



Makale Geliş | Received: 31.12.2021
Makale Kabul | Accepted: 09.03.2022
Yayın Tarihi | Publication Date: 30.03.2022
DOI: 10.20981/kaygi.1051530

Hacer AKER

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi | Assist. Prof. Dr.
Selçuk Üniversitesi, İletişim Fakültesi, Konya, TR
Selçuk University, Communication Faculty, Konya, TR
ORCID: 0000-0002-0116-6462
haceraker@selcuk.edu.tr

Deconstruction in Film Analyses: Poststructuralism, Derrida and Cinema

Abstract: Deconstructive analyses on cinematic texts are becoming widespread, albeit in limited numbers. The deconstructive readings remain in the dimension of emotion transfer due to the lack of sufficient knowledge; they become detrimental to the depth of the analysis field. Undoubtedly, there is no discussion that can be shown as “the best.” However, making in-depth analysis using deconstruction is the author’s responsibility to the film as a product, to the audience, and to criticism in general. The most important tool in fulfilling this responsibility is awareness of the applied analysis technique. This study was born out of the limitation observed in the mentioned awareness and the need created by the inadequacy of theoretical studies in the field. In this context, the study aims to reveal what deconstruction is through Derrida’s terminology and to show how this practice can be applied to film analysis. It constructs this on three levels: At the first level, deconstruction is handled and defined as one of the arguments of poststructuralism. At the second level, the work focuses on Derrida’s concepts of phonocentrism/logocentrism, Différance, reversal/displacement, and repression. The third and final level covers how deconstruction can be applied to films as a method of analysis. The opportunity that this study would be a source for researchers interested in cinema, Derrida, and deconstruction is expected to make the study meaningful as a whole.

Keywords: Poststructuralism, Derrida, Deconstruction, Film Analysis, Method.

Film Analizlerinde Yapısöküm: Postyapısalcılık, Derrida ve Sinema

Öz: Sinemasal metinler üzerine yapısökümcü analizler, sınırlı sayıda da olsa yaygınlaşmaktadır. Söz konusu okumalar yeterli bilgi birikimine sahip olunamaması nedeniyle duygu aktarımı boyutunda kalmakta; çözümleme alanının derinliğine zarar verici hale gelmektedir. Şüphesiz “en iyi” diye gösterilebilecek bir irdeleme yoktur. Ancak yapısökümü kullanarak derinlemesine çözümlemeler yapmak, yazarın, ürün olarak filme, izleyiciye ve genel olarak eleştiriye yönelik sorumluluğudur. Ve bu sorumluluğun yerine getirilmesinde en önemli araç, uygulanan analiz tekniğine yönelik farkındalıktır. Bu çalışma, sözü edilen farkındalıkta gözlemlenen sınırlılıktan ve alanla ilgili kuramsal çalışmaların

yetersizliğinin yarattığı ihtiyaçtan doğmuştur. Bu kapsamda çalışma, Derrida terminolojisi üzerinden yapısökümün ne olduğunu ortaya koymayı ve bu pratiğin film analizlerine nasıl uygulanabileceğini göstermeyi amaçlar. Bunu da üç düzey üzerinden kurgular: İlk düzeyde yapısöküm, postyapısalcılığın argümanlarından biri olarak ele alınır ve tanımlanır. İkinci düzeyde çalışma, yapısökümcü terimleriyle Derrida'nın sesmerkezcilik/sözmerkezcilik, *différance*, tersine çevirme/yerinden oynatma ve baskıya verme kavramlarına odaklanır. Üçüncü ve son düzey ise yapısökümün bir çözümleme yöntemi olarak filmlere nasıl uygulanabileceğine yer verir. Bu çabanın, sinema, Derrida ve yapısöküm yazınına ilgi duyacak araştırmacılara kaynak olabilme olanağı ise çalışmanın bütününe anlamlı kılacak temennidir. **Anahtar Kelimeler:** Postyapısalcılık, Derrida, Yapısöküm, Film analizi, Yöntem.

Introduction

A film is a product that enables cinema to meet with the masses. When a film comes out of the hands of the producer or director and is released, the audience, critics, theorists try to understand, make sense of, solve, interpret and criticize it from different aspects. Why do they need an analysis? Is it because the movie is outside the general liking levels? Is it because it is incomprehensible? Questions and answers can be multiplied. Above all, analysis is for understanding and explaining. The question of "what, how and why does the movie tell?" requires a multidimensional analysis.

To understand a film, first of all, it is necessary to know the cinematographic expression tools of the film such as color, sound, movement, editing and what these tools mean. It is seen that an analysis made with this dimension is a formal, cinematographic analysis. Similarly, it is possible to analyze the film from narrative and dramatic lenses such as the subject, conflict, theme and the plot. The way the film presents itself, as well as the question we ask to understand the film, constitutes a call to how we can analyze it.

For example, a movie that deals with the historical events of the recent period is a historical movie; a movie that deals with the differences and conflicts between classes, social movements, crime, authority, rebellion is a sociological and ideological movie; a movie that deals with issues such as identity fragmentation,

fears and desires is a psychological and psychoanalytic movie; a film about women's oppression and revolts is a feminist movie; a film about men and other gender identities in the society is a queer movie; and a film about identity and cohesion problems arising from immigration seem suitable for analysis in terms of transnational identity. No matter which approach is used, film analysis means trying to understand what it is, how and why it is so, and from this aspect it can be grasped as a part of the human effort to understand the world. The power of the analysis stems from not inviting the audience to the cinema, but calling them to explore different aspects of the film's multifaceted meanings. Analysis using different approaches emphasize the versatility of the analysis.

The purpose of this study stems from the desire to share deconstruction, which is one of the film analysis techniques, with film students, academicians and film critics. The main problem I faced in the Film Criticism course I teach at undergraduate level was the limited resources on deconstructive analysis. Despite the rapid increase in publications in the field of cinema, there was a limited number of studies on deconstructive analysis. One of the motivations in the preparation of the study is the desire to contribute to the fulfillment of the need on this subject.

In this context, the study aims to reveal what deconstruction is through Derrida's terminology and to show how this practice can be applied to film analysis. It constructs this on three levels: At the first level, deconstruction is handled and defined as one of the arguments of poststructuralism. At the second level, the work focuses on Derrida's concepts of phonocentrism/logocentrism, *différance*, reversal/displacement, and repression. The third and final level covers how deconstruction can be applied to films as a method of analysis.

Poststructuralism, Derrida, Deconstruction

Deconstruction is one of the arguments of poststructuralism. Instead of placing the subject under the structure as structuralism does, poststructuralism eliminates the subject/structure bifurcation by replacing a concept that can be called practices. What is interesting for poststructuralists is neither the constitutive interiority of the subject nor the constitutive exteriority of structures, but rather the interlocking web of contingent practices that produce both “subjects” and “structures” (May 2000: 96-97). On the concept, May further states that “neither foundationalist nor nihilist, neither totalitarian nor libertarian, this project of a political outlook produces its own anarchism” (May 2000: 189). In Stuart Hall’s words, deconstruction “historicizes structures” (1999: 102). In this new formation, macro politics are replaced by micro politics, collective resistances leave their places to daily resistances. For example, Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari speak of conflicts and repulsions in the immanence of a rhizome, rather than the great ruptures and great movements determined by the transcendence of a tree: a micro politics (1993: 24). The political attitude here derives from the recognition of the network-like character of power relations and the diversity of intertwined, irreducible pressures that develop on these relations. Just as power and oppression are decentralized, it is a must that resistance is decentralized (May 2000: 69-70). This understanding, called the politics of desire, refers to the understanding of politics, where the idea of “another way is possible” creates an impulse in the collective subconscious, which again combines with collective action (Deleuze ve Guattari 1993: 22). In his works *Movement Image* (2014) and *Cinema 2: The Time-Image* (1989), Deleuze pursues his current thinking in the field of cinema; examines how the minor deterritorializes the major and renders them nomadic, through the lines of rupture-fracture-escape (1993: 26). The possibilities offered by the cinema to the minor, according to Deleuze, present a new model to the coming public.

Derrida wanted to reverse the existing structure in favor of pluralistic relations with deconstruction, which he borrowed from Heidegger (2014a: 20). In Derrida's words, "conventions and institutions are efforts to stabilize, and this means that they seek to stabilize something that is essentially unstable and chaotic. Thus, the effort to stabilize becomes necessary precisely since stability is not natural" (Derrida 1998: 135). What Derrida wants to say here is that chaos and instability are both the worst thing we try to combat, taking with us laws, rules, conventions, politics, and temporary hegemony, but also luck; a chance to change, to destabilize. What a deconstructive point of view is trying to show is to reveal exactly this point where the possible and the impossible intersect: showing the tensions between an author's intention and the elements that emerge in the flow of her or his writing. "Close reading" that unravels the knots and knots of traces, brings to light what may have been hidden, focuses on details and footnotes to reveal that the details placed between the lines of the text can be extremely important in a deep reading (Howells 2017: 224-225) or this kind of effort, which we can say to "fall into the text" (Arslan 2005: 20), is both an interpretive strategy that stays true to the protocols of the thought, the laws, concepts and strategies that work in it and repeats them. After a point, all these strategies, violating the laws and looking at the possibilities closed by that text or in the margins of that text, is a double reading practice that finds and conceptualizes other words that remain on the shores and are not used terminologically: Repetition and infringement. Or to go beyond, to go outside the normal, to excess. It is possible to define like this: Finding and bringing to the surface the tensions, deadlocks, contradictions in a text, moments, in fact the author also shows its impossibility, when explaining the possibility of something. Ending with an undecidability (Hoy 2013: 59-62).

As a result, deconstruction is an interpretive practice that invents a concept in terms of that text in every text it deals with. It is a system of thought in which the difference and the heterogeneous are emphasized, and the difference is always

sought within the same (Derrida 2014: 38-39). This is supported by the claim that the common view that writing represents speech and speaking represents thought and that this representation necessitates the alienation of original thought is wrong. By convention, we never express exactly what we mean. This is not because language or writing deflects our intention, but because there is no pure and original intention or thought in our consciousness that precedes linguistic expression and is destroyed when represented through language (Howells 2017: 226).

Therefore, Derrida, who agrees with structural linguistics that linguistic structure consists of oppositions, mentions the necessity of making an intertextual reading between these oppositions, unlike the aforementioned approaches; he rejects a fundamentalist understanding and a holistic understanding of the subject. Intertextuality should not be considered as revealing the implicit meaning by making connections between texts. Intertextuality is related to the multiple meanings of the text, the transfer of meaning from one text to other texts due to multiple links, the text opening itself to other texts and, therefore, the continuation of the meaning.

Abandoning the ideal of referring to a transcendent signified, according to Hoy, prompted the deconstructionists to say: "If a text has a reference that goes beyond itself, which reference may ultimately lead to another text. Just as signs refer only to other signs, a text can only point to other texts, revealing an intersecting and ambiguously extensible network called intertextuality (Hoy 2013: 72). Barthes states, "Like the foreseer who tries to make sense of the flight of birds, the interpreter draws reading belts throughout the text to observe the migrations of meanings, the juxtaposition of the spectra, and the passage of quotations" (1990: 142). The aim is to show the plurality of the text, not its truth (its deep, strategic structure). For Barthes, "No criticism or criticism of a text will be submitted; the semantic existence of several critiques (psychological,

psychoanalytic, thematic, historical, structural) will be proposed; Then each criticism can have its own voice heard, which is nothing but listening to one of the voices of the text” (1990: 142). Terry Eagleton writes that Barthes operates his method in the *Article/Comment* as “dividing units and applying code to them”. “The narrative code, the interpretative code that deals with the unfolding mysteries of the story, the cultural code that examines the sum of social information on which the text is based, the semantic code that deals with the connotations of people, places and objects, and the symbolic code that maps sexual and psychoanalytic dichotomies in the text.” According to Eagleton, although these do not seem to differ much from the practice of structuralism, the division of text into units is arbitrary. The five codes are chosen from an infinite number of possibilities. They are applied to the same unit, sometimes singly and sometimes in a plural form (for example, all three). These codes ultimately avoid putting the text into any coherent semantic unity. Thus, the text corresponds to an open-ended ‘structure’ rather than a ‘structure’ (Eagleton 2014: 149-150).

Barthes’ definition of the text as a “galaxy of signifiers” (1990: 135) and suggesting that the reader should enjoy it by inviting them to get caught up in the play of signifiers is common to Derridianian deconstruction. For each thinker, an interpretation is suspended until the reinterpretation of both the text and the comment. Links are not absolute. The fact that the links are not absolute makes the stability of the text that can be added in every reading impossible. We can think of this critical thinking, which turns the reader into a writer (Allen 2002: 50), who follows the traces, attaches them to each other, and combines the textual connections, through the “cyclicity of the contextualization of meaning” (Schleiermacher 1998: 7-8). Meaning does not reach a final point here, like Sisyphus’ stone. Sisyphus is a king who was eternally punished by Hades for causing Zeus’ anger. Hades condemns Sisyphus to lift a large stone up a steep hill. However, no matter how hard Sisyphus tries, the stone rolls down every time he approaches the top. Sisyphus is a metaphor for being on the way. Although there is

a final destination in the myth, the myth of Sisyphus is the story of not reaching the goal, the road, a circular movement, a cyclical action, an endless effort. So text reading is discontinuous. For example, the same book of the same person can convey different meanings when read at different ages, just as the same person can have different meanings when reading the same book at different ages. This may even be the case with repeated readings of the same book. We can consider this as a precursor to Hall's approach that the details given by the author can vary with reader's reception. That is, the play is temporary and the meaning is constantly postponed. The view that meaning is not given, and that there is no process that organizes and prioritizes understanding from the very foundation, is the break between natural sciences and spiritual sciences. This break, which opens the door to a subjective and relative approach in producing meaning, "categorical orientation" and "priority of directed consciousness" in Husserl (2001: 218-219, 236), "singularity" and "historicity of understanding" in Gadamer and Dilthey (1979: 230; 2008: 99), "erasable schema" (1972: 247) in Heirsch, "consciousness interacting with historicity" (1998: 551) in Habermas, "facticity" (ambiguous will) in Heidegger (2004: 92), "circularity of meaning" in Schleiermacher (1998: 7-8), "open-ended", "written text" (1990: 142) in Barthes, "open-ended reading" (1991: 23), "interpretation" in Eco and excessive interpretation" (1996: 75), it extends to an endless interpretation process that questions the givenness of meaning. Derrida is also a name that is articulated to the hermeneutic tradition with a poststructuralist orientation, with the thought that the meaning, which turns into an endless game in the traces, cannot be completed. (Küçükalkan 2017: 74). Well, on which dynamics did Derrida base the rules of this play/discontinuity (deconstruction) and focus on which concepts?

Deconstruction as a State of Indeterminacy and Undecidability: Derrida and his Concepts

With its deconstructive references, Derrida focuses on the concepts of phonocentrism/logocentrism, *différance*, reversal/displacement, and imprinting. Phonocentrism is a kind of phonology discourse that establishes the superiority of the word over the writing and makes the writing dependent on the word in the word/writing binary opposition. According to Derrida, this caused the wrong establishment of the relationship between language and reality (2014a: 241). Derrida, influenced by the phenomenology tradition, glorifies writing over speech. For Derrida, who claims that speech-centered thought serves the “metaphysics of presence,” which has meanings of here and now, logocentrism is speech despotism; it operates the comprehension process against the listener. On the other hand, inability to clearly read the sender’s intention in writing will remove the author’s dominance and control; with the activation of the reader and the interpreter in the comprehension process, the meaning will have the potential to spread freely. According to Derrida, “there is nothing outside the text” (1992: 102) and deconstruction is the deconstruction of phonetic metaphysics (2014: 242).

Another concept for Derrida is “*différance*”.¹ Derrida, who opposes the registration of meaning with the here and now, develops the concept of *différance* as a refusal to the metaphysics of presence. This idea, which regards writing as equal to the *différance* that creates meaning (2008a: 54-55), agrees with the structuralists that metaphysical assumptions cannot be believed. Therefore, it does not try to revive this tradition. However, according to Derrida, this directional view² conditions us to establish a relationship between the signifiers (material,

¹ *Différance* (differentiation) is constructed over a letter change in the word *differ* (difference). These two words, which are expressed in the same way in verbal usage, have different meanings in writing. Derrida thus deconstructs the phonetic discourse (2008a: 53-54).

² Saussure argued that language is a system that works with the laws and relations of that system, and that we can clarify these laws and relations only when we enter a language system and relate to the rules there, when we understand the difference relation there.

which is the material carrier of meaning) and a signified (the relationship between the meaning and the material layer that carries that meaning) (2008a: 55). In this respect, structuralism, for Derrida, follows certain laws while analyzing myths and discourses. Moreover, these structures assume a closed system. In a way, there is a play of signifiers in that structure, but there is also a center where the play stops and everything is controlled. And that center is always understood as a presence (Derrida 2006: 34-36). In fact, Derrida objects to this: The existence of such a center, the stopping of the play at some point. According to Derrida, it is necessary to open the structure. This will only be possible by treating the play of signifiers as an endless play. Here, too, we reach the movement what Derrida calls *différance*. In difference, the priority of the play is in a way, the play is never stopped/controlled by a presence, it presents an order in which the presence and absence are in fact constantly reproduced by the play (Derrida 2008a: 55, 61-62). This system, which includes both separation and postponement instead of the closed system concept of structuralism, connects a transcendent signifier to a signifier such as *différance*, which means both "self" and "other." Here, the differential rupture is both inscribed in the economy of the 'self' and totally open to the excess of "the other." Therefore, *différance* is not an opposition, but an affirmation of the self, an economy of the self in relation to the other (Derrida 2006: 36, 60). For Derrida, the essential thing is to affirm the play in its free and rule less cycle by noticing it in the Nietzschean sense. In other words, it is to "yes" with the attitude of "love your destiny" and to perpetuate the game creatively (Derrida 2008a: 63). "This silent assurance given in a roundabout way" (Derrida 2008a: 57) According to Sim, "they miss the exact certainty that people are always inclined to see" (2000: 32). Another key concept in Derrida's philosophy is "reversal/displacement" (cross-out) (2014: 38). Because Derrida likens the deconstruction of a text to the chalkboard children use at school, and with deconstruction, he erases and rewrites what the author wrote.

Another key concept in Derrida's philosophy is "reversal/displacement" (cross-out) (2014: 38). Because Derrida likens the deconstruction of a text to the chalkboard children use at school, and with deconstruction, he erases and rewrites what the author wrote. Crossing out, which forms the basis of deconstruction, undermines the self-assurance and meaning of the sign. In this context, crossing out is a representation of this ambiguity and a picture that one half of the sign is not always the full one (Sarup 2004: 40). Wayne C. Booth, a famous American critic, humorously used the concept of cross-out against Derrida and said, "Everything I write about Derrida is 'erasing', like everything he has written. You can also cross out this footnote" (1979: 367).

"To print" means a series of operational actions that move away from the original intention of the text and reveal the latent assumptions of the text. Each re-establishment of the context will alter and metamorphose the text. Whether the chain of words can be different than what it is takes place at the moment of undecidability, which forms the points between the links of the chain of possible exchanges called contexts (Derrida 2010: 72). Hereof, deconstruction expands the area of structural undecidability, seeing the decision as something taken on an undecidable basis. The field of undecidable pluralizes the moves possible in this field. Thus, "the impossible will no longer be the opposite of the possible, but will be what 'encloses' the possible, really 'makes it possible' or enables it" (Laclau 1998: 83). The way to bring this thought of Derrida to mind is to think that "everything he says is in quotation marks" (Sim 2000: 33).

According to the thinker, deconstruction, which is structuralist on one side but has an attitude that goes beyond and criticizes structuralism on another side, is "neither an analysis nor a criticism" (Derrida 2008b: 188). Derrida speaks from behind the smoke screen: "What is not deconstruction? Everything! What is deconstruction? Nothing!" (Derrida 2008b: 189-190). Moreover, according to Derrida, deconstruction is "not a method and cannot be turned into a method"

(2008b: 189). The main reason why deconstruction cannot be reduced to a method is that it is a contentless form that changes in each individual situation. The approach that deconstruction should not be reduced to a method is related to the author's opposition to the expectation of a systematic method schedule, as cited in the continuation of the current study. Deconstruction is not a viable method with a sequential and systematic flow. Indeed, this contradicts its own nature. It has been suggested to be considered more as a reading practice, in other words, as text analysis. Deconstruction is the work of the mind, not showing flaws or weaknesses, but systematically concerned with what should be seen about what is undesirable (Johnson 1981: xv). This practice, which Derrida equates with ambushing, requires to approach the text with suspicion, to take into account the underlying social and cultural events, and to grasp the reality from a distance by discovering the contradictions and gaps in the text (Ülger 2012: 197).

In summary, deconstructive reading, which creates an opportunity to break a historical silence by suspending, questioning, delaying and altering meaning, and questioning the truth that gives rise to "an inner benefit", puts into words what is avoided, excluded, ridiculed and ignored. It does this, however partial and limited, "taking into account the rupture that the silent lands have created in the existing language and culture" (Chambers 2014: 51). Thus, at the end of the process, any ground, foundation or origin is questioned in favor of the multitude. In other words, taking undecidability as a starting point poststructuralist thought, which also means post-structuralism, suggests a series of operations that include rewriting the text in another direction, by prioritizing that the meaning is constantly postponed. The emphasis on "multiplicity" and "polysemy" which is based on the idea that the structure is not the only determinant, suggests that the structure should focus on fields such as intellectual, cultural, sexual, artistic and ethnic that are articulated as context determiners. This encourages us to discuss the following question below: how does deconstruction apply to a film? In other words, how is the structure of a film deconstructed?

Deconstructive Method in Film Analysis

In 1986, Peter Brunette complained that little was said about how deconstruction could be applied to a film even though it was used in literary criticism. However, deconstruction has remained a silent and irresistible entity in film analysis. This entity has been circulated in Derrida's film criticism discourse at the conceptual level such as "trace, dispersion, logocentrism, extremism" (Stam 2014: 192). Essentially, Derrida discussed neither deconstruction in film theory nor how to apply it in his writings (Rajyavardhan & Sharma 2017: 23), but deconstruction was used in film analysis; the films were handled as a text in a logocentric context/base.

However, despite the thirty-six-year period that has passed since Brunette's article, it does not seem possible to say that a serious distance has been covered in this direction. It can be thought that there are two important reasons for this: The first is the difficulty in understanding Derrida and his terminology. The second, the distance of deconstructive analysis to precise inferences. In other words, deconstruction's emphasis on polysemy. When the postgraduate theses and research articles written in the field of cinema in Turkey are examined, the nominal table we encounter also confirms the mentioned limitation. So what does it require to deconstruct a film, in other words, to use the deconstructive film criticism method?

When examined closely, it is seen that an important difference between the film and the printed text is that it is a visual image. Film gives audiences something to see and hear instead of reading the printed text and imagining what they read. What is relatively similar between print and film is that the film itself is a text. After all, cinematography is also a form of writing (Brunette 1986: 61). Dialogues, background music, the costumes worn by the players, the products and the used signs are the instruments of this writing. In this context, elements such as dialogues, characters, and music in the film are important in the formation of

meaning, and this meaning can be deconstructed. In this context, it can be stated that deconstruction emerges as a form of reading in cinema theory and analysis. The dilemmas of the film text in this mode of reading and the idea that all texts are essentially contradictory are noteworthy. In a deconstructive analysis, the effort to reconstruct the film in which the film writes its own text, changes it, combines the codes and uses some codes against the other becomes important. Thus, the filmic narrative is a situation in which the codes that affect and replace each other are constantly changing (Stam 2014: 193). Depending on who its object is, deconstruction shifts the political composition value and systematically challenges binary hierarchies such as male/female, West/East, black/white (Stam 2014: 195). In other words, deconstruction opposes the interpretation itself by drawing attention to the contextual and institutional limitations accompanying the film, and examines the attitude of the audience towards the film. Like psychoanalysis, it focuses on parts that are lost in meaning and explores why one idea is more privileged than its opposite in situations where oppositions are worked out. However, it emphasizes that none of the numerous meanings that can be drawn will reflect the film as a whole, and it is not possible to show what a definitively valid interpretation of the film might be, what it might look like. We can visualize an experience that has been told 'well' by someone else as if it were a movie. Since we cannot bypass our own perception, that is, we cannot reach the story itself, we can give this as an example of contextual and institutional limitations. At this point, we can begin to establish various policies on the filmic text. But how?

Deconstruction subverts oppositions through the filmic text by showing that only one of the opposing terms can exist within the other. Therefore, a deconstructive analysis distorts and casts doubt on the possibility of determining a basis for absolute knowledge, the idea of a certainty, a center or starting point that guarantees the authenticity of thought, and the obviousness of oppositions in a film (Alpyagil 2007: 53). The deconstructive analysis method, which aims to collapse the solid structure in the film, is the task of revealing just the opposite of what the

film wants to say. For example, a deconstructionist looking for situations in which an expression is privileged or prioritized according to its opposite might pose the following questions to a film that deals with the male/female opposition: To what extent and how are the reasons that make the man privileged or prioritized were applied over the woman in the film? How and in what ways was the man's subordination to woman applied to women? Or how and under what conditions was the woman attached to the man? Why are men given priority over women by appealing to women? Or how was the woman brought into a secondary status by appealing to the man? The purpose of these inquiries is to try to establish new relationships and reach new meanings between men and women through a film. The strength and quality of these new bonds depend on the continuity of the deconstruction process. Because these oppositions offer a way of seeing things, just like ideologies. The strength and quality of these new bonds depend on the continuity of the deconstruction process. Because these oppositions offer a way of seeing things, just like ideologies.

As Ryan and Kellner note in *Political Camera*, ideology points to these forces while neutralizing the tensions peculiar to societies built on inequality, and cannot fail to show the effects of other possibilities in its own way of representation. Criticizing the phrase "all Hollywood movies are inherently ideological", Ryan and Kellner invoke the terms "metaphor" and "metonymy" to reveal how Hollywood cinema responded to this trend from the late sixties to the mid-eighties. Metaphor is the use of language that is imaginative rather than bookish (no one, not even the rain, has such small hands) or the representation of something by something else resembling it. Metonymy is the representation of something by something else that is part of or related to it (crown instead of monarchy; turf instead of horse race) (Eagleton 2011: 263). According to the Ryan and Kellner (2010: 39), who consider these two terms as general rhetorical strategies to indicate the two main axes of representation (idealizing/materializing), metaphor is ideological because it refers to an ideal meaning. It's not differential, it's analogous. It identifies the image with

a meaning, pushes it behind it. Its universalism is thus independent of specific conditions (context). For example, the eagle image is the carrier of an ideal meaning such as freedom in metaphorical representation.

On the other hand, in its metonymic representation, the eagle is handled in the horizontal plane. It is not idealized. It's realistic, concrete and materialistic orientation carries meaning to an unlimited plane. The eagle is considered as a part to be associated with the whole: Bird's nest, forest, endangered species, etc. In this respect, according to the authors, metaphor is traditional, metonymy is dynamic and future-oriented due to its indeterminacy. Similar to Derrida's emphasis on *différance* and undecidability, metonymic representations are also pluralistic and unpredictable. They affirm differences; they deconstruct and subvert equating paradigms by focusing on context. The metonymic approach, which undermines ideological metaphors, also heralds the existence of significant forces that threaten the stability and identity of the domination society (Ryan and Kellner 2010: 39-42). Therefore, the strategy of deconstructive reading is to show that the texts contradict their own dominant logical system, by drawing attention to the symptomatic points, namely semantic deadlocks, where they "get into trouble, get stuck and have to contradict themselves" (Eagleton 2014: 145). In this respect, deconstruction enable to find out the effects and possibilities from the hiding places that the ideology tries to ignore, which point to a more egalitarian social structure beyond the society of domination. It treats a film not as a harmonious combination of literal and figurative meanings, but as examples of persistent contradictions between different kinds of meanings. The film is studied not as a self-contained work, but as a product of relations with other literary and non-literary texts or discourses. These readings place a special emphasis on the ways in which the works themselves implicitly present. Deconstruction draws attention to the rhetorical and performativity aspects of a film narrative and encourages the author to consider not only what a film says, but also the relationship -and potential conflict- between what the film says and "what it does."

This coincides with a process of researching key oppositions and critical terms and reexamining the final goals. When a film is deconstructed, the one deconstructs reveals the hidden motives and/or assumptions underlying the narrative. These hidden motives are not just hidden from the audience, they are also hidden from the filmmakers themselves. Walker states that it is a deconstructionist's job to uncover these hidden motives and assumptions by asking questions that audiences and producers of the material do not think to ask (1999: 22). This practice, which corresponds to Derrida's concept of *différance*, is about the way we relate signifiers to the meanings that we develop over time. Film signifiers and how we use them have often changed over different historical periods. A deconstructionist watches the film from this aspect and interprets the effects of the mentioned changes.

Another way a deconstructionist interprets a film is through the selection of camera angles and camera shots used in the film. Brunette writes: "Film is a matter of the presence and absence of light, and so everything we can see on the screen eventually makes light appear." (Brunette 1986: 61). Here's what Brunette wants to say: Spectators can only see what is on the screen. This gives filmmakers all the power to choose what audiences can and cannot see. Producers choose which camera footage to use and in what order. For example, the close-up contains only one character's face. If you see a close-up image of the facial expression, this allows viewers to understand the character's feelings and may also lead them to feel compassion or empathy for a particular character. Brunette says, "... on another level, the movie, like all signs, represents what isn't necessarily there. What is particularly interesting about cinema, therefore, is that deconstruction is the absence of groundless signifiers that it considers to be contained within the representation, or the endless chain of here, both more and less obvious than in purely verbal signs" (Brunette 1986: 61). It means that every sign or symbol has a meaning; including those not on camera shooting. When viewers watch the movie, they infer meaning based on their level of reference. Deconstruction, like a

particular branch of psychoanalysis, tends to look for missing points of meaning. Because of this dynamic process involved, deconstruction is believed to have evolved from the theories of philosophers such as Freud and Nietzsche. Because deconstruction tries not to find the hidden meaning, but to deconstruct the whole process and build the meaning on the principles of differences.

Conclusion

In this study, how deconstruction analysis can be applied to filmic texts has been researched and interpreted. In general, deconstruction requires progressing on the path opened by social sciences by asking the question “how” from the perspective of historical reading with developmental sub-problem sentences. This methodology, which is hermeneutic and phenomenological in the Derridean sense, is based on interpreting the research questions from the perspective of historical reading by looking at the forms of relations between subjects and social structures; considers films as “cultural texts” based on the logic of contingency. Thus, it can be said that researchers, who have the opportunity to ask more questions to the filmic text with a deconstructive analysis, can increase epistemological assumptions, if not reach an absolute truth. Readers can use it to further their personal knowledge of deconstruction. They can consider this study as a reference for research they can conduct. What might have been different in this study is that we could have given a model reading to exemplify how the concept could be applied. The study only talks about the techniques of what deconstruction analysis is and how it can be used in film analysis. Future researchers can apply this method to films; more than one researcher can work together on the same movie analysis to make readings that meet multiple meanings. This may also allow for the pluralization and deeper discussions of movie scenes to be included in the analysis.

REFERENCES

- Allen, G. (2002). Knowledge as a Commodity: Hypertextuality, Intertextuality and Postmodern Pedagogy. *Tijdschrift Voor Literatuurwetenschap*, 16(1), 48-60.
- Alpyağıl, R. (2007). *Derrida'dan Caputo'ya Dekonstrüksiyon ve Din*. İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık.
- Arslan, U. T. (2005). *Bu Kabuslar Neden Cemil-Yeşilçam'da Erkeklik ve Mazlumluk*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Barthes, R. (1990). *Yazı ve Yorum* (çev. T. Yüceli). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Booth, C. W. (1979). *Critical Understanding: The Powers and Limits of Pluralism*. Chicago and Londra: University of Chicago Press.
- Brunette, P. (1986). Toward a Deconstructive Theory of Film. *Studies in the Literacy Imagination*, 19(1), 55-71.
- Chambers, I. (2014). *Göç, Kimlik, Kültür* (2. Basım.) (çev. İ. Türkmen ve M. Beşikçi). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Deleuze, G. (1989). *Cinema 2: The Time-Image* (trans. by. H. Tomlinson & R. Galeta). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G. (2014). *Sinema I/Hareket-İmge* (çev. S. Özdemir). İstanbul: Norgunk Yayıncılık.
- Deleuze, G. ve Guattari, F. (1993). *Kapitalizm ve Şizofreni 2/ Kapma Aygıtı* (çev. A. Akay). Ankara: Bağlam Yayınları.
- Derrida, J. (1992). *Acts of Literature* (ed. D. Attridge). New York-London, Routledge.
- Derrida, J. (1998). Yapıbozum ve Pragmatizm Üzerine Düşünceler (çev. T. Birkan). *Yapıbozum ve Pragmatizm* (derl. E. Laclau, ss. 125-142). İstanbul: Sarmal Yayınevi.
- Derrida, J. (2006). *Gün Doğmadan-Elisabeth Roudinesco ile Konuşma* (çev. K. Sarıalioğlu). İstanbul: Dharma Yayınları.
- Derrida, J. (2008a). Différance (2. Basım) (çev. Ö. Sözer). *Toplumbilim-Jacques Derrida Özel Sayısı* (ss. 51-64). İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları.
- Derrida, J. (2008b). Japon Bir Dosta Mektup (2. Baskı) (çev. M. Atıcı ve M. Omay). *Toplumbilim-Jacques Derrida Özel Sayısı* (ss. 187-190). İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları.
- Derrida, J. (2010). Yasanın Gücü: Otoritenin Mistik Temeli (çev. Z. Direk). *Şiddetin Eleştirisi Üzerine* (derl. A. Çelebi, ss. 43-133). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Derrida, J. (2014). *Gramatoloji* (2. Basım.) (çev. İ. Birkan). Ankara: BilgeSu Yayınları.

Dilthey, W. (1979). *Selected Writings* (ed. H. P. Rickman). Cambridge University Press.

Eagleton, T. (2011). *Şiir Nasıl Okunur* (çev. K. Genç). İstanbul: Agora Yayınları.

Eagleton, T. (2014). *Edebiyat Kuramı* (4. Basım) (çev. T. Birkan). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Eco, U. (1991). *Alımlama Göstergelimi* (çev. S. Rifat). İstanbul: Düzlem Yayıncılık.

Eco, U. (1996). *Yorum ve Aşırı Yorum* (çev. K. Atakay). İstanbul: Can Yayınları.

Gadamer, H. G. (2008). *Philosophical Hermeneutics*. (trns. By. D. E. Ling). California: University of California Press.

Habermas, J. (1998). *Sosyal Bilimlerin Mantığı Üzerine* (çev. M. Tüzel). İstanbul: Kabalcı Yayınları.

Hall, S. (1999). İdeolojinin Yeniden Keşfi: Medya Çalışmalarında Baskı Altında Tutulanın Geri Dönüşü. *Medya, İktidar, İdeoloji* (derl. M. Küçük ss. 77-126). Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat.

Heidegger, M. (2004). *Varlık ve Zaman* (çev. A. Yardımlı) İstanbul: İdea Yayınevi.

Heirsch, E. D. (1972). Three Dimensions of Hermeneutics. *New Literary History*, 3(2), 245-261.

Howells, C. (2017). Jacques Derrida (çev. B. Özkul). *Çağdaş Toplum Kuramından Portreler* (derl. B. S. Turner ve A. Elliott, ss.221-236). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Hoy, D. (2013). Jacques Derrida (çev. A. Demirhan). *Çağdaş Temel Kuramlar* (derl. Q. Skinner, ss.67-88). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Husserl, E. (2001). *The Shorter Logical Investigations* (trans. by. J. N. Findlay). London: Routledge.

Johnson, B. (1981). Translator's Introduction. *Dissemination*. London: The Athlone Press.

Küçükalkan, G. (2017). Anlamın Yapısökümü: Haberi Derrida'dan Okumak. [Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi]. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Erzurum.

Laclau, E. (1998). Yapıbozum, Pragmatizm, Hegemonya (çev. T. Birkan). *Yapıbozum ve Pragmatizm* içinde (derl. C. Mouffess, ss. 81-111). İstanbul: Sarmal Yayınları.

May, T. (2000). *Postyapısalcı Anarşizmin Siyaset Felsefesi* (çev. R. G. Öğdül). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Rajyavardhan, K. & Sharma, S. (2021). Deconstruction as a Method of Film Criticism, *The Researcher: International Journal Of Management, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(2), 20-26.

Ryan, M. ve Kellner, D. (1997). *Politik Kamera-Çağdaş Hollywood Sinemasının İdeolojisi ve Politikası* (6. Basım) (çev. E. Özsayar). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Sarup, M. (2004). *Post-yapısalcılık ve Postmodernizm* (2. Basım) (çev. A. Güçlü). Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.

Schleiermacher, F. (1998). *Hermeneutics and Criticism: And Other Writings*. (trans. by. A. Bowie). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sim, S. (2000). *Derrida ve Tarihin Sonu* (çev. K. H. Ökten). İstanbul: Everest Yayınları.

Stam, R. (2014). *Sinema Teorisine Giriş* (çev. S. Salman ve Ç. Asatekin). İstanbul: Ayrıntı.

Ülger, B. (2012). Reklamda Postmodern Kültürel Analiz: Yeni Modernlik Tecrübesinde Ürünün Estetikleştirilmesine Dair Bir İnceleme. *Görsel Metin Çözümleme* (derl. Ö. Güllüoğlu, ss. 42-63) İstanbul: Ütopya Yayınevi.

Walker, C. (1999). Derrida & Deconstruction. *Journal of Religion & Psychological Research*, 22(1), 22-25.