

given in his own way and according to his own methods. He succeeded in what others had attempted, but were unable to accomplish. While Çakıcı was yet living, other gangs tried to use his name in order to accomplish their deeds; however, Çakıcı protected his name and his fame in the manner in which he had established it.

His name and fame continue to be guarded, respected and celebrated, as psychological pattern of thinking, dreaming and releasing popular feelings regarding what he accomplished and the people could not do. Neither least nor last in this regard, the respect for his name and fame as the best example of a great master of the zeybek tradition continued among the *efeler* after Çakıcı's death, and is such that Celal Bayar, the third President of Turkey once said, "Without using his name the *efeler* renamed Çakıcı "Rahmetli Büyük Efe," (the blessed, great *Efe*) (Bayar: 1968: 2146

This extreme social acceptance demonstrates how Çakırcalı Mehmet Efe has been socio-psychoanalytically idealized, and virtually enshrined in the gallery of Turkish folkheroes.

Even today in the western Anatolian region, the example of Çakıcı, the real *efe*, is used to criticize or judge other people's behavior. Parlak Hüseyin, a local *efe* in the 1940's was known in his village of Ayvalık as being "like Çakıcı, by taking from the rich and giving to the poor, and he was very handsome, a brave and quick person" (K. Kazaner:

1991)

Also, if someone who claims to be an efe hurts or kills someone who is vulnerable, or by tricky means, again he is rejected and criticized by the people. "This is not the way to be an efe. like Çakıcı" frequently is the orientation of a story from a critic's point of view

Finally, Çakırcalı Mehmet Efe is a folkhero who was produced out of the Turkish socio-cultural context. The contextual changes which reproduced him by using his life story for many purposes and by different techniques will be explored in the cult's many representative elements

CHAPTER III - THE CULT OF ÇAKICI MEHMET EFE

The cult of Çakırcalı Mehmet Efe finds these representative outlets: (1 an endless number of oral stories among the Turkish people, (2) newspapers, (3) popular books, (4) theater plays, (5) films, (6) both popular and scholarly magazine articles, (7) television and radio programs, (8) folksongs, (9) folkdances, (10) traditional village theater dramas, (11) post-cards, and (12) statues

The cult's representative elements will be classified according to the channel which is used:

I. PRINTED MEDIA

II VISUAL MEDIA

III. - ORAL MEDIA

I. - THE PRINTED MEDIA: The printed media through which information about Çakırcalı Mehmet Efe is expressed can be placed in four categories:

A- Newspapers:

B- Books

C- Theater Plays:

A- NEWSPAPERS: The first printed texts about Çakıcı appeared in the Ottoman newspapers. It is known that Italian, French and British newspapers published news items about him also

Research on the entire canon of newspaper material

covering Çakıcı's rebellion of fifteen years, would, indeed give a complete picture regarding the growth period of the Çakıcı Efe cult. However, such an enormous project is not the purpose of this thesis, though a research project of this nature might be conducted in the future. Nonetheless, I will try to outline some of the characteristics of the press' role regarding the cult of Çakıcı Efe which I have discovered.

Newspapers as sources for the cult of Çakıcı can be placed in two categories: first, those papers which published material about Çakıcı Efe while he was still alive; second, those papers which published posthumous material about Çakıcı Efe.

Category 1: - The newspapers which published material about Çakıcı Efe while he was still alive helped spread the growing fame of his cult by regaling the public with stories of his adventures. For this reason, since it viewed Çakıcı as a reactionary, the Ottoman government forbade publication of such items. However, the press continued to publish news items about Çakıcı despite this ban. The perceived power of the press can be seen when, according to Kara, Said Pasha, the commander in chief of the state army units which were trying to capture Çakıcı, resigned from his post, blaming the newspapers for the army's failure to do so. He criticized the press for printing 'false' and 'lying' news items about Çakıcı's adventures as one reason why attempts

at capturing Çakıcı had been unsuccessful (The villager newspaper, Köylü Gazetesi, February 10, 1910). Ali Pasha, the next commander in chief, also criticized the press for publishing 'false' news, exhorting the populace 'not to believe what the newspapers published about Çakıcı (Servet-i Fünun, November, 17, 1910).

One overpowering motivation behind the media's disregard of the ban against publication of news about Çakıcı Efe was the hunger of the public to read about him. For this reason, the press entertained little concern regarding the factuality of their news release, and published whatever came from oral sources, often, despite the fact that they later admitted to publication of incorrect information; for example, the January 6, 1910 edition of Tercüman-ı-Hakikat wrote that "the village where Çakıcı is has been surrounded by the army." Two days later, on January 8, the paper wrote that this had not happened, and that the previous edition's information was incorrect.

Such incorrect information, of course, was not the creation of civilian news services only. Sometimes the state's official news sources propagated such "false news". On one occasion, Mahmut Muhtar Bey, Governor of İzmir, sent a telegram to the Interior Ministry stating that "Çakıcı had been killed." Taking its cue from this telegram, the press also published the same item Tercüman-ı-Hakikat, Tanin and Yeni Gazete, October 28, 1910). Two days later, the same

papers retracted, stating that "the telegram about Çakıcı's death was incorrect"

In addition to incorrect information, the press sometimes painted very favorable, and even flattering portrayals about Çakıcı Efe and his character. For instance the Moniteur Oriental mentioned Çakıcı as a "modern-day 'Fradiavolo'", and further wrote:

"Çakıcı (Çakırcalı) is a very, very brave person; no one can capture him if he does not want them to. He teases the gendarmes and army units which are trying to capture him. He is a very handsome man. He is in the daydreams of every woman. Whole villages adore him and side with him because Çakıcı protects them from the abuses of the state's tax collector. Çakıcı even gives them money to pay taxes. He is not only king of the mountains, but also of the plains (Moniteur Oriental, October 28, 1910).

Upon occasion, journalistic ventures about Çakıcı were not limited to sensational news items about, nor flattering portrayals of him, as in the case of one satirical paper which used the phenomenon of Çakıcı Efe to criticize the state and its statesmen with the following poem:

"The most famous *haydut* (rebel) is Çakıcı, He is even more famous than the prime minister Halim Pasha; Çakıcı has built bridges and roads.. in short, things that the government has not done.

The whole province of İzmir adores him. It is expected that he will receive the award of *Mouthyon*.

Think about this; he furnishes girls with trousseaus" (Kalem, November 9, 1910).

Thus, Çakıcı Efe became a creation of interaction

between the public, the press and the state. As is often if not always the case, such intra-medial transmissions occurred to serve the socio-cultural needs of all parties concerned: sensational news items published by newspapers, whether factual or not, fed popular fascination for the deeds of Çakıcı Efe while helping to ensure the sales of newspapers; propagandistic 'disinformation' offered by the state's official news sources helped to mask military intent from the public while diluting official embarrassment over the failure of the army to capture Çakıcı Efe. Such interactions fed the cult of Çakıcı Efe which remains to this day in the resplendence of all its variations.

Category 2: The canon of posthumous newspaper material published about Çakıcı Efe can be broken down into subcategories defined by changes in Turkish national politics and, thereby, changes in state policy regarding the publication of such material. These political and socio-cultural changes can be discussed within the framework of two basic periods of influence: first, the Ottoman period, 1911-1922; second, the Republican period, 1923-1992.

With the decline of the Ottoman 'Empire', and the eventual establishment of the Turkish Republic, as well as with the rise of new political forces and influences, the cult of Çakıcı Efe no longer posed the same governmental threat as it previously had. After the establishment of the Republic there were, in fact, those political groups for

whom Çakırcalı Mehmet Efe provided a nationalistic, representative symbol as a folkhero of sorts. Obviously there also were new socio-cultural directions throughout Turkey resulting from these political changes.

The Ottoman Period, 1911-1922: Initial reactions of the press to the death of Çakıcı had their curious aspects. At last, in 1911, the state army units did succeed in capturing and killing Çakıcı Efe. This fact, of course provided the most sensational news about Çakıcı to date. Some Turkish newspapers immediately published news that Çakıcı Efe was, indeed, finally dead, and tried to provide proof of that fact to counteract the baseless news accounts of his death which had been published upon various previous occasions.

Nonetheless, suspicion was common among tabloids in general, even after receiving telegrams and other news of Çakıcı's death. For example, the state Ottoman Ajans (Osmanli Ajansi) furnished first news of the event to the civilian press on the night of November 17, 1911 when Çakıcı was killed in Nazilli. However, many Istanbul newspapers withheld the item, fearing that it was again false. Two days later when they did publish the news, they provided excuses for their original silence upon the matter. The November 19 edition of Sabah (Morning), apologized to its readership, and excused its silence upon the subject by writing that "we received the news last night, but the paper had already gone

to press"

Moreover, those Istanbul papers which did publish the Ottoman Ajan's news used carefully worded language; the November 19 edition of the Moniteur Oriental, an afternoon publication, summarized various other morning papers thus

"Is Çakıcı Efe really dead? This morning's newspapers published news of Çakıcı's death. According to a telegram which was sent from Nazilli by the Ottoman Ajans, it is claimed that Çakıcı is at last definitely dead. However, the government has not received official confirmation from the Governor of Izmir" (Moniteur Oriental, November 18, 1911).

Not surprisingly, the cult of Çakıcı Efe was far from defunct in the newspapers thereafter. Oddly enough, for a number of years afterwards, the Turkish press published accurate items about Çakıcı's death. Because of mysterious circumstances surrounding it--which will be analyzed in later chapters of this thesis--many members of the Turkish populace did not believe Çakıcı was actually dead. In an interesting informative role, there were press reactions to this particular aspect of cult belief; for instance, approximately three years after Çakıcı Efe's death, an article upon the subject by the popular writer Ahmed Rasim was published in Tasvir-i Efkâr, one of the most widely circulated Ottoman newspapers throughout Turkey. The article's topic was concerned with the folk belief that "Çakıcı did not die; no one could kill him". The writer criticized these beliefs, and popular lack of knowledge upon

the subject (Rasim: 1913).

The Republican Period, 1922-1992: Popular fascination with the Çakıcı Efe cult continued in the press during the Republican Period. Most of the items in newspapers appeared in this period, first as serial articles providing biographical material about Çakırcalı Mehmet Efe. A later characteristic of journalistic interest evolved when most of these articles were published in book form. All such publications claimed that their authors had collected material from oral sources who, in one way or another, had witnessed the life of Çakıcı Efe. Moreover, most of these authors denied any novelistic intentions, claiming to be historians presenting entirely factual material. They presented their works as "fictionalized histories" or "factual biographies", particularly by noting the "fictionalized historical" characteristics of their work in the prefaces of these books; for example: Sun (1934), Sertoğlu (1942), Asarcıklı (1973), Kemal (1956).

These biographical feuilletons about Çakıcı Efe published in the newspapers are:

1. "Çakıcı Efe" by Zeynel Besim Sun in İzmir Ticaret Postası between February 16, 1932 and October 9, 1933.
2. "Çakırcalı Mehmet Efe" by Murat Sertoğlu in Yeni Asır between April 6, 1933 and May 23, 1933.
3. "Çakırcalı Efe" by Yaşar Kemal in Cumhuriyet between

March 15, 1956 and June 25, 1956.

4. "Fransız Dış İşleri Bakanlığı Belgelerine Göre Çakıcı Mehmet Efe", as a feuilleton never collected into book form, by Ömer Sami Coşar in Milliyet between May 27, 1973 and June 18, 1973.
5. "Dağdaki Diplomat" by Hayrettin Asarcıklı in Yeni Devir between April 9, 1972 and October 13, 1972.

Other than the feuilletons which they published, the papers also made occasional mention of Çakıcı otherwise. It is important to note that a main characteristic of these solitary references--as well of the serial articles--was an idealization of Çakıcı Mehmet Efe. Thus, the newspapers helped establish an idealization of him in addition to spreading his fame throughout the nation as well as to future generations of the Turkish populace. Moreover, it can be speculated that such publication of stories about his adventures had an effect upon the oral tradition, as will be further explored in Chapter IV.

B - BOOKS:

1- Çakıcı Efe: The first biographical feuilleton about Çakıcı Efe was written by Zeynel Besim Sun, and was published in İzmir Ticaret Postası, a daily newspaper between 1932-1933, and later published by Sun in book form in 1934 under the title of Çakıcı Efe (Sun: 1934). This work was based on material gathered from oral sources during

field work done by Sun and two assistants as a research team in the region where Çakıcı Efe's rebellion took place Sun: 1934: 1). The various versions of stories were collected and their "factuality" evaluated; as Zeynel Besim Sun wrote:

"My assistants still are in the field and are sending versions of the stories. By considering their source and general characteristics we are selecting them, then publishing the stories. Sometimes there are ten different version of a story but after investigating their truthfulness we publish one of them" (Sun: 1934: 580).

The work was also enriched with written sources, such as Çakıcı's letters, and telegrams originated by the Governor of İzmir

However, the book was not presented merely as a collection of stories. It is clear that the stories which were collected from oral sources of the region were manipulated; events were dramatized and textualized by Sun's selectivity. Moreover, from the "folkloristic" point of view, the most important legends about Çakıcı were not collected and published by Sun because he classified them either as "ignorant folk fabrications/imaginations", or as stories "made up by Çakıcı", as also he wrote:

"In those years, there were such legends among the people which could give a person horror... for instance, 'Çakıcı met with Hızır' (a prophet). These ridiculous stories circulated not only among the people but also among the police. Actually, they were fabrications of Çakıcı himself... he made up these stories, but by their circulation from

mouth to mouth, they became accepted as the truth in the peoples' minds..." (Sun: 1934: 110).

Except for giving an example, Sun did not include any other "such legends" in Çakıcı Efe. This was a weak point of the work which was criticized by Pertev Naili Boratav when the book was published (Boratav: 1938).

Zeynel Besim Sun either gave, or withheld the names of his oral sources according to two principles. If the source was dead at the time of publication, Sun gave his name; or in accordance with the source's desires; if the source was still alive at the time of publication, Sun gave his name gave the source "a pen name", or simply wrote that "we do not have permission to publish the source's name" (Sun: 1934

Another important aspect of Zeynel Besim Sun's work is that the author used the life story of Çakıcı Mehmet Efe to criticize the previous Ottoman regime. Such political criticism was fashionable at the time since the Turkish Republic was in the process of establishing itself

Within the explanatory context of the present work, it is important to note that these criticisms--under the sway undoubtedly, of propaganda of the Republic--show the socio-cultural contextual changes of the period on the larger, as well as regional scale. Moreover, such criticisms demonstrate the socio-psychoanalytical basis of Sun's point of view in the collection (selection), interpretation and

publication of Çakıcı Mehmet Efe's life story; for example, after telling about the offer of amnesty by Sultan Abdülhamit to Çakıcı on condition that he leave the region, Sun wrote

"... The situation at the Palace of Yıldız (the Sultan's Palace) was such that it was begging Çakıcı since the palace was vulnerable under Çakıcı's power.

"Oh, you youths!

"This is the result of living in a kingdom. The king or "Padişah" (Ottoman Emperor's title) can do whatever he wants when he sees that the country will follow him without thinking; so much so that some of them, like Abdülhamit, were in such vulnerable situations that he was able to offer amnesty to a person like Çakıcı without thinking of the honor of the country and the nation... all nations which have tyrants are like that. For this reason, you youths who are republican, do not give any thought to sacrificing your lives to save the republic (Cumhuriyetçi; regime) [at this point, Sun told the rest of the story].

"The order came from the palace, therefore, there was nothing else for Kaymakam Halil Rüştü to do and he tried to communicate with Çakıcı Efe..." (Sun: 1934: 203).

Çakıcı Efe is important in several aspects. It sold 5000 copies when it was first placed on the market (Boratav: 1938). This was an incredibly large number of copies for a book published only six years after the Republic's alphabet revolution (1928).

As was noted earlier, Sun's work was first published in İzmir Ticaret Postası. This attracted the attention of the public; as a result the paper's circulation increased, and therefore, an interaction between oral sources and the

publication occurred which was reflected in the letters and comment about the work which were received (and to a certain extent) published by the author. Even some of Çakıcı's men who were still living wrote letters to Zeynel Besim Sun and either accepted the publication as telling "true" stories, or criticized its "mistakes." A letter from Kel Hayyım, a Jewish supporter and one of the men close to Çakıcı, was published by the author (Sun: 1934: 271). These characteristics of Zeynel Besim Sun's work made it the most widely accepted and cited source as a "truthful" book among the Turkish elite. As will mentioned later, almost everyone who later produced anything through print or visual media about Çakıcı Mehmet used Sun's Çakıcı Efe as a resource or simply plagiarized it. In short, Zeynel Besim Sun's work is the primary basis of the intense intertextuality among the elements of the cult of Çakıcı.

The interrelationships between the work of Zeynel Besim and the other mediated performances will be outlined in this thesis.

2- Çakırcalı Mehmet Efe is the first of two works by Murat Sertoğlu about Çakıcı Mehmet Efe. Çakırcalı Mehmet Efe was published as a serial article in the newspaper Yeni Asır in 1933 to compete with Zeynel Besim Sun's publication. It was published as a book in 1942. The detailed information it contains about how Çakırcalı Mehmet's father was killed provides the only difference with the work of Zeynel Besim

Sun (Sertoğlu: 1942: 1-10). This information was later used as a source by both Yaşar Kemal (1956) in his book, and Metin Erksan in his movie Dokuz Dağın Efesi (1958). However, it can be suggested to be Sertoğlu's creation, for later when he wrote a serial article about Kamalı Zeybek, he changed the place of Çakırcalı Ahmet's death from village of Eseli to the town of Adagide (Sertoğlu: Tercüman, November 18, 1972: p. 4).

Murat Sertoğlu's second book is Çakırcalı Efe Nasıl Vuruldu? (How Was Çakırcalı Efe Killed?), published in 1943. Sertoğlu used fieldwork as the basis for this second book; however, he gave the name of only one of his oral sources publishing the source's memories about Çakıcı Mehmet Efe (Sertoğlu: 1943: 9-13).

Beyond this named oral source's memories of Çakıcı, the rest of the work is fictionalized stories, inasmuch as he gathered material from other oral sources and reshaped them in his own style. Moreover, regarding his sources' similarity between some of his stories and those of Sun would seem to suggest either that both men drew from the same or similar oral sources, or that Sertoğlu drew from information published in Sun's book.

The major difference in Sertoğlu's second book regards the death of Çakırcalı. According to Sertoğlu, Çakıcı was accidentally killed by Hacı Mustafa. This claim is also common in the body of oral stories.

Murat Sertoğlu's works are important within the Çakırcalı, because though they differ somewhat from the books of Zeynel Besim Sun, by virtue of their small size and reasonable prices, Murat Sertoğlu's books about Çakıcı Mehmet Efe are the most popular books on the subject among the Turkish populace. The date of publication is not usually supplied in most editions of these works, though there are three which do provide the date of publication.

3 - Çakırcalı Efe by Yaşar Kemal, like so many other publications about Çakıcı, was first published as a series of articles in Cumhuriyet between March 15 and June 25, 1956. The work consists of two parts. Its first part is a fictionalization of Çakıcı's life drawn from selections in Zeynel Besim Sun's book (Kemal: 1991). The second part is Rüştü Kobaş' memories about Çakıcı and his claim that he, with his army unit, killed Çakıcı Mehmet Efe. This part is drawn from interviews which were made with Rüştü Kobaş by Kemal; nonetheless the language of the book's second part has been shaped by Kemal.

As noted above, the first part of Çakırcalı Efe is a novel about Çakıcı Mehmet Efe, even though Kemal insists that it is "a biography" (Kemal: 1991). The reason that Yaşar Kemal presented his book as a biography, is that he limited himself to known events in the life of Çakıcı Mehmet Efe (Kemal: 1991). He had heard oral stories about Çakıcı since he was in his mid-20's from his brother

Çavuş, while they were doing professional typing together in Kadirli, a city in southern Anatolia. Yaşar Kemal listened to Hacı's stories and the memories of Hacı's father about Çakıcı, both of whom were sergeants of the gendarmes. Kemal also met a Yörük Agha whose name was Kamil Agha who told him stories about Çakıcı Mehmet Efe. Another known oral source for him was Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, a well known Turkish writer who met Çakıcı Mehmet Efe when the famous outlaw visited his father on his farm when Karaosmanoğlu was a teenager. He had listened closely to all that Çakıcı had said, and had wanted to write about Çakıcı Mehmet Efe at that time, (Kemal: 1991

Yaşar Kemal also read the works of Zeynel Besim Sun (1934) and Murat Sertoğlu (1942-1948). However, He completely dismisses Sertoğlu's work as unimportant and gives credit only to Sun (1934):

"He (Zeynel Besim) was alive while Çakıcı was still alive. Moreover, he visited the places where the events in Çakıcı's life took place and collected material from the people who were first-hand witnesses of these events. However, the book Çakıcı Efe is a primitive book; everything is mixed together; it is hard to understand. My work is, to a certain extent, to make good selections from his book and make it more understandable... indeed, Zeynel Besim Sun was a rightist conservative, and a narrow man..." (Kemal: 1991).

It will be useful to note that Kemal did not take notes as a general working style, as he says, I do not take

notes .. I have a very strong memory... I do not forget what I have heard... (Kemal: 1991)

Despite his reservations, Kemal's work definitely shows the influence of Murat Sertoğlu by giving details about Çakıcı's father (Çakırcalı Ahmed). Nonetheless, he created his own version of the story, and Zeynel Besim Sun's book was the primary basis for his work (1934).

Kemal did emphasize some stories which showed Çakıcı Mehmet Efe's character; his "taking from the corrupt rich, and giving to the poor." He did not emphasize ethnic names and titles in his work to the same degree as did Zeynel Besim Sun. Boşnak Hasan Çavuş (Bosnian immigrants are called (Boşnak) became simply Hasan Çavuş. In addition Kemal did not emphasize Çakıcı's conflicts with Greek and Armenian bandits.

Moreover, he criticized Çakıcı for "being a hypocrite" in his work, he presented Çakıcı's killing of many people and praying five times a day as just a political tactic to gain the attention and admiration of hungry (poor people

However, these characteristics of Yaşar Kemal's work, in conjunction with his activities in the Social Democratic political movement which has connections with other leftist movements in Turkey, resulted in criticism of his work as a "Marxist fabrication" by anti-marxist and nationalistic-islamic elites. One of these critics wrote a book about Çakıcı Mehmet Efe as a reaction to Yaşar Kemal's work,

Çakıcı Mehmet Efe by

4- Fransız Dış İşleri Bakanlığı Belgelerine Göre Çakıcı Mehmet Efe by Ömer Sami Coşar was published as feuilleton (never in book form, as previously noted) in Milliyet between May 27, 1973 and June 18 of the same year, using documents of the French Foreign Affairs office about Çakırcalı Mehmet Efe as a primary source. The material was drawn from telegrams sent by French Consul Paul Blanc to his country's Foreign Affairs Ministry. The work was also enriched with Turkish sources, such as Besim, Sertoğlu, and Kemal.

The work's originality revolves around its having used "western sources." From the dates of the telegrams from which material was drawn by Coşar, it is possible to gain information about Çakıcı's real life. The work is accepted as factual by the Turkish elite who work on the Çakıcı Mehmet Efe tradition; both Yaşar Kemal and Hayrettin Asarcıklı refer to Ömer Sami Coşar's book when discussing possible future works about Çakıcı (Kemal and Asarcıklı: 1991). However, other than the dates provided by the French telegrams, it is difficult to accept the content of the French documents as entirely factual since the documents were based upon oral sources when they were written.

5- Çakıcı Mehmet Efe by Hayrettin Asarcıklı was first published as serial with the title Dağdaki Diplomat the

Diplomat In The Mountains) between April 9 and October 13, 1972 in Yeni Devir. Hayrettin Asarcıklı is the pen-name of Mustafa Müftüoğlu, who is still living. He was born in Sögüt in Bilecik. Mustafa Müftüoğlu is a rightist conservative, and is proud of being a member of the *Karakeçili Yörüks*, part of the Kayı tribe whose ancestors established the Ottoman Dynasty and Empire. For this reason, and by virtue of his political agenda as a Pan-Turkish nationalist, Müftüoğlu wrote Çakıcı Mehmet Efe as an answer to Zeynel Besim Sun, Murat Sertoğlu and Yaşar Kemal (Asarcıklı: 1991).

According to Hayrettin Asarcıklı, Zeynel Besim Sun, even though a truthful and factual source for the life story of Çakıcı Mehmet Efe, used Çakıcı's story entirely to unfairly criticize the Ottoman regime. Murat Sertoğlu, he said, simply "lied" when he wrote about Çakıcı "drinking alcohol". By the same token, Kemal used the story of Çakıcı for the Marxist agenda "by removing Çakıcı's nationalistic struggle and interpreting it as a class struggle... just being against feudal-capitalist aghas." (Asarcıklı: 1991).

It is almost possible to say that, for these reasons, Hayrettin Asarcıklı rewrote Sun's work by adding a part borrowed from Sertoğlu's book. The added material consisting of an oral source's memories about Çakıcı (Murat Sertoğlu; Asarcıklı: 1973: 360-363).

As a whole, otherwise, Çakıcı Mehmet Efe as reflected in Müftüoğlu's *Çakıcı Mehmet Efe* is a Turkish nationalist

and a great, devout Moslem, who, though he honors Caliph Ottoman Sultan Abdülhamit Han, is opposed to the corrupt Ottoman officials, and takes money only from the corrupt wealthy and gives it to the Moslem poor.

In this last connection, it is interesting to note that the Moslem minorities of the time were not loyal to the Ottoman Turks; therefore, Müftüoğlu represented the Greek, Armenian and Jewish sectors of the populace as being in socio-ideological conflict with the Turks, and presented Çakıcı as a leader, unconsciously fighting for the rights of Turks in the region. In addition, Müftüoğlu shaped his comments about the history of the Ottoman State as Sun did, criticizing the Ottoman regime and Sultan Abdülhamit only for the negative aspects of their relationship with the populace. Asarcıklı otherwise defended the regime, but criticized non-Turks, the *Young Turks* and the "corrupt wealthy among the Turkish people."

Asarcıklı says, "when 'Çakıcı Mehmet Efe' was published in the newspaper, the paper's circulation increased..." (Asarcıklı: 1991). Also, the book's 7,000 copies sold very well (Asarcıklı: 1991).

6-Çakıcı Efe by Selami Münir Yurdatap was published in 1966 as a book. It did not first appear as a newspaper feuilleton, and it is one of the most interesting publications to appear under the name of the great *efe* (Yurdatap: 1966). By adding fictional characters, such as

"Gülbeyaz and Süleyman Bey," to a story of conflict between Çakıcı Mehmet Efe and his famous enemy Kamalı Zeybek, Yurdatap created a collection of stories in the form of *ashik* tales. An *ashik* is a traditional storyteller, minstrel). The story in general revolves around Çakıcı's love for Telli Hanım. Kamalı Efe is jealous of Çakıcı because he is in love with Hanım also. For this reason, the two men fight. Çakıcı's friends kill many of the friends of Kamalı Zeybek Efe). Yunus Bey, a friend of Çakıcı kidnaps Kamalı, whereupon he becomes Kamalı's friend, and the two of them hatch a plot to lie about Çakıcı to the Lord Bey) of Manisa. The Bey of Manisa throws Çakıcı in prison; however, Telli Hanım and Çakıcı's friend Sütbeyaz save his life. Çakıcı takes courage from their brave defense of him. Finally, Çakıcı Mehmet Efe and Telli Hanım are married.

Yurdatap's work uses folksongs about Çakıcı, and new poems were also created for the book. The poems were used to give the form of an *ashik* story to the book

It is interesting to note that Selami Münir Yurdatap's Çakıcı Efe was a conscious effort to provide a mediated-performance-approach to the oral tradition by presenting his work in print in the style of *ashik* stories.

Yurdatap's work is an excellent example of discontinuity, or a lack of influence upon later mediated performances or oral sources. It can be speculated that the work's completely different approach involving the structure

of the *ashik* storytelling tradition made it a still-born item within the cult, even though folksongs, and an idealized *Çakıcı* as a hero contrasted with his enemy *Kamalı Zeybek* appear in the book.

C- THEATER PLAYS: There are four theater plays about Çakıcı Mehmet Efe. However, the scripts of two of them (listed nos. 2 and 3 below) are not extant, and the contents are unknown. The four theater plays are:

1-Çakıcı'nın İlk Kurşunu (The First Bullet of Çakıcı), by Vassaf Kadri in 1909, (Kadri: 1908):

2-Çakıcı, by Şevki Efendi:

3-Çakıcı Ölmüş? (Is Çakıcı Dead presented as a spontaneous, open air performance, without playwright):

4-Çakıcı'nın İntikamı (The Revenge of Çakıcı), by I. Bakir Tarman, (Tarman: 1971):

1- Çakıcı'nın İlk Kurşunu, (The First Bullet of Çakıcı): This, the earliest theater play about Çakıcı Mehmet, was written by Vassaf Kadri in 1909 (Moral 1909), and performed by the Osmanli Dram Kumpanyas (1971: 294). It is interesting that it was written and performed while Çakıcı Mehmet was still living. Moral is the only mediated performance in the entire canon of performances about Çakıcı which consists entirely of criticisms of him, and portrays him as an ordinary man who kills members of the Ottoman police and army.

take revenge his father's death. Moreover, the main plot revolves around Çakıcı's kidnapping and raping of a sister of Seyfullah, an Albanian officer of the Ottoman army who is attempting to capture Çakıcı. Çakıcı'nın İlk Kurşunu ends with the death of Çakıcı in this manner:

A united Ottoman army consisting of Albanians, surrounds him in a cave, and Albanian Adem Kills him, (Kadri: 1908).

Naturally, this is fiction because Çakıcı was not killed until three years later. However, the play does represent the anger which Albanian Turks living in Turkey felt toward Çakıcı. Traditionally, ethnic Albanian Turks were perceived as aggressive and war-like peoples, and at the time in Turkey, they frequently worked on local farms around Ödemiş and Nazilli, most often as guards.

In general, they enjoyed this image of being successful warriors and formidable enemies, and their defeat by Çakıcı was an exception in their usual careers as successful warriors. For this reason, the people in the Aegean provinces use their defeat by Çakıcı as a way to tease or insult the Albanian Turks concerning their "tough guy" image (Ugural: 1991).

Not surprisingly, Çakıcı's attacks upon, and the insults which he directed towards these Albanian Turks, were sources of friction. It is also not surprising that this first theater play was anti-propagandistic against Çakıcı,

motivated by

motivations

the author's last name, "Moralizade", d

is possible that he may have been of et

background, from the Greek province of

it is quite possible that the main purpose of Çakıcı'nın İlk Kurşunu was to nullify the popularity of Çakıcı, at least, in Istanbul.

Nonetheless, though the play could be classified as *anti-Çakıcı*, it does support a number of well-known motifs about Çakıcı Mehmet: the beginning of his revolution as a blood revenge for his father, the attack upon the city of Ödemiş, and as has been noted above, his status as an enemy of the Albanian Turks.

Not much is known about the play's performances, and their receptions by the people of Istanbul.

2- Çakıcı: The second play about Çakıcı Mehmet Efe was written by Şevki Efendi, and performed by his theater company, Şevki Efendi Tiyatrosu, in 1913 (And: 1971: 48). Çakıcı Mehmet Efe had been dead two years when this play was created and first performed.

3- (Çakıcı Ölmüş?) (Is Çakıcı Dead?): The third play in this genre was performed *orta oyunu* (an old, most often spontaneous, Turkish open-air theatrical presentation performed without a playwright), led by Kel Hasan in 1913 (And: 1971: 226). Unfortunately, the exact content of this