

Full Length Paper

Frustration in Cinema: Ideological Presentation of Dreams

**Tülay Çelik Ph.D., Sakarya University, Fine Arts Faculty,
Visual Communication Design Department, Sakarya, Turkey
tulaycl@gmail.com +905327694689**

Accepted 26 November 2012

The article discusses the transformative effect of the frustration theme in auteur cinema through the example of the film *Sonbahar* in which the viewer is not a consumer but part of the creative process, and the harmony between form and content allows for critical, transformative and permanent meanings to emerge. In this study, *Sonbahar* is analysed on the axis of the form of presentation of the frustration theme. It focuses on the thesis that the film, owing to its aesthetic structure, contains negation, which complements the form and questioning that will produce permanent meanings, thus revealing the hope inherent in frustration.

Keywords: dream; frustration; auteur cinema; film aesthetics; film analysis

INTRODUCTION

Art cannot change the world, but it can contribute to changing the consciousness and drives of the men and women who could change the world. (Marcuse, 1997: 35).

Departing from the dream-cinema relationship, it is necessary to take into consideration the historical and ideological context of cinema in order to develop an idea about Turkish cinema. Resulting both from the universal aspect of art and the conditions brought about by the functioning of the global system, this point of view is the prerequisite for perceiving cinema as an art form and being able to realistically look at the cinema of a country. On this axis, grasping - within the broad context mentioned- the relationship between the presentation of dreams via frustration and the transformative power of cinema is necessary for the manifestation of the ideology to which this form of presentation can render service.

First of all, it should be stated that the auteur cinema, which can be seen as a field where the transforming effect of 'frustration' in cinema could emerge, intersects with art cinema; and that it is positioned differently from the (sovereign) commercial cinema. These two fields coming closer to one another and their boundaries sometimes becoming indistinctive nowadays will not be discussed here because the prominent features of the two existing cinemas are sufficient to make an assessment on an ideological platform. Also, indicating the main points of distinction is necessary since this distinction will determine the form of dream presentation and the platform on which we will be discussing the characteristics of this form. Here, it must be underlined that this necessity ensues from the ideological decisiveness of the form—content relationship; and the

basis leading us to this distinction finds its source in the concept of culture industry. The assertions made by Theodor Adorno concerning the functioning of the culture industry and the distinction between the products of culture industry and art still have a guiding function.

According to Adorno, in the culture industry, people do not achieve their desires but are led to the illusion that they are somewhat satisfied (Adorno, 2007: 75)¹. In the culture industry, individuals exist as consumers and, by being classified as consumers, they are placed under the mass production category. Clichés and formulas taking the place of artworks become dominant. According to Adorno, apprehending the products of the culture industry requires skill and strong observation ability. However, in order to grasp the rapidly passing events, this apprehension must be fast enough to prevent intellectual activity (Adorno, 2007: 51-74). Today, it is enough to look at the Hollywood films to see all these characteristics listed.

Since we will discuss the importance of a cinema field in which the viewer is not a consumer but a part of the creative process and in which the cognitive activity is not blocked (Nalbantoğlu, 2007: 4)², Turkish cinema will be examined as auteur cinema, in light of these characteristics. In order to lay the foundation for developing an opinion on the axis of auteur cinema, it is necessary to describe the field of art cinema and to understand the overlapping areas between these two fields. David Bordwell states that, as a distinct mode of film practice, the art cinema possesses implicit viewing methods which are cognisable indirectly and points to a historically identifiable field (1979: 56). The production of permanent meaning in art cinema reveals itself as a fundamental distinction (Tarkovsky, 2007: 162)³. The form is the most important component in the creation of meaning, because the film form is the container of the content. (Bazin, 1995: 4)⁴ As Herbert Marcuse pointed out, 'In the work of art, form becomes content, and vice versa' (1997: 41). The harmony between content and form is the fundamental requirement for a film to possess transformative power.

AUTEUR CINEMA, IDEOLOGY and FORM

When we look at the cinema as an art from the historical point of view, we see that the concept of art cinema becomes evident in the process. 'The term *cinéma d'art* was first coined by the French in 1908 to give cinema [...] a legitimacy that would attract the middle classes to the cinema. This earliest form of art cinema was filmed theatre [...] accompanied by musical scores of renowned composers' (Hayward, 1999: 9). Later, the art cinema developed within national cinemas,

¹ 'The principle dictates that he should be shown all his needs as capable of fulfilment, but that those needs should be so predetermined that he feels himself to be the eternal consumer, the object of the culture industry.' (Adorno, 2007: 75).

² Nalbantoğlu refers to the dependency relationship created by the 'monotonous ideas and image patterns imported from the West' today in the field of dance as well. He emphasises that dance, functioning as an industry and trade, is a serious danger for the field of art (2007: 4). Also, in the field of cinema, the dependency relationship established between the Hollywood cinema, which moves through clichés and formulas, and the audience is posing a great danger for the field of art cinema.

³ An important auteur filmmaker, Tarkovsky, finds the most significant distinction between art cinema and commercial cinema in the fact that while the former evokes emotions and thoughts, the latter eliminates any existing crumbs of thought and emotions (2007: 162).

⁴ Likewise, Bazin also emphasises this relationship with respect to the film. Moreover, 'one way of understanding better what a film is trying to say is to know how it is saying it' (1995: 54).

nourished by the tradition of European history of thought, art and literature (Bergfelder 2005: 192). The emergence of the auteur concept had a major impact on the significant revelation of the field of art cinema. With the discussions on the *politique des auteurs* that began around the *Cahiers du Cinéma* magazine in the 1950s, directors came to the fore as auteurs. Here, we encounter the concept of creative director who is in control of the whole process. A director of auteur cinema produces a discernible style through staging and, at the same time, puts his own signature not only under the script but also the process of film production. This concept evolved in time. The scope of the theory expanded through structuralism, post-structuralism, ideological developments under the influence of Althusser, films coming to the forefront as texts, the production process and the possibility of evaluating the social, political and historical contexts. According to some critics, this expansion indicates the extinction of the auteur concept; but there is no actual extinction (Hayward, 1999: 9-20). In spite of having different manners, the language of cinema generated in this field has prominently common characteristics and these can be consolidated under an ideological attitude. These prominent characteristics and the historical process reveal the interlocking of the art cinema and the auteur cinema.

The main problem of the art cinema is to establish a relationship with reality. Criticism and creation of permanent meaning are tied to this relationship on the axis of form. While assessing the cinema industry within the culture industry, Adorno says that its main purpose is to make money and that representing the reality is not the aim. When the quest for reality is missing, the consumers themselves, who exist through calculated needs, become the ideology of this industry (2007: 68-96). Yet, the quest for reality has been the most important area of discussion in the history of cinema. The discussions in the historical process will not be addressed in this article. Suffice it to say that, from the point of view that the world created is a fictional and subjective one, different methods are chosen in order to reflect the reality and every director realises their quest for reality by way of their choice of form. In the context of the quest for reality, the important thing is to grasp the common characteristics of the form which creates what is critical, transformative and permanent. The most frequently encountered characteristics of this cinema are its contrast with the classical narrative, (Bordwell, 1979: 57)⁵ the mixing of the narrative codes, the open endings, the corruption of the cause-effect relationship, (Bordwell, 1979: 57)⁶ the contingent behaviour of the characters, the lack of a hero and the uncertainty in the construction of time and space (Hayward, 1999: 10). These characteristics create distance and give the viewer a reflective space. They do not allow 'the illusion to prevail that the outside world is the straightforward continuation of that presented on the screen' (Adorno, 2007: 55). Thus, they allow the criticism to emerge. This criticism in the art cinema finds its source in the autonomy of art. The aesthetic form according to Marcuse, who is the main reference in this study, separates the art from 'the given' but this separation is due neither to the illusion nor to the false consciousness created by art. What is produced here is counter-consciousness. 'By virtue of its aesthetic form, art is largely autonomous vis-à-vis the given social relations. In its autonomy art both protest these relations, and at the same time transcends them' (Marcuse, 1997: 9-19). What provides permanence in the art cinema is the metamorphosis of experience. Our basic experiences of the world depend on

⁵ In the classical narrative style, the logic of causality and narrative parallelism in particular constitutes a narrative in which the actions are reflected through psychologically defined and oriented characters. Narrative time and space are created in order to show the chain of causality. The importance of the components of the film stems from the functions of narrative development (Bordwell, 1979: 57).

⁶ The cause-effect 'linkages become looser, more tenuous in the art film' (Bordwell, 1979: 57).

the transient, concrete, present-tense interactions with the world. Our ability to recall the permanent meanings and to produce abstract concepts is possible by producing experiences that are beyond the transient level of concrete interaction (Grodal, 2000: 34).

Michelangelo Antonioni's film *The Passenger (Professione: reporter)* can be given as an example of the way these experiences are produced in cinema. Seçil Büker states that, by making the identity change central to his movie, Antonioni does not intend to create comedy or adventure but, by transcending these, he wants to find out whether people would arrive at reality. The film form becomes important at the daily experience phase of the work. Antonioni concludes that it is impossible to achieve the absolute knowledge by departing from the act of identity change (Büker, 1985: 102). Torben Grodal asserts that art should be the expression of high level meanings as well as skill and innovation and gives *Ulysses' Gaze* (Theo Angelopoulos, 1995) as an example: what is important here is to show (as appropriate) the deeper visions concerning society and human spirit. Experiencing the meaning depends on our ability to mentally transcend from the embodied state of the meaning to the abstract, disembodied level of it (Grodal, 2000: 35-38). Ambiguity is important in the production of meaning. 'The most profound and rich connotation or "meaning" is the one that is seated on the most ambiguous basic meaning' (Lefebvre, 1996: 127 quoted by Adanır, 2003: 59). This ambiguity is among the characteristics of the auteur cinema. This is the point where the film form becomes visible. Beyond being the components of the story told, the elements of the film—places, objects, colours, sounds and the way these are presented—become the feelings and thoughts themselves. Thus, the meanings created give the viewer the opportunity to think, question and interpret.⁷

PRESENTATION of FRUSTRATION in SONBAHAR

Having examined the form of auteur cinema on the axis of ideology, reality and permanency, we can talk about the importance of presenting the dream within this form through frustration and the transforming effect of frustration. As Marcuse indicates, positivity/negativity corresponds to different meanings in art. The dimension of affirmation and negation of art in its own language cannot be coordinated with the process of social production (1997: 28). Chosen among the post-1990 auteur cinema films by taking into account the aesthetic characteristics of the auteur cinema, the film *Sonbahar* (Özcan Alper, 2008) enables us to illustrate through frustration the negation-affirmation relationship mentioned by Marcuse regarding a work of art.

Sonbahar (Autumn) is a film which exposes the effects of political developments on the society. From the content point of view, films containing political criticism are encountered both in the post-1990 auteur cinema field⁸ and in the earlier periods. What gives prominence to *Sonbahar* is

⁷ 'As a true work of art it always allows one to relate personally with the world of the film, interpreting it differently every time' (Tarkovsky, 2007: 150).

⁸ The mention of a new period in the 1990s begins with the individual, low budget production films made by 'auteur' filmmakers who have their own language. This field, which made itself noticed with the stylistic distinction of the film *Tabutta Rövaşata*, surfaced with films like *Masumiyet*, *Kasaba*, *Mayıs Sıkıntısı*, *Güneşe Yolculuk* (Suner, 2005: 37). The new generation of directors within the field of auteur cinema has taken important steps towards creating a cinema language and gained international recognition in this field. The international support, lower costs, cinema education becoming widespread, the Ministry of Culture subsidies and the European cultural policies play as important a role as the individual efforts in the development of this field. The point to note is that films with the characteristics of this cinema field were produced in earlier periods. The argument is true that the traces of this 'new' cinema can be found in the films *Amansız Yol* (1985) and *Gece Yolculuğu* (1987) by Ömer Kavur and in *Her Şey*

basically the frustration theme as much as the film's success at becoming a work of art which produces critical and permanent meanings by carrying the frustration to an aesthetical dimension.

The film tells the story of a young man, imprisoned when he was a university student, who is set free ten years later due to his terminal disease and goes to stay with his mother in a mountain village in the Eastern Black Sea region, where he was born and raised, to spend the last months of his life. Yusuf had dreamt of a socialist order, fought for the sake of it and spent his youth in prison for this reason. When he finally comes out of prison, he is about to die because the unhealthy conditions in prison have made him sick, and nothing he had dreamt of has been realised. When viewed through the reality of daily life, both the story we encounter in the film and the film concluding with death conveys negativity (sadness, hopelessness, despair) throughout. But the film succeeds in transporting the story to another dimension of meaning through its form of character presentation within its narrative structure and language. Developed through the relationship between past and future, dream and frustration, clinging and losing grip, hope and hopelessness, faith and meaninglessness, the characters now transcend the everyday negativity. This state of transcendence is achieved through the form of the film and it reaches criticism.

According to Marcuse, the universal in a particular social status gains continuity in art and it is indicative of the transforming power of art as 'a reminder of the past life'. The characters in Dostoyevsky's *Humiliated and Insulted* and Victor Hugo's *Les Misérables* become universal through suffering the inhumanity of all times (Marcuse, 1997: 29). Likewise, Yusuf and Eka in *Sonbahar* are two 'helpless' people standing at the pier, facing life, symbolised by the giant waves of Black Sea. The frustrations of Yusuf and Eka, which can be unified in the context of socialist dreams—when viewed from different points of view—correspond to the suffering and frustration of all humanity. The helplessness of Eka, who returns from buying her daughter a toy, reaches the universal as the helplessness of humanity. While a short period of the character's life is displayed, her whole life with her hopes, expectations and frustrations is presented to the viewer through her encounter with Yusuf. Beyond creating identification or a mere emotional impact, the presentation of Eka's character in the film without separating it from the context of historical and social relationships—including love—enables the interpretation of that character's story to become permanent.

The point to remember here is that for art to say something about the society (something social) is dependent on its protection of its autonomy and keeping alive its questioning potential (Dellaloğlu, 2003: 29). In regard to this questioning, Marcuse gives examples from the history of world literature. He talks about the intensification and augmentation of the experience. 'The aesthetic transformation turns into indictment—but also into a celebration of that which resists injustice and terror, and of that which can still be saved' (Marcuse, 1997: 43). In *Sonbahar*, confronting the viewer with Eka's and Yusuf's characters—who are on the verge of despair, entrapment—by way of displaying the whys and hows of their stories evokes not only injustice but also what can be changed. In this sense, negativity contains hope in proportion to its indication of transformability. Marcuse exemplifies this particularly in the political dimension: 'The

Rağmen (1987) by Orhan Oğuz (Suner, 2005: 42). Likewise, *Teyzem* (Halit Refiğ, 1986), *Gizli Yüz* (Ömer Kavur, 1990), *Otobüs* (Tunç Okan, 1976), *40 Metrekare Almanya* (Tevfik Başer, 1986) can also be added to this list. This process can also be traced back to the Yeşilçam period (*Sevmek Zamanı*, Metin Erksan, 1965).

return of the repressed, achieved and preserved in the work of art, may intensify this rebellion' (1997: 56). Therefore, in a work of art, even the bloodiest events in history can be felt as a stronger rebellion. The flashbacks in *Sonbahar* bring the viewer face to face with an important cross section of the recent history. The viewers do not witness or watch the bloody events. They encounter video images detached from the rest of the film. These are what Yusuf remembers of his experiences, because it is important that the viewer remembers these events through Yusuf. Forgetting may alleviate life, but it is necessary to remember in order to overcome the pain. Recollection should replace repression; it should be done in an aesthetic dimension and be compatible with the form. 'In the aesthetic form [...] the terror is called up, called by its name, and made to testify, to denounce itself' (Marcuse, 1997: 56-62). Placing emphasis on this denial, Gadamer says that, by its shocking effect, art can remove the individual from everyday reality and create the possibility for them to reach the reality of the social being (Nalbantoğlu, 2000: 71). In the film, the viewers recall and face their recent history through what Yusuf remembers. While Yusuf's contemplation of his village from outside, the life which is taking its course there and his past create the sense of aimlessness and insignificance, the contrast created by the video images inside the film makes one ask the questions: 'What is the world Yusuf is fighting for? What is this village? Which one is the reality?' There is an alternation between the village, the villagers, the prison, police officers, soldiers, the quiet beauty of the nature, fights, struggles, and people dealing with their simple problems, blood, screams and violence. There is no choice in the matter; it is impossible to be peaceful in the village despite all its 'beauty'. While Yusuf's dilemmas are made clear via elements of comparison, the human suffering also becomes tangible and the beautiful uplands and majestic mountains of Black Sea, Turkey turn into symbols which are reminiscent of the real world, which create the 'possibility to reach reality'.

Marcuse bases the utopia of art in recollection. Apart from the video images, another example in *Sonbahar* of the chain of recollection, which carries the work to the field of questioning, is the one about Yusuf's childhood and youth. There is the innocence of a little child, the stirrings of thought which leads him to take the road of struggle and the dreams of a young mind in the photos hanging on the walls of Yusuf's room. The film brings us face to face with a torpid, pensive and 'defeated' character in front of his suspended dreams. As Yusuf recalls his past and dreams, we get involved in this recollection. His mental and emotional journey becomes closer and better understood.

At the end of the film we are confronted with the death of the frustrated character. But, in actuality, what brings us here is the process. Although the film intensifies the power of the negation via the idea of death, it is already beyond the point of being evaluated with a happy or sad ending. 'If art were to promise that at the end good would triumph over evil, such a promise would be refuted by the historical truth. In reality it is evil which triumphs, and there are only islands of good where one can find refuge for a brief time. Authentic works of art are aware of this; they reject the promise made too easily; they refuse the unburdened happy end' (Marcuse, 1997: 44). This is precisely the realm of freedom where *Sonbahar* transports us to. Marcuse's expression 'unburdened happy end' defines an end processed through relations with reality and actually refers to the whole of the film. For this reason, the ending in *Sonbahar* is where the narrative takes us. Within the entirety of the work, it exists as a component of the story which pushes the viewer to think about the process and is, in fact, inevitable. Even if the conflict is resolved, the process preserves the remembrance of things past because there is such a limit as 'impossibility of undoing the past'. Even if the character reaches a point that looks like a happy

ending, the construction of the story as a whole must contradict this solution (Marcuse, 1997: 45). In *Sonbahar*, the return of Eka to her country cannot be presented as a solution. Through Yusuf's life which we witness within the duration of the film, a country, a political formation and concepts of love, value, hope and ethics are opened up for discussion. In regard to the transformative power of a film, it is important that even the situations in that film which seem to be the solution contribute to the questioning within the framework of the relationships with reality. The return of Eka in *Sonbahar* turns into a factor that renders service to the development of thought over the process.

The word frustration also evokes weakness and being offended. In *Sonbahar*, Yusuf looks more impotent, weaker and more fragile because of his illness. However, here, as well as in the films of Tarkovsky, there is a character who appears to be weak but who, in actuality, is strong due to his beliefs, choices and his stance in life (2007: 163). He has taken on responsibility with the desire to change the existing system. He has sacrificed his life. The scene where he finds out that the woman he loves is married to someone else, the talks about the life outside while Yusuf is in prison, even though they are everyday ordinary experiences and usual stories, enable the viewers to face the sacrificed life of Yusuf. In the scene where we first hear the conversation of Yusuf and his friend in the darkness of the beach and then see them turn to two shadows watching the sun set, the gap created with Yusuf's silence and the completion of the scene with this gap following the words 'This is our share of life, we'll live it again if we must', uttered by Yusuf's friend, render this confrontation striking as well as they give room for the viewer to think. Does Yusuf feel any regret? The film does not say so. In his dialogue with the villagers, even though all that he went through seems—in the eyes of the villagers—meaningless, it is made obvious that there was no other possible choice. Supported by the use of natural environments, the sense of limitation in the village seems to lead this sensitive character to pursue his ideals regardless of what happens (his emotional relationship with Eka underlines his sensitivity—he feels close to a prostitute who is ousted as 'the other'). At the point where he is face to face with death, what he feels is not regret but frustration, which also contains the human-specific conflicts.

Is Yusuf trying to hold on to life by repairing the bagpipe he found in the attic, giving lessons to the little child, buying him a bicycle and lastly looking for Eka in the hotel room? On one hand, the character awaits death, and on the other, as seen clearly in the scene where he arrives at his village on a bus, he experiences an unfamiliar bewilderment. In the film, bewilderment and frustration of life are mixed together. Yusuf stands aloof from the life of the villagers. He remains indifferent to the discussions on whether the government made payment for the tea plants or the conversations on tourism, although his imprisonment was related to these matters. He does not want to think any more, perhaps because he has no strength left or because he wants to get away from what is happening in the world. He prefers to watch a caterpillar and while the camera follows the slow passage of that caterpillar, the viewers enter into that character's time. Through the alienating element used here, Yusuf's confused inner world and uncertain feelings are offered to the viewer to leave in them a permanent trace and to be questioned; thus, the participation of the viewer in the mental process is enabled.

The sense of confusion and disorientation that we encounter in *Sonbahar* is, as Angelopoulos also expressed, always obtained through melancholy (Schulz, 2006: 142). In fact, this connection is related to the transforming effect of frustration. The state of sadness and dependency is the expression of rebellion. 'While art bears witness to the necessity of liberation, it also testifies to its

limits. What has been done cannot be undone; what has passed cannot be recaptured. History is guilt but not redemption' (Marcuse, 1997: 59). We cannot escape the feeling of guilt when we watch a film that reminds us of a pain humanity suffered in any period in history. A common past is in question. Deep down, the point reached by the two characters of *Sonbahar*—Yusuf and Eka—as the point reached by humanity creates a feeling of guilt associated with this. On the other hand, in *Sonbahar*, this guilt is also communicated to the viewer via responsibility. The film offers the viewers the opportunity to question themselves, departing from the question of whether the 'naive' inhabitants of the village could also be responsible for these prisons and experiences with their ignorance and silence.

According to Adorno, art cannot be affirmative. This is because the world is in disorder. Adorno mentions the composer of *Wozzeck*, Alban Berg. Adorno finds the truth of Berg's music in his refusal of affirmation. 'The basic sadness of his music shows that he is not "reconciled"; his "resignation" is that of a person who makes utopian demands on life and sees them eternally unsatisfied, but does not give them up' (Adorno, 1970: 346 referred to by Geuss, 2003: 291). Likewise, in *Sonbahar*, there is the resignation of a man who never gave up his ideals. He has not realised his ideal and now he does not know where he stands. In fact, in the scene where the television is used as an alienating element, the dialogues of *Uncle Vanya* heard in the background and Yusuf's coughing point precisely at this direction. When the line 'We shall patiently bear the trials fate imposes on us; we'll work for others, now and in our old age' is heard, the sound of Yusuf's cough—the sound of the deadly disease which is the deadly price he is paying for having risked his life for others—suppresses the sound of the television.

To an extent, the power of the contrast in returning from great dreams and struggles to the quiet mountain life, to his mother's house lies in the defeat. But this negativity is not understood as fate because the negativity of a work of art carries the individual beyond submission to what they face in life. Angelopoulos wants his films to be a faithful image of our times. This goes beyond the optimism or pessimism of the story (Tarkovsky, 2007: 182). Likewise, *Sonbahar* gives an image of time. The time of different countries, the world and humanity are narrated through Yusuf and Eka. The good and evil exist as the qualities of that time.

In his analysis of Goethe's poem *Über allen Gipfeln* Adorno says that he witnesses the opposite of what seems unbroken and harmonious. He sees 'nothing but the accord between such suffering and such love', and says that 'only because the tone of the poem sympathizes with this sorrow, can it insist that there ought to be peace' (Marcuse, 1997: 54). This is the essence of the matter on which we focused since the beginning. Imagination becomes the bearer of frustration (Tarkovsky, 2007: 170)⁹, but it is realised through the harmony of form and content. In *Nostalgia*, Tarkovsky succeeds in the portrayal of someone 'in a state of nostalgia provoked [...] by a global yearning for the wholeness of existence' (Tarkovsky, 2007: 182). Sadness and longing are reflected in the whole of the film. The film's ability to produce permanent meanings is associated with this. Likewise, in *Sonbahar*, the form allows for the visualisation of frustration. The frustration and sadness of the characters are engraved into the film form and integrated with the film's

⁹ Tarkovsky describes the hope that art contains in a similar manner. 'I want to underline my own belief that art must carry man's craving for the ideal, must be an expression of his reaching out towards it; that art must give man hope and faith. And the more hopeless the world in the artist's version, the more clearly perhaps must we see the ideal that stands in opposition to it—otherwise life would become impossible!' (Tarkovsky, 2007: 170).

imagery. As an important element that creates imagery, the locations are not places but are a way to express emotions: the lost dreams of Yusuf, the helplessness of Eka, the destruction of the mother's dreams for her son are the giant waves, the grey sea and sky, the rain which makes the streets invisible and the foggy and snowy mountains. The rain drops on the windows of cars and rooms are the never-falling teardrops of Yusuf and Eka or the traces of the rain falling inside them. The sky and mountains framed by the window may be what is left of dreams. The locations are the limits, dreams, defeat and struggle at the same time. However, the limitation of all these words must be taken into account while using them because the idea of an image becomes real when not expressed in words (Tarkovsky, 2007: 91). Moreover, what expresses the mood of the film in *Sonbahar* is the strength of this form.¹⁰

CONCLUSION

In his article 'Türkiye'de Bir Dans Sosyolojisi İçin Peşrev' (Prelude to the Sociology of Dance in Turkey), while addressing the importance of dance as an art form, Nalbantoğlu mentions the 'transformative power' of the real art which constantly reminds us of humanity (2007: 16). By its presentation through frustration also in the field of auteur cinema, the dream becomes an important element of criticism of life and of the transformative effect. Within the scope of the film *Sonbahar* that is discussed in this study, frustration contains negation, which is a complement of the form, that creates permanent meanings in the relationship that cinema establishes with reality and questioning. Thus, the hope inherent in the film can be revealed at the level of the aesthetic. For a film of this quality, what becomes crucial is not the fact that it belongs to the Turkish cinema or to another country's cinema, but the status it obtained through its universal, critical and transformative qualities.

¹⁰ On the axis of the characters' existential quest, establishing a similarity between Angelopoulos, Bergman, Tarkovsky, and Özcan Alper would not be wrong. When he mentions weak people, Tarkovsky means those who find their strength 'in their spiritual conviction and who take upon themselves a responsibility for others' (Tarkovsky, 2007: 184). Also, in the films of Angelopoulos, there are frustrated people who are trying to find a reason for their existence. In Bergman's films, too, we encounter characters who are questioning God, love and themselves, who are still engaged in an existential quest (O'Grady, 2006: 83-84). Likewise, in *Sonbahar*, we witness the existential quest of a character who believed, who took on responsibility, who is frustrated, weak but 'strong'.

REFERENCES

Adanır, O. (2003). *Sinemada Anlam ve Anlatım (Meaning and Narrative in Cinema)*. İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları.

<http://www.idefix.com/kitap/sinemada-anlam-ve-anlatim-oguz-adanir/tanim.asp?sid=IZDDDAUFLA0A3U4TR538> VIEW ITEM

<http://www.kameraarkasi.org/yonetmenler/oguzadanir.html> VIEW ITEM

Adorno, T. W. translated by Ünler, N., Tüzel, M. and Gen, E. (2007). *Kültür Endüstrisi, Kültür Yönetimi (Culture Industry, Culture Administration)*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

<http://www.kitapyurdu.com/kitap/default.asp?id=123552> VIEW ITEM

<http://www.iletisim.com.tr/kitap/k%C3%BClt%C3%BCr-end%C3%BCstrisi-k%C3%BClt%C3%BCr-y%C3%B6netimi-1330.aspx> VIEW ITEM

Bazin, A. translated by Özön, N. (1995). *Çağdaş Sinemanın Sorunları (Problems of Contemporary Cinema)*. Ankara: Bilgi Yayınları.

http://tr.wikipedia.org/wiki/T%C3%BCrkiye'de_yay%C4%B1mlanm%C4%B1%C5%9F_sinema_kitaplar%C4%B1 VIEW ITEM

http://tr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nijat_%C3%96z%C3%B6n VIEW ITEM

http://tr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Andr%C3%A9_Bazin VIEW ITEM

<http://www.idefix.com/kitap/cagdas-sinemanin-sorunlari-andre-bazin/tanim.asp?sid=Y2KP38UDCA2NR5CZU3V0> VIEW ITEM

Bergfelder, T. translated by Özcan, E. (2005). Avrupa Sinemasını Yeniden Düşünmek: Avrupa Sinema Tarihi Yazımı İçin Kavram ve Öneriler (Rethinking European Film Studies: Concepts and Recommendations for Writings on History of European Cinema). *Toplumbilim, Avrupa Sineması Özel Sayısı (Sociology, European Cinema Special Edition)*. 18, p191-199. İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları.

<http://www.idefix.com/kitap/toplumbilim-sayi-18-avrupa-sineması-özel-sayısı-kolektif/tanim.asp?sid=MGFPQ0RQ550WW4KCM97G> VIEW ITEM

<http://www.bağlam.com/kitapyazar/tb18.htm> VIEW ITEM

Biryıldız, E. (2000). *Sinemada Akımlar (Schools in Cinema)*. İstanbul: Beta.

http://tr.wikipedia.org/wiki/T%C3%BCrkiye'de_yay%C4%B1mlanm%C4%B1%C5%9F_sinema_kitaplar%C4%B1 VIEW ITEM

http://www.kitabiyat.net/cgi-bin/index.pl?view_id=11698 VIEW ITEM

Bordwell, D. (1979). The Art Cinema as a Mode of Film Practice. *Film Criticism*. 4 (1), p56-64.

<http://www.davidbordwell.net/cv.php#pub> VIEW ITEM

<http://www.erudit.org/revue/cine/2002/v12/n2/024878ar.html> VIEW ITEM

Büker, S. (1985). *Sinema Dili Üzerine Yazılar (Writings on Cinema Language)*. Ankara: Dost Yayınları.

http://tr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Se%C3%A7il_B%C3%BCker VIEW ITEM

<http://www.fotografya.gen.tr/issue-5/birsel.html> VIEW ITEM

Büker, S. and Topçu, G. (2008). Auteur Kurama Giriş (Introduction to Auteur Theory). In: *Sinema: Tarih, Kuram, Eleştiri (Cinema, History, Theory, Criticism)*. Ankara: Gazi University Communications Faculty Press. p312-316.

<http://www.idefix.com/kitap/sinema-tarih-kuram-elestiri-secil-buker/tanim.asp?sid=B94BOXI75T6T4UCQ2G52> [VIEW ITEM](#)

Dellaloğlu, B. F. (2003). Bir Giriş: Adorno Yüz Yaşında (Adorno Centenary: an Introduction). *Cogito, Adorno: Kitle, Melankoli, Felsefe (Cogito, Adorno: Mass, Melancholy, Philosophy)*. 36, p13-36. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

<http://www.ykykultur.com.tr/dergi/cogito-adorno-kitle-melankoli-felsefe> [VIEW ITEM](#)
<http://www.ykykultur.com.tr/dergi/?makale=174&id=29> [VIEW ITEM](#)

Fainaru, E. edited by Fainaru, D. translated by Harmancı, M. (2006). Sessizlik Dialog Kadar Anlamlıdır: Leyleğin Adımı (Silence Is as Meaningful as Any Dialogue: The Suspended Step of the Stork). In: *Theo Angelopoulos*. Istanbul: Agora Kitaplığı. p89-98.

<http://www.lib.muohio.edu/multifacet/record/mu3ugb2851653> [VIEW ITEM](#)

Geuss, R. translated by Doğan, B.O. (2003). Adorno ve Berg (Berg and Adorno). *Cogito, Adorno: Kitle, Melankoli, Felsefe (Cogito, Adorno: Mass, Melancholy, Philosophy)*. 36, p281-298. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

<http://www.ykykultur.com.tr/dergi/cogito-adorno-kitle-melankoli-felsefe> [VIEW ITEM](#)
<http://www.ykykultur.com.tr/dergi/?makale=178&id=29> [VIEW ITEM](#)

Grodal, T. K. (2000). Art Film, the Transient Body and the Permanent Soul. *Aura*. 6 (3), p33-53.

<http://cogcom.ku.dk/staff/?id=138953&vis=medarbejder> [VIEW ITEM](#)

<http://cogcom.ku.dk/staff/?id=3add7460-74c6-11db-bee9-02004c4f4f50&vis=publikation>
[VIEW ITEM](#)

http://www.barslund.org/speciale/html/media/Ansatte/torben_kragh_grodal.htm [VIEW ITEM](#)

Hayward, S. (1996). *Key Concept in Cinema Studies*. London: Routledge.

http://books.google.com.tr/books/about/Cinema_Studies.html?id=x6bfHb1qCwC&redir_esc=y
[GS SEARCH](#)

<http://books.google.com.tr/books?id=V3R2QgAACAAJ&dq=Key+Concept+in+Cinema+Studies&hl=tr&sa=X&ei=wJ1DUZWqGYbA7AbOhoFw&ved=0CEAQ6AEwAw> [GS SEARCH](#)

Marcuse, H. translated by Yardımlı, A. (1997). *Estetik Boyut, Sanatın Sürekliliği: Marxist Estetiğin Bir Eleştirisine Doğru (Aesthetic Dimension: Toward a Critique of Marxist Aesthetics)*. Istanbul: İdea Yayınları.

<http://www.idefix.com/kitap/estetik-boyut-herbert-marcuse/tanim.asp?sid=YMGJACSWLE1OCS385PRG> [VIEW ITEM](#)

<http://kitap.antoloji.com/estetik-boyut-sanatin-surekliligi-marxist-estetigin-bir-elestiri-kitabi/>
[VIEW ITEM](#)

Monaco, J. translated by Yılmaz, E. (2001). *Bir Film Nasıl Okunur (How to Read a Film)*. İstanbul: Oğlak Yayınları.

http://books.google.com.tr/books?id=TSSfJb011QgC&pg=PA12&hl=tr&source=gbs_toc_r&cad=4#v=onepage&q&f=false [GS SEARCH](#)

<http://seyirci-koltugu.blogspot.com/2012/01/bir-film-nasl-okunur-1977.html> [VIEW ITEM](#)

Nalbantoğlu, H. Ü. (2000). *Yaratıcı Deha: Bir Modern Sanat Tabusunun Anatomisi (Creative Genius: Anatomy of a Modern Art Taboo)*. In: *Çizgi Ötesinden Modern Üniversite: Sanat: Mimarlık (Modern University from Beyond the Line: Art: Architecture)*. Ankara: METU Faculty of Architecture Publications. p49-74.

https://staffroster.metu.edu.tr/my_staff_roster.php?ssn=NTk2MTc=&action=Publications
[VIEW ITEM](#)

http://books.google.com.tr/books/about/Mimarl%C4%B1k.html?id=wfz7AQAACAAJ&redir_esc=y
[GS SEARCH](#)

Nalbantoğlu, H. Ü. (2007). *Türkiye’de Bir Dans Sosyolojisi İçin Peşrev (Prelude to the Sociology of Dance in Turkey)*. <http://www.metu.edu.tr/~hun/home.html> Last accessed 15 June 2009

http://www.baykusdergisi.com/?page_id=2 [VIEW ITEM](#)

https://staffroster.metu.edu.tr/my_staff_roster.php?ssn=NTk2MTc=&action=Publications
[VIEW ITEM](#)

<http://zeynepdirek.wordpress.com/2013/01/31/heideggerin-gulumseyisi/> [VIEW ITEM](#)

O’Grady, G. edited by Fainaru, D. translated by Harmancı, M. (2006). *Angelopoulos’un Sinema Felsefesi (Angelopoulos’s Philosophy of Film)*. In: *Theo Angelopoulos*. İstanbul: Agora Kitaplığı. p79-88.

<http://www.lib.muohio.edu/multifacet/record/mu3ugb2851653> [VIEW ITEM](#)

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theo_Angelopoulos [VIEW ITEM](#)

<http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1G2-3406801023.html> [VIEW ITEM](#)

<http://www.insanokur.org/?p=34485> [VIEW ITEM](#)

Schulz, G. edited by Fainaru, D. translated by Harmancı, M. (2006). *Suluk Alıp Verir Gibi Çekerim: Sonsuzluk ve Bir Gün (I Shoot the Way I Breathe: Eternity and a Day)*. In: *Theo Angelopoulos*. İstanbul: Agora Kitaplığı. p139-144.

<http://www.lib.muohio.edu/multifacet/record/mu3ugb2851653> [VIEW ITEM](#)

<http://www.aylakadamiz.com/archives/8510> [VIEW ITEM](#)

Suner, A. (2005). *Hayalet Ev: Yeni Türk Sinemasında Aidiyet, Kimlik ve Bellek (New Turkish Cinema: Belonging, Identity and Memory)*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

<http://www.frmtr.com/kitap-okumak-ve-kitap-tanitimi/658558-hayalet-ev-asuman-suner.html>
[VIEW ITEM](#)

<http://web.itu.edu.tr/asuner/pdfs/cv.pdf> [VIEW ITEM](#)

338 Journal Academic Marketing Mysticism Online

Tarkovsky, A. translated by Ant, F. (2007). *Mühürleşmiş Zaman (Sculpting in Time)*. Istanbul: Agora Kitaplığı.

http://tr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Andrey_Tarkovski [VIEW ITEM](#)

<http://entellektuel.s4.bizhat.com/entellektuel-post-5338.html> [VIEW ITEM](#)

<http://kitap.antoloji.com/muhurlenmis-zaman-kitabi/> [VIEW ITEM](#)

<http://www.insanokur.org/?p=9963> [VIEW ITEM](#)

Teksoy, R. (2005). *Rekin Teksoy'un Sinema Tarihi (Rekin Teksoy's Cinema History)*. Istanbul: Oğlak Yayınları.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rekin_Teksoy [VIEW ITEM](#)

<http://www.booksfromturkey.com/files/catalouge-25.pdf> [VIEW ITEM](#)

Vincendeau, G. (2000). Issues in European Cinema, ed. by John Hill and Pamela Church Gibson. In: *World Cinema: Critical Approaches*. New York: Oxford University Press. p112-116.

<http://sensesofcinema.com/2007/book-reviews/european-cinema-studies/#1> [VIEW ITEM](#)

<http://www.oup.com/us/catalog/general/subject/Communication/FilmTelevisionStudies/?view=usa&sf=toc&ci=9780198711247> [VIEW ITEM](#)

http://books.google.com.tr/books/about/World_Cinema.html?id=7aRsQgAACAAJ&redir_esc=y
[GS SEARCH](#)