recognition has been stabilized after 1959, he tried to reach a language that could fully and openly express his subjectivity beyond the limits of *Üvercinka*. Consequently, his second book *Göçebe* and the following books witnessed a more concrete language. The poetry was not the compensation of reality anymore, but a referential language in which he could speak with his own

subjectivity. In that sense, the last excerpt I take here explain how Süreya perceives and expresses his nomadic mood of existence in line with Turkish poetry's historical development until 50s:

> Divan Nazım Hikmet İkinci Yeni
> Kaç gündür adını düşünüyorum
> Ne demiş uçurumda açan çiçek
> Yurdumsun ey uçurum (p. 150)

In contrast with poetry, Süreya spoke of his exile, his Kurdish-Alevi roots and his traumatic experiences of childhood in interviews only after 1980. The reason why he could not speak and write on his primary experiences and he preferred to express them only in poetry can be subject of a wider study on the conditions of the political and intellectual fields in 60's and 70's throughout which the literary field has been stage of relative domination of leftist positions. However, the short poem above offers a last point of inquiry which is related with the "naming loneliness with passions": why does Süreya say "I think your name for days / what did the flower in cliff say / you are my house, cliff"? What is the name that he does not remember and the cliff that the flower blossoms in?

The question of name was in fact an existential problem for Süreya. His real name was Cemalettin Seber. In 1944 when he won the Haydarpaşa high school in Istanbul and became scholarship boarding student, he passionately continued to write and read novels, poems and magazines. He prepared a notebook full of love poems for a girl he loved. The name of his personal notebook was "Red Verses" since the hair color of the girl he loved, Seniha Nemli, was red (Süreya, 2015a, p. 215). He planned to give it to Seniha, yet once he realized that some of his classmates read it secretly, he then began to write publicly. Finally, while working in a summer holiday, he decided to change his name to "Cemal Süreyya" (Perinçek & Duruel, 2008, p. 55). He began to sign some of his works for literature class as "Cem

Süreyya" as well (Süreya, 2015a, p. 223).His humorous poems in *Kazgan* were signed as "Cemasef" and "Yürüyen Adam" which also implies a nomadic man in movement, in circulation. When he was in primary school, searching the reason behind the exile, one day he found a child magazine *Yavrutürk* and read a story titled "Memories of a nomad child". Then he asked to his grandmother if they are also "nomad". Grandmother approves him (Süreya, 2016, p. 303).

In the light of these experiences, it seems quite unavoidable to say that the use of pseudonym intersected with his first love poems for Seniha in his high school years. On the subjective side, he already chose poetry as the expression of love. On the objective side, his literary skills inherited from oral Kurdish-Alevi culture were recognized and acclaimed by the professors and his classmates; in that sense, long before the Yeditepe prize that his book *Üvercinka* won in 1959, his poetic disposition was already approved by the establishment, i.e. the major language. At this first intersection of subjective dispositions and objective conditions, he gave himself a new name to sign his poems, "Cemal Süreya", which implies a rebirth, a reinvention of the self as and by the poetry. In this sense, "Red Verses", the notebook he filled with declarations of love to Seniha was the object in which he recreated his very subjectivity from the scratch for the first time, against forced deterritoralization by the social and legal institutions. Süreya's resign from his position in bureaucracy in 1965 therefore symbolizes his denial of vehicular language and all that the social transformation the state imposed to him, in other words, his decision to reterritorialize his subjectivity in the poetry:

> The necessity of writing and reading was rooted in my feeling of being broken. I was forced to be transported in a wagon of animal when I was a child who used to see great respect in a very rich family. Then, my mother died. That was the basic reason for being broken. (Süreya, 2015a, p. 106)

Therefore, on the one side, there was a Cemalettin Seber who despite the exile in 1938, became a brilliant scholarship student in literature lessons from primary school to Mülkiye and obtained by the graduation the chance to be promoted to high bureaucratic posts with a successful career in the Ministry of Finance. That was the social transformation Cemalettin Seber might pass through. From a minority origin to reputed official positions in Ankara, this would be a story of achieved assimilation in the Republican establishment. On the other side, however, there was Cemal Süreya who chose to express his deterritoralized nomadic existence by the help of his literary dispositions and therefore to reterritorialize his minor subjectivity in one of the very respected fields of the major culture, Turkish poetry, in which he later became a gatekeeper and dominant position with the famous magazine *Papirus* he published after his resign from bureaucracy in 1965. In that sense, although Süreya's work did not offer a collective political language for minority groups as Deleuze argues for Kafka's style; his poems offered a deeper political resistance at the individual level, meaning that he managed to create his own referential language that deforms existing conventional poetry writing styles in order to allow his nomadic desire speak. From the "Red Verses" to *Üvercinka* and *Göçebe*, Cemal Süreya's struggle was against the social determination of Cemalettin Seber by the major language, institutions and Ankara. If Süreya's collected poems is today one of the bestselling poetry books in Turkey, it is because the nomad won the struggle against the social determinations of the Republican establishment that forced him to be a docileestablished.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

This study has been a tentative inquiry which aimed to discover the social meaning of Süreya's lyric poetry for himself, which were written in 1950s. The main argument which was examined throughout the process of the study is that the poetry consists of semantic entity which can be understood only by reconstructing the poet's experience in his/her social world. In this sense, the author of this study adopted a theoretical stance in and against the sociology of novels since the latter is mostly context-oriented which assumes that the novel is the representation of reality. In other words, my theoretical argument elaborated in the Chapter 2 was that the lyric poetry does not fit into the existing schema that explains the textual by the contextual; yet rather, I argued that the poetry is not the direct reflection of the wide political, economic or social determinations. In case of Cemal Süreya, I tried to understand the relation between the subjectivity of poet and the textual patterns by chronologically reconstructing the former's experience in his changing contexts from childhood to Ankara in the light of Bourdieusian and Deleuzian theories. The field theory and the minor literature have been the main theoretical assumptions I applied and tested in the case of Cemal Süreya.

Locating Süreya's case required first to reconstruct the objective structure of possibilities, tensions and formal patterns existing in the poetry field, which was the aim of the Chapter 3, in order to discover the moment of the Second New in and after 1955. Then, in Chapter 4, I tried to zoom in the Süreya's subjective trajectory both in the world of experiences and the poetic world he created throughout 50s. Against the social determinisms and deterritorialization he endured until 1950, he managed to create a poetic language which allowed him to have a referential language.

Üvercinka that won the most prestigious prize of Yeditepe in 1959 was his both political and individual accomplishment of reterritorialization as a nomad subject. Since the "Red Verses" he wrote in the high school, his use of several pseudonyms since that time implied a rebirth, a reinvention of the self as and by the poetry. The meaning of his resign from bureaucracy in 1965 was that he chose the poetry itself his new "house" in which he found a ground to reinvent his identity and overcome the determinations that the state forced him to obey. In that sense, Süreya's poetry and its writing technics like abstraction, deformation and erotic imagism was a struggle of freedom against the Republican establishment and major language.

Throughout all the way, I tried to keep the "outside" and "inside" of the poetry together in terms of epistemology since I believe (and also hope that this study demonstrates) that there is no ontological difference between text, subject and context (i.e. action, actor and the social). I also tried not to fall in danger of considering poetic texts as confirmed explanatory data for any contextual fact. The poetry is indeed artificial and therefore it does offer very little objective validity. However, it is real for the poet once it is written and it is real for the literary field once it is published.

After all, it is worth to note that a much more comprehensive sociological account of the Second New movement has to encompass the whole intellectual fields in 1950s as well as poetry in order to discover the convergences and divergences of Süreya with other poets, authors, writers and artists who potentially endured similar deterritorializing process since 1930s. Such a study can discover the intellectuals' complicated relations within their social world in which the novelists, the journalists and the editors also exist. In this sense, possible similarities in terms of formal innovation between different intellectual and artistic fields can be analyzed as well.

A further study on the cultural world from 1930s to 1960s may therefore illuminate other dimensions of the Second New phenomenon. Moreover, in order to objectify Cemal Süreya as an intellectual, a further study should widen the empirical scope to Süreya's poems, actions, experiences and writings from 1960s to 1990. An exhaustive analysis of the poetry field until 80s as well as the cultural developments throughout these decades can also explain the relations between Süreya's poetry and the rising left movement after 1960. Yet this study limits itself with the making of Süreya as a poet within the Second New years until 1959.

This monographic study possibly has theoretical and empirical lacunas due to the fact that it is not based on a ready-made sociological model to explain the genesis of a formal innovation in the poetry. Sociologists usually avoid undertaking the task of combining the textual analysis of poems and the contextual factors because the former demands a technical ability external to their discipline. Nevertheless, Turkish poetry is a fruitful domain since it harbors the historical tensions and cultural aporias of modernization process from the 19th century on. The modest methodology followed in this study should be indeed examined in the case of another poet from another historical period. In this sense, the author of this thesis would be proud if the present contribution proves itself to be meaningful for further studies that are related to sociology of the Turkish poetry.

REFERENCES

Anday, M. C. (2005). *Rahatı kaçan ağaç*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Anday, M. C. (2015). *Şiir yaşantısı. Şiir yazıları*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Everest Yayınları.

Armağan, Y. (2011). *İmkansız özerklik. Türk şiirinde modernizm*. İstanbul, Türkiye: İletişim Yayınları.

Atatürk'ün Mülkiyelilere hitabı. (1933, December 12). *Milliyet*, p. 3. Retrieved from http://www.politics.ankara.edu.tr/?bil=bil_icerik&icerik_id=291&ens_birim=0

Barrere, A. & Martucelli, D. (2011). Lectures sociologiques du roman: À la croisée de deux projets de connaissance.*Sociologie de l'Art, 1*(16),177-210.

Barthes, R. (1963). *Sur Racine*. Paris, France: Seuil.

Batur, E. & Ergülen, H. (2006). *20. yüzyıl Türk şiiri*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, Kütüphaneler ve Yayımlar Genel Müdürlüğü.

Becker, H. S. (1974). Art as collective action.*American Sociological Review, 39*,767-776.

Benjamin, W. (2014). *Pasajlar*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Bennett, T. (2010). Sociology, aesthetics, expertise. *New Literary History*, *41*(2), 253-276.

Berk, İ. (2013). *Eşik. 1947-1975 Toplu Şiirler 1*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Bilmez, B., Kayacan, G. & Aslan, Ş. (2015). *Belleklerdeki Dersim 38'*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *The Political ontology of Martin Heidegger*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1997). *Méditations Pascaliennes*. Paris, France: Seuil.

Bourdieu, P. (2006). *Sanatın kuralları*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Cansever, E. (2009). *Şiiri şiirle ölçmek*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Celal, M. (1998). *Cumhuriyet dönemi çağdaş Türk şiiri antolojisi*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Papirüs Yayınları.

Çağın, Ş. (2012). *Bir şiir eleştirmeni olarak Nurullah Ataç*, İstanbul, Türkiye: Dergah Yayınları.

Çankaya, A. (1969). *Yeni Mülkiye tarihi ve Mülkiyeliler 1859-1968, 1*. Ankara, Türkiye: Mars Matbaası.

Çankaya, A. (1970). *Yeni Mülkiye tarihi ve Mülkiyeliler 1950-1960, 4*. Ankara, Türkiye: MarsMatbaası.

Dağlarca, F. H. (1957). *Çocuk ve Allah*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Varlık Yayınevi.

Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (2015). *Kafka: Minör bir edebiyat için*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Dedalus Yayınları.

Doğan, E. (1997). *Edebiyatımızda dergiler*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Bağlam Yayınları.

Doğan, M. H. (2001). *Yüzyılın Türk şiiri*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Duruel, N. (2003). *A'dan z'ye Cemal Süreya*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Eagleton, T. (2011). *Şiir nasıl okunur?*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Agora Yayınları.

Elias, N. (2000). *Mozart. Bir dahinin sosyolojisi üzerine*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Kabalcı Yayınları.

English, J. F. (2010). Everywhere and nowhere: The sociology of literature after "the sociology of literature". *New Literary History*, *41*(2), v-xxiii.

Erdost, M. (1997). *İkinci Yeni yazıları*. Ankara, Türkiye: Onur Yayınları.

Ferguson, P. P., Desan, P. & Griswold, W. (1988). Mirrors, frames, and demons: Reflections on the sociology of literature. *Critical Inquiry, 14*(3), 421-430.

Feyiz, K. (2010). Ahmed Arif şiirin belini getiriyor. In Tekkanat, Z. & Akdamar, V. (Eds.), *Cemal Süreya yirmi yaşında* (pp. 145-156). İstanbul, Türkiye: Artshop Yayınları.

Fuat, M. (1992). *Çağdaş Türk şiiri antolojisi*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Adam Yayınları.

Goldmann, L.(1980). *Essays on method in the sociology of literature*. St. Louis, NY: Telos Press.

Hikmet, N. (2016). *835 satır*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

İlhan, A. (1959). Attila İlhan'a 30 soru. *Dost 3*(18), 35-36.

İlhan, A. (1977). *Duvar*. Ankara, Türkiye: Bilgi Yayınevi.

İlhan, A. (1996). *İkinci Yeni savaşı*. Ankara, Türkiye: Bilgi Yayınevi.

İlhan, A. (2000). *Gerçekçilik savaşı*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Bilgi Yayınevi.

İlhan, A. (2016). *Sisler bulvarı*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Karakoç, S. (1955). *Şiir sanatı*. Ankara, Türkiye: Son Havadis Matbaası.

Karakoç, S. (1986). *Edebiyat yazıları II*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Diriliş Yayınları.

Karakoç, S. (1988, September 26). Hatıralar. *Diriliş* 10-12.

Karakoç, S. (1988, October 3). Hatıralar. *Diriliş*, 10-13.

Karakoç, S. (1989, February 13). Hatıralar. *Diriliş*, 10-13.

Karakoç, S. (1989, March 27). Hatıralar. *Diriliş*, 11-13.

Karakoç, S. (1989, April 4). Hatıralar. *Diriliş*, 11-13.

Karakoç, S. (1989, April 25). Hatıralar. *Diriliş*, 10-13.

Karakoç, S. (1989, August 18). Hatıralar. *Diriliş*, 11-13.

Karakoç, S. (1989, August 25). Hatıralar. *Diriliş*, 10-12.

Karakoç, S. (1989, September 12). Hatıralar. *Diriliş*, 10-13.

Karakoç, S. (1989, October 19). Hatıralar. *Diriliş*, 10-13.

Karakoç, S. (2011). *Gün doğmadan*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Diriliş Yayınları.

Koçak, O. (2002). 1920'lerden 1970'lere kültür politikaları. In Ahmet Insel (Ed.) *Modern Türkiye'de siyasi düşünce: Kemalizm*,*2*(pp. 370-418). İstanbul, Türkiye: İletişim Yayınları.

Koçak, O. (2011). *Bahisleri yükseltmek. Turgut Uyar şiirinde kendini yaratma deneyimi*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Metis Yayınları.

Koçak, O. (2012). *Kopuk zincir. Modern şiir üzerine denemeler*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Metis Yayınları.

Kolcu, H. (1993). *Türk edebiyatında hece-aruz tartışmaları*. Ankara, Türkiye: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.

Korkmaz, F. (2007). *Pazar Postası'nın Türk edebiyatındaki yeri ve önemi*(MA thesis).Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/giris.jsp

Külebi, C. (2002). *Bütün şiirleri*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Adam Yayınları.

Lahire, B.(2006). *La condition littéraire: La double vie des écrivains*. Paris, France: La Découverte.

Lukacs, G.(1973). *The theory of the novel: A historico-philosophical essay on the forms of great epic literature*. Cambridge, UK: M.I.T. Press.

Lukacs, G.(2011). *Goethe ve çağı*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Sel Yayıncılık.

Marx, K.& Engels, F. (1995). *Yazın ve sanat üzerine 1*. Ankara, Türkiye: Sol Yayınları.

Mülkiye (1952). Ankara, Türkiye: Benli Matbaacılık.

Moretti, F.(2000). The slaughterhouse of literature. *Modern Language Quarterly, 61*(1), 207–27.

Moretti, F.(2007). *Graphs, maps, trees*. London, UK: Verso.

Moretti, F.(2015). Lukacs' theory of the novel. *New Left Review, 91*, 39-42.

Onaran, M. S. (2008). Alçaktan uçan güvercin: Cemal Süreya. In Akdamar, V. (Ed.), *Cemal Süreya ve sonrası* (pp. 32-45). İstanbul, Türkiye: Artshop Yayınları.

Orringer, N. R. (1977). Simmel's Goethe in the thought of Ortega y Gasset. *MLN, 92*(2), 296-311.

Perinçek, F. & Duruel, N. (2008). *Cemal Süreya: Şairin hayatı şiire dahil*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Can Yayınları.

Petrey, S.(1988). The reality of representation: Between Marx and Balzac.*Critical Inquiry, 14*(3), 448-468.

Rifat, O. (2014). *Bütün şiirleri I*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Rifat, O. (1954). *Karga ile tilki*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Yeditepe Yayınları.

Sazyek, H. (1996). *Cumhuriyet dönemi Türk şiirinde Garip hareketi*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Süreya, C. (1953). Vezn-i aruz, *Kazgan*, Ankara, 7.

Süreya, C. (2005). *On üç günün mektupları*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Süreya, C. (2008). Cemal Süreya'dan Nedret Gürcan'a mektuplar. In Akdamar, V. (Ed.),*Cemal Süreya ve sonrası* (pp. 176-184). İstanbul: Artshop Yayıncılık.

Süreya, C. (2014). *Sevda sözleri. Bütün şiirleri*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Süreya, C. (2015a). *"Güvercin curnatası". Konuşmalar, soruşturma yanıtları*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Süreya, C. (2015b). *Şapkam dolu çiçekle. Toplu yazılar I*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Süreya, C. (2016). *Günler*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Uyar, T. (1985). *Sonsuz ve öbürü*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Broy Yayınları.

Uyar, T. (2014). *Büyük saat*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Uyar, T. (2016). *Korkulu ustalık*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Veli, O. (2015). *Bütün şiirleri*. İstanbul, Türkiye: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

APPENDIX

THE CHRONOLOGY OF MAGAZINES AND POEMS

Table 1. Literary Magazines From 1933 to 1960

FOUNDED	CLOSED	MAGAZINE TITLE	OWNER	LOCATION	NO. OF ISSUES
1933	1949	Ülkü	Necip Ali Küçüka	Ankara	270
1933		Varlık	Yaşar Nabi	Ankara	
1935	1956	Yücel	Muhtar Fehmi Enata		163
1935	1936	Ayda Bir	Yusuf Ziya Ortaç		15
1936	1936	Kültür Haftası	Peyami Safa		21
1936	1936	Ağaç	Necip Fazıl	Ankara	17
1938	1943	İnsan	Hilmi Ziya		
1939	1940	Türklük	Hüseyin Sadettin Arel	İstanbul	15
1941	1942	Yürüyüş	Fazıl Mahmut Ülkücü		18
1943	1944	Adımlar	Behice Boran	İstanbul	12
1943	1978	Büyük Doğu	Necip Fazıl	İstanbul	
1944	1946	Yaratış	Mürsel Kalyoncu	İstanbul	9
1947		Şiirler	Vecdi Yarman	İstanbul	27
1947	1957	Seçilmiş Hikayeler	Salim Şengil	Ankara	66
1947	1952	Aile	Vedat Nedim Tör		22
1948	1955	Kaynak	Avni Dökmeci	Ankara	113
1948	1948	Meydan	Mehmed Kemal		1
1949	1951	Yaprak	Orhan Veli	Ankara	28
1949	1949	Şadırvan	Behçet Kemal Çağlar		35
1950	1957	Hisar	Munis Faik Ozansoy	Ankara	75
1950	1984	Yeditepe	Hüsamettin Bozok	İstanbul	454
1950	1953	Beş Sanat	Kemal Çilingiroğlu	İstanbul	28
1951	1959	Pazar Postası	Cemil Sait Barlas	Ankara	
1951		Türk Dili	Agah Sırrı Levend	Ankara	
1952	1976	Yeni Ufuklar	Orhan Burian	İstanbul	275
1952	1956	Mavi	Teoman Civelek	Ankara	36
1952	1957	Yenilik	Naim Tirali	İstanbul	62
1954	1957	Şairler Yaprağı	Nedret Gürcan		36
1955	1955	Şimdilik	Tevfik Akdağ		6
1955	1955	Şiir Sanatı	Sezai Karakoç	Ankara	2
1955	1956	Uyanış	A. Faruk Kakınç	Ankara	10
1955	1956	Varan	Hasatn Telciler	İzmir	14
1955	1955	Yankı	Turhan Giritlioğlu	İstanbul	2
1956	1960	A dergisi	Edip Özyörük	İstanbul	29
1957	1957	Seçilmiş Şiirler Dergisi	Necdet Göl	Ankara	4
1957	1973	Dost	Salim Şengil	Ankara	102

FOUNDED	CLOSED	MAGAZINE TITLE	OWNER	LOCATION	NO. OF ISSUES
1959	1961	Ufuk	Hamdi Akalın	Adana	10
1960	1964	Türkçe	Fazıl Hüsnü Dağlarca	İstanbul	43
1960	1992	Diriliş	Sezai Karakoç	İstanbul	352
1960	1981	Papirüs	Cemal Süreya	İstanbul	49

Table 2. Süreya's Poems and Essays From 1952 to 1958

	FORM	FIRST WRITTEN	PUB. DATE	PUB. PLACE	INCLUDED IN (BOOK)
Şarkısı Beyaz	poem		1953 Jan 8	Mülkiye	
Lalettain bir hikaye	essay		1953 Feb	Mülkiye	
Hafta Sekiz	poem		1953 March	Mülkiye	
Di Gel	poem		1953 April	Mülkiye	
Çıkmaz Sinir	poem		1953 May	Mülkiye	
Ölmüştük	poem		1953 June	Mülkiye	
Mahpushane Çeşmesi	poem		1953	Kazgan	
İnekname	poem		1953	Kazgan	
Vezn-i Aruz	poem		1953	Kazgan	
Türkü	poem		1953	Kazgan	
Yedi Adet Sultan	poem		1953	Kazgan	
Saat Beş	poem	1953			
Hamza	poem	1953			ÜVERCİNKA
Hamza Süiti	poem	1953			ÜVERCİNKA
Adam	poem	1953	1953 Oct	Yenilik	ÜVERCİNKA
Şiir	poem		1954 Feb	Mülkiye	
Balzamine Kanaviçeli Şiirler	poem		1954 Feb		
Sizin Hiç Babanız Öldü Mi?	poem	1953	1954 April	Evrim	ÜVERCİNKA
Yüzükoyun	poem		1954 May	Yeditepe	
Eski Kadınlar	poem		1954 May	Mavi	
Afrika	poem	1954			ÜVERCİNKA
Aşk	poem	1954			ÜVERCİNKA
Gül	poem	1954	1954 June	Yeditepe	ÜVERCİNKA
Aşktan İndim İncire	poem		1954 July	Yeditepe	
Şiir	poem		1954 August	Kaynak	
Piyale	poem	1953	1954 Oct	Mavi	
Şiir	poem	1953	1954 Dec	Evrim	ÜVERCİNKA
Güzelleme	poem	1954	1955 Jan	Evrim	ÜVERCİNKA
Balzamin	poem	1955			ÜVERCİNKA
Dalga	poem	1955	1955 Jan	Şiir Sanatı	ÜVERCİNKA
Cıgarayı Attım Denize	poem	1954	1955 Feb	Şiir Sanatı	ÜVERCİNKA
Üçgenler	poem	1955	1955 Feb	Yenilik	ÜVERCİNKA
Gölge Oyunu	poem		1955 March	Varan	
Önceleyin	poem	1954	1955 April	Varan	ÜVERCİNKA

	FORM	FIRST WRITTEN	PUB. DATE	PUB. PLACE	INCLUDED IN (BOOK)
Sigarayı Attım Denize	poem		1955 April	Yenilik	
Şu Da Var	poem	1954	1955 June	Şimdilik	
Nehirler Boyunca Kadınlar Gördüm	poem	1955	1955 June	Yeditepe	
Kesik	poem		1955 Sep	Yenilik	
Üvercinka	poem		1955 Dec	Yeditepe	ÜVERCİNKA
İngiliz	poem	1956			ÜVERCİNKA
Türkü	poem	1956	1956 Oct 7	Pazar Postası	ÜVERCİNKA
Elma	poem	1956			ÜVERCİNKA
TK	poem	1956			ÜVERCİNKA
Oktay Rifat'ın Şiirinde Fırsat Rantı	essay		1956 Jan 8	Pazar Postası	
Hür Hamamlar Denizi	poem	1955	1956 May	Yenilik	ÜVERCİNKA
Kanto	poem		1956 June	Pazar Postası	ÜVERCİNKA
Folklor Şiire Düşman	essay		1956 Oct 1	a dergisi	
San	poem	1957	1958 April	Pazar Postası	ÜVERCİNKA
Aslan Heykelleri	poem	1957			ÜVERCİNKA
Yazmam Daha Aşk Şiiri	poem	1957			ÜVERCİNKA
Hilmi Yavuzla	interview		1957	a dergisi	
Dinamit	essay		1957 March 1	a dergisi	
Şiir (Süveyş Kanalı)	poem	1957	1957 April	Yeditepe	ÜVERCİNKA
Şapkam Dolu Çiçekle	essay		1957 July 31	Vatan	
Etkiler Ağı	essay		1957 August 16	Vatan	
Ömer Heybe	essay		1957 Sep 1	Pazar Postası	
Cevahir Yürekli Şair: Tevfik Fikret	essay		1957 Sep 4	Vatan	
Kapalı Kedi	essay		1957 Sep 15	Pazar Postası	
Üzgünüm Leyla	essay		1957 Sep 18	Vatan	
Biçimi Anlamak / Ufak Özler Biçimin İçindedir	essay		1957 Sep 22	Pazar Postası	
Toplumculaştıramadıklarımızdan	essay		1957 Oct 6	Pazar Postası	
Bun	poem	1957	1957 Oct 13	Pazar Postası	ÜVERCİNKA
Öz Konuyu Aşar Parantezi	essay		1957 Oct 20	Pazar Postası	

	FORM	FIRST WRITTEN	PUB. DATE	PUB. PLACE	INCLUDED IN (BOOK)
Artıra Artıra Rimbaud	essay		1957 Oct 27	Pazar Postası	
Tehlikeli Alakalar	essay		1957 Nov 4	Vatan	
Sirk	essay		1957 Dec 8	Pazar Postası	
Sürek Avı	poem	1958			
Gazel	poem				
ÜVERCİNKA	book		1958 February	Yeditepe yayınları	