

NEGATIVE ANALYSIS: AN APPLICATION OF NEGATIVE THEOLOGY FOR
THE ANALYSIS OF POETRY

NEJAT CİHAN YURDAÜN

BOĞAZIÇI UNIVERSITY

2007

NEGATIVE ANALYSIS: AN APPLICATION OF NEGATIVE THEOLOGY FOR
THE ANALYSIS OF POETRY

Thesis submitted to the Institute for Graduate Studies in the Social Sciences in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

English Language and Literature

Nejat Cihan Yurdaün

Boğaziçi University

2007

THESIS ABSTRACT

NEGATIVE ANALYSIS: AN APPLICATION OF NEGATIVE THEOLOGY FOR THE ANALYSIS OF POETRY

Negative theology is a branch of mysticism that is based on the conceptualization of God as an ultimate, transcendent and ineffable being. It creates its own language called Apophasis, which acting through a series of affirmations and negations, aims to approach the ineffable God. In a similar manner, poetry is a different language in language that aims to transcend the meaning capabilities of words in order to achieve purer relation with and through language. The unique experience the poet undergoes with language is also inexpressible in essence as every poet is a distinct being, and poet's personal affiliation with language is singular. This study utilizes the concepts of negative theology in the analysis of poetry, grounding on this functional resemblance. The outcome is a method called negative analysis that works through diligent and close readings of poems. Negative analysis borrows concepts such as Apophasis, Cataphasis, negation, unknowing and inexpressibility from negative theology, and employs them in the analysis of poetry. Poems used in this study are G.M. Hopkins' "Peace" and Emily Dickinson's poem numbered 405 (It might be lonelier). In Hopkins, "silence" in its absence, and in Dickinson, "silence" in its presence, set the perfect ground to enable a study of these seemingly distinct disciplines, theology and literature, under a confluent gaze, with one method. This study aims to show that poetry is a special kind of language that demands a method of analysis befitting its special nature.

TEZ ÖZETİ

NEGATİF ANALİZ: NEGATİF TEOLOJİNİN BİR ŞİİR ANALİZ METHODU OLARAK KULLANILMASI

Negatif teoloji, mistisizmin, Tanrı'yı aşkın, mükemmel ve isimlendirilemez olarak tahayyül eden bir kolunu oluşturur. Apophasis adı verilen kendi dilini meydana getirerek bir seri onaylamalar ve inkârlar (affirmation and negation) aracılığıyla isimlendirilemeyen Tanrı'ya yaklaşabilmeyi hedefler. Benzer bir şekilde, şiir de dil içinde ayrı bir dil oluşturup, kelimelerin anlam imkânlarını aşarak dille ve dil içinde daha saf bir ilişki kurmayı amaç edinir. Şairin dil ile yaşadığı eşsiz deneyim, özünde, şairin yegâne bir birey olması ve dille kurduğu kişisel ilişkinin tekliği sebebiyle tanımlandırılmaması manasında eşsizdir. Bu çalışma, işlevsellik manasındaki bu benzerliğe dayanarak negatif teolojinin kavramlarını şiir analizinde kullanır. Sonuç olarak, negatif analiz adı verilen, şiirlerin gayretli ve yakın okumalarına dayanan bir metot ortaya çıkarır. Negatif analiz, Cataphasis, Apophasis, inkâr (negation), bilmemek (unknowing) ve ifade edilememek (inexpressibility) gibi kavramları negatif teolojiden ödünç alarak, şiir analizinde kullanılmak üzere teşvik eder. Bu çalışmada G.M Hopkins'in "Peace" ve Emily Dickinson'nun 405 numaralı (It might be lonelier) adlı şiirleri kullanılmıştır. Hopkins'te "sessizlik" yokluğu ile, Dickinson'da "sessizlik" varlığı ile kendilerini göstererek bu iki farklı görünen disiplin, teoloji ve edebiyatın tek bir bakış ve metot altında çalışılabilmesi için mükemmel ortamı oluşturur. Bu çalışma, şiirin özel bir dil olduğunu belirtip kendi yapısına uygun bir analiz metoduna ihtiyaç duyduğunu ortaya koymayı amaçlar.

CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Chapter 1	3
	Negative Theology and Poetry	
III.	Chapter 2	16
	Cataphasis and Apophasis	
IV.	Chapter 3	29
	Disordered Language	
V.	Chapter 4	52
	Shadow Protuberance	
VI.	Chapter 5	77
	The Journey	
VII.	Chapter 6	100
	The Hidden Name of God	
VIII.	Conclusion	108
IX.	Bibliography	111

INTRODUCTION

This thesis introduces a novel approach to poetical criticism based on negative theology, and its intrinsic relation with language and philosophy. The approach is illustrated in the comparative analysis of two poems by Emily Dickinson and Gerard Manley Hopkins. This approach, which can be named negative analysis, resides in, derives from and is inspired by a unique blending of two seemingly unrelated trains of thoughts: an archaic branch of theology and mysticism called negative theology, and twentieth century modern criticism in which “echoes” of this ancient lore can be traced. Negative analysis delineates the links between these two ostensibly distinct traditions to enhance the ways poetry can be creatively assessed and experienced in line with and in respect to the demands of the text.

Negative approach immediately lends itself to a series of questions: first of all, what is negative theology? How is it related to modern criticism? What do we mean by poetry? What does this approach entail? And is this thesis a religious treatise? It can be said that negative theology is not something that is solely about religion or God. On the contrary, as it acts through language and philosophy, it is skeptical and critical of religion and is already inherent and active in many modern critical approaches. With the special relation it has with poetry, which deems them similar in functioning, negative theology can be utilized to bring the analysis of poetry to a level more satisfactory in quenching the demands of the ontological and existential characteristics of modern poetry.

The method that will be pursued in this thesis will be the close readings of the selected poems “405” by Dickinson and “Peace” by G.M Hopkins. The poems will be subjected to the phases of negative analysis in comparative close readings where each phase will reveal certain

aspects of the poem through a gaze actualized by the analysis. Except for the first chapter, which serves as an introduction to the topic of negative theology and demonstrates the relation established between negative theology and poetry, each of the remaining five chapters will reflect one of the phases of negative approach. Each phase will consist of a specific mode of approaching the poems through a diligent blending of negative theology and its resemblances and traceable connections in criticism.

Regarding negative theology, in this thesis the main focus will be on Christian mysticism and the negative theology grounded in it. Pseudo-Dionysius's ostensibly fifth century text "*Divine Names*", considered one of the most important seminal texts of negative theology, will be used as the primary source of the study. Works of Meister Eckhart and the Cloud Author and their interpretations by several scholars such as Michael Sells and Denys Turner will serve as secondary sources. On the other hand, the focus on modern criticism will be mainly dealing with, but not limited, to a poststructuralist criticism of poetry. The primary source for literary criticism will be Martin Heidegger's *On the Way to Language* which deposits a unique and insightful examination of the concepts of language and poetry. As secondary sources, views from the works of many modern critics such as Jacques Derrida, James Olney, Maurice Blanchot, Gerard Genette and others will be utilized in the establishment of the negative approach.

CHAPTER I
NEGATIVE THEOLOGY AND POETRY

“Is there one negative theology, the negative theology?”

Jacques Derrida

What is Negative Theology?

There is no single kind of Negative Theology. In a historical sense what can be crudely categorized as Negative theology, is actually centuries of accumulated knowledge, comprised of contributions by many mystical authors and theologians belonging to different times and diverse cultures. On the other hand there is a core idea that underlies, governs and endures in Negative Theology despite different traditions.

Negative Theology belongs to the mystical branch of religion. As all kinds of mysticisms do, it concentrates on God and the personal relation and experience a person can have with/in God. *“The Wordsworth Dictionary of Beliefs and Religions”* defines mysticism as “The spiritual quest for the most direct experience of God...” (355). The idea of “direct experience of God” is always an issue of debate in theology. Evelyn Underhill states that mysticism can be categorized in two main schools of thought: one emphasizing the imminence of God and the other one dwelling on the transcendence of God. She calls them “immanence-theory” and “emanation-theory” (96). Negative Theology stems from and also shapes intemperately the transcendent branch of mysticism, which is considered in the category of the “emanation-theory” and takes it

to its extreme limits. Regarding the conceptualization of God, Underhill says that "... the theory of Emanations, declares His utter transcendence" (97).

The differentiating element of Negative theology, from other types of mysticisms, resides in its unique approach to the conceptualization of God. It can be better described in these lines by Pseudo-Dionysius: "Mind beyond mind, word beyond speech, it is gathered up by no discourse, by no intuition, by no name. It is and it is as no other being is. Cause of all existence, and therefore itself transcending existence, it alone could give an authoritative account of what it really is" (Dionysius 49). In this quotation, Dionysius describes God as something beyond the reach of any human faculty, especially speech. Every attempt to describe and name falls short, as it is impossible to fully apprehend God in itself, as itself, because as the Creator, it supersedes and transcends all creation. Even the type of existence God possesses is in actuality superior, transcending any kind of existence we know of. In this respect the "Being" attributed to God is different and superior to the "Being" of all other creations. God alone is the only entity that can fully explain itself; hence it must be the only one talking about itself. Even the sacred scriptures, although deemed as the closest to this category, are not satisfactory as they report and give an account through a human medium. As a result silence seems the mostly likely option to be pursued.

According to Michael Sells, from this point on, in the expression of God, there can be three directions. The first one is keeping silent and not talking about God. Secondly one can try to "distinguish between ways in which the transcendent is beyond names and in which it is not" or thirdly such a distinction can be rejected but accepted as a "genuine aporia, that is, as unresolvable" (Sells 2). Negative theology takes the second option and creates its own unique language that supposedly takes the subject closer to silence. In this view, Ten Kate and Bulhof

suggest that “silence” becomes a symbol for the divine (6). Derrida describes this silence as: “... every predicative language is inadequate to the essence, in truth to the hyperessentiality (the being beyond being) of God; consequently, only a negative (“Apophatic”) attribution can claim to approach God, and to prepare us for a silent intuition of God”(“How to Avoid Speaking” Derrida 4). Yet how is such a “silent intuition” possible? This “silent intuition” is made possible by the special language called Apophasis.

The main force in negative theology, Apophasis, bases itself on and takes place through language. It is inherent in language, and it is facilitated through certain functions and styles of thinking through language which will be explained simultaneously in the analysis stage of the poems. Apophasis can not be separated from Language. It is based on constant affirmation and negation of the suggested terms which will lead to silence or to the genuine aporia Sells talks about. On the other hand, the ideas of transcendence and the inexpressibility of God are closely related to what philosophy discusses under the topics of metaphysics and ontology. As it is going to be depicted in this thesis this ancient lore “echoes”, in certain respects, in the works of twentieth century thinkers like Derrida and Heidegger (Bullhof and Ten Kate 4). Bullhof and Ten Kate also state that “the term ‘Negative Theology’” is easily misunderstood. We must think less in terms of a religious current and more in terms of a tradition of reflection on Being, God, humanity and religion”(4). In this regard, negative theology is never something simply religious. On the contrary, with its emphasis on transcendentalism via the force of negation, it is a position that at certain times is highly skeptical and critical of what religions generally advocate. Michel Despland asserts that “Throughout the history of the church, negative theology appeared as an alternative to the mainstream” (145). For example not many religions would accept the naming of God in such dualities as both good and evil, vast and small or existent and nonexistent.

Despland regarding current views about negative theology further says that "... positive theology claims to know more than one can in fact know. In contrast, on this view, negative theology has more rigorous standards of "truth"; it does not tell as much—it may even end up saying nothing—but what it says is more solid, "sounder" (145).

In this respect the God in this thesis will not be considered and should not be thought as an entity described by religions. Negative analysis is not a religious criticism at all. It works through the "God function" facilitated by negative theology which already reposes in the language. This thesis is going to reflect this intrinsic feature with a blending of its philosophical suppositions in the realm of literature. Again, this study is a realization and employment in the criticism of poetry of the connections that already exist. This way, it aims to mobilize new understandings of existing notions of language and poetical criticism as well as it suggests new possibilities for literary criticism.

The Link between Negative Theology and Poetry

Poetry and especially modern poetry (which is what is meant when generally referred to poetry in this thesis) can be seen as a meta-language that elevates the meaning possibilities of common language or prose to a different level of expression. At the same time, it is yet highly dependent and attached at an ontological level to the language that it is born in, co-exists with and deliberately thrusts into deviations. Jon Cook, talking about poems, says: "They build a language within a language, such that words connected by rhyme, rhythm and other poetic devices create new possibilities of meaning" (20). In this general sense, poetry expressed by poetical language can be described as an attempt to overcome, supersede or surface new

possibilities of meanings and experiences that can not be truly conveyed by common language or what we name prose in literature. Gerald Bruns says that: “After all, language for a poet is rarely or never a purely transitive medium –a medium acted upon solely for the purpose of signification” (196). Poetry unlike prose, perhaps, possesses the unique ability to become or come closer to the thing it is trying to express, while at the same time, achieving a purer character than mimetic representation or narration can facilitate. Gerard Genette in his discussion on poetic language says that Mallarmé designates the aim of poetry as form united with meaning and “form eliminated in its meaning” in an attempt to overcome the arbitrary relationship between the signifier and the signified (Genette 409). Yet, explaining Mallarmé’s views, he also says that “if languages were perfect, verse would not exist, because all speech would be poetry and, therefore, there would be no poetry” (409). In this regard modern poetry is deposited into the position of a state rather than just a form deemed as a structurally different form of writing. Barthes defines modern poetry as something on its own that does not even have the need to “signal its identity outwardly”. He distinguishes it from prose as well as from classical poetry. He says: “Poetry is then no longer a Prose either ornamental or shorn of liberties. It is a quality *sui generis*¹ and without antecedents” (Barthes 54). Genette trying to define poetry says that “... it seems to me, its true ‘structure’ which is not to be a particular form, defined by its specific accidents, but rather a state, a degree of presence and intensity to which any statement may be led, so to speak, on condition that there is established around it that margin of silence which isolates it from its surroundings (but not from the gap) of ever day speech” (412). In the way Genette describes, poetry takes a statement to “a degree of presence and intensity” higher than

¹ *Sui generis* is a (post) Latin expression, literally meaning *of its own kind/genus* or unique in its characteristics. (www.wikipedia.com)

ordinary speech. It is isolated by silence from every day speech both in form and meaning. It creates different possibilities for everyday speech. As Barthes pointed out, because poetry is unique, it aims at something different, something opposed to normal meaning patterns used in common language and even thought. Blanchot basing his own ideas on those of Mallarmé says that:

The poetic word, then, is no longer opposed only to ordinary language, but also to the language of thought. In poetry we are no longer referred back to the world, neither to the world as shelter nor to the world as goals. In this language the world recedes and goals cease; the world falls silent; beings with their preoccupations, their projects, their activity are no longer ultimately what speaks. Poetry expresses the fact that beings are quiet.

(Blanchot 333)

Poetry, with the “poetic word” comes against normal patterns of meaning. It aims to invoke silence through saying. It is in this sense very similar to the idea of “silent intuition” that Derrida proposes which designates the goal of negative theology. In both poetry and negative theology, there is silence, which is both determining and determined, which shapes and is shaped and more importantly which speaks. Silence creates a break, both as the ultimate goal and as a means for distinction between poetry-prose and negative theology-theology.

In this respect a functional similarity is established between what poetry does to prose (every day language), and what negative theology achieves or aims to accomplish in theology (religions). Negative theology attempts to achieve a purer understanding of God through experiencing the inexpressible in a “silent intuition” (which is actually never silent, just like as poetry never is), and promotes genuine ways for establishing a purer relation with God by overcoming, superseding and making better the language-limited knowledge provided by

theology. Negative theology uses Apophasis for this aim and as Denys Turner asserts: “the Apophatic is the linguistic strategy of somehow showing by means of language that which lies beyond language” (34). Yet, it still uses and derives from the sacred scriptures and from the materials theology has identified itself with. In this respect, both negative theology and poetry, having language at the center of their constitutions, are endeavors at expressing the inexpressible, the unknown by trying to perhaps heave and surpass their own existential characteristics. As Gerald Bruns proposes “... there is an intimacy of poetry and things that cannot be captured by philosophical experience” (vii). However, more than philosophical, the intimacy, as it will be shown in this study, is more with mystical experience and especially with negative theology. Genette describes poetry almost the way negative theology describes itself “...it withdraws from common language *from the inside*, by an action --no doubt largely illusory—of deepening and reverberation comparable to those exalted perceptions...” (412). The withdrawal process depicted is not only true for poetry, but also points to the functioning of Apophasis in negative theology which will be explicated in the following chapters. Stemming from this intimacy and the functional similarity hinted, negative analysis takes absence, negativity and silence and several features of negative theology as productive and creative forces and applies them to the analysis of poetry. By surfacing the negative forces, it aims to delineate details that can not be gathered by conventional positive methods of analysis.

Before moving onto the analysis of poetry it should be made clear how poetry is seen through the perspective of negative analysis. The poem shall not be seen as a creation of the poet but must be deemed as part of the poet encountering an obscure state beyond description through the blending of words, feelings and ideas taking the form of a special language in language. Cook defines this as “[T]he poet becomes the conductor of affective states whose origins are not

readily identifiable. The poem becomes an artifact in which these affective states can be contemplated and perhaps shared by the reader” (Cook 5). Poetry is the attempt of the poet to become one with and encounter the unknown of the self that interacts with the world on a level rendered possible and also common by language, otherwise unique and singular in its experience. Aimé Césaire describes the poetic process vigorously:

It is not with his entire soul but with his entire being that the poet approaches the poem. What governs the poem is not the most lucid intelligence nor the most acute sensibility, but the entirety of experience, every woman loved, every desire tested, every dream dreamt, every image received or seized, the whole weight of the body and the spirit. Everything that has been lived, every possibility. Around the emerging poem the precious vortex: myself, itself, the world. And the most surprising encounters, all pasts, all futures, the anticyclone creates its stable levee, the amoeba loses its pseudopods, vegetable forms are gathered together. Every flux, every ray of light. The body is no longer deaf or blind. Everything has the right to life. Everything is summoned. Everything waits. I mean everything. The whole individual experience reconfigured by poetic inspiration. And, in a more disturbing way, the entire cosmos too. (280)

Césaire defines poetry as an amalgam of infinite possibilities of encountering the self, the world and everything through language that involves immersion of the whole being and the experiences of the poet. Césaire talks about the entire experience of the poet pouring itself into the poem. However, as each poet’s experience is unique, thus at its origin they are inexpressible. Concerning the experience, a signifier-signified relation can not be sustained because the signified comes before and without a distinct signifier in its personal ingenuity and irritability that which makes up the experience itself. As Paul De Man says regarding the relation between

matter and consciousness: “the very fact that the relationship has to be established within the medium of language indicates that it does not exist in actuality” (418). In this regard no matter how it is transformed, when the experience enters the language, it becomes something else. In poetical language, thus in poetry, this effect is doubled, because as Allen Ginsberg states: “The only pattern of value or interest in poetry is the solitary, individual pattern peculiar to the poet’s moment and the poem discovered in the mind and in the process of writing it out on the page...” (371). This makes poetical experience singular. Unlike prose of which as De Man says that words “are used as established signs to confirm that something is recognized as being the same as before; and re-cognition excludes origination”, in poetry “words are not used as signs, not even as names, but in order to name... as implying a return to the source, to the pure motion of experience at its beginning” (415). Poetry aims to recover the experience as much as it can, but what it does is that it creates a blending of the experience and the words unfolding in the poetical experience. Poetry is an “origination” because each attempt to express the inexpressibility of the experience is also unique. This inexpressibility reminds one of the mystic’s personal relation with God which is also as a vision inexpressible. In this respect Underhill states that:

The mystic, as a rule, can not wholly do without symbol and image, inadequate to his vision though they must always be: for his experience must be expressed if it is to be communicated, and its actuality is inexpressible except in some side-long way some hint or parallel which will stimulate the dormant intuition of the reader, and convey, as all poetic language does, something beyond its surface sense. (79)

The mystic and the poet, no matter how their experiences differ from each other’s, are at a fundamental level in the same position of depicting ineffability.

In a poem each word undergoes a change and acquires additional possibilities of inducing meanings and feelings other than they are defined for. Velimir Khlebnikov states that “The word leads a double life” and makes the categorization as “[I]n one form of creativity, sense turns in a circular path about sound; in the other sound turns about sense” (96). He accentuates the point that sound and sense might have different and equally important roles in poetry. Pertaining to a similar point Roland Barthes says that the “[W]ord in poetry can never be untrue, because it is a whole, it shines with an infinite freedom and prepares to radiate towards innumerable uncertain and possible connections” (“Is There Any Poetic Writing” 302). In a way, in poetry, to express the inexpressible, the words become charged with certain qualities more than they are created or intended for in common language. In the realm of poetry the dominating codes are different than prose. As Cook defines it in the following statement, poetry is existent in language but it has a code of its own: “The poetic function is at work in all language, but it comes to special prominence in poetry where the everyday requirements of clear and rapid communication do not predominate” (Cook 20). It aims something else than simple communication. Thus it requires a method of analysis in line with its character.

A poem can also be seen as an encounter of the self that expands to meet the world through emotions, intuitions and ideas with the words that try to name the world. It is an act that tries to give the experience to its reader of the unnamable by the use of names. Words can both be the object and the subject of this encounter, shaping, and being shaped by the poem. Thus the distinctions between words and the poet and the poem become blurred and unstable. The self is infused and recreated in the poem. Marina Tsvetaeva says that “[T]he poet’s self is a dream-self and a language-self; it is the ‘I’ of a dreamer awakened by inspired speech and realized only in that speech” (216). This state symbolizes the wish of the mystic to transcend the self and reach

God. As Underhill says “[U]nion must be looked as the true goal of mystical growth” and further states that the union “... is the total annihilation or reabsorption of the individual soul in the Infinite” (170). This state in literature, which can be called the state of poetry, is desirable, because through poetry, the distinctions between the poet and the poem, word and meaning, signifier and signified creator and the created, are attempted to be overcome. Césaire defining the poetic state, says that “[S]o here –by means of the poetic state—is a resolution of two most painful antinomies that there can be: the antinomy between one and another, the antinomy between self and the world” (281).

Words are not correspondences to explain or decipher this encounter, but are active and embedded elements of it, sometimes leading and sometimes being lead. They must be read and simultaneously left behind to the feeling, meaning and sound they create. They are shells and much more than shells. Concerning common language Valéry says that “... the very act of speech—does not last; it does not outlive understanding; it dissolves in the light; it has acted; it has done its work; it has brought understanding; it has lived” (238). On the other hand, as Valéry depicts the situation in poetry, it is much different, because the readers “think in accordance with a rule and under laws which are no longer of the practical order—that is, nothing that may occur in this state will be resolved, finished, or abolished by a specific act” and goes on saying that “We are entering the poetic universe” (238). Words bring the reader (the poet is also included) to a certain edge for meaning, feeling and experience, yet; they can never truly transcend, because of their existential characteristics that limit themselves to certain meanings. However, as they are taken to their limits, they are never totally understood and can be dispensed with as it is the case in common speech. In poetry, words can be opened to further meaning possibilities, into referentiality, deferral and can be repeated ceaselessly, as Valéry suggests, or be left into silence

until the next poem. What Turner says for negative theology seems to hold true for poetry as well “[I]t is in the profusion of our affirmations that we encounter the limits of language, and then break through them into the dark silence of the transcendent” (32). It is necessary that at some point words must be superseded. For this, they must be both loved and hated; therefore, they must be affirmed and negated continuously.

The limitations of the text can be overcome and a poem can be taken to a state truly appraising and appreciating its inherent possibilities of meanings, feelings and experiences, only if its own negative being and self-dissolutions are also facilitated through a series of moves involving affirmation and negation. Like the condition for stars to be seen, there has to be complete darkness, the darkness behind the poem shall be brought about. Poetry is not about knowing or explaining, yet, because of the restrictions of language, ironically, it tries to make its reader feel this unknowing through words that connote certainty and knowledge. Unknowing is not something to be feared, because it is suggestive of progress, change and freedom. In this respect, poetry is the most suitable state for the words to achieve freedom and attempt to transcend themselves. Paul De Man explicates the idea in the following line: “[T]he word is always a free presence to the mind, the means by which the permanence of natural entities can be put into question and thus negated, time and again, in the endlessly widening spiral of the dialectic” (417). Freeing the word requires a different kind of knowledge gained through affirmation and negation that puts it into constant motion. Unknowing is this different kind of knowledge in negative theology and it finds its counterpart in poetry in the definition Césaire makes: “[P]oetic knowledge is born in the silence of scientific knowledge” (276). In order not to be caged in knowing, which is a limitation and a restriction that should belong to narrations, or language, which aims to explain, the referentiality of the text must be kept open at all times in a

dynamic motion that can be made possible by a negative approach. Silence, absence and negativity must be given due respect as they are crucial, but also neglected compounds of poetry in its criticism. How does negative approach attain this? It shall be depicted through out the phases of negative analysis.

CHAPTER II

CATAPHASIS and APOPHASIS

The terms Cataphasis and Apophasis are crucial in determining the stages of negative theology. Negative theology, prior to all, requires a positive step of “being” or “existence” before it can start negation. This first step of naming things, trying to verbalize thoughts, experiences, feelings about God with simple words or metaphors, images and allegories, makes up the “Cataphatic” phase of negative theology. In simple terms, in order to deny, transcend, refuse, defer, forget, negate, unsay and simply apply all the forces of negation, we initially require something positive, in the minimalist sense a presence or at least something that becomes present in saying. As Derrida says “... there can not be an absolutely negative discourse: a logos necessarily speaks about something; it can not avoid speaking of something; it is impossible for it to refer to nothing” (“How to avoid speaking” 34).

Dionysius in the sixth part of the first chapter in his work “Divine Names” gives several examples of how God has been attributed with different names in the Bible, names such as “life, light, truth, wise, beloved, God of gods, Lord of Lords, Holy of Holies, eternal, existent, Cause of the ages, greatest of all and yet the one in the still breeze;” and finishes with the line “that he is all, that he is no thing”(55). Many other theologians and mystical authors also use words and metaphorical expressions that attempt to describe God and his attributes, words such as God’s darkness, brilliance, brightness, His naked being, and uncreated reality without beginning. Positive attempts of depiction, deriving from knowledge of things reflecting on the divine, form the Cataphatic stage. Dionysius justifies God’s names driven from the creation: “[H]ence the songs of praise and the names for it are fittingly derived from the sum of all creation.”(pg, 56)

For example, again, referring to the names Dionysius uses, among them there are such that actually belong to objects of this very material world such as, “he is sun, star and fire, water, wind, and dew, cloud, archetypal stone and rock...”(56). As human beings, the ability to think of God is very much affected by the perceptions (inner-outer) in this world, thus this neutrality creates a tendency to imagine God in the likeness of these terms. However God, at the same time owning and knowing each of them, also transcends all of them. Dionysius says “and so it is that cause of all and transcending all, he is rightly nameless and yet has the names of everything that is” (56). God possesses the three possible states of names and naming: all the names of creation, namelessness and all that transcendent naming. Negative theology with the steps of Cataphasis, Apophasis and the “disordering of language” (as Turner names it) or the “genuine aporia” (as Sells names it) continuously simulates these three name states of God. However, as Apophasis is the determining element in this process, this special kind of language is called Apophatic Language.

Basically, as Negative Theology builds upon the premise that God is unnamable, Apophatic Language consists of constant affirmation and negation of the names of God. For example if God is named “dark”, it should be negated after a while as “undark” and then labeled as “light”, which also needs to be negated after awhile. Then perhaps God can be labeled with another name such as “good” and then it should also be negated and considered as “ungood” or “bad”, then the same process is repeated endlessly. This is very close to what Derrida calls deferral. What is called difference that stimulates this deferral, incorporated in the term “differance”, finds a disparate voice in negative theology. As God, in its infinity contains all the names, the deference and difference are both comprised in God. In a way they become functions of God.

In this respect, to express it simply, affirmation, saying, writing and claiming presence is considered Cataphasis, whereas denial, unsaying and moves towards silence are considered Apophasis. These terms will be better explained in the following chapters, yet in relating this to literature, it can be said that presence, sound and knowable qualities of a text are its Cataphatic qualities. James Olney in his treatise *The Language(s) of Poetry* categorizes this in similar terms as presence and absence, which are to be explained in detail in the preceding chapters as well.

This idea of Cataphasis and Apophasis finds voice, in a very similar manner, in Reader Response Theory. In the following passage Iser almost unknowingly defines the Cataphatic phase. He unknowingly pertains almost in precision to the disordered language phase of the negative analysis and perhaps negative analysis in general:

The efficacy of a literary text is brought about by the apparent evocation and subsequent negation of the familiar. What at first seemed to be an affirmation of our assumption leads to our own rejection of them, thus tending to prepare us for a re-orientation. And it is only when we have outstripped our preconceptions and left the shelter of the familiar that we are in a position to gather new experiences. (Iser 224)

What Iser suggests in the above passage is very similar to what is done in the Cataphasis phase. In this first phase of the negative analysis visible and general information at first glance, together with the stereotypes and everything said about the poem or the poet is accumulated. This is done to see what to leave behind and deny. It aims to eliminate what can be seen as stereotypical obstacles about the poem before experiencing it through negative analysis. This is the process named “unknowing” in negative theology. It is a denial and a negation move but it is never a complete abandoning. The aim is to open the self to the new experience, that which is the poem itself.

Heidegger also says something very much in line with the process of Cataphasis and Apophasis:

Language speaks by saying, this is, by showing. What it says wells up from the formerly spoken and so far still unspoken Saying which pervades the design of Language. Language in that it, as showing, reaching into all regions of presences, summons from whatever is present to appear and fade. (124)

Cataphasis, similar to the way language is expressed in Heidegger, stems from two sources: one is the things formerly spoken about God and the second is the things yet unspoken. However, although unspoken, what is unspoken is still in the language in the form of absence. When it is spoken it becomes saying, thus presence, but most importantly, after a certain time, it fades back and it should fade back into absence again. Absence can very well be substituted by the term silence. In this respect, it is close to the steps of Cataphasis and Apophasis. Cataphasis makes the language appear, while Apophasis takes it back into oblivion. However, oblivion or silence is not a negative term, but it is the source of the poem, the being of the inexpressible, that which Heidegger calls the Language. Cataphasis and Apophasis, affirmation and negation are a continuous process and it is a necessary cycle.

In negative analysis, based on this distinction of Cataphasis and Apophasis, poems are assessed in two layers. The first layer is the outer layer, that which is visible. The second layer is the inner layer that which is reached by understanding the meaning and intrinsic elements in the poem. Just by looking at the poem, by the form, density and number of lines and words, an initial assumption is made concerning the first outer level. If the poem seems verbose then it is labeled Cataphatic; if either the number of lines or number of words are minimal for each line then it is tagged Apophatic. A poem, if it is written with in a particular form is considered Orderly; if not,

it can be named Disorderly. For example, a poem can be Orderly Cataphatic, when there seems to be a certain form and abundance of words and lines at the outer level. The second level, the inner level can only be assessed after being subject to the Disordered Language phase of the negative approach. In this level a poem can either be Apophatic or Cataphatic. How this is assessed is a promise of the preceding chapter.

First of all, initial to all, Cataphasis presents us with the poems. They are presented one on each page, in line with the solitariness they seek and the space they create:

PEACE²

- 1 When will you ever, Peace, wild wooddove, shy wings shut,
- 2 Your round me roaming end, and under be my boughs?
- 3 When, when, Peace, will you, Peace? I'll not play hypocrite
- 4 To own my heart: I yield you do come sometimes; but
- 5 That piecemeal peace is poor peace. What pure peace allows
- 6 Alarms of wars, the daunting wars, the death of it?
- 7 O surely, reaving Peace, my lord should leave in lieu
- 8 Some good! And so he does leave Patience exquisite,
- 9 That plumes to peace thereafter. And when Peace here does house
- 10 He comes with work to do, he does not come to coo,
- 11 He comes to brood and sit.

² Hopkins 36

405³

- 1 It might be lonelier
- 2 Without the Loneliness --
- 3 I'm so accustomed to my Fate --
- 4 Perhaps the Other -- Peace --

- 5 Would interrupt the Dark --
- 6 And crowd the little Room --
- 7 Too scant -- by Cubits -- to contain
- 8 The Sacrament -- of Him --

- 9 I am not used to Hope --
- 10 It might intrude upon --
- 11 Its sweet parade -- blaspheme the place --
- 12 Ordained to Suffering --

- 13 It might be easier
- 14 To fail -- with Land in Sight --
- 15 Than gain -- My Blue Peninsula --
- 16 To perish -- of Delight --

³ Dickinson 193

Repeating once more, what is seen at first glance, what is given after the initial readings, together with the positive information gathered about the poems or the poets, make up the Cataphatic phase of negative analysis. It exposes what is generally taken to be true. It is significant because what the poem hides in its negativity, in absence, in denial, is attached to these words and phrases that are present. Negative analysis aims to highlight the hidden, seemingly absent forces and the rupturing in the common patterns of language that creates the poetic effect, which in the particular case makes these two poems simply beautiful. In order for this, first, presence is necessary. In this respect the Cataphatic phase may seem a bit ordinary as it is the stage when the obvious is given. However, it is a starting point and it leads the way, because behind the obvious lies the hidden and the analysis should move in the direction of Apophasis.

The Poem "405" by Dickinson

The poem consists of four quatrains, stemming from the Hymn form. It does not seem to have the usual abab rhyming, or any other particular rhyming scheme. The first, second and the fourth lines of each stanza are written in trimeter, whereas the third lines in each stanza are measured in tetrameter establishing a singular pattern of its own. This kind of a hymn is called short meter. Each stanza barely exceeds four words, excluding the articles and the prepositions with the exception of the tetrameter lines. The last lines of the second, third and the fourth stanzas are mainly made up of only two words. In each stanza, at least three lines end with dashes. In Dickinson's poetry, dashes are generally considered to be used instead of commas and denote silences. Certain words or phrases in each stanza are also left in between dashes meaning

they are to be specially read by themselves alone, as it especially put in the middle created silences in order to bestow these words with significance over other words. Regarding these details that can be skimmed at first glance, we can say that the poem is initially Orderly Apophatic. It is orderly, because it bases itself on the hymn form and has a certain metrical pattern. It is Apophatic in the sense that there are few words in each line and lots of empty spaces, especially if we count the dashes as spaces that denote silence and refrain from the words.

In the general literary canon, this poem is not considered to have any particular significance or unique importance contributing to Dickinson's poetry. It can be said that it perfectly suits and reflects the biographical conception of the poet in the way is a woman caged in a dark and gloomy house dissatisfied with life. However, such a generalization is what we deliberately want to omit. Every poem is unique and as it can say everything, it can also say nothing about the poet, or the poem itself. Heidegger says that "[T]he poet's statement remains unspoken. None of his individual poems, nor their totality, says it all. Nonetheless, every poem speaks from the whole of the ones single statement, and in each instance says that statement" (160). In this respect it is very similar to Dionysius's statement that God possesses all three name states: all, everything and none. Once more, a functional relation between how God and poetry are related can be worked over this resemblance in the sense that each poem like God's individual names can both be saying everything about the inexpressible. Inexpressible symbolizes God in theology and Poet's individual experience with words in literature. Indulging in the poem itself, in the way language speaks, the stereotypes can and should be ignored. If we deduce certain notions and ideas about the poet after the poem we should ask, does the poem know its poet? Or what percent is a poem of a poet's life? The answers should always be different.

The Poem "Peace" by Hopkins

The poem "Peace" by Hopkins is a special treatment of the classical Petrarchan sonnet form. It is called the 'curtal' sonnet by the poet himself and it is shorter than a normal sonnet by three and a half lines: instead of an octave, it has six lines in the first section, and instead of a sestet it has four and half lines in the second part (Antikacıoğlu 54). When we look at its rhyming pattern we see that it is in the format of abcabcdcedc. When the poem is scanned at the first glance, the insistent repetition of the word "peace" in the poem is easily realized. The pauses created by commas and the time it takes to read the stressed words that constitute the sprung rhythm in full play, increases the density of the poem greatly.

The sound quality of the poem "Peace" enlivens the feeling induced thoughts, pertaining much more to sensuality rather than to reason or intellect. Reason and intellect are at a secondary position in the poem, compared to sensuality. Antikacıoğlu says generally about Hopkins that: "This is a language that is highly 'visible', in which words do not blend into meaning but stand out and language, more than meaning, calls attention to itself"(49). Hopkins says that "Poetry is speech framed for contemplation of the mind by the way of hearing or speech framed to be heard for its own sake and interest even over and above its interest of meaning."(qtd. in Ward 4)

Regarding these facts, at first glance, we can say that this poem is of Cataphatic quality. It is Orderly Cataphatic because it has a strict form even though this form is shaped by the poet himself. Yet, later in the analysis it is going to be manifested how the Cataphasis in this poem works in conveying not just sounds, but also meaning. This poem is not one of the famous poems

of Hopkins. It is considered part of the “The Sonnets of Desolation”, which is a later group of sonnets that are considered superior to the earlier ones. As Hopkins is a priest-poet and many of his works, especially the later ones, are about God this poem can be labeled as a poem about “peace” with God, on earth, in Heaven. Gardner paraphrases the poem as: “The peace he has desired had been an idle consummation of ease, a gentle cooing of the undisturbed spirit; but the peace he is now prepared to accept, “piecemeal” if God so ordain, must be active ‘will to work’ – a readiness to share in the continuous Divine act of Creation.”(286) In the negative analysis the poem will be read in a very different way, abstaining especially from over generalizations.

According to W.H Gardner Hopkins was not a ‘period’ writer. He says that only a few of his poems were “directly inspired by events or circumstances which were peculiar to the nineteenth century”. In this respect he claims that Hopkins’s poetry has “a timeless quality.” The special upbringing Hopkins had, growing up in a family of both intellectuals and artists, then joining the Jesuit order and becoming a monk have bestowed special qualities that he both benefitted and suffered from. Being stuck between his duties to his order that required strict abstinence and sole concentration on God and his artistic impulses, his eye and taste for beauty and aesthetics, he found his unique way to reconcile both.

The term “inscape”, which is very crucial in his poetry and ideology enables this reconciliation. Evident in the mystical approaches, and also available in the works of Dun Scotus, is the idea that the image of God is existent in everything, in every creation in a unique way. This incorporation makes up the core of the term “inscape”. How this “inscape” expresses itself is also referred to by Hopkins in the term “instress”. Antikacıoğlu describes this term as follows: “‘Instress’ was like an impulse, a sensation that came from the inscape of things and acted on the senses of the beholder” (44). These ideas of “inscape” and “instress” are very much

in line with the Heideggerian idea that lets the “things thing” as they make way to their own voices. In the book *The Way to Language* Heidegger says: “No thing is where the word is lacking. We could go further and propose this statement: something is only where the appropriate and therefore competent word names a thing as being, and so establishes the given being as being. ... Therefore this statement holds true: Language is the house of being” (63). When Hopkins tries to utilize this “instress” in poetry what he is actually trying to do is very similar to evoking the relation between the thing and the word. By applying the “instress” he aims to bring forth the “inscape”. Hopkins says that “Design, pattern, or what I am in the habit of calling ‘inscape’ is what I above all aim in poetry” (qtd. in Ward 3) Ward also says about the term inscape that it “can be known as a formal pattern of sound and syntax” in a poem but it is also “a pattern of psychological and emotional associations” (4-5). It is never solely a meaningless sound driven from a word because of its poetical entailments.

In his “Sermons and Devotional Writings” Hopkins says that “God’s utterance of Himself within himself is God the Word, outside himself is this world. The world then is word, expression, news of God” (qtd. in Ward 1). If he is aiming at bringing “inscape” into poetry apparently he is doing it by the medium of words and their established relations with things. In this respect, again, his aim is very similar to what Heidegger says of the word: “The word itself is the relation which in each instance retains the thing within itself in such a manner that it “is” a thing” (66). In Heidegger word and thing-thinging-being are one and simultaneous, sustained through poetry, the way language lets it. In Hopkins, thus word, and thing-inscape-instress are one or at least attempted to be made one by his poetry. This is similar to the way God lets, manifests them in His/Her word which makes up the “inscape” of things. In a way Hopkins attempts to achieve that.

Despite disparate contexts, Emily Dickinson is also in a similar situation concerning in-betweenness. Vivian R. Pollack and Marianne Noble, in their essay “A Brief Biography” about E. Dickinson, say the following:

In part, she wanted to be empowered in conventional terms: to close the gap between romance and reality. In part, she was cynical about reality and refused to be satisfied with metaphors of fulfillment that sustained others. Oscillating between “heaven” and “earth” she refused perfectionist religious culture, which she associated with the repression of glorious, sensuously gratifying particulars, and with death. (19)

Dickinson did not want to be categorized or limited by doctrines offered to her. Although she always had her connection with God, she always maintained the relation in her terms and definitions, refusing to give into any kind of dogma whether this would be religious or its extreme other disbelief. “Death” was a theme crucial in her life and the way it was portrayed through religion did not satisfy her. Like Hopkins, she wanted to celebrate the details, the particulars and the things, such as the bee, sea and the flowers. She did not register a distinction between the bee and infinity or infinity and death. In one of her poems she says: “the Balm of that Religion/That doubts –as fervently as it believes” (Eberwein 96). It seems like a contradiction, a paradox something that both “doubts” and “believes”. However, this is very close to one of the ways which the process of Apophasis ends in the forming of disordered language (DL). In this respect, the ways in which she used these seemingly opposite terms and ideas can be related to the Apophatic language of Negative Theology that is illuminated in the following chapter.

CHAPTER III

DISORDERING OF LANGUAGE

Disordering in language is closely connected to the Apophatic process. Basing his idea on Dionysius's views Turner says that "we must both affirm and deny all things of God; and then we must negate the contradiction between the affirmed and the denied" (22). Let's give a simple example and say that God is hot. (The only fact we have to take for granted and keep in mind is that God is transcendent, otherwise Apophasis and thus negative theology is not possible.) So taking that for granted, we look to see the nature of this transcendence and focus on the describing word. We state that, God is hot; (It is Cataphasis as we are declaring affirmative words), that affirm for a moment, then immediately say that God is not hot. It is Apophasis as we renounce being hot because it cannot be a single definitive word of God and we need more, not only because God is not just hot but also the hotness God possesses is different from the kind of hotness we can imagine. It leads us to the idea that God is cold (again Cataphasis), because what is not hot is thought cold, although there is a position such as uncold, a shadow word, something beyond hotness that we try to imagine, feel, experience for a split second. However in a natural signification chain it ends up at the word "cold". We also affirm that word for an instance, then negate it by saying (unsaying, Apophasis) that God is not cold. At the end we must "negate the negation" by saying that God is a cool warmness. Yet the "negation of the negation", as Turner portrays, "is not a third utterance, additional to the affirmative and the negative, in good linguistic order; it is not some intelligible synthesis of affirmation and negation; it is rather the collapse of our affirmation and denials into disorder" that creates a "disordered language" (22). The disorder of this language establishes notions that are

imaginable, but in reality unknowable notions such as cool warmness, dark brilliance or speaking silence. Such notions induce in the person the feeling of experiencing the inexpressible. This collapse of the language forces us to the limits of meaning the words, but, as we are not able to grasp them, only feeling momentary apprehensions, we fall back to the beginning of the two word combination and start over again or establish silence. In this regard, mere words depicting certain attributes, combined in negation in such a way, become the means of experiencing unknowability, further from the word, through the word combination, closer to the sensual experience, all ending, if chosen, in silence.

One might ask how Apophasis works if there is not an antonym for a word, an opposite (cold-hot, good-bad). For instance what happens if we say that God is a house? The answer is simple. When we deny that God is a house, again we think of the term not-house which can easily slip into “unhouse” forming a persistent SSS. Defining SSS, there are three crucial moments in this process of Apophasis. Right after the denial of each term, in both negation (denial) stages, there appears a split second space (SSS) where before we think of the opposite word or the term we first try to imagine what it is not. In the example I have used these moments emerge when we try to think of unhot, uncold and the final statement cool warmness which establishes a looping SSS. These SSSs takes us closer to the inexpressible.

Returning back to the initial example, the idea represented by the word “unhouse” unfolds itself to numerous numbers of “unhouse” possibilities. Unhouse, can be loneliness, destitute, freedom and etc creating an open space (SSS) for “It” to come. Yet every name we give to that “It”, it will also stay momentarily. The escape from the limitation of the word is always momentary and has to be redone again and again. Sells notes that “Apophasis moves toward the

transreferential, it cannot dispense with reference, but through the constant turning back upon its own referential delimitations, it seeks a momentary liberation from such delimitations” (8-9).

In the table below, this process of Apophasis explicated by Turner is schematized. The Apophatic movement begins from the left and moves towards right in the rows except for the last one where each column represents stages of the Apophatic Language.

Table 1

Dark	Undark	Light	Unlight	Dark Brilliance
False	Unfalse	True	Untrue	False Truth
Affirmation 1	Negation 1	Affirmation 2	Negation 2	The Disordered Language

This phase of negative analysis is made up of two closely connected stages and it is closely linked to the following chapter shadow protuberance. It consists of the search for the elements of “disordered language” (DL) making up such a combination in the poem that they create inscrutability contributing to the poetical language. Disorder in a poem can be attained by either sound or meaning. In this phase, first, each will be dealt with separately and then compared at the end.

The first step is concerned with meaning. The built up obscurities of the poem highlight a new kind of knowing, which is usually against common and reasonable knowledge and is acquired by the unknowing of the regular meanings. The term unknowing represents the denial

and negation of the ordinary meaning of the word, or word combinations. It gives away to the senses and momentary apprehensions that are close to the mystical experience. At this step, if there are any, the secret spatial character of the words or group of words invoked or gained through their usage in the poem shall be spotted and examined. This phase, the disordered language, is the heart of the negative analysis.

The second part of this phase, is the search for disordering in language via sound plays. In this stage, sounds that have particular influence in the poem, felt after its consecutive readings, are marked. Afterwards, the words marked this way, are compared with the findings of the disordered language established through meaning. The convergences of the DLs in meaning and sound indicate spots of profundity (SOP). If the number of converged DLs (pairs) is abundant, the poem is closer to an Apophatic character in its inner level. If the number of converged words (pairs) is low compared to the number of selected DLs, then the poem is closer to a Cataphatic character again in its inner level. This way the initial promise that has been made in the first reading, in the previous chapter about the Apophatic and Cataphatic character of the poem in its outer level, should be contrasted with the inner character of the poem. Determining the type of the inner character of the poem is only applicable at a recondite level that can only be uncovered after a meticulous analysis. At an outer initial level a poem can be Cataphatic, yet at a deeper level it might be Apophatic.

In order to spot disordered language, which can be mistaken for a simple oxymoron, we have to look at not only sequential combination of words such as “dark brilliance” but locate words, lines or even stanzas, according to what the poem demands, and, try to situate them in diverse places. For instance the title of Baudelaire’s book of poems *Les Fleurs du Mal* constitutes a good example. “Flowers of evil”, as it would be translated into English, is not a

simple oxymoron, because the words flower and evil are not antonyms, but it points more to a disordered language that I want to emphasize here. As flowers carry the meaning of goodness, or imply goodness, at another level that can be named transcendental, flowers contradict the word evil, creating a unique and almost a contradicting state of image and meaning. The possibility of an evil flower is a mind itching idea that in a way requires a certain kind of unknowing. General knowledge about flowers is rebuked and flowers are denoted as evil. However, this does not imply that it is a new kind of knowledge that should be taken for granted. It shall be negated afterwards as well. Otherwise it would stick as a knowledge that is not necessarily true, but only momentarily and in a certain state rendered possible. Just like the God of negative theology, a poem can not be known fully, it can be comprehended momentarily and sensuality, because it is always exactly what words can tell and more than words can tell. The constant movement is sustained at all times.

Explicated by the above paragraph, the establishment of the disordered language heavily bases itself on the cultural codes, thus meanings and symbols attributed to words and phrases. Without the implied goodness of “flowers”, which is culturally sown into the language, such an analysis would be impossible. However, without this knowledge a poetry reading or reading of any kind would be impossible as language itself is something cultural and the signified portion of the signifier-signified relation is culturally formed and personally refined.

As it is going to be better explained in the next chapter (shadow protuberance), most metaphors are established in a similar manner. In this respect the term disordered language incorporates every kind of attempt including metaphor, oxymoron or personification or any technique that comes against common meaning patterns established by prose or normal language. Thus, the step of disordered language is the perfect type of tool to recognize such

differences because, although it knows the meanings of terms like personification, metaphor or metonym and applies them without hesitation, it does not seek them as crystallized forms but examines them in the poem, in and through the language as differentiations in the text that contributes to the poetical character of the text.

The Poem "Peace" Part 1

The first example of disordered language is tacit in the rhetorical question formed by the first two lines. The word "peace" comes to be defined through the question in a single continuous way which can be deemed as constituting an element of disordered language (DL). In line one, peace, is described as "wild wooddove, shy wings shut". "Wooddove", being "wild", gives the first impression of a bird that is active, in the sense that it is flying and free. Yet, immediately after, it is depicted as "shy wings shut". The bird that we first thought of as wild and free is actually almost incapacitated to the point of not being able to fly. As the bird is a metaphor for Peace, we discern that the imagined peace is wild and at the same time inactive, which forms a contrast and thus a DL. However, the DL is a continuous one, not ending with a single contrast but performing it in an alternating pattern. After "...shy wings shut", the second line starts with the phrase "Your round me roaming end", again depicting peace, yet in a manner active enough to befit the first impression we obtain from the phrase "wild wooddove". This time, a contrast is formed with the previous phrase "shy wings shut", forming a DL. As a result this can be seen as a single tripartite DL, in which all three parts act upon each other:

- 1) Wild wooddove---onto---2) Shy wings shut---onto---3) Your round me roaming end.

The second recognized DL is in line three in the phrase “Peace, will you, peace?” The word “peace” in noun form is confronted by the word “peace” in verb form. It establishes a rupture in the language, creating a DL, in the sense that by asking peace to peace, it connotes the idea that peace is not actually peaceful, which is a sign that it is lacking its own inherent fundamental essentiality that gives itself the meaning it possesses. This DL is so crucial in the poem that it is going to help us in determining the hidden name of God for the last phase of negative analysis.

The third DL is the setting of two opposing ideas next to each other, in a sequential form, apparent in line five. “Poor peace” is juxtaposed to “pure peace” establishing an effect of ambiguity by naming peace poor and then immediately pure. Even though the subject has changed and the kind of peace talked about is different, this DL proposes the sense that peace can be seen in both ways.

The fourth DL is evident through the lines five and six, again created by a question that inquires the qualities of peace felt by the poet. “What pure peace allows/ Alarms of wars, the daunting wars, the death of it?” The form of DL is quite similar to the first DL we have recognized, in the sense that it is also a continuous move. In the beginning of the question, peace is described as pure peace, which doubles the effect of peace, trying to tap its untainted nature to distinguish it from other kinds of diluted images and feelings of peace experienced by the poet. Here the DL is more of a conceptual character, rather than having direct relations among words. Thus it is more suitable for the step shadow protuberance. Pure peace is personified here, gaining the attributes of a living being that can die. Its death resides in its opposite; “war”, portrayed by the phrases “Alarms of wars, the daunting wars”. We are led to think of peace with war and imagine its upcoming death through war which makes up the play of DL.

The fifth example of DL is a simple usage. The phrase “reaving peace”, in line seven, describes peace directly with a word that denotes the meaning of “pillaging and plundering” which is in stark contrast with what peace means. Thus a totally new type of peace is materialized through this combination, establishing a strong, apt and to the point DL very much in line with the hidden name of the god of the poem.

Disordering of language bases itself on two points: the rupturing in the relation between the signifier and the signified and the dissolution of the common meaning patterns. Starting with the latter point, Heidegger quoting a poem says: “Something strange is the soul on the earth.”(162) Deriving from that, perhaps the following meanings can be assigned based on previous conceptions of poetry Heidegger proposes. Strange something is poetry; the soul is the inexpressible experience (with life, with it, with anything) and the earth is the language. In a similar manner Olney when talking about metaphors and metonyms in the poetry of Dickinson, Whitman and Hopkins, he does not call these poets themselves strange, but masters of “making strange”. Talking about the great poets he says: “They see farther and deeper into the language and the human condition, and their vision will always, necessarily seem strange as coming from the extreme bounds – and beyond—of human experience and expression.”(Olney 93) As the poets see differently, they also use the kind of language that would enable them to reflect “the extreme bounds –and beyond – of human experience” and that naturally resides in making it strange, which is part of the poetical language. In this respect, if we had not known the Apophatic process, we would have definitely called phrases like “dark brilliance” or “cool warmth” part of language that has been made strange. Yet, we know that it is “strange” because, it is strange thus paradoxical to convey an experience inexpressible, (because it is personal,

unique, divine whatever the reason) it is virtually impossible. Hence, in a mocking way, the attempt deserves the name strange.

The sixth DL is also similar in form to the first and the third ones. It is not one of those combinations like “reaving peace” or the question “peace, will you peace?” which are small yet powerful, what we can call, “dark speckles”, but active more over on an ideological basis sustained through on going lines and related word combinations. When the DL is situated in certain contrasts of ideas over several lines or several phrases, in such manner, we can call these type “shadow smeared” DLs. Towards the end of line nine, peace is personified and situated in a rather different position than it is generally defined for. “...Peace here does house/ He comes with work to, he does not come to coo, / He comes to brood and sit”. Peace here is of a different character than being at peace connoted by the word “coo” but it has work to do and it is mostly contemplative and negative, entailed by/in the word “brood”. If we think of peace in terms of activeness and passivity, we get the image that, at first peace when housing is passive, when he has work to do is active, when he is not there to “coo” is passive, when “brooding” is active and finally while sitting is passive. We get a single DL produced by the continuous contrast of the ideological movement over/in/through peace.

The Poem “Peace” Part 2

In this part the aim is to look at the disordering through striking sound play and compare the examples of disordered language (DL) and striking sound plays (SSP) to assess the Apophatic/Cataphatic unity. The poem is so dense with SSPs that one is tempted to consider

them as a whole because it is hard to differentiate them from each other. However, a line by line analysis would help the reader hear the sound plays better.

In the first line, actually there are two kinds of SSP in play, one sustained by the usage of the “w” sound in words such as “when”, “will”, “wild”, “wooddove”, “wings” and the other one by the usage of “s” sound in two words “shy” and “shut” at the end of the line. Thus we can count these as two distinct plays. In the second line there are three types of sound plays prevalent. First one created by the words “round” and “roaming”, the second one formed by the surfacing “b” sound in “be” and “boughs” and the third one the general sound similarities between words, such as the “ou” sound existing in “you”, “round” and “bough” or the m sound in “me” and “my”. As we have examined in the first part of this step, the single DL here is formed by the depiction of the idea of peace in an alternating pattern over the first two lines. In this regard, we can say that there is a ratio 1 DL to 5 SSP over two lines. On the other hand, if we think in terms of shadow convergences, even though the ratio is 1/5, the way DL is spread renders possible the calling it as shadow convergence. So from this example we realize that numbers of DLs or SSPs are not by themselves substantive but must be closely scrutinized to delineate their relations and effects on each other.

In the first part of line three the line, “When, when, Peace, will you, Peace?” there is a single but very effective SSP created by the repetition of the words “when” and “peace”. This kind of a SSP is so potent that it actually induces a break in the flow of the poem and makes the reader focus on the idea, and because it is sound based, it gets to the senses acutely. As there is also a DL engulfed in this specific phrase, we can say that there is definitely a shadow convergence here, making a ratio of 1/1.

The next SSPs occur in the fifth and the sixth lines. “That piecemeal peace is poor peace. What pure peace allows/Alarms of wars, the daunting wars, the death of it?” The incessant “p” sound alliterated is the main source of SSP in the fifth line. During the intermission from the fifth line to the sixth, a small but effective SSP is formed through the run on line supported by a initial rhyme of “Al” sounds in words “Allows” and “Alarms” connecting as if there is no line break. Then, in the sixth line, there are two kinds of SSPs, one of them utilized by the repetition of the word “wars” and the other one established by the repetitive usage of “the” and the “d” sounds in “the daunting” and “the death”. In this respect, in two lines we have 4 SSPs. When we remember the DLs in these two lines, we see that there are two convergences, covering two of the DLs. The first one is the relation formed between “poor peace” and “pure peace”, which is embodied in the first SSP we have talked about. The second DL, which is in the shadow spread form subsisting over the second part of line five and the whole of line six, is shrouded in the other three SSPs I have mentioned above. As a result there are two convergences in the ratios of 1/1 and 1/3.

In line seven there is one DL and one SSP that do not actually shadow converge. The DL mentioned is the one established by the phrase “reaving peace”, which I have explained in the first part in detail. On the other hand, the SSP is formed by the alliteration and abundant usage of the “l” sound in the second part of the line, “...lord should leave in lieu”. Although these two SSPs are on the same line and in number seem to converge, there is no shadow convergence, whereas in lines five and six there is no confirmation in number (1/3), there appears to be shadow convergence.

In the ninth line there is a small SSP embodied by the stressed “p” sounds in the phrase “plumes to peace”. The other SSP is sound spread through the last three lines 9, 10 and 11 in the

repeated utterances of “He comes” and “does” together with the abundance of “h” and “d” and “oo” sounds provided by words such as “he” and “here”, “do”, “does” and “coo” and “brood”. Writing these lines would help visualize: “And when Peace here does house/ He comes with work to do, he does not come to coo/ He comes to brood and sit.” In these respects we can say that there are actually 3 different examples of SSPs, taking the “h”, “d” and “oo” sounds as a group, because they are not only similar in play, but also are in close connection almost inspiring the creations of each other. (Examples: do-does and coo-brood). DL here is also shadow spread over almost along the last three lines. So the resulting ratio is that there is one SSP, the first one not converging that we count as 0/1 and one DL covered by and converging on two SSPs, making the ratio of 1/2.

On the other hand, if we look at a the poem as a whole, making a metaphor from a higher distance, we can say that there is a single SSP active through the whole poem sustained by the repetition of word peace and the sound “p”. However, these can not be added to the final ratio, as most of the plays are individually assessed through the analysis. Nevertheless, it yields the notion of how strong and efficient the Cataphasis is in the poem.

When we add the numbers, (* marked ones are shadow converging) 1/5*, 1/1*, 1/1*, 1/3*, 1/0, 0/1, 0/1, 1/3* we come up with a total final ratio of 6/15 DL to SSP, which is a quite good ratio in favour of the negative unity of the poem. As a matter of fact, the potency of the negative unity of the poem stems from the high number of shadow convergences. Five of six DLs are covered and three of these five are covered with more than 1 SSP, implying that sound plays are not just made for the sake of sound plays but are also capable of holding and conveying meanings that are crucial in the breaking of common language patterns to form a poem. Especially when we consider that the poem consists of only 11 lines the number of SSPs, which

is 15 (if we consider the two general ones that I said I would not include number might rise up to 17) means that the poem is quite intense and loaded if we compare the number of SSPs and DLs to the number of lines. The resulting ration would be: 16/11 SSP to line and 8/11 DL to line. These numbers will entail much significance at the end of the step when we make a comparative analysis.

The Poem “405” part 1

In Dickinson’s poem, the most powerful DL, not only in the first stanza, but also in the whole poem is the one achieved in the first two lines by the play of the idea of “Loneliness”. The concept of loneliness, which means having nobody or nothing around, is distorted in the way that the concept itself becomes someone or something which hinders the state of loneliness. It affects the state of “Loneliness” creating a contradiction and a witty statement. This is a very crucial DL and it shall also be dealt in detail in other chapters in regard to its different aspects.

The second DL is established by an ambiguity created in the last two lines “I’m so accustomed to my Fate/Perhaps the Other –Peace—”. Here at least three different meanings can be driven. First one is that the “Other –Peace— is used to define “Fate” in the sense that fate is perhaps the poet’s other peace where peace is a noun. The second one is that peace can be situated as an opposition to fate meaning there is no peace in her fate, as it has become an “other”. Thirdly, peace could be something other than what normal peace is, matching her singular fate in its uniqueness. One last option could be the usage of peace as a verb which then cuts the relation between the word “Other” and “Peace” making them two distinct elements where perhaps the word “Other” denotes something else. For example, it could pertain to the

word “Him” in line eight. However as the second stanza lacks a subject, we immediately realize that peace is its subjects thus it is a noun. On the other hand I believe that ambiguity established is something deliberately done by the poet. In this respect we can say that there are two strong DLs in the first paragraph where one of which leans out in branches to the second stanza.

William Empson in his book *Seven Types of Ambiguity* pertains to the issue of ambiguity and defines it as an essential element of poetical language. According to Empson, a word may have several distinct meanings in a poem. It depends on how it is situated and how it is connected in the poem, but nonetheless he claims that in a poem, where there is ambiguity, we can not force a single truth or meaning. “Thus a word may have several distinct meanings; several meanings connected with one another; several meanings which need one another to complete their meaning; or several meanings which unite together so that the word means one relation or one process” (Empson 179). Evidently, his views are clearly in line with the premises of the Reading Response Theory as well, as the connections in the poem through and with the words are actualized by the reader. In poem “405”, ambiguity created at the end of the first stanza enhances the meaning possibilities in the poem. Cook reifies this idea: “Ambiguity in ordinary speech is something to be avoided because of its association with deceit, whereas in poetic language it is something to be celebrated because it charges language with a multiplicity of possible meanings that the poem can put into play” (20). The term ambiguity is also very closely connected to the idea of absence. However, this time absence is in the form of indecision between possibilities. It could be either this or that or all of it. As the mind moves from one option to the other, it leaves the unoccupied one, the other empty and absence. It resembles the Apophatic process, because as long as the ambiguity is maintained, also constant movement is stimulated. Tristan Tzara referring to the similar issue says that “[O]bscurity must be creative if

it is so pure a white light that it blinds our fellow-men” (93). Obscurity which can be equated to ambiguity is seen as a source for creation as the blindness it produces establishes momentary escapes from regularity. Light becomes so extreme a force that it creates blindness which means that in its extreme end light becomes darkness. Like a DL it creates a rupture and this rupture gives in to a different source that arouses creativity in the absence of sight it forms.

Returning back to the analysis, respectively, in the second stanza there are weaker DLs. Personification of darkness as “the Dark” and “Peace” constitutes the main DL. Qualities of interrupting and crowding are given to “Peace” in the previous stanza and it carries and executes these qualities on the other personified element “the Dark” in lines five and six: “Would interrupt the Dark--/And crowd the little Room—“. The other main DL is formed by the meaning irregularity of lines seven and eight: “Too scant – by Cubits—to contain/The Sacrament –of Him—“. Whether the “Him” refers to God or any other person (it might be the “Other” in the first stanza) keeping or containing any Sacraments (or religious ceremonies) in a “Room” (which we think that symbolizes the self), becomes absurd or at least out of place.

There are two other minor DLs in the rest of the stanza. One is created by the phrase “Too scant”. “Too” is a word that connotes excessiveness, yet on the other hand “scant” connotes deficiency or lack. Put together, almost acting as an oxymoron, they make up a DL. The other DL is established by the deliberate choosing of the word “Cubits” to be used as a unit of measurement. Cubit is defined as “an ancient unit of length based on the length of the forearm”(Word Web). When right after the phrase “by Cubits” the word “Contain” is put in the line, to the reader who knows the meaning of this unit it intuitively gives the impression of reaching out with arms to contain and hold. If we consider that the stanza ends with the word “Him” we further our connection and come up with a thought such as “reaching out with arms to

contain Him”. It becomes a hardly recognizable but inertly effective poetical device to express an intangibility through a known verifiable/reified action. As a total, we can say that there are four DLs in this stanza.

In the third stanza, the first DL is actuated when the idea of “Hope” is considered as a force that juts like a person, “intrude upon---“and “blaspheme the place”. Yet in this stanza, the main DL is established in lines eleven and twelve: “Its sweet parade –blaspheme the place--/Ordnained to Suffering—“. When it says “Its sweet parade” in line seven, “it” refers to the idea of “Hope” making the “parade” the visible display of it. Hope in general is a positive idea and has positive connotations. On the other hand, the word “blaspheme” means to contaminate something sacred with saying inappropriate words, obscenities and profanities and thus has negative connotations. In this respect, the usage of hope as something that blasphemes a place is a disordering in language. The DL does not end with this line and it expands in the same train of thought when we consider that the idea of hope blasphemes a place “ordained to suffering” in line twelve as it conveys the possible meaning that “suffering” is harmed by “hope” which is an irregularity as well. We can say that there are two DLs in this third quatrain.

Heidegger says “But when does language speak itself as language?”, which in Heidegger points to poetry as he equates poetry with the language talking itself, manifesting how he reckons poetry. Further he says:

Curiously enough, when we cannot find the right word for something that concerns us, carries us away, oppresses, or encourages us. Then we leave unspoken what we have in mind and, without rightly giving it thought, undergo moments in which language itself has distantly and fleetingly touched us with its essential being. (59)

The above passage is important in two aspects. By saying “when we cannot find the right word”, he refers to a moment of inexpressibility where words are not enough or satisfactory. What we have in mind can not find wordy expression but is left unspoken. This moment that goes unspoken is defined by Heidegger as a moment when “language itself has distantly and fleetingly touched us with its essential being.” Language touches us and gives itself in and with poetry. It can be deduce from Heidegger’s writings that poetry is the medium of expression or in better words the self manifestation of this language. Bruns says that: “... Heidegger calls “the poetic experience with language,” that is, the experience of language itself as it discloses itself through poetry” (201-202). In this respect, once again it reinforces the idea of poetical language and poetry as trying to express something that can not be conveyed with common word references or sentence structures as it has to speak itself in a special way.

Another crucial aspect about this passage is its similarity to the description of negative theology. This ephemeral movement, where language touches us, resembles very much the term split second space (SSS). They both refer to a moment of inexpressibility that opens up to a higher possibility of being, to transcendence. Moreover if we replace “its essential being” in the passage with the word God or just consider it as God, holding the secret of God in its transcendental being, we would make a perfectly viable statement of negative theology. Heideggerian description of poetry or poetical language functions resembles negative theology (Apophysis). It can be exploited in favor of literature and it would not be a religious analysis at all. In short, repeating once more, this study aims at this. The poetry is a disordering in common language, prose and the elements of DLs in a poem are points of profusion where this disordering is executed. Each individual DL contributes to the whole.

This enables the core, and unique promise of negative analysis that we accept and take for granted, as a premise stemming from the discovered functional similarity between poetry and negative theology. Every poem, as a result of the encounter with the inexpressible, should be seen as a secret that is hiding abstrusity in itself. It can be called “the essential being of language” in literature and it is called “God” in theology. By switching the places of these two names we arrive at a unique position especially for literature. Then, every poem becomes an enigma that hides its own kind of God in veil in the presence, absence and movements of its words. We have to keep in mind that when we say God we mean God as function. In this regard, negative analysis takes the text and deifies it to a point where it can be examined as God would be scrutinized in negative theology. Meister Eckhart, a very crucial mystic in negative theology that lived in Germany in the thirteenth century, rooting from the bible phrase “[I]n the beginning there was the word” claims that “every creature is full of God and is a book”. (“How to Avoid Speaking” Derrida 46) In negative analysis the statement is reversed and it is used as an instrument: every book can be read as God.

Returning back to the analysis, in the last stanza of the poem “405” by Dickinson, there are two possible DLs of weaker quality. One is sustained by the refusal/reversal of a generally accepted idea and the other by a specific word relation. The propensity to accept failure, because it is easier, while there still is the chance of success depicted as “Delight”, can be seen as a disordering in relation with the disorderings in each of the previous stanzas because it reflects the attitude of accepting the bitter fate that has been on going from the beginning of the poem. Yet to consider it as a disordering is highly debatable. The second one is the usage of “perish” which has negative meaning connotations contrast with the word “delight”. Using them together creates raptures in the thought rendered by the language. However, “to die from happiness” or “vanish

from joy” are such overused expressions that even though they might have been disorderings of language in the past, now we can perhaps say that they have become part of the regular language. Nevertheless, I still would like to consider “To perish – of Delight” as a DL. In this regard according to reader’s preference, there can be none, one, or two DLs in the last stanza.

According to Turner, in Plato the Allegory of the Cave represented the philosopher’s ascent to knowledge. He writes that “in both the Allegory and in Exodus, there is an ascent toward the brilliant light, a light so excessive as to cause pain, distress and darkness: a darkness of knowledge deeper than any which is the darkness of ignorance” (17). The crucial point is the closeness of the extremes and binaries. They constitute and facilitate an important part of negative theology. The extreme brilliance is actually the cause of blindness and darkness. For example nothing and everything are at one end extreme opposites, and on the other the closest of all terms. Eckhart says that “the loftier the heights that rise above them; the deeper the well, the higher too; for depth and height are the same thing.” Extreme heat, cold, pressure, goodness, fear all come to a point where they transcend themselves and are not themselves anymore; they become something else, eluding sensuality and imagination. Those extreme points are the moments and places where the real breakthrough takes place and those moments of explosions, bursts, irregular formations and movements are thought to be revealing a hidden God. So each concept, attribute, idea or even a simple word can also harbor, in its dark, potentiality to infinity and God. Once again, DLs in a poem can be considered as a place where such bursts and irregular formations are actualized. The last step in the negative analysis is the hidden name of god and aims to dwell on this idea of finding a special idea or word that in absence or presence can be representative of the God of the text.

The Poem “405” part 2

In the second step of this phase the DLs and SSPs (striking sound plays) in the poem are compared and contrasted. In order to this, the DLs identified in the first part should be recalled. As initially presumed in the previous chapter this poem was deemed Orderly Apophatic, and this turns out to be truer when it is realized through close reading that the most of the SSPs are achieved by silences and absences.

In the first stanza, there are actually three SSPs that exist as presence. The first one is the usage of the same word (lonelier-loneliness) in different forms in consequent lines. The second one is the abundance of “t” sounds in both lines. The third one is accomplished by the similarity of the sentence structures where “be” in the first line and “the” in the second line, by both falling at the same spot in their sentences, and by their sound similarity form an internal rhyme. Other than that, we can talk about three more SSPs established by the dashes denoting silences. The first DL in this stanza was also established in these two lines by the usage of the idea of loneliness so we can say that the SSP is covered, which means that there is a convergence. The other SSPs are executed by the dashes: one at the end of line two after the word “Loneliness”, one at the end of line three after the word “Fate”, and the last one at the end of line four where the word “Peace” is taken in between dashes. The second DL in the stanza was accomplished in the last two lines; as a result we can say that these SSPs are also covered. The ratio is 2/6.

In the second stanza we can immediately mark four SSPs materialized by the usage of dashes. In line five after the word “Dark”, in line six after the word “Room”, in line seven the phrase “by Cubits” and in line eight the phrase “of Him” is taken between dashes. Other than these, there is one more SSP achieved actually not by silence but with the play of the sounds “s”

and “c” in lines seven and the first part of line eight: “Too scant –by Cubits—to contain/The Sacrament”. Three words contain both “s” and “c” sounds and one just the “c” sound. With this, the total number of SSPs count up to five, where all of which are also covered by the four DLs, resulting in the end ratio of 4/5.

In the third stanza there are again four SSPs accomplished by the dashes: one after the word “Hope” in line nine, one after the word “upon” in line ten, one by taking in between the phrase “—blaspheme the place--” in line eleven and the last one after the word “Suffering” in line twelve. Other than these there can be one more rather weak SSP established by the repetition of the “p” sounds in line eleven. In this respect there are five SSPs against two DLs both of which are covered making a ratio of 2/5.

In the last stanza there are three SSPs actuated by taking in between dashes, “with Land in Sight” in line fourteen, “My Blue Peninsula” in line thirteen and “of Delight” in line sixteen. Other than that there is one more SSP established by the rhyming of the words “Sight” at the end of line fourteen and “Delight” at the end of line sixteen. As I have discussed before the DLs in this stanza are disputable. Thus the ratio varies like 0/4, 1/4 and 2/4. In any case the DLs in the stanza are covered forming convergences of course with the exception when there is none.

At the end of the analysis of poem 405 then the end ratio is something like this: number of DLs to SSPs ratio: 8-10/20 all of which are successfully covered, meaning they create shadow convergences at all times. Considering also that the poem consists of 16 lines then SSP to lines ratio is 20/16 and DL to lines ratio is 8-10/16.

Comparative Analysis

What do these numbers mean? First of all these numbers don't mean anything unless they are thought in connection with the other phases of the analysis and the details about the text. The text should be deified, called and remembered at all times. However they are going to help determine the character of the poem in both the outer level (Cataphatic, visual, sound based, presence oriented) and the inner level (Apophatic, meaning based, disordering, absence oriented). Valéry says that: "... the value of a poem resides in the indissolubility of sound and sense. Now this is a condition that seems to demand the impossible. There is no relation between the sound and the meaning of the word" (242). Valéry and Mallarmé define the poet's job as to give a union of these two: sound and meaning.

"Peace": DL/SSP 6-8/16, SSP/Lines 16/11 and DL/Lines 6-8/11

Poem 405: DL/SSP 8-10/20, SSP/Lines 20/16, DL/Lines 8-10/1

Regarding these numbers for the poem "Peace", what can be derived is that the poem which was crudely named Cataphatic in the first phase of negative analysis, is at a recondite level, and achieves an Apophatic character through intense usage of DLs. A ratio of 6-8 DLs in 11 lines, as it exceeds the half number, which makes it almost a DL per two lines, enables the text to be if not highly, quite Apophatic in the sense that a good amount of disordering has been used in the poem. However, when looked at the types of disorderings used, as the ratio achieved is 16 SSPs to 11 lines, it can be said that much of the disordering is established by striking sound plays. If also the kinds of SSPs accomplished are examined it can be said that they are of Cataphatic quality meaning that they act through the presence of sounds but not of pauses or silences. Then the ruling element in the poem is the striking sound plays acting through

Cataphasis. Thus the poem can perhaps be label Cataphaticaly Apophatic (The outer level is pronounced prior to the inner level).

On the other hand, when looked at poem 405 by Dickinson, comparing it with the poem “Peace”, their DL/SSP ratios are very similar; 8-10/20, 6-8/16. This tells that both poems are Apophatic in regard to the presence of DLs. Again 16 lines and 8-10 DLs, almost making a DL per two lines is a good ratio to make a poem Apophatic. However, what is interesting here and makes difference between the two poems is the type of striking sound plays. Of 20 SSPs in 16 lines, at least 14 of them are established by pauses and silences. Also considering that most of the lines are not made up of more than 3 or 4 words, regarding the sound quality and visibility that has been uncovered in the first phase of the negative analysis, we verify the initial observation made in the first phase that this poem is of Apophatic quality on the outer level. Then we can label this poem Apophatically Apophatic.

The Apophatic quality of a poem can be related to the term “mystery”, in the sense that the disordering achieved in meaning is one of the main factors in the forming of mystery along with ambiguity. Olney uses the term “mystery” about the poetry of Dickinson and Hopkins, and says that “Hopkins and Dickinson were ultimately aiming at, with distinctiveness, queerness and strangeness halfway houses on the way there, was what we can only call—and in the highest sense—mystery.”(94) Once more, the relation, with which we utilized negative analysis, surfaces in the parallelism that both poetry and negative theology define their highest goals as mystery. This mystery in both traditions is not desired to be solved but it is yearned to be lived the way it is.

CHAPTER IV
SHADOW PROTUBERANCE

Negative Theology bases itself on the inexpressibility of God stemming from God being virtually unnamable. On the other hand, to say that God is transcendent and beyond the grasp of any name, posits a dilemma itself, since, the word “God” is first of all a name and it “delimits”. Thus, instead of the name God, the phrase “that who cannot be named” should be substituted. Therefore the initial sentence becomes “that who cannot be named is transcendent”. Yet the problem is not still resolved. By naming God as “That who cannot be named” what is done is that another name is substituted; this time with the difference that it is comprised of five words instead of one. It still does not refute the fact that the naming process is abolished. So it needs further rephrasing, for example “that who cannot be named as that who cannot be named” which replaces the first initial word “God” used in the beginning. Therefore the sentence is shaped into something like this: “that who cannot be named as that who cannot be named is transcendent”. As it can be seen, the problem, the dilemma is not still resolved and there does not seem to be an end if God is truly unnamable as deemed in negative theology. Sells explains the dilemma in the following paragraph:

As I attempt to state the aporia of transcendence, I am caught in a linguistic regress. Each statement I make- positive or “negative” – reveals itself as in need of correction. The correcting statement must then itself be corrected, ad infinitum. The authentic subject of discourse slips continually back beyond each effort to name it or even deny its nameability. The regress becomes the guiding semantic force, the dynamics of a new kind of language. (2)

This new kind of language is called Apophasis. In Greek, originally, the word Apophasis means to un-say or speak away. Denys Turner notes that “Apophasis is a Greek neologism for the breakdown of speech, which, in face of the unknowability of God, falls infinitely short of the mark” (20). However, one key point is that, in the use of this word, because each word descriptive of God actually can be negated (good-ungood) or can be understood in opposites (antonyms) such as good-bad, bright-dark, hot-cold etc (except for the name God) it is not necessary that the regress Sells speaks about has to keep on trying to correct the statement through redescribing its pronoun constantly unnamable. There is another possibility, and this is the kind of Apophatic Language sustained in the previous chapter disordered language. It could move in several other Apophatic directions, one of which is substituting new words. Bearing the same example in mind, God, “That who cannot be named”, can actually be named, at least for short periods of time, after which each word has to be negated once more, over and over again.

Heidegger in *The way to Language* describes poetry as way for the language to express its own being. At this point, Language and God gain a similarity in function the sense that they become the only subjects that can talk about themselves. He accepts and sees language as something that has a being of its own that refuses to reckon it as something created. This view clearly overshadows the idea that language works on the basis of a signifier-signified relation. Heidegger says that:

The poet must relinquish the claim to the assurance that he will on demand be supplied with the name for that which he has posited as what truly is. This positing and that claim he must now deny himself. The poet must renounce having words under his control as the portraying names for what is posited. (147)

If the poet has no control over words then he becomes a medium for language to manifest “itself”. Poet undergoes an experience with the language and the result of this encounter is poetry. He does not merely find “the name for that which he had posited as what truly is” because as it is not of a representational (signifier-signified) character it is unknown to him. Heidegger further suggests: “We can keep secret only what we know. The poet does not keep the names a secret. He does not know them” (79). And gives an example of a line of a specific poet: “Wherein you hang-you do not know” commenting on the line as “The experience of this poet with the word passes into darkness, and even remains veiled itself” (79). What we can deduce from these statements is that poetry is not about knowledge of things or wordy expressions of things, but rather pertains to a mystery established by the word object relation even if it is about the simplest things.

Negative theology and the views of Heidegger converge in that both negative theology and poetry aim to name or express something that is actually reckoned unnamable. Once more, the experience the poet undergoes with words resembles the experience the mystic undergoes with God. The expressions for these experiences are facilitated by poetry in the case of the poet and by Apophatic Language in the case of the mystic. Once more repeating the core idea of this thesis grounded on this similarity, the approach in this study proposes a switch where poetry, and in individual cases, the poem, shall be considered as God. As a result, the text is deified and should be subject to an Apophatic Analysis.

This opens the way for a negative approach to act as a God function. With the following statements Derrida gives us a center to build upon the parallelism between literature and negative theology and commence on the issue of functioning: “Language has started without us, in us and before us. This is what theology calls God, and it is necessary, it will have been necessary, to

speak” (“How to Avoid Speaking” 29). Here Derrida establishes the first link between language and God in the sense that both language and God are prior. We can ask the question prior to what? Not the preciseness of the answer (if there is ever such) but the possibilities of answers are important. For example, language is prior to ideas, writing, or literature. God is prior to religion, prayer or theology. Although they are prior to different things, with the similar qualities, such as both are with in us and outside us, they determine us and are determined by us and both need to be prior to what follows them, they fulfill and execute a similar function in their own realms. We are going to think in terms of comparisons and build parallelisms through realizing these functional performances and as a result bring in a negative approach through the analysis of poetry.

As Heidegger claims, if poetry is the opening of the self to the experience of the language and in this respect it is similar to how negative theology deems the names of God and exposes them to transreferentiality, then the poem should be handled in a certain way that enables this function to divulge its unique qualities. A poem is no ordinary text. The phase of shadow protuberance aims at this. It acts by negating the affirmative elements in the poem thus opening them to referentiality. Shadow protuberance where by displaying absence that has been lurking behind/in between lines enhances the present effectiveness of the poem. It is an imitation of the first part of the Apophatic process.

In shadow protuberance, the Apophatic process will not be fully executed to its last step, the disordering of the language, because with the negations, as it is explained in the above paragraph, the aim will be here to highlight absence and stimulate it into motion maintaining referentiality. Remembering table 1:

Table 1

Dark	Undark	Light	Unlight	Dark Brilliance
False	Unfalse	True	Untrue	False Truth
Affirmation 1	Negation 1	Affirmation 2	Negation 2	The Disordered Language

In Shadow Protuberance after the second affirmation (or it can be after the first negation) the following steps are not executed and a disordering is not sought, but instead, the second affirmation (or the first negation) is brought back into the text to see how it affects the initial affirmation. For example if there is the idea of darkness in a poem, it will be negated to Undark or Light and then reinserted into the poem for analysis. It can better be realized during its execution.

The Poem “405” by Dickinson

In the first two lines “It might be lonelier/Without the Loneliness”, the poet almost in sequence with this step of shadow protuberance transfers the absence into presence in a unique way. “It might be lonelier” depicts a situation of loneliness that is the opposite of presence (crowdedness, presence of something). However, by inserting loneliness as a presence, where in actuality it is an absence, it apparently denies its first premise of loneliness. Yet, by using the word “lonelier”, which displays a degree of it (not an all or nothing situation), it protects itself

from a total loneliness. In a way, the poet covers the shadow protuberance of loneliness, which is the presence of something, by proposing the defining element of loneliness as certain kind of presence. Loneliness is stripped of its meaning and personified as a word. In this manner, we are put into a constant negation resembling the ones in negative theology in the shape of something like “if there is loneliness, there is no loneliness, if there is no loneliness (because the only present thing is refuted) then there is loneliness (again) and if there is loneliness, there is no loneliness (the statement repeats itself). . . .”

The third line “I’m accustomed to my Fate” shall be negated in two folds revealing two important absences that will resonate through out the poem. The first one is that there is nothing new or fresh as the word “accustomed” connotes habitually and tradition. The second one is the lack of control over one’s own life connoted by the idea of fate. Absence of these two main points, control/free will and freshness/newness becomes an “Other” to the self. The “Other” is equated by the idea of “Peace”. Thus “Peace”, at the end of line four can be defined as the lacking of these two qualities that simultaneously act as the result and cause of loneliness. From this moment on in the poem the process of shadow weaving kicks in, which means that these meanings we have highlighted are carried onto the terms later in the poem, changing the way they would normally be received. Especially, if we consider the movement and spatiality as a crucial and determining aspect of this poem, the process of shadow weaving gains significance. Once again Dickinson covers the shadow protuberance (absent presence in the poem) by a present term like “Peace”.

In concordance with the step of Shadow Protuberance, James Olney applies a similar method for comparing the poetical languages of Hopkins, Dickinson and Whitman. Focusing on the idea of metaphor and metonymy, he categorizes them by the way they are used in poetry:

tropes of absence and presence. He says that “Metaphor asserts a hidden, or heretofore unperceived, similarity between two terms normally taken to be at a distant remove from one another” (Olney 57). Thus metaphor becomes a very powerful tool to talk about the unsayable or inexpressible. He also notes that:

The poet employs metaphor to give presence to that which is, or has been, absent, thus creating in the poem what I will call an “absent presence.” Through metaphor that which is physically absent is given a spiritual or meaningful presence. To distinguish again between the effects of different kinds of tropes, I should say that metaphor, at its most potent and successful, asserts and establishes an absent presence- a presence for things absent; when it fails, or when the vision drives the poet to this, as I believe her vision did Dickinson, then the metaphORIZER is left simply, starkly with the void, an absent absence—nothing on the other side of the metaphors, which are thus metaphors of loss. (58)

In regard to what Olney says, two points are to be considered, both of which are reflected in the negative analysis. As the poem is analyzed in the step of shadow protuberance, especially Dickinson’s skill in creating an “absent presence” through the pauses and well picked metaphorical imagery with the underlying symbolism manifests itself perfectly. However, it is not just the metaphor that can claim absence or pertain at the spiritual or inexpressible, but even simple words and phrases have the power to contain absence through negation.

Regarding the idea of metaphor, Lacan says that: “...the metaphoric structures, indicates that it is in the substitution of signifier for signifier that an effect of signification is produced which is creative or poetic...” (95). Then he further describes the process, rather reduces the creation of a metaphor to a formula of “[O]ne word for another: that is the formula for the metaphor and if you are a poet you will produce for your own delight a continuous stream, a

dazzling tissue of metaphors.” (Lacan 89) He gives the following line as an example “Love is a pebble laughing in the sunlight” (90). The metaphor Lacan refers to is created by defining or identifying the tenor “love” with the vehicle “pebble”. If this is a metaphor, then what would be the proper signified for the word “Love” here in tenor-vehicle to “undo” the metaphor? Referring to Derrida, language is itself a system that relies on metaphors and basically on to the rule of “one word for another”. Derrida says that: “Metaphor shapes and undermines the proper name. The literal (*propre*) meaning does not exist, its “appearance” is a necessary function- and must be analyzed as such- in the system of differences and metaphors” (*Of Grammatology* 89). In this regard the process of naming, which is the most initial step of a language, is itself a metaphor. The difference between the phrases “Love is Good” and “Love is a pebble”, which would determine which one is a metaphor, is caught in a system of relations and differences residing not only in language or linguistics but also cultural codes and common meaning patterns established and conveyed in a culture. Metaphor is not simply created by whatever word the poet substitutes for a word, but it is actualized by knowing the common meaning patterns and cultural codes where that language is used, which always takes the metaphor to a state more than the signifier-signified relation. In this respect even simple words or phrases in a poem can gain metaphorical character and achieve a singular character depending on how it is stationed and cultured in the poem. Paul de Man describes the metaphorical process as follows: “The metaphor is not a combination of two entities or experiences more or less deliberately linked together, but one single and particular experience: that of origination” (415). Similar to the way it is manifested in the previous chapter de Man sees metaphor crucial in the creation and conveyance (simultaneous and inseparable) of the poetical experience.

Metaphors are very crucial in displaying “absent presences” in the poem as they are the only tools that can exhibit the links between concepts and ideas that are not normally linked. What Shadow Protuberance presented in Dickinson’s poem, in the first stanza, is that the absence of “free will” lurking beyond the word fate, and “being accustomed” to this is a very crucial idea that vibrates whole through the poem. With this discovery we were able to give meaning or better understand what was really meant by the “Other –Peace—” at the end of the stanza.

In the second stanza, the subject is missing (It is the “Peace” situated at the end of line four). Its absence is almost reified with its material absence from the stanza as if Dickinson wants to emphasize its lack. If it was here, it “Would interrupt the Dark” in which the “Dark” implies the absence of light. In this respect we understand that light is associated with free will and newness, as they are the defining elements of the peace. The process of shadow weaving enables us to carry these negative identifications with us. The term shadow weaving is similar to what Stanley Fish talks about in his essay “Interpreting the Variorum”. He says that the experience the reader gains, while reading the text, affects his judgment previously established before the reading process. Shadow weaving accepts this as an absence that becomes presence during the reading, which in the course of the reading can affect the perception and comprehension of the terms in the poem as well. It can stay as absent presence throughout and after the poem or it can fade back. This depends on the individual characteristics of the poem.

In the line “And crowd the little Room”, the verb “crowd” has negative connotations yet when Peace executes this action its presence becomes ironical and positive in the sense that by the effect of shadow weaving, the peace carries within itself the ideas of free will and newness (recalling that free will and newness is evoked by the negative interpreter through shadow protuberance in the first stanza). This description of peace is singular and belongs to the author

of the poem skulking in between lines and behind words in absence. Crowding the little Room also points to the fact that the Room is not big enough. The negative of the “little Room” in normal circumstances would be a bigger room. Through negation it becomes “unroom” and lends itself to referentiality, where it can be compensated with multiple meaning possibilities. This action of opening the word to new meaning possibilities actually resides in the center of poetry. It bestows the word, thus the poem with infinite capabilities. Césaire in a related topic says that “ And because in every authentic poem, the poet plays the world’s game, the true poet wants to abandon the word to its free associations, in the assurance that to do so is, in the last analysis, to abandon it to the will of the universe” (281). The process of negation, as it is utilized in the phase of shadow protuberance, contributes greatly to this process. In a way, at best, a poem is opened to another poem that lies within the poem dormant. Regarding the term of “unroom”, later, in the poem, Dickinson also creates her own depiction of the “unroom” position, which is covered by the phrase “My Blue Peninsula” in the last line of the last stanza.

In an earlier step in our analysis we have embellished the representative quality of the “Room” in the sense that it might be symbolizing herself. In this respect “Blue Peninsula” symbolizes another kind of self, which is the opposite or negative of the one she is currently in as expressed by the metaphor of the room. Once more Dickinson covers the revealed shadow protuberance (the big unroom situation) by herself, in fact by the poem itself.

In this respect, returning back to Olney’s views, in shadow protuberance (SP) we see that what Olney calls “metaphors of loss” are never really losses. It can be a loss to a mind that stays and does not treat each word as hiding in its negation. If the metaphor of the “room” had not been thought of in terms of absence sustained by the shadow protuberance, then the link it has with “The Blue Peninsula” would have probably never been established. In this respect

metaphors can not only be assessed by the immediate significations they have, or by the quality and power of their imageries. Even if the image or the idea created with the metaphor is poor in quality, by the words it is created, it inflicts certain ideas and can be opened to referentiality when the absence in it is evoked properly. De Man says that: “The existence of the poetic image is itself a sign of divine absence, and the conscious use of poetic imagery an admission of this absence” (417). De Man also deems absence as a powerful element in poetry that enables the creation of poetic imagery that in return readmits absence in to the poetry reifying its position.

A metaphor in a poem cannot be alienated from the rest of the poem. In this regard, if even in its poor quality a metaphor blurs the mind and creates a seemingly empty counterpart, the way with “nothing on the other side” as Olney argues, and with the absence it creates and with the negation it will go under through shadow protuberance, it opens up space for new words and ideas linked in the poem. In poetry nothing can be a loss, but it can only affect its quality and inner Apophatic and Cataphatic character.

Line seven “Too scant –by Cubits—to contain” still describes the inadequacy of the room to hold “The Sacrament –of Him--”. Here we have an absent presence in concordance with the Apophatic character of the poem, as we are given the lacking element directly “The Sacrament – of Him--” which pertains to the grace bestowed by “Him”. The absence of “Him”, who is deemed as God (though other possibilities are always viable) thus the absence of the “Sacrament” is linked once more to the smallness of the “Room”. In this respect, with the effect of shadow weaving, we can say that only the “Blue Peninsula” can be the place large enough to contain the “Sacrament of Him”. The yearning for a “Sacrament” sustains in its negativity the unholiness or dullness of the situation the room/the poet is in.

Olney, referring to some of Dickinson's poems says that "...there is the sense that they are trying to get at the unsayable" and further adds: "...they succeed not by saying something but, as it were, by pointing to something else, the metaphors through which the poems' subjects are realized" (53). Her poems attempt to reach the unsayable through negating, or by not saying, leaving a space for silence or leaving the word in the middle of silence. The words left between dashes, as explained during the analysis, are significant points in creating this silence. In this regard, the definition Genette makes for poetry can be remembered: "...rather a state, a degree of presence and intensity to which any statement may be led, so to speak, on condition that there is established around it that margin of silence which isolates it from its surroundings..." (412). This time not only the whole poem, but also certain words are deliberately surrounded by silence. In many cases silence is sought by the poet by the usage of metrical patterns, rhythm and other prosodic elements, but here Dickinson purposely and powerfully accentuates her own method of denoting silences. It is, in a Derridain sense, a deferral. By not saying, it opens up space for the silence. In the above paragraph, "The Sacrament of –Him—" is a perfect example for the subject that is hiding behind absence depicted by a metaphor with an implicit symbolism of "Him". The "Him" is left ambiguous. It does not mean that it is empty or it is a loss. Negative analysis seeks to exploit that silence and the absence between the words and behind the words. "Him" opens up to several things such as God, lover, Hymn or the absence of her both or none of them might be true.

In the third stanza by saying that "I am not used to Hope" points to its absence. In negation the line becomes something like "I am used to Hopelessness" that by the act of shadow weaving is almost a repetition of line three which says "I'm so accustomed to my fate—". Then a state in which hope is present is imagined in a similar manner when the opposite of "being accustomed

to fate” is thought as the “Other --Peace. It becomes an intrusion just like Peace becomes an interruption to darkness. The opposite of intrusion would be something that befits and naturally goes along with it. However its irregularity is once more expressed by lines eleven and twelve where negation of these two lines “Its sweet parade –blaspheme the place—/Ordained to Suffering--“ become something like “its bitter hiding blesses the place/ chosen by will to be used for delight.” By this negation we are able to clearly see the main repeating pattern.

In this respect, analysing poetry through a step like shadow protuberance is important, because it considers the whole as it gives due significance to singularity. The patterns of both absence and presence and how they bestow meaning to the words in the poem constitute the general structure of the poem and help determine the hidden forces in it. Olney also says that: “...Dickinson discovers that that which is absent is sheer absence, loss and the void, so, that what her metaphors give presence to, paradoxically, is in fact absence”. He also considers her “terrifyingly successful” in “giving presence to absence” (59). Absence, which relate to the inexpressible, is actually always present in the presence of the word. If we ever bring absence into presence, then we would be expressing the inexpressible, which is a paradox, and which actually can not be done. It is very similar to Derrida’s discussion of the secret: a secret known, is not a secret anymore, and it loses its name in it, its essential character. The next step is, if “secret” knows that it is (itself, self awareness) does it lose its secrecy? According to Derrida, apparently it does not (Derrida “How to Avoid Speaking” 25-26). This enables “absence” to be hiding and inherent in presence, in a word or a created metaphor. It is a defining element of the present word as well. For example, in the word “good” there is the absence of “bad” and the step of shadow protuberance goes after it.

In the last stanza “It might be easier” immediately makes us think of the harder choice. Both choices, the easy and the hard one, are given in the poem and once more the Shadow Protuberance is covered by the poet herself. We realize what is going to happen if the “Blue Peninsula” is reached from the last line “To perish – of Delight”. When we negate this last line as “To live (enliven) in/of Suffering” then we both achieve the result of easy failure and again reveal a repeating pattern of the poem that can be crudely described as “to live in suffering”.

Many instances, as the poet herself covers the absences by their shadow protuberances point to negative unity in the poem. Negative unity pertains to the idea that the absences retrieved through the analysis in the poem are also covered in the poem by certain presences. This idea will be explicated at the end of the chapter. Negativity unity in the poem, as it pertains to inner coherence in the poem, points to the high quality of the poem. Summing up the phase of shadow protuberance for poem “405”, the absence that acts as a driving force in the poem, seems to be lack of control that is dark and captivating, a hopelessness breeding loneliness. This may be the hidden name of the God of the poem.

The Poem “Peace” by Hopkins

In the first two lines, which actually constitute a single question, the idea of peace comes up as an object that is sought for and desired in full control. Through this we can discern that there is a lack of peace in the sense of serenity and tranquillity in the beginning. However it is not a total absence but rather a hazy presence, understood by the phrase “your round me roaming end”. In this respect it is similar to Dickinson’s poem “405” where, for example, the term loneliness is also depicted as of degree with the term “lonelier”, which means that it is less than

“loneliest”. It is not a situation of total “loneliness”, but a degree of it. So peace is not here in its negative (antonym) as war, yet, but it is existent rather in a restless form. If we are to think of the negative of the term peace here, we can call it restlessness, not war, also implied by the portrayal of it as a “wild wooddove”. The self here is imagined almost as a tree, implied by the phrase “be under my boughs” and peace a wild wooddove roaming around the tree, refusing to shut her shy wings and perch. In this imagery there exists a deep contrast in the imagining and identifying the self with a tree, and the peace with a wild wooddove. In the culturally grounded symbolism trees would implicate peace and serenity and birds free action and the wilderness; yet here it is reversed. What is really lacking is a unification of the self and the peace that is so closely felt but can not be fully achieved. It is this lack that starts to drive the poem. We can consider these first two lines as the initial steps of a shadow weaving process that gets more and more intense throughout the poem.

The high condensation of words in the lines, the abundance of sound plays all indicate “presence” in the Cataphatic sense. Olney relates “presence” to metonymy and compares metonym with metaphor over the issue of presence and absence:

Metonymy, on the other hand, at its most potent and successful, asserts and establishes a present presence, a presence in those things close at hand, as Whitman does with his lists and catalogues; when metonymy fails, however, or when the vision drives the poet to this, the metonymizer is left tragically not with a void but with a meaningless material world, a present absence, an absence in things all too much present. (58)

How Olney describes these states of metonymy and metaphor through present absence and absent absence are in essence similar to the categorization of poems as Cataphatically Apophatic or Apophatically Cataphatic. Despite similarities there are major differences between Olney’s

categorizations and how they are categorized in negative analysis. “Absent presence” and “absent absence” are negative qualifications for Olney, leaving only “present absence” as something positive. In Olney absence gains a positive meaning when it only manifests itself as presence. Moreover these terms are rather stable and in a stationary relation with each other. On the other hand, in negative analysis absence is neither negative nor stable but is always connected to presence, opening the way for presence, as presence also does the same for absence. It inherits this trait from the Apophatic Language. Remembering table one, for example, when we say “hot” we make it present. The present “hotness” in its absence possesses “coldness”. “Coldness” is an absent presence in “Hotness”. However, when we say “coldness” then we make it present and with this act “hotness” is pushed into absence. Apophasis does not mean that something is absent, or the ideas are going towards absence. It means that they are moving towards silence, and silence is not absence but it is a pause, at its extreme a pause before the next poem. Silence lets the language speak. When the next word in the poem is introduced the whole process of Apophasis can start over.

However, can the poem “Peace” be reckoned as creating “a meaningless material world” falling under the category of “absent presence” where there is “an absence in things all too much present” (Olney 58)? At the moment this can be assessed by the negative unity in the poem. Reminding the term from the previous poem if the negation of an idea or a word, an absence finds itself present in other words or ideas in the poem, then it can be said that there is negative unity.

The third line, “When, when, Peace, will you, Peace?” is recognition of a quality of the peace, which is shadow woven because we know that peace is a wild wooddove roaming. But the peace in the poem, we know now, is apparently not peaceful. So the line is driven by a profound

lack and an abstruse separation that resides in the very core of “being”. Peace is without peace, as orange is without orange, love is without love, and hate is without hate. It resembles what Emmanuel Levinas says about the issue of existing:

The existing that I am trying to approach is the very work of being, which can not be expressed by a substantive but is verbal. This existing cannot be purely and simply affirmed, because one always affirms a being (*étant*). But it imposes itself because one cannot deny it. ... It is never attached to an object that is, and because of this I call it anonymous. (48)

Although Levinas here refers to the idea of existence it can be appropriated by any concept. In another instance, he asks the question of “how are we going to approach this existing without existents” (46)? As he himself says, the possibility of such an existing is “verbal”, meaning that only by language it can express itself. He is, in a way, trying to free existence from being attached to any particular object. Both poets, Dickinson and Hopkins are manifesting a similar tendency in their poems. They do not extract or deny the subject of the act but negate the determining element of the concept or use it against itself. Dickinson in the beginning of her poem “405” takes out the determining element of the concept “loneliness” and proposes it as a second “loneliness” which creates a hindrance in its integrity that gives it the meaning it has. In this way “loneliness” loses its meaning, just as if one thing loses its capability for existence it can not be called an existent. If peace is not peaceful then can it be called peace? Hopkins applies the same act of separation to the concept of “peace” less violently than Dickinson and gradually builds it up. On the other hand, Dickinson starts the poem with this shocking concept of “loneliness without loneliness”. These are good examples of how disordering of language is achieved in the mentioned poems. This act of separation is not only confined to the idea of peace

but also symbolizes the self of the poet that experiences separation in writing. Similarly, Heidegger mentions the issue in *On the Way to Language* where this time language speaks itself which becomes an act of “speaking” without a “speaker”.

This is an idea that finds its reflection in negative theology as well. For example, in the *Enneads*, Plotinus gives an example to clarify the point of “existence without existents.” He talks about a sphere, inside which in the middle, hangs a source of light (a glowing mass) illuminating each part of the interior of the sphere equally. Then he tells us to imagine that the glowing mass is somehow magically taken out, but the light is still there, unaffected and still illuminating every inch of the interior of the sphere. He makes this analogy to exemplify how God can be the source of everything yet be undetectable in both time and space. By eliminating the source but not the effect, he grants the source a kind of transcendence. This act of taking out the source in its delimited state and opening it to transreferentiality, thus ambiguity and mystery, works as a primal force of Apophasis.

The next sentence, starting at the end of line three, portrayed over two lines is very crucial in terms of manifesting how the self experiences separation in the poem. “I’ll not play hypocrite/
To own my heart:” By negative analysis we understand that, the self (by which we mean the poet, but also not forgetting that the poet is not distinct from the poem), is not playing hypocrite but being true in its words yet also admitting that he does not really own his own heart. Not owning his own heart can be considered as a separation or differentiation in the self, similar to the case of not being yourself. So it can be related to the phrase “When, when, Peace, will you, peace?” in the format “My heart, when will you be my heart”. The repetition “peace-peace” that creates rupturing effect on the self identification the concept of “peace” is established here in a similar way by “to own” and “my heart”, because when you say “my heart” you already bestow

ownership and do not need to say “to own” again. It creates a similar sense of repetition like “peace-peace” basing on not sound but meaning.

In the second part of line four, Hopkins admits that, after all, peace comes at certain times. As a result the absence of peace is not a total non-presence. It can be felt but it does not give solace as it is corrupt, expressed by the phrase in line five as “that piecemeal peace is poor peace”. The rupturing and questioning of the identity in unity and pureness of the concept “peace” still continues. “Poor peace” is rejected and is immediately connected to its negative in the next sentence in the same line, which is “pure peace”. Hopkins establishes a negative unity by using these together. For example if he had not used “pure peace”, because we are using the method of shadow protuberance, we would have thought of “pure peace” or something like “good peace” as its opposite (negative) and visa versa. To remind us of its relation with negative theology, we can recall the example of Apophasis manifested in table one line one: God is dark (Cataphasis) then its denial that God is brilliant (Apophasis) and the final statement, the disordering of language, which is not a mid point or a compromise between the two but something beyond, that God is a “brilliant darkness” or God is a “dark brilliance”. A parallelism can be drawn here with the definitions of peace in line five “pure peace” and “poor peace”. The “dark” can be equated in parallelism to “poor” and “brilliant” to “pure”. Again in a similar manner the concepts of God and peace would be parallel. As a result, poor pure peace would be parallel to the dark brilliant God achieved at the end of the Apophasis. By using “poor peace” and “pure peace” in the same line, Hopkins creates his own Apophatic process. The disordering achieved at the end of Apophasis display itself as Negative Unity in the poem.

We have to say that the first group of shadow weaving ends at the start of the sentence “What pure peace...”. The reason for this is that the uncertainty in the character of the peace that

started with the first two lines that question its nature that heighten in the question with “Peace, will you peace?” and continue in the recognition of “piecemeal peace is poor peace” ends at the middle of line five. In all these lines we thought/imagined peace as distorted from its general definition. However, now, we have to think of “pure peace” much closer to its common known form, which naturally initiates a tearing down of the previously woven meanings.

After this point on, the meaning of “pure peace” is taken to a further end, using the other meaning of the word peace that is to cease fire, the opposite of war. The identity of “pure peace” is questioned this time, emphasizing its deficiency in certain situations, created by a simple absence-presence equation. If there is peace, how can there be wars? If there are “daunting wars”, is it not the “death of” peace? The negative that we would take out to the surface by shadow protuberance is actually utilized by the poet in using the opposite ideas in an alternating pattern. This alternating pattern continues in the next line when “peace” this time is denoted as “reaving peace”. The idea of “reaving peace” when compared to the imagery of “wild wooddove” or “poor peace” is much sharper and much more divergent from its general meaning, almost to the point that peace loses its significance against the word “reaving”. We sense this from the following part of line seven when the poet almost cries to the lord (God) for “some good” that may come out in the absence of what we can call as “pure peace” instead of its tainted form “reaving peace”, which is closer to war than peace itself. “... my lord should leave in lieu/Some good!”.

Thus after the first patch of shadow weaving that ends at the middle of line five, a new patch of shadow begins to be woven in which the peace now means pure peace, the opposite of war or pure conflict. Almost at the middle point of the poem, as it is eleven lines, this change occurs. As a result, we can say that the poem is taken to a more severe and heightened level.

Resuming the analysis, we discern that what the lord has left as good is “Patience exquisite”. In the absence of pure peace and the presence of war, there can be patience bestowed by God. In this respect, patience becomes a state that can co-exist with the state of war or conflict. It paves the way for peace, depicted in line nine as “That plumes to peace there after”. Patience, as it is also started with a capital letter, is of core significance here, as it holds the key for peace. The absence of patience would keep us in war or conflict, which holds in itself the idea that the opposite of patience that can be named impatience, hastiness or quick temper as something that endues the state of war.

Now, in this part of the poem the absence of patience becomes an important factor affecting the poem inherently. Despite crucial differences, the terms used by Olney such as “absent presence” and “present absence” are similar to the ones used in negative analysis. Yet a stronger resemblance occurs between Heidegger’s views and the step of shadow protuberance. Heidegger says: “What is unspoken is not merely something that lacks voice...” here the term unspoken coincides with what is meant by absence in the negative analysis, as the absence belongs to the word. He continues: “[I]t is what remains unsaid, what is not yet shown, what has not yet reached its appearance” (122). Here absence can be thought of in three ways, all of which are covered in the negative analysis: one is that absence refers to the negative of the word in question like “dark” is the absence of “light” or vice a versa. This absence is brought forth by the step shadow protuberance. The second one is the reification of the absence of the object or idea it denotes, provokes or brings to the mind. Related to the previous one, the third one is the absence created by the absence of the direct reference in the sense of direct experience, which pertains to the issue of inexpressibility, breaking the chain of signifier signified relation or at least rupturing the link between the two. It gives way to the “unsaid” in a dimension or medium much different

than “saying” could and that is poetry. This is covered specifically by the step disordered language and as whole by the negative approach. Heidegger goes on to say: “That which must remain wholly unspoken is held back in the unsaid, abides in concealment as unshowable, is mystery” (120). Interestingly enough, Olney had called the poetry of Hopkins and Dickinson mystery. In this poem what are unshowable and inexpressible are centered around the concept of “peace”. Peace is lived and experienced with the poem in states singular to the poet. Essentially all the verbose attempts in the poem aim to reflect this inexpressibility which establishes the core mystery of the poem.

God is definitely not one of the main absences in the poem. If we are to elucidate a God of the poem naming him, it would definitely not be God. This will be given due respect in the section where the idea of the hidden name of the god of the text is explicated. The idea that God brings patience is also another crucial implication that God, whose presence has not been felt through the whole poem, seems like it has actually been silently watching, waiting for the worst moment (in regard to the dire situation the self falls into) to act. From this moment on, where God’s presence is revealed almost as a soothing element, the intensity starts to drop in the last two lines: “And when Peace here does house”, which we know is pure peace that has survived through conflicts and wars and has come out sound. However, peace is different in the sense that it is now active, expressed by the phrases “He comes with work to do” and “He comes to brood and sit”. So at the end of the second patch of shadow weaving, “peace” becomes something active, gaining additional meaning in a unique way.

At the end of the poem, there is an important point regarding Negative Unity. It is implied by the last line “he comes to brood and sit” in respect to the second line in the poem where almost a negative mirror reflection of this initial phrase exists in the phrase “your round me

roaming end". Since, in this step, shadow protuberance has been applied, the meaning capabilities of words and phrases have been tried to be enhanced through what they lack or their opposites (negatives) to make them protrude. Yet, due to the perfection of the poem, Hopkins seems to have covered all the opposites by himself in verbal excellence leading to Negative Unity in many cases. The same excellence has been witnessed in Dickinson's poem as well. It is seen that the negative of "sit and brood" (if it had been recovered by shadow protuberance it would for example be: "wander aimlessly without thinking") is captured by the phrase "round me roaming" in the second line by the poet himself. "Peace" which is personified here seems to be active in thinking especially of considering the negativities such as war. On the other hand, "peace" is in the house in contrast to being outside implied by the phrase "be under my boughs" which suggests that it was distant in the beginning of the poem.

As a result, at the end of the poem, Hopkins achieves his own conception of peace, almost living it step by step in the process of its creation. As discerned from the placing of line eleven that begins with a small indent space, there is a spatial imitation of the feeling of the kind of peace created by this little space which presupposes a pause. It is a half line making the sonnet three and a half lines shorter than normal. However, this way the last line can be experienced as if the reader is "sitting and brooding" himself. As it is also the shortest line in the poem, in the absence of extra words, one gets closer to the feeling, empowering the sense of unification with the poem through an Apophatic move that appraises silence.

Silence and absence are driving elements of a poem, as they not only enable the reader to distinguish it as a poem, but also as they create the spaces for the reader to experience the coming and leaving of the words which struggle to arouse the feeling experienced by the poem. Although the absent otherness, which is a driving force, is used in many theories in different

shapes. For example, regarding Reader Response Theory, if discerned from a certain point, the task prescribed to the reader is similar to the initial idea inherent in the negative analysis that every text contains absence or leaves something missing for the reader to come and assign meanings. It is positive that there are parts left absent, missing or ambiguous in each text, but even if it had not been that way (imagining a perfect text with every detail given) even then there would be lurking absence, something unsaid in everything uttered. Wolfgang Iser takes this absent otherness as play, as play of the text. As it is play of the word, it is also the play of being, it is the play of the God and it is the play of the Language (“Play of the Text” 325-340). It does not leave any space for simple emptiness or absence in the way they are used in common sense. Silence and absence are always active in a poem. As Heidegger says: “Thus silence, too, which is often regarded as the source of speaking, is itself a corresponding. Silence corresponds to the soundless tolling of the stillness of appropriating-showing saying” (131). What Heidegger means by “appropriating-showing saying” is the presence of words bestowing presence. Blanchot, deriving from Mallarmé’s views says that: “...language whose force lies in not being, whose very glory is to evoke, in its own absence, the absence of everything. This language of the unreal, this fictive language which delivers us to fiction, comes from silence and returns to silence” (331). Silence is the unseen force infinite and pregnant for presence, being and thus saying. When Blanchot says “comes from silence and returns to silence”, he almost designates it as the ultimate source, the beginning and the end. In this regard silence resembles God, also self manifested in the anonymous saying that seems to belong to the conception of God in all religions that, everything comes from God and returns to God. With this similarity the initial claim of this thesis, the functional similarity between poetry and negative theology in terms of

deifying the text to God function, is once more reinforced. In a manner befitting, Hopkins fulfills a circular move and ends the poem almost in silence.

CHAPTER V
THE JOURNEY

“Is a poem not a flight from the *I*?”

Velimir Khlebnikov

All mystical approaches aim at one ultimate goal: the unification or the experience of unification with God. Unification, prior to all, indicates a movement that is executed between at least two distinct objects, one of which becomes naturally the “other”. In mysticism, this is a journey, a venture that is life long as the idea of God is infinite, and the journey to him is also endless. Apophasis, in its constant movement through negation and transreferentiality imitates, utilizes and appropriates this journey with/in language.

The basic idea behind transreferentiality resides in the wish to become one with divinity. “Rather than pointing to an object, Apophatic language attempts to evoke in the reader an event that is -- in its movement beyond structures of self and the other, subject and object-- structurally analogous to the event of mystical union” (Sells 10). As Sells explains further on in his discussion of Plotinus, this union is actually “the union of subject, predicate and object” all together granting such a fusion that the grammar functions are inherently identical as well. In the phrase “to think is to make it” the poet and grammar happen simultaneously. “We are asked to think of an act so total that the subject has been utterly fused into the act: a willing without a willer” (Sells 24).

“The willing” without “the willer” indicates a fusion of identities at several levels. Mystical union with God proposed as the utmost goal of the mystic definitely requires a self abandoning. It is a movement. It is one of these levels. The other level is the delaminated

subject/object relation, which is not only expected between God and the attributes that denote God, but, in a triangular scheme, also anticipated between the utterer of these words and God. This pertains to another aspect of Apophasis, examples of which are abundant in the works of Meister Eckhart. In “The Talks of Instruction” he says; “Begin, therefore, first with self and forget yourself” (3), and further he says “If you are just, your actions will be just too” (6), and he also cites from the Bible: “If any man will come after me, let him first deny himself” (6). Beginning with the first sentence, “the self”, which is seen as an obstacle, because it is a limit, a boundary between God and what is named as self, must be left behind. It is a movement not only to break the boundary in order to achieve union, but also, by accomplishing that, to pave the way for the contents of the self to dissolve, so that instead of the Self’s will, God’s will takes this place/takes place. This requires movement as well. Before it is an abandoning of the self, it is first of all an attempt at fusion, because the word “forget” denotes not termination or annihilation but a leaving behind of things, a mingling with the rest of the things that are left behind. It is a type of unknowing and denial of the self.

However, if we continue the Apophatic movement, as the new self will merge with God and according to Dionysius as God actually owns every name, then all the things we left behind are going to be fused in different shapes and names in the anticipated union with God (Dionysius 55-109). The characteristic of this new self, which is something other than a self, is that in God it will achieve a purer character, like the second sentence above implies: “if you are just, your actions will be just too”. The first part of the sentence talks about a self that is not a self but is what we can call a concept, similar to one of Plato’s ideals. It means to be “Just” and to possess only one attribute, but nothing else. Keeping in mind that the self is abandoned the fusion of the self is with the concept of “just”. Thus, every further movement, as it stems from the acquired

name “just” consequentially becomes “just”. The identity of the subject is dissolved in the act, the will, the willed thing and the willer are the same and simultaneous. The third sentence, “If any man will come after me, let him first deny himself” which is quoted from the Bible, points not only to the abandonment of the self but highlights the necessity of a denial of the self, implicating the necessity to negate the self attributes. To become just, you have to be nothing else.

The idea of the self when reflected in the realm of literature identifies with the reader position, who is at the same time the Negative Analyzer. The reader must try to become one with the text as much as possible. In order to do this it must first of all get rid of the self attributes. This idea has echoes in Reader Response Theory, in the sense that the formal features of a text are not independent of reader’s experiences and own interpretive judgments before facing the text. Wolfgang Iser considering the reader says that: “...he must think in terms of experiences different from his own; indeed, it is only by leaving behind the familiar world of his own experience that the reader can truly participate in the adventure the literary text offers him” (“The Reading Process” 218). Conjoining this idea with that of negative theology, and Heidegger’s concept of lending the self to the language, the final premise becomes to leave the self and mingle with the poem diffusing into it word by word. How is this possible?

Underhill states that “since the aim of every mystic is union with God it is obvious that the vital question in his philosophy must be the place which this God, the absolute of his quest, occupies in the scheme” (96). As negative analysis deifies the poem to the position of the mystical God then the question becomes identifying the lived or experienced spatiality in the poem. In this respect language helps, as the most important source of Apophasis, it resides in the special and spatial character of the human language. Derrida says that:

Thus the name, especially the so-called proper name, is always caught in a chain or a system of differences. It becomes an appellation only to the extent that it may inscribe itself within a figuration. Whether it be linked by its origin to the representations of things in space or whether it remains caught in a system of phonic differences or social classifications apparently released from ordinary space, the proper-ness of the name does not escape spacing. (*Of Grammatology* 89)

Not only in the usage of such words as; “beyond”, “in”, “out”, “ascent” and “unity”, some of which are already prepositions, but even many simple words such as “I”, “he”, “come”, “disappear”, “book” and etc. connote certain kinds of spatiality. Spatiality infers, necessitates and needs movement. For example when you say “I”, most of the time consciously or unconsciously you think of yourself in some space whether it is the place you are currently in or related to in the imagined space in relation to the rest of the sentence. Or when you say “come”, it is naturally thought of in the simple way that a space is provided for the “come” to take place, which requires a outer and a interior for the transition to happen. Likewise when you say “book”, “book” is reckoned in some spatiality either of a tangible or intangible quality such as on a shelf, in a mind or in empty space. As it is impossible for us to think of things without their existence or being as an inherent feature, in a similar, but in a less definitive sense, it is very much the same for spatiality.

In spite of the fact that terms and concepts like “goodness”, “mercy” and “fear”, because of their intangibility, are much less prone to the limitations of spatiality, they are never totally devoid of spatial delimitations. As they come into relation with other words, they also become entangled, in various degrees of spatiality. For example, the words “mercy” or “fear”. As we utter the words by themselves far away from any kind of spatiality, as you try to keep them away

from any other word by keeping silent, you create spatiality for them as they are left alone in the middle of emptiness, which denotes spatiality. Genette and Blanchot have pondered upon the issue accentuating silence as an element that creates spacing at least in the sense that it separates words from other words. Yet, in a similar manner, if you say the two intangible words together, “mercy” and “fear”, by creating an order (one is spoken, written or seen first) again, you form a spatial arrangement.

Negative theology needs to overcome spatiality in order to achieve union with God. It requires movement and negation through language in thinking, feeling and experiencing. However in the attempt to elude spatiality, the apophysis is itself trapped in spatiality. Yet the ironic fact is that, without spatiality it would also be impossible to think of God. So it is like a component that needs to be gotten rid of after showing the difference, thus revealing the way and therefore manifesting the way to overcome difference. For example Eckhart writes that “... to accept or receive you must be empty” and in another instance notes that “soul that is empty of creatures is lifted up to God” (53-54). To “empty yourself” implicates that you are or you have a vessel that needs to take out whatever is inside, meaning that, it has to flow somewhere else, which points to another a space, so that God can come into the abandoned place. This is like a spatial Cataphasis that needs to be unsaid with Apophysis because most basically it depicts God as something that can fit into a human being. It defines a human being also under-depicted, as a hollow space to be filled. In the second sentence the soul in a vertical motion is “lifted” up to God, locating God up, where as humans and creatures are located on the ground. Yet at another level creatures are thought to be on/in the soul and they need to be disposed of if a union with God is desired. In this regard, spatiality might be linked to the phase of Cataphasis in its similarity, where it is first need to be lived but eventually demands to be overcome.

How can that spatiality lived and evoked in the poem? In Dickinson's poem number 405, spatial and thematic center in the poem the self is expressed by the "I" and this yields us a clear point of reference for the movements in the poem. In this analysis, the reader becomes one with the utterer and according to the inner qualities and positional distribution in the poem, of course in close relation with the meanings induced, makes a physical map of things said. Reader experiences and designates the outer, inner and horizontal (stable) movements in the poem and assesses its Cataphatic and Apophatic qualities. (The subjective "We" is deliberately used here to emphasize the process of becoming one with the text).

These movements depicted as outwards and inwards or stationary resemble and at certain times imitate the journey considered in mystical union as "upward and outward". Underhill pertains to the issue as "... if this theory of the Absolute be accepted the path of the soul's ascent to union with the divine must be literally a transcendence: a journey "upward and outward"..." (98). However, at the same time, it derives from how Roman Jakobson deals with the functioning of language. Describing the basic functioning of language in verbal communication, he says that "THE ADDRESSER SENDS A MESSAGE TO THE ADDRESSEE" (35). In this basic depiction, if the "addresser" and the "addressee" are considered as two distinct units, as they are different from each other, then a distance, however incalculable, is created between the two. If there is distance then there has to be some kind of a movement to overcome that distance. So it can be said that every message involves a movement away from the "addresser" in one way or the other towards the "addressee". What this step dwells on is that addresser--addressee relation is also established between the words themselves, which means that, as explained in the beginning of the chapter, they also have their own spatial relations. The distance created is shaped by the meaning of the words. For example, when someone says "there is a book" we reckon the utterer of this sentence

as the “addresser” and whoever hears, reads or receives it as the “addressee”. Yet, it depicts a situation where a certain spatiality is created. There is a book situated somewhere away from the utterer of this sentence (distance is unknown). But it can be counted as an outward move as it takes the reader mentally to the image or the meaning of the book being situated somewhere away from the utterer. However if it had said “there is a book in me” then it would be an inward move where the reader would imagine a likewise image or idea. On the other hand if it says “I am fine” there is stability that points neither to an outer or inner movement but displays continuity. The poems are assessed in the following pages basing on these assumptions.

The Poem “405” by Dickinson

The first line “It might be lonelier” with the word “It” displays a point distant from the self. Like Dickinson’s famous term “circumference”, it almost designates a general truth, which can be thought as life, surrounding the self. As it surrounds it is both close and far. Close because surrounding makes it touch, far because it is vast. Yet, in the second line “Without the loneliness” we make an immediate return to the self as we realize that “loneliness” is something here by our side. It is by our side because as the line reveals if we had not had loneliness with us we would be lonely. With the dash at the end of line two, we pause, as if trying to preserve and appropriate the situation. The feeling of “loneliness” is strengthened by this little pause. Pause is not a movement but it can be depicted by horizontality.

After the pause in line two, line three, “I’m so accustomed to my Fate—“almost reinforces this horizontal movement enhanced by the pause. However there is a difference between where loneliness and fate are situated. Fate is situated inside the self. From the loneliness situated at the

outside, though really close, with the third line “I’m so accustomed to my Fate--” a movement towards the self is established. This is an inner movement. This line also ends with a dash emphasizing the “Fate” that is reluctantly accepted as if mimicking daily speech in which one describes an undesirable situation and pauses at the end to think and re-feel the situation. Yet with this pause, the third line, like the loneliness, is left alone by itself.

The last line, “Perhaps the Other—Peace—“, depicts a position again away from the self. It symbolizes a yearning and thus distance. However, it has two inner steps: the “Other” and the “Peace”. “Other” is the name of the current outside unknown yearning. Perhaps it should be thought in a similar way that the “Other” is like the general name of a place and the “Peace” is a specific and very significant point in that geography. The word “Peace” is highlighted by the dashes put before and after the word that almost display it in an empty space, a fauna that symbolizes its both distance and importance to the self. It is a two step out movement.

The second stanza continues with the movement inherited from line four taking the word “Peace” as its subject; “Would interrupt the Dark—“. The location of this interruption is not yet given in the sense that we are not aware of the direction and proximity of the movement in respect to the self. Suffice to say, we move with the “Peace” (it gains mobility by becoming the subject) to meet/disturb/cut off dark at another point. With this confluence where the “Peace” is thought to have subdued the “Dark” we move into a room depicted in line six “And crowd the little Room”. At this point, we are not actually, clearly informed whether the merging between dark and peace, where peace gains control, takes place before entering the room or in the room. It is significant because when we think of the first stanza, especially the third line in relation with the first and the second where the self is situated in the middle with the “Fate”, there arises the possibility of deeming the “Room” as the place where the self is contained or just symbolized. If

we consider it that way, which I believe is a higher possibility, then the movement whose direction we were unsure becomes a drift towards the interior, in other words back into the self. Room becomes the self. Then it deems an inner movement from the space of the “peace” towards the “room”. The sixth line “And crowd the little Room” still refers to the idea of peace diffusing, highlighted specifically by the word “crowd” which bestows to it almost a negative aspect, into the room. From this moment on, until the end of the stanza we are spaced in this room so the movement is of a contained almost stable diffusion horizontal and stationary. Stationary moves can be refreshing and stimulating but here it is more of captivity. From outside peace we are taken into the deeper self where it is darker. This movement towards the inner has been the source of inspiration for many poets as it in a way symbolizes the encounter with the self. Mallarmé about his own poetry says that:

My work was created only by elimination, and each newly acquired truth was born only at the expense of an impression which flamed up and then burned itself out, so that its particular darkness could be isolated and I could venture ever more deeply into the sensation of Darkness absolute. (95)

How Mallarmé defines his writing process resembles Apophasis in general. Darkness is a creative and exuberant force that enables him to write and “venture ever more deeply into the sensation of Darkness absolute”. He signifies the power of “elimination” in the creative progress that is similar to negation, a movement towards absence only to be made possible by the “flaming up and then burning itself out” which would also pertain to affirmation and negation. “Darkness absolute” resembles the God of negative theology. How can one “venture ever more deep” and become one with it? What Mallarmé wishes in a way, is what Dickinson in poem 405 tries to avoid but can’t manage.

Regarding Dickinson's poem can it be said that Apophasis takes place in the dark room of the self. The Apophasis in this poem, which moves towards silence, symbolizes and in every absence presents captivity. As language fails to control, it is a space that is unknown. In Dickinson it is both crowded and unholy. It is referred to in negative theology by many names, such as "darkness", "a dark cloud" and a "cloud of unknowing".

"The Cloud of Unknowing" is a special work of Medieval English mysticism, whose author, because we have no specific information about him that he is called the "Cloud Author". However we know that Cloud's author is very much influenced by Dionysius as he has written a section named "The Mystical Theology of Saint Denis" in which he briefly comments on his theology. The Cloud author writes that:

... by transcendence of yourself and all other things, and by thus cleansing your feelings of all worldly, fleshly and natural pleasures, and your intellect of everything that can be known according to its own form, then, once everything has been negated in this way, you will be drawn up in your feelings above understanding to the radiance of divine darkness that transcends all being. (2)

The key part in the selected text is the "radiance of divine darkness" where the transcendent God, the place of the transcendent God, can be experienced. If recalled it is very much in line with what Mallarmé calls "Darkness absolute". After the soul is detached from worldly creatures and worries, as it is suggested by nearly all of the mystics including Eckhart and Dionysius, it is drawn into and experiences this divine darkness. In the Apophatic fusion, being drawn into and the experience becomes identical at that moment. "Radiance of divine darkness" as radiance is a quality that belongs to light, but not to darkness in ordinary usage, is also an Apophatic move that aims to depict the uniqueness and ambiguity of the experience. In this divine darkness

whatever is learned as part of the earthly-humanly experience is left behind. All prior knowledge is actually a hindrance and must be simply undone. This is called unknowing. When applied to Dickinson's poetry, as it can be deduced from the moves in the poem, despite the desire to leave the self it can not be achieved. Every failure is a return to darkness but this darkness is not positive as in negative theology or as Mallarme depicts it, but it is negative and harmful.

After the word, "Room" there is another dash signaling us to a halt again. In the seventh and eighth lines, "Too scant – by Cubits—to contain/The Sacrament – of Him---"we are introduced with a new force whose originating point we are not certain at first glance. The "Room" is still the same room and it is depicted in the following line as "Too scant" by which the "Room" nearly shrinks once more after it's being referred to as "little" in line six. With the normal flow of poem we still think that the "Room" is small for "Peace" yet at line eight we realize that it is not large enough for "The Sacrament – of Him—". Where does it originate? Is it an inner or outer movement? Since the poet knows that it is not large enough we naturally assume that it is something tried (In the sense that it is measured in someway) before or at least the size of the "The Sacrament – of Him—"is known thus is at a close point, perhaps already inside the "Room" and emerging/appearing. He is already there but becomes active with the attempt of the peace to penetrate into this darkness. However, when it is expressed by the poet that it does not fit inside, it consequently suggests that it is bigger than the room itself. The way "—of Him--" is written with dashes and a capital letter once more isolates and enhances/enlarges it in our eyes.

We then ask the question, might it be the "Him" that contains the "Room", but it is just realized? The transgressions of ideas and feelings between the interior and the exterior through the usage of spaces reveal the situation of the self in the poem. Ambiguities created amongst the

container and the contained resemble the idea of union and separation in mysticism and the ruling elements in the poem.

The third stanza starts with line nine “I am not used to Hope—“ where it resembles line three “I’m so accustomed to my Fate—“ with the only difference that by not being used to “Hope”, just like the concept of Peace, it is located outside the self. The word “Hope” just like the word “Peace” then becomes an outward force with whom the poet, the “I” is not familiar with. Tenth line “It might intrude upon” supports this idea as it describes “Hope” as an intruding force. “Its Sweet parade –blaspheme the place—“gives us another spatial word “the place”, which we sense with our knowledge from the previous stanza is the “Room”, defined in the twelfth line as “Ordained to Suffering”. Repeating once more, the room should symbolize the self. Again the movement is from outside to inside. The lines eleven and twelve, just like the diffusion movement in lines seven and eight, by depicting a situation do not designate a movement but stay almost stable. The enslaving qualities of the room is once more emphasized by the word “Suffering”. These movements in the poem reveal us that suffering is lived in the self making it almost an inner attribute of the self.

The fourth stanza begins with line thirteen “It might be easier” and this time here “it” refers to the specific event imagined in the preceding lines, not to a general, surrounding truth. Hence, the word “might”, as it denotes something that has not been accomplished yet or something not in total control, leaves the “it” outside the self. Line fourteen “To fail – with Land in Sight” endorses the first idea of exteriority as it describes a “Land in Sight” meaning a place distant from the place where the self is located, as it can be seen by the eyes making a metaphor of sailors locating the land while sailing on a ship. Through this metaphor, also regarding the metonym of the room as the self, we can almost imagine a self watching from the window of a

quarter in a ship, imagining being somewhere else, but not being able to overcome this captivity. In line fifteen “Than gain –My Blue Peninsula” another location more desirable than the previous one is introduced. As it needs to be gained, it is away from the self, indicating again an outward movement. However, a comparison is made between the “land in sight” and the “blue peninsula” regarding distance, in the favor of “land in sight” because it is closer; it is reckoned as the easy solution.

Heidegger says: “When we intend nearness, remoteness comes to fore” (102). This is similar to the idea that when something is desired, a realization of its absence also arrives quickly after the desire. In the same manner, saying something distances it from us. Derrida talks about this in the sense that when we write something, we are in a way alienated from it, which is a distancing, a separation. Then realizing that you are separated you desire to get back which lends itself to the concept of “nearing”. When something is said about the inexpressible, that distancing is lived in double effect. First is the usual one like the one Derrida mentions, and the second one stems from the lack of information or the unstableness about the desired thing because it is inexpressible. Something expressible is closer in regard to distance than something inexpressible.

The last line “To Perish – of Delight” connotes an idea that is going to happen on the condition of reaching the “Blue Peninsula”. It is actually a final stop to the movement when the last line is considered as a continuity of the previous lines. The self desires to expand outward from its dark room in the sense that the self will perish because of contacting with delight. The final move is a stop and it shows the desire to not to move back to the room. “Perish of Delight” not only refers to the wish of transcending the self but also manifests the urge to become part of infinity, which is perfectly in line with the poetry of Dickinson. For Dickinson the term

“Infinity”, like the concept of death, has been a recurring theme in many of her poems. Nonetheless, “To perish of delight” is a term that is used and seen as the ultimate goal in mysticism representing the union with God after abandoning the self.

The term unsaying (Apophysis) is the method and reflection of this self abandonment in language that attempts to achieve a similar state. Leaving the self to perish in delight can be related to that movement. Soul’s ascent into divine darkness to become united with God, bases itself very much on Moses’ journey to see God. The Cloud author briefly explains the process:

It was at this point that, in singleness of love, Moses was separated from the chosen priests mentioned above, and entered by himself the darkness of unknowing, darkness which is truly hidden, and in which all intelligible knowledge is shut up; and, in an invisible and intangible manner, having neither feeling nor thought of any existing thing, nor yet of himself, he was made to experience in every way the presence of him who is above all things. But in the emptying out of all knowledge of what is entirely unknowable, he is united with him in the best way; and in knowing nothing he is made to know beyond understanding. (4)

However the idea of darkness, like it is used many times in negative theology, is not negative here. The Cloud author explains it as “For when I say darkness I mean an absence of knowing, in the sense that everything you do not know, or have forgotten, is dark to you, because you cannot see it with your mind’s eye” (26). By emphasizing God’s transcendence, a strong correspondence is built between God, as a being unknown and not knowing something. Dickinson in the darkness of her own room encounters knowledge that she wants to leave behind. The ambiguity and ignorance is a positive attribute in this mode. It is a very controversial idea to embrace, especially, for scientific minds. Unknowing can be better

simplified as accepting not-knowing, losing and forgetting, to count as knowledge in their own right. This idea reflects itself in the word “perish” in Dickinson’s poetry. On the bright side (or shall I say the dark?), it adds great mobility and referentiality to process knowledge from backwards in its discrepancies, because, what is missing, will always be much more than what is captured, and thus, potentiality will incite a continued progress.

When looked at the movements delineated in the poem as a whole, it can be seen that there is a certain retracting pattern. It is as if there is this repeating pattern of a feeble wish or desire induced movement towards outside or in other words stemming from outside that is never strong enough to break the chain of captivity in the self. Whenever we encounter something out of ordinary or outside the self that is a wish like “peace” or “hope”, we are, almost being haunted by the darkness of the self, return back deeper into the self. It becomes a retracting movement, first to the outside, then to the inside and then a horizontal, stationary act of suffering and hopelessness. If we go back to the analysis of each stanza we can also see that starting from the first stanza, each retreat is harsher than the previous one.

At the end, the final weak burst to break free, which seems to last longer than any of the previous ones, as it is more outward oriented when compared to the previous one because they were from outside to inside, does not project a return home but desires oblivion at the outside. It is a final acceptance of having no peace at home, in the self. However, in each instance what is closest, what is visible or what is present is chosen, enhancing the horizontal movement and expanding the sense of enduring and suffering. This makes almost every movement in the poem illusionary as there is no escape. In these respects, the poem is very much stationary thus making the God of the text likewise. I am going to refer to the issue of God of the text in more detail in the hidden name of the god phase.

The Poem "Peace" by Hopkins

In this poem as we do not have an "I" to wrap our centre around, we will consider the main voice in the poem as our spatial defining unit but consider it as being diffused into the poem. Line number one is a call in the form of a question to "peace", which is obviously located away from the self. Peace is described with many adjective phrases until the end of line two up to "... under be my boughs?" Yet in line two, in the "your round me roaming end" we see that where peace is located is not really far away from the self. It is in constant movement, around the self depicted by "round me". Unlike in Dickinson's poem where the outside elements were stable, before being called upon, here "peace" is very active. This can be felt, also in circular yet disorganized motion reposed in the word "roaming". It also can not be controlled fully, depicted in the phrase "be under my boughs" which means it is currently not. This attempt or question is a motion back to the self that aims to take peace with itself to the self. However, by saying "under be my boughs" it refers to the outer part of the self, clearly not letting it in, unlike Dickinson has incorporated her fate, which was in the self. So the movement in the first two lines, which is actually a single question, "When will you ever, Peace, wild wooddove, shy wings shut, / Your round me roaming end, and under be my boughs?" is first towards outside, but the outside is not far away, we stay there pointing to a spiral movement sustained in the "round me roaming". Then the movement is a return back to the self into a position that connotes safety in the phrase "under be my boughs". As a result it is an outward movement, almost a circular turn and a movement back to self, almost like a pulsing motion, which is incorporated in a single question.

The words that connote much prominent spatiality are effectively used by mystics to elucidate intangible, thus, hard to comprehend ideas, feelings and personal experiences assisting for a successful Cataphasis. For example Dionysius writes that “God is therefore known in all things and as distinct from all things. He is known through knowledge and through unknowing” (108). Here, the prepositions “in”, “from”, and the double usage of “through” are of special significance in their tasks to lead us in, out and through the experience. It helps us in two ways: first it clarifies the subject/object relation by designating the fusion, separation and the movement of what comes into what and secondly, by adding further spatiality it contributes to the physicality of the text, rendering it more tangibly apprehensible. Likewise, words and phrases such as “under be” and “round me roaming” in this poem enable us to see the movements and sustained spaces.

Line number three opens with another question directed to “peace” again: “When, when, peace, will you peace?” and it designates a motion once more outwards where peace is located. Yet this time it is not desired of the peace to come back or move somewhere else but to just cease motion, or stop. We can not say there is no return since the next sentence in line three starts with from the self. So the return is not in physical form but in shadow form. Return in a shadow form is the one that is done in silence. It is not a visible move implying that it is not continuous.

“I’ll not play hypocrite to own my heart” is an inward movement in the form of a confession. “Heart” just like peace is not yet under control. The distance created with the heart is important here and at this point we are unsure about its location whether it is inside or outside. Yet, “I yield you do come sometimes” is an inward movement and from this we deduce that

“heart” is in the self. Symbolically, the doubling of the motion inward, expresses the power of the desire to experience peace inside.

However, divided by the word “but” which gives us the middle centre point to adjust, a feeling of disappointment is almost exhaled in the phrase “that piecemeal peace is poor peace” after the recognition that what is taken is not real or satisfactory in its quality. The experienced peace is assessed in the heart (self) at the beginning of line five and deemed disappointing then as if refusing something rotten, it is pushed at a distance with the word “that” adding distance: “that piecemeal peace is poor peace”. So with the word “but” there is a little pause that enables us to realize once more the distressed quality of what is taken in.

When we compare it with Dickinson’s poem, there arises a big distinction in where unifications with these feelings are lived. If we consider that in both poems there are disappointments about “peace”, in Hopkins’s the source of the problem lies outside so once it is realized and it is immediately taken out. On the other hand, in poem 405, this feeling of despair is submerged in the self and the source of corruption is not an outside force but it is noted as part of the darkness of the self.

The next sentence, which is also in line five again, criticises the quality of “pure peace” in a question “What pure peace allows/Alarms of wars, the daunting wars, the death of it?” From the earlier lines we have a vague idea of where peace is located. However, here it is even taken further to the position of an ideal. So, the question stemming from the self moves towards that direction. However, when it arrives at the intended point it goes into a transformation, starting with the phrase “Alarms of wars”. The identity of the peace is being questioned, which can be regarded as seeing it in change, through comparing it to wars. So from the point of pure peace we go to three more points, first one, “Alarms of wars”, the second one, a further enhanced

description; “the daunting wars” and the last one; designating a point so far away from “pure peace” that it signifies the “death of it”. This change happens in quick movements as if jumping from one stone on to another. On the other hand, in Dickinson’s poetry such a horizontal movement takes place much more slowly, as I have mentioned almost like diffusion; lines eleven and twelve in poem 405 are good of examples of this: “Its sweet parade –blaspheme the place-- /Ordained to Suffering”. The rhythms sustained by metering in the poems also contribute to these dissimilar effects. Sprung rhythm supports these quick changes with its single stress where as Dickinson’s trimeter and tetrameter lines help extend the feeling of diffusion.

With this we come to the seventh line, which starts back from the self again. “The reaving peace” is leaving in the direction of its own death, predicated at the end of the sixth line. It is an outward movement. So the idea here is the replacement of what is gone. When peace leaves, from the direction of the Lord, whose direction is not clearly depicted and it can be attributed to any direction. However, it is unlikely to be from the point of the self as there are no words indicating as such. The Lord is bringing something into the pronounced and alleged emptiness created by the departure. This designates an inward movement. It is the “patience exquisite” that is brought instead, denoted at the end of the line eight. It is left there and it momentarily stays stable. However, we see that after this brief inertia, there is a “pluming” movement of the “patience exquisite” towards peace. This “pluming” move towards peace is again a call to peace to come back to its prior position.

The starting of the sentence in the second part of line nine, peace comes back to “house”. It presumes an inner move where the word “house” used as a verb hints at us the notion that this final kind of peace will be able to dwell and fit in here. “House” just like Dickinson’s room, symbolizes the self. We understand from the word “when” situated at the beginning of the

sentence that this is an idea of what is going to happen when peace comes. Similar to what is imagined in Dickinson's poem, here there is an assumption at what is going to happen when peace comes. Peace comes with "work to do" from the out to the inside of the house which means that peace in its current form will be active.

At the end of line eleven, the idea of movement goes to the image where peace comes to "coo" meaning that it is inactive, it is negated "he does not come to coo" and we are immediately brought back to its new form where it has come here "to brood and sit". The word connoting a negative image of thinking signifies a final move of peace into the inner self. While it was situated somewhere outside in the beginning of the poem, in its final form defined by the work it does, it is taken in to "brood and sit" implying a horizontal ending of stable continuity, although the peace received at the end is much different from the one considered in the beginning of the poem. On the other hand, poem "405" ends outside the self.

The importance of this step of designating the movement of idea in the poem from the perspective of the words, almost identifying/unifying with the poem, enables us to get closer to the feeling of the poet, in the sense of attempting to imitate him in the experience of the poem. Marina Tsvetaeva defines the "feeling" of the poet as the major element in the creation of poetry. The term "feeling" can be equated with the "experience" of language that Heidegger talks about. "There is nothing for feeling to do on the periphery of the visible, it is in the centre, is itself the centre. There's nothing for feeling to seek along any roads, it knows that it will some—will lead-- into itself" (219). The feeling becomes the poet and the poem himself drawing everything, in the sense Césaire talks about, onto itself. So distance created by the words, their places and movements they induce in meaning, become an essential element in the realization of the pervasive feeling of the poem.

The proximity of the words to its utter is an issue handled in certain aspects by both Derrida and Heidegger. Heidegger equates “saying” and “nearness” in the sense that saying brings the “said” closer to the utterer. Heidegger says that: “Nearness, then, is by its nature outside and independent of space and time” (103). If this is applied to the most basic of all relations in terms of distance, then each word uttered creates a distance between its utterer and itself not only in physical sense but in meaning as well. The meaning of a word affects the “nearness” it is perceived. Then it becomes a designating feature of the type of unification, separation thus journey attained or attempted in the poem. As the poem is deified, considered as a God, through the words that try to depict this inexpressibility, the negative analyser imitates the mystical journey. The situation of the self reveals much about the things significant and insignificant in the poem, how certain concepts and ideas are deemed. In Hopkins, the idea of peace is a constant issue of inner debate for the poet, which moves as far as to the idea of its opposite that is represented by the idea of war. Peace is desired in each moment in the poem, yet when it finally arrives at the end, it is not really a peace that gives peace in the sense that it soothing and calming in a rather motionless state. It is a final realization of the idea of peace by the author and the author of himself.

When both poems are compared and contrasted at the end of their individual assessments, it can be clearly said that the types of movements definitive in each are very different. In Hopkins’s poem “Peace”, the movements are quick, abrupt and verbosely abundant almost pushing the reader through fast vibrations. If we think of it as a battle, the battle takes place outside the self most of the time or at least the attempt is to take it outside the self. Although the range of movement is dire, in the sense that we never go far away from the self, the intensity of it is high. Whereas in poem 405 by Dickinson, movements are less abrupt and scarce in number

and take place in wider ranges. Although almost each movement ends in the darkness of the self, the final one aims at an ending outside but implies its failure which presupposes an inevitable ending in the self once more. A similar thing can be said of Hopkins' "Peace" with the exception that it ends in the self successfully. In this respect it can be said that both poems, almost in a circular move end in the self, establishing a return. Tsvetaeva says that: "thought is an arrow/feeling is a circle" (219). As briefly explicated in the previous paragraphs, what she means by "feeling" is the poetic drive that is in the center of the poet. It becomes representative of poetry in this sense, whereas "thought" gains a rival stance of the unpoetical position. In a way, the return home in both poems, inducing a circular movement, becomes a symbol for the poetic quality of these poems. In a similar manner, Valéry depicts poetry and prose in the likeness of dancing and walking. He says: "Walking, like prose, has a definite aim. It is an act directed at something we wish to reach" and further notes that "[T]here are no movements in walking, that are not special adaptations, but, each time, they are abolished and, as it were, absorbed by the accomplishment of the act, by the attainment of the goal" (241). On the other hand, he relates poetry to the act of dancing as:

The dance is quiet another matter. It is of course, a system of actions; but of actions whose end is in themselves. It goes nowhere. If it pursues an object, it is only an ideal object, a state, an enchantment, the phantom of a flower, an extreme of life, a smile—which forms on the face of the one who summoned it from empty space. (Valéry 241)

The distinction Valéry makes between poetry and prose, of poetry holding an end in itself like dancing and prose possessing a definite aim like walking, coincides with how Tsvetaeva distinguishes between an arrow representing thought and a circle poetry. Dancing is usually conducted through circular and repetitive movements, the sole aim its own perfection and the

feeling or sensuality it invokes. Valéry also says that "...the poem, on the other hand, does not die for having lived: it is expressly designed to be born again from its ashes and to become endlessly what it has just been. Poetry can be recognized by this property that it tends to get itself reproduced in its own form..." (241-242). The fact that it is repeatable becomes a symbol for its circular nature. Likewise, in this circular scheme, then what Tsvetaeva designates as the center, where all "feeling" converges becomes an essential point in realizing the movement in the poetry. Once more repeating what Genette says, the poem "withdraws from common language *from the inside* , by an action –no doubt largely illusory—of deepening and reverberation..." (412). Poetry in its repetitiveness, like prayers, enables the words to protrude and manifest themselves in their own beings as they are continuously focused on and revered. How and where words are situated against the self, the "feeling" contributes to their own revelations and mysteries. In this respect, in a poem, words by designating distances, through meaning, not only reveal the distance of the hidden God but also hint at their own mysteries. "As mystery, the word remains remote. As a mystery that is experienced, the remoteness is near" (Heidegger 154). Every word is actually a name and every name hides what it names.

CHAPTER VI
THE HIDDEN NAME OF GOD

“What's in a name? that which we call a rose
By any other name would smell as sweet;
So Romeo would, were he not Romeo call'd,
Retain that dear perfection which he owes
Without that title. Romeo, doff thy name,
And for that name which is no part of thee
Take all myself.”

Romeo & Juliet, Shakespeare

In determining the hidden name of God we are going to benefit from all the previous steps in the poem and the information gathered. In the phase of the hidden name of the god when a certain name, a phrase or names and even sentences are distinguished as the hidden name, it doesn't mean that the text can be represented or reduced to that name. This is close to Derrida's treatment of the idea of the “secret”. Derrida says that secret “...denies itself because it appears to itself in order to be what it is...” (“How to Avoid Speaking” 25). In this regard, when we consider the poem as a secret, because it is inexpressible and ineffable, because it is the text deified, if it is revealed in some way then it denies being a poem. The moment the poem is reduced to a name, it is no more that name or that poem. This is the secret of the denial reflecting in this phase, because, in negative analysis, it is denied that a poem can be known. Stanley Fish says that “...I stand opposed: the assumption that there is a sense, that it is embedded or encoded

in the text, and that it can be taken in at single glance. These assumptions are, in order, positivist, holistic, and spatial, and to have them is to be committed both to a goal and to a procedure” (319). As Fish asserts, there is no such determinate knowledge that waits to be uncovered. The hidden name of the god in the poem, regarding Reader Response Theory, is the outcome of the realization of the crucial absent or present elements in the poem. A poem can only be experienced, in the way Heidegger implies language can be experienced. Heidegger says: “In experiences which we undergo with language, language itself brings itself to language” (59).

Gertrude Stein when defining poetry and especially pointing out its difference from prose reveres the affiliation poetry has with nouns and naming of things. She says: “so then poetry up to the present time has been a poetry of nouns a poetry of naming something of really naming that thing passionately completely passionately naming that thing by its name” (241). Poetry names the ineffable but what can poetry be named?

The Poem “Peace” by Hopkins

In the poem “Peace” by Hopkins, the hidden name of god, most ironically, is the most obvious and most repeated non-presence in the poem. As it can be deduced, even with a correct guess from the first step of Cataphasis in the poem, it would be ridiculous to call it hidden. Concentrating on the sound and meaning quality of the word “peace”, it is the name of the God of the text in the poem. As we have defined the poem Cataphatically Apophatic it is actually not strange to encounter the name of the God of the text in a form easily perceivable. However this does not mean that it does not entail Apophatic qualities. It stands in almost every instance as a symbol of a fleeting image of a desired union. It can be called non-presence in this respect,

because it is the absence of “peace” and its felt transformed qualities that actually create the yearning for it and its imagined states. The absence of “peace” does not stem from its material qualities or its being never felt, but root from the inexpressibility of the “peace” experienced. We live this inexpressibility of “peace”, in both defining and attaining, the way it is felt by the poet in every line and through each kind of phase we executed in negative analysis.

The hidden name of God in a poem can protrude from several diverse sources, ranging from a single word to a non-presence dispersed through out the whole poem. This single phrase, “Peace, will you, Peace?” holds such a crucial position in the poem acting almost as black hole that sucks all revolving ideas to itself. It nearly transforms and reduces all the ideas to this single elementary form of question. It acts as the primal essence. However, as it is a question, there is no single answer but multiple layers of answers. We can almost feel every step of this act of “peace” trying to find peace or find a new identity in itself through each word in the poem that relates to it. The name peace is constantly redefined in the poem. Hopkins, in a way, is almost trying to bring on to the surface the “inscape” of the word peace. It is very close to what Stein says: “...I decided that if one definitely completely replaced the noun by the thing in itself, it was eventually to be poetry and not prose...” and further notes that “the noun must be replaced not by inner balance but by the thing in itself and that will eventually lead to everything” (245-246). A name, a word like it has been manifested in the phase of shadow protuberance, in its absence and presence, through negation, can be opened up to referentiality, or as Stein defines lead “to everything” or as Derrida labels exposes itself to constant deference.

When we reflect it to the core Apophatic discourse we can almost come up with a genuine dichotomy just like it is used in negative theology in the discussion of God’s names. If we go back and recall the way Apophasis works in three steps, perhaps we can use it here in a unique

way. About the poem, we can say that the poem is “peace” (Cataphasis) then negate and say that poem is not “peace” (Apophasis) thus it is “war” (Cataphasis) then also negate this and say it is not “war” (Apophasis) leading to the final statement, genuine premise of disordering and say: “peace is war”. All space and time between the steps of this Apophatic process contain what is in the text. Remembering also the final line; “He comes to brood and sit” referring to peace, isn’t it a wonderful way to depict “peace is war”?

The Poem “405” by Dickinson

On the other hand, in poem 405 by Dickinson, the name of the God of the text hides itself much more resolutely. The name of the hidden god in the poem lurks beyond an absence fed from four different points in each stanza and it is both hard and delimitingly unnecessary to cover it with a single word or phrase. In this respect, induction should be used as a method here and these four fountain points should be scrutinized.

In the first stanza, the fountain point is the concept of “loneliness” the way we consider it as the opposite of presence of something or someone. Secondly, strangely enough, the main idea or the prevailing feeling (neither of them can truly represent it) of the second stanza starts or actually is situated at the last word of the first quatrain which is the “Peace”. Similar to Hopkins’s poem it rules in the form of absence both literally and figuratively and sets an important point of meaning channel. In the third stanza, the crucial point is the absence of “Hope”. In the last stanza; the fountain point is the idea of “Failure” as an opposite to certain gain or success. However, what makes these four points fundamentally constituting for this poem is actually how these four types of absences are compensated in an excellent and unequalled way.

Looking at these four fountain points that feed the text in absence, the hidden name or the names can be traced.

In the first and second lines “It might be lonelier/ without the loneliness” the concept of “loneliness”, which is apparently never devoid of feelings and thoughts, is first materialized and then personified as a tangible being. When we consider that loneliness in literal meaning is a lack of company or the state of having nobody or nothing around the self that is uttering his/her/its loneliness, we naturally designate an absence. However what is seen as absence is compensated by a singular kind of presence that is nothing else than the “loneliness” personified itself. I have dealt with this idea in detail in the previous chapters so I am not going to say more about it here. When we look at the word “lonelier” once more, we can see that the state of loneliness, which connotes absence, is thought in terms of presence, as it signifies levels of absence such as lonely, lonelier, and loneliest that arouse in the reader a sense of tangibility for an intangible term. “Loneliness is a lonely other” can very well designate the hidden name in this initial stanza. In the first quatrain, the third line has almost no bearing in this meaning creation as it only reifies this unique state of loneliness as “a fate accustomed” and links it to the second stanza.

The main point of the second stanza actually starts with the end line of the first stanza “perhaps the other—Peace—”. The “peace” is defined from the beginning as an “other” in which the word “other” begins with a capital “O” making it a specific and rather ponderous “other”. The “peace” here unlike the “loneliness” in the first stanza is not an absence by itself but it is portrayed as something desired which is put as an opposite, as an “other” to the idea of loneliness depicted. In this second stanza, the self expressed in terms of a room or the room in which the self dwells (either of these can be viable) actually sets and defines the dark state when the peace

is absent, almost defining the opposite of the peace which tells us what is not desired. So perhaps a suitable hidden name would be “an empty dark room of peace”.

The third point designating an absence is the idea of “Hope” mentioned in the third stanza. Line number five says, “I am not used to Hope—“where the word Hope starts with a capital H just like Loneliness and Peace start with capital letters emphasizing its significance. Being “not used to hope” alienates it and positions it to a further place also supported by line number six where it says, “It might intrude upon” underlining the word “intrude” which clearly indicates its absence as it will come as an outside force obtruding. Where there is no hope there is suffering. Thus the hidden name here is actually overt and projects it self as “suffering”.

The last point reposing in the fourth stanza is the absence of success expressed by the wish or in better words the inclination to accept failure depicted by the lines thirteen and fourteen “It might be easier/To fail—with Land in sight—”. What is harder to gain but what is actually desired is evinced in line fifteen as “My Blue Peninsula”. In this regard the hidden name here is the success which is symbolized by the phrase/place “The Blue Peninsula” that sets itself against easy failure which will probably be the chosen presence.

Negative theology by the process of Apophasis moves through all the possible names, which, in a way, becomes naming with all and nothing at the same time. It hides and reveals, says and unsays concurrently. Stein says that she felt “the need of making it be a thing that could be named without using its name” and talking about Shakespeare further adds that “... Shakespeare in the forest of Arden had created a forest without mentioning the things that make a forest. You feel it all but he does not name its names” (211). Poetry imitates the ineffability of the experience and it becomes ineffability through naming.

Unlike Hopkins's poem there is no single name or a genuine premise driven from the application of Apophasis to it. Considering the hidden names that are obtained from each stanza, as a whole, perhaps such a line comes up: "Loneliness is a lonely other, an empty dark room of peace, suffering, My Peninsula". Can it be the hidden name of the whole poem? Can it be another poem?

Loneliness is a lonely other,
An empty dark room of peace,
Suffering, My Peninsula

Perhaps what this analysis portrays is the ongoing idea in this thesis that a poem can not be known or explained through something unequal and not matching its intrinsic characteristic. And perhaps what is in poetry is another kind of knowledge that can be only hinted, implied and incited best by/in another poem. A poem defers to another poem. It gives way to, creates another poem, like a word is deferred to another. Similar to the Apophatic process, it can not afford to stay. A poem is part of the poetry as a whole that has been written and will come to be written. Once more referring to Levinas, it resembles the idea that existence in all existents belongs to existence as a whole. Perhaps this is the only way and that is all that can be analyzed in a poem. Otherwise every act of forcing knowledge upon a poem would be similar to what Heidegger says: "There is the danger that we will oversteer a poem such as this by thinking too much into it, and thereby debar ourselves from being moved by its poetry" (69). Being moved by poetry is poetry itself and lends itself to poetry. Heidegger says: "Above all, the discussion of the poetic statement can never be a substitute for or even guide to our listening to the poem" (161).

Setting poetry against scientific knowledge, Césaire says that “All in all, scientific knowledge counts, measures, classifies and kills” (276). Poetry, because of its singular characteristic demands a style of analysis, a mode of reading, such as negative analysis that would not trammel but enhance its special mode of being in literature. The following conclusion rests on this final idea

CONCLUSION

Negative approach is not about knowing the poem but it is about living the poem as close as possible to its being. It values absence and through its gratification aims to enhance presence. Although it has a structure manifesting how to approach a poem, it is never itself structuralist in its treatment, as the main idea is to give a way to and lend the self and the text to the text, so that it can open up possibilities of understanding in a timeless manner that befits and values the poem. It is no-more religious than philosophy, physics or literature could be. It invokes to keep asking questions even if the answers are thought to be found. The process of negation is conducive in the sense that it always carries the consequent question “if it is not that what is it?” in its being. As everything changes, the questions and the answers also change over time necessitating different perspectives. Better than all, absence is the only thing that can incorporate that which is already “unknown” and will only come in time. In its constant affirmation and negation, through Cataphasis and Apophasis, it simulates this main idea. It keeps moving so it can keep pace with the change. As a negative analysis of a poem by one reader or critic may vary, also its negative analysis over different time spans could also differ. It is one of its secrets: absence of the secret and the secret of absence, much like Derrida’s view about the secret.

In its every step, negative analysis is also an imitation of the basic ideas of affirmation and negation. It favours or highlights the importance of absence and inexpressibility and symbolizes the resistance to the tyrannies of presence and clear cut expressions. Pertaining to the idea of the power and knowledge relation argued by Foucault in his works collected in the book “*Power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings*” it can be said that claiming knowledge about a certain issue is a way of controlling and disciplining. The modern powers of

our day manifest themselves in materiality, crowdedness of information, money, commodification and consumption, leading to the knowledge of the “other” which delimits and assimilates. Negative analysis concentrates on showing how the poem works particularly through absence and silence and especially refrains from claiming knowledge, but introduces a term like “unknowing”. However, ironically, it can not escape from creating knowledge of a certain kind of its own or forming categories such as Apophatic or Cataphatic. In this regard, negative analysis can and should be denied after each application, in order to escape what it detests; if it is necessary it should lend itself to other methods of analysis and always finally return and give itself to the text, out of respect for the text. Derrida says that: “There is a secret of denial and a denial of the secret” (“How to Avoid Speaking” 25). It aims to protect, enhance and live the secret without harming it. Harming the secret occurs through demystifying it, by claiming knowledge over it. Remembering Dickinson and Hopkins: negative analysis shows that being lonely without loneliness is possible and that peace can exist beyond peace.

Negative analysis is enabled by the promise that there is a secret, a mystery that can not be known, controlled but only attempted to be experienced. It brings negative theology and poetry together against theology and prose at this point. Derrida, basing his ideas on Dionysius’s text says that: “... on the one hand unspeakable, secret, prohibited, reserved, inaccessible (aporreton) or mystical (mystiken), “symbolic and initiatory”; on the other hand, philosophic, demonstrative (apodeiktiken), capable of being shown.” Then he refers to their point of intersection saying; “The ‘inexpressible’ (arreton) is woven together or intersects (sympeplektai) ‘the expressible’” (“How to Avoid Speaking” Derrida 24). This intersection gives a rise to poetry, the way we describe poetry in this thesis. When two things intersect or come up against each other or begin to exist in dichotomies, one of the elements starts to rule, gain power over the “other”. That is

what Derrida tells us. Derrida also asks the question: “At the intersection of the secret and the nonsecret, what is the secret?” (“How to Avoid Speaking” 25) We once more answer, “It is poetry”. In order to prevent prose from overcoming, overpowering and assimilating poetry like knowing does over unknowing and creativity --a method like negative analysis can be applied to maintain the secret and still talk about it. It can remind us that we have secrets and that we will continue to have them, because the secret is in our very being and it shrouds the way we can feel unique and infinite. Bruns regarding Heidegger says: “The language in the poem is an opening into the realm of language and only by listening to this language in the poem can we return to our origins, thus to locate ourselves in the very being of the world” (205). Poetry is the mystery of mankind, as also God is, and they share and shape a genuine absence that lay beyond the origins of being.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Antikacıoğlu, Sosi. *The Modern and Contemporary Sonnet in English*. Istanbul: Boğaziçi University, 2007. 44-54
- Barthes, Roland. "from Writing Degree Zero". *A Barthes Reader*. Ed. Susan Sontag. New York: Hill and Wang, 1956. 54
- . "Is There Any Poetic Writing?". *Poetry in Theory*. Ed. John Cook. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004. 302
- Blanchot, Maurice. "Mallarmé's Experience". *Poetry in Theory*. Ed. John Cook. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004. 331-333
- . *The Infinite Conversations*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.
- Blans, Bert. "Cloud of Unknowing: An Orientation in Negative Theology from Dionysius the Areopagite, Eckhart, and John of the Cross to Modernity". *Flight of the Gods; Philosophical Perspective on Negative Theology*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2000.
- Bruns, Gerald L. *Modern Poetry and the Idea of Language*. Yale University Press, 1974. Vii-205
- . "Disappeared: Heidegger and the Emancipation of Language". *Languages of the Unsayable; Play of Negativity in Literature and Literary Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1987.
- Bulhoff, Ilse N. and Ten Kate, Laurens. "Echoes of an Embarrassment: Philosophical Perspectives on Negative Theology—An Introduction". *Flight of the Gods;*

Philosophical Perspective on Negative Theology. New York: Fordham University Press, 2000. 4-6

---. "Being Open As a Form of Negative Theology: On Nominalism, negative Theology, and Derrida's Performative Interpretation of 'Khora'". *Flight of the Gods; Philosophical Perspective on Negative Theology*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2000.

Césaire, Aime. "Poetry and Knowledge". *Poetry in Theory*. Ed. John Cook. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004. 276-281

Cloud Author. *The Cloud of Unknowing*. London: Penguin Books, 2001. 2, 4, 26

Cook, John. Introduction. *Poetry in Theory*. Ed. John Cook. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004. 5-20

Creely, Robert. "A Sense of Measure". *Poetry in Theory*. Ed. John Cook. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.

Culler, Jonathan. *On Deconstruction; Theory and Criticism after Structuralism*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1982.

De Man, Paul. *Critical Writings 1953-1978*. Ed. Waters, Lindsay. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989.

---. "Intentional Structure of Romantic Image". *Poetry in Theory*. Ed. John Cook. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004. 415-418

Derrida, Jacques. "Of an Apocalyptic Tone Newly Adopted in Philosophy". *Derrida and Negative Theology*. Ed. Harold Coward and Toby Foshay. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992.

- . "How to Avoid Speaking: Denials". *Languages of the Unsayable; Play of Negativity in Literature and Literary Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1987. 3-71
- . *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins U P, 1967. 89
- . *Writing and Difference*. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Despland, Michel. "On not Solving Riddles". *Derrida and Negative Theology*. Ed. Harold Coward and Toby Foshay. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992. 145
- Dickinson, Emily. *The Complete Poems of Emily Dickinson*. Ed. Thomas H. Johnson. New York: Little, Brown & Company, 1960.
- Dionysius. *Pseudo-Dionysius; The Complete Works*. New York: Paulist Press, 1987. 49-109
- Eberwein, Jane Donahue. "'Is Immortality True?'. Salvaging Faith in an Age of Upheavels. *A Historical Guide to Emily Dickinson*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004. 96
- Eckhart, Meister. *Meister Eckhart: A Modern Translation*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1941. 3-54
- Empson, William. *Seven Types of Ambiguity*. London : Chatto and Windus, 1947.
- . "Seven Types of Ambiguity". *Poetry in Theory*. Ed. John Cook. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004. 179
- Fish, Stanley. "Interpreting the variorum". *Modern Criticism and Theory*. Ed. David Lodge. New York: Longman, 1988. 319
- Foucault, Michel. "Power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977". Ed. Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

- Foshay, Toby. "Introduction: Denegation and Resentment". *Derrida and Negative Theology*. Ed. Harold Coward and Toby Foshay. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992.
- Gardner, H.W. *Gerard Manley Hopkins; A Study of Poetic Idiosyncrasy in Relation to Poetic Tradition*. London: Martin Secker & Warburg Ltd, 1949. 286
- Gelpi, Albert J. *Emily Dickinson; The Mind of the Poet*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- Gennette, Gerard. "Poetic Language, Poetics of Language". *Poetry in Theory*. Ed. John Cook. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004. 409-412
- Ginsberg, Allen. "When the Mode of the Music Changes and Abstraction in Poetry". *Poetry in Theory*. Ed. John Cook. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004. 371
- Heidegger, Martin. *On the Way to Language*. New York: Harper & Row, Publisher, 1971. 59-162
- . "Three Lectures on Poetry". *Poetry in Theory*. Ed. John Cook. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.
- Hopkins, Gerard Manley. *Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins*. Ed. Robert Bridges. Kessinger Publishing, 2006.
- Iser, Wolfgang. "The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach". *Modern Criticism and Theory*. Ed. David Lodge. New York: Longman, 1988. 224
- . "The Play of the Text". *Languages of the Unsayable; Play of Negativity in Literature and Literary Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1987.

- Jakobson, Roman. "Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics". *Poetry in Theory*. Ed. John Cook. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.
- . "Linguistics and Poetics". *Modern Criticism and Theory*. Ed. David Lodge. New York: Longman, 1988. 35
- . "The Metaphoric and Metonymic Poles". *Modern Criticism and Theory*. Ed. David Lodge. New York: Longman, 1988.
- Khlebnikov, Velimir. "On Poetry and on Contemporary Poetry". *Poetry in Theory*. Ed. John Cook. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004. 96
- Lacan, Jacques. "Excerpts from Seminars and Papers". *Poetry in Theory*. Ed. John Cook. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.
- . "The Insistence of Letter in the Unconscious". *Modern Criticism and Theory*. Ed. David Lodge. New York: Longman, 1988. 89-95
- Levinas, Emmanuel. *Time and The Other*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne U P, 1987. 46-48
- Mallarmé. *Mallarmé: Selected Prose Poems, Essays & Letters*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1956. 95
- Motzkin, Gabriel. "Heidegger's Transcendent Nothing". *Languages of the Unsayable; Play of Negativity in Literature and Literary Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1987.
- Olney, James. *The Language(s) of Poetry; Walt Whitman, Emily Dickinson, Gerard Manley Hopkins*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1993. 59-94
- Plato. *Republic*. Ed. Tom Griffith. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1997.
- Pollak, Vivian and Marianne Noble. "Emily Dickinson, 1830-1886: A Brief Biography". *A Historical Guide to Emily Dickinson*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004. 19

- Sells, Michael. *Mystical languages of Unsayings*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994. 2-24
- Saint John of the Cross. *The Collected Works of St. John of The Cross*. Washington: ICS Publications, 1991.
- Stein, Gertrude. *Lectures in America*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1935. 211-241
- The Wordsworth Dictionary of Beliefs and Religions*. Ed. Goring, Rosemary. Edinburg: W & R Chambers Ltd, 1992. 355
- Turner, Denys. *The Darkness of God*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. 17-34
- Turner Mark, Lakoff George. *More than Cool Reason; A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Tsvetaeva, Marina. "Poets with History and Poets without History". *Poetry in Theory*. Ed. John Cook. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004. 216-219
- Tzara, Tristan. "Note on Poetry". *Poetry in Theory*. Ed. John Cook. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004. 93
- Underhill, Evelyn. *Mysticism*. London: Methuen & Co ltd, 1911. 79-170
- Ward, Bernadette Waterman. *World as Word, Philosophical Theology in Gerard Manley Hopkins*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2002. 3-5
- Wikipedia. 20 June 2007. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sui_generis
- Word Web Dictionary. Anthony Lewis, 2006. <http://wordweb.info/>
- Valéry, Paul. *Aesthetics*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964.
- . "Poetry and Abstract Thought". *Poetry in Theory*. Ed. John Cook. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004. 238-242

Ver Eecke, Wilfried. *Denial, Negation, and the Forces of the Negative*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006.