LOCATED SUBJECTHOODS: GENDER AND LIVED BODY

IN *AN ATLAS OF THE DIFFICULT WORLD* AND *AFİŞ*

YAPRAK DAMLA YILDIRIM

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2019

LOCATED SUBJECTHOODS: GENDER AND LIVED BODY

IN *AN ATLAS OF THE DIFFICULT WORLD* AND *AFİŞ*

Thesis submitted to the

Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Critical and Cultural Studies

by

Yaprak Damla Yıldırım

Boğaziçi University

2019

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Yaprak Damla Yıldırım, 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 ....16.09.2019.............................

ABSTRACT

Located Subjecthoods:

Gender and Lived Body in *An Atlas of the Difficult World* and *Afiş*

This thesis investigates whether feminist critical discourse analysis (FCDA) could be applied to poetry via the notion of lived body (*corps vivant*), as opposed to the conventional methods of poetry analysis which centralize male-oriented post-Cartesian subjecthoods based on rationale, transcendental agency, and coherency. It embraces lived body as a central theme in the poems and abandons the conventions of poetry analysis which have regarded poems as separate works, unaffected by the geographical and chronological locatedness the poets. With the aid of Elizabeth Grosz's corporeal feminism which adapts the notion of lived body, the thesis applies feminist critical discourse analysis to explore the poetry collections *An Atlas of the Difficult World* and *Afiş* [Poster], published by Adrienne Rich (US) and Sennur Sezer (Turkey), respectively. Identifying the common discursive categories in the books as corporeality of subjecthoods and locatedness of subjecthoods within a community, the thesis suggests that together with FCDA, (feminist) lived body provides feminist scholars the grounds to approach poetry as a cultural text and identify the discursive methods in poetry to defy patriarchal power relations.

ÖZET

Konumlandırılmış Öznelikler:

An Atlas of the Difficult World ve *Afiş*'te Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Yaşayan Beden

Bu çalışma; feminist eleştirel söylem analizi (FESA) yönteminin yaşayan beden (*corps vivant*) kavramı aracılığıyla şiir analizine uygulanıp uygulanamayacağını araştırmayı hedefler ve temelini akıl, üstün delalet ve tutarlılıktan alan, erkek-merkezli, post-Kartezyen, geleneksel şiir analizi yöntemlerini terk etmeyi savunur. Çalışmada yaşayan beden şiirlerde merkezi bir temadır ve şiirlere şairlerin coğrafi ve kronolojik konumlandırılmışlığından azade, münferit birer ürün olarak yaklaşan şiir analizi gelenekleri reddedilmiştir. Bu çalışma -Elizabeth Grosz'un, yaşayan beden kavramını uyarlayarak ileri sürdüğü beden feminizmi teorisinden de faydalanarak-sırasıyla Adrienne Rich (ABD) ve Sennur Sezer (Türkiye) tarafından yazılmış *An Atlas of the Difficult World* [Zor Bir Dünyanın Atlası] ve *Afiş* adlı şiir kitaplarını feminist eleştirel söylem analizi yöntemi ile inceler. Kitaplardaki ortak söylemsel kategorileri özneliklerin bedenselliği ve özneliklerin bir topluluk içine konumlandırılmışlığı olarak tespit eden çalışma, FESA yöntemi ile bir araya geldiğinde (feminist) yaşayan beden kavramının, feminist araştırmacılar için şiire bir kültürel metin olarak yaklaşma ve şiir içinde patriarkal güç ilişkilerine meydan okuyan söylemsel yöntemleri tespit etme imkânı sunduğunu öne sürer.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The question of who the subject is and how the subject could be defined -if at all- has been on the agenda of philosophy, particularly post-Cartesian western philosophy-for long. The power holders within the intellectual circles claimed the authority to answer such questions, and thus defined the subject in their own image, on their own terms. As a result, the discussions on subjecthood were centered on a biased and inevitably flawed definition of universal subject, which caused many underrepresented, misrepresented, or unrepresented to challenge such exclusionary approaches.

Perhaps the most important challenge to the subject as this transcendental, coherent rigid entity came from the corroboration of poststructuralist thought and feminist criticism. Inspiring and affecting one another reciprocally, particularly after the mid-60s, these two currents of thought posed the question of whether it was possible to imagine new subjecthoods. The questions they began to raise about power and authority as well as the assumed coherency of the subject, which was given a divine position, changed the way people approached their own identities and how these identities were represented in different areas such as literature and politics. Such influence became even more influential after the 1980s because of the political events that took place all over the world. The world entered into a new era that began to welcome the identities that defied the enforced structures and mechanisms which tried to oppress and fixate them.

One of the biggest challenges against the rigidity of identity was posed by Merleau-Ponty who suggested that the way we approach subjecthood has been

flawed since Descartes who imposed the idea that the subject was first divine and second mind-oriented. The subject for Descartes was authoritative and absolute so long as it was rational. Most philosophical schools that came after Descartes, until Marleau-Ponty abjured these mind-oriented approaches,[1] followed the Cartesian separation between body and mind, and developed their theories predicated upon the idea that mind was the superior one in the hierarchy between mind and body. Disregarding the role of the corporeality in subjecthood, western philosophy took the question of subject to be the question of mind, rationale, and intellectual agency alone - all of which were placed as though they were separate from the body or at odds with corporeality. Instead, Marleau-Ponty suggested a new approach to subjecthood with the term lived body (*corps vivant*).

Lived body entails a new understanding of subjecthood that takes corporeality to the center, a being that lives with and through its corporeality as well as its relationship with the rest of the world. Lived body is not a separate, rigid and coherent entity that is completely distinct from the world, with defining contours, lines and borders that separate it from the rest. It is a being that remains in constant conversation with other lived bodies, and thus becomes part and parcel of the world. It touches other lived bodies and is touched back by them simultaneously. With this corporeal conversation that takes place among, between, and through lived bodies, the world becomes one organic entity in a constant state with ever-continuing movement which results both from and in various experiences and encounters. The encounters lived body undergoes create new experiences through which the parties

---

[1] Merleau-Ponty developed his ideas in response to and in conversation with the arguments in phenomenology constructed by philosophers like Heidegger, Bergson, Husserl, Scheler, and Sartre, all of whom challenged the traditional Cartesian school of thought with their phenomenological approaches. What differentiated Merleau-Ponty from them was his tendency to centralize the body.

involved in the encounter affect one another, and create new subjecthoods as a result of this conversation.

Bringing the body into the question of subjecthood through the notion of lived body allowed the possibility of reconsidering subjecthood from a feminist perspective.[2] Elizabeth Grosz famously noted that by prioritizing mind over body, western thought created a sexist philosophical convention of theorizing the subject, for it associated mind with men and body with women. In that regard, the conventional approach to subjecthood itself was patriarchal and kept creating patriarchal accounts of subjecthood as the western philosophy based itself on this Cartesian separation of and hierarchy between mind and body. With the lived body, there occurred the possibility of establishing feminist ways of expressing subjecthood, understanding and deconstructing the linguistic, philosophical, political, social, and cultural structures that position women in a way that they cannot express themselves to the fullest so long as they remain as the inferior other in the hierarchy between mind and body. As corporeality gained importance, the notion of "womanhood", that is "the woman subject" who speaks through corporeality, became open to debate. The subject was no longer male- and mind-oriented.

Although there have been different approaches to the notion of the lived body, one of the main arguments that remains valid today is that it is quite useful in acknowledging the individual experiences of gendered bodies. Despite the fact that it was suggested to abandon the term gender altogether so that we can have a more identity-oriented and comprehensive understanding of subjecthood in feminist studies based on the notion of the lived body, that suggestion carried the risk of

---

[2] This is primarily because Merleau-Ponty considered lived body as a sexless and genderless entity. Feminist phenomenologists like Grosz objected to his approach, finding it too generalized to acknowledge the subjecthoods experiences through women's corporeality (See Chapter 3.1).

overlooking the structural mechanisms that try to impose certain ideologies on individuals as if they were characteristics intrinsic in them.

In that regard, the idea is to keep the notion of gender as something that allows the possibility of talking about shared experiences caused by the large-scale structures. These structures function at micro and macro levels.[3] Micro level structures are the interactions between individuals and institutions, which keep creating certain values. Macro level structures are based on those values and come to exist owing to the interactions at the micro level, yet they are bigger than the total of what micro structures offer, for they produce their own surplus values and impose them as universal. That the micro or macro level structures try to impose certain ideologies as characteristics on individuals leads to the patriarchal understanding that everything needs to be categorized according to certain norms and values, which are in fact created by the power holders within the structures. Since the power holders who are given the privileged position of establishing subjecthood are usually upper-class, white, mind-oriented men, what they deem to be universal knowledge within and through the structures are biased towards their own image. Therefore, what becomes the habitus[4] in the field remains gendered since the power holders are almost always patriarchal subjects with the claim of mind-oriented, somatophobic, transcendental subjecthood as sovereign authority. It is, for that reason, of great

---

[3] The terms "micro and macro level structures" (145-157) are borrowed from Alexander Wendt (1999). A more detailed discussion on how to appropriate these terms for feminist purposes will take place in Chapter 3.1.

[4] I borrowed the terms habitus, doxa, and field from Pierre Bourdieu's (1984) cultural/social theory, where he argues that a field is a social space in which a system with its own specific rules, means, and dynamics, namely its own doxa, takes place. Any agent in the field seeks to obtain power and rule the field (p. 178). For that, individuals endeavor to maximize their symbolic capital –the means to bring them closer to ruling the field. In order to do that, individuals practice certain strategies, being unaware that their behaviors and reactions are in fact strategies (p. 172). These unperceived strategies constitute the habitus of the field. That is to say, habitus is the active practices taking place in the field without being explicitly taught to the individuals through known education channels. In Bourdieu's own words habitus is "a structuring structure, which organizes practices and the perception of practices" (p. 170).

importance that a new body-oriented understanding of subjecthood which welcomes individual experiences challenge the doxa of these oppressive structures.

The new corporeal subjecthood proved useful for feminist thought, as we saw in French feminists and many others like them who attributed great importance to the experiences of the female body in establishing subjecthood. The restrictive role of the patriarchal language and of the father's law on non-male subjecthoods was reviewed in its relation to body and how the bodily experiences of non-male subjects, particularly those of women, might differ from the supposedly universal and transcendental experiences of the male bodies. What this difference meant in terms of linguistic expression became vital.

Traditional theories on the relationship between language and subjecthood which granted the author full authority did not take into account the fluidity, the multiplicity, and the plurality of the subjects, all of which are suggested by the theories of the lived body from a feminist perspective. Poetry, which provided a platform for the poets to subvert language and establish their own subjecthoods formed by their own ideological choices, was not exempt from the patriarchal conventions of separating the poet from the poem, and of approaching the poem as something that has a persona in it who speaks as an authority but is never the poet - unless it is confessional poetry. Such approach not only culminated in a short-sighted reading but also prevented the scholars to regard poems as cultural texts and analyze them accordingly. The conventional approaches which were predicated upon mostly the interpretation of poems kept causing a confusion among scholars and critics about how to analyze poetry, whether to take the poet's life and experiences into account as an important factor or leave it completely aside and focus on the poem itself alone, independent of the historical and biographical backgrounds.

Such confusion stems from the Cartesian dualism to make a separation between mind and body, between the social and biological, between a somehow created intermediary poetic persona and the poet. All these "either/or" approaches made poetry interpretation limited, abiding by the rules of the father and still remains tied to rules set by "wise old men" regarding what good poetry is, what good criticism is, and how to conduct poetry criticism. These approaches include Russian Formalism which was developed as a "rational" and "scientific" way of literature analysis that ignored the author and the reader, New Criticism which relied heavily upon close reading and overlooked any extra-textual information, Structuralism which focused on the units of a text at the cost of losing comprehension of a text in its entirety and in relation to its contextual background, Post-structuralism which concentrated on the text and its iterability disregarding the authors who made the choices that formed the discourse in the texts, Reader Response Criticism which centralized the readers so much so that the authors and their selections that act as discursive tools were almost denied any role in the language of the text, and others. The closest school of criticism that would be helpful was New Historicism, which argued that the historical background and contextual information regarding both the author and the critic played significant role on the texts. However, New Historicism did not offer a methodology for analyzing poetry as a cultural text, nor did it provide a feminist emancipatory agenda.

What I argue in this research in response to the conventional and patriarchal ways of poetry interpretation is that, with the perspective lived body introduces, it is possible to approach poetry as a cultural text and analyze it with a political (in this case, feminist) agenda, regarding the relationship between the poet and the poem – instead of interpret it as a literary text alone. Whether it's a full confession poetry, or

lyric poetry, or political poetry, or concrete poetry does not change the fact that subjects in poems are part of the poets who wrote them. That is to say, regardless of its kind, any poetry reflects some part of the poet since the poet themself [5] is a subject living in the world as lived body. Therefore, every encounter and experience the poet undergoes has its consequences reflected in the poems. Every action the poet as lived body takes entails an interaction between the self and the world, which keeps creating momentary subjecthoods, as a result of which some sort of projection of the self of the poet takes place in the poem. In other words, the decisions of the poet -the choices they makes artistically, politically, culturally, and linguistically- function as a conversation between the poet and language, the poet and the world, which culminates in the creation of new subjecthoods that are located in the poem as a projection of the self. This, however, does not mean that the subjects in the poems are true representations of a coherent and rigid self of the poet because there is no such thing as a coherent and rigid self.

The experiences that makes a person write poetry, make the choice to apply certain tools and techniques in their poems, and take the responsibility to include the topics of their own choice in them denote that the corporeal existence and momentary subjecthoods suggested by the lived body play a significant role in the production of poetry. It is, therefore, a feminist task to abandon the rules and approaches we have so far used as models in analyzing poetry for a more comprehensive and less rigid way of understanding first the subject, and second what the subject creates with a more inclusive, fluid, pluralistic, corporeal, and

---

[5] As a feminist researcher, in this thesis I used the singular version of the pronoun "they" since it is now a universally acknowledged linguistic revolution to deprive the English language of its gender assumptions. Therefore, please note that it is not a grammatical mistake but a political decision that I used the singular "they/them/theirs" as well as the word "themself" when needed throughout my thesis.

conversation-oriented approach. For this task, I chose the works of two women with political motives for gender equality because I thought it would be convenient to observe the identity crisis in the poems of two poets who were living in a world of identity crisis during the late 1980s and were concerned about defending the rights of the subjects who until then had been neglected, overlooked, and even suppressed.

Adrienne Rich from the US and Sennur Sezer from Turkey appeared to have the common concerns about identity, poetry, and the role of language on politics. I investigated whether there was something common to be observed in the poetries of two people living on different sides of the world during the same era with similar agenda, which proved fruitful. *An Atlas of the Difficult World* and *Afiş* [Poster]*, written by Rich and Sezer respectively, are concerned with the contemporary debates about identity, body, experience, and gender. Published in 1991, both books carry the traces of the political turmoil and intellectual interests of the previous decade, since Rich herself was an academic with various identities like woman, lesbian, Jew while Sezer was a self-read activist and a political figure in labor movement in Turkey. Both poets were involved in women's rights and are known to have written political poems. Looking at their poems in the books *An Atlas of the Difficult World* and *Afiş*, I was able to observe how lived body could be useful in understanding subjects and that poetry itself could be the data for critical analysis as a cultural text.

What necessarily followed was the question of methodology. If I wanted to apply a feminist way of analyzing poetry, I ascertained that the tools that I had at hand were not mastered and enforced by the patriarchal subjects. Hence, I looked at different methodologies that I can apply to analyzing poetry and eventually decided on feminist critical discourse analysis (FCDA). Although FCDA has not been widely applied to poetry so far, it proved helpful to frame my methodology as FCDA

because analyzing a discourse from a feminist standpoint meant analyzing both the meanings of the words and the patriarchal structures behind them. That is to say, instead of focusing only on the interpretation of the language in the poems or on an analysis of the historical background and entrenched large-scale structures, FCDA provided the grounds for me to bring together an analysis of language predicated upon the sociopolitical structures like gender, to incorporate my position as a feminist into the methodology I apply, and to challenge the traditional ways and patriarchal conventions set as normative and doxic. Since I was able to find only a very limited number of preceding examples of FCDA applied to poetry, I developed my own model in line with the previous examples of FCDA applied to other mediums. I investigated the texts in a two-step analysis. In the preliminary analysis, the poems yielded various themes as the frequently visited concepts. In the second and main round of analysis, these concepts converted into the categories that unfolded the patriarchal power mechanisms present in the communities within which the poets locate their subjecthoods as well as the ways to resist such mechanisms. By applying FCDA to poetry, I became able to note not only the images or words in their most immediate meanings but also how images are constructed under the influence of which micro and macro structures. Bringing this technique together with the concept of the lived body from a feminist perspective allowed me to adopt the new and feminist understanding of subjecthood as lived body by depriving the subject of its transcendental position that the patriarchal conventions grant to it, which allowed me to have a more accurate analysis of the language in the poems. As a result, the way I approached the poetry of these two women with FCDA yielded some categories of discourse which were dominant in both their works and applied in

idiosyncratic ways by each. Those categories, which have their own sub-categories, are: 1. Corporeal subjecthoods, and 2. Locatedness within communities.

Since my attempt to analyze the poems in *An Atlas of the Difficult World* and *Afiş* proved fruitful and yielded such categories, I became able to suggest that FCDA could be applied to poetry for poems are cultural texts. This methodology provides an alternative approach to poetry and poetic language, which is different from the conventional methods which consider poems separate works independent of their poets, their readers, and their chronological and geographical locatedness. Therefore, in this research, I argue that FCDA can be applied to the poetry collections in question and identifies the following power relations in the poems:

1) formative power relations: mind vs body

2) social power relations: subjecthoods in micro and macro structures

These power relations are gendered and entail gendered subjecthoods and experiences. Rich and Sezer share the same strategies to overturn such relations: They defy formative power relations by bringing forth corporeal subjecthoods, and social power relations by suggesting the locatedness of subjecthoods, both of which amount to the concept of the lived body from a feminist perspective. In other words, due to their political positionings, Rich and Sezer try to resist and overcome these power structures by building the discourse of corporeality and locatedness with the aid of the concept of (feminist) lived body.

Combined with the concept of lived body from the feminist perspective, FCDA also has the potential to offer a feminist methodology as opposed to the traditional patriarchal methods of poetry analysis which centralize male- and mind-oriented transcendental subjects. Since lived bodies exists as part of a holistic entity wherein they remain in touch with one another, unfolding the transindividual

relationship among the lived bodies as well as the structural limitations imposed upon them by locating the lived bodies as momentarily established subjecthoods within the macro level structures is a political act, for it unravels the oppressive mechanisms that categorize individuals. Correspondingly, locating subjecthoods as lived bodies in and through poetry becomes a feminist act, since it challenges the rational, transcendental, absolute subject enforced by the language of the father and patriarchal conventions of poetry as a cultural text.

Taking the previous arguments into account, this research aims to answer the following question "How do the poems in *An Atlas of the Difficult World* by Adrienne Rich and *Afiş* by Sennur Sezer respond to feminist critical discourse analysis, with regards to reflections of the political and personal agendas of the poets on their poetic discourses?" It begins with a contextual analysis which provides insight into the geographical and chronological locatedness of the poets and the poems in Chapter 2. It, then, continues with the theoretical background, which fosters the argument that locating corporeal subjecthoods in poetic language is a feminist act, in Chapter 3 where it presents the debates about lived body as a feminist concept, about the determining role of locatedness of lived bodies in micro and macro level structures on enforcing gendered subjecthoods, and about the subversive nature of poetic language as well as FCDA as a methodology which have the potential to defy the entrenched rules of the male- and mind-oriented understanding of subjecthood imposed by the symbolic, respectively. In Chapter 4, the thesis identifies the need for a feminist methodology that takes lived body as its key tool and concept in analyzing poetry and suggests FCDA as a useful technique to analyze poetry while maintaining an emancipatory political stance. Chapter 5 exemplifies the arguments constructed in the preceding chapters, analyzing the poems from *An Atlas*

of the Difficult World and *Afiş*. Finally, the thesis states its concluding remarks in

Chapter 6 and calls feminist scholars to conduct further research to improve the

suggested methodology as part of a feminist agenda in the academics.

CHAPTER 2

CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION

Both *An Atlas of the Difficult World* and *Afiş* [Poster] were published in 1991, which suggests that the poems in the books were possibly written at the end of the preceding decade, under the influence of the 80s. 1980s, all over the world, posed a time when war, tension and violence were over ruling in a tumultuous fashion. Yet, at the same time, it was an era of acknowledging and welcoming different identities and identity-based politics, as well as politics of difference. As the minority movements were gaining power in different places around the globe, matters of what constitutes the self and their relation to politics became of high importance in the intellectual world. New identities, variety, and diversity were appreciated as the challenges set to the traditional understanding of transcendental subjecthood. The 1980s were confusing in terms of how any subject is related to the world, how any individual locates themself in a community, or what sort of conversations subjecthoods engage in with the rest, what outside structures have impacts on the individuals as they establish their subjecthood. The questions regarding identity, power and politics were overpowering in both the intellectual debates and activist practices during the 80s, the questions that occupied the works of both Rich and Sezer.

Adrienne Rich had been writing poems since the late 50s, yet the years that were the most influential on her poems in *An Atlas of the Difficult World* were the late 80s. The poems in her difficult world were shaped in conversation with the world she lived in back then in the US. During this era, the US was concentrated on ending the Cold War and participating in the wars around the world to settle the

matters peacefully and democratically –to put it in the way authorities promoted it. The war between Iran and Iraq (22 September 1980 - 20 August 1988) was particularly important to US, for various reasons, including the hostage conflict in Tehran, which took place in between 1979-1981, where 52 US citizens were held hostage for 444 days. Shortly after this hostage crisis, Iraq invaded Iran, with the aid of US government in many forms and shapes, including armament supply. The military force of the US waited until 1988 to intervene in the war, which ended with a ceasefire in the same year (Fayazmanesh, 2008, pp. 39-40).

The negotiations to end the Cold War, the regime changes in the European countries with whom US had trade relations, and of course the US involvement in the war between Iran and Iraq raised questions about location, citizenship, and identity. Being a part of the conflicts that take place overseas, in the name of defending the country, stirred a debate on what it means to be located in a certain geographical area of the world with the notion of citizenship and how one defines oneself as citizen. The role of the geographical boundaries on defining the country and thus the notion of citizenship were challenged. This flux about location, county, citizenship, and subjecthood is present in *An Atlas of the Difficult World*.

One of the challenges about the politics in the US was that it denied its own imperialistic power and colonialism. Although the governments of the day executed by Reagan and Bush respectively considered the era as a success in terms of national security and welfare, the critics from all around the world suggest that the period was in fact an imperial and colonialist period, for US kept invading other countries and exploited them economically through the threats of embargos, seemingly-unrelated yet purposefully-performed military interventions, and enforced trade agreements. Still, the intellectual activists of the US who were anti-war, who supported peace and

solidarity and advocated the liberation movements of different identities were blind to the imperialistic and colonial power US executed overseas (Janiewski, 2001, pp. 279-80).

This subtle yet powerful colonialist approach was present in the feminist movement of the day in the US. Most feminists who were in positions to speak, even though they supported equality for all, were white heterosexual women from privileged classes. Their claim to be speaking for all while they represented only a particular privileged percentage contradicted with feminism's stance against the all-knowing patriarchal subject that claims to be transcendental and universal while invading the space for other subjects as a "wise white man". This colonialist approach in the feminism of US meant that women of "the third world", women with different sexual identities, black women, Jewish women etc. were not given the space to speak for themselves, which culminated in biases in the intellectual world and publishing sector (Janiewski, 2001, pp. 280-2). With the peak of the black women's movement (against the dominance of men in black activism and against the dominance of whites in feminist activism) and under the influence of the rising self-authoritativeness of the lesbian feminists (who radically claimed their own space in the feminist movement standing against the essentialist and reductionist approaches in defining who the subject is in the feminist movement), feminism in the US began to reconsider its approach to identities and matters of power and sovereignty among women (Janiewski, 2001, pp. 281-3). Correspondingly, towards the end of 80s, the self-centeredness of the American white feminists was challenged and began to be replaced by the pluralistic and inclusive approaches in identity and subjecthood.

In addition to her position as a feminist, which entailed that Rich engaged in such debates about identity and subjecthood, as scholar in literature and a person

with various identities, Rich not only was exposed to the debates about subjecthood academically but also questioned the concept of subjecthood at a personal level. Under the influence of the poststructuralist movement, scholars were renegotiating the authority attributed to the subject. Under the influence of poststructuralist theory, many theoreticians in literature and philosophy proposed the deconstruction of the transcendental and coherent subject in literature (See Chapter 3.3). Rich was part of the academic world and followed such debates closely as a scholar in literature. In addition to this, the fact that Rich herself was a lesbian, who was questioning her identity in the world in terms not only of sexual orientation but also of ethnic background as her father's side was Jewish, culminated in a very strong influence of identity politics on Rich's poetry during this era. Correspondingly, Rich's works of the decade reflect an intense questioning about what constitutes a subject, and her identity as a woman, as a Jew, as a mother, as a lesbian, as a poet etc.

Furthermore, identity and subjecthood reconsidered under the scope of location and locatedness were Rich's primary focus partially due to her personal life during the 80s. As a result of her peripatetic academic career which necessitated that she travelled from school to school, Rich moved from New Jersey to Massachusetts in 1979, then to California within a year or so. The beginnings of the 80s for Rich was thus a time to consider the importance of location and motility for the subject. As Rich states in a prose wherein she refers to her own experience of moving and how that particular time in her life affected a poem she wrote then, moving across the country causes people to look for something to make them feel connected to the place as a subject belonging to it. As a result, one tries to locate oneself. This is, she says, what she does when writing her poems: She maintains some sort of presence in the poem as a subject belonging to it. Yet, this does not mean that she as a person is

16

fully included in the poem, or represented by it (Rich, 1993e, pp. 252-4). Self-affirmatively, Rich shows that there is a part of some sort of located subjecthood of the poet included in the poem.

Sennur Sezer, too, reflects the historical locatedness she undergoes as a subject living in Turkey during the 80s. 1980s in Turkey correspond to a very specific era in the political history of the country. After the military coup on September 12, 1980, Turkey moved into an extremely oppressive epoch during which the enforced military government of the coup prohibited all political movements, abolished the democratically elected civilian government and the parliament, suspended the Constitution, and banned all political parties, adversative NGOs, opposing publications, and trade unions (Zürcher, 2007, pp. 405-8).

After the new Constitution was proposed in 1982, the ban on political parties was lifted and new political parties were allowed to emerge –although with many restrictions. In the first half of the decade, the country was in a state of flux considering the matters of government and the parliament. In addition to the problems at the executive level, the unsettled matters with the Kurdish communities climaxed and the Kurdish movement gained a new dimension in 1984 when PKK (Partiya Karkerên Kurdistanê / Kurdistan Workers' Party) –founded in 1978 with the initial goal to establish an independent Kurdish state ruled by communism- decided to continue its activism with full insurgency through an armed paramilitary rebellion (Zürcher, 2007, pp. 432-6). According to Zürcher (2007), PKK claimed that their attacks on the Turkish government were a response to the extreme suppressive politics against the Kurdish communities –such as the ban on the Kurdish language in both public and private areas (p. 432). Activism in those years raised questions

about culture and identity, as well as their relation to space, in addition to the primary and rather explicit issues of communism, freedom, equality, and people's war etc.

Both because of and despite such an oppressive and violent political atmosphere, several intellectuals from various fields founded İHD (İnsan Hakları Derneği / Human Rights Association) in 1986 –after the ban on NGOs was lifted. İHD's major aim was to report human rights violations and defend freedom both within and outside Turkey. Together with the volunteers, the founding members traveled around the country to raise awareness about the violations and urge a more collective response from the public. They conducted research, published reports, organized panels, ran adversary campaigns about death penalty, war, torture, maltreatment in prison, and assassinations reported as unidentified murders, among others (İnsan Hakları Derneği, 2014). Sennur Sezer was among the founding intellectuals (Nacitarhan, 2010, pp. 27-30) who worked all around the country to stand against the oppressive implementations of the post-coup government, which resulted in severe human right violations.

The 1980 coup proved to be the beginning of perhaps the most oppressive political atmosphere in the history of Turkey up till then –since even the slightest possibility of a disagreeing voice was prophylactically annihilated by the bans of the military government. The feminist movement in Turkey was the first political movement to challenge this oppression. Gathering together under new associations and/or publications, women with different political agendas and various backgrounds began to discuss, within their own distinct political communities, the amplified impacts of the oppressive governmental policies on women and thus delved into conducive intellectual debates which culminated in organized demonstrations and campaigns. Although it is true that, up till the 80s, there had been a number of

feminist works particularly in the intellectual realm, many scholars and prominent feminist activists agree that it was after the 1980s that something that could be called an organized feminist movement was formed[6] –for during this era, not only the intellectual debates became more systematic and comprehensive, but also such theoretical debates were paralleled by activist practices which congregated many women who would otherwise remain in their own political parties and groups. The feminists of the era –although not all of them were comfortable calling themselves "feminist" at the time, were divided into four fractions: radical feminists, Marxist feminists, socialist feminists, and liberal feminists (Kara, 2006, pp. 16-8).[7]

Sezer does not explicitly called herself a feminist, yet on many occasions she stated that she was primarily interested in issues of labor, women, and children. She mostly wrote about and for women and children, yet her political affiliations as a Marxist and as a founding member of EMEP (Emek Partisi / Labor Party) were at the time incompatible with what was then defined as or perceived to be feminism. That is to say, what we now name as Marxist feminism in retrospect to the 80s remained cautious not to label itself as feminist, for Marxists believed feminism was a bourgeois ideology. Nonetheless, the activism of Marxist women for the sake of gender equality served the purposes of feminism. Their main agenda in the late 80s included exploitation of women's labor inside and outside households, motherhood

---

[6] It is of high importance to note here that the feminist movement of the 1980s were not the first political actions women took in defense on women's rights. Not only during the late Ottoman era, particularly after The Second Constitutional Monarchy Period, but also before and after the establishment of the Republic of Turkey, many women produced intellectual works and exhibited political activism for women's rights and gender equality. Yet, these movements, albeit effective and significant, did not identify themselves as "feminist" acts, nor were they organized as political movement with feminist principles and methods.

[7] Later Islamist/Muslim feminists grew to be the fifth fraction. Yet, during the 80s, Islamist and Muslim women refrained from associating themselves with feminists, whom they regarded as leftists. It is also important to note here that such fractions are not widely accepted by contemporary feminists and thus remain as retrospective observations of the researcher Nurten Kara.

as a societal matter, and antiwar propaganda (Kara, 2006, pp. 19-25) –some concepts that Sezer frequently visits in her poems.

The antiwar propaganda of the Marxist feminists in particular was in response to the anticipation of the upcoming Gulf War (2 August 1990 - 28 February 1991). Although Turkey was not officially involved in the war, the debates about whether or not Turkey would allow the Incirlik Air Base -located in Adana, Turkey- to be used by the US planes for warfare triggered antiwar propaganda to become a topic of interest. Many feminists argued that war was a political decision made by a male-oriented political system in which almost all decision-makers were men, and correspondingly women must stand against war and violence, for it was impossible to find equality under the circumstances of such a competitive patriarchal practice as result of which the societal burden would be imposed on women particularly in terms of labor (Kara, 2006, p. 23). Not surprisingly, the tension about involvement in a potential war at the macro level reflected upon Sezer's poetry in the form of accentuating violence and pain through corporeality (See Chapter 5.2).

Such micro and macro structures that locate the poets find place in their poems as well. Under the influence of their chronological and geographical locatedness, both poets depict their own poetic worlds with reference to bodily existence, subjecthood as located lived body, and the potential conversations such subjecthoods could engage in. To further understand how these three aspects are presented in both Rich and Sezer, it is important to conceptualize the notion of the lived body which serves both as a theme and as a tool that allows the communication between the poems and the world, investigate the role of locatedness on such conversations which establish subjecthoods, and observe poetic language's potential

to deconstruct the entrenched subjecthoods to generate new ones. In the next chapter,

I will provide the theoretical background for each of these notions.

CHAPTER 3

CONCEPTS, TERMS, AND THEORETICAL FRAME

To understand how new subjecthoods come to existence as opposed to the identities enforced by the oppressive power mechanisms, it is important to note the role of corporeality in gender-related identity politics, and the new ways feminist subjecthoods entail in terms of engaging in a conversation with the world. For this reason, this chapter begins by investigating the relationship between corporeality and gendered subjecthood. The concept of lived body from a feminist perspective becomes helpful in understanding the significance of corporeal existence and experiences in shaping subjecthoods. The chapter then explores the impacts of locatedness and space on subjecthoods as well as their significance in terms of gender. Lastly, it brings together the challenges against the oppressive identity politics and poetic language to portray how poetic language proves helpful and convenient to oppugn the traditional understanding of subjecthood, since it allows the poets to frustrate the rules of the symbolic and renegotiate the concept of subjecthood shaped by linguistic devices to establish new subjecthoods. Since the thesis analyzes poetry with feminist critical discourse analysis to exhibit that poetic language, too, could provide data for FCDA, this chapter attempts to explain the concepts that would aid in such analysis.

3.1 Corporeal feminism and the notion of the lived body

As discussed before, within the dominant circles of philosophy, the self has almost always been associated with a thinking subject especially since Descartes introduced his *res cogitans* as a key element in ontological quest. From the 20th century

onwards, many philosophers have questioned this mind-oriented understanding of the self. Particularly after feminist theories as well as poststructuralism challenged the wholeness, concreteness, and absoluteness of the self, it became possible to approach the self from divergent perspectives. Many feminist theorists stood against the male-oriented self in order to reconsider a feminist ontology.

In her seminal work *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism*, Elizabeth Grosz traces the notion of the self back to Plato and Aristotle, and presents a historical account of how philosophers approached the self in relation to agency and reason. In such account, she argues that it was Descartes' mind-oriented approach to the self that incorporated into modern philosophy the bifurcations that consider body and mind separate entities, and place emphasis on mind over body. For Grosz, such bifurcations inevitably create a hierarchy between its two components in which the thinking agency is praised at the cost of ignoring the corporeal existence of the agency in question. This somatophobia, inherited from Plato's philosophy, not only denigrates the body but also obstructs the way to come to a holistic approach to existence of the self, a sort of existence in which mind and body are not treated as two distinct entities frequently at odds with each other, but as parts of a uniting self, intertwined with and integral to one another (Grosz, 1994, pp. 5-12).

Grosz argues that such bifurcated approaches associated women with the side of biology and corporeality, and thus automatically assumed that women's subjecthoods are less significant. Because of this male-oriented thinking, the role the body plays in ontology of the self was overlooked and the non-male bodily existences were neglected. This posed a central conundrum for many feminists. Becoming suspicious of and hostile towards the body during the earlier phases of

feminist theory, feminists tried to overcome the inequality caused by women's association with the body which was regarded inferior and faulty. However, this wrongful approach to deny the body turned into a reexamination of the body as the feminist theory progressed from egalitarian feminism to social constructionism and finally to the third wave feminism of sexual difference (Grosz, 1994, pp. 14-17). The supporters of the sexual difference theories –such as Irigaray, Cixous, Spivak, Gallop, Butler, Wittig, and many more– in one way or another maintained that the body is not "an ahistorical, biologically given, acultural object" (Grosz, 1994, p. 18) unlike what the previous generations considered it to be. Under their scope, the body became the lived body, "interwoven with and constitutive of systems of meaning, signification, and representation" (Grosz, 1994, p. 18). Consequently, the lived body gained the position as the agent to produce knowledge according to and in conversation with its surroundings in a given time and place (Grosz, 1994, pp. 19).

Grosz's understanding of the self brings together the approach the third wave feminists adopted regarding the body and the phenomenological[8] subjecthood Merleau-Ponty propounds, concerned with the experiences the self undergoes. Merleau-Ponty's body is a body in relation to space. Instead of Sartre's distinction of "being for itself" and "being in itself," Merleau-Ponty suggest a "being-to-the-world" (Grosz, 1994, pp. 86) which places the body in the position of neither an object observed by others nor a subject as a lived reality, but in the combination and dialogue of the two. Subsequently, communication gains a new dimension: It is, what Merleau-Ponty calls, the flesh that communicates, not the senses. The flesh for him "designate[s] being, not as a plenitude, self-identity, or substance but as divergence

---

[8] Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology is an epistemological and ontological view which suggests that there is no distinction between a subject and object, every entity is corporeal, and perception is the quiddity of subjecthood. Refer to his *Phenomenology of Perception* for further details.

or noncoincidence. Flesh is no longer associated with a privileged animate category of being but is being's most elementary level. Flesh is being's reversibility, its capacity to fold in on itself, a dual orientation inward and outward…" (Grosz, 1994, pp. 100). Since the flesh entails reciprocity, the lived body mutually communicates with what it encounters. Whatever the lived body looks at, looks back at the lived body. And each time it touches something, it is touched back by that very thing (Grosz, 1994, pp. 101-2). These encounters function at an ontological level. That is to say, every encounter the lived body experiences creates new subjecthoods in the corresponding space of encounter. The space itself is in fact included in the conversation: The body is not placed in space, it is part and parcel of it and vice versa (Grosz, 1994, pp. 90).

The lived body, as it claims its existence in conversation with the space, is perhaps everything the Cartesian body is not: It is an ever-changing corporeal schema, dependent on perception (Grosz, 1994, pp. 66). In other words, the way human brain perceives the world and its own corporeal existence is definitive of how the self establishes subjecthoods. As the lived body moves in space and thus goes through encounters, its self-perception changes; and it is through these changes that the self becomes able to distinguish various subjecthoods.

Grosz's attempt to reconsider the traditional way the history of philosophy has approached the body as well as the promises of individuality present in third wave feminism culminates in corporeal feminism, a feminism in which the experiences of women are analyzed, interpreted and processed with reference to their corporeality. Grosz argues that women have always been more corporeal, considering their reproductive capacities in particular, and thus finds a commonality in women's corporeality as opposed to men's (Grosz, 1994, p. 207). She believes that

unraveling the potential, which the exclusionary theories of mind- and male-oriented theories of the self disregarded, corporeal feminism can pose a more grounded challenge to the patriarchal dualist structures. In that sense, the experiences that consist the phenomenological self and thus the lived body become of high importance in understanding what it means to be a woman in a patriarchal world. In this research, I use corporeal feminism as the frame in which gendered subjecthoods of the self undergo experiences as lived bodies, as well as the tool to comprehend the locatedness of these subjects.

Toril Moi (1999) agrees with Grosz in that phenomenology allows more room for theoreticians to try to understand and analyze the experiences human beings undergo than the notion of gender (p. 65). She believes that by placing gender as the lynchpin to understand the human experience in a patriarchal world, theorists not only become unable to avoid biological essentialism and/or reductionism but also prioritize the social over the biological and thus mind over body (Moi, 1999, pp. 30-9). As a result, existence of the self per se remains both dependent on and restricted by the distinction between mind and body. Her suggestion is to shift the focus from the gender theories to the notion of the lived body in order to extrapolate how any woman identity is formed through which power relations in what particular circumstances (Moi, 1999, pp. 64-66). The focus of feminist studies, according to Moi, should be the power relations that construct the often hierarchical relationships between gender categories (Moi, 1999, p. 65), which is something this thesis centralizes, particularly in the analysis part.

Even though Iris Marion Young, an influential feminist phenomenologist, admits that Moi's approach is viable and accountable for the most part, she suggests that eliminating the theory of gender altogether causes the loss of politically

significant categories via which certain groups of people share their experiences for the purposes of both meaning-making and claiming ontological space. That is to say, without the notion of gender theoreticians would fail to acknowledge the common experiences certain individuals undergo and thus remain deficient in their theories. In that sense, she finds Moi's general reference to power relations too vague to follow. For that, Young (2005) proposes to keep the notion of gender in order to firstly remain in scope in terms of feminist theory and secondly pay attention to the rooted structures behind what brings subjects together in certain experiences under a gendered umbrella (pp. 69-78).

Benefiting from the terminology of Alexander Wendt, Young argues that any society has micro and macro level structures. Micro structures are constituted by the interactions between people and institutions, the sociopolitical communicative acts among the members that belong to a certain group. Macro structures, on the other hand, are the large-scale constructions that come to exist as a result of these interactions and produce new values to be entrenched as overarching doxa and norms (Young, 2005, pp. 20-1). The interactions at the micro level (the ones I argue are the equivalent of the experiences and encounters of the lived bodies) play a determining role at the macro structure; yet the macro structure itself is bigger than the sum of the interactions at the micro structure, that is to say, the macro structure cultivates its own structural characteristics by creating a surplus value that exceeds the initial sum of the micro structure (Young, 2005, pp. 20). It is for that reason that feminist theory should not overlook the macro structure of gender while focusing on the individual experiences at the micro structure. In this thesis, these micro and macro level structures within which subjecthoods located serve as the main concepts to explain how power relations try to fixate individuals as gendered identities

To understand the locatedness of and in the poems through feminist methods, one must identify the role of the macro structure of gender. I follow Young's definition, who agrees with Moi in that a category of gender that defines the self yields in reductionism, biological determinism, and essentialism. Yet, when we reposition the notion of gender such that it refers to a social structure rather than a characteristic intrinsic in individuals, then gender as a tool to analyze and understand collective experiences becomes quite useful for feminist studies, argues Young. It is crucial to see how individuals are positioned in certain structures within which they go through experiences (Young, 2005, pp. 21-3). In her own words:

> Gender, I suggest [in a previous writing], is best understood as a particular form of the social positioning of lived bodies in relation to one another within historically and socially specific institutions and processes that have material effects on the environment in which people act and reproduce relations of power and privilege among them. On this account, what it means to say that individual persons are "gendered" is that we all find ourselves passively grouped according to these structural relations, in ways too impersonal to ground identity. (Young, 2005, p. 22)

At the very end of her article Young points at a parallel between the structures she talks about and Bourdieu's notion of habitus, suggesting that, although valuable in providing a framework as well as a terminology, Bourdieu's approach to gender as a structure is too rigid and ahistorical (Young, 2005, p. 26).[9]

In conclusion, all these approaches to theory of the lived body[10] Merleau-Ponty introduced share the motivation to appropriate the theory with a gender-oriented reconsideration. Grosz begins by acknowledging a different and distinct

---

[9] Moi (1991) herself, in an earlier article named "Appropriating Bourdieu: Feminist Theory and Pierre Bourdieu's Sociology of Culture" argues a very similar idea and instead suggests to take habitus as a notion gendered by patriarchal doxa (pp.1017-1049). However, Young's article does not engage in this potential conversation with Moi's appropriation of Bourdieu; nor does it acknowledge what Moi's own work, albeit an earlier one, could inform Young's article of, regarding Moi's suggestion of leaving the notion of gender altogether. For the purposes of this research, I choose not to cultivate that potential and leave it to other studies to investigate.

[10] In the rest of the thesis, the lived body I refer to will correspond to the lived body of corporeal feminism. I often use the term corporeal subjecthoods to indicate the feminist lived body and distinguish between the lived body of phenomenology and the lived body from a feminist perspective.

corporeality of and for woman, suggesting that woman's engagement to the world through their lived bodies are not the same as that of men. She brings forth corporeal feminism to suggest a new way of comprehending subjecthood as opposed to the male Cartesian subject. Moi welcomes this new way of comprehending subjecthood and goes so far as to propose that feminist scholars should abandon the notion of gender –since the distinction between gender and sex itself is the reiteration of the mind/body dualism. For her, lived body corresponds to the individual experiences of people from –what is called- different genders while avoiding to fall to any reductionism or mind-oriented dualism. Young, however, suggests that gender is a term that helps people locate themselves in certain macro structures and comprehend the space within which they move and create their own subjecthoods. For her, it is important to be able to recognize the macro structure of gender in order to understand the possibilities you are given (and not given) when constructing your identity. The lived body, then, is the self which keeps gaining various subjecthoods at different times and places. Every subjecthood is in conversation with the pre-individual as well as the macro structures. It is through these nets, the nets of the intrapersonal relations and the nets of the structural space, that any lived body is located.

3.2 Locatedness of subjects

After shifting the focus from the subject as a mind-oriented, transcendental agency to the subject as (feminist) lived body, it becomes crucial to observe and identify the relationship between the subject and its surroundings, for lived bodies exist as one organic entity and establish momentary subjecthoods located in micro and macro structures in dialogue with other lived bodies. Likewise, a feminist poetry analysis

with lived body at its center should take into account the relationship of the poem, poet, and the reader to their surroundings and identify their locatedness. For this reason, understanding the relationship between subjects and location as well as what this relationship means for feminist criticism and the field of Critical and Cultural Studies play an important role in this study.

The relationship of the individual to the space has been the debate of many disciplines. Until phenomenology introduced the concept of the lived body, scholars from various disciplines tried to extrapolate the individual from the body, studying them separately. As a result, locating the individual was understood in terms of the stability of an unchanging agency and its immanence. What connected the individual to the space was the body, a phenomenon which was denied a prominent role in Cartesian western philosophy.

This standpoint took various turns as Cultural Studies approached space as not only a geographical concept but also an effective and constitutive element with its social and philosophical projections. In an article wherein the European and Anglo-American approaches to space in the field of Cultural Studies are compared, Sigrid Weigel (2009) argues that the topographical turn in Cultural Studies was about leaving "the 'classic' discourse-historical criticism" (p. 191) for an approach that no longer took national territory as the basis when discussing cultural identity due to the ethnographic perspective it gained (p. 191). Such ethnographic orientation allowed scholars to see space as something that could be interpreted in relation to its impacts on the social and philosophical spheres. Despite –or perhaps because of, the differences in the approaches to space, it became a topic of interest for many scholarly discussions, including the ones about literature. Literary theory, too, began to discuss notions like movement and space, particularly after Bakhtin introduced his

famous *chronotopos* (Weigel, 2009, p. 192).[11] Both literature and literary theory investigated the potential of movement in space, questioning what such movement might reveal about the subject that moves as well as significance of the movement for its literary value. Therefore, even in literature, space became something that defines, shapes, or impacts (Weigel, 2009, p. 193). This thesis benefits from the idea that space plays a definitive role in the formations of subjecthoods in cultural texts and considers poetry a cultural site where such processes could be observed.

The significance space gains allowed many theorists, including Foucault and de Certeau, to examine the role space places on determining the subjecthoods of the individuals. Such deconstructive and postmodern accounts of topography consider space as a text itself and try to read the intricacies that specific topographies institute on individuals (Weigel, 2009, pp. 194-5), for the postmodern subject is shaped in relation to certain topographies. Taking the conversations about the postmodern subject in space to a different level, geographer Linda McDowell questions how women postmodern subjects might have a different relationship with space, something which the general (male-oriented) theories overlooked. In "Spatializing Feminism: Geographic Perspectives", McDowell (1996) agrees with Doreen Massey in that the postmodern subject is defined with and within the space which "is relational and constitutive of social processes" (p. 29). She emphasizes that the establishment of the relation of the individual to the space plays a crucial role in negotiating subjecthoods of non-male individuals within a male-oriented epistemological sphere.

---

[11] Chronotopos is a term used by Mikhail Bakhtin (1981) for representations of time and place in literary works (pp.84-258). It may refer to the time and place within which an author produces their work, or the constructions of time and place in the text itself. Chronotopos suggests that a literary work is more than a sequence of words, events, or speech acts. It includes spatio-temporal dynamics. Bakhtin's ideas were informed by the developments in the natural sciences of the time, such as the theory of relativity, which were reflected in the idea of chronotopos.

After the challenges varying philosophies posed to the Cartesian subject, the approach that believes in the omnipotence of mind left its place to the limitations of human agency, advocating that the so-called individual decisions made by overpowering minds were in fact constituted by macro structures, the unconscious, the symbolic, power relations etc. (McDowell, 1996, p. 33). Feminist criticism posed yet another challenge by questioning the identity, bringing forth the gendered ways of building what is taken as the subject (McDowell, 1996, pp. 33-4). When the agency of the subject was challenged by feminism, the space-related aspects of submissive patriarchal practices became visible. Women's agency was paralleled with the inside, the private, and the personal whereas men had the right to claim the public sphere (McDowell, 1996, p. 34). As a result of the attempt to unravel the epistemological structures that position women as such, feminist theory suggested that "epistemologies must be regarded as contextual, situated, and positioned, as well as temporary" (McDowell, 1996, p. 34). This perspective allowed researchers and theoreticians to acknowledge their positionality in conducting research and thus cutting the margins of unrightful claims of objectivity narrower. Consequently, the focus in many theories became the relativity and difference. Donna Haraway famously called for a new theorization of "geometry of multiple difference" (McDowell, 1996, p. 36). As a result, trying to map the differences that constituted the subject, or rather differentiated the subject from the rest, became the goal of many feminist works, which rendered the concept of locatedness important for feminist criticism.

Benefiting from the theories of Paul Gilroy, Stuart Hall and Homi Bhabha, McDowell (1996) suggests that, like postcolonial subjectivity, feminist subjectivity too is dependent upon time and place, and thus is never completed (pp. 40-1). For

her, if feminist theory and criticism focused on the situated subjecthoods in certain epistemological structures in order to demolish the given mechanisms that position women as the "Other" and marginalize the "non-males" in the epistemological field (McDowell, 1996, pp. 42). McDowell (1996) calls for claiming certain epistemological spaces our own and spatializing feminist theory, remaining alert to the danger of falling to separatism (pp. 43-4).

McDowell's approach, provides the grounds for renegotiating the role of the theorist in epistemology and suggests that feminist researchers should mark their positionality to deconstruct the centrality of the male author in research. Therefore, locating the subject becomes crucial for both feminist academic research as well as this thesis. Yet, her approach, however insightful, continues to follow the body/mind separation, focusing on the mind as the representation, or even the equivalent, of the locatable subject. It does not take into account the body and its relation to locatability. It, for that reason, remains an approach that needs to be improved. This thesis aims to provide an improved account which exhibits the relationship between gender and locatedness, via analyzing the discursive impacts on locating subjecthoods.

Locating a subject, in this research, means unraveling the sociopolitical structures of macro and micro levels to understand the experience that the subject undergoes in a given place and time as a corporeal entity. Therefore, the notion of the lived body becomes quite useful in understanding and explaining the locatedness of any subjecthood: Locating a subjecthood means capturing a version of the self as lived body in a time and space, while remaining in dialogue with other chronological and geographical topographies. This definition entails that any located subject is also located in a community with and within which they keeps interacting. In order to

unfold the socio-political mechanisms that impact subjecthoods, the thesis benefits from feminist critical discourse analysis (FCDA) and attempts to contribute to the field of Critical and Cultural Studies by analyzing poetry as a cultural text, which has not frequently been the interest of research for the scholars in the field. Locating subjecthoods in poetry by analyzing them with FCDA offers the opportunity of observing not only the political macro structures that try to fixate them but also the interactions of subjecthoods with one another within the communities wherein they are located.

Locatedness of a subject in a community and its impacts of individual subjecthoods appear as a common conundrum for both Rich and Sezer (See Chapter 5 for more details). In effect, in an article examining the relation between the subject and its locatedess in certain communities, Mary Eagleton deliberately examines Adrienne Rich's work vis-à-vis the question of identity and location. Her focus is on Rich's prose, particularly the essay titled "Notes toward a Politics of Location." She explains that Rich raises an ontological problem regarding the use of pronouns of "I" and "we." Including the "I" within the "we" poses a challenge for the subject since the subject cannot know the scope of the community of the "we." The example Eagleton gives is the repetition of Rich's own self-inquiry: Does Rich, a Jew on the father's side, born and raised in the US, have the right to include herself in the "we" of the survivors of the Anti-Semitic massacres in Europe? The answer does not seem to come easily. Her unactualized possibility of being born in Europe during the time of the massacres does not necessarily make her a survivor. Yet, there is a secondary level of being traumatized by the very same thing which murdered many people and traumatized the first-hand survivors. Where does "the I" of Rich stand in this relation? (Eagleton, 2010, pp. 299-302)

These questions cause Rich to contemplate the importance of location, as Eagleton puts it. What defines the "I" as well as the scope of the "we" is very much dependent on location. Yet the location itself is a site of constant changes and encounters, bringing together different identities over and over. As a result, one's knowledge is always subjected to the situations a certain location poses –an issue undertaken also by Donna Haraway. Drawing a parallel between the questions Rich raised and Haraway's theories on "situated knowledges," Eagleton (2010) concludes:

> We are all located in multiple ways; these locations interconnect with intricate patternings; and, though certain locations may be to the fore at specific moments, a whole range of determining factors will always be operating. What constitutes a location changes and is constantly reformed while earlier locations can be remembered and reconstructed in different ways. Thus, Rich's understanding of location brings together geography, history, several identities, memory and process (300).

Rich's understanding of location, then, is what forms the subjecthood, situated at a certain moment, in conversation with its surroundings, "bring[ing] together geography, history, several identities, memory and process" (Eagleton, 2010, p. 300). However, Eagleton criticizes Rich for speaking from a distant position when it comes to her own body in "Notes toward a politics of location." She argues that Rich examines her own body as though it were an object to be read from a distance. A similar distance occurs when Rich tries to find her place in relation to the anti-Semitic massacres in Europe (Eagleton, 2010, pp. 302, 305). Yet, the lived body cannot possible be understood from a distance. It is precisely the situation of being one, united, and within that allows the lived body to create subjecthoods, as discussed before. As a result, Eagleton suggests that Rich's politics of location is not fully predicated upon finalized philosophies as it is still "notes toward" a politics of location, not politics of location as such (Eagleton, 2010, p. 301).

Although there is not any academic research on the poetry of Sezer, it is possible to flag the importance of locating the subject for her, too. She takes into account the importance of geopolitical situatedness as a determining factor in terms of subjecthood(s). For her, locating any subjecthood means unravelling the potential that might bring together those who undergo somewhat similar experiences. Once the self is located in the macrostructures that limit and impose a type of subjecthood, the structural oppressions become more pellucid, and therefore those who are subjected to the same oppressive forces could acquire the consciousness of not only their individual situatedness but also the collective societal group -namely the class and gender- they belong to. Hence, locating the subject within the macrostructures of class and gender means providing the grounds to read the cultural mechanism trying to fixate the subject and initiating resistance against them (See Chapter 5).

3.3 Poetic language, discourse, and feminist subjecthoods

The relationship between language and subjecthood has been under the scope in discourse studies as well as critical theory. Language has been regarded as one of the most important elements that corroborates to the formation of human subject, from a psychoanalytical standpoint in particular. Yet, the impact of language on subjecthood might be challenged by violating the rules of language in an attempt to deconstruct the given subjecthood and establish new subjecthoods. The language that is used in poetry -subverting the immediate associations of signifiers, regulated placements of words, and the like- allows room for a renegotiation of human psyche and corresponding sociopolitical structures regarding the establishment of subjecthoods. It is, therefore, highly important to approach poetry as a cultural text and analyze poetic language to see how it allows the poets to avoid the doxa constituted by the

dominant ideologies like patriarchy. Correspondingly, the refusal of the coherent, rigid, supposedly universal, transcendental subject itself has the potential to be a feminist act because, through this, language welcomes non-patriarchal, fluid, and plural subjecthoods, which might be observed as a result of analyzing poems as texts within the field of Critical and Cultural Studies.

One of the most renowned scholars who investigated the relationship between language, patriarchal codes, and subjecthood in relation to poetic discourse is Julia Kristeva. Agreeing with the Lacanian distinction, Kristeva argues that there is a phase in the development of the human self during which the subject identifies themself as the subject, based on their difference from what they thought to be one holistic entity. The phase until when the self is established is the pre-mirror stage for Lacan and the semiotic stage for Kristeva, where the subject is one with the objects, unable to distinguish their subjectivity from them and untouched by the structured rules of the symbolic world. What Lacan argues is that the break from this phase into the phase of the symbolic where the subject becomes exposed to "the law of the father" happens when the subject acknowledges themself in the mirror (Kristeva, 1984, pp. 25-9). For Kristeva, on the other hand, the break off from the semiotic phase into symbolic realm does not take place as a sudden rupture, but as a gradual occurrence, to which Kristeva refers as the semiotic *chora*. In the chora, the subject is in the process of being formed; however, there is not yet a sense of a coherent and separate self. It is a pre-symbolic stage in the sense that it revolves around non-differentiation while it exhibits some elements of the symbolic in its configuration of how to mark the difference. There is no structured language but drives, rhythm, movements and chaos. The subject constantly repeats splitting from the semiotic and

rebounding to it, gradually becoming more prone to splitting than to rebounding, which eventually leads them to the symbolic realm (Kristeva, 1984, pp. 46-51).

Kristeva argues that poetic language, particularly that of the avant-garde poetry, comes from this semiotic chora where the rules of the symbolic -that is, the rules of the colloquial language as we speak it- do not apply. The semiotic chora offers uncontaminated images, sound, and rhythm with which avant-garde poetry reconstitutes the social aspects of words. Kristeva associates semiotic chora with the womb of the mother and suggests that until the symbolic fully takes over, which happens after oedipal phase comes to an end, the semiotic serves as a kind of primordial existence, unable to distinguish the self from other subjects. Therefore, during this phase the body acts as the subject, which underscores the corporeality of the semiotic stage that begins with the womb and continues to be led by the body. For this reason, poetic language of the semiotic chora, too, favors corporeality as opposed to the social, since it negotiates the social aspects of the words and redefine the concepts, through which the subject constructed by the symbolic is demolished, and new subjecthoods that might take any form or shape get established via the fluidity of the semiotic (Kristeva, 1984, pp. 57-67).

In line with Kristeva's groundbreaking arguments that bring together psychoanalysis, language, ontology, and gender, scholars like Marjorie Perloff have examined innovative poetry and its suggestions about the subject. In *Differentials*, Perloff (2014) argues that the question of the subject in innovative poetry is in fact an extension of the poststructuralist criticism which challenged the transcendental authority ascribed to the writer/poet (p. 130). Following Barthes's complete absence of the author, the conventional approach to the poet as the genius with full authority

began to change. Language poetry[12] was one of the first movements that welcomed and promoted such a change, suggesting that interpreting poetry with a reference to a poetic voice, separate from the poet, coherent and solid in itself like the transcendental poet themself was passé now that it was an era of fluid subjecthoods, multiple identities, and incomplete selves (Perloff, 2014, pp. 133-4). Perloff (2014) states that even though the Language movement started as an act in which the poets had more or less the same agenda and technique, the movement has expanded over the past twenty years or so to include much more diversified poetries with poets who now have their own understandings of the disposal of the transcendental "I" as well as the poetic voice (p. 153). In that sense, Language writing became even more fluid regarding what differentiates a subject.

The possibility to renegotiate subjecthood in poetry matched with the feminist criticism of the day, which challenged both the patriarchal, mind-oriented, authoritative subject and the feminist literature which granted the floor only to a small percentage, failing to be inclusive and diversified enough vis-à-vis other subjecthoods, identities, ethnicities, and belongings. As a result, Language poetry - which in fact started out as a Marxist movement (Perloff, 2014, p. 162)- attracted many woman poets including Susan Howe, Johanna Drucker, Rosmarie Waldrop, Kathleen Fraser, and so on (Perloff, 2014, pp. 162-3). In that sense, Language poetry which had been heavily influential particularly during the late 80s was in conversation with feminism, feminist criticism and writing in particular, regarding the way they both approach the transcendental "I" of conventional poetry.

---

[12] The Language movement was initiated with the establishment of L=A=N=G=U=A=G=E journal in early 1980s, where a group of poets stated that they abandoned the traditional understanding of the poet as the isolated, transcendental genius, in favor of a more pluralistic approach which does not grant any poetic voice the position of fulfilled, coherent, and singular subjecthood, namely the poetic persona (Perloff, 2014, pp. 130-3).

Interested in innovative poetry by women, Redell Olsen (2008), too, focuses on this transcendental "I" as the coherent subject existing in the lyric poetry and its relation to women's innovative writing (p. 375). For her, "I" in Language writing is the employment of "a variety of different textual strategies… undermin[ing] the notion of a bounded and coherent 'I' whose experience could be directly accessed through poetic language" (Olsen, 2008, p. 374). She argues that an attempt to approach feminist poems to see if the lyric I is employed or not inevitably leads to the remodeling of what the avant-garde poetry by women stands against, that is, the presupposition that there must exist a coherent and fixated I notwithstanding its employment in the poem (Olsen, 2008, p. 375). This way, leaving the conventional understanding of the subjecthood in poetry itself becomes a feminist act in itself.

The idea that patriarchal literary conventions were not comprehensive enough to express subjecthoods other than "the male" was dominant in feminist criticism of the 1980s, too. During the 80s, feminists were focused on diversifying the voices that that feminist criticism took into account (Humm, 1998, pp. 15-6). It expanded its scope by including the social ideologies structures that shape sexist and gendered ways of approaching literature. As pluralistic as it became over the decade, feminist criticism of the early 80s was not fully open to different identities, other than those belonging to white, heterosexual, Euro-American, upper-mid class feminists (Humm, 1998, pp. 16-7). In response to, and also in conversation with the post structuralist and postmodernist theories, feminist literary criticism began to question the subject of women's writings (Humm, 1998, p. 15). Toril Moi, for example, wrote the first introduction to feminist literary theory in English, in her book *Sexual/Textual Politics*, where she questioned the essentialist approaches to identity and self in literary theory (Humm, 1998, pp. 15-6). Concurrently, the French feminists, too,

were challenging the authoritative subjecthood granted to the mind- and ration-oriented male author. They attempted to desert the patriarchal paradigms of literary criticism and instead suggested that there could be a feminist version which took into account woman, her experiences, and her corporeality (Humm, 1998, pp. 16-8).

Such debates about who the subject is, who can speak for and/or as women, who the woman is, or who we deem the woman writer to be perforce entailed the question of ethnicity, background, and sexual identity. During the 1980s, particularly towards the end of the decade, feminist criticism finally began to fully embrace different identities and make room for women who are not given the same opportunities as the white, heterosexual, Euro-American, upper-mid class women. The question of who speaks via the language and what sort of language that person uses found correspondence in the social structures, too. That is to say, the identity crisis of the 80s feminism was interested in the linguistic ontology of women on the one hand, and in the sociopolitical macro structures that define certain women as black, lesbian, Jewish, etc. (Humm, 1998, pp. 18-9) on the other. The racial and sexual differences in feminists, combined with the rise of the black movement of the day and the developing identity-based gender politics, caused feminist criticism to take a more inclusive and diversified stance. Black writing and identity politics influenced many feminists on how they define a feminist subject and how blind they might be to other social structures that cause discrimination (Humm, 1998, pp. 19).

Taking into account the feminist politics regarding the gender-based identity formation through language and discourse and considering the possibilities poetic language offers regarding the establishment of new subjecthoods, it becomes essential to explore and develop feminist methodologies to cultivate such potential in academic research. Although various methodologies for critical analysis of discourse

and language have been extant, the one that functions as a tool to bring

interdisciplinary approaches together to analyze discourse with a feminist agenda of

emancipation and liberation is feminist critical discourse analysis (FCDA). As one

of the founding theorists of FCDA, Lazar defines the FCDA as:

> a perspective that seeks to examine the complex, subtle, and sometimes not so
> subtle ways in which frequently taken-for-granted gendered assumptions and
> power asymmetries get discursively produced, sustained, negotiated, and
> contested in specific communities and discourse contexts. With a focus on
> social justice and transformation, the aim is to challenge discourses that
> entrench gendered social arrangements that work toward a closure of
> possibilities for women and men as human persons. (Lazar, 2014, p. 182)

FCDA is therefore a methodology which not only investigates the discursive

strategies which create and foster gender identities according to patriarchal doxa, but

also nurtures the political purposes to defy the patriarchal power mechanisms. It,

therefore, provides the analytical tools the observe the ideologies that feed the

gender-based discriminatory discourse, urge the oppressed ones to gain

consciousness about their positionalities in patriarchal power relations, and invites

them to resist the oppressive structures. For this reason, FCDA becomes a very

useful method for feminist researchers who have a political agenda of serving

feminist purposes.

As much beneficial and useful as FCDA proves to be, it is not widely applied

to literary texts. Criticizing the lack of application of FCDA on literature in general,

children's literature in particular, Sanna Lehtonen points to this gap in literature and

provides a study on how FCDA could be applied to children's fiction. She finds it

crucial that feminist studies focus on children's fiction with political activism for

literature plays a grand role in shaping identities, creating gender roles, and ensuring

that oppressive gender codes are inscribed upon the readers, children in her case

(Lehtonen, 2007, pp. 1-3). She argues that FCDA brings together similar tools used

by different disciplines to yield a more a to-the-point analysis of the texts, which she

exemplifies based on children's fiction (Lehtonen, 2007, pp. 7-9). Her arguments about the benefits of bringing together FCDA and literature as an interdisciplinary social project of feminism proves fruitful.

What FCDA has overlooked even more than literature in general is poetry as a specific type of text in literature. Although poetry, like any other text, constitutes a work of cultural production and thus has the potential to reveal the discursive and ideological acts the discourse-builders, namely the poets, in the corresponding milieu, FCDA has been applied to poetry in only a limited number of cases. One of the works I was able to find was a conference presentation by Parvaneh Khosravizadeh and Sara Mahabadi, where they attempted to compare the poetries of Forough Farrokhzad and Nikki Giovanni under the scope of CDA. In their research, Khosravizadeh and Mahabadi (2011) count the terms in the poems of the two, composing two tables that visualize the frequencies of repetition of certain terms in Farrokhzad's earlier and later works while verbally articulating some of the terms in the earlier and later works of Giovanni (pp. 101-2). They used CDA to determine whether or not there was a chronological shift in the discourses of their poetry based on the content of the poems such as "love and seduction, love of oneself, [and] adulthood and death" (Khosravizadeh & Mahabadi, 2011, p. 101). Shortly thereafter, they mentioned the poetic styles in a comparative fashion (Khosravizadeh & Mahabadi, 2011, pp. 103-4), yet the link between CDA and the rest of the paper including the style section remains a weak one.

A more recent and insightful study of applying FCDA to poetry was conducted by Esther O. Ohito and Tiffany M. Nyachae, on Black feminist poetry regarding how FCDA proves to be a rigorous method. In this work, Ohito and Nyachea (2018) argue that both poetry and FCDA are used as the means which could

have the sociopolitical goal of liberating (p. 2). By bringing them together, the researchers become able to unfold how Black feminists make political use of language through poetry. Their focus is on how to preserve rigor as one applies FCDA to poetry, for which they focus on the devices of "narrating the process of interpretation" and "crafting the description of findings" (Ohito and Nyachae, 2018, p. 2), with "creativity and voice" as their main categories to reveal the oppression Black women are exposed to. After analyzing four poems from various Black poets, they argue that FCDA can be applied to poetry as a rigorous method and poetry could be subjected to data analysis as a form of text, like any other text (Ohito and Nyachae, 2018, p. 8-9). They conclude that the process of writing the Black feminist poetry reveals political implications about the oppressedness of the Black feminists, and thus Black feminist poetry is responsive to FCDA (Ohito and Nyachae, 2018, p. 9)

Applying FCDA to poetry allows room for the researchers to observe how feminist poets reject the patriarchal self that is holistic, concrete, solid, transcendental, and mind-oriented, and instead establish their own subjecthoods that are, in fact, various projection of the self, which can never be fulfilled. Although it is possible to locate different versions of the self as subjecthoods, the sum of these subjecthoods would never equate to a coherent self, since subjects keep interacting with other lived bodies and change through these interactions to establish new subjecthoods. Thus, there can be no rigid entity that we can pinpoint as the self. What we capture can only be one located version of the self. Taking this standpoint, poetry and poetic discourse become inseparable from the subject who creates them, namely the poet. To use the conventional terminology, every *voice* that we hear in the poem is a voice that is chosen, created and executed by the poet. That is to say,

each artistic choice behind the voices, each political decision to include what sort of topics in the poems, each linguistic selection in terms of form, shape, sound, and rhythm necessitate that the poet themself is present in the poem. The subjecthood that writes the poem is a projection of the poet. As a result, applying FCDA to poetry gains even more significance, for it allows the researchers to understand the political agendas of the poets who themselves are oppressed by the patriarchal power relations. Language in poetry, in that sense, functions as a macro structure that locates various subjecthoods. Yet the difference between the sociopolitical macro structures -e.g. gender, race, class- and the macro structure of language of poetry is that in the macro structure of language of poetry, the poet is the one who creates the doxa, and who decides how and which subjects are to be located under what conditions. This difference is important because poetry becomes a platform charged with the potential to refuse the given subjecthoods and establish new subjecthoods of poet's choice. In that sense, poetry as a way of deconstructing the subjecthood given by the symbolic, by the everyday language, by the law of the father has the potential to serve a feminist purpose, which is demolishing the gendered locatedness of subjecthood and reconstituting new subjecthoods, independent of patriarchal doxa, via "a language of our own". Therefore, each discourse built in poetry, each linguistic and artistic choice made to compose poems, and each poetic device used to reinstate the subjecthoods in the macro structure of language offers a political stance. In the case of Adrienne Rich and Sennur Sezer, both known for their political activism in defense of women's rights, this stance is closely related to the notion of gender and how to fight against and create resistance towards patriarchy while raising awareness about the macro structure of gender that locates women as the inferior other.

CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

Even though poetic language allows room for the establishment of multiple

subjecthoods and thus has the potential to provide tools for feminist purposes, very

little research has been conducted on feminist poetry with a political feminist aim in

Critical and Cultural Studies or related disciplines. In order to understand how

subjecthoods are located in macro structures, create a feminist resistance against

them, and establish new subjecthoods, examining the poems of women who have a

feminist agenda would prove fruitful. I chose Adrienne Rich and Sennur Sezer, for

there has not been any research comparing their poetries, even though they were each

other's contemporary and wrote political poetry with a particular focus on women

and gender equality. Looking at the subjecthoods established by two political poets

who lived contemporaneously at different corners of the world and published poetry

collections in the same year offered the potential to observe if lived body and poetic

language together present a new feminist approach to analysis of poetry as a cultural

text. For I wanted to cultivate that potential, my research question became: "How do

the poems in *An Atlas of the Difficult World* by Adrienne Rich and *Afiş* by Sennur

Sezer respond to feminist critical discourse analysis, with regards to reflections of the

political and personal agendas of the poets on their poetic discourses?"

4.1. Towards a multidisciplinary and feminist research model in poetry as a cultural

text

In this research, my objective is to portray the discursive similarities in the works of

Adrienne Rich and Sennur Sezer, comparing the books they published in 1991, *An*

Atlas of the Difficult World and *Afiş [Poster]* respectively. I benefited from feminist critical discourse analysis (FCDA) to lay down the discursive similarities between the two poets who composed their poems as political activists concerned with women's struggle, at separate corners of the world in the same era. I chose to run FCDA for it allowed me to position myself as a feminist researcher, carrying out the academic purpose of cultivating knowledge as well as the political purpose of feminist transformation.

Although it is unconventional for critical discourse analysis to be applied to poetry, I chose this methodology to analyze the poems in question for a number of reasons. The preliminary research I conducted on the poems by various techniques including close-reading and post-structural analysis suggested that there were a number of common themes and poetic techniques both Rich and Sezer used. The common themes like the gendered body and locatedness as well as the shared techniques of building imagery, called attention to the discursive and linguistic similarities between the poets. As a result, instead of using the methodologies of literature, which would allow me to read the poems in-depth with one primary focus, I looked at the techniques used in Critical and Cultural Studies which would enable the analysis to be more interdisciplinary, and thus unfold the relationality between the two books as well as the dynamics between poetry as a cultural text and discourse.

One of the noticeable texts that sets a methodological relationship between poetry and discourse is Barbara Johnstone's *Discourse Analysis* (2018), where she refers to Tannen to argue that discourse owes some portion of its influence on the addressees to its aesthetic value and style (p. 97). What discourse communicates to the addressees cannot be considered separate from its style, and thus the style itself

becomes a determining part of the ideological speech acts underlying in any given discourse. She, then, adapts Jacobson's functions of discourse and accentuates the function of the poetic discourse: "When the focus of discourse is on the message itself, the actual look, sound, and structure of the discourse, then it is *poetic* in function. ('Poetic,' in this sense, means something like 'artistic,' not necessarily 'poetry-like.')" (Johnstone, 2018, p. 98). Taking into account that Johnstone (2018) acknowledges the ritualistic and thus cultural elements of poetry in the section "Poetics, Grammar, and Culture" (pp. 49-50), her remark about the poetic function of discourses like poetry provides the grounds for researchers to apply discourse analysis to works of poetry to discover the cultural, social, and ideological dynamics that shape the texts in question. Because discourse depends on aesthetics and style, the poetic function of discourse -which is centered precisely on the message itself, bears the potential to re-read the style as well as the content of poems as discursive narratives.

I found Johnstone's input inspiring and began to contemplate on what type of discourse analysis I must choose to apply to poetry and decided to investigate critical discourse analysis (CDA) first, as a result of which I came across the works of Paul Chilton. In an article where he criticizes the lack of mainstream applications of CDA, Chilton acknowledges poetry as a discourse. In the section where he argues that cognitive aspects of discourse are noteworthy in CDA, Chilton (2005) lists a number of discourses which might be the object of the cognitive act of blending (p. 38). Although he mentions poetry only as one example of such discourses and never revisits the idea of poetry as a discursive prop to be analyzed by CDA, the underlying meaning communicates to the reader that poetry can be analyzed with CDA.

As promising as Chilton's remarks were, it was very difficult to find any research that approached poetry with CDA. Identifying the lack of such research urged me to delve more on how I, as a researcher, can best approach poetry as a discourse that entails broader meanings as cultural signifiers. As a result of my attempts to comprehend the cultural aspects of discourse in general, poetic discourse in particular, I looked at the cultural approach to critical discourse analysis (CCDA). In an article where Dalia Gavriely-Nuri introduces CCDA, she argues that discourse can be found in many different narratives, including social practices, which constitute meanings as cultural codes (2012, p. 80). For Gavriely-Nuri "[c]ultural codes operate like the skeleton in a human body" (2012, p. 81) and only through analyzing these codes a researcher could unfold the meanings of social practices. Her approach to CDA suggests that discourse is not only an act of language but also an act of the social, verbal and non-verbal respectively (Gavriely-Nuri, 2012, p. 79). CCDA examines how the cultural aspects of the verbal and non-verbal discourses creates abuses of power (Gavriely-Nuri, 2012, pp. 78-9). Although I acknowledge the importance of such methodology in which the verbal and the non-verbal are treated alike, I needed a methodology that leaned more towards the verbal since poetry is not only verbal in nature but also creates another verbal layer through imagery. Additionally, I had to choose a methodology with a more defined positionality vis-à-vis the abuses of power, for I wanted to discover gendered power relations. As a result, CCDA did not successfully match my purposes.

My next focus, thus, was on feminist research methodologies. Since I benefited from post-structural analysis in my preliminary research, feminist poststructuralist discourse analysis (FPDA) attracted my attention as a potential methodology. FPDA is one of the options that focuses on the gendered ways of how

abuses of power are established through discourse, argues Judith Baxter. For her, FPDA focuses on "the discursive construction for subjectivity" (Baxter, 2008, p. 2) with no emancipatory agenda. In other words, FPDA analyzes discourse without setting a dominant group as opposed to an oppressed one so that the analysis plays a liberating role on the side of the oppressed. For that, FPDA welcomes as many voices as possible into the analysis, in line with Bakhtinian heteroglossia. It, thus, looks at discourse in synchronic and diachronic aspects (Baxter, 2008, p. 5). My analyses of Rich and Sezer were limited to the poems they published in 1991 and lacked the diachronic aspect. Moreover, I wanted my analysis to have an emancipatory agenda, for I regarded myself as a feminist activist in the realm of academics. Adding to these the fact that FPDA is not a primary methodology but a supplementary one (Baxter, 2008, p. 8), FPDA could not be the methodology I applied in this research.

For I wanted my analysis to yield results that aim to make a change in the ways we approach poetry and to regard it as a cultural text to be analyzed, feminist critical discourse analysis (FCDA) proved more useful than FPDA. Although FPDA is less commonly applied and thus has more potential for discovery (Baxter, 2008, p. 1), FCDA allows the possibility to analyze the poetic discourses, portray the differences in similarities, drive conclusions from such portrayal, and call for changes in attitude, discourse, and methodology while allowing the researcher to establish and maintain their positionality (Lazar, 2007, pp. 151-2, 160). Yet, I was unable to find any research where a feminist researcher analyzes poetry with FCDA even though there have been some projects in which the researchers ran CDA on poetry. The examples of even CDA being applied to poetry are limited in number and questionable in technique, as argued above. For this reason, running an FCDA

on poetry presented itself as an opportunity to serve the secondary purpose of exploring the advantages and disadvantages of such methodology. Introducing the benefits FCDA yields in the field of poetry and the techniques I have developed to overcome the issues related to the indirect nature of poetic discourse while unfolding the limitations of such methodology played a role in my decision to apply FCDA.

4.2 Feminist critical discourse analysis (FCDA)

My decision to run FCDA on the poems of Rich and Sezer necessitates that I define what I understand from feminist methodology, as a feminist myself. Since feminism is an eclectic movement with many enriching approaches not only in practice but also in theory, the term feminist has many connotations. Therefore, it is beyond crucial that I clearly state what makes my methodology a feminist one: Using lived body as a key term for feminist studies while keeping the notion of gender as a macro structure, bringing to the front the long-overlooked corporeality which has been associated with women, examining the works of two women who defended women's rights, and trying to offer a new and feminist method in our approach to poetry analysis.

I consider the centrality of the notion of the lived body in my analysis to be a feminist stance, for contemporary feminist movements welcome individual experiences rather than large-scale generalizations that cause essentialism and/or reductionism. I agree with Moi, in that sense, the term gender alone no longer suffices for feminist studies, now that the subjects of the feminist movement and the objects of feminist studies are finally diverse. Then again, I agree with Young, too, on her argument that gender as a macro structure is necessary to express the shared experiences of those who have been subjected to systematic sexist and non-inclusive

51

behaviors. So long as gender is not regarded as something that defines a person as an already intrinsic characteristic and provided that it remains as a tool to help us analyze the entrenched structures behind sexist practices, it remains a convenient notion in feminist research. For this reason, I maintain the notion of gender not as an intrinsic characteristic but as a macro structure throughout my analysis while focusing on the experiences of the lived bodies to understand what constitutes subjecthoods.

In addition to serving as an alternative to -or bolstering- the notion of gender in feminist studies, the concept of lived body necessarily prioritizes corporeality, something which the traditional approaches in epistemology and ontology undermined. As Grosz argues, body has been not only regarded as the inferior other in the fabricated duality of body and mind but also associated with womanhood. Even today, the body politics of governments concentrate heavily upon the non-male bodies, issuing regulations and expressing perspectives on abortion, birth control, appropriate attire, motherhood, and the like. Hence, bringing body to the center and owning the discourse on our own corporeality itself is a feminist act.

Furthermore, I believe choosing two women who had the political agenda of women's emancipation and gender equality as the poets of the study is another aspect that makes my research feminist since it grants the possibility to observe the ways in which two women from separate corners of the world tried to cope with the oppressive patriarchal practices they were exposed to as women, to witness their attempts to stand in solidarity with other women, and to see the feminist ways of building a poetic discourse of our own. I believe, as a feminist researcher, I should focus more on the works of women, of feminist women in particular, so that we can

have a writing of our own -with methodologies appropriated for feminist purposes-
in the academics as well.

Lastly, my attempt to apply feminist critical discourse analysis to the poems
of two women with feminist agendas through the concept of lived body carries the
objective to exhibit whether it is possible to reconsider the conventional ways in
which we approach texts in general, and poetry as an example. Instead of keeping the
author either fully outside from or completely inside in their texts while interpreting
poetry, the lived body allows us to acknowledge the fluidity of the self and thus
locate some projection of the poet in the poems, regardless of which conventional
category (e.g. lyric poetry, or confessional poetry) the poems belong to. This way, I
aim to set a feminist challenge against the patriarchal approach of categorizing
poetry according to the mind-oriented male subject and the conventional methods of
analyzing poetry which neglect the body as well as women's experiences of writing
with and through their corporeality. Therefore, I believe my decision to apply FCDA
to poetry on my own terms serves feminist purposes.

Since I was not able to find any preceding research in which a feminist
critical discourse analysis was applied to poetry, I had to develop my own categories
and discursive units. In CDA and FCDA, the unit with which the researcher works is
usually words and sentences. However, in poetry, words and sentences alone do not
offer a healthy analysis, for poetic language purposefully defies the rules of
linguistics. Words and sentences become of value only when they are placed in an
imagery. For that reason, I decided to take poetic images as my main unit in
analyzing the discourses built by the poets. That is to say, instead of focusing on the
words, their immediate meanings, and their ideological understatements, I focused on
the images words contain, possibly but necessarily their immediate meanings, and

the ideological understatements offered by the different layers of the imagery via poetic devices.

4.3 Modes and methods of analysis

To answer the question "How do the poems in *An Atlas of the Difficult World* by Adrienne Rich and *Afiş* by Sennur Sezer respond to feminist critical discourse analysis, with regards to reflections of the political and personal agendas of the poets on their poetic discourses?" it was necessary to analyze the poems in *An Atlas of the Difficult World* and *Afiş* as primary data with a feminist perspective. To do that, I followed the following steps: 1. primary reading of the poems, 2. grouping of researcher memos, 3. researching the contextual frame, and 4. analyzing the poems.

The primary reading of the poems was the phase during which I read the poems as a feminist scholar with no preliminary concepts. I began the reading with *An Atlas of the Difficult World*, then moved to *Afiş*. *An Atlas of the Difficult World* consists of 13 poems that are divided into two chapters named as I and II. In Chapter I, there is only one poem titled "An Atlas of the Difficult World" which is comprised of 13 interconnected sections. The remaining poems, 12 in total, are placed in Chapter II. *Afiş*, on the other hand, included 23 poems in total, divided into three chapters –namely the untitled introductory chapter comprised of 11 poems, "Eviçi Şiirleri" [Indoors Poems] comprised of six poems, and "Kısa Özgeçmiş" [Short Autobiography] comprised of six poems. As I was reading the poems, I marked the repeating words and wrote researcher memos which reflected the common and frequently visited themes. During this stage, I did not focus on any similarities or differences between the books, which therefore remained independent and separate from one another.

I was able to observe the connections between the books after re-visiting and closely examining the memos of the primary reading. The memos for Rich showed that the most frequent concepts in *An Atlas of the Difficult World* were *body, death and survival, citizenship and country, sense of belonging vs. the lack of belonging, woman and gender, movement, and location*. The memos for Sezer portrayed Sezer's most frequently used concepts as *body, woman and gender, labor, voice, inside vs. outside, violence and pain, and class*. After noting the similarities and differences between the groups of memos, I concluded that the common concepts like body and woman and gender might be the result of the shared milieu of the time, for both poets wrote their poems as a woman and published them in the same year, 1991. The different yet possibly connected concepts suggested that it was possible that these differences were the result of the poets' positionalities, given that Rich lived in the US as a scholar and a lesbian, while Sezer lived in Turkey with very little history of education and in a long-lasting heterosexual marriage.

To become able to have a more translucent understanding of the contextual background that might have impacted the language in the poems, I researched both the political agendas of the 80s in the US and Turkey and the personal agendas of the poets during the same era. As discussed in Chapter 2, the main political matters for the US were about defining the proper citizen and the borders of the country as well as the identity politics shaped by black movement, feminist movement, and gender identities movements. Turkey, on the other hand, was preoccupied with the consequences of the military coup of 1980. The main political debates were about freedom of speech, violation of human rights, feminist movement, suppression of the left, the anxiety of a potential war, and identity politics. The historical locatedness of

the poets pointed that the language they chose to use in their poems might reflect the common political matters like identity politics and feminist movement.

Consequently, I re-visited the poems to understand if the preliminary concepts that the primary analysis yielded and the contextual frame that suggested a parallel between the ideologies of the time and the discourse built by the language in the poems could render any results about the ways the poets use poetic discourse to overcome the power relations of gender. I identified the dominant power relations in the books as the formative power relations, which try to define what and who the subject is, and the social power relations that try to fixate subjects in various micro and macro structures based on their identities. The formative power relations in the poems were primarily concerned with the role of mind and body on forming subjecthoods whereas the social power relations were about the tension between the norms inscribed on subjecthoods and the resistance against such norms. Due to their political positionings, both poets tried to resist and overcome these power structures by building the discourse of corporeality and locatedness.

Having examined the discourse in *An Atlas of the Difficult World* and *Afiş* with the approach I outlined above, I observed that both Rich and Sezer had two main foci in their poems: 1. They take body to be the main determinant of subjecthood, 2. They accentuate the interactions that affect individual subjecthoods within the communities they are placed in. Correspondingly, the FCDA analysis on the poems yielded the following categories:

- Corporeal subjecthoods
  - Locating gendered corporeal subjecthoods
  - Identifying the oppressive power mechanisms and inviting the oppressed to resist them

- Locatedness within communities

    o Locating the "I" within the "we"

    o Calling for new subjecthoods

Table 1 summarizes how these categories respond to the formative and social power relations by exhibiting the main objectives and tools of the poets as they confronted the power relations in question, which will be further discussed in Chapter 5.

Table 1. Strategies of Rich and Sezer to Overcome Power Relations

	Adrienne Rich	Sennur Sezer	Political Implications
Formative Power Relations (Mind vs. Body)	1. Locating gendered corporeal subjecthoods		Defying the mind-oriented understanding of the subject
	Corporeal subjecthoods: fragmented and ambiguous	Corporeal subjecthoods: dissolving into and merging with the surroundings	
	2. Identifying the oppressive power mechanisms and inviting the oppressed to resist them		Defying the patriarchal rigidity and transcendence
	Embrace corporeality	Embrace corporeality	
Social Power Relations (Fixated Self vs. Located Subjecthoods)	1. Locating the "I" within the "we"		Defying the fixated selfhood imposed on the individuals
	The "we": country and gender	The "we": class and gender	Defying the communal associations and patriarchal roles fixated by macro structures, by questioning their validity and meaning
	2. Calling for new subjecthoods		
	Gain a new subjecthood: through movement	Gain a new subjecthood: through voice	

CHAPTER 5

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

ANALYZING *AN ATLAS OF THE DIFFICULT WORLD* AND *AFİŞ*

5.1 Corporeal subjecthoods

Both Rich and Sezer accentuate corporeality as opposed to the mind-oriented self of
the post-Cartesian philosophy in order to defy the conventional understandings of
subjecthood which take into account neither the non-male subjects nor their
corporeality. By bringing forth the corporeality of subjecthoods, the poets express
resistance against the patriarchal conventions that granted subjecthood to mind,
placed mind over body, and associated mind with men and body with women. Body
is what is located within various macro structures and what undergoes interpersonal
and transindividual experiences of the micro structures. In that sense, the body
imagery Rich and Sezer apply is a projection of the lived body of feminism. The way
Rich and Sezer benefit from corporeality exhibit the following pattern:

    - Locating gendered corporeal subjecthoods,

    - Making reference to the oppressive power mechanisms that try to fixate the

    subjecthoods in accordance with the norms of the rigid and transcendental

    subject of patriarchy, and inviting the oppressed ones to become aware of and

    resist such mechanisms.

This pattern is important because it allows the researcher to not only see to what
extent the political agendas of Rich and Sezer as well as the milieu of the time
affected their poems but also identify the ways in which FCDA can be used to
analyze poetry. In this case, FCDA shows that there is a connection between the
poets' interests in identity politics and the corporeal subjecthoods they establish.

Rich has at least one direct reference to corporeality as fragmented and/or ambiguous subjecthoods in all her poems except "1948 Jews", "Tattered Kaddish", "Eastern War Time".[13] Rich's understanding of subjecthood suggests that the self is located as various subjecthoods which cannot be the full representation of the self. The subjecthoods, being ambiguous and fragmented, are only the momentary projections of unfulfilled selfhood. The poems in which this sort of subjecthood becomes the most dominant are "An Atlas of the Difficult World", "That Mouth", "Marghanita", "Olivia", and "Through Corralitos under Rolls of Cloud". As for Sezer, in all her poems, except for "Ağrı Eşiği" [Threshold of Pain] and "Bu Bir İlandır" [This is a Declaration], she establishes corporeal subjecthoods; yet the ones in which the relationship between corporeal subjecthoods and their tendency to dissolve into their surroundings is most prominent in the poems "Ağrıyan" [The one that Hurts]", "Beton Kıyılar" [Concrete Coasts], "Şiir Dersi" [Poetry Lesson], "Amsterdam", "Kısa Özgeçmiş" [Short Autobiography], "Afiş" [Poster], "Güze Önsöz" [Preface to Autumn], and "Gençkızlar" [Young Women]. In this chapter, the examples to illustrate the pattern used by the poets will be provided from the poems "An Atlas of the Difficult World", "That Mouth", and "Marghanita" by Rich, and "Ağrıyan" [The one that Hurts], "Amsterdam", "Kısa Özgeçmiş" [Short Autobiography], "Afiş" [Poster], "Güze Önsöz" [Preface to Autumn], and "Gençkızlar" [Young Women] by Sezer.[14] The following sections investigate how the poets benefit from the concept of the feminist lived body as they politicize the body and locate corporeal sucjecthoods.

---

[13] The listed poems are the ones related to Jewish identity where Rich's main question shifts from the corporeality of subjecthoods to locating the subjecthoods in communities. See Chapter 5.2 for a more detailed discussion.

[14] All translations in this thesis pertaining to Sezer's poems are performed by me. The translations have not been published elsewhere.

5.1.1 Locating gendered corporeal subjecthoods

The subjecthoods Rich and Sezer locate are corporeal subjecthoods that are gendered in various ways. Rich's corporeal subjecthoods are usually immediately marked by linguistic indicators of gender such as the word "woman" or the third person pronouns that specify gender. Sezer's corporeal subjecthoods, on the other hand, are usually established via the first person singular. The language of the pronoun "I" reflects a gendered experience from Sezer's poems even when the linguistic gender indicators are not present since the speaking subjects in the poems are located subjecthoods of Sezer. Additionally, Sezer herself states in many interviews and writings that she writes as a woman for women's voices to be heard, and thus the "I" in Sezer's poems serves as the voice of a woman.

Regardless of the linguistic devices the poets choose to indicate the genderedness of the subjecthoods, they both use corporeality to defy the patriarchal codes inscribed upon those who are identified as women. To defeat the mind- and male-oriented subjecthoods that are presumed to be rigid and transcendent, both Rich and Sezer benefit from body imagery and thus create a discourse of corporeality. Yet, the poets differ in their approaches to body, for Rich depicts a fragmented body in pieces which promises ambiguity whereas Sezer's portrayal of body displays the tension of dissolving and merging with the surroundings. Therefore, the subjecthoods Rich establishes are ambiguous and fragmented while the ones Sezer suggests tend to disintegrate or dissolve into what surrounds them.

Both fragmentedness and dissolving serve as strategies to defy the patriarchal conventions that grants subjecthood to only a rigid and transcendental self, which claims to be the universal self reflecting a true version of human existence and yet remains biased towards patriarchal subject for it does not encompass all subjecthoods

and excludes the experiences of the oppressed ones. Therefore, Rich's strategy to challenge the rigidity of the patriarchal mind-oriented self by establishing fragmented and ambiguous corporeal subjecthoods and Sezer's strategy to establish corporeal subjecthoods that dissolve into the world, which overthrows the pre-eminence of the transcendental patriarchal self are feminist acts become a call for action when the pattern is completed with its third step. To understand how each poet applies their own strategy to establish corporeal subjecthoods that defy the patriarchal self, it would be helpful to provide examples from Rich's and Sezer's poems and explain how each poet benefits from the concept of corporeality in conversation with the notion of feminist lived body.

How Rich establishes her subjecthoods is observable at the beginning of the book, in the first section of the first poem of the book, namely "An Atlas of the Difficult World" where Rich (1993c) welcomes the reader with the line "[a] dark woman, head bent, listening for something" (p. 142). Even in this single line, we come across a vagueness, communicated to the reader with the word "dark". This word is deliberately ambiguous, calling for various possibilities and interpretations. As such, why this person is characterized as dark remains unclear: Is it because of her skin color? Is it related to her education level? Is it about poverty? This ambiguity already sets the poem a poem of possibilities, potentialities, and numerous experiences –all of which are the underlying dynamics of feminist lived body. As a result of the syntactical order, the second thing we learn about this "dark" subject becomes their gender: The dark person is "a woman". Having been gendered at the first step into the poem, the woman is explicitly located in the macro structure of gender, with other possible positions in macro structures of race, education, and class. The third thing the poem informs us of this gendered subjecthood is her

physical situation: Her head is bent and she is listening for something, both of which involve corporeality. She is located as a subject in at least one macro structure, namely that of gender, with her corporeal existence. Furthermore, the act of listening she is involved in entails a reciprocity. That "something" she aims to hear presents possibilities of encounters and conversations. Accordingly, what we observe at this very first footage into the movie Rich is displaying to us is possibilities, gender, corporeality, and reciprocity of potential encounters, respectively – by which Rich begins to draw the frame of her difficult world.

It is possible to argue that the subjecthoods in this difficult world are located in the macro structure of gender as women. One of the reasons for that is that the lines that follow the image of the dark woman include the description of various subjecthoods with references to their corporeality through words like "hand, wrist, throat, wombs" (Rich, 1993c, p. 142, lines 6-10). As argued before, corporeality as the marker of subjecthood necessitates that the established subjecthoods stand against the conventional patriarchal subject that depends on mind and ignores body. Therefore, the corporeal depictions that describe subjecthoods whose identities remain unknown and ambiguous potentially imply that the subjecthoods in this part of the poem are women. Another reason to support the idea that the subjecthoods are women is that Rich refers to domestic labor (e.g. describing the first subjecthood as: "at the sink / rinsing strawberries flocked and gleaming, fresh from market / one says:") and the situation of being inside as opposed to remaining in the public sphere (e.g. through the following statement belonging to another subjecthood: "I live here so I don't have to go out and act") both of which are concepts used by macro structure of gender to fixate subjecthoods as gendered subjects in line with the social roles prescribed upon them. Another indicator of gender takes place with regard to

the first subjecthood, for the statement we hear from her ("finer than my mother's handkerchief / received from her mother, hemmed and initialed / by the nuns in Belgium") suggests a maternal genealogy and woman-oriented linearity and communicates that the speaking subject is also a woman (Rich, 1993c, p. 142). Additionally, the discourse of the statements that follow the first one imply that these subjecthood are from an oppressed group since they describe their conditions with the following phrases: "sleep comes hard", "I'm trying to hold on to my life, it feels like nothing.", "I had to make my life happen / from day to day.   Every day an emergency" (Rich, 1993c, p. 142). The discourse of hardship, privation, and perseverance, the expression of inability to continue life, and the suggestion of possible urgencies threatening the daily life entail that the subjecthoods are experiencing oppression as a result of various power relations, which are like to be predicated primarily upon gender, since the section begins by an image of a woman, continues with corporeality, focuses on domestic labor and interior space, and describes the hardships various subjecthood undergo with reference to maternal lineage and corporeal existence.

Another poem where we can explicitly observe how Rich (2016) establishes corporeal subjecthoods as fragmented and ambiguous as well as gendered entities to defy the male- and mind-oriented understanding of the self who is rigid and transcendental is "That Mouth". In this poem, Rich tries to show that as much as the macro structure of gender tries to fixate individuals, feminist approach to subjecthoods as lived bodies that are corporeal and in conversation with one another could help subjects overcome what the macro structure forces upon them, with the aid of the partial and interdependent nature of their subjecthoods. These corporeal subjecthoods are established as a result of the encounters with others through the

micro structures: "This is the girl's mouth, the taste / daughters, not sons, obtain: / These are the lips, powerful rudders / pushing through groves of kelp, / the girl's terrible, unsweetened taste / of the whole ocean, its fathoms: this is that taste " (Rich, 2016). Right at the first step into the poem, we see corporeality via the reference to a body part which belongs to a gendered subject, namely to the girl. Immediately after these lines, the girl's lips appear and move within the ocean touching the kelps. The girl, deliberately located in the macro structure of gender with an imagery that fragments her body and places her subjecthood to a small part of it. Through her mouth and lips, she moves around in the ocean, which serves as a metaphor for knowledge as the macro structure of gender presents. Subsequently, it is the girl and her corporeality that recognize the doxa of the macro structure of gender, by moving within, and through it. As familiar as she is with the taste of being located as a gendered subject, her subjecthood will never amount to a full selfhood, for the self cannot be fulfilled. The subject who continues to live as lived body will come across other bodies and keep changing as a result of such encounters. It is, for that reason, an endless process for the self to be located over and over as new subjecthoods, something which Rich portrays in her poems by building fragmented and ambiguous subjecthoods who remain unfulfilled to allow room for such a process.

Rich's choice of using corporeality to defy the patriarchal conventions by establishing fragmented and ambiguous subjecthoods is dominant in the poem "Marghanita", too. In "Marghanita", Rich overthrows the gender-related power relations regarding the body. For that, she first acknowledges that the subjecthoods in the poem are gendered right as the poem begins. The title of the poem, "Marghanita", which is also the name of the main subjecthood described in the poem, is a gendered word, ending with the feminine suffix "–a". In the first scene of the poem, the

readers see Marghanita sitting "at the table counting up / a dead woman's debts" (Rich, 2016). With the excessive use of gendered vocabulary in the first stanza,[15] Rich accentuates that the world within the poem is placed in the macro structure of gendered within which she would focus on the oppressed subjecthoods belonging to women.

Sezer's use of corporeal subjecthoods differs from Rich's use in that Sezer does not focus on the fragmentedness or ambiguity of corporeal existence but establishes subjecthoods that try to become part and parcel of their surroundings. In that sense, location and space become prominent to define subjecthoods. The bodies she depicts are inclined to disintegrate and dissolve into the world. She uses the discourse of disintegration by employing body's either engagement in or disengagement from location in order to preserve unfulfilled selfhoods. The concept of engagement appears more prominent in the poems "Ağrıyan" [The one that Hurts]", "Beton Kıyılar" [Concrete Coasts], "Şiir Dersi" [Poetry Lesson], "Amsterdam", "Kısa Özgeçmiş" [Short Autobiography] while the concept of disengagement remains dominant in "Afiş" [Poster], "Güze Önsöz" [Preface to Autumn], and "Gençkızlar" [Young Women]. Furthermore, the genderedness of Sezer's subjecthoods in these poems are usually communicated as she constructs a discourse that employs the pronoun "I". Since Sezer identifies herself as a woman who writes for and about women, her locatedness in her poems through the language of first person singular provides grounds for the analyst to acknowledge that the

---

[15] The gender indicators and their frequency of appearance are as follows:
"She": five times, "her": three times, "Marghanita": twice, and "woman": once.

corporeal subjecthoods Sezer establishes are gendered as women even when explicit linguistic indicators of gender are not present.[16]

To exemplify the discourse Sezer builds to establish corporeal subjecthoods that engage with their surroundings, it would suffice to study the poems "Ağrıyan" [The one that Hurts], "Amsterdam", and "Kısa Özgeçmiş" [Short Autobiography]. In "Ağrıyan" [The one that Hurts], Sezer insinuates that there is nothing in her chest, no heart or no feelings, after which she states "The street hurts" (Sezer, 2017, p. 227). The language here denies the subject the capacity to be hurt: It is not her who hurts, it is the street. Street as an image, of course, entails the notion of locatedness. Talking about a certain location while trying to express the feelings the subject experiences suggests that the speaking subject perceives itself one with its surroundings, just like the lived body. The lived body is in conversation with the street, the garden, the world. The physiological situation of hurting is not fully separate from the surroundings. It is possible to observe this merge with the surroundings in the poem called "Kısa Özgeçmiş" [Short Autobiography] where we hear the subject saying "The asphalt flashing / allured me" (Sezer, 2017, p. 252), expressing her desire to dissolve into the surface and describing it as a moment of "dizziness" (Sezer, 2017, p. 252). The urge to advance the conversation the subject has with whatever it encounters with comes into being through corporeality (namely the dizziness). Here the subject tries to maximize the oneness with the world, going back to the pre-individual level. Similarly, in the second part of the poem "Amsterdam" the subject says "C'mon! Fill your pockets with the lights ..." (Sezer, 2017, p. 248) to someone she refers to as "stranger" (Sezer, 2017, p. 248). Once the

---

[16] It is should be noted here that in Turkish language the pronoun for third person singular, namely "o", is a gender-neutral word, and thus does not function to explicitly indicate gender, unlike the third person singular in English language.

stranger attempts to mix with the world by trying to absorb the lights through corporeality, the "non-belongingness" of the stranger might abate, as the poem implies. Yet, not belonging to the given location sets an obstacle to full subjecthood, for the stranger can never capture the lights which keep moving away as [the stranger] walk[s] towards them" (Sezer, 2017, p. 248). By choosing to employ an imagery that plays with the sense of belonging (or its absence) with particular attention to its corporeal dimension, Sezer intentionally establishes a strong relationship between situatedness of the subject and its inevitable connection to the body, and thus locates her subjecthoods through their corporeality in her poems.

Sezer's subjects present their unfulfilled selfhoods through their relationship with their surroundings, which might take the form of anxiety of losing locatedness, too. She questions the relationship of the immediate location and the locatedness of subjecthoods, as well as how this contributes to the unfulfilledness of the self as the lived body in her poems, in order to unravel the power relations that try to fixate individuals. Since individuals are gendered in relation to space, as discussed in Chapter 3.2, understanding the role of losing locatedness and corporeality in Sezer's discourse becomes important. To illustrate how Sezer benefits from the concept of disengagements from the location via the dynamics among space, surroundings, corporeality, and the anxiety to lose locatedness to establish corporeal subjecthoods as opposed to patriarchal ones, it would be helpful to study the poems "Güze Önsöz" [Preface to Autumn], and "Afiş" [Poster].

An example for Sezer's technique of building a discourse on anxiety of losing locatedness occurs in the first poem of *Afiş*, namely, "Güze Önsöz" [Preface to Autumn]. She begins the poem by saying "The summer is over" (Sezer, 2017, p. 224), and thus, pointing to the end of an era. The poem communicates a sense of

anticipation that something undesirable might happen now that an era is closed. In eight lines, the poem describes a military atmosphere where "Clasped hands / Fear the loss of the city" (Sezer, 2017, p. 224). The imagery here immediately positions the body (through the word "hands") as the subject while referring to the anxiety of losing a type of locatedness. With the loss of the city -mentioned in the line 8, the subjecthoods located at this particular place and in this particular era would also disappear. Therefore, the poem –beginning with time and ending with place– aims to show the vital role locatedness in time and place plays in establishing subjecthoods.

The same anxiety about losing the subjecthood when losing the locatedness appears again in the second poem of the book, the one that gives the collection its title: "Afiş" [Poster]. Sezer (2017) associates locatedness with identity in the first stanza: "Because I / By scraping off the buildings / Want to look at your faces / What is left?" (p. 225). Asking the vital question of what remains once the locatedness is gone, Sezer suggests that identity -symbolized by face- would disappear if the locatedness of that identity -symbolized by the buildings- disappeared. In the second stanza, the poem moves from the question of located subjecthood to subjecthood established through language: "Because I / As posters cover my voice / Think of love / By scraping of the poem / What is left? (Sezer, 2017, p. 225). Here, instead of the buildings, the subject of the poem scrapes off the poem. Since the subject of the poem can only exist within the poem itself, eliminating the poem itself perforce entails eliminating the locatedness and thus the subjecthood of the subject of the poem. Just like the macro structures within which various subjecthoods are located, the poem serves as a platform which creates its own subjecthoods. Syntactically, too, it is observable that the parallelism in the structure calls for an association between location and poetry, as there is an anaphora between lines 2 and 8 where "scraping

68

off" is followed by "the buildings" and "the poem", respectively. Therefore, the speaking subject remains a subjecthood located within the poem. Striping the subject of the poem off of first their voice and then their linguistic/symbolic locatedness - namely the poem- means cutting them off from language. When the language is lost, the subjecthood established here is also lost. Hence, as the poet of this poem, Sezer advocates that language itself serves as a macro structure that captures various subjecthoods, and that losing locatedness could be in the form of losing locatedness in language, which is a reflection of the debates about the ban on the Kurdish language in Turkey during the 80s.

5.1.2 Identifying the oppressive power mechanisms and inviting the oppressed to resist them

The second strategy Rich and Sezer apply to defy the patriarchal conventions is to make visible the power mechanisms that attempt to shape and fixate subjecthoods, and thus to urge the oppressed subjects to withstand the imposed norms of the macro structures. Regardless of the ways they establish their corporeal subjecthoods, both poets follow the pattern of first identifying oppressive power mechanisms of patriarchy that try to fixate the subjecthoods as mind-oriented, rigid, and transcendental subjects, and second urging the oppressed ones to gain consciousness about such mechanisms in order to resist them. In other words, by depicting women as corporeal subjecthoods who experience oppression regarding the power relations of mind and body as well as gender identity and who can and do claim a space for themselves to speak and make their voices heard, the poets not only exemplify the ways to resist against the given power relations but also invite women to speak up

and make their voices heard so that they can resist and overturn the power relations prevalent in their lives.

The messages they convey to the readers carry the potential to stir the audience into becoming active political agents who resist the existing patriarchal codes. For this reason, every message delivered to the reader either by directly addressing them or by assuming that they will hear the indirect undertone of the lines not explicitly addressed to them plays an important role on the emancipatory agenda of the poets. In other words, as the poets locate the readers via the discourse they build, within which they also locate themselves, they create a conversation between them and their readers. Such conversation aims to bring the oppressed ones together, generate a sense of solidarity, and serves as a call for action.

To illustrate how Rich implements her strategies of defiance through language, it would be helpful to revisit the poems analyzed in the previous section, namely "An Atlas of the Difficult World", "That Mouth", and "Marghanita". Recalling the statements[17] of the women located in the first section of "An Atlas of the Difficult World", we can observe that the significance of these statements expands the function of indicating genderedness. Firstly, by depicting the oppressedness of women who are described with their corporeality, Rich problematizes the mind-oriented understanding of subject and depicts the political outcomes of such an approach. Since the statements suggest that the women who exist as corporeal subjecthoods are oppressed due to their gender identities, Rich tries to show that by prioritizing a certain type of subjecthood, namely that of the

---

[17] In the first section of the poem, Rich incorporates some statements of her located subjecthoods as quotations. The examples of used in the previous chapter are: The "I live here so I don't have to go out and act", "finer than my mother's handkerchief / received from her mother, hemmed and initialed / by the nuns in Belgium", "sleep comes hard", and "I'm trying to hold on to my life, it feels like nothing.", "I had to make my life happen / from day to day.   Every day an emergency" (Rich, 1993c, p. 142-3)

patriarchal subjects who are presumed to be rigid, coherent, and transcendent, macro structures create and foster the power relations between mind and body as well as among gender identities. Secondly, in addition to showing the political implications of granting valid and full agency only to the patriarchal oppressors, the statements also emphasize the fragmentedness of the alternative subjecthoods standing in defiance to the transcendental ones fixated by patriarchal power structures. After describing subjecthoods through body parts like "hand, wrist, throat, and womb" (p. 142), Rich (1993c) partitions the language in the poem too through the interruptions that come as the statements of other subjecthoods, which are incorporated into the text via quotation marks. The fragmentedness of the body of the text is in parallel with the fragmentedness of the corporeal subjecthoods that are described right before the quotations. Lastly, the fact that the statements are communicated via quotation marks as separate, independent discourses in themselves functions to provide space for the subjecthoods from the oppressed group in terms of patriarchy to speak for themselves. Women are able to express their feelings and thoughts in their own words within special spaces they claim in the macro structure of the language in the poem, which are distinguished from the rest of the text by the invisible lines created by the quotation marks.

Rich's strategy to locate gendered subjecthoods to cause them to act against oppression presents itself also as accentuating the different positions taken by different gender identities in the macro structure of gender. It is possible to observe this in the second stanza of the poem "That Mouth" with the lines "This is not the father's kiss, the mother's: / father can try to choke you, / a mother drown you to save you", where Rich (2016) marks the differences between gender identities regarding the ways they respond to power relations. The patriarchal subject tries to

71

annihilate other subjects to assert his power and achieve transcendence whereas the oppressed subject annihilates other subjecthoods only to protect them from the oppression. She remains in dialogue and solidarity with other subjecthoods upon whom the patriarchal doxa inflicts gender codes that reinforce the power relations between gender identities. Another difference between the two acts of annihilating subjecthoods is that the mother tries to "drown" while the father tries to "choke". Both verbs involve the situation of cutting someone's connection to air to potentially kill them, yet the former involves fluidity and offers a trade-off between air and fluids during the act of dying/killing. In that sense, while the oppressor in the patriarchal macro structures kills only to destroy, the oppressed kills to generate an alternative value and tries to diffuse into the subject they killed by turning the act into an encounter of lived bodies through the trade-off between air and fluids. The tendency to generate and the fluidity present in the act of drowning marks the difference between the ways the oppressor and oppressed respond to the power mechanisms the macro structure of gender. Another example of this gender differentiation regarding positionality takes place in the following and last stanza. Particularly with the lines "that mouth / described as a girl's– / enough to give you a taste: / Are you a daughter, are you a son?" Rich (2016) conveys that she has introduced the gendered world to the readers and now asks them to question their positionality in order to try to understand the world from the standpoint of the oppressed. This way, in this poem Rich not only describes the macro structure of gender in terms of corporeality and interconnectedness but also invites the readers to acknowledge their locatedness so as to see the mechanisms that try to fixate them and strive to overcome the power relations which cause such positionalities.

Rich's conversation with the readers allows her to introduce them to different positionalities in terms of gender identity as well as convey them the message that these positionalities are negotiable and thus vincible. Returning to the poem "Marghanita" as another example, we observe that the prevailing power relations become most visible in the third stanza where Rich implies that there occurred a gender transition at some point in the life of the now "dead woman" (Rich, 2016). Here, Rich uses words like "a box of false eyelashes and fingernails", "a set of veils", and "a string of pearls" (Rich, 2016) to depict two things: First, body is fragmented and ambiguous. Second, this fragmented and ambiguous body can resist what the macro structure of gender imposes upon it. In that sense, the corporeal existence provides grounds for the oppressed subjecthoods to renegotiate their bodily existence and resist to the patriarchal bifurcations that categorize subjecthoods as women and men alone. This is the political dimension of what Rich does in this poem: She uses the corporeal subjecthoods of the women in her poem to call other women to own their bodies and gainsay the inscriptions that the patriarchal power relations about the body impose. The last stanza begins by the lines "Marghanita will / take care of it all" (Rich, 2016), leaving the readers with the image of a strong, accomplished, and confident woman, which exemplifies the emancipatory agenda Rich has.

Even though their ways of establishing corporeal subjecthoods differ, Sezer's emancipatory agenda is very similar to that of Rich's. After locating corporeal subjecthoods, Sezer unfolds the political structures that try to fixate these subjecthoods in the form of the transcendental and mind-oriented patriarchal subject, and urges the oppressed subjects to gain consciousness of their positionalities in order to become able to overturn them. The poems "Ağrıyan" [The one that Hurts],

"Kısa Özgeçmiş" [Short Autobiography], and "Gençkızlar" [Young Women]

represent the political dimension of the located subjecthoods in Sezer's discourse.

In "Ağrıyan" [The one that Hurts], the subject conveys that she does not have

anything left, not even hope, and communicates her indifference to see the world and

acknowledge the diversity in it, through the lines "I open my hand / To cover my

face / It makes no difference whether I wear my glasses or not / The youngsters look

alike" (Sezer, 2017, p. 227). The fact that she articulates a discourse in which she

reflects how despondent and detached she is matches the political atmosphere of the

era during which Sezer was composing her poems. The governmental oppression of

the 80s in Turkey required the citizens to abide by the suppressive regulations which

restricted their freedom, confided them to interior spaces, deprived them of hope, and

forced them to submit to the rigid, military, and thus patriarchal modes of living.

Hence, the regulations not only created a dark and bleak atmosphere which affected

the individuals on a daily basis but also enforced a strictly rational categorization

between private and public, inside and outside, banned and allowed, unaccepted and

accepted, based on patriarchal oppression mechanisms. In that regard, the language

of the subjecthood located in this poem reflects the milieu of the era, and therefore

serves as an example of how Sezer places her corporeal subjecthoods in macro

structures. Yet she suggests the possibility of overcoming such macro structures via

the discourse of pain that she builds in this poem. Pain is the common factor of the

subject and her surroundings, it is the experience that brings them together.

Correspondingly, through the corporeality marked by the pain, the oppressed

subjects are able to find ways to merge with the world as a way of resisting the

rigidity and transcendence of the patriarchal doxa. Therefore, the poem carries the

traces of the oppressive 80s in Turkey as well as the ways to possibilities of defying the oppressive mechanisms.

Likewise, in "Kısa Özgeçmiş" [Short Autobiography], Sezer (2017) signals the end of a difficult era, particularly in the following lines where she borrows a phrase from folkloric tales: "'Iron sandals are pierced / Iron scepter is bent / The road has come to an end' / It's over… It's over…" (p. 252). The borrowed phrase alludes to the folkloric trope that a person who will begin a long and difficult journey wears iron sandals and carries an iron scepter so that they would remain undamaged throughout the journey. The fact that the iron sandals and scepter are damaged - "pierced" and "bent" (Sezer, 2017, p. 252)- conveys that the journey was extremely corrosive, which is followed by a line that communicates the hardships are behind now. The lines "It's over… It's over…" carries an undertone of relief that the journey is over, which reflects the relief felt owing to the end of the extreme measures taken by the government of the military coup which included murders and torture. Even though the violence of the 80s is now over, the corrosive and damaging impacts left their traces on the subjecthoods located in Turkey in that era, which finds embodiment as indifference and hopelessness in the previous poem, and "pierced" and "bent" state of minds in this one. Yet, in this poem too, the call for action against the violence of the power mechanisms is present, as Sezer ends her poem with a tone of hope. Looking back at the past, she finds what happened "[d]esperate and ridiculous" (Sezer, 2017, p. 252) right after she expresses her urge to dissolve into the world. Therefore, Sezer's technique of using the "I" as the example of someone who has survived and resisted the oppressive macro structures to convey her political emancipatory message serves to provide hope for the subjects who are oppressed in similar ways.

In "Gençkızlar" [Young Women], after locating gendered corporeal subjecthoods, Sezer establishes bond between body and location, through which she unfolds the impacts of the locatedness on subjecthood and what this might mean in terms of power relations within macro structures. In this poem, too, it is possible to observe how Sezer uses the communication of corporeal subjecthoods with their surroundings as a possible strategy for women to reestablish their subjecthoods. In the first stanza, we see an image where the body and location are pictured as dispersed parts with no sense of belonging:

> They resemble sailboats. Their hair are in haste to run away. (Even though in the evenings, like a nomad tent, they crease). They miss the sea, their trunks dragged to the shore, on mountain tops. Look, all this jewelry around their arms, and the burdens of the nomad around their necks. They wait for the wind. With their eyes on the sky: If only the moon would rise. (Sezer, 2017, p. 213)

Here, the bodies of women are described in such a way that creates the image that they dissolve into their surroundings. However, these surroundings do not point to a stable household, but to a nomad life throughout which the location keeps changing. The hair of the women is neglected like the nomad tent is creased as a result of being transported frequently. Rootlessness of the tent -as well as the sailboats with which women bear resemblance- accentuates the rootlessness of the bodies of the women. This sense of non-belonging is further communicated with the references to the body parts of those women, compartmentalized and isolated. Their hair, arms, necks, and eyes are described in separate lines, not completely detached from the bodies but creating a sense of rootlessness of nomadic practices. The repetition of the word "nomad" emphasizes this rootlessness, this split between the identity and location. This is important because the discourse Sezer chooses to employ suggests that oppressed subjects like the women in the poem can resist the norms inscribed on them by the patriarchal habitus within the field, and establish their own subjecthoods

by acknowledging their locatedness and renegotiating the relationship they have with their locatedness. Their corporeality functions as the key to overpower the mind-oriented categorization and rigidity of patriarchal macro structures. The metaphor of nomadicity, in that sense, draws attention to the vital role locatedness could play re-establishing one's own subjecthoods (which are symbolized as the body parts in the poem). As much as they stand separate and isolated, these body parts/subjecthoods are still inclined to merge with their surroundings as a way of resistance. The hair of the women has not yet run away, their trunks are still sailed, and their eyes still expect to see the moon. That is to say, there is still a possibility for the oppressed subjects to struggle against the patriarchal power mechanisms to claim independence and freedom, which exemplifies the tone of hope Sezer uses as the strategy to communicate her political aims regarding women's emancipation.

To sum up, both Rich and Sezer establish corporeal subjecthoods to disrupt the patriarchal sense of fulfilled selfhood, yet the former tends to place emphasis on the fragmentedness and ambiguity of the corporeal subjecthoods whereas the latter portrays corporeal subjecthood in relation to their surroundings, trying to merge and thus remaining in constant dialogue with the world. For that, both poets follow the pattern of first locating gendered corporeal subjecthoods and second identifying the oppressive power mechanisms and inviting the oppressed to resist them. In the first step of this pattern Rich establishes fragmented and ambiguous subjecthoods whereas Sezer establishes subjecthoods that dissolve into the world. By establishing such subjecthoods, both poets defy the conventional patriarchal standards of appropriate subjectness: Their subjects are not fixated as rigid, coherent, and transcendental individuals but are fluid, obscure, and unfulfilled subjecthoods. In the second step of their pattern, Rich and Sezer share the aim of marking the oppressive

patriarchal mechanisms and urging the oppressed ones to acknowledge their locatedness to overcome the patriarchal doxa imposed on them. They both draw attention to gender identities and positionalities within the macro structure of gender wherein the habitus tries to fixate the corporeal subjecthoods, who engage with one another as lived bodies, as either the patriarchal self or the unapproved Other. The poets invite the oppressed subjects to claim space for themselves and establish their own unyielding corporeal subjecthoods in response to the mind-oriented, rigid, transcendent understanding of the patriarchal self.

5.2 Locatedness within communities

The analysis yielded that, after locating gendered corporeal subjecthoods, Rich and Sezer explore the relationship between subjects and the immediate communities within which they are placed. Since the encounters within the social structures as well as the habitus of the immediate communities play a role on the establishment of subjecthoods, the poets try to unfold the social mechanisms that affects the subjecthoods. By causing the oppressed subjects to realize and explore their locatedness, which allows room for them to appreciate various subjecthoods, Rich and Sezer strive to defy the fixated selfhood imposed on the individuals. As a result, the discourse in their poems functions to frustrate the social power relation between the fixated self and located subjecthoods.

In order to resist the conventional patriarchal understanding of the fixated self, that is, a person who follows the doxa within the field in accordance with the categorization they is forced into by the power holders, it becomes crucial to become aware of the intrapersonal relationships one is engaged in and the macro structures one is placed within. To accomplish this, both poets follow two strategies. Firstly,

they locate the "I" within the "we" as a way of resistance against the communal associations fixated by macro structures by questioning their validity and meaning. For Rich, the "we" in question becomes country while for Sezer it is class, yet they both consider gender as the overarching macro structure that includes the corresponding communities in question. Secondly, they point to the ways of gaining new subjecthoods so as to defy the roles assigned to the oppressed subjects by the micro structures. Rich centralizes movement as the key factor to gain new subjecthoods whereas Sezer focuses on the function of voice for the same purposes.

5.2.1 Locating the "I" within the "we"

Locating the subject through their corporeality in corresponding macro structures entails the process of identifying the transindividual interactions that take place in the micro structures. For Rich and Sezer, identifying those structures means to unravel the ways gendered corporeal subjecthoods are oppressed as a result of the power mechanisms that try to fixate subjecthoods according to the patriarchal conventions and categories. As a result, once a subjecthood is located, their relation to their immediate circle becomes constitutive in understanding the experiences and encounters the subject undergoes under the oppressive macro structures. For his reason, Rich and Sezer focus on the communities that play a determining role on patriarchal identity formation. By marking the influences that try to shape subjecthoods, the poets demonstrate the possibility of rejecting the oppressive identity formation that aims to fixate subjecthoods in the categories that patriarchal doxa enforces and urge the oppressed subjects to claim their own identities. The immediate communities Rich and Sezer identify are that of country and class, respectively. However, the language in their poems reveal that the poets do not

consider these communities independent of the macro structure of gender. That is to say, even when they focus on the immediate communal circles wherein the subjecthoods are placed, the poets remain cautious about the gender-related oppressive mechanisms that marginalize the ones who are not the power holders and/or who do not yield to the fixating mechanisms of patriarchal identity formation.

The locatedness of the subjecthoods is a central issue for Rich, an issue that remains in constant dialogue with the notion of lived body and corporeal feminism. In her famous "Compulsory Heterosexuality," Rich herself signals her forthcoming tendency to locate the subject in a lived body. What she suggests as the lesbian continuum requires "a range of woman-identified experience" (Rich, 1993b, p. 217). Rich (1993b) regards "the lesbian experience as being, like motherhood, a profoundly female experience, with particular oppressions, meanings, and potentialities we cannot comprehend as long as we simply bracket it with other sexually stigmatized existences" (p. 218). Rich's account of lesbian experience reveals that she recognizes a common experience of different selves, created by the macro structures operating at a broad level to subtly direct the self to constitute the biopolitical subjecthoods the macro structures like, in this case the subjecthood of heterosexual orientation. For her, first acknowledging then unwrapping the way macro structures operate to nurture certain politically charged social groups, like women, lesbians, Jews, etc. means to locate the subject and thus gain a momentary identity. In effect, Rich famously calls herself as a woman, a lesbian, and a Jew. These categories do not define what the self is but exhibit the ways in which macro structures attempt to create subjecthoods. Therefore, calling out the identities one is assigned to is a political act of reconsidering one's own subjecthoods. For Rich, this reconsideration could be achieved through the medium of poetry, where politics has

almost always been acting in concealment despite the traditional assertions claiming the opposite. In "Blood, Bread, and Poetry" Rich states that her approach to the relationship between poetry and politics changed as she read more and more poetry after an influential class she took from Francis Otto Matthiessen. She came to realize that poetry in fact can be political and/or about politics, and poetry up till then was being political as it had placed women in a disadvantageous and hardly realistic position (Rich, 1993a, pp. 242-3). As she kept on negotiating her positions as a woman and a poet, she realized that being compelled to compartmentalize her identity so as to keep the political away from poetry, or the woman from the poet, yielded nothing but an insincere enforcement. Eventually, she refused such compartmentalization and embraced her experiences as a whole, which she reflected onto her poetry (Rich, 1993a, pp. 244-5). This situation eventually urged Rich (1993a) to "write directly and overtly as a woman, out of a woman's body and experience, to take women's existence seriously as theme and source for art" (p. 249).

For Sezer, on the other hand, locatedness of the subjects means not the geography within which the subjects are placed but the macro structures that shape the societal and cultural mechanisms that affect the subjects. Corporeal subjecthoods play a significant role in Sezer's poetry and the locatedness of subject is the foremost determinant of the sociopolitical structures that impact individual existence in lived body. In that sense, every lived body that undergoes certain experiences is situated in larger political frames. To examine the experiences of the lived body, Sezer pays attention to the politics of class and exploitation of labor, in particular (Nacitarhan, 2010, pp. 175-6). As much as she is concerned with the politics of class and exploitation of labor, the locatedness of the subjects in her poetry has an aspect that

reflects corporeality through patriarchy and an involvement with the politics of gender as well (Nacitarhan, 2010, pp. 176-7). As she herself argues in an interview about another book that she wrote, namely *Dilsiz Dengbej*, in which she locates different identities and folkloric works belonging to those identities of various subcultures in Turkey, Sezer underlines the necessity to locate subjecthoods and acknowledge variety in identity, properly welcoming those into poetry. A panoramic representation of a society is only possible when different subcultures within it are located and represented through various subjecthoods situated in the poems, the structure in which cultural values find embodiment (Nacitarhan, 2010, pp. 155). The corporeal existence of not only individual subject but also the cultures wherein they are located is, therefore, a political statement for Sezer.

Between those two poets, Rich's poems reveal themselves more inclined to establish the most dominant community as the community created through the notion of citizenship. Being a citizen with others as a community means to be located in a certain geographical space, namely in a country. For Rich, the community of "we" established by the notion of citizenship remains dependent on a shared geographical and chronological locatedness. Yet, as a person who has questioned her own geographical and chronological belonging based on her Jewishness, Rich's understanding of country as a communal field includes the ethnicity-based community of Jewishness as well. In other words, being a Jew and/or carrying the traces of the history of oppressedness as a Jew is central in Rich's community of citizenship. By locating the subjecthoods in the community of country under the macro structure of gender, Rich makes the oppressive mechanisms visible and calls the oppressed structures to question their locatedness and act against the communal associations fixated by macro structures. She locates her subjecthoods according to

the citizenship and ethnicity oriented communities in all her poems, yet centralizes the Jewish identity in only three of them, namely "1948 Jews", "Tattered Kaddish", and "Eastern War Time". In this chapter, we will study a section from "An Atlas of the Difficult World" and "Eastern War Time" to exemplify Rich's discursive strategies regarding the community relations.

After locating individual subjecthoods in the first section, Rich moves on to locating a "we" in section II of "An Atlas of the Difficult World", portraying a general picture of the setting wherein the "we" is placed. She begins the section with the line "[h]ere is a map of our country:" (Rich, 1993c, p. 144). Although the pronoun "our" is used section I too, the discourse of "we" is technically built in section II, for the community this "we" corresponds to is described and located in this section. The "we" is located through the language of belonging and codes of citizenship. Here Rich presents the imagery of country via the vocabulary and discourse of war, trade, and government. Talking about "missiles", "the poor / who died for democracy", "hourly wages", "the capital of money" (Rich, 1993c, p. 144) etc., she delineates the country wherein she locates her subjects -who thus gain the subjecthood of citizenship. Rich directly tackles this locatedness at the end of the second section, in the following lines which reveal Rich's (1993c) main purpose of writing this poem in the first place: "I promised to show you a map you say but this is a mural / then yes let it be these are small distinctions / where do we see it from is the question" (p. 144). The question for Rich is from where do we see and try to understand the world? Where exactly are we located? Do we see this map from within or outside? From a distance of from the core? The position the subjecthood holds is, therefore, of utmost importance for Rich. The place from where they tries to make meaning affects the experiences the lived body can possible live. The discourse

Rich builds in this section by first picturing the locatedness of the "I" within the "we" through the notion of citizenship and second calling the subjecthoods to question their positionality within this "we" constitutes a political act which urges the oppressed subjects to become aware of the power mechanisms that try to constrain them. It should be noted here that each time Rich mentions country and citizenship throughout all thirteen sections of the poem, she purposefully refers to gender and genderedness either before or after the corresponding lines, which exemplifies how Rich uses discourse to point at the genderedness of the experiences in the immediate communities where subjecthoods are located.

Another example where we observe that Rich locates subjecthoods within a community is "Eastern War Time". In this poem, Rich describes a woman recalling the year 1943, the year during which a Jewish uprising against the Nazi soldiers took place in Warsaw.[18] Her recollections bring back the memories from when she was a young Jewish girl trying to go to school in the US, which coincides with Rich's own personal history. Rich's discourse depicts how the understanding of "we" is shaped when geographical locatedness in the Jewish communities suffering from the massacres in Europe is not present. Belonging to the country of US yet struggling to preserve their Jewish identities while both protecting themselves from and resisting against the oppressive mechanisms, the subjecthoods in the poem establish the "I" within the "we" as a response to political repression. The following lines epitomizes how the discourse of "we" is created in Rich's poems and what this means in terms of politics:

---

[18] In April 1943, the Jewish activists residing in the ghetto of Warsaw, Poland performed an uprising against the Nazis with the armament they had been accumulating for months. Their main motive was to prevent the attempt of the Nazis to send them to the death camp in Treblinka, Poland. The uprising was the most famous and large-scale Jewish resistance during the Holocaust. Although the Jewish were successful at the beginning despite being far outnumbered by the Nazi soldiers and the lack of proper armaments, the resistance could only last for about a month (Einwohner, 2033, 656-65).

> :   "this is what our parents were trying to spare us"   :
> here in America   but in terrible Europe
> anything was possible   surely?
> :   "But this is the twentieth century"   :
> what the grown-ups can't teach   children must learn
> how do you teach a child what you won't believe?
> how do you say   *unfold, my flower, shine, my star*
> and *we are hated, being what we are?* (Rich, 2016)

The vocabulary of "we" is first established in this part of the poem "Eastern War Time", through the parental relationships. Even though the parents, who are implied to be Jewish in the earlier sections of the poem particularly via the telegrams they receive from Europe which are incorporated into the poem, do not want to teach their children the identity-based hatred, the social power relations which places them as "the other" within the country where they assume to be safe and welcomed and where they establish their communal belongingness, causes the formation of a "we" as the oppressed ones. Given that Rich wrote this poem in 1989-90, something which Rich states at the end of the poem, when identity politics were debated and the notions of country and citizenship were renegotiated under the influence of the wars the US was involved in, and that her own background as a Jewish girl raised in the US, Rich uses her poetry to build a discourse that founds a strong relationship between acknowledging one's communal belongingness and defying the doxa that aims to fixate one as the oppressed other. Additionally, the fact that Rich portrays gendered subjecthoods within the Jewish community in the US unfold the ways in which different gender identities are suppressed and placed according to corresponding gender categories of the patriarchal power mechanisms. References to the physical appearance of the girl, e.g. "her permed friz of hair" which makes her Jewishness recognizable as Rich (2016) states, and the comparison between the experiences of the girl and her boyfriend regarding the war in section six suggest that

Rich acknowledges the genderedness of oppression and tales into account the impact of multiple discriminations on subjecthoods within communities.

In order to overcome these discriminations, Rich directly addresses the readers, demolishes the lines that supposedly separate the readers and the poet and establishing a community of "we" through their shared oppressedness. Correspondingly, she purposefully melts subjecthoods into one another, which is observable at the tenth and the last section of the poem. Here, Rich gives a list of oppressed subjecthoods located in numerous macro structures belonging to different geographies, chronologies, genders, races, classes by using the pronoun "I" which linguistically refers to the woman Rich describes, the woman who remembers her young ages. Yet, it becomes an indicator of Rich, too, not only because every poet is located as a subjecthood in their poems but also because this poem depicts the resemblances of the ways Jewish girls experience oppression in the US, something which Rich herself experienced (Rich, 1993d, pp. 226-30). This identification which occurs at the end of the poem functions to invite the readers to become aware of their own oppressedness regarding communal associations in order to resist the social power relations that try to fixate them. Particularly with the lines "I am standing here in your poem   unsatisfied / lifting my smoky mirror", which end the poem after the long list of oppressed subjecthoods, Rich addresses the readers to find their own reflections in the poem and stand up against the oppressive mechanisms just like she did. She urges the readers to acknowledge their oneness with her difficult world by reading their subjecthoods in the poems. In other words, Rich wants the readers to join in a conversation with the world inside the poems as lived bodies themselves. For that, Rich needs to locate the readers as subjecthoods in the world she creates. As a result, poetic language for Rich functions as a macro structure that locates the

people described in them, the poet herself, and the readers as subjecthoods who bear the potential to encounter with one another, form a community, acknowledge their shared oppressedness, and resist them in solidarity.

While Rich locates the "I" within the "we" via the notion of citizenship as she calls the oppressed subjects to question their understandings of the sense of community, Sezer locates the "I" within the "we" through the political associations of the corporeal existence, which she epitomizes via the reflections of the political debates of her time. Her most prominent community is the community of class. Class-consciousness present in her poems include the oppressedness of the late 80s in Turkey. In Sezer's poetry, the subjecthoods within the community of class who reflect the outcomes of the repressive milieu are located in the macro structure of gender, which causes them to experience multiple discriminations. Sezer's interviews and writings in the various journals, magazines and newspapers portray that she, as a firm supporter of socialism, had been focused on class-consciousness of Marxist thought. That she pays particular attention to class-consciousness -and within this, the consciousness of gender that those who are located as women should have- is because Sezer believes in the potential to deconstruct the structures that locate someone as a certain identity and to reestablish subjecthood. That is to say, by raising consciousness about where and how a subjecthood is located, the oppressed subject becomes able to establish new subjecthoods and resist the structures that suppressively fixate them. As a founding member of Labour Party, Sezer's primary focus in politics was always on class. Yet, she never disregarded the macro structure of gender as another extremely powerful sociopolitical mechanism that tries to locate subjecthoods in oppressive ways. For this reason, she advocated that gaining consciousness of class alone would not suffice for women, since women were

situated as the inferior other by gender as well, and thus needed to become aware of their locatedness in the macro structure of gender. This is the predicament of overcoming the boundaries set upon women by the doxic patriarchal rules and establishing liberated subjecthoods as women. As a result, those who have been placed in macro structures as women, who have been defined as the inferior other by gender, and who have identified themselves as women need to be aware of the conditions that impact their subjecthood, trying to differentiate between their individual subjecthoods as lived bodies and the oppressive mechanisms of the macro structure of gender. As a result of the genderedness of the subjecthoods, inviting the oppressed subjecthoods to gain consciousness about the oppressive mechanisms that try to fixate the subjects carries a feminist goal in Sezer's poems. To exemplify how she brings together gender and class under the influence of the politics of the late 80s, the poems "Eviçi Şiirleri" [Indoors Poems], "Aydın Kızın Aşk Türküsü" [Love Song of the Enlightened Girl], and "Bir Halk Türküsünden" [From a Folk Song] are examined.

In "Eviçi Şiirleri" [Indoors Poems], Sezer locates gendered subjecthoods from lower classes in order to show how women's experiences within communities differ from men's, and the political significance such difference constitutes. As these subjecthoods shop from or work at "an evening bazaar" (Sezer, 2017, p. 238), and remain unable to do anything -out of the fear of losing their jobs- even when they are fully frustrated by their employers -indicated by the line "A slap that can't be smacked on the face of the boss" (Sezer, 2017, p. 238), they are located in relation to their most immediate community, that is the community of class, as the oppressed ones. In the depicted community of class, the subjects are described to lead a sorrowful life on the surface. However, as the last stanza informs, there is a potential

joy hidden underneath. As opposed to the first stanza where people are described to feel restlessness when asked what love is, the final stanza asks the question to a woman from the same bazaar and describes her as "As she looks down abashedly / the henna of her hair gets flirty" (Sezer, 2017, p. 238). This opposition in the stanzas about the feelings -emphasized by the repetition of the first line "Ask what love is" (Sezer, 2017, p. 238)- attempts to obliterate the boundary between inside -represented by the woman- and outside-represented by the people in the first stanza. The shared first line brings the stanzas together, obscuring the separation of public and private and contrasting the non-gendered and gendered accounts of locatedness. The woman as a subject is more corporeal, responsive, and lively. She has a more intricate subjecthood than the ungendered and unknown people in the first stanza, which suggests that for Sezer gender as a macro structure is one of the most significant determinants of how subjecthoods are established even when the subjecthoods are oppressed by the same mechanisms within the shared community of class. In other words, the genderedness of subjecthoods places the subjects in different positions within the field since as a result of the patriarchal doxa, which Sezer emphasizes by creating distinctly separate discourses to differentiate women's experiences within the community of class.

Another example to observe the genderedness within the community of class takes places in the poem "Aydın Kızın Aşk Türküsü" [Love Song of the Enlightened Girl], where Sezer brings together corporeality and politics as a feminist statement. In this poem, Sezer expresses how she experiences love through her corporeality, stating that "Whenever I fall in love /. . . / In my veins a foolhardy bug / Paces" (Sezer, 2017, p. 230). The repetition of the line "Whenever I fall in love" at the beginning and at the end connects love to first corporeality -through the bug

imagery- and then the macro structure of class, through the lines "Whenever I fall in love / Workers get fired" (Sezer, 2017, p. 230). Such structural choice directs the reader to bring together biology and politics, or body and mind. Correspondingly, it becomes an overt attempt to locate a corporeal subjecthood within a macro structure in relation to a class-related community. We should also note that, in addition to gender, the discourse of workers provides a socio-political depth into the poem, locating the subject in a class-conscious society where unemployment plays a definitive role. The questions between the two "Whenever I fall in love" lines further strengthen the socio-political dimension, inquiring history and collective identity. It is not a coincidence that the final question in the corresponding lines is "Who am I?" The attempts to identify the self through a negotiation between corporeality and socio-political macro structures. To comprehend the oppressedness of corporeal subjecthoods in/through their most immediate communities, namely the class, as a way of resisting the patriarchal mechanisms cannot be considered independent of gendered experiences of feminist lived bodies located within macro structure of gender.

It is possible to observe how important the macro structure of gender is in Sezer's poems, regarding the responsiveness of her discourse to the feminist debates of her time. During the 1980s, in Turkey, one of the most important matters of the feminist movement was motherhood and the burden of child rearing. Sezer's political poetry appears to preserve its responsiveness to the political agenda by focusing on women's corporeality in terms of motherhood. In "Bir Halk Türküsünden" [From a Folk Song] Sezer focuses on motherhood as a form of subjecthood located in the macro structure of gender. The poem positions the mother vis-a-vis a son and his possible death, repeating in each stanza the same first line which, borrowed from a

folk song, questions whether or not Ferhat -a famous male folk hero- died. Placing

the existence of the woman as opposed to the absence of a son -via a non-present

imaginary folk hero and not the presence but "the scent of a son" mentioned in line 3

(Sezer, 2017, p. 232) - the poem points to a relationality between subjecthoods. In

other words, since the subjecthoods are not the patriarchal self but feminist lived

bodies, encounters play a definitive role on how subjecthoods are located as

individuals: Where a person is located as son, another person is located as mother in

relation to the son as a result of such an encounter. This reciprocity is challenged in

the poem: The son is missing; therefore, the located motherhood of the mother is in

jeopardy. This exemplifies how corporeal subjecthoods located in the communities

remain dependent on the communal relations. Such communal dependence in terms

of identity reflects Sezer's Marxist perspective about sense of community. That is to

say, the significance Sezer attaches to the immediate communities of the located

subjecthoods is in parallel with her class-conscious politics.

5.2.2 Calling for new subjecthoods

Rich and Sezer purposefully mark the communities within which the corporeal

subjecthoods exist under the macro structure of gender, so that the subjetchoods

could gain consciousness about their locatedness and use it to establish new

subjecthoods. This serves as a method to overpower the oppressive patriarchal

mechanisms that try to fixate subjects according to certain categories. To gain new

subjecthoods through corporeality in response to the rigid categorization of mind-

oriented patriarchal structures constitutes a focal point for both poets. Their discourse

reveals a tendency to invite the reader to acknowledge their capacities to resist and

act upon such acknowledgement. Rich emphasizes the impact of movement on establishing new subjecthoods while Sezer focuses on the role of voice.

The motility in the poems corresponds to the movements in Rich's life in late in the late 80s. During those years, Rich (1993e) not only moves across the country in her personal life but also begins to contemplate about what it means to move and how it is related to the sense of belonging in her intellectual works (p. 252-3). That the concepts of belonging, location, and movement occupy Rich's mind a lot is observable in Rich's prose, as exemplified by "Notes Toward a Politics of Location", where Rich questions the possibility of belonging to a certain community without geographical togetherness, taking under the scope her family's history of moving, to run away from the anti-Semitist massacres in Europe (Rich, 1986, pp. 216-23). Therefore, the poems reflect Rich's personal and intellectual agenda, and present motility as a predicament of subjecthood.

Since movement is a central element in establishing new subjecthoods for Rich, it is also the key to resist the power structures that try to define individuals according to patriarchal categories. Rich uses movement and motility to show that her subjecthoods are lived bodies of feminism, who do not submit to the stability and rigidity imposed by the macro structure of gender. As a result, movement becomes the means to defy the roles assigned by such power mechanisms and gain self-defined subjecthoods. Rich's emphasis on movement is dominant in the poems "An Atlas of the Difficult World", "She", "Eastern War Time", "Darklight", and "Two Arts", among which we will study "Two Arts", "She", and "Darklight" to exemplify the discursive strategies she applies in order to cause a feminist empowerment.

To illustrate the impact of movement on subjecthood, one of the strategies Rich uses is to examine the two versions of the same entity, one without movement

and the other with movement. In "Two Arts", the art piece in question is limned ineffective before the artist redoes it by adding light and movement (Rich, 2016). The artefact is probably a sculpture because the artist brushes the filings of their apron and wraps it in white sheets to mail it to the gallery where it will stand on a glass table (Rich, 2016), which bring forth the corporeality of the artefact that turns into a subject as the poem progresses. Although the metaphor of the sculpture and sculptor is possibly functioning at other layers, too, simply the surface-level content that a sculpture becomes valued after the sculptor incorporates light and motion into it over a night suggest that motility plays a significant role in subjecthood. In the lines "By dawn you were pure electric.   You pulsed like a star / You awoke in the last darkness…" (Rich, 2016) Rich not only animates the sculpture but also accentuates motility as one of the main elements of life, since the imagery of electric suggests the situation of being charged and kinetic and pulsing entails rhythm and movement. After the sculpture wakes up, they gains subjecthood so much so that they now "have a brutal thing to do" as the last line informs. Even the brutal act the sculpture must perform is based on movement, namely raising something up in the air. By contrasting the before and the after versions of the sculpture, Rich epitomizes the role motility plays in establishing subjecthood. Without motion, lived bodies cannot undergo new experiences and encounters, as a result of which they lose their subjecthoods. Therefore, the imagery she builds here communicates the message that the oppressed ones can overpower the structures that oppress them by gaining new subjecthoods through movement and taking action.

Another example of Rich's (2016) strategical use of movement takes place in the poem "She" where Rich describes a woman fixated "in her chair" who sets herself free of the ties that fixate her through movement. The woman she describes is

a corporeal subjecthood, whose corporeality is communicated with references to her physical positionality ("sit[ting] in her chair") and bodily motionlessness. Rich expresses the fact that the woman lost her intrinsic subjecthood as she became deprived of her motility by building a discourse on the decay around her. The "mildew spores", "nests", "webs in corners", "rots or rusts" (Rich, 2016) that surround the woman implies the lack of movement, which is further accentuated by the woman's association of herself with a "weir" (Rich, 2016). Like a weir, the woman has been stable and rigid, which deprived her of her subjecthood. However, immediately after she "[l]ifts her brush" (Rich, 2016), which was described to be sitting still in her hand, she gains subjecthoods as she decides to strip herself of the nets that restrict her movement. The final line "and she is not there" (Rich, 2016) suggests that the woman abandons the place wherein the power relations appoint her, by taking action against everything that points to a decay, the things that the conventional patriarchal understanding of the self wishes to impose on the subjects. The fact that the subjecthood in question is a woman further emphasizes the importance of movement and action as a way of resisting against the patriarchal power mechanisms. The title of the poem itself is the gendered pronoun used for women in third person singular, which implies that the main message in the poem is about a woman's personhood. Correspondingly, movement serves as a tool for Rich to urge women to stand up and take action.

For Rich, movement is the method of resistance against the patriarchal self for it allows the establishment of various subjecthoods. An example of this could be taken from the fifth section of the poem "An Atlas of the Difficult World": "— poet journalist   pioneer   mother / uncovering her country: there are roads to take" (Rich, 1993c, p. 150). Describing a woman trying to define who she is, Rich

refs to a number of identities. Yet, even with these numerous identities in which the woman gains subjecthood, the description of her ultimate self is not completed, for it can never be fully completed. The "roads to take" suggest a continuum, a process which has not come to an end. Through the movement the roads promise, the woman becomes receptive to new experiences in new locations. Therefore, the lines inform the readers that the self establishes subjecthoods via the lived body of feminist perspective which moves and experiences, and thus becomes locatable in various structures which render corresponding identities such as poet, journalist, pioneer, and mother. The macro structures that try to fixate her in pre-defined locations are challenged by this lived body–which keeps creating subjecthoods as she continues to take the roads. Therefore, as exemplified by this poem too, Rich conveys that movement provides the grounds for the oppressed ones in the patriarchal power relations to deny the positions they are given, fixated in the macro structure of gender. Through continuous movement women can undergo various experiences and encounters, as a result of which they defy the roles inscribed upon them by the patriarchal doxa.

Sennur Sezer, too, focuses on raising awareness about the enforced patriarchal doxa which try to fixate subjecthoods. One of the most important outcomes of such awareness for Sezer herself is that it allows women to see the situatedness of "woman poets" too. In a number of her interviews and writings, Sezer mentions that being both a woman and a poet is difficult, for people around a woman poet usually do not seem to agree that women could be successful poets (Nacitarhan, 2010, pp. 289-93). Sezer was not wrong in her observations, considering that there were only a few woman poets known and accepted by literary circles in Turkey until the 80s. Most of the women who wrote were either overlooked or never discovered

(Nacitarhan, 2010, p. 59). Poetry belonged to men. It was towards the end of the decade that woman poets began to be credited for their works. It was precisely to earn this kind of rightful recognition and to generate a sense of solidarity that Sezer insisted upon the importance of gaining consciousness about locatedness not only as women but also as woman poets, so that woman poets could claim to be poets just as easily as man poets do. Knowing that one, as a woman and poet, are situated in a community and remaining alert to the oppressive patriarchal codes that try to confine one all to the limited subjecthood the macro structure of gender sees fit, one becomes aware of your locatedness and claim your own subjecthood together with others like one. For this reason, Sezer's poetry is political. It is political not only because it talks about political issues of the day but also because it invites other woman poets to claim their own voices, and thus calls for a social and political change in terms of gender and women's rights movement.

Correspondingly, Sezer's poems place great emphasis on finding one's voice and preserving it. This might be because the decade before the book was published, namely the 80s, was one of the most suppressive decades of the history of modern Turkey. In response to the political oppression that forbade any oppositional voice, shut down all political parties and NGOs, and silenced people violently, women were the first to react to claim back their voices. The first authorized public demonstration after the bans took place as a women's rights march against abuse (Kerestecioğlu, Savran, & Günaysu, 2019, pp. 82-3). It is, therefore, not a surprise that Sezer, a political figure who worked at the foundation of Human Rights Association to investigate the human rights violations of the 80s, writes poems about finding one's voice and speaking up. For her, identity is about voice. Finding her own voice and causing the readers to find their own voices mean to establish a shared sense of

solidarity with each other as the oppressed ones. The voice, therefore, acts as the tool that creates a conversation between the poet and the readers, which aims to include the readers in the conversation at times by urging them to find their own voice.

One of the poems where Sezer uses voice to address the readers so as to galvanize the oppressed ones among them to take action against the oppressive mechanisms is the poem "Savunmamdır" [Here is my Testimony]. In this poem, which serves as a type of afterword since it is the last poem of the collection, Sezer locates herself through her own voice. She quotes, in the first line of the poem, what -presumably- critics say about her: "Sennur Sezer kept her usual voice" (Sezer, 2017, p. 254). In this poem, Sezer ensures that she as a poet -also as the poet- has a voice that allows her to mark her subjecthood. She invites young poets to find their own voice so as to maintain at least one type of subjecthood in the macro structure of language. As discussed in Chapter 3.3, poetic language allows the individual to deconstruct the symbolic -that is, the doxa of the macro structures within which the individual is located- and establish other forms of subjecthoods out of free will. For Sezer, then, finding one's voice is about locating oneself. This is also in line with her Marxist views of class consciousness. Just like the argument of class consciousness suggests, the more aware one becomes of the structures that situate one according to their suppressive doxa, the more possible it gets for one to deconstruct or resist them. The same applies to language and voice as well. Becoming conscious of the structures that locate one in language and trying to deconstruct them via poetry, one can establish one's voice and subjecthood. Yet, Sezer's insistence on voice is not only about establishing an individual subjecthood but also to constitute a communal space where interpersonal and transindividual interactions of the micro structures form a sense of solidarity against oppressive mechanisms. In that regard, when Sezer

(2017) says "In short young bard / My voice is still as usual…/When you with all the power of your voice / Defend life / I will hear a new voice / Of that I'm sure" (p. 254). Here, she calls the next generation of poets to join forces with her in the fight to defend life, defend human rights -as she does in İHD. This political outreach shaped around the act of finding and preserving your voice to establish subjecthood and interact with other momentary subjects to keep creating a continuous resistance to the oppressions of the political macro structures concludes the book.

We can observe this tendency to create resistance through voice in other poems as well. For example, in "Yankı" [Echo], Sezer associates voice with mother tongue, referring to the contemporary debates in Turkey about the prohibition of any language but Turkish. After the coup of the 1980, the new Constitution declared Turkish to be the only legitimate language to be spoken in Turkey, which turned thousands of people from minority communities into criminals simply for speaking their mother tongue, particularly the already criminalized and marginalized Kurdish. The ban on language was lifted in 1991, the year Sezer published *Afiş*. Therefore, it is safe to assume that when Sezer (2017) wrote "Yankı" and said "-If you do not have a country / Other than your mother tongue / Take refuge in your own song." (p. 250), she was criticizing the ban that was either still valid or recently lifted. In the given lines, Sezer regards language as a country, as a sort of home to feel immediate belonging to. As discussed previously, being located in language itself is problematic for any subjecthood since it situates the subject according to the doxa of the overpowering ideology. When the language you are placed in is not your native language, it becomes considerably more difficult to establish one's own subjecthoods. The micro structures within the macro structure of language which would allow the lived bodies to engage in transindividual actions to create new

98

experiences and thus new potentials for counter-action and resistance to oppression become almost unavailable to those who are forced into a non-native language. For that, Sezer (2017) calls for more voice, suggesting to take refuge in the songs of one's own mother tongue (p. 250). In addition to her efforts to excite subjects and communities to claim voice and language, Sezer associates this voice with corporeality and thus gender. To ensure that the reader does not regard what she means by voice as a separate entity independent of the body, Sezer (2017) repeatedly refers to her own corporeality with the lines "How could I possibly know where my heart was / If it didn't ache?" (pp. 224-5). Through these famous lines, not only her particular interest in body and pain becomes visible again but also the corporeality of the subject as well as the importance of location in defining any subjecthood becomes centralized. The ache of the heart is in line with the mother tongue of the minorities and the voice of the subjects. It is corporeal and definitive. Therefore, Sezer's use of the voice is a projection of the feminist lived body which allows subjecthood and remains corporeal within the macro structure where it is located.

Another direct reference to the readers to take action against the oppressive mechanisms takes place in the poem "Sıradan Test" [An Ordinary Test]. Written in a form resembling to a multiple-choice test, the poem mocks and criticizes the institutional codes and formalities, which are shaped by the oppressive macro structures. Sezer reminds the readers of the insecurities and anxieties they might have due to being placed as the oppressed other in the current political macro structures. The possibilities presented in the poem -e.g. the lack of security and future, or the increasing doubt (Sezer 2017, p. 234)- reflect the general milieu of the late 80s in Turkey, and thus locates the poet herself as a lived body subjected to the macro structures of the day as well as the readers to whom the poem speaks to, which

creates a sense of solidarity between the poet and the readers for they all are part of the "we" as the oppressed other in the suppressive power relations. Sezer benefits from the technique of direct addressing in second person plural in order to locate the readers to ensure that they are aware of their shared locatedness. In the last stanza of the poem, she advises the readers, saying "A) Do not remain silent / B) Do not close your eyes / C) Be a witness, do not forget." (Sezer 2017, p. 234). As the lines exhibit, one of the most important aspects of the meta-poetical communication with the readers for Sezer is that it creates the possibility to instigate an action among them, galvanizing them to claim new subjecthoods by posing resisting forces in the macro structures wherein they are located. In line with her tendency to associate subjecthood with voice, Sezer urges her readers to speak up and interact with the world within which they exist as lived bodies. It is through such interactions that the world can change, for each interaction in the micro structures affect not only the lived bodies they consist of but potentially the macro structures that locate these lived bodies, too. Sezer's revolutionary subjecthood is, therefore, calling the readers to open their eyes and speak up to experience the world through corporeality so that they can initiate a change around themselves and in the oppressive macro structures.

To conclude, the relationship between the subjecthood and community plays a central role in the political purposes of both Rich and Sezer. In order to deft the social power relations that attempt to fixate subjecthoods in accordance with the patriarchal doxa, the poets emphasize the importance of realizing and exploring one's locatedness and thus appreciating various subjecthoods. For that, the poets conduct two main strategies. First, they pay attention to locating the "I" within the "we", in order to resist against the communal associations fixated by macro structures, by questioning their validity and meaning. For this reason, both Rich and

Sezer define immediate communities for the corporeal subjecthoods they locate. Rich's preeminent community is shaped around the notion of citizenship. The sense of belonging to a country as a citizen is bounded to a shared locatedness at the same time and in the same place. Sezer's community necessitates such shared locatedness, too. Her most immediate communal association depends on the political agenda of the day, including but not limited to class. Regardless of which community Rich and Sezer chose to build their imageries around, gender remains as the determining macro structure in their poems. Secondly, the poets invite the oppressed ones to gain new subjecthoods in order to defy the roles assigned to them by patriarchal power structures. The main element of gaining new subjecthoods is movement for Rich and voice for Sezer. Rich suggests that without motility, subjects would lose their active agency as they would submit to the patriarchal tendency to fixate the subjects. As a result, she calls the oppressed ones to take action by moving against the communal roles inscribed upon them. Sezer, on the other hand, regards voice as the main determinant of subjecthood and urges both the subjects she describes in her poem and her readers to find their voices to remain in conversation with the world and overturn the patriarchal power relations that silence women.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

As a result of my analysis, I concluded that both Adrienne Rich and Sennur Sezer were under the impact of political events and intellectual debates around identity, which were influential throughout the 1980s. Their books, *An Atlas of the Difficult World* and *Afiş* reflect the anxieties about subjecthood and its relation to corporeality. The subjects they locate are lived bodies from a feminist perspective, as they remain in conversation with what surrounds them via their corporeality, and keep establishing new subjecthoods as a result of these conversations within the macro stricture of gender. The FCDA I applied to their poems yielded that there were two main categories that their discourses revealed: 1. Corporeal subjecthoods, 2. Locatedness within communities. The categories FCDA rendered about the poems of Rich and Sezer are in line with the concept of the lived body as feminist theorists approach it. The feminist lived body acknowledges the corporeality and locatedness of subjecthoods as a feminist act.

The first category, namely "corporeal subjecthoods", corresponds to the poets' response to the patriarchal understanding of the rigid, coherent, mind-oriented, transcendental self which does not acknowledge plurality and diversity in subjecthoods, disregarding the experiences of the non-male identities. To defy the formative power relations between mind and body which is constituted by the patriarchal approach to subjecthood, Rich and Sezer locate gendered corporeal subjecthoods as the first step. Rich's corporeal subjecthoods are fragmented and ambiguous while Sezer's are prone to dissolve into and become one with what surrounds them. In the second step, the poets identify the oppressive power

mechanisms and invite the oppressed to resist them. They both urge the oppressed ones to embrace their corporeality as a way of uprising against the patriarchal mind-orientedness.

The second category, namely "locatedness within communities", appears as a strategy to overturn the social power relations between fixated self and located subjecthoods. In defiance of the macro structure of gender which endeavors to categorize subjects in line with patriarchal doxa and fixate the individuals based on gender identities, Rich and Sezer unravel the relationships subjects have with their immediate communities and how these relationships constitute a gendered experience. In order to do that the poets follow a two-level strategy. At the fist level, they locate the "I" within the "we", which corresponds to the most immediate communities of the located subjecthoods, so as to defy the communal associations and patriarchal roles fixated by macro structures. For Rich the community that remains dominant throughout the book is related to the notion of citizenship. It entails a sense of togetherness and belonging in the shared topography of both geography and chronology. Sezer's community, on the other hand, remains dependent on the political agenda of the time, which amounts to the notion of class for the most part. Both poets locate the "I" within the "we" by paying particular attention to gender as the encompassing macro structure. That is to say, regardless of the communities they describe, the subjecthoods established within those communities are gendered in both books. At the second level, the poets call the oppressed subjects to gain new subjecthoods a way of resistance against the fixated selfhood imposed on them. For Rich, the main factor that remains definitive in establishing subjecthoods is movement whereas it is voice for Sezer. Regardless of that, both poets call their readers to act against the patriarchal power mechanisms

that oppresses not only the readers but also the poems themselves, which creates a sense of solidarity among them.

The observations I was able to make via FCDA suggested that poetry, too, could be data for FCDA just like any other text. Since poets are located in their poems, their language reveals the ideological devices that shape their choices as well as the linguistic strategies they apply to defy patriarchy. Combined with the notion of lived body from a feminist perspective in mind, FCDA could be very useful for feminist scholars who would like to approach poetry as a cultural text by relinquishing the conventional and patriarchal ways that favor mind-oriented, coherent, rigid, transcendental subjecthoods. It presents an approach wherein many voices, identities, subjects as well as their corporality become just as equally important. Approaching poetry with this sort of understanding of subjecthood, that is, a new model based on the notion of lived body helps the researcher overcome the dilemma between the subjects in the poem and the subject as the poet. Also, it enables the researcher to understand the impacts of personal experiences as well as historical and political events that might have affected the poems.

Furthermore, poetry itself provides the grounds for feminist scholars to work more conveniently, for the language in poetry challenges the ways macro structures impose rules upon individuals. The language of the father, the language that is set by the power holders in the macro structures, could be abandoned and denied for the construction of a new meaning-word association through independent and self-regulating process of building imagery by the poet's own account, which itself is in line with the emancipatory agenda of FCDA. The possibilities of creating new subjecthoods through poetic language and the discursive opportunities poetic

language offers proved to be useful for feminist researchers who might be interested in applying FCDA to poetry.

As helpful as this methodology was in my research, I remain cautious so as to not make large generalizations about it. Although it is thought-provoking to see that poetry as a cultural text is responsive to FCDA, which also suggests that methodology of FCDA potentially introduces a new and more efficient way to poetry interpretation as a surplus benefit, many more works are yet to be analyzed through this methodology for us, feminist researchers, to fully embrace it. My attempt to see if it was possible to run FCDA on poetry and bring it together with the new corporeality-based understanding of subjecthood via the poems of Rich and Sezer rendered a small-scale result, yet looking at only two books in a given era would not suffice to yield a universal and comprehensive result. There surely is need for more research conducted on the poems of other parts of the world, with different interests, by multiple feminist scholars of various backgrounds.

The question of "I" as a subject cannot be a question restricted to only one area, discipline, or sphere. That is to say, since the crisis of the "I" is not independent from the identity crisis of politics, approaching the subjects in language differently means to make a political statement. For this reason, I invite feminist scholars interested in poetry and subjecthood to enhance the scope of this research by conducting their own, so that collectively we can envision and facilitate a political statement to be made in the academics.

REFERENCES

Bakhtin, M. (1981). Forms of time and of the chronotope in the novel: Notes toward a historical poetics. In M. Holquist (Ed.), *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. (C. Emerson, Trans.), (pp. 84-258). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Baxter, J. A. (2008). Feminist post-structuralist discourse analysis: A new theoretical and methodological approach?. In K. Harrington, L. Litosseliti, H. Sauntson & J. Sunderland (Eds.), *Gender and Language Research Methodologies* (pp. 243-255). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Chilton, P. (2005). Missing links in mainstream CDA. In P. Chilton & R. Wodak (Eds.), *A new agenda in (critical) discourse analysis* (pp. 19-52). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Eagleton, M. (2010). Adrienne Rich, location and the body. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 9(3), 299-312.

Einwohner, R. L. (2003). Opportunity, honor, and action in the Warsaw ghetto uprising of 1943. *American Journal of Sociology*, 109(3), 650-675.

Fayazmanesh, S. (2008). The dual containment policy in the 1980s. In *The United States and Iran: Sanctions, wars and the policy of dual containment* (pp. 28-52). London: Routledge.

Gavriely-Nuri, D. (2012). Cultural approach to CDA. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 9(1), 77-85.

Grosz, E. A. (1994). *Volatile bodies: Toward a corporeal feminism*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Humm, M. (1998). *Contemporary feminist literary criticism*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

İnsan Hakları Derneği. (2014). Retrieved from https://www.ihd.org.tr/hakkimizda/

Janiewski, D. E. (2001). Engendering the invisible empire: Imperialism, feminism, and US women's history. *Australian Feminist Studies*, 16(36), 279-291.

Johnstone, B. (2018). *Discourse analysis* (3rd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Kara, N. (2006). 80 ve 90'larda Türkiye'de feminist hareketler. *Kadın Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 1(3), 16-39.

Kerestecioğlu, F., Savran, G., & Günaysu, A. (2019). Feminist mücadelede kampanya örnekleri. *Jineolojî*, 12, 81-97.

Khosvizadeh, P. & Sara M. (2011). CDA: A comparison of contemporary Iranian and American poetry, presented at International Conference on Languages, Literature and Linguistics, Singapore, 2011. Singapore: IACSIT Press.

Kristeva, J. (1984). *Revolution in poetic language*. (M. Waller, Trans.), New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Lazar, M. M. (2007). Feminist critical discourse analysis: Articulating a feminist discourse praxis. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 4(2), 141–164.

Lazar, M. M. (2014). Feminist critical discourse analysis: Relevance for current gender and language research. In S. Ehrlich, M. Meyerhoff & Janet Holmes (Eds.) *The handbook of language, gender, and sexuality* (pp. 180-199). West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.

McDowell, L. (1996). Spatializing feminism: Geographic perspectives. In N. Duncan (Ed.), *Body space: Destabilizing geographies of gender and sexuality* (pp. 28-44). New York: Psychology Press.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (2005). *Phenomenology of perception* (C. Smith, Trans.). New York: Routledge. (Original work published in 1945)

Moi, T. (1991). Appropriating Bourdieu: Feminist theory and Pierre Bourdieu's sociology of culture. *New Literary History*, 22(4), 1017-1049.

Moi, T. (1999). *What is a woman? And other essays*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Nacitarhan, C (Ed.). (2010). *Şiirin ve umudun yorulmaz iğnesi Sennur Sezer*. Istanbul: Evrensel Basım Yayın.

Ohito, E. O., & Nyachae T. M. (2018). Poetically poking at language and power: Using Black feminist poetry to conduct rigorous feminist critical discourse analysis. *Qualitative Inquiry*, doi:10.1177/1077800418786303

Olsen, R. (2008). Strategies of critical practice: Recent writing on experimental and innovative poetry by women; A review essay. *Signs Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 33(2), 371-387.

Perloff, M. (2004). *Differentials: Poetry, poetics, pedagogy*. Alabama: University of Alabama Press.

Rich, A. C. (1986). Notes toward a politics of location. In *Blood, bread, and poetry: Selected prose 1979-1985* (pp. 210-231). New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Rich, A. C. (1993a). Blood, bread, and poetry: The location of the poet. In A. Gelpi & B. C. Gelpi (Eds.), *Adrienne Rich's poetry and prose* (pp. 239-252). New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Rich, A. C. (1993b). Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian existence. In A. Gelpi & B. C. Gelpi (Eds.), *Adrienne Rich's poetry and prose* (pp. 203-224). New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Rich, A. C. (1993c). From An Atlas of the Difficult World: Poems 1988-1991 (1991). In A. Gelpi & B. C. Gelpi (Eds.), *Adrienne Rich's poetry and prose* (pp. 142-161). New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Rich, A. C. (1993d). Split at the root: An essay on Jewish identity. In A. Gelpi & B. C. Gelpi (Eds.), *Adrienne Rich's poetry and prose* (pp. 224-239). New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Rich, A. C. (1993e). The genesis of "Yom Kippur 1984". In A. Gelpi & B. C. Gelpi (Eds.), *Adrienne Rich's poetry and prose* (pp. 252-258). New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Rich, A. C. (2016). *Collected poems* [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from https://www.amazon.com/Collected-Poems-1950-2012-Adrienne-Rich-ebook-dp-B013RM25PU/dp/B013RM25PU/ref=mt_kindle?_encoding=UTF8&me=&qid=

Sezer, S. (2017). *Direnç: Bütün şiirleri*. Istanbul: Manos Kitap.

Weigel, S. (2009). On the "topographical turn": Concepts of space in Cultural Studies and Kulturwissenschaften. A cartographic feud. *European Review*, 17(1), 187-201.

Wendt, A. (1999). *Social theory of international politics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Young, I.M. (2005). Lived body vs gender: Reflections on social structure and subjectivity. In *On female body experience: Throwing like a girl and other essays* (pp. 12-26). New York: Oxford University Press.

Zürcher, E. J. (2007). Üçüncü cumhuriyet: 1980'den itibaren Türkiye. In *Modernleşen Türkiye'nin tarihi* (Y. Saner Gönen, Trans.). Istanbul: İletişim.