

Deniz Bayrakdar¹
Kadir Has University, Istanbul, Turkey

SPECTACLE MIRRORED IN TURKISH CINEMA: FAIRGROUNDS, CIRCUS AND THEATRE

791.32(560)
COBISS.SR-ID 255698444

Abstract

This paper will discuss how spectacle, in form of fairgrounds, circus and theatre, is represented in Turkish Cinema. A historical background of the tradition of spectacle and especially theater's importance at the beginning of Turkish Cinema builds the basis of my introduction. How fairgrounds are reflected in the 1960s melodramas, and how films mirrored filmmaking process in the 1990s will lead the discussion to the recent examples of the New Turkish Cinema. Usta Beni Öldürsene/Sawdust Tales (Barış Pirhasan, 1998) a film solely constructed in the circus atmosphere will be the base of my analysis and thereof I will make the references to other Turkish films which are mirroring spectacle. Kasaba/The Town (Nuri Bilge Ceylan, 1997) Hacivat Karagöz Neden Öldürüldü?/Killing the Shadows (Ezel Akay, 2006) and Hazan Mevsimi/A Fairground Attraction (Mehmet Eryılmaz, 2017) will be comparably analysed due to their self-reflexive characters and use of different spectacle forms and spaces. My first question is: "The root spaces of cinema: fairground, circus and theatre – are they only non-places of self-reflexivity or do they have other reasons 'd'être' in these films?" My second question is: "Do these places exist as spaces "on the way" due to the narrative or do they survive on their own?" The first question refers to "place" and "non-place", the second question investigates the roles of fairground and circus and theatre concerning their values as "metanarratives". The third question will be discussed in the detailed analysis of Usta Beni Öldürsene/Sawdust Tales referring to the "bread and circuses" theory by Brantlinger.

Key words

Spectacle, Circus, Fairgrounds, Theater, Turkish Cinema, Non-Places, Heterotopia

1 denizb@khas.edu.tr

Introduction

*The circus today represents the most colorful mass show or the image of a sensation, it is the Arabic fantasy in the cheered roman arena*².

Ernst Bloch

Circus, fairground and theatre as pre-forms of spectacle were always mirrored in cinema. It was a kind of questioning of the self of the medium and a playful ground between all spectacle forms.

My paper will focus on circus, fairgrounds and street theaters and discuss their characteristics concerning self-reflexivity, place values and the meta narratives. The knowledge of the films tackling with the theme of the spectacle we know had always a director behind, who thought on the ontology of the film and the cinema, the existence and essence of the medium. From Fellini to Makavejev from Renoir to Bergman, auteurs were deeply interested in the question how spectacle should be mirrored in the film.

Charlie Chaplin's *The Circus* (1928) reflects and mirrors the illusionary world of the circus in the mirror mace and in the circular ring along with the audience. Federico Fellini places *La Strada* (1954) in fairgrounds using Zampano (Antony Quinn), Gelsomina (Giulietta Masina) and the Fool as the main figures of the spectacle. Ingmar Bergman tells the story of a family on the background of the puppets in *Fanny and Alexander* (1982). Wim Wenders' *Himmelüber Berlin/Wings of Desire* (1987) is paralleling the lives of the angels and the trapeze artist in the circus.

Films mirroring spectacle have a multi-faceted enjoyment for the spectator, and further a rich possibility of film analysis for the scholars. Rushton discusses the absorption of certain films and shares that film watching for him means entering its world:

Though of course the process of spectatorship is egocentric, dare I say 'transcendental', the moment that the viewing and writing about cinema are always waiting for is that of being in the film's place – within the structure of experience the film opens up for others to inhabit. (Rushton 2007: 111)

2 "Der Zirkus stellt heute noch die farbigste Massenschau dar oder das Bild der Sensation; er ist der arabische Fantasia in der aufgeheitertsten römischen Arena." (Ernst Bloch, 1985: 423).

He uses the terms “experience” and “inhabit” which both refer to another space/place then one is in. In that context, he is accepting the absorption of the film and welcomes it. (Rushton 2007: 112)

Metin And³ writes in his article “Clown: The Life Water of Theater” that “the clown”, “the fool”, other names for street performers were used in a pejorative meaning. He names the old Turkish performing artists professions like “Hokkabazlık”⁴ and “Soytarılık” and repeatedly he claims that both of them along with the circus arts are the mother of tperforming arts (And 1999: 127). In his summary about the background of the puppeteers and clowns, he mentions that the Jews migrated and found shelter in the 16th century in the Ottoman Empire presented their skills and helped to spread these performances till the 20th century. Throughout his article Metin And argues that the theatre people undervalued these type of spectacle – that of the clowns, the fools and the circus. He adds that theater people also do not consider ballet, opera and circus as a theater form and in his opinion this had as a consequence that our theater lacked creative arts. He argues that the circus in the Ottoman Empire was very important and developed and to his day he regrets that there is no circus in Turkey.

Now the interesting twisting point in Metin And’s article is his reference to Muhsin Ertuğrul, the leading figure of the first phase of Turkish Cinema. Metin And refers to Muhsin Ertuğrul’s texts and claims that in the beginning he agreed with the Ertuğrul’s claim about the circus: “If the Byzantines would not replace theater with circus, their reign would not be that short. “Metin And even used Ertuğrul’s comment in his book *BizansTiyatrosu* (Byzantinien Theater, 1962) but then he admits that he later disagrees with him. And lists the three mistakes of Muhsin Ertuğrul: First of all, Metin And claims that Byzantine lived a long life as an empire, more than a thousand years despite all struggles and political quakes. Secondly Metin And criticizes Muhsin Ertuğrul’s lack of not only history, but also theater history. For him, MuhsinErtuğrul did not count circus in the framework of theater and criticized the Byzantines for replacing the circus with theater. Metin And repeats that circus is a theater and beyond this, it is the mother of all performing arts.

3 Metin And (1927-2008) Turkish theater scholar who has a variety of books on the spectacle world, from illusion to art history. (1927-2008).

4 “Hokka Oyunu” is an ancient play. A similar form of this play is named in Italian as “gioco di bussolotti”, and in French “jouer de gobelets”. The performer uses three balls and three pots (inkholder). (And: 127).

Surprisingly the the first period in Turkish cinema is called the “Theatre People Period”⁵ and the first institutionalized narrative films were realized under the management of the theater player and manager as afore mentioned Muhsin Ertuğrul. The late Turkish film historian Giovanni Scognamillo underlines this date as follows: “Year 1922. Muhsin Ertuğrul enters the cinema.” (Scognamillo 1998: 53).

After justifying that the silent period of Turkish Cinema is continued with a cinema tradition that has its roots in theatre, Scognamillo adds: “...this should not surprise us: Each art, each spectacle is in the beginning phase primitive, the relation between cinema and theatre in the beginning of cinema is inevitable.” (1998: 53).

Savaş Arslan gives a portrayal of the era in his chapter entitled Muhsin Ertuğrul –The “One-Man” of Turkish Cinema: “The reign of the Republican People’s Party and the career of director Ertuğrul seem comparable when one looks at the political and cinematic histories of Turkey.” (Arslan 2011: 55).

Burçak Evren in his categorization of the periods of Turkish Cinema dates the “Theatre People Period” between 1922-1939, which is the time after Atatürk’s death, a new political era under the “second man” President İsmet İnönü. This period is in-between theatrical influences in cinema and then the first films on the way of being the productions of the independent companies’ and directors’ works. Burçak Evren names this period between 1950-1960 as “Filmmakers or Transfer from Craftsmanship” (Evren 91: 117). Scognamillo entitles the period only as the “Filmmakers Era”. He explains the difference between the “Theater People” and “Filmmakers Periods”. Scognamillo points out that the popularity of European and American films against the Turkish films decreased in the “Filmmakers’ Era”. He draws a line between the two periods by the influence of the theatre as a spectacle form and how theater leaves the scene to the more cinematic form of the spectacle: “...an increase in the number of films involving artistic realism that shied away from the influences of theatrical filmmaking.” (Scognamillo 1998: 137, Arslan 2011: 64).

The 1960’s were the time of Turkish melodramas, they used both the indoor shootings but in many cases the poor and rich environments of Istanbul. And in the outskirts of the city, these films brought the spectacular world of the fairgrounds, amusement parks, circus grounds as a contrast to the luxurious villas of the rich. Especially in *Ayşecik*, *Sokak Kızı/Ayşecik*, *Street Girl* (Ülkü

5 “Theater People Period” is Savaş Arslan’s definition.

Erakalın, 1966) one of the film in the series of *Ayşecik* – a little girl is the heroine – who sings and dances and experiences the double-sided world of the melodrama, the rich villas and Bosphorus is attached to the mother's family and the circles of the poverty, moreover the spaces of the losers belong to his father's everyday life. The melodramatic mode of the films was supported by the spectacular motives in the films. Street musicians, belly dancers, wire walkers, bear leaders were the figures in the background. These films were box office hits in the matinées for women and in the summer in open air movie theaters, the cheap entertainment for families of the lower middle class. The atmosphere of the films paralleled the space of the open movie theater and the audience inside the film who entertain themselves in the leadership of the little girl.

Ayşecik SokakKızı (Ülkü Erakalın, 1966), *Ateş Parçası* (Atıf Yılmaz, 1971), *Köyden İndim Şehire* (Ertem Eğilmez, 1974), *Yumurcaka Veda* (Orhan Aksoy, 1974), *Kuklalar* (1976), *Akrebin Yolculuğu* (Ömer Kavur, 1997), *Değirmen* (Atıf Yılmaz, 1986), *Kasaba* (Nuri Bilge Ceylan, 1997) *Hacivat*, *Karagöz nedenöldürüldü?* (Ezel Akay, 2006), *Hokkabaz* (Cem Yılmaz, 2006), *Ve Panayır Köyden Gider* (Mete Sözer, 2015) were films among many others which definitely focused their themes on the spectacle in form of fairgrounds, circus and theaters.

In the 1970s and 1980s fairground and circus disappeared from the films' spaces. *Akrebin Yolculuğu* (1997) tells the story of a weird couple in the country, a dan, his young wife and the watchmaker who is invited to repair the clock tower in the little town. The story is based on the weird relations between the three. The passion triangle is suddenly broken and we see the dan and his attractive wife sitting in the first row watching and listening to the choir of blind singers. One of the blind singers, a blonde woman with black glasses is reaching such a crescendo in her tone that the lightbulbs in the stage all blow. A wonderful reminiscence and intertextual reference to Oskar in the film *Die Blechtrommel/The Tin Drum* (Volker Schlöndorff, 1979).

By the 1990s, self-reflexive films focused their stories on the film making process and the relation between the actors and players in the film. The script gained more importance and the dialogues needed strong acting qualities. Yavuz Özkan realized in 1989. *Filim Bitti* (Movie is over) a self-reflexive film that dealt with the filmmaking process and the tension between the couples in the world of the sparkling spectacle. This time the spectacle represented in the film was neither circus nor theater it was cinema itself. The passion

between a star couple at the verge of separation is more deliberate in front of the camera scenes than their love relation in their private lives. The motto of *Les Enfants du Paradis* (Marcel Carné, 1945) where the stage life is more real and acceptable than the life on the street, seems also to be a guiding point for Yavuz Özkan's film.

From the mid-1990's onwards the 'root spectacles' fairground and circus and theater took place in the New Turkish Cinema.

This intellectual investigation of the spectacle forms reached a peak with Ezel Akay's film *Hacivat Karagöz Neden Öldürüldü?/Killing the Shadows* (2006). The legendary shadow puppet figures Hacivat and Karagöz and their fate is told in the foreground of the establishment story of the Ottoman Empire. Karagöz and Hacivat are the performers of 'ortaoyunu' – a street performance in the old Turkish tradition – they performed in front of the Sultan and criticized him between the lines which brought their end. This circular place of the spectacle 'ortaoyunu' was shared both by Sultan and the peoples. The film is an intellectual homage to all traditional performances and its heroes, illusion, shadow play, magic, and cinematic transitional devices. They are used in a multi-layered form. The end of the film is a mimicry about the lives of the two shadow figures Hacivat and Karagöz. They directly look into the camera as they are beheaded and they continue to speak. A courageous playful end referring to the power of the fool, the comic, the street performer who has no fear of the ruler and furthermore a reference to the illusion and absorption qualities of the medium film. We at the end ask ourselves the question although announced in the title: *Why was Hacivat and Karagöz killed?* The answer is: because of a funny reason and not all the critique they made against the Sultan and secondly, as we are confronted with the funny death scene, we know that everything belongs to the filmic reality. With a further intertextual reading we consider although they were half real legendary people, they were both killed in reality.

Nuri Bilge Ceylan uses in *Kasaba* (Town, 1997) the amusement park as the space of spectacle. The same year *Usta Beni Öldürsene/Sawdust Tales* (Barış Pirhasan, 1997) is based solely on the story of the circus people's existence under the suppression of a coup d'état. *Hazan Mevsimi-Bir Panayır Hikayesi* (Fairground Attraction, Mehmet Eryılmaz, 2007) is entitled as fairground attraction and uses the spaces of the fairground and amusement park along the construction of the new roads.

In these last film examples, another aspect beyond the performance in the spectacle is conceptualized: the space.

Root places of Spectacle Spaces

Bernard de Fallois questions: “Is circus a performance?”. This question is tricky. Of course that circus is a performance, but de Fallois let us think for a moment and he asks “what is that ‘to go to the circus?’ what is that we want to see? The action, or the space where the action takes place?”. There are so many things to be seen and wondered about in a circus, inside the tent, in the circular ring and the audience around. Fallois provokes us to imagine the space of the circus; for him the performances are its sparkle, but more than this the circus has a magic beyond all the objects, gadgets, people, it is a world beyond the activities in the ring, it is a planet on voyage with its own “rules and traditions” and even its “oxygen” (De Fallois 1999: 213).

Taking these last three films as the center of my analysis I will ask the following questions:

I. The “root places” of these spectacle spaces, do they stand for the sake of “self-reflexivity” or are they a part of the play because of other reasons?

The best answer to that question can be found in Nuri Bilge Ceylan’s film *Kasaba*. The film is about a family in a small town. We see the children along their way from the cold class rooms of the village school to the nature, to the scene of a turtle standing for life and death, and to the forest where the family gathers around the grandfather and grandmother. After these images, suddenly an amusement park scene is inserted into the narrative. In the whole structure of the film, an autobiographical tense is used and the amusement park stands in the middle of the film as an ontological questioning of the self-reflexivity. In this scene Nuri Bilge Ceylan’s cinematography – a collection of photographic moments and frames – gains a mobility through the dynamic movement of the swing boat. The boat is moving towards us and then back. *Here photography becomes a film by mirroring another spectacle space, namely amusement park.* The lights of the swing boat dim higher and lower reminding us of the luminance in the film. The amusement park scene breaks the sequences’ foto-novel style and its monotony and the players are taken out of this world to the amusement park. The players who animated a

character become suddenly the ones who entertain themselves and the ones who break the filmic reality in the spaces of the spectacle. In *Kasaba* the “root place” amusement park stands for the sake of self-reflexivity as a mirror of the medium itself.

II. Are these spaces to be visited as a must in the narrative or do they exist independently of the narrative.

In *Kasaba* the film also would work without the amusement park. Looking from this perspective, Nuri Bilge Ceylan's preference is solely an obsession with the self-reflexive aesthetics. The form and image of the amusement park and its sparkle is the reason of his choice. The scene exists independently of the narrative.

Hazan Mevsimi is different. Singers, dancers, shooting galleries in the fairground exist outside the city and the road constructor works there nearby and he finds his way into the fairground like in any other workers' everyday life flow. The road is a linear space whereas the fairground's space is unbounded. They have to intersect since there is not a strict bound to the city or a village. The fairground in this case is not existing independently of the narrative.

III. Circus, fairgrounds and theatre are the names not only of the spectacular forms but also of some places and spaces. What kind of places are they?

As Catherine Strasser point out, the circus ring is circular and calls to all directions, the audience platform refers to the spectator who looks at the image transformed the concept of *Le Théâtre du Monde* to *Le Cirque du Monde*; she continues that this image is to be found in Seurat's tableaux, especially in his work in 1890, where circus manager stands in front of the stars in the foreground there is the caption *L'homme a Femmes* (1999: 220). Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec in his painting *Equisterienne* at the cirque Fernando (1887-88) halves the circular ring and uses the body of the horse trainer in the movement of slashing the white horse with a female rider. At the right hand side of the painting, we see the audience platforms and inside the ring a clown and a stool upon which another clown's legs and funny trousers are seen. To put a half circular form into the rectangular shape of the frame suddenly gives the painting the sparkle of attraction and about the space with surprises of the spectacle.

Looking at these paintings of Seurat and Lautrec the relation to any identical background is neglected, the circus manager is even called as “l’homme a femmes”, the audience in Lautrec’s painting is cut out to a part, even the clown’s body is not show as a whole, the space is divided and a half of the ring is chosen. There is an intention to rip the space of the circus as a spectacle apart from any social and spatial attachment. Hence, there is no relation to any history, any identity. Then the circus is not a place *per se*. It is a non-place.

Marc Augé defines a place “as relational, historical and concerned with identity, then a space which cannot be defined as relational, historical or concerned with identity will be a ‘non-place’”. (Augé in Ponzanesi 2012: 5).

Augé’s intonation is on the anonymity of the space “without history as if trapped and frozen in time unmarked by events happening in the present.” (ibid) Keeping Augé’s definitions in mind, I can look at the films from this perspective again. The choice of these spaces then would give a cue about the meta narratives embedded in self-reflexivity.

Hazan Mevsimi (Mehmet Eryılmaz, 2007) is realized in a space of nowhere. Fairground people and the road workers around are not attached to the city or to another place. The only thing they have as an alternative space is the amusement park as a non-place in Augé’s terms.

The love between the road worker and the show girl is impossible, because the fairground at last as a non-place has to move away. The only possibility for their love is rerunning the film again. Their love can be only possible on the matter of the celluloid strip. They stand for all lovers of the impossible passion between figures of the spectacle world.

The spaces in *Usta Beni Öldürsene/Sawdust Tales* (Barış Pirhasan, 1998) on the other hand can be read on the basis of Foucault’s heterotopia. Ponzanesi points out that “Augé’s definition of non-places is also built on Foucault’s notion of heterotopia: ‘Sites with no real places ... (with) a direct or inverted analogy with the real space of society’” (Foucault in Ponzanesi: 2012: 6) Ponzanesi points out that these sites, according to Foucault, organize “otherness and difference, and a space that helps to escape the authoritarianism and repression. Spaces of otherness, physical or mental.” (ibid) She claims that heterotopia and non-place are in relation but they are not “interchangeable, since Augé’s term is more focused to account for an anthropology of supermodernity”,

hence can be applied moreover to “mass-mediated and technological contexts.” (Ponzanesi 2012: 6)

Circus, fairground and theatre in cinema therefore can be seen as heterotopian non-places that mirror spectacle in the film scene. They are the “root spaces” of cinema. Cinema before its first screening by Lumiere’s was an experience lived in the fairgrounds and outside and solely for one individual each time of the screening after throwing a pence in the trunk. Catherine Strasser parallels the beginning of cinema and the fairground attractions. Laterna Magica was used by the illusionist to reflect the images and Robertson gives movement and life to these images, realizing it for the first time in *Nouveau Cirque*, in 1886, the same year Emile Reynaud presents the “Pantomimes Lumineuses” in the Fantastic Theatre of the Museum Grévin, his figures were the stars of *Nouveau Cirque*; the atmost link between the cinema and the circus is conceptualized by Méliés, and later Eisenstein underlines the importance of the circus performances and music halls in his writings. (Strasser 1999: 217)

Circus spaces structured on a circular base, ferris wheels, rotors etc. were places where the working class found a possibility for recreation. In Karel Reisz’ *Saturday Night, Sunday Morning* (1960) the amusement park is the space where workers spend their time on weekends aside to the bars. It stands also for places to hide, to escape and to go out one own’s sane. Its place is outside the rows of the workers’ little houses. This non-space parallels Brantlinger’s theory of “bread and the circus” that both are the ways to manage people and hold them in line and under pressure.

IV. What is the meta narrative, reached through the fairground and circus, in these examples?

Circus spaces structured on a circular base, swing boats, rotors etc. were places where the working class found a time for itself to recreate. Filiz Aydoğan gives a cue about the “Circus Culture and Mass Culture” and their backgrounds in her article. “The major factor of the Greek civilization flourishing, mainly was, the free citizens devoting themselves to arts, politics and philosophy while slaves and artisans has been involved in production of necessities.” (2003: 2) She continues that according to some authors two most destructive institutions of history were Circus and Nazizm. Roman Empire used “bread and circuses” to keep people away from political life and she mentions that the role of the circus is taken over by the media. (2003: 4) Aydoğan refers to Brantlinger’ theory of “bread and circuses”.

Brantlinger defines the modern world history as being entered a phase like that of Roman Empire and he attaches the phase “negative classicism” which he calls as “mythology”. Referring to Salvador Giner Brantlinger underlines that the transformation of the Roman thought and imagination to mass culture image has the bread feeding and cheap entertainment of and for the people in the background (1983: 22,23). This thought continued even after the destruction of the Roman circus and colosseum into ruins. It served a Makiavellian politics. “Bread and circus” were the evident for the relation between governments and culture and entertainment producers.” David Riesman pointed out that conspiracy theories existed in the popular culture from the very beginning and they were integrated into a whole in the concept of “bread and circuses”. (ibid) Riesman refers to Thornstein Veblen’s 1929 editorial “Breadline and Movies” a more complex concept, that “the American masses pay to the ruling classes since for having the privilege to entertainment.” (Brantlinger 1983: 23). Veblen’s idea according to Brantlinger is important hence “bread and circuses” for him deters proletariat from the revolution goal. (ibid)

Sawdust Tales: A film on “bread and circuses”

I argue that the film *Sawdust Tales* exactly reflects Brantlinger’s theory of “bread and circuses”.

Usta Beni Öldürsene tells the story of a young trapez artist his master and the mermaid as the figures of the circus *Iaola*. The film begins with a coup d’état atmosphere, soldiers and commanders are around. We hear the announcements made from loudspeakers and we do not know where we are. The city atmosphere is uncanny and cannot be attributed to any time and space. It seems to be a mid-European town, but there are no traces and information about the nation, people and country.

Abrupt cuts turn our attention to the heights of a circus tent, by night shot we see the title *Iaola*. In contrast to the terrorized people. the audience in the circus feels itself secure, although the entrance of the soldiers into the circus changes the atmosphere.

The film begins with the speeches on “Solidarity and integrity” and then the coup d’état is announced. Without bridging to the main story we see a trapez artist’s anxiety moment and then the cut to a baby’s first steps. In subjective camera the blurred vision is continued with the survival of the artist and rescuing himself of falling down. A naïve smile on his face the young trapez art-

ist frees us from the gravity in de Fallois' imagination of the circus; along with his steps on the wire we also are liberated and saved from the weights of our body and can enjoy the happiness of this moment (De Fallois 1999: 214).

The intercuts between the uncanny coup d'état and the circus is followed by the mirror scene /mirror stage of the disciple and his master.

Master:

"There is no place for memories and dreams."

"There is no place for memories and dreams."

the disciple repeats.

Then we see the name of the director Barış Pirhasan. This sentence is like a creed of the director towards the spectator and to himself. In the non-place of the circus there cannot be any memory, since this space will be deconstructed every time, after the show ends, and no place for dreams, since the circus itself is already the subconscious of the director, the film and the spectator. And the intercut scenes of the coup d'état and its cruel world reminds us of the outer reality and that this spectacular part of the circus is there only to hypnotize us. Thank to the director, we are reminded of the situation we are in. In between the circus people are investigated by the soldiers and the commander with the suspect that they have hidden the fugitive soldier.

The commander visits the circus and raises his glass to 'the honor of the circus'. This toast is to the circus that gets people numbed through entertainment. Next scene shows us Isaac the disciple looking at the picture of the mermaid he frees her from the strings. She murmurs: "I have thirst. Thirst. There is no water in the flask." "I have thirst" as sentence goes back to Jesus' words before the crucifixion.

The scene with the knife thrower and the woman at the target can be seen from the very ontological sense of the filming namely "to shoot".

A cut into the execution scene of the soldiers and one of them rejects shooting on the rebels and he escapes and finds shelter in the caravan of the knife thrower man's girlfriend.

The circus is the world of wonders and uncanny beings, dwarfs and exotic animals. Here comes the caravan of the mermaid. And the owner of the business cries loud and invites everyone in the tent to see a real mermaid. On the tent there is a humble illustration of a mermaid.

The scene with the knife thrower and the woman at the target can be seen from the very ontological sense of the filming namely “to shoot”.

The tent over the circular ring of the circus changes the pattern of the film frame and gives us the possibility to look to the circus spectator from above. It is like in a Richter painting that we as the spectator of the film look at the spectators in the film and there is a mirroring of our being in that scenes. We become aware of the fact that the circus is there for us to be the passive participants of the whole play. The director refers here to our situation as the spectator and as the target of the spectacle.

The film ends as Isaac the trapeze artist takes the mermaid to the sea. She disappears in the depths of the film/in the darkness of the screen.

Conclusion

Theories of Augé, Foucault and Brantlinger integrate the idea where and why the fairground, circus and theatre function. In the 1960's melodramas, Yeşilçam street entertainers were more seen inside the towns and had a link to the environment, they were a continuation of the same place, which was a real place. Whereas circus and fairground from the mid 1990's onwards exist in form of non-places in the examples of the New Turkish Cinema.

I argue that *Sawdust Tales* is to be analyzed using Brantlinger's theory on “bread and circuses”. The *coup d'état* and its suppression is forgotten under the entertainment shelter of the circus. The soldiers therefore congratulate the circus manager for his success in holding the people inside as the audience of the cruel world outside it heterotopian place. *Hazan Mevsimi/Fairground Attraction* is a non-place in the sense of Augé's terminology. And the road worker and the fairground singer live in parallel times and spaces, but there will be never a chance for their beings to intersect in this time-image.

Nuri Bilge Ceylan with his obsession with the photography and its ontology sees the self-reflexivity in its several layers and therefore uses the amusement park as part of his experiment between the medium and the spectator and him as the auteur. In that sense, it is a non-place since it is ripped off from the family and school sequence with its cinematography. Nuri Bilge Ceylan's look at the spectacle is moreover like Lautrec, cutting out a part of the reality, to fragment it. The entrance into the ferris wheel atmosphere is for the antihero

and for the spectator something like escaping the world of the family memories and clashes and more then this the filmic environment and entering the magical world of the fairground and help us to be absorbed in this sequence.

In conclusion the return of the traditional spectacle forms and spaces; fairground, circus and street theatres mirror a rich and multi-layered self-reflexivity in the New Turkish Cinema. These films in the last decades conceptualize the spaces of spectacle as both heterotopias and non-places to build a meta narrative that of the social and political critique, and sometimes an escape into the fortunate world of the spectacle.

References

- And, Metin (1999) “Soytarı: Tiyatronun Yaşam Suyu”. *Sanat Dünyamız*. No. 74, Winter. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi, Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık A.Ş., pp. 126-136.
- Bloch, Ernst (1985). *Das Prinzip der Hoffnung*. Kapitel 1-32. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.
- Arslan, Savaş (2011). *Cinema in Turkey. A New Critical History*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Aydoğan, Filiz (2003) Kitle Kültürüne Sirk Kültürü. *Selçuk İletişim*. 2, 4, pp. 13-20.
- Brantlinger, Patrick (1983). *Bread and Circuses: Theories of Mass Culture and Social Decay*. London: Cornell University Press Ltd.
- Evren, Burçak (2007). *Türk Sineması*. 42. Antalya Golden Orange Film Festival Publications.
- Fallois de, Bernard (1999) “Sirk Güzel Bir Haberdır Aslında”. *Sanat Dünyamız*. No 74, Winter. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi, Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık A.Ş. pp. 212-216.
- Ponzanesi, Sandra (2012). “The Non-Places of Migrant Cinema in Europe”. *Third Text. Critical Perspectives on Contemporary Art*, 26(6). pp. 675-690.
- Rushton, Richard (2007): “Absorption and theatricality in the cinema: some thoughts on narrative and spectacle”, *Screen* 48: 1.
- Scognamillo, Giovanni (1998). *Türk Sinema Tarihi*. İstanbul: Kabalcı Yayınevi.
- Strasser, Catherine (1999). “Öncü Sanatlarda Sirk”. *Sanat Dünyamız*. No 74, Winter. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi, Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık A.Ş. pp. 216-242.

Filmography

- *The Circus* (Charlie Chaplin, 1928).
- *La Strada* (Federico Fellini, 1954).
- *Saturday Night, Sunday Morning* (Karel Reisz, 1960).
- *Himmel über Berlin/Wings of Desire* (Wim Wenders, 1987).
- *Usta Beni Öldürsene/Sawdust Tales* (Barış Pirhasan, 1998).
- *Kasaba/The Town* (Nuri Bilge Ceylan, 1999).
- *Hacivat, Karagöz Neden Öldürüldü?/Killing Shadows* (Ezel Akay, 2006).
- *Hazan Mevsimi/Fairground Attraction* (Mehmet Eryılmaz, 2007).

