

Nietzschean Gift Model as an Alternative to Potlatch Culture in Turkish Cinema: The Movie *Kosmos*

Cenk ATEŐ¹

Abstract

Potlatch defines the ceremonies where pre-market economy societies come together for celebration and exchange gifts. This universal culture based on giving-accepting and giving back more than enough, aims to destroy the surplus value and spend to the furthest extent. Although gift carries traces of potlatch culture today, it has evolved into gifting consumer products as an expression of love on specific days that have become a ritual of capitalism. This study analyzes the “gift” not with its function in the potlatch or consumer culture but with the dimension of transcendence of humans in a philosophical sense. Therefore, the focus of this study is not Mauss and the anthropologists or sociologists who are in this line, but Nietzsche, who defines the gift as giving oneself rather than giving what one has and interprets that gifting type as one of the key concepts in the transition from human to superhuman. This research claims that in Turkish cinema, the gift is included with the functions and meaning systems in potlatch culture. However, the movie *Kosmos* deconstructs these systems and leads the audience to Nietzschean thoughts about gifts. In conclusion, an alternative gift model to potlatch culture is presented in *Kosmos*.

Key Words: Gift, Potlatch, Reciprocity, Thus Spoke Zarathustra, Kosmos

Türk Sinemasında Potlaç Kültürüne Alternatif Olarak Nietzscheci Armağan Modeli: *Kosmos* Filmi

Öz

Potlaç pazar ekonomisi öncesi toplumların çeşitli nedenlerle bir araya geldikleri törenleri ve bu törenlerdeki hediye alışverişini tanımlayan terimdir. Vermek-kabul etmek ve fazlasıyla iade etmek esasına dayalı bu evrensel kültürün temel ögesi, artı değeri yok etmek, eldekini mümkün olduğunca harcamaktır. Günümüzde ise armağan, potlaç kültürüne ait izler taşımakla birlikte daha çok kapitalizmin ritüeline dönüşen özel günlerde, sevginin ifadesi olarak tüketim ürünlerinin hediye edilmesine evrilmiştir. Bu çalışma armağanı potlaç ya da tüketim kültüründeki işleviyle değil, felsefi anlamda insanın kendisini aşması boyutuyla ele almakta dolayısıyla odağına Mauss ve onun çizgisinde eserler üreten antropolog/sosyologları değil, armağanı elde olandan çok kişinin kendini vermesi şeklinde tanımlayan ve onu insandan üstinsana geçişte kilit kavramlardan biri olarak yorumlayan Nietzsche'yi almaktadır. İddia, Türk sinemasında armağana potlaç kültüründeki işlev ve anlam dizgeleriyle yer verildiği ancak *Kosmos* filminin bu dizgeleri yapısökümüne uğratarak seyirciyi armağan konusunda Nietzscheci düşünceye sevk ettiği. Elde edilen sonuç, *Kosmos* filminde potlaç kültürüne alternatif bir armağan modeli sunulduğudur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Armağan, Potlaç, Karşılıklılık, Böyle Buyurdu Zerdüşt, Kosmos


Atıf İçin / Please Cite As:

Ateő, C. (2023). Nietzschean gift model as an alternative to Potlatch culture in Turkish cinema: the movie *Kosmos*. *Manas Sosyal Arařtırmalar Dergisi*, 12(ÖS), 338-351. doi:10.33206/mjss.1348005

Geliş Tarihi / Received Date: 22.08.2023

Kabul Tarihi / Accepted Date: 26.09.2023

¹ Dr. Arş.Gör. - Selçuk Üniversitesi, İletişim Fakültesi, mserarslan@selcuk.edu.tr,

 ORCID: 0000-0002-0209-4026

Introduction

Potlatch is the name given to the feasts in which gifts, what is available is given and what is not is taken, are exchanged at certain intervals in societies where no trace of the market economy can be found (Schulte-Tenckhoff, 2001, p. 178). However, whether responding/not responding to a potlatch or returning more than the gift previously received determines the social status of an individual (Mauss, 2018, p. 148) potlatch is depicted as a competition with gifts (Sedillot, 2005, p. 16) or a challenge against an opponent (Bataille, 2010, p. 28), symbolizing it with a knife attached to the end of the stick, it has even been likened to war (Mauss, 2011, p. 266).

On the other hand, the gift, which forms the basis of the potlatch culture, has yet to find its place as a central research subject within the system philosophies and in the world of science. It has been an ongoing debate since the turn of the 20th century. During this period, most names "either thought of other things besides the gift when they thought about the gift, or they tended to think about the gift when thinking about other things" (Yurt & Yıldız, 2021, p. 8-9). Mauss, who examines the modes of exchange of societies in which the commodity order is not yet seen to find a solution to the economic impasse of the century he lived, and who has a nostalgic hope that communalism will be reborn in modern society with the gift formula he has obtained (Shapiro, 2021, p. 118), Godbout (2003), who evaluates it as the third sociality next to the market and the state with the same quest, or C. Eisenstein, who in his book *Sacred Economics*, aims to examine the gift as "our fragmented communities, our relationships, our cultures... to show that we can gain the power to imagine a reunification economy that will restore their integrity" (2012, p. 20), are some of the names mentioned. Although the given examples express nostalgia and suggest that the gift serves the profit-oriented logic of capitalism today, most sources claim that traces of potlatch culture and its specific gift world are still found today (Adanır, 1997, p. 338); (Godbout, 2003, p. 33); (Eisenstein, 2012, p. 16); (Mauss, 2018, p. 235). This claim can be evaluated by analyzing Turkish cinema. However, just as in the world of science and thought, the subject of gifts in Turkish cinema has always been accompanied by another motif, such as migration, solidarity, and private property in social realist films; In the art films directed towards the individual after 2000, themes such as gratitude, evil and prestige were processed by feeding on the gift/potlatch culture. In commercial films, the gift, reproducing the dominant system, is often portrayed as an expression of love or affection on special occasions such as marriages and birthdays.

This study considers the gift not in terms of its function in potlatch culture or in the context of the commodity that turns into more of a consumer product in today's market conditions but in the dimension of human transcendence in a philosophical sense and focuses not on Mauss or the anthropologist/sociologists who produce works along his lines, but on Nietzsche, who considers the gift as one of the key concepts in the transition from human to superhuman. The claim is that in Turkish Cinema, the gift is included with the functions and meaning systems in the potlatch culture, but the film *Kosmos* (Reha Erdem, 2009) deconstructs these systems and leads the audience to Nietzschean thinking about the gift, depicting the concept with a meaning not encountered in our cinema and leading to a re-evaluation of values. In order to address the issue from this point of view, it is necessary first to mention the potlatch-gift culture and the reflection of this culture in Turkish cinema.

Methodology

Philosophising through film can mean two different things: using film as a source for illuminating philosophical ideas and using film itself as a philosophical tool (Aker, 2022, p. 350). In the traditional sense, film philosophy focuses on the reflective study of the nature of film, aiming to explain what film is, its relation to art, and its difference from other arts (Falzon, 2002, p. 5). On the other hand, according to Herzoganrath (2017, pp. xi-xii), philosophy of cinema can be grouped under four categories: films about philosophers, films as the embodiment of philosophical propositions, film philosophy and films as philosophy. 'Films about philosophers' are film versions of philosophical monologues, biographies or dialogues. The 'films as embodiment of philosophical propositions' approach relates films to philosophical questions and axioms such as freedom, justice, value, but leaves the disciplinary boundaries intact. In this approach, film can show philosophical problems, but these problems belong to the field of philosophy. The film (unwittingly) shows and responds to the problems of a field outside itself. What is essential in this approach is the embodiment of philosophical issues in films. The third approach, 'philosophy of film', consists of the two approaches mentioned above and deals with some of the basic questions of 'classical film theory'. In the last approach, 'film as philosophy', the films themselves philosophise and think.

This study, which claims that the film *Kosmos* deals with the gift with Nietzschean thought differently from the potlatch-specific representation in Turkish cinema, adopts the approach of 'films as the embodiment of philosophical proposals', one of the prominent approaches within the philosophy of cinema. Thus, while establishing the relationship between a film and philosophy, it becomes possible to both interpret the concepts related to the content with philosophical approaches and to consider the film itself as philosophy and to examine it as an act of thinking in itself. Because whether we focus on the subject and characters of the film or consider the film as a film-thinking, both approaches will lead us to follow the traces of a search for the relationship between human, philosophy, art, cinema and philosophy.

This study, which considers the relationship between films and philosophy as an encrypted relationship and will carry out film analyses in the form of a deciphering activity with references to the approach of "films as the embodiment of philosophical proposals", will subject the sampled film *Kosmos* to textual analysis.

Potlatch Culture and Its Reflection on Turkish Cinema

In his critique of the calculable life that he thought modernism had caused, in *Notes from Underground*, Dostoevsky has the protagonist state the following: "The Underground Man states: [Man] may even wish to do the opposite of his own interests, sometimes it is even necessary for this to be so [...] Man's own free will, his will, his whims from the most fierce, sometimes his fantasies if he has madness [...] That is what is the most useful forgotten side of personal interest" (2015, p. 34). This statement, which is contrary to rational thought, continues with the question: "And where did all those wise men deduce that rational interests were necessary for man?" (Dostoevsky, 2015, p. 34). Mauss, who discussed the gift comprehensively even though he wanted to reach a different conclusion, had similar thoughts on the natives of Trobriand with this culture to Dostoevsky's views on interest:

In these civilizations, people pursue interests, but in a different way than in our time. Wealth is accumulated but to spend [...] What is received is returned in multiples, but this [...] is meant to humiliate the first gift-giver or the first exchanger. Interest is involved, but it is not like the interest that drives us (2018, p. 252-253).

This quote highlights the idea that the basic principles specific to the potlatch-gift culture are included in archaic societies; the gift is not an act performed without recompensation and without expectation of benefit, as idealized or desired in our time, but a cultural system that serves a specific purpose, aims to win and, as Malinowski points out, contains mutual duties and obligations (Malinowski, 1998, p. 19). What is the reason that drives archaic societies to spend as opposed to today, and how can we relate spending to earning? Ali Akay's answer to the question is as follows:

[...]A system has been created in such a way that if he does not give what he receives, he has to give because he believes that he will be cursed [...] We are facing the opposite situation of today. What the modern capitalism does today; taking more than giving. Turning the surplus value into yourself [...] Here, the opposite is true. Not getting as much as possible anymore [...] even if there is no longer [...] it is a terrible thing that this is in hand. It brings trouble to people" (1999, p. 38).

In other words, in archaic societies, we encounter Max Weber's profile of the human being who gets rich by distributing, spending, and acquiring symbolic capital in contrast to the rich man who amasses capital by accumulating in the capitalist system. Because in these societies, the ceremonies in which things are distributed (potlatch) are much more important than trade, and the prestige that faith-based distribution will provide is much more important than the value of the goods (Sedillot, 2005, p. 15). Moreover, in an archaic society, dignity is achieved not only by distribution by faith, but also by the fact that the individual shows that he does not care about wealth in the present sense, declares his nobility, and puts the other tribe under a debt to which he cannot answer with the potlatch he gives, thus dominating them (Benedict, 1999, p. 198). Therefore, in the gift system or in the potlatch culture, the equation can be explained as follows: Distribute/consume = wealth = prestige / authority / power. Distributing and consuming are peaceful and warlike practices of gift-giving. The former aims to protect social relations by helping each other within the tribe or between tribes, by giving-accepting and by returning in excess (Mauss, 2011, p. 221-224). The items that a father presents at the feast he organizes for his son who has entered adulthood or the banquet given by a fishing family to the other members of the village can be included in the peaceful application of the gift, even if it compels those who attend the invitation to respond in excess (Benedict, 1999, p. 198). However, although it reminds us of the idea of charity, what is essential in this peaceful practice is the principle of reciprocity. Each guest who participates in the potlatch has to give a potlatch in return; in the

future young people have to return excessively what they received from their fathers; otherwise, it can discredit the person and even lead to suicide (Güvenç, 1999, p. 210). On the other hand, the peaceful practice of the gift can also be included in what Mauss defines as 'hau' (2018, p. 35-40), the belief that the gift bears the soul of the giver. Items such as necklaces circulated in this way both strengthen the giver by transferring the mystical power to the receiver and support the socio-economic balance as opposed to private property by the recipient giving the gift to a third person (Sahlins, 2010, p. 149-167).

The combative practice of this culture (Hyde, 2008, p. 43-44), which, unlike commercial equivalence, creates a constant obligation and thus ensures the continuity of social relations by excessively returning the gift received, goes one step beyond distribution as a show of authority and power. "The personal prestige of a chief and the prestige of that chief's clan," Mauss writes:

[...] nowhere else is it depended on spending and returning the accepted gifts with interest, as in the case of the Native Americans [...] In some potholes, it is necessary to spend everything owned not store anything [...] In some cases, it is not a question of giving and receiving, but only spending and consuming (2011, p. 269).

The actors of this practice, what Ruth Benedict calls "megalomaniacs with a sense of superiority" (1999, p. 227), kill dogs and slaves, destroy functional hunting tools, and burn their villages to prove their superiority over their rivals and expect more loss of life and property in the counter-potlatch (Akay, 1999, p. 12). From this point of view, it can be concluded that the gift in potlatch culture is not only generosity and altruism but also the search for superiority over the other, dignity and honor (Godbout, 2003, p. 11). The main point that should not be forgotten is that the 'possessions' are abandoned through distribution or destruction in the pot, and this brings it to the rank because the giver of the gift has the last word (Bataille, 2010, p. 86). Because in this culture, responding to the gift received in a short time is not welcomed by society, and it is considered appropriate to pass a certain amount of time for the counter pot or gift. Thus, the time elapsed corresponds to the period when the giver of the gift proved his superiority over the receiver and established his authority (Bourdieu, 2006, p. 116-167).

Therefore, the keywords in the gift system or potlatch culture are reciprocity-competition, prestige-social status, altruism, and the spirit of the gift, and the equivalent of these words in Turkish cinema can be mentioned. For example, in *Züğürt Ağa* (Nesli Çölgeçen), a 1985 film that deals with changing values with urbanization and thus touches on a social problem, data on the relationship of the gift system with social status can be observed. The villagers of Haraptar, suffering from drought, are getting poorer day by day, and the agha constantly reduced their share of the collected harvest. The agha, who is aware of the situation, establishes his prestige by organizing festivities, wrestling and giving feasts to the peasant after each opponent he defeats; in other words, distributes what he has, like the potlatch culture in archaic societies. However, the drought and the poverty it caused forced the agha to kiss the hand of the imam for the prayer of rain (loss of authority). When this solution was not available, he could not give anything to the peasant, that is, he lost his prestige by abandoning the position of the giving hand. After the peasant stole his own product and settled in Istanbul, the desperate agha left the village and migrated to Istanbul. Following the parable of the person who has lost his prestige in archaic society (Mauss, 2018, p. 158), the agha begins to live in shame in the house of a peasant whom once was his servant. Agha even attempts suicide because of the symbolic capital and social status he has lost. That he has lost his authority is staged many times by the director through the villagers who offer him a cigarette when they meet in Istanbul and offer him a job to work with them.

In *Susuz Yaz* (Metin Erksan, 1963), traces of the circulation of the gift, one of the important features of the potlatch culture, are encountered. Kocabaş Osman, who for many years wanted to take possession of the water that came out of his field and used jointly by all the peasants, is observed to be exclusivist by the peasant, similar to the person who stops the circulation of the gift in archaic societies. In *Eykejiya* (Yavuz Turgul, 1996), just like necklaces and bracelets that societies with potlatch culture offer to each other as gifts and believe that they carry the spirit of the giver, we encounter the amulet given to the bandit Baran by Ceren Ana, the shaman woman of the village. During this presentation, Ceren Ana tells Baran, who plans to go to Istanbul and kill her opponent, that the amulet she presents will protect him from bullets. Baran, who has survived many troubles thanks to this amulet throughout the film, drops the amulet in the final scene and is targeted by the bullets of the pursuing policemen, as the audience predicts.

In the 2000s, films with social content that emphasized the themes of potlatch culture that strengthened social relations cared about collective life and prioritized the spirit of the gift were replaced by productions that emphasized the principle of reciprocity and the 'negative' aspect of the gift. It can be said that the film *Kabadayı* (Ömer Vargı, 2007) acts as a bridge between these two attitudes towards the gift in Turkish cinema. The film portrays Ali Osman, a former bully who follows his traditions/customs, as both respectable and benevolent, like the chief in archaic society, who allows children to play for free on the artificial football pitch he owns and gives feasts similar to potlatch ceremonies to those around him. However, Ali Osman, who is also the leader of the former bullies he befriended, starts to apply the principle of reciprocity when the state-sponsored mafia leader Devran kidnaps his son Murat. In potlatch culture, responding to the challenge that points to violence is the basic principle (Bataille, 2010, p. 80-95). Ali Osman fulfils the demands of Devran, who can be considered as the chief of the opposite tribe, and instead of losing his reputation, he risks death and goes to the place where Murat was kidnapped and responded to Devran's challenge by killing him.

In *Kor* (Zeki Demirkubuz, 2016), Ziya pays for surgery to Emine, who cannot get her sick son treated because her husband Cemal works in Romania. However, this is not a gift given without the expectation of reciprocity. Ziya wants to take more than he gives; Emine is the character who wants to reciprocate what she receives, and the result is Ziya and Emine's betrayal of Cemal. The frustration created by the principle of reciprocity is also observed in *Üç Maymun* (Nuri B. Ceylan, 2008). Businessman Servet is a newcomer to politics in preparation for the upcoming elections. However, he experiences an unexpected tragedy leading to the death of someone due to a traffic accident. He asks his driver to take the blame. While Eyüp accepts the situation and is in prison, his wife Hacer, who thinks that there must be compensation for this, knocks on Servet's door for a job for her son Ismail. However, receiving brings with it the expectation of giving, and giving her body to Servet. On the other hand, Ismail, who wants to get paid for his father's imprisonment (a job or a large amount of money), is aware of Hacer and Servet's relationship but remains silent on this situation.

There are several films that justify the claim that the principle of reciprocity specific to this culture is valid today. The devastation caused by inability to return a debt in the film *Çatlak* (Fikret Reyhan, 2020), in *Borç*, the protagonist Tufan, who took care of his neighbor who suddenly fell ill and bedridden (Vuslat Saraçoğlu, 2018) for a long time but left him alone by giving the patient's salary to his daughter who did not take care of him, evaluated the potlatch culture as a mental phenomenon rather than a food feast (Adanır, 1997, p. 337). Unlike these films, examples of which can be reproduced, *Kosmos* (2009) handled the gift in a different way from its function, reflecting the potlatch culture in Turkish cinema or its commercial meaning in box office films and adding a Nietzschean interpretation to it.

Findings

The concept of gift in Nietzsche's philosophy and its reflection in the film *Kosmos*

Ecce Homo's preface can be a good starting point to understand Nietzsche's thoughts on the gift: "In my lifework, my Zarathustra holds a place apart. With it, I gave my fellow-men the greatest gift that has ever been bestowed upon them" (Nietzsche, 2003, p. 9). The phrase is an alternative to the principle of exchange and necessity, the orientation of the gift to a specific goal in potlatch culture. For Nietzsche does not receive the gift he has given from another, nor does he want it to turn excessively, but to make the field transcend itself, to enrich the self. In other words, unlike the Maussian understanding, the gift as mentioned above does not contain the danger of domination, and it does not turn to 'seeking profit' such as prestige-respectability, but it is one that criticizes the existing values/evaluation system. Unlike the potlatch culture when its content is taken into consideration, and finally it seems to have abandoned the effort to maintain the social relations in the potlatch culture because it does not determine its direction /goal (Lemm, 2018, p. 164). In other words, "this gift is for everyone and nobody," which cannot be reduced to the category of intersubjective objects and the form of exchange².

Although Nietzsche presents Thus Spoke Zarathustra (1964), which talks about replacing good and evil and producing a new morality as a gift to humanity, he also includes his views on direct gifts in his work. The first example of this is the sun that Zarathustra, who went up to the mountains at the age of thirty, lived

² The phrase is in the cover page of, Thus Spoke Zarathustra (Nietzsche, 1964).

alone for ten years and woke up one morning with a changed heart, and whom he admired because he always gave and never received but also spread his light everywhere. Thus Nietzsche's gift was with Thus Spoke Zarathustra (1964); A similarity can be said between the sun's gift and light in the sense that they are not directed towards a specific goal and are unrequited. However, this means expecting nothing in the face of the gift given. For the sun that gives in abundance also provokes a response in the form of growth, flowering and energy (Shapiro, 2021, p. 117), so Thus Spoke Zarathustra (1964) opens the way for the upper human being by offering man the opportunity to re-evaluate values. To take advantage of the sun's light or to leap towards the superhuman is left to the choice of those who receive the gift of the sun and Nietzsche.

In the same chapter, Zarathustra's words to the sun take us one step further in understanding Nietzsche's views on the gift: "Great star! What would your happiness be, if you had not those for whom you shine! You have come up here to my cave for ten years: you would have grown weary of your light and of this journey, without me... we have waited for you every morning, we have taken your surplus from you and we have blessed you for this" (Nietzsche, 1964, p. 27). It turns out that for Nietzsche, the gift is more to be than to give, the abundance of the self like the sun, the overflow of self-sufficiency, to flow to another. Zarathustra's decision to descend among people, inspired by the sun, confirms this idea: "Look! Like a bee that has collected a lot of honey, I am tired of my wisdom; I need hands to reach out to pick it up. I would like to give, to distribute, until the wise among the people rejoice again with their madness and the poor with their riches (Nietzsche, 1964, p. 27). Zarathustra's willingness to give and distribute suggests spending in the Maussian gift model, but this points to "a self-expenditure in which the self reveals itself simultaneously and sinks before anyone else," as opposed to self-preservation in archaic society" (Lemm, 2018, p. 161).

Just as the sun appears during the day and sets in the evening to illuminate the underworld and does not distinguish between earth and man, so does Zarathustra, whose heart changes and goes beyond good and evil. He wants to sink while descending among people that he does not know and illuminating them. In Nietzsche's philosophy, virtue is the will to sink, and those who go to the other side or go on the way to becoming a superhuman, those who spend what they have (property/slave) with the desire to gain prestige and honor, are not individuals, but individuals who are destined to sink, carrying from their source, like the sun, and flowing to someone else (Nietzsche, 1964, p. 32). In other words, for Nietzsche, giving a gift, contrary to Maussian thought, "means giving oneself rather than what one has" (Lemm, 2018, p. 161). However, one should not confuse sinking or giving oneself to the self-sacrifice of the person who is a command of God and refers to good morality. The first is the individual who is overflowing with himself and whose existence is, therefore, a gift in itself; the other is the person whose self is weak, and, therefore, too poor to gift himself (Lemm, 2018, p. 162). Zarathustra's response to the advice of the hermit he met on his way down from the mountains that he should give alms to people, not gifts, is an example of this view: "I do not give alms. I am not that poor" (Nietzsche, 1964, p. 28). Therefore, in order to sink or give oneself, it is necessary to first enrich the self, and for this to do so, by rejecting the evaluation system³ of herd morality, it is necessary to take what life gives without limiting it. "I love the one whose heart is overflowing," Zarathustra told the crowd gathered in the marketplace, "so that he forgets himself and everything is in him: so that everything becomes his sinking" (Nietzsche, 1964, p. 32). Although he looks at those who ridicule what he says, who are too poor to be a gift, he says "I am not a mouth according to these ears" (Nietzsche, 1964, p. 33). There are students around Zarathustra who understand him, who abundant his self in order to overflow, but who cannot fully get rid of the herd morality and do conscience accounting. Zarathustra, who hopes that they will not be students throughout their lives, but also wants them to come out of their dilemma in a healthy way, calls out to them this time:

[...] Verily, I divine you well, my disciples: you strive like me for the bestowing virtue. [...] It is your thirst to become sacrifices and gifts yourselves: and therefore have ye the thirst to accumulate all riches in your soul. [...] Insatiably strive your soul for treasures and jewels, because your virtue is insatiable in desiring to bestow [...] Ye constrain all things to flow towards you and into you, so that they shall flow back again out of your fountain as the gifts of your" (Nietzsche, 1964, p. 91-92).

At the end of his speech, Zarathustra gives place to what needs to be done for this and how he evaluates this necessity: : "[...] Verily, an appropriator of all values must such bestowing love become; but healthy and holy, call I this selfishness" (Nietzsche, 1964, p. 92).

³ The herd person is the type of person who adheres to nihilistic values, is unable to act, and from the lack of power makes inaction seem to be a voluntary act. Herd morality is also a moral model that defends established values, starting with belief in god and preventing the formation of new values due to belief in the 'beyond' (Diken, 2011, pp. 30-45).

What Zarahustra is to Nietzsche⁴, Kosmos is to Reha Erdem, the character of Kosmos with the same name as the film:

Being as generous and simplifying as he does makes you a little bit of a tramp. Going that far with our current rules is impossible, but this is a wish. The wish of the being [...] That's an ideal for me. To be able to get this close [...] To be so smooth to get this close [...] Here is a superhero! (Kaplan, 2010).

Just as Zarahustra descended among people after the period of wisdom, Kosmos, in his own words, "who goes back and forth to the pole star, goes up and down seven floors", in other words, "reaches the source of life and reaches the secret of life" (Altıntaş, 2015, p. 43), comes to Kars, where traditional values reign at the opening. The way he runs and cries looking behind him gives the audience the feeling that he is running away from those who pay the price for having reached the secret of life where he came from. In the opening scene, Kosmos notices a child about to drown in the river and his sister cannot dare to jump into the river to rescue him. Kosmos jumps into the river and takes the dead child out of the icy water and hugs him tightly by screaming. He shakes the child and brings him back to life and he collapses on the ground. Such an action, which interrupts the principle of self-preservation, is involuntary in Nietzsche's philosophy. It is like the natural movement of a river that erodes its own boundaries, and in the owner of the act "the instinct of self-preservation is suspended; the overwhelming pressure of the forces of the flood forbid him to protect himself" (Nietzsche, 2014, p. 104). This scene is the first step towards the miracles or gifts that Kosmos will show to the audience.

In the next sequence, we see Kosmos interviewing local people, especially the father of the rescued child. This meeting is reminiscent of Zarahustra's market place speech. His response to those who said "May Allah be pleased with you," was: "Everything happens to everyone in the same way. What happens to the good and the bad, the generous and the stingy, is the same. Just as the good guy is, so is the one who commits crimes. Like the one who swears and the one who fears the oath." One of the flock, who had no capacity to understand his words and looked at him in amazement, asked this mysterious stranger his name: "Battal". "In other words, it is useless, 'garbage', unemployed powerless" (Tabak, 2012, p. 12). Because of these properties gold is the symbol of the greatest virtue in Nietzsche's philosophy. "But tell me: how did gold get to be the highest value? Because it is uncommon and useless [...]; it always gives itself. Only as an image of the highest virtue did gold get to be the highest value. [...] Uncommon is the highest virtue and useless, it is gleaming and gentle in its brilliance: a gift-giving virtue is the highest virtue" (Nietzsche, 1964, p. 91). Battal is also unscathed and rare in everyday life and in the evaluation system of herd morality. He doesn't work, for example, and he says to those around him, "I have already turned away from work so that my heart does not expect anything in return for the labor it gives." However, as one of the herd said, "Allah does not love those who do not work." Instead of spending time on ordinary affairs and dulling his soul, Battal earns his bread out of theft (Tabak, 2012, p. 12) and tries to reverse the dominant values. What he said to those in the café suggests a distance from herd morality, hence Nietzschean thought: "Allah created man correctly, but they sought many orders." In Nietzsche's philosophy, the search for order corresponds to nihilism, which is not to accept the world of being as it is, but to evaluate it with immutable meanings and values (Nietzsche, 2002). To be a gift means, as Kosmos reflects, to deny the disorder of the universe itself, to overcome the social fiction caused by man's effort to create his own order, to take the energy of the cosmos that is hindered by the dominant values and to reflect it to his life (Kanbur, 2009, p. 117).

The similarity of Kosmos with Nietzsche's definition of the superman and the gift continues later in the film. The whole city, starting with the father of the child he rescued, wants to give more than what he received to Kosmos with a Maussist understanding. Since they know that he is broke, they provide him with a place to sleep, and a job in the coffee shop, their meeting point. However, in return, they expect him to be more than him, to be like them: "This cannot be done with such help, you have to do a job that will feed you like a human being; you have no paper, you do not have an identity [...] Come and work here. You open the shop in the morning, you deliver the tea orders during the day, you eat all three meals." However, Kosmos refuses the gift given in return, the working life, and steals the candies from the coffee shop. He does not want to oblige others with the child he has 'involuntarily' saved, nor does he avoid being in debt through the gift he will receive. Because such a gift, that is, a gift given in return and with reflection, leads the receiver to be in debt and, therefore, to submission to the values and evaluation of the creditor (Nietzsche, 2013, p. 87). Thus, in Nietzsche's philosophy, "those who are noble and virtuous do not give back because they do not feel indebted or compelled by a debt. Rather, they give with almost innocence, for no reason at

⁴ Nietzsche considers Zarahustra to be the ideal person he wanted to achieve (Çestov, 2007, pp. 146-150).

all" (Lemm, 2018, p. 155). They are the ones who neither thank you nor expect them to be thankful, they always want to give (Nietzsche, 1964, p. 33). Moreover, it is conceivable that Komos rejected poverty in the soul of the givers of the gift because it understood the absence of overflowing with life energy. With this attitude, he is reminiscent of Zarahustra (Nietzsche, 1964, p. 84), who asked the snake that stung him to take back his gift on the grounds that he was not rich enough to give it.

Rejecting the gift given in return, thus not becoming one of the herd, Kosmos was excluded from the community by those who gave gifts in the Maussian thought exclude Kosmos. Among the gratuitous givings of Kosmos, there is a session of healing of a tailor⁵, who is kneaded with dominant values and argues that there is no evil in the city where he lives, that is, he denies the 'evil' in man and is therefore designed by the director as a chronic asthma patient. Kosmos, who screams and hugs and shakes the tailor just as he did when he saved the child, is taken away from the scene by those around him thinking that he has harmed the man and that he has 'evil' with the language of the herd. However, the asthmatic tailor begins to breathe easy after being battered by Kosmos. There is a striking similarity between the crying of the man who regained his health accompanied by images of slaughtered animals, the way those who 'rescued' him looked at the Kosmos and the Zarahustra who proposed a new morality instead of the good-evil morality. While looking from a distance as the herd gathers in a house and enjoys themselves with music, Kosmos sees that the female teacher, who came from another city and was exiled to Kars in her own words, was attacked by stray dogs and rushed to help her.

As mentioned below, in Nietzsche's philosophy, he says that the animal, which is closely related to gift-giving, is not a subordinate species than man, and takes the new guest's belongings to his home. He heals the woman's (teacher) headache, which was persistent, and makes love with her. However, the gift given by Kosmos is not that he heels woman's headache, but that it guides her to abandon herd values, that it gives her light. Whether or not to receive such a gift is a woman's choice. The dialogue between them when they meet again confirms this idea. Kosmos: "I have come to hug you, mam".

Woman: "Get out". Kosmos: "Why don't you look at my face". Woman "Shut up." Kosmos: "This is the harshest punishment that can be given to a man." Woman: "You Shameless. You seduced a woman of this age. I'm so ashamed." Kosmos: "Isn't the will of our body the will of our soul?" Woman: "It's not. Animals do what you say. Where is the difference of man". Kosmos: "There's no difference!" Woman: "Shut up, immoral savage". Kosmos: "I have come to love you with my soul and body, mam." Woman: "Get out." The teacher who scolds Kosmos with the evaluation system of the dominant ethical understanding and she does not realize that she has won when she thinks she has lost by abandoning herself to Kosmos, as Reha Erdem states (Yücel, 2009, p. 18). In the later parts of the film, she undresses in front of the mirror and looks at herself- recognizing and, therefore, understanding the artificiality of the values she has believed so far. She realizes that she is not the person she has defined and evaluated in line with these values. With Nietzsche's words, we see that she is regretfull and has pangs of remorse not because she is free, but because she thinks she is a free person (Nietzsche, 2021, p. 39).



Visual 1. Screenshot of the scene where the teacher looks at herself in the mirror

⁵ In Reha Erdem's films, characters who defend established values are portrayed as patients.

The role that Kosmos plays here announced to the reader by Nietzsche as "we immoralists prefer not to believe in 'crime' [...] we want him to regain the innocence of being" (2002: 134, p. 372), and Zarathustra tells his followers in 'On the Virtue of Gifting' as follows:

And the spirit what is it to the body? Its fights and victories' herald, its companion and echo... Similes, are all names of good and evil; they do not speak out, they only hint. A fool who sought knowledge from them! Give heed, my brethren, to every hour when your spirit would speak in similes: there is the origin of your virtue. Elevated is then your body, and raised up; with its delight, enraptured it the spirit; so that it became creator, and valuer, and lover, and everything benefactor. When your heart overflowed broad and full like the river, a blessing and a danger to the lowlanders: there is the origin of your virtue. (Nietzsche, 1964, p. 92-93).

Zarathustra relates the communication between the soul and the body and the relationship of the overflowing of the heart with the gift in the continuation of his speech:

Remain true to the earth, my brethren, with the power of your virtue! Let your bestowing love and your knowledge be devoted to be the meaning of the earth! . . . Let it not fly away from the earthly and beat against eternal walls with its wings. . . . Lead, like me, the flown-away virtue back to the earth—yes, back to body and life: that it may give to the earth its meaning, a human meaning! A hundred times hitherto had spirit as well as virtue flew away and blundered. Alas! in our body dwelled still all this delusion and blundering: body and will have it there become (Nietzsche, 1964, p. 93).

Zarathustra's discourse, as Lemm mentions (Lemm, 2018, p. 168), is not to impose his thought on those around him. In other words, it is not to force him to receive his gift, but to inspire by showing how he elevates himself, to present an exemplary image of a way of life: "Physician, heal thyself: then wilt thou also heal thy patient. Let it be his best cure to see with his eyes him who maketh himself whole" (Nietzsche, 1964, p. 94). Kosmos' help to the 'sick' reflects through its behavior that it has been stripped of slave morality and the life of the herd-end man, that the prevailing values are not the truth, and that these values impoverish life instead of enriching it. He does this by having relationships with many women, stealing, believing that man and animal are equal, tearing down old plates. In other words, "Battal's life energy is not bound by the laws of nature or by the laws of society such as morality and honor; He is a hero who gives miracles and lives life like a miracle" (Altıntaş, 2015, p. 43). However, in order to understand his life and, therefore, to receive his gifts, it is necessary to have 'seeing eyes.' Although there is no local person and teacher who commits suicide, there is someone in the film who understands the life energy of Kosmos and benefits from the light he emits: Neptune.

Neptune is the older sister of the child saved by Kosmos in the opening sequence, and there is communication between her and Kosmos based on screams that goes out of the language. The only scene between the two that remains within the confines of language is the moment when they meet. Since the girl imagines another world away from girl identities, cultural codes and given life, she calls herself Neptune, the planet most related to the afterlife, known as the planet of deep desires, imagination and fantasy to become one with the universe (Tabak, 2012, p. 13). Battal, who has already realized this dream, says that his name should be Kosmos. Realizing that he has met the only person who has the eye to see the gifts he wants to give, Kosmos tells Neptune about the overflowing emotions inside him: "The most beautiful, my heart will now drip from my fingers. Now look, my active innerworld, it's going to blow the wind out of me." Reha Erdem conveys the enthusiasm of Kosmos, which overflows from its source, to the audience through his climbing trees, screaming like an animal. When he meets Neptune, the letters are thrown into the air, that is, the written language is invalid, and instead she communicates with the "bone that represents the raw material of life" (Tabak, 2012, p. 13) in most pre-civilizational societies. Because in Nietzsche's philosophy, language is the biggest obstacle to offering or being a gift. To develop the virtue of gift-giving, Zarathustra surrounded himself with animals for this reason (Lemm, 2018, p. 152): "[...] I have to be the light! And thirsty for the nocturnals! [...] Oh, of all those who forgive solitude! Oh, of all those whose silence shines!" (Nietzsche, 1964, p. 124). The gift that Kosmos offers by going beyond civilization and language creates freedom in Neptune, not dependence in the Maussian sense. Because Kosmos "does not feel the need to compromise with any social rules. The events through which this primary-instinctive man goes are also meaningless [...] in the established world Battal has only one concern; to discharge that enormous life energy that rises and overflows from within" (Gülsoy, 2010).



Visual 2. Screenshot of the scene Kosmos screams making animalistic noises

In Nietzsche's philosophy, this way of life is the basic meaning of gift: "Those who are virtuous and noble understand life as a gift and understand their own life as a response to life and responsibility" (Lemm, 2018, p. 155). Such a gift, which departed from the Maussist line, is the translation of Zarathustra: "It is the will of noble souls: they do not want anything for free, much less life. The one who is free of the pile wants to live; Yet we—life has given itself to us—we always think about what we can best give in return! Yes, it is a noble saying: what life devotes to us, we keep it for life" (Nietzsche, 1964, p. 217-248). Reha Erdem's interpretation of the character of Kosmos parallels to this idea: "This is a loyal man. Loyal to animals, to all people. Someone who wants to give back for what he receives [...] is something that is in all of us but maybe we do not use" (Yücel, 2009, p. 177). However, in order for this to happen, it is necessary to reach the animal forgetting that civilization wants to forget, to use the pain of the past to shape the future life and to overcome the feeling of revenge (Nietzsche, 2013). Zarathustra's views on the subject are as follows:

Willing emancipates: but what is that called which still puts the emancipator in chains? "It was": thus is the Will's teeth-gnashing and loneliest tribulation called. Impotent towards what had been done it is a malicious spectator of all that is past. [...] All "It was" is a fragment, a riddle, a fearful chance until the creating Will said thereto: "But thus would I have it!" (Nietzsche, 1964, p. 157-158).

In this respect, it can be argued that there is a similarity between Nietzsche's seeing the virtue of giving gifts and Reha Erdem's placing Kosmos somewhere between man and animal (Tuncer, 2009, p. 100) through the affirmation of bestiality and underlining the absence of orientation, consciousness or reason in such a gift (Lemm, 2018, p. 151). Just like Nietzsche, for whom the recovery of bestiality or animal forgetting does not mean a return, but rather a transcendence of civilization, the attainment of the superhuman (Lemm, 2018, p. 170), for Erdem, the animality or animal forgetting attributed to Kosmos is not considered a longing for return: "I don't think there's a place to go back. At best, there is a place to go. However, a small number of individuals may be aware of these" (Yücel, 2009, p. 181). It can be inferred that Kosmos has animal forgetting as well as its bestiality because he visits those who no longer want him among them since he steals from the community. He speaks in public of his exuberant feelings for Neptune; he does not interrupt his dialogue with her father even though Neptune's father puts out a cigarette in his hand. Most importantly, because of the way he continues the same way of life in this city for which he came from by running away probably because she has experienced the same things and is punished. In this respect another similarity can be mentioned between him and the Zarathustra, who scattered away the gift he received from life, not from a particular person: "What to sacrifice! I squander what is given me, a squanderer with a thousand hands: how could I call that sacrifice?" (Nietzsche, 1964, p. 258).



Visual 3. Screenshot of the scene where *Kosmos* and *Neptune* make love without touching each other

Kosmos has another common point with *Zarahustra* about gifts. *Zarahustra* does not want to give any more gifts where he comes to give his gifts: "Ah, my friends! I should have something more to give unto you! I should have something more to give unto you! Why do I not give it? Am I then a niggard?" (Nietzsche, 1964, p. 166). However, *Zarahustra*'s unwillingness to give does not come from his stinginess: "As yet had my word not removed mountains, and what I have spoken had not reached man. I went, indeed, unto men, but not yet have I attained unto them" (Nietzsche, 1964, p. 164). Seeking to present a new gift in the finale, in an old town hall allocated to him, *Kosmos* wants to heal the garrison commander's sister who is disabled and maintains her life with medications and whose life has been determined by others. During this session, which resembles a sensual lovemaking scene, he is caught by the commander who is after him due to the unrest he has caused in the city. Eventually he, being perceived differently just like *Zarahustra* who "cannot reach the people," is forced to leave the city of *Kars* crying as he came crying.

"They mocked me when I found and walked in mine own path; and certainly did my feet then tremble," says *Zarahustra* and "Now have you heard all, and why I have to return into my solitude" (Nietzsche, 1964, p. 164-165). It turns out that, like *Zarahutra*, the issue for *Kosmos* is not stinginess, but that the time has not yet come to give.

Conclusion

On the general front, the conclusion is that *Kosmos* gives a different interpretation to the gift than other films of its period. When we look at Turkish cinema, the gift has a structure that serves the profit-oriented logic of capitalism in commercial films and is reduced to gifts offered on special occasions. In social realist films, on the other hand, the gift is mostly dealt with with themes related to the peaceful implementation of potlatch culture, solidarity and criticism of private property. The archaic belief that Mauss defines as 'hau', that the given item-gift carries to the soul of the giver and protects the space from dangers, is also among the principles specific to the potlatch culture we encounter in our cinema.

Although there were productions in the 2000s that focused more on the individual, the gift culture remained present in these films, but in contrast to the positive aspects of it that provide social unity/solidarity, the principle of reciprocity, which can be defined as the evil side of the potlatch culture was emphasized. *Kor*, *Üç Maymun*, *Çatlak* and *Borç* are among the films in which the principle of reciprocity is at the forefront. In each of these films, the characters have given the gift with reciprocity in mind, aiming to receive more than what is given in the Maussian sense. In addition to defining the gift with the principles specific to the potlatch culture, the aforementioned films also meet a common denominator with the messages of this understanding, which is based on giving-accepting and returning excessively, that the giver dominates the space.

The 2009 film *Kosmos* removed the concept of the gift from its malevolent meaning, but provided Nietzschean arguments outside of the Maussian lines. In Nietzsche's philosophy, the gift is something that, unlike the potlatch culture, cannot be reduced to the category of intersubjective objects and the form of exchange, and is not about one's giving but about one's being. Therefore, the principle of reciprocity in the Nietzschean gift has weakened and evolved into the return to life of what has been taken from life. The key

words chosen to realize this purpose are animal forgetting, sinking, superhuman, and abandoning the herd morality. When we analyze the lifestyle of the character Kosmos in the film, it is seen that he encourages those around him to free themselves from the moral model that reduces the life force, and he proposes a new model. It is observed that he achieves this not with an imposition but with his presence and actions. In other words, *Kosmos*, in contrast to the films that focus on the gift with the principles specific to the potlatch culture, depicted the gift as giving oneself rather than what one has, thus developing an alternative gift model to the potlatch culture.

Ethical Declaration

During the writing process of the study “*Nietzschean Gift Model as an Alternative to Potlatch Culture in Turkish Cinema: The Movie Kosmos*” scientific rules, ethical and citation rules were followed. No falsification was made on the collected data and this study was not sent to any other academic publication medium for evaluation.

Declaration of Conflict

There is no potential conflict of interest in the study.

References

- Adanır, O. (1997). *Eski dünyaya yeni bir bakış* I-II. İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Yayınları.
- Akay, A. (1999). *Armağan*. İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları.
- Aker, H. (2022). Deconstruction in film analyses: poststructuralism, Derrida and cinema. *Kaygı-Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Felsefe Dergisi*, 21(1), 333-353. doi: 10.20981/kaygi.1051530
- Altıntaş, G. (2015). Reha Erdem sinemasında bir direniş olarak arada kalmışlık. In D. Bayrakdar (Edt.), *Türk film arařtırmalarında yeni yönelimler* 11 (pp. 33-46). İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları.
- Bataille, G. (2010). *Lanetli pay*. (Trans: I. Ergüden). Ankara: Dost Yayınevi.
- Benedict, R. (1999). *Kültür örüntüleri*. (Trans: M. Topal). Ankara: Öteki Yayınevi.
- Bourdeiu, P. (2006). *Pratik nedenler*. (Trans, H. Tufan). İstanbul: Hil Yayınevi.
- Ceylan, N. B. (Director). (2008). *Üç Maymun* [Sinema Filmi].
- Çestov, L. (2007). *Nietzsche ve Tolstoy'da iyilik fikeri*. (Trans I. Ergüden). İstanbul: Versus Kitap.
- Çölgeçen, N. (Director). (1985). *Züğürt Ağa* [Sinema Filmi].
- Demirkubuz, Z. (Director). (2016). *Kor* [Sinema Filmi].
- Diken, B. (2011). *Nihilizm*. (Trans: A. Onacak). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Dostoyevski, F. (2015). *Yeraltından notlar*. (Trans: E. Altay). İstanbul: Can.
- Eisenstein, C. (2012). *Kutsal ekonomi*. (Trans: S. Gül. Okuyan). İstanbul: Okuyan Us Yayınevi.
- Erdem, R. (Director). (2009). *Kosmos* [Sinema Filmi].
- Erksan, M. (Director). (1963). *Susuz Yaz* [Sinema Filmi].
- Godbout, J. T. (2003). *Armağan dünyası*. (Trans: D. Hattatoğlu). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Gülsoy, M. (2010, 04 17). *Kosmos'un çığlığı*. Türkiye. <https://muratgulsoy.wordpress.com/2010/04/17/kosmosun-cigligi/>
- Güvenç, B. (1999). *İnsan ve kültür*. Ankara: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Hyde, L. (2008). *Armağan*. (Trans: E. Ayhan). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Kanbur, A. (2009). Yaralarıyla büyüyen insan ruhu. In F. Yücel (Edt.), *Reha Erdem sineması: Aşk ve isyan* (pp. 115-131). İstanbul: Çitlembik Yayınları.
- Kaplan Ö, H. (2010, 04 13). Bir derbeder şaman Kosmos. Yeni Şafak Gazetesi. Retrieved from <https://www.yenisafak.com/kultur-sanat/bir-derbeder-saman-kosmos-251952>
- Lemm, V. (2018). *Nietzsche'nin bayvanları*: Kültür, politika ve insan hayvanlığı (Trans: V. Ay). İstanbul: Gram Yayınları.
- Malinowski, B. (1998). *İlkel toplum*. (Trans: H. Portkal). Ankara: Öteki Yayınevi.
- Mauss, M. (2011). *Sosyoloji ve antropoloji*. (Trans: Ö. Doğan). Ankara: Doğu Batı Yayınları.
- Mauss, M. (2018). *Armağan üzerine deneme*. (Trans: N. Özyıldırım). İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları.
- Nietzsche, F. (2013). *Ablakın soykütüğü üstüne*. (Trans: A. İnam). İstanbul: Say Yayınları.
- Nietzsche, F. (2014). *Putların alacakaranlığı*. (Trans: İ.Z. Eyuboğlu). Say Yayınları.
- Nietzsche, F. (1964). *Böyle buyurdu Zerdüşt*. (Trans: A.T. Oflazoğlu). Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.
- Nietzsche, F. (2002). *Güç istenci*. (Trans: S. Umran). İstanbul: Birey Yayınları.
- Nietzsche, F. (2003). *Ecce homo*. (Trans: C. Alkor). İstanbul: İthaki Yayınları.
- Nietzsche, F. (2021). *İnsanca pek insanca-1*. (Trans: M. Tüzel). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Reyhan, F. (Director). (2020). *Çatlak* [Sinema Filmi].
- Sahlins, M. (2010). *Taş Devri ekonomisi*. (Trans: T. Doğan & Ş. Özgün). İstanbul: bgst Yayınları.
- Saraçoğlu, V. (Director). (2018). *Borç* [Sinema Filmi].
- Schulte-Tenckhoff, I. (2001). Misrepresenting The potlatch. In C. Gerschlager (Edt.), *Expanding The Economic Concept Of Exchange: Deception, Self-Deception* (pp. 167-190). London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Sedillot, R. (2005). *Değiş tokuştan süpermarkete*. (Trans: E.N. Erender). Ankara: Dost Yayınevi..

- Shapiro, G. (2021). Armağanlar metafiziği: Nietzsche'nin armağanı, Emerson'a borç, Heidegger'in değerleri. In E. Yurt, & E. Yıldız (Edt.), *Armağanın Fenomenolojisi* (pp. 107-131). İstanbul: Pinhan Yayınları.
- Tabak, Y. (2012). Hiç kimsenin kutsal aşkı. In U. T. Arslan (Edt.), *Bir kapıdan Gireceksin* (pp. 11-19). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Tuncer, A. Ö. (2009). Beden- zamansallık ve kaçış. In F. Yücel (Edt.), *Reha Erdem sineması: Aşk ve isyan* (pp. 87-107). İstanbul: Çitlembik Yayınları.
- Turgul, Y. (Director). (1996). Eşkiya [Sinema Film].
- Vargı, Ö. (Director). (2007). Kabadayı [Sinema Film].
- Yurt, E., & Yıldız, E. (2021). Armağanın fenomenolojisine ilişkin genel bir çözümleme. In E. Yurt, & E. Yıldız (Edt.), *Armağanın fenomenolojisi* (pp. 7-27). İstanbul: Pinhan Yayınları.
- Yücel, F. (2009). Kosmos'un Karsı: Dönülecek değil, gidilecek yerler. In F. Yücel (Edt.), *Reha Erdem sineması: Aşk ve isyan* (pp. 143-187). İstanbul: Çitlembik Yayınları.

TÜRKÇE GENİŞ ÖZET

Potlaç, pazar ekonomisinin izine rastlanmayan toplumlarda elde olanın verilip, olmayanın alındığı, belirli zaman aralıklarıyla karşılıklı hediye değiş tokuşunun yapıldığı şölenlere verilen addır (Schulte-Tenckhoff, 2001, s. 178). Ancak bir potlaça karşılık verme(me)nin ya da cevap niteliğindeki potlaça önceden alınan armağandan daha fazlasını iade etme(me)nin bireyin toplumsal statüsünü belirlemesi (Mauss, 2018, s. 148), potlaçın armağanlarla yapılmış bir yarışma (Sedillot, 2005, s. 16) ya da rakibe karşı meydan okuma (Bataille, 2010, s. 28) şeklinde betimlenmesine, sopanın ucuna takılmış bir bıçakla sembolize edilmesine, hatta savaşa benzetilmesine (Mauss, 2011, s. 266) yol açmıştır. Arkaik toplumlarda Max Weber'in kapitalist sistemde biriktirerek sermaye edinen zengin insanın aksine dağıtarak, harcarak zenginleşen, simgesel sermaye edinen insan profiliyle karşılaşırız. Zira bu toplumlarda şeylerin dağıtıldığı törenler (potlaç) ticaretten, inanca dayalı dağıtımın sağlayacağı saygınlık da malların değerinden çok daha önemlidir (Sedillot, 2005, s. 15). Üstelik arkaik toplumda saygınlık, yalnızca inanç gereği dağıtımla değil, bireyin günümüzdeki anlamıyla zenginliğe önem vermediğini göstermesi, soyluluğunu ilan etmesi ve verdiği potlaçla karşı kabileyi cevap veremeyeceği bir borcun altına sokması, dolayısıyla onların üzerinde tahakküm kurmasıyla da elde edilir (Benedict, 1999, s. 198). O halde armağan sisteminde ya da potlaç kültüründe denklem şöyle izah edilebilir: Dağıtmak/tüketmek= zenginlik=prestij/otorite/güç. Dağıtmak ve tüketmek armağan vermenin barışçı ve savaşçı uygulamalarıdır. İlki (dağıtmak) kabile içi ya da kabileler arasında yardımlaşmayı, vermek-kabul etmek ve fazlasıyla iade etmek yoluyla sosyal ilişkileri korumayı amaç edinir (Mauss, 2011, s. 212-224). Ancak her ne kadar bağış-sadaka fikrini hatırlatsa da bu barışçı uygulamada esas olan, karşılıklılık ilkesidir. Potlaça katılan her konuk, karşılığında bir potlaç vermek zorunda, gençler babalarından aldıklarını ileride fazlasıyla iade etmek zorundadır, aksi bir durum kişiyi itibarsızlaştırmakta hatta intihara sürükleyebilmektedir (Güvenç, 1999, s. 210). Alınan armağanı fazlasıyla iade etme yoluyla, ticari eşdeğerliliğin aksine sürekli bir yükümlülük yaratan dolayısıyla toplumsal ilişkilerin devamlılığını sağlayan bu kültürün (Hyde, 2008, s. 43-44) savaşçı uygulaması, otorite ve güç gösterisi olarak dağıtımın bir adım ötesine geçer. “Bir şefin kişisel prestiji ve o şefin klanının prestiji” diye yazar Mauss, “başka hiçbir yerde, Kızılderililer’de olduğu gibi harcamaya ve kabul edilen hediyeleri faizli olarak geri vermeye bağlı değildir [...] Bazı potlaçlarda sahip olunan her şeyi harcamak ve hiçbir şeyi saklamamak gerekir [...] Hatta bazı durumlarda alıp vermek değil de sadece harcamak ve tüketmek söz konusudur” (2011, s. 269). Öyleyse armağan sistemi ya da potlaç kültüründeki anahtar kelimelerin karşılıklılık-rekabet, prestij-toplumsal statü, diğerkamlık, armağanın ruhu olduğu söylenebilir ve bu kelimelerin Türk sinemasındaki karşılığında bahsedilebilir. *Züğürt Ağa* (Nesli Çölgeçen, 1985), *Susuz Yaz* (Metin Erksan, 1963), *Eşkiya* (Yavuz Turgul, 1996), *Kabadayı* (Ömer Vargı, 2007), *Kor* (Zeki Demirkubuz, 2016), *Üç Maymun* (Nuri Bilge Ceylan, 2008) *Borç* (Vuslat Saraçoğlu, 2018), *Çatlak* (Fikret Reyhan, 2020) Türk sinemasında armağanın potlaça özgü içerikle temsiline yönelik filmlerden bir kaçıdır. Ancak bu filmlerin aksine *Kosmos* (Reha Erdem, 2009), armağanı Türk sinemasında potlaç kültürünü yansıtan işlevinden ya da gişe filmlerindeki ticari anlamından farklı bir şekilde ele almış, ona Nietzscheci bir yorum katmıştır. Nietzsche felsefesinde armağan, potlaç kültürünün aksine öznel arası nesne kategorisine ve mübadele formuna indirgenemeyen, kişinin verdikleriyle değil varlığıyla ilgili bir şeydir. Armağana ilişkin bu yönlü bir yaklaşım, Mausscu düşüncenin ters kutbunda “kişinin sahip olduğu şeyden ziyade kendisini vermesi anlamına gelir” (Lemm, 2018, s. 161). Dolayısıyla Nietzscheci armağanda karşılıklılık ilkesi zayıflamış, hayattan alınan hayata geri verilmesine evrilmiştir. Bunun gerçekleşmesi için seçilen anahtar kelimeler de hayvan unutmaları, batma, üst insan, sürü ahlakını terk etmektir. Filmde Kosmos karakterinin yaşam biçimine bakıldığında, çevresindekileri içinde buldukları yaşam gücünü düşüren ahlak modelinden kurtarmaya teşvik ettiği, yeni bir ahlak modeli önerdiği ve bunu bir dayatmayla değil, varlığı ve eylemleriyle gerçekleştirdiği görülmektedir. Zerdüşt’ün bilgelik döneminden sonra insanların arasına inmesi gibi, kendi ifadesiyle “ta kutup yıldızına gidip gelen, yedi kat çıkıp inen”, eş deyişle “yaşamın kaynağına varıp, hayatın

sırrına eren” (Altıntaş, 2015, s. 43) Kosmos da açılıřta geleneksel deęerlerin hüküm sürdüęü Kars’a gelir. Onun arkasına bakarak kořması ve ağlaması, geldięi yerde hayatın sırrına ermiř olmasının bedelini ödetenlerden kaçıęı hissi verir seyirciye. Zira ilk sahnede derede boęulmak üzere olan bir çocuęu ve onu kurtarmaya cesaret edemeyen ablasını gören Kosmos, düşünmeden dereye atılıp ölmüř çocuęu çıkarır, çıęlıklar atarak ona sıkıca sarılır, sarsılır ve çocuęu hayata döndürüp kendisi yere yęılır. Yani onun sıradan insandan farklı bir yařam enerjisi vardır. Nietzsche felsefesinde özkorumum ilkesini sekteye uğratan böyle bir eylem, kendi sınırlarını ařındıran ırmaęın doęal hareketi gibi istemsizdir, eylemin sahibinde de “kendini koruma içgüdüğü askıdan indirilmiř; taşkın güçlerin ezici baskısı ona kendini korumayı yasak” etmiřtir (Nietzsche, 2014, s. 104). Bu sahne, Kosmos’un seyirciye göstereceęi mucizelerine ya da armaęanlarına yönelik ilk adımdır. Kosmos’un ‘karřılıksız’ verdikleri arasında, egemen deęerlerle yoęrulup yařadığı kentte kötülük olmadığını savunan yani insanın içindeki ‘kötü’yü yadsıyan ve bu nedenle yönetmen tarafından kronik astım hastası olarak tasarlanan bir terziyi iyileřtirme seansı, Kars’a öęretmen olarak atanan ve geleneksel deęerleri savunan öęretmen kadının kendini sorgulmasına imkan tanınması, řehrin yüksek rütbeli komutanının engelli kız kardeřine çare olması gibi bir çok ‘mucizesi’ vardır. Dolayısıyla *Kosmos* filminde armaęan, potlaç kültürüne özgü ilkelerle deęil, kiřinin sahip olduęu řeyden ziyade kendisini vermesi řeklinde betimlenmiř, potlaç kültürüne alternatif bir armaęan modeli geliřtirilmiřtir.