

tribal name of "Ekberoğlu". This is a creation of Metin Erksan's imagination and has been accepted and assimilated by oral sources (Yalçın: 1991). This acceptance could be explained inasmuch as this naming is a socio-culturally "positive" value which helps idealize Çakıcı who exhibited compassion toward a noble yörük. Moreover, the absence of the name Yörük throughout all the other sources is noteworthy inasmuch as even Salih Çakırcalı, Çakıcı's grandson, who claims to have known the yörük's daughter does not otherwise know anything about her father, nor his real-life name.

Çakıcı's death at the hand of Bayındırlı Mehmet Çavuş is a completely new and important motif to the cult, but the public reacts neither positively nor negatively to it for many reasons. Çakıcı's death is mysterious; there are many versions which claim that Çakıcı was killed by one of the following persons: a- Hacı Mustafa, by accident; b- Sinan (a kızan in Çakıcı's band), by accident; c- Hacı Hüseyin (also a kızan) by accident; d- Rüştü Kobaş' brother Osman, as an Ottoman policeman; e- Eşref Kuşçubaşı, who claimed to have killed Çakıcı as the commander of the special unit which surrounded Çakıcı; f- Çerkez İdris Çavuş, who claimed to have killed Çakıcı as a member of an army-police unit; and g- Anzavur Ahmet, who claimed to have killed Çakıcı as the commander of the army-police unit.

One of the reasons why many people claimed to have

killed Çakıcı in the army unit which surrounded Çakıcı and his gang was the reward of 4,000 lira (golden coins which the state offered to anyone who killed or captured Çakıcı. However, the fatal combat took place at night making it possible for many people to claim to have been Çakıcı's killer. Nonetheless, the state used the natural confusion inherent in this night-time situation as an excuse not to pay the reward to anyone. Moreover, Çakıcı's friends, following his wishes, cut off his head and hands and took these parts with them, making the body unidentifiable. Only Bayındırlı Mehmet Çavuş recognized the body by a mole on the body's left leg, with Çakıcı's first wife Raziye İraz agreeing that çavuş's identification was correct. Çakıcı's head and hands were never found. For these reasons, the death of Çakıcı has become mysterious, and many people did not and still do not believe that the body was Çakıcı's.

Therefore, Metin Erksan's new cinematic motif of Çakıcı's death at the hand of Bayındırlı Mehmet Çavuş has not been criticized as a fabrication. Moreover--if the case were limited to the province of Ödemiş--there are further cultural reasons which made Metin Erksan's new motif acceptable. Most versions of the story of Çakıcı's death say that he was accidentally killed by Hacı Mustafa, Hacı Hüseyin or Sinan during combat. These friends of Çakıcı's were together when Çakıcı ordered them specifically to guard one weak spot in their line of defense, whereupon Çakıcı himself

rode through that space, and one of these three killed him, thinking that he was a policeman. This is interesting, in that the public did not want to believe that Çakıcı killed by the other persons who claimed to have killed him.

Another reason was that all of these people who made the claim of having killed Çakıcı belonged ethnically to groups of Caucasian immigrant Turks known as *Çerkezler* who were Çakıcı's enemies as the Albanian Turks had been. For this reason, native Turks did not want to believe that Çakıcı was killed by the *Çerkezler*--as Zeynel Besim pointed out:

"Even Çakıcı's enemies in the region say that they are happy hearing of Çakıcı's death. However, the arrogance of the *Çerkezler* in saying that 'we killed Çakıcı' upset us" (Sun: 1934: 628).

This arrogant claim of inflicting revenge for their ethnic relatives who were killed by Çakıcı was displayed in Vassaf Kadri Moralizade's theater play Even while Çakıcı was alive, Moralizade wrote that Çakıcı was killed by the Albanian Turk, Arnavut Adem (Kadri: 1908).

All of these reasons caused native (*yerli*) people to believe that Çakıcı was accidentally killed by one of his own men, and they did not want to believe that he was killed by his enemies

Additionally, there are other reasons why the populace has not criticized Erksan's new cinematic motif of Bayındırlı Mehmet Çavuş as the killer. Çakıcı was a native

of the region as were the members of his band. Bayındırlı Mehmet Çavuş was also a native of the region. He lived a long life in Ödemiş, dying in the late 1940's.

His personality was perceived as brave and noble, and he was loved by the people of Ödemiş. Moreover, there are stories which suggest that though Bayındırlı Mehmet Çavuş was a police chief who had many tangles with Çakıcı's gang, when Çakıcı was given amnesty and employed by the state as a country policeman, Bayındırlı Mehmet Çavuş and Çakıcı worked together. For this further reason the people did not react to the claim of Metin Erksan's that Çakıcı was killed by Bayındırlı Mehmet Çavuş. This was only one of many claims and a much better one than many others.

In addition, there are stories holding that once during the fatal conflict (*Cevizalani harbi*), Bayındırlı Mehmet Çavuş wounded Çakıcı Mehmet. Therefore, many people who have seen the movie thought that Bayındırlı Mehmet Çavuş did not kill Çakıcı Mehmet Efe but only wounded him in that particular scene (Bilgin: 1991).

These cultural reasons made the new elements in Metin Erksan's movie acceptable and positive

However, further delineating the "positive" and "negative" interpretive interrelationships of mediated performances with members of the public, it is useful to point out that Salih Çakırcalı brought me a copy of a newspaper interview with him concerning his grandfather. Its

author represented Çakıcı Mehmet Efe as having lived in Ödemiş, and having become a historical figure by his heroism in the War of Independence which occurred between 1919 and 1922 (Kurtuluş Savaşı; Sadık Özcan: *Türkiye Gazetesi*, September 3, 1985). In light of Salih Çakırcalı's attitude which presently will be shown, let it be reiterated that his grandfather died in 1911. Salih Çakırcalı did not protest this contradiction; moreover, when I pointed out this misrepresentation, Salih unhappily responded, "It is not important; maybe he the author wrote it by mistake." Then, as if to reinforce this, Salih Çakırcalı told me that he had heard his grandmother (Çakıcı's actual wife, Raziye say, "If your grandfather had been alive, the Greek armies could not have occupied Ödemiş" (Çakırcalı: 1991).

Regarding something like the Erksan movie, the public's as well as Salih Çakırcalı's critical reactions, which are rooted in many complex social interactions, show that interrelationships between mediated performances and oral forms are semantically shaped by one general, outlining rule: new elements or motifs in circulation are unconsciously defined or classified as "negative" or "positive" according to the orientation of the larger scale of Turkish culture

Oral forms are completely open to culturally "positive" elements; such as claims of Çakıcı's being a hero in the War of Independence (Tarman:1971), Salih Çakırcalı's

grandfather's being a leader of volunteer units in the Balkan war, and the like. (Akkaş: 1991).

"Negative" elements represented by mediated performance sources receive critical reactions: the romance scene involving intimate touching in public, and Çakıcı's marriage to Raziye in *Dokuz Dağın Efesi* (Erksan: 1958 and 1989; Çakırcalı: 1991; Yalçın: 1991; Bilgin: 1991; Akkaş: 1960's) both drew negative reaction, and the same is true regarding oral sources.

During my research when Ahmet Yörükoğlu was telling me, in company with Salih Çakırcalı, a story about how Çakıcı received important support from Governor Kamil Pasha in İzmir, and from Jews and Greeks *yunanlılar*. Salih Çakırcalı expressed his anger, cutting Yörükoğlu's story short by saying in a loud voice, "There were no Greeks!... there were no Greeks! There might have been British (*İngiliz* or *Rum* "Rum": native Greeks), but there were no *yunanlılar*. Ahmet Yörükoğlu continued his narrative by compromising with an abstraction which perhaps included a correction: "Whatever! *herneyse*) (Çakırcalı: 1991 and Yörükoğlu: 1991).

Ahmet Yörükoğlu's version of the story brought forth such a strong, negative reaction because historically it was considered acceptable for the Turkish people to have relationships with domestic Jews and Greeks who were counted among Ottoman citizenry. However, the word *Yonan Yunan* refers to Greeks from Greece who occupied the region of

Western Anotalia; therefore, for Turkish people to have relationships with *yunanlılar* in the historical context is equal to high treason. Perhaps this was the reason why Salih Çakırcalı did not let Ahmet Yörükoğlu use the word "yonan" which is used with nearly the same meaning at the national level in many contexts

Moreover, Salih, by emphasizing "British", showed that this was a well-known story about a "superior" relationship between Çakırcalı Mehmet Efe and the British. Memories of the British survive with a connotation of superiority; memories of *yunanlılar*, Greeks from Greece, survive with the worst possible connotations. Based upon my observations it can be speculated that the friendly conversation might have ended in a fight between Ahmet Yörükoğlu and Salih Çakırcalı had Yörükoğlu insisted upon using the term "Yonan" after Salih's protest, or had he presented Çakırcalı as a traitor

H. Süleyman Yalçın's Version of the Story and Its Contextual Characteristics:

Süleyman Yalçın, a native of the city of Ödemiş, is an outstanding *meraklı* of Çakıcı Mehmet Efe stories. Yalçın told his story in the company of his friends, Çakırcalı and Bilgin. Their topic of conversation was Metin Erksan's fabricated version of "the story of yörük's daughter" versus the true story. They were in a coffeehouse known as "Efeler

Kahvesi", the coffeehouse of the people who are interested in the stories and folkdances of efeler.

Yalçın's version is as follows:

"(Some) Albanian boys (*Arnavut oğlanları*) took the *yörük's* daughter and his flock of sheep. Then, they said, 'We are *Çakıcı*,' to him. Then, they took the *yörük's* daughter with them to entertain them by dancing (*oynatmağa*).

"Meanwhile, *Çakıcı* came to the tent of the *yörük*.

"He said, 'Hey you, why are so unpleasant like this. Look, my men (*kızanlar*) want *ayran*' (a traditional Turkish drink consisting of yogurt and water). The *yörük* said, 'Efe, I'm upset. There is a pimp known as *Çakıcı* who came and took my daughter,' he said. Then he start to cry.

(Recep Bilgin)--"Okay..This is true".

"*Çakıcı* said, ' Which way did he go?'

"The *yörük* said, 'That direction, in the valley of the river.'

Çakıcı went there. The Albanian boys were forcing her (*Raziye*) to dance by prodding her with their knives... 'dance!...dance!... hah! hah! hah!'.they were laughing at her situation.

"There was a watchman (lookout) of the gang, and some of them were forcing her (the *yörük's* daughter) to dance, and some of them were cooking a sheep.

"They (*Çakıcı* and his men) made an attack upon the watchman; they took him and tied him (up) very well. Then, they tied his mouth (gagged him) with a handkerchief so that he could not shout. Then, they surrounded (the false *Çakıcı* gang); all of them were alive. They tied them (up) very well. Then they went directly to the *yörük's* tent.

"*Çakıcı* asked *Ekberoğlu*, 'Which one of them is *Çakıcı*?'"

"The *yörük* said, 'This one.'

"*Çakıcı* said to the *yörük*, 'Let's throw this huge tree on the campfire.'... the huge tree is on the fire now (*Yalçın* paused here, then demonstrated and emphasized the size of the fire with his arms).

"*Çakıcı* said to *Hacı*, '*Hacı*,' he said, 'Let's take this *Çakırcalı* by the arms and legs.' One of them took his arms, the other

one his legs; they threw him into the fire... then another one and another one. Finally, there were two more (left).

"One of them said to Çakıcı 'Efe, let me kill this guy (his friend), because he forced me to force her to dance.' Efe said, 'Okay.' Then, those two started to fight, then both of them fell into the fire and finally all of these seven guys were burned in the fire.

"Efe said to the yörük, 'I personally, I do not want anything from you. But my men spent time and energy (*emek*) doing this job. Give one golden coin (*sari lira*) to each of them.' Then, Ekberoğlu gave one golden coin to each of them.

"The Çakıcı asked the yörük, 'Do you know Çakırcalı?' and said, 'I am Çakırcalı.'

"The yörük apologized to Çakırcalı; he was scared because he had cursed him (Çakıcı) many times.

"Then, Çakırcalı said, 'I will give your daughter a wedding. Let me know when it will take place.' And he did."

At this point, Yalçın's friend Salih Çakırcalı spoke up, "Actually, it is true (*nitekim*). My grandfather gave her a wedding. That woman (the yörük' daughter) visited my grandmother. I talked with that woman... her name was also Iraz (*Raziye*). It is true. She told me the story like that (Salih Çakırcalı: 1991).

The story's ethnic characteristics as told by Zeynel Besim Sun (Sun: 1934) and emphasized by Murat Sertoğlu

Sertoğlu: 1943 are kept in Yalçın's version. The storyteller used the phrase "Albanian boys" *Arnavut oğlanları*

This usage has an insulting connotation putting the Albanians in a situation as though they were gays. This does not mean that they were actually gays but morally and behavioral bad inasmuch as they were not real, brave, and honest men. This emphasis could have been the influence of Murat Sertoğlu (Sertoğlu:1943

Süleyman Yalçın twice called the *yörük* by the name Ekberoğlu--as a wealthy *yörük* leader, he is the creation of Metin Erksan in Dokuz Dağın Efesi (Erksan: 1958 and 1989). This is another example of a culturally positive element which the storyteller accepted. Besides accepting the name Ekberoğlu, his character as a wealthy *yörük agha* is also accepted. And that made possible the acceptance of another motif: the *Yörük* gives each of Çakıcı's men a golden coin at Çakıcı's suggestion. One of this motif's versions is a creation of Hayrettin Asarcıklı (Asarcıklı: 1973 and 1991). Even though Süleyman Yalçın used or recreated the motif in a slightly different fashion in that Çakıcı asks money for his men, it can be assumed that the idea came from Asarcıklı's works. However, since Süleyman Yalçın is not acquainted with Asarcıklı's book, it is possible that the channel of transmission could be another oral sources or some serial newspaper article with which he is familiar (Asarcıklı: 1972).

The number of burned people became seven in Yalçın's story. This is another influence of Erksan's movie. The gang represented in that film consisted of seven persons. However, the printed media, in Çakıcı's time represented the gang as consisting of nine.

Süleyman Yalçın's usage of the story's elements and his manner of storytelling is as though he actually lived the event. In addition to his verbal talents, which were

briefly noted earlier, it can be speculated that his manipulation of elements and story presentation might be influenced by his role as an actor in the movie, since he jokingly refers to himself as "the last *kızan* of *Çakıcı*" when mentioning his role in the movie

Yalçın's version of "the story of the *yörük*'s daughter clearly demonstrates that at least two elements were taken from the producers of mediated performances. Further delineating the power of transmissional relationships and the cult's power of assimilation, it is obvious that story is not only accepted but "performed" as truth by Yalçın and two other outstanding *meraklılar* while they yet accuse Metin Erksan's movie of being a "fabrication" in which the *Çakıcı*/*Raziye* love story is "made up"

This situation can be explained culturally. *Çakıcı*'s falling in love and showing romantic passion publicly is rejected as a negative element. By contrast, the other new elements such as the name *Ekberoğlu*, the suggestion of giving a reward by *Ekberoğlu* and *Çakıcı*'s having been killed by *Bayındırlı Mehmet Efendi* are accepted as positive elements. Culturally, for all concerned, the most important part of the story is *Çakıcı Mehmet*'s saving his name reputation as a demonstration of his character of helpful nobility as well

The purpose of the story in the given case (criticism about Metin Erksan's movie) was to tell the "true story of

the *yörük's* daughter." It functioned as a proof that Metin Erksan fabricated his version of the story in his movie, especially by virtue of Salih Çakırcalı's comment on the story--despite the fact that he paid no notice to the movie's new elements--that knowing the *yörük's* daughter and "listening to stories" from her like the one told by Yalçın, he supposedly knew the "true story." These aspects of his orientation to the story completed the meaning and function of the story in the event

Nonetheless, by contrast, a day later at the same place with almost the same people in attendance, Salih told a story to explain "why ethnic Albanian Turks and Çakıcı were enemies". Though his version has close textual similarity to Yalçın's, the contextual changes transformed the story's meaning and its function

3. Salih Çakırcalı's version of the same story:

"The reason that Çakırcalı and Albanians became enemies.

They are coming to the tent of the *yörük* they. What they were, Albanians--They are taking the daughter of the *yörük*.

Then, they are saying 'We are Çakıcı,' to the *yörük*. They are saying 'We are Çakıcı!' A *yörük* whose name is Şaban. Uhm..an Albanian whose name is Şaban. They are taking the *yörük's* flock of sheep.

They are going toward the river valley by following the flock.

Then, they starting to force to *yörük's* daughter to entertain them by dancing..the sheep were being cooked by some of them.

Meanwhile, Çakıcı is coming to the

yörük's tent. He is coming to the same tent by chance, and Çakıcı is saying to the yörük,

"Why are you so unpleasant (kararıyorsun). And he is continuing "look my men want some ayran.

The yörük is saying (diyo), 'Efe..I am upset because my daughter is taken by a pimp who is known as Çakıcı. He came and took my daughter and went..' The yörük is saying 'He took my daughter,' The yörük is saying 'He also took my flock of sheep. For this reason I am upset,' the yörük is saying.

" 'Where did he go..(Çakıcı asked).

'He went in that direction,'..Çakıcı is giving a command (işaret) to his man, 'Let's see all of them'..following the Albanians. They (Albanians) were forcing the girl to dance. And were preparing dinner by cooking some sheep.

One of them were stabbing at the girl with a knife..like this (gesture). To force her to dance.

They (Çakıcı and his men) attacked first the watchman. They tied up him very well and put a hankircief over his mouth..without letting him shout out to his friend they tied him up very well then lay him down there.They lie down him there.

"They lay him down there" (İbrahim Kamalı, an audience).

Then, they are attacking suddenly the others.

Finally they captured all of them alive. They surrounded them while they were alive.

Then, they tied all of them very well. Then tied them together like a chain of camels (deve katarı gibi)..putting them..in front (of Çakıcı's group).

They tied them up..and went directly to the yörük's tent.

Çakırcalı says to the yörük, "Which one is Çakıcı among these? "

He says, 'This one is.Çakırcalı says to the yörük. "Put those huge pieces of wood on the fire. Throw them into the fire".

The huge fire is growing now..in the garden of the yörük's house..(Yörüğün evinin avlusunda).

Çakırcalı says, 'Hacı tie this Çakıcı's hands.

Then..one of them grabbed his arms and another his legs moving him back and forth

(*sallayıp..sallayıp*)one two **langirt**
 (they) throw him into fire. Then another one
 ..another one .

Finally there are two of them (left). One of them says, "Efe..this guy forced to me to force her..let me kill him with my hand.."

Then, they are fighting there..each one trying to kick to other one into the fire. They lose their balance and fall into the fire together.

Finally all of seven are burned by fire.. Then, Çakırcalı says to the *yörük*, give a *sarı lira* (golden coin) to each of my man. They spent their energy and time (*emek*). I do not want anything.

Çakırcalı did not take anything from him for himself. The *yörük* is giving a golden coin to each of Çakırcalı's man (Kızan).

Çakırcalı says to the *yörük*, 'Do you know Çakırcalı.

Çakırcalı says."I am the Çakırcalı".

The *yörük* is apologizing to him..by saying..forgive me, those guys talked like that.

Çakırcalı is saying, 'Whenever your daughter will get married let me know..I will give her a wedding".

Indeed the wedding was given to her by my grandfather (*dedem*)..That woman was coming and going to the our house..

(Recep Bilgin).. 'When the subject is related with the honor of a woman no one can say a single bad word about him. He.."

(Salih Çakırcalı)..This is the reason that the Albanian were enemy of his. Their anger toward him was coming from this story.. Çerkez's.. situation is different."
 (Çakırcalı:1991).

I. Orhan Kazaner/ Kemal Kazaner's Version of the Story and Its Contextual Characteristics:

Orhan Kazaner, Rahime Kazaner, and Kemal Kazaner are non-native or immigrant people of the region who learned the Çakıcı Mehmet Efe stories primarily from mediated performances. Kemal Kazaner and his son Orhan Kazaner are

both master builders. Rahime Kazaner is a housewife. The Orhan/Kemal Kazaner version shows the story's adaptability and the selection and synthesis of aspects of mediated performances and oral sources to create their own versions.

During my first interview with Orhan Kazaner, he told the life story of Çakıcı Mehmet which was primarily based on Metin Erksan's film. In his story, Orhan Kazaner emphasized the noble character of Çakıcı Mehmet Efe and his mysterious death. He did not mention a "blood revenge" or "the story of the yörük's daughter" though he kept mentioning the yörük's daughter as Çakıcı's lover. However, he did not repeat the movie's order of events; he selected these two topics and recreated ideas and events by reference to the movie, while adding new motifs from oral sources (*meraklılar*) to whom he had listened at one of the local coffeehouses. During the second interview he was with his mother, father and his wife mother-in-law's house with the other guests. At this time his father, Kemal Kazaner, told a version of a Çakıcı story which he had heard from friends:

"There is a story about Çakırcalı that is like this, brother.

I know when Çakıcı was up in the mountains, some of the other gangs were doing bad things in Çakıcı's name. I mean someone was sexually harassing young girls. Then, when someone asked these guys, who are you?', they said, 'I am Çakırcalı, like these many gangs (*eşkiyalar*) are called *çalıkakan* ("false efeler, ordinary outlaws"), and they were using Çakıcı's name in a bad manner; they were humiliating Çakıcı in that way.

"They were saying that, 'Çakıcı is a bad man (*yobaz*), he is the enemy of the people. He

does not do anything good for the people. He does not like the people (*halk*).

"Indeed, this Çakırcalı was a great man for the people. He was helping the people a lot.

"Finally, when he (Çakıcı) went down to the plain from the mountain, there was gossip about him everywhere, even his friends and supporters asked him, 'Are you doing such things that we don't know? If you are doing such things, shame on you somehow or other how can we follow you as a leader?'

"Çakırcalı went down from the mountain and started to follow these gossiper. He saw a young girl who was crying under a tree on the plain. Çakıcı came up to her and asked,

'My daughter, why are you crying?'

"She said, 'I will marry someone, but we are poor. My family is forcing me into the marriage. But I don't have a dowry. I will marry him, but I don't have a dowry. Then, maybe one day he will blame me that I did not have a dowry. For this reason, I'm crying.'

"Çakıcı said, 'My daughter, don't worry about it. Take this money and tell your mother and father what you want, then they can buy it for you.'

"She refused the money - 'I cannot take the money. My father and mother - you don't know how they are. If I take your money, they will think that I did something bad that you gave me this money.'

"Çakıcı said, 'Okay, where is your father now?'

"She said, 'He is somewhere like that.'

"Çakırcalı went to that place and found her father and said this and thus, 'Take this money and go buy whatever is necessary for your daughter. If it is not enough, I will be this day in that place. Come and find me.'

Her father took the money. They bought whatever his daughter needed for a dowry. The money was enough.

"But now the man (the girl's father) went to that place on that day to fine out who this guy was, and whether he would keep his promise.

"Anyway, he went there. Çakıcı... he saw him. Then, he (Çakırcalı) asked him if the money was enough.

"The man said, 'Yes, my son, it was enough. Who are you?'

"He said, 'I am Çakırcalı.'

"The man said, 'That is impossible. You cannot be Çakırcalı because Çakırcalı is a bad, horrible man.'

"Çakırcalı said, 'How can it be like that? Who told you that?'

"The man said, 'This man and that man told me that Çakırcalı is like that.'

"Çakıcı said, 'Okay, take this money too; maybe your daughter will need some thing else.'

"Then, Çakıcı went back to his friends and told them what was going on... this is this and thus. Then, he said, 'I'm going to find them. If I don't return, forgive your rights that are on me.'

"His friends said, 'This is not right. We will also come with you.'

"He said, 'No', but he took only one of them who was his closest friend, his second in command (Yaveri).. what was his name?.. Hacı.. yes, he took only Hacı with him. then, they went and found all of those gossipers in one coffeehouse. Then, he took his gun and said to them, 'Hey, all of you! Stand up! Who are you.. one by one?'

"They said, 'I'm this and thus. I'm this and thus (falan, filan).'

"Then, Çakıcı said, 'Who am I?'

"They said, 'Eee, we do not know.'

" 'Who is the man who you were humiliating and gossiping about?'

" 'Çakırcalı.'

" 'Is he really a bad man?' Çakıcı asked.

"One of them said, 'I saw him rape a woman yesterday.'

"Then, Çakıcı killed him. The rest escaped. Then those guys tricked (tuzak) Çakırcalı.. Then it is heard by the people and they married Çakıcı with a girl. Then, his enemies tricked him. This story (event) happened around the city of Aydın."

Orhan Kazaner--"This was in the movie. They tricked Çakıcı like that.

"Çakırcalı had a sweetheart (sevgili). Those guys went to her house, then, they took her... for a revenge against Çakırcalı they forced her to dance. Çakırcalı heard this and surrounded them and attacked them with his friends. They killed all of them. He saved his sweetheart. Actually his sweetheart recognized

the body of Çakıcı in the movie that..." (Orhan and Kemal Kazaner: 1991)

It is clear that Kemal Kazaner's story is a version of "the story of the yörük's daughter" which he heard from oral sources. As told by Kemal Kazaner, the story provided a starting point to tell about a trick which was played against Çakıcı Mehmet Efe. Then it worked to remind Orhan Kazaner of the movie's plot as a continuing part of his father's story

It is interesting that as a result of the relationships which developed from different transmissional chains, one event in the narrative's context was made into two different events

Orhan Kazaner selected one part of the movie which was almost entirely his recreation: the yörük's tent became Çakıcı's sweetheart's house. Also, Çakıcı's name is deleted in Orhan's comments because his father's story's emphasized that motif. The woman is kidnapped because she was Çakıcı's sweetheart. The attempt was to trick Çakıcı and take revenge for their friends who were killed by Çakıcı. However, Orhan's father mentioned that Çakıcı married someone and Metin Erksan's movie shows Çakıcı's wedding ceremony

Orhan Kazaner always described the woman that Çakıcı married as a "sweetheart" or "lover" rather than as his

wife. This could be explained as a result of Çakıcı's noble, morally correct image in general, and because the movie contains a conflict which was criticized by the other sources

Orhan Kazaner does not criticize the movie. However, he does not accept the movie's form. He puts it in a category that is common in the movies.

This seems to be a formal compromise, or it could be his mother's influence since she told the story of the movie to him as a folktale (*masal*) when he was a child. His mother, Rahime Kazaner, after seeing "a Çakıcı movie" at the theater, began telling stories from it to her children as folktales, (R. Kazaner: 1991).

However, her son remembers only one element from these "folktales": Çakıcı had a mole on his leg by which his wife recognized his dead body. Since Orhan Kazaner also has a mole on his leg, his mother used to refer to it as "Çakıcı's mole", (Orhan Kazaner:1991). Moreover, though Orhan Kazaner later watched Erksan's movie twice, he nonetheless referred to the "yörük's" daughter as Çakıcı's "lover" rather than as his wife

In addition, Orhan gave the end of the story a new motif which combines aspects of the movie and the oral sources;

"The police took Çakıcı's lover to identify the headless, dead body of Çakıcı. When she saw the mole, she understood that the

body was Çakıcı's. Though she did not tell the police (zaptiye) that the body was Çakıcı's, instead saying, 'Who are you who can kill Çakıcı? No one can kill Çakıcı', (nonetheless) two teardrops fell from her eyes. But, the policemen saw her tears, and they decided that the dead body was Çakıcı's. I heard from many people that they were talking that (since) no one knows really how Çakıcı (came to his) end, (it is) a kind of legend" (O. Kazaner: 1991).

It is clear that no one memorizes movies or books completely. People take parts from any source and build their own versions. This means that people collect from a mixture of sources to create own individual versions; in other words that which is received by people from mediated performances is selected by memory, often in contradiction to the mediated performance. For example, in Orhan Kazaner's version of the identification of Çakıcı's body Çakıcı's lover Raziye cries and accepts that the body is Çakıcı's, (Erksan: 1958, and 1989

III. The Analysis of The Transmissional Relationships in Story of The Yörük's Daughter:

Stories of the yörük's daughter" are multi-episodic. It came into existence quite likely in more than one version. Stories have lost their time and place dimensions since the early period of their existence. The meaning of the stories depends on the contexts within which it has been performed since its creation.

At least two of referential meaning are known. First it is told to emphasize that Çakıcı Mehmet was a great man, "a true efe" who helped the poor people, while demonstrating how he kept his name and reputation from ill usage by false gangs. Second, it is told as an explanation of why Çakıcı was an enemy of ethnic Albanian Turks

If we summarize the story's reproduction in mediated performances by taking into account the performances' chronological appearances, we can easily see creations of new elements and their dialogical relationships. These dialogical relationships are both the reason and the result of strong intertextual connections which are obtained from one item of the cult to another, or from one performance to another as the transmissions of elements, and the transformal meanings form bases for new creations.

Originally, Zeynel Besim Sun collected the story from oral sources and stylized its language (Sun: 1934). He then used it as an introduction to the life story of Çakıcı

Mehmet Efe in his book This organizational technique the self-sufficiency of the story in representing and expressing the peoples' norms and ideals about Çakıcı possibly made it the favorite and most famous story of cult to be used and propagated by other mediated performances

Murat Sertoğlu, who has been accused by many people of plagiarizing Zeynel Besim Sun, changed the organization of his book (Sertoğlu:1942) by expanding the motif of Çakıcı's father's death at Hasan Çavuş's hand, which was very limited in Zeynel Besim's book. Murat Sertoğlu then proceeded to make "the story of the yörük's daughter" the most important part of his work by extending the story to a length of 15 pages in a volume of only 85 pages. Moreover, Sertoğlu, having captured his readers' attention, in order to make the book even more exciting added a new element in between lines in that Çakıcı looked upon the yörük's daughter's beauty in a sexual sense when he saved her from the false gang. However, this new element is "hidden" between the story's lines, for it was allegedly occurred in Çakıcı's mind. In addition, the rest of the story is extended detailed episodes are presented by Sertoğlu which had already been told by Zeynel Besim Sun. The "brother/sister formula was also extended.

This "hidden" new element of Çakıcı's sexual interest in the yörük's daughter alchemized into her unrequited love

for him in Faruk Kenç's movie (Kenç: 1950), providing the movie's plot with "more intrigue." The generic changes from printed to visual had important roles and functions for the extension and continuation of Murat Sertoğlu's new elements into the Kenç film. Nonetheless, Kenç also diluted the new "romance" element by preserving the referential meaning of Çakıcı's character, inasmuch as the love theme was at least one-sided, and the "brother/sister" formula was not broken on the part of Çakıcı. Thus, Çakıcı's image was maintained.

The first part of Yaşar Kemal's work was important for its aesthetical and formal representation of Çakıcı (Kemal:1956). Yaşar Kemal paid more attention to Çakıcı's character than he did to his stories themselves. He recreated them by limiting his creations to selected actions of Çakıcı and emphasizing their connections within the socio-economic context of the times and region of Çakıcı's operation. The "story of the yörük's daughter" is contained in the second part of the work. It is represented as one of the famous stories which were told to him by Rüştü Kobaş, a retired Ottoman gendarme colonel who claimed that his brother killed Çakıcı upon his order. However, the episodic and stylistic closeness and usage of Zeynel Besim's books as a source by Yaşar Kemal is reflected in the story's

The new element which Murat Sertoğlu added and which Faruk Kenç extended in his movie is not a part of Yaşar Kemal's version. Even if he had added it, it would not have

functioned as Sertoğlu's would have because Yaşar Kemal extended two of Çakıcı's actual, traditionally known and accepted loves (his two wives Raziye and Fatma in an idealized manner. It could be speculated that for this reason, "the story of yörük's daughter is represented in the work of Yaşar Kemal as just "a famous story" which needed to be included in his work for academic purposes.

In contradistinction to Yaşar Kemal's approach, Metin Erksan took the story of yörük's daughter as a main plot of Dokuz Dağın Efesi (Erksan:1958, 1989). Moreover, the new element which was first created by Murat Sertoğlu as Çakıcı's sexual interest in the yörük's daughter, was presented as an unrequited love on her by Kenç and represented in his movie as a tragic cinematic ending, and the first time in a Turkish movie that a person and horse were shown falling over a precipice.

These two plot and cinematic techniques nonetheless paved the way for their particular use and presentation in Metin Erksan's movie. Erksan wished to make "an unusual efe movie," similar to the literally artistic Çakıcı presented by Yaşar Kemal in the printed media. Metin Erksan recreated "the story of the yörük's daughter" by eliminating or changing some of the story's episodes and motifs: the "brother/sister" formula, the dowry, and the Albanian Turks being burned by Çakıcı.

Moreover, he added new episodes which took the

traditional referential meaning of the story out of its normal, already popularly established, socio-cultural framework by showing Çakıcı's marriage to Raziye and his physical displays of passion for her in public and his return from the mountains just to be able to marry Raziye

These new episodes and motifs and their violation of the referential meaning of the story were criticized by the people, and the state banned the movie for public viewing. However, socio-contextual changes in the political arena allowed the movie to be shown in public within a year after the movie's production. In recent years, it has twice shown on state monopolized television stations.

As a result of these changes and the recreations of Çakıcı motifs, particularly by Yaşar Kemal in his written work and Metin Erksan in his movie, Hayrettin Asarcıklı rewrote and recreated Çakıcı Mehmet Efe stories in the form of a novel in his work. The resulting publication was a reaction against the image of Çakıcı as presented in those particular mediated performances. His effort was to keep Çakıcı's behavior as it had originally been given in Sun's book, making Çakıcı a pure nationalist and a great Moslem

Hayrettin Asarcıklı's reproduction was colored by political agenda as well as by the mediated performances of the producers who had gone before. He used Zeynel Besim Sun's organizational style in his book and placed "the story of the yörük's daughter" first, changing the Albanian gang

into an Armenian one.

He also introduced other episodes such as the monetary reward offered by the *yörük* and refused by Çakıcı's suggestion that the reward be shared by his men to compensate them for their effort, time, and "bullets." It is useful to note that Asarcıklı resorted to an Armenian, traditionally symblocial social mannerism of not completely refusing the *yörük's* suggestion (*ikram*) by giving the rest of the reward to the *yörük's* daughter as a dowry) Nonetheless, for all of the new episodes introduced by Asarcıklı, he did retain the "brother/sister" formula Moreover, he employed terminology which suggested that the *yörük* was a middle aged man, while his daughter was a very young girl through Çakıcı's reference to her as "my daughter" (*kızım*) and "sister" (*bacım*). This phraseology functioned to make the "brother/sister" formula stronger. It is also clear that Asarcıklı rejected other versions of the story, such as the *yörük's* being a wealthy *agha* (which is an idea in Erksan's movie), and Çakıcı's simply killing, rather than burning, of the Armenians as presented in other versions of the story; according Islamic folk values, burning someone alive is a terrible sin.

The oral sources also break down the mediated performances. Form of visual or printed media, and plots from movies, are taken back into folklore as genuine parts of the storytelling tradition.

Thus, these are the mediated representations of "the story of the yörük's daughter". It is clear that intertextual relationships exist between them, though not even the strongest intertextualities are exact copies of each other.

The elimination or addition of new episodes and the contexts thereby created, are interpreted by their creators' political orientations which are reflected throughout the productions making each one different from the others.

Every creator show his individual creativity, based on his talents, limitations and technical opportunities which he employed in his printed or visual performances. However, their political agendas, in the larger sense as world view, and specifically as it applies to the recontextualization of "the story of the yörük's daughter," appears as an important manipulative element of the entire process of transmission. One other manipulative element in these transmissions is the various mediating techniques and the variety of their usage by their producers. Transmissional relationships develop as processes and are based on actions: the breaking down of the sources' frames, and the reframing of the medium's printed, visual or oral generic characteristics with individual creativity

In other words, it (the broken frame) can appear in a generic form such as a printed story, novel, movie or oral story. The transferred parts of elements from the broken